

MARKSCHEME

November 2000

PHILOSOPHY

Higher & Standard Level

Paper 2

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA HIGHER LEVEL PAPER 2

The same criteria (A and B) are to be used as for Paper 1 but the three criteria for ‘quality of philosophising’ (criterion A) are to be interpreted in the following way:

COMMENTARY ON AN UNSEEN PASSAGE *[10 marks]*

CRITERION A: QUALITY OF PHILOSOPHISING *[7 marks]*

Understanding

Does the answer show that the passage has been well read and understood? *[Up to 2 marks]*

Relevance

Does the candidate write a commentary which arises directly from the text or only a free essay on the theme of the text?

[Up to 1 mark]

Analysis and argument

Does the candidate use the instructions above the text, i.e. use his/her own words, identify the main points of the text, analyse its argument, provide objections and examples, assess the scope and validity of the conclusion of the text?

Does the candidate provide a philosophical dialogue with the author (using other authors, for instance)? Does the candidate critically evaluate the text?

[Up to 4 marks]

CRITERION B: ORGANISATION *[3 marks]*

Structure

Does the candidate write an essay of adequate length to present and discuss at some depth the issue in hand?

Does the candidate use a style that is appropriate to philosophy (dialogue, essay, point form)?

Does the essay contain an introduction? Does this introduction present the core of the subject as well as a sensible strategy for dealing with the problem(s)?

Is the answer organised in such a way that the intentions of the candidate’s analysis and argument are easy to identify even without the help of numbers or letters by the different paragraphs?

Are the connections between sentences and between paragraphs logical?

Is the thought progressive?

Does the candidate provide a functional conclusion, that is, a conclusion which contains:

- more than the candidate’s opinion or more than a mere yes or no answer to the chosen question;
- more than the mere repetition of what the candidate has already written in developing the argument;
- an echo of any sub-questions which were formulated in the introduction;
- an awareness of the possible further development of the question.

[Up to 2 marks]

Expression

Does the candidate write in a clear prose which is appropriate to philosophy?

Does the candidate avoid spoken or colloquial language?

In the case of grammatical incorrectness, does the candidate’s prose still communicate in an adequate way?

Please remember: some candidates will not be writing in their first language. We are not marking for grammatical accuracy: what is important is that candidates present their arguments as clearly as possible.

[Up to 1 mark]

ESSAY ON A PRESCRIBED AUTHOR

[20 marks]

CRITERION A: QUALITY OF PHILOSOPHISING

[14 marks]

Understanding

Does the answer show that the prescribed text has been well read and understood? *[Up to 4 marks]*

Relevance

Does the candidate show adequate knowledge of the issue targeted by the question?

Does the candidate demonstrate an ability to select the specific issue addressed in the question and to relate it to other relevant concepts in the text (for example, in discussing the notion of duty in Kant’s *Foundations of Metaphysics of Morals*, does the candidate relate it to the Categorical Imperative?)

Does the candidate avoid a biographical and encyclopedic description of the author and his theory?

[Up to 5 marks]

Analysis and argument

Does the candidate provide a discussion and a critical evaluation as the question demands?

[Up to 5 marks]

CRITERION B: ORGANISATION

[6 marks]

Structure

Does the candidate write an essay of adequate length to present and discuss at some depth the issue in hand?

Does the candidate use a style that is appropriate to philosophy (dialogue, essay, point form)?

Does the essay contain an introduction? Does this introduction present the core of the subject as well as a sensible strategy for dealing with the problem(s)?

Is the answer organised in such a way that the intentions of the candidate's analysis and argument are easy to identify even without the help of numbers or letters by the different paragraphs?

Are the connections between sentences and between paragraphs logical?

Is the thought progressive?

Does the candidate provide a functional conclusion, that is, a conclusion which contains:

- more than the candidate's opinion or more than a mere yes or no answer to the chosen question;
- more than the mere repetition of what the candidate has already written in developing the argument;
- an echo of any sub-questions which were formulated in the introduction;
- an awareness of the possible further development of the question.

