
A-LEVEL PHILOSOPHY

PHIL1 An Introduction to Philosophy 1
Mark scheme

2170
June 2014

Version: 0.1 Final

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

Philosophy Unit 1: An Introduction to Philosophy 1

General Guidance for Examiners

Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The generic mark scheme must be used consistently across all questions. The question-specific mark scheme will indicate a variety of material and approaches that a candidate is likely to use. It is not, however, prescriptive. Alternative responses are possible and should be credited if appropriate.

It will be found that when applying the generic mark scheme, many responses will display features of different levels. Examiners must exercise their judgement. In locating the appropriate band, examiners must look to the best-fit or dominant descriptors. Marks should then be adjusted within that band according to the following criteria:

- understanding of philosophical positions
- accuracy and detail of arguments
- quality of illustrative material
- grasp of technical vocabulary where appropriate
- quality of written communication

It must be noted that quality of written communication should only determine a level in cases where the meaning of a response is obscured. In most cases it will determine adjustments within a level.

It must also be emphasised that, although the question-specific mark scheme is not proscriptive, examiners must familiarise themselves with its content. Examiners must recognise creditworthy material and the subject-specific mark scheme is an important tool for achieving this.

Generic mark scheme for questions with a total of 15 marks**AO1: Knowledge and understanding****Level 2 5–9 marks**

At the top end of the level there will be a clear, detailed and precise understanding of the relevant philosophical issues. Lower down the level, responses will be accurate and focused but may lack balance. At the bottom end there may be some blurring of distinctions, but one issue will be clearly explained.

Level 1 1–4 marks

The explanation will lack detail, or the detail may be narrow and/or only partially addresses the question. Blurring or conflation of issues may result in some lack of clarity. There may be significant omissions. At the bottom end of the level responses may be vague, unfocused or fragmentary.

0 marks

Nothing worthy of credit

AO2: Interpretation, analysis and application**Level 2 4–6 marks**

At the top end of the level, the illustration(s) or example(s) will be clear and have a precise bearing on the issues being explained. Relevance will be apparent. At the lower end of the level, one illustration may be treated precisely with another illustration treated briefly, with only a partial grasp in evidence.

Level 1 1–3 marks

Where two illustrations are required, one may be clear and precise but the second confused or absent. Alternatively, there may be a blurring of points and their relevance to the explanation is not apparent. At the lower end of the level, examples will lack detail and clarity and may fail to serve their purpose. If only one illustration is required it will be vague or only partially succeed in achieving its purpose.

0 marks

Nothing worthy of credit

Generic mark scheme for questions with a total of 30 marks**Level 6 26–30 marks**

Relevant philosophical issues will be analysed and positions clearly and precisely explained. The analysis and use of examples will proceed from a secure knowledge base. Evaluation must be present and will show sophistication and direct engagement of the issues. The relation between argument and conclusion will be clear.

The response is written in a fluent and sophisticated style with minimal, if any errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar. The response will read as a coherent whole.

Level 5 22–25 marks

Relevant philosophical issues will be analysed and explained but there may be some imprecision. Examples will be deployed effectively but their implications may not be made fully apparent. Evaluation must be present but may lack philosophical impact, or it may be penetrating over a limited range of material. Knowledge and understanding of the issues will be apparent but not always fully exploited.

The response is legible, employing technical language accurately and appropriately, with few, if any errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar. The response reads as a coherent and integrated whole.

Level 4 16–21 marks

The response will explain and analyse some relevant material but positions might be juxtaposed rather than critically compared. Relevance will generally be sustained, though there may be occasional tangents at the lower end of the level. Knowledge of issues will be present but may lack depth and/or precision. Evaluative points are likely to be underdeveloped or applied to a limited range of material and may not be convincing. Examples are likely to be used descriptively rather than critically.

The response is legible, employing technical language accurately and appropriately, with few, if any errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar.

Level 3 10–15 marks

Responses in this level may be short or of limited scope. There may be narrow focus on one aspect or a range of issues may be referred to with limited understanding or analysis. Evaluation may be replaced by assertion or counter-suggestion. Sporadic insights may be present but they would lack development. Some knowledge will be present but it is likely to either lack detail and precision, or will not be analysed or evaluated. This is likely to feature at the lower end of the level.

The response is legible, employing some technical language accurately, with possibly some errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar.

Level 2 5–9 marks

There may be a basic or philosophically unsophisticated grasp of some issues. Analysis may be predominantly simple and/or lack clarity in places. There may be errors of reasoning and understanding. Evaluation, if present, will lack penetration or be very narrowly confined. The response may lack overall purpose and may fail to directly address the relevant issues. At the lower end of the level, the response may be disjointed.

Technical language is limited in its employment or used inappropriately. The response may not be legible and errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar may be intrusive.

Level 1 1–4 marks

There may be an extremely basic awareness of one relevant point without development or analysis. The response may be tangential with an accidental reference to a relevant point. Errors of understanding are likely to be intrusive. Fragments of knowledge will feature in this level.

Technical language is not employed or is employed inappropriately. The response may not be legible and errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar are intrusive.

0 marks

Nothing worthy of credit

Theme 1: Reason and experience

Total for this question: 45 marks

0 1

Explain and illustrate **two** reasons for holding the view that at birth the mind is a tabula rasa (blank slate).

