

Final



**General Certificate of Education (A-level)
January 2013**

Critical Thinking

CRIT1

(Specification 2770)

Unit 1: Foundation Unit

Final

Mark Scheme

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all examiners participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from: aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2013 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Copyright

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

Critical Thinking Mark Scheme

INTRODUCTION

The nationally agreed assessment objectives in the QCA Subject Criteria for Critical Thinking are:

- AO1** Analyse critically the use of different kinds of reasoning in a wide range of contexts.
AO2 Evaluate critically the use of different kinds of reasoning in a wide range of contexts.
AO3 Develop and communicate relevant and coherent arguments clearly and accurately in a concise and logical manner.

- Marks are allocated to the assessment objectives according to the nature of each question and what it is intended to test.
- For Section A, Examiners need only provide a total mark for each of the candidates' answers. They do not need to provide a breakdown by Assessment Objective.
- For Section B, marks should be awarded according to the generic marking grid.
- For Section B you should add summative comments to justify the mark awarded (comments can be added, where necessary, to Section A).
- Candidates should be able to achieve the highest marks with a selection of relevant points, not necessarily the complete range.
- **Indicative content is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and other valid points must be credited.**

Unit 1 Critical Thinking Foundation Unit

Section A

Questions 1 to 3 refer to Document A

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
1	Whose side is the author, Dominic Lawson on; Mr Movahedi's or Ms Bahrami's? Justify your answer with reference to the text.	(3 marks)	1	2	

Ms Bahrami (1 mark)

Award 1 mark, if they support their judgment with only one reference to text, eg 'I can't say that I am greatly relieved.'
regarding the courts blocking the sentence of blinding.

OR: if they put, He says she has a point (paragraph 6).

OR: he called Movahedi "her tormentor"

Award 2 marks for more substantial support for their judgment, eg at least two relevant references to text and/or, justifying argument based on the text.

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
2	Identify two significant similarities and three significant differences between the punishment proposed for Mr Movahedi and the crime he committed against Ms Bahrami. (5 marks)	5			

NB Mark only the first two and first three respectively.

Award 1 mark up to a maximum of 5, for each of the following examples.

Similarities

Both blinded
Both acid
deliberate / intended
Both revenge
Both were without 'victim's' consent
Both are painful (in broader sense)

Differences

Anaesthetic / no anaesthetic
Not disfigured / disfigured Both
Drops of acid / bucket of acid
Knows it's coming / didn't know
Dispassionate / passion or hate
On behalf of other women / selfish
Hospital / no medical facilities
Legal / illegal

NB Max. 2 marks for similarities
Max. 3 marks for differences

NB Award the marks regarding "differences", even if candidate only gives **one side** of the difference.

NB Only award similarities/differences that have a clear textual basis, eg no marks for "they'll both bump into things". But one mark for "neither will be able to work in their normal jobs." (textual basis for this).

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
3	With reference to paragraph 3 , what implicit assumption is made in Amnesty International's argument that such a sentence on Mr Movahedi was not a proper punishment since it 'amounted to torture'? (2 marks)	2			

That torture is not a proper punishment. (2)

Accept: examples

'punishment must not involve torture.' (2)

'Its wrong to use torture as a punishment.' (2)

'Even offenders shouldn't be tortured.' (1)

'torture is wrong.' (1)

But The sentence on Mr Movahedi is the same as torture (0 marks)

Questions 4 to 7 refer to Document B

4	Read the following exchange before answering question 4.				
	Tom Did you see that crazy Lawson article? He actually thinks that legally blinding someone is ok! It's barbaric; that's what it is, and if you ask me, he needs his head examined. Gandhi himself said, "An eye for an eye makes the whole world blind", and what Gandhi says is good enough for me.				
	Bev Why should we care what Gandhi says? He's been dead over 50 years.				
No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
4(a)	Critically assess the quality of Tom's reasoning in this extract. (3 marks)			3	

Specifics:

Use of emotive / persuasive language.

Examples: 'crazy', '!', 'barbaric', 'actually', needs his head examined'

(maximum 1 mark if candidate mentions / refers to these)

Tom's language unduly pressurises his audience to agree with him / softens them up prior to his actual argument, but this is not strictly speaking a logical error. That's why maximum 1 mark.

