	Part 1 Max 60		Part 2 Max 40			Total points
CODE	Task 1	Task 2	Task 1	Task 2	Task 3	
	Max 30	Max 30	Max 10	Max 10	Max 20	Max 100

To be completed by the Jury. Participants are not allowed to make notes!

PHILOSOPHY

10th Grade

to be completed within 120 minutes

Maximum score – 100 points

Part 1. *(maximum grade - 60 points)*

Contemporary philosophers often engage in thought experiments in order to verify their own hypotheses, refute their opponents or find new solutions to well-known problems. Please consider one of the famous thought experiments below. Read the text and answer the questions.

Task 1. *(30 points)*

Imagine that there's a computer programme, which can converse so well that the majority of people don't recognize that they are talking with a programme rather than a real person. Even when you suspect that your conversation partner might be a computer programme and try to expose this fact, you still can't finally decide whether you are conversing with a person or a computer.

After this programme has successfully passed all tests, it is made part of an operating system used to control robots. Soon an android is created, which has all the appearances of a real person and able to communicate and act like a human being.

Now, imagine you are a member of the team tasked with testing this android's ability to appear and act like an everyday person.

Can you suggest a reliable way of distinguishing this android from a real person? If such an android was real, would it be considered as having a consciousness? If this android is capable of self-awareness, should people grant it rights and make it a full-fledged member of human society? Justify your answer.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Task 2. *(maximum grade - 30 points)*

Imagine the following: in the future, doctors learn how to transplant organs with a 100% success rate. Therefore, if a person needs a kidney or lung transplant, they can receive healthy organs from a donor without having to spend a lot of time on expensive therapy. However, there's one complication – there are not enough donor organs even now, and this will inevitably complicate the situation with transplants in the future. How can the needs of sick people be met in a society where the value of every life is equally high? For instance, when there is only one healthy donor for several patients needing a transplant, and doctors might have to remove the potential donor's necessary organs to save the ailing people.

Consider the following: by sacrificing one person (let's say a healthy person), we can save the lives of several people – two, three or even a dozen of patients, by transplanting the former's organs. In order to avoid abuse of the donor selection process, a lottery is set up: donors can be selected at random by an unbiased computer programme.

If the lives of all people are equal, what would prevent us from introducing such a lottery? Is it permissible, in moral terms, to sacrifice the life of one person for several? Would you

agree to the results of such a lottery, if you were selected as a donor at random? Justify your answer, citing your understanding of ethical theory.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Part 2. *(maximum grade - 40 points)*

Solve the logical problems and explain your reasoning.

Task 1. *(10 points)*

Answer the question and justify your position in terms of logic. What is the logically correct conclusion of the following argument?

It is well known that all philosophers tend to read a lot. And it is believed that any person who thinks about eternal questions is a philosopher. However, no person who thinks about eternal questions can give a direct answer to the question of the necessity of evil. Therefore…

1) anybody who can give a simple answer to the question of the necessity of evil reads a lot.
2) some of those who can give a simple answer to the question of the necessity of evil read a lot.
3) none of those who can give a simple answer to the question of the necessity of evil reads a lot.
4) none of those who read a lot can give a simple answer to the question of the necessity of evil.

5) some of those who read a lot cannot give a simple answer to the question of the necessity of evil.
6) none of the above.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Task 2. *(10 points)*

Answer the question and justify your position in terms of logic. What is the logically correct conclusion of the following argument?

If the world is endless, this means it has no boundary. If the world can be known in its entirety, it means it has a boundary. We know that the world either is endless or our knowledge of it can be perfect. Therefore…

1. the world has no boundaries.
2. the world cannot be known in its entirety.
3. the world has no borders or it is impossible to be known in its entirety.
4. the world can be known in its entirety.
5. knowledge of the world can't be perfect.
6. none of the above

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

4

_____
_____
_____

Task 3. *(20 points)*

My friend's family has a tradition: on even numbered days, they always tell the truth, while on odd-numbered days, they always lie. Yesterday, he said: "Tomorrow, I will tell the truth". Today, he said that he's 18 years old. But the day before yesterday, he said he was 81 years old.

What is his real age? Justify your answer relying on logical arguments.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____