

A Level Philosophy

PHIL2: An Introduction to Philosophy 2

Exemplar Responses to the June 2010 Examination





AS Philosophy: PHIL2

Exemplar responses to the June 2010 examination

Theme 1: Knowledge of the external world

01 Describe the representative realist account of a perceiver's relation to the external world.

(15 marks)

Representative realism argues that we do not perceive the world directly, but instead experience an indirect representation of the real world, which combines an awareness of external, physical objects with our own sensory reactions.

According to a representative realist, the perceiver's experience consists of both these primary and secondary qualities. Certain qualities such as colour and sound can be shown to be sensory reactions to external phenomena such as electromagnetic radiation and particle vibration; these qualities do not, therefore, exist objectively, instead being a perceiver's way of compartmentalising and comprehending these phenomena. However, other qualities, such as mass, quantity, size and shape, could be said to be 'primary'. In being contained within external objects and so not contingent or dependent upon the perceiver's experiencing them.

For example, a representative realist would argue that within an apple, its mass, size and shape are all features of the external world, and so exist beyond perception. However, its red colour and its taste would be secondary and not contained within the object itself. In this way, these secondary qualities which make up our sense data could be said to be illusions of sorts: they are in a sense products of our experience. However, the representative realist would argue that primary and secondary qualities are linked causally and so are relevant and important to the object. In the case of the apple, its colour and taste may be able to tell us whether it is ripe or not.

Therefore, according to a representative realist, the perceiver experiences the world through what could be called a 'veil of perception', whereby we do not see the world directly, or as it exists objectively, but as a collection of secondary sense data, and so our perception is in this way indirect.

The response to this question is detailed and covered several key features of representative realism. There is a detailed account of the primary/secondary quality distinction which has been illustrated to further demonstrate that the candidate can apply the theory to a particular object of perception, in this case an apple. There is also a reference to the fact that there is a causal link between the external world and primary and secondary qualities and they also draw out the implication that such a view entails that we view the world through a veil of perception. Although the candidate recognises that the immediate objects of perception are sense-data, this could have been more explicit. There is also a suggestion that the candidate seems to think that sense-data only has secondary qualities.

The mark awarded was 13/15

02 'Grass is green.' To what extent, if at all, is this claim philosophically naïve? (30 marks)

The philosophical position which suggests that the grass is green, and that our perception of the greenness of the grass is unmediated and directly in line with the nature of the grass itself, is known as 'direct realism', or sometimes 'naïve realism'. Direct realists argue that our perception and knowledge of the external world is direct and unmediated, and is in line with the nature and existence of the external world itself—we experience the grass as being green, so it must be so.

This philosophical position is described as being naïve by some for a number of reasons, firstly in relation to how the position of direct realism accounts for illusions. A proponent of this argument from illusion would refer to a stick, which when half submerged in water, appears to have bent under the surface of the water. If our perception of the external world is directly in line with the nature of objects themselves, then would the stick not be physically bent underneath the water? The same can occur with the previously given example of green grass—if the grass that appears to be green is not actually green, but is instead grass that has been painted white, with a green light shone on it, how would the direct realist account for such illusions? The position of direct realism can be seen as philosophically naïve in this scenario, as if our perception of the external world was to be directly in line with its true nature and existence, the stick would have to be physically bent, or the painted grass would have to be physically green, and this is not the case.

However, in response to this, a direct realist such as the philosopher JL Austin would appeal to the sciences, and argue that the illusion of the bending stick can be scientifically and empirically explained by the refraction of light in water, and that while our original viewing and perception in this case was not directly in line with the nature of the object itself, our perception is still unmediated and direct—it is merely contingent upon other factors in the external world, such as the refraction of light, and the properties of water. While there exists illusions such as light refraction or mirages, or indeed the example of the white painted grass, this is the result of scientific phenomena, and does not lead to the conclusion that our perception is somehow mediated, and that we are somehow viewing the external world behind some kind of 'veil of perception'.

Despite this, there exists another problem with the view that our perception and knowledge of the external world is direct and unmediated—how would a direct realist account for hallucination? If one was to hallucinate and perceive a pink elephant jumping around the room, and our perception of the world was to be direct and unmediated, would this not mean that the pink elephant would be an existing object in the external world? The same can be illustrated in the example of green grass—if one was to hallucinate and view the grass as red, and our perception of the grass was to be directly in line with the nature of the grass, would that not make the grass red? And as a result of this, how do we not know that we are constantly hallucinating?