(0 marks if candidate thinks this is ad hominem)

Tom is guilty of an appeal to authority. By quoting Gandhi as if that clinches the matter he is appealing to Gandhi's authority as a moral leader.

But just because Gandhi says something doesn't make it right – even if he is a moral authority speaking about morals. (up to 3 marks for this)

1 mark for identifying this as an appeal to authority.

2 marks for the explanation with reference to text.

NB Can get all 3 marks if give a good explanation of the flaw even if they don't identify it explicitly as an appeal to authority.

Tom may also be guilty of a slippery slope.

By endorsing Gandhi's remarks, ie quoting them with approval, Tom is in effect asserting that having a law of 'an eye for an eye' will eventually lead (if we take the quote literally) to the eventual extreme of global blindness. This is far from inevitable etc. (up to 3 marks for this)

NB If candidate focuses purely on Gandhi being guilty of a slippery slope, then maximum 2 marks, because the focus should be on Tom, not directly on Gandhi.

Up to 3 marks for a positive assessment of Tom’s reasoning, eg candidates may argue along the lines that if Gandhi’s quote is not taken literally, then what Gandhi and Tom are getting at is that all humanity is lessened / dehumanised when inhuman brutal punishments are used on fellow human beings.

And if ‘an eye for an eye’ has this effect on humans, then it is wrong and should be stopped.

- NB. Some candidates may, unusually, interpret Tom’s reasoning as:
 P1. He actually thinks that legally binding someone is ok.
 P2. It’s barbaric
 ∴ He needs his head examined.

Award max 2 marks for a reasonable assessment of this, eg having strong/extreme opinions isn’t sufficient to conclude that Lawson is mentally unstable “needs examined”.

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
4(b)	Critically assess the quality of Bev’s reasoning in this extract (2 marks)			2	

Bev: She’s correct to reject Tom’s appeal to authority in the form of Gandhi, (1 mark)

but gives a flawed reason involving an appeal to history (1) – ‘he’s been dead over 50 years’. Being made over 50 years ago has no effect on a statement’s truth or falsity. (2 marks)

Also, being dead doesn’t make one’s claims wrong. (2 marks)

OR: Bev wrongly assumes that statements made in the past and/or by dead people, aren’t true or are not worth caring about. (2 marks)

OR: Bev is too dismissive of the quote. Gandhi was an important figure, and Bev needs to do more than just say “he’s been dead over 50 years” to effectively challenge this.
(2 marks)

NB. Don’t award marks for answers which merely repeat or paraphrase what Bev is doing. Eg Bev assumes, thinks, etc. that being dead makes your statements untrue/unreliable.

5	Read the following extract from Document B.				
	Bev [...] And he’s wrong anyway. Blinding one person won’t make the world blind. Look, let’s say each half of the world pokes out an eye of the other half. Then the first half pokes out the one remaining eye of the second half. It follows that the second half will now be blind; and that’s why they won’t be able to find the first half in order to do some eye-poking. So at most, only half the world would be blind with the remaining half being one-eyed. So there!				
No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
5	Analyse Bev’s reasoning by identifying the reasons and conclusion(s), and outlining its structure.	(7 marks)	7		

Level	Marks	Description
Good	6–7	Analysis of the reasoning into its main components (reasons and conclusions) is accurate. Distinctive features of the author’s reasoning (eg use of evidence, examples) and its structure (eg intermediate conclusions) are likely to be correctly identified.
Intermediate	4–5	Analysis of the main components is largely correct but may contain errors or omissions. Candidates may recognise some additional features of the author’s reasoning. Or individual reason not specifically picked out but are correctly identified as a group, eg 2 or more reasons referred to as “reasoning”.
Basic	1–3	Analysis is mostly incorrect, but some understanding of the general direction of the argument.

Specifics:

Award 1 mark for each of the premises / reasons, and for the main conclusion (MC), up to a total of 6 marks, and add an extra mark if they state that at least one of them is an intermediate conclusion (IC).

(so if they only get, say three of the premises, but correctly state that one of them is an IC, then award 4 marks.)

Premise / reason 1: Let’s say each half of the world poked out one eye of the other half.

Premise / reason 2: The first half then pokes out the one remaining eye of the second half.

