



MARKSCHEME

November 2010

PHILOSOPHY

Higher Level and Standard Level

Paper 1

*This markscheme is **confidential** and for the exclusive use of examiners in this examination session.*

*It is the property of the International Baccalaureate and must **not** be reproduced or distributed to any other person without the authorization of IB Cardiff.*

Note to examiners

This markscheme outlines what members of the paper setting team had in mind when they devised the questions. The topics listed in the bullet points indicate possible areas candidates might cover in their answers. They are not compulsory points and not necessarily the best possible points. They are only a framework to help examiners in their assessment. Examiners should be responsive to any other valid points or any other valid approaches.

Using the assessment criteria

Candidates at both Higher Level and Standard Level answer **one** question on the Core Theme (Section A).

Candidates at Higher Level answer **two** questions on the Optional Themes (Section B), each based on a different Optional Theme.

Candidates at Standard Level answer **one** question on the Optional Themes (Section B).

Answers on the Core Theme and the Optional Themes are assessed according to the assessment criteria set out in the Subject guide.

SECTION A

Core Theme: What is a human being?

1. Extract from “The Human Person: Animal and Spirit” by David Braine

This passage encourages reflection on some of the central concepts associated with our understanding of the person, the human condition, and our existence in relationship to others and to the world around us on several levels. It allows for discussion of the special status human beings might possess. It invites reflection on the relationship of the person to the natural environment and the responsibilities a person might have with regard to caring for the natural environment. It also raises the question of a possible relationship with a creator conceived of as a creator-God.

Key Points

- Existentialism
- Environmental Ethics
- Animal rights viewpoints
- Mind/body/soul views
- Deep ecology
- Buddhism
- Jainism
- Animism
- Pantheism, panentheism
- Other religious views
- Virtue Ethics
- Situation Ethics
- Speciesism
- Nihilism
- Rationalism
- Neurophilosophy
- An approach reflecting a “worldview” (not necessarily drawing on a classical philosophical school or tradition), *e.g.* New Age views, cultural traditions, local traditions

Discussion

- Does the human being possess a special, particular and/or peculiar position in the various realms of existence?
- How effective is it to define a human being as an “animal” with a “peculiar character and role”?
- What might some of the values of personhood be?
- Is it possible to appreciate the individual human being in relation to ever-widening horizons of community (self, family, environment, cosmos)?
- Is it possible for the non-human realm to have dignity?
- What is a human being’s responsibility to the cosmos?
- Is awareness of and care for the natural environment a defining characteristic of being human?
- How would a person approach the question of a possible maker of the natural environment or of the cosmos?
- Is it the case that a “maker” must be conceived of as God? What alternatives might there be?
- Does reverence for the environment carry with it practical, ethical or moral responsibilities?
- Would indifference to the matters identified in the citation result in inauthentic existence in the personal, social, global and/or cosmic contexts?
- Would nihilism constitute an effective counter position to the sense of the passage?
- Are views of humans as carers/guardians of the environment/cosmos paternalistic?

2. Cartoon Image

This cartoon image invites reflection on the phenomenon that human beings feel challenged by the question of the meaning, direction, or goal of life. It might also invite an exploration of whether or not the attempt to develop answers or approaches to this challenge is an essential characteristic of human beings. It allows for an exploration of a variety of approaches to the “in between stuff” that might help individuals understand what it means to be a human being.

Key Points

- Existentialism
- Functionalism
- Evolutionary theories
- Humanism
- Buddhism
- Jainism
- Hinduism
- Other religious views
- Virtue Ethics
- Utilitarianism
- Scepticism
- Nihilism
- Rationalism
- Postmodernism
- Mind-body views
- Approaches to human destiny and the issue of free will *e.g.* determinism, fatalism
- An approach reflecting a “worldview” (not necessarily drawing on a classical philosophical school or tradition), *e.g.* New Age views, cultural traditions, local traditions, scientific, biological or bio-chemical views, religious views

Discussion

- Do people always, and of necessity, ask questions about the meaning of life?
- Does life have to be conceived of in a linear, chronological fashion? What other ways might there be?
- Is there any single, convincing answer? Should there be one? Is it better that there are many?
- What might make one interpretation of the meaning of life more valuable than another? What criteria would you use? Who establishes the criteria?
- Does a strictly scientific, reductive view successfully address the citation on the board?
- To what extent can the existence of the mind/soul/self before life and their continuity after death be considered?
- Can anyone “teach” what the meaning of life or authentic existence ought to be?
- Can the questions about the “in between stuff” be settled naturally? Scientifically? Supernaturally? Metaphysically?
- Is life a project that we freely carry out between birth and death?
- Individuality and particularity *vs.* universal human concerns
- How would a nihilist address the cartoon?
- How do non-Western perspectives address the message of the cartoon?

