



**General Certificate of Education
June 2012**

Philosophy

PHIL4

Unit 4

Philosophical Problems

Final

Mark Scheme

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 students' 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 students' 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 students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2012 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges 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.

GCE PHILOSOPHY UNIT 4**GENERIC MARK SCHEME for part (a) questions (Total: 15 marks)**

	Knowledge and Understanding	Interpretation, Analysis and Application
	AO1	AO2
Level 2	<p>5–8 marks</p> <p>At the top end of this level, there is a clear grasp of textual material. Detail must be present.</p> <p>At the lower end of this level subtle detail may be lacking without affecting the general grasp of the material.</p> <p>Philosophical sophistication should be present at the top end of the level.</p>	<p>4–7 marks</p> <p>At the top end, relevance will be sustained. Examples are appropriate and their implications made apparent.</p> <p>Some detail may be lacking at the lower end of the level.</p> <p>Textual material is applied in a directed manner regarding the requirements of the question.</p>
Level 1	<p>1–4 marks</p> <p>There is a partial grasp of arguments/positions. Detail is omitted.</p> <p>At the bottom end of this level there is little grasp of the material. At the top end a grasp of at least one topical idea is in evidence.</p>	<p>1–3 marks</p> <p>Analysis of arguments or positions is partial or lacking. Examples are not fully analysed. Implications may not be drawn out.</p> <p>The response may not always sustain relevance and there may be misinterpretation of key ideas.</p>
0 marks	No relevant philosophical points.	No relevant philosophical points.

GCE PHILOSOPHY UNIT 4**GENERIC MARK SCHEME for part (b) questions (Total: 45 marks)**

	AO1: Knowledge and Understanding	AO2: Interpretation, Analysis and Application	AO3: Assessment and Evaluation
Level 5			<p>20–24 marks</p> <p>The evaluation displays accuracy and penetration. At least two arguments are treated in detail. A sophisticated grasp of the issues is apparent. Depth is demonstrated through the exploration of points, examples and their implications. Counter-arguments are considered. Positions are argued for and clearly related to the material discussed.</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>
Level 4			<p>15–19 marks</p> <p>There is an accurate and developed treatment of at least one argument. Counter argument is in evidence. A detailed treatment is expected at the top end of this level. Alternatively, a range of arguments may be present but a detailed treatment is lacking. Examples and counter-examples are used evaluatively. The assessment shows a sophisticated grasp of a position.</p> <p>The response is legible, and technical language is employed with partial success. There may be occasional errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar and the response reads as a coherent whole.</p>

GCE PHILOSOPHY UNIT 4**GENERIC MARK SCHEME for part (b) questions continued**

	AO1: Knowledge and Understanding	AO2: Interpretation, Analysis and Application	AO3: Assessment and Evaluation
Level 3	<p>8–10 marks</p> <p>There will be a clear grasp of the issues with appropriate detail. The text will have been engaged. Key positions/arguments are presented with clarity and philosophical sophistication.</p>	<p>9–11 marks</p> <p>The analysis is detailed. Examples are well constructed and their implications are apparent. Textual material is appropriately directed and relevance sustained.</p>	<p>9–14 marks</p> <p>At the top end of this level there is clear grasp of evaluative issues, but the assessment lacks penetration. There may be a juxtaposition of contrasting stances rather than developed assessment of a position. Use of examples may be limited to illustration with evaluative issues underdeveloped. This features strongly at the lower end of this level. Generality, rather than detailed treatment is likely to be a dominant characteristic. The response is legible, employing some technical language accurately, with possibly some errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar.</p>
Level 2	<p>4–7 marks</p> <p>There is a general grasp of the material shading into a basic grasp at the lower end. Textual detail is lacking. At the top end of this level a clear understanding of at least one argument must be present.</p>	<p>5–8 marks</p> <p>Examples or analogies should be present. The implications may not be fully drawn out but there is a clear sense of directedness. Detail is present at the top end, though the analysis as a whole may lack sophistication or be characterised as 'general'.</p>	<p>5–8 marks</p> <p>Evaluative points may be asserted rather than argued. There is little development of points and examples might be met with counter-assertions. Some arguments might be tangential. Sophistication may be lacking. The response may be legible, with a basic attempt to employ technical language, which may not be appropriate. There may be frequent errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar.</p>
Level 1	<p>1–3 marks</p> <p>A rudimentary or fragmentary grasp of the material is in evidence. Textual detail is lacking or misunderstood. At the top end a partial grasp of an argument or position must be in evidence.</p>	<p>1–4 marks</p> <p>The material may not directly impinge on the question. Examples are not fully analysed or explained. At the lower end of this level material may be misinterpreted. The analysis might be characterised as 'basic'.</p>	<p>1–4 marks</p> <p>Evaluation is misdirected or lacking in any detail. Arguments may be weak or absent. There is no development of issues. At the top end of this level there must be an indication of one evaluative issue. 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>
0 marks	No relevant philosophical points.	No relevant philosophical points.	No relevant philosophical points.

