



ASSESSMENT and
QUALIFICATIONS
ALLIANCE

Mark scheme

June 2003

GCE

Philosophy

Unit PLY3

Copyright © 2003 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

AS PHILOSOPHY UNIT 3

*Candidates must answer **one** question.*

Marks should be awarded in accordance with these levels-of-response marking criteria. Question-specific marking notes are provided for reference on the following pages.

Levels-of-Response Marking Criteria**Part (a)****Total: 10 marks**

- (i), (ii)** 2 marks: A full answer in accordance with the mark scheme.
- 0-1 marks: A partial or incorrect answer.
- (iii)** 4-6 marks: The candidate selects those aspects of the passage which are relevant to the central requirement of the question. The candidate applies them in accordance with that requirement. There are few, if any, errors of spelling, grammar and punctuation and the response should read as a coherent whole.
- 1-3 marks: Some relevant aspects are selected and applied but others are omitted or are misunderstood. There may be some lack of clarity in the expression with errors of spelling, grammar and punctuation in evidence.
- 0 marks: No relevant aspects are selected.

Part (b)**Total: 10 marks**

- 8-10 marks: The candidate displays a detailed and relevant knowledge of the text. Selected material bears directly on the central requirement of the question. The response forms a coherent structure with few, if any, errors of spelling, grammar and punctuation.
- 5-7 marks: The candidate displays relevant knowledge of limited aspects of the appropriate text detail. The response may be wide-ranging and not always directly focused on the central issue. Lack of focus is more in evidence at the lower end of the band. There may be some errors of spelling, grammar and punctuation.
- 3-4 marks: The candidate displays a basic knowledge of the relevant material. There will be a limited understanding of at least one relevant point. The response will lack detail and will not be well focused. Repetition and lack of sophistication are likely to be present. Presentational problems may also be evident.
- 0-2 marks: The candidate displays little relevant knowledge. There may be some fragmentation in the response or a lack of coherence in relation to the requirements of the question. Structural or expressive difficulties may be intrusive and the meaning of the response may be obscured.

Part (c)**Total: 25 marks**

- 20-25 marks: The candidate shows an ability to analyse and critically assess the relevant issues. Support material is deployed in accordance with the requirements of the question and judgements are supported by argument. Criticism will be sustained and the response will read as an integrated and logically developed whole. There will be few, if any, errors of spelling, grammar and punctuation.
- 15-19 marks: The candidate shows an ability to analyse and critically assess some relevant material. Reasoned judgement must be present but detail may be lacking. Support material may also lack detail but some will be effectively deployed. The response will sustain relevance and evaluative points will be directed at the requirements of the question. There may be occasional errors of spelling, grammar and punctuation.
- 10-14 marks: The candidate will demonstrate a limited appreciation or critical understanding of the relevant issues. Support material will be limited but some relevant material must be effectively deployed. The evaluative aspects may lack penetration and this will be more in evidence at the lower levels of the band. Some errors of spelling, grammar and punctuation are likely to be present.
- 5-9 marks The candidate shows an ability to address some limited aspects of the question. The material selected may not always be directly relevant and there may be some misinterpretation of the text and/or errors of reasoning. This will be a dominant feature of responses at the lower end of the band. Critical assessment is likely to be weak or to be replaced with assertion. Some responses may be characterised as displaying a basic knowledge of the key issues. Errors of spelling, grammar and punctuation may be present.
- 0-4 marks: There will be little or no relevant grasp of the issues. Textual awareness will be minimal or fragmentary. Errors of spelling, grammar and punctuation may be intrusive.

Candidates must answer one question.

1. Text: Plato's "The Republic"

Total for this question: 45 marks

N.B. The following marking notes are not prescriptive and do not constitute 'model answers'; they are intended as an 'aide-memoire' for Examiners. Marks should be awarded in accordance with the levels-of-response marking criteria.

(a) (i) With an uneasy feeling. (2 marks)

(ii) A game of draughts. (2 marks)

(iii) It produces conclusions which do not really convince. It achieves such conclusions by logic-chopping and trickery – makes you feel trapped by an expert. Those who don't give up Philosophy early but pursue it become odd birds. Philosophy should be given up after early education. Those who study it become useless members of society. (6 marks)

(b) A brief description of any **three** of the following:

(1) Knowledge is of the Forms, an unchanging reality. Ethical knowledge might be referred to. Knowledge is then contrasted with opinion which is of particulars; they are subject to change.