[15 marks]

Two reasons, and illustrations, will probably draw from the following:

Expect some explanation or interpretation of the term ‘tabula rasa’ eg as a term employed within empiricism; as a view of the mind as a piece of white paper devoid of any characters (Locke); as a view of the mind as a ‘blank slate’ or, perhaps, an ‘empty cabinet’. Some may briefly develop an explanation of the term as the view that there are no innate ideas or as the view that all of our ideas and/or non-trivial knowledge derive from sensory experience and reflection on sensory experience.

Reasons are likely to be drawn from Locke or Hume:

- Locke’s view that if a proposition is innate its component elements must be innate – but there are no such innate elements. So that eg $2+3=5$ is not innate because the ideas of two, three, five, addition and equality are not innate.
- Staying with Locke, if a proposition is innate it would be present at birth in which case all would know it – but children and idiots do not possess the abstract ideas that appear in eg the laws of logic, such as ‘it is impossible for the same thing to be and not be’. Similarly, the idea of God is not universal etc.
- If innate propositions were discovered once the ability to reason is developed, and they are unlocked, there would be no difference between innate maxims and any theorems that mathematicians deduce from them – all would be innate.
- Alternatively, reason can’t ‘discover’ anything that we allegedly ‘knew before’.
- Examples of other propositions which may be held to be innate, such as ‘the square on the hypotenuse...’ for example, which in fact are drawn out through reason and are demonstrated or proven. There may be criticisms of Plato’s argument in the *Meno*.
- Similarly, other self-evident, or necessarily true, propositions that may be universally assented to are not innate because they involve ideas drawn from experience – ‘whatever is white all over is not black all over’ is not innate because it requires ideas of white black and difference.
- Examples of where sensory impairment and/or an inability to reflect deprive us of certain ideas, suggesting that all ideas derive from experience. Hume’s examples might feature: a blind man has no idea of colour, a deaf man of sound; a man with a selfish heart can’t conceive of the heights of generosity etc.
- Abstract ideas that don’t seem to come from sense experience – eg God – are merely the augmentation without limit of ideas which are drawn from sense experience (Hume again).
- Hume’s challenge: to find an idea that is not derived from experience.
- Human infants appear to lack basic concepts such as object permanence (Piaget).

No marks are available for critical/evaluative accounts although relevant knowledge and understanding in such accounts should be rewarded.

0 2 'All of the concepts we have are derived from sense experience.' Discuss.

[30 marks]

This claim will probably be identified as an empiricist approach to the acquisition of concepts – interpreted as being (roughly) the same as the “ideas” discussed by early modern philosophers – the view that all of our ideas are acquired through experience (and reflection on experience). There may be references to Locke and/or Hume. It is possible that some students may feel that they have provided a background in their response to the 15-mark question in which case some may refer explicitly to what they’ve said in response to question 01 (eg ‘as already noted...’).

Expect the following points of discussion:

- A contrast with the view that some concepts are innate or gained through reasoning (either deduction or intuition).

Support for the view:

- A more developed outline of empiricism: Locke and/or Hume in more detail.
- Specific criticisms of innatism; eg of Plato and the view that there is a metaphysical realm the soul inhabited prior to birth in which the forms were known.
- Examples of concepts that can be derived from experiential input – particularly in relation to claims that are typically proposed as examples of innate ideas (eg the idea of God, the idea of necessary connection – Hume).
- The view sets a clear limit on which concepts are legitimate (and which are merely convenient fictions) and allows us to proceed without getting distracted by empty metaphysical speculation.
- The view reflects our experience of learning, where the acquisition of concepts is acquired through new experiences.

Weaknesses of the view:

- Do all the concepts we have require an experiential grounding? Does talk about eg God, the self, universals, morality, causation etc. escape the empiricist framework?
- Some ideas may be regarded as innate, (eg a Euclidean straight line, God, ethical concepts). The view is problematic in relation to general terms or universals: we need to have the general concept in order to recognise particulars as members of that class (Plato and/or Socrates and the slave boy)
- The conceptual scheme under which our experience of the world is subsumed is acquired via experience and something else. The active power of the mind in shaping our knowledge. Hume’s account in particular is too passive.
Innate categories or concepts or forms of intuitions: space, time, unity, causation etc (Kant).
- Some support for innate concepts may be given through reference to nativism, genetic dispositions etc. There could be references to Leibniz, Chomsky, Pinker and/or evolutionary psychology.
- Some ideas, (eg the idea of a missing shade of blue) do not appear to derive from sense experience.
- For Hume, ideas and mental images are pretty much the same thing. But at least some concepts are best viewed as skills or propensities rather than as mental images, eg having the concept of ‘wisdom’ is the ability to distinguish between the wise and the unwise. It barely makes sense to say that concepts of this kind are mere copies of sense impressions.
- If all my ideas derive from my sense experience and all your ideas derive from your sense experience, we can never share the same idea or employ a concept which means the same thing. There may be references to solipsism.