IC1 / reason 3: It follows that [the second half will now be blind.]

IC2 / reason 4: That's why [they won't be able to find the first half in order to do some eye-poking.]

IC3 / reason 5: So, [at most, only half the world would be blind with the remaining half being one-eyed.]

MC: Gandhi is wrong. Blinding one person won't make the world blind.

NB Accept either one of these on its own.

NB Maximum of 2 marks (ie in Basic level) if argument merely paraphrased with no explicit identification of reasons and / or conclusions.

NB No mark for saying the MC is an IC.

NB No mark for saying an R is the MC.

NB Saying that what follows the MC is an "analogy" or an "example" is not enough to get a mark. Candidates must clearly indicate these support or back up or justify the MC.

NB "Blinding one person won't make the world blind" is not an IC nor an R, so no marks for this.

6	<p>Read the following extract from Document B before answering Question 6.</p> <p>Bev [...] None of those 7800 cases of women being deliberately burned by men would have happened if those men knew the same would be done to them in return. I know I would think twice about blinding someone if I knew I would be blinded as a punishment.</p>				
No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
6	Explain the flaw in this argument.	(3 marks)		3	

Award 3 marks for answers along the lines of the following examples:

'hasty generalisation' or 'overgeneralisation'. From her own personal attitude, Bev generalises to 7800 others. Inadequate evidence. Not a big enough sample.

OR

'unrepresentative sample'. She assumes that she is typical of everyone else when there is no evidence of this. These are people from a different culture and country and gender.

OR

'The conclusion is overstated or overdrawn'. as 'wouldn't have happened'. This is made with unjustified certainty. Even if it had been softened to 'probably wouldn't', it's still far too strong as the solitary bit of evidence makes it merely a remote possibility.

NB No need to label flaw in order to get all 3 marks.
But can get 1 mark for naming the flaw.

Acceptable names are:

'hasty generalisation' or 'overgeneralisation'

'unrepresentative or insufficient sample'

'overstated or overdrawn conclusion' 'dubious (etc.) assumption that one is typical'

7	Read the following extract before answering Question 7				
	Tom [...] When Movahedi blinded Ms Bahrami what he did was wrong. But blinding him is an act of pure revenge, so blinding him is not right, because two wrongs don't make a right.				
No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
7(a)	Outline the structure of Tom's argument.	(4 marks)	4		

Award 1 mark for each of the following:

- R1. When Mr Movahedi blinded Ms Bahrami what he did was wrong.
- R2. Blinding him is an act of pure revenge.
- R3. Two wrongs don't make a right.
- MC. Blinding him is not right.

Award ½ mark (^) for a clear reference to a reason, but text not quoted.

No marks for mistaking R for MC and vice versa.

No mark for thinking the MC is an IC.

Allow 1 mark BOD for thinking an R is an IC.

No mark for merely saying "Tom states" or "Tom says" or "Tom makes points".

No mark for mistaking R1 as a counter-argument.

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
7(b)	Identify an implicit assumption that Tom makes in this argument.	(2 marks)	2	0	

Award 2 marks for:

'an act of pure revenge is wrong' OR

'pure revenge is wrong'

'an act of pure revenge can't be right.'

Award 2 marks (BOD) for 'revenge is wrong'.

Award 1 mark for 'assumes "not right" is synonymous with "wrong"'. Award 1 mark for

imprecise answer, eg 'revenge is bad/undesirable/unacceptable'.

OR 'tit for tat is wrong'. (1)

NB if additional wrong or irrelevant material is present with a correct answer then reduced 2 marks to 1, and 1 mark to 0, if correct part is contaminated.

Examiners to use judgment as to whether and what degree this occurs, eg 'an act of pure revenge is wrong, and blinding Movahedi is an act of pure revenge (this gets only 1 mark, not 2).

Questions 8 to 10 refer to Document C

8	<p>Read paragraphs 1 and 2 before answering Question 8.</p> <p>In paragraph 1 the doctor says, “What happened to my patient could not be described as justice, except in the technical sense that it was the sentence passed by a judge.”</p> <p>The doctor refers to one sense of justice as the ‘technical’ sense.</p>				
No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
8(a)	What other meaning could the word ‘justice’ have?	(3 marks)	1	2	

3 marks for plausible and convincing alternative meaning.

