



Cambridge International Examinations  
Cambridge Pre-U Certificate

---

**PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY (PRINCIPAL)**

**9774/03**

Paper 3 Topics and Key Texts in Philosophy and Theology 2

**May/June 2017**

**2 hours**

Additional Materials: Answer Booklet/Paper

---



**READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST**

If you have been given an Answer Booklet, follow the instructions on the front cover of the Booklet.

Write your Centre number, candidate number and name on the work you hand in.

Write in dark blue or black pen.

Do not use staples, paper clips, glue or correction fluid.

**DO NOT WRITE IN ANY BARCODES.**

Choose **one** of Topics 1 to 3.

Answer **two** questions.

You must answer **both** parts of the question in Section A and **one** question from Section B for the Topic you have chosen.

You should divide your time equally between the questions you attempt.

At the end of the examination, fasten all your work securely together.

The number of marks is given in brackets [ ] at the end of each question or part question.

---

The syllabus is approved for use in England, Wales and Northern Ireland as a Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate.

---

This document consists of **4** printed pages.

Choose **one** of Topics 1 to 3.

Answer **two** questions.

You must answer **both** parts of the question in Section A and **one** question from Section B for the Topic you have chosen.

You should divide your time equally between the questions you attempt.

### Topic 1 Philosophy of Mind

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

#### Section A

Now, the moral of this discussion for cognitivism can be put very simply: *In the sense in which human beings follow rules* (and incidentally human beings follow rules a whole lot less than cognitivists claim they do), *in that sense computers don't follow rules at all. They only act in accord with certain formal procedures.* The program of the computer determines the various steps that the machinery will go through; it determines how one state will be transformed into a subsequent state. And we can speak *metaphorically* as if this were a matter of following rules. But in the *literal* sense in which human beings follow rules computers do not follow rules, they only act as if they were following rules. Now such metaphors are quite harmless, indeed they are both common and useful in science. We can speak metaphorically of any system as if it were following rules, the solar system for example. The metaphor only becomes harmful if it is confused with the literal sense. It is o.k. to use a psychological metaphor to explain the computer. The confusion comes when you take the metaphor literally and use the metaphorical computer sense of rule-following to try to explain the psychological sense of rule-following, on which the metaphor was based in the first place.

And we are now in a position to say what was wrong with the linguistic evidence for cognitivism. If it is indeed true that people follow rules of syntax when they talk, that doesn't show that they behave like digital computers because, in the sense in which they follow rules of syntax, the computer doesn't follow rules at all. It only goes through formal procedures.

[Extract from **John Searle**: *Minds, Brains and Science*: Ch. 3: 'Cognitive Science']

- 1 (a) With reference to this passage, explain Searle's argument that human brains do *not* function as digital computers. [10]
- (b) Critically examine Searle's view that cognitive science can never explain how a brain becomes a mind. [15]

#### Section B

- 2 Evaluate the claim that Cartesian substance dualism explains nothing about the nature of mind. [25]

OR

- 3 'Persons cannot be defined.' Discuss. [25]

**Topic 2 Ethics**

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

**Section A**

First, what do we mean by anguish? The existentialist frankly states that man is in anguish. His meaning is as follows – When a man commits himself to anything, fully realising that he is not only choosing what he will be, but is thereby at the same time a legislator deciding for the whole of mankind – in such a moment a man cannot escape from the sense of complete and profound responsibility. There are many, indeed, who show no such anxiety. But we affirm that they are merely disguising their anguish or are in flight from it. Certainly, many people think that in what they are doing they commit no one but themselves to anything: and if you ask them, “What would happen if everyone did so?” they shrug their shoulders and reply, “Everyone does not do so.” But in truth, one ought always to ask oneself what would happen if everyone did as one is doing; nor can one escape from that disturbing thought except by a kind of self-deception. The man who lies in self-excuse, by saying “Everyone will not do it” must be ill at ease in his conscience, for the act of lying implies the universal value which it denies. By its very disguise his anguish reveals itself.

[Extract from **Jean-Paul Sartre**: *Existentialism and Humanism*]

- 4 (a) With reference to this passage, explain the role of anguish in Sartre’s ethics. [10]
- (b) ‘Sartre’s view that anguish is important in ethics is wrong.’ Discuss. [15]

**Section B**

- 5 Critically assess the value of Natural Law ethics. [25]

**OR**

- 6 ‘Virtue ethics is of no value when dealing with the issues raised by embryo research and genetic engineering.’ Critically examine this comment. [25]

**Topic 3 Old Testament: Prophecy**

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

**Section A**

<sup>31</sup> The days are surely coming, says the LORD, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah. <sup>32</sup> It will not be like the covenant that I made with their ancestors when I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt—a covenant that they broke, though I was their husband, says the LORD. <sup>33</sup> But this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, says the LORD: I will put my law within them, and I will write it on their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. <sup>34</sup> No longer shall they teach one another, or say to each other, ‘Know the LORD’, for they shall all know me, from the least of them to the greatest, says the LORD; for I will forgive their iniquity, and remember their sin no more.

[Jeremiah 31:31–34 NRSV]

- 7 (a) Comment on the meaning and purpose of this passage in the context of Jeremiah’s message. [10]
- (b) ‘Jeremiah’s optimism about the new covenant conflicts with his pessimism in other parts of his message.’ Discuss. [15]

**Section B**

- 8 Critically examine the relationship between prophets and kings in the pre-exilic period. [25]

**OR**

- 9 Critically examine the importance of ecstatic visions and auditions in the work of the prophets. [25]

---

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

To avoid the issue of disclosure of answer-related information to candidates, all copyright acknowledgements are reproduced online in the Cambridge International Examinations Copyright Acknowledgements Booklet. This is produced for each series of examinations and is freely available to download at [www.cie.org.uk](http://www.cie.org.uk) after the live examination series.

Cambridge International Examinations is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.