



2012 Philosophy

Higher

Finalised Marking Instructions

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2012

The information in this publication may be reproduced to support SQA qualifications only on a non-commercial basis. If it is to be used for any other purposes written permission must be obtained from SQA's NQ Delivery: Exam Operations.

Where the publication includes materials from sources other than SQA (secondary copyright), this material should only be reproduced for the purposes of examination or assessment. If it needs to be reproduced for any other purpose it is the centre's responsibility to obtain the necessary copyright clearance. SQA's NQ Delivery: Exam Operations may be able to direct you to the secondary sources.

These Marking Instructions have been prepared by Examination Teams for use by SQA Appointed Markers when marking External Course Assessments. This publication must not be reproduced for commercial or trade purposes.

Marking a philosophy exam is not a purely mechanical exercise and it is important for markers to use their professional judgment within the framework laid down by these guidelines. In particular it is important to note the following:

1. The information indicating the points which a candidate might be expected to make in response to a question should be treated as a guideline: a candidate will not necessarily have to cover all the points listed in order to gain the available marks and credit should be given for additional valid points made by the candidate, even if they have not been listed.
2. Marking is positive not negative. That is to say marks are not deducted when an error is made. If a candidate makes an incorrect statement that does not impinge on anything else they have written then that statement can be ignored. However, it can often be the case, especially in the longer answers, that the marker will have to make a judgment about what a candidate means by a particular statement and how this illustrates their understanding of the material. Making these kinds of judgments requires the marker to consider the wider context. In these cases it can be legitimate to consider the incorrect statements when trying to form a judgment about what the candidate has written.
3. Each question (or sub-question) is marked holistically. That is to say the marker is not required to identify separate marks for KU and AE. The allocation of marks to KU or AE is there as a guide and a help to candidates; the distribution of KU and AE was never intended to be 'followed slavishly'. Similarly, the marker should use the distribution of marks as a guide when assessing an answer. In particular, markers should be aware that if a question is allocated AE marks then there must be evidence of analysis and/or evaluation in the candidate's answer. On the other hand, markers should also be aware that analysis and evaluation depends upon knowledge and understanding. For this reason credit should be given when additional KU points contribute to a candidate's AE answer.
4. Markers should be aware that the final mark awarded to a question does not necessarily have to correspond exactly to the number of substantive points that have been made. A fewer number of points that are developed, show insight or demonstrate a more sophisticated understanding of the material may carry more weight than a greater number of points that are superficial or are inaccurately or ambiguously expressed. This consideration is likely to be more relevant when marking questions that attract a higher number of marks.
5. If a candidate writes more in answer to one part of a question than is necessary to gain full marks and the additional content is relevant to the next part of that question then credit for what the candidate has written can be carried forward.
6. The following procedure should be used for marking:
 - a. As the answer is read, all points relevantly made in accordance with the marking instructions for that question and the marker's own professional judgment will be ticked. (Markers must **not** write any comments on the scripts but may use ticks, crosses, question marks or underlining to assist with their marking.)
 - b. At the same time, or through a re-reading of the answer, an initial impression should be formed about the quality of an answer as indicated by the Grade Descriptions for an A and C. This is particularly relevant for questions that attract a higher number of marks.
 - c. Taking into account both a and b the total mark for that question is to be written at the end of the question and circled.

To assist with the final allocation of marks the following table should be consulted.

	Indicative of a grade C	Indicative of a grade A
30 mark question	15-17	21-30
20 mark question	10-11	14-20

