



General Certificate of Education

Philosophy 5171/6171

PLY3 Texts

Mark Scheme

2006 examination –June series

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' 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.

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 level. There may be some errors of spelling, grammar and punctuation.
- 3–4 marks: The candidate displays a basic knowledge of the relevant material. There is a limited understanding of at least one relevant point. The response lacks detail and is not 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 is sustained and the response will read as an integrated and logically developed whole. There are 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 sustains relevance and evaluative points are directed at the requirements of the question. There may be occasional errors of spelling, grammar and punctuation.
- 10–14 marks: The candidate demonstrates a limited appreciation or critical understanding of the relevant issues. Support material is limited but some relevant material must be effectively deployed. The evaluative aspects may lack penetration and this is more in evidence at the lower levels of the level. 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 is 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 is little or no relevant grasp of the issues. Textual awareness is minimal or fragmentary. Errors of spelling, grammar and punctuation may be intrusive.

1. Text: Plato's 'The Republic'

Total for this question: 45 marks

NB 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) identify the common view; (2 marks)

Some of the young men are corrupted by sophists. **2 marks**

(ii) how are the public described? (2 marks)

Sophists on a grand scale. **2 marks**

(iii) briefly explain why Socrates thinks the public influence the young philosopher. (6 marks)

Their collective influence is greater than any individual. When they gather *en masse*, they generate a great deal of noise. There is an echoing effect. Approval/disapproval is shown through noise rather than argument. No individual training can stand up to such a barrage. The young man will be carried away. **6 marks**

(b) Explain and illustrate the role of the Form of the Good in Plato's theory of knowledge. (10 marks)

The simile of the cave/sun is likely to be used in illustrating the Form of the Good. The Good should be compared with the sun. The Form of the Good is the pinnacle of knowledge. It is this Form which gives sense and intelligibility to all others. Source of reality and truth. There is likely to be some account of the theory of Forms with the Form of the Good at the top of the hierarchy. It is so overwhelming that it cannot be fully apprehended. Reference might be made to the Good having an almost mystical significance. Knowledge determines action.

10 marks

- (c) Assess whether the simile of the large and powerful animal succeeds in its purpose. (25 marks)

There should be a description of the simile. The animal is large and powerful – the crowd. It needs pacifying as it could be dangerous if it got out of control. The trainer (sophist) observes its mood, behaviour, reactions, noises. He claims scientific status for these observations; the ‘science’ can be taught. Whatever pleases the animal is called ‘good’, what displeases it is called ‘bad’. The trainer panders to its whims without any idea of what is really good for the animal.

Critical Points

The purpose is likely to be regarded as an attack on democratic politics. It may also be taken as a criticism of empirical methods.

1. The simile is more appropriate as a criticism of direct Athenian democracy than of modern western democracy.
2. Similarities may be claimed between our democracy in terms of sound bites, election promises. There are, however, dissimilarities, eg politicians’ voting on capital punishment as a matter of conscience.
3. There is a difference between an educated public and a rabble. Even if the public can behave like a rabble, this should be taken as an incentive to improve moral/rational standards.
4. Empirical observation does not have to be superficial. Theoretical backing can underpin such observations.
5. The analogy focuses on control and subduing of the animal. This should not be the ultimate end of politics. Reference to respect is omitted. Plato’s alternative would involve a paternalism of experts who know what is good for others. Presumably this would be a legitimate study.
6. The beast has reactions and makes noises. This needs to be distinguished from the ability to articulate viewpoints and justifications for those views.
7. A simile needs to be distinguished from an argument.
8. The position of the individual may be discussed. Self-determination should be a political objective. This may be discussed in conjunction with the pessimistic view of human nature implicit in the simile.

25 marks

[Maximum for question: 45 marks]

2. Text: Descartes' *Meditations*

Total for this question: 45 marks

NB 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 what does Descartes identify himself? (2 marks)

Nothing other than a mind.

2 marks

(ii) how does Descartes seem to conceive of the wax? (2 marks)

Clearly and distinctly.