Section A**Hume: An Enquiry concerning Human Understanding**

01 Outline and illustrate any three of Hume's reasons for rejecting accounts of miraculous events. <i>(15 marks)</i>
--

AO1

- Hume's definition of a miracle is likely to feature in setting up the response: a violation of a law of nature caused by a divine being. Three of the following should feature:
- Probabilities always against miracles.
- Accounts of miracles abound amongst barbarians or are inherited from such sources.
- Assenting to the miraculous engenders pleasing emotions.
- Witnesses are too few or lack credibility.
- Miracles could never constitute a foundation for a religious system.

AO2

- 'Laws of nature' may be unpacked in terms of universal experience. It is always more likely for testimony to be mistaken than for such experience to change. The notion of a 'full proof'.
- 'Rationality' defined in terms of weighing up probabilities.
- Examples of 'miracles' in primitive societies. Biblical examples might feature.
- 'Primitive' might be unpacked in terms of undeveloped science.
- Major historical religions may be used as examples of inherited accounts. The last three points may also feature in the number/credibility issue.
- Examples to illustrate how we like to be inspired by awe, mystery and wonder.
- Religions are bound to discredit each other. If miracles were foundational, they would be the focus of such attacks. However, this would be self-destructive as it would involve an attack on testimony which is what all miraculous accounts are based on.

AND EITHER

02 Assess the adequacy of Hume's account of cause and effect. <i>(45 marks)</i>

AO1

- Hume's definitions of cause and effect: objects of type A are followed by objects of type B, the thought of A or seeing A conveys the thought of B. If A had not been, then B would not have occurred.
- The importance of repetition and constant conjunction in Hume's account. Appropriate examples should feature but they should not be multiplied to make the same point.
- There should be some reference to habit and expectation.
- No natural necessity.

AO2

- If there is no natural necessity, why do we have such an idea?
- Hume's search for the source of such an idea. His empiricist thesis that all ideas rest on sense impressions.
- There is no such impression- bodies in the world, mind-body, mind and its own ideas, God and laws of nature. None of these yield an impression.
- The source is repetition- the only difference between one and many is the many aspect.

Strong responses will draw on textual detail in their analysis.

AO3

- There is an issue of consistency with Hume's empiricism. If no impression can be found for an idea, then that idea should be rejected. Hume speaks of some other principle of equal weight and authority but his empiricist position allows for one and only one.
- Repetition is not itself an impression.
- If we do not invoke some kind of necessity the distinction between genuine causal laws and accidental generalisations become problematic. There may be reference to accidents on a cosmic scale and to correlations of an accidental nature.
- Related to the above is the fact that we recognise coincidences as coincidences.
- Genuine causal connections support counterfactuals, accidental generalisations do not. This point might be illustrated with an example and / or linked to the persistence of causal laws.
- There is likely to be an assessment of Hume's definitions. If not A, then not –B suggests necessity and this is inconsistent. The definitions have different meanings. They are intensionally and extensionally different. Examples may be used that fit one but not others. One of the definitions is purely psychological.
- The importance of repetition might be questioned. Causal connections might be inferred from single instances or observations. Examples are available, hand in fire, astronomical phenomena which rarely occur. Alternatively, causal connections may not be inferred in spite of repetition. It may be concluded that repetition is neither necessary nor sufficient.
- There could be a discussion of what Hume means by 'similarity'. Physical resemblance does not seem to be necessary or sufficient. It may be that our judgements regarding what counts as similar are made after causal powers and connections are established.
- There is some vagueness with the appeal to 'many'. What counts as many may depend on the phenomena in question and our ability to make such judgements may presuppose causal knowledge.
- The problem of simultaneous causation. When A and B occur simultaneously in our experience, why do we say A is the cause of B rather than B is the cause of A? Examples like wind/waves might feature.
- Hume's account of how we acquire the concept of causation presupposes causation.
- Limitations of Hume's account may be discussed. This might involve our ability to extrapolate from one situation to a different one, our ability to sift relevant features, frame hypotheses, make comparisons. There may be reference to causation at a spatial or temporal distance. Directed critique of the copy principle.
- Is causal power unobservable?

There may be comparisons, either supportive or critical, with other positions on causality. Kant's account of causation as an innate category. Popper's imaginative leap of the scientist, or Wittgenstein's claim that belief in the causal nexus is superstition.

OR

03 “Hume’s empiricist account of knowledge and our acquisition of ideas fail to explain our knowledge of the world”.
Assess whether this claim is justified. (45 marks)

AO1

- There should be a clear grasp of Hume’s account.
- Ideas are dependent on sense impressions. Ideas as weaker copies.
- Denial of innate ideas.
- Complex ideas as combinations of simpler ones derived from experience.
- No a priori knowledge of the world. Limits of reason, mathematics, logic, tautologies.
- There may be reference to the Principles of Association as an account of thinking.
- Ideas/impressions as an exhaustive account of the contents of the mind

AO2

- Hume’s argument that a deficiency in a sense-organ from birth results in a lack of ideas associated with that organ.
- Challenge to find an idea that does not depend on an impression. Tracing back to an impression as a theory of meaning.
- Discussion of possible counter-examples and Hume’s response. E.g. God as human qualities on a grand scale, infinity as an amplification of the finite.
- The shades of blue and his dismissal in terms of singularity.
- Automatic operations of the Principles of Association.
- Example of Adam or similar to demonstrate importance of sense experience.
- There might be some discussion of Hume’s Fork in unpacking the nature and role of the *a priori*.

