

Yr12 (KS5)	Topic Area	Knowledge/Skills that are taught	Knowledge/Skills revisited	What does good look like?	Resources/s support at home
	<b>Epistemology</b>	<p><b>What is knowledge?</b></p> <p>The distinction between acquaintance knowledge, ability knowledge and propositional knowledge.</p> <p>The nature of definition (including Linda Zagzebski) and how propositional knowledge may be analysed/defined.</p> <p>The tripartite view - Propositional knowledge is defined as justified true belief: S knows that p if and only if: S is justified in believing that p, p is true and S believes that p (individually necessary and jointly sufficient conditions).</p> <p>Issues with the tripartite view including:  the conditions are not individually necessary  the conditions are not sufficient – cases of lucky true beliefs (including Edmund Gettier’s original two counter examples):</p> <p>Responses:  alternative post-Gettier analyses/definitions of knowledge including:  strengthen the justification condition (ie infallibilism)  add a 'no false lemmas' condition (J+T+B+N)  replace 'justified' with 'reliably formed' (R+T+B) (ie reliabilism)  replace 'justified' with an account of epistemic virtue (V+T+B).</p> <p><b>Perception as a source of knowledge</b></p> <p>Direct realism - The immediate objects of perception are mind-independent objects and their properties</p>	<p>Recognising Inductive &amp; Deductive arguments.</p> <p>How to construct an argument</p> <p>How to criticise an argument</p> <p>Students will demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the core concepts and methods of philosophy, including through the use of philosophical analysis.</p> <p>They will also be able to analyse and evaluate philosophical arguments to form reasoned judgements.</p>	<p>The exams will measure how students have achieved the following assessment objectives.</p> <p>AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the core concepts and methods of philosophy, including through the use of philosophical analysis.</p> <p>AO2: Analyse and evaluate philosophical arguments to form reasoned judgements.</p> <p>Students will be able to answer any of the 4 different types of exam question (3, 5,</p>	<p>Ensure students are accessing the textbook</p> <p>Discuss issues</p> <p>Ensure students are aware of where to find support materials - Google Classroom, &amp; AQA website</p>

		<p>Issues including:  the argument from illusion  the argument from perceptual variation  the argument from hallucination  the time-lag argument  and responses to these issues.</p> <p>Indirect realism - The immediate objects of perception are mind-dependent objects (sense-data) that are caused by and represent mind-independent objects.  John Locke's primary/secondary quality distinction.</p> <p>Issues including:  the argument that it leads to scepticism about the existence of mind-independent objects.  the argument that it leads to scepticism about the nature of mind-independent objects.</p> <p>Responses including:  Locke's argument from the involuntary nature of our experience  the argument from the coherence of various kinds of experience, as developed by Locke and Catharine Trotter Cockburn (attrib)  Bertrand Russell's response that the external world is the 'best hypothesis'  the argument from George Berkeley that we cannot know the nature of mind-independent objects because mind-dependent ideas cannot be like mind-independent objects.</p> <p>Berkeley's Idealism - The immediate objects of perception (ie ordinary objects such as tables, chairs, etc) are mind-dependent objects.  Arguments for idealism including Berkeley's attack on the primary/secondary quality distinction and his 'Master' argument.</p>		<p>12 and 25 marks) for any topic</p>	
--	--	--	--	---------------------------------------	--

		<p>Issues including:  arguments from illusion and hallucination  idealism leads to solipsism  problems with the role played by God in Berkeley's Idealism (including how can Berkeley claim that our ideas exist within God's mind given that he believes that God cannot feel pain or have sensations?)  and responses to these issues.</p> <p><b>Reason as a source of knowledge</b></p> <p>Innatism - Arguments from Plato (ie the 'slave boy' argument) and Gottfried Leibniz (ie his argument based on necessary truths).</p> <p>Empiricist responses including:  Locke's arguments against innatism  the mind as a 'tabula rasa' (the nature of impressions and ideas, simple and complex concepts)  and issues with these responses.</p> <p>The intuition and deduction thesis - The meaning of 'intuition' and 'deduction' and the distinction between them. René Descartes' notion of 'clear and distinct ideas'. His cogito as an example of an a priori intuition. His arguments for the existence of God and his proof of the external world as examples of a priori deductions.</p> <p>Empiricist responses including:  responses to Descartes' cogito  responses to Descartes' arguments for the existence of God and his proof of the external world (including how Hume's Fork might be applied to these arguments)  and issues with these responses.</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

