MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2014 series

9774 PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY

9774/03   Paper 3 (Topics and Key Texts in Philosophy and Theology 2), maximum raw mark 50

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2014 series for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

Topic 1 Philosophy of Mind

Answer Question 1 **and** either Question 2 **or** Question 3

Section A

[Extract from **Derek Parfit**: *Reasons and Persons:* Ch.10, WHAT WE BELIEVE OURSELVES TO BE, pp.199–200]

1 (a) With reference to this passage, explain the questions that Parfit is raising about personal identity. [10]

Parfit comments that despite some of us having deep misgivings about the value of such unprecedented situations, most of us will react to these scenarios with fairly deep-rooted beliefs about ourselves and about what is concerned in our continued existence: we discover our beliefs about personal identity over time. In the first scenario (the *Main-Line case*) of 'simple Teletransportation', my Replica is physically and psychologically exactly similar to me, and we share the same memories, and I have 40 or more years ahead of me when I arrive on Mars. But there are two divergent views about whether or not we are the same person. For some, the Replica will be me; for others, when I press the green button I die: my Replica is someone else who has been made to be like me. This second conclusion seems to be confirmed by the second part of the story (the *Branch-Line case*), in which there would follow conversations between myself and my Replica on Mars, who would try to console me by promising to take care of my wife and children and by fulfilling my ambitions. This consoles me a little bit, and is not as bad as simply dying; nevertheless I know that I shall soon have a heart attack, lose consciousness and die forever. He, however, will feel nothing, and so clearly he is not the same as I.

If we believe that my Replica is not me, then we might naturally assume that my prospect on the *Branch-Line* is almost as bad as ordinary death. Parfit denies this assumption, and indicates that he will argue that being destroyed and replicated is about as good as ordinary survival. This is because the past debate about PI asks questions which pre-judge the issue: in other words it focuses on the question of what constitutes personal *identity*, whereas the real issue is more likely to be one of psychological *continuity*.

(b) Evaluate Parfit's reductionist view of persons. **[15]**

Parfit's reductionist view of persons follows from his rejection of the assumptions of the prior debate, where the instinctive language of the discussion has a predisposition to assume the existence of Cartesian souls. Such an assumption gives rise to insuperable problems which can be expressed by a series of thought experiments based on Teletransportation, brain fission and brain fusion, where the notion of Cartesian souls solves nothing and obscures everything. Despite the fact that most of these experiments might never be realisable in practice, according to Parfit, this does not matter, since in principle it is a given fact that under certain conditions a brain can contain two centres of consciousness that are unaware of each other. Whereas opponents of the reductionist view argue that each stream of consciousness retains unity, Parfit concludes that in neither stream of consciousness is there a 'thinker of the thought': we might ascribe the experiences in each stream to a subject of experiences which is *not* 'me', and, therefore, not a person. Or, if we doubt the existence of such entities (as Parfit does), we can accept the reductionist explanation – persons reduce to collections of experiences and thoughts. In cases of fission, 'my' survival in two new bodies is therefore a survival of whatever psychological connectedness that exists with 'me' before I divided.

Candidates might defend Parfit's reductionist approach, for example by reference to mind-brain identity theory, which proposes an ontological reduction of the mental to the physical – mental states are identical with brain states. Parfit's conclusion that questions about identity reduce to statements about psychological connectedness might be held to be indicated by the fact that all physical states of the body and brain are subject to change; moreover people's memory and psychology change continually, so the best sense to be made of this is to assume that 'identity' really boils down to a sufficient degree of physical and psychological connectedness to maintain continuity with different states of 'me'. The fact that there can be extreme discontinuity (e.g. where through brain disease a person ends up with no connected memories or psychological states) supports Parfit's conclusion that personal *identity*, as such, does not exist.

