



**General Certificate of Education**

**Philosophy 1171/2171**

**PHIL2      An Introduction to Philosophy 2**

**Mark Scheme**

*2009 examination – January 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](http://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 © 2009 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.

---

**AS PHILOSOPHY**
**GENERIC MARK SCHEME for part (a) questions (Total: 15 marks)**

	<b>AO1: Knowledge and Understanding</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	<p><b>11–15 marks</b></p> <p>Answers in this level provide a clear explanation of the relevant issues and demonstrate a precise understanding of philosophical positions and arguments. Appropriate illustrations are sharp, articulate and properly developed.</p> <p>Answers at the bottom of this level are accurate and focused but too succinct: <i>either</i> the illustrations need development, <i>or</i> the significance of important points is only implicit.</p>
<b>Level 2</b>	<p><b>6–10 marks</b></p> <p>Answers in this level <i>either</i> briefly list a range of points <i>or</i> two or more points are blurred together <i>or</i> the explanation is clear but unbalanced so that one point is well made but a second is only briefly stated.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Answers in this level <i>either</i> clearly identify, explain and illustrate one relevant point so that a partial explanation is given <i>or</i> provide a generalised, prosaic, response lacking detail and precision.</p>
<b>Level 1</b>	<p><b>0–5 marks</b></p> <p>Answers in this level <i>either</i> provide a basic, sketchy and vague account <i>or</i> a confused or tangential account which may only coincide with the concerns of the question in places.</p>

**AS PHILOSOPHY**

**GENERIC MARK SCHEME for part (b) questions (Total: 30 marks)**

	<b>AO1: Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>AO2: Interpretation, Analysis and Application</b>	<b>AO3: Assessment and Evaluation</b>
<b>Level 4</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>15–18 marks</b> Answers in this level provide an integrated, comprehensive and sustained critical analysis of the issues.	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	<b>3 marks</b> Answers in this level are focused, full and informed accounts of the relevant issues.	<b>10–14 marks</b> Answers in this level provide an uneven analysis lacking precise detail or a partial perspective on the issues. Nevertheless, the discussion is directed at the relevant issues, links are present and the significance of points for the question is explicit.	<b>7–9 marks</b> At the top of this level answers will be subtle and penetrating and evaluation is sustained. A critical appreciation of points raised is employed to advance a position.  At the bottom of this level assessment is explicit and conclusions are clearly supported, but the assessment could be more subtle or penetrating.  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.
<b>Level 2</b>	<b>2 marks</b> Answers in this level are <i>either</i> general responses lacking precision, <i>or</i> provide a partial account that is otherwise sharp.	<b>5–9 marks</b> Answers in this level provide some relevant material but the links between points or their significance for the question are not made clear.	<b>4–6 marks</b> Evaluation is not sustained, although it is present. Evaluation may take the form of a disengaged but explicit juxtaposition of theoretical approaches or be a reasonable but undeveloped assertion. Answers lower in the level present a limited range of critical points and evaluation may be largely implicit. The response is legible, employing some technical language accurately, with possibly some errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar.

**AS PHILOSOPHY**

**GENERIC MARK SCHEME for part (b) questions continued**

	<b>AO1: Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>AO2: Interpretation, Analysis and Application</b>	<b>AO3: Assessment and Evaluation</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	<p><b>1 mark</b>                      Answers in this level demonstrate a basic and limited grasp through a sketchy and vague account lacking depth, detail and precision <i>or</i> through a confused or tangential account in which some points coincide with the concerns of the question.</p>	<p><b>0–4 marks</b>                      Answers in this level are undeveloped or fragmentary and the discussion lacks any direction. Alternatively some relevant points may feature in a tangential approach.</p>	<p><b>1–3 marks</b>                      Minimal evaluative points are merely asserted and there is little or no appreciation of the critical issues.                       Technical language may not be employed, or it may be used inappropriately. The response may not be legible and errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar may be intrusive.</p>
<b>0 marks</b>	<p>No relevant philosophical knowledge.</p>	<p>No relevant philosophical points.</p>	<p>No relevant philosophical insights are presented.</p>

**Theme: Knowledge of the external world****1****Total for this question: 45 marks**

- (a) Explain and illustrate **one** argument for distinguishing between primary and secondary qualities. (15 marks)

The distinction has been drawn in various ways:

- Primary qualities (eg size, shape, mass, density, motion/rest) are mind-independent properties that belong to the object itself. Secondary qualities are the sensible qualities attributed to the object (eg colour, smell, sound, texture, taste) and depend upon our perceiving.
- Primary qualities are objective properties studied by science and quantifiable, whereas secondary qualities are subjective non-measurable characteristics.
- Secondary qualities are explicable with reference to the inherent causal powers belonging to the object that happen to produce particular kinds of effect in us. The inherent causal powers belong to the object's primary qualities.