It could be argued that:

- An exhaustive account of our concepts (at least those which aren't fictions) can be given in experiential terms alone. All else is 'sophistry and illusion'.
- Conceptual schemes are linguistically determined and culturally relative (Sapir-Whorf). The concepts we possess are acquired through our experience of the culture we inhabit. We learned the meaning of pain when we learned language: if a lion could speak we wouldn't understand it (Wittgenstein).
- Certain concepts that we possess do not seem to be acquired through experience (eg God, the self or 'I', universals, time, space, physical object, causation, morality etc).
- What is 'given' in experience is testimony to the existence of certain (synthetic *a priori*) principles which govern our experience of the world.
- Experience merely 'triggers' certain concepts: experience would be unintelligible unless some concepts were presupposed.
- Certain concepts are innate and universal: without them experience would be a blooming, buzzing confusion (Kant, James).

Theme 2: Why should I be governed?**Total for this question: 45 marks****0 | 3**

Illustrating your answer explain **one** criticism of the view that in a state of nature people live together peacefully, in perfect freedom and equality.

[15 marks]

Some may begin with an explanation of the concept of 'a state of nature': eg a fictional device employed to illustrate why the existence of the State is in our interests; or to illustrate what lies beneath political society; or to suggest that it is our actual past.

The view in question, that a state of nature is a state in which natural moral laws are present and generally prevail in human relations so that people are able to live together peacefully, according to reason, in perfect freedom and equality without superiors (on earth) to judge them, is Locke's. One criticism of the view might be drawn from:

- Whether the account offered by Locke is consistent or coherent: he refers to both the 'inconvenience' of not having a body to enforce the moral law as well as to the 'executive power of the law of nature'.
- The moral law requires a moral lawgiver (God). Suppose there is no moral lawgiver? The 'rights' (to life, liberty, health and property) envisaged by Locke may simply be social convention.
- What Locke is describing isn't a state of nature; rather it is civil society minus the State. Moreover, it is a relatively affluent society, characterised by abundance rather than scarcity. Consequently, it is difficult to see how the concept could apply universally.
- Is life in a state of nature relatively ordered, rational, moral and harmonious or is it inconveniently less than peaceful? If the former then the justification for the existence of the State appears to be weak; if the latter then Locke's view of humanity may be less accurate than that proposed by either Hobbes or Rousseau.
- Similarly, this view of the outcome of the perfect freedom enjoyed by people in a state of nature may be challenged: as negative freedom it is unlikely to generate a progressive view of either people or society given that, rather than living together, people are isolated (Rousseau); alternatively, at least in conditions of scarcity, it is less likely to generate peace than a war of all against all as each are equally free to pursue interests (Hobbes).
- Would the condition of people in a state of nature differ from that of a non-human animal in a state of nature? In non-human animal 'societies' it isn't clear that peace or equality are present.
- If Locke's view is based on evidence (he does make some reference to American Indian cultures) does he neglect how authority can be rooted in social structures, based on eg age or gender, rather than rational-legal, political structures? Don't these impact on freedom and equality?

Depending on the point made, illustrations may focus on what life would be (or is) like when (human) authority is absent eg in fictional accounts (such as 'Lord of the Flies'), or in Hobbes (the solitary, nasty, brutish and short nature of existence) or in actual societies (such as Syria at present, London during the riots etc). Alternatively, a lack of peace or equality or (positive) freedom may be identified in social groups without government (via the role of 'chiefs', elders, witchdoctors or via a lack of opportunity due to the absence of law or, perhaps, through references to physical power whether human or non-human).

Descriptions of alternative accounts of life in a state of nature should clarify what the criticism of the view in question is.

0 4 'The use of unlawful conduct for political purposes cannot be justified'. Discuss.

[30 marks]

Unlawful conduct may involve civil disobedience or direct action. Our justification for using such conduct should be seen in moral terms. It is likely that most responses will focus on civil disobedience (as this is more accessible in the philosophical literature).

Expect the following points of discussion:

The claim in question may be dismissed on the grounds that we possess a right of dissent. This may be justified through:

- More developed *descriptions* of what civil disobedience involves. Rawls' description is likely to feature: public, non-violent, conscientious action, aimed at changing a law or policy, without undermining political stability and the rule of law, through appealing to a wider societal sense of justice.
- Similarly, Rawls' account of when civil disobedience is *justified* may be seen to impose some limits on what a just action would involve. It is justified when a law or policy poses a significant threat to liberty or equality; when normal political appeals have failed or met with indifference; when it doesn't spread so that political stability is undermined; it is public, not covert – the authorities will be informed in advance of the actions taken.
The rider that while one may have a right on these grounds it may not be prudent to exercise it may also be seen as a pragmatic limit to what can and what can't be justified.
- Unlawful conduct may be justified if the state is acting unlawfully.

The claim in question may be dismissed on grounds involving the nature and role of the State

- Protest through direct action does seek to challenge established cultural, economic and political orders. Direct action is associated with new social movements which adopt a moral stance aimed at changing values and lifestyles through active participation. Direct action has been associated with the extension of rights (feminist, anti-racist, gay and animal rights movements) and the protection of the environment (greens, eco-warriors).
- The *justification* for direct action is more contentious. The established order may be seen as repressive, materialistic, patriarchal, racist etc. and, against this, the idea that the personal is political has been used. Active participation to improve or protect the quality of society, and of one's individual life, is seen as empowering. Some groups are prepared to use various forms of violence – against what they see as state violence – to achieve a desired end. The established order is seen as too bureaucratic and remote to deal with local issues adequately (eg concerns about the impact of a by-pass on an area) and too powerless to deal with global issues adequately (eg global warming, famine etc).
- It might be argued that secular law does not possess the authority to prohibit actions aimed at realising God's law – this may be linked to protests associated with various fundamentalisms.