[Up to 4 marks]

Expression

Does the candidate write in a clear prose which is appropriate to philosophy?

Does the candidate avoid spoken or colloquial language?

In the case of grammatical incorrectness, does the candidate's prose still communicate in an adequate way?

Please remember: some candidates will not be writing in their first language. We are not marking for grammatical accuracy: what is important is that candidates present their arguments as clearly as possible.

[Up to 2 marks]

Total marks for Higher Level Paper 2: 30

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA STANDARD LEVEL PAPER 2

The same criteria (A and B) are to be used as for Paper 1 but the three criteria for 'quality of philosophising' (criterion A) are to be interpreted in the following way:

ESSAY ON A PRESCRIBED TEXT *[30 marks]*

CRITERION A: QUALITY OF PHILOSOPHISING *[20 marks]*

Understanding

Does the answer show that the passage has been well read and understood? *[Up to 6 marks]*

Relevance

Does the candidate write a commentary which arises directly from the text or only a free essay on the theme of the text?

[Up to 7 marks]

Analysis and argument

Does the candidate provide a discussion and a critical evaluation as the question demands?

[Up to 7 marks]

CRITERION B: ORGANISATION

[10 marks]

Structure

Does the candidate write an essay of adequate length to present and discuss at some depth the issue in hand?

Does the candidate use a style that is appropriate to philosophy (dialogue, essay, point form)?

Does the essay contain an introduction? Does this introduction present the core of the subject as well as a sensible strategy for dealing with the problem(s)?

Is the answer organised in such a way that the intentions of the candidate's analysis and argument are easy to identify even without the help of numbers or letters by the different paragraphs?

Are the connections between sentences and between paragraphs logical?

Is the thought progressive?

Does the candidate provide a functional conclusion, that is, a conclusion which contains:

- more than the candidate's opinion or more than a mere yes or no answer to the chosen question;
- more than the mere repetition of what the candidate has already written in developing the argument;
- an echo of any sub-questions which were formulated in the introduction;
- an awareness of the possible further development of the question. *[Up to 6 marks]*

Expression

Does the candidate write in a clear prose which is appropriate to philosophy?

Does the candidate avoid spoken or colloquial language?

In the case of grammatical incorrectness, does the candidate's prose still communicate in an adequate way?

Please remember: some candidates will not be writing in their first language. We are not marking for grammatical accuracy: what is important is that candidates present their arguments as clearly as possible.

[Up to 4 marks]

Total marks for Standard Level Paper 2: 30

Paper Specific Guidance - Key points and Discussions

Note to examiners: this markscheme outlines what members of the paper-setting team had in mind when they devised the questions. The topics listed in the bullet points are possible areas candidates might cover in their answers. They are not compulsory points and are not necessarily the best possible points. They are only a framework to help you in your assessment. Be responsive to any other valid points.

SECTION A Commentary on an unseen passage

Carlos Gurméndez, *Basic feelings of human life*, 1994

Key points:

- Suggestion that there is an intrinsic link between human life and happiness.
- Distinction between two kinds of achievements:
 - (1) completion of immediate goals (daily tasks)
 - (2) fulfilment of more private projects (sharing intimacy in an engaging loving relationship)
 - (1) is said to demand will (determination and purposiveness), to concern simple tasks and to provide temporary happiness
 - (2) is said to be more complex.
 - Both are claimed to be necessary, (2) is suggested to be even more necessary than (1).
- The passage stimulates the reader to wonder why the fulfilment of more private projects is more ‘complex’ and however more ‘necessary’.

Discussion:

Candidates might be irritated by the assertiveness of the passage. They are however expected to elaborate their reaction. They should at least comment on one of the four following issues.