GRADE DESCRIPTIONS AT A AND C

Skills	Grade C	Grade A
<p><i>Knowledge and Understanding</i></p>	<p>candidates have described some (but not all) of the features of argument, and the philosophical issues, theories and positions in relation to each Unit</p> <p>the descriptions are mainly clear and largely accurate</p>	<p>candidates have described the main features of argument, and the philosophical issues, theories and positions in relation to each Unit</p> <p>the descriptions are clear, accurate and presented in a well-structured manner</p> <p>the descriptions may provide evidence of the integration of knowledge and understanding across the Units of the Course</p>
<p><i>Critical Analysis and Evaluation</i></p>	<p>candidates have explained some (but not all) of the stages of reasoning and the assumptions on which ordinary language arguments and philosophical positions, theories and accounts of knowledge are based</p> <p>candidates have explained some (but not all) of the following: deductive and inductive reasoning; sound and unsound arguments; examples of fallacious reasoning when these are present (CTU)</p> <p>candidates have explained some (but not all) of the implications, strengths and weaknesses of positions adopted in relation to a metaphysical debate and normative moral theories, and an account of knowledge</p> <p>candidates have made attempts to assess, or reach conclusions on, the soundness of ordinary language arguments and the relative merits of normative moral theories, and an account of knowledge</p>	<p>candidates have explained the main stages of reasoning and the assumptions on which ordinary language arguments and philosophical positions, theories and accounts of knowledge are based</p> <p>candidates have explained the following: deductive and inductive reasoning; sound and unsound arguments; examples of fallacious reasoning when these are present (CTU)</p> <p>candidates have explained the main implications, strengths and weaknesses of positions adopted in relation to a metaphysical debate and normative moral theories, and an account of knowledge</p> <p>candidates have made assessments or reached conclusions on the soundness of ordinary language arguments and the relative merits of normative moral theories, and an account of knowledge</p>

GRADE DESCRIPTIONS AT A AND C (continued)

Skills	Grade C	Grade A
<p><i>Critical Analysis and Evaluation (continued)</i></p>	<p>candidates have given at least one reason which supports the assessments or conclusions they have reached</p> <p>the points made are mainly clear and largely free from inaccuracy</p> <p>the points made relate to the question asked</p>	<p>candidates have given 2 or more developed reasons – based on evidence, aspects and, or sources previously discussed – which support the assessments or conclusions reached</p> <p>the points made are clear and free from inaccuracy</p> <p>the points made are presented in a well-structured manner and are used to support a conclusion that answers the question asked</p> <p>there may be evidence that the candidate is aware of the wider implications and/or relevance of the skills, theories, positions and issues they have studied</p> <p>there may be evidence of the integration of knowledge and skills across the Units of the Course</p>

SECTION 1 – CRITICAL THINKING IN PHILOSOPHY

Section 1 – total marks 20

KU AE

- This section examines the mandatory content of the Unit “*Critical Thinking in Philosophy*”
- It has **one** structured question with **4-10** related parts
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **1-6** and requires either a short-answer or restricted response
- Candidates answer **all** related parts of this question

There is no choice in Section 1 of the Question Paper.

a. State three differences between deductive and inductive arguments.

- 1K Valid v Strong
- 1K Sound v Cogent
- 1K Certain v Probable

3

Consider the argument in the following passage:

How can I go to the party? If I'm to get a good mark in this course I need to finish the project and to complete the project I will need to work on it all weekend. Don't call me, don't come round. Just let me get on with my work.

b. Re-write the argument in standard form clearly identifying the premises and conclusion.

- 1A for correctly identifying two premises; no marks if premises are wrongly identified.
- 1A for correctly identifying the conclusion.
- Zero marks if the argument is not written in standard form.

P1: If I'm to get a good mark in this course then I need to finish the project.

P2: To complete the project I will need to work on it all weekend.

C: I cannot get to the party (**or** “You should not call me /come round” **or** “you should let me get on with my work”)

2

c. What is meant by a “hidden” premise?

- 1K: a statement which is not explicitly stated in an argument but on which the argument may rest for its strength or validity.

1

d. State one hidden premise associated with the above argument.

- 1A for either ‘I must get a good mark in this course’ or ‘the party is this (or the same) weekend’ or any other appropriate suggestion.

1

e. Read the following argument.

KU AE

If you have a good diet you will grow up to be fit and strong. Since you are clearly fit and strong you must have had a good diet.

- (i) Name the fallacy in the above argument.
(ii) Explain what is wrong with this kind of argument.

- Affirming the consequent.
- Any accurate explanation eg just because the antecedent implies the consequent doesn't mean the consequent will imply the antecedent.

1

1

f. Which of the following contains or implies a false dilemma? Give a reason for your answer.

