

MARKSCHEME

November 2003

PHILOSOPHY

Higher and Standard Level

Paper 1

SECTION A

1. (a) **In no more than 50 words, identify the philosophical concept raised by this passage about the person.** **[3 marks]**

The point of this question is to raise (one version of) the mind/body problem; through a concrete example, the taste of chocolate, it raises issues of what “the mind”, “the mental”, “consciousness” *are* (their ontological status); of their (problematic) relation to the body, and how we can/cannot make sense of this.

- The “taste of chocolate” needs to be elaborated on, and understood as an example of a “mental event”, something in “consciousness”, in the “mind”; some development of what we mean by “the mind” and “consciousness” (thoughts, feelings, beliefs, hopes, fears, desires, intentions, wishes, colours seen, smells *etc.*).
- An understanding of the “body”, the physical event involved in the eating of chocolate. The sensory organs, neural system and brain as part of the “body”. Why this is seen, by some people, as distinct from the first.

- (b) **In no more than 250 words, compare and contrast *two* different philosophical approaches to the problem of personal identity.** **[12 marks]**

- Compare and Contrast: Any two approaches to the mind/body will do: dualism (Descartes), the idea that the mind and the body are two distinct entities since they have such different features and are conceptually separable; or some modified version of it;
- Physicalism or behaviourism, the idea that there is only physical substance/events (no distinct separate thing floating above matter called “the mind”); the mental is fully reducible to physical events and observable behaviours, or some variation of this.
- Idealism, solipsism, identity theory, functionalism, evolutionary views, or even approaches that go beyond the traditional framework of the mind/body problem, such as Zen Buddhist views of the embodied mind, Taoism or other Eastern approaches; other more embodied views of the person some in environmental thought, in existentialism, *etc.*

- (c) **In no more than 500 words, discuss the meaning of the above passage with regard to knowledge of others.** *[15 marks]*

The discussion needs to be left open to accommodate for very different possible approaches to the problem.

- The author argues that the physical description, though very closely connected to events in the mind is not sufficient. There seems to be an irreducible subjective component, how *we* experience things. Why does the author suggest that the scientist, looking inside the chocolate lover's skull and brain would still not find the taste of chocolate there?
- Implications for knowledge of ourselves. There seems to be an inner, phenomenological perspective of experience, and an outer, objective scientific one (how the brain looks, how our behaviour looks to external observers). According to view of passage, we seem to need both to make sense of human beings; a purely scientific perspective would not suffice. Is there a basic asymmetry between one's immediate consciousness of oneself, and access to the consciousness of others? What do we have to do to know others?
- Knowledge of others: knowledge by analogy and how we project our limited experience onto the others.
- **Compassion, sympathy and empathy:** useful ways of knowing others?

2. (a) **In no more than 50 words, identify what this picture suggests about the human condition?** **[3 marks]**
- Although life is worked out in relationship with other persons, the individual often experiences loneliness, isolation and alienation.
 - The individual is always compelled to reflect upon the “meaning of life”.
 - The person’s freedom to create opportunities may be limited by the consequences of choices already made.
 - Freedom can be understood in ways that transcend the bounds of the situation.
 - The individual cannot escape from the demands placed upon him or her by significant others.
 - Personal choices bring responsibilities and create human relationships.
 - Emotions, imagination and hope for the future play roles in evaluating the human condition.
 - There is universality in the striving to make sense of the human condition.
- (b) **In no more than 250 words, describe and assess *two* different philosophical perspectives that offer an individual a possibility to make sense of his/her life.** **[12 marks]**
- The candidate will choose and clearly identify two specific and differing philosophical approaches to the issues set out in the question (*e.g.* existentialism, egoism, behaviourism, a personal morality, spirituality, nihilism, *etc.*). The choice should be made with the issues suggested by the picture (see above “a”).
 - The candidate will succinctly identify, describe and assess the major elements of each of the two philosophical perspectives chosen.

- (c) **In no more than 500 words, assess and evaluate the claim that the person who I am is completely determined by the circumstances in which I find myself.**

[15 marks]

Key Points

- Is the person who I am determined by my gender, my ethnic background, my culture, or my socio-economic condition?
- Am I simply a biological organism completely determined by the physical laws of nature?
- Am I free to make decisions that transcend the factors that define me? – the questions of authenticity, immanence and transcendence.

Discussion

- No matter what alternative I choose I must acknowledge the material factors of my particular existential situation. There are some elements (*e.g.* gender) that seem to be beyond my control.
- Is it possible to argue in a positive fashion that race, ethnic origin, gender, *etc.* actually constitute aspects of the *self* and help define the person who I am?
- In spite of the circumstances in which I find myself can I argue for the continued existence of negative and positive freedom (freedom from and freedom for)?
- Can the notion of practical freedom – the freedom to choose among the possible alternatives in a given situation all factors taken into consideration – provide me with a viable alternative?
- Is there an *absolute* freedom that transcends all circumstances?
- Is authentic human existence precisely living one's life in the belief that the person can transcend the internal and external factors, which are claimed to predetermine one's life?
- Is it self-defeating to argue that my circumstances limit my imagination and creativity with regard to my conception of who I am and who I can choose to be?