		<p><b>The limits of knowledge</b></p> <p>Particular nature of philosophical scepticism and the distinction between philosophical scepticism and normal incredulity.          The role/function of philosophical scepticism within epistemology          The distinction between local and global scepticism and the (possible) global application of philosophical scepticism          Descartes’ sceptical arguments (the three ‘waves of doubt’)</p> <p>Responses to scepticism: the application of the following as responses to the challenge of scepticism:          Descartes' own response          empiricist responses (Locke, Berkeley and Russell)          reliabilism.</p>			
	<p><b>Moral Philosophy</b></p>	<p><b>Normative ethical theories</b>          The meaning of good, bad, right, wrong within each of the three approaches specified below          Similarities and differences across the three approaches specified below</p> <p><b>Utilitarianism</b></p> <p>The question of what is meant by 'utility' and 'maximising utility', including:          Jeremy Bentham's quantitative hedonistic utilitarianism (his utility calculus)          John Stuart Mill’s qualitative hedonistic utilitarianism (higher and lower pleasures) and his ‘proof’ of the greatest happiness principle          non-hedonistic utilitarianism (including preference utilitarianism)          act utilitarianism and rule utilitarianism.</p>	<p>Recognising Inductive &amp; Deductive arguments.</p> <p>How to construct an argument</p> <p>How to criticise an argument</p> <p>Students will demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the</p>	<p>The exams will measure how students have achieved the following assessment objectives.</p> <p>AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the core concepts and methods of philosophy, including through the use of</p>	<p>Ensure students are accessing the textbook</p> <p>Discuss issues</p> <p>Ensure students are aware of where to find support materials -</p>

		<p>Issues, including:            whether pleasure is the only good (Nozick's experience machine)            fairness and individual liberty/rights (including the risk of the 'tyranny of the majority')            problems with calculation (including which beings to include)            issues around partiality            whether utilitarianism ignores both the moral integrity and the intentions of the individual.</p> <p><b>Kantian Deontological Ethics</b></p> <p>Immanuel Kant's account of what is meant by a 'good will'.            The distinction between acting in accordance with duty and acting out of duty.            The distinction between hypothetical imperatives and categorical imperatives.            The first formulation of the categorical imperative (including the distinction between a contradiction in conception and a contradiction in will).            The second formulation of the categorical imperative.</p> <p>Issues, including:            clashing/competing duties            not all universalisable maxims are distinctly moral; not all non-universalisable maxims are immoral            the view that consequences of actions determine their moral value            Kant ignores the value of certain motives, eg love, friendship, kindness            morality is a system of hypothetical, rather than categorical, imperatives (Philippa Foot).</p> <p><b>Aristotelian virtue ethics</b></p> <p>'The good' for human beings: the meaning of Eudaimonia as the 'final end' and the relationship between Eudaimonia and pleasure.</p>	<p>core concepts and methods of philosophy, including through the use of philosophical analysis.</p> <p>They will also be able to analyse and evaluate philosophical arguments to form reasoned judgements.</p>	<p>philosophical analysis.            AO2: Analyse and evaluate philosophical arguments to form reasoned judgements.</p> <p>Students will be able to answer any of the 4 different types of exam question (3, 5, 12 and 25 marks) for any topic</p>	<p>Google Classroom, &amp; AQA website</p>
--	--	---	---	---	--

