

General Certificate of Education
June 2004
Advanced Level Examination



PHILOSOPHY
Unit 5 Texts

PLY5

Friday 25 June 2004 Afternoon Session

In addition to this paper you will require:
an 8-page answer book.

Time allowed: 1 hour

Instructions

- Use blue or black ink or ball-point pen. Pencil should only be used for drawing.
- Write the information required on the front of your answer book. The *Examining Body* for this paper is AQA. The *Paper Reference* is PLY5.
- Answer **one** question.
- Do all rough work in the answer book. Cross through any work you do not want marked.

Information

- The maximum mark for this paper is 50.
- You will be assessed on your ability to use an appropriate form and style of writing, to organise relevant information clearly and coherently, and to use specialist vocabulary, where appropriate.
- The degree of legibility of your handwriting and the level of accuracy of your spelling, punctuation and grammar will also be taken into account.

Answer **one** question.

1 *Text: Aristotle's "Nicomachean Ethics"*

Total for this question: 50 marks

Study the following extract and then answer **all** parts of Question 1.

Text from ARISTOTLE, *Nicomachean Ethics*, Penguin Classics, translated by J A K THOMSON, 1953, revised by H TREDENNICK, 1976, pp. 317-8 - not reproduced here due to third-party copyright constraints.

Question 1

- (a) With close reference to the extract above:
- (i) what does Aristotle suggest as a first response to those who cite examples of bad pleasures? *(2 marks)*
 - (ii) how does Aristotle try to show that not all pleasures are desirable? *(6 marks)*
 - (iii) suggest and briefly develop a criticism of Aristotle's claim that pleasure is not *the* Good. *(6 marks)*
- (b) Outline and illustrate Aristotle's distinction between voluntary and involuntary action. *(11 marks)*
- (c) Critically assess the Doctrine of the Mean as a guide in morality. *(25 marks)*

2 Text: Hume's "An Enquiry concerning Human Understanding" **Total for this question: 50 marks**

Study the following extract and then answer **all** parts of Question 2.

“Though it be too obvious to escape observation that different ideas are connected together, I do not find that any philosopher has attempted to enumerate or class all the principles of association – a subject, however, that seems worthy of curiosity. To me there appear to be only three principles of connection among ideas, namely, *Resemblance*, *Contiguity* in time or place, and *Cause* or *Effect*. 1
5

That these principles serve to connect ideas will not, I believe, be much doubted. A picture naturally leads our thoughts to the original. The mention of one apartment in a building naturally introduces an inquiry or discourse concerning the others; and if we think of a wound, we can scarcely forbear reflecting on the pain which follows it. But that this enumeration is complete, and that there are no other principles of association except these, may be difficult to prove to the satisfaction of the reader or even to a man's own satisfaction. All we can do, in such cases, is to run over several instances and examine carefully the principle which binds the different thoughts to each other, never stopping till we render the principle as general as possible. The more instances we examine, and the more care we employ, the more assurance shall we acquire that the enumeration which we form from the whole is complete and entire.” 10
15

Question 2

- (a) With close reference to the extract above:
- (i) identify the principles of association; (2 marks)
 - (ii) briefly explain and illustrate how the principles are said to operate; (6 marks)
 - (iii) suggest and briefly develop a criticism of Hume's principles of association. (6 marks)
- (b) Outline Hume's attempt to show that liberty is compatible with necessity. (11 marks)
- (c) Critically assess Hume's account of how we acquire the concept of necessary connection. (25 marks)

TURN OVER FOR QUESTION 3

Turn over ►

3 Text: Mill's "On Liberty"

Total for this question: 50 marks

Study the following extract and then answer **all** parts of Question 3.

“He who lets the world, or his own portion of it, choose his plan of life for him has no need of any other faculty than the ape-like one of imitation. He who chooses his plan for himself employs all his faculties. He must use observation to see, reasoning and judgement to foresee, activity to gather materials for decision, discrimination to decide, and when he has decided, firmness and self-control to hold to his deliberate decision. And these qualities he requires and exercises exactly in proportion as the part of his conduct which he determines according to his own judgement and feelings is a large one. It is possible that he might be guided in some good path, and kept out of harm’s way, without any of these things. But what will be his comparative worth as a human being? It really is of importance, not only what men do, but also what manner of men they are that do it. Among the works of man which human life is rightly employed in perfecting and beautifying, the first in importance surely is man himself. Supposing it were possible to get houses built, corn grown, battles fought, causes tried, and even churches erected and prayers said by machinery – by automatons in human form – it would be a considerable loss to exchange for these automatons even the men and women who at present inhabit the more civilized parts of the world, and who assuredly are but starved specimens of what nature can and will produce. Human nature is not a machine to be built after a model, and set to do exactly the work prescribed for it, but a tree, which requires to grow and develop itself on all sides, according to the tendency of the inward forces which make it a living thing.”