1. William was no longer sure he wanted to break in to the house. "Come on," said Sarah, who by now had taken charge, "What are you, a man or a mouse?"
2. "Neither a borrower nor a lender be" (William Shakespeare, "Hamlet", Act 1 scene 3.)
3. The rebel soldiers surrounded the hut where the two friends were hiding. There was now no escape. They heard the captain call out, "You have two choices—surrender or die."
4. "I don't know what to do", the woman said. She was lying, she knew full well what she had to do.
5. Let's see what's in the picnic basket. Well, you can have an apple or an orange.

- 1A for identifying option one.
- 1K for explaining that a false dilemma is an argument which attempts to establish a conclusion by presenting two options when there are more possibilities.
- 1A for explaining that it doesn't follow that he is a coward (mouse) because he doesn't want to break into the house. There may well be other 'manly' options, eg it may take more courage to not go along with the crowd.

1 2

g. *'All cats like fish so Tiddles likes fish.'*

KU AE

Identify four features of this argument using what you have learned from studying critical thinking.

- Any four relevant points, eg
- the argument is deductive.
- reference to the likely hidden premise 'Tiddles is a cat'.
- acknowledgment that such a hidden premise would render the argument valid.
- the grounds for accepting the claim 'All cats like fish' are likely to be inductive.

4

h. **Make up a sentence that is not a statement.**

- Any appropriate example eg a command or a question.


1

i. **What is a sound argument?**

- 1K a deductive argument which has true premises and is valid. The mark will be awarded if the candidate mentions both validity and true premises but fails to explicitly state that soundness is a feature of deductive arguments.

1

Look at the following diagram:



j. **Make up a sound argument about some aspect of the above diagram.**

- 1K any relevant argument. There should be an attempt to establish a conclusion eg the triangle is inside the circle so the triangle is smaller than the circle because to be inside something means it has to be smaller than the thing it is in.
- 1K the argument is sound.

2

Totals 10 10

SECTION 2 – METAPHYSICS

Section 2 – total marks 20

KU AE

- It has **two** structured questions, each with **1-5** related parts and candidates choose **one** question.
- Each structured question samples across the mandatory content of one of the options in this Unit and may contain a stimulus.
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **2-20** and requires either a restricted or extended response. Possible options within this structure are: a series of restricted response questions/restricted and extended response questions/an essay question.

Does Anselm’s ontological argument successfully prove the existence of God? Give reasons for your answer.

In marking this question it is essential that reference be made to the grade descriptions and the general instructions at the start of this document. If there is an adequate amount of description and an appropriate evaluative comment then a candidate will be awarded a minimum of 10 marks; if the answer is indicative of a ‘B’ then a candidate will be awarded a minimum of 12 marks; if the answer is indicative of an ‘A’ then a candidate will be awarded a minimum of 14 marks.

It is expected the candidates will follow the philosophical consensus and argue that the Anselm’s argument does not prove the existence of God. If a candidate were to take the opposing view they are required to show awareness of the standard criticisms and give their reasons for rejecting them.

Relevant descriptions may include:

- The distinction between *a posteriori* arguments (knowable or justified from experience) and *a priori* arguments (knowable or justified independently of experience) and the recognition that Anselm is using an *a priori* argument.
- The recognition that Anselm uses a *Reductio ad Absurdum* argument, a type of argument which shows that a claim, assumed for the sake of argument, is false because it leads to an absurd or obviously false conclusion. Anselm shows that the assumption that God exists only in the mind is false because it leads to the conclusion that you can conceive of something greater than that which nothing greater can be conceived.
- Anselm moves from a definition of God to a claim about the existence of God.
- Anselm begins with the definition of God as ‘a being than which nothing greater can be conceived’.
- This being exists in the mind. This is proposed as a non-contentious point to which even a fool would agree.
- Suppose ‘that than which nothing greater can be conceived’ existed only in the mind.
- Under the circumstances it could be conceived to exist in reality as well.
- However, a being that exists in reality is greater than one that exists only in the mind.
- This means that if ‘that than which nothing greater can be conceived’ exists only in the mind it is not as great as something else that can be conceived but this is impossible.
- Therefore, ‘that than which nothing greater can be conceived’ cannot exist only in the mind but must also exist in reality.
- Therefore, God exists.