Reasons for distinguishing between primary and secondary qualities might be:

- Some of the properties an object appears to have will vary depending on conditions, but the object itself cannot be subject to such variability. Whatever belongs to the object itself (its primary qualities) must have a constancy apart from the variable ways we happen to experience that object (its secondary qualities).
- An absolute conception of reality must purge any perspective-dependent properties (secondary qualities) from its description of what there is (the primary qualities of objects).
- As a matter of fact, physics and chemistry focus on what philosophers call the primary qualities of objects, eschewing the secondary qualities, in their effort to describe and explain the nature of things.
- Subtracting the inessential properties leaves the primary, essential properties.

- (b) Consider whether the strengths of idealism outweigh the weaknesses. (30 marks)

*Possible strengths:*

- Objects really are as they appear, so idealism reflects commonsense.
- No need to propose an unobservable mind-independent reality and so idealism avoids having to explain how we come to know 'matter' and how it operates.
- Idealism is ontologically economical (cf Occam's razor).
- Focus on 'coherence with other observations' reflects actual practice.
- God is centre stage – epistemologically and ontologically – which is where He ought to be.
- Idealist themes are still fruitful (eg instrumentalism in science, anti-realism).

*Possible weaknesses:*

- It confuses the act of apprehension with the thing apprehended.
- It cannot cope with the continuous existence of intermittently unperceived objects or explain the regularity of our experience.
- The role God plays in the theory is philosophically dubious.
- It contravenes our instinctive beliefs.
- The theory is more complex than its rivals.
- It leads to solipsism.

- It fails to recognise the significant distinction between primary and secondary qualities.
- The requirement that beliefs cohere leaves everything ‘hanging in the air’.

***In order to achieve the mid/higher Level 3 scores and above, candidates must show a critical appreciation (‘consider’) of the issues, not merely recall and list relevant points.***

**Theme: Tolerance****2****Total for this question: 45 marks**

(a) Describe and illustrate **two** characteristics a tolerant individual should possess. (15 marks)

- 'Toleration' is a stance taken towards thoughts and actions that are disapproved of. As such, a person who is merely indifferent to the thoughts and actions of others is not tolerant. A tolerant person has their own values that are in conflict with the values being tolerated.
- Being powerless to control thoughts and actions you disapprove of is not being tolerant. Being tolerant involves having the power to be intolerant but choosing not to use that power because you accept autonomy and diversity.
- A tolerant individual is someone who values toleration as a virtue.
- A tolerant individual may be neutral about views of the good life.
- A tolerant individual will tend to be optimistic about and committed to public institutions that foster dialogue and transparency, believing them to be effective devices for conflict resolution and enhancing social development.
- A tolerant person is positively committed to the value of toleration and will defend it against intolerance – they will not tolerate intolerance of thoughts and actions they disagree with.

***The question asks candidates to both 'describe' and 'illustrate'. Unless both elements are there, a candidate can achieve a maximum of 8 marks (Level 2). Illustrations can combine a number of examples or focus on a single example to draw out the relevant ideas.***

(b) 'Religious believers should tolerate lifestyles which they find disagreeable.' Discuss arguments in favour of this view. (30 marks)

*Expect the following:*

- Toleration is a characteristic virtue of all religion, and so religion requires tolerant believers. However, support for this interpretation of religion is far from overwhelming. Are liberal values being projected onto religion?
- If toleration is a virtue, this leads to a paradox because then it would become morally right to tolerate what you regard as morally wrong.
- Different lifestyles should be tolerated because it is not clear which conception of the good life is right. However, religious believers are often convinced they know what the good life involves – and disagreeable lifestyles are just wrong.
- Different lifestyles should be tolerated because it is only through 'experiments in living' that we can establish the best way to live. However, we do not need to do 'experiments' if we know the will of God. Liberalism implicitly assumes that the truth of religion and the methods by which religion acquires those 'truths' are, at best, an open question.
- Religious believers have 'consented' to accept the protection of the state under its law and so if the state upholds the rights of individuals to pursue lifestyles that the religious find disagreeable, the religious have an obligation to obey the law. But the religious might not accept this analysis of state authority and obligation.