Some might point out that while we may have a right to exercise dissent this may itself be subject to various constraints:

- While one might have a right of dissent in principle it isn't always prudent to exercise that right: if unlawful conduct is designed to appeal to a sense of justice in the majority and the chances are that actions might fail to do so then it is difficult to justify the action/irrational to undertake the action.
- Unlawful conduct may not be justified if a law, or policy, does not infringe the liberty and rights of citizens – if the law is not clearly an unjust law.
- It may not be justifiable if lawful attempts to redress an unjust law or policy have not been made – ie when unlawful conduct is not employed as a last resort.
- It may not be justifiable if a sense of injustice extends to so many that the scale of action threatens serious disorder or a crisis of legitimacy (unlawful conduct is not revolution).

- It may not be justifiable if actual law does not conflict with natural law and/or as a private action taken on grounds of individual conscience when an individual feels they have a higher duty than to obey the law (as the act is no longer a public act).
- It may not be justifiable where laws or policies enacted by the state do not exceed its legitimate role and/or do not contradict or infringe core principles of justice.

Some might seek to place a limit on the kind of unlawful conduct that could be justified:

- Violent protest may be thought to be unjustifiable, partly because it won't be successful in winning hearts and minds but mainly because it does not exhibit fidelity to the law in general.
- Similarly, all unlawful conduct may be unjustifiable if the group or groups involved are unwilling to accept punishment for infringements of the law as this does not exhibit fidelity to the law.

Some may claim that unlawful conduct is *never* justified:

- All unlawful conduct weakens the rule of law generally and that, because we all benefit from political order and stability, it is not in our interests to engage in unlawful conduct.
- That, despite the moral grounds involved, it is never appropriate to violate law. Law is divorced from morality.

Any position reached, in relation, to the question is likely to follow from one or more of the above lines of argument. Beyond this it might also be argued that:

- The end may justify the means but whether the means are likely to be successful in securing the end is much less clear.
- Concepts like rights, justice, autonomy, equality etc are more important than law and order and the latter can be challenged when the former are threatened.
- These concepts may also impose limits on the form and extent of unlawful conduct we might use.
- There is no limit to dissent or to the form unlawful protest might take. Attempts to impose a limit undermine what they try to uphold.
- Even in a democracy, the legislative process is necessarily imperfect, creating the possibility of unjust laws that need to be challenged.

Theme 3: Why should I be moral?

Total for this question: 45 marks

0 5	Explain and illustrate the claim that universal moral principles are too abstract to guide action.
-----	--

[15 marks]

It is likely that the reference to universal moral principles will lead candidates to discuss (relevant) objections to Kantian ethics. However, the question can be interpreted as being more open than this so that it would also be legitimate to refer to a wider range of moral theories:

- Some may refer to different formulations of the categorical imperative: eg universality and treating people as ends. For example, preserving life may fit the former but may be difficult to reconcile with the latter. The obvious illustration would be when euthanasia is voluntarily requested by a rational agent. (Similar claims may be directed at Plato's theory of forms).
- Alternatively, universality may be difficult to interpret. Does eg preserving life merely require me not to kill others or commit suicide or does it require me to prevent others from killing or committing suicide? Should I be prepared to intervene when life is threatened ('Jim and the Indians' might be referenced) or when actions which may shorten life are undertaken (smoking, binge drinking or eating, mountain climbing etc)?
- Similarly, treating people as ends in themselves may be difficult to interpret. Does an under-achiever require assistance or punishment? Aren't both equally consistent with the universal principle?
- Imperfect duties (developing talents and helping others) may present difficulties: eg how many talents, which ones and how far etc?
- The most likely point, perhaps, is the apparent conflict between two perfect duties: preserve life and tell the truth. Kant's own example of the axe murderer is likely to feature. Alternatively, some may refer to Kant's neglect of human bonds, sympathy and emotions.
- Universal moral principles fail to take account of the range of conditions which prevail within different human societies. These conditions will affect what promotes human well-being and what is morally justifiable (eg the freedom to have as many children as you want might be morally justified in most circumstances but not where there is over population – China).
- Ethical egoism (the principle that I should always act in my own interests) may provide an alternative answer. Insofar as this is teleological, will I always know which actions are in my interest? If I'm asked for moral advice is it clear what I should say?
- There is scope for a discussion of some 'virtues' if it is suggested that these are universal rather than relative to societies: eg the belief that courage is a virtue, coupled with the desire to be virtuous and a situation in which *either* it isn't clear what the courageous thing to do is *or* in which there is a potential clash with other virtues (such as temperance) *or* that there is more than one potentially virtuous action and one can't perform both.
- If utilitarianism is referred to various difficulties might be referenced: eg the potential for a clash between act and rule versions of the theory; difficulties of measuring pleasure or happiness; difficulties of knowing the outcome of an action etc.
- Alternatives, such as act utilitarianism and/or virtue ethics if referred to should be related to the question: universal principles are too formal or rigid to guide actions so it would be more realistic if the morality of each action were assessed; both act utilitarians and the virtuous may act differently on separate occasions.

Some illustrations are indicated above, others may be drawn from the literature (eg Sartre's student) but candidates' own examples should be rewarded if they illustrate a relevant point.