A strong analysis will demonstrate a secure grasp of the text.

AO3

The question is wide enough to allow a variety of approaches.

- Students may question the claim that there is no a priori knowledge of the world. Mathematical examples may feature, e.g. Euclidean geometry. Empiricist responses in terms of mathematical systems being internally necessary but their external application is ultimately decided by experience.
- There may be a discussion of Kant’s categories. Experience has to be organised and systemised in order for there to be knowledge. Such organising principles are innate.
- *A priori* knowledge holds between such categories. This may be developed into a critical point regarding Kant’s psychologism.
- Inadequacy of Hume’s Principles of Association. Resemblance requires an active power of the mind. Contiguity confuses ideas with objects. Cause and Effect refers to a relation between objects, not mental images of those objects.
- Hume’s account is too passive. He fails to explain active dispositions of enquiry e.g. distinguishing relevant from irrelevant data, selection, extrapolation, comparison, theorising. Such a discussion is likely to be linked to the copy principle.

- Hume's account of impressions and ideas leads to scepticism and ultimately, solipsism. Fails to account for meaning. There may be reference to social and public criteria as opposed to the purely private.
- The account of ideas / impressions is flawed. There are a number of issues here. The account of how we acquire the concept of God is persuasive for some of God's properties but not others e.g. omnibenevolence and transcendence. Or, God's properties are different in kind, not degree.
- Descartes' point that infinity is not just the negation of the finite. It is a completely different concept.
- The dismissal of the shades of blue is too cavalier. The claim that it is singular fails to acknowledge that this is precisely what a good counter- example should be. Or, it is not that singular and applies to anything that admits of gradations on a scale. Failure of attempts to explain the missing shade in terms of the imagination as a colour patch is a simple idea.
- Defence of Hume: his thesis is too particularised. We can perceive holistically without damaging empiricist claims in general.
- Hume's distinction between ideas and impressions in terms of force and vivacity may be questioned. Examples may be provided where the opposite appears to be the case.
- How would Hume know that a blind man had no idea of colour? Response: the criteria for knowing would not apply.

There are many opportunities for contrasts with other positions. In addition to those already mentioned, Leibniz, Chomsky, Wittgenstein might feature.

Section B**Plato: The Republic**

04 Outline Plato's simile of the ship and explain **one** of its purposes.

(15 marks)

AO1

- The ship refers to the ship of state.
- The captain refers to the people or the democratic leader.
- The crew refers to the current politicians or sophists.
- The navigator is the philosopher.
- The stars may represent the Forms.

AO2

- Simile can be unpacked in terms of the captain resembling the people – large, strong, a little deaf.
- Crew competing for leadership.
- None of the crew possess the art of navigation and deny there is such an art.
- Philosopher who has studied the stars possesses such knowledge but is ignored.
- The winner turns the voyage into a drunken pleasure cruise.

Purpose may be selected from: a comment on the plight of the philosopher doomed to be ignored, a comment on the nature of direct democracy- any means of gaining power is acceptable, or failure to acknowledge/recognise the Forms as constituting knowledge.

AND EITHER

05 Assess whether Plato can provide objectively correct solutions to moral issues. *(45 marks)*

AO1

- There should be an account of the Theory of Forms, why Plato thought they were necessary.
- Properties of the Forms.
- Ignorance, belief and knowledge.
- Hierarchical structure of the Forms with particular reference to the Form of the Good.
- Moral qualities and the Forms.

AO2

- Similes may be used to explain/illustrate points with the Cave and Divided Line most likely to feature.
- Knowledge is virtue- those who know the good will act accordingly.
- Wrongdoing is lack of knowledge.
- Those who acquire knowledge of the Forms will know what is morally right / just.
- There may be reference to political implications. This should be connected to moral knowledge.

