Markscheme

May 2019

Philosophy

Higher level and standard level

Paper 2

I.   QIG availability

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

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

II.   Candidates who overlook the new Paper 2 rubric of answering <u>both</u> parts a and b of <u>one</u> question

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

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

Overarching principles

The following statements underpin our decisions below:
1. No candidate should be disadvantaged for following the rules.
2. Whenever possible candidates should receive credit for what they know.

Example

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

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

Q7. (a) Explain Mill's view of the relationship between liberty and utility. (10 marks)

(b) To what extent are liberty and utility fundamentally conflicting concepts? (15 marks)

Q9. (a) Explain the view that morality has a clear and traceable genealogy. (10 marks)

(b) To what extent do you agree with the genealogy Nietzsche proposes? (15 marks)

Scenario 1. Candidate answers parts from two different questions.

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

Action:

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

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

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

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

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

Action:

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

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

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

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

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

Action:

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

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

Example: Candidate states they are answering 7(a) and 7(b) but their response clearly talks about Nietzsche (Q9) rather than Mill's (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 9 for part A responses, and page 10 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

Marks	Level descriptor
0	• The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–2	• There is little relevant knowledge of the specified idea/argument/concept from the text. • The explanation is minimal. • Philosophical vocabulary is not used, or is consistently used inappropriately.
3–4	• Some knowledge of the specified idea/argument/concept from the text is demonstrated but this lacks accuracy, relevance and detail. • The explanation is basic and in need of development. • Philosophical vocabulary is not used, or is consistently used inappropriately.
5–6	• Knowledge of the specified idea/argument/concept from the text is mostly accurate and relevant, but lacking in detail. • There is a satisfactory explanation. • Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately.
7–8	• The response contains accurate and relevant knowledge of the specified idea/argument/concept from the text. • The explanation is clear, although may be in need of further development. • Philosophical vocabulary is mostly used appropriately.
9–10	• The response contains relevant, accurate and detailed knowledge of the specified idea/argument/concept from the text. • The explanation is clear and well developed. • There is appropriate use of philosophical vocabulary throughout the response.

Paper 2 part B markbands

Marks	Level descriptor
0	• The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–3	• There is little relevant knowledge of the text. • Philosophical vocabulary is not used, or is consistently used inappropriately. • The response is mostly descriptive with very little analysis. • There is no discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view.
4–6	• Some knowledge of the text is demonstrated but this lacks accuracy and relevance. • 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. • Some of the main points are justified.
7–9	• Knowledge of the text 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.
10–12	• The response contains accurate and relevant knowledge of the text. • Philosophical vocabulary is mostly used appropriately. • The response contains clear critical analysis. • There is discussion and some assessment of alternative interpretations or points of view. • Most of the main points are justified.
13–15	• The response contains relevant, accurate and detailed knowledge of the text. • There is appropriate use of philosophical vocabulary throughout the response. • The response contains clear and 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.

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

1. (a) **Explain de Beauvoir's account of biology's influence on a female's experience of inequality between the sexes.** **[10]**

    (b) **Evaluate de Beauvoir's view that biology does not establish a "fixed and inevitable destiny" for a woman.** **[15]**

    In the early parts of Vol. 1 de Beauvoir explores reasons for the way females have become the "other" in their experience of existence and in their treatment by men. De Beauvoir does not restrict her argument to social and political behaviour, but also examines the role that biological processes play in shaping the experience of women. De Beauvoir does not believe biology determines destiny, but she explores its role in determining experiences, which lead to differentiation between the sexes. The actual biological moment of conception is one of parity, but the discussion of the process introduces an imbalance of power between the sexes. There is a contrast between the differences between male and female before conception and the differences between male and female at birth. Later, the female body undergoes more change, including the menstrual cycle as a reminder of subordination. "[T]he woman is adapted to the needs of the egg rather than to her own requirements"; de Beauvoir paints a grim picture of the experience of pregnancy. The physical experiences of pregnancy "signalize the revolt of the organism against the invading species". There are processes as emotional reactions to the workings of the female's physical system, and a woman's destiny is tied to her biology. Other thinkers who could be raised in relation to these issues are Greer, Dworkin, J R Richards, Grimshaw, Irigaray. Candidates might also mention modern feminist theories in comparison.

    Candidates might explore (part A):
    *   The account of biology used in society which reduces female power in favour of men
    *   De Beauvoir's example of conception, where female "reception" is contrasted with the vigorous "active principle" of the male sperm, despite the loss of individuality once an egg is fertilised
    *   The biological process of gestation places a burden on women not shared by men due to accompanying illnesses, feeling of sickness, *etc*
    *   The female body is dominated from puberty onwards by having to prepare itself for its role in giving birth
    *   Females experience more illness than men but live longer, being liberated only through menopause from the childbearing onus they live with from puberty
    *   In contrast the male's "sexual life is not in opposition to his existence as a person, and biologically it runs an even course, without crises and generally without mishap".

    Possible discussion points include (part B):
    *   De Beauvoir attacks the language of biology which sets up a barrier between men and women in the choice of descriptive phrases used to understand different physical processes
    *   Biological differences do not confer weakness except where external situations like war or social violence, as perpetrated by men, see physical inferiority as "weakness"; such distinctions can be eroded through different understanding, not because of something inherent in biology
    *   While a woman's physical experience, set by biology, is important to understanding a woman's situation, de Beauvoir denies that biology establishes "a fixed and inevitable destiny"
    *   In contemplating human differences, the human animal offers a much less fixed understanding of its relationship with gender; sex does not define the human animal like it does other animals
    *   Is de Beauvoir's picture of pregnancy unrealistic or misconceived?

- "[T]he body is not a thing, it is a situation"; is this convincing? Examples of where physical experiences play a more determining influence on an individual
- The current topic of gender identity
- Modern genetic understanding; does this make de Beauvoir's treatment outdated and lacking true biological understanding?

2.   **(a)**   **Explain de Beauvoir's account of the role of work in establishing "the independent woman".**   **[10]**

(b)   **Evaluate de Beauvoir's account of the role of work in enabling the woman to gain independence.**   **[15]**

In Vol. 2 part 4, de Beauvoir uncovers her assessment of the status – in terms of independence and relation to the male sex – of the modern woman in France. Women, by 1949, had the vote and were no longer obliged to vow obedience to a husband in the marriage ceremony. However, de Beauvoir finds many points of objection to the ability for a woman to stand in equal relation to a man, especially in terms of economic equivalence. The woman finds herself in a "situation" fashioned by the male forces in society, the male seeing the woman as "the other" and objectifying her in terms of the roles she must perform. "[S]he remains a vassal, imprisoned in her condition". For de Beauvoir, it is in ceasing to be "a parasite" – through work and economic and situational independence – that the gap between the sexes will diminish. Candidates might consider Ortega's counter-criticism that men are referenced to women as much as women are referenced to men. Other feminist theories such as those offered by Greer, Wolff, Dworkin, JR Richards, Grimshaw, Irigaray might be used in responding to the question.