Candidates might question Parfit's approach on several fronts, for example the notorious difficulty in reducing the mind's intentionality: it is hard to see how mere brain states can have a representational content. Some might refer (for example) to Swinburne's arguments in favour of Cartesian-type souls; others to the body of philosophical opinion that mental phenomena are simply irreducible (e.g. by appeal to quantum mechanical arguments that reality cannot be explained through mechanistic/materialist models). Parfit appears to claim that where strong connectedness exists between different states of a person, then psychological continuity is maintained, but this seems to be making use of the very concept that Parfit is analysing – i.e. the concept of 'same person'. A reductive analysis cannot make use of the concept it is supposed to be analysing. Parfit admits that he finds it difficult to relinquish his 'intuitive belief in the Non-Reductionist View', which echoes the opinion from 'folk psychology' that persons do exist and have identity. Perhaps the reason that the intuitive view is so prevalent is that it is a common sense view.

Section B

2   **Critically examine the computational theory of mind.**   **[25]**

Candidates are likely to begin with an overview of the computational theory of mind, which in essence holds (as in Putnam's version) that the human mind and/or brain is an information processing system / symbol manipulator, and that thinking is a form of computing. The empirical world provides input which the brain converts to output in the form of appropriate mental or physical states. Mental processing is algorithmic. Computational input comes in the form of symbols or representations of other objects. In Fodor's version of CTM representation is carried out in 'mentalese', a language of thought which is a biologically fixed code analogous to computer machine-code.

Candidates might discuss several problems with the computational theory of mind, for example however well it might deal with deduction, it does not cope with induction and abduction, both of which are crucial aspects of human reasoning. It falls foul of general criticisms of materialist theories, e.g. that it cannot properly explain intentionality or the nature of conscious experiences such as *qualia*. Consciousness is not computational, and machines are not conscious anyway, so if minds are conscious and consciousness is not computational, then neither can minds be computational. Candidates are likely to refer to Searle, who insists that mental states are biological phenomena. There is more to mind than having formal or syntactical processes: a computer program can *only* be syntactical, so can *never* be a mind. Minds are semantical – they have more than a formal structure – they have a content. Candidates are likely to illustrate this through Searle's thought-experiment of the Chinese Room, which is directed principally at computationalism and functionalism. They might also know the systems/robot/zombie replies to Searle. For the first of these, Searle argues that anyone who is willing to accept the "system reply" that a mind can emerge from a system, without saying what the system is or how it might give rise to a mind is arguably under the grip of an ideology.

Candidates might argue that Searle's account is good because it avoids the pitfalls of dualism, although any monist theory of mind does this. It is a naturalistic theory, and so it avoids importing insights from other disciplines (such as computational theory) into the philosophy of mind. The evolutionary advantages to beings possessing self-awareness are obvious, so the development of consciousness as a biological and not as a computational phenomenon seems clear. Candidates can comment on any relevant aspect of the debate they like; for example Fodor objects that Searle gives no account of why biochemistry is necessary for intentionality, arguing instead that the way in which an organism is connected to its environment is a more likely explanation of intentionality. Such problems suggest that Searle does not necessarily disprove the computational thesis that the brain carries out its functions mechanically.

3 **'Nothing justifies our certainty that other people have minds.' Evaluate this claim.** **[25]**

