

# **MARKSCHEME**

**November 2000**

**PHILOSOPHY**

**Higher & Standard Level**

**Paper 1**

**ASSESSMENT CRITERIA                      HIGHER / STANDARD LEVEL                      PAPER 1**

**CRITERION A: QUALITY OF PHILOSOPHISING**

**[35 marks]**

**Understanding**

Does the answer show that the candidate has identified the central theme or sub-theme which the chosen question is intending the candidate to focus on?

Does the candidate demonstrate any personal response to the problem(s) posed?

**[Up to 6 marks]**

**Relevance**

Does the candidate centre the development of his/her argument on the core of the question?

Does the candidate provide a specific argument and answer particular to the question?

Do the different parts of the answer relate explicitly to the problem(s) which the candidate has identified?

Are the arguments, examples and comparisons directly relevant for demonstrating the argument?

Is the content interesting? Is the content original?

**[Up to 14 marks]**

**Analysis and argumentation**

Does the candidate identify and correctly define the key concepts of the subject?

Does the candidate define his/her own concepts and show awareness of their implications and relations?

Does the candidate achieve a level of conceptual thinking, avoiding the mere affirmation of opinions and the mere description of examples?

Does the candidate show an ability and readiness to challenge the assumptions (if any) implied in the question?

Does the candidate present a personal, even original, argument?

Does the candidate provide arguments, objections and counter-arguments?

Does the candidate avoid authority, *ad hominem* and adverbial arguments? (By ‘adverbial’ arguments we mean candidates who make sweeping statements like, “Generally/obviously it is the case that...”)

Are relevant, appropriate and original examples supplied and commented on?

Is there proper evidence for the affirmations/negations provided in the answer?

Does the candidate make appropriate reference to philosophical theories? (For example, a question such as ‘Can I know if there are any other beings in the world beside myself?’ calls for a reference to Descartes’ solipsism.)

In those cases where a candidate replaces a personal argument by a summary of philosophical theories (a ‘patchwork’ or ‘collage’ essay), such an answer should be considered as satisfactory if at least two positions are contrasted and are accompanied by some discussion.

**[Up to 15 marks]**

**CRITERION B: ORGANISATION**

*[15 marks]*

**Structure**

Does the candidate write an essay of adequate length to present and discuss at some depth the issue in hand?

Does the candidate use a style that is appropriate to philosophy (dialogue, essay, point form)?

Does the essay contain an introduction? Does this introduction present the core of the subject as well as a sensible strategy for dealing with the problem(s)?

Is the answer organised in such a way that the intentions of the candidate's analysis and argument are easy to identify even without the help of numbers or letters by the different paragraphs?

Are the connections between sentences and between paragraphs logical?

Is the thought progressive?

Does the candidate provide a functional conclusion, that is, a conclusion which contains:

- more than the candidate's opinion or more than a mere yes or no answer to the chosen question;
- more than the mere repetition of what the candidate has already written in developing the argument;
- an echo of any sub-questions which were formulated in the introduction;
- an awareness of the possible further development of the question.

*[Up to 10 marks]*

**Expression**

Does the candidate write in a clear prose which is appropriate to philosophy?

Does the candidate avoid spoken or colloquial language?

In the case of grammatical incorrectness, does the candidate's prose still communicate in an adequate way?

Please remember: some candidates will not be writing in their first language. We are not marking for grammatical accuracy: what is important is that candidates present their arguments as clearly as possible.

*[Up to 5 marks]*

**Total marks for Paper 1: 50**

## Paper Specific Guidance - Key Points

*Note to examiners: this markscheme outlines what members of the paper-setting team had in mind when they devised the questions. The topics listed in the bullet points are possible areas candidates might cover in their answers. They are not compulsory points and are not necessarily the best possible points. They are only a framework to help you in your assessment. Be responsive to any other valid points.*

### Section 1: Myself and Others

#### 1. Can human behaviour be reduced to explanations in mechanical terms?

##### Key points

- Mechanical terms: the metaphor of the machine applied to human beings and their acts.
- What type of explanation do ‘mechanical terms’ provide: cause–effect scheme; accent on results or facts; a quantitative type of explanation?
- What types of human behaviour, if any, could possibly be explained by reference to a machine?
- Reduction: such an explanation leaves any consideration of ‘intention’ out of sight.

