

# Markscheme

May 2017








Philosophy

Higher level and standard level

Paper 2

This markscheme is the property of the International Baccalaureate and must **not** be reproduced or distributed to any other person without the authorization of the IB Global Centre, Cardiff.

The following are the annotations available to use when marking responses.

Annotation	Explanation	Shortcuts
	Highlight (can be expanded)	Alt+4
	Unclear	Alt+3
	Incorrect Point	Alt+2
	Good Response/Good Point	Alt+1
	Underline tool	
	Apply to blank pages	
	On-page comment text box (for adding specific comments)	Alt+0
<b>AE</b>	Attempts Evaluation	Alt+6
<b>AQ</b>	Answers the Question	
<b>CKS</b>	Clear Knowledge Shown	
<b>Des</b>	Descriptive	
<b>EE</b>	Effective Evaluation	
<b>EXP</b>	Expression	Alt+9
<b>GD</b>	Good Definition	
<b>GEXA</b>	Good Example	
<b>GEXP</b>	Good Explanation	
<b>GP</b>	Good Point	
<b>GUT</b>	Good Use of Text	
<b>IL</b>	Inaccurate Language	
<b>IR</b>	Irrelevant	
<b>LNK</b>	Good linkage to course (P3 only)	
<b>NAQ</b>	Not Answered Question	

<b>Nexa</b>	No examples	
<b>NMRD</b>	Not much reasoning or discussion	
<b>NUT</b>	No Use of Text	
<b>PE</b>	Poorly Expressed	Alt+5
<b>PEOC</b>	Personal experience of course (P3 only)	
<b>REF</b>	Reference Needed	Alt+8
<b>REP</b>	Repetition	
<b>TNCE</b>	Theory is Not Clearly Explained	
<b>U</b>	Understanding	
<b>VG</b>	Vague	Alt+7

You **must** make sure you have looked at all pages. Please put the **SEEN** annotation on any blank page, to indicate that you have seen it.

**I. QIG availability**

The following QIGs are available this coming session for which you can to attempt qualification:

QIG number	Text/author	English QIG availability	Spanish QIG availability
01	Simone de Beauvoir <i>The Second Sex</i> , Vol. 1 part 1, Vol. 2 part 1 and Vol. 2 part 4		
02	René Descartes <i>Meditations</i>	✓	✓
03	David Hume <i>Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion</i>		
04	John Stuart Mill <i>On Liberty</i>	✓	
05	Friedrich Nietzsche <i>The Genealogy of Morals</i>	✓	✓
06	Martha Nussbaum <i>Creating Capabilities: The Human Development Approach</i>		
07	Ortega y Gasset <i>The Origin of Philosophy</i>		
08	Plato <i>The Republic</i> , Books IV–IX	✓	✓
09	Peter Singer <i>The Life You Can Save</i>	✓	
10	Charles Taylor <i>The Ethics of Authenticity</i>	✓	✓
11	Lao Tzu <i>Tao Te Ching</i>		
12	Zhuangzi <i>Zhuangzi</i> , Inner Chapters		

**II. Candidates who overlook the new Paper 2 rubric of answering both parts a and b of one question**

However clearly the IB sets out its expectations on how candidates should answer exam questions there are occasions when we receive work that does not match what we asked for. There is a specific case in exams where we ask students to select particular questions to answer and they fail to follow these rules (rubrics).

This note is intended to clarify how we deal with these situations through a series of scenarios. The actions have been checked to ensure that they are supported by RM Assessor.

**Overarching principles**

The following statements underpin our decisions below:

1. No candidate should be disadvantaged for following the rules.
2. Whenever possible candidates should receive credit for what they know.

### Example

To help understand the different scenarios we will make reference to an example assessment.

**Instruction: candidates must respond to both parts of one question.**

- Q7. (a) Explain Mill’s view of the relationship between liberty and utility. (10 marks)  
(b) To what extent are liberty and utility fundamentally conflicting concepts? (15 marks)
- Q9. (a) Explain the view that morality has a clear and traceable genealogy. (10 marks)  
(b) To what extent do you agree with the genealogy Nietzsche proposes? (15 marks)

### Scenario 1. Candidate answers parts from two different questions.

Example: Candidate answers 7(a) and 9(a) or answers 7(b) and 9(a)

#### Action:

Mark all of the candidate’s answers. The student will receive their best mark from one question.

In the second example this means the best mark for either 7(b) or 9(a).

This requires that examiners assign each mark to the correct question part (i.e. gives the mark for 9(a) to 9(a) and **not** 7(a) – if question is QIGed this will happen automatically).

### Scenario 2. Candidate does not split their answer according to the sub-parts.

Example: Candidate writes one answer which they label as question 7 or they indicate they have only answered 9(a) but actually answer both 9(a) and 9(b) in that answer.

#### Action:

Examiners use their best judgement to award marks for all sub-parts as if the candidate has correctly labelled their answer.

In the example this means the candidate would be able to gain up to 25 marks despite only labelling the answer as 9(a).

**Exception** – where the nature of the two parts of the question means it is important to differentiate between the two answers, for example the first part should be done before the second part (in maths) or the candidate needs to show they understand the difference between the two parts of the question then examiners should use their judgement and only award marks if it is clear that the candidate has simply made a mistake in numbering their answers.

### Scenario 3. Candidate duplicates their answer to the first part in the second part.

Example: Candidate answers 7(a) and the repeats the same text as part of 7(b)

#### Action:

Only give credit for the answer once (in the first part of the question). The assessment criteria should assess distinct skills when there are parts to a question so this problem should not occur.

### Scenario 4. Candidate provides the wrong question number for their answer.

Example: Candidate states they are answering 7(a) and 7(b) but their response clearly talks about Nietzsche (Q9) rather than Mills (Q7).

#### Action:

Mark the answer according to the mark scheme for the question that they should have indicated.

**Exception** – this only applies when there is no ambiguity as to which question the student has attempted, for example if they have rephrased the question in their opening paragraph. It is not the role of the examiner to identify which question is the best fit for their answer (i.e. which questions their answer would get most marks for). If the given question number is a plausible match with their answer then the student should be marked according to that question. Only in exceptional circumstances should this rule be applied to sub-questions (i.e. assuming the candidate had mistakenly swapped their answers for Q7(a) and Q7(b))

## How to use the Diploma Programme Philosophy markscheme

The assessment markbands constitute the formal tool for marking examination scripts, and in these assessment markbands examiners can see the skills being assessed in the examinations. The markschemes are designed to assist examiners in possible routes taken by candidates in terms of the content of their answers when demonstrating their skills of doing philosophy through their responses. The points listed are not compulsory points, and not necessarily the best possible points. They are a framework to help examiners contextualize the requirements of the question, and to facilitate the application of marks according to the assessment markbands listed on page 4 for part A responses, and page 5 for part B responses.

It is important that examiners understand that the main idea of the course is to promote *doing* philosophy, and this involves activity and engagement throughout a two-year programme, as opposed to emphasizing the chance to display knowledge in a terminal set of examination papers. Even in the examinations, responses should not be assessed on how much candidates *know* as much as how they are able to use their knowledge in support of an argument, using the skills referred to in the various assessment markbands published in the subject guide, reflecting an engagement with philosophical activity throughout the course. As a tool intended to help examiners in assessing responses, the following points should be kept in mind when using a markscheme:

- The Diploma Programme Philosophy course is designed to encourage the skills of *doing* philosophy in the candidates. These skills can be accessed through reading the assessment markbands in the subject guide
- The markscheme does not intend to outline a model/correct answer
- The markscheme has an introductory paragraph which contextualizes the emphasis of the question being asked
- The bullet points below the paragraph are suggested possible points of development that should not be considered a prescriptive list but rather an indicative list where they might appear in the answer
- If there are names of philosophers and references to their work incorporated into the markscheme, this should help to give context for the examiners and does not reflect a requirement that such philosophers and references should appear in an answer: They are possible lines of development.
- Candidates can legitimately select from a wide range of ideas, arguments and concepts in service of the question they are answering, and it is possible that candidates will use material effectively that is *not* mentioned in the markscheme
- Examiners should be aware of the command terms for Philosophy as published on page 54 of the Philosophy subject guide when assessing responses
- In markschemes for Paper 2 there is a greater requirement for specific content as the Paper requires the study of a text by the candidates and the questions set will derive from that text. The markscheme will show what is relevant for both part A and part B answers. In part B responses, candidates may select other material they deem as relevant
- Responses for part A and part B should be assessed using the distinct assessment markbands.