- Relation between the two kinds of achievements and ‘happiness’:
 - is (1) (completion of goals) necessary to happiness?
 - is (2) (carrying out of higher/deeper/more subtle goals) necessary to happiness?
 - or are (1) and (2) both necessary for other reasons (for instance, respectively, self-discipline and peaceful social life)?
 - is happiness necessary to life?
 - can happiness be obtained by will-power? Or is happiness something that occurs precisely when one doesn’t aim at it?
 - might happiness precisely lie in the detachment from any needs, desires and purposes?
- Role of will:
 - will and daily goals: is Gurméndez a good psychologist? Which kind of ethics might he support?
 - ‘more private projects’: what may Gurméndez have in mind when he suggests that the fulfilment of more private projects is more complex? Does the word ‘complex’ mean that willpower could be an obstacle to a successful fulfilment of those projects? What does each of the words ‘sharing’, ‘intimacy’, ‘engaging’, ‘loving’, ‘relationship’ specifically mean? Can ‘sharing intimacy in an engaging loving relationship’ be called a ‘project’? Or does it demand a kind of perception of the other which excludes any form of active will?

- The distinction itself:
 - ‘We ought not to limit ourselves to the immediate goals of everyday life’: on which grounds can/should ‘sharing intimacy’ be said to be more important than ‘putting bookshelves in order, writing an article, meeting a friend, going to the theatre’?
 - Elaboration of such a distinction: concern with myself *vs* concern with the other; activity and activism *vs* openness and receptivity; utility *vs* contemplation *etc.*
 - Is it sound to consider ‘sharing intimacy *etc.*’ and ‘achieving daily goals’ as total different experiences or ways of being?
- Basic feelings of human life: related to this passage, the title of Gurméndez’ book suggests that ‘sharing intimacy in an engaging loving relationship’ is a (the?) ‘basic feeling of human life’ and a synonym for ‘happiness’. What about this ‘basic’ value given to love? What about other ‘basic feelings’? Other definitions of human life?

SECTION B Texts

1. Plato: *The Republic*

Explain and discuss Plato’s view of the importance of the development of morals for political leaders.

Key Points

- Plato’s strong identification between ethics and politics
- Political leaders, to be the best ones, must be philosophers
- The qualities of character required of the philosopher: memory, truthfulness, capacity to grasp the eternal, knowledge of the true reality
- How are morals developed in political leaders? The importance of innate disposition, proper training, adequate environment, time
- The importance for political leaders to grasp the difference between the Good-in-itself and the relative good argued by the sophists.

Discussion

- Is Plato’s assumption that being endowed with strong morality automatically qualifies one for governing acceptable?
- In the end, what matters? That the leader governs well? or that s/he upholds high moral standards?
- To what extent is Plato’s view on the moral qualities of political leaders relevant for the twenty-first century?
- Candidates could well discuss this question with reference to a contemporary political leader or contemporary dilemmas met by political leaders.

2. Aquinas: *Summa Theologica*

Explain and discuss Aquinas' view of the soul being in each part of the body.

Key points

- The soul as the form of the body: the soul gives the body its right organisation (guarantees that each part functions rightly, that eyes see and ears hear). The soul is a substantial cause, which is more than an efficient cause or first mover.
- How does Aquinas deal with Aristotle's view that the soul possesses better qualities than the body (understanding and will)? Are these faculties also in each part of the body?

Discussion

- The relevance of the view that the soul is not localised elsewhere.
- Animists see God or the divine in everything: is Aquinas' view an animist one?
- Does talking about a 'soul' make sense for someone who has studied physiology and psychology?
- Does talking about a 'soul' make sense for an atheist?

3. Descartes: *Meditations and Discourse part 4*

Explain and discuss why the Cartesian doubt is called methodical and not sceptical.

