3.1 The philosophical analysis

Name: _____ Class: _____ Date: _____ **Total: 24 marks**

KEY WORDS stimulus • objection

The philosophical analysis

Objective

Choose a non-philosophical stimulus, draw a philosophical issue from it with the framing sentence, and develop the 2 000-word analysis – concept applied, objection answered, conclusion owned (the internal assessment).

1 Key knowledge and worked examples

> **Analysis toolkit.** The stimulus: non-philosophical, specific, the student's own (a photo, an advert, a cartoon, a lyric). The issue: philosophical (reasoning-answerable, not pollable) and genuinely drawn from the stimulus. The framing sentence: stimulus, concept, question in one line. Treatment: explain the concept with attribution, apply to the stimulus's specific features, develop the student's own argument, answer the strongest objection, conclude owning limits. Voice: a pursued line, not a gallery of names, not a report. 2 000 words; marked on treatment, personal engagement, clarity.

2 Practice

2.1 State the two tests a stimulus must pass. [2]

2.2 What makes a question philosophical rather than empirical? [2]

2.3 Name the four components of the treatment. [2]

2.4 What is the "philosophical gallery" failure of an analysis? [2]

2.5 What does the conclusion of the worked analysis own? [2]

3 Exam-style questions

3.1 *(Framing style.)* A cartoon shows a commuter stepping over a rough sleeper outside a luxury shop window. Write the framing sentence for an analysis of this stimulus, and name the concept and the question. [4]

3.2 *(Treatment style.)* Develop the treatment's first move: the duty–charity concept (deontology's imperfect duties and consequentialism's demandingness) applied to the window and the sleeper. [6]

3.3 *(Objection style.)* State the singer's-pond objection to the worked analysis and draft the reply. [4]

Solutions

2.1 Non-philosophical (not already philosophy: no textbook extracts, no lifted thought experiments) and specific and the student's own (rich in issue, chosen freely) (2).

2.2 Philosophical questions are answerable by reasoning (conceptual analysis, argument), whereas empirical questions are settled by observation or measurement (2).

2.3 Explain the concept (with attribution); apply it to the stimulus; develop the argument; consider the objection – with the conclusion following (2 for three or four).

2.4 The gallery: five philosophers toured by name with no argument of the student's own: names where reasoning belongs (2).

2.5 That the reading is one reading: the image supports others, and the analysis states that limit rather than claiming the only interpretation (2).

3.1 Model framing: "This photograph raises the question of whether the ordinary duty to help survives when the helper's own plans must be sacrificed" (2). Concept: duty versus charity – the supererogation question (imperfect duties, demandingness) (1). Question: is the commuter's failure a moral failure or an institutional indictment? (1).

3.2 Deontology: duties of aid are imperfect – real but not specifiable as owed to each person at each moment; the maxim of walking past cannot be willed universally, but neither can a maxim of limitless giving (2). Consequentialism: the arithmetic of the window (the good life displayed against the person unseen) makes the failure look enormous, and this is the demandingness objection (how much must morality demand?) (2). Application: the image's STRUCTURE is the problem – the window frames the sleeper out, an arrangement that trains the eye; the commuter inherits a situation the institution made (2).

3.3 Objection (the singer's pond): if you would wade in to save a drowning child at the cost of your shoes, distance and salience cannot change the duty – the commuter is the passer-by, the sleeper the child (2). Reply: the pond is an individual emergency; the window is an institutional arrangement – the duty's addressee differs, and the image indicts the arrangement, not the passer-by; the analysis owns that a pond-reading of the same image is possible (2).

Local review guidance: the framing sentence names stimulus, concept AND question in one line; (R1 3.2) apply to the image's specific features, not the general topic; (R1 3.3) the reply concedes what the objection gets right before dividing. Authored guidance.