No marks are available for evaluation although relevant knowledge and understanding in such accounts should be rewarded.

0 6 'It is always in my interest to conform to moral conventions to which I have contractually agreed.'
Discuss.

[30 marks]

The general idea is that there is no conflict between a contractual approach to ethics and egoism (defined in terms of psychological, enlightened or rational self-interest): indeed conforming to moral conventions and self-interest might be seen to be synonymous. A specific focus could *either* be given to one *or* to both of the two phrases in the question: will it always be in my interests to adhere to moral conventions and/or to what extent is it the case that moral conventions are a product of a contractual agreement?

Expect discussion to cover *some* of the following issues:

What does 'in my interest' amount to?

- It isn't the same as being selfish, given that people who are openly selfish are often disliked and mistrusted. If this is so then moral behaviour, including an altruistic concern for or sympathy towards others, may be the best course of action. It surely isn't accidental that phrases like 'honesty is the best policy' persist. So, perhaps acting in accordance with the moral rules I contract into is always 'the best policy' and maximises my self-interest in the long run.
- Why else would I make contractual agreements?

Why is it in my interest to contractually agree to moral conventions?

- Hobbes is likely to feature: expect bleak accounts of life in a state of nature so that it is rational for an enlightened egoist to want to escape it and rational to expect others to want to do the same.
- Others provide less bleak accounts of life in the state of nature (Locke, Rousseau) but nevertheless find positive reasons for making contractual arrangements with our fellows eg Rousseau's vision might be linked to an increase in positive freedom or to human development; Locke's to the convenience of having an authority to resolve disputes, decide and inflict appropriate punishment etc.
- Examples from game theory, such as the prisoner's dilemma, may also be employed to suggest that mutual co-operation is advantageous. Gauthier's idea of a 'constrained maximiser': someone who is open to the rewards of cooperation potentially furthers his self-interest to a greater extent than someone who does not.

What is the basis of any contractual obligations I have?

- Whether I have *actually* made a contractual agreement with others and, if not, in what sense do I agree to moral conventions? Tacitly? Hypothetically?
- If we say *hypothetically* would this equate with the conventions that *actually* exist? To what extent do eg Rawls' principles apply?
- If we say *tacitly* to what extent do I conform to moral conventions?

Do contracts produce specifically *moral* conventions?

- Even if (at some point in the past) a contract was made did it include moral conventions? Even if it did, is it likely that all moral conventions would be covered?
- Is this really what morality amounts to? Is it the case that morality can be described purely in terms of self-interest and mutual advantage?
- Can morality be the product of a contract? Don't we need moral principles in order to make a contract? What we (would be prepared to) contract to must be the product of some pre-existing beliefs and values about what constitutes a worthwhile life. Contracts presuppose law and law may presuppose morality.
- Given differences in the contractual approach (concerning why we make a contract, who we make a contract with and/or what we contract to) this approach leaves the question of what our motivation to be moral is open.

- Do outsiders, or those who cannot express consent, have no moral rights? Can we treat them as we please? If we are unlikely to abuse those outside of the contract, why is this?
- Where contractual agreements are made between the powerful and the powerless resulting moral principles are likely to favour the powerful and, consequently, it will not obviously be in the interests of the powerless to honour them.
- We can identify social conventions in different times and places that seem to us to be immoral.

Does the fact – if it were a fact – of a contractual agreement mean that it ought to be honoured?

- There may be references to the fact-value gap.
- What if I can get away with not doing so? There must be occasions where this would be in my interests. There may be references to ‘the ring of Gyges’ and to the strengths and weaknesses of Plato’s argument: similarly, there might be references to the death of Socrates.
- How far would ‘free-riding’ be ruled out by contractual arrangements?

A range of argumentation is possible. For example:

- Some are likely to question whether conforming to moral conventions out of self-interest or mutual advantage is a genuinely *moral* motivation for action.
- This might lead to an argument for an alternative approach. If it is accepted that self-interest could be a moral motivation then some might argue that eg virtue ethics provides a more convincing account of this. If it is rejected then some might argue that our moral sentiments are, in some sense, natural (eg Hume, Evolutionary Biology) or functional (leading to the survival of society).
- Some might question whether moral principles are captured in the idea of a relativistic convention. This might be extended to a critique of cultural or moral relativism. We do criticise other societies (and our own society at a different time) on moral grounds: we do argue that some things (eg slavery) are morally wrong rather than simply accept that, by convention, they are morally right for that society. This could be linked to a claim that it would not be *right* to honour those conventions even if they were in my interests or those of a majority (or powerful minority).
- This might lead some to defend a view of morality that is divorced from self-interest and which provides a more convincing account of why the moral conventions that exist do exist.
- It might be argued that self-interest is compatible with an (impartial) regard for justice and fairness – some might see Rawls as achieving this.
- Some are likely to argue that we do (or should) act self-interestedly and, because of this, there are occasions when we would (or should) ignore moral conventions.
- Moral conventions may clash with self-interest.