2 marks

(iii) briefly explain why Descartes is so sure of his own existence. (6 marks)

He knows himself more clearly and distinctly. If he judges the wax exists, then *he* who judges is all the more certain. He could not be mistaken about that even if he was mistaken about the wax. This applies equally to all judgements based on the senses or imagination/other cause. **6 marks**

(b) Outline Descartes' indivisibility argument for distinguishing mind and body. (10 marks)

The argument is intended to show that mind and body are separate and distinct. The strategy is to show that something is true of one and not the other, therefore they must be different. The difference is that the body can be divided whereas the mind cannot be. Although the mind can be divided into faculties, Descartes' point is that the exercise of any faculty requires the entire self. 'I' as subject, eg I imagine, I remember, etc and this 'I' cannot be divided.

10 marks

(c) Assess Descartes' ontological argument for the existence of God.

(25 marks)

There should be a statement of the argument. It is a purely conceptual argument, moving from the idea of a perfect being to its actuality. If God lacked existence, He would lack a perfection. Existence cannot be separated from the essence of God any more than the logically necessary properties of a triangle can be separated from it. The same point is made with the mountain/valley example. "God exists" thus becomes a necessary truth. There is an objection: granted you cannot conceive of triangles, etc without their logically necessary properties, it does not follow that there are *in fact* such things. Descartes, however, is claiming that God is a unique concept. It includes existence as part of its definition/conception. He is not free to imagine it otherwise, unlike a winged horse.

Critical Points

1. Kant's criticism is likely to feature prominently. Existence is not a predicate/property. We do not add to the conceptual content of something when we say that it exists. Existence is not a property akin to being green, round, etc. Surface grammar can lead us astray.
2. To say that something exists makes a difference to our knowledge or adds to our knowledge. Does Kant's criticism do justice to this? His own example of 100 real thalers might be discussed. Kant's point concerns conceptual content rather than our knowledge.
3. Russell's analysis of existence in terms of the propositional function might be discussed. Existence/non-existence are not properties. In making such attributions, we are saying that certain propositional functions are instantiated or not, eg "men exist" is analysed as the propositional function, 'x is a man' is true for some value of x.
4. Descartes claims to have an idea of God but fails to bridge the gap between idea and real existence.
5. The argument is *a priori* and no existential proposition can be established in this way. The conclusion is presupposed in the premises. The argument is circular – existence is built in to the initial definition of perfection.
6. Schopenhauer-type objections: anything can be defined into existence when existence is included in the concept of the thing. Gaunilo objection – perfect island.
7. Descartes can respond to point 6 by appealing to the uniqueness of the concept of God. It is the only concept which incorporates existence as part of its content. The relation between God and existence is necessary not contingent.
8. The empiricist view that there are no logically necessary existential propositions.

25 marks

[Maximum for question: 45 marks]

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

NB 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) what is Feuerbach said to misunderstand? (2 marks)

Existing reality. **2 marks**

Existence/essence confusion is worth 1 mark.

(ii) what does Feuerbach regard as the essence of a human individual? (2 marks)

The actual conditions of his/her existence/actual existence. **2 marks**

(iii) briefly explain why Marx and Engels think Feuerbach's account of essence is mistaken. (6 marks)

He regards essence as something fixed/unchanging. Any exceptions to his thesis are explained away, treated as abnormalities which have to be tolerated. Feuerbach neglects the world of man in favour of 'external nature', but this is shrinking as it surrenders to human invention. Practice will ultimately lead to revolution. **6 marks**

(b) Outline and illustrate the importance of the division of labour in Marx and Engels' account of productive relations. (10 marks)

The importance of the division of labour lies in its inherent contradictions. Interests will be opposed. It will determine class and lead to various forms of alienation, eg worker from product. The inherent conflicts will generate a revolution which will remove them.

Division of labour means specialisation and this may be illustrated by reference to divisions like male/female, industrial/commercial, mental/physical or urban/rural. Such divisions are the measure of the stage of a nation's productive forces. The divisions are closely related to forms of ownership and private property. **10 marks**

(c) Assess Marx and Engels' use of the concept of ideology.

(25 marks)

There might be some discussion of Marx's critique of Hegel or the Young Hegelians who are accused of inverting the true relation between ideas and change. They fail to realise the material base of ideas. There may be some reference to sub-structure/super-structure in explaining Marx's thesis. The material forces of production determine ideas – they are the driving forces of history. They determine class and the ruling class determines the ruling ideas.

