



--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Write your **student number** in the boxes above.

Letter

Philosophy

Question and Answer Book

VCE Examination – Day Date Month Year

- Reading time is **15 minutes**: — to —
- Writing time is **2 hours**: — to —

Materials supplied

- Question and Answer Book of 20 pages

Instructions

- Use the additional space at the end of this book if you need extra space to complete an answer.

Students are **not** permitted to bring mobile phones and/or any unauthorised electronic devices into the examination room.

Contents	pages
Section A (4 questions, 40 marks) _____	2–9
Section B (1 of 3 questions, 20 marks) _____	10–16
Assessment criteria _____	19

Section A

Instructions

- Answer **all** questions in the spaces provided.
- Write your responses in English.
- Each question in Section A is worth 10 marks, to be assessed holistically and with no specific mark allocation for each question part. Your response will be assessed according to the assessment criteria set out on page 19.

Question 1 (10 marks)

[Laelius:] Advice must not be harsh, or criticism offensive. If we are going to flatter ... let it be just a form of courtesy, entirely free of any servile elements ...

Life with a friend is not like life with a tyrant. A man whose ears are so completely closed to the truth that he cannot even hear it from a friend is a hopeless case. Cato spoke shrewdly, as so often, when he remarked, 'In some ways our worst enemies do us greater services than our friends who seem so agreeable: since enemies often tell us the truth, whereas friends never do.'

Certainly it is irrational, if you are criticized, not to feel annoyed when you hear something that warrants annoyance, but to feel furious about a remark which ought not to upset you at all. You are annoyed not because you have done wrong, but because you are blamed for it: whereas what you ought to be feeling sorry about is the wrong you have done and when it is corrected you ought to be glad.

So it is an essential feature of genuine friendship both to offer advice and receive it.

Source: Cicero (trans. Michael Grant), *On the Good Life*, Penguin Classics, UK, 1971, p. 221

- a. With reference to the passage above, outline why Laelius believes that it is important that friends tell each other the truth.

Do not write in this area.

Question 2 (10 marks)

If we were to try to establish a kind of hierarchy among men, we would put those who are denuded of this living warmth—the tepidity which the Gospel speaks of—on the lowest rung of the ladder. To exist is to *make oneself* a lack of being; it is to *cast oneself* into the world. Those who occupy themselves in restraining this original movement can be considered as sub-men. They have eyes and ears, but from their childhood on they make themselves blind and deaf, without love and without desire. This apathy manifests a fundamental fear in the face of existence, in the face of the risks and tensions which it implies. The sub-man rejects this “passion” which is his human condition, the laceration and the failure of that drive toward being which always misses its goal, but which thereby is the very existence which he rejects.

Source: Simone de Beauvoir (trans. Bernard Frechtman), *The Ethics of Ambiguity*, Open Road Integrated Media, New York, 2018, p. 45

- a. Outline de Beauvoir’s argument in the passage above that the life of the sub-man is not an authentic life.

- b. How might **one** other thinker studied in Unit 3 respond to de Beauvoir’s argument?

Question 4 (10 marks)

I mentioned our awareness of our own cognitive limitations, our feeble powers. We can only see what is here and now, and that only to a limited extent. Our memories even of this are less than total and often corrupt, and our inferential powers are feeble. A superior being, one who lacked our cognitive limitations, and could do all the work herself, in finding out about the universe, could be epistemically autonomous in a way that no one of us, with our limited research time and processing capacities, is able to be. She would not need to take anything on trust from another’s word, because she would have the epistemic power to check up, to find out for herself about everything she wanted to know, without reliance on others. We are not such beings, and so we can extend our knowledge beyond a small base only through rational trust in the spoken or written word of others.

Source: E Fricker, 'Testimony and Epistemic Autonomy' in *The Epistemology of Testimony*, Clarendon Press, 2006, p. 240

- a. In the passage above, E Fricker uses a thought experiment involving a ‘superior being’ to present an argument about the relationship between experience, testimony and rational formation of belief. Outline this argument.

- b. Compare E Fricker’s view about why it is rational to accept another person’s testimony with the view expressed by **one** other thinker studied in Unit 4.

Section B

Instructions

- Write an essay in response to **one** of the following questions in the space provided on pages 11–16.
 - Write your response in English.
 - The question in Section B is worth 20 marks, to be assessed holistically according to the assessment criteria set out on page 19.
-

Question 1 (20 marks)

On what basis should we accept the testimonies of others?

Discuss this question using viewpoints and arguments from **two** thinkers studied in Unit 4, using a case study you have studied this year as your central example.

OR

Question 2 (20 marks)

'We have a responsibility to express beliefs that improve the lives of ourselves and others.'

Discuss this statement using viewpoints and arguments from **two** thinkers studied in Unit 4, using a case study you have studied this year as your central example.

OR

Question 3 (20 marks)

'We should never fear having our beliefs challenged.'

Discuss this statement using viewpoints and arguments from **two** thinkers studied in Unit 4, using a case study you have studied this year as your central example.

Do not write in this area.

SAMPLE

Do not write in this area.

Do not write in this area.

SAMPLE

SAMPLE

Do not write in this area.

Do not write in this area.

SAMPLE

SAMPLE

Do not write in this area.

SAMPLE

Do not write in this area.

If you use any additional Question and Answer Books to complete your responses, write your **student number** on the front cover. At the end of the examination, place the additional Question and Answer Books inside the front cover of the first Question and Answer Book.

Assessment criteria

Section A

Each of the four 10-mark questions in Section A will be assessed against the following criteria:

- understanding of philosophical concepts, arguments, viewpoints and/or perspectives, as expressed within the extract / set texts and as relevant to the demands of the question
- understanding of connections, similarities and differences between arguments, viewpoints or perspectives, as expressed within the extract / set texts and as relevant to the demands of the question
- evaluation and/or critical comparison of relevant arguments, viewpoints or perspectives, and/or the formulation of a justified philosophical position that addresses the demands of the question
- plausibility, coherence and development of a reasoned and supported response that addresses the specific demands of the question
- use of clear and precise language appropriate to philosophy

Section B

The 20-mark essay response in Section B will be assessed against the following criteria:

- knowledge and understanding of philosophical concepts, viewpoints, arguments and perspectives, as expressed in the set texts and relevant to the topic
 - evaluation and critical comparison of arguments, viewpoints or perspectives as relevant, and formulation of a justified philosophical position in response to the topic
 - knowledge and use of a relevant case study
 - plausibility, coherence and development of a reasoned and supported discussion that addresses the specific demands of the topic and integrates relevant material
 - use of clear and precise language appropriate to philosophy
-