Question 3

- (a) With close reference to the extract above:
- (i) what is said to be the characteristic of those who choose their own life-plan? (2 marks)
 - (ii) briefly describe Mill’s case for encouraging individual development; (6 marks)
 - (iii) suggest and briefly develop a criticism of Mill’s individualism. (6 marks)
- (b) Outline any **three** of Mill’s arguments in support of free discussion. (11 marks)
- (c) Critically discuss Mill’s claim that democracy is a “tyranny of the majority”. (25 marks)

4 Text: Nietzsche's "Beyond Good and Evil"

Total for this question: 50 marks

Study the following extract and then answer **all** parts of Question 4.

"To refrain from injuring, abusing, or exploiting one another; to equate another person's will with our own: in a certain crude sense this can develop into good manners between individuals, if the preconditions are in place (that is, if the individuals have truly similar strength and standards and if they are united within one single social body). But if we were to try to take this principle further and possibly even make it the *basic principle of society*, it would immediately be revealed for what it is: a will to *deny* life, a principle for dissolution and decline. We must think through the reasons for this and resist all sentimental frailty: life itself *in its essence* means appropriating, injuring, overpowering those who are foreign and weaker; oppression, harshness, forcing one's own forms on others, incorporation, and at the very least, at the very mildest, exploitation – but why should we keep using this kind of language, that has from time immemorial been infused with a slanderous intent? Even that social body whose individuals, as we have just assumed above, treat one another as equals (this happens in every healthy aristocracy) must itself, if the body is vital and not moribund, do to other bodies everything that the individuals within it refrain from doing to one another: it will have to be the will to power incarnate, it will want to grow, to reach out around itself, pull towards itself, gain the upper hand – not out of some morality or immorality, but because it is *alive*, and because life simply *is* the will to power. This, however, more than anything else, is what the common European consciousness resists learning; people everywhere are rhapsodizing, even under the guise of science, about future social conditions that will have lost their 'exploitative character' – to my ear that sounds as if they were promising to invent a life form that would refrain from all organic functions. 'Exploitation' is not part of a decadent or imperfect, primitive society: it is part of the *fundamental nature* of living things, as its fundamental organic function; it is a consequence of the true will to power, which is simply the will to life.

Assuming that this is innovative as theory – as reality it is the *original fact* of all history: let us at least be this honest with ourselves!"

Question 4

- (a) With close reference to the extract above:
- (i) identify any **two** features that are said to belong to the essence of life; (2 marks)
 - (ii) briefly describe how Nietzsche regards our social or moral principles; (6 marks)
 - (iii) suggest and briefly develop a criticism of Nietzsche's view of exploitation. (6 marks)
- (b) Outline any **two** of Nietzsche's criticisms of religious belief. (11 marks)
- (c) Critically assess Nietzsche's view of past philosophy as the expression of prejudice. (25 marks)

TURN OVER FOR QUESTION 5**Turn over ►**

5 Text: Russell's "The Problems of Philosophy"

Total for this question: 50 marks

Study the following extract and then answer **all** parts of Question 5.

"The principle we are examining may be called the *principle of induction*, and its two parts may be stated as follows: 1

(a) When a thing of a certain sort A has been found to be associated with a thing of a certain other sort B, and has never been found dissociated from a thing of the sort B, the greater the number of cases in which A and B have been associated, the greater is the probability that they will be associated in a fresh case in which one of them is known to be present; 5

(b) Under the same circumstances, a sufficient number of cases of association will make the probability of a fresh association nearly a certainty, and will make it approach certainty without limit.

