

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Pre-U Certificate

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2010 question paper  
for the guidance of teachers**

**9774 PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY**

**9774/03**

Paper 3 (Key Texts and Topics in Philosophy and Theology 2),  
maximum raw mark 50

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

- CIE will not enter into discussions or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2010 question papers for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.



Page 2	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9774	03

## Topic 1 Philosophy of Mind

### Section A

[Extract from **John Searle**: *Minds, Brains and Science*: 13]

- 1 (a) With reference to this passage, how does Searle explain the two different conceptions that human beings have of themselves? [10]

According to Searle, *all mental* phenomena are caused by brain processes: e.g. events inside the central nervous system cause pain. The crucial bit is what goes on in the head, and not what occurs at the site of the pain. Pains and other mental phenomena are just features of the brain (and perhaps the rest of the central nervous system).

We have a dual level of explanation: brains cause minds, yet minds are features of brains: if mental and physical phenomena have cause and effect relationships, how can one be a feature of the other? – by looking at the common distinction in physics between the micro and macro properties of systems. For example many surface features of water can be explained by the balance of elements at the micro level; this gives us a model for understanding the relationships between mind and brain.

In liquids and solids, we have no problem in seeing that their surface features are both *caused by* the behaviour of the micro elements and at the same time is *realised in* the system that is made up of the micro elements. The surface features are just higher-level features of the very system whose behaviour at the micro level causes those features. So, mental processes are caused by processes going on in the brain at the neuronal level, and at the same time are realised in the very system that consists of neurons. Just as we cannot reach into a glass of water, pull out a molecule, and say, 'This one is wet', I cannot say, 'This neuron is in pain / is experiencing thirst' – yet I can say 'This brain is experiencing thirst or pain'. This kind of thinking can explain consciousness, intentionality, subjectivity and mental causation. There really are mental states: some of them are conscious / many have intentionality, and so on. Naive mentalism and naive physicalism are perfectly consistent with each other, and are both true.

Page 3	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9774	03

**(b) Critically examine Searle's argument that human brains *do not* function as digital computers. [15]**

Searle rejects the prevailing view in philosophy, psychology and artificial intelligence, which emphasises the analogy between the functioning of the human brain and the functioning of digital computers. Instead, he insists that mental states are biological phenomena. There is more to mind than having formal or syntactical processes: a computer program can *only* be syntactical, so can *never* be a mind. Minds are semantical – they have more than a formal structure – they have a content. Candidates are likely to illustrate this through Searle's thought-experiment of the Chinese Room. Searle also claims that however complicated computers become, they will be unable to duplicate consciousness, feelings and emotions, for example – at best they could simulate them, but no simulation ever constitutes duplication.

Candidates might argue that Searle's account is good because it avoids the pitfalls of dualism, although any monist theory of mind does this. It is a naturalistic theory, and so it avoids importing insights from other disciplines (such as computational theory) into the philosophy of mind. The evolutionary advantages to beings possessing self-awareness are obvious, so the development of consciousness as a biological and not as a computational phenomenon seems clear.

Criticism of Searle's theory might focus on consciousness and his view that digital computers cannot in principle be conscious. It is not clear that consciousness is the primary function of brains, since brains have many different functions in relation to the body. Moreover if consciousness is a brain function, at what point can a demarcation be made to say that something (such as a bacterium) is *not* conscious? With regard to mental states such as intentionality, for example, Fodor objects that Searle gives no account of why biochemistry is necessary for intentionality, arguing instead that the way in which an organism is connected to its environment is a more likely explanation of intentionality. Such problems suggest that Searle does not necessarily disprove the computational thesis that the brain carries out its functions mechanically.

