



**General Certificate of Education**

**Philosophy 1171**

**PHIL2      An Introduction to Philosophy 2**

**Mark Scheme**

*2009 examination - June series*

**This mark scheme uses the [new numbering system](#) which is being introduced for examinations from June 2010**

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 © 2010 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 and detailed explanation of the relevant issue and demonstrate a precise understanding of philosophical positions and arguments. Illustrations, if required, are appropriate, articulate and properly developed.</p> <p>Answers at the bottom of this level are accurate and focused but <i>either</i> too succinct <i>or</i> unbalanced: for example, <i>either</i> one point is well made and illustrated but a second point or illustration is less developed <i>or</i> important points and/or illustrations are accurate but briefly stated so that significance is not fully drawn out.</p>
<b>Level 2</b>	<p><b>6–10 marks</b></p> <p>Answers in this level may <i>either</i> briefly list a range of points <i>or</i> blur two or more points together <i>or</i> explanation is clear but unbalanced so that a point is well made but illustrative material is less convincing <i>or</i> illustrations are good but the point being illustrated is less clear and perhaps left implicit.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>If two points are required answers in this level may <i>either</i> clearly identify, explain and illustrate one relevant point so that a partial explanation is given <i>or</i> one point may be well made and well illustrated but the second is very briefly stated or unclear, unconvincing and/or not illustrated. Two points briefly stated with no illustrations would go to the bottom of this band. Two fully developed points with no illustrations may reach the top of this band.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The response is broadly accurate but prosaic, generalised and lacking detail and precision.</p>
<b>Level 1</b>	<p><b>0–5 marks</b></p> <p>Answers in this level <i>either</i> make one reasonable point with little development or without illustration <i>or</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>	<p><b>15–18 marks</b></p> <p>A clear and closely argued discussion incorporating a well-developed appreciation of some of the philosophical issues at stake by applying and analysing a range of points in some detail and with precision.</p>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	<p><b>3 marks</b></p> <p>A sound understanding of some issues raised by the question, identifying relevant ideas/evidence.</p>	<p><b>10–14 marks</b></p> <p>Answers in this level are directed at the relevant issues but:</p> <p><i>Either:</i> a narrow focus but the detail is pithy and organised intelligently.</p> <p><i>Or:</i> Broad and accurate detail but analysis, while present, is undeveloped or not always convincing.</p> <p>Answers at the bottom of this band may be full but largely descriptive.</p>	<p><b>7–9 marks</b></p> <p>Answers at the top of this level provide a well thought out appreciation of some problematic issues raised by the specific demands of the question. Reasoning is employed to support the conclusion advanced.</p> <p>Lower in the band the critical discussion may lack penetration. Conclusions are supported but the reasoning is not sharp.</p> <p>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.</p>

**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 2</b>	<p><b>2 marks</b></p> <p>Answers are relevant but <i>either</i> fail to maintain a focus on the specific question <i>or</i> are partial responses, where ideas/examples lack detail.</p>	<p><b>5–9 marks</b></p> <p>Answers in this level provide some relevant material but:</p> <p><i>Either:</i> points are made but not developed and analysis, if present, is limited.</p> <p><i>Or:</i> the relevance of some points may be unclear although analysis is present.</p>	<p><b>4–6 marks</b></p> <p>Evaluation is not sustained, although it is present implicitly or explicitly.</p> <p><i>Either:</i> alternative approaches are merely described, without explicit comparison or assessment.</p> <p><i>Or:</i> relevant critical material is selected but the conclusion advanced does not seem to follow from the argument.</p> <p>The response is legible, employing some technical language accurately, with possibly some errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar.</p>
<b>Level 1</b>	<p><b>1 mark</b></p> <p>Answers in this level demonstrate a basic grasp of aspects of relevant issues. Responses may be sketchy and vague; <i>or</i> confused <i>or</i> largely tangential although at least one point should coincide with the concerns of the question.</p>	<p><b>1–4 marks</b></p> <p>Answers in this level are sketchy, fragmentary responses <i>or</i> an isolated relevant point appears in an otherwise tangential <i>or</i> confused response.</p>	<p><b>1–3 marks</b></p> <p>Critical comments are vague and the reasoning sketchy. Lower in the band argumentation may be confused <i>or</i> a response to the question may be barely outlined without any critical discussion.</p> <p>Technical language may not be employed or used inappropriately. The response may not be legible, errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar may be intrusive.</p>

