

Version 1.0



**General Certificate of Education  
June 2010**

**Philosophy**

**PHIL2**

**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 meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting 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 the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting 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 to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2010 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.

## AS PHILOSOPHY

### GENERIC MARK SCHEME FOR QUESTIONS WITH A TOTAL OF 15 MARKS

<b>AO1: Knowledge and Understanding</b>	
<b>Level 3</b>	<p><b>11–15 marks</b></p> <p>Answers in this level provide a clear and detailed explanation of the relevant issue and demonstrate a precise understanding of philosophical positions and arguments. Illustrations, if required, are appropriate and properly developed.</p> <p>Answers at the bottom of this level are accurate and focused but <i>either</i> too succinct <i>or</i> unbalanced: <i>either</i> important points and/or illustrations are accurate but briefly stated so that significance is not fully drawn out <i>or</i> one point is well made and illustrated but a second point or illustration is less developed.</p>
<b>Level 2</b>	<p><b>6–10 marks</b></p> <p>Answers in this level may <i>either</i> list a range of points or blur two or more points together <i>or</i> explanation is clear but unbalanced so that a point is well made but illustrative material is undeveloped or unconvincing <i>or</i> illustrations are good but the point being illustrated is less clear and perhaps left implicit. OR If two points are required answers in this level may <i>either</i> clearly identify, explain and illustrate one relevant point so that a partial explanation is given <i>or</i> points may be well made but not illustrated. OR The response is broadly accurate but prosaic, generalised and lacking detail and precision.</p>
<b>Level 1</b>	<p><b>0–5 marks</b></p> <p>Answers in this level <i>either</i> make one reasonable point with little development or without illustration <i>or</i> provide a basic, sketchy and vague account <i>or</i> a confused or tangential account which may only coincide with the concerns of the question in places.</p>

*NB Answers may demonstrate characteristics of more than one mark band, for example:*

- *Points are clearly identified and explanation is detailed and precise (level 3) but only one point is illustrated (level 2). The response should be placed at the bottom end of level 3 (ie 11–12 marks).*
- *Two points are required but only one relevant point is clearly identified, explained and illustrated (level 2) and the second point and illustration is confused or tangential to the question asked (level 1). The response should be placed at the top end of level 2 (ie 9–10 marks).*

---

**AS PHILOSOPHY**
**GENERIC MARK SCHEME FOR QUESTIONS WITH A TOTAL OF 30 MARKS**

	<b>AO1: Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>AO2: Interpretation, Analysis and Application</b>	<b>AO3: Assessment and Evaluation</b>
<b>Level 4</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>15–18 marks</b> A clear and closely argued discussion of the issue incorporating a well-developed appreciation focused on some relevant philosophical issues by applying and analysing a range of points in some detail and with precision.	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	<b>3 marks</b> A sound understanding of some issues raised by the question, identifying relevant ideas/evidence.	<b>10–14 marks</b> Answers in this level are directed at the relevant issues but: <i>Either:</i> a narrowly focused response but detail is pithy and organised intelligently. <i>Or:</i> several issues are discussed but the application of points is less well-organised, the focus may drift or analysis may be less developed and unconvincing in places. Answers at the bottom of this band may be full but largely descriptive responses.	<b>7–9 marks</b> Answers at the top of this level provide a well thought out appreciation of some problematic issues raised by the specific demands of the question. Reasoning is employed to support the conclusion advanced. Lower in the band the critical discussion is not sharp and reasoning employed to support the conclusion is less well-developed. The response is legible, employing technical language accurately and appropriately with few, if any, errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar. The response reads as a coherent and integrated whole.