Candidates might explore (part A):
- The woman emerges from childhood having femininity thrust on her by external forces that drive her to passivity, subjugation and – critically – economic subordination and dependence
- Women must overcome the expectation that they must inhabit traditional roles of housework, child bearing and submitting to a man's sexual desire
- Even in being unconventional (like being a prostitute) the definitions of the situation still come from men
- Only in work can the woman achieve independence. If a woman can support herself, she is no longer dependent on another sex for basic sustenance and identity and she can gain liberation.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
- De Beauvoir identifies the economic underpinnings of female subordination – and the economic roots of woman's liberation
- Is the biological account convincing in order to sustain the freedom of women to articulate their own role?
- Is the account of a woman's biological dependence and situational reliance on external influences convincing?
- Are women really forced to take on roles like that of "mother" or "wife" in their seeking after equality of esteem? Is this convincing?
- The current topic of gender identity
- Assessment of the logistical hurdles to a woman seeking equality that de Beauvoir raises in the final chapter.

René Descartes: *Meditations*

3. **(a)** **Explain the concept of substance dualism in the context of Descartes's argument on indubitable knowledge.** **[10]**

    (b) **Evaluate the concept of substance dualism in the context of Descartes's argument on indubitable knowledge.** **[15]**

    This question invites candidates to explain a key theme in the *Meditations* where Descartes advances an argument concerning the different substances of mind and body and goes on to consider the implications by discussing the relationship and interpenetration of the two substances. Descartes makes his argument depend on what can be clearly and distinctly perceived. For example, we achieve a clear and distinct idea of our essence in just the way we can form clear and distinct ideas of mathematical truths and God. The connection to his argument on indubitable knowledge is that only through our mental substance, *eg* the irreducible essence of the *cogito*, and through other clear and distinct ideas of our minds that we can come to certain knowledge of our bodies and the external world. Modern counter-positions that could be considered include the work of Dennett and Searle.

    Candidates might explore (part A):
    * For Descartes, the mind is a mental substance, the body and external world are material substances
    * For Descartes one's essence is thinking; the mind cannot be divided against itself or into smaller parts
    * Descartes says that in thinking he can imagine himself to be distinct from his body
    * Descartes admits that he is not present in his body as a sailor is present in a ship, but instead his mind and body are intermingled
    * The body as substance is more open to the possibility of doubt than the mind
    * The material has extension while the mind is immaterial.

    Possible discussion points include (part B):
    * Just because Descartes has a clear perception that he could exist without a body, does not mean that he actually could do so – does he need a body to exist?
    * Is it so clear that the mind cannot be divided into parts? *eg* Freud, Lacan, and other psychological theories
    * Is the mind so transparent to itself? Are there not hidden reaches of the mind – *eg* suppressed consciousness or indeed the subconscious and unconscious?
    * The relation between mind and body has caused the greatest problems for Descartes; the pineal gland does not solve the problem of interaction
    * Is it possible to have indubitable knowledge?
    * The importance of the physical necessity of the brain to a proper understanding of the mind
    * Alternative means of interaction such as parallelism, epiphenomenalism
    * Eastern philosophical traditions emphasize the non-physical essence of the person.

4. **(a)** Explain the claim that error originates not from the intellect, but from the extent of the will. **[10]**

(b) Evaluate the claim that error originates not from the intellect, but from the extent of the will. **[15]**

The question addresses, in the first place, the specific issue of error arising from judgment. In the 4th Meditation, Descartes states that it's impossible to think that God should deceive him, and as the faculty of intellect comes from God, then the conclusion here is that this faculty is immune from error. Our free will is also provided by God, so this too cannot be in error when making judgments on our clear perceptions from the intellect. On further investigation, Descartes concludes that error is caused by the scope of the will; we are apt to pass judgments on matters we do not understand, nor perceive of clearly. The intellect is limited in what it can perceive and understand, but the will is infinite in scope and is apt to pass judgments on confused and unclear perceptions of the intellect. Unclear perceptions are a source of error, unless they are provided by God, in which case they are clear.

Candidates might explore (part A):
- Error refers to that sort alone, which arises in the determination of the true and the false. It does not refer to matters of faith, or to the conduct of life, but only to what Descartes regards as speculative truths, and such as are known by means of the natural light alone
- Judgment depends on two faculties, the intellect or faculty of cognition and the faculty of choice or freedom of will
- Though made in the image of God, humans are not God and are imperfect. The source of error must lie with them and not with God
- Intellect is not the source of error as the intellect perceives ideas, *ie* the mind presents it with objects and ideas in a neutral manner, and the intellect is a faculty provided by God who cannot be a deceiver
- The will's role is to affirm, deny, or refrain from judging when the ideas have been presented, but the freedom of the will is also from God, and also cannot be the source of error when presented with clear perceptions of the intellect
- The distinction between what we actually see and what we intellectually judge to be the case. For each volition a perception is passed onto the intellect. In many cases the intellect is overwhelmed and confused. It is our inability to recognize these confused perceptions when we pass judgments on them that leads to human error
- The scope of the intellect is limited, but the range of the will is virtually infinite
- According to Descartes, we should pass judgments only on those objects to which our minds possess clear and distinct ideas otherwise we should hesitate on passing judgments.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
- Descartes's account of judgment compared with others: *eg* the Aristotelian conception of judgment
- Is error equated with false judgment? Is there a more fundamental category of error?
- The role of senses; the knowledge of Descartes's body; the wax example
- The role of imagination and the *cogito* in the making of a judgment
- Why is it necessary to refer to will when dealing with speculative truths?
- The seeming contradiction between the perfection of the will and its tendency to be deceived by confused ideas
- Descartes's criteria of clear and distinct ideas as criteria for certainty
- Are *a priori* concepts related to the possibility of error caused by the conjunction of judgment and will?

David Hume: *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*

5.   (a)   **Explain the discussion between Cleanthes and Philo over the difference between true religion and organized religion.**   **[10]**

      (b)   **Evaluate Philo's argument that organized religion is destructive.**   **[15]**

This question stems from the arguments Hume presents in Part 1 and offers a chance to explore both the nature of and the reasons behind the discussion Cleanthes and Philo have over the nature of religion. The discussion follows immediately after Philo admits that he might believe the argument from design as a proof of the existence of God. It is therefore the very nature of religion that seems to separate the two. Cleanthes claims that organized religion will encourage the development of morality whereas in contrast Philo argues that organized religion is in fact bad. Organized religion actually encourages acts of evil and historical evidence of these actions or occurrences might be put forward. For Philo natural religion would develop empathy and benevolence towards other humans. Natural virtue is more effective in developing morality than organised religion. The skepticism that Philo has promoted establishes true religion. He even takes a fideist position held earlier by Demea to argue that reason has little place in true religion and it is revelation that is the bases of true religion.