AO3

- There could be an assessment of the knowledge is virtue thesis. Plato may be taken as having redefined knowledge. Is he proposing a logical or psychological thesis? It is possible to know what is right and still do wrong. We may act out of bloody-mindedness, compulsion or indifference. There may be a discussion of Aristotle's points regarding weakness of the will.
- What kind of account would Plato give of remorse? We blame ourselves for what we did rather than for our ignorance.
- Would Plato's knowledge of the Good solve moral dilemmas? Plato's thesis seems to imply that moral problems are soluble in terms of the acquisition of knowledge. Examples may be constructed to question this view.
- Related to the above, knowledge of the universal may not solve the uniqueness of a particular problem.
- The apprehension/comprehension of the Good is itself problematic. Plato speaks of visions but there does not seem to be any rational procedure governing the apprehension. The claim that no one can truly understand the Good hardly advances matters.
- There is the related problem that there can be different interpretations of what constitutes the Good. Plato's vision led him to advocate elitism, censorship and even the murder of children at the state's convenience. Different interpretations are possible and it's not clear how we choose between them.
- Plato's thesis leads to moral experts. This may be related to the precarious position of the individual in *The Republic*. The notion of moral experts or objective morality fails to acknowledge an irreducibly personal element in morality.
- Relevant and directed criticism of the theory of Forms. Aristotle's point that there are too many diverse uses of 'good' to suppose there is one Form in which they all partake.
- Aristotle argued that the Good cannot be achieved by man, so there is an important sense in which it cannot be the goal of political science- this can be extended to limit its ethical significance.
- There may be a discussion of the dangers inherent in claims to have absolute knowledge on moral issues. Historical examples may be used.
- There may be reference to social and cultural diversity in moral issues. Examples might be used to question an objective morality, or to support it as a way of avoiding unacceptable practices. It might be argued that there are some actions that should never be undertaken regardless of socio-cultural considerations.
- There are many opportunities for contrasts with other positions on the nature of morality, e.g. we can have objective judgements and correct actions without moral experts, moral judgements are inherently subjective, relative to the individual, circumstances, no such thing as moral knowledge.

OR

06 “The Theory of Forms cannot be established by reason or experience and must therefore be rejected.”
Assess whether Plato’s theory can withstand this criticism. (45 marks)

AO1

- Reason and experience exhaust the possibilities, so if it fails both, it must fail completely.
- May be interpreted as a verificationist criticism, or more generally, an empirical one.
- Explanation of the theory of Forms, difference between Forms and particulars, participations, hierarchy, Form of the Good.
- Plato regarded Forms as a requirement of reason.
- Use of similes to demonstrate the theory.

AO2

- Details of similes, cave and divided line likely to feature. Credit for textual accuracy. Cave, chained prisoners, one is freed, journey into the light, the sun, what objects represent. The divided line, reasoning and object.
- Knowledge and object, characteristics of Forms, eternal, immutable, non-spatial.
- Different faculties imply different objects.
- Contrasts between Forms and particulars.
- Theory of Forms not an empirical theory but can be seen as a way of rendering sense experience intelligible.

AO3

- Critical discussion of whether the Forms are required by reason. Different faculties do not imply objects of a different ontological status.
- Relation of Forms to particulars is unclear. Problem of whether all objects require a Form. Parmenides’ examples of dung or hair, or similar might feature.
- It is not clear why ontological status should be enhanced by eternal, immutable existence.
- There may be discussion of alternative accounts of the relation between universals and particulars, e.g. Aristotle: abstracted qualities are not real as abstractions, Russell’s subsisting entities, Wittgenstein’s rejection of essentialist doctrines. There does not have to be a common essence to explain our application of the same term. Family resemblances may feature or the rope that ties the ship to the wharf.
- The third man arguments of Parmenides show the theory of Forms cannot be established through reason. Response: objection is misconstrued the Form of man is not a man.
- The theory implies a too restrictive account of knowledge. It limits what can be known to the a priori. There is likely to be reference to the limited extent of such knowledge, Hume, Russell, Ayer et al.
- Does it make sense to speak of unqualified knowledge?
- We can make sense of our experience of the world without supposing it is an imperfect copy of anything. Examples might be provided of understanding, explanation and prediction which do not point to anything outside themselves. Theoretical understanding in science is not like the predicament of the prisoners in the cave.

- Students may interpret the quote as the verification principle, and consider whether the theory of Forms should be treated as a counter-example which succeeds or fails in its own terms. Other counters to the theory might be provided, e.g. dancing toys, dark matter.
- The principle excludes any metaphysical attempts to describe the ultimate nature of reality. The theory of Forms has no implications for experiential propositions. Its truth or falsity makes no difference to what we experience. A response might be that it does make a difference to our understanding of that experience. It also has moral and political implications that do make a difference.
- Appeals to ordinary language uses of 'appearance' and 'reality'. The distinction is made within the empirical world, requires checks within that world and it makes no sense to claim that the empirical world itself is an appearance

Section C**Mill: On Liberty**

07 Explain and illustrate Mill's reasons for suggesting there are dangers inherent in democratic government. *(15 marks)*

AO1

- Mill's historical references and why democracy appears to address past evils.
- Democracy enacts the will of the people. People need not fear their own will.
- However, in practice the will of the people comes to mean the will of the majority or of those who are most politically active.
- This may result in the suppression of minorities hence the need to limit government powers.

AO2

- Mill uses the term 'tyranny of the majority' to emphasise the danger.
- This is extended to cover majority opinion on moral issues.
- Such views could be wrong; there should be no dictating on moral issues.
- Use of popular opinion, prejudice and superstition.
- Illustrations might be given of the use of absolute power, contentious moral issues. There may be reference and / or illustration of the influence of pressure groups.

AND EITHER

08 Assess whether Mill succeeds in establishing the limit of state interference in the actions of the individual. *(45 marks)*

AO1

- Harm Principle to mark off area of government intervention.
- The only justification for exercising power over a member of a civilised community against his will is to prevent harm to others.
- The individual's own wellbeing, physical or moral, is not sufficient for intervention.
- Exceptions to the principle, children, idiots, barbarian nations.
- Mill's distinction between self-regarding and other-regarding acts.

