



2011 Philosophy

Higher

Finalised Marking Instructions

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2011

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 Team.

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 Team 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

- 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.

Question 1

(a) State the difference between a statement and a command. 1 KU

- A statement can be true or false whereas a command cannot.

(b) Can an argument have a valid conclusion? Give a reason for your answer. 3 KU

- No.
- Valid applies to arguments.
- A conclusion is a statement capable of being true or false.

Any three correct points that support the answer 'no'.

(c) What makes an argument invalid? Support your answer with an example. 2 KU

- The conclusion doesn't follow from the premises.
- An argument that is badly structured.
- Any appropriate example of an invalid argument.

(d) What features does an inductive argument need to ensure that it is cogent? 2 KU

- Strong, ie premises produce a conclusion of high probability.
- The premises are true.

Consider the following argument.

God doesn't exist. If God did exist then he would be all knowing and perfectly good. But, if God were perfectly good then he would never have experienced what it is like to feel greed. On the other hand, if God were all knowing then he would know what it is like to feel greed. So, if God did exist then he would both know and not know greed. So, there you are. Proved!

Adapted from Michael Martin *A Disproof of God's Existence*
in *Darshana* 10 (1970): 22-26

(e) Show the structure of this argument by re-writing it in standard form clearly labelling its premises and any conclusions. 4 AE

- Answer:
- P1. If God did exist then he would be all knowing and perfectly good.
- P2. If God were perfectly good then he would never have experienced what it is like to feel greed.
- P3. If God were all knowing then he would know what it is like to feel greed.
- C1. Therefore, If God did exist then he would both know and not know greed.
- C2. Therefore, God doesn't exist.

- One mark for correctly identifying the conclusion.
- One mark for correctly identifying the premises.
- One mark identifying the intermediate conclusion.
- One mark for a logical order.

Candidate should also receive a mark if they suggest a hidden premise saying that C1 is contradictory.

(f) Is this argument inductive or deductive? Give a reason for your answer. 2 AE

- Deductive.
- It is intended that if the premises are true then the conclusion will certainly be true.
- Any appropriate supporting reason.

(g) What is wrong with arguments which commit the fallacy of post hoc ergo propter hoc? Support your answer with an example. 2 KU

- They wrongly assume that because one thing follows another the first has caused the second.
- Any appropriate example.

Consider the following argument.

'If each man had a definite set of rules of conduct by which he regulated his life he would be no better than a machine. But there are no such rules, so men cannot be machines.'

Alan Turing

(h) Identify the fallacy committed in this argument. 1 AE

- Denying the antecedent.

(i) Explain why this example fails to prove its conclusion. 1 AE

- Although the consequent may be true if the antecedent is true it does not follow that the consequent will necessarily be false if the antecedent is false.

NB a student may explain this in a number of different ways making specific reference to the example.

(j) Is this a formal or informal fallacy? Give a reason for your answer. 2 AE

- Formal.
- It is a formal fallacy because it has a particular invalid form that is commonly mistaken to be a valid form.
- The error is a result of a structure of the argument rather than the content.
- $p \rightarrow q; \sim p \mid - \sim p$

(20)

SECTION 2 – GOD

Section 2 – total marks 20

- It has **two** structured questions, each with **1-5** related parts.
- 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.

Question 2

Discuss the Cosmological Argument for the existence of God.

**10 KU
10 AE**

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.

A candidate may approach this question in a number of different ways and credit should be given for any appropriate answer.

Aquinas:

- From experience we know that causes are ordered into causal chains.
- It is not possible for something to be the cause of itself. This is because
 - If something were its own cause it would be 'prior' to itself and this is impossible.
- It is not possible for the causal chain to be infinite. This is because
 - In a causal chain the first cause is the cause of the middle cause(s) whether there are just a few or many
 - The middle cause(s) is the cause of the final cause
 - If there is no cause then there can be no effect
 - So, if there is no first cause there will be no middle or final causes
 - However, if a causal chain were infinite then there would be no first cause
 - So if the causal chain were infinite then there would be no effects and this is clearly false.
- Consequently the causal chain cannot be infinite and there must be a first cause.
- This first cause is what people call God.
- A candidate may explain how Leibniz's 'Principle of Sufficient Reason' deals differently with the possibility of an infinite series by saying it leads to the conclusion that 'the sufficient or ultimate reason must...exist outside the succession of series of contingent particulars, infinite though this series be.'

