

GCE 2004  
*June Series*



# Mark Scheme

## Philosophy *AS Unit 3 – Texts (PLY3)*

---

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

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' 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:

Publications Department, Aldon House, 39, Heald Grove, Rusholme, Manchester, M14 4NA  
Tel: 0161 953 1170

or

download from the AQA website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2004 AQA and its licensors

#### COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered charity number 1073334. Registered address AQA, Devas Street, Manchester. M15 6EX.

*Dr Michael Cresswell Director General*

Marks should be awarded in accordance with these levels-of-response marking criteria. Question specific marking notes are provided for reference on the following pages.

### **Levels-of-Response Marking Criteria**

#### **Part (a)**

**Total: 10 marks**

- (i), (ii)** 2 marks: A full answer in accordance with the mark scheme.
- 0 - 1 marks: A partial or incorrect answer.
- (iii)** 4 - 6 marks: The candidate selects those aspects of the passage which are relevant to the central requirement of the question. The candidate applies them in accordance with that requirement. There are few, if any, errors of spelling, grammar and punctuation and the response should read as a coherent whole.
- 1 - 3 marks: Some relevant aspects are selected and applied but others are omitted or are misunderstood. There may be some lack of clarity in the expression with errors of spelling, grammar and punctuation in evidence.
- 0 marks: No relevant aspects are selected.

#### **Part (b)**

**Total: 10 marks**

- 8 - 10 marks: The candidate displays a detailed and relevant knowledge of the text. Selected material bears directly on the central requirement of the question. The response forms a coherent structure with few, if any, errors of spelling, grammar and punctuation.
- 5 - 7 marks: The candidate displays relevant knowledge of limited aspects of the appropriate text detail. The response may be wide-ranging and not always directly focused on the central issue. Lack of focus is more in evidence at the lower end of the band. There may be some errors of spelling, grammar and punctuation.
- 3 - 4 marks: The candidate displays a basic knowledge of the relevant material. There will be a limited understanding of at least one relevant point. The response will lack detail and will not be well focused. Repetition and lack of sophistication are likely to be present. Presentational problems may also be evident.
- 0 - 2 marks: The candidate displays little relevant knowledge. There may be some fragmentation in the response or a lack of coherence in relation to the requirements of the question. Structural or expressive difficulties may be intrusive and the meaning of the response may be obscured.

**Part (c)****Total: 25 marks**

- 20 - 25 marks: The candidate shows an ability to analyse and critically assess the relevant issues. Support material is deployed in accordance with the requirements of the question and judgements are supported by argument. Criticism will be sustained and the response will read as an integrated and logically developed whole. There will be few, if any, errors of spelling, grammar and punctuation.
- 15 - 19 marks: The candidate shows an ability to analyse and critically assess some relevant material. Reasoned judgement must be present but detail may be lacking. Support material may also lack detail but some will be effectively deployed. The response will sustain relevance and evaluative points will be directed at the requirements of the question. There may be occasional errors of spelling, grammar and punctuation.
- 10 - 14 marks: The candidate will demonstrate a limited appreciation or critical understanding of the relevant issues. Support material will be limited but some relevant material must be effectively deployed. The evaluative aspects may lack penetration and this will be more in evidence at the lower levels of the band. Some errors of spelling, grammar and punctuation are likely to be present.
- 5 - 9 marks: The candidate shows an ability to address some limited aspects of the question. The material selected may not always be directly relevant and there may be some misinterpretation of the text and/or errors of reasoning. This will be a dominant feature of responses at the lower end of the band. Critical assessment is likely to be weak or to be replaced with assertion. Some responses may be characterised as displaying a basic knowledge of the key issues. Errors of spelling, grammar and punctuation may be present.
- 0 - 4 marks: There will be little or no relevant grasp of the issues. Textual awareness will be minimal or fragmentary. Errors of spelling, grammar and punctuation may be intrusive.

**NB** The following marking notes are not prescriptive and do not constitute ‘model answers’; they are intended as an ‘aide-memoire’ for Examiners. Marks should be awarded in accordance with the levels-of-response marking criteria.

1. *Text: Plato’s “The Republic”*

**Total for this question: 45 marks**

(a) With close reference to the extract above:

(i) identify the capacity said to belong to philosophers; (2 marks)

To grasp the eternal and immutable.

(ii) what must the Guardians be able to guard? (2 marks)

The laws and customs of society.