AO2

- Text illustrations to unpack the above points, e.g. performance of public duties, crossing the dangerous bridge.
- Harm Principle would not apply in cases of free competition – free trade, competitive examinations.
- Applications of the Principle. These may be drawn from the text, e.g. sale of poison, gambling, or original to make same points.
- 'Harm' to be understood as physical harm. Offence is not sufficient for intervention.

AO3

- The distinction between self and other regarding actions may not always be clear cut. Examples of borderline cases are likely to feature.
- However, such cases and what they show needs careful handling. The existence of borderline cases may be taken to imply that in most cases we do know what lies on either side; this is a precondition for recognising such cases.
- A more general criticism may involve Donne's claim that no man is an island but does this imply that all our actions relevantly affect others?
- Mill's remarks on 'social acts' may be examined in the light of an increasingly interdependent society.
- There is likely to be some discussion of what counts as 'harm'. There may be distinctions made between psychological damage and mere offence. Laws regarding the promulgation of religious views/ activities might be discussed.
- Difficulties in establishing the causation of psychological damage. There may also be a discussion of what is reasonable for people of mature faculties to tolerate.
- There is a clear connection between morality and law. The Harm Principle may fail to acknowledge this.
- Incestuous relationships between consenting adults, the generation of certain computer images may not harm anyone in Mill's sense, yet the state prohibits them. There are clearly issues of what an activity involves. Not just whether it has an effect on others. There may be references to the Hart-Devlin debate.
- There are possible clashes between the Harm Principle and the Principle of Utility. Mill may have a problem with the clash of two absolute principles. Examples should be given to make the criticism clear.
- Consistency of Mill's applications might be questioned. He attempts to exclude slavery on logical grounds- freely consent to relinquish freedom – how convincing is this? Attempted suicide might also be discussed in the light of the social circumstances of the attemptee.
- Use of the Harm Principle avoids paternalism, allows experiments in living, individual moral development which is richer through being freely chosen and respects the rationality of the individual.
- The above values involve some risk taking. This is the price of a free and open society.
- If individuals are sufficiently rational to choose their government, they must also be sufficiently rational to choose their own lifestyles.

OR

09 'Mill overestimated the importance of freedom of thought and discussion to a free society'
Assess the validity of this claim.

(45 marks)

AO1

- Mill regards such freedoms as essential to individual and social development.
- Such freedoms essential to the pursuit of truth. Both sides of an issue must be heard.
- Truth and utility. Utility of an opinion is itself a matter of opinion.
- Free discussion consistent with man as a progressive being and our rationality.
- There cannot be a legitimate power to suppress opinion.

AO2

- Mill has a range of arguments to support his position: fallibility, supplement, dead dogma, heretical ideas. Need to play devil's advocate.
- Illustrative examples are likely to be given of the above, such as Christianity.
- Suppression of opinion logically amounts to an assumption of infallibility. Such an assumption has no place in a free society.
- Free society requires free market of ideas.
- Truth / utility distinction is dubious as the truth of an opinion is part of its utility.

AO3

- Mill sees too close a connection between truth and utility. The two principles can clash and must therefore be separate and distinct. Examples may be given where suppression is alleged to be in the interest of a free society.
- It can be argued that suppression need not involve assuming infallibility. The suppressor need not regard himself as infallible. But this is a psychological point which seems to fail. Mill's point is that deciding for others without their having the opportunity to hear both sides logically amounts to an assumption of infallibility. This assumption is both false and has no place in a free society.
- A free or democratic society must allow minorities the opportunity to become majorities. An informed public is the ultimate arbiter and this presupposes free discussion.
- Mill's individualism and the benefits of discovering the truth for oneself. This requires the free discussion of ideas. Any curtailment of this freedom also curtails the possible content of thoughts. To suppress is damaging both to dissenters and receivers of opinion.
- There may be some discussion of incitement cases. Suppression might be justifiable on utilitarian grounds or on appeal to the Harm Principle. Mill's treatment of such cases, angry crowd and the immediacy of physical harm.
- Is Mill obsessive about freedom? In Mill's defence: giving a theoretical structure for your views, appealing to evidence and seeking to justify are not characteristic features of obsessiveness. Mill is vigilant rather than obsessive.
- Vigilance is necessary to the maintenance of a free society. Those who cease to be vigilant may have already lost their freedom. Historical examples, burning books.
- Mill's advocacy of the accessibility of the free market of ideas is empty without access to the mass media.
- The weak and easily manipulated need protection, especially in a media/image dominated society.

- Mill overestimates the levels of rationality in a society. Replies: what he estimates is consistent with the democratic ideal, the criticism should be taken to be an incentive to improve those levels rather than a justification for suppressing free speech.
- Free speech is open to abuse. Sensationalism, intrusiveness, profit can be pursued under the guise of free speech/inquiry. Reply: they can only be identified, recognised and exposed through further free discussion. The possibility of abuse is not sufficient for surrendering valuable principles.
- Revitalising an opinion is often achieved through new ways of presentation rather than by endless questioning which may result in scepticism.

