



**General Certificate of Education
June 2011**

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

Copyright © 2011 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

	AO1: Knowledge and Understanding
Level 3	11–15 marks 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. 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.
Level 2	6–10 marks 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 generalised and lacking detail and precision.
Level 1	0–5 marks 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.

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 (i.e. 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 (i.e. 9–10 marks).*

AS PHILOSOPHY

GENERIC MARK SCHEME FOR QUESTIONS WITH A TOTAL OF 30 MARKS

	AO1: Knowledge and Understanding	AO2: Interpretation, Analysis and Application	AO3: Assessment and Evaluation
Level 4	N/A	15–18 marks 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.	N/A
Level 3	3 marks A sound understanding of some issues raised by the question, identifying relevant ideas/evidence.	10–14 marks 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.	7–9 marks 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)

	AO1: Knowledge and Understanding	AO2: Interpretation, Analysis and Application	AO3: Assessment and Evaluation
Level 2	2 marks Answers are relevant but <i>either</i> fail to maintain a focus on the specific question <i>or</i> partial ideas/examples lack detail.	5–9 marks Answers in this level provide some relevant material but: <i>Either:</i> points are raised but not developed, analysis is limited and the answer lacks organisation. <i>Or:</i> the relevance of points may be unclear.	4–6 marks Evaluation is not sustained, although it is present. <i>Either:</i> alternative approaches are juxtaposed without explicit comparison or assessment. <i>Or:</i> a position is briefly stated but not adequately supported by the preceding discussion. The response is legible, employing some technical language accurately, with possibly some errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar.
Level 1	1 mark 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.	1–4 marks 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.	1–3 marks 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. Lower in the band a view may be outlined without any critical discussion. Technical language may not be employed or used inappropriately. The response may not be legible, errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar may be intrusive.

Theme 1: Knowledge of the external world**Total for this theme: 45 marks**
01 Outline and illustrate two ways of distinguishing primary from secondary qualities
(15 marks)

- Primary qualities exist independently of our perceptions of them. They belong to the object itself. Secondary qualities depend for their existence on a relation between the object and us.
- Primary qualities are objective and can be measured mathematically. Secondary qualities are subjective and not quantifiable in the same objective way. Primary qualities tend to be accessible to more than one sense.
- Locke-type distinction regarding causal powers of primary qualities. They cause us to experience the secondary qualities which are effects in us. Inherent causal powers are a property of the primary qualities.
- Primary qualities are the subject-matter of physics' and chemistry's attempt to give an objective account of what the world is like. Secondary qualities are inessential for this purpose. A truly objective account of reality would omit secondary qualities.
- Illustrations of primary qualities may include: size, shape, mass, density, temperature. Secondary qualities: colour, texture, taste, smell, sounds (as opposed to sound waves), felt temperature (e.g. wind chill factor).

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

02 'Sense data theories cause more problems than they solve.' Assess whether this claim can be justified.
(30 marks)
AO1

- A grasp of the key terms, sense-data and a theory in which it plays a role. There might be some historical reference: Descartes, Galileo, Locke, Berkley, Hume, Russell

AO2

- Explanation of sense-data with examples. Contrast with physical objects.
- Problem with realism, e.g. illusions.
- Representative realism is the most likely sense-data theory, though others are possible, e.g. idealism, phenomenalism.
- Arguments in favour of sense-data theories: illusion, phenomenal variability, qualitative similarity, time-lag, science inspired arguments.
- Idealism as a solution to both problems of realism (material substance) and representative realism (linking problem).
- Physical objects as causes of sense-data.
- External world as a hypothesis for best explaining occurrence of sense-data.
- Nature of external world as mental, mind of God (Berkeley).
- There may be reference to phenomenalism e.g. Mill's physical object as permanent possibility of sensation. Or, Ayer's translation procedure regarding statements about physical objects into statements about sense-data.

