Version 1.0

General Certificate of Education (A-level)
June 2013

Philosophy PHIL4

(Specification 2170)

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 events which all examiners participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process 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 standardisation each examiner analyses a number of students' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been raised 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 from: aqa.org.uk

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

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.

PHIL4 Generic mark scheme for part (a) questions (15 marks)

AO1: Knowledge and understanding
Level 2 5–8 marks At the top end of this level, there is a clear grasp of textual material. Detail must be present. At the lower end of this level subtle detail may be lacking without affecting the general grasp of the material. Philosophical sophistication should be present at the top end of the level.
Level 1 1–4 marks There is a partial grasp of arguments/positions. Detail is omitted. 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.
0 marks No relevant philosophical points.

AO2: Interpretation, analysis and application
Level 2 4–7 marks At the top end, relevance will be sustained. Examples are appropriate and their implications made apparent. Some detail may be lacking at the lower end of the level. Textual material is applied in a directed manner regarding the requirements of the question.
Level 1 1–3 marks Analysis of arguments or positions is partial or lacking. Examples are not fully analysed. Implications may not be drawn out. The response may not always sustain relevance and there may be misinterpretation of key ideas.
0 marks No relevant philosophical points.

PHIL4 Generic mark scheme for part (b) questions (45 marks)

AO1: Knowledge and understanding
Level 3 8–10 marks 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.
Level 2 4–7 marks 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.
Level 1 1–3 marks 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.
0 marks No relevant philosophical points.

AO2: Interpretation, analysis and application
Level 3 9–11 marks The analysis is detailed. Examples are well constructed and their implications are apparent. Textual material is appropriately directed and relevance sustained.
Level 2 5–8 marks 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'.
Level 1 1–4 marks 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'.
0 marks No relevant philosophical points.

AO3: Assessment and evaluation
Level 5 20–24 marks 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. 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.
Level 4 15–19 marks 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. 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.
Level 3 9–14 marks At the top end of this level, there is a 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.
Level 2 5–8 marks 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.
Level 1 1–4 marks 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.
0 marks No relevant philosophical points.

Section A: Hume

0 1 Explain and illustrate Hume's Principles of Association and outline their purpose.

(15 marks)

AO1

- The principles are intended to explain how ideas come together in the mind.
- Resemblance.
- Contiguity in time and place.
- Cause and effect.
- The principles operate naturalistically.
- They explain all human thinking, this is the central purpose.

AO2

- Resemblance may be illustrated with the example of the picture and the original or similar.
- Contiguity may be illustrated by the temporal succession of ideas and the example of apartments next to each other or similar.
- Cause and effect may be illustrated with examples of a wound and pain, a gun and a dead man or similar.
- There may be analogical reference to Newtonian method. Hume saw himself doing for psychology what Newton had done for physics.
- All human thinking would include our everyday thoughts, our finest reasoning and the imagination of the poet.
- It might seem that there are more principles but ultimately they reduce to these three.

0 2 'There is no real conflict between liberty and necessity.'

Assess whether Hume has solved the free will problem.

(45 marks)

AO1

- Hume thought that long-standing philosophical issues may be resolved by clarification of the key terms in the disputes.
- In the case of free will the relevant terms are 'liberty' and 'necessity'.
- Hume attempts a compatibilist solution arguing that a correct analysis of the key terms will show that disagreement is apparent not real.
- Necessity is to be analysed in terms of regularity and constant conjunction.
- Liberty is the power of acting or not acting in accordance with the will.
- Freedom is distinguished from randomness or caprice.
- Hume's method may be seen as an anticipation of the analytic approach to philosophy, ie getting clear about the meaning of terms.

AO2

- The same regularity is present in the operation of bodies and the voluntary acts of men. We just feel differently about the latter. This feeling, however, carries no implication for there being any real difference. In both cases 'determined' simply means 'regular'.
- A free action is one that is not subject to felt constraint or force. The example of the prisoner in chains might feature.
- An action can be both of the above, determined in the sense of being regular, and free in the sense of not being subject to felt constraint. So there is no inconsistency in saying that an action can be both free and determined.
- Our moral vocabulary can be preserved as praise and blame applications are part of the encouraging and deterring of certain types of action. They have a role to play in increasing or decreasing the likelihood of particular actions. So Hume thinks he has reconciled freedom and determinism and shown how we can retain our traditional vocabulary.

AO3

- Hume owes us an account of **why** we should feel differently about the operation of bodies and voluntary actions. If they are the same in terms of impressions, then what is the source of this feeling of difference?
- There are problems with Hume's analysis of a free action. He neglects the libertarian idea that the agent would have been able to choose some other action in the same circumstances. Hume seems to be saying that no other action would have been possible without there being a change in the circumstances. If no other action were possible, then how can the action be free? Kant's 'ought implies can' might be discussed in this context.

- Flew's example of the smiling bridegroom and the shotgun wedding or similar may be developed from the above. A free action involves a choice between X and Y but a set of causal conditions determine that you do X not Y so in what sense did you have a choice to do Y? If you do not have a choice, then the action is not free. Such arguments may be regarded as self-contradictory.
- It may be argued that the essence of a free action is the ability to choose otherwise. This is the only way the meaning of 'choice' can be preserved.
- There are further problems with Hume's account of liberty. The absence of felt constraint is not sufficient for describing an act as free. Actions performed in hypnotic trances or in some drug-induced states may not be accompanied by felt constraint but they would not be regarded as free.
- Removal of the reference to 'felt' may create further problems, eg how are we to know when such constraints are operating? Presumably there is a real difference between their operating and not operating. Dropping the reference may seriously undermine the compatibilist solution.
- Felt pressures could be present and the action may still be regarded as free and the appropriate subject of praise or blame. Certain actions resulting from emotional blackmail may still be regarded as free and the agent held responsible. So absence of felt pressures may be neither necessary nor sufficient for describing an act as free. If so, it can hardly constitute the meaning of a free action.
- There are problems with Hume's account of necessity in terms of regularity. We do not regard all regular sequences as necessary. All necessary sequences are regular does not imply that all regular sequences are necessary.
- A distinction needs to be drawn between reasons and causes, a rational framework as opposed to a causal network. Even if both result in regularity, it does not follow that 'regularity' is all we mean when we talk in these different ways. There may also be discussion of Hume on contrary causes.
- The nature and status of the will needs clarification. Is it like any other empirical phenomenon of psychology? There is the issue of whether its determinations could be any different without a difference in the antecedents.
- Hume's account of liberty is closer to political liberty than metaphysical freedom. If doing what you want is what makes an action free, then the actions of a maniac will turn out to be free.
- Punishment (and reward) is not to be seen just as links in a causal chain which deter or promote actions. There must also be reference to what is deserved. There should be some discussion of responsibility as underpinning ascriptions of praise and blame. A purely causal account would create problems with proportionality of punishment.
- Some recent discussions might be referred to, eg Honderich's appeal to strict liability. That an action of mine was an effect does not imply that I cannot be held responsible for it. There are problems with this kind of move. It fails to distinguish being held responsible from actually being responsible. It also exploits a legal concept that is logically parasitic on cases where intentions, motives and desires **do** matter. We need such cases to actually formulate the concept of strict liability.
- There might be reference to Frankfurt type examples of inevitable outcomes and responsibility, first and second order desires and the thought experiment of the intervening demon. There are attendant problems, eg how we categorise desires, the kind of inevitability involved and whether the demon would know all the decisions and deliberations in an indeterministic world.
- There might be reference to Fischer's idea that free will is essentially a scientific question whereas moral responsibility is a social/cultural issue. But are the two distinguishable in this way? There could be a discussion of whether there is a principled scientific way of answering the question of whether we could have acted differently or whether there is a logical connection between responsibility and choice.