		<p>The function argument and the relationship between virtues and function.  Aristotle’s account of virtues and vices: virtues as character traits/dispositions;  the role of education/habituation in the development of a moral character; the  skill analogy; the importance of feelings; the doctrine of the mean and its  application to particular virtues.  Moral responsibility: voluntary, involuntary and non-voluntary actions.  The relationship between virtues, actions and reasons and the role of practical  reasoning/practical wisdom.</p> <p>Issues including:  whether Aristotelian virtue ethics can give sufficiently clear guidance about  how to act  clashing/competing virtues  the possibility of circularity involved in defining virtuous acts and virtuous  persons in terms of each other  whether a trait must contribute to Eudaimonia in order to be a virtue; the  relationship between the good for the individual and moral good.</p> <p><b>Applied ethics</b></p> <p>Students must be able to apply the content of Normative ethical theories and  meta-ethics to the following issues:  stealing  simulated killing (within computer games, plays, films etc)  eating animals  telling lies.</p> <p><b>Meta-ethics</b></p> <p>The origins of moral principles: reason, emotion/attitudes, or society.  The distinction between cognitivism and non-cognitivism about ethical  language.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>Moral realism - There are mind-independent moral properties/facts.          Moral naturalism (cognitivist) – including naturalist forms of utilitarianism (including Bentham) and of virtue ethics.          Moral non-naturalism (cognitivist) – including intuitionism and Moore’s ‘open question argument’ against all reductive metaethical theories and the Naturalistic Fallacy.</p> <p>Issues that may arise for the theories above, including:          Hume’s Fork and A J Ayer’s verification principle          Hume’s argument that moral judgements are not beliefs since beliefs alone could not motivate us          Hume’s is-ought gap          John Mackie’s argument from relativity and his arguments from queerness.</p> <p>Moral anti-realism          There are no mind-independent moral properties/facts.</p> <p>Error Theory (cognitivist) - Mackie          Emotivism (non-cognitivist) – Ayer          Prescriptivism (non-cognitivist) – Richard Hare</p> <p>Issues that may arise for the theories above, including:          whether anti-realism can account for how we use moral language, including moral reasoning, persuading, disagreeing etc.          the problem of accounting for moral progress          whether anti-realism becomes moral nihilism.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

Yr13 (KS5)	Topic Area	Knowledge/Skills that are taught	Knowledge/Skills revisited	What does good look like?	Resources/s support at home
	<b>Metaphysics of God</b>	<p><b>The concept and nature of 'God'</b></p> <p>God's attributes: God as omniscient, omnipotent, supremely good (omnibenevolent), and the meaning(s) of these divine attributes competing views on such a being's relationship to time, including God being timeless (eternal) and God being within time (everlasting).</p> <p>arguments for the incoherence of the concept of God including:                      the paradox of the stone                      the Euthyphro dilemma                      the compatibility, or otherwise, of the existence of an omniscient God and free human beings.</p> <p><b>Arguments relating to the existence of God</b></p> <p>For the arguments below, students should pay particular attention to nuances in the logical form of the arguments (deductive, inductive etc), the strengths of the conclusions (God does exist, God must exist etc) and the nature of God assumed or defended by the argument.</p> <p>Ontological arguments -                      St Anselm's ontological argument.                      Descartes' ontological argument.                      Norman Malcolm's ontological argument.                      Issues that may arise for the arguments above, including:                      Gaunilo's 'perfect island' objection                      Empiricist objections to a priori arguments for existence                      Kant's objection based on existence not being a predicate.</p>	<p>Recognising Inductive &amp; Deductive arguments.</p> <p>How to construct an argument</p> <p>How to criticise an argument</p> <p>Students will demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the core concepts and methods of philosophy, including through the use of philosophical analysis.</p> <p>They will also be able to analyse and evaluate philosophical arguments to form reasoned judgements.</p>	<p>The exams will measure how students have achieved the following assessment objectives.</p> <p>AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the core concepts and methods of philosophy, including through the use of philosophical analysis.                      AO2: Analyse and evaluate philosophical arguments to form reasoned judgements.</p> <p>Students will be able to answer any of the 4 different types of exam question (3, 5, 12 and 25 marks) for any topic</p>	<p>Ensure students are accessing the textbook</p> <p>Discuss issues</p> <p>Ensure students are aware of where to find support materials - Google Classroom, &amp; AQA website</p>