### Note to examiners

Candidates at both Higher Level and Standard Level answer **one** question on the prescribed texts. Each question consists of two parts, and candidates must answer both parts of the question (a and b).



**Paper 2 part A markbands**

<b>Marks</b>	<b>Level descriptor</b>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.</li> </ul>
1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is little relevant knowledge of the specified idea/argument/concept from the text.</li> <li>• The explanation is minimal.</li> <li>• Philosophical vocabulary is not used, or is consistently used inappropriately.</li> </ul>
3–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some knowledge of the specified idea/argument/concept from the text is demonstrated but this lacks accuracy, relevance and detail.</li> <li>• The explanation is basic and in need of development.</li> <li>• Philosophical vocabulary is not used, or is consistently used inappropriately.</li> </ul>
5–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge of the specified idea/argument/concept from the text is mostly accurate and relevant, but lacking in detail.</li> <li>• There is a satisfactory explanation.</li> <li>• Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately.</li> </ul>
7–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The response contains accurate and relevant knowledge of the specified idea/argument/concept from the text.</li> <li>• The explanation is clear, although may be in need of further development.</li> <li>• Philosophical vocabulary is mostly used appropriately.</li> </ul>
9–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The response contains relevant, accurate and detailed knowledge of the specified idea/argument/concept from the text.</li> <li>• The explanation is clear and well developed.</li> <li>• There is appropriate use of philosophical vocabulary throughout the response.</li> </ul>

**Paper 2 part B markbands**

<b>Marks</b>	<b>Level descriptor</b>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.</li> </ul>
1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is little relevant knowledge of the text.</li> <li>• Philosophical vocabulary is not used, or is consistently used inappropriately.</li> <li>• The response is mostly descriptive with very little analysis.</li> <li>• There is no discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view.</li> </ul>
4–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some knowledge of the text is demonstrated but this lacks accuracy and relevance.</li> <li>• Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately.</li> <li>• There is some limited analysis, but the response is more descriptive than analytical.</li> <li>• There is little discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view.</li> <li>• Some of the main points are justified.</li> </ul>
7–9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge of the text is mostly accurate and relevant.</li> <li>• Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately.</li> <li>• The response contains analysis, but this analysis lacks development.</li> <li>• There is some discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view.</li> <li>• Many of the main points are justified.</li> </ul>
10–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The response contains accurate and relevant knowledge of the text.</li> <li>• Philosophical vocabulary is mostly used appropriately.</li> <li>• The response contains clear critical analysis.</li> <li>• There is discussion and some assessment of alternative interpretations or points of view.</li> <li>• Most of the main points are justified.</li> </ul>
13–15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The response contains relevant, accurate and detailed knowledge of the text.</li> <li>• There is appropriate use of philosophical vocabulary throughout the response.</li> <li>• The response contains clear and well developed critical analysis.</li> <li>• There is discussion and assessment of alternative interpretations or points of view.</li> <li>• All or nearly all of the main points are justified.</li> </ul>

**Simone de Beauvoir: *The Second Sex*, Vol. 1 part 1, Vol. 2 part 1 and Vol. 2 part 4**

1. (a) **Explain the claim that “humanity is not an animal species: It is a historical reality”.** **[10]**

This question focuses on the argument that de Beauvoir presents in Ch. 3 of Vol. 1, *The Point of View of Historical Materialism*. The question invites an explanation of the main topics that de Beauvoir illustrates and an understanding of the framework of her analysis; historical materialism. Responses might explain de Beauvoir’s criticism of Engels’s view of sexual distinction between men and women and the methodological limits of historical materialism in taking many assumptions for granted. Particularly, de Beauvoir criticizes the fact that any explanation of sexual distinction is connected to material conditions or the economic organization of the society only, which is quite limited and simplistic, since technological progress has historically reduced the gap between men’s power and women’s strength in modern times. Moreover, the condition of women depends on facts that go beyond physical and biological factors, such as sexual awareness, values, meanings, and so on. Of course, there are biological aspects that render women necessarily different from men. Candidates might refer to such elements and conditions, eg pregnancy, childcare, and family, though these elements have a variable weight according to the specific societal structure in which women live and give birth (for example, the existence of specific policies supporting pregnant women and their children). Responses might consider another of de Beauvoir’s criticisms, though secondary with respect to Engels’s: Freud’s psychoanalysis, whose limit is, after all, not that different from Engels’s, that is, to be monistic; Engels presents an economic monism, while Freud produces a sexual monism. Neither theory is capable of grasping the whole complexity of the “second sex”. Reference to the history of humanity through the main evolutionary steps in technological progress might be another element in structuring a response.

Candidates might explore:

- Engels’s view of sexual distinction: Class division, technologies, family
- Freud’s psychoanalytical approach to sexual matters
- De Beauvoir’s criticism of Freud’s sexual monism and Engels’s economic monism
- Economic organization of society as a reason for sexual differences or oppression
- The history of technological progress as a possible history of an increasing sexual oppression.

- (b) **Evaluate de Beauvoir’s criticism of this claim.** **[15]**

Possible discussion points include:

- Methodological and/or conceptual limits of historical materialism
- De Beauvoir’s view of women on a biological basis
- Technology as levelling strength differences between sexes
- Societal organization as possible support for women’s specific conditions, eg pregnancy, childcare, family policies.

**2. (a) Explain de Beauvoir’s view of women’s economic independence. [10]**

This question focuses on the last chapter (14) of de Beauvoir’s work. In this chapter, de Beauvoir analyses the basic elements that render women independent, or freer from men. Responses might take into account the first element of this analysis, that is the role played by a job in the process of emancipation of a woman. Economic independence is the first step for further independence in other fields: As de Beauvoir states, “a woman with a ballot paper in her hand is not independent”; her condition as a voter who has acquired civil liberties needs a real independence, which is granted by having a job. Nonetheless, a job is not necessarily a guarantee of emancipation at all costs. On the contrary, just because a woman might consider a job so important for her independence, she might be led to accept it under oppressive conditions or as the consequence of a favour after asking for it. The condition might result in a fake independence, because the woman is in a situation of working slavery, sometimes sentimentally too, in relation with her employer/lover; the married woman does not live a radically different condition, since in most cases her job just means an extra income within a family situation that still sees her under man’s protection (her husband). Responses might refer to one or more of these mechanisms and phenomena that de Beauvoir clearly presents in the chapter within the topic of the independence of women, also referring to other elements that can support women’s emancipation, such as acquisition of civil liberties (eg right of vote) or active participation in trade unions or political parties. Another element that candidates might consider for detailed analysis is femininity: Women’s emancipation is limited by the fact that women can hardly renounce their femininity as imposed by fashion and customs. This goes from dress codes and clothes to housekeeping, from the rules of attraction of the opposite sex, to reputation and social judgment in such ways that are not required of men. Even a totally emancipated woman has to face social obstacles and environments that put high pressure on her career or personal relationships, actually rendering her always less free than men in similar contexts.

Candidates might explore:

- Economic independence and the importance of a job
- Other factors of emancipation, eg civil liberties, active participation in trade unions or political parties
- Cases of fake economic independence, eg employer/lover or oppressing conditions.