As just stated, the principle applies only to the verification of our expectation in a single fresh instance. But we want also to know that there is a probability in favour of the general law that things of the sort A are *always* associated with things of the sort B, provided a sufficient number of cases of association are known, and no cases of failure of association are known. The probability of the general law is obviously less than the probability of the particular case, since if the general law is true, the particular case must also be true, whereas the particular case may be true without the general law being true. Nevertheless the probability of the general law is increased by repetitions, just as the probability of the particular case is. We may therefore repeat the two parts of our principle as regards the general law, thus: 10

(a) The greater the number of cases in which a thing of the sort A has been found associated with a thing of the sort B, the more probable it is (if no cases of failure of association are known) that A is always associated with B; 20

(b) Under the same circumstances, a sufficient number of cases of the association of A with B will make it nearly certain that A is always associated with B, and will make this general law approach certainty without limit."

Question 5

- (a) With close reference to the extract above:
- (i) why is the probability of a general law less than that of a particular case? (2 marks)
 - (ii) briefly describe Russell's formulation of the inductive principle; (6 marks)
 - (iii) suggest and briefly develop a criticism of Russell's treatment of the problem of induction. (6 marks)
- (b) Outline and briefly illustrate what Russell means by the Laws of Thought. (11 marks)
- (c) Critically assess Russell's rejection of Idealism. (25 marks)

6 Text: Ayer's "Language, Truth and Logic"

Total for this question: 50 marks

Study the following extract and then answer **all** parts of Question 6.

“The power of logic and mathematics to surprise us depends, like their usefulness, on the limitations of our reason. A being whose intellect was infinitely powerful would take no interest in logic and mathematics. For he would be able to see at a glance everything that his definitions implied, and, accordingly, could never learn anything from logical inference which he was not fully conscious of already. But our intellects are not of this order. It is only a minute proportion of the consequences of our definitions that we are able to detect at a glance. Even so simple a tautology as ‘ $91 \times 79 = 7189$ ’ is beyond the scope of our immediate apprehension. To assure ourselves that ‘7189’ is synonymous with ‘ 91×79 ’ we have to resort to calculation, which is simply a process of tautological transformation – that is, a process by which we change the form of expressions without altering their significance. The multiplication tables are rules for carrying out this process in arithmetic, just as the laws of logic are rules for the tautological transformation of sentences expressed in logical symbolism or in ordinary language. As the process of calculation is carried out more or less mechanically, it is easy for us to make a slip and so unwittingly contradict ourselves. And this accounts for the existence of logical and mathematical ‘falsehoods’, which otherwise might appear paradoxical. Clearly the risk of error in logical reasoning is proportionate to the length and the complexity of the process of calculation. And in the same way, the more complex an analytic proposition is, the more chance it has of interesting and surprising us.

It is easy to see that the danger of error in logical reasoning can be minimized by the introduction of symbolic devices, which enable us to express highly complex tautologies in a conveniently simple form. And this gives us an opportunity for the exercise of invention in the pursuit of logical inquiries. For a well-chosen definition will call our attention to analytic truths, which would otherwise have escaped us. And the framing of definitions which are useful and fruitful may well be regarded as a creative act.”

Question 6

- (a) With close reference to the extract above:
- (i) how does Ayer account for the power of mathematics and logic to surprise us? (2 marks)
 - (ii) briefly describe Ayer’s account of mathematics and logic; (6 marks)
 - (iii) suggest and briefly develop a criticism of Ayer’s view of mathematical knowledge. (6 marks)
- (b) Outline Ayer’s account of the function of philosophy. (11 marks)
- (c) Critically assess Ayer’s claim that sentences about material objects can be translated into sentences about sense-contents. (25 marks)

END OF QUESTIONS

THERE ARE NO QUESTIONS PRINTED ON THIS PAGE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COPYRIGHT-OWNERS AND PUBLISHERS

Permission to reproduce all copyright material has been applied for. In some cases, efforts to contact copyright owners have been unsuccessful and AQA will be happy to rectify any omissions of acknowledgements in future papers if notified.

- Question 1 ARISTOTLE, *Nicomachean Ethics* (Penguin Classics), translated by J.A.K. Thomson, revised by Hugh Tredennick
Question 2 D. HUME, *An Enquiry concerning Human Understanding* (Oxford University Press)
Question 3 J.S. MILL, *On Liberty* (Penguin)
Question 4 F. NIETZSCHE, *Beyond Good and Evil* (Oxford World's Classics), translated and edited by Marion Faber
Question 5 B. RUSSELL, *The Problems of Philosophy* (Oxford University Press/OPUS)
Question 6 A.J. AYER, *Language, Truth and Logic* (Victor Gollancz)

Copyright © 2004 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.