**GENERIC MARK SCHEME FOR QUESTIONS WITH A TOTAL OF 30 MARKS (cont)**

	<b>AO1: Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>AO2: Interpretation, Analysis and Application</b>	<b>AO3: Assessment and Evaluation</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<p><b>2 marks</b></p> <p>Answers are relevant but <i>either</i> fail to maintain a focus on the specific question <i>or</i> partial ideas/examples lack detail.</p>	<p><b>5–9 marks</b></p> <p>Answers in this level provide some relevant material but:</p> <p><i>Either:</i> points are raised but not developed, analysis is limited and the answer lacks organisation.</p> <p><i>Or:</i> the relevance of points may be unclear.</p>	<p><b>4–6 marks</b></p> <p>Evaluation is not sustained, although it is present.</p> <p><i>Either:</i> alternative approaches are juxtaposed without explicit comparison or assessment.</p> <p><i>Or:</i> a position is briefly stated but not adequately supported by the preceding discussion.</p> <p>The response is legible, employing some technical language accurately, with possibly some errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar.</p>
<b>Level 1</b>	<p><b>1 mark</b></p> <p>Answers in this level demonstrate a basic grasp of aspects of relevant issues. Responses may be sketchy and vague; <i>or</i> confused <i>or</i> largely tangential although at least one point should coincide with the concerns of the question.</p>	<p><b>1–4 marks</b></p> <p>Answers in this level are sketchy, fragmentary responses <i>or</i> an isolated relevant point appears in an otherwise tangential <i>or</i> confused response.</p>	<p><b>1–3 marks</b></p> <p>Critical comments are sketchy and fail to contribute to any explicitly reasoned conclusion <i>or</i> argumentation may be confused so that the conclusion advanced does not seem to follow.</p> <p>Lower in the band a view may be outlined without any critical discussion.</p> <p>Technical language may not be employed or used inappropriately. The response may not be legible, errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar may be intrusive.</p>

**Theme 1: Knowledge of the external world****Total for this theme: 45 marks**

**01** Describe the representative realist account of a perceiver's relation to the external world. *(15 marks)*

*Anticipate the following:*

Characteristically, representative realism maintains that:

- There is a material reality independent of our perception of it – an external world.
- Perception involves a causal connection between material object and perceiver. In some versions of representative realism (eg Locke) the causal link is elaborated in terms of the relation between primary and secondary qualities. Other versions (eg Russell) do not distinguish between primary and secondary qualities.
- Our perception of material objects is mediated via 'a veil of perception'. Our immediate awareness is of an 'internal' non-material something – 'ideas' or sense-data – that we take as representative of mind-independent external reality. How this representation is understood is various. Some explanation of what is meant by sense data.
- For some representative realists, perception discloses the primary qualities of material objects as they are in themselves. For others, we should not presume any resemblance between perceptions contemplated in 'phenomenological space' and the material objects such representations are supposed to map in 'physical space'.
- The claim that there is an external world is a hypothesis. (Russell)
- Consciousness is something like an exclusive 'theatre' populated by mental representations; or 'experience' is the field of our immediate awareness, contrasted with an external world described by objective science.
- May combine secondary qualities thesis with scientific descriptions.

*No marks are available for critical/evaluative accounts although relevant knowledge and understanding in such accounts should be rewarded.*

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

**Knowledge and Understanding**

Various philosophers can be cited in order to motivate a discussion of the points below: eg Descartes, Locke, Berkeley, Russell, Wittgenstein, Austin, Strawson, Sellars, Nagel.

Likewise, various philosophical positions might be referred to in order to develop the discussion: representative realism, direct realism, idealism.

**Interpretation, Analysis, Application**

Candidates should think about some of the following issues:

*There are various considerations that suggest that the claim is naïve:*

The claim is naïve because it innocently and falsely assumes that how things appear is how they are; this grass appears green because it is green and remains green even when unperceived.

- The appearance of grass varies depending on the conditions in which the observer perceives it. Presumably the grass itself remains the same. If so, the varying and transient colours we experience are not exactly the same properties as the stable material properties we attribute to the grass itself – it would be naïve to think otherwise.