Theme 4: The idea of God

Total for this question: 45 marks

07	Explain and illustrate two problems with the idea that God is supremely good.
----	--

[15 marks]

The focus is on one attribute of God, His benevolence, although it is likely that the compatibility between supreme goodness and other attributes will feature in most answers. Problems are likely to be drawn from:

- If it is the will of God that is supremely good there is an issue concerning how we are to determine what God's will is. Biblical readings can be said to support contradictory views; the commandments can't be used to unravel what to do in many awkward situations (eg the Catholic Church's position on euthanasia).
- If it is God's work, His creation, that is good then, as God is the source of the Natural Law governing the universe what is good is determined by its function. However, what is 'natural' is contestable. Is there any such thing as human nature? Even if there is it can be accounted for in other ways (evolutionary biology) and there still remains a problem of linking this to morality (is-ought).
- Alternatively, if His creation (the universe or multiverse) is subject to the occurrence of natural disasters doesn't this place a limit on His goodness – ie it falls short of perfect goodness.
- The moral argument that there must be a supreme good which is the source of all goodness (God) in order for us to be able to recognise relative goods may be referred to and challenged. Aristotle's claim that 'good' is relative to what is being qualified, so there are many goods and no supreme good; or the relativist's claim that good is merely what I, a culture, or human beings, value, so that there need not be any transcendent source (a supremely good God) for judgements of value.
- If God, as creator, is omniscient and knows what His creation (man) will choose to do then, even if He has created man with free will, He knows about every action that every man will choose and would seem to be responsible for all the sins of mankind.
- The issue of whether God can be both omnipotent and benevolent. If it is the case that a supremely good God cannot will evil then He is not omnipotent; similarly, if He does not will evil but simply cannot prevent evil from occurring He is not omnipotent. If He is omnipotent but doesn't care that evil is occurring He isn't benevolent. There may be references to the logical or evidential problem of evil. (This could be presented as two points).
- Whether everything that God commands is moral because God commands it or whether God commands only that which is moral (the Euthyphro Dilemma). The consequences of either view: eg why worship a God who is bound by the same moral principles as we are, or a God that is cruel and vicious?
- If God is immanent then He is aware of human suffering – why doesn't He do more to prevent it? Similarly, if He is in the world then is He also in the evil and suffering that occurs? Wouldn't the impact of this prevent Him from being perfectly good?
- Alternatively, if God is transcendent, then it is difficult to see how He could intervene in His creation to prevent evil and suffering. Moreover, it is difficult to see how He could be a personal God, one who is responsive to our needs.
- If God is immutable is there any point in prayer? Can He respond to the way I feel? If He can't does He possess supreme goodness?
- Can God be both infinitely just and infinitely merciful? If not, is the notion of supreme goodness singularly coherent?

Given the nature of the theme it is likely that exposition and illustration will blur. However, it shouldn't be difficult to provide a brief illustration of sin or evil.

No marks are available for evaluation although relevant knowledge and understanding in such accounts should be rewarded.

0 8 Is any account of how we obtained the idea of God convincing?

[30 marks]

Candidates may briefly outline what our idea of God entails, eg by listing His attributes – eternal, immutable, transcendent, omniscient, omnipotent etc – before questioning how this idea is obtained.

Discussion of how the idea is obtained will probably focus on the claim that the idea is innate and/or on various accounts of how the idea might be obtained through mundane social and psychological processes.

Discussions should apply and analyse *some* of the following, or similar, points:

Arguments for innateness:

- Descartes' 'trademark' argument may be outlined. Just as a craftsman leaves his mark on his product so too God stamps the idea of Himself in us.
- The idea cannot be obtained adventitiously or fictitiously: it is neither acquired from the senses nor is it invented (since nothing can be added to or subtracted from it): consequently the idea is innate.
- The use of the causal adequacy principle to demonstrate that God is the source of this idea – 'there must be at least as much reality in the efficient and total cause as in its effect' – and only God possesses as much (formal) reality as is present in the (objective) reality of the idea.

Whether this is convincing:

- Do the causes of our ideas possess the same qualities as our ideas (primary and secondary qualities may be referred to but the sponginess of cakes is more likely).
- Responses to this: the total and efficient cause includes heat (not just the ingredients in the cake mixture). Descartes' wax example may be used to illustrate the idea that an effect does not possess the same properties as the cause. Different properties may nevertheless have the same degree of reality.
- Whether there are degrees of reality.
- Whether it is legitimate to argue from effects to causes.
- Whether the argument is contradicted by scientific theories such as evolution (or the emergence of consciousness), chaos theory (small, insignificant, events – and/or the ideas they produce – may be amplified, perhaps into a greater idea) or quantum physics (could ideas, like some events, be randomly generated?).
- Response: small events (as in chaos theory) are not the total and efficient cause.
- Locke's arguments against the idea of God being innate: there are whole nations that don't possess the idea; even if everyone did possess the idea it wouldn't follow that it was innate, in fact different ideas of God are learned in different linguistic communities.
- There may be references to Leibniz – perhaps the idea of God is innate and theistic variations are due to the idea being triggered by different experiences and/or different linguistic schemes.
- Hobbes' objection to the view that the idea of God is innate is that we do not have an idea of God, the 'idea' is simply a label we attach to something we believe in: similarly, Gassendi's point that we have no idea of an infinite being. (Some may know Descartes' response that the infinite is not the negation of a limit, rather all limitation implies a negation of the infinite).