- Hume's claims about the distinction between freedom and randomness may be explored. Searle has claimed that freedom may apply at the sub-atomic level and von Bonin has claimed that actions could turn out to be free if we discovered random, unpredictable events in the brain. There are traditional problems in seeing what such accounts have got to do with what we **mean** by a free action. It might also be argued that there is no smooth symmetry between sub-atomic events and human actions. It's not that we have two descriptions of the same events, but rather descriptions of one kind of event cannot be generated from descriptions of the other.
- In the case of actions it is precisely those that appear random or maverick that we tend to seek explanations in terms of causes rather than reasons.
- There might be references to the phenomenological aspects of freedom, eg remorse and their supposed implications.

0 3 Assess Hume's claim that it is always irrational to believe in the occurrence of miracles.

(45 marks)

AO1

- Hume defines a miracle as a violation of a law of nature caused by a divine being. It needs to be spectacular, not merely unusual.
- The probabilities are always against miracles. Breaches of laws of nature are less likely than falsehood of testimony.
- Accounts of miracles prevalent amongst barbarians or have been inherited from barbarians.
- Assenting to miracles engenders pleasing emotions.
- Witnesses are too few or lack credibility.
- Miracles could never serve as the foundation for religious systems. In discrediting the miracles of other faiths, which a religious system is bound to do, testimony itself is discredited. One's own miracles, however, rest on the evidence of testimony.

AO2

- Rationality is seen in terms of past experience and probability.
- Laws of nature are to be understood in terms of universal experience, no exceptions.
- Hume's idea that what is different in religion is contrary.
- Whether Hume is claiming that miracles are impossible or highly improbable.
- The credibility of testimony might be unpacked.
- There might be reference to Hume's claim that any unexplained events will be explained by, as yet, unknown laws of nature.
- Examples of miracles and their significance might be provided.

AO3

- There might be alternative accounts of miracles. Holland type examples are likely to feature. The significance of improbable events within the life of the individual is what matters rather than breaches in laws of nature. Expect references to the child on the railway line or the reversal of terminal illnesses.
- If by laws of nature we mean, eg Kepler's laws of planetary motion, Newton's laws of motion etc then it is not clear that miracles are in direct conflict with them rather than with statements deducible from them.
- It might be argued that miracles are not to be taken literally. It seems that the resurrection of Christ is, however, essential to Christianity.
- There might be a discussion of what Hume means by a full proof. Does this preclude the possibility of miracles? Given that for Hume there is no necessity in nature the strength of the 'full proof' might be questioned. Alternatively a full proof simply indicates the strongest type of proof that is ever available.
- Examples of modern miracles not inherited from barbarians may be provided. There is also an issue regarding **why** we should retain accounts of miracles from barbarians whilst rejecting all other aspects of their belief systems.

- Hume does not give a satisfactory account of what would count as an acceptable number of witnesses. Does it really require whole nations? There is a similar problem concerning the quality of witnesses. It could be argued that familiarity with regularities in the way the world functions is the main qualification.
- If miracles engender such pleasant emotions then you would expect more reports of them. The appeal to emotions does not tell us whether the events they are directed at have or have not occurred.
- Hume seems to be defining miracles out of existence. No matter what evidence is provided, it is always more likely for that evidence to be mistaken.
- If you witnessed a miracle yourself, you would be rationally bound to disbelieve the evidence of your own senses.
- Miracles have to be seen within a religious context. Christ's power over death has to be seen in terms of the ultimate mission of the destroyer of the destroyer. They are not to be seen in terms of random, one-off unpredictable events. If you saw Christ raise Lazarus from the dead, could you doubt that Christ had done this?
- The paradox of supernatural causation – it must be understandable in order to be explanatory but, at the same time, mysterious in order to inspire awe and wonder. There are disanalogies with natural explanations, eg the cause is in principle unobservable, the events cannot be predicted or repeated and there are no comparable laws of supernature.
- Hume seems right in claiming that miracles cannot serve as a foundation for religious belief given the point regarding the discrediting of testimony. Hume equates 'different' with 'contrary' but this might be questioned. A Hume-type response might include references to how monotheism could be anything other than contrary to polytheism or how belief that Christ was the messiah could be anything other than contrary to the claim that he was not.
- Seeing events as miraculous presupposes belief in God and a religious system rather than demonstrates it. Similar remarks may be taken to apply to the idea of supernatural causation in general.
- Hume's claim regarding the explanatory power of unknown laws of nature involves a leap of faith or is simply vacuous.
- There might be some discussion of Hume's account of causation, the lack of necessity and how this should at least allow for the possibility of miracles.
- Would Hume's claim about rationality apply to **any** unusual events? This might have unacceptable implications.

Section B: Plato

0 4 Outline Plato's simile of the cave and **two** of its purposes.

(15 marks)

AO1

- Description of chained prisoners with the fire burning behind them casting shadows on the screen in front of them. The shadows are of images/models.
- Shadows are taken as reality.
- One prisoner is forcibly released and dragged out. (He does **not** escape).
- Difficulties of coping with his new surroundings.
- The Sun is seen as the source of all light.
- The reluctant return to the cave.
- Purposes may be metaphysical, epistemological, ethical or political.

AO2

- Shadows may correspond to empirical knowledge. Plato is distinguishing appearance and reality.
- Objects outside the cave correspond to the Forms, the difficulties of apprehending them, eg see them as reflections in water to begin with.
- The Sun corresponds to the Form of the Good. The hierarchical structure of the Forms.
- The difficulty of the learning process with the transition from empirical objects to Forms. The distinction between knowledge and belief in terms of their respective objects.
- The difficulty of the philosopher's task. The reluctant return to the cave out of a sense of duty.
- The ultimate fate of the philosopher is to be disbelieved, ridiculed or even killed.
- Purposes might be integrated within the above. They should be selected from the Forms as constituting reality with the empirical world as a mere reflection, it is only the Forms which we can properly be said to know as all else is belief/opinion or ignorance. The philosopher in understanding the Forms will have ethical and political knowledge, will know what is just or how the state should be run but is doomed in his attempt to tell others. There may be reference to absolute values in relation to the Forms.