- Because science provides the most objective account of reality we have, and scientific accounts of being grass do not refer to 'green', it is naïve to claim 'grass is green'.
- We are immediately aware of ideas or sense-data; directly acquainted with appearances. Such appearances are insufficient to justify a secure inference to the nature and existence of the external world. So, it would be naïve to assert 'grass is green'; rather only, I know grass appears green.
- Artists are expert about what things look like and an artist would think it naïve to say 'grass is green'; rather *this* grass looks a multiplicity of colours if you look attentively – it isn't really green at all.
- Grass can appear in various ways and there is no non-arbitrary reason for insisting that one appearance (eg green) has overriding definitive authority over any another (eg dark brown) – it would be naïve to think otherwise.

*There are various considerations that suggest the claim is not naïve.*

- Talk of 'looks', 'appears' 'seems' are used to qualify our assertions tentatively or partially – they do not imply direct access to an inner object of attention. When asserting 'grass is green' no inference is innocently being drawn from 'an appearance' to the supposed grass 'in itself'. We directly perceive the properties of objects we encounter.
- Saying 'grass is green' is claiming that under normal conditions, the material properties of grass are disposed to strike us as green. Being green is just having those material dispositions.
- Our certainty that in normal conditions 'grass is green' calibrates our mutual descriptions of the world we are interacting with. Such hinge propositions are not naïve hypotheses; and worries about 'favouritism' betray a misunderstanding of the use of 'grass is green'.
- Whether or not scientific descriptions of reality refer to 'greenness' is irrelevant unless you happen to be practising science. However, it would be naïve to believe that what science says exhausts 'the truth about reality'.
- What else could grass be apart from the sensory package (eg 'experiencing green and ...') that makes up our 'idea' of *this* grass?
- The naïvety of the novice painter is not an assumption that how things appear is how they are: rather, by not attending closely to the appearance of *this* grass they fail to capture its reality.

### Assessment and Evaluation

The above considerations can be used to advance a case for the following:

- In non-veridical experience the direct object of perception may be sense-data (e.g. disjunctive account). But this is not sufficient to conclude that the claim is naïve.
- Failure of perceptual variability argument. We expect and can predict that object look different under different conditions (Reid)
- Scientific descriptions do not **discover** that our common sense beliefs are wrong. They change the criteria for the application of terms. (Stebbing)
- May question the idea of **one** objective reality.
- The term 'green' refers to what we experience.
- As colour is a secondary quality, candidates may argue for the secondary qualities thesis.
- This may be combined with a physicist's account to establish the claim of naïvety.
- There may be discussion of the representative view e.g. how do we know what our sense data represent? Or how do we have the concept of a representation if all we are aware of are representations?
- The naïve account has problems with perceptual error – but how is it possible to recognise these errors?
- Although appearances of the grass may change under different conditions, the changes are not chameleon-like.
- There may be reference to Russell's **reductio**: the naïve claim leads to physics and physics, if true, shows the naïve claim to be false.

- I see the grass directly, not a green **something** called a sense datum.
- There may be other arguments used against naïve realism, e.g. time-lag, qualitative similarity, causal argument. These, together with standard criticisms, should be rewarded e.g. reification of appearances, the assumption that we know facts about physical objects to get the arguments started. The arguments are therefore self-defeating.



**Theme 2: Tolerance****Total for this theme: 45 marks**

<p><b>03</b> Explain and illustrate <b>two</b> ways in which the idea of tolerance appears to produce paradox or contradiction. <span style="float: right;">(15 marks)</span></p>
---

The idea of tolerance might appear to produce paradox or contradiction in the following ways:

- A person who refrains from acting on their prejudice for merely prudential reasons qualifies as tolerant – the stronger the latent prejudice, the greater the tolerance exemplified.
- Tolerance implies a limit and so a tolerant individual or society is inevitably intolerant regarding some matters.
- Tolerance permits and protects that which sets out to undermine tolerance. (political slant)
- Tolerance grounded in moral relativism/conventionalism has no authority amongst intolerant culture.
- Tolerance implies that it is morally right to permit and even defend what you regard as morally wrong. Might be references to Voltaire.
- Or, a moral duty to defend the morally repugnant.
- If tolerance is a moral virtue, then I cannot be virtuous in this sense if I lack the power to oppose. Thus the possession of virtue becomes contingent on the power I have.

