

**2004 Philosophy**

**Higher**

**Finalised Marking Instructions**

## HIGHER PHILOSOPHY 2004

### Questions and Marking Scheme

All questions including the logic option are marked out of 25.

In their essays candidates are rewarded according to the quality of thought revealed in their answers. They are not rewarded solely or even mainly for the quantity of knowledge conveyed. "Quality of thought" is taken as including the extent to which the candidate:

- gives an answer which is relevant to the question and relates explicitly to the terms of the question;
- argues a case when requested to do so;
- makes the various distinctions required by the question;
- responds to all the elements in the question;
- where required explains, analyses, discusses and assesses rather than simply describing or narrating;
- answers with clarity and fluency and uses appropriate philosophical language.

The following descriptions provide some additional guidance on the features of essays which may be categorised as grades A, B and C respectively. Clearly, many essays will exhibit some though not all of the features listed in any one category. Others will be stronger in one area than another. These characteristics do however, provide a general indication of aspects to be expected in an essay at a particular grade.

#### **18 - 25 marks would correspond approximately to a Grade A**

the answer covers all or most of the main points relevant to answering the question, with development (definition; explanation; exemplification; quotation; etc) as appropriate.

the essay is a closely-argued and sustained response to the question,

effective use is made of philosophical concepts and terminology

an effective exposition and evaluation of the texts and/or positions under consideration is presented

#### **15 - 17 marks would correspond approximately to a Grade B**

most of the answer engages with the question and is a coherent response;

exposition of the texts and/or positions under consideration is accurate;

there will be some coherence to the candidate's analysis of the philosophical argument or issue and appropriate evaluation;

some attempt will be made to arrive at a conclusion which relates to the rest of the answer.

### **13 –14 marks would correspond approximately to a Grade C**

the candidate demonstrates competence in the subject area, and a grasp of the texts and/or positions under consideration;

there may be omission or inaccuracy, but there will be basic analysis of the argument or issue and limited evaluation.

### **Awarding a mark**

In marking essays the full range of available marks is to be awarded. Marking should reflect what it is reasonable to expect from a candidate at this stage in their development in relation to the subject and quality is rewarded accordingly. Full marks are attainable for answers written within the time constraints even though these can never be a fully comprehensive analysis of the arguments or issue. An essay worthy of an "A" grade should not automatically receive 18 or 19 marks but as high a mark as you considerate merits; full marks should not be reserved for the "perfect" answer. In Philosophy no such thing exists!

The detailed information which follows indicates the points that a candidate is likely to make in response to the questions. This list is not to be considered exhaustive and it is also possible for candidates to write high quality essays and not mention all the points listed.

## SECTION A: CLASSIC TEXTS

Candidates must answer **ONE** question.

### 1 Plato

"Plato's Theory of Forms has many problems. His simile of the cave is a vivid illustration of the Theory but it does not help us solve any of the problems."

Discuss

**(25)**

Points to expect in the answer:

- Outline theory of forms
- Outline problems with theory of forms eg
  - problem of participation
  - problem of extent of forms
  - knowability of forms
- Outline simile of the cave
- Outline problems with the simile of the cave
  - weakness of analogical arguments
  - some aspects of simile not explained/have no corollary in the theory
  - simile not fully explicit?
    - why does returned prisoner fail to describe things accurately?
    - what do all the objects outside the cave represent?
  - only illustrates forms of physical objects
  - doesn't address significant difficulties of the theory of forms
- Evaluate to what extent the simile addresses the problems with the theory
  - to be taken in context of other similes

### 2 Descartes

Is Descartes successful in overcoming doubts about the senses?

**(25)**

Points to expect in the answer:

- Explanation of the dream argument
- Explanation of context – search for certainty
- Depends on the argument for the existence of God
- Argument from God's benevolence
- Dreams are qualitatively different
- Why doubts about senses do not undermine certainty
- Possible comments/criticisms
  - how to reconcile the claim that God is not a deceiver with the claim that the senses are unreliable as a guide to the essences of physical objects
  - existence of God is not sufficiently established
- alternative responses to the dream argument (asymmetry between being asleep and being awake)

### 3 Aristotle

Critically evaluate Aristotle's use of the concept of 'function' in the Nicomachean Ethics.