Candidates might explore (part A):
- Organized religion as self-centred and focused on improving the condition of an individual's soul as opposed to ameliorating the human condition
- Caring for others seems to be secondary to caring for oneself
- Whether the rewards that would motivate humans to act with benevolence are too far removed from their everyday life
- Whether Hume is trying to reduce the radical nature of the argument by finally resting the case on revelation and not reason
- The degree to which Hume is challenging the contemporary perceptions of belief and organized religion, hence his self-censorship and his delay in publishing this work.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
- Reasons for Philo thinking that organized religion is superstition. To what degree does this contradict his later view that natural religion needs to be mysterious?
- The way that true religion rests on rational belief in a deity
- To what extent is morality, encouraged by organized religion, bad as it might be self-centred?
- Whether Philo's acceptance that the order in the universe might reveal something similar to human intelligence weakens his argument
- Is organized religion a social control mechanism through fear or just a pacifier of people?
- Is organized religion a product of fear of the unknown: ways of answering questions that are beyond reason
- The degree to which the criticism of organized religion might only apply to aspects of western Christianity
- Are non-western religions less or more destructive?
- Is organized religion focused on the afterlife only: consideration might be given to the notion of good deeds or charity
- The degree to which the argument presented is applicable to all religions or just Christianity
- Is Philo's whole argument a disguise for a deeper argument of declaring what is truth? Cleanthes is announced as the winner of the debate but it is the sceptic that might be closer to the truth as revealed in other parts of the text.

6. **(a)** **Explain Demea's arguments concerning the existence of God.** **[10]**

(b) **Evaluate one or more of Demea's arguments concerning the existence of God.** **[15]**

This question stems from the arguments Hume presents in Part 7 and invites an explanation and evaluation of the various arguments put forward by Demea in the exchanges with Cleanthes and Philo concerning the problems related to proving God's existence. Demea essentially in the first part of the discussions takes a position that rejects the idea that reason can be used to prove the existence of God. He puts forward a mystical view. He claims that faith alone is the way to establish the existence of God. Any use of human reason is open to error as it is reflective of our human understanding. God is not in the same state as man, as God is simple in that he has no parts. In some ways, the argument is a cosmogonic theory. He later objects to Philo's uses of analogy and the idea that the universe might be a machine and that order can be perceived within it. Demea rejects the argument from design and yet later does identify with an ontological argument. Demea claims that *a priori* arguments do prove religious truths and therefore God is infinite, perfect, error free, and simple. When confronted with the problem of the existence of evil Demea resorts to an "argument from the gut" in that humans have to believe in God. Humans do not need evidence to support their belief in God and the issues of evil can be resolved by the claim that humans cannot comprehend the complex balance that God has created. Demea's significance in the discussion could be questioned. A counter-position might be presented to suggest that Demea's role is simply to establish that there are alternative proofs of God but that the argument from design is the best.

Candidates might explore (part A):
* The self-evident approach to proving the existence of God
* The ontological alternatives to the cosmological proofs of God
* The use of analogy in explaining the nature of God
* The relationship of evil in any proof of the essence of God
* The consequences of God being omnipotent and omnipresent
* Whether God is and can be simple.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
* Demea's role could be seen as the fool in the play as his arguments might be seen as inconsistent. The inconsistencies presented might be seen to strengthen the positions of Cleanthes and Philo
* The reason why Demea leaves the discussion at one point in response to Philo's arguments
* How Cleanthes is used by Hume to critique the *a priori* arguments and therefore belittle Demea's position: Demea commits a category mistake, claiming necessary existence is consistent when it is not, and that a causal being is not necessarily a deity, and design and order is only an inference
* Demea's claim that evil can only be addressed and resolved by the existence of God
* The attacks on Demea's position in that humans cannot comprehend the place of evil in a supposed complex and perfect world.

John Stuart Mill: *On Liberty*

7. **(a)** **Explain Mill's understanding of the individual within society in terms of individual liberty.** **[10]**

    (b) **Evaluate the development of the individual within society in terms of individual liberty.** **[15]**

    This question arises from the arguments Mill illustrates in his text, particularly in chapter 3, and offers the possibility of an exploration of an important section of ideas presented in the text with a focus on Mill's understanding of the development of the individual within society in terms of liberty. For Mill, individuals are sovereign over themselves and, as such, their right to action ends when it impinges on another person. Mill views the state as a protector and arbitrator of common interests. The individual accepts a "contract" that contains the right not to injure the interests of others and in so doing, gaining of the right of protection for themselves. Individual pursuits of truth or an authentic life brings with it a plurality of views and enrichment of ideas and of the culture. It is a necessary condition for personal, social and technological progress. With this level of freedom, a danger is that the civil life will diminish. Mill strongly argues for a social conscience, usually gained through education, to restrain baser instincts. The harm he refers to is predominantly physical in nature, however verbal incitements to riot or defamation are viewed as harmful. The limit to action is also of benefit in encouraging varieties in modes of life. Children and those limited in their mental activity are protected despite not having liberty of action. Counter-positions might include Williams's critique of utility as an ethical principle. Political counter-arguments and alternatives might come from Plato, Rousseau, Foucault, *etc.*

    Candidates might explore (part A):
    - The essential principle on the limitation of action is to prevent harm inflicted upon others, either deliberately, or inadvertently. The only qualification to the principle is in the status of children, the insane and of "backward societies"
    - Mill makes a moral distinction between self-regarding and "other-regarding" acts
    - The concept of freedom implicit in Mill's argument is that freedom is the ability of the individual to pursue and achieve benefit for one-self and others
    - Mill's distinction between the legality of an act and its reception by others as a means of justifying his Harm Principle is an argument against legal moralism.

    Possible discussion points include (part B):
    - Is Mill right that the giving of offence does not constitute harm?
    - Apart from social rejection and approbation, what protection do minorities have from vilification under Mill's scheme?
    - Is Mill over-optimistic about education producing a civilized, prudent individual?
    - Is Mill right about the assumption that government interference is usually less useful than non-interference?
    - Individual protection outweighs any utilitarian benefit that could be argued for involving government; the law cannot proscribe individual expression without a negative effect on overall utility
    - Is Mill elitist about the truth and who discovers/knows it?
    - The example of belief in God and the defence of belief by the Early Church
    - Mill distinguishes between taking offence at an action with its legality. Has he missed the point that in democratic states, often the tastes of the majority shape the laws, so what is legal and not, and what legally constitutes harm or not, can change?

8.   (a)   Explain the issues Mill identifies with conformity.   **[10]**

(b)   Evaluate Mill's critique of conformity.   **[15]**

This question arises from the arguments Mill illustrates in his text, particularly in chapter 3, and invites an exploration of the benefits of non-conformity which is at the heart of individuality and liberty. Mill bases his rejection of conformity on several points: the autonomy of the individual, the benefits of free speech and the value of reason and rationality. These are the means by which society might progress and a lack of conformity helps encourage a variety of modes of living. Liberty and individuality contribute to the utility experienced in the society. Mill sees diversity as good and encourages people to "dare to be eccentric". Custom can cause progress and diversity to cease. Conformity is allowing custom to rule one's life according to the single faculty of "ape-like…imitation". Blindly following custom stops human qualities like perception, judgment or feeling for others from developing. Even in error, expressed immoral opinions can be corrected and truth can be seen to win the day, and all known truths must be open to challenge. Our opinions are formed over time, and as such, are given to necessary review and discussion with others. This either reassures us that the opinions we hold are correct, or it gives us the opportunity to change or refine them. If we consciously choose how to act, we make use of all our faculties.

