

A Level Philosophy

PHIL1: An Introduction to Philosophy 1

Exemplar Responses to the June 2010 Examination





AS Philosophy: PHIL1

Exemplar responses to the June 2010 examination

Theme 1: Reason and experience

01 Illustrating your answer, explain the difference between contingent and necessary truths.

(15 marks)

A contingent truth is a truth which rests upon another claim. Contingent truths are subject to change and their truth value is not a part of the predicate. Contingent truths are based on an assumption and give uncertain conclusions. For example, 'bananas are yellow' is a contingent truth because it is a condition that the bananas in question are ripe, thus the truth value of this statement relies upon another statement ('the bananas are ripe'), this makes it a contingent truth.

Conversely, a necessary truth is one known a priori, there is no way that it could be untrue, without redefining the terms of the sentence. The most common example is the proposition: 'all bachelors are unmarried men'. This is necessarily true because the truth value is contained within the predicate, that is, that the subject of the statement contains, in its definition, the predicate. The sentence 'all bachelors are unmarried men' is necessarily true because if one understands the terms it is impossible to logically deny its truth.

The response is quite brief. The second paragraph, on necessary truths, provides a clear account and brief illustration of analytic propositions (although this term isn't employed). The account of contingent truths, in the first paragraph, is partial. The illustration provided – 'bananas are yellow', or 'ripe bananas are yellow' – isn't a truth and even if it were changed to 'most ripe bananas are yellow' it would still have been better to develop the exposition in terms of the second sentence in this paragraph rather than the first. The response assumes 'necessary' and 'analytic' are synonymous and misses key points on contingent truths.

The mark awarded was 10/15

02 'Without a predetermined conceptual scheme our sense experiences would be unintelligible.'

Assess the implications of this for empiricism.

(30 marks)

The concept of the conceptual scheme explains that there are an innate set of abilities (or categories) that register the sense datum received from experience and turn it into information applicable to the human mind. This undermines completely the theory of empiricism as it implies that the human mind is not in fact a 'tabula rasa' void of knowledge but contains a unique set of abilities to mediate the perceptions from what Kant calls the 'noumena' to what we perceive. This is a logical theory that almost combines the beliefs of empiricism and rationalism to create a sensical way in which we gain knowledge. To explain further we can use the example of Condillac's statue. Condillac was an empiricist who believed that if you gave a statue (completely senseless as the beginning) one sense at a time, the statue would register each piece of sense datum i.e. sights, sounds, smells and be able to transfer these impressions into knowledge.

However, following conceptual schemes the scenario would be different. Conceptual schemes would claim that the statue would simply be bombarded by endless sense datum that could not be considered knowledge as it would be a blur of impressions without some form of conceptual schemes to organise the datum. This is a logical explanation for the way in which we attain knowledge yet some empiricists had already taken the point that interpretation was needed into account. For example, Locke used his 'ideas of reflection' to explain how sense impressions could be converted into ideas yet this simply undermines empiricism itself as it would suggest that interpretation itself is innate again showing that without some form of categorisation as Kant called it, the sense impressions would simply be useless and could not be considered as knowledge.

However, if one ignores the fact that Locke's 'ideas of reflection' could be considered as innate then empiricism would not be affected by the idea of conceptual schemes. This can be further explained with the argument that as a baby, humans have the knowledge to suckle without having prior experience. Hume claims this 'a loose use of the word to know' dismissing it merely as behaviour and therefore instinct as part of our biological makeup. The same could be said for the conceptual schemes, and that they are simply part of our nature or behaviour and therefore not an innate piece of knowledge'.

We also see how the idea that conceptual schemes are the only way in which we can attain knowledge from impressions may not work itself. With empiricism, the transfer of impressions to concepts is quick and almost instantaneous, with what you perceive being what is actually there, and thus considered knowledge. Although the lack of conceptual schemes may damage the idea that all knowledge is gained from experience, the fact that the mind mediates (through the schemes) all the sense datum perceived, means that (concerning conceptual schemes) what one sees will never be representative of the 'noumena' and can therefore not be considered knowledge as the mind determines what is seen, whereas with empiricism all impressions are unmediated and can therefore be seen as representative of the real world.