(25)

Points to expect in the answer:

- Every natural thing has a function, therefore
- Man has a function
- Doing well consists in performing function well – telos
- Eudaimon is to perform function well
- Man's function is to be rational, therefore
- A good man lives in accordance with reason
- Criticisms
  - assumes that human nature is universal
  - asserts rather than argues that distinctive features determine function
  - rationality is not the only distinctive function (art etc)
  - accident of birth objection – those who are unable to perform the supposed function
  - does man have a function?

### 4 Hume

Does Hume give a convincing case against belief in miracles?

(25)

Points to expect in the answer:

- Hume's definition of a miracle – a violation of a natural law by the volition of a deity
- The 'matter of fact' consists of testimonial reports.
- Wise person proportions belief to the evidence
- Stronger evidence defeats weak evidence (strongest is a proof)
- Uniform experience against violation of natural law amounts to proof
- Reliability of witnesses is questionable, (motives, time etc)
- Criticisms
  - arguably too stringent – any historical reports may have to be rejected
  - problem with definition of miracle
  - earlier has questioned reasons for belief in the uniformity of nature but now seems to depend on such uniformity to rule out the possibility of miracles
  - exceptional observations are often important to prove a scientific point (according to Hume anomalies should be rejected, whereas such anomalies often overthrow existing definitions of natural law)

## SECTION B: PROBLEMS IN PHILOSOPHY

Candidates must answer **ONE** question.

### 1 Induction

Does the problem of induction make science irrational?

(25)

Points to expect in the answer:

- Explanation of the principle of induction
- Acknowledgement that problem arises from beliefs that go beyond sense experience
- Possible approaches
  - Hume: induction not based on reason but is a psychological phenomenon, therefore it should undermine science, however Hume argues for a mitigated scepticism which does not affect scientific practice
  - Russell: No – induction as an instinctive belief can be adopted into a coherent system; Russell provides a probabilistic description of induction
  - Ayer: No – because to behave rationally is to use a consistent and accredited procedure irrespective of whether it offers any guarantees
  - Popper: No – induction is not used, falsification is used
- Evaluation of these stances

NB a good essay does not have to discuss all theories, it may just discuss one response in detail.

### 2 Scepticism

Is certain knowledge beyond our grasp?

(25)

Points to expect in the answer:

- Brief outline of scepticism
  - knowledge as justified true belief
  - sceptic's rejection of the justification criterion
  - denial that we can have certain knowledge
  - global v local sceptics
  - main argument to support scepticism; problem of infinite regression
- Coherentist response to infinite regress – justification can be circular or holistic
- Sceptic's objection to coherentism – fantasies can be coherent but true; holistic coherentism inadequately explained
- Foundationalist propositions as a response to infinite regress
  - analytical propositions
  - sense experience
- Sceptic's response to foundationalism
  - analytical propositions tell us nothing about the world
  - sense experience is easily undermined
- Evaluation

### 3 Existence of God

"The world seems to have order and purpose. This is best explained by the existence of God."

Discuss.

(25)

Points to expect in the answer:

- Identification of design as an a posteriori argument
- Explanation of design argument eg Aquinas, Paley, Cleanthes
- Key assumption – order and purpose require an intelligent designer
- Critiques
  - Hume, eg poor analogy; possibility of infinite regress; evil and suffering; doesn't lead to intended conclusion
  - Kant eg we cannot help but perceive the world as orderly
- Impact of scientific theories
  - alternative explanations of design eg Darwin, genetics etc
- Science has revealed more order in the universe than previously appreciated
  - science has revealed a complex beauty to nature leading many scientists to accept the idea of design
  - evidence from cosmology, anthropic balances.

### 4 Free-will and Determinism

If human beings were completely predictable, would that mean that they could not be free?

(25)

Points to expect in the answer:

- Discussion of the nature of 'freedom'
  - the ability to originate decisions
  - the ability to act without constraint
- Predictability irrelevant to compatibilist position, therefore freedom as defined by compatibilists is possible
- Discussion as to whether predictability implies determinism
- Discussion as to whether randomness enables freedom
- Unpredictability does not imply freedom
- Clarify the distinction between hard and soft determinism
- Evaluation and conclusion

## 5 Moral Philosophy

Do we invent 'right' and 'wrong'?

(25)

Points to expect in the answer:

- Definition of the subjectivist and objectivist positions
- Reference to relevant theories eg emotivism, prescriptivism, existentialism
- Strength of the subjectivist position
  - explains inability to resolve moral disputes
- Problems with the subjectivist position
  - justifies any behaviour
  - inability to settle disputes
  - goes counter to the widespread intuition that morality is objective
  - cannot account for duty conflicting with desires
- Strength of the objectivist position
  - explains consensus regarding moral attitudes
  - explains moral language
- Problems with the objectivist positions
  - difficulty in identifying moral facts
- Possible problems with the objective/subjective definition

NB in order to achieve the top grade candidates should be arguing a case not just reciting six standard positions.