The general issue is that mental states are ostensibly private, so we can only make inferences to other minds based on people's public behaviour. How do we go from knowing behaviour to knowing mental states? According to J.S. Mill, we can do so by inductive analogy: I know that I have mental states, so analogically I can infer that other human beings have mental states. The obvious problem is how one generalises from one case to all others, and how one knows that the inference is correct. According to Wittgenstein's critique, the analogical argument to other minds claims that I understand the words I use to describe mental states because I am acquainted with my own private mental states; but how can I expand my private definitions and experiences to others? Words/terms used to describe mental states must be acquired in a public context to be applied to others and to myself – words cannot acquire meaning in the privacy of my own mind, but only in 3rd-person social contexts: so we can meaningfully attribute mental terms to ourselves and others, thus gaining knowledge of other minds. Some will claim that this moves towards untenable forms of behaviourism, since Wittgenstein is relying heavily on public behaviour to explain mental terms. According to Strawson, ascribing mental states to oneself is only *possible* if mental states can be ascribed to others. Identifying others means ascribing to them material-object predicates as well as 'P-predicates' (those that ascribe conscious states), and ascribing the latter still requires observing outward public behaviour. The latter point suggests that Strawson's account can also slide into behaviourism, and as A.J. Ayer pointed out, everyone except me might be a zombie with regularly observable behaviour yet devoid of mental states. To know that other people have minds is a sensible claim in so far as we have reason to believe that it is true; nevertheless proving it is a different issue. Candidates might address the issue of epistemological certainty in a number of ways, perhaps concluding that one might as well claim to know what it is like to be a bat, or else to be a brain in a vat.

Topic 2 Ethics

Answer Question 4 **and** either Question 5 **or** Question 6.

Section A

[Extract from **John-Paul Sartre**: *Existentialism and Humanism* p36 – 37]

4 (a) With reference to this passage, outline what Sartre means by 'abandonment' and explain the relationship between abandonment and morality. **[10]**

Candidates should identify the following key points: In a godless world, there are no absolute, objective guides for morality, belief or action. People are radically free and experience the feeling of "abandonment" when forced to take full responsibility for themselves. The experience of "abandonment" comes from the realisation that there is no God or guide. Abandonment occurs when a person realises that they have to decide themselves how to choose what is "good". In a world where there are no absolute standards separating good from evil, there are no absolute standards to help people to decide what they *should* want. Values, morals, and standards are not predefined. Human nature is not predefined. Abandonment is the consequence of the realisation that we are *condemned to be free* because there is no way around taking absolute responsibility for the choices made. Nobody can pass the responsibility for a decision on to God or onto their 'nature'. Abandonment emerges from the knowledge that all choices are free choices and the responsibility is ours and ours alone.

People are abandoned and must make their own choices about what they will value, what the differences are between good and evil, and what sorts of standards they will expect. Sartre claims that this does not mean that we cannot judge what others do. There is a common human condition which creates certain constraints upon what we can do. Choices may not be constrained by 'a priori' standard but they will be constrained by external factors such as the situation confronted or others who will be affected. People have to create values because there are no values prior to existence but even so the human condition will require some values to be *regarded* as if they have a priori existence, even though they do not.

(b) Assess the importance of subjectivism for Sartre's existentialist philosophy. **[15]**

Expect an overview of the meaning of subjectivity. There are two aspects of subjectivism which ought to be included. Firstly, subjectivity meaning that an individual makes a choice and in making this choice makes themself ('man is the sum total of his actions') and is responsible for what they do. Secondly, subjectivity meaning that a person cannot transcend the human condition whereby our own mental activity is the only unquestionable fact of our experience. The latter is the meaning which Sartre most stresses and regarded as '*the essential meaning of existentialism*'. Students may include the traits of subjectivity (anguish, bad faith, abandonment, rejection of a priori values, the student moral dilemma, despair), the truth of consciousness and becoming aware. Intersubjectivity, in which the individual can pass beyond personal subjectivity, may also be included.

Students are asked to evaluate the importance of subjectivity in Sartre's account of what it is to be human. Subjectivity and 'inwardness' are core themes for Sartre. A person is a 'being-for-itself' aware of the gap between themselves and other objects in the world and aware of the inner 'nothingness' which can be filled. All other objects are 'beings-in-themselves' unable to perceive the world or act within it. Humans are unique in their ability to observe the world, or to note their own inner world, whilst at the same time being aware of themselves as the observer. Students may contrast the ontology of subjectivity with objectivity and evaluate Sartre's picture of the unstable existence of facts and freedom in an indifferent universe. What is the relationship between the inner world of consciousness and the external world? Students may contrast the relative importance of subjectivity with other key ideas such as individual freedom and atheism.