(2) Knowledge is infallible whereas opinion is fallible. There might be reference to the *a priori* nature of knowledge (Plato's rationalism).

(3) Knowledge is of what is; ignorance of what is not. Opinion lies between these two extremes.

(4) Knowledge is direct (intuitive). Opinion is mediated.

(5) Knowledge produces true understanding; opinion reduces us to mere sight-seers.

(6) Possession of knowledge related to ruling; opinion related to pandering or worse.

[Responses are likely to consist of a mix of the above.]

These points may be made in the context of the similes.

(10 marks)

(c) Description of the cave simile: the bound prisoners, cave/fire/puppeteers, the released prisoner, reluctance to leave, the painful path to knowledge, dark/light/reflections/sun - the analogies. The forced return to the cave/hostile reaction, the ridicule and resentment of the chained prisoners.

Discussion points:

(1) By analogy the Philosopher Ruler will have gained absolute knowledge. There are dangers inherent in such a conception, especially in relation to political and social implications. Reference might be made to totalitarianism or closed societies. Social divisiveness might also be explored, elitism, etc.

(2) Closely related to (1) is the claim that such a conception is ethically dangerous. It contains the idea of a moral 'expert' with moral 'knowledge'. Candidates might approach the question from the direction of ethics rather than politics. Both (1) and (2) imply a precarious position for the majority. There might be some contrasts with democracy, eg is the general public of a 21st century democracy really comparable with the prisoners in the cave?

- (3) The rulers' apprehension of knowledge (sun) is too subjective; it is an almost mystical apprehension. This is not a safe ground upon which to base leadership. 'Safety' might be cashed out in terms of dangerous implications, inherent irrationality or both.
- (4) The simile emphasises reluctance. Would this be a good quality in a ruler? It is not clear that political leaders would be any better as leaders through being reluctant. Historical examples of leaders in various crises might be used. In defence of Plato, it might be argued that he is stressing duty over and above naked, personal ambition and this is desirable in those who rule. Equally, historical examples could be used to support this claim.
- (5) Is there something self-defeating about the simile? It seems that those in the cave *cannot* understand the returning prisoner – they cannot be expected to, given their predicament. Are they not, therefore, bound to disbelieve him? They will treat what he says as illusory and never appoint him as leader. This can be compared with Plato's view of the status of the philosopher in his society.
- (6) Knowledge claims rest on the two worlds view, hence on the Forms. Deficiencies in this theory could be used to show that the elevated position of the philosopher is unjustifiable.
- (7) Are all political and ethical problems solved by the acquisition of knowledge? Does knowledge guarantee personal qualities? (25 marks)

2. Text: Descartes' "Meditations"

Total for this question: 45 marks

N.B. The following marking notes are not prescriptive and do not constitute 'model answers'; they are intended as an 'aide-memoire' for Examiners. Marks should be awarded in accordance with the levels-of-response marking criteria.

- (a) (i) His parents **or** some cause less perfect than God. (2 marks)
- (ii) There must be as much reality in the cause as in the effect (2 marks)
- (iii) Starting with a principle of causal adequacy as outlined above, Descartes argues *from* his ideas of himself and God *to* God. Descartes is a thinking thing with the idea of God: the cause must also be a thinking thing with the idea of the traditional attributes of God. Either this cause is God or is caused by something else again which has these qualities. We thus ultimately reach God if we are to avoid an infinite regress. (6 marks)
- (b) A brief explanation of any **three** of the following:
- (1) The argument from imagination. Imagination is not part of his essence and must therefore depend on something other than mind. Body is postulated as an answer to the question of what it is dependent upon.
 - (2) The argument from clear and distinct perceptions. Material things can be conceived of clearly and distinctly. God has the power to create anything that satisfies this condition.
 - (3) The argument from God's veracity. He has a strong and natural inclination to believe in material things. Perception is passive so ideas of material things must be produced by an active power, God or Body. But some ideas are deceptive, so God is excluded, thus Body is isolated as the cause of our ideas.
 - (4) The argument from involuntariness. Such ideas occur contrary to/irrespective of his will. This is a sign of their external origin.
 - (5) The argument from vividness. Ideas of material things are more vivid than other ideas – again a sign of their external origin.
 - (6) Candidates may also appeal to the faculties argument in Meditation 6. (10 marks)
- (c) The use of the method is to achieve certainty. So sceptical doubt is being used as a tool for this purpose. Even if it fails, it may show that nothing certain can be known. There should be a description of the method employed:
- (1) doubt of all beliefs acquired through the senses on the grounds that the senses are known to be deceptive on some occasions;
 - (2) the dreaming argument which claims a lack of distinguishing features between dreaming and waking life;
 - (3) The evil demon hypothesis, a general deception concerning everything – even mathematics.