Candidates might explore (part A):
- Liberty is founded on the notion that different modes of living can be empirically tested and people can make a rational choice about which mode to adopt/accept
- That we have reasons for any action is the very condition that justifies us in assuming its truth for purposes of the action; it then follows that these reasons may be challenged. On no other terms can a being with human faculties have any rational assurance of being right
- But spontaneity represents a problem and "is hardly recognized by the common modes as having any intrinsic worth"
- Individuality is seen as "troublesome and rebellious" but Mill attempts to draw a line between offence and harm in the *Harm Principle*
- The *Harm Principle* as defending spontaneity in individual expression
- Mill fears homogeneity of society will enable a paralysis to set in; he was concerned a single dominant culture will be established and we shall become increasingly alike.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
- Comparison with notions of individuality today
- Does Mill's *Harm Principle* militate against individuality and spontaneity?
- Mill puts a lot of emphasis on using empirical experience as a guide for action and judging behaviour, but experience can be too narrow or open to misinterpretation
- There must be a standard social setting from which eccentrics can differ, or from which non-conformity can be judged
- Eccentricity can militate against correct interpretation of behaviour or custom
- Liberty is a "good" unless it entails harm to others, which may then encourage conformity
- Under what conditions does the majority view become a tyrannous one?
- Mill acknowledges that some people have greater gifts or are more suited to lead than others
- The forces of conformity in the modern world, especially with global media and communication
- A much-touted feature of modern society is tolerance for minorities. Does this necessarily mean understanding, respecting or even valuing their views and ways of life?

Friedrich Nietzsche: *The Genealogy of Morals*

9. (a) **Explain Nietzsche's claim that "we need a critique of moral values, and we must first question the very value of these values".** **[10]**

   (b) **Evaluate Nietzsche's claim that "we need a critique of moral values, and we must first question the very value of these values".** **[15]**

   The question asks for an explanation of this central "new demand" according to his own words. Nietzsche's claim in the Preface (point 6) presents a decisive initial step in the development of his genealogical approach, where morality and values are put into question. Values are the salient aspect of normative systems, which show certain structural characteristics: a) they presuppose a particular descriptive account of human agency, and, b) they embrace norms, which favour the interests of some people, perhaps at the expense of others. Accordingly the genealogical approach has to provide an explanation of the "value of these values" referring to who gave rise to them and how. The genealogical approach presents the deconstructive aspect of Nietzsche's work, the sense in which he sought to disentangle western metaphysics, Christianity, and morality in order to display what he took to be their reactive decadence. This side of his thought looks at the past and exhibits this heritage at its roots. On the other hand his critique of moral values offers a positive or reconstructive side, which seems to be turned toward the future, suggesting visions of possible new forms of western life. The substance, goal, and success of Nietzsche's attempted transvaluation of all values is a matter of discussion in the interpretation of his thought.

   Candidates might explore (part A):
   - Under what conditions did men invent for themselves these value judgments good and evil? And what inherent value do they have?
   - Nietzsche argues that English psychologists err in regarding the original sense of good as useful. The sense of good varied, depending upon which class perceived it
   - For the dominant class, or masters, the primary sense of what is good is the self and that which resembles the self. By contrast, the socially subordinated, the slaves behave in very different ways, which the master designates as bad or ignoble
   - From the slave perspective, what the master calls "good" causes the slave's suffering and subordination. Thus, he designates the master as evil or wicked. The slave then invents the fiction of free will. The master is free to not behave in a wicked way, and the slave is equally free to begin to do so. The slave then constructs a moral scheme according to which his own passivity makes him morally superior to the master and therefore good
   - Here are characteristic themes of genealogy: pragmatic interests, perspectivality, demystification
   - Nietzsche's critique of Christianity. Beyond that, he broadens his analysis by claiming that modern liberal institutions and norms are versions of secularized Christianity. Thus liberalism inherits much of Christianity's slavishness without the religious rationale which legitimated it
   - The role of the ascetic priest; he blames the master morality and encourages hard work as a means to the life of true value.

   Possible discussion points include (part B):
   - The scope of Nietzsche's critique of morality: a critic of all morality or only a critic of some particular kind of morality, *eg* "Christian" or "European" morality? Or both?
   - It seems that eventually Nietzsche just attacks some systems of value and proposes others
   - Comparison and contrast of the genealogical approach with other approaches in ethics, *eg* duty-based, common good

- Is it possible within Nietzsche's approach to sustain that human agents possess a will capable of free and autonomous choice?
- To what extent is it possible to give an account of the origins of values?
- The "will to power" as an attempt to re-evaluate all values
- Guilt and values
- Values and the ascetic ideal
- Values, the death of God and nihilism
- The evaluation that all genealogical arguments suffer from the fallacy of composition.

10. (a) Explain Nietzsche's claim that "we are unknown to ourselves, we knowers – and with good reason, because we have never sought ourselves." **[10]**

(b) Evaluate Nietzsche's idea that we do not know ourselves. **[15]**

The question asks for an explanation of this central Nietzschean idea, which is presented in the very first sentence of the text in the preface. It expresses a central philosophical concern of Nietzsche, which might be indicated by saying that one can hide from oneself, but that one can overcome oneself. Real motives, according to Nietzsche, are often exactly the opposite of what is avowed, even sincerely avowed, and most problematically, the real motives are hidden because the agent hides them. He frequently contrasts what he calls "consciousness" with what he calls "instincts". These drives or instincts function in a distinctly unacknowledged way; they are hidden, not merely unnoticed or beyond conscious control or acknowledged and motivating but hypocritically denied. One can identify this central idea at different stages in the whole text, but it certainly has a central role in the second essay where Nietzsche traces the psychological origin of guilt to the primitive experience of debt. The possible explication of this origin requires its own method of understanding, which Nietzsche describes as "an art of interpretation" in the third essay, where an aphorism is presented, and the essay itself is a commentary on it guided by the question: What do ascetic ideals mean?

Candidates might explore (part A):
- Self-knowledge is always acquired from the viewpoint of particular drives, interests and values
- The primitive experience of debt: anticipating Freud, Nietzsche thinks that the inner mechanism mediating this experience is the product of introjected aggression
- The development of conscience (*Gewissen*) and, in particular, bad conscience
- While we cannot dismantle the conscience, we can reprogramme it with values and standards other than those derived from slave morality
- In the third essay, Nietzsche asks why we regard asceticism so highly. He reveals its psychological roots in the reduction of the life instinct. Its persistence is due to the socially stabilizing function of the ascetic's ideology of sin and contrition
- What compels a person to the unconditional will for truth is the faith in the ascetic ideal itself, even though it may be for him an unconscious imperative
- Nietzsche strongly condemns the will for truth
- Furthermore, modern science is an outgrowth of the ascetic ideal, its self-hating contempt for pleasurable illusion expressing itself as a commitment to truth
- The genealogy traces the moral version of each strand back to pre-moral sources. Morality negates life, because morality is an ascetic interpretation of the ethical life.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
- Self-knowledge, possibilities and the value of self-knowledge
- Phenomena in connection to self-deceit: ascetic ideal, guilt, slave morality
- Perspectivism as a claim about knowledge and self-knowledge
- The commitment to science as actually the latest version of the ascetic ideal, based as it is on the Platonic/Christian belief that God is truth, and that truth is divine. This amounts to the assumption that truth is more important than anything else (*ie* life, happiness, love, power)
- Nietzsche believes that we need a new ideal, alternative to the ascetic ideal, and new values. The overcoming of the ascetic ideal that Nietzsche promotes is thus a self-overcoming
- Different philosophical, moral and religious views on self-knowledge and self-deceit
- Self-knowledge, freedom and personal agency
- A genealogical approach is an assertion not an argument.

