



ASSESSMENT and
QUALIFICATIONS
ALLIANCE

General Certificate of Education

Philosophy 5171/6171

PLY3 Texts

Mark Scheme

2008 examination – June series

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 to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

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.

Copyright © 2008 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723) and a registered charity (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 level. There may be some errors of spelling, grammar and punctuation.

3 – 4 marks: The candidate displays a basic knowledge of the relevant material. There is a limited understanding of at least one relevant point. The response lacks detail and is not 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 is sustained and the response will read as an integrated and logically developed whole. There are 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 sustains relevance and evaluative points are directed at the requirements of the question. There may be occasional errors of spelling, grammar and punctuation.
- 10 – 14 marks:** The candidate demonstrates a limited appreciation or critical understanding of the relevant issues. Support material is limited but some relevant material must be effectively deployed. The evaluative aspects may lack penetration and this is more in evidence at the lower levels of the level. 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 is a dominant feature of responses at the lower end of the level. 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 is little or no relevant grasp of the issues. Textual awareness is minimal or fragmentary. Errors of spelling, grammar and punctuation may be intrusive.

1 *Text: Plato's 'The Republic'***Total for this question: 45 marks**

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.

(a) (i) identify how people are said to receive Socrates' arguments; (2 marks)

With an uneasy feeling.

2 marks

(ii) with what does Adeimantus compare Socratic argument? (2 marks)

A game of draughts.

2 marks

(iii) outline Adeimantus' view of the study of Philosophy. (6 marks)

It produces conclusions by verbal trickery or logic-chopping and such conclusions are not truly convincing. You feel trapped by an expert. Those who pursue philosophy become odd birds; useless to society. The subject should not be pursued after early education.

6 marks

(b) Outline the simile of the cave and **one** of its purposes. (10 marks)

There should be a description of the cave simile: bound prisoners, screen, fire, parapet, shadows of images being cast on the screen (double deception). A prisoner is released – reluctantly leaves the cave (he does *not* break free). The painful path to knowledge, dark/light, reflections, the sun-analogies. The return and subsequent hostility and ridicule.

Purposes: knowledge/belief distinction, weaker status of empirical knowledge, supreme form, ethical/political implication, philosopher's status.

10 marks

(c) Assess whether Plato's Philosopher Rulers would be ideal political rulers. (25 marks)

There should be some discussion of why Plato thought that philosophers would make ideal rulers. They have the right qualities: honesty, modesty – they are reluctant to rule, disinterested in material wealth. They have knowledge of the Good and thus know right. Knowledge determines virtue. They also have a rigorous training. There may be some contrasts with Athenian democracy/sophists.

Critical Points

- Political danger is inherent in any claim that rulers have absolute knowledge or are infallible. Counter observations are possible, eg absolute power corrupts absolutely or the chilling image of Bronowski sifting the soil at Auschwitz and saying this is the product of those who *knew* what was right – absolutely.
- Will knowledge always issue in right action? Not all wrong-doing is through ignorance. Not all problems can be resolved through the acquisition of knowledge. There may be discussions of doing wrong through bloody-mindedness, weakness of the will. There may be references to ethical/political dilemmas.
- Some of the problems above might be responded to by an appeal to the qualities of the ruler, eg it might be claimed that weakness of the will would not be an issue. These responses, however, come at a cost:
 - Plato may be taken as *defining* perfection into the philosophical nature, or,
 - rendering it highly unlikely that such individuals will ever be found, or,
 - failing to acknowledge clearly observable traits and facets of human nature – especially when taking difficult political decisions.
- Plato fails to distinguish knowledge from skills. He fails to distinguish knowledge of desirable ends from the means of how best to achieve those ends. There could be relevant critical references to the ship simile.
- Some of the personal qualities are not that desirable in a ruler, eg a complete lack of ambition. There is no guarantee that a lack of care about oneself will result in care for others.
- The ruler might be too remote. Social and cultural remoteness may result in failure to sympathise/empathise with his subjects; he may even fail to understand them at some levels. There may be some discussion of the dangers of a non-participatory understanding, eg intellectual contempt.
- Ruled subjects will have their social function decided for them. There may be some discussion of the precarious position of the individual in regard to paternalism or authoritarianism. There may be contrasts with democratic participation and associated liberties. Ideally, this should be related to the development/progress of the individual/society. Open/closed societies.
- There are no ‘absolutely’ right people to rule. Who is the right ruler may depend on circumstances, eg internal factional strife, war, etc.
- Can Plato’s rulers disagree? Presumably not if they apprehend the ‘Good’, but this apprehension is difficult, even mystical. Can this be the basis for rule?
- Aristotle’s point: if the ‘Good’ is not attainable, then how can it be an end for political science?
- There may be some discussion of elitism. This should be linked to the emphasis on intellectual superiority and how this leads to rigorously enforced class boundaries.