There are many opportunities for contrasts and comparisons with other positions. Plato's views on censorship when it suited the state, Popper on closed societies, regimes with claims or assumptions regarding absolute knowledge may feature.

Section D**Descartes: Meditations**

10	Outline Descartes' wax example and explain two of its purposes.	<i>(15 marks)</i>
-----------	--	-------------------

AO1

- Description of example, hard wax, list of sense-given qualities.
- Wax is melted, resultant liquid.
- All properties change except extension in space, but same wax.
- Liquid can adopt infinite number of shapes; infinity grasped by intellect not senses.
- Purposes: two from, essential nature of matter, rationalist theory of knowledge, reinforcement of cogito.

AO2

- Particularly well chosen example as it appeals to the five senses.
- Extension is a geometric property, geometry is *a priori*, therefore essence of matter known *a priori*.
- Essence is what remains the same through all other changes, extension is the only property which satisfies this condition. What applies to wax, applies to matter in general.
- If Descartes can be so sure of all this, he can be even more certain of the self who sees it, thus cogito is strengthened.
- Mind and essence of matter known in the same way.

AND EITHER

11	Assess Descartes' reasons for supposing that mind and body are separate and distinct substances.	<i>(45 marks)</i>
-----------	--	-------------------

AO1

- What Descartes means by 'substance': existing in its own right, can only be destroyed by God.
- Each mind a separate substance, only one physical substance.
- Mind and Body have different essential natures, thinking/extension.
- Awareness of his actual arguments, knowledge argument, knowledge of mind can't depend on what I don't yet know, body; appeal to god's omnipotence, indivisibility.

AO2

- The arguments are intended to show mind is not identified with body, it is separate and distinct, not causally dependent.
- Detail of the arguments, e.g. indubitability of mind, God can do whatever is logically conceivable, indivisibility and Descartes' treatment of the faculties response.
- The pilot/ship example (or intermingling thesis) should be treated as a disanalogy. Accurate textual knowledge is expected.

AO3

- The interaction problem. Inadequacy of pineal gland response and some contemporary solutions, occasionalism, two clocks.
- Failure of first form of the knowledge argument. Leibniz' Law does not apply in intentional contexts and 'doubting' is clearly such a context. Comparisons might be made with loving, worshipping or similar. The Masked Man Fallacy.
- Failure of second form of knowledge argument. Things we know may well depend on things we do not yet know. The weaker claim that our knowledge can't depend on things we do not yet know is more defensible but will not give Descartes the ultimate conclusion he wants. Epistemological priority does not imply ontological priority or causal independence.
- The appeal to God's omnipotence presupposes the existence of God and that God has exercised his power. Difference between exercise and possession of a power.
- The mere possibility of distinctness may be accepted by contingent identity theorists.
- Indivisibility argument does not involve an obvious misuse of Leibniz' Law as it concerns properties not attitudes.
- Problems with the indivisibility argument. Freud's tri-partite division, the unconscious, cases of split or multiple personality.
- There may be substantial discussions of the above anticipating how a Cartesian dualist might respond. Freudian theory can be questioned, e.g. is it a science or does it have to be accepted? Some of Freud's key concepts may be critically assessed. The issues surrounding cases of split personality- are they properly described? Is there an over reliance on memory as the criterion for personal identity? Do they imply unacceptable ways of talking about persons?
- Difficulties involved in explaining how brain damage or brain surgery can have effects on the mind if they are different substances. Response in terms of damage is only to the instrument of expression. Some support for this view from recent findings with deep coma patients.
- The concept of an immaterial substance is self-contradictory inasmuch as 'substance' implies substantial/material.
- If the essence of mind is consciousness, then Descartes is vulnerable to instances of dreamless sleep. Do we cease to exist?
- Thinking is identified as an essential attribute but this does not imply it is the sole attribute.
- We need some form of dualism in order to accommodate undeniable features of consciousness, qualia, intentionality, subjectivity, the possibility of ordered, structured meaningful experience.
- Descartes position may be contrasted with identity theory, Ryle's behaviourism, epiphenomenalism. Descartes likely responses to such theories may be examined critically.

OR

12 'The mere possession of an idea of a perfect being does not guarantee the existence of such a being.'
 Assess whether this is a valid criticism of Descartes' case for the existence of God.
 (45 marks)

AO1

- Proceeding from the idea of God is a feature common to both of Descartes' arguments.
- Ontological argument moves from the idea of God through its logical properties and concludes with the existence of such a being.
- Trademark argument appeals to the cause of the idea of God invoking the Causal Adequacy Principle. Levels of reality.
- Idea of God stamped on our minds, hence 'trademark'.

AO2

- Ontological argument is purely a priori, existence demonstrated through pure reason.
- Analysis of argument: existence implied by perfection, analogy with triangle/mountain valleys. God as a unique concept.
- Trademark argument a form of cosmological argument. Some empirical support used to uphold causal adequacy principle.
- I, as a thinking thing, could only have been created and sustained in existence by God.