The direct realist would then respond to this by claiming that hallucinations are highly rare phenomena, and have not been experienced by the majority of people. There exists a large degree of consensus among most people in the world that the grass is not red, but is green. The direct realist would also again appeal to the sciences and explain that hallucinations can be scientifically and empirically explained as irregular chemical activities in the brain, and certainly do not say anything about the existence of the external world. There is no gap between our perception of the external world and the nature of the external world—our perception (and irregularities in our perception) is again contingent and dependent on other factors of the physical and external world itself, such as irregular chemical and electrical brain activity.

The final argument suggesting that the view 'the grass is green' is philosophically naïve, and that our perception of the external world is not unmediated and not direct, is the argument from time lag. Opponents of the philosophy of direct realism could attempt to argue against direct realism by pointing towards examples such as the difference in time between lightning striking and hearing the sound of thunder, to suggest that there is a gap between our perception of the external world and the existence and nature of the external world itself. The opponent of direct realism would suggest that if the direct

realism was indeed correct and our experience and knowledge of the external world was to be direct and unmediated, there would have to be a physical gap in time between the action of lightning striking and the sound of thunder—which is indeed not the case.

Despite this, direct realists such as JL Austin are able to respond by again appealing to the sciences in this situation, and arguing that the time lag between thunder and lightning can be scientifically explained by our distance from where the lightning strikes and the speed of sound. Just because there is a time lag between the lightning striking and the sound of thunder does not mean there is a gap between reality and our perception of reality, it merely means that our perception of the external world is dependent on various other factors. Our perception of the gap in time between thunder and lightning does not suggest anything about the nature of our knowledge of the external world, apart from the fact that it is contingent upon other physical and external factors such as the speed of sound and our distance from a lightning bolt.

In conclusion, despite the various problems and arguments against the view that 'the grass is green' and against the philosophical standpoint of direct realism, it is apparent that direct realists such as JL Austin are able to successfully deal with these problems by appealing to the sciences, and explaining that illusions, hallucinations and time lags do not suggest that there is a gap between our perception of the external world and the nature of the external world itself, merely that our experience of the external world is dependent upon other external and physical factors.

The response starts off with a clear exposition of the theory associated with the question, i.e. direct realism. They then move on to give a series of lucid and well illustrated accounts of the standard objections that are levelled at direct realism, including the problem of illusion, the problem of hallucination and the problem of time-lag. In each instance the candidate was well acquainted with the kind of response that could be given by the direct realist in terms of an appeal to external factors to account for what we directly perceive. For instance, in the case of illusion direct realists can respond that we directly experience the refraction process when we perceive the bent stick in water. The response to the problem of hallucination was reasonable. It started off well, but could have made more of the point that hallucinations are rare by referring to the idea that we only know the 'rare' by comparing it to the 'normal' (e.g. a Norman Malcolm style argument). Instead they explained it in terms of brain processes, but that is not totally convincing as there is still something that I see... sense-data? There was also some blurring of the distinction between an illusion and hallucination in the illustration. A similar point can be said about the time-lag argument. Yes, the direct realist can appeal to science here, but the real implication is that we directly experience the world in the past. However, despite these remarks it was refreshing to see that a candidate had directly tackled and tried to present a balanced view of direct realism rather than dismissing it very early in the essay.

The mark awarded was 3+14+7=24

Theme 2: Tolerance

03 Explain and illustrate two ways in which the idea of tolerance appears to produce paradox or contradiction. (15 marks)

One of the justifications for tolerance states that it is necessary in order to maximise autonomy within a society. Autonomy is a person's potential to choose and so means their potential to gain happiness. Maximising autonomy, therefore, maximises happiness. This is a utilitarian argument. Because tolerance allows people to do what they wish within the private sphere, in theory it would produce maximum autonomy, but this is not always the case. Suppose a group of individuals exist who do not accept the virtues of tolerance, and if they were able to alter society in line with their own conception of the good. Their intolerant attitudes may lead them to severely reduce the freedoms of their own household, and in some cases (such as with fundamentalist sharia groups) may marginalise women within their community. The paradox here is that a tolerant society would allow intolerant fundamentalists to live the way they see fit, even though their views are restricting others' freedom. In this case tolerance of such individuals may reduce autonomy rather than maximising it.