Key points

- Why does Descartes claim we must doubt everything?
- What is a sceptical doubt? Why does Descartes reject it?
- What is a methodical doubt?
- The parallel between the method of maths and methodical doubt
- The Evil Genius and the risk of drowning in scepticism
- Descartes' attempt at finding certainty and not living with scepticism
- The evidence of clear and distinct ideas as the criterion for truth

Discussion

- Was it not predictable that Descartes would arrive at a truth if he used a manner of thinking akin to maths? Consequently, was it not predictable that the outcome would not be scepticism? Hence, was Descartes not postulating the answer?
- Does the introduction of the Evil Genius finally defeat scepticism as a valid answer?
- What would our world be like if Descartes had not invented the methodical doubt?

4. Locke: *Second Treatise on Government*.

Explain and discuss Locke's contention that men entrust to the State the liberty they enjoy in the state of nature in order to guarantee their liberty in society.

Key points

- What is the difference between liberty in the state of nature and liberty in the State? What do I gain? What do I give up?
- The presence of others and their contribution to my life
- What does it mean *to entrust* my liberty? I am not losing it. I can get it back. What do I get in exchange for my liberty?
- How does Locke propose that the State will guarantee my liberty?

Discussion

- The paradox of gaining more liberty while giving up the liberty of the state of nature
- Does the State effectively guarantee my liberty? Are there other options beside a social contract of some sort?
- Are men pursuing an ideal of civilisation when they form a society? What would this one have been for Locke?
- The presupposition that spiritual freedom and intellectual freedom are possible only if the liberty to own property is guaranteed by the State. Is this assumption correct?

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

Explain and discuss Rousseau's view of the advantages and disadvantages presented by reason.

Key points

- Reason is not a defining characteristic of humanity.
- Reason is secondary to compassion for the suffering individual.
- Reason makes man shrink from his true nature and develop self-love, a socially destructive faculty.
- We use reason because we covet pleasures. ('A man free from fears and desires would not take the trouble to reason.')
- Ultimately, reason is what brings the state of nature to an end.

Discussion

- Rousseau reminds us that we are not only, and not first, 'rational animals' but emotional ones.
- Rousseau's radical rejection of the value of reason: does he not overlook some positive contribution that reason can offer?
- The paradox of recognising that passions are innately violent and at the same time rejecting reason.
- Rousseau's view of innocence fails to take into account how easily it is corrupted. Only the firm command of reason can maintain us in the line of duty. (This reference to Kant's criticism of Rousseau is optional).

6. Kant: *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*

Explain and discuss why, according to Kant, the Categorical Imperative should be universally valid.

Key points

- What is the Categorical Imperative?
- Why does Kant propose three formulations for the Categorical Imperative?
- The difference from the Hypothetical Imperative
- What does it mean to say that it is universally valid?
- The link between positive reason, the Categorical Imperative and universal validity

Discussion

- Assuming that the Categorical Imperative is universally valid, does that make the moral command stronger than if it weren't universally valid?
- In moral conflicts John could well think that the Categorical Imperative commands him to do X, while in the same circumstances Bob would come to the conclusion that he must do Z to satisfy the demand of the Categorical Imperative: should we then admit the assumption that the Categorical Imperative is universally valid?
- Is Kant's contention that all rational beings can will the moral command as if it were a universal law really possible regardless of cultural bias?
- Kant himself acknowledged the impossibility of seeing behind the 'secret incentives'. Is this not admitting the very impossibility of the Categorical Imperative, let alone its universally valid application?

7. Nietzsche: *The Genealogy of Morals*

Explain and discuss Nietzsche's view of Communism.

Key points

- Equality as a social invention which denies life
- The herd mentality common to Christian and Communist
- Loss of individuality and authenticity
- Communism as a form of resentment

Discussion

- Is it possible to avoid herd mentality in a community that shares values (even if the values are those of 'Masters')?
- Could a Communist be a representative of Master morality? Does the application of Nietzsche's values necessarily lead to rejection of this idea?
- Does Nietzsche's defence of individuality give a sufficient account of our need of a community?

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

Explain and discuss Marx's materialistic conception of history and its implications.