SECTION B

Optional Theme 1: Grounds of epistemology

3. Explain and discuss the role of scepticism in approaching the possible basis of knowledge.

This question invites an explanation and discussion of the possible ways in which scepticism might play a part in confirming the basis of knowledge. Answers might look at philosophical scepticism as opposed to ordinary scepticism.

Key Points

- The role of scepticism in different approaches to the acquisition of knowledge *e.g.* the thoroughgoing use of Descartes or the more moderate scepticism of Hume
- Different levels/types of scepticism
- The application of scepticism to inductive arguments: the main target of scepticism is any statement about the external world based on sense experience; the logical limitation of inductive arguments in guaranteeing the truth of their conclusions or predictions
- Sceptics may also question deductive arguments as well asking if internal certainty is any different from the certainty of the reality of dreams
- The limitations of scepticism: without any basis for reality it is impossible to assert the truth of ignorance as well. For falsity to be meaningful it must contrast with the possibility of reality; ignorance implies knowledge – although sceptics may not be proposing ignorance so much as an inability to be certain *e.g.* Hume
- The global sceptic attacks all bases for knowledge and thus does not argue from experience, since experience can be doubted
- The possible differences between certainty and knowledge, and the possibility of knowledge without certainty

Discussion

- What can possibly be said to a thoroughgoing sceptic? What statement could count against a sceptic's refusal to accept a basis for knowledge?
- Is the sceptic position illogical or self-contradictory in that in order to make any sort of argument there has to be an acknowledgement of a shared knowledge to make arguments intelligible?
- Is scepticism too tied to a foundationalist approach to knowledge when in fact alternatives, *e.g.* the coherence or pragmatist approaches, may be maintained?
- The incorrigibility of internal knowledge
- Responses to scepticism, *e.g.* Moore's "two hands argument" in which he accepts the impossibility of the proof of a statement to a sceptic while still maintaining that he knows the statement to be true
- Positive applications of scepticism in the quest for assumptions, critical awareness, clarity and certainty, and the avoidance of dogmatism or emotional attachments in the acquisition of knowledge
- Does scepticism inevitably lead to solipsism?

4. Critically evaluate the view that induction offers the best route to knowledge.

This question enables a critical evaluation of a central epistemological issue about the status of knowledge gained through induction. Answers can draw on a wide range of material which attempt to deal with the strengths and weaknesses of approaching knowledge through inductive arguing.

Key Points

- What induction is and how it differs from knowledge gained by deduction
- The early empiricist view of the *tabula rasa*
- The limits of knowledge about the external world offered by deduction
- The reliance of induction on observation via the senses
- The issue of the reliability of the senses
- The problem of induction *e.g.* as raised by Hume and Russell
- The realism of premises used in inductive reasoning
- The observer's sensations of the world and the world itself – is the gap able to be bridged?
- The logical nature of pure reason in contrast to knowledge based on perception
- What is available to know *e.g.* Russell's sense data or Kant's phenomena?

Discussion

- The competition between induction and deduction; is this a false antithesis?
- Is reliance on inductive reasoning more a psychological state of mind than a logically sound basis for knowledge?
- The issue of perception and the reliability of premises based on indirect perception
- Idealism; Phenomenalism *etc.* as responses to the problems of perception
- Possible examples of the problem of induction *e.g.* Hume's black swan; Russell's chicken fed at dawn
- Subjective *vs.* objective knowledge

Optional Theme 2: Theories and problems of ethics

5. “Morality differs in every society and in every culture and is, therefore, a convenient term for socially approved habits.” Discuss and critically evaluate.

This question asks for a discussion and critical evaluation of ethical/moral relativism. It invites a discussion of the nature of morality and the ways in which different communities establish and develop moral values and codes of conduct. It also allows for a discussion and evaluation of ethical/moral absolutism.