Another justification for tolerance is the view of pluralism. Pluralists believe that any single belief system has the potential to be the truth, so it would be wrong to say that any one view is 'right' or 'wrong'. But once again we have a paradox, because the mere action of saying 'it is wrong to judge the views right or wrong' is judging a view wrong. Tolerance advocates pluralism, but within the principle of tolerance one must accept that tolerance is the 'right' belief. With this paradox tolerance is in danger of becoming a dogma, which is a contradiction of its essential principles.

The candidate takes time to explain to unpack a reason for being tolerance, but then smartly applies this account of tolerance to an example related to individuals and groups that are themselves intolerant. The nature of the paradox is clearly presented. The second example is reasonable, though there is some suggestion of blurring with the first example. Note that they refer to the virtue of tolerance in the first example, but that the second example is also one that is referring to morality. There is also no illustration of the second example.

The mark awarded was 12

04 'A tolerant society should accept cultural expressions that it finds offensive.'

Discuss.

(30 marks)

In this essay I will discuss the claim that a tolerant society should accept cultural expressions that it finds offensive. To attempt to answer this question I will use various viewpoints of tolerance including those of the liberals and conservatives and see whether the claim is valid.

Tolerance is the view that you ought to accept the beliefs and practices even if you do not like or wish to engage in their expressions. Usually there are two main ways in which tolerance is seen. Firstly tolerance is viewed as a virtue in itself and secondly as an instrument for peace and civility. Liberals tend to believe in the former, seeing that tolerance has intrinsic worth. This may be because that liberals stress individuality and autonomy and think tolerance is a virtue that an autonomous person should have. For example, an autonomous person should allow others to do as they wish as long as it does not harm others.

If we look at tolerance in terms with the other perspective and see it as a vehicle or instrument for civility and peace, then it would be correct to accept the claim that a tolerant society should accept cultural expressions it may find offensive as long as it keeps peace and civility. So for instance, if a radical atheist group residing in the UK and constantly tried to undermine religions and what they stand for and this caused offense, then it would be ok to tolerate them as long as they do not harm others. It would be right to tolerate them as if they were not it may cause an upset and result in violence. On the other hand if suppressing these radicals was better suited to cause peace and civility then a conservative may argue that this option would be preferred.

If we look at a liberal perspective then it may be more difficult to take action. Firstly, a liberal would ask what causes offense? An obvious answer would be to say anything that causes harm, however this leads to another issue of what is harm? Where do you draw the line? We cannot just be intolerant because it causes disgust. Another issue facing the liberals is paradoxes. These are two different scenarios a liberal may take when dealing with the previous example, they may tolerate it or they may not tolerate it. Tolerating the radical would mean that within your society there is an intolerant individual against your values. Does this mean that it is right to tolerate what the society sees as morally wrong? If they do not tolerate it, they are undermining tolerance, so either way there is a problem.

Conservatives tend to be pragmatic which means in this case they will only be tolerant of cultural expressions that it finds offensive if it works. This means that it sees tolerance as an instrument for peace and what works for society and if it is not useful it is not used. For example, a conservative tolerant society will tolerate and allow the use of the hijab covering the whole body of an Islamic woman no matter if it causes offense to others in society as long as it keeps peace. However, if they begin to suspect that maybe some of these women in society may be hiding weapons under the hijab then they will not be tolerated and made to not wear it as it promotes civility and peace.

From this discussion I have drawn three conclusions. Firstly the claim can only be justified to an extent meaning that all the viewpoints we have discussed have boundaries and none show complete tolerance, and in the case of the liberal society if it does then it causes paradoxes. Secondly, the conservatives' pragmatic approach to tolerance appealed most to me being the most cohesive and justified. Lastly, the liberal view point, although it had many positive views it showed too many contradictions and flaws for me to accept that a liberal tolerant society should accept cultural expressions.