**(b) Evaluate de Beauvoir’s view of women’s economic independence. [15]**

Possible discussion points include:

- Whether an economic emancipation guarantees a moral/psychological or social independence
- Femininity as a limiting factor of emancipation as applied to several contexts, eg clothes, housekeeping, sex (rules of attractions, sex as relief, paying for sex)
- Social pressure on reputation, eg career.

**René Descartes: *Meditations***

3. (a) **Explain the distinction Descartes makes between innate, adventitious and factitious ideas.** [10]

Descartes makes these distinctions in the *Third Meditation*. He draws a distinction between the nature of ideas. Some are innate, some are acquired and some are fabricated. The fact that he understands what a thing is, what truth is and what thought is, seems to result from his own nature alone. Descartes does not question the certainty of innate ideas. His problems stem from those ideas that originate from outside himself: Adventitious ideas. Clear and distinct ideas are means to ensure ideas are immune from doubt. Clarity and distinctiveness are the characteristics of certainty. The prime and original example of a clear and distinct idea is the *cogito*. It should be noted that while Descartes is concentrating on certain propositions under his attention, their clarity and distinctiveness make them unshakable in the face of hyperbolic doubt. It is when he no longer gives them full attention that they may appear to be doubtful. As impressive as this epistemic perception is as a marker for truth, it is still not enough for Descartes to establish this signifier of truth from doubt; the Evil Genius argument shows that even though my perceptions be clear and distinctive, my cognitive faculties are always in error. In order to rescue this argument, Descartes must employ a non-deceiving God to establish the truth of his perceptions and hence, his clear and distinct ideas.

Candidates might explore:

- Clarity and distinctiveness as qualities of knowledge
- The persistence of doubt even though ideas are clear and distinct
- Ideas are usually a type of mental copy of sense experiences, but Descartes also describes angels and God as examples of ideas which are beyond sensory perception
- Ideas are modifications of the mind, properties of the mental substance which are revealed through clear and distinct perception
- Descartes's clear and distinct ideas are innate ideas which are present in the mind from the beginning, such as the truths of mathematics and other truths that are self-evident
- Sensory ideas, though mental, are caused by physical, external objects (adventitious ideas); thus, ideas are brought about by matter, not a mental substance.

- (b) **Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the distinctions Descartes makes.** [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Though Descartes claims that the *cogito* is the prime example of a clear and distinct idea, is this merely a report of an experience without any epistemic content?
- Is Descartes's *cogito*, and hence his clear and distinct ideas, ultimately appealing to a form of epistemological intuitionism? cf GE Moore
- Does Descartes defeat his own investigation by using an unrealistic level of doubt which undermines any hope for truth and certainty?
- The role of the mind in producing its own ideas
- Different positions on the question and debates between rationalists (eg Descartes), empiricists (eg Hume), and Kant's synthesis of empiricism and rationalism in his "transcendental logic"
- Are innate ideas limited to the notion of God, our finite mind and the indefinite body?
- The idea of God is innate but is also adventitious (ie caused from outside Descartes)
- Are clarity and distinctiveness markers of truth? The subjective nature of both seems to contradict the certainty and objectivity Descartes requires for knowledge
- If the truth of a proposition is confirmed using clear and distinct ideas when Descartes gives attention to it, then why does the same proposition become doubtful when direct attention is withdrawn?

**4. (a) Explain how Descartes uses doubt as a means of gaining certainty. [10]**

This question invites candidates to explain how Descartes uses doubt as a method for certainty. Universal hyperbolic doubt is the fundamental and particular method of enquiry. The reason for the severity in the level of doubt is that it is necessary to shake even the most unshakable propositions and thoughts; without such doubt, Descartes would have no reason to question his beliefs. First, Descartes introduces the dreaming arguments where a parallel is drawn between waking and dreaming life; the second stage is to introduce the Evil Genius which is to demonstrate the possibility that, though I may believe the laws of arithmetic and logic, and I may perceive correctly, I may be in error cognitively, so that these laws, and other seemingly self-evident ideas, are now without a solid justification. Descartes needs to establish a non-deceiving God to defeat the Evil Genius argument and establish that the external world can be known with certainty.

Candidates might explore:

- The dreaming argument: Qualitatively, experiences and dreams are similar
- The Evil Genius argument: Although I may perceive correctly, I may be in error cognitively
- Descartes describes many things that are knowable; his aim is to make them known
- Descartes’s idea of God is a being that is eternal, infinite, all-knowing, all-powerful, and the creator of all things that are out of himself. The idea of God has in it more objective reality than those ideas which represent finite substances
- The idea of God is not drawn from the senses, nor is it pure production or fiction; it is innate in the same way as the idea of myself is, which I also received from God
- Possible analysis of the “cognitive error” on other grounds, eg pragmatism, Kant’s view of understanding
- Does the “cogito ergo sum, I think therefore I am” argument necessarily entail that “I may perceive correctly”, but “be in error cognitively”?
- The need for doubt to be universal and hyperbolic to defeat skepticism and to ensure any possible errors in current beliefs are avoided.

**(b) Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses in his methodology in the search for certainty. [**

Possible discussion points include:

- The criticism that Descartes’s doubt is actually self-deception as there are some things that Descartes has no positive reason to doubt, and the adherence to a maxim is no substitute for these positive reasons
- Is a methodological approach – the application of a method of inquiry to ontological or epistemological questions, a preferable one to a particularist approach?
- Has Descartes taken an over-exaggerated approach to his search? Has he made the success of finding any certainty impossible by insisting on an unrealistic level for knowledge?
- In what significant ways are dreams and waking like similar? In what significant ways are they different?
- A problem of this argument is that if I, who possess this idea of God, clearly and distinctly believe that there is no God, then could I exist?
- Descartes makes certain assumptions about God’s nature (as well as his existence), eg his reliability in guaranteeing the correctness of our sense experiences. Are they well-founded?
- Why must the idea of God be externally inspired and not a direct product of my desire or will?

**David Hume: *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion***

**5. (a) Explain in what ways Philo presents evidence that God might not be perfect. [10]**

This question invites an explanation of the arguments put forward by Philo for God not being perfect. The analogy between the universe and an ugly palace is put forward to show that even though there was a good architect the ugliness remains. The ugliness is presented in the four types of misery in the world. The conclusion drawn is that these miseries are not sufficient to remove our faith in God as the relationship between good and evil could be resolved, but in an unknown way. However, the inference of goodness is difficult to establish and therefore mostly probably God seems to be morally neutral.

Candidates might explore:

- The four miseries: Physical pain, the impact of natural laws, limits on species survival attributes, and fragility in the universe (imbalances in the natural phenomena)
- Methods of deducing God's attributes from the world and the consequence that God is neither good nor evil
- The consequences of a morally neutral God and the four hypotheses put forward by Philo; God as perfectly good, perfectly malicious, good and malicious, or neither good nor malicious
- The obvious negation of the first two and the cultural evidence that supports the third position (that of two conflicting forces), but the real lack of empirical evidence of the cultural tradition suggests that the fourth position is the most secure: Natural laws operate and God is indifferent
- Therefore, our belief rather than empirical evidence points to a moral neutrality.

**(b) Evaluate the arguments presented to support a morally neutral God. [15]**

Possible discussion points include:

- Empirical evidence does not provide evidence for a moral stance being taken by God
- Dual and balanced forces working in the world, although put forward by traditions, do not stand up to empirical investigation
- Experience does not seem appropriate to support any argument for the moral nature of God. The First Cause argument does not relate to any generalizable positions about the nature of God
- The claim that God is morally neutral starts to build an argument for atheism.

**6. (a) Explain the nature of the dialogic method used by Hume. [10]**

This question invites an exploration of Hume’s dialogic method. The use of three conversationalists allows for an interplay of contrasting positions and the repetition of position counter and rebuttal as a way exploring positions about the existence and nature of God.