AO3

-
- There is likely to be a critique of representative realism. Some of the following points are likely to feature:
 - We can explain, predict and expect perceptual variation on the assumption that we really see objects.
 - In the case of illusions it is not the world that becomes distorted but our view of it.
 - We cannot know there are physical objects and therefore cannot know their causal powers.
 - We could not describe something as a representation if all we had were representations.
 - Arguments from illusion commit the fallacy of the reification of appearances. In the bent stick case, there is no thing that is bent.
 - The preconditions for the possibility of recognising illusions and hallucinations.
 - Science-inspired arguments are self-defeating, at the very least they already assume the existence of a mind-independent world; they assume there are objects independent of us in the first place. Similar for time-lag arguments.
 - Deception of one sense corrected by others.
 - External world as a hypothesis leads to scepticism or solipsism.
 - External world cannot be a hypothesis in the normal sense. What would count against it? How can it relate to past experience and lead to the formulation of any probability judgement? Is it the most economical?
 - If idealism is used, expect a selection of:
 - God is just as incompatible with Berkeley's empiricism as Locke's matter.
 - Confusion/ambiguity in Berkeley's use of 'idea'. In the mind/before the mind.
 - Hallucinatory ideas.
 - Solves linking problem.
 - Limits our knowledge to minds and their ideas (Russell). But how much of a limitation is it when the mind is that of God?
 - Need independent proof of God's existence
 - Cannot distinguish phenomenologically from direct realism. Need this worry Berkeley? (a) no theories of perception are distinguishable phenomenologically, (b) Berkeley tells us that an idealist does not lose any object of common sense (Dr Johnson's mistake).
 - Any references to phenomenalism are likely to include:
 - Issues regarding a phenomenalist account of why two people looking in the same direction experience similar sense-data.
 - Translation problems e.g. statements about sense-data do not logically entail physical object statements and visa-versa.
 - Actual objects are caused by unfulfilled hypotheticals.
 - Criteria for saying that sense-data belong to the same physical object and the problem of perceptual depth.

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

03	Explain and illustrate two characteristics of a tolerant individual.	<i>(15 marks)</i>
-----------	--	-------------------

- Does not have to tolerate everything. There might be a distinction drawn between a tolerant individual and a permissive one. Illustrations are likely to include the kinds of things tolerated, e.g. opposing viewpoints, artistic expression, political expression.
- He will tolerate those things of which he disapproves. Certain actions and expressions of thought may clash with his values. Illustrative examples should be given. This needs to be contrasted with indifference or agreement where the issue of tolerance does not arise (examples).
- A tolerant individual would have the power of prevention or intervention but elects not to exercise that power. Illustrations may be given of cases where intervention has not occurred and contrasted with cases where it clearly has. Reasons may be given for not exercising the power, e.g. respect for rationality, integrity, freedom, autonomy of others. Examples may be used to illustrate one or more of these.
- A tolerant individual may hold tolerance as a moral value, i.e. an integral component of his value system. This need not imply unlimited application. Examples of its use might be given. Its coherence with other values may also be illustrated. This point might be approached through the social dimension of value systems.
- He will be prepared to participate/engage in open discussion, listening to alternatives. He will respect social institutions that encourage discussion and openness. Examples may be given regarding resolution of disputes, promotion of diversity, etc.
- He will oppose intolerance and willingly allow actions and opinions for which he feels no sympathy. He may encourage a neutral approach as to what constitutes a good life. Examples may include Voltaire's 'I disagree with what you say but would defend to the death your right to say it.' Mill's promotion of experiments in living could also feature.
- The issue might be approached through a distinction between intrinsic and instrumental value. Utilitarian-types of examples and counters.
- A tolerant individual may regard his own beliefs as fallible, and in doing so admit the possibility of being wrong. Historical examples might support this. Tolerance of other beliefs is thereby grounded in rationality and experience.

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

04	Assess whether a liberal society should tolerate religious minorities.	<i>(30 marks)</i>
-----------	--	-------------------

AO1

- There should be a clear grasp of what a liberal society is and what constitutes a religious minority. References to Mill, Popper *et al.*

AO2

- There may be some outline of a religious perspective together with examples of religious minorities.
- Differences in practices may be contrasted with or traced to differences in principle.
- Tolerance must amount to more than indifference. Respecting others' rights.
- Differences in following beliefs, customs and laws.
- Issues relating to the sovereignty of a nation.
- Benefits of diversity – both material and intellectual. Examples might be given.
- Better understanding of ourselves and others through acquaintance with alternatives.
- Liberalism and a commitment to multi-culturalism.

- Nature of democracy.
- Respect for others grounded in humanity or rationality.
- Practices that do not impinge (e.g. diet) on others, not genuine candidates for tolerance.
- Some religious tenets may be inherently offensive, hostile or dangerous.