0 5 'Plato's rulers would know what is right and therefore would do what was right'.

Assess the validity of this claim.

(45 marks)

AO1

- The rulers would have knowledge of the Forms. Expect some account of the Forms and particularly the Form of the Good. Examples such as justice are likely to feature. Such knowledge should be contrasted with opinion regarding particulars.
- Knowledge of the Good would make them particularly suited to rule.
- Knowledge would determine action.
- Knowledge of the Forms would be supplemented with certain personal qualities.
- They would provide objectively correct solutions to moral and political questions.
- There might be some reference to the lengthy education of the rulers.
- Nature of their knowledge may be unpacked through reference to similes eg ship, beast or divided line.

AO2

- Personal qualities may include reluctance to rule, lack of ambition, disinterested in personal and material wealth. This is likely to be contrasted with the present rulers or the sophists.
- This contrast may be clarified through reference to the similes, ship's crew motivated by personal power, the beast trainer by impressing the crowd. In neither case do they possess genuine knowledge.
- There should be some explanation of the knowledge is virtue thesis. Wrong doing is a matter of ignorance. The present rulers lack knowledge whereas Plato's rulers would possess it and this would guarantee right action. If you know the Good, you cannot do wrong.
- Knowledge of the Forms is established through reason and provides certainty.
- Points might be made through appropriate detail of the similes but different similes should not be used to make the same points.

AO3

- The claim that knowledge will always issue in right action can be questioned. There are counter examples available. One can know what is right and fail to do it through weakness of the will or bloody-mindedness.
- Is all wrong doing a matter of ignorance? This seems to imply that all moral or political problems can be solved by the acquisition of knowledge but again counter examples are possible. There are cases where we have knowledge and are still uncertain about what to do or where we change our minds without there being a corresponding change in our knowledge.
- A supporter of Plato will claim that knowledge needs to be of the Forms not of particular facts. He will, however, need to show how knowledge of the general will solve all problems once all the facts are known.
- The reference to the personal qualities of the ruler may solve some of the above issues (weakness of the will) but at a cost. Plato may be seen as **defining** perfection into the nature of the rulers and thus trivialising the thesis, or rendering it highly improbable whether such individuals will ever be found.

- Expert reasoning may produce moral and political disasters. There is too much emphasis on intellectual superiority. Eichman's reasoning was of the highest order.
- There may be reference to features of our experience such as remorse. What is lamented is not our ignorance but our choices. The acquisition of further knowledge need not be the issue at all.
- Plato fails to distinguish knowledge of ends from knowledge of means. The ship simile might feature here. Knowledge of the stars (Forms) would provide navigational skills but not knowledge of what the actual destination should be.
- The paternalistic and authoritarian nature of rule by experts will place the individual in a precarious position. His function will be decided by those who 'know'. It will be decided by a priori reasoning, which he cannot follow, regarding objects he cannot know.
- There are inherent dangers with claims to have absolute knowledge regarding ethical and political matters. One is reminded of the chilling image of Bronowski sifting the soil at Auschwitz and saying here is the result of those who had absolute knowledge.
- There may be reference to the corrupting nature of absolute power and whether the personal qualities attributed to the leader would avoid this and still allow him to be a suitable leader.
- It is not clear that the leader's qualities are always ideal in a ruler. Reluctance to rule may not be a desirable quality. Would Churchill have been a better leader without ambition? Having no fear of death may not be ideal in deciding the futures of others. The development of these qualities may distance the leader from the ruled.
- The last point may be developed into a general discussion of remoteness. A ruler who is socially and culturally remote may fail to understand, sympathise or empathise with his subjects. There are dangers with a non-participatory understanding. Plato may respond to this by claiming that the rulers would understand in a similar way that a parent understands the activities of a child.
- The society which is ruled in this way would be a static society. There is no scope for individual development.
- There is no **one** good for society to be known in the first place. There is a wide variety of goods which need not have a common essence.
- Attaining the Form of the Good is not a clearly defined process and Plato even speaks of a kind of mystical intuition. Can this be the basis for ruling?
- There may be a consideration of Aristotle's point that if 'the Good' is unattainable by man, then how can it be the goal of political science?
- It might be argued that there is an irreducibly personal element in moral decision making.
- There might be a directed criticism of the theory of Forms arguing that there are no such objects. Their reality is as abstractions only and this is not the basis for legitimate authority. Knowledge is confined to the empirical world. Such a discussion should consist of argument and not merely claiming there is no evidence for the Forms as if their existence was to be assimilated to the existence of the Loch Ness Monster or similar. It should be noted that Plato did not simply assert the existence of Forms without reason or argument.

0 6 Assess Plato's claim that knowledge is confined to the Forms.

(45 marks)

AO1

- There is likely to be a distinction drawn between Forms and sensible particulars.
- Knowledge is of the Forms, an unchanging reality. This should be contrasted with belief/opinion which is of particulars and subject to change.
- Knowledge is of what is, ignorance of what is not. Belief lies between these extremes.
- Knowledge of Forms is direct/intuitive whereas belief is mediated.
- Knowledge provides true understanding and must be directed at ultimate objects, belief reduces us to mere sight-seers.
- Knowledge concerns a different faculty from belief.
- Knowledge of the Forms relates to ruling as opposed to pandering.

AO2

- Properties of the Forms are likely to feature, immutable, beyond the world of the senses, timeless, perfect.
- The hierarchical structure of the Forms with the Form of the Good as the pinnacle should be made apparent.
- Simile of the sun may be used with an accurate diagram being sufficient.
- Other similes that sustain relevance might feature, eg stars corresponding to Forms in ship simile or the beast simile may demonstrate the distinction between true knowledge and empirical method, or between knowledge and pandering.

AO3

- By restricting knowledge to the Forms, Plato alters our concept of knowledge beyond recognition. It is now so restrictive that we can only properly be said to know a priori propositions.
- We can be said to know states of affairs without implying the necessity of those states.
- Plato's notion that knowledge must concern that which cannot be false may have absurd consequences. Credit should be given for supportive examples.
- It is not clear why eternal existence should carry any implications regarding what we can be said to know. Aristotle's example of whiteness may feature.
- It is not clear that anything can be known in the unqualified sense required by Plato.
- Differences in faculties will not establish ontological differences in their respective objects.
- The distinction between knowledge and belief is well made within the world of the senses. Differentiating criteria can be supplied without reference to a world beyond the senses. Credit appropriate examples.
- The question 'what is knowledge?' is an essence question. It should be answered by examining the different ways the concept is used and applied. This should be contrasted with looking for one particular kind of object to which it applies.
- We can be said to know things that are subject to change.