(iii) outline how Socrates tries to persuade us that philosophers should be rulers. (6 marks)

By appealing to their superior knowledge. Non-philosophers are lost in the world of appearances. The exploitation of the blindness simile. Philosophers are preferred as they have knowledge **and** no less practical experience. Their natural character enables them to have all desirable qualities.

(b) Describe the simile of the ship and **one** of its possible purposes. (10 marks)

Credit should be given for drawing the appropriate analogies: ship = ship of state, captain = present ruler/people, crew = politicians/sophists, navigator = philosopher, stars = Forms by which they should navigate.

The captain is larger, stronger, the crew compete and argue for the leadership. They do not know how to navigate, they deny it is an art and will kill those who oppose their views. The successful group will drug the captain, plunder and turn the voyage into a drunken pleasure cruise. Esteem is afforded to whoever can subjugate the captain by fraud, deception or force. The true navigator is thus redundant, a dreamer/star-gazer.

One purpose from the following:

- A damning simile of the present democratic system,
- The sad plight of the philosopher in such a society,
- Governing a state requires knowledge.

(c) Critically discuss Plato's thesis that true knowledge is of the Forms.

(25 marks)

Points used to set up the discussion are likely to include the following:

- Knowledge concerns what is – the Forms, this may be contrasted with belief and ignorance.
- Knowledge needs to be infallible – the Forms would guarantee this.
- Knowledge constitutes a different faculty from belief and, for Plato, their respective objects will also be different. Much of what is commonly regarded as knowledge is not knowledge at all. Due to multiplicity and change, the world of the senses does not provide us with knowledge. Similes can be used in support of these points as can the example of the sightseers.

### Critical Points

1. Even if the faculties are different, it won't follow that the objects are.
2. The claim alters our conception of knowledge beyond recognition. It is so restrictive that we could only be said to know *a priori* propositions.
3. Directed, informed criticism of the theory of Forms, as opposed to assertions that there is no empirical evidence for them.
4. Candidates may argue that knowledge can be understood as justified true belief (though the example of Hesiod's wagon might be used as a counter example).
5. Plato's notion that knowledge must concern that which cannot be false may be taken to have absurd consequences. Credit should be given for the use of a supportive example.
6. Knowledge/belief distinction can be made **within** the world of senses.
7. As Plato's claim generates absolutes, the implications for ethics and politics can be explored.
8. Does it make sense to say that anything can be known in the unqualified sense required by Plato?
9. Relationship between Forms and sensible particulars is left unclear.
10. Why should eternal existence carry any implications for what we can be said to know?

**NB** The following marking notes are not prescriptive and do not constitute ‘model answers’; they are intended as an ‘aide-memoire’ for Examiners. Marks should be awarded in accordance with the levels-of-response marking criteria.

2. Text: Descartes’ “Meditations”

**Total for this question: 45 marks**

(a) With close reference to the extract above:

(i) what is the power of imagination said to differ from? (2 marks)

The power of conceiving (understanding or intellection).

(ii) why does Descartes claim that the imagination is not essential to him? (2 marks)

Even if he did not possess it, he would remain the same.

(iii) briefly explain why Descartes concludes that bodies probably exist. (6 marks)

Imagination is a faculty of knowing related to/directed at body. The intellect is concerned with understanding (ideas it has within itself). If bodies do exist then this would explain why I have this faculty of imagination. It is a probabilistic argument only as it fails to establish that bodies necessarily (certainly) exist.

(b) Outline Descartes’ Trademark Argument for the existence of God. (10 marks)

Ideas of substance have the greatest objective reality, and ‘God’ more than that of finite substances. (Partakes of a higher degree of perfection.) Descartes then appeals to his causal adequacy principle: there has to be as much reality in the cause as the effect it produces, otherwise the cause would not be efficient nor the effect actualised. Just as nothingness cannot produce anything, so the more perfect cannot originate in the less perfect. This applies in the realm of things (actual/formal) and ideas (objective reality). Examples might be given (stone/heat). He conceives of God as an infinite substance, Descartes, as a finite being, could only receive such an idea from something infinite. Rejection of negating the finite as the source of the idea.

The above is more than sufficient for maximum marks. An alternative approach is also permissible:

He argues that God is the author of his being. He rejects that he is self-produced as he would have given himself all perfections. His lifetime consists of an infinite division of parts which are independent of each other; he is thus created afresh by some cause at every moment. If he were self-produced, he would be conscious of such a cause, he is not, therefore some other being is the cause. He appeals to the causal adequacy principle to show that this being is a perfect being as he has the idea of perfection. He rejects the plurality of causes option as God’s unity is itself a perfection.