25 marks

[Maximum for question: 45 marks]

2 Text: Descartes' *'Meditations'***Total for this question: 45 marks**

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.

(a) (i) identify two features which Descartes attributes to his body;	(2 marks)
--	-----------

Any **two** of:

- ill disposed to pain;
- needs to eat;
- needs to drink.

2 marks

(ii) with what does Descartes compare being lodged in his body?	(2 marks)
---	-----------

Pilot and a ship.

2 marks

(iii) briefly explain Descartes' account of the mind-body relation.	(6 marks)
---	-----------

Nature teaches him that he has a body to which he is joined very closely. Mind-body are intermingled - a single whole. The intimacy is explained by considering pain, hunger and thirst. I do not merely perceive a wound; I *feel* the pain – unlike the pilot. The feelings depend on a union of mind and body.

6 marks

(b) Outline the wax example and two of its purposes.	(10 marks)
---	------------

There should be a description of the wax before and after melting. It is a well chosen example as it appeals to all five senses. *All* the sense given qualities change. The only property that remains the same is extension in space. This is grasped by an intuition of the mind. It can take an infinite amount of shapes and 'infinity' is grasped by the intellect. Purposes:

- to defend a rationalist theory of knowledge;
- to present his thesis concerning the essential nature of body;
- the reinforcement of the *cogito*.

10 marks

(c) Assess whether Descartes succeeds in establishing the existence of God. (25 marks)

Candidates may concentrate on one or both of Descartes's main arguments. Full marks can be obtained through a detailed description of *one* of them.

- (i) the reformulated ontological argument. God is defined as the perfect being and existence is derived from perfection – if He did not exist, He would not be the most perfect. 'God exists' becomes a necessary truth. You can no more conceive of God not existing as you can a triangle without its logically necessary properties or a mountain without a valley. He considers an objection that granted he could not think of such things without their logically necessary properties, this does not entail that there are such things. However, the concept of God is a unique one – the only one with existence built into its definition. The relation between God and existence is internal/necessary;
- (ii) the Trademark argument. This appeals to the causation of our idea of a perfect being. It could not emanate from an imperfect being - the causal adequacy principle of the greater cannot come from the lesser which is said to hold for things and ideas. The tracing back of the idea ultimately leads to God. The idea is stamped upon us by God - like a trademark.

Critical Points

- Relations between things cannot be simply transferred to ideas. Descartes' remarks on the causation of a stone do not have to apply to the idea of a stone.
- Even in the realm of living things, the causal adequacy principle is false. Evolution seems to constitute a counter-example. More complex organisms (greater) have developed from simpler ones (lesser).
- Alternative accounts of the origin of the idea of God are available, eg Hume rooting it in a sense experience plus augmentation, enlargement etc.
- In regard to the ontological argument, Kantian criticisms are likely to figure prominently. Existence is not to be regarded as a property or predicate. We do not add to the conceptual content of anything when we say that it exists. It is not a property like 'red' 'cold' or 'hard'. The subject-predicate form of the sentence is superficial and confuses us.
- In response to the above, would not the attribution of existence to, eg the Yeti, make a difference to our knowledge? Does Kant's analysis do justice to examples like this? One might appeal to a difference between adding to knowledge and adding to conceptual content. Kant's own example of 100 real thalers affecting his financial position in a way that 100 imaginary ones do not might be discussed.
- Russell's analysis of existence might be discussed. To be is to be the value of a propositional function. In saying that something exists we are not attributing a property to a thing; we are talking about a propositional function and saying that it has at least one instance.
- Schopenhauer-type objections might be used. You can define anything into existence by incorporating existence into the concept of the thing. Gaunilo's island might be discussed. Reply: these examples concern contingent existents.