Arguments for mundane social or psychological processes:

- Hume's view that the idea of God could be formed adventitiously and fictitiously by 'reflecting on the operations of our own mind, and augmenting, without limit ...qualities of goodness and wisdom'. (Locke's view that simple ideas are 'enlarged' by the addition of infinity might also be stated).
- Some may outline Hume's account of the transition from anthropomorphism and polytheism to theism and the existence of one God possessing all perfections.

- Some may claim that experience is the source of all of our ideas through sensation and then reflection on sensation and/or that emotion and feelings (such as anxiety and fear of the unknown) give rise to the idea of God. Some may also refer to Russell.

Whether this is convincing:

- Does Hume's position cover all of God's attributes? Power, wisdom and goodness may be ideas initially gained from impressions and then augmented without limit but it is difficult to see how ideas such as transcendence could be gained in the same way. God's love is different in kind not simply degree.

Further references to social and psychological processes are likely to include:

- Feuerbach's claim that our idea of the Divine Being is an abstraction from the being of man – 'poor man possesses a rich God'. Similarly, Marx's view that 'man dreams of a superman in the fantastic reality of the heavens' – in order to appease misery, distress, hardship. Both may be linked back to Hume.
- Dawkins' claim that the idea of God is a useless by-product of a useful evolutionary process – the transmission of cultural knowledge, particularly learning from adults, is necessary for evolutionary success; unfortunately some are gullible enough to continue to believe myths/fictions.
- The Freudian view that belief in God represents the desire for a heavenly father figure, protection, security etc. This 'longing for the father', idealised and imaginary, is a neurotic transformation of helplessness. (Nietzsche may also be referenced).
- Dennett's theories about the origin of religion (hyperactivation of the intentional stance and other naturally explicable processes).

Whether these are convincing:

- Against Feuerbach and Marx one might ask whether it is always the case that religious belief is the province of the poor and powerless. Alternatively, one might question the extent to which faith or religious belief is declining and a process of secularisation is occurring: if it is this might lend some credence to Marxist views; if it isn't then is the Marxist view falsified? Can it be falsified?
- On Dawkins' account shouldn't the gullible have died out? Is evolutionary biology or psychology any more verifiable or falsifiable than Marxism? Is it simply a 'just so' story?
- Freud's account(s) of repression and transformation are suspect; what sort of observations could verify or falsify such claims? Does the idea of God include the idea of a male? Is an ideal 'father' or 'protector' immutable?
- Against any or all of the above accounts of the origins of the idea of God and/or of religious belief, the extent to which they square with accounts that religious believers themselves might give could be questioned.

Following analysis a range of positions might be argued:

- Innateness is more convincing than mundane processes (or vice versa) because...
- There is little to choose between some of these positions: differences are exaggerated and mainly involve differences concerning the active or constructive power of the mind.
- There's no (or inadequate) justification for any view and/or each view is unverifiable or unfalsifiable (but where does this leave us?)
- How we gain the idea is not relevant to more important issues concerning religious belief or whether or not God exists.

Theme 5: Persons

Total for this question: 45 marks

0 | 9

Illustrating your answer explain **two** reasons for separating the concept of a person from that of a human being.

[15 marks]

A number of reasons might be given:

- Some may claim that it is desirable to classify 'human' in purely biological terms – that, for example, a human foetus or neonate, or a human in a coma or in the advanced stages of dementia is nevertheless still 100% human whereas they are not yet or no longer a person. In contrast, the concept of a 'person' has social, psychological, moral and legal connotations connected to attributes such as self-awareness, self-creation, autonomy, responsibility, reason and language.
- Consequently, some may claim that whereas being human is a matter of kind being a person may be a matter of degree. This could be illustrated in any number of ways – for example, the idea that becoming an educated person (if education is viewed as an improvement term) is a movement from simplicity to complexity and/or involves possessing certain attributes in more depth; whereas becoming demented is a movement in the opposite direction, the loss of or diminution in certain attributes resulting in a lessening quality of life.
- Moreover, there may not be a 1:1 relationship between human and person: some humans may be more than one person. This may be illustrated through references to multiple personality disorder or dissociative identity disorder.
- Similarly, the ratio may be 1:0 – a human being is present but personhood is absent. There may be references to potential persons and/or ex-persons.
- Also, the ratio may be 0:1 – some persons may not be human beings. The most likely examples to be given are the great apes: expect reference to various attributes such as self-awareness, reason, language and sociability and, perhaps, comparisons with human infants.
- The idea that the ratio may be 2:1 – that some persons may be more than one human – is more problematic but it might be argued that two humans may share a personality or be numerically different but qualitatively the same. Some illustrations from the literature on identity/survival through time might be given or some might refer to cloning.

Some care may need to be taken to avoid making the same point twice.

A further issue concerns distinguishing between explanation and illustration (eg whether a reference to dementia is part of an explanation or an illustration of a point) and illustrations are likely to be stronger if specific examples are given:

- Scales of complexity/simplicity or references to diminution if describing degrees of personhood could be illustrated through reference to specific individuals if reasonably well-known (Clive Wearing, Tony Nicklinson, Iris Murdoch, Ronald Reagan etc) or through references to fictional characters eg in films that deal with similar issues.
- Specific animals and machines associated with complex characteristics of personhood include Koko, Kanzi, Washoe (all higher primates) and Asimo (robot). Again references could be made to fictional characters (such as Data).
- Multiple personality disorder or dissociative identity disorder could be illustrated through various case studies – 'Sybil' is probably the best known. Cloning is likely to be illustrated through references to films and qualitative identity through references to thought experiments eg from Locke or Parfit.