- It may be argued that believing is a component of knowing. This may develop into a discussion of knowledge as justified true belief. Good responses may discuss Plato's own counter example of Hesiod's wagon.
- The relationship between Forms and sensible particulars is unclear. There might be some discussion of 'partaking' and how it is achieved or whether there are Forms corresponding to all particulars. Examples from the Parmenides might feature.
- Plato's concept of knowledge generates absolutes and this can have dangerous or unacceptable consequences, eg moral experts, political despots, closed societies and elitism. Credit for a discussion of whether dangerous consequences are sufficient grounds for rejection should be given.
- There could be directed and informed criticism of the theory of Forms as opposed to asserting there is no evidence for them. Third man arguments may feature.
- There may be a discussion of whether all problems can be solved by the acquisition of knowledge. Ethical and political issues are likely to feature. This might be related to Aristotle's point regarding the utility of knowledge of the universal as opposed to knowledge of the particular.
- The apprehension of the highest knowledge (Form of the Good) borders on the mystical and there are issues regarding its attainability. Plato might respond by appealing to our limitations and of how knowledge of other Forms might be acquired and demonstrated through the use of reason. There could be discussion of the Socratic method in general and its approach to essence questions and the underlying assumptions it makes. Assumptions may be logical, epistemological or metaphysical.
- Candidates may develop alternative accounts of universals, eg Aristotle or standard British empiricist accounts.
- There may be some discussion of verificationist criticisms of a world beyond sense experience in particular or metaphysical claims in general. Ayer is likely to feature but there should also be discussion of why Plato thought the world of the Forms was required by reason. Responses to verificationism may include its adequacy as a theory of meaning or whether regarding the verification principle as a theory of factual meaning need worry Plato at all.
- There might be reference to knowledge as recollection. The problem of infinite regress, if knowledge consists of acquaintance with objects in another world, then knowledge in that world will… and so on.

Section C: Mill

0 7 Outline any **three** of Mill's arguments for defending free speech.

(15 marks)

AO1

Candidates should display knowledge of any three of the following arguments. Illustration may feature as part of the outline.

- The infallibility argument, the suppressor assumes his own infallibility.
- No real distinction between truth and utility.
- Development of the individual as a rational and progressive being.
- The dead dogma argument. We need to protect truths.
- The supplement argument, ie how arguments may complement each other.
- The heretical ideas argument.
- The appeal to the free market of ideas.

AO2

- In suppressing an opinion in advance of any discussion, the suppressor logically assumes that he is infallible. None of us is infallible.
- Mill thinks the truth/utility distinction is dubious. The supposed utility of any opinion is itself a matter of opinion and therefore should be discussed.
- To prevent free discussion is bad for both receivers of and dissenters from opinion. Their rational/mental development would be impaired and this is not consistent with Mill's conception of man as a progressive being.
- Certain truths need to be enlivened and belief stimulated to prevent them from becoming dead dogma. Example of Christianity might feature.
- Some opposed arguments may contain portions of truth and discussion allows us to identify and preserve them. Heretical opinions should be discussed as they might contain elements of truth or reinforce our opinions. Text examples may feature.
- The free market of ideas allows for choice in a similar way to a free market for goods. The market can only be genuinely free without intervention in deciding its content. It is for us to select from the market with rational discussion as the currency.

0 8 'Actions that do not harm others should not be the subject of interference either from the state or society.'

Assess whether Mill succeeds in defending this view.

(45 marks)

AO1

- There should be a clear grasp of the Harm Principle and its purpose, namely to mark off what would be the legitimate conditions of interference.
- Power can only be exercised rightfully against any individual member of a civilized society, contrary to his will, if it is to prevent harm to others.
- The agent's own physical or moral well-being is not a sufficient reason for interference.
- The agent is sovereign over his own mind and body.
- Exceptions to the Principle would include barbarian nations, children and the mentally unsound.
- Interference might be in the form of legislation or social sanctions.

AO2

- There should be some discussion of what Mill meant by harm. He is clear on this and it is not correct to say that Mill does not attempt to define harm.
- It is physical harm that matters, not mere offence.
- There might be reference to social action, other-regarding, and individual action, self-regarding.
- The above is likely to be illustrated by the drunken policeman or similar.
- The limits of interference in someone's free choice regarding their own well-being may be illustrated by the broken bridge or similar.
- Social sanctions can be even more damaging than legislation. They can penetrate even deeper.
- There might be references to Mill's applications of the Principle, eg sale of poisons, location of gambling houses, public decency, fair competition or similar.

AO3

- There can be a problem in distinguishing self-regarding actions from those that are other-regarding. This could be compared with Donne's claim that no man is an island. Mill does address this issue with his reference to 'social acts'. If there is a risk of harm to others, then this will remove the act from the individual sphere. There may be discussion of how helpful this is in a highly inter-dependent society. There might be some level of description at which there is always a risk. Credit realistic and problematic examples.
- Although it may be difficult to draw precise boundaries between self and other-regarding actions, this need not imply that we do not know in **any** cases what lies on either side. A boundary may have 'fuzzy' edges without implying there is no boundary.
- It may be argued that the existence of borderline cases presupposes a boundary rather than demolishes it. What are the preconditions of recognising problem cases?
- There may be difficulties in understanding what exactly is meant by 'harm'. Mill is clear that offence does not constitute harm and neither do financial catastrophes brought about by the operation of fair competition. Again, this might be questioned in an inter-dependent economic society. What constitutes 'fair' in a media-advertising dominated society may also be questioned. Offence does not constitute mental harm but what does? If Mill means

psychological damage, the causation is notoriously difficult to establish. Recent court cases may be discussed.