The points above can be illustrated in various ways. For instance: the secular liberal who defends the rights of the religious fundamentalist; the ‘tolerant’ racist; the banning of religious/cultural symbols or clothing in public spaces or forbidding the public celebration of religious/cultural identities in civil society; safeguarding the legal rights of the would be despot; the relativist confronted with an intolerant cultural perspective.

*No marks are available for critical/evaluative accounts although relevant knowledge and understanding in such accounts should be rewarded.*

<p><b>04</b> ‘A tolerant society should accept cultural expressions that it finds offensive.’ Discuss. <span style="float: right;">(30 marks)</span></p>
--

**Knowledge and Understanding**

There may be an attempt to define tolerance, eg as involving objection, acceptance and rejection, before discussing why or whether a tolerant society might accept what it finds offensive. Candidates will probably refer to various political perspectives – in particular, varieties of liberalism – in order to motivate their discussion. There may be some attempt to argue for a limit to what is acceptable. Expect discussions of J.S Mill.

**Interpretation, Analysis, Application**

Examples of potentially offensive cultural expressions can be drawn from various sources such as religious practices, ethnic traditions, and manifestations of sexuality, humour and taste and so on.

Depending on the points stressed, candidates might distinguish between contexts in which the cultural expression is manifest (private, public, exclusive and inclusive institutional settings and so on).

- ‘Tolerance’ implies permitting objectionable cultural expressions – unless society found the expression offensive then accepting it would not be tolerance, just indifference.

- Tolerating offensive cultural expressions is required by any society that claims to value autonomy. Respecting a person's autonomy/right to choose over-rides the objection to what they choose.
- Tolerance of 'offensive' cultural expressions is inseparable from a society adopting a value-neutral stance on the governance of civil society.
- Insofar as the overall benefits of freedom of thought, discussion and action outweigh the costs of offence, utility recommends society tolerate cultural expressions it finds offensive.
- A limit to what is tolerable might be expressed in terms of harm. There may be some discussion of what harm is and/or of what should be included. Conservatives might argue that apparently self-regarding acts might undermine the moral fabric of society: radicals might be concerned that certain things are repressive and socially/psychologically damaging.
- The notion of 'offence' is ambiguous: whether or not something merely offends or causes harm is debatable and there is no value-neutral viewpoint from which we can decide where to draw the line between offence and harm.
- In multicultural societies there are bound to be differences amongst us. Tolerance should be recommended on the basis of minimising strife. Such pragmatism might be associated with conservative positions.
- Cultural expressions that undermine the values tolerance is supposed to protect and promote should not be tolerated in a tolerant society. This might be linked to either the moral paradox or the problem of imposing a limit: does a tolerant culture undermine itself by not taking a stand against cultural expressions it finds offensive?
- The idea of 'tolerance' is essentially contested and so whether 'a tolerant society' should or should not 'tolerate' this or that 'offence' is, by its very nature, an open question. What is contested is how tolerance 'pans out' in practice – do we 'permit' difference, 'co-exist' with it, 'respect' it or show some 'esteem' for it? It might be argued that some of these conceptions are more persuasive than others.

### Assessment and Evaluation

Candidates can argue for a variety of positions drawn from the material above regarding the motivations for tolerance, its scope and temper and the relation between these elements.

