Markscheme

May 2018

Philosophy

Higher level and standard level

Paper 1

24 pages

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

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

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

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.

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 7 for the core theme and page 10 for the optional themes.

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 Paper 1, examiners must be aware that a variety of types of answers and approaches, as well as a freedom to choose a variety of themes, is expected. Thus, examiners should not penalize different styles of answers or different selections of content when candidates develop their response to the questions. The markscheme should not imply that a uniform response is expected
- In markschemes for the core theme questions in Paper 1 (section A) the bullet points suggest possible routes of response to the stimulus, but it is critical for examiners to understand that the selection of the philosophical issue raised by the stimulus, is *entirely at the choice of the candidate* so it is possible for material to gain credit from the examiner even if none of the material features in the markscheme.

Note to examiners

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).

Paper 1 Section A markbands

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–5	• The response is poorly structured, or where there is a recognizable essay structure there is minimal focus on the task. • The philosophical issue raised by the stimulus material is implied but not explicitly identified. There is minimal or no explanation of how the issue relates to the stimulus material or links to the question of what it is to be human. • There is little relevant knowledge demonstrated, and the explanation is superficial. Philosophical vocabulary is not used, or is consistently used inappropriately. • The essay is descriptive and lacking in analysis.
6–10	• There is some attempt to follow a structured approach although it is not always clear what the answer is trying to convey. • The philosophical issue raised by the stimulus material is implied but not explicitly identified. There is some limited explanation of how the issue relates to the stimulus material or links to the question of what it is to be human. • Knowledge is demonstrated but lacks accuracy and relevance, and there is a basic explanation of the issue. Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately. • There is some limited analysis but the response is more descriptive than analytical. There is little discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view. Few of the main points are justified.
11–15	• There is a clear attempt to structure the response, although there may be some repetition or a lack of clarity in places. • The philosophical issue raised by the stimulus material is explicitly identified. There is a basic explanation of how the issue relates to the stimulus material and to the question of what it is to be human. • Knowledge is mostly accurate and relevant, and there is a satisfactory explanation of the issue. Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately. • The response contains analysis, but this analysis lacks development. There is some discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view. Many of the main points are justified.
16–20	• The response is structured and generally organised, and can be easily followed. • The philosophical issue raised by the stimulus material is explicitly identified. There is good justification of how the issue relates to the stimulus material and to the question of what it is to be human. • The response contains accurate and relevant knowledge. There is a good explanation of the issue. Philosophical vocabulary is mostly used appropriately. • The response contains critical analysis. There is discussion and some assessment of alternative interpretations or points of view. Most of the main points are justified.
21–25	• The response is well structured, focused and effectively organised. • The philosophical issue raised by the stimulus material is explicitly identified. There is a well-developed justification of how the issue relates to the stimulus material and to the question of what it is to be human. • The response contains relevant, accurate and detailed knowledge. There is a well-developed explanation of the issue. There is appropriate use of philosophical vocabulary throughout the response. • The response contains well developed critical analysis. There is discussion and assessment of alternative interpretations or points of view. All or nearly all of the main points are justified. The response argues from a consistently held position about the issue.

Section A

Core theme: Being human

1. **Grayson Perry excerpt about gender stereotypes**   **[25]**

   The following paragraphs provide only a framework to help examiners in their assessment of responses to this question. Examiners should be responsive to a variety of philosophical perspectives and approaches. Examiners should be aware that candidates might respond to this passage in a variety of ways including ones not mentioned in the summary below.

   This question requires candidates to identify and discuss philosophical issues and/or concepts in the set passage related to the fundamental question of what it is to be human. This passage offers the chance to discuss matters to do with human identity and what things can influence our understanding being a human. In this passage, the example of what causes our understanding of masculinity is raised, and this is an example of possible social conditioning and the questioning of the freedom of the individual in a society. Is masculinity a product of civilisation or genetic/biological conditioning? Is human nature a malleable or fixed thing and what are the principal characteristics of human nature? Are there universal characteristics which bind all humans regardless of gender, ethnicity or age? The notion of the continuing self over time might be explored.

   In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:
   • Personal identity – who am I?
   • To what extent does culture shape identity?
   • Cultural determinism *versus* individual freedom
   • What role does genetic determinacy have in our understanding of the self or others?
   • What is the difference between philosophy and science or anthropology in examining human nature?
   • Participation in a group and the influence of society on the individual, *eg* relativism or determinism in understanding human beings
   • The issue of democracy on human understanding of persons, freedom and identity
   • The notion of individual authenticity in different traditions
   • How do we know the self and others?
   • Reasoning in a group, reasoning as an individual.

2.   Image of person and waxwork   **[25]**

The following paragraphs provide only a framework to help examiners in their assessment of responses to this question. Examiners should be responsive to a variety of philosophical perspectives and approaches. Examiners should be aware that candidates might respond to this passage in a variety of ways including ones not mentioned in the summary below.

This question requires candidates to identify and discuss philosophical issues and/or concepts in the image related to the fundamental question of what it is to be human. Responses are likely to use the image to discuss issues of what the human being comprises. Responses might weigh up how important the physical identity of humans is to understanding the make-up of the human being. This might enable responses to develop ideas about the possible relationship between the body and the mind in the constitution and experience of human beings. Another area of interest that might appear in response is the issue of identity, in terms especially of the same-ness between individuals, or the ability to share experience in the inter-relatedness of human life. Some responses might look at the ability of humans to reflect on the self and to have a third-person perspective on the self. Responses might look at the epistemological issue of identity, exploring how identity is not something empirically achievable, but mentally understandable, as detailed in the work of writers like Plato and Descartes.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:
- The role of the physical in human identity
- Accounts of the mind-body relation, *eg* dualism, monism, idealism, materialism
- Theories of human experience and behaviour, *eg* behaviourism, functionalism
- What makes a human person?
- Questions of human nature
- Freedom
- The human self and self-reflection – the self and other
- How individuals inter-relate
- Non-western accounts of the person and the relationship between body and mind
- The possibility and status of artificial intelligence
- Non-human minds
- The idea that gender can be fluid and a human construction
- The issue of identity – a concept not available to empirical investigation
- The issue of identity – modern technology and the relationship between image and identity.

Paper 1 Section B markbands

Mark	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–5	• The response is poorly structured, or where there is a recognizable essay structure there is minimal focus on the task. The response lacks coherence and is often unclear. • The student demonstrates little relevant knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme. Philosophical vocabulary is not used, or is consistently used inappropriately. • The essay is mostly descriptive. There is no discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view. Few of the main points are justified.
6–10	• There is some attempt to follow a structured approach although it is not always clear what the answer is trying to convey. • The student demonstrates knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme, but this knowledge lacks accuracy and relevance. Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately. • There is limited analysis but the response is more descriptive than analytical. There is little discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view. Some of the main points are justified.
11–15	• There is a clear attempt to structure the response although there may be some repetition or a lack of clarity in places. • Knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme is mostly accurate and relevant. Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately. • The response contains analysis, but this analysis lacks development. There is some discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view. Many of the main points are justified.
16–20	• The response is structured and generally organised, and can be easily followed. • The response contains accurate and relevant knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme. Philosophical vocabulary is mostly used appropriately. • The response contains critical analysis. There is discussion and some assessment of alternative interpretations or points of view. Most of the main points are justified.
21–25	• The response is well structured, focused and effectively organised. • The response contains relevant, accurate and detailed knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme. There is appropriate use of philosophical vocabulary throughout the response. • The response contains well-developed critical analysis. There is discussion and assessment of alternative interpretations or points of view. All or nearly all of the main points are justified. The response argues from a consistently held position about the issue.

Section B

Optional theme 1: Aesthetics

3.   **To what extent can aesthetic judgments be more than declarations of personal taste?**   **[25]**

This question offers the possibility of discussing the paradox between the acknowledgment that statements about aesthetic value are personal to the one making the judgment (and thus reflect her/his subjective experience, or taste), but at the same time, the acknowledgement that the way aesthetic judgments are housed involves a normative element of the speaker believing that others "should" agree with the judgment in some, more objective, way. This discussion offers the possibility that a case can be made for – or criticised, indeed – the claim that aesthetic judgments have a rational basis and can be argued objectively, in various possible ways.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:
- The paradox in aesthetic judgments that what is deemed beautiful is both a subjective feeling of beauty by the beholder, but also a quality that is somehow possessed by the object or activity in mind
- Kant acknowledges that there can be no rules compelling people to recognise anything as beautiful, yet he believes aesthetic ideas induce much thought and cognition that is not confined to a statement of sensual preference – hence Kant asserts that aesthetic judgements involve an interplay between the faculties of imagination and cognitive understanding
- Hume asserts the need for critics to be of 'sound mind' implying criticism as a rational activity, not a mere declaration of subjective taste
- Aesthetic judgments require the experience of the beholder, not just an agreement with the authoritative assertion of a critic – hence there is room for disagreement and difference of appreciation, yet the identification of beauty involves a normative dimension where the declarer expects the agreement of others
- Nietzsche's critique of aesthetic judgements
- Possible scientific explanations of beauty, involving mathematical or evolutionary explanations of attractiveness and appeal
- Plato's world of the Forms
- Relativism and issues of relativism for knowledge claims.

4.   To what extent must art, for it to be counted as art, be appreciated for its own sake, as opposed to some other end?   [25]

This question encourages a response that considers, and possibly challenges, the view that art cannot be appreciated properly as art unless the object or activity or product in discussion is regarded not as a means to an end but as a piece of art in its own sake. This encourages discussion as to what constitutes a piece of art and responses might consider both the status of art and how art is appreciated – the intention of the creator and the reception of the work by the audience. Can art be found accidentally in a piece where there is no intention of it to be art in the maker (*eg* urban graffiti, propaganda)? In covering whether art can be discounted by the observer as art because it is designed to serve some other purpose, responses might look at what constitutes art being art "for its own sake". In what ways can art be inherent in a work? Such a notion will reflect a Platonic notion of beauty as having separate existence, something a work can possess in and of itself. If art gets it beauty, or existence, from internal relations of the piece (as in a mathematically analysable shape or balance, say, in music) then, again, it is art in the sense of some feature it possesses, not some use to which it is put. Even art that challenges notions of form and function could possess beauty or truth in itself, but if the main intention is to challenge, then is the piece of art not more of an educational thesis than a work of art?

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:
• The various conceptions of the nature of art
• Plato's view of art as mimesis
• Kant's aesthetic argument
• Teleological views of art as having a purpose beyond itself
• The use of art in propaganda or in raising social/political/religious consciousness – does this disqualify it from being counted as art per se?
• Art coming into existence only in its reception by the observer, whatever the intentions of the creator
• Non-western interpretations of art – *eg* Chinese, Arabic, African, indigenous tradition interpretations.

Optional theme 2: Epistemology

5. **Evaluate the role played by technology in shaping a human's knowledge.** [25]

This question invites an analysis of the linking of technology with knowledge. Candidates might choose one of the many feasible approaches in building their responses. As possible paths, candidates might focus on one of the historical contributions that philosophy has offered: From Plato's view of *techne* to Aristotle's contraposition to *episteme*, often – though not always appropriately – intended as practice *versus* theory. As a general view, in ancient Greek philosophy, technology was often considered as a tool for imitating and reproducing nature, so that knowledge could take advantage of it. Candidates might consider modern stages of the relationship between technology and knowledge, as in Bacon's view or in Galileo's methodology. In these or similar cases, candidates might also consider the role played by imagination in the technological progress and in shaping knowledge: Imagination has always been a precious tool for both scientific methodology and technological innovation, just like it has been crucial for reinterpreting past knowledge or fostering new knowledge. In more recent times, philosophy has offered more contributions to the analysis of the linking of technology with knowledge: *Eg* Dewey's pragmatism has frequently and widely focused on technology as a central, necessary tool for granting a proper education and a reconstruction in logic, ethics, and politics. Another path might be the analysis of Popper's distinction between Worlds 1, 2, and 3 and his bucket theory of the mind. Candidates might also take into account the arguments against technology, as in Jonas's view, or the numerous criticisms of technology in relation with information: Does an increasing number of media of communication contribute to spread wider, deeper knowledge? Or do the new technologies and their stimuli simply overwhelm our senses? Is information equal to knowledge? Is the new digital era granting access to sources and knowledge to everyone or is it increasing "the digital divide"? Candidates might pinpoint some issues emerging from the control of technology – *ie* censorship – and how it might affect knowledge.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:
• *Techne versus episteme*, *eg* in Plato's and Aristotle's views; *poiesis versus praxis*
• Technology as a means for creative knowledge; role of imagination
• Role of design and engineering for spreading new knowledge
• Tradition *versus* innovation
• Popper's bucket theory of the mind
• Criticisms of technology, *eg* Jonas
• Technology as a means for information; information *versus* knowledge; Searle's view
• Issues related to the control of technology for knowledge: *eg* censorship, "the digital divide".

6. **Evaluate the claim that "colour, taste, *etc* must be contemplated not as properties of things, but only as changes in the subject, changes which may be different in different men".** **[25]**

This question focuses on an issue which is the origin and nature of reality and the human possibility of knowing it. Candidates might also refer to the philosophical origins of this argument, by referring to some examples or theories of the past philosophical tradition. Responses might analyse the Kantian claim, particularly in relation with knowledge and reality: Space, time, senses, reality, ideality, *a priori, a posteriori*. For example, Democritus was probably the first philosopher to express the distinction between objective and subjective reality: "By convention there are sweet and bitter, hot and cold, by convention there is colour; but in truth there are atoms and the void" (DK 68B9). Another path that candidates might follow in building their responses leads to one of the very well-known illustrations of this argument, by Locke and Hume. Therefore, candidates might explore and evaluate Locke's and Hume's distinction between primary and secondary qualities of objects and, accordingly, examine the related Humean claim "that the mind has a great propensity to spread itself on external objects" (*A Treatise of Human Nature,* 1.3.14.25). Candidates might also consider criticisms of these and similar arguments by mentioning metaphysical realism, *eg* Carnap's argument of mind-independent existence, or counter-arguments, like in essentialism (*eg* Plato's idealism).

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:
- Pre-Socratic arguments, *eg* Democritus
- Essentialism, *eg* Plato's theory of Forms; Idealism
- Nominalism *versus* realism; Scholasticism
- Theory of primary and secondary qualities, *eg* Locke, Hume
- Empiricism *versus* realism; Berkeley's view
- Kant's *a priori* knowledge; space and time
- Pathetic fallacy
- Conventionalism, *eg* social ontology.

Optional theme 3: Ethics

7. **To what extent is it possible that fundamental moral principles can be applied to every situation?** **[25]**

Starting from one of the issues as presented in the *Guide*, the question opens a discussion on a central matter of normative ethics and allows for taking different lines in the response. One would be to follow arguments specifically related to normative ethics, *eg* the nature and scope of moral principles. Moral principles have often been put in terms of what is required by duty, but there has been a reaction against this notion. Different lines of arguments considering meta-ethical issues would also be relevant, *eg* origins and nature of moral values, foundations for moral judgments and ethical language. The analysis of moral principles might be related to the central concerns of moral theory; *eg* a moral theory should help us to make sense of the fact that people are often moved to do the right thing, by identifying basic motives to moral behaviour as a source of reasons. There are different accounts of moral motivation in terms of self-interest, sympathy, and a higher-order concern to act in accordance with moral principles. In this case, responsiveness to moral principles appears to be constitutive of human nature. Further, the application of moral principles itself might be analysed, opening a connection with applied ethics.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:
*   Does a given moral principle apply everywhere, and at all times, or is morality somehow bounded by space or time (moral relativism, universalism in ethics)?
*   What is going on when someone allows morality to guide them, or asserts a moral principle (relation to moral judgment and moral knowledge)?
*   How is the capacity of moral judgment acquired? The view that humans possess a special moral sense or capacity for intuition, often identified with conscience; intuitionism in ethics; moral sense theories; common-sense ethics
*   Scepticism about the claims of morality, *eg* Nietzsche
*   Moral principles can be understood to rest on moral values. How are these values characterized and how are evaluative assumptions required in order to ground ethical claims?
*   In contrast to emotivism, moral realism has asserted the existence of values, some identifying moral properties with those properties postulated in an almost scientific approach. Situation ethics suggests that circumstances can lead to the abandonment of any moral principle. Particularism argues that this is because it cannot be assumed that a reason that applies in one case will apply in others (moral particularism, situation ethics)
*   Normative approaches, *eg* consequentialism, deontology and virtue ethics
*   The application of moral principles in the casuistic tradition
*   Parfit's position: Looking for 'what matters' in order to come up with an answer to what is the right moral thing to do
*   Conflicts between moral principles
*   Reactions against the pre-eminence of moral principles, *eg* feminist ethics: It is a result of a masculine overemphasis on rules at the cost of empathy and care.

8. **Justify which ethical approach offers the most effective way to articulate and address moral issues.** **[25]**

The question asks for a discussion on at least one ethical approach, its conceptual basis and power to tackle specific problems. The usual approaches of the standard ethical theories, *eg* teleological, utilitarian or deontological are the immediate possibilities, but there might be other kinds of approaches, *eg* moral realism. Moral realism is the view that there are facts of the matter about which actions are right and which are wrong. Behind this statement lies a significant complexity, *eg*: First, moral facts are somehow special and different from other sorts of fact; secondly, realists hold that moral facts are independent of any beliefs or thoughts we might have about them. In turn, realism is usually related to objectivism and cognitivism, which might be seen as ethical approaches too. However, the scope opened by the question is not restricted to this variety of approaches at all. On the contrary, the analysis might be related to a broad and general understanding of philosophical ethics where the discussion of the approaches is related to specific notions central to ethics: Autonomy, the self, its moral nature and its ethical relation to others, determinism and indeterminism, evolution and ethics, free will and self-deception. Further the answers might analyse specific cases, moral situations and concerns coming from applied ethics.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:
- Virtue-based theories, *eg* Aristotle, MacIntyre, Anscombe
- Deontological theories, *eg* Kantian ethics, divine command theory
- Teleological theories, *eg* Rule Utilitarianism, Act Utilitarianism, consequentialism
- Morality as the real anthropological systems of value and custom instantiated in the lives of particular groups of human beings, often described as the ethics of these groups
- Morality involves notions such as rightness and wrongness, guilt and shame, and so on
- Is a moral system one with a certain function, such as to enable cooperation among individuals, or must it involve certain sentiments, such as those concerned with blame or specific conducts?
- Different attempts at explaining morality (biological, psychological, sociological *etc*) might offer the conceptual basis for ethical approaches, *eg* Nietzsche's genealogical view
- The possible grounds on which we could validate our moral judgments as a nuclear element for the justification of an ethical approach
- Views on ethical justifications or assessments from other approaches to ethics, such as feminist ethics, Marxist or Foucaultian views, non-western perspectives
- The justification of an ethical approach must refer outside philosophy to common sense beliefs or real-life cases
- The justification of an ethical approach consists in its possible, consistent and practical application: Biomedical and environmental ethics or to ethical responsibilities to humanity, *eg* poverty, inequality, taxation, charity.

Optional theme 4: Philosophy and contemporary society

9. **Evaluate the claim that while civil disobedience is sometimes justified, the use of violence in support of the aim cannot be.** **[25]**

The aim of this question is to engage with a number of concepts, primarily, what constitutes civil disobedience and its moral justifications, and how these differ from acts of social violence. A common view is that civil disobedience involves a public and publicised non-violent breach of law, committed in order to change a law or policy, and to create a better society. The usual assumption is that acts of civil disobedience are much easier to morally justify than other illegal acts. A further related assumption is that there is a generally passive acceptance of punishment by those who are prosecuted. Ideally, those punished are punished for a breach of law, not for their views. In some instances, authorities abstain from prosecution. In contrast to civil disobedience, a key distinction of terrorism is a willingness to use violence and not to inform authorities of any intended actions. Escaping punishment is not a necessary condition. One common view of terrorist groups to justify their actions is that they are fighting a state which itself commits acts of terrorism either directly against them, or at a group that the terrorists determine needs defending.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:
*   Why are acts of civil disobedience required to be non-violent? Why publicise the event and seek permission from the authorities? Must those classed as civilly disobedient be willing to accept punishment?
*   Withdrawal of tacit consent (Locke)
*   Examples of civil disobedience: Mahatma Gandhi, Martin Luther King, opponents of the Vietnam War, Occupy Wall Street, Environmental groups, Animal Rights groups
*   Civil disobedience and conscientious objection: *eg* Quakers (pacifists) and Jehovah's Witnesses (refusal of blood transfusions); Ultra-Orthodox Jews in Israel are exempt from national service, the Amish communities in the USA
*   The distinctions between civil disobedience, legal protest, radical protest, revolutionary protest
*   The inclusion of terrorists into civil government, *eg* ex-members of the IRA in Northern Ireland, the accommodation of FARC members in Colombian elections
*   Should indirect victims of civil disobedience receive compensation or consideration from those protesting? *Eg* lost jobs or income from the closure of mines, logging mills, fisheries
*   Whom do social protest movements address? Always governments? Society as a whole? Other countries?
*   Which moral framework is used to evaluate the effectiveness or value of any civil protest, or terrorist act?
*   Issues in assessing particular acts of civil disobedience: Proportionality regarding the objection against which civil disobedience is aimed; the distinction between tactics and evaluation of objectives.

10. **Evaluate the claim that multicultural societies are faced with a dilemma: On the one hand they are, by definition, inclusive of all minority groups; but on the other hand, they must listen to the majority.** **[25]**

This question invites candidates to consider a central source of tension in pluralist societies: how to address the rights and needs of cultural minorities within the greater group of citizens of a contemporary nation state. Multiculturalism is associated with various politics (identity, recognition, etc) all of which share a common commitment to changing dominance in representation, because it is this that contributes to the marginalisation of certain groups. The justification for this view is based on the assumption that having choice of action and representation within a cultural context is a necessary condition for human dignity, or a basic human right. Multi-culturalism also seeks solutions to economic and political disadvantages that people suffer as a result of their minority status. This is often a point complaint of those who see this an unwarranted allocation of resources and influence.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:
- Examples of cultural accommodations or "group-differentiated rights" include exemptions from generally applicable law (*eg* religious exemptions), assistance to do things that the majority can do unassisted (*eg* multilingual ballots, funding for minority language schools and ethnic associations, affirmative action), representation of minorities in government bodies (*eg* ethnic quotas for party lists or legislative seats
- Multi-culturalists take for granted that it is "culture" and "cultural groups" that are to be recognized and accommodated. Yet multi-culturalism makes claims involving religion, language, ethnicity, nationality, and race.
- One criticism of multi-culturalism is the seeming contradiction between the accommodation of cultures and a national identity, or at least a set of shared and agreed set of values between citizens and the state. One of these values is equality before the law and this is 'broken' by some accommodations before the law afforded to minority groups; *eg* religious courts deciding family matters; the right to use traditional law in indigenous groups, affirmative action
- How should a pluralist society deal with examples of cultural practices which are either explicitly against the law, or against the laws of convention, such as polygamous marriage, the denial of reproductive rights for women, discrimination against non-members of minority groups?
- Rather than designate the individual as the bearer of a right, multi-culturalism assigns the right to a group, and it is membership of this group that allows an individual to exercise this right
- How far can toleration of those who are intolerant extend?

Optional theme 5: Philosophy of religion

11. **Evaluate the claim that God's existence is not a matter of deductive or ontological proofs, but is established by experience.** **[25]**

The aim of this question is to invite a discussion and evaluation of the source(s) of the existence of God(s). A central philosophical issue raised by the question is that of the evidentiary source of knowledge in religion: Is it essentially experiential rather than a wholly rationally based source? As a type of epistemic foundationalism, evidentialism requires a proposition is rationally acceptable only if it is certain for an individual and it can only be certain for an individual if it is about either the individual's mental states (*eg*, what she perceives) or is self-evident.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:
- The nature of religious experience in general; spiritual or mental, spontaneous or conditioned by discipline; are they mystical or noetic? Can they be expressed linguistically, or are they ineffable?
- Argument from Religious Experience: Religious experiences are in all relevant respects like sensory experiences; sensory experiences are excellent grounds for beliefs about the physical world – so religious experiences are excellent grounds for religious beliefs
- The problem of verification of such experiences
- What qualifies as a religious experience?
- The critics of religious experience often refer to the inconsistency and variety of experiences reported
- The requirements for the rationality of belief and the withholding of belief
- Should a sure and certain belief in the existence of God(s) be treated with the same degree of trust and veracity as a report of what was eaten for lunch? *ie* certain of our beliefs, *eg* in God, about what happened yesterday should be seen as properly basic and so as not having to be supported by evidence or argument
- An analysis of different ontological arguments as to their efficacy, *eg* Aquinas (God as causal agent); Anselm (God as the greatest conceivable being); Kalam (cosmological arguments); Kant (moral arguments)
- The degree to which any of the arguments for God's existence are self-evident
- The degree to which these arguments require experience
- Kantian objections to existential ontological arguments, *ie* existence is not a predicate
- The problem of evil as evidence against the existence of God. What is the epistemological status of this evidence?
- Fideism removes the necessity for evidentiary proof, but is it a feasible response?
- Is the burden of evidentiary proof too great for religious experiences compared with other types of experience?
- Hume's skeptical argument, *ie* empirical propositions cannot provide a deductive proof, though 'beyond reasonable doubt' can be a conclusion.

12. Evaluate the claim that religious language is not the same as ordinary language, and hence the usual rules for establishing its truth do not apply.   [25]

The aim of this question is to invite a discussion and evaluation on the nature of religious language and its connection to truth. Many analyses of religious language follow the criticisms of the Positivists: Language is meaningful only insofar as it is moored in our experiences of the physical world. Since we cannot account for religious language by linking it to experiences of the physical world, such language is meaningless. Weaker versions of this argument claim that if propositions are not falsifiable, then they are illegitimate. These criticisms are open to the charge of self-undermining: They seem to take other kinds of language with them – like moral language, talk about the future or past, and talk about the contents of others' minds. These evidentiary-based criticisms of religious language are also open to the charge of begging the question, for to deny the meaningfulness of religious experience claims on the grounds that they are not moored in experience assumes that religious experiences are not real experiences.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:
- Lack of a collective experience to verify the personal one; the subjective experience cannot be objectified
- Religious language as a language game with its own procedures for verification
- Furthermore, Wittgenstein proposed a type of fideism that while it is appropriate to ask questions about justification within a language game it is a mistake to ask about the justification of "playing" the game
- The use of metaphor and other literary tropes employed in religious language: Historical, epic, mythological, apocalyptic, and the often revelatory nature of the theological concept, means that truth is determined by interpretation, which is open to the possibility of cultural/political influences
- Critics of the epistemological value of religious language often rely on the Ockham principle that, in the absence of evidence for the existence of things of kind X, belief in Xs is not reasonable (*eg* Flew, Scriven)
- Plantinga's counter claim that evidentialism is self-referentially inconsistent for there is no evidence for evidentialism
- Another possibility is to allow that religious claims are meaningful, but they are not true or false, because they should not be understood as assertions *eg* religious claims could be expressions of commitments to sets of values
- Can a religious experience also convey elements that prove the non-existence of God to the experiencer?

Optional theme 6: Philosophy of science

13. **Evaluate the claim that "wherever external authority reigns, thinking is considered suspected and dangerous".   [25]**

This question focuses on the connection between science and society, on the effects of society on science, and whether science is independent from social values or not. Particularly, it arises from Dewey's proposal to reform philosophy – specifically logic, ethics, and politics – by trying to extend the progress that science has gained in the last centuries to philosophy. Candidates might consider a historical approach, by considering those cases that have represented examples of advancement, stasis or decrease in scientific progress and the quality of it, *eg* cases of obscurantism, censorship, monopoly, or cases of scientific progress that has been fostered or limited by military power or political authorities. Candidates might also mention the relationship between science's openness, social order, and people's education, with reference to one or more philosophers who underlined the role played by the latter, *eg* Plato, Bacon, Popper, Dewey. In building their responses, candidates might also take into account the connection between science and a specific form of authority, *eg* religious or economic: Candidates might analyse the role played by religion for the promotion of science (*eg* Index of Prohibited Books, astronomical and physical theories) and, on the contrary, illustrate how science affected religion and changed it; candidates might consider how politics or economic powers can contribute to the advancement of science, *eg* specific laws, public or private funding, and, these being dependent on the structure of a particular society, how the latter affects science, *eg* in terms of quality and quantity of research; in setting specific priorities; in deciding what science fields need for improvement and what needs to be stopped or strictly disciplined, *eg* stem cells, assisted procreation. Another path of analysis might lead candidates to explore Ortega y Gasset's view on the progress of society and science ("height of the times", "fullness of the times").

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:
- Social values and scientific progress
- Control of scientific advancement by authorities: Censorship, propaganda, persuasion, agenda setting
- Religion and science
- Military power and science
- Economic power and science, *eg* funding
- Education and science openness: Plato, Bacon, Popper, Dewey
- Ortega y Gasset's view, *eg* "height of the times", "fullness of the times"
- Need for disciplining scientific research, *eg* assisted procreation, stem cells.

14. **Evaluate the claim that "accuracy of observation is the equivalent of accuracy of thinking".**   **[25]**

The claim is from a poem by Wallace Stevens and invites an analysis of the role played by observation in humans' thinking, with particular reference to science. Candidates might consider to illustrate the importance of methodology in scientific logic, by referring to the conditions of observation, the construction of experiments, the project of tests and the formulation of hypotheses. Candidates might take into account a historical approach, which could present the progress of scientific methodology, *eg* from Aristotle's and Archimedes's physics to Galileo's method. Also, candidates might pinpoint the distinction between deductive and inductive reasoning as different ways of thinking. Another path might lead candidates to an analysis of the role that the observer plays in observation and the possible consequences in terms of misinterpretation of the results, *eg* theory-laden data. A more detailed approach might refer to the general conditions of perception and how these affect science: Candidates might present Kant's view or take into account the role played by emotions. Candidates might also consider the contributions of neuroscience, the relationship between philosophy of mind and cognitive science, and/or biosemiotics. A reference to brain imaging might lead candidates to refer to the scientific issues related to the observation of brain activity, *eg* interference and/or brain rest. Another point that candidates might present is the role played by imagination as a cross-element between observation and science.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:
• Methodology in ancient science
• Development of modern science; *eg* Bacon, Ockham, Galileo, Descartes, Newton, Pascal
• Deductive and inductive reasoning; hypotheses and experiments
• Observer and observation; possible issues, *eg* theory-laden data
• Condition of observation, *eg* Kant's view, intuitionism, essentialism
• Emotion and science
• Consciousness and science, *eg* neuroscience, cognitive science, philosophy of mind, biosemiotics, brain imaging
• Imagination and science, *eg* 'Gedankenexperiment'.

Optional theme 7: Political philosophy

15. **Evaluate the view that the state governs legitimately only when it has the consent of those they govern.** **[25]**

This question invites responses that will develop the notion of consent as a feature of legitimacy in the relationship between the state, its government and its governed people. It is likely that responses will focus on social contract theories of government, in discussing the issue of legitimate rule. There might also be discussion of rule by theocracy, where the citizen gives consent not directly to the government but to the will of God, or to the ruler due to a divine right. The key issue in social contract theories is whether any individual has consented to the contract. Different accounts of consent might be discussed and it is possible that the means by which a citizen could withdraw that consent might be used to illustrate the philosophical issues that arise.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:
- The social contract and its place in the modern democratic tradition
- Other forms of government requiring consent – Marxist notions of the relationship between the citizen and the state
- Examples where consent is conceived differently, *eg*, theocracy, monarchy, oligarchy, plutocracy
- How social contract theories conceive of the state's "offer" to its citizens
- Different ways in which consent might be understood to have been given by the citizen; hypothetical, tacit, other theories
- The different accounts of Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau
- Hume's criticisms of the social contract and its weakness in handling consent
- Grounds for rejecting consent and options available to citizens who question the government's legitimacy
- Possible grounds for questioning legitimacy in democratic societies where few people vote or where an individual does not vote for the political party that forms the government.

16. Evaluate the claim that human rights are arbitrary inventions and not a natural, universal feature of human life.   [25]

This question invites responses which address the issue of how rights arise. Some thinkers, notably those who see value as being calculated through experience, reject the notion that rights exist naturally. Bentham, famously described rights as "nonsense on stilts", believing that humans were under the sovereignty of pleasure or pain, not any concepts described as "rights". To Bentham, "right" could be used as an adjective in describing a legal or moral situation, but not as a noun – a thing we can be possessed. Yet modern political institutions regard rights as of fundamental importance, and the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948 remains one of the most significant acts of the post-Second World War political realignment. From where might claims of universal rights emerge? Are such rights natural to humans or are they constructs of a political discourse navigating new social cultural sensibilities about humans in the modern world. What can philosophy do to shed light on the question as opposed to, say, social or political science?

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:
- The possible origins of rights – especially the claim that rights emerge as a natural feature of human life
- The link between claims of natural rights to claims of the divine origin of human life
- Natural rights linked to human faculties – do disabled people have fewer rights?
- If there are natural rights, what are their limits? The non-human world?
- Rights as permissions granted and limitations imposed
- What is the corollary of the existence of a right? What must be guaranteed and by whom for any right to exist?
- Rights and responsibilities
- The prescriptive sense of talk about rights – the notion that a claim of a right entails a duty by some other party, and that this duty ought to be fulfilled
- If rights are not universal or natural, then they cannot be used to ground political or legal ideas
- Utilitarian and empirical objections to the metaphysical language of rights
- Marxist opposition to claims about rights getting in the way of finding rational, indeed empirical, solutions to society's moral and political problems
- Rawls's view on equality of all members of a society *versus* Nozick's
- The battle between multi-culturalism, relativism and rights.