A candidate may discuss

- the fact that the argument has some intuitive plausibility in that we expect things to have an ultimate cause.
- the fact that argument does attempt to provide a rational basis for belief in God.
- the 'schoolboy' objection that we are faced with a new problem, namely, what made God come into existence? The response might be that God, as cause, does not have to be like other causes.
- whether the argument commits the fallacy of composition, the fact that everything in the universe has a cause does not establish that the universe as a whole has a cause.
- whether the argument establishes that there has to be a single first cause — there might be multiple causal chains streaming from innumerable 'first' causes.
- the assumption that all events need a cause, eg by making reference to quantum fluctuations.
- whether even if the argument establishes the need for a first cause it goes on to establish anything more about the nature of this first cause — it is at best misleading to equate this first cause with God without further argument.
- Hume's objection that the nature of any being necessary for bringing the universe into existence is beyond our comprehension and so not necessarily restricted to God, ie given that we have no reason to assume that we fully understand the characteristics required for some being or event to be a first cause, we have no reason to assume that God is the only being or event that could have them.
- The claim that although both God and the universe itself might have the necessary characteristics to be a first cause, an answer that does not use God is to be preferred because it achieves the same results without positing an extra entity.
- Kant's objection that the cosmological argument relies on the ontological argument which is itself doubtful.

(20)

SECTION 2 – FREE WILL

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 questions/restricted and extended response questions/an essay question.

Question 3

The human brain processes information. We don't know how the brain works but it has inputs and outputs just like a computer. It makes no more sense to say that humans are free and responsible than it does to say that my computer is free and responsible for what it does.

**10 KU
10 AE**

Discuss this philosophical position.

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.

A candidate may approach this question in a number of different ways and credit should be given for any appropriate answer. However, the question requires the candidate to 'discuss' the quotation. An answer that simply lists the different positions on the free will/determinism debate should be awarded a maximum of 13 marks. A candidate being awarded a mark indicative of an A will show awareness that the focus of discussion is the Hard Determinist position.

Arguments in favour of determinism might indicate:

- Examples of determinism in the human sphere might be drawn from, eg genetic determinism, environmental determinism, psychological determinism.
- The success of science which is based on the presumption of determinism.
- Explanations require a reference to how things came about and so without causation there can be no explanation.

Arguments for incompatibilism might include:

- the fact that as certain causes are recognised we do tend to attribute less responsibility to an individual, eg when people who are mentally ill are treated differently to those deemed sane.
- The consequence argument: if determinism is true then our acts are the consequence of laws of nature and events in the remote past. But it is not up to us what went on before we were born, and neither is it up to us what the laws of nature are. Therefore, the consequences of these things (including our present acts) are not up to us.

Candidates may develop their answer in a number of different ways and should receive credit for any appropriate point that they make.

- A candidate may argue that the examples of determinism function as an inductive argument but do so not by themselves establish that all events are caused.
- A candidate may discuss how chance and indeterminism are presumed to play a role at the quantum level and how this may result in chance operating at the larger scale in which we operate. This might mean that ultimately not all events are caused. This would refute a strict definition of hard determinism but a candidate may then consider whether this has any impact on the issue of human responsibility.
- A candidate may discuss whether events have to be caused by events. This has implications for the stance taken on the mind-body problem for it would mean that all thoughts are reduced to brain events, that thoughts arise from brain events but that thoughts cannot in turn affect brain events. In this context a student may discuss agent causation as an alternative position.
- A candidate may argue that determinism is self-refuting for in a world where prior states of affairs determine our attitude to an argument we can no longer have any confidence in why we hold any particular position.
- A candidate may argue for a compatibilist understanding of freedom.
- A candidate may argue that determinism does not imply lack of responsibility and argue that just as we identify a faulty component in a deterministic mechanical system and act to deal with the fault so we can identify persons as particular causes of problems in society and act to deal with them in a similar way.

(20)

SECTION 3 – EPISTEMOLOGY

Section 3 – total marks 40

Part 1 – 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.

Question 4

(a) How do Locke and Leibniz differ in their approach to innate ideas? 5 KU

- definition of innate ideas/appropriate examples
- block of marble (Leibniz)
- potentialities (Leibniz)
- blank sheet of paper (Locke)
- there are no innate ideas (Locke).

(b) How successful is the claim that there are innate ideas? 5 AE

Candidates should be awarded for each substantive point and receive two marks for a developed point, eg

- Reference to the claim that “Nothing is in the intellect which was not first in the senses.”
- Locke’s observation that if there are innate ideas then everyone should have them but likely candidates, such as ‘whatever is, is’ are not recognised by “children and idiots.”
- That there is no universal consent is especially true of moral and religious truths.
- The near universal consent to some ideas might be accounted for by near universal experience.

- Candidates may question Locke’s claim that innate ideas would be known to the person who had them.
- Innate ideas as potentialities – Leibniz.
- Rationalists may argue that innate ideas do explain why there is universal understanding of certain concepts.
- Candidates may refer to evidence from developmental psychology that some near universal ideas exist much earlier than hitherto thought.

(10)

SECTION 3 – DESCARTES

Section 3 – total marks 40

Part 2 – 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.