Key Points

- The nature of morality: descriptive and normative aspects
- The nature of relativism: descriptive and normative aspects
- The reality of cultural and moral pluralism
- Naïve relativism *vs.* critical relativism
- *Mores vs.* morals; practices *vs.* values
- The impact of cultural pluralism on a variety of moralities in a variety of cultures and societies
- Morality differs or is relative to each society or culture; morality differs or is relative to each individual member of a society or culture
- Ethics/morality is, in fact, constituted by commonly approved and disapproved behaviour patterns in a given community
- Universal, absolute, unconditional moral values *vs.* local, provisional, conditional moral values
- Habitual, strategic behaviour *vs.* moral, virtuous behaviour
- Formal, general moral norms *vs.* concrete, specific norms
- Adaptation to varying moralities in a global, mobile world
- What is moral for one society or culture might not be moral for another society or culture

Discussion

- Can there ever be uniformity or consensus about morality? Should there be?
- Does society form morality or does morality form society?
- Can there be a universal notion of morally good and morally bad behaviour?
- Is relativism a valid argument against the search for universal moral norms?
- Can we respect the common behaviour patterns of different cultures when those behaviour patterns are deemed by our culture to be immoral? Should we?
- How can we take into account documents like “The Universal Declaration of Human Rights” or “The Geneva Conventions” with the claim that morality is nothing more than a convenient term for socially approved habits?
- What defines a society?
- Is it not the case that while morality might differ across cultures, each culture defines a set of universally acceptable moral values for the members of each culture?
- Does ethical/moral relativism eventually lead to moral scepticism or moral nihilism?
- Are all socially approved habits good for the members of a society or culture?
- If a behaviour pattern is socially approved does that entail that it is personally approved?

6. Critically evaluate the claim that we should never treat a person as a means to an end.

This question asks for a critical evaluation of a central moral issue. It invites a critical evaluation of the notion of a human person in the context of an assessment of the intended goals and objectives of our actions and choices. The question allows for references to a variety of moral theories, or to a common-sense approach.

Key Points

- Notions of person and personhood: human organism, human being, human person
- Notions of a person's rights: attributed, acquired, achieved, inalienable
- Defining the moment when personhood is achieved defines what or who we use as a means to an end
- Hierarchy of goals and objectives: priorities, obligations, circumstances
- The greater good *vs.* the common good *vs.* the private, personal good
- Moral judgments and actions based upon duties, obligations, and universal values *vs.* those based upon consequences, outcomes, and objectives
- Moral prescriptivism
- The end does justify the means *vs.* the end ought to justify the means
- Moral character and treatment of persons: the virtuous character and the dignity of the person
- Non-cognitive and emotive approaches to the dilemma

Discussion

- Can a person or life be valued just like goals and objectives can be valued?
- What is the value of one human life? Of many human lives?
- Do some goals or objectives outweigh the value of one or more human lives?
- How can we morally assess goals and objectives?
- Are there positive and morally acceptable uses of persons as means to ends? What might they be?
- What if a person agrees to be used as a means to an end?
- Is it not necessary and morally justifiable in some circumstances to use a person as a means to an end?
- How does one define a person? How does one assess personhood?
- Would a utilitarian analysis justify treating a person as a means to an end? A Kantian analysis? An analysis from the perspective of Virtue Ethics?
- How might religious perspectives view this dilemma?
- How might non-Western perspectives view this dilemma?

Optional Theme 3: Philosophy of religion

7. Critically evaluate the claim that to understand religious experience you must abandon reason.

This question invites a critical evaluation of whether it is necessary to give up rational processes to understand religious experience.

Key Points

- Religious experience cannot be fully understood by reason as it deals with a metaphysical world and involves revelation and faith which do not seem to follow rules of reason
- The nature of belief and reason might make them incompatible
- A distinction between natural and revealed religions might be developed showing that in natural religions evidence and reasoned argument do establish religious knowledge
- Attempts at reasoned arguments to try and establish a God; arguments from design, cosmological and ontological arguments
- The nature of faith and fideism
- Claims of miracles in discussing religious experience
- Religious experience is like sentiment and personality and is a quality of all humans
- Neurophilosophy and “artificially” induced religious experiences
- Eastern perspectives on routes to heaven; loss of self, what you do
- The role of the “leap of faith” in religious experience