- If offence is allowed to count as harm, then is there some level of description at which virtually anything can be regarded as harm?
- We make assumptions of rationality and maturity amongst agents and can ask what is reasonable for them to tolerate.
- Mere difference is not **itself** sufficient for establishing harm. There has to be reference to what the difference involves.
- Conservatives may stress the importance of the continuity of a society and the conditions necessary for maintaining that continuity.
- A society is a partnership between the living and the dead (Burke). Our duty of tolerance is tempered by our duty to sustain that partnership.
- There can be borderline cases between self-and other-regarding actions but this does not imply that we can never distinguish them or that distinction is not useful.
- We can only **recognise** borderline cases because most of the time we **know** what lies on either side.
- Justifying tolerance in terms of utility may be morally dubious.
- The primary function of any government is the protection of its citizens. This included **all** its citizens and clearly has implications for a multi-cultural society.
- Tolerant attitude is the only one consistent with individual autonomy and choice.
- The above point might be elucidated in terms of discussions of democratic values, equality of opportunity, personal liberty and social responsibility.
- Alternative view-points have to be tolerated in order to accommodate freedom of expression. There may be a discussion of Mill's defence of such freedoms.

**Theme 3: The value of art****Total for this theme: 45 marks**

<b>05</b>	Explain <b>and</b> illustrate <b>two</b> ways in which art might illuminate experience.	<i>(15 marks)</i>
-----------	---	-------------------

*Anticipate two from the following:*

- The purpose of some art is to convey information (eg religious paintings, historical plays, protest songs).
- Art reflects the scene out of which it emerged and so can shed light on that background (eg cultural histories).
- Art should transmit authentic or worthy feeling from a genuine artist to their audience (eg art as having a religious or moral function).
- Art can nurture a sensibility which is susceptible to facets of experience that would otherwise pass us by (eg Eliot's '*...we had the experience but missed the meaning*').
- Art can ignite innate understanding that would otherwise remain latent (eg art therapy, Blake-like mystical insight).
- Art shows what good art is and the components which comprise it (eg art is purely aesthetic and art critics draw our attention to the relevant formal properties).
- Art may illuminate through empathy. Examples can be drawn from many sources:

Religious paintings might be used to express hope or sacrifice – to make us realise what was done **for** us. Novels, plays may express truths about the human condition or emotions (Macbeth/ambition and greed). They may also illuminate us in a literary manner regarding historical facts (Dickens's novels and the prevailing social conditions). They may illuminate present conditions, or make us see them in a new way, e.g. Lady Gaga video can be seen as a comment on the financial aspects of the music business. Protest songs may make us think about events, may provoke our consciences or lead to empathy. They make us think **philosophically** about recurrent trends in history, e.g. Donovan's 'Universal Soldier'. Examples are available for illustrating moral truths – importance of promise keeping/Pied Piper of Hamelin (Browning).

- Art can reveal truths without the need for formal explanation.

*No marks are available for critical/evaluative accounts although relevant knowledge and understanding in such accounts should be rewarded.*

<b>06</b>	Consider the view that only 'form' matters when properly appreciating art.	<i>(30 marks)</i>
-----------	--	-------------------

**Knowledge and Understanding**

Form focuses on the relations and orderings that hold between different elements comprising the work. Typical formal qualities are: balance, proportion, structure, harmony, symmetry, unity, wholeness, coherence.

Various philosophers, artists and critics might be referred to – the obvious being Bell.

**Interpretation, Analysis, Application**

A candidate needs to think about some of the following points:

**Possible Strengths:**

- 'Form' identifies the essence of art, realised in various ways across the different 'arts'.

- Focusing on ‘form’ explains how we can appreciate art without understanding or otherwise being in agreement with the ideas and feelings of the artist, the content of their work, or the original audience.
- The vocabulary of form distinguishes artistic judgement from other kinds of judgment.
- Form unites appreciating art with our appreciation of natural beauty: natural or found objects can have aesthetic properties because they have form.
- Form constitutes beauty and so the beautiful supervenes on objective features of the world, including art. Beauty is not merely in the eye of the beholder.
- If not beauty, ‘significant form’ picks out those features of an art work that express a peculiar ‘aesthetic emotion’.