**Theme 1: Knowledge of the external world**

**Total for this question: 45 marks**

**01** Outline and illustrate the differences between sense data and physical objects. (15 marks)

*Anticipate the following explanations:*

Whereas physical objects exist apart from being perceived, sense data exist only as they are perceived. We are immediately acquainted with sense data, on the basis of which we infer a mind-independent reality. Descriptions referring to a mind-independent reality are fallible whereas my reports regarding sense data are incorrigible. The latter reports describe my private experience whereas the mind-independent world is comprised of public neutral objects. The way the world appears to me is dependent on and will vary according to the conditions in which I perceive, whereas the properties that belong to physical objects have constancy. Sense data, unlike physical objects, can have indeterminate properties. Sense data are (usually) mental in contrast to physical objects comprised of matter.

*Illustrative examples are likely to differ depending on the points being made and can be drawn from various sources:*

Illusions and delusions (eg bent sticks, mirage, hallucinations), perceptual relativity (the real shape of the coin, the real properties of the table), phenomenology (apparent and real speckled hens) or time-lag arguments (seeing the 'sun') that distinguish between the way the world appears and the way it is. Candidates will probably discuss sense data in relation to representative realism, but that explicit link is not required, and a description of representative realism can only be credited to the extent that it addresses the distinction in question.

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

**02** 'The existence of the external world is a reasonable hypothesis.' Consider what can be said both for and against this view. (30 marks)

**Knowledge and Understanding**

In order to explain why the existence of the external world is something that might be hypothesised, or what that hypothesis amounts to, candidates will probably develop an account of representative realism, where the external world is proposed as the source and ultimate target of our beliefs, mediated through a veil of perception (eg arguments that we are immediately acquainted with: sense impressions, sense data). Certainly, they will need to show an understanding of the alleged distinction between experience (an 'internal' world) and the objects and events which we suppose that experience is an experience of (an 'external' world).

**Interpretation, Analysis, Application**

*Anticipate the following points of discussion:*

**For**

*The existence of the external world is a reasonable hypothesis:*

- The existence of an external world explains the character of our experience of objects and events – as something given, which we receive from the outside.
- The existence of an ordered external world is the best explanation for the orderliness of our experience (cf the chaotic character of dreams).
- The existence of an external world is the best explanation for the continued existence of unperceived objects.
- The existence of an external world avoids the absurdity of solipsism.

- The existence of an external world provides the most satisfactory model (eg simple, instinctive, sanctioned by God) of our experience amongst the alternatives (eg idealism).
- The existence of an external world explains how one and the same thing can appear differently.
- The existence of an external world is necessary for truth: our thoughts about the world are true if they correspond to a world independent of our thought.

### **Against**

*The existence of the external world is not a reasonable hypothesis:*

- The hypothesis is idle; we cannot get 'outside our skins' and establish any isomorphism between an internal (representation) and external (represented) world.
- The external world cannot feature as a causal explanation of our perception as it is a causal hypothesis that we cannot test in principle (ie it is a pseudo causal hypothesis).
- The idea of a representing (eg sense data) only makes sense if we can specify the represented (the object or event in themselves) and as the represented is unknowable, the notion of a 'representing' in this context is vacuous.
- The only reasonable option is to acknowledge scepticism about the external world (and adopt solipsism?).
- It is simpler to drop the idea of an external world (and its partner – an internal world). We don't talk about an external world. The world we talk about is the world we see, hear, taste, touch and smell or otherwise observe (eg using technology) directly (which could be cashed out in terms of direct realism or idealism).
- Appearance and reality are best discriminated by reference to other experiences, not by supposing there is an external world to which experience might or might not correspond.

### **Assessment and Evaluation**

It could be argued that:

- There is a genuine issue regarding the external world and hypothesising that it exists is reasonable, all things considered.
- There is a genuine issue regarding the external world but, all things considered, reason supports scepticism.
- There is not a genuine issue regarding the external world – it's a philosophical chimera and, all things considered, the issue ought to be analysed away.