- Respect for individual autonomy requires that we tolerate different lifestyles, disagreeable or not. However, religious believers might not prize individual autonomy (as secular liberals do) and instead prioritise other imperatives (eg saving lost souls).
- Sacred and secular matters should be kept apart. The neutral state should maintain this division by enforcing and nurturing a tolerant society. However, this view of the relation between church/mosque/synagogue/temple and state has little basis in religious tradition and is just transient liberal dogma.
- We live in a multi-cultural society and we will all tend to be happier if we tolerate diverse lifestyles. However, is it true that happiness is best achieved through tolerating such diversity, and is happiness 'here and now' of that much value?
- It's impossible to coerce someone out of a disagreeable lifestyle, so you might as well tolerate it. However, a religious believer might not be so sceptical. Also, disagreeable lifestyles have corrupting effects on others and offend God, so the religious have a duty to be 'intolerant'.
- It depends on what you mean by 'tolerate' and at what level. A religious believer might respect an individual's rights but make it plain and public why they despise that individual's way of life. Is that 'toleration'?

***In order to achieve the mid/higher Level 3 scores and above, candidates must show a critical appreciation ('consider') of the arguments, not merely recall and list relevant points.***

**Theme: The value of art****3****Total for this question: 45 marks**

(a)	Explain and illustrate the notion of ‘form’ in relation to works of art.	(15 marks)
-----	--	------------

- Focusing on form draws attention to qualities within an art work, such as balance, proportion, structure, harmony, symmetry, unity, wholeness, coherence. Form focuses on the relations and orderings that hold between different elements comprising the work.
- Although different kinds of art work (eg music, drama, photography) realise form in different ways, form is the *common denominator* that qualifies art as art – it is the essence of art.
- ‘Form’ is commonly used to distinguish extrinsic properties of an art work (such as its representational content or the accompanying everyday emotions that this content typically evokes) from the intrinsic properties of the art work *qua* art.
- Form can be regarded as constituting beauty and so grounding the beautiful in objective features of the world, including art. Beauty is the focus of aesthetic appreciation, so we value form.
- If not beauty, ‘Significant Form’ picks out those features of an art work that express a peculiar ‘aesthetic emotion’ – exactly what features this highlights is unclear as the emotion is peculiar to the appreciation of ‘significant form’ and the ‘significant form’ is apprehended by way of the aesthetic emotion.
- ‘Form’ can be used in a less exclusive way; to draw attention to features in a work of art that are supposed to correspond to structural features of everyday human emotions. In this way the ‘form’ of an art work expresses our feelings and is valuable because of it.

***The question asks candidates to both ‘explain’ and ‘illustrate’. Unless both elements are there a candidate can achieve a maximum of 8 marks (Level 2). Illustrations can combine a number of examples or focus on a single example to draw out the relevant ideas.***

(b)	‘We value art because it expresses the artist’s feelings.’ Consider what can be said both for <b>and</b> against this view.	(30 marks)
-----	---	------------

*For:*

- When evaluating art we often consider whether it is a ‘sincere’, ‘authentic’, or ‘genuine’ expression of the artist’s feelings towards the world around them. If it is, we tend to think the art work is more valuable because of it.
- We often view the artist as especially emotionally sensitive who has the capacity to convert their vivid inner experience into a publicly accessible work of art. The art work is a symptom of being an artistic soul.
- The artist’s intentions are relevant in determining how we ought to judge their work. Frequently artists intend to express their feelings and we should appreciate their art accordingly.

*Against:*

- It is not obvious that all the art we value is emotionally expressive.
- The evaluation of art should restrict itself to focusing on the artwork itself and its intrinsic *aesthetic quality* (eg formalism).
- Even if some works of art are best understood as expressions of feeling and emotion, this might have nothing to do with the artist's feelings. Rather, the expressive qualities we value might inhere in the artwork, or else be the effects the artwork stimulates in us.
- The causal origins of an art work are independent of the artistic product and as a matter of fact we have plenty of evidence showing that what or how strongly an artist happens to be feeling has no bearing on their capacity to produce even the most emotionally direct and intense work.
- Artistic production is not a kind of magical realisation of 'inner feeling' and the artist's 'feelings' are not the issue. The judgements artists make in creating an artwork involve the studied application of genre specific techniques onto a more or less recalcitrant medium, towards an evolving conception of the finished product – we appreciate the artist's practical intelligence.
- The intentions of the artist are often not known, but we can nevertheless appreciate the art. If so, it is implausible to claim the artist's intentions must determine our appreciation of their work.
- 'The death of the author' leaves the artist's intentions out of consideration.

***In order to achieve the mid/higher Level 3 scores and above, candidates must show a critical appreciation ('consider') of the issues, not merely recall and list relevant points.***

**Theme: God and the world****4****Total for this question: 45 marks**

- (a) Describe **one** feature of the World that appears to show design. Explain **one** reason for doubting this feature does show design. (15 marks)

Features of the World that appear to show design:

- Comprehensive orderliness in nature as revealed by science.
- Structure and fit towards some function or purpose.
- Deviations from the norm (eg water expanding as it freezes) that look like deliberate interventions or ‘fine-tuning’.
- Beneficent features such as beauty.
- The providential nature of that order and purpose for our existence.
- The improbability of these features being seen in a system that is not the product of design.