- There may be a consideration of Mill's response in terms of maturity of faculties. This may be discussed in relation to certain kinds of verbal bullying or verbal abuse.
- Some abhorrent practices are abhorrent for what they involve rather than because of any direct harm accruing to others. Voluntary incestuous relationships or the generation of pornographic images on computers **need** not involve others. If the Harm Principle excludes interference here, then are we creating too wide a gap between morality and the law?
- There is an issue of whether Mill is consistent with the application of the principle in the case of voluntary slavery. Mill thought there was something paradoxical in using one's freedom to relinquish one's freedom. It is not clear whether this constitutes a social or moral wrong, or whether it is a logical inconsistency.
- The above may be developed into a broader discussion of whether liberty should be used to deny liberty. Freedom of speech to certain racist groups might be discussed. The Harm Principle has application to free speech where cases of incitement are involved and by this Mill means incitement to action where there is clear and immediate danger (angry crowd and the corn dealer). Incitement to racial hatred seems more concerned with inculcating a particular attitude rather than with immediate action.
- An appeal to the utility principle may solve some of these problems. We would though now have two absolute principles with the possibility of conflict between them and no way of resolving that conflict. The supposed benefits of free speech may be appealed to.
- By allowing freedom to the individual in life-choices, Mill avoids paternalism. He allows moral growth, individuality and responsibility and this is consistent with his position on man as a progressive being. It may be argued that he has too optimistic a view on human nature or that greater protection is needed today given the different influences that an individual is subjected to. There may be discussion of whether such considerations lead to the 'nanny' state, together with whether we can reconcile this approach with giving a clear meaning to 'maturity of faculties'.
- There may be discussion of Mill's applications of the principle, eg sale of poisons, women's rights, or public decency. The discussion should focus on the consistency and implications of the application. The discussion may be extended to cover topical issues.
- Attempted suicide may be discussed and whether the social circumstances of the attemptee should make a difference. This might be developed into a more general discussion of sovereignty over one's own body.
- Mill's Harm Principle is a principle of demarcation and if it fails to mark off clear boundaries, then it is a failure.
- Experiments in living are worth pursuing for their own sake. This is how we learn, develop and become mature individuals. There is no guarantee that right choices will always be made but neither is there a guarantee that governmental or social interference will involve the right choice.
- Mill assumes too high a degree of rationality; people need guidance in order to avoid disasters. There is a difference, however, between guidance and cajoling. It may also be argued that such appeals are an incentive to improve the education system, rather than a justification for interference. Mill has already specifically excluded those of impaired faculties.
- There might be some discussion of whether 'harm' includes setting a bad example or undermining traditional values. Mill could respond by saying that perceived bad examples will themselves serve as a disincentive to follow particular paths and are thus an invaluable part of the learning process. In the case of undermining values, merely being different or novel are not themselves sufficient conditions for establishing this. Strong moral values have stood the test of time and would not be vulnerable. Mill would also hold that values are for the individual to decide and this is preferable to blind obedience or mere imitation. No distinctly human faculty is required to accomplish these.

0 9 Assess whether Mill was right to claim that there are dangers inherent in democracy.

(45 marks)

AO1

- Democratically elected governments seem ideal as they enact the will of the people.
- There may be some historical remarks regarding the limiting of the power of rulers whose interests were at variance with those of the ruled.
- There was a shift to representative government and the idea of coincidence of interests.
- A nation does not require protection from itself.
- There is a problem concerning what is meant by the will of the people.

AO2

- In practice the will of the people may turn out to be the will of the numerically greater, most vociferous or politically active.
- Such groups may seek to suppress minorities.
- Such suppression may result in a tyranny of the majority.
- Social tyranny can be exercised through current opinion, prejudice or superstition. It penetrates deeper than the enactment of laws.
- The majority must be prevented from dictating on moral issues, hence the need to limit the power of even those who are democratically elected.
- Examples may be given to illustrate Mill's historical remarks.

AO3

- It might be argued that Mill has overstated his case. Talk about 'tyranny' evokes certain images (examples) but does a working democracy have anything in common with such imagery?
- Alternatively, the case needs overstating in order to sustain vigilance. There is a real danger (examples) and Mill was right to warn against it.
- Mill is not opposing majority rule as such but highlighting the dangers of the ascendancy of a dominant class that decides moral issues. This inhibits individual development or stunts individual growth.
- One of the most dangerous tyrannies is a creeping tyranny – one that almost imperceptibly creeps into our lives or our thinking. This was Mill's concern, hence the wariness of public or current opinion.
- Mill is claiming that the rightful claims of the individual are not exhausted by an examination of the prevailing social/political forces. But such a claim could only be defended within a democratic framework – such a framework cannot therefore be characterised as a tyranny.
- It might be argued that Mill's position is not consistent with general utilitarian considerations with the greatest happiness of the greatest number being the final court of appeal.
- Mill might claim that such considerations embody the lessons of history which we ignore at our peril.
- A moral consensus is necessary for a unified and cohesive society. Toleration can be one of the values without implying unlimited application.

- Is Mill claiming that any view or activity should be defended on the grounds that it is practised by some minority? It might be argued that we have to consider what they involve and that the ultimate judgement here lies with the moral majority.
- The issue of minority pursuits or interests needs to be related to Mill's conception of man as a progressive being. It is not the case that just **anything** could be part of such a conception. Credit should be given for examples which raise issues of conceptual limitations.
- Mill allows for society to be the ultimate arbiter in what is necessary for its protection. Is this consistent with his remarks on tyranny? There could be some discussion of what is meant by 'protection', eg from what? There might be reference to specifiable harm, demonstrable harm, or a completely risk-free society.
- There may be discussion of the issue of remoteness. Some minorities who lack effective representation may become so remote that there will be no practical difference between democracy and tyranny.
- A possible danger in a democracy may be the influence of powerful pressure groups which may adversely affect the interest of some minorities.

Section D: Descartes

1 0 Explain any **two** of the arguments Descartes considers in his attempt to prove the existence of material things.

(15 marks)

AO1 Two of the following should be selected

- The argument from imagination which involves a consideration of the appropriate objects of that faculty.
- The argument from clear and distinct perceptions and the claim that this criterion can be applied to material things.
- The argument from God's veracity and the appeal to our strong and natural inclinations.
- The argument from the involuntariness of our perceptions.
- The argument from the vividness of our perceptions which is held to be a sign of their external origin.
- Descartes does not regard these arguments as being as strong as his arguments for the existence of the self or God. They are not logically certain.
- If the arguments from vividness or involuntariness are selected, it should be made clear that Descartes rejects them.

AO2

- Imagination is not part of his essential nature, unlike intellection. It is a faculty of knowing directed at body, ie it pictures material things. If there really were material things it would explain why we have such a faculty, otherwise we have no explanation. This, he thinks, renders the existence of material things probable.
- Descartes uses the criterion of clear and distinct ideas as a test for certainty. He claims that we have clear and distinct perceptions of material things. Given that God can do anything that satisfies this criterion, it follows that he can guarantee our ideas of material things.
- Descartes has a strong and natural inclination to believe in the existence of material things. Perception is passive so ideas of material things must be produced by an active power. God and body are postulated as possible powers. As some of our ideas are deceptive, God is rejected as he is no deceiver. So body is isolated as the probable cause of our ideas of material things. May be reference to workings of nervous system and dropsy case.
- The argument from involuntariness involves an appeal to the fact that our ideas of material things occur contrary to and independent of our will. This has frequently been taken as an indication of their external origin. If you look in front of you it is not a matter of choice that you see tables or chairs. Descartes rejects this argument as ideas that originate in him can also occur contrary to and independent of his will. Dreams, illusions or hallucinations may be cited as examples.
- The argument from vividness is similar to the above. The appeal here is that our ideas of material things are more vivid or forceful than our other ideas. So that our idea of a tree is more vivid when we are looking at a tree than the idea we have when we imagine a tree. The vividness is held to be a sign of the external origin of such ideas. Descartes rejects this argument. Again, vividness can also be a feature of illusory ideas. Some ideas can be vivid enough to fool us so this criterion is no guarantee of their external origin. There might be reference to hallucinations, nightmares or optical illusions.

