2007 Philosophy

Advanced Higher

Finalised Marking Instructions

Philosophy 2007

Advanced Higher

Marking instructions

Important Note:

These marking instructions are no more than guidance and are intended to be used in the context of central marking where there can be discussion between the markers about the merits of individual scripts.

All questions are marked out of 30, and the full range of marks is used. In the logic options, the marks allocated to each component of the question are indicated. For other questions, candidates are rewarded according to the quality of the thought revealed in their answers, and not solely – or even mainly – for their knowledge about the topic. In particular, this requires that candidates' answers:

- relate explicitly to the terms of the question asked
- argue a case when requested to do so
- make distinctions which are requested by or relevant to the question
- explain, analyse, discuss, contrast, and assess, rather than merely narrating or describing
- are clear, fluent, and well-expressed
- use appropriate philosophical terminology
- support a clearly expressed conclusion which answers the question set.

Although there is no separate allocation of marks to Knowledge, Understanding, Analysis and Evaluation, at Advanced Higher level there is expected to be an emphasis on the higher level skills. The mark awarded to an answer will therefore require a judgement by the marker of the quality of the understanding, analysis and evaluation contained in the answer. In particular it should be noted that a candidate can be penalised for writing too much as it may become clear that he or she fails to discriminate between relevant and irrelevant material. Thus candidates are likely to be awarded a higher mark for an answer which mentions a few facts and uses them well to construct a cogent argument for a particular answer to the question asked, than for one which regurgitates a long list of factual statements without regard to their relevance to the question.

There is usually no single standard answer to philosophical questions, and an excellent answer may use entirely unexpected material from other parts of the subject. However, it will still have to meet the above criteria.

The following are general indications of the characteristics of essays in grades C, B and A respectively. Clearly not every essay in each grade will show each of these characteristics equally strongly, and these are intended only as general guidance. As noted above, markers are able to discuss the specific strengths and weaknesses of every essay at central marking.

Grade C:

The candidate demonstrates competent knowledge and understanding of the subject area, and a grasp of the relevant texts or theories, albeit with some omission or inaccuracy, with basic analysis of relevant issues and positions, and some limited evaluation.

Grade B:

In addition, the answer engages coherently with the question, accurately describes and analyses the relevant texts or theories, and uses the rest of the essay to support an evaluative conclusion which answers the question asked.

Grade A:

In addition, the answer covers most of the main points relating to the question, with clear and cogent exposition and analysis of relevant texts or theories, and accurate and effective use of philosophical terminology and techniques. Taken as a whole, the essay will be a closely-argued and sustained response to the question asked.

Marks reflect what can be expected of candidates at this level within the constraints of the examination, and full marks can be awarded for an outstandingly accurate and well-argued answer, even although this will never amount to a complete consideration of the question.

The comments below on individual questions indicate points that a good candidate is likely to make in answering the question. However this list is not exhaustive, and candidates may also write excellent essays which mention relatively few of the points listed. Such answers would be subject to discussion by the markers.

SECTION A: EPISTEMOLOGY

1. When you look at your watch and it says 12 o'clock, are you entitled to say you know it's 12 o'clock? Explain why Gettier thinks that examples of this kind pose a problem for the tripartite theory of knowledge. Evaluate one attempt to overcome this problem. (30)

Although there is in principle no unique correct way of approaching this question, the following bullet points will serve as a guide to markers:

- candidates should identify "justified true belief" as the traditional tripartite definition of knowledge
- there should be a brief statement concerning the significance of justification, truth and belief
- the three conditions (justification, truth and belief) are said to be *individually necessary* and *jointly sufficient* for saying "S **knows** that p"
- candidates should construct a Gettier-style counter-example *which relates to the question*. For example, your usually-reliable watch indicates that it is 12 o'clock (so you have **justification**), it is **true** that it is 12 o'clock and you **believe** that it is 12 o'clock. However, your watch has stopped and it is purely a coincidence that it is showing the correct time. In other words, your belief is true and justified but most people would say that it does not count as knowledge
- the significance of this example should be made clear − Gettier's paper suggests that the three conditions (justification, truth and belief) are not sufficient for saying "S **knows** that P"
- candidates should evaluate **one** attempt to overcome this problem and it is likely that they will focus on the indefeasibility theory **or** the causal theory. It would be desirable for candidates to relate this discussion to the example of the watch
- the indefeasibility theory – a justification for a belief is indefeasible if it survives intact despite the discovery of new information
- the causal theory – a subject knows something when there is a causal connection between the state of affairs and the subject's belief
- a clear conclusion will be reached, indicating how the argument of the essay answers the question set, and the absence of such a conclusion is likely to be penalised.