Reasons for doubting those features do show design:

- The evidence is insufficient or indeterminate from our perspective.
- There is too much counterevidence (note: ‘evil’ is only counterevidence against a particular kind of design or designer – so a *partial* response if on its own and just assumed).
- What ‘appears’ to be design is, for all we know, a symptom of the way we make sense of our experience.
- Design requires intelligence. Evolution can account for the most impressive evidence put forward for design, without requiring ‘intelligence’. So those ‘impressive’ features do not, in fact, show design.

***The question asks candidates to do two things. Unless both elements are there a candidate can achieve a maximum of 8 marks (Level 2).***

- (b) ‘Natural evil does not count against the existence of God.’ Discuss. (30 marks)

- We would not expect an omnipotent, omni-benevolent creator to allow natural evil (eg earthquakes, floods, droughts, disease) and so its occurrence appears to count against the existence of such a God.
- Natural evil does not count against the existence of such a God because God is not responsible for it. We are responsible for natural evil. It is the consequence of our (Adam and Eve’s) disobedience. The abuse of our free-will brought disorder into an otherwise harmonious creation (*privatio boni*). An omnipotent and benevolent God has meted out a just punishment and a chance for redemption.
- Natural evil is necessary for ‘soul making’. In order for us to develop we have to cope with and overcome real obstacles and hardship. God does not want us to suffer, but he must allow suffering in order to produce the greater Good.
- Even if some of the suffering caused by natural evil could be reconciled with God, the extent of that suffering and its indiscriminate nature cannot be.
- Natural evil emerges from a system that God created but cannot control (process theodicy). So natural evil shows that God is not all-powerful but it does not count against His omni-benevolence. The creation was a risk God took on our behalf and He suffers with us.

- We must have faith that what appears 'evil' from our limited perspective is not so from God's eye view. It is a matter of faith seeking understanding.
- God is not a hypothesis, more or less compatible with the evidence, and so natural evil does not 'count against' Him.

***In order to achieve the mid/higher Level 3 scores and above, candidates must show a critical appreciation ('discuss') of the issues, not merely recall and list relevant points.***

**Theme: Free will and determinism****5****Total for this question: 45 marks**

(a)	Explain and illustrate the distinction between reasons and causes.	(15 marks)
-----	--	------------

- Reasons make action intelligible in terms of culturally constrained norms and values. Causes explain events in terms of universal laws of nature.
- Reasons are goal orientated, unlike causes.
- Causes operate even if we are always ignorant of them, whereas reasons are the kinds of things we are typically aware of.
- A cause and its effect are *contingently* related 'distinct existences'. A reason and the action it produces are *intrinsically* or *conceptually* related.
- That reasons guide action is a prerequisite for being an agent. The idea that causes bring about our 'action' undermines the notion of agency.
- The contrast between the intentional stance and the mechanical stance.
- One can have both good and bad reasons for actions. Causes are neutral.

***The question asks candidates to both 'explain' and 'illustrate'. Unless both elements are there a candidate can achieve a maximum of 8 marks (Level 2). Illustrations can combine a number of examples or focus on a single example to draw out the relevant ideas.***

(b)	Explore the claim that because human beings have minds as well as bodies, they have free will.	(30 marks)
-----	--	------------

*Expect the following kinds of consideration:*

- Acts of volition and the associated activity (eg understanding, deliberating, deciding, planning) would all be described as *mental* activity, so regarding free-will as belonging to 'the mind' seems reasonable.
- If determinism is true then it only operates in the physical realm. Minds are outside the physical realm and so minds escape the constraints of determinism.
- Even if minds escape the constraints of determinism, what about our bodies? If physical bodies behave deterministically then it looks as if our volitions are impotent. Conversely, if our volitions cause changes in the physical world then not all physical occurrences accord with the laws of nature.
- Minds and mental activity could be reducible to or causally dependent upon physical states and processes (in the brain). If so, mental acts such as willing are ultimately subject to deterministic physical laws, and so are not free.
- Freedom does not depend upon minds being 'outside' the physical causal nexus. Rather, freedom is the capacity to act on our beliefs and desires without obstruction.
- Saying a being has a mind is inviting us to consider their actions permeated with rationality and moral autonomy.
- Looking at us from 'the outside' it isn't clear that we do have minds – our freedom is an illusion.
- The view assumes that unlike minds, mere bodies are not free because 'the physical' obeys deterministic principles. However determinism is not obviously true.

***In order to achieve the mid/higher Level 3 scores and above, candidates must show a critical appreciation of the various ways the claim might be analysed and interpreted, not merely develop a single view (ie not 'explore').***