Discussion

- Is the view that reason and faith seem incompatible a naïve, simplistic view of the complexity of human encounters with religion?
- Rational investigation attempts to uncover evidence of religious experience *e.g.* William James; some scientists argue that natural evidence contradicts any claims for God
- Is religion a fundamental aspect of humanness?
- Does evidence from psychological research perhaps reveal that those who behave irrationally have a closer/better view of God or no view at all?
- If God and heaven are figments of human imagination, might reason be used to enlighten and expound on our creation of God?
- Does the spiritual aspect of humans show that humans are multifaceted and reason need not be abandoned?
- God might play no part in the physical world, so reason could be abandoned as any direct encounter with God is impossible
- Do all humans have the spiritual ability to reach God *e.g.* arguments from Buber and Eliade?
- God is the author of reason and therefore reason leads to God
- If our encounter with God is at a personal level it might follow that reason is not necessary as many human relations develop contrary to the laws of reason
- Is there an intellectual basis for faith? Is natural reason or natural information necessary to have religious knowledge?
- Eastern approaches to religious experience

8. Critically evaluate the claim that the existence of evil and suffering is an argument against the existence of a God.

This question asks for a critical evaluation of the nature of evil and suffering in relationship to the belief in God.

Key Points

- The nature of evil and suffering
- Approaches that deny the existence of evil and suffering *e.g.* monism
- The inconsistent triad: God’s omnipotence, God’s omnibenevolence, the fact of suffering
- The relationship of an omnipotent God with evil and suffering
- Distinctions between moral evil and natural evil. Natural evil might be part of being human and therefore not in contradiction to God’s love and care but a means of developing human maturity
- Process theology sees God as part of the world and s/he is working against evil in the world
- God is not all powerful and transcendent, and evil and suffering are inevitable
- Faith suggests that God does not allow the innocent to suffer. Do we perceive suffering when it is not actually occurring?
- The relationship of suffering to purification; *Jihad* in Islam, Lent in Christianity and *Karma* in Hinduism and Buddhism
- The notion of suffering as a route to deeper religious experiences in some Eastern traditions and Christian sects
- The relationship of human freedom to evil and suffering. God has given humans free will but it is misused by humans contrary to God’s will, *e.g.* the Free Will Defence
- God might be all-powerful but not all-loving
- God’s supposed benevolence and omnipotence is challenged by evil, therefore these qualities might not be part of God and thus our image of God needs to be revised

Discussion

- If moral evil is rooted in a human’s misuse of free will it might not be contradictory to God’s existence, as God wants free agents, not puppets, in the created world
- The struggle against evil and suffering can be seen as good for humans. Humans have a capability to fight against it if they choose to do so
- God knows that good will in the end win through and the afterlife will compensate for suffering in this life
- If God is omniscient s/he might be seen to be responsible, but it might be argued that the human type of responsibility might not be appropriate to God
- The exercise of faith might be a way of overcoming doubt in God when natural suffering takes place
- Evil and suffering might have the purpose of making humans better and encourage us to do more good
- To what extent is self-inflicted suffering a component of religious experiences?
- God’s intervention might not be direct, but through human innovation and action there is a great deal of evil
- What is the balance between good and evil? Evil is outweighed by good
- The incompatibility between God and evil in the world seems to be a result of an application of reason and it might be inappropriate to use reason in this context
- Is it realistic to think that an all-powerful God would try only to persuade humans to act in a good way? Why not intervene totally and be all-powerful?
- Might evil and suffering just be part of the mystery of religion and faith?

Optional Theme 4: Philosophy of art

9. To what extent is art an imitation or representation of reality?

This question might provoke the discussion of the specific issue of art as representation of reality, but it also might be the starting point for related arguments, and it might allow for an exploration of questions, for example, about the nature of art itself.

Key Points

- One of the hallmarks of some art forms is the emphasis on an awareness of nature. The natural world is a rich storehouse of images and metaphors for use as subject matter
- Many definitions of art were intended to emphasize salient or important features of art
- The possibility that art is to be defined in terms of a relation between the activities of artists, the products that result and the audiences that receive them
- Some views regard something as art only if it serves the function for which we have art, usually said to be that of providing aesthetic experience
- The view that something is art only if it has been baptized as such through an agent's application of the appropriate procedures
- In Western cultures the stress has moved from imitation to expression; from the registration of the way we see the world to the expression of our attitude towards it
- Possible relationships between art and reality
- Views of art as actively constructing and imagining reality