##### Discussion

- Can we speak of human behaviour in the singular?
- Is behaviour (are all human behaviours) predictable?
- Determinism–free will debate.
- If an explanation in mechanical terms is reductive, what other kinds of explanation exist? What about (psycho)-analysis? Interpretation? For instance, what does it mean that detectives are often wrong when they look for tracks and facts, while they are more successful when they empathise with the protagonists?

#### 2. Is it possible to love a person we don’t really know?

##### Key points

- In the same way that we often don’t know why we love somebody, we may fall in love with somebody we hardly know. ‘Knowing’ doesn’t seem necessary to ‘feeling’.
- Paradox: love, sometimes, doesn’t remain when we know the other better. Is ‘knowing’ an obstacle to ‘feeling’?
- But if we hardly know the other, what guarantee do we have that our love is justified?
- If we have no idea about the other’s feelings for us, how ‘real’ vs. ‘imaginary’ is our love?
- Might it be the case that ‘loving’ is the best way of knowing the other?

##### Discussion

- Does it matter that we hardly know the other and his/her feelings for us as long as our ‘love’ satisfies us?
- Is love doomed to be a fantasy, a projection (do we always love ourselves, or a lost first love *etc.*, in the other)?
- If love is not the best way of knowing the other, what alternatives exist?

3. **‘The fact that we are genetically different *should* justify the domination of some (the most talented) over others (the less talented).’ Explain and critically assess this proposition.**

Key points

- Are we our genes? Genetic determinism *vs.* freedom.
- Are talents innate or acquired? If the latter, then does this proposition make sense?
- Which talents should leaders possess?
- The need of social organisation: do we need social organisation? Does it necessarily imply hierarchy?

Discussion

- Is leadership by the ones who are genetically superior desirable?
- Is genetic superiority the only guarantee to achieve ideal social organisations? Is it the best guarantee?
- Don’t the less talented also have important elements to contribute to an ideal social organisation? Don’t they have the right to? But what is then the rationale for this right?
- The problem of democracy: what if the most talented are the minority? Won’t we need to change the rules to accommodate them?

## Section 2: Individuals and Institutions

4. **How can we define injustice?**

Key points

- Natural inequalities *vs.* social and economic injustices. Examples.
- Equality and equity and their relation to justice and injustice.
- What makes an act unjust or a decision unfair?
- On what grounds do we decide that something is unjust? Reason? Emotion? Tradition? Religion?
- Is there such a thing as injustice-in-itself or only what a group of persons think is unjust? The issue of relativism *e.g.* slavery, female circumcision, racism, child labour, hunger, punishments which are considered just in one culture and unjust in another *etc.*

Discussion

- Are the causes for injustice natural? Or human? In the case of natural inequalities, does it make sense to name them injustices or are they simply the way nature is and therefore ‘just’?
- We can only correct natural inequalities, not fight them.
- What is an unjust punishment? When the punishment does not fit the crime? Wrongfully accused person?
- Do citizens have a duty to fight injustice? Why? Fighting it all over the world or only in our country?

**5. ‘Since I do not have a responsibility for the laws and norms which were decided before my birth, what was decided before my birth should not limit my liberty.’ Explain and critically assess this proposition.**

Key points

- Responsibility. Am I only responsible for my own acts or am I also responsible for others’ actions? Which others? To which extent?
- Liberty and limit. Are these terms incompatible?
- Does my liberty mean that I can dispense with traditions? That I may reject the past in general?

Discussion

- Should norms and laws transcend time or should they constantly be adapted to new realities?
- Why should I be bound by decisions which may have been the most adequate at a certain time but appear to me to be outdated?
- Am I (or not) allowed to waive the duties imposed on me by previous generations, *e.g.* to pay taxes? Why?
- Is it my responsibility to see that norms and laws do adapt to new realities?

**6. Could there be a society without coercion?**

Key points

- Definition of coercion (power exerted on me without my consent)
- Examples of direct and indirect forms of coercion, *e.g.* police, education *vs.* moral norms, social control from my neighbourhood.
- Aren’t we social animals by nature? Should we be forced to sociability?
- Are a family, a school community, a state, similar forms of society, which need similar rules?

Discussion

- Is coercion necessarily a bad thing? What about the formation of character and personality? Does coercion deliver strong or weak individuals? Shouldn’t one learn to obey before s/he learns to give leadership?
- To which extent does social cohesion, order *etc.* justify coercion? Is ‘order’ preferable to ‘life’? Is disagreement necessarily unfruitful?
- The limits of coercion: repression, domination, exclusion.
- Would, for instance, a school where the only rule would be ‘Don’t disturb others unnecessarily’ be able to survive?
- An anarchist society: is it a contradiction in terms?