---

**Theme 2: Tolerance**

**Total for this question: 45 marks**

<p><b>03</b> Explain and illustrate <b>two</b> reasons why tolerance should not rule out being offensive. (15 marks)</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Anticipate the following points:*

- There is no explicit or implicit imperative to eliminate offence entailed by the idea of tolerance. Tolerance assumes offence. This might be expressed as a reciprocal relation: ‘they’ offend ‘us’, and ‘we’ are expected to tolerate ‘them’, so why shouldn’t ‘we’ offend ‘them’?
- Tolerance is a positive virtue because a free market of ideas (including offensive ones) yields benefits. Avoiding offence might diminish such benefits. Freedom of thought and expression includes the freedom to offend.
- In the interests of promoting tolerance, a lifestyle or view might be defended that will offend some groups; who is to say what constitutes offence?
- From a critical perspective, tolerance is a mechanism for legitimising what should be regarded as offensive – in this sense, tolerance incorporates offence.
- In a democracy everyone must be allowed the opportunity to persuade others of their views, however offensive their views might be.
- Some people find any criticism offensive. Surely we shouldn’t repress criticisms simply because someone might be offended? If freedom of expression is incompatible with tolerance we should give up the latter (tolerance is normatively dependent rather than a virtue).
- We should never tolerate harm. To the extent that offence is harmful, it too should be ruled out. But sometimes offence is just offence and so it ought to be tolerated.

*Illustrations of the two reasons might include:*

- Offensive actions (eg sexual behaviour, religious rites, political demonstrations).
- Offensive ideas (eg political ideologies, racist or sexist jokes, religious beliefs, atheistic beliefs and so on).
- Points might be illustrated negatively – eg through references to ‘political correctness’.

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



<b>04</b> Discuss the claim that society should be tolerant because the benefits of toleration outweigh the costs. (30 marks)
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### **Knowledge and Understanding**

The value of tolerance might be unpacked in the context of classical liberalism, utilitarianism or value pluralism and the costs might be explored in terms of fundamentalist, conservative or communitarian ideals. The stress of the question is on discussing various arguments.

### **Interpretation, Analysis, Application**

- Consideration of evidence for and against the claim that the benefits outweigh the costs, so tolerance is justified.
- Consideration of the problems of determining what is meant by 'cost' and 'benefit' (eg universal 'goods') and difficulties interpreting, quantifying and assessing the evidence (eg is Britain 'better off' than Singapore?)
- Consideration of the view that tolerance is an essentially contested concept and so it's not clear what being tolerant involves and so we cannot assess 'its' costs and benefits.
- How can we estimate the 'costs and benefits' if we are interested in promoting the *quality* of life?
- Consideration of the view that the value of tolerance explicitly acknowledges that what is of benefit and what is a cost is contested. Nevertheless, tolerant societies allow a free critical debate which is the most effective method for arriving at justified beliefs.
- Consideration of the view that consequentialism makes toleration a contingent value – merely a means to an end.
- Tolerance is part of the fabric of western societies for historical reasons – we are and should be tolerant because that is our inherited tradition.
- Tolerance works better in diverse societies than repression.
- Tolerance is an ideological device maximising the interests of the capitalist class.

It may be the case that the issue is discussed within a particular context – eg religious pluralism.

### **Assessment and Evaluation**

- It could be argued that the benefits of tolerance outweigh the costs, to a greater or lesser extent.
- It could be argued that the costs of tolerance outweigh the benefits, to a greater or lesser extent.
- It could be argued that whether the benefits outweigh the costs or vice versa depends on local historical circumstances and so there is no general answer.
- It could be argued that we cannot measure the costs and benefits as the variables are far too complex to track.
- It could be argued that there is no value-neutral position from which an 'objective measurement' can be made.

These points may be broadly identifiable within an assessment of 'theoretical' approaches: liberalism, conservatism, critical theory.

---

**Theme 3: The Value of art**

**Total for this question: 45 marks**

<b>05</b> Explain <b>and</b> illustrate <b>two</b> criticisms of the claim that something cannot be art unless it is emotionally moving. (15 marks)
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Anticipate two of the following points:*

- Emotional reactions to art need not be aesthetic reactions (eg getting angry because a song reminds you of a miserable holiday) so merely responding emotionally to art is an insufficient characterisation of the kind of response art demands.
- Not all art is moving emotionally; it might be valued because it is intelligent, clever, intriguing and so on. Nevertheless, we should value such art for these other qualities. So being emotionally moving does not look like it's necessary for qualifying as art.
- The claim is vague – are the emotions everyday emotions or peculiar aesthetic emotions? Should the emotions be uplifting, or any old emotion?
- It depends on what the artist intended. If the art is supposed to move you emotionally, but does not, then it is an artistic failure. Otherwise, being emotionally moving is irrelevant (eg conceptual art).
- Who should be moved – the audience or the artist or both? Does the art need to move everybody?