Discussion

- Is the main purpose of art to provide an aesthetic experience?
- Does art have an essence which allows for an answer to the question of what art is?
- Art-making is creative and, hence, inevitably defeats the definer's attempt to congeal what is a fluid process
- Is reality something so fixed that we might be able to represent it?
- As an aspect of culture, the nature of art is socially constructed and historically malleable, depending on human interests and judgments.
- Is the nature of art relative to, and affected by, human concerns and practices?
- If art does not represent or imitate reality, what does it do?
- Other views of art, *e.g.* as the communication of feelings or fiction
- Art's definition, like any other definition, changes historically
- How might a work of art be a vehicle of truth about the actual world?
- How might use denote artistic meaning as opposed to the intentional act of creation?

10. To what extent should art have a moral purpose?

A complex set of questions is raised by an examination of the relationship between art and morality. The question might raise some of these issues, *e.g.* whether art has to respect moral boundaries, or it also might give place to discussions about the purpose of art.

Key Points

- Should works of art be designed to have moral effects, and if so, how best can that be achieved?
- Many would argue that the artistic merits of a work are independent of any attitudes or actions it may lead us to adopt or perform
- A tradition: literary works should at least aim to instruct as well as delight, and a great deal of debate has been occupied with the relationship between the two goals
- Although works of art do have moral effects, it has been argued that it is not part of their value that they do
- The claim that art is only valuable in so far as it has a beneficial influence on people's behaviour
- Aesthetic experience is detached from ordinary self-interested pursuits; it is disinterested. Works of art are made to be viewed aesthetically and to be enjoyed for no other purpose
- Works of art must be innovative, creative, and express new ideas in new ways. This does not mean that they have a different end than the aesthetic one

Discussion

- Is art a means to an end or an end in itself?
- The artistic process as a means of expression, communication, education, propaganda, indoctrination
- No human activity can be done as an end in itself; all of them pursue some end, *e.g.* artists show us how to look at the world, how to understand ourselves, who we are, and what our world is like
- Does the fact that there are different art forms play any role? *E.g.* does literature have a political purpose more readily than music?
- Though there are no coercive arguments to show that we have to take into account the moral qualities of works of art; it is in practice very difficult to ignore them, especially when the point of the work is insistently moral, or when the work is conspicuously depraved. *E.g.* the contentious case of pornography
- Art should serve the development of human spirituality
- What of works that have an admirable moral content or message, but are of low aesthetic merit?
- What of works that have a dubious moral content or message, but are of high aesthetic merit?
- A long tradition, dating back to Plato, regards art with suspicion for its power over our emotions
- Issues of censorship in relation to morals

Optional Theme 5: Political philosophy

11. “Some people are born rich and some are born poor. If this is unjust, should anything be done about it?” Discuss and critically evaluate.

This question invites a discussion and critical evaluation of justice. Answers might be more focused on the quote or on the notion of justice itself. It is apparent that the answers may be developed in a number of ways.

Key Points

- Ideas or conceptions of justice
- Distributive and retributive justice: the right or will of the strong; substantive vs. procedural justice; relations to fairness; truth; the moral and positive law
- Some inequalities are deliberately imposed. Racial or gender discrimination
- Two main sources of undeserved inequalities: differences in the socio-economic classes into which people are born, and differences in their natural abilities or talents for tasks which are in demand
- Some people will have a head start and will end up with greater benefits than others whose native talents are the same
- Equality of opportunity, equality of outcome
- In a competitive system differences in native talent will produce big differences in the resulting benefits
- Economic and educational disadvantages: some can overcome those disadvantages, but it is much harder than making good from a higher starting point
- Redistributive taxation involves the use of government power to interfere with what people do, not because what they do is wrong in itself, like theft or discrimination, but because it might improve the collective welfare

Discussion

- Do inequalities which seem wrong arise from causes which do not involve people doing anything wrong?
- The problem of social justice within one society is more difficult on a global scale. Is global justice possible?
- To what extent should something be done against inequality? Might it be a legal obligation? Is it an ethical imperative?
- Is the idea of justice innate? Is it based on something like human nature?
- Can justice be an ideal as well as a process?
- Views of social inequalities and differences as socially constructed

12. To what extent might there be a right to revolution?

This question raises issues about the conditions under which political obligation can arise, and what might provide good reason to change the *status quo* of a society radically. This might include the justifications of the political obligation itself in which the society is based.

