

1: What is direct realism? [3 Marks]

Errors

- Writing too much! Some of you gave responses which could have been 3 marks, but had to be given 1 or 2 marks because you went off topic.
- Direct Realism is a theory, not an argument.
- Some responses did not clarify that "real" = "mind-independent"
- Using the word "direct" in your definition – you need to explain what "direct" means (ie that we perceive the external world immediately/without mediation).
- Some responses only explained what "realism" meant and not the "direct" aspect.

Example top band response:

Direct realism is ^{the belief} that the world & its existing objects exist independently of the mind & that we perceive them ^{without} immediately any mediation.

2: Explain one of Berkeley's criticisms of indirect realism [5 Marks]

Errors

- This response needs to go into one of Berkeley's arguments specifically – some responses talked generally about the problem that "sense-data" provides a "veil of perception" meaning we can't be sure there is an external world behind the veil. This is a problem for the indirect realist, but not the issue we have attributed to Berkeley.
- We are expecting to see one of his arguments where he states that either:
 - There is no distinction between primary and secondary qualities, or
 - Material/physical properties (primary qualities) cannot be represented by mental properties (secondary qualities)
- More than one response confused Berkeley and Russell. Russell was an indirect realist so his argument about a cat continuing to exist when not perceived cannot be used as a criticism of indirect realism (he was actually criticising Berkeley!)
- More than one response confused Berkeley and Austin.

Example top band response:

0 2 Explain one of Berkeley's criticisms of indirect realism. [5 marks]

Berkeley criticises indirect realism by arguing how there is no difference between primary and secondary qualities. Indirect realists believe that primary qualities are mind independent and ~~the~~ ~~not~~ measurable and they cause secondary qualities which is what we perceive (colour, sound etc). Berkeley argues that if you

imagine an object without any secondary qualities then that object no longer exists to the mind and therefore objects are mind dependant and there are no primary qualities. Without mind-independent qualities the theory of indirect realism is forced to be false.

3: Outline the issue of perceptual variation against direct realism. [5 marks]

Errors

- The key point is that the object of my perception changes whilst the physical object does not change
- Must link your answer to direct realism – ie if there are perceptual changes with no corresponding physical changes, we must not be perceiving the object directly so direct realism must be false.
- Some responses weren't clear as to whether illusions were being discussed (ie bent straws in water) or perceptual variation.
- You should not try and bring in direct realist responses to the issue – the question doesn't ask for it, so it would count as redundancy.
- Examples can be helpful (eg [Russell's] table with different colours/shapes, parallel train tracks which appear to get closer together), but they must help your explanation, the argument should be the focus. If it is all example you probably won't be making the point clearly.

Example top band response:

0 3 Outline the issue of perceptual variation against direct realism [5 marks]

The object I am perceiving ^{directly} appears to change (e.g colour)

If the object I am perceiving ^{appears} to change then the physical object must have changed.

But the physical object does not change.

~~This means I am not perceiving that object directly~~

The object I am perceiving is the physical object directly from each other

This means I am not perceiving the object directly. So direct realism is false.

Turn over ▶

~~Perceptual variation means that when objects are viewed from different angles but the actual object is the same everyone.~~

Perceptual variation means that everyone could ~~perceive~~^{be} looking at the same object but perceiving it differently. Someone standing

~~on one side~~ on one side of a table might see a white spot on it where the light reflects off the table, someone on the other side might not see any spot. So how would we know whether the white spot is really there or not. This argument of perceptual variation challenges Direct Realism's theory that "what you see is what you get".

Extra space If the way we're perceiving something changes but the object itself doesn't change ~~then~~
~~direct realism must be false~~ then it goes against the theory of Direct Realism.

4: Explain how indirect realism leads to scepticism about the existence of mind-independent objects and Locke's response based on the involuntary nature of our experience [12 marks]

Errors

- Responses should start with a definition of indirect realism
- Be clear that sense-data/secondary qualities are all that can be experienced **not** reality itself.
- Vaguely discussing indirect realism and scepticism without making a clear link as to why it leads to it.
- Not being concise enough – always ask yourself if you can say what you have said in fewer words.
- Confusing terminological details (e.g. Describing primary and secondary qualities as primary and secondary data / defining scepticism as solipsism / referring to the brain rather than the mind / confusing Indirect Realism with Idealism or Direct Realism / confusing mind-independent with mind-dependent).
- Not mentioning Locke or his response at all / confusing Locke's response by talking about involuntary dreams, hallucinations, or sleep paralysis – you should be discussing involuntary perceptions.
- Locke's key point is to contrast involuntary experiences (ie veridical experience) with voluntary experience (ie things we choose to call to mind) – it's not enough to say something like "there must be an external world because some perceptions are involuntary"
- Be careful by saying Locke "proves" there is an external world. Locke's argument is inductive and therefore can only support or suggest there is an external world.

- Including things not asked for in the question, e.g. objections to Locke's response or Idealism / the coherence of perceptions / Russell's response to scepticism / illusions or hallucinations.
- Not defining/explaining scepticism.
- Confusing Locke with Russell.
- Including a conclusion and/or evaluation.

Example top band response:

0 4

Explain how indirect realism leads to scepticism about the existence of mind-independent objects and Locke's response based on the involuntary nature of our experience.

[12 marks]

Indirect realism is a realist theory of perception which states that we perceive an external mind-independent world through an intermediary, such as sense-data, which we then perceive directly and accurately.

Since we perceive mind-independent objects and their properties through sense-data it is never possible to see around the sense-data in order to perceive the mind-independent objects directly. Additionally, sense-data doesn't necessarily resemble the mind-independent object nor does it need a corresponding object to represent at all. This means that we can never truly know the nature of mind-independent objects or even their existence. Furthermore, through illusions or perceptual variation we know that the secondary qualities of an object, which are similar to sense-data and cause sensations directly in our minds, can vary be subjective.

Locke responds to this by saying that our perceptions are involuntary. He explains that unlike memory or thoughts created through our imagination we cannot ~~prevent~~ consciously alter our experiences or prevent ourselves from experiencing things. For example, when you look into the sky you cannot help but observe and perceive the sun. Similarly it is Locke then concludes that because we cannot stop ourselves from experiencing these things, it is probable that there is an external cause for them which exists outside of the mind. This cause is independent of the mind in order to form these experiences without any thought. Therefore, Locke claims ~~we can say~~ that there is a mind-independent reality which in turn forms these perceptions within us and this fits with ^{indirect realism,} ~~indirect realism.~~