X073/701

NATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS 2007

MONDAY, 28 MAY
1.00 PM – 4.00 PM

PHILOSOPHY
ADVANCED HIGHER

Answer **three** questions, **one** from Section A, **one** from Section B, and **one** from Section C.

All questions are assigned 30 marks.

SECTION A

Marks

EPISTEMOLOGY

Candidates must answer ONE question.

1. When you look at your watch and it says 12 o'clock, are you entitled to say you **know** it's 12 o'clock? Explain why Gettier thinks that examples of this kind pose a problem for the tripartite theory of knowledge. Evaluate one attempt to overcome this problem. **(30)**

2. When we "see" a tree, what is it that we really perceive? Discuss with respect to direct and indirect realism. **(30)**

SECTION B

PHILOSOPHY OF MIND

Candidates must answer ONE question.

3. Could a machine made of silicon and metal have a mind? **(30)**

4. Jane claims to have lived a previous life in ancient Egypt. Which of the theories of personal identity that you have studied allow this possibility? Are any of these theories plausible? **(30)**

SECTION C

Marks

Candidates must answer ONE question
EITHER from (i) Social Philosophy
OR from (ii) Logic

(i) SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY

Answer either question 5 or question 6.

5. "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal, that they are endowed . . . with certain inalienable rights . . .". Discuss. **(30)**

OR

6. "Taxation is theft." Discuss with reference to Rawls' and Nozick's theories of justice. **(30)**

[Turn over

(ii) LOGIC

Marks

Answer either question 7 below or question 8 on pages five and six.

7. Answer all parts of this question.

(*a*) Explain carefully with examples whether it is possible for a **valid** argument

(i) to have false premises and a true conclusion

(ii) to have true premises and a false conclusion. **6**

(*b*) Explain whether the following argument is valid or invalid.

All men are equal.

All men are not equal.

Therefore there are no moral facts.

If it is valid, why do philosophers continue to debate the conclusion?

If it is invalid, what **can** be validly concluded from these premises? **4**

(*c*) Use truth-functions to explain clearly the difference between

Candidates need to pass English and either French or German.

and

Candidates need to pass either English and French or German. **2**

(*d*) A set of statements is said to be consistent if it is possible for them all to be true at the same time. Explain how a truth-table test can be used to determine whether or not a set of statements is consistent. **3**

(*e*) Use a truth-table to show whether the following set of statements is consistent:

$(p \,\&\, q), \qquad (q \vee \neg p), \qquad \neg(p \rightarrow q)$ **5**

(*f*) Consider the truth-function p # q defined by:

p	q	p # q
T	T	F
T	F	T
F	T	T
F	F	T

Construct the truth-table for (p & q) # (q v r) **5**

(*g*) Construct a proof using rules of inference for the following argument:

$p \rightarrow q \;\vdash\; \neg(p \,\&\, \neg q)$ **5**

(30)

Marks

OR

8. Answer all parts of this question.

(*a*) For each of the following, say whether it is true or false:

All arguments which are invalid in sentence logic are invalid in predicate logic (set logic).
There are arguments which are invalid in sentence logic, but valid in predicate logic.
There are arguments which are invalid in predicate logic, but valid in sentence logic.

Explain your answers. **4**

(*b*) Define the term "contradictory".

Which of the statements "All spiders are arachnids", "Some spiders are arachnids", and "Some spiders are not arachnids", are contradictory?

Explain how Venn diagrams demonstrate this. **5**

(*c*) How many distinct regions are there in a Venn diagram representing a single statement concerning the relationship between **two** sets?

How many are there in a Venn diagram representing the relationships between **three** sets?

Explain your answers. **3**

(*d*) Can you use Venn diagrams to determine whether or not the following are valid? If so, draw the diagram and explain how it shows validity or invalidity. If not, explain why not.

(i) Every intelligent person has studied logic.
Not all nuclear physicists have studied logic.
So no intelligent people are nuclear physicists. **4**

(ii) Some intelligent people have studied logic.
No nuclear physicists have studied logic.
So no intelligent people are nuclear physicists. **4**

[Turn over for Question 8 (*e*) on *Page six*

Marks

8. (continued)

(*e*) Consider the following arguments. For each one:

- say which logical system is appropriate to test its validity.
- make explicit any missing premises.
- if it is best analysed using statement logic, construct a truth table to show whether or not it is valid.
- if it is best analysed using predicate logic, use a Venn diagram to show whether or not it is valid.
- comment also on any aspects of the argument which cannot be represented logically.

(i) Whenever there's an economic recession the government is defeated, and the present government has become unelectable. So there will be a recession. **3**

(ii) Most trains stop at Preston, but very few passengers want to go there. So if we want the railways to respond to passenger demand, the whole timetable will have to be revised. **7**

(30)

[*END OF QUESTION PAPER*]

[BLANK PAGE]

[BLANK PAGE]