Question 5

- (a) **Describe the arguments Descartes uses to arrive at a position of universal doubt in Meditation One.**

10 KU

Answer:

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

- Early learning suspect.
- Sense experience suspect.
- Dream argument.
- Deceiving creator.
- Evil genius.

Only one mark is available for setting the arguments in context.

A maximum of eight marks will be awarded if there is no clear awareness of the progressive nature of the argument.

A maximum of three marks will be awarded to a description of any one part of the argument.

- (b) **How effective are Descartes' sceptical arguments in Meditation One?**

6 AE

- Descartes doesn't doubt logic, memory, language.
 - Although in the *Replies* Descartes says the cogito is only trying to establish the first thing that exists.
- Assumes the truth of foundationalism. (He is looking for a foundation that may not exist!)
- He wants all knowledge to have the certainty of maths.
- 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.
- There may be criteria for assessing the reliability of the senses if they are not assessed individually, eg corroboration.
- The concept of a deception presupposes that we are not deceived all the time.
- Positively, Descartes only needs to establish the possibility of doubt.
- He returns to many of these issues in Med VI.

(c) Critically evaluate the claim that the cogito is beyond doubt.

**5 KU
9 AE**

- Explain what is meant by the cogito.
- Explain why the cogito is meant to be undeniable.
- Arguably uses a suppressed premise (Lichtenberg) – All thinking things exist.
 - This premise is questionable.
 - Do the existence of thoughts necessarily imply a thinker?
 - David Hume (bundle theory) argued that we have no right to assume this, as does the anatta (no-self) doctrine of Buddhism.
 - Perhaps Descartes should have said, “There is thinking going on therefore there are thoughts.”
 - The cogito therefore doesn’t actually establish the existence of a self.
 - However,
 - The form in the Meditations is not intended as a piece of deductive logic. Descartes did not intend the cogito to operate this way. The meditations should be seen as a course in guided self-discovery and the cogito as a self-authenticating proposition. (According to Cottingham, Descartes expressly made this point to Leibniz at the time.)
- “I” is merely a linguistic convenience. It doesn’t actually refer to anything, no more so than the “It” in “It is raining.”
- It can be argued that Descartes strays from his rationalistic agenda here since “thinking things exist” is an a posteriori, observation.
- According to Bertrand Russell the cogito is circular since it assumes what it is setting out to prove.

A maximum of five marks are available for describing the claim.

(30)

SECTION 3 – HUME

Section 3 – total marks 40

Part 2 – 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.

Question 6

(a) Describe how Hume supports his claim that all ideas derive from impressions.

10 KU

- Impressions explained.
- Ideas explained.
- Complex ideas.
- Inductive argument.
 - Every idea we examine can be traced back to an impression
 - Hume's example — God.
- Absent impressions.
 - Defective sense organs.
 - A blind person has no notion of colours.
 - A deaf person no notion of sound.
 - Missing experience.
 - If wine hasn't been tasted.
 - If an emotion hasn't been felt.
 - Human senses compared to animal senses of which we have had no experience.

A maximum of five marks are available for describing 'impressions' and 'ideas'.

(b) How effective are Hume's arguments that all ideas derive from impressions?

6 AE

- It is questionable whether Hume has established a clear distinction between impressions and ideas — some impressions seem less vivid than some ideas.
- The problem of the speckled hen — ideas do not seem to be simply faint copies of impressions.
- Hume's inductive argument.
 - It has all the problems of inductive arguments.
 - Better understood as a challenge?
- Hume's second argument.
 - Defective sense organs.
 - Seems likely that sensory ideas are not possible without functioning sense organs.
 - The appropriate nerves may be artificially stimulated but this might count as an impression.

- Missing experience.
 - Taste of wine might be a complex idea so the example is poor.
- Second argument may establish that those ideas that are obvious copies of sense experiences cannot be formed without an impression but the argument has ignored the more difficult cases such as justice and other abstract ideas.
- Hume's position is contradicted by his example of the missing shade of blue.

(c) How convincing is Hume's argument concerning the missing shade of blue?

**5 KU
9 AE**

- Missing shade of blue explained.
- Why it is a problem – Hume states it is a contradictory example just after saying that only a single contrary example would be required to refute his argument.
- Leaves open the possibility of innate ideas.
- States it is a singular example but arguably applies to sounds and tastes.
 - But text implies Hume was aware of this and the singular may apply to the type of example (ie a highly ordered sequence) rather than this specific example.
- Possibility of colours being produced as a complex idea.
 - Hume's philosophy requires that colours are simple.
 - But not clear that augmenting and diminishing result in complex ideas.
 - Possibility that there should be another category added to augmenting, diminishing, etc. eg mental mixing.
- Possibly Hume is wrong and someone might not be able to supply the missing shade unless they had prior experience — difficulty in finding an appropriate test subject.
- Problem: if the solution is this simple then why did Hume include it as a counter-example?
- Naïve psychology. We perceive colours by comparison not as discrete concepts.
- Possibility that Hume requires the possibility of an exception so that it can be classified as a matter of fact rather than a relation of ideas.
 - But the contrary only has to be possible not actual.