To conclude, we see how the idea of empiricism cleverly explains that all knowledge is attained from the outside world filling the 'blank slate' yet there are clear problems with it when compared with conceptual schemes. Kant's theory highlights that interpretation is clearly innate and Condillac's statue can be attached to show the flaws in the categorisation of knowledge concerning empiricism, showing that yes, without some form of innate conceptual schemes, impressions may not be considered useful in empiricism but just a bombardment of the senses.

The response begins with a broadly accurate definition of (one account of) conceptual schemes and an apparent implication for empiricism is identified. This is developed in a lengthy second paragraph in which the Kantian synthesis of rationalist and empiricist approaches is developed and there is some analysis of the empiricist position via Condillac and Locke. The third and fourth paragraphs are less convincing although the tone remains discursive: there is an attempt to link conceptual schemes, ideas of reflection, instinct and behaviour to our 'nature' rather than to innate knowledge and the focus on knowledge is continued via the claim that conceptual schemes do not provide knowledge of the noumenal world whereas (some version of) a realist theory of perception does. These two paragraphs are imprecise in several respects. The position reached in the final paragraph reflects the points made in the first two paragraphs. The response begins well; remains focused and relevant throughout; relevant material is employed although this could be both more detailed and more precise; an analytical and discursive tone is adopted, although analysis is not always convincing, and there is an attempt to evaluate. The evaluation lacks depth/ detail.

The mark awarded for each assessment objective was 3+13+6 giving a total mark of 22/30

Theme 2: Why should I be governed?

03 Outline and illustrate two reasons why it may be in our interests to submit to political authority. (15 marks)

According to Hobbes, life in the state of nature is nasty, brutish and short. He argues that we are self-interested and would kill to protect ourselves. Hobbes says that the only way to escape this way of life is to completely submit to a higher authority: the leviathan. Under this new state, the leviathan would ensure that our lives are protected and our property is protected. For example, in a state, murderers are usually sent to prison for life and are usually executed.

Locke argued that it is the rational thing to do to submit to a political authority. Man has natural rights to land and property in the state of nature and in the state these laws are enforced ensuring that our land and property and our life which we have natural rights for, are protected. For example in capitalist America, if someone steals your land or property they are prosecuted.

The response is brief but pertinent. Two benefits are identified: the first, via Hobbes, is protection implicitly linked to our safety or security; protection is referred to again in the second paragraph and, via Locke, is linked to natural rights. Exposition is both brief and blurred in the sense that the terms 'protection' and 'property' are referred to in both points. The candidate's understanding that these are different points perhaps only becomes clear in the brief illustrations provided. However, as two points are made and both are briefly illustrated there is (just) sufficient material for a mark in the top band.

The mark awarded was 11/15

04 'We have consented to be governed so we are obliged to obey the government.' Discuss. (30 marks)

Consent means that a person has allowed something to happen so to consent to being governed is to allow to be governed.

One argument for us to obey the government is that we have given our approval to be governed by the state/government. So if we have allowed this to happen and accepted government as sovereign, we must follow and obey government as it is rational to do so. You don't agree with your parents on a particular issue and then do the other thing.

However, several arguments are raised from this. First, we should talk about how we consent. The most probable answer is that we give our consent through voting. We are directly giving consent to the government to do what they need to do by consenting them to lead the country. This is known as explicit consent because we are explicitly making ourselves heard. Another way we are giving consent is that we are not doing anything to stop the government from governing. Because of us not being actively against the government, we have to assume that we are fine with the government. This is known as tacit consent. So we can see that there are different ways in which we give consent and the majority fall under this category, enforcing the idea that through one way or the other we should all be obliged to obey the law.

A point to oppose this view is what if we don't get the party we voted for in power? This means we did not give consent for a different type of government but we got it. By definition to give consent we have to obey, so if we did not vote for the government or didn't vote at all, we have not given our consent and

therefore we have no obligation to obey the law. This also questions tacit consent, just because people have not made themselves heard does not mean we should take their silence as consent.