SECTION B

Optional Theme 1: Political Philosophy

3. **“In the name of national security, democratic states must be prepared to limit individual rights and liberties.” Do you agree with this statement? Justify your answer.**

Key Points

- The distinction (if any) between public and private rights and liberties.
- The distinction (if any) between rights and liberties in a democratic state.
- The conditions (if any) under which a state has a legitimate right to withdraw rights and liberties of its citizens.
- Rights and liberties of the individual *versus* social duties and responsibilities (if any), *i.e.* what are the limits of legitimate dissent?

Discussion

- Can legitimate dissent against a state include acts of violence?
- What types of acts endanger the security of the state? Are these acts **necessarily** the same types that endanger the security of its citizens, *e.g. Falun Gong* in China?
- What, if anything, limits the power of a state? Is there a line of personal freedoms, rights *etc.* that cannot be crossed no matter what the situation?
- If threats to the state are potentially violent ones, then does the state have the right to curtail personal liberties *etc.* based on threats (or perceived threats) rather than on actual instances of violence?

4. **Will society recognise the rights of citizens along with citizens’ duties and responsibilities? Discuss the origin of the concept of rights and with the help of examples, evaluate them.**

Key Points

- Distinction between natural rights and civil rights.
- Definition of what are perceived to be “basic, natural rights” *e.g.* speech, life, property.
- Extent to which rights link to duties.
- Investigation of what is reasonable – who defines what is reasonable may define rights.
- Source of natural rights – nature, God, an aspect of human nature.
- Social contract theories as institutionalization of rights and responsibilities.

Discussion

- To what extent rights reflect the political system the human operates within.
- Are there “inalienable” rights?
- Relation of natural rights to human rights, as for example enshrined in the U.N. declaration.
- Resolution of perceived natural rights with restriction of rights due to political expediency, example of reasons why – state security, individual safety or contrast these with an increase in state power and control.
- Reflections on who/which institutions are guardians of natural rights.
- Contrasting position that “natural rights” do not exist and all rights derive their origins from the will of states or sovereigns.
- What means, if any, do humans have to ensure their rights will not be violated?
- What means does society have to ensure humans will take their responsibilities?

Optional Theme 2: Knowledge

5. In everyday life, we assume that the world is as we experience it. Discuss whether there are any philosophical reasons to doubt this assumption.

The intention of this question is to allow candidates to demonstrate both a breadth of knowledge about epistemological concepts, particularly around the concepts of Knowledge, Truth and Certainty.

This question is focused on part A and B of the Knowledge Theme:

Key Points

- Naïve realism – the view expressed in the *claim* in the question.
- Scepticism and the arguments from illusion – illusion as one source of epistemic doubt and the distinction between appearance and reality.
- Representative theory of perception – the contrasting view to naïve realism – that our knowledge of reality is based on (non inferential) knowledge of subjective experience.
- Idealism – the possible metaphysical implications of the distinction between appearance and reality – that what is real is the contents of our minds.
- Phenomenalism – the possible epistemic implication of an appearance/reality distinctions – that physical object statements appeal to nothing more than sensory experience statements.
- Knowledge – especially the problem which arises from the impossibility of assuming a “God’s eye view” from which to compare our perceptions and reality.
- Theories of justification – knowledge as justified true belief.
- Theories of Truth
 - Coherence – statements are true only if they “cohere” with other statements.
 - Correspondence – statements are true if they “correspond” to the actual state of affairs.
 - Pragmatism – statements are true if believing them to be true is advantageous to the believer.
 - Certainty – as indubitable (philosophical certainty) vs. “everyday” certainty.

Discussion

Discussion should move beyond an accurate description of key points and a demonstration of their strengths and weaknesses. It should include the defence of some kind of claim (or thesis) related to the question. The most relevant sorts of claims are those to do with the usefulness and implications of the search for truth and certainty.

6. **We come to know the existence, order, organization, development and function of everything in nature with the help of several paradigms. Explain and discuss this claim with reference to science and scientific theories.**

The intention of this question is to allow candidates to demonstrate a breadth of knowledge about concepts in Epistemology, especially within the Philosophy of Science, and a depth of understanding about the role of teleological explanations in Science.

This question is focused on part C of the Knowledge theme: C. Science and the Scientific Method. However, the question is also set in the wider context of Knowledge, so references to epistemic concepts and ideas are relevant.

Key Points

- Understanding – can Science help us understand reality?
- Explanation – teleological and scientific.
- Teleological explanations – explaining causes by effects, rather than the normal explaining of effects by causes, especially in Biology (evolution) and Cosmology (big bang).
- Scientific theories – as structures? as paradigms? as discourse?
- Falsifiability – as a characteristic of scientific theories.