Relevant evaluation might include:

KU AE

- Gaunilo – A reply on Behalf of the Fool
 - Purports to show that if the argument is valid it would prove that the most perfect island exists. Since this is clearly absurd the argument cannot be valid. A response might be that the argument only applies to the greatest possible being of any kind not the greatest possible being of a particular kind.
- Knowledge of existence must precede knowledge of essence. Until the existence of God is established by other means the ontological argument merely establishes that if God is perfect then God exists necessarily.
- Existence is not a predicate
 - Distinction between subject and predicate is explained eg the cat is black (cat = subject; black = predicate). The predicate tells us something about the subject.
 - The claim is that, whatever the grammar might suggest, forms of the verb 'to exist' do not tell us anything about the subject.
 - The claim directly attacks Anselm's notion of 'greater'.
- Russell's analysis of existence as a propositional function
 - 'Cows exist' equates to 'There is an x such as 'x is a cow' is true'
 - 'The table exists' is not so much attributing existence to the table as attributing the property of being a table to something
 - Analogous to number. 'Mice exist' is comparable to saying that there is at least one mouse.
- A candidate may note that Anselm's stated purpose was to help those who seek to understand what they believe and so may be taken less as a proof for the existence of God and more as a demonstration that the God which is believed in is either necessary or impossible.

Section 2 – total marks 20

- It has **two** structured questions, each with **1-5** related parts and candidates choose **one** question
- Each structured question samples across the mandatory content of one of the options in this Unit and may contain a stimulus
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **2-20** and requires either a restricted or extended response. Possible options within this structure are: a series of restricted response questions/restricted and extended response questions/an essay question

To what extent is the Libertarian argument convincing?

In marking this question it is essential that reference be made to the grade descriptions and the general instructions at the start of this document. If there is an adequate amount of description and an appropriate evaluative comment then a candidate will be awarded a minimum of 10 marks; if the answer is indicative of a 'B' then a candidate will be awarded a minimum of 12 marks; if the answer is indicative of an 'A' then a candidate will be awarded a minimum of 14 marks.

It is possible for the candidate to answer this question in a number of ways but normally no more than 13 marks can be awarded if a candidate simply recites different positions on the issue of free will and fails to engage properly with the question.

A candidate may make the following points:

An explanation of how 'agent causation' differs from other kinds of causation.

- distinguished from event causation in which an event occurs because it has been caused by a prior event.
- if everything were the result of event causation then the world would be fully determined.
- in agent causation the agent is the originator of a new causal chain, is an uncaused cause.
- if there is agent causation then there are alternative futures.

The arguments philosophers have used to defend the Libertarian position.

- a candidate might note that the sense of freely choosing is very strong and is therefore the default position; the arguments for Libertarianism are a response to the arguments for determinism.
- a candidate might note that one motivation for defending Libertarianism is because of what is at stake, namely it is thought by many that morality and justice can only make sense if we have a Libertarian notion of freedom.
- it can be argued that belief in agent causation is required for an understanding of event causation; it is only as a result of exercising our own power to cause things to happen that we begin to understand the idea of causation.

Libertarian freedom as a first principle

- First principle defined as a foundational proposition that cannot be derived or explained from any other proposition.
- The Libertarian assumption of freedom is comparable to other necessary assumptions such as the existence of an external world or the existence of other minds.
- The assumption of libertarian freedom is necessary for reasoned debate.

The arguments philosophers have used to oppose the Libertarian position.

- a candidate might note that identifying the psychological motivation is not the same thing as identifying an argument and that the sense of freedom might be an illusion.
- a candidate might note that if the moral motivation is construed as an argument it becomes to look like a fallacious appeal to consequences.
- the increasing evidence for determinism makes the Libertarian position less credible.