		<p>Teleological/design arguments -          The design argument from analogy (as presented by Hume).          William Paley’s design argument: argument from spatial order/purpose.          Richard Swinburne’s design argument: argument from temporal order/regularity.          Issues that may arise for the arguments above, including:          Hume's objections to the design argument from analogy          the problem of spatial disorder (as posed by Hume and Paley)          the design argument fails as it is an argument from a unique case (Hume)          whether God is the best or only explanation.</p> <p>Cosmological arguments -          The Kalām argument (an argument from temporal causation).          Aquinas' 1st Way (argument from motion), 2nd Way (argument from atemporal causation) and 3rd way (an argument from contingency).          Descartes' argument based on his continuing existence (an argument from causation).          Leibniz’s argument from the principle of sufficient reason (an argument from contingency).          Issues that may arise for the arguments above, including:          the possibility of an infinite series          Hume's objection to the 'causal principle'          the argument commits the fallacy of composition (Russell)          the impossibility of a necessary being (Hume and Russell).</p> <p><b>The Problem of Evil</b></p> <p>Whether God’s attributes can be reconciled with the existence of evil.          The nature of moral evil and natural evil.          The logical and evidential forms of the problem of evil.          Responses to these issues and issues arising from these responses, including:          the Free Will Defence (including Alvin Plantinga)          soul-making (including John Hick).</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

		<p><b>Religious language</b></p> <p>The distinction between cognitivism and non-cognitivism about religious language.</p> <p>The empiricist/logical positivist challenges to the status of metaphysical (here, religious) language: the verification principle and verification/falsification (Ayer).</p> <p>Hick's response to Ayer (eschatological verification) and issues arising from that response.</p> <p>Further responses: the 'University Debate'</p> <p>Anthony Flew on falsification (Wisdom's 'Gardener')</p> <p>Basil Mitchell's response to Flew (the Partisan)</p> <p>Hare's response to Flew (blikes and the lunatic) and issues arising from those responses.</p>			
	<b>Metaphysics of Mind</b>	<p><b>What do we mean by 'mind'?</b></p> <p>Features of mental states:            All or at least some mental states have phenomenal properties            Some, but not all, philosophers use the term 'qualia' to refer to these properties, where 'qualia' are defined as 'intrinsic and non-intentional phenomenal properties that are introspectively accessible'            All or at least some mental states have intentional properties (ie intentionality).</p> <p><b>Substance dualism</b></p> <p>Minds exist and are not identical to bodies or to parts of bodies.</p> <p>The indivisibility argument for substance dualism (Descartes).            Responses, including:            the mental is divisible in some sense            not everything thought of as physical is divisible.</p>	<p>Recognising Inductive &amp; Deductive arguments.</p> <p>How to construct an argument</p> <p>How to criticise an argument</p> <p>Students will demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the core concepts and methods of philosophy, including through the</p>	<p>The exams will measure how students have achieved the following assessment objectives.</p> <p>AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the core concepts and methods of philosophy, including through the use of philosophical analysis.</p>	<p>Ensure students are accessing the textbook</p> <p>Discuss issues</p> <p>Ensure students are aware of where to find support materials - Google Classroom, &amp; AQA website</p>