1 1 'The application of Descartes' method of doubt establishes the existence of a thinking self as a logical certainty.'

Assess the validity of this claim.

(15 marks)

AO1

- The method of doubt is used as a tool for achieving certainty. It mimics scepticism but has a positive goal, ie to find something that cannot possibly be doubted.
- A certainty is required as a foundation for knowledge.
- The method consists of three stages, the senses, the dream argument and the evil demon hypothesis.
- Initial sceptical conclusion that the only certainty is that nothing is certain.
- The positive conclusion at the start of Meditation 2 is the presentation of the cogito. The 'I' survives the method of doubt. This is the logical certainty.

AO2

- The application of the method. The senses are rejected as the source of certainty as they have been deceptive in the past. It is not wise to trust something that has let you down. However, he could not doubt objects in close proximity without being classed insane so could that be the certainty?
- The dream argument is used to counter this suggestion. Frequently he has thought he was sitting at the table but was actually asleep in bed. There are no distinguishing features between dreaming and waking. However, even in dreams certain general truths remain intact, eg mathematical truths, so can he take these as certain?
- The third stage is the postulation of an evil demon that deceives him about everything, including mathematics and other general truths. This is global scepticism. But not even the demon can deceive him about his own existence. In order to imagine the demon, he must exist or for the demon to deceive him there must be something to deceive. He must therefore exist as a matter of logic.
- The first certainty is the 'I' not God. The existence of God is doubted as part of the demon hypothesis. So even if there were no God, Descartes would still be assured of his own existence.

AO3

- The most the method can achieve is the existence of an isolated self. We cannot get beyond this to construct a theory of knowledge. Descartes tacitly acknowledges this when he tells us that his arguments for the existence of body are no more than probable.
- Descartes' conception of knowledge is too restrictive. Logical certainty is too stringent a condition for knowledge.
- There may be a discussion of Moore's point that we can be said to know propositions that are logically contingent. Contingency implies that a proposition might not have been true, not that it might not be true. The first does not entail the second.
- The problem of narrow content. Basic foundational certainties do not have sufficient content to generate systems of knowledge. This may be taken as a particular criticism of the cogito or of Descartes' project as a whole.

- The validity of the cogito might be questioned. It may establish that there is a thought now (Russell et al) rather than an enduring self. Or the argument is circular if presented in syllogistic form and it needs to be if it is to be logically certain. As it stands it lacks the major premise, but if that is supplied, the argument presupposes the issue in question.
- Descartes may have responses to these points and similar. There might be a discussion of whether memory could be used to answer the question of an enduring self. Is the syllogism too narrow to capture the kind of self-evident proposition Descartes is seeking to establish? It simply would make no sense to deny it.
- 'Thinking' does not require agency, we can say it is raining without implying agency. This, however, may overlook the logical behaviour of different verbs. Some seem to imply agency, eg suing, composing and preaching. The issue hinges on which family 'thinking' belongs to.
- Descartes was supposed to doubt everything that could be doubted. He does not, however, doubt his memory or consider the implications of so doing. If he had done so in conformity with his method he might have found that he would have to assume the veracity of some memory to know that memory had deceived him on some occasion. If memory was established as reliable, he would have a response to the enduring self-issue.
- There is likely to be a discussion of the method of doubt. The kinds of arguments most likely to feature are: (a) that the senses have let us down sometimes does not permit the inference that they may always do so (Austin, Ryle). There may be a response that this misses the point as all Descartes needs is that he does not know **now** that his senses are not deceiving him. But Descartes is doubting **classes** of beliefs and a deceptive one will not dispose of the entire class. (b) We must have a concept of reality, not only to compare the dream with, but also to formulate the concept of a dream. (c) There are distinguishing features between dreams and reality, eg structure, continuity, coherence and remembering dreams as dreams. There may be reference to Malcolm and lucid dreaming. (d) Is the demon hypothesis meaningful? Talk about deception only makes sense against a general background of non-deception. Doubt requires a background or context. The hypothesis is consistent with all eventualities. It does not contain a difference that makes a difference. There are no distinguishing features or possible counter-examples. It could never be known. (e) There may be references to the Matrix or similar. If we allow for deceptions within deceptions, then those who control the Matrix could be deceived and the way is open for an infinite regress.
- The method of doubt is carried out in language but what are the presuppositions of doing this? Wittgensteinian arguments may feature regarding public and private rules, the role of public criteria and meaning and usage. Strawson type arguments regarding self-ascription depending on other-ascription might be used to show Descartes' procedure is confused. The points raised here will include the need for public checks to establish meaning. Purely private criteria cannot do this, the inherent public nature of rule following, internal baptism could not confer meaning and language is necessarily a public activity.
- Wittgenstein's point that talk about knowledge only makes sense if it is also possible to talk about doubt may be discussed. Expressions like 'I know I am in pain or know that I am thinking' require a special background to give them a meaning. They have no use. This should be discussed in conjunction with Descartes' idea that knowledge is all the more secure when doubt is logically precluded.

1 2 Assess whether Descartes succeeds in establishing that mind and body are separate and distinct.

(45 marks)

AO1

- Mind and body have different essential natures, properties which they could not lose without ceasing to be things of that kind. Cartesian dualism.
- Mind – thinking in a broad sense (narrowed to intellection in Meditation 6), body – extension (demonstrated in wax example).
- Interaction at the pineal gland.
- The intermingling thesis and the disanalogy of the pilot-ship example.

AO2

- The official position is that of two radically separate and distinct substances. There may be some reference to substance as that which can exist in its own right, cannot be destroyed except by God.
- Arguments for the distinction.
- Knowledge argument first form: I can doubt the body but not the mind.
- Knowledge argument second form: my knowledge of things cannot depend on things I do not yet know, or more strongly, things we know cannot depend on things we do not yet know.
- The appeal to God's omnipotence, God can do anything that is clearly and distinctly conceived.
- The indivisibility argument. Mind cannot be divided, body can be. Descartes' rejection of the faculties response. The exercise of any faculty requires the 'I' as subject and it is this 'I' that cannot be divided. There cannot be thinking or remembering without an 'I' as their subject.
- There may be some reference to the wax example in discussing the nature of body but a detailed account is not required.