AO3

- Appeals to benefits may result in regarding other belief systems as contingently valuable. The implications of change.
- Benefits established as above are often difficult to demonstrate conclusively and this raises issues of how disagreements can be resolved.
- Does tolerance towards a religious minority require some element of reciprocation?
- For any rational individual there are certain issues they must decide for themselves. Religious belief is one such issue. Failure to recognise this is a failure to respect their rationality.
- Issues relating to religion are open and no one should regard religious belief as sufficient warrant to be intolerant of others.
- The dangers of intolerance have been demonstrated through the lessons of history.
- Minority customs/laws should be subordinated to the law of the nation.
- There may be some discussion of security issues. It is the duty of any government to protect its citizens. This is the legitimizing function of **any** government.
- Anti-terror legislation is not specifically aimed at any one religious group. It is directed against **all** groups posing a threat to other citizens. This may be contrasted with Nazi legislation or similar.
- Paradox of democracy: minorities have the opportunity to become majorities. Does this only operate at the political level? Can a neat separation be made between minority religious beliefs and politics?
- Differences between tolerating and promoting. The Swiss government is still a *de facto* liberal society/democracy even after a negative referendum on promoting Islam.
- Mill-type arguments regarding the benefits of taking from each belief system. But can you do this when dealing with absolutes? Lively debates refresh the belief system. Challenges should be welcomed.
- There may be some discussion of which practices do impinge, e.g. the wearing of certain kinds of clothing.
- Is neutrality desirable – or even possible?
- Liberalism/tolerance are themselves values. Does this have implications for the possibility/desirability of neutrality?
- Locke's letter regarding religious tolerance might feature.
- Not only do people have fundamental rights to their beliefs, but, in the case of religious beliefs, there may be a recognition that coercion is not possible. Attempts to coerce will result in civil strife. Tolerance encourages social cohesion.
- It may be argued that religious activity is itself a minority practice. However, this would be a contingent fact about some societies. Also, many nations have an official religion and religion permeates many societies.

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

05	Explain and illustrate two reasons for regarding form as important in judging a work of art. (15 marks)
-----------	--

- It helps us to concentrate/focus attention on qualities within a work of art. Balance, symmetry, coherence, order, structure, harmony and proportion may be used to illustrate.
- Form can be realised differently in different arts but it is the common feature which unifies the work and makes it art. Illustrations from various fields might feature: poetry, music, painting etc.
- Form is the one property of a work of art which is intrinsic to it. It differs from the object represented or the emotions invoked, or the information conveyed. It is the work itself. Examples may be given of the differences with an explanation of how they differ.
- The concern of art is beauty and form can be regarded as constitutive of beauty. The formal features are necessary for conveying beauty, hence it is central to aesthetic appreciation. There may also be references to form and aesthetic emotion being intertwined. The formal features, even if not conveying beauty, convey an emotion which is dependent on those features.
- Form has a role to play in conveying information. The structural features of a work of art may illuminate the structural features of emotion or experience or the human condition.
- Examples of works of art may be used to illustrate the last two points. 'The Scream' would be an appropriate example relating to fundamentals of human existence or emotion. There may also be references to harmony or balance to illustrate these points.

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

06	'We value art because of the information it conveys.' Assess the validity of this claim. (30 marks)
-----------	--

AO1

- There should be a grasp of what could be meant by 'information'. There might be reference to theories that regard art as essentially imitative or representative.

AO2

- Being informative can be a feature of art without necessarily being the most important **artistic** feature.
- Works can have valuable information, either implicit or explicit, regarding the past. Examples of novels or plays are likely to feature.
- The relation between information and truth. If truth is what we pursue in art, then informative aspects are paramount.
- The information aspects of art, together with the various avenues of conveyance, broaden our cognitive faculties. We can learn lessons in new non-standard ways.
- Information aspects can sharpen our faculties of interpretation – there is a right interpretation, or some interpretations are more convincing than others and reasons can be given to support such claims.
- Does art have to inform in order to be art? Does the value of art **qua** art increase according to its information content?

AO3

- There might be some level of description whereby all or any art could be regarded as informative.
- References, with examples, to art conveying information together with an argument in favour of the claim that this is where its value resides. Or, an argument to show that the art would be valuable **as art** anyway.
- Historical information is useful – but to historians.
- Priority of aesthetic judgements should be in the direction of the mode of presentation rather than the information itself.
- Examples may be taken from atonal music, abstract painting etc to show that information is not essential or not important.
- If the primary concern of art was to convey information, are there not so many more efficient ways of doing this that it becomes hard to explain the origin and progress of some art forms.
- Related to the above: would anything be lost if the informative art was substituted by some other equally informative medium? Would it matter and why would it matter?
- There might be discussions of other features of art, e.g. emotional or formal content, but there should be clear focus on why information is less important, or why it is subordinate to them.
- Art may determine our experience of the world rather than tell us about it.
- Is our initial interest in art concerned with what it can tell me? Examples might be used to support either view.
- In what sense could a work of art be mistaken? Is this possible?
- If information was the primary concern then the above question would arise as naturally in art as in any other informative subject. Does it?
- There is no **one** truth that all subjects aim at. Truth is internal to the subject as are the criteria for achieving it – this blocks comparisons.
- Examples might be used to demonstrate or develop the above. The love poems of Catullus tell us something – a truth – about love that a psychological experiment could not.
- Art can be used to improve our understanding of the significance of non-artistic concepts, e.g. interpretations of the significance of the unconscious mind.
- Art in all its forms may be seen as an integral part of culture. Information about the world is an aggregate of the components of that culture. They supplement each other rather than compete with each other.
- Is imagination valued only in so far as it succeeds in being informative? Is this our criterion for aesthetic judgement?

