



# **MARKSCHEME**

**May 2001**

**PHILOSOPHY**

**Higher Level & Standard Level**

**Paper 2**

## **Paper Specific Guidance - Key points and Discussions**

### **How to use these guidelines**

*The aim of the following guidelines is to give an indication to assistant examiners of the kind of responses to the questions the paper-setting team were anticipating when they prepared the examination papers.*

*They show that in the candidate's answer you should expect some relevant knowledge and some attempt to analyse or evaluate the theme or text under consideration.*

*However, they are not a prescriptive list of the points a candidate must include to be rewarded. Some candidates will make perfectly valid points that are not noted here or take a different approach to the topic. In all cases, therefore:*

- *be open-minded to the candidate's answer and expect a variety of responses*
- *exercise your own judgement in deciding whether the candidate's answer is an appropriate response to the question.*

## **SECTION A**

### **Charles Fried: Privacy and Personal Relations**

#### Key points

- Adequate definition of privacy as control over our lives.
- Privacy is made possible through laws and architectural structures.
- Privacy and information about us.
- Meaning of privacy adapts to the social context I am in.
- Control in privacy amounts to deciding *what* I share with *whom*.

#### Discussion points

- Is the need for privacy innate in us or is it learned?
- Does every individual need privacy?
- How can we account for cultural differences colouring our need for privacy? For example, in some cultures, families all live together in one room, while in others individuals will want to have their own private space.
- The relationship between privacy and personal dignity: to follow up on Fried's example, I may not want my friend to know the nature of my illness but I don't mind if the doctor does.
- Privacy and shame: I want to control what is known about me because I would be ashamed if it were known. Is this the case?

## SECTION B

### 1. Plato: *The Republic*

**Explain and discuss the contrast Plato makes between the ideal and the real.**

#### Key points

- The theory of the forms.
- The allegory of the cave, and the metaphor of the Sun.
- The implication of the theory on the elaboration of the political society.
- The importance that the conditions for the realisation of the theory be the right ones if it is to be successful.

#### Discussion

- 'Does practice ever square with theory?' If not, does it invalidate the theory?
- Can Plato's view of the division between the ideal and the real be defended? If not, does Plato's theory collapse?
- Is Plato's view of the world not just based on prejudices?

### 2. Aquinas: *Summa Theologica*

**Explain and discuss Aquinas' view on the nature of human knowledge.**

#### Key points

- What is the nature of human knowledge?
- In what ways is human knowledge any different from the knowledge of other species?
- The distinction between rational knowledge and knowledge gained through theology.
- How do we arrive at abstraction and what is the importance of the senses?

#### Discussion

- Aquinas accepts that there is a non-rational knowledge (faith).
- If knowledge is derived from senses and animals have senses, why don't they have faith?
- What can we make today of Aquinas' contention that only through faith in God can we gain a complete knowledge of reality?

3. **Descartes: Meditations and Discourse Part 4**

**Explain and discuss what Descartes meant when he said: “And I see that I am, as it were, a mean between God and nothingness, that is, so placed between the supreme Being and not-being.”**

Key points

- God as perfection, the human being as lacking perfection, but not totally imperfect.
- Free will as the instrument illustrating my place between God and nothingness.
- God does not make mistakes, while I do.

Discussion

- While Descartes described the physical world as a mechanical world, the human being escapes this mechanism through free will. What importance does this have?
- Is it “an imperfection in God that he has given me the liberty of judging or not judging on matter on which he has given me no clear and distinct knowledge”?
- Today the perfect life is defined with references to physical reality: the perfect muscular body, the perfect job, the perfect pay, the perfect spouse, house, *etc.* Have we not fallen from metaphysics into sheer materialism?

4. **Locke: Second Treatise on Government**

**Explain and discuss Locke’s view that we must possess to live and not live to possess.**

Key points

- The right to own property.
- Locke’s theory of property: its goals, its limits. The right to accumulate money.
- The State as the regulator of conflicts of property.
- There is no guarantee for our property in the state of nature, while it is protected in the State.
- Owning property as part of God’s plan “to make use of it to the best advantage of Life and convenience”.
- The product of my labour is my property: “the labour of his Body and the work of his hands are properly his”.

Discussion

- “Personality is the extension of property” (Locke): therefore, it is lawful to kill a robber. Is such an extremist view still defensible?
- Are we capable of discerning when we own enough to live? Or is greed so powerful that it overwhelms our judgement? And does this imply that all attempts at communal property are doomed from the start?
- Must we possess in order to live? Is this inherent to life or is it a fact of materialist societies? Could we imagine a community that would dispense with possession or is this an illusion? Thomas More’s *Utopia*, the first Christian communities *etc.*
- Given that property is acquired through labour, does it make sense to argue in favour of inheritance?
- Could we still accept Locke’s point that there is no harm in accumulating wealth?

5. **Rousseau: *The Discourse on the Origin of Inequality***

**Explain and discuss Rousseau's contention that the establishment of human society leads to the destruction of original human happiness.**

Key points

- What constitutes human happiness?
- The circumstances of the establishment of human society. Why doesn't it allow for the preservation of human happiness?
- The beginning of comparing one with the other and the realisation of individual differences leading to moral degradation: envy, jealousy, greed, lust, *etc.*
- It is man's nature to become morally degraded and unhappy: "Man alone can become an imbecile."

Discussion

- Does it make sense to talk about happiness outside of the social context? Is it not the case that the awareness of being happy requires the social framework to be identified? Does it make sense to talk of the Good (as in the Good Savage) in the ignorance of evil?
- Rousseau's contention that man does not know what anxiety is in the state of nature. But would not the weaker members, the disabled ones have felt fear and anxiety in the face of all the danger that nature confronted men with?
- Rousseau's "good Savage Man" does not have any historical value but has value as a 'bench mark' for the development of humanity.
- Is it possible to assess the happiness of animals?