Key Points

- One characterization of revolution: the illegal introduction of a radically new situation and order for the sake of obtaining or increasing individual or communal freedom
- Related concepts: reformation, rebellion and *coup d'état*
- Historical examples, e.g. the French Revolution, Hobbes and Locke and the divine right of kings, the American Revolution, Marx's analysis of revolution and the historical circumstances that bring it about or encourage its application
- Revolution is intended to effect a total change: institutions sanctioned in the past, through extra-individual powers, are found wanting when judged by new norms demanding a new order derived from its subjects
- It is said that reformers re-institute old norms; revolutionaries establish new ones
- Not all alterations of fundamental laws or constitutions are illegal; constitutions often include directives for their legal amendments. Revolutionary change is illegal change of fundamental laws, unconstitutional change of constitutions
- Because revolutionary change is intended to be sweeping and fundamental, it aims to remove whatever opposes it, primarily, the current order
- Justifications of political orders; social contract; tacit consent

Discussion

- Is there a relation between reason and revolution? Often revolution is connected with passion, because revolutionaries are persons suffering under constraints which they want removed
- Does a group, a class or even the majority within a society have the right or obligation to radically change a settled order without respecting the right of the minorities?
- Without revolutions there would be no historical or political change
- Are revolutions guided by the attempt to promote human freedom?
- Is it only possible to rebel against contingent structures, or perpetrate coups at best resulting in transfer of control from one group to another without a fuller realization of individual or communal freedom?
- Modernity's revolution became possible given its concepts of rationality, freedom, radical novelty and progress. Postmodernism questions the meaning of each of these terms and makes the univocal use of the concept "revolution" problematic
- Is there a difference between the right to revolution and the obligation for revolution?

Optional Theme 6: Non-Western traditions and perspectives

13. Explain and discuss the relationship between the individual and the community with regards to moral life in one or more of the non-Western traditions you have studied.

This question invites an explanation and discussion of how at least one non-Western tradition approaches the philosophical question of the interrelationship between the individual and the community in terms of moral life. One or more non-Western tradition could be selected for the discussion. There could also be some comparative analysis of non-Western traditions with some Western traditions.

Key Points

- Non-Western traditions and perspectives that might be discussed could include; Indian *e.g.* Jainism, Hinduism, Buddhism; Oriental *e.g.* Taoism, Confucianism, Shintoism; African *e.g.* Kongo, Kawaïda, Yoruba epistemology; Ancient Central and South American *e.g.* Aztec, Mayan; Australasian traditions
- The relationship of the individual to the community
- The dominance of community as the focus of all actions; issues of equality and rights
- The role of family
- Mechanisms that control and direct both superstition and authority
- The idea that the well-being of people overrides individual will
- The development and responsibility of tribe
- The role of duty, filial loyalty and piety towards leaders of the community
- The changing role of Shaman from “magicians” to regulators of community actions; *e.g.* marriage, sex, property
- Contrasting views on the role of community and the metaphysical; individual higher states of being compared to collective consciousness and mass hysteria
- The relationship of the community towards the environment; a collective notion rather than individual responsibility
- Resolutions of collective suffering through collective “right action”, collective acceptance of causation and resolution
- Social conditioning through dominant community structures

Discussion

- To what extent can the individual develop his/her own morality?
- To what extent is individual responsibility permitted?
- Does a focus on a community produce a lack of concern for the self?
- Is the whole greater than the part and therefore a stress on community is in the end a strength of such traditions?
- Is selflessness collectivism?
- Should individual actions be completely governed and dictated by the wider community?
- To what extent is community interference a cover for a paternalistic society?
- Could a strong sense of community be beneficial for Western ways of thinking?
- Are there inherent contradictions with community actions in terms of reaching metaphysical states when reaching higher states of being might be solely individual?

14. Evaluate philosophically the ideas of filial loyalty and piety in at least one of the non-Western traditions that you have studied.

This question seeks a philosophical evaluation of the concepts of loyalty and filial piety in the context of non-Western traditions. Their differences and status might be investigated within an individual tradition or through a comparison of traditions.