## 6 Social Philosophy

Are we, or should we be, equal?

(25)

Points to expect in the answer:

- Distinguishes between different meanings of 'equal'
  - formal equality; everyone entitled to the same rights
  - material equality; wealth etc
  - inequalities of natural endowment
- Should the state try to bring about equality of opportunity or equality of outcome?
- Approach to equality will be determined by one's attitude to the importance of individual freedom
  - illustrated by appropriate examples
- Statement of personal conclusion

## SECTION C: LOGIC

If this optional section is chosen, candidates must answer ALL questions.

- 1 State whether the following statements are true or false:
- (a) All sentences are propositions. (1)  
False: commands and questions are sentences but aren't propositions
- (b) All premises are propositions. (1)  
True
- (c) No conclusions are valid. (1)  
True. Conclusions can only be true or false
- (d) Some invalid arguments are sound. (1)  
False
- 2 What do all valid arguments have in common that invalid arguments do not? (2)  
All valid arguments have at least one valid form. Invalid arguments have no valid forms. This means that all valid arguments have the sort of form which guarantees a true conclusion whenever all the premises are true. They are truth preserving.  
(candidates can receive one mark or two marks)
- 3 Is it possible to have a valid argument for the existence of unicorns? (2)  
If yes, give an examples of such an argument. If no, explain why not.  
Yes. Validity refers only to the structure of the argument, not whether its premises or conclusions are true. Therefore arguments for unicorns can be perfectly valid. Any valid argument with the conclusion that unicorns exist would be acceptable. One possible response is.  
If the sky is blue then unicorns exist.  
The sky is blue, therefore unicorns exist.  
NB an explanation is not required an example is required.  
(Candidates will either receive 2 marks or nothing)
- 4 "I can't agree with his argument since it doesn't even start from sound premises." (2)  
Having studied logic, how should you respond to this comment?  
Logically speaking, premises are neither sound nor unsound, only whole arguments are. Therefore you cannot object to an argument because its premises are unsound. You can only object that the premises are false which in turn has made the argument unsound.  
(candidates will receive either 1 mark or 2 marks)

- 5 Is the following argument valid? Give reasons for your answer. (2)

Fire engines are red  
Therefore fire engines are coloured

It has been decided that at this level of study either of two possible answers are acceptable. For this reason it is necessary to insist that the explanation given by the candidate supports the yes/no answer they have given and that only 0 or 2 marks are awarded. Possible answers may be:

- No, the argument is not valid. Strictly speaking it has no valid forms but could be made valid by making explicit the presumed hidden premise "all red things are coloured".
- Yes, the argument is valid. There are no possible circumstances where the premise can be true and the conclusion false.

(Candidates will either receive 2 marks or nothing)

- 6 What is the difference between an argument's logical form and its grammatical form? (2)

Illustrate your answer with an example.

An argument's grammatical form is the way the argument appears in ordinary language. The logical form is the underlying logical structure that the argument has which the argument's grammatical form may mask. For example, the sentences "If you are a pig then you are pink" and "All pigs are pink" have a different grammatical form but share the same underlying logical form of "If P then Q" (where P = "you are a pig" and Q = "you are pink.")

(explanation, 1 mark; Example, 1 mark)

7 The following argument could be said to have the three forms given below.

"Tom will drink milk because all cats drink milk and Tom is a cat."

- |       |   |     |
|-------|---|-----|
| (i)   | If P then Q                               | P = |
|       | $\frac{P}{Q}$                             | Q = |
| (ii)  | All A are B                               | A = |
|       | $\frac{x \text{ is } A}{x \text{ is } B}$ | B = |
|       |   | x = |
| (iii) | P   | P = |
|       | $\frac{Q}{R}$                             | Q = |
|       |   | R = |

For each form state what the variables stand for.

(3)

P = "Tom is a cat"

Q = "Tom will drink milk"

A = "cats"

B = "milk drinkers" – (NB must indicate a set, ie just 'milk' is not acceptable)

x = "Tom"

P = "All cats drink milk"  
Q = "Tom is a cat"  
R = "Tom will drink milk" } can be reversed

8 What is the difference between a formal fallacy and an informal fallacy?

(3)

Illustrate your answer with examples of each.