Page 4	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9774	03

## Section B

- 2 'We cannot know that other people have minds.' Consider whether this is a sensible claim? [25]

Mental states are private, so we can only make inferences to other minds based on people's public behaviour. How do we go from knowing behaviour to knowing mental states? According to J.S. Mill, we can do so by inductive analogy: I know that I have mental states, so analogically I can infer that other human beings have mental states. The obvious problem is how one generalises from one case to all others, and how one knows that the inference is correct. According to Wittgenstein's critique, the analogical argument to other minds claims that I understand the words I use to describe mental states because I am acquainted with my own private mental states; but how can I expand my private definitions and experiences to others? Words/terms used to describe mental states must be acquired in a public context to be applied to others and myself – words cannot acquire meaning in the privacy of my own mind, but only in 3rd-person social contexts: so we can meaningfully attribute mental terms to ourselves and others, thus gaining knowledge of other minds. Some will claim that this moves towards untenable forms of behaviourism, since Wittgenstein is relying heavily on public behaviour to explain mental terms. According to Strawson, ascribing mental states to oneself is only *possible* if mental states can be ascribed to others. Identifying others means ascribing to them material-object predicates as well as 'P-predicates' (those that ascribe conscious states), and ascribing the latter still requires observing outward public behaviour. The latter point suggests that Strawson's account can also slide into behaviourism, and as A.J. Ayer pointed out, everyone except me might be a zombie with regularly observable behaviour yet devoid of mental states. To know that other people have minds is a sensible claim in so far as we have reason to believe that it is true; nevertheless proving it is a different issue.

Page 5	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9774	03

OR

**3 Critically assess mind-brain identity theory. [25]**

Mind-brain identity theory (MBIT) asserts that mental states are identical with brain states: when you have a mental state, such as a desire, it is a brain process, so for every mental state there is a brain-state with which it is identical. For example, every pain event is held to be identical with C-fibres firing. In support of MBIT, mental events do appear to be localised in specific areas of the brain. People who suffer localised brain damage also suffer localised damage to the mind, and the most natural explanation of localisation is that the mind *is* the brain.

The theory is propounded variously in a type-type and a token-token format. Support from the former comes from successful scientific reductions, e.g. that lightning consists of electrical discharges and water consists of H<sub>2</sub>O, on the basis of which MBIT philosophers suggested that a given type of mental state will be found to be identical with a given type of brain state. So, just as water is always identical with H<sub>2</sub>O, pains will always be found to be identical with C-fibres firing.

The main problem, with type-identity theory is that it restricts mental states to humans, whereas it seems likely that different biological systems could develop mentality – if Martians with green slime for brains could clearly be shown to think, then we would have to accept that green slime could develop mentality. Mental states do appear to be multiply realisable, so that, for example, in people with severe localised brain damage, other parts of the brain can and do take over the functions of the damaged sections. For this reason, many espouse a token-token version of MBIT in which a token of one type can be identical with tokens of different types, e.g. in the way that 'wristwatch', 'Big Ben' and 'digital clock' are different tokens of the type 'timepiece' that nevertheless have identity in having some construction that tells the time.

Candidates might commend MBIT's virtues as a more plausible alternative to dualism, together with the fact that the correlation between mental states and brain states is obvious to a point, e.g. in that damage to the brain causes damage to the mind. Some might argue that MBIT falls foul of Leibniz's law of the identity of indiscernibles; that it cannot account for the intentionality of mental states; that individuals do seem to have privileged access to their own mental states; that materialism is unsatisfactory in general, and so on. Candidates do not need to cover an exhaustive amount of ground in their analysis in order to access the highest levels.

Page 6	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9774	03

## Topic 2 Ethics

### Section A

[Extract from **John Stuart Mill: *Essay on Bentham in Utilitarianism*: 99-100]**

#### 4 (a) Examine the ideas about Bentham's philosophy which Mill addresses in this passage.[10]

The passage shows one of the key areas of difference between the thinking of Mill and Bentham. Summarised by Ryan as: 'And however much at odds it sometimes is with his determinist universe, Mill's concern with self-development and moral progress is a strand in his philosophy to which almost everything else is subordinate.' (Alan Ryan, *The Philosophy of John Stuart Mill* London: Macmillan, 1970) In his Autobiography, Mill identifies two 'very marked effects' on his 'opinions and character' brought about by the period of his mental crisis. The first involved no longer making happiness 'the direct end' of conduct and life. The second effect was that Mill 'gave its proper place, among the prime necessities of human well-being, to the internal culture of the individual', i.e. the cultivation of the feelings. He had, he says, ceased to attach 'almost exclusive importance to the ordering of outward circumstances, and the training of the human being for speculation and for action'. Ideas on Bentham which candidates might identify and explain:

1. The limits of Bentham's perception of human nature. Humans are solely driven by pleasures and pains.
2. The limits of Bentham's perception of the religious motive – 'self-regarding interest', 'self love or love or hatred towards other sentient beings'.
3. The limit of Bentham's understanding of conscience – a subjective reality with no external point of reference.
4. Bentham's inclination to identify higher 'Springs of Action' with self interest.
5. Bentham's inclination to ignore completely the subjective experience of '*self respect*' and human capacity to make moral judgements about others and self ('feeling of moral approbation or disapprobation').
6. Mill argued that Bentham had failed to properly incorporate the notion of character into his ethics which created a lack of attention to interior culture.

<b>Page 7</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9774</b>	<b>03</b>

**(b) 'Mill's Utilitarianism is preferable to that of Bentham.' Critically assess this claim. [15]**

Candidates should have offered in part **(a)** many of the key ideas and are expected to draw on the observations made in that section to develop an evaluative response. Demonstration of key differences between the Utilitarianism of Mill and Bentham expected:

Bentham

'The greatest good [pleasure] for the greatest number'

Focused on the individual alone

Quantitative – hedonic calculus

Act Utilitarianism

In search of maximisation of happiness

Consequentialist

Mill

'The greatest happiness for the greatest number'

We should protect the common good, universalistic

Qualitative – higher/lower pleasures

Rule Utilitarianism

Consequentialist

Some candidates might argue that Mill's insistence on higher pleasures and a higher dimension of human life is to be preferred to Bentham's purely quantitative ideas about pleasure and pain. Some might argue that Bentham appears to have ignored or treated too lightly some areas of human experience which do not sit easily with his philosophy. Others may draw out the strengths of Bentham, who is philosophically coherent and does not require us to value the subjective pleasures of others against an ideal, which is itself difficult to justify. It might be argued that philosophically Mill compromises the whole principle of utility and Bentham's secular approach to ethics by his introduction of 'higher' pleasures. Other candidates might argue that since both make the presumption that pleasure can in some sense be the measure of a good life that neither one is preferable to the other. Others may debate how the term 'preferable' is employed and to whom it is applied. The conclusion reached is not important. Candidates are free to respond however they choose to the question and will be graded on their ability to draw evidence and make evaluative reflections.

Page 8	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9774	03

## Section B

### 5 Consider the view that Fletcher's Situation Ethics is not a Christian ethical system. [25]

An outline of the key aspects of Situation Ethics may be anticipated. This may include introductory remarks about the historical political and social context in which Situation Ethics arose. Expect a summary of Fletcher's four presuppositions and six working principles.

Expect a range of responses which may include some of the following points:

*Not Christian* – existentialist influence, non-deontological flavour, focus on pragmatism, relativism, end justifies the means. Challenge to church and traditional Christian values. The Roman Catholic Church initially condemned Situation Ethics cf. 'Instruction on "Situation Ethics": *Contra Doctrinam*' (1956).

*Christian* – J Fletcher a Bishop, influence of Tillich, Bonhoeffer, focus on Agape, example of Jesus. Catechism of the Catholic Church states: §1757 The object, the intention, and the circumstances make up the three 'sources' of the morality of human acts.

Candidates may argue that Situation Ethics is not an ethical *system* so much as an ethical method.

The Anglican Bishop John Robinson was an early supporter of Situation Ethics saying that it was: '*The only ethics for the man come of age*'. He later changed his view on the basis that individuals were not necessarily capable of taking responsibility for the morality of their actions: '*It will all descend into moral chaos*'.

### 6 Critically examine religious approaches to environmental ethics. [25]

This question falls within the context of the syllabus thus a specifically Christian approach is anticipated and is sufficient to attract a full range of marks. If candidates include approaches from other world religions this will also be credited, but is not necessary for a complete response. Environmental ethics are a modern phenomena to which there is little specific teaching. A range of responses are acceptable and may include reflection on Natural Law tradition, Situation Ethics, Biblical perspectives and Church teachings past and present. A good response will include reflection on practical application.