2. When we "see" a tree, what is it that we really perceive? Discuss with respect to direct and indirect realism. (30)

Although there is in principle no unique correct way of approaching this question, the following bullet points will serve as a guide to markers:

- a clear statement of direct realism, in contrast to indirect realism, using the example of the tree.

Direct realism:

- subject in direct contact with the world – there are no mediating objects
- when our perceptual systems are working properly we are in direct contact with the external world − the tree is as it appears to us
- physical objects retain all their properties even when they are not observed
- often called "naïve realism".

Indirect realism:

- subject aware of world *indirectly*
- what we immediately perceive is sense data (the effects of objects on our sensory organs)
- distinction between primary and secondary qualities
- physical objects retain only some of their properties when they are not observed

- candidates should discuss the issues raised by these theories of perception, eg problems with direct realism − different perceptual states, hallucinations, dreams and illusions, etc
- problems with indirect realism − indirect realism has created a gap between the world as it appears and the world as it really is − a veil of perception. Indirect realism can lead to doubts about the existence of the external world − our present sensations could be caused by a dream, a powerful demon, a virtual reality machine, etc. Indirect realism can lead to solipsism. The solipsist denies that anything exists other than his/her own sense experience
- a clear conclusion will be reached, indicating how the argument of the essay answers the question set, and the absence of such a conclusion is likely to be penalised.

SECTION B: PHILOSOPHY OF MIND

3. Could a machine made of silicon and metal have a mind? (30)

An acceptable answer is likely to begin by indicating that the topic of the question is the relationship between the nature of the mind and the brain. In particular, candidates might focus on the type identity theory, which identifies types of mental states with types of brain states.

Although there is in principle no unique correct way of approaching this question, candidates are likely to mention the following:

- what it is to have a mind, in terms of, for example, the ability to think, to undergo perceptual experience, to have sensations
- the different theories of the mental − substance dualism, the type identity theory, functionalism − and the responses they might give
- details of each of these theories.

Candidates should then proceed to an analysis and evaluation of these theories, which could be expected to draw upon the following points:

- the claim that substance dualism can allow that silicon and metal machines might have minds associated with or connected to them, since minds for the substance dualist are independent of the material bodies to which they are connected
- objections to this that claim that this uninformative/not an adequate account, in that the metal is defined only negatively (ie it is *not* physical, or extended, etc)
- the claim that type identity theories cannot allow that such machines could have minds as the ability to undergo mental states is tied to the physical material out of which the system is composed. If pain, for example, is identical to a state of a carbon-based brain, then such silicon machines cannot undergo pain.
- the claim that type functionalism can accept that such machines can have minds, as the possession of a mind in this theory is the possession of a system of internal states organised in a certain way, independent of the material constitution of the system. As long as the internal states of the machines are appropriately related to each other, to inputs and outputs, then the machine will possess a mind.

The essay should conclude with a clear statement of the conclusion of the candidate's argument indicating how this answers the actual question set.

4. Jane claims to have lived a previous life in ancient Egypt. Which of the theories of personal identity that you have studied allow this possibility? Are any of these theories plausible? (30)

An acceptable answer is likely to begin by indicating that the topic of the question is personal identity over time.

Although there is in principle no unique correct way of approaching this question, candidates are likely to mention the following:

- a statement of the problem of personal identity: what is it that makes person p1 at time t1 the same person as p2 at t2?
- an initial statement concerning how the question relates to the problem of personal identity
- a clear statement of the Psychological Continuity Theory:
  - p1 at t1 is identical to p2 at t2 if and only if p1 is psychologically continuous with p2
  - a statement to the effect that this theory allows for the above possibility if and only if Jane is psychologically continuous with the person in ancient Egypt
- a clear statement of the Body/Brain Theory:
  - p1 at t1 is identical to p2 at t2 if and only if p1 and p2 possess one and the same body/brain
  - a statement to the effect that this theory allows for the above possibility if and only if Jane possesses the same body or brain as the person in ancient Egypt (candidates can be expected to rule this out given the temporal distance involved)
- a clear statement of the Same Soul Theory:
  - p1 at t1 is identical to p2 at t2 if and only if p1 and p2 possess one and the same immaterial soul (ie the same soul is associated with p1 and p2)
  - a statement to the effect that this theory allows for the above possibility if and only if Jane has the same soul as the person in ancient Egypt

Candidates should then proceed to an analysis of the answers to the question, which should then be used to support the answer given to the question. This evaluation should involve a consideration of the merits of each theory, which may include discussion of the following points:

The Psychological Continuity Theory

- Some discussion of whether it is consistent with this theory that different sets of psychologically continuous properties be associated with one body at either the same time or different times.
- Reid's objection to Locke's theory of personal identity can be taken to show that it is consistent with the psychological continuity theory that different persons can be associated with the same body at different times.