Section B

5 Critically examine Kant's theory of duty. **[25]**

Deontology from <u>Greek</u> *deon*, "obligation, duty". Kant has a number of important considerations about duty. An action in accordance with duty is not the same as an action performed FROM duty. Only actions performed from duty have moral worth. Kant seems to question whether a person can or should feel any happiness from doing an action from duty – and yet doesn't the good feeling indicate that the action is right? Shouldn't a shopkeeper who, out of a sense of duty and fairness, only sells products at a fair price, but who benefits from gaining more customers, be happy in this success? A 'good will' is the only thing that is good without qualification and a person of good will acts out of duty not inclination. How easy is it to truly judge a person's good will – even your own? If something is an *unconditional ought* then one ought to do it apart from any consideration of merit. Acting out of duty demonstrates that the person is respectful of universal law. Acting out of duty is aligned to the Categorical Imperative and not to hypothetical imperatives, which relate to one's own desires. To act out of duty is to act rationally. To act out of duty is to have the right intention for action. Motive gives actions moral value, not consequences. Is it possible to separate motives and consequences totally? The fulfilment of our duty does not rest on the consequences of our actions. However, the results of an action may be necessary in determining where duty lies.

Kant almost seems to argue that the least inclined one is to act from duty the more value it has. Aristotle argued to the contrary, that in the formation of a good character a person will become more inclined to act reliably and well. Acting well by inclination is arguably more reliable. Candidates may argue that consideration of consequences is more important than duty in ethical decision making, or that agape is more important that duty. A candidate who uses this question to write out their notes on Kant will self-limit.

OR

6 **'We are never so defenceless against suffering as when we love.' (Freud)**

Evaluate this claim with reference to applied ethics. **[25]**

Candidates may explicate what is meant by Christian love and may draw upon the Sermon on the Mount, Romans and/or Situation ethics to do this. Reflections may include: wanting the best for the other person regardless of what it costs oneself, selfless love, selfless giving, compassion, agape, an attitude of goodwill rather than an emotion, revealed in action not in sentiment, not self-interested, not expecting a return, not transactional, not romantic, not familial, love of enemy and neighbour as oneself, a spiritual gift. An examination of how love can lead to suffering of various kinds e.g. emotional, physical. Candidates might exemplify this e.g. the death of Maximilian Kolbe. Discussion with respect to the relationship between love and ethics is expected to be wide ranging and will be marked according to level of response. High level responses will make close reference to practical ethics topics. The quotation provided might point candidates in the direction of end of life issues, euthanasia, or war ethics but any topic which is brought to the service of the question is to be credited. Candidates may examine generalities that apply to many practical ethical issues, supported by a range of brief examples, or may examine a single ethical issue, e.g. going to war, in depth. Candidates may question whether love is necessary, and draw on the quotation to comment upon what would be essential for a Christian, a non-Christian or an atheist, such as Freud. Candidates may argue that reason or justice or self discipline or following the rules is more essential to moral practice than love.

Topic 3 Old Testament: Prophecy

Answer Question 7 **and** Either Question 8 **or** Question 9.

Section A

[Hosea 13: 1 – 13 NRSV]

7 (a) With reference to this passage, explain the basis for Hosea's proclamation of judgement. **[10]**

Expect an analysis of the historical situation, with the people of the northern kingdom having rejected the Davidic line of kings, establishing their own temples and including aspects of Baal worship in the cult. The passage links the past events with the punishment that is to come, sent by God. Hosea's thoughts were inspired by his wife's faithlessness and candidates will probably make links between that fact and the above passage. There should be detailed link with the covenant relationship of God and the people. Reference might also be made about the nation turning for help to other countries and taking part in international intrigues, abandoning reliance on the God who saved them from Egypt.