Key Points

- Some non-Western traditions and perspectives might include: Indian *e.g.* Jainism, Hinduism, Buddhism; Oriental *e.g.* Taoism, Confucianism, Shintoism; African *e.g.* Kongo, Kawaiida, Yoruba epistemology; Ancient Central and South American *e.g.* Aztec, Mayan; Australasian traditions
- The difference between loyalty and filial piety; the latter being related to family and/or relatives while the former is more towards non-family based responsibilities and commitments
- The “contractual” bases of filial piety through birth; the strength and dominance of the family
- The status of shame and loss of reputation for the family and group
- Loyalty arising out of duty and a “debt payment”, notions of “feudalism” in rural societies
- Consequences of such moral relations; selfless actions that are duty-based actions, the rise of a moral agent who is not bound or limited by individual self-interest
- The impact of these concepts on metaphysical states and ideas of worship and religion
- Community responsibilities that override individual desire and interests

Discussion

- Is the individual suppressed through loyalty to the group?
- Could loyalty to oneself be a necessary stage of development for a moral agent?
- Could filial piety be misfounded, and possibly lead to the justification of actions against other individuals and the wider community, that might otherwise be seen as wrong?
- To what extent do these two concepts restrict individual freedom and individual rights?
- In what ways are the two concepts compatible with human rights?
- Is filial piety only effective in a strong extended family environment?
- Has loyalty become difficult to maintain because of consumerism and globalization impacting on non-Western traditions?

Optional Theme 7: Contemporary social issues

15. “Contemporary society’s emphasis on consumerism, consumptionism and materialism has challenged our understanding of leisure time.” Evaluate philosophically.

This question asks for a philosophical evaluation of some characteristics of contemporary society that have impacted upon and influenced our understanding of leisure time. It also invites a consideration of the relationship amongst our notions of work, free time and leisure time and our approaches to authentic selfhood.

Key Points

- Characterization of contemporary society: consumerism, commodification, materialism, technological specialization, increased work load *etc.*
- Post-industrial society *vs.* postmodern society
- Notions of the meaning of work: personal, social, economic, instrumental *etc.*
- Leisure as release from work to engage in intellectual, aesthetic, civic and contemplative endeavours
- Leisure as time required to rest, recreate and recuperate in order to return to work
- Leisure as abstinence from work in order to pursue luxury, pleasure and conspicuous consumption
- Leisure as idleness, free time, waste of time, spare time, meaningless time
- Leisure as culture consuming time *vs.* leisure as culture creating time
- Leisure as a device to support work where work is seen as an end in itself
- Increase in workload makes leisure the time to consume and increase material possessions
- Work becomes time to acquire the means to acquire and consume material goods
- Work acquires religious meaning, seen as satisfaction of God’s expectations of us, while leisure is seen as the “devil’s arena of temptation”
- Intensification of workloads make leisure time individualistic and characterized by exchange relationships and instrumental reasoning
- Authentic selfhood in contemporary society: alienation and atomism *vs.* integration, co-operation and co-participation

Discussion

- How has the pressure of contemporary lifestyles, reinforced by work, economic, social, and political factors, reduced our understanding of our self and of the quality of life?
- Do we now live to work rather than work to live?
- How can we break the current paradigms of work and leisure in order to make life more meaningful and satisfying?
- Can we give up the compulsive purchase of material things which erodes our appreciation of non-work related activities?
- Can a sense of simplicity help us regain a more authentic view of leisure?
- Is it possible to control the consumption tendencies of contemporary lifestyles? How?
- How can we use leisure to move from materialistic individualism to social solidarity?
- Can we move from the live-to-work to a work-to-live philosophy?
- How can we recapture leisure as a time for creativity, fun, innovation and interpersonal relationships?
- Are consumptionism, consumerism and materialism inevitable aspects of modern life?
- How can we reassess our understanding of work and of the workplace?
- Has technology increased the quantity of leisure time while eroding its quality?
- Is leisure understood differently in industrial, pre-industrial and post-industrial societies?

16. “Human trafficking is a violation of basic human rights, a devaluation of personhood and a modern form of slavery and human bondage.” Discuss and evaluate philosophically.

This question invites a discussion and critical evaluation of human rights.