AO3

- The knowledge argument fails in both forms. The first form misuses Leibniz' law which does not apply in intentional contexts. The second form invokes a false principle as things we know may well depend on things we do not yet know (diseases and bacteria). Conceptual distinctness does not guarantee ontological distinctness or causal independence. The weaker formulation will not give the conclusion Descartes wants as the independence of my **knowledge** of mental states does not entail the independence of the states themselves.
- The appeal to God's omnipotence fails to establish that God has exercised his power. The most it establishes is that he has the power.
- The indivisibility argument does not misuse Leibniz' law but can be challenged on other grounds. Cases of split or multiple personality may be cited as counter examples. Freud's tri-partite division of the mind may also be discussed.
- A supporter of Descartes may respond by claiming that such counter examples are themselves open to objection. Cases of split personality are incorrectly described as literally two or more different persons inhabiting the same body. They are over-dependent on memory as the sole criterion for personal identity. There are limits on the number of persons there could be in one body. If memory is essential to the person then what happens to person A when person B is in control? Do they cease to exist?

- A discussion of issues relating to Freud may centre on the substantive use of the unconscious, whether it makes sense to talk of mental states of which we are unaware, whether there are compelling scientific reasons for accepting the theory or if it is a science at all.
- Descartes' position is internally inconsistent. The arguments for separateness and distinctness are not consistent with the intermingling thesis. Descartes here switches to our more normal way of talking about persons, ie having a mind and a body rather than as a Cartesian soul substance.
- Does the notion of an immaterial substance make sense? It may be argued that 'substance' implies materiality.
- The thesis leaves us with the insoluble problem of interaction. The 'Humpty-Dumpty' problem of taking the person apart and not being able to put him together again. The failure of the pineal gland solution as the mind is not spatially located and cannot be spoken of in this way.
- Descartes would have difficulties in explaining how brain changes can affect the mind. Brain injury can result in aphasia, and if our ability to think depends on our use of language, then this kind of damage could result in losing our essential nature.
- Responses to the above may include the claim that brain injuries result in damage to the instrument of expression only not to the mind. This has been taken to imply that we can never know what the mind of a brain-damaged person is like. A supporter of Descartes may now appeal to cases of comatose patients responding to messages or providing accurate accounts of their surroundings after surprisingly coming out of comas. There is also the corresponding difficulty for the materialist of accounting for mental effects on the body.
- Dualism is incompatible with the goal of ontological simplicity.
- Candidates may develop materialist solutions to the problems of dualism but should remain focused on the question. Ryle's logical behaviourism and Descartes' alleged category mistake, attempts to identify the mind with the brain or attempts to dismiss dualism as a kind of folk-psychology may feature.
- Some form of dualism is required to account for facts of consciousness. There may be a discussion of whether there are irreducible conscious states (qualia) or the problem of intentionality. Mental states have the property of being directed, physical states do not. Problems involved in naturalising intentionality. There may be some discussion of Foster's attempt to defend Cartesian dualism within the recent analytic tradition.
- There may be some references to historical attempts to deal with the interaction problem, eg occasionalism or psycho-physical parallelism, and their attendant difficulties. Over reliance on God or speculation about what God has done or circularity or substituting mental causation with an inexplicably convenient accident may feature.
- Any alternative to Descartes must deal with the issue of mental causation. Behaviourism, Epiphenomenalism or Eliminativism have serious shortcomings in responding to this issue.

Section E: Nietzsche

1 3 Outline and illustrate Nietzsche's claim that past philosophy is an expression of the prejudice of its author.

(15 marks)

AO1

- He is concerned with the foundation of philosophy. The notion of objective truth.
- Ad hominem arguments are used against a variety of targets.
- Language has led philosophers astray (bewitchment).
- Importance should be placed on the function of concepts and whether they are life-promoting or life-enhancing.
- The fundamental concept is the will to power.
- Importance of physiological states.

AO2

- What has traditionally been regarded as pure objective truth is riddled with the preferences and prejudices of its authors.
- Examples of ad hominem arguments should feature. Expect references to Kant on the synthetic a priori or Plato's elitism.
- There may be discussion of how language can lead us astray. The subject-centred grammar of our language involves the imposition of our interpretation of the world.
- The above may be illustrated by reference to Descartes' Cogito or the problem of free-will.
- What have been regarded as fundamental concepts, eg causation, are invented rather than discovered.
- Some candidates may make comparisons with Freudian concepts, eg the unconscious or rationalisation.

1 4 'Nietzsche's account of religious belief shows little understanding of the meaning and significance of such belief.'

Assess whether this is a justifiable criticism of Nietzsche.

(45 marks)

AO1

- Religion is described as an ongoing suicide of reason.
- It involves the sacrifice of freedom, pride and spiritual self-confidence.
- There might be reference to the ladder of sacrifice.
- Religion is described as a neurosis.
- Religious belief is attributed to instinctual fear, the will to truth at any price. Such belief is contrary to nature.
- Religion may be used as a means to an end.

AO2

- Being contrary to nature involves a denial of the world and the will. There may be references to solitude and abstinence.
- Christianity has reversed moral values and is responsible for the modern sickly, mediocre European.
- The new philosopher may use religion as a tool in exercising control over the weak.
- Some of Nietzsche's lurid and negative descriptions might feature, eg the saint living rapturously contrary to nature. There is, however, a redeeming feature here, namely the manifestation of the will to power (though it has become turned in on itself).
- There might be an account of the stages of sacrifice, human beings, our very nature and then God himself. The ladder culminates in the worship of nothingness.

AO3

- Attempts have been made to render religious faith a rational activity, or to at least show that it is not irrational, eg Aquinas, James. Nietzsche neglects any philosophical analysis of such attempts. They cannot be dismissed by appealing to the motives of their proponents. The limits of ad hominem arguments may be discussed.
- The meaning or significance of religious belief may consist of providing a fundamental reason for why there is something rather than nothing; it may provide a satisfactory explanation of the phenomenological aspects of conscience. It may provide a unified world view; a scientist may see himself as unfolding God's plan.
- Meaning and significance are given in the concepts used and the responses elicited from others. This is true of any practice and we cannot make judgements about one practice by using the criteria of another. This becomes an acute problem if you are a perspectivist.
- If all Nietzsche's perspectivism requires of a belief system is that it is life-enhancing, then this claim could be made by the religious. There would then be nothing left to say. Nietzsche could respond by claiming it **could** not be life-enhancing given what it involves. This may, however, involve making absolute claims regarding what is life-enhancing.
- Meaning and significance cannot be separated from what eg Christians, actually believe. The mission and status of Christ and the ultimate message it carries are part of a complex belief structure and this is not to be dismissed by simply describing it in other terms. Arguments must be produced to demonstrate its falsity. Pointing out effects of beliefs may be

distinguished from the reasons for holding them. The latter may not collapse into the former.