No marks are available for evaluation although relevant knowledge and understanding in such accounts should be rewarded.

1 0 'The idea that a machine could be a person is ridiculous.' Discuss.

[30 marks]

This is likely to be addressed in different ways: some will focus on the philosophical literature concerning artificial intelligence (Turing, Putnam, Searle and possibly Fodor or Dennett); others are likely to focus on more recent developments in AI research (eg ASIMO and similar machines or androids) and/or on future possibilities (as portrayed in science fiction); others are likely to focus on certain attributes associated with personhood (self-awareness, self-creation, reason and reflection, a social being, a language user etc. and the extent to which they do or do not apply to 'intelligent' computational machines, robots or androids.

Some of the following, or equivalent, points could feature in discussions:

- If the possession of attributes identified is a matter of *degree* then *do* some artificial systems possess sufficient degrees of complexity with regard to the relevant attributes to be on the scale of personhood?
- Beyond this it may be argued that, even if no machine is sufficiently complex at present, if the rapid development of AI in the past 60 years is continued then at some point in the future some machines *could* be sufficiently complex in relevant respects.

A response opposing the view stated in the question may cite evidence of machines/artificial systems possessing:

- Reasoning and rationality – and, perhaps, the speed of computational machines. There may be references to eg Dennett.
- Dennett's analysis of creativity in terms of a system for generating random ideas plus a filtering mechanism suggests that a machine could be creative.
- Language or communication skills – robots like ASIMO can 'hear' and 'speak' for example.
- The ability to learn through the artificial equivalent of human senses.
- The ability to form judgements about 'experiences' (already present in ASIMO).
- The potential for consciousness, self-awareness and emotion to 'emerge' in functionally equivalent systems.
- The possibility of identities, sociability, roles within a network emerging.
- The possibility that a machine will pass the Turing Test.

There may be some attempt to link this to a philosophical theory (functionalism perhaps) or to a philosopher (eg Turing, Putnam, Dennett). Some may draw from their knowledge of what eg robots can already do and some may look to science fiction to consider future possibilities.

- For example, on what grounds would we exclude androids like Data or replicants such as those depicted in *Bladerunner* (should this become a reality) from personhood?
- Some may refer to 'speciesism'.

Those agreeing with the view stated in the question are likely to focus on:

- Programming, autonomy and doubts concerning self-creation.
- Some may refer to the soul.
- Some may argue that no machine has passed a Turing Test or question the adequacy of the Turing Test (which is not a test for personhood).
- There may be references to subjectivity – qualia or whether there is anything which it is like to be a machine (computer, robot, android).
- There may be references to intentionality – whether replicating the structure and function of human systems is all there is to intelligence, whether instantiating a programme is 'about' anything.
- Whether we could develop empathy or sentiment in relation to machines.

If any references to philosophers are made expect to see eg Dennett (discussing the ‘apparent’ abilities of machine programmes to pass the Turing Test) or Searle (on the ‘as-if’ understanding or intentionality of machine programmes). Some counter-arguments to this position may focus on the fact that Dennett is referring to a machine programme written in 1964 and Searle’s ‘Chinese Room’ example first appeared in 1980: some may be aware of some of the responses to Searle.

There may be a more general focus – for example, could there be a test for consciousness and personhood? Could it ever be decided at what point of complexity personhood is attained?

A range of argumentation, following points selected for discussion, is possible:

- The view stated is correct. The idea that a machine (that can replicate certain human abilities) is a person is ridiculous. Humans are persons no machines are persons *or* some humans are not persons but no machines are persons: this position may be linked to eg the view that (at least at present) no machine is sufficiently complex in relevant respects and/or that machines are completely lacking certain attributes essential for personhood (autonomy, self-creation, emotion etc.); the view that we could not form sustainable relations with machines; the view that no developments so far, and no future developments, will alter our ordinary way of thinking about persons – we will not extend our concept of a person to an artificial system no matter how complex it is.
- It is not a ridiculous idea. Those who advance the above view are either speciesist or committed to certain intuitions that are, in fact, unjustified. While no machine is sufficiently complex at present to be on the scale of personhood we can’t rule this out given the successes in AI already and given the possibility of further successes. This might be supported by arguments such as Searle underestimates the possibilities of machine intelligence and is merely operating with an ‘intuition pump’; or the view that we have as much reason for extending an intentional stance towards machines as we do to humans; or by thought experiments – eg Bladerunner scenarios – and what we would do if... (eg we couldn’t distinguish between a human and a replicant even if we were in *the same room*).
- Some may argue that current research in AI, bionics and genetics already suggests a position on this issue. Current AI research does not programme ‘intelligence’ – rather it creates a structure capable of learning (the claim that AI is ‘evolving’ ten million times more quickly than humans did). Alternatively, humans already enhance themselves and will continue to do so. The claim that in the future cyborgs will be a new post-human species. The point that it isn’t clear that a human would be less of a person by becoming more of a machine.

Assessment Objective Grid

AS Assessment Objective	Marks allocated by Assessment Objective 15 mark question	Marks allocated by Assessment Objective 30 mark question	Total Marks by Assessment Objective
AO1	9	9	18
AO2	6	12	18
AO3	0	9	9
Total	15	30	45