The candidate starts by making a useful distinction between tolerance as having instrumental value and tolerance as having intrinsic value. However, they are hasty to draw the conclusion that liberals should be aligned with the latter, as liberals can, and do, also argue that tolerance is a means to securing progress, truth, freedom from strife, etc. The candidate is quick to draw out these points, but it creates a tension with their previous observation. However, despite this issue the candidate has a clear grasp of the demands of the question and they present their argument with some relevant illustrations including the idea of a radical atheist group trying to undermine religion and the tension that may exist between tolerating hijabs at the cost of undermining security. The last point was made in the context of conservatism. The content of this essay was relevant, with several points not only raised but discussed, and the argumentation, though not particularly convincing, was nevertheless present and cogent.

The mark awarded was 3+13+6=22

Theme 3: The value of art

05 Explain and illustrate two ways in which art might illuminate experience. (15 marks)

The first way that art could illuminate human experience is by imparting moral and spiritual values. The word 'illuminate' suggests the educational and enriching aspects of art; moral and spiritual values fulfil these criteria. Picasso's 'Guernica' is an excellent example, as it reveals a truth: that war is an aberration. If we simply read this statement in passing, we might agree with it intellectually, but it would make no deep impact upon us. But art enables us to absorb this truth, and it hopefully improves us as people. This view would give art a distinct value, as it would allow us access to 'deeper' truths and values that might usually be inaccessible.

A second view of art's ability to illuminate our lives focuses more on art's intellectual aspects. Aristotle argued that whilst we normally see specifics art can show us universals. Whilst Plato would say that art takes us further from the truth, Aristotle would respond it brings us closer. For example, perhaps 'The Hay Wain' by Constable shows us not a particular patch of countryside, but the epitome of 'countryside-ness'. The ideas art can impart are general rather than specific. This allows us closer contact with the truth, illuminating experience in that the truth arguably has spiritual value to human beings.

The response to this question is sharp. The candidate has clearly identified the demands of the question and has produced two examples of how art not only depicts, but also illuminates experience. The examples given in each case are also well chosen. On the one hand the candidate has referred to Picasso's 'Guernica' to show how art can illuminate us to the horrors of war. On the other hand the candidate has chosen Constable's 'Haywain' as example of how art can teach us about typicality, e.g. the quintessential, idyllic notion of the countryside. The response could have drawn out in more detail just how these pieces of art do this, e.g. reference to the grotesque form of the bull's head, or the elegant composition of browns and greens, etc. It could have also been slightly clearer on the difference between the two accounts.

Mark awarded was 11

06 Consider the view that only 'form' matters when properly appreciating art. (30 marks)

Throughout this essay I'm going to explain the view that only form matters as well as explain why some people believe that mimesis and expression may also be why some people value art, as well as why some appreciate art for its formal qualities.

Some people believe that only form matters when properly appreciating art because it highlights art's beauty. Form is the way particular colours, shading, brush strokes, come together to produce an aesthetic effect. Some people believe that form is the only important thing because it brings out all the artistic qualities; form is what makes an artist. It can be argued that form is what defines art and makes it special, because anyone can inform, copy reality or express emotion, but not everyone has the ability to sketch really well or compose music really well. Also, some people believe content is not important in art; formal qualities count alone. For example, Mondrian paintings are full of formal qualities, and they are appreciated for artistic qualities, the colours and brush strokes etc. Therefore, content is not important.

However, some people believe that art should be valued for its expressive property. Some people believe that art brings out human emotion of joy and tears etc, and therefore it should be appreciated.

Aristotle believed that art results in catharsis (emotional purging and cleansing). He believed this is why people watched tragedies because it made people emotional and cry at watching other peoples' lives. This in return made people happier, because they had gotten rid of all their bad emotions of pity and sadness. Thus some people believe that only expression matters when appreciating art. However, some people would argue that form matters more because anything can trigger tears or pity, it does not have to necessarily be art; whereas formal qualities are UNIQUE and so form should only matter.

Moreover, some people believe that only mimesis matters, because mimetic art copies, imitates or represents the 'truth of life' and that should be appreciated. For example, some people appreciate the film 'My Sister's Keeper' because the actors imitated people going through similar situations really well. The level of emotion was really high, thus its mimetic value was excellent. Nonetheless, some would argue that mimesis is just copying, and actors are just pretending so the piece of art isn't sincere. Therefore, form matters more, because form is unique and individual, it does not copy and is not 'fake', however actors are fake as they portray 'fake' emotions, because they are not going through that situation.