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

11. (a) **Explain the claim that "no society that pursues equality can avoid curtailing freedom in very many ways".**   **[10]**

     (b) **Evaluate the relationship between equality and freedom in Nussbaum's** *capabilities approach***.**   **[15]**

     The question arises from a claim in chapter 4, "Fundamental Entitlements", and invites an analysis of some central concepts in Nussbaum's text and philosophy, such as freedom and equality. Candidates might analyse the relationship between equality and freedom by mentioning the apparent contrast between these two key-concepts. As Nussbaum states in chapter 4, "the very idea of freedom involves the idea of constraint": candidates might refer to the necessity to counterbalance equality and freedom and, because of this, they might explore the reasons why Nussbaum criticizes Sen's view of freedom. According to Nussbaum, "some freedoms limit others" and this is why it is not possible to bear a general idea of freedom, independently from specific situations. Candidates might analyse some cases, which present a contrast between freedom and equality. For example, Nussbaum states that "gender justice cannot be successfully pursued without limiting male freedom". Candidates might also consider this argument with relation to social welfare, national agendas, governmental strategies, and political issues – key elements in Nussbaum's view. As possible counter-arguments, candidates might consider Rawls's *theory of justice* and Sen's criticism. Candidates might also analyse how the *capabilities approach* relates to the need for equality at the expense of freedom. Moreover, candidates might consider one or more alternative views to the *capabilities approach*, *eg* utilitarianism and the theory of the social contract. Finally, candidates might mention the nature and possibilities of the connection between politics and ethics.

     Candidates might explore (part A):
     * Definitions of equality and freedom
     * Is a universal idea of freedom possible?
     * Nussbaum's criticism of Sen's view
     * Specific cases of equality limiting freedom, *eg* gender justice.

     Possible discussion points include (part B):
     * Sen's criticism of Rawls's *theory of justice*
     * Reasons why Nussbaum holds the validity of Rawls's theory
     * Is the *capabilities approach* feasible, with relation to equality and freedom?
     * Alternatives to the *capabilities approach*, *eg* utilitarianism, theory of the social contract
     * Role of nations and governments with relation to individual welfare and freedom
     * Feasibility of political liberalism
     * Is there a possible link between ethics and politics, *eg* consequentialism, deontology?

12. (a) Explain the claim that "poverty involves heterogeneous failures of opportunity". [10]

(b) Evaluate the relationship between poverty and opportunity. [15]

The claim is from the last chapter of Nussbaum's work and invites an analysis of the phenomenon of poverty, with relation to opportunities, capabilities, and functioning. A key element of Nussbaum's argument is the link between poverty and income. Nussbaum asserts that "in general, income is a means to an end, and capabilities are the end". Nonetheless, "people in positions of social exclusion may have difficulty converting income into actual functioning, so income is not even a good proxy for capabilities". Candidates might also present other difficulties linked to the relationship between poverty and income, *eg* issues in measuring poverty or failure in evaluating other elements, such as gender, nutrition, health care, and the likes. Responses might also include an analysis of the concept of disadvantage that Nussbaum presents in connection with Sen's theory. Candidates might focus on the importance of another concept, security: Nussbaum claims that "people need to have not just a capability today but a secure expectation that it will be there tomorrow". Candidates might also include an analysis of another important disadvantage that Nussbaum illustrates in several works, the inequality of women. Candidates might also explore other causes of disadvantage, *eg* disability, aging, and care. Finally, responses might take into account how the *capabilities approach* can relate to the animal entitlements and the quality of the environment.

Candidates might explore (part A):
• Relationship between poverty and income
• Relationship between income and capabilities
• Concept of disadvantage
• Causes of disadvantage and inequality
• Concept of security
• Gender, disability, and aging
• Animal entitlements and environmental quality.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
• Issues linked to the relationship between income and opportunity
• Issues in measuring poverty
• Role of education
• The *capabilities approach* and possible alternatives, *eg* utilitarianism, Kant, the GNP approach
• Capabilities and human psychology.

Ortega y Gasset: *The Origins of Philosophy*

13. **(a)** **Explain Ortega's use of history in articulating philosophy's fundamental task**. **[10]**

(b) **Evaluate the role history plays in philosophical activity, according to Ortega.** **[15]**

Ortega asks how searching back into philosophy's origin we might be enlightened – at a time of seeming retreat for philosophical discourse – as to how philosophy can add to our search for meaning about existence. In delving into past worlds, Ortega aims to shine a light on what philosophy can mean in the present, and he discovers that philosophy cannot be explained only by reference to the past. He uses figures like that of Parmenides and Heraclitus to illustrate historical examples, but recognises they cannot speak for humans in the modern, contemporary situation. In the exploration of history and philosophy, Ortega sees a strong connection between the role of reason in history and in philosophy.

Candidates might explore (part A):
- Ortega's use of past thinkers, especially the Greeks, like Parmenides, Heraclitus, Thales and Socrates
- Ortega finds that history teaches philosophy about its past revealing "a defunct world of errors", but he still feels there is an objective truth able to be discovered by humans in their own situations, contemplating experience from their own perspective
- Ortega looks at different ways of approaching the past of philosophy – the use of analysis and synthesis
- Ortega sees a distinction between the conceptual world and the world of experience as exhibited in existing.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
- As we are unable to do philosophy by looking at past examples, Ortega says, "we have no choice but to attempt to construct one of our own"
- Despite the historical pursuit, philosophy reveals a "world of errors". Nonetheless, the task is a uniquely human activity and it helps the thinker to see the reality of the present experience in contrast to the past
- The contemplation of the past also sets up space for philosophical activity of the future, and we are reminded that we face no choice other than to construct our own philosophy for the future in response to what we see in the past and experience in the present
- The task of philosophy is revealed through Parmenides as a response to "being".

14. **(a)** **Explain Ortega's treatment of human freedom in response to the human experience.**
[10]

(b) **Evaluate Ortega's account of human freedom.** **[15]**

The basis of Ortega's response to the issue of human freedom is "I am myself and my circumstance". Ortega relays an account of how humans develop through stages where gaps appear between the relation of needs and possibilities. It is in the increase of possibilities over needs that human freedom is experienced. Ortega comes from a phenomenological and existentialist tradition, influenced by thinkers who emphasised the importance of understanding human experience. Candidates might draw upon alternative approaches in this tradition where an emphasis on the life of the individual is made, while relegating the importance of social structures and political institutions on what constitutes freedom for individual humans, *eg* Marxist approaches, Foucault, Sartre.

Candidates might explore (part A):
- The account Ortega makes of human "possibilities", as defining the freedom humans experience in the face of needs
- Social and political institutions are formed arising from the experience of freedom but they are effects and are not the basis of human freedom – that comes from individual experience
- If possibilities multiply then a problem of choice emerges and living is transformed by the accessibility of that choice
- But absolute freedom is impossible, because it would mean a life lived without the human necessities of circumstances, which are necessary for any human life.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
- Ortega separates human freedom from material necessities; but does Ortega give too little credence to the importance of economic wealth and circumstances to the experience of freedom?
- How does Ortega deal (or not) with the determinism of the biological sciences? Is Ortega scientifically naive?
- The epistemological implications of human existence – see Ortega's treatment of Descartes and other figures in the history of philosophy
- Is "freedom" best defined by the sense of the availability of possibilities?
- Is Ortega's account of life as "making futures" convincing? Is the idea that the past and present are there to throw us into our futures convincing?
- Ortega's links with other accounts of freedom, *eg* Sartre's.