His parentage cannot be appealed to as a source of his conservation or of his being **qua** thinking thing. Therefore God is the cause. The idea of God is not derived from the senses nor self-produced; it is like a mark left by a tradesman.

There may be some conflation of the two approaches.

(c) Critically discuss Descartes' reasons for claiming that mind and body are different.

(25 marks)

The two radically distinct natures are:

- Mind as a thinking, non-extended thing.
- 'Thinking' can be taken to mean the having of conscious experiences. Each mind is substance in its own right and depends on nothing except God.
- Body's essential nature is to be extended in three-dimensional space. The wax example may be used to explain this point though a full description is not necessary.
- Knowledge arguments, appeal to God's omnipotence and indivisibility argument.

### Critical Points

1. If they are so different, then how do they interact? Inadequacy of the pineal gland appeal.
2. The knowledge argument in both its forms fails to establish that mind and body are different and distinct. To argue that I can doubt body but not mind, therefore they are different commits the intentionalist fallacy. To assert that things we know (mind) cannot depend on things we do not yet know is open to counter-examples (disease and bacteria).
3. The appeal to God's omnipotence only shows that God has the power to create them separately; it does not demonstrate the exercise of the power (there may be reference to clear and distinct ideas).
4. If they are so distinct then how are we to explain cases of brain damage affecting mental ability?
5. The indivisibility argument might be referred to. How would the indivisibility claim stand up to cases of split or multiple personality? Freudian divisions might also be used in counter-argument.
6. If they are so radically different, then how is this to be reconciled with Descartes' intermingling thesis of Meditation 6?
7. If we are essentially thinking things, then our whole way of talking about ourselves and others becomes inappropriate as such a way of talking implies embodiment.
8. Descartes moves without justification from thinking as an attribute to thinking as the sole attribute.
9. Do examples like a dreamless sleep show that we periodically cease to exist?
10. Candidates might question whether the concept of an 'immaterial substance' is a coherent one.
11. To claim that the essential nature of body is geometric leads to extreme rationalism and fails to provide a satisfactory explanation for distinguishing one body from another.



**NB** The following marking notes are not prescriptive and do not constitute ‘model answers’; they are intended as an ‘aide-memoire’ for Examiners. Marks should be awarded in accordance with the levels-of-response marking criteria.

3. Text: Marx and Engels’ “The German Ideology”

**Total for this question: 45 marks**

(a) With close reference to the extract above:

(i) how do Marx and Engels characterise German philosophical criticism? (2 marks)

As a criticism of religious conceptions.

(ii) identify the alleged starting point of the critics; (2 marks)

Real religion and actual theology.

(iii) briefly describe Marx and Engels’ account of the importance of religious concepts in German philosophy. (6 marks)

It had the status of a dominant category, others were classed under it. The dominant conception of ‘man’ that resulted was religious. Such dominance was assumed. Religious concepts were applied/extended to other domains. Even the conflict of old and young Hegelians presupposed the importance of religious conceptions – one for understanding, the other for criticism.

(b) Outline and briefly illustrate **three** aspects of alienation suggested by Marx and Engels. (10 marks)

Candidates may select any **three** of the following, together with a brief explanation/example:

Alienation:

- from each other,
- from the community,
- from ourselves as self determining or autonomous beings,
- from individuality,
- from the objects of production,
- from nature or land.

Illustrative references to the division of labour, production relations under capitalism and private property may legitimately feature in more than one explanation.

- (c) Critically discuss Marx and Engels' claim that the driving forces of history are economic and material. (25 marks)

Hegelian influence regarding laws of history with the crucial difference regarding the nature of those laws. For Marx they are material/economic. Marx's criticism of the Utopians: men are not motivated by ideas. We have to analyse the real causes of social phenomena before we can understand/predict. Marx thought that it was the mode of production of material life which determines the general character of our socio-political and spiritual life. Economic structure determines what happens in a society. Importance of technological change, modal points, emergence of new structures and new ideologies. There may be some historical illustration of these ideas, e.g. city states, feudalism, capitalism.