**But possible weaknesses:**

- Everything has ‘form’ and so form fails to distinguish art from non-art.
- You cannot distil ‘form’ apart from the content of the work of art (eg what is the form of a poem apart from the meaning and associations expressed by it?).
- We cannot identify formal properties universally necessary or sufficient for qualifying as art.
- ‘Form’ is an ideological device for removing artists from real life and creating an esoteric community of ‘critics’ trading in cultural capital.
- The relation between form and the aesthetic properties that supervene upon them is mysterious if it only contributes to their beauty or value (copies, forgeries).
- ‘Significant form’ is a vacuous notion – the proper emotion is peculiar to the appreciation of ‘significant form’ and the ‘significant form’ is apprehended by way of the aesthetic emotion.
- Form matters, but so do other things.

**Assessment and Evaluation**

*A candidate can use the above issues to argue for the following:*

- Too much emphasis on form lead to artistic elitism. Only a select few would be able to understand.
- Does a beautiful landscape copy/capture a form already present in nature?
- Form clearly does matter, but it is the features that it relates which are of primary importance.
- Form in poetry can be regarded as that which enables meaning and association to be most clearly expressed.
- Form vital to painting, but the artistic value cannot be determined solely in terms of it. Credit should be given to the identification of other features.
- It may be argued that our emotional responses to art in general are not guaranteed by purely formally characteristics of the piece. Alternatively, it is form which channels the emotion and initially grabs our attention.
- The cult TV series, ‘The Prisoner’ has been described as the ultimate triumph of form over content. If all that mattered were form, then how is this criticism possible? Examples can be chosen from other fields of art to make a similar point.
- Form may be discussed in relation to film. The importance of other features e.g. characterisation, plot, acting, may be discussed in order to show that form is not the only consideration. Emotional appeal does not depend on form, but rather the situation.
- Candidates may approach the question by selecting a work of art, literature or film as a model of exploring what gives it aesthetic value. Such responses should be rewarded provided they focus on the issue of form in relation to other features.
- Candidates may focus on the use of ‘properly’ in the question. Is its use an attempt to make the claim true by definition?

**Theme 4: God and the world****Total for this theme: 45 marks**

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

God is supposed to be the all powerful and all loving creator and sustainer of everything. An all powerful and all loving creator and sustainer would abolish suffering. Nevertheless, there is suffering. Therefore, the existence of an all powerful and all loving creator and sustainer is called into question.

Candidates might distinguish between the 'logical' (God is impossible because contradictory) and 'evidential' problem (the facts render God unlikely). Better responses will use this distinction to shed light on how their chosen theodicy addresses the issue.

A theodicy attempts to show that God's existence can be reconciled with suffering. Anticipate the following points:

- An all powerful and all loving creator and sustainer is compatible with suffering because
  - (i) God is not the cause of suffering; suffering is the consequence of our (or Adam and Eve's) free will;
  - (ii) possessing free will is ultimately a benefit that outweighs the cost.
- God does not want us to suffer but has to allow it in order to afford the opportunity for spiritual growth or soul-making.
- From God's perspective the suffering we experience is perfectly intelligible as an aspect of the best of all possible worlds.
- God is all loving but not all powerful – God is engaged in a cosmic struggle to overcome evil and He suffers alongside us as we do. However, God has chosen out of love to take the risk of creation.
- See Tennant on natural evil.
- Tennant: moral progress is dependent on a stable background (laws of nature). Once these laws are in place, the possibility of harm is built in. Natural disasters occur within this framework.
- Suffering is necessary as it is logically required as a pre-requisite of certain good. It is logically impossible to feel sympathy, compassion etc without the occurrence of evils, and these are goods of the highest sort.

*No marks are available for critical/evaluative accounts although relevant knowledge and understanding in such accounts should be rewarded.*

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

**Knowledge and Understanding**

Various philosophical treatments can be cited in order to motivate the discussion of the points below. Anticipate reference to some of the following: Plato, Aquinas, Paley, Hume, Kant, Darwin, Tennant, Swinburne, and Dawkins.