In addition, as mentioned before, it is rational to obey the government because of the benefits we obtain. But when the government stops or is unable to provide us with these benefits, we have what is known as the right to dissent. Dissent should be for a politically motivated reform in government. Another way we are allowed to dissent is if the government no longer has legitimacy and power. If we say that legitimacy requires popular approval, we can say that if the government loses favour with the people, they have the right to disobey the laws.

Both of these points are of a contradiction to Socrates. He says that we are all obliged to obey the law because of the benefits the state has bestowed on us and we should be inclined to honour it with acceptance of punishment if we do break the law. He also explains that the state/government does not need popular approval or even consent to run the country. This is because the politicians are more informed as to how to administer the country. For example you wouldn't have a baker catch fish or a fisherman bake bread. He therefore suggests that regardless of popular approval or consent, for the 'greater good' we are obliged to obey the laws of the state that protects us.

In conclusion, consent for government does not necessarily mean that we are obliged to obey the laws. We have to take this into account when it is rational for us not to obey the laws or if we have an over-riding moral obligation to obey the law. It really does depend on the circumstances.

The response begins with a brief definition/clarification of 'consent' and the explicit focus on the question is maintained in the second paragraph via the link between consent and political obligation. Two different ways in which we might be said to consent – by voting/giving explicit consent and by not dissenting/giving tacit consent – are identified in the third paragraph and (some) difficulties with both are considered in the fourth paragraph. The idea that we have a right of dissent is developed in the following paragraph and linked to reasons why a Government might lose legitimacy. The idea that legitimacy might not depend on consent and the notion that legitimacy might be linked to benefits is developed in the sixth paragraph. Some concluding comments are offered: consent doesn't necessarily imply obligation; circumstances have to be considered; sometimes there may be over-riding moral obligations to consider. The response is focused and discursive, a range of points are made but not fully developed.

The mark awarded for each assessment objective was 3+13+6 giving a total mark of 22/30

Theme 3: Why should I be moral?

05 Outline and illustrate the view that virtue is its own reward.

(15 marks)

The view that virtue is its own reward was one put forward by Ancient Greek philosophers such as Plato and Aristotle. Plato argued that the way to achieve true happiness or 'eudaimonia' is to be virtuous, and any other pleasures such as hedonism would not bring true happiness at all. Consider a person who is hedonistic, always wishing to fulfil their transient desires. This person will never be truly satisfied, as they are constantly rushing to fulfil their desires and seeking more than they have. Socrates used the analogy of a man with a leaky jar: as soon as he tries to fill it (i.e. satisfy his desire) the liquid leaks out, and he must race to fill it again.

Plato believed that temperance is a virtue that emerges when reason is in control of desire. To illustrate the way in which a temperate person would ultimately be more satisfied than a hedonistic person, Socrates used the analogy of a sound jar: the temperate person can fill the jar (i.e. fulfil their desires), but unlike the intemperate person they do not need to keep refilling it in order to satisfy their cravings.

Therefore, the Ancient Greeks would argue, virtue is the way to find true happiness, i.e. virtue is its own reward, and theories such as the social contract theory in which it is argued that we should be 'virtuous' in order to gain short-term benefits such as the avoidance of censure are misleading and will not bring true happiness.

The response is approximately 250 words long, focused and quite detailed. Virtue is linked to eudaimonia – happiness or flourishing – and one virtue, temperance, is employed to develop the point that virtue is its own reward. The point is reinforced via a contrast with contractual views and a developed illustration, drawn from Plato, is employed to clarify the point. Some sophistication.

The mark awarded was 14/15

06 'Self-interest must be disregarded when deciding which actions are morally right.'

Assess this view.

(30 marks)

Firstly, Kant would argue that we must overcome self-interest when making moral decisions. He argued that we should use reason to find out our duty and not be led by emotions. He argued that we should follow the categorical imperative to find the objective moral maxims. They are only moral if they can be universalised e.g. 'I should steal if I can't afford it' becomes 'everyone should steal if they can't afford it'. The fact that this is not desirable means that it is not universalisable. We should also treat people as an ends in themselves and respect their own desires and goals. If everyone did this we could reach the 'Realm of Ends'.