The Same Soul Theory

- Some discussion of whether it is consistent with this theory that different souls be connected to one body at either the same time or different times.
- A recognition of the difficulty in determining which person it is that one encounters if the person is distinct from the body in front of one.

The Body/Brain Theory

- Some discussion of whether it is consistent with this theory that different persons be associated with one body at either the same time or different times.

The essay should conclude with a clear statement of the conclusion of the candidate's argument indicating how this answers the actual question set.

SECTION C: (i) SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY

5. "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal, that they are endowed…with certain inalienable rights…" Discuss. (30)

Although there is in principle no unique correct way of approaching this question, the following bullet points will serve as a guide to markers:

- Candidates must explain the idea of "Natural rights", eg:
  fundamental justified claims
  possessed by virtue of being human
  human law is to be derived from natural law
  inalienable/irrevocable
  rights imply duties
  God-given rights
  positive and negative rights

- There may be reference to Thomas Aquinas. For example, according to Aquinas, to live, to learn, to reproduce, to live in an ordered society and to worship God are the ultimate purposes of human beings. For these to be achieved, good health, education, the permission to make free choices, etc are required. This means that it will be wrong to damage someone's health, to deprive people of education, freedom, etc
- There may be reference to John Locke. For example:
  (i) according to Locke the state of nature would be one of peace because of a special kind of law, one that needs no government to legislate it
  (ii) he thought this law to be self-evident to any rational person
  (iii) he refers to the law of nature as the "will of God"
  (iv) since God created all people as equal, it is wrong to attempt to dominate or exploit another person
  (v) everyone is free to do what they like, as long as they do not interfere with others
  (vi) people ought to pursue peace and the preservation of all mankind
  (vii) transgressions of the Law of Nature should be punished
  (viii) when natural laws and the laws of a particular government are in conflict, the artificial laws of the government must give way
- The evaluation should focus on the issue of the basis and authority of claims to natural rights
- Candidates may discuss Bentham's claim that "Right…is the child of law" − rights are legal rather than natural
- Does the idea of natural rights make sense without a teleological understanding of human beings or a belief in the existence of God?
- Some argue that if rights are a human construction, they do not have the force and authority we usually attribute to them. Without such moral absolutes is there a defence against relativism and subjectivism?
- It would be possible to consider utilitarian conceptions of rights − ie, it may be useful to grant people certain rights in order to increase happiness and decrease misery. Rights do not represent anything fundamental or inviolable − they are a mechanism used to achieve the general happiness
- There may be discussion of Marx's view that natural rights are the products of a capitalist mindset − individualistic and separatist
- How do we account for disagreements over the character and range of human rights or whether they exist at all?
- It could be argued that descriptions of human rights are socially conditioned
- A clear conclusion will be reached, indicating how the argument of the essay answers the question set, and the absence of such a conclusion is likely to be penalised.

6. "Taxation is theft." Discuss with reference to Rawls' and Nozick's theories of justice. (30)

Although there is in principle no unique correct way of approaching this question, the following bullet points will serve as a guide to markers:

Candidates should discuss the claim that "taxation is theft", drawing on the ideas of Rawls and Nozick.

Nozick would accept this claim:

- he defends the idea of a minimal state
- the state only has the role of defending the right to liberty and property: everything else is left to effort and luck
- Entitlement Theory of Justice − just distribution consists in everyone acquiring their goods through accepted procedures
- respect for liberty involves a commitment to the non-enforcement of patterns
- whatever has been justly acquired can be freely transferred. Whatever is to be transferred must itself have been acquired under just circumstances
- Coercive taxation does not constitute free transfer

Rawls would reject the claim that "taxation is theft":

- the importance of the "original position" and the "veil of ignorance" in Rawls' theory of justice − they serve as a guarantee of impartiality and fairness
- discussion of those principles which Rawls believes would be chosen from the "original position":
  (i) Principle 1: equal right to equal basic liberties (liberty principle)
  (ii) Principle 2: social and economic principles to benefit the least advantaged (the difference principle)

- evaluation of Nozick's theory:
- Nozick's libertarian community may be particularly productive and economically efficient
- however, its individualism can seem unacceptably harsh in its consequences for losers. Justice in a libertarian community emphasises merit rather than need − merit understood as successful effort
- unequal access to medical care and education limits freedom
- the stress on the individual erodes community life. Inequality is tolerated at the price of freedom
- evaluation of Rawls' theory: eg, Rawls' approach impinges upon people's freedom − people have a right to possess whatever they have acquired without injustice
- a clear conclusion will be reached, indicating how the argument of the essay answers the question set, and the absence of such a conclusion is likely to be penalised.