AO3

- In the trademark argument, 'reality' specifically refers to existence. It is not clear that the concept can admit of degrees in this context.
 - Relations between items in the world cannot simply be transferred to ideas of such items
 - There is a difference between an idea of a perfect being and a perfect idea.
 - Failure of causal adequacy principle. Evolution seems to be an example of the greater (more complex) coming from the lesser (simpler organisms). Expect references to emergent properties. Cake mixture and sponginess is likely to feature.
 - Alternative accounts of the origin of the idea of God are available. It need not be regarded as innate. Hume's account in terms of sense experience plus augmentation, enlargement etc.
 - The empiricist account is more plausible for some of God's properties than others.
 - In regard to the ontological argument, Kant's criticisms are likely to figure prominently. Existence is not a property or a predicate. We do not add to conceptual content when we say something exists. The subject-predicate form of the sentence is superficial and confusing. There are likely to be examples of genuine predicates contrasted with 'exists'.
 - Attributions of existence do make a difference to our knowledge (black holes and sea monsters). Kant's own example of 100 real thalers might be discussed. Differences between knowledge and conceptual content might be explored.
-

- Existence (and non-existence), are to be analysed in terms of the propositional function. To say that men exist is to say that the propositional function 'X is a man' is true for some values of X.
- Schopenhauer-type objections might be used. If you include 'existence' in the concept under discussion, then there are no limits to what you can *define* into existence. Gaunilo's island might be adapted accordingly.
- There might be a discussion of the above in terms of contingent connections contrasted with God where the connection is internal or necessary.
- Another disanalogy: when we talk of the perfect unicorn or Gaunilo's perfect island, these are known in advance not to exist. This is not the case with God.
- Would an attribution of an existence add something to what was formerly thought to be a fictional character?
- Standard objections within the empirical tradition, no existential proposition is logically certain, a priori arguments cannot tell us what exists, circularity issues. Cannot bridge the gap between ideas and real existence-i.e. he can't separate existence from the idea of God.
- There may be some reference to the Cartesian circle but these arguments can be formulated independently of Descartes' general epistemological concerns.

Section E**Nietzsche: Beyond Good and Evil**

13	Outline and illustrate Nietzsche's stages of morality.	<i>(15 marks)</i>
-----------	--	-------------------

AO1

The three stages should be clearly identified:

- The pre-moral stage. The value of an action is determined by its consequences.
- The moral period. The value of an action is determined by its intention.
- The extra-moral stage. The value of an action is determined by that which is non-intentional, that which is hidden. (Unconscious)

AO2

- Illustrations are likely to be drawn from utilitarian, deontological theories for the first two and Nietzsche's new morality for the final stage.
- Moral stage is the first attempt at self knowledge.
- Final stage involves deeper self knowledge, will to power.
- Moral stage to be overcome by the extra-moral, in a similar way to astrology being something that is overcome.
- There might be some reference to the reversal of values. What is natural is for value distinctions to be applied primarily to people and derivatively to actions.

AND EITHER

14	Assess Nietzsche's claim that past philosophy is an expression of prejudice. .	<i>(45 marks)</i>
-----------	--	-------------------

AO1

- Nietzsche is concerned with the very foundation of Philosophy.
- The status of the writings of past philosophers is examined.
- What has been presented as pure or objective knowledge/truth is tainted by their own self-interest and physiological states. There may be contrasts with Freud.
- Use of *ad hominem* arguments.
- Also concerned with the language that leads philosophers astray.

AO2

- Subject centred grammar of our language involves imposing our interpretation on the world.
- Real issue with the analysis of concepts concerns the function they perform. Key question is whether they promote life.
- Concepts like causality are invented not given.
- Examples of Nietzsche's targets are likely to include Kant and synthetic a priori or categorical imperative, Plato's Theory of Forms, Descartes' Cogito, Idealism, stoicism, the traditional approach to the free-will problem and the status of laws of nature.

AO3

- There is likely to be a discussion of the issue of truth. Should we question the truth of Nietzsche's own claims or should we just ask what function they have? This latter interpretation may be hard to reconcile with the way the claims are made. The issue of 'function' in relation to what?
- Is the criticism of past philosophers directed at the attempt to attain the unattainable (pure truth) or at failing to attain it? Has Nietzsche attained it? The problem of allegedly 'true' accounts of undermining truth and whether reasons can be given for accepting them.
- There are consistency issues, e.g. Kant is criticised for arguing from possibilities to faculties, but Nietzsche uses similar arguments/strategies to justify talk about instincts and the will.
- The limitations of ad hominem arguments. You do not dispose of a thesis by appealing to motives behind it, even hidden motives. There is the related issue of establishing the criteria for hidden motives in a non-circular way.
- The strictures of language also apply to Nietzsche. The issue of special pleading. It may also be argued that all language requires a logical structure that no user can step outside of as any attempt to do so involves the use of language.
- We are told that the writings of past philosophers are caused by their physiological states. We are also told that causation is a fiction, an invented concept.
- Realist arguments might be used to show that we have good, independent reasons for employing the linguistic categories/concepts we do.
- There may be individual defences of the philosophers criticised. Descartes did address the nature of the self and knowledge. What he said stands or falls on the quality of his arguments. Plato did advance arguments for the Forms, regardless of his motives. Sense data theorists did attempt to secure uniqueness of reference.
- How might Nietzsche deal with the case of a philosopher reaching a repugnant conclusion? Would this have to be mere appearance and what is the status of the 'have'?
- It is too easy to dismiss 'the will' as a common prejudice. One should be suspicious of prejudices which occur on a universal scale.
- Nietzsche has been selective in his use of examples. There may be counter-examples to the prejudice thesis, study of logic, formal validity or the more particular issues that have arisen out of the study of major philosophers.
- Philosophers have constructed potentially damaging counter-examples to their own theses, e.g. Plato- third man argument, Hume-shades of blue. Must this be a mere facade? And what would count as genuine?