Key points

- Concept of materialism, and Marx's view of history as led by infrastructural elements (modes of production)
- Notion of determinism (economic and cultural)
- Interpretation of reality in the dynamic framework
- Idea of direction in historical development and communism as a final stage

Discussion

- Why would Marx's theory be more than a product of economic and cultural forces of the time?
- Teleological assumption of Marx (concept of history). Does history necessarily fit into Marx's model?
- Why should internal conflicts of capitalism lead to harmony rather than chaos?
- What is the role of human action in a materialistically determined world? (soft-determinism).

9. James: *Pragmatism*

Explain and discuss how James contrasts the pragmatist and rationalist view of truth and reality and claims that the pragmatist view is 'humanistic'.

Key points

- Pragmatist view of reality as 'still being in the making' as opposed to rationalist view where reality is 'ready made and complete from all eternity'
- The pragmatist view of reality as a three part reality (flux of our sensations, our relations between sensations and their copies in our minds, previous truths and new experiences)
- Pragmatism and positive beliefs: 'if theories work satisfactorily they will be true'
- James' definition of humanism as a doctrine proposing that 'to an unascertainable extent our truths are man-made products'
- Humanistic view of reality as 'resisting yet malleable'
- Similarities between pragmatism and humanism and differences with rationalism

Discussion

- Is James' account of rationalism objective? 'The rationalist mind is of a doctrinaire and authoritative complexion'
- Is James' account encompassing rationalism as an epistemological method only or does it include a tool to help us live better lives?
- What does James propose instead of rationalism to guide us in making decisions?
- Is James' account of humanism satisfactory? Is humanism what James makes it to be? Only that? Or all of it?

10. Russell: *Problems of Philosophy*

Explain and discuss whether, according to Russell, we know ourselves better by acquaintance or by description.

Key points

- What we can know about ourselves by acquaintance and description, and the effect of the interplay of the two types of knowledge on our self-knowledge.
- Russell's distinction between 'my thoughts and feelings' and 'I' and the problem of self-knowledge

Discussion

- Assumption that there are primarily two types of knowledge: acquaintance and description, and their relevance to the possibility of self-knowledge
- Is it possible to 'know better' by a certain type of knowledge?
- Are the descriptions of others about me, about me?
- Are my feelings and thoughts 'mine' or did they surreptitiously invade my inner world?

11. Freud: *Five Lectures on Psychoanalysis and Outline of Psychoanalysis*

Explain and discuss Freud's idea that to interpret dreams we have to analyse them 'in the direction opposite to the dream-work'.

Key points

- Why are dreams even (more?) important than thoughts and sayings 'by day'? The function of dream as fulfilment of repressed desire
- Dream-work: an 'irrational logic' (condensation and displacement)
- Manifest and latent content of the dream
- Interpretation is not a word-by-word or image by image translation
- The respective roles of dreamer and psychoanalyst in the interpretation of the dream

Discussion

- Dream as 'cure' for neurosis: do dreams necessarily have a psychological function?
- Why should dream-work have two mechanisms?
- Do dreams necessarily have a 'meaning' and can we ever learn something from their interpretations?
- Is it possible to avoid any arbitrariness while stating the definitive meaning of a dream?

12. Sartre: *Being and Nothingness*

Explain and discuss one of the attitudes that, according to Sartre, I may adopt in order to recover the freedom the other deprives me of.

Key points

- In-itself, for-itself, for-others: how the other reduces my for-itself to an it-self (for the other 'I am what I am')
- Being-for-others and conflict (reciprocal denial of freedom)
- One example of concrete relations with the other (love, masochism, indifference, desire, hatred, sadism)
- Do I recover my freedom by this attitude or not? What happens with the other's freedom?

Discussion

- Could the other never be the one who helps me overcome my facticity and vice versa?
 - Does Sartre's theory make it possible to escape existential loneliness?
 - Does happiness exist for Sartre?
-