An initial benefit seems to be that Kant has formed a way in which we can determine and decide on moral decisions. However Sartre found that, unlike what Kant argued, moral conflicts can occur. For example, he was approached by a boy who was unsure of whether to go to war and fight for his country (universalisable) or whether to stay home and look after his mum (universalisable). Ross argues that Kant should regard duties more as 'prima facie' duties that are rough and ready to be used but can be prioritised when conflicts arise. Furthermore, Bernard Williams argued that we should not take such an impersonal stand, as we would in a factual question, as we cannot remove ourselves from the question. Kant argued that someone who gives to charity dispassionately because it is their duty is moral, but someone who gives to charity because they cannot bear the thought of suffering is not. This seems counter-intuitive and Williams argued we'd lose our sense of self.

Kant therefore believed morality and self interest conflict, but we should overcome the latter as it is our duty. The categorical imperative can also be accused of being able to universalise amoral things or things that seem to be more social etiquette than morality, such as 'everyone should eat with their knives and forks'.

Hume on the other hand, argued that self-interest and morality do not conflict, and rather than following reason we should follow our natural sympathies. Reason cannot assume 'any other office' than to 'serve and obey' emotions. Hume argued that morality is objective as it is part of our biological makeup. We therefore judge morality on virtues that are either useful or agreeable to us or others. Hume argued that morality is agent centred, unlike Kant who believed it was act-centred. This is a more flexible position as it explains how it is wrong to lie, but if you are lying to protect a madman from knowing where to buy an axe to kill people with then you are acting morally, unlike with Kant where a conflict would arise. Hume listed virtues such as wit and benevolence and said some were natural others social virtues, with the latter acting as a social glue to bind society together. This seems more intuitive than Kant's theory, and accepts that some feelings are blame or praiseworthy in themselves, such as jealousy or charity.

Hume, however, did not construct any empirical research when finding out his virtues and so they are subjective to his opinion. Furthermore they are also arguably subjective to his social class and historical era. He also dismissed 'monkish' values such as sobriety and fasting, without any reasoning given.

Furthermore, Kant would argue that through following feelings, you do not show a commitment to any moral act, just because you didn't steal once, doesn't mean you won't again.

Hume's stance also has implications for ethics. If we simply determine morality on our feelings, on what upsets us, our natural sympathies and what is agreeable and useful to us, then the concept of morality does not exist outside of us. Ayer and the logical positivists argued that morality is subjective at best, if not non-existence. Unlike 'John is big' there is no sense impression to perceive 'John is bad' or 'John is immoral'. Ayer therefore argued that moral judgements are just an expression of our feelings; our likes and dislikes. To embark on moral discussions is therefore meaningless as we cannot contradict each other if it's just our personal feelings. We could discuss technical differences e.g. 'do you believe abortion is the same as killing a person' but 'is it wrong to steal' is meaningless. Saying 'it's immoral to steal' is simply like saying 'I don't like stealing and nor should you'.

The fact that this argues morality as futile to discuss, seems counter-intuitive and detrimental to social progress. Neither Kant nor Hume also appear convincing in encouraging hedonists or those who are immoral to change their ways. This is where Hobbes' 'social contract' or the ancient Greeks' belief in 'eudaimonia' appear strange, as the self-interest element can be an incentive.

The response begins by linking the view in question to Kant's position on ethics and this is developed via references to all three versions of the categorical imperative (the first of which might be more precise). This is developed in a point/counter-point way in the second paragraph: the position is said to assist us in determining which acts are morally right; the problem of conflicting duties is referred to via Sartre; prima-facie duties are referred to as a possible resolution and the idea that all of this might be a little too impersonal is added as a critique. A further critical point, suggesting that there may be an issue concerning what can be universalised, is offered in the following paragraph and, in paragraph four via a contrast with Hume, the suggestion that Kant's position may be too inflexible or rigid is considered. This is further developed in the following two paragraphs via a contrast between virtue ethics and deontology. Some support for the Kantian position is then developed via a critique of 'subjectivity' and the meta-ethical implications of basing moral decisions on feelings. The response is focused, detailed and analytical. A range of points are considered and subjected to critical scrutiny. The response peters out at the end, perhaps due to time constraints, so that no clear position is identified.

The mark awarded for each assessment objective was 3+16+6 giving a total mark of 25/30.