Critical Points

1. Certain ideas of the ruling (capitalist) class can be palatable to the proletariat. A Marxian response in terms of false consciousness might be discussed.
2. If Marx is claiming that ideas are a mere epiphenomenon (no causal efficacy in bringing about change) then counter-examples might be possible. These are likely to be of a moral/political/religious nature. Credit should be given to candidates who engage the issue and who consider how Marx might respond by linking them to prevailing economic structures.
3. Related to point 2, some moral beliefs transcend particular material conditions. Marx could respond by claiming that it is only at certain stages of economic development that such moral positions become possible.
4. The power of ideas is not to be thought of in terms of causal efficacy but in terms of rationality. There are dangers inherent in accounting for rationality in terms of prevailing material conditions.
5. There may be some discussion of the alleged 'purity' of certain influential scientific ideas. Man and his place in nature, literature, art, etc can be influenced directly by such ideas.
6. The status of Marx's own theory may be discussed. It contains important *ideas* but what are we to say of their origin? Do they have the power to influence or to bring about change?
7. Giving the causal history of a belief system is not the same as disposing of that system.
8. There are identification problems with the concept of 'class'. The concept is taking too much theoretical strain; it is, or has become, too nebulous to take that strain. What are the determinants of class?
9. Does Marx's account provide a complete explanation of historical change?

25 marks

[Maximum for question: 45 marks]

4. Text: Sartre's 'Existentialism & Humanism'

Total for this question: 45 marks

NB 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) how are we said to regard God when we think of Him as the creator? (2 marks)

As a supernal artisan.

2 marks

(ii) what is meant by saying that the will follows from the understanding? (2 marks)

When God creates something, he knows what He is creating. (Reference might be to an artisan.)

2 marks

(iii) briefly describe the two ways that essence has been said to precede existence. (6 marks)

When God is thought of as the creator, He has a conception of man in His understanding prior to the creation (paper-knife analogy), therefore the essence of man comes first. Secondly, without God, there are various human nature theories, whereby a certain conception of that nature is exemplified in individual men regardless of their situation.

6 marks

(b) Explain and illustrate what Sartre means by anguish and despair. (10 marks)

Anguish – a consequence of total freedom. The realisation of our complete responsibility for ourselves and others. This freedom extends to our interpretations. Examples might include the anguish of Abraham or the military leader. It is the condition of action.

Despair – we should limit ourselves to a reliance upon that which is within our wills. Do not rely on possibilities that are not directly concerned with your action. We must act without hope. Examples might include the friend coming by train or what can be relied on in the political struggle.

10 marks

(c) Assess Sartre's view that something is valuable because it is chosen.

(25 marks)

There are a number of sources in the text that can be used to start the discussion. There are no *a priori* values or God-given values – we create them and we do this by choosing them. The monogamy example can be used. Reference might be made to Sartre's claim that if a person chooses in all sincerity, then it is impossible to choose a better course for him. The student example involves the affirmation of value through choice.

Critical Points

1. Does Sartre's thesis imply that fascism would be valuable if chosen?
2. Related to point 1 is Sartre's restriction that actions must be chosen freely or in good faith. Thus it could be argued that certain political commitments, eg Nazism, could not be chosen freely given what they involve.
3. Do all brands of fascism involve bad faith? Counter-examples are possible that need not involve appeals to human destiny or racial superiority.
4. Even if something is chosen in bad faith, it can be valuable in the sense that good or beneficial consequences can follow from it. Mary Warnock type examples might figure here.
5. The previous point might be developed into the more general claim that it is not *how* something is done that matters, but rather *what* it involves.
6. Defence of Sartre: even if good consequences flow from an act of bad faith, it does not follow that bad faith does not matter. It would be better to achieve the same results without the bad faith.
7. The student example is problematic. In order to generate a moral dilemma, both options must be regarded as valuable and neither has yet been chosen.
8. Does Sartre make due allowance for phenomena such as weakness of the will/remorse that an action was not chosen?
9. Not all values can be chosen in Sartre's sense. Words like 'good' or 'bad' are taught in application to something, so how could *that* be a decision as in the case of the student?
10. Defence of *a priori* values or the importance of motives or consequences may be argued for. There may be some criticism of Sartre's dismissal of Kant, eg how would fighting for the resistance involve the student treating his mother as a means?
11. Sartre is ambivalent regarding the possibility of moral criticism. He wavers between making a moral judgement and a logical judgement. If someone acts in bad faith, then a judgement of truth can be made. However, if this is to have *moral* impact, then the *value* of truth is presupposed.

25 marks

[Maximum for question: 45 marks]