### Section 3: Human Environment

#### 7. Is it justified to differentiate between natural and artificial needs?

##### Key points

- Concept of needs, as different from desires.
- The use of these concepts in the definition of human being and of culture.
- Natural needs: Are there natural needs? Are biological needs natural? Are there other natural needs than biological?
- Is there a hierarchy of those needs? How is it justified?
- Relation between needs and rights.
- An example of a need created by culture.

##### Discussion

- Is it possible to determine where natural needs and artificial needs begin?
- Are artificial needs, if there are any, superfluous? Or are they the very characteristics of human existence?
- If the candidate claims that differentiation between natural and artificial needs is possible, he/she should make explicit/discuss/justify on what grounds this is possible or which value judgement is assumed.

#### 8. If it is impossible to combine the well-being of all humans and the preservation of nature, what should we choose?

##### Key points

- Notion of well-being: its relation to needs and to the 'creation' of new needs in a technological society.
- Assumption that all humans share the same concept of well-being and of distributive justice in global scale.
- Assumption that there is an antagonism between the well-being of humans and the preservation of nature vs. the possibility of combining economy/technology and ecology.
- Arguments for the better choice between two incompatible entities.

##### Discussion

- Well-being and consumption: is it necessary to consume more to experience greater well-being?
- Is it possible to avoid moral dogmatism while aiming to preserve nature?
- Is human well-being possible without nature? Should we preserve nature for other reasons than because it makes human well-being possible? Definition of Human Being as a cosmological animal and not only a social animal. Nature as a Subject.
- To which extent is a technological solution to the problem of the using up of natural resources a solution?
- What would the option of not aiming at the well-being of 'all' humans imply?

**9. Is work an impediment to the true enjoyment of life or do earnings provide the means to enjoy it?**

Key points

- The connections between work, money and enjoyment of life.
- Assumption that work and enjoyment of life are incompatible, while money and enjoyment of life are inseparable. Are these assumptions absolute truths?
- How to define ‘true enjoyment of life’?

Discussion

- Could it be that earnings provide the means to enjoy life and work is an impediment to that enjoyment? Or that work is a way of enjoying life and earnings an impediment to true joy?
- Possibility of life without money and consumption. Examples: work and leisure. Would life without work be of better quality than life with work?
- Is there a necessary relationship between money and work? Does money transform our conception of work?
- Earning money: a mean to the enjoyment of life or to something else? Or an end in itself?

**Section 4: Reason**

**10. Is intuition rational?**

Key points

- The notion of intuition. Narrow definitions, *e.g.* the evidence of innate ideas; intuition as opposed to concept and broad definitions, *e.g.* instinctive knowledge, divination, mystical vision.
- What is rationality?
- How do we know if/when something is rational?
- Where do intuitions come from?
- The function of intuition.

Discussion

- If intuition is rational, how can we explain that it does not follow the rules of logic?
- Can intuition yield a valid knowledge of the world? Or is intuition only the impetus leading to rational and empirical ways of knowing?
- If intuitions are not a product of reason, does it mean they are not a mental activity? What kind of activity generates them?
- If intuition is a knowledge gained without the use of reason and of the senses, why is it called our ‘sixth sense’?
- When candidates appear to be seduced by a broad definition of intuition, they should show their ability to critically evaluate such claims as: ‘Artists are endowed with more intuition than other human beings’ or ‘Adolescence is an age where intuition is stronger than reason’ or ‘We are living in a rational era, where intuition is underdeveloped’.
- Or to discuss such a question as: Is intuition a faculty than can be developed through education? That should be developed?



**11. Do we need not only sensations but also concepts in order to perceive?**

Key points

- Can we perceive without sensations? Can an 'intellectual intuition', a mystical vision, a phenomenon of paranormal clairvoyance be called a 'perception'?
- Can we have sensations that were not accompanied by concepts? Are they to be called 'perception'?
- Can we have concepts that were not accompanied by sensations? Again, are they to be called 'perception'?

Discussion

- If it were the case that we do need concepts in order to perceive, would it follow that individuals who have a more active intellectual life also have more acute sense perception?
- The counter-example of a new-born who feels sensations but does not have a concept ordering them.
- Where do concepts come from? Can a blind person have a concept of colour, a deaf person a concept of music?
- For new-born the smell of excrement is not repulsive. Yet we all have acquired this awareness. Is this to say that the very way in which we perceive reality is pre-ordained by social conditioning?
- If the candidate concludes that concepts enrich or impoverish sensations, examples and justification are necessary.