Plato: *The Republic,* **Books IV–IX**

15. (a) Explain the relationship between power and personal sacrifice in the case of rulers.
[10]

    (b) Evaluate the relationship between power and personal sacrifice that Socrates asks of the rulers of the ideal city. **[15]**

In the opening lines of Book IV, Adeimantus points out that when listening to Socrates's description of the ruler's life, it sounds like one of sacrifice, lacking common pleasures and rewards: "The city in fact belongs to them, yet they derive no benefit from them" (419). Moreover, "unlike the others, they receive no pay over and above their food […] they can't give presents to mistresses, or spend money on anything else they choose" (420). Socrates's argument is grounded on the overall balance of the city, which overcomes the possible benefits of specific groups or individuals. Candidates might focus on the concepts of harmony and balance and the relationship between single parts and the whole, as it happens to be discussed by Plato through the analysis of the tripartite soul and the Chariot Allegory. Candidates might also present another example that Socrates mentions about colouring a statue: "The thing to ask yourself is whether by giving the right colours to everything we are making the whole thing beautiful" (420d). Candidates might also explore the rulers' lifestyle and how it is described in Plato's text: whether they can have private property, wives, or children. Finally, candidates might analyse the relationship between power and personal sacrifice by referring to Plato's idea of the division of labour, according to the individuals' skills and nature, as it is described through the Ship Analogy.

Candidates might explore (part A):
* Whether the rulers' life is similar in any way to the one that the rest of the society will live
* The education of the rulers
* The connection between social structure and the Realm of the Forms
* The connection between the rulers' role and the notion of Justice
* The Ship Analogy and the role of each group of people in it
* The vision of a society ruled by philosopher-rulers and its practical implementation
* The analogy of the building of a statue
* The way happiness may arise among rulers living in such a particular way
* The type of happiness that arises from a way of living.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
* The fundamental task of the ruler is to achieve justice in the city
* The relationship between the Forms and the ideal city structure
* The chance of having a long term and healthy rule under these severe conditions of living
* Historical aspects that may be behind this type of behaviour that Socrates proposes
* The understanding of the Forms as an essential prerequisite for political order
* Different ways of understanding happiness
* The extent to which Plato's political vision might guide the political reflection or life for present societies
* The possibility of having a group of people living in a sort of non-human way
* The modern conceptions of history and society outdate the platonic political ideals.

16. **(a)** **Explain the relationship between knowledge and reality in the *Analogy of the Divided Line*.** **[10]**

(b) **Evaluate the relationship between knowledge and reality in the *Analogy of the Divided Line*.** **[15]**

The *Analogy of the Divided Line* is presented by Plato in the Republic 509d–511e. Socrates elaborates it upon the immediately preceding *Analogy of the Sun*. This question offers the chance to explain Plato's key aspects of his epistemology. As it is known, the separate segments of the divided line mirror specific affections of the psyche. The divided line also symbolizes a separation of the intelligible – represented by the higher section of the line – and the visible – represented by the lower section of the line. Candidates might describe the analogy and structure of the divided line and how it relates to increasing levels of reality, from opinion to clear knowledge. The first division of the kinds of cognition: knowledge (*gnosis*) and opinion (*doxa*), their objects of cognition: The intelligible and the visible. Within knowledge: intellection (*noesis*) and thought (*dianoia*). Within opinion: belief (*pistis*) and imagination (*eikasia*); their objects: plants, animals and artefacts, and shadows and reflections. Plato also highlights the importance of the highest level of intellect (dialectic), a conversation (question and response) that seeks to determine, without the aid of diagrams or physical models, a conclusion about some Form, for example, the conversation about Justice.

Candidates might explore (part A):
- The link between knowledge, ignorance, what it is and what it is not
- The role of opinion as something in between (476e–480a)
- The realm of Forms as something separate from the world of perceptible things
- The role of epistemology within Plato's metaphysics
- The lowest level of intellect, imagination *(eikasia)* and the unreleased people in the Allegory of the Cave
- The characteristics of belief *(pistis)* as a limited mental activity of people who only perceive tangible things or things of material substance
- The role of the study of abstract elements, like the world of mathematics
- The importance of a philosophical education so as to reach the highest knowledge
- The philosopher is not only the one that may possess knowledge but also the most virtuous of men.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
- Whether the kind of reality has to correspond to a mode of cognition or not
- Whether there is not any possibility of knowledge for the first level ("the world of becoming and passing away")
- Plato's strict notion of knowledge
- The ways different states of cognition attach to different objects of knowledge
- Whether the distinction made by Plato is a useful one
- The foundation of dualism: the division of Plato's line between visible and intelligible as a division between the material and the ideal
- Plato's line connection to the division between body and mind
- A link to the *Simile of the Sun* in Book VI, where the sun's light gives us our vision to see and the role of the Good. The sun rules over our vision and the things we see
- The extent to which Plato's epistemology is connected to other Greek traditions (Heraclitus, Parmenides, Pythagoras, *etc*)
- Plato and Kant: the phenomenal world, the noumenal world.

Peter Singer: *The Life You Can Save*

17. (a) Explain the claim that "extreme poverty is often accompanied by a degrading state of powerlessness". **[10]**

(b) Evaluate the relationship between poverty and powerlessness. **[15]**

The claim is from the first chapter of Singer's book and invites an analysis of the key elements of Singer's view, particularly of the concepts of poverty and powerlessness. Candidates might describe the lack of material goods, *eg* food, water, house, health care, and clothing. Nonetheless, according to Singer, "poverty is not only a condition of unsatisfied material needs". Candidates might explain how poverty can generate a deep, unsolvable feeling of powerlessness, by mentioning non-material needs, *eg* education or freedom, and how these relate to a sense of failure and shame. Responses might offer some data to support the analysis, *eg* with reference to the World Bank survey. Candidates might also explore a particular kind of poverty that it is possible to experience in wealthy countries: as Singer states, "in wealthy societies, people feel poor because many of the good things they see advertised on television are beyond their budget". Another interesting path that responses might follow focuses on the relationship between poverty and childhood: children suffer from the consequences of poverty in terms of material and non-material needs more than adults do. Candidates might refer to social issues with relation to child poverty, malnutrition and no education.

Candidates might explore (part A):
* The relationship between poverty and powerlessness
* Material and non-material needs
* Supporting data, *eg* World Bank survey
* Poverty and childhood, *eg* malnutrition, no education
* Poverty and adulthood, *eg* lower life expectations, disease.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
* Poverty in wealthy societies
* Luxury as not the main cause of waste; the necessity to change people's everyday habits
* Lower standards of life and cheaper expenses do not mean poverty
* Waste of energy related to basic goods, *eg* water, coffee
* Environmental care as a means to reduce waste
* Other views on poverty and failure of opportunities, *eg* Nussbaum's *capabilities approach*
* Role of education in reducing poverty and freeing from powerlessness.