**Interpretation, Analysis, Application**

A candidate should think about some of the following:

- What is the case for design? For instance, it could be argued that structure and regularity, fitness for purpose, exceptional or improbable fine-tuning, the anthropic principle, aesthetic 'benefits', irreducible complexity ...indicate design.

- What is the case against design? For instance, it could be argued that structure and regularity are ‘projected’ by us or merely assumed; fitness is a naturally selected function; there is arbitrariness in an anthropic perspective; the supposed aesthetic ‘benefits’ are merely subjective responses to a world devoid of aesthetic properties; there is pointless suffering and waste.
- What about the inferential machinery? How sound are arguments by analogy, probability, inferences to the best explanation? Is the analogy plausible or the only or most plausible parallel, what sense does ‘probability’ have here and how should we judge what is and what is not the best explanation? Do we inevitably end up anthropomorphizing ‘God’?
- Can we make a unique inference to God? Is an existent single supreme being the only option; or what about an existent malicious or indifferent being; merely a no-longer existing originator; many ‘less than supreme’ beings, a something we know not what?
- The statement ‘the world appears designed, so God exists’ is unverifiable and so meaningless.
- The statement ‘the world appears designed, so God exists’ is an expression of a commitment to explore the world as a Divine creation.
- God as best explanation of laws of nature.

### Assessment and Evaluation

Arguments can advance the following kinds of conclusion:

- Weaknesses of argument from analogy, e.g. world is not like a watch, similarities are too remote to permit inference to similar causes. The criteria that need to be satisfied by analogical argument (Hume).
- Analogy has unacceptable implications: could not infer God was perfect, all good infinite. Team of gods objection.
- Difficulties with probability arguments. How can you make such a judgement in a unique case? The only considerations are those of past experience and these are lacking. How do you **calculate** the probabilities?
- Probabilities regarding features of the world. Common examples: human brain, human eye, DNA molecule. Highly unlikely for them to emerge by chance.
- But in a universe of infinite possibilities, given there had to be some outcome, are they that surprising? Analogy with hand of cards – you had to be dealt **one** hand.
- Irreducible complexity is not irreducible. Examples from biology may be used to support the argument.
- Paley’s argument undermined by Darwin – at least in relation to some of Paley’s examples.
- Swinburne’s argument ultimately rests on analogy – regularities of succession caused by humans. This seems to refer to machines and their operation – but in what way is the universe **like** a piston engine or a DVD player?
- Design as an hypothesis – but what would count against such a hypothesis? Is it an hypothesis that allows us to explain and predict? Does it explain one event rather than another? Dissimilarities with scientific hypotheses.

**Theme 5: Free will and determinism****Total for this theme: 45 marks**

**09** Explain **and** illustrate the distinction between an action and a mere bodily movement. (15 marks)

*Anticipate the following suggestions:*

- Some actions are passive.
- An action is a meaningful or significant gesture, whereas a bodily movement is dumb.
- An action is made intelligible in terms of historically specific norms and values, whereas a bodily movement is explained according to universal biomechanical principles.
- Some actions can only be specified within a social context.
- Actions are motivated by reasons, good or bad, whereas bodily movements can be merely automatic. It makes sense to ask people why they perform actions, but not mere bodily movements.
- Actions, unlike mere bodily movements, are goal-directed.
- Talking about action implies an agent who can be evaluated and held accountable, whereas talk about mere bodily movements need not imply responsibility and choice.
- The same bodily movement can be involved in different actions.
- Passive action – waiting for a friend
- Social action – voting: this could not be even described without using socio-political criteria.
- The same bodily movement – raising your arm – two different actions, acknowledging a friend, bidding at an auction.
- Examples can be given of the relation of mental states to action e.g. intention, and contrasted with descriptions of brain states or reflex actions.
- Examples may be given of rational explanations and contrasted with causal ones.