Additionally, some people believe that a piece of art's ability to inform us is what matters the most when appreciating art. For example, 'The Constant Princess' by Phillipa Gregory, informed me of the 16th Century and the life of Catherine of Aragon; the book gave me immense historical knowledge regarding that period. However some would say that anything could inform me, it does not have to be art. My AQA Philosophy book informs me and educates me, but it is not art. Therefore some would say that only 'form' matters when appreciating art because form is what defines art. Form is the 'artistic qualities' whereas art's ability to inform us is not sufficient alone to make us appreciate it.

However, people who disagree with this statement would argue that form on its own is not sufficient, they would argue that content is necessary as well, that to truly appreciate something there has to be a meaning, as story, a message, some content- and form lacks this, form on its own is void, same goes for a painting that has no content. They would argue that looking at a painting that only has formal qualities would not last for very long, because the audience does not have enough to capture them, as beauty alone is not enough.

To conclude, I personally believe that form does matter when appreciating art because form is what makes art unique. Nevertheless I do not think that only form matters, because I also appreciate art for its mimetic value, its informative value and its expressive value. I appreciate art using a combination of all these things.

The candidate's essay structure is conducive to good philosophical argumentation. Although they do present each theory they that they have been taught, they do not merely trawl through everything that they know. Instead the candidate engages in some comparative analysis, in each case identifying why the alternative theory fails to be a sufficient condition for appreciating art. For this reason they were rewarded appropriately for their assessment and evaluation. However, there was a lack of explicit expression of their knowledge of formalism, leaving the examiner to work out exactly how subtle their knowledge of this theory was. At the end there was an appreciation that non-formal qualities may not be sufficient, but there was no exploration of whether these qualities may be necessary, which is directly relevant to the question. There is also very little in the way of critical analysis of the internal arguments for formalism, with most analysis being drawn out comparatively. Nevertheless, a well argued response.

The mark awarded was 3+11+7=21

Theme 4: God and the world

07 Explain and illustrate one attempt to show that suffering is consistent with the existence of God. (15 marks)

The Irenaean theodicy would argue that suffering is soul making. This being that it helps you build up your character to its full potential. For instance if a loved one dies, you are made stronger through the suffering you go through. It could also be argued that as a result of having experienced losing a loved one you are yourself less likely to commit murder. Therefore you have become a better person: soul making. This is a gift that God has provided us with, the freedom to do otherwise so that we are able to exercise our free will to its full extent. Something that would be absent if suffering was removed. Therefore suffering is consistent with the existence of God because as a result of our free will we were also given suffering so as to be able to exercise our free will as well as possible.

The Irenaean theodicy also argues that God has placed an epistemic distance between us so that we are able to exercise our free will away from them. For example if we see God as analogous to a parent, a parent lets their child learn from their own mistakes, this includes them falling so that they can pick themselves up again. So looking at it now from the theistic viewpoint, God allows us to fall and stumble so that we can learn from our mistakes, this includes suffering. He puts an epistemic distance between us so that we can exercise our free will as well as possible. This includes suffering because as parent he guides us while allowing us to learn from our mistakes. Therefore God is consistent with suffering because as a loving parent He allows us to learn from our mistakes and this includes suffering.

In order to show that suffering is consistent with the existence of God the candidate has chosen the theodicy of Irenaeus. The details of this account are reasonable, with the candidate covering the ideas of soul-making, free will and epistemic distance, and linking these key ideas together in a reasonably coherent manner. There are some fairly good illustrations, though they could have been sharper, and although there is reference to the death of a loved one, it is not clear that this is meant to be an example of a natural disaster. Indeed, the distinction between natural and man-made evil is not sharp in this response. At one point the candidate claims that suffering is a result of free will, but it is not clear from the context of this remark why this should be so.

The mark awarded was 12

08 'The world appears designed, so God exists.' Discuss. (30 marks)

The 'design argument' explains that through looking at the complexity in the world and how everything seems to have been meticulously created we see how there must have been an intelligent creator as there must be no other option.