2 marks for reasonable alternative.

1 mark for a too simplistic alternative meaning.

‘justice’ could mean treating people fairly in everyday life. Respecting people’s rights. Being morally upright. Performing one’s moral duties. Deciding impartially, eg. When refereeing a match. (None of these need the decision of a judge to make them right or just.

(3 marks for an answer that makes any of the sort of points made above)

(1–2 marks for a shorter, simpler account, eg. Justice could mean being good (1 mark)

It could mean treating people as equals not cheating (2 marks)

(0 marks for “‘justice’ could mean ‘legal’.”

It could mean extra-legal “rough justice” in the sense that if the perpetrator had been blinded in return, say by relatives of the victim, this is in some sense ‘just’. (3 marks)

It could mean ‘justice’ in the sense that a proper, appropriate legal system, (other than that in place), sensitive to true moral justice, would have handed down a much harsher penalty consonant with the crime. (3 marks)

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
8(b)	Identify the doctor’s main conclusion in paragraph 2.	(2 marks)	2		

Award 2 marks for:

‘This is not justice but mere theatre’, which dishonestly portrays the courts as concerned with the views of the victim.

Also award 2 marks if candidate puts, “This is not justice but mere theatre.” Also 2 marks if candidate just puts, “This is not justice.”

Only 1 mark for partly accurate paraphrase, eg this is not right.

9	<p>Question 9 refers to claims made in paragraph 3 of Document C.</p> <p>Consider the following two arguments before answering question 9.</p> <p>Argument 1: The idea of retributive justice is sneered at by the legal establishment. Therefore, retributive justice is wrong.</p> <p>Argument 2: Retributive justice has a continuing hold on the sentiments of the public. Therefore retributive justice is right.</p>				
No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
9	Explain the flaw in each argument.	(6 marks)		6	

Level	Marks	Description
Good	5–6	Two flaws very well explained.
Intermediate	3–4	Two flaws reasonably well explained [4] OR one flaw very well explained, plus one flaw poorly explained [4], OR only one flaw very well explained while the other not covered at all or done very badly [3].
Basic	1–2	Only one flaw reasonably explained, OR two flaws poorly explained.

NB If candidate gives more than one flaw for one argument, then mark the best attempt.

Specifics:

Flaws:

Award 1 mark for name of flaw, and up to 2 marks for the explanation if flaw not named, can award up to 3 marks for good explanation.

Argument 1. Appeal to Authority (1)

Just because the legal *establishment* sneers doesn't mean they are right to sneer. (1 mark)
Authorities can still be wrong, eg when slavery was legal (3 marks)

NB award 1 mark only if focus is on 'sneering' as insufficient to prove the conclusion.

NB Not in spec for Unit 1, but some students may know this.

Argument 1. Mistaking legal for moral. (1)

Just because an eye for an eye may be legally scorned doesn't mean it's morally wrong.
One can have bad laws that make morally good actions illegal. (2)

Award up to 3 marks for explanation of 'legal for moral'. (3)

Argument 2. Appeal to popularity. (1)

Just because retributive justice is approved by the majority (the public), doesn't mean it's right. The majority used to approve of slavery but it was still wrong. (2)

Max 1 mark for "appeal to history" based on word "continuing".

Possible appeal to emotion (1), or strength of feeling, implied by the phrase 'continued hold on the sentiments of the public'. Just because something feels so strong it doesn't mean it can't be wrong. (2)

NB If candidates focus on dubious claims in the premises, eg that all of the legal establishment sneer, OR that all the public agree about retributive justice then max 1 mark for this on its own.

NB Award 1 mark if candidate merely says, "just because premise 1 is right doesn't mean to say (or "it doesn't follow that") the conclusion is true.