Candidates might highlight the split in Christian ethical approaches to the environment – e.g. those (based primarily on Natural Law) that see 'dominion' as 'power over' the rest of the environment, and those which see 'dominion' as service/stewardship, since these are fairly crucial for the environmental ethical approaches that spring from them. The first interpretation is driven by the Natural Law approach, for example following on from Aquinas' judgement that animals have instrumental and not intrinsic value.

Mature responses will identify that the issue at the heart of the debate within Christian circles is the status of the environment, and animals, and their relationship to humans and to God. There may also be an awareness of a range of views on the Christian spectrum – from deep ecology, through to shallow ecology.

A critical examination may include reflection on religious claims as a whole and the sufficiency of religious approaches in a secular world. Others may identify strengths and weaknesses in any of the individual approaches listed above. Others may argue, with Lynn White, that religion is responsible for the current environmental crisis and thus is self evidently inadequate. Candidates may consider the extent to which religious approaches are in any way distinctive.



Page 9	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9774	03

### Topic 3 Old Testament: Prophecy

#### Section A

[Amos 7: 10–17]

**7 (a) Consider what this passage contributes to our understanding of Amos' message. [10]**

Candidates may seek to place the text in its social historical and literary context. Reference to the reign of Jeroboam, which was long and prosperous (and thus associated in the popular mind with divine approval), to the long standing debate about the nature of prophecy and the prophet in this period and to textual analysis would all be relevant preparatory material for a response to the question. To the functionaries of the northern shrine, allegations of corruption would have been ludicrous, since current theology equated prosperity with divine approval.

Reflections on Amos' message might include reflections on Amos' claim to authority, his fearlessness in delivery of his prophecy, the judgemental message towards Amaziah, Bethel, professional prophets, the King, and other nations (branded as 'unclean'). The message of destruction for the Northern Kingdom which in this passage appears to be declared because of their rejection of Amos and his message – this is seen by Amos as a rejection of God since he believes himself to be the subject of divine election. Good candidates will identify what this passage contributes to our understanding and may also identify features which are absent from this passage.

Candidates could consider whether or not Amos functioned as a cultic/professional prophet. One view is that being taken from the flock signifies his rejection of being a *nabi'* (7:14). Others take 7:14 to be in the past tense, with 7:15 being an admission by Amos that he has now assumed the status of a *nabi'*. Amaziah addresses Amos not as *nabi'* but as *hozeh* – 'seer', which is confusing. Amos' banishment to Judah seems to imply that Amos was a southerner and that Amaziah was telling him to go back there; but some suggest that he was perhaps in the employ of the northern royal shrine of Bethel, and was being banned for the crime of speaking against both the king and his royal shrine. In other words, the basis for understanding Amos' message is not clear. The unit in 7:10-17 is stylistic, and is similar to other narratives in which the focus is the challenge to prophetic authority. It serves to show the basis for Amos' authority, although whether or not it reflects historical fact is not known.

**(b) 'Amos spoke only words of doom.' Critically assess this claim. [15]**

Candidates are expected to draw on information presented in part (a) but no credit for repetition. Candidates may consider the causes for words of doom – worship of other gods, hypocritical religiosity, corrupt religious leaders and hypocritical religious ceremonies, social injustice and oppression of the poor and the perversion of justice. He condemns social injustice in Judah and the surrounding pagan countries. He warns that there will be a day of judgement which will be a day of darkness for Israel because it has deserted God.

The issue of the last three or five verses of Amos has long been one of scholarly debate and candidates might be expected to draw on this whole debate. Is the text consistent in showing God to be not only just but also loving and forgiving? The small ray of hope in 7:1-6, 5:4-6 may be referred to by way of support for this view. Or is there reason to believe that these verses were added later? The book seems to have undergone a series of editings which candidates may show awareness of:

- \* the Book of Amos seems to have undergone an editing process as part of the Book of the Twelve, in which hopeful expansions to the text were a standard feature, which in turn suggests that they are intrusive to Amos' message
- \* Jeremiah's comment that 'true' prophets before him did not speak salvation oracles also suggests that 9:11-15 in Amos are post-exilic additions to the text
- \* the severity of the language in general suggests unmitigated doom (appropriate quotations selected by candidates).

<b>Page 10</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9774</b>	<b>03</b>

## Section B

### 8 Critically examine the theme of messianic hope in Second Isaiah, Micah and Malachi. [25]

The message of the coming Messiah is not totally consistent in the three books cited and candidates may attempt to offer some historical, social and literary context for each work. Candidates are expected to be able to identify and comment upon the key texts concerning the messianic hope.

Second Isaiah is an exilic prophet. In Deutero-Isaiah the key passages are the suffering servant passages including 52:13-53:12. The historical context is the exile and these passages are ones of hope for forgiveness of Israel and return from exile. Debate concerns the identity and paradoxical nature of the suffering servant – whether this is an individual or Israel herself, the servant is chosen by God – which connects the messianic tradition historically to the monarchy and to the prophetic tradition. The nature of the Messiah is to suffer. This picture of vicarious suffering is a unique feature of the Messiah in these passages and echoes the roll of the scapegoat on the Day of Atonement. The Messiah is not a priest but has a priestly function. It is due to this willingness to take on the burden of innocent suffering that there is hope. It is a messianic hope of salvation and has a universal element (52:14-15).

Micah was a pre-exilic 8th century BCE prophet but the text is complex with a series of editors. In Micah the key passage is 5:2-4 in which both the exile and the return from exile are anticipated. The Messiah will belong to the family of David, and will thus be associated with the monarchy as well as the priesthood. He will come out of Bethlehem, and will restore the fortunes of Israel and Judah but the message is one of universal relevance. His greatness will extend to the ends of the earth and he will bring peace and security to all people.

In Malachi the messianic hope is found in 3:1-4. This is a post exilic work probably 460 BCE. The temple has been rebuilt and still there is injustice. The 'messiah' is referred to as a 'messenger' from God, but it may be that a theophany of Mt Sinai variety is anticipated. The message will be delivered from the Temple and will involve renewal of covenant and priesthood.

Reflections on the divergence in the Hebrew Scriptures regarding this hope may be found. Themes such as the universality of the messianic hope, associations with the house of David, Jerusalem and priesthood may be expected as well as reflections on the function of the Messiah.

Page 11	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9774	03

OR

**9 'There is nothing 'new' about the New Covenant of Jeremiah 31.' Discuss. [25]**

Expect some introductory reflections on what a covenant is and the range of ideas in the Hebrew Scriptures. Jeremiah chapters 30 and 31 are sometimes known as the Little Book of Comfort because they predict the restoration and reunification of the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah and a new covenant between them and God.

New elements in this covenant might be identified as: not written in stone but in the hearts of the people. It will be unbreakable since it is given by God directly and the people will have the will to follow it. Unconditional forgiveness without commitment to written rules. The new covenant is a relationship between the individual and God, not a collective deal passed down from one generation to the next. It is one-sided and requires nothing from the recipient.

Evaluation of 'newness' may include comparison between this and other earlier covenants such as that with Noah, the three with Abraham, Sinai and the covenant with David in 2 Samuel 7. Common features with earlier covenants include the commitment to belief in Israel as covenant people, the theme of sin and expiation of sin, belief in God as of justice but also a God of loving kindness and forgiveness.

Some candidates may reflect on the literary exegesis of the text. Is it genuine to Jeremiah? Candidates might look at "nothing new" in connection with specific themes, such as:

- \* 30:1ff – restoration of the Davidic king – part of a pattern of editorial reworking? (like in Amos)
- \* 30:11– theme of the remnant
- \* echoes of the wilderness tradition (e.g. 31:2)
- \* the "new thing" of a woman ('virgin Israel') protecting a man
- \* the proverb in 31:29-30 – quoted in Ezekiel 18, and presumably a focus of contemporary discussion – revocation of the doctrine of corporate responsibility for sin
- \* comparison of the new covenant with that in Hosea.

Some might explore the originality of the passage to Jeremiah – denied by many scholars. If the passage is intrusive (and there are many issues concerning the textual integrity of Jeremiah, not least that the presumed Hebrew original on which the LXX of Jeremiah is based is a third shorter than MT), then the passage is hardly 'new' in any sense in Jeremiah.

Considerable flexibility will be allowed in the interpretation of "new" in the question, depending on the themes explored by candidates.