		<p>The conceivability argument for substance dualism (expressed without reference to God) (Descartes).  Responses including:  mind without body is not conceivable  what is conceivable may not be metaphysically possible  what is metaphysically possible tells us nothing about the actual world.</p> <p>Issues facing substance dualism, including:  The problem of other minds  Responses including:  the argument from analogy  the existence of other minds is the best hypothesis.  Dualism makes a "category mistake" (Gilbert Ryle)  the conceptual interaction problem (as articulated by Elisabeth, Princess of Bohemia)  the empirical interaction problem.  Physicalist theories</p> <p><b>Physicalism</b></p> <p>Everything is physical or supervenes upon the physical (this includes properties, events, objects and any substance(s) that exist).</p> <p><b>Philosophical behaviourism</b></p> <p>'Hard' behaviourism: all propositions about mental states can be reduced without loss of meaning to propositions that exclusively use the language of physics to talk about bodily states/movements (including Carl Hempel).</p> <p>'Soft' behaviourism: propositions about mental states are propositions about behavioural dispositions (ie propositions that use ordinary language) (including Gilbert Ryle).</p>	<p>use of philosophical analysis.</p> <p>They will also be able to analyse and evaluate philosophical arguments to form reasoned judgements.</p>	<p>AO2: Analyse and evaluate philosophical arguments to form reasoned judgements.</p> <p>Students will be able to answer any of the 4 different types of exam question (3, 5, 12 and 25 marks) for any topic</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>Issues including:            dualist arguments applied to philosophical behaviourism            the distinctness of mental states from behaviour (including Hilary Putnam's 'Super-Spartans' and perfect actors)            issues defining mental states satisfactorily due to (a) circularity and (b) the multiple realisability of mental states in behaviour            the asymmetry between self-knowledge and knowledge of other people's mental states.</p> <p><b>Mind-brain type identity theory</b></p> <p>All mental states are identical to brain states ('ontological' reduction) although 'mental state' and 'brain state' are not synonymous (so not an 'analytic' reduction).</p> <p>Issues including:            dualist arguments applied to mind-brain type identity theory            issues with providing the type identities (the multiple realisability of mental states).</p> <p><b>Eliminative materialism</b></p> <p>Some or all common-sense ("folk-psychological") mental states/properties do not exist and our common-sense understanding is radically mistaken (as defended by Patricia Churchland and Paul Churchland).</p> <p>Issues including:            our certainty about the existence of our mental states takes priority over other considerations            folk-psychology has good predictive and explanatory power (and so is the best hypothesis)            the articulation of eliminative materialism as a theory is self-refuting.</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

		<p><b>Functionalism</b></p> <p>All mental states can be characterised in terms of functional roles which can be multiply realised.</p> <p>Issues, including:          the possibility of a functional duplicate with different qualia (inverted qualia)          the possibility of a functional duplicate with no mentality/qualia (Ned Block’s China thought experiment)          the ‘knowledge’/Mary argument can be applied to functional facts (no amount of facts about function suffices to explain qualia).</p> <p><b>Property dualism</b></p> <p>There are at least some mental properties that are neither reducible to nor supervenient upon physical properties.</p> <p>The ‘philosophical zombies’ argument for property dualism (David Chalmers).          Responses including:          a 'philosophical zombie'/a 'zombie' world is not conceivable          what is conceivable may not be metaphysically possible          what is metaphysically possible tells us nothing about the actual world.</p> <p>The ‘knowledge/Mary’ argument for property dualism (Frank Jackson).          Responses including:          Mary does not gain new propositional knowledge but does gain ability knowledge (the 'ability knowledge' response).          Mary does not gain new propositional knowledge but does gain acquaintance knowledge (the ‘acquaintance knowledge’ response).          Mary gains new propositional knowledge, but this is knowledge of physical facts that she already knew in a different way (the ‘New Knowledge / Old Fact’ response).</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

		Issues facing epiphenomenalist dualism, including:  the challenge posed by introspective self-knowledge the challenge posed by the phenomenology of our mental life (ie as involving causal connections, both psychological and psycho-physical) the challenge posed by natural selection/evolution. Physicalist theories			
--	--	--	--	--	--