It is pushed in the form of a 'teleological argument' which has two forms, the first is through analogy (i.e. looking at process of design and comparing this to the universe showing a creator). The second is looking at elements of complexity in the world through experience and coming to the conclusion that a designer is the only option. They both use the idea that you can look at a result to see where it has come from as teleological= a study of ends.

Anselm explains that through looking at unintelligent creatures in the world we can see elements of design. Unintelligent creatures have a goal or purpose in life yet they must be led. As they are unintelligent they can't reach this purpose on their own and therefore a divine and intelligent being must exist to take them to this goal as they would not be able to do it without God. He used the analogy of an

archer leading an arrow. For an arrow to reach its target it must be led by a superior intelligence, i.e. an archer—for an animal to reach its goal it must be led by a superior intelligence i.e. God. This is a logical argument however when it was thought up Anselm believed that the earth and humans were at the centre of the universe and therefore God's focus. However, at the discovery that the world was not at the centre of the universe but the universe was a wide and complex mechanism that could exist independently we see how creatures can also exist independently of God's help. However, the complex nature of the universe could also be used to further the design argument as it shows a massive creation that could not have really been created by anyone other than God.

Paley uses the watchmaker argument (an analogy) to further the design argument. He said that in a watch we see a number of parts that work together harmoniously to form a motion therefore showing elements of design. He said that we can look at the universe in the same way and see elements of design more wonderful and complex than any thoughts a man could come up with therefore showing evidence of design from a superior being. Paley also anticipated criticisms by saying that things that did not seem to have a purpose (i.e. are not working together in a regular motion) do not disprove the argument as we have just not found their purpose yet.

Hume attacked Paley's argument from analogy by saying that as we do not have empirical evidence of the universe we can't make judgements on its design whilst with watches we have experience of mechanical design and therefore can see it. Paley would thus reply with that even though a person may not have known the watch had been designed they can still see the element of design within it. Hume again attacked Paley's argument saying that through general knowledge of mechanic design one can see that any mechanism has been designed, yet with the universe we have nothing to compare it to (i.e. another universe) and no relative experience of the universe and therefore can't make judgements on its design. Hume also made a few more criticisms saying that analogies work best when they are discussing subjects which are alike and that the universe would be better compared to the growing and decaying of a vegetable rather than a watch. He also inferred that machines have multiple designers, are the products of trial and error so does this apply to the universe? He finally brings down the teleological argument from analogy by saying that as we give God human attributes why do these not show in his creatures? Surely there would be mistakes like that of a human if we have given him mortal-like attributes yet they are not evident.

The design argument also talks about the idea of irreducible complexity pointing to that of the eye. The eye is made of numerous components i.e. iris, retina etc that all work together and only work as they are in a state of perfection (came into the world through God's creation of this state and would not work if one was missing). However, Darwin came up with his evolutionary theory which the creationists had to combat with intelligent design (the view that evolution was part of God's creation). Darwin's evolution also involves the eye showing how it also evolved and doesn't need perfection to work, showing that it didn't just appear into existence as the design argument explains. Darwin furthers this point that perfection is not needed saying that a partially sighted creature would do better in life than a blind one, again disproving the idea that perfection is needed in design (for it to work) therefore showing how science attacked the design argument.

To conclude, we see how the design argument from experience is clever yet as Hume said 'a clever man bases his assumptions on that of evidence'; showing that we clearly need evidence of creation to make a judgement, whilst Darwin's evolution... (candidate ran out of time)

The candidate starts the essay by demonstrating a very grasp of the design argument via a discussion of Aquinas (who they mistake for Anselm) and Paley. It is nice to see that the candidate cited a weakness with Aquinas' account in order to justify moving on to Paley, as candidates often merely juxtapose these two theories. They then moved on to criticisms levelled at Paley from Hume, and, again, it was good to see that these objections were not hurriedly listed but unpacked and discussed. The essay finished with a quick reference to the notion of intelligent design and a not all together convincing Darwinian reply; there are better examples of purported intelligent design than the eye. This essay would have benefitted from

less initial exposition, which went on for a page and a half, and more detailed discussion of the arguments. Nevertheless, this was a strong response.