SECTION C: (ii) LOGIC

Answer all parts of this question

7. (a) Explain carefully with examples whether it is possible for a valid argument:

- **to have false premises and a true conclusion**
- **to have true premises and a false conclusion** **(6)**

A valid argument is one which can't have true premises and a false conclusion; no other combination is excluded, so (a) Yes; (b) No.

(1 mark each for answers; 1 each for explanations; 1 each for examples).

(b) Explain whether the following argument is valid or invalid:

- **all men are equal**
- **all men are not equal**
- **therefore there are no moral facts**

If it is valid, why do philosophers continue to debate the conclusion?

If it is invalid, what can be validly concluded from these premises? **(4)**

The given premises cannot both be true at the same time, and so the definition in (a) above is always satisfied. So the argument is valid.

However, since the premises cannot both the true, the argument is not sound, and so tells us nothing about whether the conclusion is true or not.

(2 marks for each part: 1 for answer; 1 for explanation)

(c) Use truth-functions to explain clearly the difference between
Candidates need to pass English and either French or German.
and
Candidates need to pass either English and French or German **(2)**

The statements can be formalized as E & (F v G) and (E & F) v G respectively. The difference is which connective has wider scope: in the first sentence, the conjunction ("and") has wider scope; in the second, it is the disjunction ("or").

(NB: formalisation is not required; 2 marks for clear explanation of distinction, 1 mark for formalisation without explanation, and 0 if only one correct formalisation)

(d) A set of statements is said to be consistent if it is possible for them all to be true at the same time. Explain how a truth-table test can be used to determine whether or not a set of statements is consistent. **(3)**

The lines of a truth table set out all possible combinations of truth-values of the component sentences, from which (assuming all the connectives are truth-functional) the truth-values of the given statements can be worked out. It therefore shows whether there is any situation in which they could all be true at the same time. We know that all possible cases are included, so if there is no such case, that set of statements can't all be true at the same time, so are inconsistent.

(alternative formulations are possible, but they must be absolutely precise to gain 3 marks)

(e) Use a truth-table to show whether the following set of statements is consistent:

(p & q), (q v -p), –(p → q) **(5)**

p	q	(p & q)	-p	(q v -p)	p →q	–(q →p)
T	T	T	F	T	T	***F***
T	F	***F***	F	F	F	T
F	T	***F***	T	T	T	F
F	F	***F***	T	T	T	F

The given statements are all truth-functions of the component simple sentences *p* and *q*, and the table shows all possible combinations of truth-values of the components. We can therefore work out the truth-values of each of the given sentences in each of these cases and simply check whether there is any line in which they all come out true. The bold italic entries show that there is not, and so the given sentences are inconsistent.

(3 marks for table; 2 for explanation)

(f) Consider the truth-function p # q defined by: **(5)**

p	q	(p # q)
T	T	F
T	F	T
F	T	T
F	F	T

Construct the truth-table for (p & q) # (q v r) **(5)**

p	q	r	(p & q)	(q v r)	(p & q) # (q v r)
T	T	T	T	T	F
T	T	F	T	T	F
T	F	T	F	T	T
T	F	F	F	F	T
F	T	T	F	T	T
F	T	F	F	T	T
F	F	T	F	T	T
F	F	F	F	F	T

(1 mark off for each error; no explanation required)

(g) Construct a proof using rules of inference for the following argument:

(p → q) ⊢ -(p & -q) **(5)**

1	(1)	p → q	A
2	(2)	p & -q	A
2	(3)	p	2, &E
2	(4)	-q	2, &E
1, 2	(5)	q	1, 3 MPP
1, 2	(6)	q & -q	4, 5, &I
1	(7)	-(p & -q)	2, 6, RAA

(1 mark off for each error; no explanation required)

(30)

Answer all parts of this question

8. (a) For each of the following, say whether it is true or false:
All arguments which are invalid in sentence logic are invalid in predicate logic (set logic).

False: Validity depends on form and predicate logic can represent formal patterns that sentence logic does not recognise. For example, No As are Bs, so no Bs are As can only be represented as P so Q in sentence logic, so its sentence form is invalid, but its predicate form is valid.

There are arguments which are invalid in sentence logic, but valid in predicate logic.

True: see previous answer.

There are arguments which are invalid in predicate logic, but valid in sentence logic. Explain your answers. **(4)**

False: If an argument is valid in sentence logic then no argument which has that form can have true premises and a false conclusion in the same circumstances.