10	<p>Re-read the following paragraph from Document C before answering Question 10.</p> <p>The law of ‘an eye for an eye’, it is true, makes no attempt to deal with notions of forgiveness or rehabilitation, which are at the heart of modern systems of justice. Yet the state has no right to forgive an attacker on behalf of the victim – for it is uniquely the right of the victim to decide whether to forgive or not; as for rehabilitation, that is a valuable social tool, but it has absolutely nothing to do with justice as commonly understood.</p>				
No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
10	Comment critically on the quality of Lawson’s reasoning. (8 marks)			8	

Level	Marks	Description
Good	6–8	Largely or impressively effective comments focusing on central issues concerning the validity of the reasoning, its point, and soundness. Does not need to be fully comprehensive to get all 8 marks. Clear attempt is made to grapple with several points in the reasoning.
Intermediate	4–5	Some reasonably effective / relevant comments on the logic / reasoning of the argument but partial critique with some points missed.
Basic	1–3	Mostly paraphrase or analysis (max 3). Misses the crux of the matter and focuses on minor points eg. the use of an emotive word, or disputing the truth of a claim. Likely to be assertive rather than evaluative. Only paraphrase or analysis (max 2).

General summary of a good answer:

A counter claim / argument is considered, which states that an eye for an eye makes no attempt to deal with notions of forgiveness or rehabilitation.

Two replies are given:

1. The state has no right to forgive an attacker on behalf of the victim
2. Rehabilitation has absolutely nothing to do with justice, commonly understood.

Response 1 is effective because the logic of the concept ‘forgiveness’ does indeed preclude anyone other than the offended party from forgiving the culprit. Only the person wronged is entitled to forgive. This means that the counter claim in this respect is irrelevant.

Response 2 is weak because although it is indeed true that rehabilitation has nothing in common with justice commonly understood, rehabilitation may nevertheless be preferable to that sort of justice. So response 2 misses the point of the objection, which is that rehabilitation is a better way of dealing with such crimes. Merely saying that the two methods are different does not address this objection because the objectors already know this.

Specific points and mark allocation

Lawson begins with what can variously be described as a counter claim / counter argument / concession, that "...'an eye for an eye' makes no attempt to deal with notions of forgiveness or rehabilitation, which are at the heart of modern systems of justice."

The gist / core / thrust of this counter argument is that forgiveness and rehabilitation are good / valuable things which 'an eye for an eye' fails to achieve, so it is a bad idea.

Lawson's reasoning involves an attempt to deal with / reply to both these changes contained in the counter argument.

(maximum of 2 marks for candidates who explain this structure of counter argument and reply, even if they don't evaluate Lawson's response.)

NB These 2 marks may be added on to the marks for evaluation.

Lawson's first response:

"...Yet the state has no right to forgive an attacker on behalf of the victim – for it is uniquely the right of the victim to decide whether to forgive or not;"

Critical Comment

Lawson's first response is effective because he is right about the notion of forgiveness. It does indeed make it impossible (logically) for someone other than the victim of an injustice to forgive the criminal on behalf of the victim. Only the victim has the prerogative to forgive their attacker. So this objection to 'an eye for an eye' is refuted because it demands the impossible from such a law.

(up to 3 marks for an assessment along these lines)

Some candidates may take a different line and argue that there is more to be said for the objection.

For example, that although the state / law can't forgive on behalf of the victim, it should still set an example of forgiveness to the victim.

(2 marks for this line of reasoning)

OR: That the state may also have a right to decide whether to 'forgive' a criminal, because it may also feel wronged in that the criminal has harmed one of its citizens.

Others may argue that Lawson is right because it's not the state's / law's job to forgive. It's job is to punish / administer justice.

(maximum 2 marks for an answer along these lines)

NB If candidates combine a number of these evaluations on 'forgiveness' then maximum 5 marks for this if they don't deal with the 'rehabilitation' issue.

Lawson's second response:

“... as for rehabilitation, that is a valuable social tool, but it has absolutely nothing to do with justice, as commonly understood.”

Critical Comment

Lawson's second response is weak. The main weakness lies in the fact that even if it is true that rehabilitation 'has absolutely nothing to do with justice as commonly understood', rehabilitation may nevertheless be preferable to that sort of justice. Lawson has not addressed this point, so his second response misses the point of the objection, which relies on the assumption that rehabilitation is a better way of dealing with such crimes. Merely saying, as he does, that rehabilitation is not the same as justice commonly understood, is ineffective because the objectors already know this.

(3 marks for good answers along these lines)

Candidates may fasten on lesser weaknesses in Lawson's second response.