Key Points

- Human trafficking: deception, fraud, coercion for purposes of exploitation of persons for labour and profit objectives
- Human trafficking vs. the smuggling of persons and/or illegal immigration
- Human trafficking: domestic, national, international and global aspects
- Human trafficking as the result of the global flow of capital, goods, services and labour
- Labour and the value of labour vs. the person and the value of the personhood
- The value, dignity and integrity of human life and personhood
- Having the right to choose a profession vs. being forced to take up a profession
- Labour exploitation and global profits
- The person as an economic and financial commodity: bondage, servitude, exploitation
- Human trafficking and the loss of one’s right to the results of one’s labour
- Economic servitude, debt bondage, inadequate compensation and the loss of personhood
- Human trafficking as the violation and loss of human rights by means of explicit and tacit consent
- Devaluation of the person through psychological coercion, subservience, use of threats and physical violence
- Human trafficking and the destruction of personal, familial, social and cultural bonds
- Enabling human trafficking: political corruption, organized crime and moral responsibilities

Discussion

- How is human trafficking the equivalent of human slavery and bondage? To what extent?
- How is human trafficking a violation of basic human rights? How can these rights be reclaimed and protected by victims of trafficking?
- Why do people enter the foreign labour force in exchange for a loss of rights and violations of human dignity?
- Why do individuals feel “pushed out” of familiar and supportive situations and “pulled into” unfamiliar and threatening situations?
- Is human trafficking related to globalization?
- Are there differences of responsibility with regard to countries that send, provide means of transit for, or receive persons into human bondage?
- How does human trafficking impact on an understanding of personhood and authenticity?
- What organizations work to put an end to human trafficking?
- How does human trafficking lead to the isolation and alienation of individuals?
- Is human trafficking a criminal problem, a moral problem, or both?
- Who is to be held responsible for trafficking? How?
- How does historical/cultural relativism impact on the issue of human trafficking?

Optional Theme 8: People, nations and cultures

17. “It is impossible to make judgments about cultures other than one’s own.” Discuss and critically evaluate.

This question invites a discussion and critical evaluation that can draw on a number of features of the issue of judging other cultures. Responses may evaluate the issues involved in making judgments and ask if it is possible to make a value judgment of the inferiority or superiority of different cultures in the world.

Key Points

- The issue of the ability – or not – to make judgments free from unavoidable cultural bias of one’s own
- Is there any such defined thing as a culture? Or is any one culture inevitably a composite of a set of different sub-cultures?
- The pluralism and diversity debate both from a particular specific viewpoint – multiculturalism within a single society – and a global perspective
- The different bases on which to judge cultures: religious, historical, rational, technological, fiscal *etc.*
- Is culture not just the sum total of human actions in a given space? Is there anything else to observe and judge when considering the concept?
- The debate between fact and value – when we look at cultures other than our own are we considering merely ways of life or underlying values?
- The universality of values *vs.* the particularity of different ways of life
- What criteria may be used to consider the issue of cultural inferiority/superiority?

Discussion

- The impact of globalization on cultural considerations and judgments
- Cultural identity and how this is established and maintained
- The influence of cultural experience on any person making cultural judgments
- The view that culture is essentially an exercise of power and how this might affect making judgments
- Do/can cultures progress? Is the notion of cultural progress a fanciful or wishful one?

18. Evaluate philosophically the implications that globalization might have for the development of self-identity.

This question enables a philosophical evaluation of the issue of self-identity in an international and global setting. Answers may include the impact of globalization generally and the particular issues raised by the pressure of globalization on the individual.

Key Points

- What globalization is: a sense of a general, single cultural or ideological pressure extending around the world
- The notion of self-identity and individual development in a global setting; how I have become who I am
- The scope of globalization: does it relate to all fields of human activity in a given space?
- How does culture develop in a global setting and what influence does culture have on the individual and self-identity?
- The reliance on geographical, historical, traditional, religious, economic, and political factors in developing self-identity
- Globalization and multiculturalism and their effects on self-identity
- The emphasis on a society's produce for an analysis of globalization
- Can globalization affect artistic endeavours as well as retail ones?
- Globalization as a mind-set as opposed to a material market
- The effect of power relations on developing self-identity

Discussion

- The dependency on technology for the spread of globalization; is globalization more about economics than culture? Does it impact on self-identity?
 - Globalization and the non-industrialized world. Does globalization affect individuals in rural or economically developing settings?
 - Aspects of cultural uniformity: personal identity vs. linguistic or legal codes that apply internationally
 - The impact on individuals of international institutions *e.g.* the UN, the World Bank, the G20, the IB
 - The concept of human rights applying to individuals above and beyond geographical borders
 - The secular nature of globalization in a world with a plurality of religions
 - The notion of cultural development *e.g.* Marx, postmodernism
 - Globalization as an economic, social and political system
-