Candidates might explore:

- An outline of positions held by Cleanthes, Demea and Philo: An empirical theist confronting a classical Christian, countered by a skeptic. The rhetorical style of Cleanthes might be illustrated
- Differing views on whether Cleanthes is in fact Hume himself speaking
- Plato and Cicero used the dialogic method to develop arguments on issues with no definitive answer as opposed to arguments about matters of fact
- The dialogic approach between three fictional characters allows for the exploration of a controversial subject (a dangerous subject), the nature of God, without putting the writing in the front line of criticism, confirmed by the late publications of the work
- The structure of the dialogue between three people allows for the investigation of the issue of religion without coming up with definitive answers
- In dialogue form that which seems to be obvious, the existence of God, can be challenged, through question and answer
- The sequencing of the development of the argument for and against the existence of God might be developed and perhaps critiqued for its simplistic nature and the use of analogies to draw points out which is often the case in dialogues
- A possible contrast is the Platonic approach; in Hume’s case the format is the contrasting and challenging of fixed positions whereas in Plato’s case it is the drawing out views and positions as a result of leading questions.

**(b) Evaluate the degree of success that Hume achieves by using a dialogic method. [15]**

Possible discussion points include:

- Personal identification with the lines of argument
- The degree to which Hume was able to mirror everyday discourse with the use of ambiguities and confusion within the argument
- The ever-shifting position course by counters and rebuttals
- The possibility of disguising Hume’s own personal position through the character Cleanthes
- The dialogic approach might allow for hypocrisy to appear without causing offence
- Irrational positions being presented as rational because of the dialogic nature of discussion and analysis
- Does it have success in exploring critically the major arguments for and against the existence of God?



**John Stuart Mill: *On Liberty***

**7. (a) Explain Mill’s claim that “one’s standard of judgment is his own liking”. [10]**

The question focuses on a basic assumption of Mill’s entire work, as it is presented in the *Introductory* first chapter. Mill discusses the friction between individuals and society emerging from, on one hand, the necessity of guaranteeing personal liberties and, on the other hand, from the need for social security. This is a key element of the whole contractarianism, since its theoretical origins (beginning with Marsilius of Padua and his *Defensor Pacis* (1324)) rise from the long-term conflicts between the Empire and the Papacy (“investiture struggle”). Particularly, the question emerges from a specific issue that Mill presents at the beginning of his work: Whether, and how, it is possible to set “the rules of conduct that mankind impose on one another”, because “there is a limit to the legitimate interference of collective opinion with individual independence” (and to find that limit is an indispensable condition of human affairs). Candidates might refer to this basic issue by reporting Mill’s concern about any risk of violability of personal tastes and opinions: First of all, the limits and dangers of any customary behaviour if taken as the ground for any judgment of others’ habits. Any standard of judgment that is not supported by reasons is grounded on personal feelings, opinions, or beliefs only, whose validity cannot be stronger or higher than those of others; nonetheless, even though they should be supported by reasons, these would greatly be deduced from others’ behaviour; so, they generate a preference again, instead of offering a real reason for choosing or adopting a specific behaviour against another one. Responses might also analyse related concepts, such as negative and positive liberty, equality, civil rights, use of power (*ie* in order for the state to maintain the social order), and refer to other theories (eg Hobbes, Locke, and Kant). Moreover, candidates might mention the three categories that Mill defines in order to divide the human liberties (liberty of thought and opinion, liberty of tastes and pursuits, liberty to unite with others).

Candidates might explore:

- The justification of standards of judgement by reasons vs. unsupported preferences/opinions; differences between the way we assess our own judgements and actions and the way we assess other people’s judgements and actions
- Issues around free speech: a lack of rational justification for our own standards of judgement undermines any assumption of infallibility of those standards; hence the need for free speech, discussion, and debate
- the relationship between personal liberty, especially the right to one’s own views and the associated right to live life according to that and the values of the community at large as they impinge upon those personal rights
- The impact of social customs which might provide good reasons for conformity on the part of individuals and an adjustment of their personal preferences
- Whether it is possible to set universal rules of behaviour; definition of “good”
- Mill’s different categories of human liberties
- Different types of liberties, eg as in Locke’s theory
- The state’s limits in protecting and maintaining the social order; possible comparison to other theories, eg Hobbes’s *Leviathan*, Bentham’s panopticon, Nozick’s “free riders”.

**(b) Evaluate the relationship between social customs and conformity. [15]**

Possible discussion points include:

- The people’s demands for conformity; conformity as a means for social security
- The relationship between judgment and habits and/or social accepted customs
- The relationship between social order and the limitation of individual liberties
- Coercion, use/misuse of political/military power.

8. (a) **Explain Mill’s claim that “the state should require and compel education”.** [10]

The question takes into account a specific argument that Mill presents in the last chapter of his work. Mill illustrates the issue of education as an example of the general topic concerning the duties of the state to avoid someone to be harmed by someone else; these duties have to be fulfilled in all such cases, where someone’s liberty is a danger for someone else. Candidates might mention one or more examples that Mill shows, *eg* the family relations (husbands, wives and children), trade, gambling (and, generally, “bad businesses”), drunkenness and all the public violations of decency. Another related point is that parents do not have full ownership over the lives of their children. Candidates might underline whether, and why, Mill seems to contradict himself about the basic defense of liberty expressed all along the previous chapters of his work; stronger responses might present the reasons why Mill seems to limit individual liberties and strengthen the state’s power in certain fields: Education is clearly one of the best examples Mill offers for the fact that there are some values, *ie* social values, which seem to be more important than individual liberties. As Mill states, “to bring a child into existence without a fair prospect of being able, not only to provide food for its body, but instruction and training for its mind, is a crime”. A deeper analysis might succeed in showing that Mill’s arguments in favour of a government’s action and against individual harmful behaviours is, after all, not really contradictory with his previous theses, since the higher and final aim is still the individual: To prohibit actions that can damage him and/or foster behaviours that promote his development is a guarantee for society of having a capable citizen who is in the best conditions to make his own decisions (including the right to make mistakes) and choose his life; this is the highest defense of liberty at the very end and the reason why some actions and behaviours (such as gambling or drunkenness) are considered violations of both social and individual values.

Candidates might explore:

- Existence of duties or obligations for individuals towards others
- Possibilities of a government’s action or state’s punishing actions/coercion
- Mill gives examples of limited individual liberties for specific contexts
- Mill’s view of education and its social function; comparison to other theories on education, *eg* Plato, Rousseau
- Social values versus an individual’s values.

(b) **Evaluate the extent to which Mill’s view of education is self-contradictory.** [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Individual liberties as means for personal and social development
- Reasons why some individual actions are considered to be harmful, *eg* gambling or drunkenness; harmful actions or behaviours
- Parents do not have ownership over their children: Cases of dispute between the state and individuals/communities about the education of the children, *eg* Amish
- Cases of abuse of power by the state in totalitarian societies.

**Friedrich Nietzsche: *The Genealogy of Morals***

**9. (a) Explain the origins of the value judgments “good and evil”. [10]**

The genealogy of the value judgments and values synthesized under the expressions “good and evil” and “good and bad” form the backbone of the First Essay. Nietzsche questions the real origin of our notions of good and evil and investigates under what conditions man devised the value judgments “good and evil”.

Candidates might explore:

- The etymological quest for the root meanings of “good and evil” and “good and bad”
- The genealogy of morality aims to show that there are distinct aspects of morality, each with a separate pre-moral source. Genealogy traces the moral version of each strand back to pre-moral sources – thus to ancestors of morality; eg the sense of “good” varied, depending upon which class perceived it. For the dominant class, or “masters”, the primary sense of what is good is the self and that which resembles the self
- Morality is always rooted in drives, instincts and will or their failure; ideal values as illness of instincts and will
- The original aristocratic value-equation (and its inversion) which makes the following equivalent: Good, noble, powerful, beautiful, happy, beloved of God
- The aristocratic morality is historically the earlier; it is characterized by an ethic of active and ruthless self-affirmation
- The slave morality is a reactive and resentful response of the weak to the domination by the self-affirming strong
- The aristocratic morality is driven by the will to power, whereas the slave morality by *ressentiment*
- Suffering as a source of human progress.