*No marks are available for critical/evaluative accounts although relevant knowledge and understanding in such accounts should be rewarded.*

**10** Explore the claim that free will is an illusion. (30 marks)

**Knowledge and Understanding**

Various philosophers can be cited to motivate a discussion of some of the points below: Aristotle, Descartes, Hobbes, Hume, Kant, James, Marx, Sartre, Nagel, Williams, Honderich.

**Interpretation, Analysis, Application**

*A candidate should explore some of the following issues:*

- It looks as if an analysis of true/false propositions about future actualities show that what occurs at T2 must occur, if 'p' is true at 'T1. But must propositions be true or false prior to the state of affairs they propose coming to be?
- Could it be the case that everything is pre-destined by the will of God or fate, so free will must be an illusion? But what does that imply about God and is 'fate' a meaningful idea (cf 'fate keeps on happening')?
- If the undermining claim that 'everything is determined' outstrips the evidence, the status of the claim is questionable. Neither is it clear that the truth of determinism is entailed by the possibility or success of science.

- As a matter of fact, isn't there evidence that what we think of as instancing free will is the inevitable effect of causal processes we are not always or ever conscious of (eg neuro-physiological, psychological, social, historical, economic)?
- Determinism doesn't undermine the possibility of free will – it is compatible with free will. Having free will is acting according to our desires without impediment. Determinism is simply the claim that past regularities will continue into the future. So, whenever we anticipate an action by subsuming it under a generalisation (eg 'if he's that angry he'll lash out – angry people do that') we are acknowledging the compatibility.
- Even if free will is not compatible with determinism, we have more reason to believe in the reality of free will on the basis of experience than rejecting it on the basis of metaphysical abstractions or the generalities of science.
- Might it be that saying 'free will is an illusion' betrays bad faith and a flight from responsibility?
- On analysis, might it turn out that the conceptual location of 'free will' is not amongst the realm of causes? Free will only appears to be an illusion if you fail to appreciate it is a necessary condition for the possibility of being a rational moral agent. As a rational moral agent I am not situated amongst the empirical, but am instead a transcendental ego.

### Assessment and Evaluation

A candidate could use the above to argue that:

- The truth of propositions about the future is contingent on whether in fact they are instantiated but there is no independent necessity to make them inevitable. A similar point can be made about divine foreknowledge.
- Tarski's three-value logic, true, false and undecided. The third category could be used to categorise statements about the future that are made in the present.
- Free will is a ludicrous idea as it implies that human beings are not part of the natural order.
- Determinism is not a clearly defined thesis. Is it empirical? If so, what would count against it?
- Determinism and the circularity problem. We could predict all future events if we had sufficient knowledge. But 'sufficient' would seem to mean the ability to predict future events.
- That an action is predictable does not show that it is not freely chosen.
- Phenomenological aspects of free will might be discussed, e.g. anguish, remorse, dilemmas – what, if anything, do they tell us.
- Our ability to categorise some actions as determined presupposes that not all are, e.g. shellshock/cowardice
- If free will is an illusion would our moral/legal framework breakdown?
- Can compatibilism do the work required? A free action is one that could have been different. Can we choose differently in the same circumstances?
- Can compatibilism provide an adequate theory of punishment? Deterrence is not the only issue.
- Analogies with legal concept of strict liability are not that useful (Honderich). They fail to distinguish being held responsible from being responsible.
- There may be some discussion of Freud and/or Sartre. Freud in terms of free will as an escape from the truths of the operations of the unconscious mind: Sartre in terms of determinism being the illusion of trying to escape the fact of absolute responsibility.



---

- **ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVE GRID**

<b>AS Assessment Objective</b>	<b>Marks allocated by Assessment Objective part (a) question</b>	<b>Marks allocated by Assessment Objective part (b) question</b>	<b>Total Marks by Assessment Objective</b>
<b>AO1</b>	15	3	18
<b>AO2</b>	0	18	18
<b>AO3</b>	0	9	9
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>45</b>