E.g. Israel has called God's judgement on itself because they have abandoned the God who saved them from Egypt (v.4). For Hosea, God's work on behalf of the people proves his love: he was their saviour and the one who provided for them (v.5–6). The people have turned away from God. Hosea draws the parallel with his faithless wife. God wanted a deep permanent relationship with the people of Israel but they have turned to other gods. They have created idols that they worship, even though they pretend that they are still being faithful to God. The recourse of temple prostitutes and to aspects of Baal worship shows that the people have broken the covenant with God. Therefore they can no longer expect God to provide for them. By the people demanding a king of their own, they have also rejected the role of God as their king and protector. God will work through the events of history to show that he is still almighty.

(b) **'The writing prophets relied entirely upon more ancient traditions, offering no new insight or revelation.' Assess this claim.** **[15]**

Candidates can limit their answer to specific prophets or they could do an overview, reinforcing the material with specific examples. The evaluation might include commentary on new theological insights or revelations given in the work of the prophets e.g. to what extent Hosea's idea of the people being prostitutes was new with him.

E.g. All the writing prophets started with the same commitment to God and the covenant that God made with the people. For them, the Jewish people were the people of God who were bound to God, who should rely solely on God and who should respond to God by faithful obedience to his will and observing pure worship. In some ways, all this is simply echoing what has been said all along. Some scholars believe that the writing prophets did not know of the Mosaic tradition, claiming that the "traditions" which most people would connect with the Exodus are simply later developments of the religion, to focus the minds of the people on the work of God. However, the writing prophets' message would not appeal to the people if it were totally new. They drew on the fundamental beliefs and practices of the people, reminding them of the traditions and the true implications of the people's attitudes. If all the writing prophets had done was to present exactly the same material in the standard format that people were used to, the writing prophets' message would not have made any great impact. The prophets needed to gain the people's attention and the way they did this mostly was by presenting different insights into the meaning of the relationship with God. Hosea's use of the parallel with his own life helped him to use the analogy of the people becoming prostitutes. This imagery would have offended many Israelites, but since Hosea spelled out how the distorted worship reflected the idea of prostitution, the people would be forced to re-examine how they were living and worshipping. The more ancient traditions would support the ideas of justice and fairness for all the people, but the work and words of Amos and Micah, among others, would help the people understand the links between serving God in worship and in honouring him in their everyday life through caring for the poor and needy and not abusing power. The writing prophets did not invent anything new. They relied totally on the religious traditions, but they gave new life to these traditions by showing deeper implications for all the people.

Section B

8 Critically assess the significance of the call of the prophets. **[25]**

Candidates may refer to the connection between a prophet's call and their later work and message or to the theological significance of being 'called' by God. They may discuss whether the prophetic call accounts seem to be the product of later redaction and evaluate whether it was the prophets themselves who placed importance on their call or a later generation. Candidates may evaluate whether the call was significant in relation to other areas of the prophet's life and work.