Arguments in favour of determinism might include

- The success of science which is based on the presumption of determinism.
- Examples of determinism in the human sphere might be drawn from, eg genetic determinism, environmental determinism, psychological determinism.
- it can be argued that agent causation, if it occurs, is completely mysterious and attempting to defend something for which there are counter-arguments and which might be an illusion with something that is not itself understood is not convincing.
- Darwinian theory both makes it difficult to see how capacity for agent causation could emerge from an antecedent history of exhaustively event-caused events, and it can account for the intuition of agent causation (the formation of social groups required a moral sense, which in turn requires a notion of individual responsibility).
- Explanations require a reference to how things came about and so without causation there can be no explanation.
- It may be questioned whether the assumption of freedom is a first principle in the same way that other assumptions might count as first principles—there are good arguments for determinism but there are not similar good arguments for disbelieving in the external world or in existence of other minds.
- It may be argued that, given its difficulties, it is not necessary to adopt a Libertarian position as there is an alternative, compatibilism, that preserves much of what Libertarianism would want to preserve, ie moral accountability.

10 10

Totals 10 10

Question 4 – Epistemology

Section 3 – total marks 40

KU AE

Part one – total marks 10

- It has **one** structured question with **1-5** related parts
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **2-10** and requires either a restricted response or extended response

The Tripartite Theory of Knowledge is the theory that knowledge consists of justified true beliefs and that these criteria are individually necessary and jointly sufficient for knowledge.

a. Why are these criteria deemed to be ‘individually necessary’ and ‘jointly sufficient’?

- if any of the criteria are missing then it cannot be counted as knowledge; and
- if all the criteria are present then that is all that is needed for it to be knowledge.
- credit should be given for any appropriate exemplification.

2

b. How does scepticism challenge the possibility of satisfying the justification criterion?

- challenges to the reliability of the evidence, eg reliability of sense experience, etc.
- the problem of the infinite regress.

one mark for each relevant point; an additional mark for relevant expansion or exemplification.

2 2

c. How do Gettier problems challenge the tripartite theory of knowledge? Give an example to support your answer.

- challenges the claim that the criteria are jointly sufficient. (1)
- relevant example. (1)
- in the example the candidate should make clear that the three criteria are satisfied (1) but that there is no knowledge. (1)
- marks should be awarded for any other relevant information, eg reference to accidental correctness.

2 2

Totals 6 4

Section 3 – total marks 40

Part two – total marks 30

- Each structured question may contain an extract from the relevant prescribed text and has **2-8** related parts
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **2-20** and requires either a restricted or extended response. Possible options are: Series of restricted response questions/Some restricted response questions and 1 extended response/2 extended responses

At the beginning of Meditation 1 Descartes tells us what strategy he is going to use.

a. Describe the strategy that Descartes says he intends to use.

- demolish all his existing opinions and start afresh.
- concentrate on principles rather than specific beliefs
- reject obvious falsehoods
- withhold assent from anything capable of being false
- reference to relevant metaphors, eg foundation of a building,
- credit should be given to metaphor of barrel of apples even though this is not in the Meditations.

4

b. Describe how Descartes implements this strategy in the rest of Meditation 1.

Candidates should be awarded a mark for any appropriate point and any further explanation.

- Early learning suspect
- sense experience suspect
- possibility of being 'mad' or 'insane'.
- dream argument
- deceiving creator
- evil genius.

One mark for each relevant point or reference with a further mark for relevant expansion.

A maximum of eight marks should be awarded if the candidate fails to explain that the argument is progressive with each step building on the previous step.

10

c. Evaluate the arguments Descartes uses to arrive at the *Cogito*.

KU AE

Comments on Descartes' strategy:

- He wants all knowledge to have the certainty of maths.
- The concept of a deception presupposes that we are not deceived all the time.
- Positively, Descartes only needs to establish the possibility of doubt.
- Descartes doesn't doubt logic, memory, language.
- Assumes the truth of foundationalism. (He is looking for a foundation that may not exist.)
- Explanation of the *Cogito* as something that cannot be doubted.

Comments on the individual stages of the argument:

- There may be criteria for assessing the reliability of the senses if they are not assessed individually, eg corroboration.
- Just because you don't know that you are asleep when you are dreaming it does not follow that you don't know that you are awake when you are awake. It is an asymmetric argument.
- God, when properly understood, cannot be a deceiving creator.
- The evil genius is an effective device at maintaining the previous doubts.
- In the *Replies* Descartes says the cogito is only trying to establish the first thing that exists.
- A candidate may note that Descartes returns to many of these issues in Med VI.