OR

15 “Nietzsche has shown that religious belief can no longer be taken seriously”. Assess the validity of this claim. (45 marks)

AO1

- Nietzsche’s key components of religious belief- sacrifice of freedom, pride and spirit, subjugation, self-derision. Erosion of self confidence and self esteem.
- Religion as neurosis, solitude, self-denial (fasting, sexual abstinence). Denial of the will/world.
- Reference to ongoing suicide of reason, clear connection with irrationality/delusion.
- Religion as cause of superstition/nonsense. Caused by instinctual fear.
- Ladder of sacrifice.

AO2

- Examples of some of the above points.
- Religion responsible for reversal of natural values.
- Also responsible for the present, sickly, mediocre human being.
- There is emphasis on causes and effects which carries an implicit judgement on truth and rationality.
- Religion as a means- useful tool, sources of comfort for the weak.

AO3

- The components of religious belief, if correctly described, are inherently bad and religious belief should not be taken seriously. The components may be discussed together with their connection to religious belief, their accuracy and exhaustiveness.
- If religion can reverse values which would hurt the weak, then it is in their rational self-interest to pursue it.
- There are implications that what is unnatural should be avoided. ‘Natural’ tends to have a commendatory role. This may be questioned in terms of internal consistency or in terms of whether or not it is correct. Counter-examples are possible.
- To criticise entire belief systems involves seeing them from a particular viewpoint. Does that viewpoint have to be an absolute one? Nietzsche may respond with all that is required is the viewpoint/perspective which can have its own recommendations without being absolute.
- Are there criteria for choosing between perspectives? There is an issue regarding whether such criteria can be set out in rational and factual terms.
- There are issues concerning the possibility of regarding entire belief systems as irrational or false. Wittgenstein/winch type critiques may feature, primitive tribes’ belief structures.
- Reasonably complex religious systems offer ways of understanding or explaining the world or offering an explanation of why there is something rather than nothing. If it responds to serious questions, it should be taken seriously.
- It is not clear that religion and reason have to be in opposition. There have been attempts to provide rational accounts of faith and these must be treated on their own merits, not dismissed by appealing to the motives of their authors.
- Christian sacrifice has to be seen in the appropriate context, God’s ultimate sacrifice for man. Removing practices from their context results in absurdity but not necessarily in the absurdity of the context itself.

- Religious understanding is participatory and cannot be grasped or criticised from an external viewpoint. A supporter of Nietzsche may respond with Tertullian's Paradox – there are no unbelievers, only those who fail to understand.
- Nietzsche is offering a quasi-functional account. There are a number of issues here. Functional accounts do not show the beliefs to be false, functional accounts can also be given functions or the accounts may be too selective/ fail to acknowledge counter-examples or even admit their possibility.
- Appeals to instincts in general, and the religious one in particular, achieve little. Issues of explanatory power and circularity, evidence, application criteria and generality are likely to feature.
- There is likely to be discussion of Nietzsche's general approach. A range of points may feature. The approach is essentially psychological and this will not provide sufficient grounds for ultimate judgement of truth or falsity. Religious arguments must stand or fall on their actual content. If they cannot be supported by reason, where does reason take us and is this consistent with perspectivism?
- Problems inherent with perspectivist accounts of truth. Religion is a possible perspective and there is nothing left to say.
- Reason and argument may be regarded as merely functions of the will to power. But there would be a paradox in establishing this through the use of reason and argument.
- The fact that religious belief is practised is sufficient to establish its seriousness. There are, however, examples of practices that are no longer taken seriously. How and why this has happened, whether religion shares these features might be discussed.
- Can a religious person deny himself by doing as he chooses?
- Is religion a soft/comforting option or does it make stern demands?
- There is some admiration of the saint inasmuch as he exhibits the will to power. But ultimately this is a perversion of that will.

ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVE GRID

A2 Assessment Objective	Marks allocated by Assessment Objective 15-mark question	Marks allocated by Assessment Objective 45-mark question	Total Marks by Assessment Objective
AO1	8	10	18
AO2	7	11	18
AO3	0	24	24
Total	15	45	60