**(b) To what extent is Nietzsche’s genealogical method when applied to value judgments (for example “good and evil”) a justifiable approach to understanding the nature of morality? [15]**

Possible discussion points include:

- How might genealogy be justified as a method?
- The issue of the historical evidence to support the genealogical claims
- To what extent can the genealogical approach help us to understand the normative character of ethical criteria?
- Is relativism an unavoidable result of the genealogical approach?
- Nietzsche’s critique of morality calls for a revitalization of life and forms of ethical life
- “Will to power” as a possible basis for a new moral life
- To what extent might perspectivism be a fruitful way of developing genealogy as ethical guidance?

10. (a) **Explain Nietzsche’s account of the human ability to make promises and its relationship to memory as central parts of becoming human.** [10]

The question asks for an explanation of Nietzsche’s idea, considered in the *Second Essay* that man is the sole animal able to promise. He says that to breed an animal that is entitled to make promises is the essence of the paradoxical task nature has set itself where human beings are concerned and that this is the real problem of human beings.

Candidates might explore:

- In order to organize the future, human beings must have first become something one could predict, something bound by regular rules, so that finally they are able to act like someone who makes promises, who makes him/herself into a pledge for the future
- Making promises and keeping memory as ways of organizing the human temporality as history
- That development is the history of the origin of responsibility. The task of breeding an animal with a right to make promises contains within it, as a condition and prerequisite, the more urgent prior task of making a human being necessarily uniform to some extent, one among many other like him, regular and consequently predictable
- Forgetfulness is the power which works against this promise-making. Forgetfulness is not merely a force of inertia; it is an active capability to repress, something Nietzsche sees as a positive
- For Nietzsche, there is nothing more fearful and more terrible in the history of human beings than the technique for developing his memory: “Only something which never ceases to cause pain stays in the memory”, that is a leading principle of the most ancient (and the most recent) psychology on Earth. When the human being considered it necessary to make a memory for himself, it never happened without blood, martyrs, and sacrifices
- The person who really has the right to make promises, becomes free; s/he is the master of free will, is sovereign and enjoys superiority over the others.

- (b) **Evaluate Nietzsche’s view that making promises and its relationship to memory are the essential features in the social bond between people.** [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Making promises as the distinctive feature of human bond. Keeping the word as the condition for granting contracts
- Accounts of memory as a condition for developing as a human being
- The struggle between memory and pride as a critique of illusion regarding oneself
- The subsequent influence of Nietzsche’s conception of memory, eg psychoanalysis
- To what extent do we as human beings master our memory?
- Memory and “will to power”
- Memory and promising might be conditions for a moral life, but moral action is something more, it requires acting by free will.

**Martha Nussbaum: *Creating Capabilities: The Human Development Approach***

**11. (a) Explain how Nussbaum applies the capabilities approach to feminism. [10]**

At the start of the work, Nussbaum uses an example of a woman in a developing world setting being enabled to develop her capabilities where otherwise her culture and social setting would have meant more servitude and suppression – *A Woman Seeking Justice*. This question allows for a treatment of how Nussbaum’s approach throughout the work, using specific examples and more universal claims, can apply to the issue of female equality and development.

Candidates might explore:

- The human development approach and its emphasis on self-respect for individuals
- The notion of human dignity and how this relates especially to women
- The human development approach claims to offer a path to justice – how this relates to gender equality
- The restriction that imperialism places on the development of individuals
- The tension between the need to respect different cultures and the universal demand to battle against injustices against women
- Nussbaum’s three main principles: Each person must be an end in herself; there must be scope for individual choice; social injustice must be discovered and addressed
- Nussbaum’s 10-point scale of measurement for human dignity and how that can apply to the lives of individual women in different cultures
- Humans must not be “objectified” or assumed to be a mere economic resource
- The treatment of contemporary matters of injustice including gender (see Chapter 8).

**(b) Evaluate the problems involved in applying the capabilities approach to feminism. [15]**

Possible discussion points include:

- The tension between developing universal human capabilities approach and the individual cultures and experiences to which it must apply
- The traditional measurement of economics concentrates on financial matters to the exclusion of the “real” economics of individuals’ lives
- The fact that GDP is too vague and ignores different factors to be measured, like gender equality
- Nussbaum’s views of the way figures are used to demonstrate economics which hide the real issues of the lives of the women (and other people) concerned
- The difficulty of measuring opportunities rather than resource consumption/production
- The different ways of looking at human behaviour (eg the difference between a person fasting (choice) or starving (no choice))
- The difficulty Nussbaum has in moving from a descriptive social science account of human dignity to a normative prescriptive ethical universal demand.

**12. (a) Explain Nussbaum’s view of cultural imperialism. [10]**

Nussbaum bases her treatment of human dignity and the demand for justice on the lives of individuals. However, individuals exist in different cultural settings within an increasingly overall global environment. This causes tensions in examining from one cultural perspective how an individual in another setting can or should be treated according to the needs of human dignity. Nussbaum refers not just to Western views on human capabilities but also to the Indian background, where one of her influences is the work of Amartya Sen.

Candidates might explore:

- Rights of individuals have a high place and the capabilities approach encourages intervention when rights are violated in the settings of individual lives – how does this fit with a critique of cultural imperialism?
- The 10-point list of capabilities is drawn in an abstract way to enable adaption to different settings
- Can Nussbaum’s approach be shown to be based on rational principles rather than personal preferences?
- Different cultural practices within a global environment
- The tension between communitarian approaches (relativism) and universal approaches (absolutism)
- Individual human dignity transcends cultural settings.

**(b) Evaluate the claim that the capabilities approach suffers from a form of cultural imperialism itself in its demand for intervention against individual flourishing. [15]**

Possible discussion points include:

- The issue of “value imperialism” where a person from a setting raises a critique against another setting
- The tension between encouraging intervention and respecting the varied cultural settings that individuals experience
- The emphasis on individualism appears to be a Western value, although Nussbaum draws on the Indian tradition as well – is this a problem?
- Is a value being branded “Western” a problem that should be addressed – or is this inverse bigotry?
- Is the 10-point list too abstract?
- How successfully does Nussbaum meet the difficulties of religion offering a more fundamental loyalty than rational principles on their own?
- Does Nussbaum effectively overcome the tension between relativism and objectivism?

**Ortega y Gasset: *The Origins of Philosophy*****13. (a) Explain Ortega’s claim that “the thing is the master of the man”. [10]**

A study of the history of philosophy instigates a necessary forward-looking set of questions and new possibilities – a “dialectical series”, according to Ortega, and it is in this context that he explains our interaction with, and comprehension of, the external world using a version of existential phenomenology. It is a human being’s interaction with something “other” that compels them to investigate further, to look again to form a more complete picture, and in the process develop ideas and concepts that are subject to further review. This is what Ortega calls having an “aspect” of a thing. An aspect is a “piece of the thing” which cannot exist without a beholder, so an aspect is the response of the thing to being looked at. This is what Ortega means by his claim, that objects direct and guide our attention. It is not the thing that moves that provides us with another aspect, but the movement of our attention over the object. Ortega provides the example of looking at an orange to demonstrate how the object is responsible for our passing from one aspect to another. It does so in a dialectical series traversing discursively from one concept to another, and he concludes that as we are not ubiquitous and cannot see the thing simultaneously from all vantage points, we are also the cause of our efforts to know the external world. The concepts that make up an aspect are in part an accumulation of our understanding of same concept based on its past – its history, with the contemporary understanding of this concept. Ortega calls the contemporary view an adversary of the collective and current understanding of a concept.

Candidates might explore:

- The distinction between observed and observer, subject and object, and the subsequent realism and anti-realism of experience
- New ideas are an adversary to current ideas and generate a dialectical series
- The assumption that there is a degree of agreement in the narratives of history, and that some level of objectivity is possible
- History is necessary to understand the content of current concepts and ideas, and to understand ourselves and our culture
- Ortega’s phenomenology as a method and as ontological position means that his history is not only from a human point of view, but is for a human view, as Ortega considered human experience as the ultimate reality
- History as a series of linked experiences
- The unity of historical facts: Ultimately facts about human interaction with each other and other objects, is found in the minds of individuals.

**(b) Evaluate the merits, or otherwise, of this claim. [15]**

Possible discussion points include:

- Ortega seems to give inert objects a particular “quality” for influence; is our interaction and understanding of the external world a wholly human determined matter?
- Why are people “compelled” to continue their investigation of an object?
- History is not a settled narrative, but one that dominates for a period before it reviewed or challenged by current generations
- How does this view of human experience impact upon Ortega’s view of history?
- In his examples of the orange and of observing a wall, does Ortega assume a natural curiosity or other motive(s) that may not be present?
- Each epoch in history contributes some truth to our understanding of reality.

**14. (a) Explain the significance of Parmenides and Heraclitus in the origin of philosophy. [10]**

In describing the origin of philosophy, Ortega uses the writings of Parmenides and Heraclitus to show what “pre-Socratic philosophy” was, *ie* the era in Greek thought prior to a formal understanding and definition of what philosophy became with Socrates and Plato. In both philosophers he finds the origins of modern philosophy. Paramount in Ortega’s analysis are the particular motives and background for the doing of philosophy. The historical and intellectual background, and hence set of motives, were: Dionysian and Orphic religions, proto-geography and history, Ionian physics, astronomy, and arithmetic, Pythagorean ethics and mysticism, tyranny and legislation. They also made interesting contrasts: Parmenides was a social, respected figure; Heraclitus was a solitary one. Parmenides employs mythic conventions as the literary form for his philosophy, as he regarded the experience of discovery as a transcendental phenomenon, to convey his idea and emotion. Heraclitus speaks with a sense of absolute certainty and conviction in his own pronouncements, based on his sense of god-like individuality. His fragmentary style was also influenced by a religious literary genre: Oracular and sibylline divination.

Candidates might explore:

- The most frequent motive for adopting a particular distortion of language, “stylization”, is emotion as it manipulates and re-invigorates tepid language
- Ortega believed that it is necessary to know the cultural and collective past of an individual, their unconscious values, their “subsoil”, and the immediate past and present, their current milieu, their “soil”
- Individuals are shaped by intellectual and physical realities and that intellectual progress is not only possible, but necessary for human understanding of reality
- Intellectual progress as a reaction to the status quo
- The perspectivist view of epistemology suggested by Ortega’s historical method; protagonists have a choice and must select a course of action that fits their motives
- History as a social analysis of personal motives, and as a system generated by an excess of possibilities
- Most civilizations and individuals pass through a form of life known as freedom. It is a brief, glowing stage that is between primitivism and its decline
- The notion of an intellectual vanguard that develops new truths for society
- The location of the origins of philosophy outside Athens in the colonized territories.

**(b) Evaluate Ortega’s analysis of the origin of philosophy. [15]**

Possible discussion points include:

- The choice of Heraclitus and Parmenides seems an arbitrary one; other philosophies can also be seen to be intellectual watershed moments
- Ortega seems to suggest that the oppressed and marginalized are often the sources for new ideas and truths; is necessity or marginalization the mother of invention?  
*cf* Nietzsche
- The view that individual acts can change the course of history; does Ortega have a romanticized and inflated view of the impact that individuals can have?
- Are there other possible motives – if any – that can be attributed to the generation and form of the philosophies of Parmenides and Heraclitus?
- Would the same “intellectual soil” in other cultures result in the same generation of an activity?
- Is Ortega arguing that the range of human activity is necessarily constrained by its history?



**Plato: *The Republic*, Books IV–IX****15. (a) Explain Plato’s claim that the Good is the goal of all striving. [10]**

After explaining the relationship between knowledge and ignorance, and identifying an object called belief, Socrates begins to describe the education of the philosopher ruler. The intellectual and moral aim of this education was an understanding of the Form of the Good. In the passage prior to the quote, Socrates is arguing that the Good is not pleasure as there are both bad and good pleasures, nor is it knowledge as those who believe this cannot say what knowledge it is. He also adds that there is little point in possessing any type of knowledge without knowing what is good and valuable. Though he cannot provide an explicit content for the Form of the Good, he uses the two figures of the Sun and Cave primarily to make analogies to the Form of the Good.

Candidates might explore:

- Knowledge as a goal for philosopher rulers
- The theory of Forms or Universals
- The Good as practical wisdom
- The Good illuminates all knowledge and possesses all other Forms
- The figures of the Sun and Cave, and the characterization of the Good from these figures
- The ethical responsibilities and qualities of a ruler
- The possible comparison between Plato’s view of the Good and other theories, eg virtue ethics, Aristotle.
- The philosopher is compelled to act by virtue of his training, character and knowledge.

**(b) Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of this claim. [15]**

Possible discussion points include:

- Plato defines knowledge as “what is”; in what sense does he mean this: Existential, veridical, or predicate?
- Why does knowledge of abstract principles guarantee a just society? How far should and could we go in understanding the Forms? Is Plato correct when he sees the difficulties in convincing society that these abstract principles will ensure a just state?
- Why should my knowledge impel me to do good? What does Plato say about those who know but do not act, or act in opposition to the good?
- If I have beliefs or opinions on an issue, does it make sense to say that I am partially ethical on this issue?
- Why is a moral term used to describe the apex of an epistemological hierarchy? Or is this question irrelevant for Plato, as he held no distinction between ethics and epistemology?

**16. (a) Explain the education of the philosopher ruler. [10]**

The aim of this question is to explore Plato's two-stage programme of education in relation to its function within the state. The epistemological basis for Plato's education is the distinction between two types of perception: Those that stimulate thought and those that do not. Plato describes a regime that emphasizes the moral, intellectual, and physical. Initially, all children are to be educated with the emphasis on games, selected heroic poetry, and lessons in virtue. The intellectual aspect must be undertaken with patience, as there should be no duress in learning. The aim is to produce virtuous citizens who are of value to the state, to determine for the individual where they can best serve the state and themselves, and to identify potential philosopher rulers. Women are also to be educated to be of value to the state, and they are not precluded from becoming philosophers. For Plato, mathematics is the prime example of perceptions that instigate abstract thinking, rejecting astronomy and harmonics because they rely on empirical methods. After some time in the army and in civil service, the last step in the education of the philosopher is the dialectic; this is when the mind is turned to the Forms; it corresponds to the last part of the Cave when the prisoner looks directly at the Sun and corresponds with the highest section of the Line.

Candidates might explore:

- The emphasis in the early years of education on moral conformity
- The connection between the virtuous individual and the just state
- Mathematics as a paradigm for abstract thought
- The lack of a family for the philosopher ruler
- Knowledge characterized as having universal and atemporal qualities
- The classification of two types of perception.

**(b) Evaluate this model for the development of leaders. [15]**

Possible discussion points include:

- Possible positive aspects of Plato's education: Its inclusiveness, and that the pace of the programme is based on the intellectual and psychological maturity of the individual; the age at which philosopher rulers begin their rule
- Possible negative aspects: Emphasis on elitism; individual needs are subordinated to those of the state; the moral conformity insisted on in the early years of education is not conducive to producing independent and creative thinkers; the age at which philosopher rulers begin their rule
- Are the virtues and education described by Plato all that are necessary for a successful leader? *cf* Machiavelli: That a leader must be like a lion (courageous and terrifying) and like a fox (cunning and prepared to deceive willfully)
- Does Plato's general approach, *ie* an emphasis on physical activity in the early years, and the freedom to learn, make for a sound education for a philosopher? As a general programme for education? How does one assess the efficacy of such a programme?
- How can mathematics be a suitable framework for understanding or finding the truth on moral questions, or for developing the qualities of a political leader?