The mark awarded was $3+15+7=25$

Theme 5: Free will and determinism

09 Explain and illustrate the distinction between an action and a mere bodily movement.

(15 marks)

It can be seen that there is an important distinction between action and bodily movement. An action is something which has significance and meaning. When one chooses an action it entails and conclusion. For example, the action to get married. If one explains they got married this presents only one certain conclusion. With bodily movements to say 'I went to the church and said I do', does not mean one got married just because they made particular bodily movements one makes when getting married. Furthermore, a bodily movement may have many different meanings whereas actions signify one meaning, conclusion or effect. For example, the bodily movement of raising one's arm may signify stretching, waving, asking a question and so on. However an action can only signify one of these things for example 'I waved to her'. This does not just mean I raised my arm but it presents the reason and action involved, rather than just the bodily movement.

The candidate expresses a clear grasp of the difference between an action and a bodily movement by citing several key aspects of the distinction. Actions are expressions of my free will; actions have a logical reason behind them; actions involve making a rational choice. Bodily movements, on the other hand, are characterised as 'reactions to stimuli'; instinctive; part of a causal chain; determined. However, some of these expressions are not precise. A soft determinist can believe in determined action, and depending on how you characterise 'rational', an action could still be an action if it issues from an irrational choice. The examples are accurate and enabled the examiner to decipher whether the candidate's understanding was genuine.

The mark awarded was 11

10 Explore the claim that free will is an illusion.

(15 marks)

This morning I made the decision to help an old lady across the road. I could say that this decision was my choice, and I chose to do it of my free will. However, a hard determinist would argue that it was only because of the neurophysiological state of my brain, the way the neurons were at that particular moment in time that caused me to help her. A hard determinist would say that it was only because I had been singing, which had released endorphins into my brain and made me happy, that I helped her and so on and so forth. It is only because of the various states I was in previously that caused one to act the way I did. In this sense it was an illusion and I did not use any free will.

One could also argue with psychology to say that my particular mental state and the series of mental states that went before that were the only reason I chose to do what I did and I couldn't have chosen otherwise given the previous mental states, however this is weak are there is

nothing to suggest our mental states (as causes) and our choices (as effects), it could very well be the other way around.

So if all physical objects fall under the law of nature then all physical objects are subject to determinism. My body is a physical object, human beings are part of the physical natural world. So it could be argued that my body falls under the laws of physics and my brain falls under the laws of psychology and neurophysiology. If this is the case then all my actions must be determined and free will is an illusion.

However Plato can counteract this argument, as a dualist he believes we have a soul from the realm of the souls. This explains the regularity in human actions that may cause us to think human actions are determined because like the realm of the forms all souls are bound to share a common trait that makes human behaviour look predictable. However, more importantly, if human beings had souls, something non-physical, then the laws of nature cannot apply and therefore determinism cannot apply to human choices. To say we have a soul would mean that choices could somehow be made by the soul and then transmitted to and carried out by the physical body.

In conclusion I believe that unless we have a soul then free will is an illusion as the laws of nature apply to humans and any differing result in human nature is a result of genetic and environmental factors. I think this can be proved by looking at particular sections of society. Take this north London liberal school for example, cliques have developed within the year 12 classes, these cliques consist of people with common interests. Everyone who is black seems to have common interests. Everyone who is working class seems to have common interests. This shows that upbringing and genetic and environmental factors have a huge effect on the kind of character a human develops. This can be shown in the broad similarities I have described above. This does seem to suggest that the choices humans make are determined. I do not claim that humans have no free will, clearly humans make choices. I only claim that the choices humans make are determined by factors beyond their control. Humans suffer the illusion of having options, but really there is only ever one option they will take.

The candidate starts with a nice example of a purported case of free will and then presents a hard determinist's analysis of this case. They go on to elaborate on this position in the third paragraph, though this does come after a very sketchy account of psychological determinism that does little to enhance the cogency of this argument. This account of hard determinism is then juxtaposed against an account of Plato's dualism where the candidate rightly notes that the fact that souls are non-physical entails that the laws of nature do not apply. This is also some interpretation of Plato's theory of forms as a way of explaining why determinism qua predictability is an illusion, rather than free will. This point was interesting but not developed. The candidate finishes by concluding that we are determined by our socio-economic and/or genetic histories but this is not qualified by any previous discussion.

The mark awarded was 2+9+4=15