Theme 4: The idea of God

07 Briefly explain two contrasting accounts of how we obtain the idea of God. (15 marks)

The acquisition of the idea of God has been explored in many differing ways. The opinions of those such as Karl Marx and Sigmund Freud reveal that they believe our idea of God is a human construction. Marx based his theory on three main theories. The first is grounded in communism. He believed that man is exploited by those in the highest authority. Religion is constructed in order to alleviate the distress and hardship created by this exploitation. Secondly Marx explored the theme of alienation. He claimed that religion alienated man from his true nature which was to work, rest then play. Instead it caused man to worship a 'God' in the hope of betterment. Thirdly, Marx spoke on the idea that religion only benefits the rich and pacifies the poor with the promise of divine afterlife. It is the opium of the people. People follow the idea of God because they are promised great things. They are taught not to complain as all their suffering was part of God's plan. This is seen in the Hymn 'all things bright and beautiful' where the rich man was in a castle and the poor man was at his gate, and this was God's intention.

Marx was influenced by Feurbach, a projectionist and believed that all which man lacked i.e. power, knowledge was projected onto a superior being; God.

This idea was disagreed by Descartes, a rationalist, who claimed the idea of God was imprinted upon us by God himself. This trademark analogy proved that the idea of God was in fact not a human construction. Descartes' proof hinged on cause and effect and his belief was that the cause of something must have the same reality as the effect. Therefore the cause of God must have the same reality as the effect of Him. Since God is an infinite being and humans are no more than finite beings, we could not have possibly created the idea of God because the cause would not then have the same reality as its effect; an infinite being cannot create a finite being.

Two contrasting accounts of how we obtain the idea of God, those of Marx and Descartes are identified. The response is full and detailed although the treatment of Marx is, perhaps, a little too sociological (it could, for example, refer to the idea of god as 'the semblance' of man himself and Descartes could have been rounded off with more precision.

The mark awarded was 14/15

08 Assess whether the ontological argument demonstrates the existence of God. (30 marks)

The ontological argument was first formulated by St. Anselm in the 11th century. It argues the existence of God from a deductive and a priori stance.

God is a being than which none greater can be conceived. This is the response given by St Anselm to the fool in the psalm who believed there was no God. St Anselm the Archbishop of Canterbury and of the Benedictine Order explained that for God to exist in the mind he would not be the greatest being. However were God to exist in the mind and reality this would make a being 'than which none greater can be conceived', this means God must exist.

This demonstration for the existence of God was immediately criticised by his contemporary Gaunilon. He argued that Anselm's argument could easily be used to prove the existence of many different beings or even places. In Gaunilon's 'response on the behalf of the fool', he argued that he could conceive of a perfect island 'blessed with all manners of delight', yet it did not mean it must exist.

However, Anselm responded to this claim arguing that a perfect island contains contingency; it is dependent, whereas God possesses aseity, is self-sufficient. This means that God's existence is therefore, necessary, independent.

Descartes famously wrote his version of the ontological argument in the 'Meditations' in which he argued that God is an infinite being, perfect. For God to remain perfect he must then retain existence. He used the illustration of a triangle with three angles which all add up to 180 degrees. This quality of the triangle allows the triangle to be perfect and to be defined as a triangle. If the angles were taken away from the triangle it would no longer be a triangle. This is similar as to God; he could not be God if he did not exist. This proves according to Descartes that God's existence is necessary.

But, it can be argued that the ontological argument is using an analytic format to define God as existing. Immanuel Kant refutes this as he believes that existence as a predicate or property cannot define God. For instance, the analytic statement 'a spinster is an unmarried woman' is tautological and true by definition. But if you were to add the predicate existence it would have no direct effect on the statement, this means that existence cannot be a property of God.

David Hume also went on to support this idea, as we cannot prove that existence is even a positive attribute, we know that 'evil' exists yet could this 'existence' be the same as the 'existence' of God?

They would argue that the ontological argument failed to understand and make existence a meaning of God.