E.g. In the early stages of prophecy, especially with the prophets connected to the sanctuaries and the royal palaces, there does not seem to be any form of call. The prophets appear to inherit their positions as sons of prophets. This raises questions about the validity of their role or the truthfulness of what they had to say. With some of the writing prophets, e.g. Micah, the book simply starts with 'The word of God that was addressed to..' (Mic 1:1), so there is no reference to a call, which does not invalidate the message of the book. With others e.g. Hosea, the prophetic role comes through God directing aspects of their life rather than a direct summons from God to pass on a message. Hosea's introduction: 'When God first spoke to Hosea, God said to him: Go marry a whore…' (Hos 1:2) contrast with the vision of Isaiah when Isaiah's lips are touched with a burning coal to remove the impurity that prevents Isaiah from passing on the message of God. Isaiah's call is a blatant summons from God to 'Go and say this to my people' (Is 6:9) and Jeremiah's summons is: 'Before I formed you in the womb I knew you; before you came to be I consecrated you; I have appointed you as prophet to the nation.' (Jer 1:4–5). This means that the prophet is assured that what they say is from God, regardless of how it is received. The prophet can continue despite all the rejection and abuse, confident in the knowledge that God is on his side. It is this type confidence that allowed the likes of Elijah to fight on in the face of persecution from Ahab and Jezebel. Similarly, Jeremiah's confessional material where he complains about the way God is using him, is only a personal human reaction to the treatment he is receiving. Jeremiah probably feels that his message should be better received since it is from God. Amos' reference to his call from God when he was herding the sheep to 'Go prophesy to my people Israel' (Am 7:15) justifies Amos' presence and preaching in the sanctuary, even when he is being dismissed by the priest. The main problem with the calls is that we only have the prophets' own testimony that they took place. In the writings, it is not always clear that the accounts of the calls come from the prophets themselves rather than from their followers who are trying to validate the teachings of their heroes. Sometimes the calls seem to be late editions to support the teachings of the prophets being handed down to later generations, as without the authority of God, nobody has the right to claim to be a prophet. These calls, if true, would show how God is still active and involved in what is happening in the world. Their message is God's warning of judgement that cannot be ignored.

OR

9 'The primary message of the writing prophets concerns the person and character of God.' Evaluate this claim. **[25]**

Candidates are likely to identify a number of themes in answer to this question, for example: judgement; the Day of the Lord; warnings about the consequences of present conduct; the fact that God is not limited by geography; God's name (*I am who I am*, or variants on that translation); God's nature as Holy, loving, powerful, merciful, constant, faithful, just, etc.; Israel as God's people bound by election and covenant; reminders about the covenant; the *Heilsgeschichte*: salvation history – God's appearance in the history of the world / God's control of historical events; messianic predictions; visions of future blessings; predictions of destruction and exile; the survival of a remnant; God's use of foreign nations to punish Israel and the nations themselves; demands for social morality and justice.

In addressing some of these themes, candidates should evaluate what they teach about the person and character of God. Candidates may approach this essay by focusing on a limited number of prophets or they might write a more generic answer with examples from a range of prophets. Candidates will need to refer to a minimum of two prophets in order to be eligible for the higher bands.

E.g. At first glance most of the prophets seem to be warning the Jewish people about the need for them to keep their part of the covenant with God. This involves reminding the people of why God chose them in the first place and what the consequences of their abandoning God will be. Promises for the future whether in the threat and punishment implied in the ideas of the Day of the Lord (e.g. Amos 5:18f) or in the restoration of people in the perfect Jerusalem, under the leadership of a new David (Amos 9:11) are intended to make the people change their ways and return to God. The promise of the new covenant written in people's hearts (Jer 31:31ff) shows how important the covenant is to God. The threats of God intervening in history to punish the people in order to get rid of those elements that have misled others and set poor standards, especially the leaders and shepherds (e.g. Jer 8:8), reveal how God can use all nations to bring about his will. All this type of material does not appear to deal with the character of God, but in reality what it is all showing is that God is constant and loving. It is in God's nature to be open to people changing their hearts and coming back to him. God's forgiveness is a central issue in the prophets' call for people to reform (e.g. Hos 2:16). If there is no forgiveness, there is no purpose in people changing. The power of God that is exercised is always done to bring the best out in all people. God knows that justice has to be done (e.g. Amos 3:13–15). His choice of Israel has given the Jewish people a special dignity but their refusal to honour God's name is an insult to God himself in the face of the nations. God's own self-esteem cannot allow this to go without being rectified, especially through God working in history, through famines and droughts (e.g. 1 Kings 17:1) or through anointing foreign kings to do his bidding (e.g. Is 45:1). But all these actions are still expressing the nature of God. As God is constant and constantly present, anything that happens or that is done in God's name has to express something about God's character, even though on the surface the focus might seem to be elsewhere.