(1 mark each for demonstrating understanding plus 1 for each part).

(b) Define the term "contradictory". **(1)**

A pair of statements (or any set of statements) are contradictory if they can neither both (all) be true nor both (all) be false at the same time.

Which of the statements
"All spiders are arachnids",
"Some spiders are arachnids",
"Some spiders are not arachnids",
are contradictory? **(2)**

The pair of statements "All spiders are arachnids" and "Some spiders are not arachnids" are contradictory.

(NB: No marks for only identifying one of these!)

Explain how Venn diagrams demonstrate this. **(2)**

The circles in a Venn Diagram represent the named sets, and the shading, etc indicate the relationships between the sets. So in this case the part of the circle representing spiders which is outside the circle representing arachnids would be shaded to show it is empty ("All spiders are arachnids") but would also have to have a tick to show it has at least one member ("some spiders are not arachnids") − and obviously both are not possible at the same time.

(some detail required to be worth 2 marks).

(c) How many distinct regions are there in a Venn diagram representing a single statement concerning the relationship between two sets?

4: two circles, their overlap, and the area outside both.

How many are there in a Venn diagram representing the relationships between three sets?

8: three circles, 3 pairwise overlaps, the overlap of all 3 circles, and the area outside all 3.

Explain your answers. **(3)**

Some reference required to the fact that the diagram represents all possible relationships between the sets.

(1 for each answer; 1 for explanation).

(d) Can you use Venn diagrams to determine whether or not the following are valid? If so, draw the diagram and explain how it shows validity or invalidity.

If not, explain why not.

(i) Every intelligent person has studied logic. Not all nuclear physicists have studied logic. So no intelligent people are nuclear physicists. **(4)**

I = Intelligent people
L = people who have studied logic
P = nuclear physicists

Premises:

The area of I outside L is shaded to indicate that there are no intelligent people who have not studied logic.

The tick indicates that some nuclear physicists have not studied logic.

However, the conclusion would require the overlap of I and P to be shaded, and the premises give us no information about this, so the argument is invalid.

(ii) Some intelligent people have studied logic.
No nuclear physicists have studied logic.
So no intelligent people are nuclear physicists. **(4)**

With same abbreviations as above,

Premises:
The tick indicates that there are some people who are both intelligent and have studied logic.

The shading indicates that the overlap of nuclear physicists and those who have studied logic is empty.

However, the conclusion would require the overlap of I and P to be shaded, and the premises give us no information about this, so the argument is invalid.

(In each case candidates need not only draw the correct diagram but to explain what it represents and how it supports their answer.

(2 marks for diagram, translation scheme, and premises. (Deduct marks if no universal set, or no translation scheme.) 2 marks for identifying as invalid, and explaining.)

(e) Consider the following arguments. For each one:

- **say which logical system is appropriate to test its validity**
- **make explicit any missing premises**
- **construct a truth table to show whether or not it is valid, if it is best analysed using statement logic**
- **use a Venn diagram to show whether or not it is valid, if it is best analysed using predicate logic**
- **comment also on any aspects of the argument which cannot be represented logically.**

(i) Whenever there's an economic recession the government is defeated, and the present government has become unelectable. So there will be a recession. **(3)**

This would seem to be an argument in predicate logic, possible representation is:
(1) Whenever there's an economic recession the government is defeated
(2) This government will be defeated.
SO there will be a recession

Here:
R = times when there is a recession
D = times when the Government is defeated

The conclusion would require the tick to be in the circle representing R, so the argument is invalid.

Possible issues are about whether "has become unelectable" and "will be defeated" are intended to mean the same thing (If not, then there just is no argument.), and about whether there is a change of tense between premises and conclusion.

(ii) Most trains stop at Preston, but very few passengers want to go there. So if we want the railways to respond to passenger demand, the whole timetable will have to be revised. (6)

Some steps in the argument seem to use sentential logic and others use predicate logic, but the whole argument is too complex to be handled simply in either.

Problems include how to represent
"most" in the first premise
"very few" in the second premise
whether "if we want X" means any more than "if X is to be the case"

Depending on how other matters are handled, it might be suggested that there is a missing premise along the lines of "To respond to demand, the railways should not do what passengers don't want."

One possible representation is then:
(1) the railways should not do what passengers don't want
(2) passengers don't want to go to Preston
SO: (A) trains should not stop at Preston
(3) (but) most trains do stop at Preston
SO: (B) most of the timetable will have to change

(There are no unique correct answers to these questions, so marks should be given for any sensible attempts to identify the elements and structure of the argument, and test any appropriate subarguments.)

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]