6. **Kant: *The Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals***

**Explain and discuss what it means and why it is important, according to Kant, to consider humanity as an end-in-itself.**

Key points

- The human being is capable of rationality and is thus positively free.
- Kant points out the impossibility of not treating human beings as means, but insists that we ought not to treat them as means *only* but *at the same time always* as ends-in-themselves.
- What does it mean to think of humanity as an end-in-itself?

Discussion

- Why does it matter to do so? How could we treat human beings if we did not follow Kant's prescription?
- Is it not the case that the Declaration of Human Rights, whether it is acknowledged or not, is based on the uniqueness of each rational being, the very principle Kant sought to enshrine in his categorical imperative?

7. **Nietzsche: *The Genealogy of Morals***

**Explain and discuss Nietzsche's assessment of the guilt feeling as a disease.**

Key points

- What is guilt feeling?
- Guilt feeling as an invention of Christianity.
- The chain between freedom, culpability, responsibility and punishment. Guilt feeling as a self-imposed punishment.
- Nietzsche's view of the new innocence which assumes an atheistic/deterministic foundation.
- The metaphor of guilt feeling as an illness like pregnancy. What does it mean? The child as the future Superman.

Discussion

- In Japanese there is no word for guilt feeling – while there is for shame. This goes to suggest Nietzsche is right when he claims guilt feeling is a learned process.
- Can guilt feeling therefore be unlearned?
- Is it correct to think that guilt feeling is a punishment, *i.e.* a negative reinforcement to stop the condemned behaviour?
- How would individuals correct their undesirable behaviours without an internal regulator such as guilt feeling? That is, is guilt feeling at all necessary? Can we dispense with it? What could we replace it with?
- Would dispensing with guilt feeling not create a void that a Freudian 'pleasure principle' would quickly fill, thus producing a society of selfish individuals?
- If guilt feeling is a disease, this assumes a relation between the mind and the body? Do the medical sciences give us supporting evidence of this being the case?
- Nietzsche's claim that all guilty people are in fact only sick people. The rejection of free will – if we agree with Nietzsche, should we punish criminals? How? Would it be at all justifiable?

8. **Marx: *The German Ideology and Theses on Feuerbach***

**Explain and discuss what Marx means when he says that “consciousness is essentially a social product and will remain so as long as men exist”.**

Key points

- Consciousness as a product of social, economic and cultural forces and not, for example, as a faculty given by God.
- Consciousness emerges in human interaction and in a social context. Consciousness is always consciousness of the world, of my situation in it and its contingency.
- Difference between (human) consciousness and (animal) instinct.

Discussion

- Is it possible for a human to know that consciousness is socially determined, since also her consciousness would be determined? Also, what would be the justification for the prediction that it “will remain so”?
- Is it possible to get a non-determined consciousness of oneself? How?
- Is a solitary human a “conscious” being?

9. **James: Pragmatism**

**Explain and discuss James' ideas that our knowledge "grows in spots".**

Key points

- "Growing in spots" is a figure of style to describe what happens to the process of knowing and to what our mind does with acquired and new knowledge.
- A "spot" is an area of expanding knowledge.
- Knowledge is limited, gradual, and not universal yet it "grows" *i.e.* knowledge expands.
- New knowledge thus results from the dynamic interaction of old beliefs with new truths.

Discussion

- Is this image of the process of knowing adequate?
- How does it fit with the rest of the pragmatist theory?
- Is using an image such as this helpful to understanding?
- What other learning theories can we oppose to this one?

10. **Russell: Problems of Philosophy**

**Explain and discuss Russell's view on the probable opinion.**

Key points

- The notion of self-evidence and the possibility of having "degrees of self-evidence".
- The idea that most knowledge is maybe neither knowledge nor error but a "probable truth".

Discussion

- Is Russell convincing in trying to combine the coherence theory and empiricism into single theory of knowledge?
- Russell's ambiguity in describing the role of probable opinion (degree of self-evidence, "more or less probable opinion").
- If most knowledge is probable opinion, does it not make Russell's theory of knowledge doubtful?
- The problem of knowing what is true in Russell's theory of knowledge.

11. **Freud: *Five Lectures on Psychoanalysis (1909)* and *Outline of Psychoanalysis (1938)***

**Explain and discuss the philosophical implications of Freud's ideas that it is possible to know something about the unconscious.**

Key points

- The notion of the unconscious
- The methods of accessing the unconscious: interpretation of dreams, 'talking cure'.
- The interaction between the patient's words and the psychoanalyst's interpretations.
- The unconscious as a source of determinism in behaviour, feeling and thought. Some knowledge of the conscious implies the knowledge of the determining factors.

Discussion

- The knowledge of the unconscious is filtered by the ego and by the psychoanalyst.
- Does the knowledge of the unconscious help to 'cure' me?
- If the unconscious affects the ego, then philosophy or any branch of knowledge, is not a purely rational exercise, but unconsciously motivated. Hence the possibility of a psychoanalytic reading of philosophical texts, looking for metaphors, slips or 'gaps'.

12. **Sartre: *Being and Nothingness***

**Explain and discuss Sartre's idea that the Other objectifies me.**

Key points

- 'Being-for-others'.
- The look of the other.
- The other's bias about me deprives me of my freedom.

Discussion

- Assumption that others exist and are not only in my mind.
  - Is it impossible to gain freedom for myself because of the presence of others?
  - Are others really a threat to me or is there a possibility that I am projecting my own fear upon them? Will I ever know that?
-