However, there have been responses by other philosophers such as Frege who argues that existence is actually a first level predicate which is able to explain the second level predicate. For instance, the 'greenness of the apple' is known through our senses but by adding 'the greenness exists' we are able to understand that such a predicate exists in reality. This means that 'God exists' allows us to understand that such a being as powerful as God does exist in reality as well as the mind.

However from an empirical view, Thomas Aquinas would argue that the flaw in the ontological arguments attempt to demonstrate God's existence stems from the fact that Anselm wanted to argue that God's existence can be proven from 'de dicto' instead of what is 'real', and this caused the argument to be weak.

On the other hand, some will still argue that St Anselm and the ontological argument is still strong in the second half, 'God is a necessary being'. This is due to the fact that only God's existence can be either necessary or impossible and because it is possible, God is proven to exist.

To evaluate the whole ontological arguments' attempt to prove and demonstrate God's existence, it is clear due to the deductive stance, it shouldn't be argued as the conclusion drawn must be 'God is a necessary being', 'God is a being than which none greater can be conceived'. But as soon as you understand that definition you will find that it could be used to prove the existence of many things and beings. The ontological argument proves the idea that if God exists he is going to be a necessary being, but it does not prove that he actually does exist. Therefore as Richard Dawkins would describe it 'infinite, playground argument' and does not demonstrate God's existence.

Like most responses to this question, the candidate begins by referring to Anselm and this is followed by Gaunilo's objection and a brief response to this objection. Descartes' ontological argument is then stated and the objection concerning the use of existence as a predicate – together with the view that one can't define God into existence – is developed and argued via Kant, Hume, Frege and Aquinas. The point being made is, broadly, clear if not detailed and precise. This is followed by the idea that, nevertheless, some will find Anselm's argument compelling. The concluding paragraph is effectively a summary. The response is focused, a range of points are raised although analysis is neither detailed nor sharp.

The mark awarded for each assessment objective was 2+11+5 giving a total mark of 18/30

Theme 5: Persons

09 Explain and illustrate two possible reasons for distinguishing the concept of a person from that of a human being. (15 marks)

Anencephalic babies are born with much of their brain missing. They can carry out some basic bodily functions- even respond to sound, but have no psychological qualities. They cannot think without a mind, or any mental qualities. They simply cannot have qualities like self-awareness, a network of beliefs, a social being, language, reflection or rationality. To be a human is to belong to the species 'Homo Sapiens' and to have a certain genetic code. These babies are human, but they are not persons because they don't really have a first person perspective or nearly enough qualities to possess personhood.

Many argue that some higher animals, e.g. chimpanzees possess enough qualities to be a person despite not being human. They are social beings, living in groups with complex social structures

and behaving towards other members correspondingly- so they have a social sense of themselves and of others as subjects of experience. The animal Washoe was even taught sign language- beyond common signs between animals- as it is of course a conventional language. She learnt over 250 signs, and conversations with all sorts of apes in sign language have led the Great Ape project to declare that bonobos, chimpanzees and gorillas are persons enough to have rights similar to ours.

Two points are made and illustrated. The first, illustrated by anencephalic babies, is that not all humans are persons: the second, illustrated by chimpanzees/great apes, is that some non-human animals may possess enough qualities to be considered as persons. Both points are supported by reference to some characteristics of personhood. A very direct response.

The mark awarded was 14/15

10 'It is more appropriate to speak of our survival through time rather than our identity through time.' Discuss. (15 marks)

Personal identity through time has been central to debates between Philosophers for a long time. To have personal identity a person must be identical at T1 and T2. But what is it that makes someone's personal identity? Many believe that bodily continuity is important, if the body stays the same then the person is the same. Or is it psychological continuity? Perhaps the body isn't important, and all we need is psychological continuity to be the same person at T1 and T2. However, Parfitt claims that identity isn't what's important, it's survival. Which of these views are correct, if any?

Firstly, we look at the view of bodily continuity; the view that our personal identity is possible due to our body being the same. Yet this seems ridiculous because over a 7 year period our cells are completely replaced, so it seems that bodily continuity fails. However, philosophers would defend this view that even though they are replaced, we maintain a certain structure to the way they are put together. Imagine your life is filmed on CCTV, you wouldn't suddenly see a massive change, suggesting that bodily continuity is there. However, imagine your brain was removed and transplanted into somebody else's head, are you still you? No, because it seems that what's important for personal identity is maintained within the brain, since we would say you were in someone else's body.