A formal fallacy is an argument which is fallacious because of its invalid form. It doesn't guarantee a true conclusion even when the premises are true. An informal fallacy is one which may well be formally valid but is fallacious for some other reason, for example the premises are false and so the argument is unsound. Any appropriate examples will be accepted.

9 Read the following:

"In 1665-66 the plague broke out in the village of Eyam. The village became famous for its self-sacrifice when it voluntarily quarantined itself, not allowing anyone to enter or leave the village. Most of the villagers who caught the plague died within days of fever and infected swellings in various parts of their bodies. One of those to survive was Frances Blackwell. Whilst in a fever, she quenched her thirst from a jug of warm bacon fat instead of water. For some time after, bacon fat was mistakenly considered a cure for the plague."

- (a) Explain the reasoning that led some people to consider bacon fat a cure for the plague. (1)

The people mistakenly assumed that because the symptoms disappeared after drinking the bacon fat that the bacon fat was therefore responsible for the alleviation of the symptoms. However this is fallacious since the symptoms may have disappeared for some other reason.

- (b) This kind of reasoning is normally regarded as a fallacy. What is the name of this fallacy? (1)  
(Post hoc ergo propter hoc/Post hoc/Coincidental correlation)

- (c) Give an appropriate underlying form to illustrate this reasoning. Remember to give a key to identify what the variables stand for on this occasion. (1)

Any appropriate form will be acceptable. An example is as follows:  
(NB the form must include or indicate the conclusion that bacon fat cures the plague.)

If P then Q	P = "symptoms disappear after drinking bacon fat"
P	Q = "bacon fat cures the plague"
Q	

Or more informally

P and Q	P = "Drinking bacon fat"
P causes Q	Q = "Symptoms disappear"

**10** "There's no rest for the wicked,' or so they say. Well, I can't find any time to rest so I guess that means I must be wicked."

(a) State whether the argument is valid or not. **(1)**

The argument is invalid.

(b) Give an appropriate underlying form to illustrate your answer. Remember to give a key to identify what the variables stand for on this occasion. **(1)**

If I am wicked then I get no rest	If P then Q	P = "I am wicked"
I get no rest	Q	Q = "I get no rest"
Therefore I am wicked	P	

(or All A are B; x is B; therefore x is A)

**Total (25)**

## SECTION D: MORAL PHILOSOPHY

If this optional section is chosen, candidates must answer ONE questions.

1 "The Categorical Imperative has too many difficulties to make it a workable theory."

Do you agree?

(25)

Points to expect in the answer:

- Explain the categorical imperative
- Describe at least two formulations of the categorical imperative
  - formula of universal law
  - formula of ends (or any other appropriate example)
- Identify standard difficulties:
  - identifying the maxim
  - no account of consequences
  - duties may conflict
  - is duty the only valid motive?
  - lack of clarity regarding knowing when someone is not being treated as an end
- Illustrate difficulties of applying the formula
- Discuss strengths of the Categorical Imperative, eg
  - respect for rational autonomous humans
  - focus on motive

2 "It is impossible to predict the consequences of going to war."

Discuss the problems this presents for the Utilitarian.

(25)

Points to expect in the answer:

- Explain the main features of Utilitarianism, eg
  - consequentialism, hedonism, impartiality, Bentham and Mill, Act and Rule
- Identify some possible consequences of war
- Application of the theory to war
- Problems of identifying consequences in general and in relation to war
- Bentham's attempt to produce a calculus
- The utilitarian assumption that we can make reasonably successful predictions.
- The consequences of not going to war have the same status.
- Relevant examples.

- 3 In the film 'The Dirty Dozen' some murderers facing the death penalty are offered the chance of a pardon if they succeed in a dangerous mission that will benefit their country.

Analyse and evaluate possible Kantian and Utilitarian responses to this offer.

(25)

Points to expect in the answer:

- Outline the main features of Kantian ethics
- Outline the main features of Utilitarian ethics
- Explain application of the theories to the issue of punishment  
possible conflict in application of the formulation of universal law (some maxims may possibly be universalised, others not)
- Recognition that Kantians oppose people escaping their due punishment
- Exploitation of prisoners facing death may arguably be regarded as treating them as a means only
- Recognition that utilitarians would probably approve of the offer (if the probable outcome maximised utility)
- Possible opposition to the offer by rule utilitarianism
- Evaluation of the response.

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]