- The ladder of religious sacrifice omits the most important sacrifice and that which gives a meaning to Christian sacrifice. This is the sacrifice by God for man. It is this fundamental belief that gives the system its significance.
- The concept of sacrifice is too narrow as an explanation of more developed religious systems.
- Nietzsche's perspectivism does not prevent him from making rationality judgements regarding entire belief systems. The consistency of this approach might be questioned. The implication seems to be that we can use reason to distinguish rational and irrational activities but this seems to involve regarding the rational as more than another perspective. If it does not, then it's hard to see why those deemed irrational may not simply bring the same charge against Nietzsche and then there would be nowhere left to go.
- Describing religious practices when removed from their context will produce absurdities, but the same is true for **any** practice described in this way. Philosophical gains can only be made by arguing against the context itself. Whether religious belief is a legitimate response to the human situation may be discussed.
- Nietzsche's account of religious belief involves providing motives that the agents could not themselves give of their activity. There may be discussion of how this procedure is to be justified, under what conditions or presuppositions could such judgements be justified? Marxian or Freudian explanations may be used in comparison.
- Religion has to be regarded as an end in itself otherwise the entire situation collapses and it would no longer be recognisable as religion. Nietzsche's suggestion of using religion as a means refers to the social effects of certain practices but this misses the point of the significance they have for their practitioners. Nietzsche may respond by appealing to the utility of lulling the masses into a false belief system but this will involve a distinction between true and false beliefs and a method for deciding it. A response may be made in terms of furthering the interests of the new philosophers or restoring the natural order of things (purposive accounts of morality may feature). If adopting religious belief helps the weak avoid or escape Nietzsche's new morality, then the weak should pursue it as a matter of rational self-interest.
- Nietzsche is primarily concerned with the psychology of religion and it's not clear how one moves from this approach to judgements regarding rationality. The appeals to instincts or some fundamental will requires some independent evidence and not just the actions they are intended to explain. There is a danger of circularity.
- Nietzsche neglects actual arguments for the existence of God. Even if none of these is decisive, some may still pose questions (eg recent issues relating to design) and these are not adequately dealt with by attacking the motives of their proponents. If we are to preserve any sense of rationality, arguments must be judged on their actual content. It seems we need some sense of rationality in play if we are to make sense of Nietzsche's comments regarding neurosis and suicide of reason.
- Lurid descriptions could be provided to illustrate Nietzsche's perspective but to make a rational choice between them seems to require more than just the descriptions.
- One cannot have a non-participatory understanding of religious belief but Nietzsche could appeal to something like Tertullian's paradox, namely there are no disbelievers only those who fail to understand.
- Living up to genuine Christian values in the present epoch is a sign of strength not weakness. It distinguishes you from the mediocre and Nietzsche has failed to grasp the significance of such values for the individual.
- There might be some discussion of Nietzsche's historical account of religious development. Some events may be subsumed under it but it's not clear that all can. The account may be regarded as selective.

1 5 Assess the validity and implications of Nietzsche's distinction between slave and master morality.

(45 marks)

AO1

- Master and slave morality are the two basic traits or moral codes to which all others reduce.
- They can co-exist in the same society or the same person.
- Master morality is typified by harshness and severity. It is applied consistently in that the master is harsh with himself as well as others. It is harshness of soul and thus penetrates the entire being.
- Slave morality is based on fear or self-protection.
- The master will subjugate the weak.
- The master/slave relation is an organic function.

AO2

- Master morality is exemplified by noble aristocratic values or proud states of the soul.
- It is the individual, not the action, who is the bearer of moral predicates.
- Moral historians have inverted the true relation. There might be reference to the slave revolt.
- The master creates value, the slave receives it.
- Slave morality makes virtues of pity, suffering, and Christian humility. 'Good' is closer to stupidity.
- Master morality may be illustrated with Nietzsche's admiration of Viking morality and the consistency of harshness.
- Exploitation of the slave by the master is not subject to moral judgment any more than any other natural process is.
- To deny the nature of the relation is to deny life itself. Exploitation is fundamental and natural. It is beyond good and evil.

AO3

- There may be a discussion of the accuracy of Nietzsche's historical account. He could be charged with naivety, romanticism or preferential selection. You cannot simply transport values across epochs. They are internal to the social and economic conditions of a society. Viking morality cannot be separated from Viking society.
- The slave revolt seems to require considerable ingenuity, organisation, determination and courage. It is not clear how the slave value system could produce this. Alternatively, such a revolt could not be predicted from such a value system. This may cast doubt on whether Nietzsche is providing an 'explanation'.
- How do we distinguish the strong from the weak? Candidates may use similar arguments to those used by Socrates against Callicles, eg the herd is now the stronger.
- What is human and all too human is our ability to act contrary to nature. There seems to be a tacit acknowledgement that nature does not 'fix' everything for us like it does for the rest of the natural order. We are owed an explanation of this together with why appeals to nature should be decisive in determining social action.

- Nietzsche's account seems to rely on truths about nature. Is this consistent with his general position on truth? In defence it may be argued that all that is required is that such judgements be life-enhancing. If that is the case, then the majority will quite reasonably reject them.
- There may be an exploration of the fact-value gap. From alleged facts about nature or organic processes what follows morally? Nietzsche may respond by claiming that he is only concerned with factual judgements, ie this is how things are.
- It may be countered that such judgements are not purely factual. Any judgement concerned with how people should be treated, or is taken to have such implications, is inherently moral. To deny this would alter our concept of morality beyond recognition.
- There is a strain in Nietzsche between giving an account that is beyond morality and yet at the same time moral. If there are moral implications, then it is open to rejection on moral grounds (Russell).
- Morality constitutes a fundamental category of human experience and no behaviour can transcend it.
- There is nothing particularly admirable about natural processes per se. Our ability to resist exploitation, recognise it or take a view on it distinguishes us from such processes. There might be criticism from within the existentialist tradition, eg ignoring this is a flight from freedom or an act of bad faith.
- To claim that exploitation is an organic function could be seen as an attempt to incorporate pseudo-science or evolutionary principles into ethics. (Spencer and the treatment of American Indians may be used in comparison).
- What is so special about exploitation? There are other equally plausible candidates for the essence of life, assuming that life has an essence.
- The implementation of master morality would be a social and political disaster. If adopted internationally, it would be a recipe for chaos and suffering. It might be argued that there are worrying similarities with Hitler's remarks regarding how natural it is for the strong to enact their will.
- There is a difficulty in Nietzsche's account of the bearers of moral predicates. Can you separate an individual from the actions they perform? This may be discussed in the context of Nietzsche's division of moral development into three epochs. Does history divide up like this? Is the emergence of one epoch from another adequately explained? Is the position being offered a preference of its author?
- Nietzsche is offering us a particular picture which we may or may not find appealing. This claim needs to be reconciled with the way the 'picture' is painted.
- Alternative accounts of morality may be developed or defended, eg Kant, Aristotle Utilitarianism etc. Focus needs to be sustained on a critical discussion of Nietzsche.
- Nietzsche undermines the role of reason in morality but seems to rely on reason to arrive at his position.
- There are too many significant differences between natural processes and human actions for one to be a prescription for the other.

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**