- Descartes should not have used the term 'perfect being', where perfect includes existence, until after he knew such a being to exist.
- Standard points within the empiricist tradition: cannot bridge the gap between ideas/real existence, no existential proposition is logically certain, *a priori* arguments cannot establish existential propositions, such arguments are bound to be circular as conclusions are pre-supposed by premises.
- Any appeal to clear and distinct ideas fails as God is the ultimate guarantor of such ideas.

25 marks

[Maximum for question: 45 marks]

3 *Text: Marx and Engels' 'The German Ideology'* **Total for this question: 45 marks**

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.

(a) (i) identify the way in which first premises are said to be verified; (2 marks)

In a purely empirical way. **2 marks**

(ii) what is regarded as the first premise of all human history? (2 marks)

The existence of human individuals. **2 marks**

(iii) briefly explain why Marx and Engels regard physical conditions as important. (6 marks)

Physical conditions provide a concrete and verifiable starting point. The first fact to be established is the physical organisation of individuals. Material conditions are the foundation of history. We distinguish ourselves from animals by producing our means of subsistence and this is conditioned by the physical organisation of individuals.

6 marks

(b) Outline and illustrate what Marx and Engels mean by 'ideology'. (10 marks)

There might be some discussion of the critique of Hegel or the Young Hegelians. They are accused of inverting the true relation between ideas and change. Ideas have a material base, they are part of the super-structure. The sub-structure (material) determines the ideas (ideology). The material forces are the real driving forces of history, not the ideas. It is changes in the real forces that brings real social change. It is these which determine class and the ruling class determine the ruling ideas. Illustrations might involve how the 'virtue' of punctuality benefited the factory owners or religion as the opium of the masses – things will be better in the after-life.

10 marks

- (c) Assess whether Marx and Engels were right to regard revolution as inevitable. (25 marks)

There should be some reference to Marx's theory of economic/materialist determinism, the division of labour and the significance of alienation. Different socio-economic systems generate internal contradictions; historical examples (feudalism) might be given. There could also be some discussion of Marx's idea of modal points. Revolution results from the internal contradictions. It does not come from the super-structure. There might be reference to laws of history.

Critical Points

- Marx thought he was providing a (broadly) scientific account of history. This can be questioned. The laws/trends issue might figure here. Popper-type objections regarding possible falsification would also be relevant.
- Can modal points only be identified retrospectively? If so, doubt is cast on the scientific status of the thesis and its ability to generate predictions. The technological revolution might be discussed in this context.
- Even if revolution is inevitable, has Marx shown that it will be of the kind he envisaged? It might be argued that factors such as nationalism have not been given sufficient attention.
- Marx failed to allow for the flexibility/adaptability of economic systems to accommodate change and survive. Capitalism has made workers 'partners' in share ownership, land ownership. Tasks have been diversified, leisure time has increased, etc. Even if these are no more than gimmicks, some account of their efficacy and time-scale needs to be provided. Marx underestimated the regulatory function/power of the state. Modern capitalism has moved away from the purely laissez-faire position of the late eighteenth/nineteenth centuries.
- The criteria for false consciousness are not clearly defined. Is there some level of description at which they always apply? There could be a discussion of concepts such as real interest as opposed to perceived interest. There could also be a discussion of capitalism's ability to meet interests.
- Some of Marx's key concepts will not take the theoretical strain required, eg alienation is over-stated, at least in some forms, as is capitalism's attempt to mollify its effects. The division of labour has benefits as well as drawbacks.
- The revolution has failed to materialise and there has to be some theoretical limit to attempts to accommodate this problem.
- Marx's theory is not value-neutral, is culture bound, historically relative or moribund. Is *any* theory value – neutral?
- Is it correct to downplay the importance of ideas? Capitalists can have restrictions imposed upon them which are contrary to their economic interests, eg environmental restrictions, local community interests etc.
- Does Marx's concept of 'class' have the obvious application today that it did in the nineteenth century? Are there agreed identification criteria (even amongst Marxists)?

25 marks
[Maximum for question: 45 marks]

4. Text: Sartre's 'Existentialism & Humanism' Total for this question: 45 marks

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.