A maximum of five marks are available for simply describing the problem but a maximum of four if there is no clear sensitivity to the text. **(30)**

SECTION 4 – NORMATIVE ETHICS

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.

Question 7

“There is nothing good about Utilitarianism. According to this terrible philosophy the only thing wrong with an act of violence is that there are not enough people standing around enjoying it.” **15 KU
15 AE**

To what extent is this a fair criticism of Utilitarianism? In your answer you should consider how a utilitarian might respond to this accusation.

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 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 may approach this question in a number of different ways and credit should be given for any appropriate answer. However, the question requires the candidate to discuss the quotation. An answer that simply lists the main features of utilitarianism and lists the problems with that ethical theory should be awarded a maximum of 18 marks. A candidate being awarded a mark indicative of an A will show awareness that the focus of discussion is whether utilitarianism can avoid the charge of approving of seemingly inappropriate pleasures.

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.

- Explanation of the reasoning behind the quotation.
- Utilitarianism as hedonistic philosophy.
- Explanation of hedonism.
- The utilitarian definition of the good – that which bring about the most aggregate happiness.
- The utilitarian method of calculating the quantity of happiness.
- The Hedonic Calculus.
- Whatever pain is felt by a victim of violence it would seem that it can always be outweighed by increasing the number of people getting pleasure from the incident.
- Factual criticism: a utilitarian would say that the pain experienced by the victim is a ‘wrong’ albeit one possibly outweighed by the onlookers pleasure.

- Possible act utilitarian response: the long-term consequences have to be considered and a society that tolerated such actions will encourage further such actions and, in the long run, the total happiness would not be maximized.
- Objection: This defence amounts to saying that our utilitarian calculations should take into account that not everyone will behave like utilitarian's. In practice this may be the case but in principle if the action is good on one occasion then the more times it happens the better — as long as there are enough spectators on each occasion.
- Possible rule utilitarian response: experience teaches that having a rule that forbids violence results in a greater net happiness than not having such a rule.
- Objection: it is not sufficient to show that having a specific rule is better than not having that rule; what is required is an argument that the set of rules that will maximise happiness includes a rule that will prevent such actions. Example of a rule that might allow such actions: never use violence unless it is supported by the majority people. Possible scenario — public execution of certain categories of criminals.
- Possible ideal utilitarian response: happiness is not the only intrinsic good and other things have to be considered.
- Objection: it is not clear how to arrive at the correct list of what is good and it is tempting to decide on that list by ensuring all scenarios lead to the 'correct' answer. This raises the further problem over whose intuition it is that decides on the 'correct' answer.
- A candidate may consider whether the Mill's introduction of a qualitative difference between pleasures helps solve the problem. A good answer will question whether the qualitative difference that Mill identifies is applicable to this answer.
- A candidate may discuss whether even if there are problems with Utilitarianism it follows that "there is nothing good about Utilitarianism."

(30)

SECTION 4 – NORMATIVE ETHICS

Section 4 – total marks 40

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.

Question 8

(a) State two different formulations of the Categorical Imperative.

4 KU

Answer:

- **Act only** on that **maxim** through which you can at the same time **will** that it should become a **universal law**.
- Act in such a way that you always **treat** humanity, **whether in your own person or in the person of any other**, never **simply** as a means, but always **at the same time as an end**.

or...

- Act as though the maxim of your action were to become, through your will, a universal law of nature.
- Act in such a way as to treat humanity, whether in your own person or in that of anyone else, always as an end and never merely as a means.

Credit should also be given if a candidate refers to one of the other formulations, eg So act as if you were through your maxims a law-making member of a kingdom of ends.

Two marks for each formulation. Although the wording may vary slightly the full two marks should only be awarded if all the key features of the formulation are included.

According to Kant we have an imperfect duty to help those in need.

(b) What is the difference between a perfect duty and an imperfect duty?

2 KU

- Perfect Duty: A duty that does not allow exceptions.
- Imperfect Duty: A duty that allows exceptions.

(c) According to Kantian ethics why do we have a duty to help the poor? 4 AE

A candidate should be awarded a mark for each point made that is relevant to the question. A maximum of three marks should be awarded for an answer that draws on just one formulation of the categorical imperative.

- It is not possible to universalize a maxim such as ‘ignore those in need’ as it leads to a contradiction in the will.
- Not treating someone as a means only requires that we have an imperfect duty to further other people’s goals.

A candidate should also be rewarded if they interpret the question in a way which leads to an exploration of the distinction between duty and inclination. **(10)**

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]