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

07 Outline and illustrate **two** reasons for supposing natural disasters are compatible with the existence of God. *(15 marks)*

- This existence is not intended to be a paradise (Hick). The world is part of the process of soul making: we become souls or develop morally in the face of hardships.
- For the purpose of our moral development it is vital that good situations emerge from bad ones. They are not just better by comparison. Natural disasters afford this opportunity.
- They provide the opportunity for the use of free will to bring good out of evil and eventually create a greater good.
- We need a stable background for the possibility of moral development. Laws of nature provide this background but once they are in place disasters are possible. (Tennant).
- They provide the opportunity to increase our sense of being part of the 'human family'. The impetus to help each other ensures moral progress on a global scale.
- They provide conditions which are necessary for the attainment of the highest moral attributes – courage, sympathy and compassion. These are the kind of attributes which separate us from the rest of the natural order.
- If we assume religious beliefs hold independently of the problem of evil, then it might be argued that we should have faith that these evils will turn out to be part of some good. This might be hard to believe but we should have faith. Or, they are the price we pay for the misuse of free will – original sin.

Examples of various disasters historical or recent are likely to feature, together with responses to them and what emerged later. Expect implicit or explicit references to God's omnipotence and omni-benevolence in setting up the problem.

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

08 'We see examples of design throughout the natural world and conclude that an intelligent designer is clearly demonstrated.'
Assess whether this argument succeeds. *(30 marks)*

AO1

- A clear grasp that the quote involves the claim that the argument is from a designed world – the effect, to an intelligent designer – the cause.

AO2

- Examples of design, or apparent design, are likely to feature. These may be on a large scale or small scale.
- The strategy of arguing from analogy. Requirement of close similarity.
- Empirical nature of the argument.
- Expect references to man-made objects, especially Paley's watch, in setting up analogies.
- Arguing from spatial arrangements of parts (Paley, Cleanthes) or regularities of succession (Swinburne).
- Design as best possible explanation.
- Probability arguments in favour of a designer. Highly improbable for certain features of the world to be the result of chance e.g. DNA molecule, human eye.

- Incompleteness of scientific theories, e.g. evolution.
- Design should be taken as a working hypothesis.
- Appeals to various functions of natural processes may be discussed with examples.
- Such an impressive product points to a divine designer.
- Universe shows mathematical precision in its constructions.
- Epicurean hypothesis. Trial and error.

AO3

- Weakness of empirical analogy: the world does not look like a watch.
- Insufficient similarities to justify inference to similar causes.
- Team of gods objection if analogy is applied consistently. God's unity.
- Failure of argument to establish God's perfection. Universe contains faults. Examples should be given.
- Failure to establish God's infinity as we do not know the universe is infinite (scales example).
- Failure of trial and error objection as there is no empirical evidence of previous worlds.
- If the plan – ideas in God's mind – can fall into place without a cause, then why can't matter?
- Basing the argument on inadequacies in current science gives you a God of the gaps.
- Such inadequacies are merely an incentive to improve one's theory of matter.
- Design in living organisms is only apparent, not real. Darwinian explanations are likely to feature.
- The inference from world to God fails to show that God is not sexual or mortal (Hume).
- Swinburne's argument that any creator of laws of nature would have to be incorporeal. This would dispose of the sexual/mortal problem.
- Swinburne's argument also rests on analogy (with machines) and is therefore vulnerable to the similarity objection.
- Difficulties of applying probability arguments to singular, one-off-events. Requirement of past experience.
- Problems with chance arguments – there has to be one outcome of many highly improbable ones so why should we be so surprised with *this* outcome? Examples of dealing hands of cards might feature.
- Problems with the notion of a hypothesis. Does it explain one feature rather than another? Does it enable prediction? Does the hypothesis of a designer or design differ in its power from the Epicurean hypothesis? There might be some reference to Flew, Wisdom and the gardener parable.
- Universe does not show any ultimate purpose. Generation of plants and animals shows no purpose.
- Design should be seen as at least posing a question even if we can't derive a definite conclusion from the arguments.
- How well do naturalistic explanations account for aesthetic experiences of the world?
- Design is part of the religious perspective – seeing the world in a particular way. However, this kind of response owes us an account of what those who **argue** for design are actually doing.