Discussion Points

- (1) Concerning the use – it would be paradoxical to claim that he was certain that nothing certain could be known;
- (2) A thoroughgoing scepticism would have explored the idea of a deceptive memory. Descartes refers to this but does not develop it.
- (3) That something has let us down on some occasions does not permit the inference that it may always do so. Austin/Ryle-type arguments are likely to figure here. The crucial issue concerns how we *know* we have been deceived on some occasions.
- (4) A similar point can be made in regard to the dreaming argument. We must have a concept of reality, not only to compare the dream with, but also to formulate the concept of a dream
- (5) The claim that there are no distinguishing features between dreaming and waking can be questioned. Structure, sequence and order, coherence, and our memories of dreams *as* dreams appear to be such features. Norman Malcolm and the problem of lucid dreaming.
- (6) It is not clear that the demon is a meaningful hypothesis. Doubt requires a background or context, not the obliteration of all possible ones. How does Descartes acquire the language to express such doubt? If I am *always* deceived, how could I know this and how would I have the concept of a deception? References to the Matrix might be used.
- (7) Descartes was wrong to restrict 'to know' to only those propositions which are logically certain, ie Moore-type arguments might be used: the mere logical possibility of doubting a proposition is not *in itself* sufficient grounds for rendering it dubious.
- (8) The method can, at best, result in the discovery of an isolated self – nothing else can be known.

Note: Candidates are being asked to assess Descartes, not to list alternative theories.

(25 marks)

3. Text: Marx and Engels' "The German Ideology"**Total for this question: 45 marks**

N.B. The following marking notes are not prescriptive and do not constitute 'model answers'; they are intended as an 'aide-memoire' for Examiners. Marks should be awarded in accordance with the levels-of-response marking criteria.

- (a) (i) It is all just a question of taking. (2 marks)
- (ii) By appealing to the barbarians taking the Roman empire. (2 marks)
- (iii) They have a better claim to be *the* social determinant. Taking is itself determined by the object taken (banker). What is important is not so much the taking, but the state of productive forces of that which is taken – this will explain/determine future changes. Conquerors must adapt to the productive forces of what is conquered. This explains the servant-master paradox. Development of feudalism depended on pre-existing productive forces. (6 marks)
- (b) There are likely to be some examples of the division of labour indicating varying degrees of specialisation. There should also be reference to the forms it can take, eg within a family, male/female, mental/physical, industrial/commercial, urban/rural and between nation states themselves. The degree and amount of division of labour is closely related to the stage of a nation's productive forces. Reference should be made to Marx's idea of the relation of the division of labour to forms of ownership and private property. Contradictions are implicit in the division of labour, interests are in opposition. It will determine class with inherent conflict and lead to alienation, eg worker from product. These contradictions and conflicts will ultimately result in a revolution which removes them. (10 marks)
- (c) There might be some reference to the traditional German Ideology which Marx is opposing. The real driving forces of history are the material forces of production which generate the ideas. It is a mistake to regard the ideas as being the driving force (critique of Hegel). The ruling ideas are the ideas of the ruling class and class is determined by material forces of production.

Discussion Points

- (1) Marx seems to be questioning the causal power of ideas to bring about change. This is a mistake of the earlier philosophers. If the status of ideas is a mere epiphenomenon, then counter-examples might be used to question this status. Certain moral, political or religious ideas might be cited as causally important in bringing about change. Special credit should be given to candidates who anticipate a Marxian response.
- (2) It could also be argued that not all moral beliefs can be explained in terms of local material conditions. Are there any moral beliefs which transcend particular material conditions? Credit for realistic examples should be given.
- (3) It could be claimed that Marx is only trying to warn us of the dangers of the reification of ideas. He would recognise the importance of ideas in the identification and conceptualising of the generated contradictions.
- (4) It is not clear why an idea should have no causal efficacy simply because it itself has been caused. There is an issue here, ie do we dispose of *any* phenomenon by citing the conditions which gave rise to it?
- (5) What account is to be given of Marx's own theory? One can hardly deny that it contains important *ideas*. Is Marx engaging in special pleading? My theory is excluded from the criticism that applies to all theories.

- (6) Can we really give a full explanation of historical change in the way Marx suggests? It might be argued that there is a difference between historical explanation and redescription in terms of an all-embracing theory. Is the history of kings and queens naïve?
- (7) There is too much weight given to the concept of 'class'. What is class? Is it easy to identify? Are there common identification criteria persisting through history? How feasible is it to claim that such classes have a common belief system? What account is to be given of persistent beliefs which cut across traditional class distinctions? Candidates may question the concept of 'false-consciousness' as an explanation of such phenomena.

(25 marks)

4. Text: Sartre's "Existentialism & Humanism"**Total for this question: 45 marks**

N.B. The following marking notes are not prescriptive and do not constitute 'model answers'; they are intended as an 'aide-memoire' for Examiners. Marks should be awarded in accordance with the levels-of-response marking criteria.

- (a) (i) Treat everyman and yourself as an object. (2 marks)
- (ii) To present the human world as a pattern of values distinct from the material world. (2 marks)
- (iii) His is not a narrow subjectivism. Not only do we discover ourselves through the cogito, we also discover the existence of others. We discover others as the condition of our own existence; others define us. It is only through the mediation of the other that I can *be*. Subjectivity alone is compatible with the dignity of man. (6 marks)
- (b) There are likely to be some detailed descriptions of the example itself. The family background of the student, the historical setting are likely to figure here. The student has a moral dilemma and seeks Sartre's advice. The 'advice' given is you are free, therefore choose. Sartre's rejection of moral formulae and his reasons for doing so should be mentioned. The purpose is to illustrate the nature of moral choice – there are no pre-determined moral values, no set formulae. Even the choice of adviser could be an act of Bad Faith. The student will create his own value through the action *he* chooses. Illustration of abandonment. (10 marks)
- (c) Bad Faith is the term coined by Sartre to describe the various ways we attempt to deny or escape from our total freedom. In bad faith we are failing to recognise the nature of our existence. We may take comfort in some deterministic doctrine or pre-ordained plan or pre-existing value system which will absolve us from the responsibility of our own actions. It might be argued that such a doctrine is the opposite of that of Freud. Bad faith may take a number of forms. See discussion points for likely examples.

Discussion Points

- (1) Regarding the formulation of the concept, bad faith or self-deception is not like lying to oneself. There is a difficulty with lying to oneself: if the liar knows it is a lie, then how can he deceive himself? If he does not know, then it is ignorance not deception.
- (2) It can be argued that self-deception can be regarded as a corruption of knowledge and ignorance, eg the avoidance of carrying out checks for fear of the truth. This is a common pattern of human behaviour.
- (3) Some of Sartre's well-known examples might be used to illustrate his meaning, eg the girl on the date, the waiter, the soldier. Does Sartre require these examples to do too much work? Is everyone who is involved in a social role denying the fact of choice?
- (4) Warnock's criticism that good can come from social roles may be used. However, this would not show that the deception did not matter. It would be better to have the good without the self-deception.
- (5) How defensible is it to claim that all kinds of scientific determinism involve bad faith? Candidates may discuss the limitations this places on possible future developments.
- (6) Belief in a human nature is an example of bad faith. Candidates may focus on whether Sartre does justice to such theories and whether his appeal to a universality of condition adequately explains human similarities – if it explains anything at all.

- (7) Closely connected to human nature is God. For Sartre you cannot have the former without the latter. Sartre does not argue for the non-existence of God. In this text he merely assumes it.
- (8) The student example implies that we can never sincerely seek moral advice. It also implies that we will not get unexpected advice. Either of these implications can be explored.
- (9) Sartre is somewhat ambivalent on the question of whether there is anything wrong with bad faith. He wavers between a moral judgement and a logical judgement. By definition bad faith involves an error, but is this sufficient to establish a moral criticism? From the *fact* that someone has deceived themselves, what follows *morally*?
- (10) For Sartre, bad faith seems to be the only possible source of moral criticism. However, we blame people for what they do, not just for the way in which they do it.
- (11) Sartre employs the notion of a fundamental commitment. There could be a problem here in establishing the criteria/conditions for distinguishing actions flowing from such a commitment from those actions rooted in bad faith. Presumably, Sartre would reply that they could be distinguished in terms of their ultimate justifications. (25 marks)