18. (a) Explain the relationship between the "identifiable victim effect" and "the rule of rescue". **[10]**

(b) Evaluate the relationship between the "identifiable victim effect" and "the rule of rescue". **[15]**

The question arises from an argument that Singer presents in chapter 4 of his book and focuses on what can trigger generous responses. Candidates might analyse the meaning of the "identifiable victim effect" and how it relates to "the rule of rescue". Responses might include an exploration of the psychological experiments and studies that Singer illustrates, in order to explain Singer's claim that "we will spend far more to rescue an identifiable victim than we will to save a 'statistical life'". Candidates might take into account the role compassion (or empathy) plays in identifying a "victim": as Singer states, "the identifiable person moves us in a way that more-abstract information does not". Candidates might also explain the difference between affective and deliberative systems, by mentioning the role played by emotions and logic. Finally, candidates might analyse how "the rule of rescue" relates to parochialism – the fact that "we give far less to help foreigners than we give to those within our own country". A possible counterargument might be Nussbaum's ideas about emotions, particularly compassion, which tends to neglect the role of identification, by focussing on our ability to give a specific meaning to people and objects instead.

Candidates might explore (part A):
- The meaning and functioning of the "identifiable victim effect" and of "the rule of rescue" and how they relate
- Experiments and studies supporting Singer's arguments
- Role of compassion/empathy
- Difference between affective and deliberative systems; role of emotions and logic
- Definition and role of parochialism.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
- Does compassion imply identification? Is compassion possible in abstract terms?
- Does compassion involve the affective system only? Or does it call for logic? Or both?
- Aristotle's view of empathy; Nussbaum's view of compassion and her criticism of Aristotle
- Is the "identifiable victim effect" ascribable to the Christian concept of neighbour?
- Possible moral relationships between the self and the other, *eg* Sartre, de Beauvoir, Levinas, the Golden Rule.

Charles Taylor: *The Ethics of Authenticity*

19.   (a)   Explain Taylor's use of the term "instrumental reasoning".   **[10]**

(b)   To what extent does instrumental reasoning contribute to the problems Taylor identifies with modern society?   **[15]**

Taylor described instrumental reasoning as "the kind of rationality we draw on when we calculate the most economical application of means to a given end" (p. 5). He labels it as one of the three malaises of modern society because it leads to people treating each other as materials or instruments for their own projects. Taylor goes on to argue that, properly understood, instrumental reasoning is incompatible with authenticity because authenticity is reliant on relationships with others. Taylor thinks that our technocratic and bureaucratic society increases instrumental reasoning, which leads to atomism and fragmentation in society. Candidates might explore the link between instrumental reasoning and the other malaises (individualism and loss of freedom). They might consider the relationship between instrumental reasoning and authenticity and how "boosters" or "knockers" might view instrumental reasoning. Zizek could be offered as a counter-position to Taylor's cultural criticism. In general, there is a Marxist critique of modern liberalism and individuality.

Candidates might explore (part A):
• Technology as a driver of instrumental reasoning
• The consequences of instrumental reasoning for society
• Arguments for and against instrumental reasoning
• Ethical discussions about treating people as a means to an end
• How Taylor describes authentic relationships with others, as opposed to instrumental relationships.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
• Advances in modern society as a result of instrumental reasoning
• Whether instrumental reasoning is incompatible with authenticity
• Whether it is possible to completely eradicate instrumental reasoning
• The merits of the "boosters" and the "knockers"
• Whether Taylor is correct in his view that taking the correct approach to authenticity will help individuals and society to avoid instrumental reasoning
• Whether the three malaises are present in modern society
• The views of other philosophers might be used to provide counter-arguments.

20. (a) Explain the claim that "at its best authenticity allows a richer mode of existence". **[10]**

(b) Evaluate the claim that "at its best authenticity allows a richer mode of existence". **[15]**

Taylor addresses the view that modern society is suffering from three malaises: individualism, instrumental reason and loss of freedom. He says that these are often viewed by other thinkers as resulting from an underlying ideal of authenticity. Taylor disagrees, and while others blame authenticity for the three malaises, Taylor thinks that authenticity is a sound ethical principle and the book is an attempt to present a definition of "authenticity", which allows it to play this role. Authenticity is defined in terms of determining one's own life, which might include making independent, individual life-decisions, taking pride in one's own identity and defining one's own way of life. The idea of authenticity might be subject to criticism from the perspective of thinkers like Nietzsche, Freud and Derrida. Alternative discussions about authenticity arise from thinkers such as Heidegger and Sartre.

Candidates might explore (part A):
- The three malaises and their relationship to authenticity
- How horizons of significance shape authenticity
- The importance of relationships with regard to authenticity
- Taylor's analysis and evaluation of the "knockers" and "boosters" of modernity
- Taylor's three-part argument for embracing an ethics of authenticity: that it is a valid ideal, that it is possible to reason about authenticity and how to achieve it, and that these arguments are significant and can make a difference.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
- An evaluation of Taylor's critique of philosophers who he identifies as following Nietzsche's tradition of nihilism
- A discussion of the positive effects of an ethics of authenticity
- Whether modern society does in fact suffer from the malaises identified by Taylor
- Whether Taylor is right in thinking that authenticity is a good ideal when correctly defined
- What a richer mode of existence might entail and whether it is possible
- Candidates might refer to the views of other philosophers to provide counter-arguments.

Lao Tzu: *Tao Te Ching*

21. **(a)** **Explain how the Sage embodies *wu wei* (non-action).** **[10]**

(b) **Evaluate the picture of the Sage as an embodiment of *wu wei*.** **[15]**

A key attribute of the Sage is his ability to detach from things, and thus provide an example that does not seek recognition or approval from others. The Sage treats others and himself impartially and this is the key attribute, which enables the Sage to demonstrate the *Tao* – or "way of doing something". Many of the insights into the Sage show how he embodies a kind of antithesis in all he does; he is the non-active actor, an individual who subsumes his individuality into the *Tao* thus losing individuality. The Sage reflects the impartiality of nature, and this might be a point of contention to some who find nature's impartiality cruel. The Sage is characterized by non-action embodying *wu wei*, and achieves virtue through not trying to achieve any end – an example is the Sage who teaches through not teaching. This picture of *wu wei* can be seen in relation to other schools, like Confucianism, classical and modern Virtue Ethics.

Candidates might explore (part A):
- The account of the Sage in relation to the *Tao*
- The Sage moves naturally like a new-born infant who pays no regard to the structures of the world set up around her
- The analogy with emptiness, like the bowl, valley, window, *etc* which underline the Sage's desire to empty himself of action and eternal influence
- The relationship established between *yin* and *yang* in the activity of the Sage.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
- Is it necessary to have an embodiment of the principles of the *Tao*? Why is a Sage necessary?
- How convincing is the notion of non-action in the modern world?
- Is it helpful to compare the principles of the *Tao* and their embodiment in the Sage with nature?
- Is the impartiality of nature not cruel?
- How dated is the identification of the Sage with nature? Would younger or modern generations not prefer a more technologically rooted comparison?
- Is impartiality such a desirable quality in the Sage?