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

09	Explain and illustrate the distinction between determinism and fatalism.	<i>(15 marks)</i>
-----------	--	-------------------

- Determinism as the view that all future events are determined by prior causes. The inevitable outcome of inviolable laws of nature.
- References are likely to be made to predictive power (Laplace).
- Assumption of scientific world view.
- Fatalism may be explained in a crude form of whatever will be will be – no point in taking precautions, more precisely, that choices do not feature in the causal chain, they are epiphenomenal. Or, in a religious form, God's plan or predestination of the soul. Or, a more sophisticated version – logical fatalism. Statements about the future made now have a truth value now.
- The illustrative aspect may be satisfied in a variety of ways: scientific theories, social or psychological determinism may feature (Marx, Freud and Skinner). Fatalism may be illustrated by e.g. the sailor saying there is no point in learning to swim, religious thinkers like Luther and Calvin may be used. Logical fatalism may be illustrated by Aristotle and the sea battle or similar examples of statements about the future.

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

10	Assess the claim that we are responsible for our actions.	<i>(30 marks)</i>
-----------	---	-------------------

AO1

- An understanding of the key concepts of freedom, determinism and responsibility and how they connect.

AO2

- The thesis of determinism in relation to the issue of moral responsibility.
- The rationality of attributions of praise and blame. The pre-suppositions of such applications.
- Kant's ought implies can.
- Universality of causal determinism. Can there be exceptions?
- Determinism in the spheres of the mental and the physical.
- Conflicts with freedom.
- Phenomenological aspects of freedom e.g. what does the structure of remorse reveal?
- Concepts of absolute or radical freedom e.g. Sartre.
- Freedom as a fundamental cornerstone of our legal system.
- Examples of actions thought to be in our control which science has shown not to be the case e.g. shellshock.
- Analysis of what such examples show and their limitations.
- Difficulties in regarding our own actions as determined – eventually we would talk nonsense.
- Differences between 'how' and 'why' questions.
- Attempts to reconcile freedom and determinism with the preservation of moral responsibility e.g. Hume, Honderich.
- Application of legal concept of strict liability and its implications, e.g. Honderich.
- Distinctions between action and movement.
- Differences in conceptual schemes of free action and physical movement.

- There might be some reference to religious aspects but this should not be the central focus.
- Use of prediction in natural science and its use in the sphere of human action (as reference to social scientific statistical laws/trends)

AO3

- It is just too hard to accept that human beings are not subject to laws of nature/exempt from the operation of such laws.
- Human actions will ultimately have physical causes identified.
- Alternatively, our actions are caused by our mental states and these are not subject to the same rigorous laws.
- We could not even begin to make sense of human actions without assumptions of freedom and responsibility.
- Determinism is not universal in the physical realm e.g. quantum physics.
- Would indeterminism in physics have any relevance to the free-will problem? Issue of responsibility?
- Human actions can be accurately predicted without implying they are not free or that we are not responsible.
- Conceptual framework of freedom is phenomenologically grounded and therefore not subject to revision.
- Same physical movements can have more than one action description.
- We cannot generate the concept of an action from purely physical descriptions.
- We can, for example, distinguish shell-shock from cowardice, but this could not show that there are **no** appropriate subjects of praise and blame.
- Problems with compatibility solutions. Failure to deal with the issue of whether we could have acted differently. 'Free' does not mean absence of felt constraint. Praise and blame are not just elements in a causal chain; there is also the issue of what is deserved.
- Difficulties of regarding an action as an effect and being held responsible. Differences with examples of being responsible and being held responsible.
- Appeals to strict liability run into problems, e.g. we need the ordinary cases to even talk about it. It exists essentially by contrast.
- Is determinism a clearly defined thesis? What kind of a claim is it? Empirical or conceptual?
- Two languages view. The question of what the relation is between them. We cannot specify the subject matter independently of them.

ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVE GRID

AS Assessment Objective	Marks allocated by Assessment Objective 15 mark questions	Marks allocated by Assessment Objective 30 mark questions	Total Marks by Assessment Objective
AO1	15	3	18
AO2	0	18	18
AO3	0	9	9
Total	15	30	45

UMS conversion calculator: www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion