

# Markscheme

**May 2018**

**Philosophy**








**Higher level and standard level**

**Paper 2**

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

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

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	
	Apply to blank pages	
	On-page comment text box (for adding specific comments)	
<b>AE</b>	Attempts Evaluation	
<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	
<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	
<b>PEOC</b>	Personal experience of course (P3 only)	
<b>REF</b>	Reference Needed	
<b>REP</b>	Repetition	
<b>TNCE</b>	Theory is Not Clearly Explained	
<b>U</b>	Understanding	
<b>VG</b>	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.

**I. QIG availability**

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

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 answer 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 candidates 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 assigns 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:**

Examiner uses 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 8 for part A responses, and page 9 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 what de Beauvoir means when she claims that being female and being a woman are different. [10]

This question asks for an explanation of de Beauvoir's distinction between being female and being a woman which rests upon her more fundamental notion of woman as Other. In Volumes 1 and 2 of the text, de Beauvoir explores the biological, psychoanalytical, historical and social contexts of femininity and womanhood in order to develop her view of the woman as Other. In these contexts, she makes reference to the influence of Hegel, Marx, Engels, Freud and Kinsey amongst others. However, the greatest influence on de Beauvoir's analysis of the female, woman and the Other comes from existentialism, existentialist phenomenology and the philosophical views of Sartre. Applying the central existentialist themes of freedom, existence before essence, transcendence, alienation and the project of making oneself, de Beauvoir explores what can be described as female embodiment. She concludes that a number of assumptions about femininity and womanhood alienate women from themselves, their self-definition and their possibilities forcing them to view themselves as the Other in the face of men who define themselves as the Subject.

Candidates might explore:

- Perspectives that view the feminine as the weaker, inferior sex
- Biology is not destiny; nature *versus* nurture
- Masculinity as the standard of being human; femininity as the exception or after-thought
- Social, psychological, cultural and political experiences which enter into the definition of personal identity
- Woman as passive; Men as activity; matriarchy *versus* patriarchy
- Inability of psychoanalysis to explain femininity; it posits a self-loathing of women
- The trauma of puberty for women
- Women and a frustrated search for freedom, meaning and happiness
- Existentialism and the re-definition of femininity and womanhood
- The woman as Other; the man as Subject

- (b) Evaluate the extent to which de Beauvoir is justified in this distinction. [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- An example of the continuation of the "legitimacy" of a woman's body through the values of men is the use of images of women in current advertising and media
- The importance of economic autonomy for women
- As the Other, woman finds herself returned to the world of the child, a world of bad faith where she does not have to assume responsibility for her choices
- The influence of the Church in western Europe has apparently declined in recent years; have any of the other oppressive forces de Beauvoir identifies either disappeared, or has their influence declined?
- Has the biological determination of sex as a defining property of femininity become irrelevant because of the concept of gender fluidity?
- The notion of the Other, which is wholly dependent on man for its meaning, constructs a context from which women are powerless to escape
- Oppressed Others may call on the resources of a common history and experiences of shared abusive situations to assert their subjectivity and identity in order to affirm recognition and demand reciprocity
- How relevant is de Beauvoir's analysis in the modern world? Is her analysis influential in situations where women experience repression and alienation?

2. (a) **Explain how Freudian psychoanalytic models deny freedom in the concept of the feminine.** [10]

For de Beauvoir, any analysis of the feminine must contain an acceptance of the basic principles of phenomenological existentialism: The subject is born free and within this freedom, makes itself. De Beauvoir makes a case for using historical materialism, *ie* to locate any analysis of woman within the historical conditions which are relevant. Biological explanations for femininity lack an explanation grounded in the psychic life of the subject, and any explanation for femininity found must treat the body-object as a subject. Though it treats woman as a subject (in a very narrow sense compared with the masculine), Freudian psychoanalytic theory denies this freedom to the subject as it perpetuates the definition of woman as non-masculine, and denies her conscious agency in actions apart from seeking pleasure. Her analysis finds that psychoanalysis fails for a number of reasons.

Candidates might explore:

- The rejection of Freud's psychoanalytic models for femininity due to its fundamentally male orientation
- The view of woman is a "mutilated" man
- The Freudian interpretation of the Oedipal and Electra complexes
- The deification of the father image based upon social factors rather than upon an interpretation of feminine libido
- de Beauvoir's explanation of the prohibition of incest as a social phenomenon
- Freud's attempt to explain human life exclusively by an appeal to sexuality versus de Beauvoir's explanation of pleasure on the basis of internal motivation
- Psychoanalysis presents a negative estimation of free choice and of the values embedded in those choices. This jeopardizes the existential notions of subjectivity, self-definition, freedom and transcendence
- De Beauvoir explores the tensions that emerge between Subjects and Others when the Subject is the man and the Other is the woman
- The Other as an oppressed and alienated reality

- (b) **Evaluate the extent to which de Beauvoir's critique of patriarchy can liberate women.** [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Liberation must be a woman's work. It is not a matter of appealing to men to give women their freedom, but a matter of women discovering their solidarity, rejecting the temptation of bad faith and affirming the pleasures of freedom.
- The goal of liberation, according to de Beauvoir, is our mutual recognition of each other as free and as Other.
- If patriarchy determines the semantics and moral values of language, then is there a possibility of a wholly feminine understanding of abstract ideas such as compassion, honesty, justice?
- Although de Beauvoir claims that liberation is possible through a collective effort, is liberation possible given the extent of patriarchy? Are there new cultural and social forces on the horizon that might reinforce women as "other" and threaten their rights (social, sexual, reproductive, economic)?
- The historical record demonstrates her point of oppression, but many of the institutionalized forms of discrimination have not only been removed, but their practice prohibited by law. Does this weaken her argument?

**René Descartes: *Meditations***

3. (a) **Explain how Descartes concludes that information acquired through our senses is unreliable.** [10]

This question invites an explanation of how Descartes concludes that knowledge through the senses is an unreliable source of knowledge, and therefore it can be doubted. He would like to believe that corporal things (those that have been formed as thought) are more distinct and clear and reliable. This approach of questioning the senses means that in the beginning his quest is to find what is certain. Although we need senses to operate in the physical world all that we meet are uncertainties and uncertain truth. The physical objects might not be real in any sure sense. Descartes would accept that there are primary qualities within the physical world that we can have certainty about because they are mental abstractions of the physical world; such things as size and shape. He claims through the analogy of the piece of wax that we need mental acts to comprehend what our senses give us. There is need for a mental condition that interprets the primary qualities of the wax (the flexibility and mutability) that are non-sensory, and therefore need our imagination. It is therefore the mind that aids our understanding. He claims that sensual experiences of hearing, seeing, warmth *etc* are acts of thinking. He contrasts the uncertainty of the physical with the certainty of the mental world. The world of thinking he claims is certain and he claims that these certainties are what he calls “clear and distinct ideas”.

Candidates might explore:

- The role of imagination
- The need and process of introspection
- The analogy of the piece of wax
- How the mind itself might be uncertain and can be fooled
- The interaction between senses and reason; interactions between the mind and body
- The difference between clear and distinct ideas and that which seems to exist in the physical world
- The nature and role of Cartesian methodological doubt.

- (b) **Evaluate the claim that it is not through the senses that we know truth, but through the intellect.** [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- The intellect has clear and distinct ideas which are certain
- In the Cartesian Circle the cogito is that which is certain
- The difference between false reality, the physical world, and objective reality of that which is mental
- Sense perception’s reliance on the mind as we can only know things properly through the mind
- If the aim is truth then senses can give us little real understanding of the world around as our interpretation of the world can be deceptive
- It might be the case that it is both senses and mental interpretation that clarify our perceptions of the world; interactions of experience, imagination and intuition that build a world picture.

4. (a) **Explain Descartes’s theory of mind.** [10]

This question seeks an explanation of a central thesis within in the *Meditations*. The theory is based on an idea of dualism; body and mind being separate. The mind is where mental acts take place. Although Descartes claims to know that the mind is separate he has difficulties proving this or showing how the body and mind coexist. His “*cogito ergo sum*” creates 3 “I”s. The “I” of that which is thinking, the “I” being observed and the “am” which is the “I” that exists (being, aiming). The mind is seen as the thing that thinks. The mind also understands, affirms, denies, will and desires. It creates images. It is not part of the physical world and can only be encountered by introspection. Descartes could well be confused between the two categorisations of substance dualism and property dualism. Traditionally Descartes’s theory is seen as substance dualism but is now more easily categorised as property dualism, where consciousness happens. The argument of indivisibility is used by him as the mind has no extension and this relies on Leibniz’s law of identity. His separation argument also establishes the body and mind being different and separate.

Candidates might explore:

- Methods of doubt resulting in surety of the mind and its existence
- Activities that would be mental states; thinking, willing
- The nature of clear and distinct ideas held by the mind
- Challenges to the separateness of the mind and body
- How the gap between mind and body might be bridged
- The causal relationship between God and the mind
- Is the relationship of the mind to body akin to pilot and vessel?
- Whether Descartes’s purpose was to avoid the issue of trying to explain how the mind and body were linked.

(b) **Evaluate the claim that by possessing a mind we can gain certainty.** [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- The way Descartes arrives at certainty through his *cogito ergo sum*
- The claim that the mind is created by God
- His uncertainty of the physical world that is not encountered directly by the mind
- The ‘will’, which God provided to humans, allows them to make cognitive judgements and within the realm of clear and distinct ideas these judgments are true and certain
- The nature of cognitive error and the way Descartes separates primary and secondary qualities, the latter open to degrees of uncertainty
- Whether “material falsity” is a result of a cognitive error or a misrepresentation.

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

5. (a) **Explain Philo’s ideas about the relationship between “reasons” and “motives” for belief in God.** [10]

The question focuses on the importance of having to consider reasons and motives to allow an understanding of why human beings believe in God. A motive takes into account the drive that causes us to act with a particular goal or objective in mind; a reason, on the other hand, provides the rational and/or logical explanation which justifies the motivation. The text presents a discussion amongst the interlocutors which describes and analyses why men support the idea of a divinity. Philo finds difficulties in maintaining a reasonable belief in God which could be supported in a rationally justifiable manner. This leaves him the option of assessing the motives that could underpin that belief. Philo's argument is interesting insofar as he claims that “the sources of these motives are not equal and may vary among men”. This conclusion allows Hume to take into consideration certain of the characteristics of human nature in terms of reasons and motives for belief in God. The conclusion reached by Demea is that it is ‘... that each man feels, in a manner, the truth of religion within his own breast; and from a consciousness of his imbecility and misery, rather than from any reasoning, is led to seek protection from that Being, on whom he and all nature is dependent.’ Thus, there are no good reasons a skeptic can bring forth that will persuade humans to ignore the motivation to believe in God.

Candidates might explore:

- “Reasons” as arguments that lead to solid conclusions
- Philo’s position that there are no “reasons” to believe in God not even with probability
- That “there are no reasons to believe in God” does not imply “that there may not be motives” to do so.
- “Motives” to believe might not be rationally founded. Therefore, Philo suggests that foundations for motives can be quite variable
- These sources/foundations can proceed from association with groups of people (philosophers, men of letters, poets, men of common sense, scientists, etc)
- A consideration of “the motives why most of men – beyond the reasons they may give – believe there is a God”
- What are the true sources of belief in the face of the absence of convincing reasons?
- Can ‘imbecility’ and ‘fear’ function as motives for authentic belief
- Philo’s view that “it is required more the talent of eloquence and vivid imagination rather than reasoning and argumentation”
- Skepticism does not persuade some men to abandon belief in God.

- (b) **Evaluate the relationship between “reasons” and “motives” for a belief in God.** [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Is it possible to defend the existence of God from a rational perspective?
- Is the distinction between ‘reasons’ and ‘motives’ raised by Hume clear and convincing?
- The notions of “reasons” and “motives” as a crucial issue in the discussion
- Could humans avoid the influence of ‘motives’ when facing belief in God despite reasons to the contrary?
- An analysis of the non-rational attitude implied in our motives to believe in God
- What are some of the reasons humans believe in the existence of a supernatural being?
- The importance of ‘fear’ and ‘imbecility’ among the motives mentioned in the Dialogues; Twentieth century interpretations of the relationship between reasons and motives, eg Wittgenstein, Davidson
- The impotence of skepticism to persuade men to abandon the belief in God when motives are the basis of their belief.

6. (a) **Explain the difficulty evil represents for human understanding of God.** [10]

Hume focuses attention upon the problem of evil in Parts X and XI of the text. Philo and Demea mount an intense, emotionally charged description of the extent of misery, disease, wickedness, of the corruption of human nature, and of a general dissatisfaction with life experienced by all humans. Ironically, this situation seems to be brought upon humans by the divinity we are all forced to try to appease. Philo observes that humans, who can overcome all real enemies, create imaginary enemies who turn all things natural in life into ills and evils. He goes on to ask why people complain so incessantly about the evils they experience in life. Does this tendency proceed from human nature itself preoccupied with evil and suffering in the world? This only begs the question of why, with so much evil present, would anyone wish to remain in this world? Against the counter-claim raised by Cleanthes that he, like many others, has not felt the weight of human misery, Demea cites several historical figures who have felt otherwise and resigned themselves to the presence of evil and suffering in the world. Philo finally poses the ultimate objection to a moral God citing Epicurus's old questions about the existence of a good, loving and powerful God in the face of the continued existence of evil and suffering. Hence, any discussion about establishing natural attributes to assist in an understanding of God become entirely futile given that God's moral attributes are placed in extreme jeopardy as the result of the existence of evil. Some argue that a more careful assessment of the human condition would show that evil can and will be resolved in some future time and place and that this resolution will demonstrate the benevolence, infinite wisdom and providence of God. Philo counters claiming that pain, suffering and the experience of evil far outweigh any experiences of pleasure and happiness. In fact, the very nature of the universe seems to pose an insoluble confrontation of good and evil. Despite the argument that God is only 'finitely' perfect in his creation of the universe, a universe filled with the incontrovertible evidence of pain and suffering, governed by blind, mechanical and determined natural laws, filled with species each facing limitations and existing within a fragile balance amongst the powerful, violent natural forces leads inevitably to a scepticism within which one is not able to convincingly infer the moral goodness of a divinity.

Candidates might explore:

- The extent of pain, suffering and evil experienced by animals and humans
- Religion and belief in a God can be sources of fear and anxiety
- Epicurus's dilemma of an omniscient, omnipotent, omnibenevolent God and the existence of evil and suffering
- Evil and suffering proceeding from human nature
- Evil and suffering as a temptation to suicide
- God's infinite wisdom and providence cannot be penetrated when it comes to understanding the presence of evil and suffering
- The experience of evil as a source of skepticism
- Examples of evil mentioned by Philo, Demea and Cleanthes
- An infinitely perfect God *versus* a finitely perfect God
- The nature of the universe entails physical evil
- Evil is not a problem in an indifferent universe
- The difficulties encountered in inferring the existence of a moral God
- Parts X and XI present a type of theodicy.

**(b) To what extent does the existence of evil represent a significant problem for belief in God? [15]**

Possible discussion points include:

- The strength of the catalogue of misery and suffering provided by Philo to support the idea that evil is a clear and present reality
- An analysis of the idea that the presence of evil is a central challenge to the Christian conception of the deity
- The connection of the debate to Epicurus's "old questions"
- An analysis of Demea's position about not being able to understand the complex reality of the world as it is
- An analysis of Philo's challenge to the empirical theist's attempt to infer God's nature from the universe
- An analysis of causes enumerated by Philo in his speech
- Philo's position about the evident indifference of God faced with evil
- An analysis of Philo's final idea that God is neither good nor bad.



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

**7. (a) Explain Mill’s denial of the right of people to exercise coercion over the opinion and expression of others. [10]**

Mill denies the right of the people to exercise coercion controlling the expression of opinion (either by themselves or by their government) in his defense of liberty of thought and expression. For that purpose the power itself is illegitimate; the best government has no more title to it than the worst. It is as harmful or even more, when exerted in accordance with public opinion than when in opposition to it. In the second paragraph of Chapter 2 Mill states: “If all mankind minus one were of one opinion, mankind would be no more justified in silencing that one person than he, if he had the power, would be justified in silencing mankind.” He insists that there has to be the fullest liberty of professing and discussing, as a matter of ethical conviction, any doctrine, no matter how immoral it may be considered, and goes on explaining that “the peculiar evil of silencing the expression of an opinion is that it is robbing the human race, posterity as well as the existing generation – those who dissent from the opinion, still more than those who hold it. If the opinion is right, they are deprived of the opportunity of exchanging error for truth; if wrong, they lose, what is almost as great a benefit, the clearer perception and livelier impression of truth produced by its collision with error.” (Chapter 2)

Candidates might explore:

- All silencing of discussion is an assumption of infallibility. Those who desire to suppress an opinion are not infallible. They have no authority to decide the question for all mankind, and exclude every other person from the means of judging
- For Mill, utilitarianism is subservient to liberty, so it is clearly a precondition of the greatest good for the greatest number that liberty be guaranteed
- Complete liberty of contradicting and disproving our opinion is the very condition which justifies us in assuming its truth for purposes of action; and on no other terms can a being with human faculties have any rational assurance of being right
- A quality of the human mind: It is capable of rectifying its mistakes by discussion and experience, not by experience alone. There must be discussion, to show how experience is to be interpreted.

**(b) Evaluate Mill’s denial of people’s coercion of the opinion and expression of others.[15]**

Possible discussion points include:

- The steady habit of correcting and completing our own opinion by collating it with those of others is the only stable foundation for a just reliance on it
- The case of Socrates: a memorable collision between his teachings and the legal authorities and public opinion of his time
- Liberty of the press as defense against corrupt or tyrannical government
- To what extent do freedom of opinion and freedom of expression really contribute to the mental well-being of mankind (on which all their other well-being depends)? What about lying for humanity’s sake?
- The respect for the beliefs of the other should not be a limit of the of liberty of expression
- No political or social principle, except the very basic human rights, has to be held as absolute
- Are liberty of thought and liberty of expression equivalent?

8. (a) **Explain Mill’s arguments in relation to the claim that his doctrine contains important lessons for modern multicultural societies.** [10]

The reference to multicultural societies opens a wide understanding of what “multi-cultural” might mean. Hence, it allows for a variety of ways of approaching Mill’s text in order to find related arguments. Mill’s statement in chapter 1 “I regard utility as the ultimate appeal on all ethical questions; but it must be utility in the largest sense, grounded on the permanent interests of man as a progressive being” might serve as an initial way of tackling the issue. Mill has in mind the higher human nature, capable of development by self-culture, which he believes to be present in every human being. Self-culture opens access to higher forms of human happiness, but it has to be self-culture, first because human potentialities are diverse and best known to each human being itself, and second because only when human beings work to their own plans of life do they develop moral freedom, itself indispensable to a higher human nature. This puts at the forefront a flexible view on human nature where the possible diversity is constitutive. This view in turn provides a platform to explain and analyse the issues in relation to multi-cultural societies that might be identified in Mill’s text.

Candidates might explore:

- The importance that free self-culture assumes in Mill’s idea of human good: “the free development of individuality is one of the leading essentials of well-being” (Chapter 3)
- The defense of liberty of thought and discussion
- Some of Mill’s recommendations: plural voting, a public ballot, proportional representation of minorities
- Mill’s protection of minorities
- Mill’s advocacy of equal rights for women.

(b) **Evaluate the claim that Mill’s doctrine contains important lessons for modern multicultural societies.** [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Present multi-cultural approaches to social and political life stress ways of accommodating cultural diversity fairly
- Public policies often have different consequences for members of different cultural groups. *Eg* given the importance of language to culture, and the role of the modern state in so many aspects of life, the choice of official languages will affect different people very differently. Similar issues arise concerning the content of education and the criminal law
- Mill’s accent on liberty might be in many ways an attractive ideal, but there are reasons to doubt that it provides a realistic model for organizing social and political life, *eg* it might conflict with security
- Criticism of Mill’s basic conception and some radicalized positions: The radical Mill, spouting nonsense about individual licence, abrasive feminism and socialism
- A sympathetic view: At any rate, in political philosophy from Plato’s Republic to the present day, Mill’s discussion of democracy has few rivals – for its open-mindedness, its historical and psychological awareness, and its underlying ethical power; all of which constitutes a solid basis for multicultural approaches.

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

9. (a) **Explain the account of the development of morality from the earliest period to Nietzsche's own time.**

**[10]**

Nietzsche sees his work as explaining the state that civilisation has reached in Europe with its Judeo-Christian heritage at a time when the foundations of that heritage were being replaced by a modern form of nihilism. Nietzsche seeks to re-examine the values that have shaped the development of western history, as he then goes on to offer a new insight for the way forward at a transitional period of history. Prominently in Essay 1, Nietzsche characterises the understanding of contemporary moral life as one of "slave morality" and he says this is the case because of historical features of social development. Nietzsche offers an account of the historical development of the moral life, but warns us not to confuse the origins of an idea with its current use in society. Nietzsche's main claim about contemporary moral matters is the division between master and slave morality, which has arisen due to the influence of Christianity which replaced the pre-moral and the moral periods from the earliest times. In his distinction between master and slave morality Nietzsche draws a distinction between social classes. He ascribes the master morality to the aristocratic traits of self-affirmation and freedom to choose what one will. In his time, men and women were influenced both by the aristocratic morality and also the slave morality which is typified by a feeling of suffering and suppression. The slave morality thinking looks towards the virtues of compassion, humility and hard work in contrast to the powerful virtues of the aristocratic master.

Candidates might explore:

- The psychological account of the types of morality displayed up to the modern period
- The account and analysis of social class
- The account and analysis of religion's influence on the development of morality to the modern day
- The slave revolt insists on turning its eyes on the master morality and describing it as 'evil' or "bad" in that there is an intention of revenge, whereas the master morality only uses the term "bad" to denote something inferior
- The master morality does not fit in with the modern world with its emphasis of looking after only one's own kind and not having duties to those of a lower class
- In the end we are defined more by the revolt of slave morality in directing resentment towards the noble, master class, but we are also made aware of ourselves as agents with the possibility of free action.

- (b) **Evaluate the account of the slave revolt as being the defining event for modern morality.**

**[15]**

Possible discussion points include:

- The nature of slave morality and its origins in the Judeo-Christian tradition
- The revolt against the dominance of aristocratic, noble, supremacy
- The slave revolt is the "great politics of revenge"
- The slave revolt is parasitic on what it must attack, unable to affirm itself, but condemns self-affirmation
- The slave revolt invents the idea of the free subject and develops a vocabulary making virtues of weakness (sin, guilt, pity, compassion) in order to attack what it resents in the masters
- The defining attitude is one of resentment
- Yet Nietzsche sees how the priestly form of existence makes humans interesting building on the idea of humans being capable of free action, which came from the slave morality encouraged in the Judeo-Christian tradition
- How effective is Nietzsche's method philosophically?

- Is the conception of slave and master morality pure speculative reading into history?
- Is the separation of the act from the agent, achieved through this reading of moral history, convincing?

**10. (a) Explain Nietzsche’s account of the role of guilt in the development of human culture. [10]**

In the second essay Nietzsche develops a psychological account of the development of humans under the influence of the Judeo-Christian moral tradition and culture. The process by which the human animal becomes a moral agent is not through gentle methods but by deployment of the harsh instruments of punishment and discipline. “Conscience” is both a moral faculty and an internal method of control that primitive humans gained in the process of being civilised, but once disciplined the human is able to live beyond morality autonomously. However, this process gets deformed by the influence of Christianity with its repression of natural human instincts. Principally the ancient debtors’ notion of guilt has been transformed into a moral sense of shame from sin. The failing is one of moral shame, not a missed legal contract. Bad conscience arises as a break with the old understanding of guilt and Nietzsche says it as fundamental a leap for humans as for fish when they evolved from sea to land. Bad conscience involves an internalisation of human instincts which would before have roamed free. Humans become entrapped by the internalisation and by the limitations of society, and this causes the bad conscience to arise. This occurs before the slave revolt but the psychological impact of this turn makes the slave revolt possible with its emphasis on moral guilt.

Candidates might explore:

- The role of guilt and its change from a legal to a moral account
- The account of pre-moral human psychological life and how it develops prior to the influence of Christianity
- The influence of Christianity in developing the bad conscience into the slave revolt
- The account of the construction of society in nomadic times.

**(b) Evaluate Nietzsche’s account of guilt. [15]**

Possible discussion points include:

- The method employed to speculate about man’s psychological development
- Conscience as a moral faculty developed in ancient humankind
- The initial role of violence in cultivating conscience prior to the influence of Christianity
- Conscience as a method of social control
- The role of guilt and Nietzsche’s account of the influence of Christianity transferring guilt from a legal to a moral concept
- Debt as a constituent of guilt
- Is Nietzsche’s psychological account convincing?
- Can such an account count as Philosophy?

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

11. (a) **Explain Nussbaum’s argument that the best way to achieve your own well-being is understood in terms of capabilities.** [10]

This question asks for an explanation of Nussbaum’s central concept, which focuses on freedom and human dignity. Particularly, Nussbaum’s notion of human dignity is shaped by Aristotle, Stoicism, Smith, Kant, Mill, Marx, and Rawls; the common approach was to determine the conditions under which humans can choose to make their life flourish. Implicit in this formulation is that people can rationally assess what is best for them, and that they can realistically achieve these goals (functioning). To achieve both functioning and ensuring capabilities is the duty of social policy. Capabilities are spheres of freedom; areas of social and personal existence, without which our human dignity is compromised. For Nussbaum, freedom of affiliation, practical reason, are the two that appear the most important, but others are bodily integrity, sexual reproduction rights, religious/spiritual freedom, and education.

Candidates might explore:

- The nation state is the vehicle for the expression of people’s autonomy
- Capabilities approach can also be applied to non-human animals
- The equal level of respect afforded to each individual is a fundamental principle in framing a capability
- Capabilities are not “tradeable” commodities, *ie* reaching a threshold level in one capability does not and cannot come at the expense of another capability, but in situations where there is conflict between capabilities, it is still possible to rank them
- Capabilities offer a better way to measure individual satisfaction in social life rather than GDP, utility, resource and distributive approaches, as these measurements are often too crude to accurately reflect levels of satisfaction
- Nussbaum’s claim that holding any set of values that hold human dignity as central is the best way to deliver social justice.

- (b) **Evaluate the concept of a capability as the best approach to improving the well-being of individuals.** [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Nussbaum’s defense against the claim that the concept of human dignity and respect for the individual rights are western values that are relevant and meaningful in democracies; many other traditions have similar values
- A possible contrast with other models: Maslow’s List of Needs, Universal Declaration of Human Rights, religious views on human dignity
- If human dignity is the basis for the Capabilities approach, then is it readily applicable to non-human animals, as Nussbaum claims?
- Nussbaum devotes a great deal of her argument outlining entitlements of individuals; what responsibilities and duties are required of the individual under a Capabilities approach?

**12. (a) Explain Nussbaum’s moral case for extending the scope of the capabilities approach from successful nations to other nations. [10]**

In Chapter 6, Nussbaum asserts that nations have a duty to ensure global equality and justice. Candidates could take a broad or narrow approach in discussing Nussbaum’s moral case. Because of inequalities in basic life chances, and because of serendipity, or otherwise, those suffering from these inequalities should also be entitled to reaching the threshold levels for capabilities. If basic justice requires that a person’s entitlements not be curtailed by arbitrary features, then equality is ubiquitously violated in the current world order. Some problems of nations were caused by earlier colonization, and some form of reparation or redistribution is appropriate. Earlier approaches to global justice were very inadequate as they claimed that beyond peace treaties, states had no other duties to other nation states.

Candidates might explore:

- “Differences of history and culture have a legitimate bearing on a nation’s interpretations of the capability threshold for specific capabilities”
- Globalization has made consumers complicit in any injustice or exploitation, so there is a duty to redress this
- The only efficient way for redistribution is through the institutions of nations; NGOs are not accountable like democratic governments, and private philanthropy simply does not work
- A single world government is impractical as it is too culturally crude to identify specific needs, and a utilitarian response to the problem of global justice by obligating people to donate money to NGOs highlights the deficiency of utilitarianism: It cannot make sense of personal freedom and integrity. My life and actions are my own.

**(b) Evaluate the argument that a nation state has the duty to promote the happiness of citizens other than its own. [15]**

Possible discussion points include:

- What type of other arbitrary features, like nationality or gender, would entitle others to consideration for redistribution?
- The views that foreign aid fosters a culture of dependency, while the market encourages entrepreneurship, and is the most moral way to improve other nations, as it respects the abilities of individuals
- Do nations that aid other nations have an entitlement to ask for changes in traditions that inhibit other capabilities? *I.e* insist on universal suffrage, or sexual reproduction rights
- Is it appropriate for current generations to assume responsibility for past wrongs? Is there a time limit to moral responsibility?
- One of the practical realities of international politics is a nation’s self-interest is a primary and morally justifiable approach to global justice.

**Ortega y Gasset: *The Origins of Philosophy***

13. (a) **Explain Ortega’s claim that skepticism is not a state of mind, but an acquisition that has been formed with effort, as the most demanding of philosophies.** [10]

The question focuses on a central issue raised by Ortega in the first part of his work. The importance of skepticism as a vital part of the work of philosophy is worked with some detail by the author. Beyond referring to a philosophical approach, skepticism involves a general attitude of doubting, included what is trusted to be an undoubtable truth or a common belief. Maybe it is because of this that the skeptic is not always well received in a debate. It is, of course, not the same thing as cynicism – the view that we can never come to an appropriate understanding of what is right and wrong. One important issue in the skeptic attitude is “to avoid appeals to authority”. Ortega y Gasset observes “that from time immemorial men have bent themselves to conform to ideals” and it has not always been easy to question what is believed. The vision of questioning, challenging, and criticizing for the sake of deepened, purified, and renewed answers always implies an effort for the individual. Today we need a “constantly questioning consciousness”. The question then invites the analysis of this “acquisition” and its importance in any true philosophical activity.

Candidates might explore:

- The idea that skepticism implies a change of attitude and that is not necessarily something natural
- The idea that the skeptic goes even beyond the extraordinary effort of searching that the philosopher faces in the quest for the truth
- The importance of not accepting things as natural or unquestionable
- The importance of the skeptic who has not enough with that search of truth because he goes on thinking and analyzing the truth found till it is proven invalid
- The idea that the skeptic scrutinizes truths to further limits than other people questioning things beyond the point where philosophers believe they are unquestionable
- The distinction between a fair skeptical attitude and a negative attitude of merely questioning things
- The relevant role that some individuals offer to society when doubting and questioning established ideas
- The idea that the skepticism of the true skeptic is something acquired, the result of a long and laborious process and not something simply or mechanically applied.

- (b) **Evaluate the extent to which skepticism is a demanding philosophy.** [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Reference to the importance of skepticism in different philosophers and philosophies
- Analysis of the role that skepticism plays in the philosophical analysis of reality
- Analysis of the importance of skepticism in changing views and opening new roads
- Importance of considering skepticism not as something anecdotal or rhetorical but as something vital and truly connected to the discipline
- The chance of offering a critique to the idea that skepticism is a sort of easy attitude that requires no effort, no particular method
- To what extent each and all philosophies need a skeptic spirit and methodology
- Analysis of some obstacles to the skeptical attitude
- The connection between skepticism and the development of knowledge from Greece onwards.



14. (a) **Explain Ortega’s claim that the “thinker” should resort to certain precautionary defences as a social figure, because of the negative reaction of the populace.** [10]

The question focuses “on the particular profession developed by the first philosophers and how this way of thinking and living is not attached to the Greek period but finally became something associated to the discipline from then onwards”. Ortega y Gasset reflects “on the importance of the thinker in society”. He shows how dangerous it could become to the society where he is born as the individual or concrete thinker “may question beliefs and ideals that are usually shared by that society”. In a way the thinker becomes something apart from the group where he was raised. “There is not always a clear understanding of his role” and could be attacked for his intellectual attitude. Fear to change is something to be taken into account in this answer society may offer. Ortega y Gasset mentions concrete cases of “our western tradition to show that life is in danger if you question common or accepted ideas”. Responses may offer an analysis of the main challenging characteristics connected to philosophy and the danger that philosophers faced through time. Ortega y Gasset mentions “the exile of Anaxagoras or the death of Socrates as the first concrete proofs” of this clear and present danger.

Candidates might explore:

- The idea that a new type of individual was emerging as a social figure
- The idea that this social figure was reacted to by society
- The idea that a religious attitude as predominant was something that was present when the first philosophers began developing and sharing their work
- Religion in general as one of the most traditional elements in society that may be affected by a thinker
- The sentiment of uneasiness that philosophers seemed to have raised among common people
- Fear to change as one important reason to avoid change and particularly to reject the role developed by those who want to develop a thinking attitude
- The idea “that philosophers know too much” and then became “extravagant and even sacrilegious”
- The very name “philosopher” is connected to the difficult public position found by the first thinkers.

- (b) **Evaluate the role of the philosopher as a dangerous one.** [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Comparison with the dangerous reality faced by different philosophers along time
- An analysis of the cases mentioned by Ortega (eg Socrates)
- The importance of individuals in questioning as opposed to the idea of collective agreement in traditional ideas and beliefs
- An analysis of the idea given by Ortega that in Greece it was felt that there was a connection between the new discipline and atheism
- The idea that the philosophical attitude could be petulant and insolent
- The new role proposed to philosophy in the Greek world and the difficulty to understand its nature
- An analysis of the different contents associated to the new discipline and its connection to the origin of the word “philosophy”
- The difficulty to measure the levels and directions that the discipline called philosophy could reach.

**Plato: *The Republic*, Books IV – IX****15. (a) Explain the account of the Form of the Good given in the Simile of the Sun. [10]**

At no point does Plato argue for the existence of the world of the Forms, their existence is assumed. The supreme Form is that of the Form of the Good, given all Forms must participate in that Form in order to be a Form at all – all Forms must represent the perfect “good” of the thing of which they are a Form. Plato does not directly describe the Form of the Good, but instead offers a simile during a passage discussing what good is not. After being asked what the good actually is, Plato responds with three similes, the first of which is that of the Sun where a developed analogy is established between the sun and the Form of the Good. The Sun’s action in supporting life and in offering light is compared with the role of the Form of Good in sustaining all reality and in conferring true knowledge. The analogy with light-giving properties is especially central. The simile follows the discussion Socrates has which again underlines the way the Forms offer a distinction between things or examples/particulars and the property in itself.

Candidates might explore:

- The Form of the Good as the ultimate grounding for truth and knowledge of that truth – just as the sun confers both the colours on things that are seen and our ability to see them in the first place
- The sun enables both life to exist and our ability to see what life consists of
- The link between moral goodness and functional goodness – the Form of the Good being able to confer the “most good” quality onto all other forms, as well as being the source of moral goodness
- The simile of the sun’s position in the dialogue, building Plato’s account of the Form of the Good up
- The issue of the difficulty for Socrates of finding the definition of the Good
- The similes of the Divided Line and of the Cave as other examples of Plato’s theory of the Forms.

**(b) Evaluate Plato’s account of the Form of the Good. [15]**

Possible discussion points include:

- For Plato, things are good for us, as well as good in themselves, so his account of the good includes a teleological aspect
- How is the Good related to our interests?
- Is Socrates’s inability to define the Form of the Good a weakness in his epistemological account of the Form’s centrality to the gaining of true knowledge?
- What is the precise relationship between the Form of the Good and other Forms? Does the Form of the Good somehow exist in a different way/on a different plane? Does this raise questions about the coherence of Plato’s treatment of the Forms?
- Knowledge of the Good and knowledge of truth – is there a difference?
- How does the Form of the Good have any influence on the world of human affairs?
- What is the relationship between moral goodness and the goodness of things in terms of their function?
- How does the Form of the Good relate to the question of knowledge (see the simile of the Divided Line in discussion of this, as well as, perhaps, the simile of the Cave)?
- The use of analogy and simile in philosophical activity.

**16. (a) Explain the desirability of the state being run by the philosopher-ruler. [10]**

Plato proclaims the desirability of rule by philosophers as a central tenet of the political treatise he asserts in the *Republic*. The philosopher-ruler has a love of wisdom which detaches him or her from the self-interest characteristic of rule in democracy, or other systems like the recent oligarchy in Plato's time. The key ability of the philosopher is to understand the world of the Forms, which leads to a knowledge of justice and truth. In possessing wisdom the philosopher has a clear advantage for proper rule, but there are other qualities, like a dispassionate temperament, that qualify the philosopher to rule. Philosophers possess the natural virtues and excellences of character and skill that make him or her best-suited to rule. Plato asserts that in the philosopher the proper hierarchy of reason in the soul is established with the desiring and instinct parts subjugated to the reasoning part that seeks after truth. There is a central section with a list of qualities, besides the educational and epistemological advantages that the philosopher possesses.

Candidates might explore:

- The qualities possessed by the philosopher
- The hierarchy of the soul of the philosopher
- The simile of the Ship in explaining the desirability of the ruler possessing proper knowledge/training
- The issue of the people not recognizing the true virtues of the philosopher to rule
- The question of the philosopher's possession of true knowledge – see the simile of the Cave
- The extent of the training of the philosopher
- The portrayal of democracy as a setting for the mob where the manipulator of the mob succeeds
- The philosopher's ability to know the universal and distinguish it from particulars, and thus establish true justice in the state.

**(b) Evaluate the desirability of rule by the philosopher. [15]**

Possible discussion points include:

- The simile of the Ship – does it set up an effective analogy for rule by philosophers?
- The simile of the untamed beast
- The qualities of the ruler and why disinterested philosophers may not be the best to lead other humans in a state
- Why is knowledge of the Forms desirable for rule?
- Can rule be accepted if exercised by completely different people, with no connection to the ruled?
- The difficulty Socrates has in answering Adeimantus's objection that most people see philosophers as useless.

**Peter Singer: *The Life You Can Save*****17. (a) Explain the claim that there is a moral demand in the practice of giving. [10]**

This question asks for an overall explanation of what, for Singer, constitutes a person of moral worth. Singer's argument found in chapter 1 is, a) suffering and death from lack of food or medicine is bad; b) if it is your power to prevent something bad from happening without sacrificing anything nearly as important, it is wrong not to do so; c) donating to aid agencies prevents this level of suffering without sacrificing anything nearly as important; therefore, d) if you do not donate to aid organizations you are doing something wrong.

Candidates might explore:

- The second premise determines the limit of what should be given
- The practice of giving is enhanced by a culture of giving. Simple things like, eg the public acknowledgment of who and how much is given, and promoting associations like the 50% League, encourages others to give more
- Donations best directed via aid organizations that invest money in projects that generate work and other benefits for the recipients
- A further moral obligation is, because of globalization, those in the affluent world have a duty to help those exploited by its worst excesses
- Inequity in social capital places poor countries at a disadvantage
- Nations also have a duty to assist other nations and groups of individuals
- The partly false assumption that the 'norm' of giving is based on self-interest.

**(b) Evaluate the claim that there is a moral demand in the practice of giving. [15]**

Possible discussion points include:

- Singer calls donations to the art morally dubious because you cannot compare a child's life to listening to an orchestra, or viewing a painting. What of cultural practices and institutions that are seen as essential elements in national or personal identity, like museum collections, ballet, *etc*?
- Singer claims that in regards to work, that unemployment is not the fault of the poor. Whose fault is it? Is it worth donating money where government inaction or corruption prevents positive development?
- It is no fault of my own that I was born in a nation where the principles of rule by law, and the possession of an infrastructure that supports and promotes economic development. This was paid for by taxes and with the continual vigilance of rights. Is this an advantage I should be morally concerned about possessing, when others do not?
- My moral obligation to others because of the effects of globalization is indirect at best, and technically, non-existent, if I institute a boycott of all relevant products and benefits.

**18. (a) Explain the distinction Singer makes between necessary and unnecessary personal spending. [10]**

In this question, candidates are asked to explain the threshold of sacrifice that Singer determines ought to be considered the minimum for it to be of moral value. It is best summarized by his second premise in his overall argument that if it is within your power to prevent something bad from happening without sacrificing anything nearly as important, it is wrong not to do so. Necessary spending needs to fall within this premise, and the limits of necessity is a central point for discussion.

Candidates might explore:

- We give to the point of running significant risk to our lives (Miller)
- We give to the point at which further contributions undermine our pursuit of intrinsically life enhancing goods (Cullity)
- We give to the point of a personal significant cost to achieve the best outcome (Hooker).
- Singer claims that these three views do not go as far as his own in their demands for personal sacrifice
- Living in a “midst of an emergency in which 27,000 children die...every day.” Is Singer’s justification for rejecting these more moderate thresholds convincing?
- Spending resources on family/friends as a priority is, in most circumstances a natural response, but the principle of a level of commensurate sacrifice applies
- Singer also claims that giving money to the arts is morally dubious
- A sense of a flourishing life due to charity.

**(b) Evaluate the distinction Singer makes between necessary and unnecessary personal spending. [15]**

Possible discussion points include:

- The value of sustaining cultural institutions for cultural identity, like museums, art collections, symphony orchestras
- If the value of the life of an innocent child is always going to be more important than virtually any other instance, is Singer primarily using our morally intuitive response to convince us?
- What moral obligations do we have when pursuing a flourishing or contented life?
- Singer’s principle of sacrifice does allow some degree of personal judgment, but the world he wants us to inhabit is too austere.

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

**19. (a) Explain Taylor’s claim that authenticity is a justifiable moral ideal. [10]**

This question invites candidates to explain Taylor’s case for authenticity, particularly in the face of the criticisms made by the “knockers” and the excesses of the “boosters” in chapters 1 and 2. If authenticity is to be taken seriously as a moral ideal, one has to believe three things, a) that authenticity is a valid idea; b) that one can argue with reason about ideals and about the conformity of practices to these ideals; and c) that these arguments can make a difference. Authentic life is an ethical goal and peculiar to modern culture, stemming from individualism. Individualism comes from Descartes instituting the primacy of the individual bearing responsibility for finding the truth. This morality is also anchored in Romanticism. It is a “voice within” or “the intimate contact with oneself”. As long as the project of authenticity is grounded on a horizon of significance, so it finds some of its points of reference outside of the individual and in the communal, then it is a morally worthwhile pursuit.

Candidates might explore:

- The growth and role of instrumental reason as a solution to questions of value
- The alienation and atomization of the individual
- The tendency in modern culture to move from a justified sense of individualism into a self-referential and self-regarding subjectivity and narcissism
- The lack of a common ‘objective’ set of values and language, understood and participated in by all
- The selection of horizons of significance
- The essentially dialogic nature of authenticity, according to Taylor
- For Taylor, choice is the sine qua non of freedom, but it cannot become the standard by which to judge the worth of ideas and actions. Choice in itself is not enough. This is the slide that relativism makes in confusing an exercise in choice with authenticity.

**(b) Evaluate Taylor’s justification that authenticity is a worthy moral ideal. [15]**

Possible discussion points include:

- Although Taylor states that moral authenticity is fundamentally dialogical in character, his view on authenticity, which is a main way to overcome instrumental reason, is still individualistic
- Taylor contends that currently, there is a value which claims that all lives are equal not merely in terms of their values as human beings, but in their individuality, their personal experiences. Taylor believes this causes people to become self-absorbed, and can bring about a loss of meaning in their lives
- What is really at stake is a balanced judgment on modernity; on the one hand the modern search for authenticity is grounded in the belief of its nobility and ethical allure (the Boosters); on the other, the modern search for authenticity is grounded in the beliefs of self-destructiveness, self-flattening and narcissistic tendencies (the Knockers)
- Though Taylor’s defends the search for authenticity as a noble tradition made possible by the Enlightenment, is it a search only possible for those in modern democratic and technological societies with the means to do so?
- Is Taylor being disingenuous when he at once acknowledges and celebrates the plurality of the modern world, but argues against even a soft version of relativism?

**20. (a) Explain the parallels between art and the concept of the self in Taylor’s argument on authenticity. [10]**

Taylor draws a parallel between the shift in concepts of the self and individualism and the movement in art from mimesis to creation in chapter 6. The language of poets and the images of artists had previously drawn on common understandings and mythologies; art was a mimesis of the world in its content and its manner, and was accessible to most of the public. Like art, the idea of the self changed from one that was defined by external moral obligations, to an internal one built upon notions of originality, imagination, and inspiration. The result of the change in reference for art resulted in a subjectivation (Taylor’s term) of meaning; previously, the external references for art meant that all had access to its symbolism and meaning. Now, the meaning must be mediated through the language of the particular artist. This makes meaning more difficult to access. Art became less public and more personal in interpreting its meaning. Similarly, the shift in the definition of the individual, cut the individual free from long held definitions, and the need for a replacement set of definitions, saw the birth of the modern concept of authenticity.

Candidates might explore:

- Modern art highlights the criticism of narcissism made against the search for authenticity: The personal language now found in art and the manner in which it is conveyed collapses art into a subjective exercise without an external reference point. Similarly, for the self
- Art also serves as an example of how the subjectivation of the self does not mean that this subjectivation leads to narcissism and egoism
- Taylor makes a distinction between the manner in which art express itself (personal) and its content (public)
- The shift in emphasis in the definition of the individual, divorced from the medieval chain of being was contemporary with the Romantic Movement that changed the view of art and beauty from the mimetic to the actions and original idea the artist. The move was essentially from external definitions to an internal one based on feeling
- Great art still engages with common and universal human experiences; with the self, though the personal is now of primary importance, it can only avoid narcissism if it seeks external, common reference points for its definition; a new chain of being for meaning.

**(b) Evaluate the parallel between art and the concept of the self in Taylor’s argument for authenticity. [15]**

Possible discussion points include:

- If the concept of art is a parallel to the concept of the self, then what does this mean about non-western cultures that have different artistic ideologies and practices? Do they have a need for authenticity?
- In the context of a parallel to the concept of the individual, how can anyone understand my art if I use my own private symbols? Furthermore, Taylor assumes an easy separation between the content and manner of art. Is it as clear as he implies?
- 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?
- Can self-fulfillment ever be authentic according to Taylor?
- Can the tension between the individual and the public be resolved?

**Lao Tzu: *Tao Te Ching*****21. (a) Explain the relationship between Heaven and Earth. [10]**

This question invites an explanation of the relationship between Heaven and Earth and the role of the *Tao* within this relationship. The analogy of the flute and the flute player is used to demonstrate the interaction between Heaven and Earth. The Earth is the object, the flute, and the musician is Heaven. It is the *Tao* that is the breath; the air that transforms the flute from a static object to a producer of various sounds. The more it is played the more mature the sounds become, *ie* the more encounters with *Tao* the better. Heaven is eternal and Earth lasting. Consequently when the imaginary is untangled the *Tao* breathing is the source of ideas that can be materialised in space and time. Heaven evolves from what exists and is driven by the “non-existent” *Tao*. The real world, the world of phenomena, the world of things, arises out of these ideas. The Earth “things” gain names and are something that have arisen out of nothing. It is the “non-existence”, the nothing, that should be focused on, the breath not the sound or the instrument or the player. The essence of “things” on Earth should be sought. Similarities to Confucian ideas where Heaven is constructed from primal ideas and Platonic Form Theory might be developed. It is on Earth that we see glimpses of the *Tao*. Heaven and Earth do not live of themselves.

Candidates might explore:

- Essences can be discerned through primary qualities
- The way names change but the essence is eternal
- The way absolutes are defined by their opposites and therefore our understandings acquired through relativistic interactions
- Yin and Yang are understood as complimentary to each as Heaven and Earth are
- The way Heaven and Earth relate to nature and treat creatures as “straw dogs”.

**(b) To what extent is awareness of the breath of life on Earth essential to our harmonious existence? [15]**

Possible discussion points include:

- How knowledge of things comes about through naming
- The valuelessness of naming as names do not lead to the *Tao*
- The way awaiting the coming of the breath is important, as in seeking the breath, the *Tao*, will result in it not being found. The activity of *wu wei* is how the *Tao* can be encountered
- How the essence of phenomena can be seen between Heaven and Earth
- The breath matures by being expelled often and can affect the behaviour of things but not the essence
- Knowledge is seen as of less value than enlightenment
- The nature of enlightenment is feeling the breath which is between Heaven and Earth
- The way to experience the breath is through *wu wei*, non-action
- The harmony and the symmetry of Heaven and Earth is seen and felt in the breath, the *Tao*
- The aim of *Taoism* is harmony with and in Earth in all its forms.



**22. (a) Explain why learning should be banished and knowledge discarded. [10]**

This question invites an explanation of the valuelessness of knowledge and the ineffectiveness of active learning as they are not routes to enlightenment and the appreciation of the *Tao*. Theoretical knowledge is learnt from a teacher and the teacher is not necessary as the *Tao* can be discovered through *wu wei*. Knowledge results in the naming of things and the acquisition of a false wisdom. Knowing too much, claiming to know the world, is not true understanding of the essence of “things”. Cleverness and knowledge lead to a flourishing of lies. *Wu wei* will allow the person to encounter the *Tao* in things. This is done by non-action, by seeking nothing.

Candidates might explore:

- The nature of *wu wei* as an effective behaviour towards enlightenment
- The growth of spiritual awareness
- Ways to reach the nameless things and non-conceptual reality
- The effects of lies and false wisdom leading to interference in the ways of the world
- Wisdom as a behavior.

**(b) Evaluate the claim that cognition is “the original sin”. [15]**

Possible discussion points include:

- Original sin of cognition is a desire for ever increasing knowledge
- Original sin of cognition is seen as pointless, fruitless, as it will not bear the fruit of the *Tao*
- The limitations of taught knowledge which is concern with things not essences
- The ways in which worldly knowledge is not the route to the *Tao*
- A desire for more information and investigating and seeking results is a loss of sight of the essence of things
- A comparison with Greek traditions and the contrast between sophists and the “true” philosophical approach founded in Plato
- The appreciation of essences and the *Tao* can lead to an expansion of duty and compassion
- The applicability of *wu wei* and a rejection of knowledge in a modern world which is driven by knowledge and information
- Does the sin of cognition recognize that knowing is the easy part but understanding, application and evaluation are the hard parts which might reflect a somewhat modern approach to education making education worthwhile?

**Zhuangzi: *Zhuangzi*****23. (a) Explain Zhuangzi’s use of nature to teach the art of living. [10]**

“Wandering Beyond” (Chapter 1) has been translated as journeying without a destination, implying the need to empty one’s life of distraction or goals in order to achieve true appreciation of the nature of things. In this way, the person can go beyond familiar things and thus achieve personal freedom. Such things as being focused on our place in society, or, worrying about the expected roles we should be fulfilling, exemplify the kind of distraction that “Wandering Beyond” encourages us to shed. In looking anew at things, without preconceptions or normal restraints, we can realise the truth of the nature of things around us – hence a strong use of the natural world to illustrate this in the chapter. Wandering encourages the sense of *wu* – a centrally important concept of emptying, nothingness and being without. This encourages the proper ordering of things which lead to the true flourishing of the individual. Achieving the natural way of doing things is achieving the *Tao*. There is encouragement not to be distracted by comparison of the vast and the petty, and encouragement not to be taken in by the petty when – naturally – the vast, by dint of its size incorporates the petty. Zhuangzi uses natural metaphors and changes in nature to encourage this personal journey, including the transformation of the fish into the bird, and the natural behaviour of the elements, which underline the need to avoid fixed outlooks and expectations as you take up the challenge of “wandering beyond”. This leads to flourishing – even if not a life of immediate pleasure or success, but one of true fulfilment according to one’s natural potential.

Candidates might explore:

- The use of natural metaphors
- The concept of *wu*
- The social message in the chapter – how interaction in society can suffocate proper living
- Journeying without a fixed goal or route
- The conception of the flourishing individual.

**(b) Evaluate the role of nature for the flourishing of the individual. [15]**

Possible discussion points include:

- The individual flourishing is covered in Chapter 1
- The individual is in nature and part of nature
- Flourishing as not dependent on social recognition or social status – is this achievable or realistic?
- Flourishing not in line with social, traditional views of ‘success’ – is this a realistic picture of flourishing?
- Why should flourishing be so cut off from others?
- Is the emphasis too ascetic to be of practical use in the modern world?
- Can the concept of *wu* do the work towards flourishing that the book asserts?

**24. (a) Explain the account of the genuine human being (sage – *sheng ren*). [10]**

In Chapter 6, Zhuangzi brings into play the notion of the ideal life as instantiated in the *zhenren*, or “genuine human being”. Here there is a continued discussion of the nature of humanity and its relationship with the divine, as expressed in the concepts *ren* and *tian*. The greatest wisdom lies in accommodating both and not forcing a false distinction between the human and the divine, thus echoing earlier passages on being natural and being human at the same time. Nature features in the picture of the sage with the *zhenren* being in harmony with nature and its cycles, though not dominated by anything – just like being both unified with and not bound by things in life. The *zhenren* exemplifies moderation and an ability not to be affected by extremes – indeed he cannot be drowned by the ocean or burnt by fire.

Candidates might explore:

- The relation between *tian* and *ren*
- The relationship between the *zhenren* and nature
- The relationship between the *zhenren* and worldly things
- The *zhenren*’s attitude to life and death and our ancestral roots
- The place and use of techniques to help develop harmonious, real humanity.

**(b) Evaluate the account of the genuine human being (sage – *sheng ren*). [15]**

Possible discussion points include:

- Discussion of *tian* and *ren* and their relationship
  - The role of practices and disciplines in which humans cultivate the ancestral foundation inside everyone – is this a realistic or coherent idea?
  - In clinging to our ancestral nature humans are able to avoid being overcome by the busyness and the change of ordinary life, giving humans a stability that is not affected by unpredictable events – is this a convincing idea?
  - Inevitable opposites are mentioned – light and darkness, happiness and sadness, and life and death – this is descriptive of the transformation humans experience
  - Humans are caught in an inevitable process of change and natural circumstances that the Tao helps them navigate – to be genuine humans are not to avoid suffering or challenge, but accept them as inevitable – is this fatalistic?
  - The analogy of the potter bringing into reality a creation of things which get reshaped and respond to their natural environment before re-entering the unformed state from which they emerged
  - Can this human being operate successfully in the modern world?
-