(a) (i) identify what is said to be the real reproach against existentialism; (2 marks)

Its' stern optimism. **2 marks**

(ii) how is Zola said to depict his characters? (2 marks)

As having their behaviour determined/caused by heredity or environment or determining factors psychic or organic. **2 marks**

(iii) outline how Sartre attempts to show that we are responsible for our actions. (6 marks)

He uses the example of cowardice. A coward is not a coward because of his physiological state. It is through his actions that he becomes a coward. There is no cowardly temperament. It is the *act* of giving up. There is some comfort in determinism, but it is false. **6 marks**

(b) Explain and illustrate what Sartre means by 'anguish' and 'despair'. (10 marks)

Anguish: a consequence of our total freedom and responsibility. It has a deeper meaning than anxiety. Text examples such as the anguish of Abraham or the total responsibility for all felt by leaders/military might be used.

Despair: We must act without hope, we must realise that we cannot rely on others (a consequence of their freedom). We rely on our own wills or the probabilities that make our action feasible. Examples might include Sartre's reference to political parties or the train. **10 marks**

(c) Assess whether Sartre was right to claim that man is completely free. (25 marks)

Sartre's doctrine is one of absolute freedom. There is no determining human nature. There is likely to be a discussion of the paper knife example or similar. Existence precedes essence; no God, no *a priori* values. We are responsible for our actions and values, we are without excuse – condemned to be free. There should be some reference to universality of condition and facticity.

Critical Points

- Sartre's thesis is too dependent on the absence of God and this is not argued for (in this text). Determinists do not need to be Theists.
- Candidates might offer alternative varieties of determinism. This should, however, amount to more than asserting that we have genes. Wild speculations about what genetic science has achieved should not be regarded as a refutation of Sartre's position.
- There might be criticism from the direction of human nature theorists. Human behaviour is so uniform that an underlying nature seems probable.
- Sartre may respond to the above by appealing to universality of condition. This attempts to account for uniformity of behaviour without referring to a specific nature. There are certain limiting conditions that we all must face. This response fails to explain the particularity of one set of actions over another.
- Candidates may argue that our freedom is limited through limited possibilities of choice. This needs care for two reasons: (a) Sartre's response in terms of facticity, (b) Sartre's freedom is not about getting what you want, it is about determining what you want.
- Sartre's thesis is not refuted by the multiplication of alleged examples of instincts.
- Appeals to environmental influences might feature but this should be coupled with the realisation that Sartre did not think that any of us lived in a vacuum.
- How convincing is it to say that we are responsible for our passions or feelings? Are they the sorts of things that could be freely chosen? If this is so, why do we have such expressions as a 'fit' of anger, being 'swept' away by passion, 'falling' in love, etc? In law, passion may be regarded as a mitigating factor – especially in France!
- It seems implausible to claim that *all* our values are freely chosen. Words like 'right', 'wrong' are learnt by application, so how could *that* be a matter of free choice in Sartre's sense?
- Related to the above, to say that we 'invent' values overstates the case. Some account needs to be given of background possibilities. Certain moral codes are no longer possible.
- There might be some directed discussion of bad faith, eg do such examples illustrate a flight from freedom, is the concept coherent?
- How is it possible for us to use our knowledge of a person's character to accurately predict future actions?
- Sartre underestimates phenomena like weakness of the will, emotional blackmail or compulsive behaviour, eg there is a difference between placing a bet on the Grand National and gambling one's house on the turn of a card. It seems simplistic/plainly wrong to describe both as the exercise of free choice.
- Can Sartre provide a reason for why we should *care* about the freedom of others?
- There might be some discussion of the connection between freedom and responsibility but this should sustain relevance, eg whether the thesis of absolute freedom has unacceptable implications for responsibility. The claim that in fashioning myself, I fashion man might be discussed. Does universalisation follow from Sartre's thesis? Would it not be more consistent with freedom to recognise cases where an action might be right for me but not for someone else?
- There is likely to be reference to some of Sartre's examples: Jesuit priest, student, Maggie Tulliver. Such references need to be focused on the central issue of how free we are and not just described in detail for their own sake.
- Too sharp a distinction between human beings and the rest of the natural order.

25 marks

[Maximum for question: 45 marks]