*Illustrations*

Illustrations can be drawn from any of the arts: music, literature, visual arts, film, dance, architecture and so on.

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

<b>06</b> How convincing is the claim that 'Because art is informative, we value it'? (30 marks)
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Knowledge and Understanding**

The question could be linked to theories that regard art as essentially imitative or representational (eg Plato), or as serving some other edifying purpose (eg Tolstoy, revolutionary aesthetics).

**Interpretation, Analysis, Application**

*Anticipate the following points of discussion:*

- The claim is ambiguous: is it a description or a prescription? Is being informative the *only* reason, or just a reason?
- Some might claim that, historically, the information conveyed in art was its prime value, and we do value art works because they are insightful, even if they lack other qualities (eg history plays, 1984).
- We assess art in terms of its truthfulness, so the information contained in the art must be an aspect of the value of art.
- It's not just the information we value, but how that information is conveyed artistically (eg war painting).
- Art is valued because it increases our 'capacity to be informed'; by nurturing and sensitising our cognitive faculties.
- Some valued art tells us nothing – either because it cannot (instrumental music) or it just does not (abstract painting) – so its value cannot be because it is informative.

- Valuing art because it is informative, suggests you could substitute the art for another equally informative medium (eg a text book).
- The value of art consists in other things: its emotional or formal qualities.
- Art does not inform us about the world: rather art shapes the way that world appears to us.
- Where art is essentially informative, it is often poor.
- Art is always informative as every work of art is a contribution to the discourse of art.

### **Assessment and Evaluation**

It could be argued that:

- The value of art qua art is independent of any informing it might or might not do.
- The capacity to inform is a valued function of some kinds of art (eg literature) but is insignificant in respect to other kinds of art (eg instrumental music).
- If the notion of 'informative' is broad enough to include anything that can be reflected upon rationally then art – embedded in normative discourse – must be informative.

---

**Theme 4: God and the world**

**Total for this question: 45 marks**

<b>07</b> Explain <b>and</b> illustrate <b>two</b> ways in which a world without pain and suffering could be less good than a world with pain and suffering. (15 marks)
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Candidates will probably locate their answer in either Irenaean or Augustinian theodicies, but they do not need to in order to get full marks. Illustrations will be diverse.

*Anticipate the following:*

- Without pain and suffering you would not notice or appreciate the good things.
- The meaning of good is inseparable from pain and suffering (cf inside/outside).
- Without pain or suffering you will not develop morally and spiritually.
- Without pain and suffering sin would go unpunished and the World would be more unjust than it is.
- Possessing and exercising free will is intrinsically and supersedingly good; but free will brings with it the risk and actuality of pain and suffering.
- Without pain and suffering the universe is a less faceted creation than the divine mind is capable of producing – less aesthetically good.
- Pain and suffering provide us with opportunities to produce a greater good.
- God created us with free will so we could 'love'. The price of the existence of love could be evil.

*Illustrations*

Illustrations can be drawn from the literature, but the points can all be illustrated with their own examples. The important point is that the idea is properly illustrated.

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

<b>08</b> Assess whether 'God designed the world' is a reasonable hypothesis. (30 marks)
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Knowledge and Understanding**

The discussion can refer to Aquinas, Paley, Swinburne, Tennant, Hume, Kant, Wisdom, Ayer and so on.

**Interpretation, Analysis, Application**

*Anticipate the following kinds of points for discussion:*

- Evidence and counter-evidence for design (eg considering claims focusing on order and spatio/temporal regularity, purpose, fine-tuning, special benefit apparent in the universe, anthropic principle).
- Interpretation and assessment of that evidence in terms of analogies with known designs (eg Paley), estimates of probability and inferences to the best explanation (Swinburne).
- Problems of inferring God from the evidence – equally plausible alternative explanations (eg many gods, infant gods, indifferent gods, non-divine creators, etc).
- 'God designed the world' is not offered as a hypothesis that should be testable in specifiable ways (verified or falsified by particular observations): 'God designed the world' is one schema, amongst many, of making sense of experience (cf Wisdom's 'Gods').
- 'God designed the world' is not a hypothesis but a personal commitment to a form of life (cf belief that, belief in).