Locke takes this one step further. He believed that the body is unimportant, it's what's in the brain, our psychology, which creates someone's personal identity, particularly memories/ Imagine all your memories, thoughts, desires etc were copied onto a memory stick, then they were erased from your head. The memory stick of 'you' is put into someone else's brain and somebody else's memory stick is put into your brain. Which person is now you? It seems that we would say you were the other person which suggests that personal identity is based on psychological continuity.

However, is the other person really you? You would not be able to recognise yourself, and nobody else would be able to recognise you, therefore perhaps bodily continuity and psychological continuity are necessary for personal identity.

But, does Locke's theory of memories mean that if we forget something, then we are not the same person? Thomas Reid showed this through his example that a general doesn't remember the time as a boy when he stole apples, but does remember being the soldier; and the soldier remembered stealing the apples. Does this mean that the soldier is the same person as the boy, the general is

the same person as the soldier, but the general isn't the same person as the boy? According to Locke's theory this is true, because he says that personal identity is based on memories. This seems crazy, because it suggests that we are not the same person at T1 and T2 if we forget something.

Butler overcomes this problem by saying that it is not about the memories as such, it's important that they are linked. So because the general remembers being the soldier, and the soldier remembers being the boy, then the general is the same person as the boy because they are connected. It's just like a rope, not all parts need to be touching, but because all the different parts are linked, they form the rope.

Parfitt agrees with the idea of psychological continuity, however he states that it's survival, not identity which is important. He supports the view of the 'best candidate' theory, as he believes that if more than one person has the same psychological aspects as me, the one who is MOST psychologically continuous is me.

This seems to overcome the brain transplant problem. If half of my brain, A is put into someone else's head and part B is destroyed, then I continue to exist because the person with part A is psychologically continuous to me. However, if part B isn't destroyed, and is put into somebody else, then it seems that I cease to exist, because there are two 'best candidates'.

This is because even though they are qualitatively identical (possess the same psychological continuity), they just can't both be me. As identity is numerical, two of me can't both be me. Two things can't be one thing.

Parfitt overcomes this by saying that's why we should talk in terms of survival rather than identity. It shouldn't matter to us whether part B is destroyed or not, as long as they are psychologically continuous, that's all that matters. We should be just as happy, because we 'survive'.

This is a very strong argument because it shows that it isn't important for me to be identical, because as long as somebody has the same psychological aspects as me, I am still in existence.

However, this claim is criticised by philosophers who say we must have personal identity, because there is something that connects us and makes us the same at T1 and T2.

Personally I find Parfitt's view very powerful because why should it matter that we have personal identity, as long as part of us, psychologically, continues. Overall it seems that bodily continuity isn't sufficient for personal identity, and psychological continuity is given the problem of forgetting memories, and the duplication problem.

I feel that survival through time is the strongest view as it overcomes these problems, because it's not about being the same one person, it's about continuing psychologically. You cannot hold the 'best candidate' view if you do not say that survival is more important than identity through time.

Perhaps the first point to notice about this response is its length. At approximately 1000 words it indicates what some candidates are able to do in timed conditions. The first paragraph outlines the terms of the debate concerning identity and survival through time. The following two-three paragraphs provide detailed, illustrative, accounts of why physical continuity (of the whole body) isn't necessary for identity and why psychological continuity may be more promising. A difficulty is briefly raised and it is suggested that physical and psychological continuity may be jointly necessary. Reid's objection to Locke – which isn't fully clear – is introduced to question psychological continuity and Parfit's approach is introduced, via Butler and the linking of memories, so that survival and, implicitly, connectedness rather than identity and continuity may offer a resolution. This is further supported by an example of how one person might survive in two selves whereas two selves cannot be numerically identical. A

vague, undeveloped, critique of survival is offered before the essay is concluded by adopting a position in support of survival. The essay is focused and reads as a coherent whole. Analysis is detailed although one-sided. A position is reached and supported.

The mark awarded for each assessment objective was 3+15+7 giving a total mark of 25/30