16

Totals 14 16

Section 3 – total marks 40

Part two – total marks 30

- Each structured question may contain an extract from the relevant prescribed text and has **2-8** related parts
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **2-20** and requires either a restricted or extended response. Possible options are: Series of restricted response questions/Some restricted response questions and 1 extended response/2 extended responses

Even after we have experience of the operations of cause and effect, the conclusions we draw from that experience are not based on reasoning or on any process of the understanding. I shall try to explain and defend this answer.

(Hume Enquiries, Section IV: II)

- a. What conclusions does Hume think we normally draw from the “experience of the operations of cause and effect”? Give examples to support your answer.**

- the future or present experience will resemble past experiences.
- similar effects will follow from similar causes.
- we come to believe that the effect is a necessary consequence of the cause.
- relevant examples, eg bread and nourishment.

6

- b. Why does Hume believe that these conclusions are “not based on reasoning or on any process of the understanding”?**

- Hume is presenting an empiricist account of knowledge.
- children infer from experience.
- animals infer from experience.
- geniuses arrive at the conclusions in common with ‘the vulgar’.
- the processes need to be quicker than achievable by reason.
- if there were any reasoning we cannot identify it.
- it isn’t a relation of ideas as there is no logical impossibility that things may be different to the way they have been in the past.
- Any reasoning about matters of fact is based on the principle of cause and effect and therefore cannot be used to reason about that same principle.
- the conclusions are derived from ‘custom and habit’.
- relevant examples.

8

c. Evaluate to what extent Hume's position on the reason of animals supports the above claim.

KU AE

An explanation of Hume's argument:

- Our conclusions about man will be more convincing if we can show that they operate similarly in animals.
- Humans infer causal connections by habituation – seeing similar event constantly conjoined to events which are in turn similar to each other. We have an instinct for induction that is part of our natural make up.
- Any conclusions about man will gain greater credibility if they can also be found to operate in the animal kingdom generally.
- Firstly animals clearly learn from experience.
- Young animals show less ability and wisdom than old.
- Reward and punishment of animals show that they can be trained to suppress instincts.
- They can learn an arbitrary name.
- We can see that animals can infer facts beyond that which they are immediately experiencing.
- Secondly it's impossible for this inference to be founded on any argument or reasoning that like events must follow like objects.
- If there were any such arguments (which there may not be) animals couldn't identify them.
- Animals aren't therefore guided by reasoning in making these inferences and neither are children or men or philosophers.
- Reasoning and argumentation are too slow and uncertain a process to cope with the essential ability to infer effects from causes.
- It is custom alone which does this.
- But animals don't learn all of their knowledge this way, they also have natural instincts. Things which animals are unable to improve on and don't need to have been taught.
- The experimental reasoning we use in everyday life is nothing but a species of this instinct. We identify causes in the same instinctive way that birds build their nest.

Comments on Hume's argument

- The minds of other people, never mind other animals are closed to us.
- Problem of drawing analogies from other species – animals may differ in important respects.
- Some species seem more sophisticated than others – ants (completely instinctual) v elephants (more human?).
- Hume's arguments seem to make science look unscientific.
- Hume seems to reduce all causation to cases of correlation.
- Hume can only distinguish cause and effect by temporal priority but some causes are contemporaneous with their effects.
- Human psychology is more complex than Hume suggests – constant conjunction does not always yield a belief in necessary connection – eg the compulsive gambler or the beaten wife.
- We also seem to be able to draw inferences about causes from single observations – eg food poisoning.

16

Totals 14 16

Section 4 – total marks 40

Question 1 – total marks 30

- This Question samples across the mandatory content of the Unit
- It has **one** essay question which may be divided into **two** related parts
- It may contain a short case study or stimulus

Describe Bentham’s utilitarianism and explain why other utilitarian philosophers have modified this position.