- 'God designed the world' is a revealed truth – 'reasonableness' is not apt, it rests on faith.

**Assessment and Evaluation**

- It could be argued that 'God designed the world' is a reasonable hypothesis.
- It could be argued that 'God designed the world' is not a reasonable hypothesis.
- It could be argued that 'God designed the world' is a pseudo-hypothesis.
- It could be argued that 'God designed the world' is not a hypothesis but instead an expression of something else (eg a commitment to a religious way of life).

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

<b>09</b>	Contrast determinism with fatalism, illustrating your answer.	<i>(15 marks)</i>
-----------	---------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------

*Anticipate the following kinds of points:*

Determinism is supposed to be an empirical claim. It is the view that whatever occurs next is *causally* necessitated; given how things are now and the laws of nature, the future could not be otherwise. Perhaps this is compatible with free will. However, the laws themselves and the initial conditions could be just ‘brute facts’.

Fatalism can be a logical claim. If propositions must be either true or false and their truth value is independent of the passage of time, then what is true or false now, must have been true or false in the past; and so what is true of me in the future is true now as it always must have been. So it looks as if what occurs next is not something I could bring about or prevent. This kind of necessity could also be linked to an omniscient God who knows all truths in a timeless way.

Fatalism could also be understood as something ‘written in the stars’. If so, the contrast with determinism would stress the purpose, meaning, significance etc of fateful events rather than mere causality.

**Illustrations**

Examples for determinism could include scientific explanations for particular phenomena that appear deterministic, or accounts of how human behaviour might be analysed as determined. For fatalism, Aristotle’s sea battle, the sailor who never learns to swim, student who never revises and so on. Or, star crossed lovers, football teams with their name ‘written on the cup’ and so on.

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

<b>10</b>	Explore the claim that ‘We make the choices we do because of our nature’.	<i>(30 marks)</i>
-----------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------

**Knowledge and Understanding**

Depending on the angles they choose to explore, a response could draw on incompatibilist, compatibilist or libertarian philosophical positions as well as evidence and theory from the natural and social sciences. The stress in the question is the exploration of the nuances in the question (ie ‘explore’) rather than detailing a particular perspective on it.

**Interpretation, Analysis, Application**

*Anticipate the following kinds of points:*

- We are merely physical and ultimately, as this is our nature, our choices are the outcome of deterministic physical processes; just like the rest of nature is determined.
- Our God-given or inherited nature (accumulated karma) determines our choices. So God or some divine cosmic order has predestined the course of our lives.
- We make the choices we do because of our nature, but free will is part of our nature (eg given by God).
- Our choices are determined, not by nature but by nurture. Some psychological research suggests that the particular culture we belong to is the overriding determiner in the course of our lives, not anything innate and universal.
- We make the choices we do because we are free, and this freedom is independent of nature.

- Once you understand our nature, you understand we don't make choices. Our will is just a facet of more primordial (subconscious) drives and the experience of choice is merely epiphenomenal.
- Our nature is just 'what we do' and so the statement is trivial: we do what we do because we do what we do. So what?
- The choices that make our actions intelligible and can be assessed normatively are not to be confused with causes of behaviour.
- We realise our nature in choosing, so we have the nature we do because of our choices.

**Assessment and Evaluation**

A candidate could argue that:

- We have no free will because our nature determines our choices.
- Having free will is compatible with nature determining our choices.
- We have free will because our nature does not determine our choices.
- We have free will because we have no nature to determine our choices.
- The relevant factor is not nature but nurture (applying to the three positions above).
- The notion of nature is either ambiguous or so loaded that it is not helpful.

**ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVE GRID**

<b>AS Assessment Objective</b>	<b>Marks allocated by Assessment Objective part (a) question</b>	<b>Marks allocated by Assessment Objective part (b) question</b>	<b>Total Marks by Assessment Objective</b>
<b>AO1</b>	15	3	18
<b>AO2</b>	0	18	18
<b>AO3</b>	0	9	9
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>45</b>