**Peter Singer: *The Life You Can Save***

17. (a) **Explain the argument that it is wrong to fail to donate to the alleviation of poverty if you are able to.** [10]

A cornerstone of Singer’s argument is that a wealthy person not giving aid represents a moral wrong. The premises and conclusion are that suffering from poverty is a moral wrong, and if you have the ability to address that suffering through donations, then there is a moral duty to make those donations.

Candidates might explore:

- Singer draws an analogy between a bystander failing to save a drowning child and the wealthy failing to alleviate global poverty
- Singer ignores the instinct that you have special duties to people nearest you, physically or genetically
- It is not sufficient to pay taxation to fulfil the moral duty to alleviate poverty
- Singer’s use of the Bob and the Bugatti example
- The behaviour of others does not change the moral imperative, nor does the relative indifference of the individual who is wealthy.

- (b) **To what extent is Singer justified in claiming that because the wealthy are in a position to alleviate poverty there is a duty to do so?** [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Singer uses a principle of assistance which is used in the works of other economists involved in global wealth (like Sen)
- The problem of determining, whose causes are more demanding of one’s wealth – in assessing the need, the overall demand seems harder to sustain
- Why should the wealthy only be committed to a “reasonable” level of giving?
- Does Singer make a plausible argument for the wealthy assisting the poor?
- Are Singer’s limits to the principle of giving, which make the moral demand to give “moderate”, plausible?
- Why should donations be anonymous?
- The difference between praise for generosity and the demand for generosity – we might salute those who are generous but do we think they must be generous?

18. (a) **Explain the account Singer gives of why wealthier peoples and nations do not give as much as they could.** [10]

Singer aims to explain in his work why it is that such an obvious moral imperative as alleviating poverty and suffering is overlooked by so many wealthy thinkers, who in other aspects of their lives conform to basic moral principles. In Chapter 4 Singer asks “Why Don’t We Give More?” and in it he investigates the possible foundations for such oversight. He claims it comes not from human rational consideration but from psychological perspectives.

Candidates might explore:

- If humans used rationality then would such global poverty and inequality exist?
- The role of psychology in preventing greater donations
- The identifiable victim
- Parochialism
- Futility
- The diffusion of responsibility
- Sense of fairness
- Money
- Singer’s conclusions entitled “Psychology, Evolution and Ethics” where he entertains a view about our ancestors’ survival in explaining human behaviour towards giving to others.

- (b) **Evaluate the arguments that Singer gives for explaining the lack of generosity among the wealthy.** [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Is Singer reliant on psychological arguments that are difficult to evaluate when describing the fact of inequality of wealth?
- Is the appeal to our ancestors convincing?
- Is Singer guilty of ignoring special duties to those closest to us?
- How convincing is Singer’s view that awareness of money causes distance from others?
- Do you agree with Singer that our immediate awareness of distant events – like the tsunami in Thailand and Sri Lanka – means that such events are no longer distant events which we can ignore?

**Charles Taylor: *The Ethics of Authenticity***

**19. (a) Explain the ethical imperative to be true to oneself. [10]**

The question asks for the explanation of a central issue of Taylor’s argument: Authenticity as an ethical ideal. The ethics of authenticity holds that each person is seen as having his or her own mode of being human and is encouraged to realize this rather than conform to a pre-existing model or a pattern imposed from outside. Basic premises: a) Authenticity is truly an ideal worth espousing; b) it is possible to establish in reason what it involves; c) this kind of argument can make a difference in practice.

Candidates might explore:

- Authentic life is an ethical goal peculiar to modern culture, stemming from individualism. Some sources: Individualism comes from the affirmation of the primacy of the person as self-responsible to find the truth (Descartes); a “voice within” or “the intimate contact with oneself” (Romanticism); also, Rousseau, and Kant
- “Horizons of significance” are the background of intelligibility against which things take on importance; authenticity implies keeping the horizons which define us significantly
- Malaises of the modern culture which threaten authenticity: Individualism, disenchantment of the world, “instrumental reason”
- Authenticity requires rational dialogue and cannot be achieved by taking a “knocker” or “booster” approach
- The role of participation in social groups and institutions.

**(b) To what extent do you agree with Taylor’s idea that being true to oneself is an ethical imperative? [15]**

Possible discussion points include:

- Transforming authenticity into an ethical ideal might mean emptying the specific contents or values of moral life
- The search for authentic self-fulfillment can become incoherent and self-defeating when it is tied to atomistic individualism
- Does Taylor successfully answer the criticism of those who maintain that the collapse of external points of self-reference must necessarily lead to a false search for authenticity?
- The fragmentation of political life endangers the realization of the self
- Self-deception (Nietzschean and psychoanalytical critiques, bad faith, ideology) and moral life.

20. (a) **Explain Taylor’s idea that our identities are formed in dialogue with others in agreement or struggle with their recognition of us.** [10]

The question asks for the explanation of two central notions and their conjunction in Taylor’s argument: Dialogue and recognition. Taylor stresses that identity is constructed through exchanges with others who matter to us, what George Mead called, “significant others”. The genesis of the human mind is in this sense not “monological”, not something each accomplishes on his or her own, but dialogical.

Candidates might explore:

- The discovery and articulation of the fact of this constitutive interrelationship in its modern form came about in close connection with the developing ideal of authenticity
- On the social plane, the understanding that identities are formed in open dialogue, unshaped by a predefined social script, has made the politics of equal recognition more central and stressful. It has, in fact, considerably raised its importance. Equal recognition is not just the appropriate mode for a healthy democratic society. Its refusal can inflict damage on those who are denied it
- Competing demands for recognition of the legitimacy or value of different identities. This “politics of recognition”, appearing in nationalism, identity politics, feminism and multiculturalism, is an outgrowth of the modern valuation of self and ordinary life.

- (b) **To what extent do you find Taylor’s emphasis on the role of dialogue in forming identity convincing?** [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Dialogue with others and agreement or struggle with their recognition of us within the context of modern malaises: A loss of meaning, the fading of moral horizons and the eclipse of ends, in the face of rampant instrumental reason
- Development and realization of the self requires both individuality and community
- The role of political life
- The fragmentation of political life endangers the realization of the self; a fragmented society is one in which its members find it harder and harder to identify their political society with a community
- Can the tension between the individual and the community be properly resolved?
- The Marxist idea of relating or subsuming the individual into the collective
- A serious attempt to engage in the cultural struggle of our time requires the promotion of a politics of democratic empowerment, which would strengthen communitarian bounds
- Art as an example of how the “subjectivation” of the self does not mean that this “subjectivation” leads to narcissism and egoism.

**Lao Tzu: *Tao Te Ching*****21. (a) Explain the idea that the ruler must govern the state without resorting to action. [10]**

The Taoist sage is supposed to govern the state in a non-intrusive or non-interfering way. The question invites an exploration of the way of government proposed by the Taoist sage, the conducts and ideals related to the sage, and an exploration of the political implications of the *Tao Te Ching*.

Candidates might explore:

- When a person who follows the *Tao* attains an administrative or advisory position in government, the *Tao* he possesses would inform the policies he promotes, and, above all, his leadership style
- The uncarved block among other things may symbolize the original state of man; the ruler must keep the people in a state like the uncarved block. To keep the people free from their desires, the ruler must be aware of his own
- Those whose *wu wei* may become one with the *Tao* would be the sages
- The sages (*sheng ren*) act naturally (*wu wei*) (Chapters 2, 63). They are like newborn infants, who move naturally, without planning and reliance on the structures given to them by others (Chapter 15). Sages empty themselves, becoming void of simulation
- The sages know the value of emptiness as illustrated by how emptiness is used in a bowl, door, window, valley or canyon (Chapter 11). They preserve the female (*yin*), meaning that they know how to be receptive and are not unbalanced favoring assertion and action (*yang*) (Chapter 28). They shoulder *yin* and embrace *yang*, blend internal energies (*qi*) and thereby attain harmony (*he*) (Chapter 42).