**12. 'The only function of reason is to provide a justification of and means for satisfying our passions.' Explain and critically assess this statement.**

Key points

- Disqualification of reason, in contrast to the dominant idea of a human as a rational animal. Reason as an illusion.
- Assumption that reason is 'the slave of the passion' and does nothing else than serve them. 'Reason' is mere 'rationalisation'.
- Assumption of the irrelevance of the traditional polarity of mind into reason and passions.

Discussion

- Is it the case that passions are so powerful that I can't disobey their orders or control them? Examples. Where does this power of the passions come from?
- Slaves may revolt, and are also said to be the real masters of their master. Why couldn't this be said of reason?
- Should we or shouldn't we be defined as 'passionate animals'? Are passions necessarily 'dangerous' and reason necessarily wise?
- Does it make sense to see myself as distinct from my passions and from my reason?
- The alternative to managing ever occurring passions (*e.g.* the Buddhist notion of quenching the passions).

## Section 5: Meaning and Value

### 13. Is it self-evident that torture is morally wrong and compassion morally right?

#### Key points

- Is it the case that morality is made of 'self-evidences'?
- Torture: a pain, inflicted without my consent, mostly inflicted in order to let me say or do something I don't want. Do these three elements equally contribute to the claim that torture is morally wrong?
- What is compassion exactly? Being moved by human and animal suffering?
- If by using torture we can save millions of lives, is torture still 'wrong'? If by acting out of compassion (*e.g.* giving money out of charity) we encourage others' dependence, is compassion still 'right'?

#### Discussion

- Can torture (as a means) be justified by the end it serves?
- Is it morally right to torture the torturer?
- Don't we sometimes enjoy making the other (animals, human beings) suffer? If this is the case, can we say that compassion is innate?
- However, shouldn't we argue (but how?) that compassion is fundamental to humans?
- Compassion may weaken my own will. Is it then still morally 'right'?
- If, according to Rousseau, animals show signs of compassion, should someone incapable of compassion be called not only sub-human but sub-animal? Should a torturer be called sub-animal?
- Are expressions of compassion as mercy, charity and sharing others' destiny, only partially or totally different?

### 14. Should we regard the International Declaration of Human Rights as the minimum acceptable foundation for a secular international ethics?

#### Key points

- A secular ethics, an international secular ethics.
- Why might a secular and international ethics be necessary?
- What kind of human being emerges from the content of the Declaration? (The candidate does not need to mention all details of the Declaration.)
- Relation between Human Rights and ethics: if we consider the Declaration as a minimum acceptable 'foundation' for a secular international ethics, what might a secular international 'ethics' add to it?

#### Discussion

- Why might the International Declaration of Human Rights not provide a minimum acceptable foundation? Should we consider changing some articles? Or electing something else?
- The attacks on the Declaration: that it is culturally biased, and therefore impossible to apply universally.
- Is the way the Declaration came about (an international group of men and women, meeting after WWII to formulate universal rights in order to protect each and every human being) a guarantee that what they have produced (the declaration itself) is indeed what we need as a foundation for a secular ethics? Could the world dispense with an internationally agreed foundation for a secular ethics?

**15. Since different religions make contradictory claims, does it not follow that they are all true or false?**

Key points

- The assumption that religions make contradictory claims.
- Examples, if any, of such contradictions (different Higher Being(s)? different moralities? different theologies?).
- The idea that through religions the same truth is expressed by different prophets vs. the tendency of many religions to claim that they are the only true one.
- Religions pretend to be 'true' or to give access to 'truth'. Which sense of the word 'truth' is that?
- Should truth be one? What does the idea that truth is plural imply?
- Proselytism and religious fundamentalism: a refusal to accept a pluralistic world view.

Discussion

- How can we verify the truth or falsehood of such things as religious claims? (Let's assume that tomorrow the sky opens and Allah appears in Mexico City: what would this prove? Would it imply that other religions are false? Or: Are miracles a proof?)
  - The role of faith, and the fact that faith is oblivious to epistemological questions, even those concerning the object of their faith.
  - Does it matter if religions are true or false (or: does it matter that I believe in this or in that) if they comfort people? If they successfully control undesirable behaviours?
  - This is exactly where pluralism becomes important: that I can practise my faith with total conviction and, at the same time, accept the fact that others have devotion to their own faith.
  - Does it follow from the above that religions shouldn't aim to be considered as 'true', but should promote themselves on other grounds?
-