In marking this question it is essential that reference be made to the grade descriptions and the general instructions at the start of this document. If there is an adequate amount of description and an appropriate evaluative comment then a candidate will be awarded a minimum of 15 marks; if the answer is indicative of a ‘B’ then a candidate will be awarded a minimum of 18 marks; if the answer is indicative of an ‘A’ then a candidate will be awarded a minimum of 21 marks.

A candidate will be awarded a maximum of 20 marks if there is no clear understanding of how later theories respond to problems in earlier theories.

The following lists points that are likely to be included in an appropriate answer but the list is not exhaustive and credit should be given for any relevant points made, any appropriate development of those points and for appropriate discussion.

- Bentham is a hedonist and a consequentialist.
- Principle of utility to be applied to each separate act.
- Bentham does slightly qualify this: need not carry out calculus every time, but should keep it in view.
- So Act Utilitarian position – in effect, there is only one moral rule (promote pleasure/prevent pain).
- Rule utilitarians employ the principle of utility differently – on each occasion for moral choice, seek to identify which rule, from a number of rules, to follow. These rules grounded in the principle of utility: what makes them good rules to follow is that they tend, when followed, to generate a positive outcome (more pleasure/less pain).
- Motivation behind RU: (i) desire to moderate utilitarianism by endorsing traditional and intuitive moral principles such as ‘keep your promises’; (ii) concern over tenability of a calculus-style approach to moral deliberation.
- Act utilitarian objection: betrayal of the principle of utility (not every promise ought to be kept).
- Rule utilitarian response: Act utilitarianism risks being dogmatic – and is open to challenge on grounds of violation of rights, justice etc (which RU can accommodate – albeit indirectly).
- Mill’s ‘quality’ criterion: de facto criticism of Bentham’s quantitative approach. Implication that smaller quantity of high quality pleasure to be preferred to higher quantity of low quality pleasure – so simple ‘maximising’ dropped.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ideal Utilitarianism: Mill's position must be elaborated further, in order to accommodate values other than happiness (however defined). Examples love, beauty, etc. So validation of actions which promote unhappiness (e.g. patriotic acts of futile self-sacrifice), on consequentialist criteria. • Problem of identifying what is in practice valued by individuals leads to development of Preference Utilitarianism. • Captures democratic intuition that public choices ought to be translated into public policy. • Liberal motivation behind PU: individuals' preferences must be valued and accounted for. • Also preferences more readily expressible (and so observable and measurable). • Application of PU to public policy choice – obviates inappropriate Bentham-style questions such as 'how much pain and pleasure will attacking Iraq/building trams/cutting housing benefit cause?' Individuals may prefer the sub-optimal outcome, in hedonistic terms. • Problem of 'bad preferences' (but corresponding problem of 'bad pleasures' for all except Mill and Moore (?)). • Conclusion: common commitment to evaluation of actions and choices in terms of consequences – but scope for divergence of opinion regarding the question: in what do good consequences consist? 	KU AE
	15 15
	Totals 15 15

Question 8 – Normative Ethics

Section 4 – total marks 40

KU AE

Question 2 – total marks 10

- This Question samples across the mandatory content of the Unit
- It has **one** structured question with **1-5** related parts
- It may contain a short stimulus
- The related parts have a possible mark range of **2-10** and require either a restricted or extended response

a. **What is meant by ‘contradiction in conception’?**

Give an example to support your answer.

- In Kant’s philosophy this is a contradiction, which some impermissible maxims are guilty of, because they attempt to will a logically impossible state of affairs.
- Any appropriate example eg tell a lie, because if everyone told lies the background assumptions that make any form of communication reliable would be undermined and the notion of lying could not exist.

2

b. **What is meant by ‘contradiction in the will’?**

Give an example to support your answer.

- In Kant’s philosophy this is a contradiction which some impermissible maxims are guilty of because, although they are possible to conceive, they are inconsistent with other maxims which any rational person would wish to assent to at some point.
- Any appropriate example eg never give help to the poor, because if you yourself were poor you would be wanting people to give help to you.

2

c. **Explain two criticisms of Kantian ethics.**

- Any appropriate criticisms, eg difficulty of identifying the maxim, conflicting maxims, etc.

6

Totals 4 6

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]