### Critical Points

1. There may be some dispute about whether there can be laws of history at all. Popperian points are likely to figure here, e.g. such 'laws' lack universality and are not therefore 'laws' in the sense that laws of nature are, they are trends.
2. Marx recognises the existence of biological needs – at least in the early stages of the theory – but fails to give them proper weighting as the theory develops. Examples might be given to sustain this point.
3. Marx's account of ideology is suspect. He plays down the importance of ideas in historical change: they are more vital than mere epiphenomena. Even if one allows ideas to be a spin-off from more fundamental economic structures, this will not in itself dispose of their possible efficacy.
4. If **all** social theories are generated by underlying economic causes, then is not the same true of Marx's theory? Does denying this involve special pleading?
5. Is the claim open to possible falsification? If not, what status is to be afforded to the claim?
6. Candidates may argue that some of our values or ideals transcend particular economic structures and are therefore not to be explained in terms of such structures.
7. Does Marx confuse 'explaining' with 'explaining away'?
8. It is not clear what role human reason plays in the account. On the one hand it seems to be manipulated by economic causes over which it has no control; on the other it can reveal those causes and inspire the revolutionary change.

**NB** The following marking notes are not prescriptive and do not constitute ‘model answers’; they are intended as an ‘aide-memoire’ for Examiners. Marks should be awarded in accordance with the levels-of-response marking criteria.

4. Text: Sartre’s “*Existentialism & Humanism*”

**Total for this question: 45 marks**

(a) With close reference to the extract above:

(i) what does Sartre mean by ‘quietism’? (2 marks)

Let others do what I can’t do.

(ii) how does Sartre’s doctrine regard Man? (2 marks)

As the sum of his actions.

(iii) briefly describe how Sartre shows the importance of action. (6 marks)

Action defines our existence. No genuine comfort is to be found in appeals to adverse circumstances – examples. Abilities, inclinations and potentials exist only in so far as they are manifested in action. Love and genius exist only in as much as they are shown.

(b) Outline what Sartre means by ‘subjectivity’. (10 marks)

Subjectivity refers to the *Cartesian cogito* - the absolute starting point. This is the one absolute starting point. This is the one absolute certainty which we are all capable of attaining. Other objects are no more than probable, but in order to define anything as probable we must possess at least one truth. Sartre also claims that we discover others through the *cogito* - it is only through them that I can be anything (ethical predicates). There is a second sense of ‘subjectivity’ which serves to distinguish man from material objects. Man propels himself towards a future and is aware of so doing. It is the only doctrine that is compatible with the dignity of man.

(c) Critically discuss Sartre's claim that we are completely responsible for our actions.

(25 marks)

Sartre's doctrine is one of absolute freedom. There is no human nature, we are without excuse. Candidates may discuss this with reference to the paper-knife example, the absence of God or the absence of any *a priori* values. Our character cannot be blamed for our actions as our character simply **is** our actions (examples of cowardice). We cannot use heredity or the environment or our passions as an excuse for our actions. Denial of freedom is bad faith. Our actions also carry implications for others (universalisation), thus the depth of our responsibility is greater than first thought. We create values through actions and are responsible for those values.

### Critical Points

1. There could be criticism from human nature theories, e.g. human behaviour is so uniform that an underlying nature seems likely.
2. In opposition to the above, candidates may consider Sartre's universality of condition reply. This attempts to account for similarities without reference to a specific nature. Sartre's reply doesn't seem to explain one set of actions rather than another.
3. Sartre's account of human nature is too closely tied to the existence of God. Determinists need not be deists. Candidates may **argue** for other determining factors.
4. What account would Sartre give of certain kinds of compulsive behaviour? Surely there is a difference between, e.g. putting a bet on a horse and gambling one's house on the turn of a card. It seems rather simplistic, if not plainly wrong, to say that they are both examples of free choice.
5. The relation between action and character can be explored, e.g. we do use our knowledge of a person's character in predicting their future actions. Presumably, Sartre would reply that our knowledge of their character is simply that of their past actions and they could change in the future.
6. Sartre does not argue for the non-existence of God: he assumes it.
7. Are we as responsible for others as Sartre claims? He seems to be implying that I cannot choose an action for myself and also regard it as wrong for someone else.
8. There might be some discussion of bad faith as a flight from freedom. Examples are likely to figure prominently here, but they must remain directed.
9. Sartre's thesis is not rebutted by the multiplication of alleged examples of maternal instincts.
10. How convincing is Sartre's claim that we are responsible for our passions/feelings? Relevant points for discussion here could include why, in ordinary language, we speak of being swept by passion or why, in law, passion can be regarded as a mitigating factor – especially in France – with the notion of a crime of passion.

As a general point, candidates need to do more than merely assert that we have genes, an environment, instincts and so on if they are to do well in the critical/evaluation aspect.