**(b) To what extent do you agree that *wu wei* (non-action) is an effective approach to government? [15]**

Possible discussion points include:

- In which sense should we understand “doing nothing” as a way of ruling society? The text states that “doing nothing” one could “accomplish everything”. Is this a paradox, a problem or an advantage?
- The behavior of the sage-ruler seems to involve contradictions. He seems quite deliberately to create a utopia which will turn the world back to the simplicity of the *Tao*, without preference, without rejection, and without deliberate choice. However, political and moral actions seem to imply a conscious project
- Comparison with other models of political leadership, eg Machiavelli’s prince, or Plato’s philosopher king, political leadership in the present world
- The Taoist political views tend to make people politically passive, and experience a life of intellectual and material poverty.

22. (a) **Explain the depiction of the *Tao* as natural, eternal, spontaneous, nameless and indescribable.** [10]

The question asks for an exploration of possible interpretations of the central notion of the *Tao*. The *Tao* – “path” or “way” – is a complex concept. Already in the initial Chapter the *Tao* is conceived as being and non-being: Non-being is called the beginning of heaven and Earth; being is called the mother of all things. In a metaphysical sense the *Tao* has been identified by means of dimensions such as: Material reality, origin, principle, function, virtue and technique.

Candidates might explore:

- The *Tao* has been described as natural, eternal spontaneous, nameless and indescribable. There are two *Taos*, one real (*chang tao*) and the other apparent, superficial or impermanent (the *Tao* that *can* be told). The real *Tao* is beyond the reach of the ordinary, that *Tao* which can be told. According to this interpretation, *Tao* is the underlying reality that evades transmission and even comprehension; its ineffability also frustrates attempts to understand the concept
- The *Tao* as the entirety of reality is greater than the sum of its individual parts (Chapter 14). The relationships between the individual entities are also an important part of the *Tao*. Individual entities inevitably act on and mutually influence others; the resulting whole is dynamic and ceaselessly transforming
- “The *Tao* produced the One, the One produced the two, the two produced the three, and the three produced the ten thousand things” (Chapter 42). Although the myriad things exist in countless forms, they all revert to the One. The metaphysics of the *Tao* is non-dualistic and non-conceptual. The *Tao* is the ultimate source and the grounds of Heaven, Earth, and people
- The *Tao* as ultimate reality is at times characterized as the origin and source of all things; the *Tao* is the mother (*mu*) and ancestor (*zong*) of all (Chapters 52, 4). The biological – generative motif implies that the *Tao* produces or evolves into manifold things, the “ten thousand things” (*wan wu*).

- (b) **Evaluate the claim that the *Tao* means nature itself in terms of the spontaneity of the world and man.** [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Interpretations of the *Tao* in terms of modern Western philosophical concepts: Mysterious “ineffable reality”; “the source of all things”; a “metaphysical monistic absolute”. Are any of these a good match?
- Can the *Tao* be compared with a principle of nature? In this case, how far can the comparison between water and human life be followed?
- The metaphysics of the *Tao* requires an understanding based on a non-conceptual approach: Self-cultivation, a primordial level of human conscious being that is inactive, and undifferentiated
- The text presents a set of overlapping images rather than a system of doctrines, and there is no very explicit indication as to how they relate to each other
- Interpretations of this facet of the *Tao Te Ching* thought vary widely, and nothing can be regarded as settled
- To what extent is the claim consistent with the initial idea of the text that the *Tao* has no name?
- The ideal of the sage might be seen as the correspondence of man with the *Tao*.



**Zhuangzi: *Zhuangzi*****23. (a) Explain Zhuangzi's metaphor of the fish (*Kun*) and the bird (*Peng*). [10]**

The question invites an explanation of the content of *Zhuangzi's* first chapter, *Wandering Beyond* (*Xiao Yao You*). Responses might refer to the metaphors that are illustrated in this chapter: The fish (*Kun*) and the bird (*Peng*) and their relationship with their natural elements, water and wind. The metaphor also considers the dynamic quality of nature: Change is the ordinary language of nature and transformation of the fish into the bird is a clear example of it. Candidates might explain the metaphor as a path to explore the general concept of nature in relation with men in *Zhuangzi*: The chapter is a manifesto of the importance of spontaneity and the capacity to “wander beyond” social structures and rooted habits, because men's effort to define and to label is a constriction of their understanding of nature and a limitation of their life. Reference to the power of imagination and creativity might well help understand Zhuangzi's invitation to reject the comfort of biases and familiar schemes. Candidates might also mention the issue of measuring and linking things of different sizes, particularly the vast (*da*) and the petty (*xiao*) and how they mutually correlate. Responses might also consider the relation with newness, unfamiliarity – both somehow disorientating – are the conditions for approaching a flourishing life, based on the cultivation of men's own spirit (*shen*) and disposition (*xing*).

Candidates might explore:

- The meaning of the metaphor: Fish, bird, water, wind
- Nature as movement, change, transformation
- Prejudices, schemes, habits as limiting factors for the understanding of nature and the flourishing of one's own life
- The importance of imagination, creativity and spontaneity
- The uniqueness of the spirit and disposition of each individual.

**(b) Evaluate the extent to which the metaphor of the fish and the bird explains how social customs limit personal development. [15]**

Possible discussion points include:

- Tradition *versus* innovation
- Personal values *versus* social values
- The risk of increasing social disorder *versus* risk of increasing conformity
- The role of passions and feelings in one's own life
- The capacity to doubt and discuss, not taking anything for granted
- Power and dangers of habit.

24. (a) **Explain the claim that people “do not mirror themselves in running water – they mirror themselves in still water”.** [10]

The question focuses on the content of *Zhuangzi’s* Chapter 5, *Signs of the Flourishing of the Potency (De Chong Fu)*. Responses might explain the claim by referring to some basic concepts, which are expressed in the whole of *Zhuangzi’s* Inner Chapters: Virtue as harmony, consisting in perfect balance between the mind and the surrounding world, that is always changing and uncertain. The claim implies the principle that “only what is still can still the stillness of other things”, so still water is the perfect example of harmony and balance. The question also invites an exploration of the main characters populating the stories of this chapter, who all present deformities or physical deficiencies. The dialogue, whose main speaker is Confucius, tries to illustrate the importance of facts that overcome earthly limitations; and so responses might show that people’s joy resides in a combination of “powers as a whole”, though their virtue “takes no form”. Candidates might underline the importance of their “right” perspective, in order for them to live harmoniously: People should not consider change, contingency and uncertainty as causes of troubles or limitations in satisfying their lives; on the contrary, the proper evaluation of these conditions is the sole opportunity to transform the limits into potencies. Another possible path in structuring a response might consist in considering men as a part of the whole and seeing their parts (a foot or a hand) just like “lumps of Earth”: Harmony and joy should not come from bodily or worldly things, nor should they depend on external elements or objects; differently, they can only emerge from our own capacity to gauge the world and adjust our nature to the closest condition of “still water”.

Candidates might explore:

- The metaphor of running/still water
- Virtue as harmony, balance
- Physical deformities as means to show that joy does not depend on earthly or bodily elements
- The view of “powers as a whole”
- Conditions of potency.

- (b) **Evaluate the claim in relation to the role of human feelings.** [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- The definition of feelings: Likes/dislikes affecting human harmony, eg causing harm
  - Harmony as independent from passions
  - Feelings as earthly, changing elements
  - Comparison to other traditions, eg Epicureanism, Stoicism, Christianity.
-