22. **(a)** **Explain Lao Tzu's approach to the governing of the state.** **[10]**

(b) **Evaluate Lao Tzu's approach to the governing of the state.** **[15]**

Lao Tzu mentions the role of the Sage, comparisons with nature and non-action (*wu wei*) as key elements of his approach to the successful ruler's ability to govern the state. *Wu wei* enables a decrease of competition so as to build up a harmonious life in the state. The state is a thing not to be messed about with through misplaced energy; rather it is to be left alone by rulers who then allow the natural flow of the life of the state to follow. The symbolic image of a ruler is the uncarved block, which highlights the passivity of the image of best governance, but also represents the idea that the original human state is an uncarved block and that this is the optimum condition which the best ruler will strive to bring about in the state. The leader aims to keep the people in a child-like state. Other views of governing can be used as counter-positions, like Plato, Confucius, Hobbes, Machiavelli, von Clausewitz, Sun Tzu, Rousseau, Kant, Virtue positions.

Candidates might explore (part A):
- The picture of governing offered by Lao Tzu
- All striving and urgency is counter-productive leaving the best course of action to be non-action (*wu wei*)
- The image of the uncarved block
- Harmony in society is an aim of governing
- The need to seek out the true nature of things, the successful ruler will shape his actions in accordance with the true nature of things in any situation
- The link between non-action and a rejection of material gain.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
- Is it helpful to encourage non-action in a world where so much affirmative action seems to be needed? Examples might be explored
- Is the picture of governing compatible with life in the modern world?
- The desirability of direct action and passion and commitment in political leaders
- Is non-action not really an encouragement away from the practical needs of the people of the state? How connected with the struggles of the people can a ruler be who focuses on contemplation of nature rather than the plight of the people?
- Is the paradox of true action stemming from non-action too much to convince a reader?
- Is the aim of harmony practically realisable in the modern world?
- Can the rejection of material gain help a ruler understand the challenges of the people who are tied to possessions and the means of gaining them?

Zhuangzi: *Zhuangzi*

23. (a) **Explain how language shows a relative approach to the world around us.**   [10]

     (b) **Evaluate the role of language in approaching the world as it is presented in Zhuangzi's text.**   [15]

In chapter 2 (Discussion on Smoothing Things Out), among other sections, Zhuangzi does not reject language (as arguably Lao Tzu did). Zhuangzi does not consider language as a depletion of being natural, since it belongs to the whole of natural sounds, just like the languages of animals and nature do, *eg* the birds' singing or the howling wind. Language is the natural tool that human beings, including philosophers, use in order to set rules and discuss. "We think our speech is different from the chirping of baby birds, but is there a real distinction, or is there none?" Actually, words become obscured in flowery speech only. "Language is not blowing breath; language users have language. That which it languages, however, is never fixed". He asks if anything is inherently "this" or "that". Is there anything that cannot be "this" or "that"? These key terms in language illustrate the claim that it does not have any rigid, naming relation to an external reality. Language traces our changing position relative to reality. His argument relies heavily on the core terms of Chinese philosophical analysis, *shih* (is this: right) and *fei* (not this: wrong). Zhuangzi tells us of an encounter between a giant sea turtle and a frog in a well. It is correct to suggest the sea turtle represents some ultimate truth not accessible to the frog. However, the sea turtle cannot even get one flipper into the frog's well. He is as incapable of appreciating the frog's perspective as the frog is his. Similar analysis applies to the great bird and the small chickadee, the great fish and other examples. Different and changing conventions of usage and principles constitute conventions and generate a language and a perspective. Counterpositions could be developed from thinkers like Wittgenstein, Chomsky, Russell, Lao Tzu, Plato, JL Austin, Searle, and Nagel.

Candidates might explore (part A):
• How one can learn the true nature of things
• The relation of speech to the *Tao*
• The suspicion of words and language
• The relationship of speech in explaining whether issues are right and wrong
• The bias of the individual in selecting and expressing words
• The connection between meaning and context
• The human fallibility when using language
• The acceptance of changes in things in all their aspects with equanimity.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
• Comparing the approaches of Lao Tzu and Zhuangzi to language
• Language and reality
• Words might obscure truth or knowledge of the world
• The level of confidence we get in the appearance of right and wrong in our language
• As the author puts his positions in fantasy and parable, interpretations are inherently subject to dispute
• How can one talk without the use of names?
• Is there any point discussing a metaphysical concept without language?
• Does Zhuangzi highlight the perspectives of individual subjectivity (consciousness or internal representations)?
• Is perspective mainly arising from using language differently?

24. **(a)**   **Explain the idea that "not everything useless to someone is truly useless".**   **[10]**

(b)   **Evaluate the idea that "not everything useless to someone is truly useless".**   **[15]**

This question invites a discussion on a central concept in Zhuangzi's book: the usable and the useless. Candidates might consider whether humans appreciate surrounding things according to their use and utility, in relation to Zhuangzi, who also speaks of the "utility of futility". Candidates might explore the relationship between value and utility, on the basis that there are things that are considered as values, despite not having a clear or direct utility for someone; or things that are useful for someone, despite being dangerous for someone else; or, finally, things that can have possible uses that someone ignore or disdains. Candidates might make reference to the metaphor of the tree, as it is presented in Book 4 (In the World of men): "Tzu-ch'i of Nan-po was wandering around the Hill of Shang when he saw a huge tree there, different from all the rest. But, looking up, he saw that the smaller limbs were gnarled and twisted, unfit for beams or rafters, and looking down, he saw that the trunk was pitted and rotten and could not be used for coffins." Candidates might explore the concept of usable through another example presented by Zhuangzi in this section of the book: "The region of Ching-shih is fine for growing catalpas, cypresses, and mulberries. But some are cut down for people who want monkey perches, others for the ridgepoles of tall roofs and others for the families of nobles or rich merchants who want side boards for coffins. So they never get to live out the years Heaven gave them, but are cut down in mid-journey by axes. This is the danger of being usable." Chieh Yu, the madman of Ch'u says "The mountain trees do themselves harm; the grease in the torch burns itself up. The cinnamon can be eaten and so it gets cut down; the lacquer tree can be used and so it gets hacked apart. All men know the use of the useful, but nobody knows the use of the useless!"

Candidates might explore (part A):
- The meaning of utility/futility and its relative sense according to situation/need
- How perfect equilibrium can be achieved
- The bias of the individual
- The value of images and metaphors when talking of abstract ideas
- How to consider things that may have uses to us beyond their immediate common one
- The connection of this topic to the teachings of the Holy Man
- The need to be aware of the nature of things and of how they transform and develop
- The relationship between the good and the useful; utility as a value
- The relativity of values and judgments, according to the relativity of uses
- The fragile knowledge we may build surrounding values.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
- The nature of the *Tao* in connection to these concepts of utility/futility
- The idea that we did not know how to really use or see many things around us
- Perspectives in connection to the value and the utility of things
- Does utility/futility change in a logical manner?
- Are we then pushed to live in an ever-changing human world?
- If the *Tao* is eternally changing, can anyone grasp a clear sense of utility/futility?
- Who establishes utility/futility? Might one person do this?
- The wise words in the mouth of a madman (Chieh Yu).