Among these are:

- 1 “absolutely nothing to do with” is an exaggeration / hyperbole / overstatement which weakens his case. (2 marks)
- 2 “justice as commonly understood” is too vague to be of use to the argument. What does “commonly understood” actually entail? How common is “common”? (2 marks)
- 3 How does Lawson know what the so-called common understanding of justice is? Isn't this a guess / subjective judgment? (1 mark)
- 4 Lawson might be wrong. Perhaps the common understanding of justice might include the idea that it is fair / just to give someone a second chance or that no-one is beyond redemption and that we should at least try, ie rehabilitate them. (max 2 marks)
- 5 There may be a hint of an appeal to popularity in Lawson's claim about justice as commonly understood. Just because most people think of justice in a certain way doesn't mean they are right. (max 2 marks)
- 6 On the other hand, if we're dealing with legal issues or the law in a democratic society, surely what the common populace thinks is politically relevant, so perhaps Lawson has a point. (max 2 marks)

NB Maximum 5 marks for a combination of these points if candidate does not comment on forgiveness objection and Lawson's first response.

Section B (see Generic mark-grid, page 18)

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
11	<p>Write a reasoned argument in response to the following claim.</p> <p>‘An eye for an eye’ is both wrong in principle and unworkable in practice.</p> <p>In your answer you should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • state your conclusion (or conclusions) clearly • offer effective reasoning to support your conclusion(s) • use the information and respond to issues or arguments, in the source documents. <p style="text-align: right;">(20 marks)</p>				20

Candidates may take the title claim as referring either just to the legal system or to society and individuals in general in their daily lives, eg vigilantes, feuds, etc.

Examples of specific points / arguments:

Arguments **against** ‘an eye for an eye’

Gandhi quote / bad consequences

Barbaric / immoral /cruel / torture

Two wrongs don’t make a right

It makes you just as bad as the person who wronged you

It’s revenge and revenge is wrong

So is rape for rape right? Surely not. So eye for eye can’t be right.

Blinding him won’t bring back her sight

What about forgiveness instead? Isn’t this better?

What about rehabilitation?

‘Eye for an eye’ doesn’t deter.

Impractical, eg If in a minor car crash, who would want to crash into the other person again in retaliation?

If a person kicks your cat what can be done if they don’t have any pets?

What can be done if you are burgled by a homeless person?

It’s an inhuman abuse of the criminal’s human rights as stated by the UN.

Arguments **for** ‘an eye for an eye’

Gandhi’s warning is a slippery slope – it would never happen

Calling it ‘barbaric’ is question-begging.

Calling it old-fashioned is an appeal to history

The two wrongs don't make a right argument, a) begs the question, and b) is disputable via analogies with other areas (eg colours, chemicals, maths).

What's wrong with revenge? It could be a form of rough justice, or even smooth justice.

It doesn't make you as bad as them because their attack on you was unprovoked whereas your revenge attack on them was provoked.

No need to argue for 'an eye for an eye' across the board. We can draw the line at morally wrong examples and impractical ones.

It's not necessarily torture, but if someone has tortured you what would be wrong with torturing them in return?

Blinding Movahedi won't bring Bahrami's sight back but it was never intended to, so this is irrelevant. We're talking retributive justice, not medical recovery.

We're talking justice, not rehabilitation, deterrence, or forgiveness.

What about victims' rights?

Generic mark-grid for Section B:

	Award Level		
	Good response	Reasonable response	Limited response
Descriptor	Criteria well met. Communication is clear and appropriate.	Criteria partially met. Communication is mostly clear and appropriate.	Criteria barely met. Communication errors may impede understanding.
Conclusion A conclusion is clearly stated that is consistent with the reasoning, and directly responds to the question.	3	2	1
Reasons / Lines of Reasoning The above conclusion is well supported with reasons, contributory arguments, examples, clarification of terms. Counter-arguments considered and replied to.	9 – 11	5 – 8	1 – 4
Use of source documents Candidate has engaged critically with source material.	5 – 6	3 – 4	1 – 2

Distribution of marks across the questions and assessment objectives for Unit 1

AO Balance	AO1	AO2	AO3
Total Section A	24	26	–
Total Section B	–	–	20
Paper Total: [70] Marks	24	26	20
Paper Total: Percentage	34%	37%	29%