Discussion

- Does a scientific explanation equal understanding?
- Is the order and organization in the universe which scientific knowledge seems to reflect purposeful, or has it come about by chance?
- If it has come about by chance is it less valuable or meaningful?
- Can teleological explanations be falsified?
- Consideration of relevant scientific explanations (*e.g.* Big Bang, Evolution)
- Consideration of pseudo scientific explanations (*e.g.* Intelligent Design Theory, Creationism)
- Science often asks “how”, but does it ever ask “why”?
- Can science explain why there is something rather than nothing?

Optional Theme 3: Philosophy of Culture

7. It has been held that culture is most visibly manifest in art. Is this the case, or is it manifested more in political life? Justify your answer with examples.

It has been said that culture is most visibly manifest in art, because “art works are cultural objects par excellence”, without any purpose beyond themselves. Suggesting a possible conflict between politics and art, the question intends to give candidates an opportunity to develop different lines of argumentation. A characterization of the concepts politics and art as cultural forms should be provided. Best answers should discuss – concepts of culture and cultural forms. The question can be answered in very different but equally valid ways.

Key Points

- Are culture and politics equally permissive of the variety of artistic expression?
- A totalitarian state often imposes censorship on many if not all forms of art as potentially critical of the political regime. Can it be argued that nevertheless whatever art is produced under such regimes remains a powerful expression of the culture?
- Art and politics: a fragile balance at best: for example, conservatism often seems to endorse rigid thinking and hinder the development of art, while liberals encourage the loose development of artistic expression.
- Examples

Discussion

- A discussion of Kant’s: “faculty of taste” would be interesting.
- It can be argued that culture encompasses education, politics, religion, society, the arts, and more.
- In “The Crisis in Culture,” an essay from *Between Past and Future*, Hannah Arendt refers to the contemporary concern about the relationship between politics and culture. She questions whether it is still possible to rediscover the past without continuing standards of interpretation, in an increasingly secularized world of utilitarian culture. On the one hand she analyses a most famous quote from Pericles’ Funeral Oration, which is synthesized in the expression “We love beauty within the limits of politics”.
- A more general characterization from the point of view of the relation between politics and the ideals of culture sees culture in its relationship to life as an autonomous activity, whose faculty is reason.

8. Analyse and evaluate the extent to which we are able to understand a different or past culture. Justify your answer with examples.

The question asks crucially to evaluate the possibilities of conducting ourselves regarding cultural diversity. Any reflection upon “other”, “alien” culture is possible always from the perspective of a definite culture: the other culture is seen as refracted through the prism of our culture. The awareness of this situation causes attempts to find out how it is possible to overcome this subjectivity of the reflection upon other culture and reach a more objective understanding of it. The question expects candidates to construct an argument which goes beyond an immediate response and easy relativism.

Key Points

- The problem of encounter of cultures has a number of particular aspects belonging to universal history, ethnology, archaeology, social and ethnical psychology, sociology, law, *etc.* But a general idea of this crucial phenomenon of human society and history one can get viewing it from the point of philosophy.
- The conceptions which just continue the traditions of classical philosophy, claim that despite the great variety of particular, individual cultures there are common patterns in their structure and function.
- But typical of this century are the conceptions which reveal what makes every particular culture a unique whole, with its peculiar vision of the world, with its own classification of phenomena, meanings, values, *etc.*, only within the bounds of which isolated facts are meaningful and intelligible. The extreme form of this position has got the name of “cultural relativism”.

Discussion

- The term “encounter of cultures” is intended to cover the whole spectrum of this phenomenon: the contacts of cultures in space and time; their interactions; their dialogue, conflict, collision; the inheritance relations between them, *etc.*
- The assumption that the existence of common patterns in structure and function in different cultures makes it possible to reach adequate translation and understanding of other cultures in the language of our culture. Is this assumption valid?
- It has been held that a developed culture, the culture which has had expanded its potentialities in the whole “cultural space”, is an open culture, and only such a culture is able to enter into a dialogue with another culture, because only such a culture is capable of translating into its language and adopting the phenomena of other types of culture. Is this so?

Optional Theme 4: World Philosophies

9. Compare and contrast beliefs about the nature of God in Hinduism and Islam.

In this question, candidates are expected to highlight the points of divergence between the two world philosophies. In doing so, they must avoid turning their essay into a declaration of faith, or an attack on one or both faiths. The exercise is focused on demonstrating a fairly detailed understanding of the key points related to each world philosophy, and an ability to analyse them.

Key Points

(a) Hinduism

- While Hinduism is polytheistic, it is characterized by the belief in an ultimate reality called *Brahman*.
- *Brahman* is uncreated, impersonal and transcendent. It is the supreme reality that includes everything within itself.
- The many different deities of Hinduism are ways of understanding the various aspects of *Brahman*. The earthly appearance of a deity in a specific form is called an *avatar*.
- *Brahman*, being without form and specific quality, takes on three fundamental manifestations (trimurti). These manifestations are viewed as individual personal deities *Brahma*: The Creator; *Shiva*: The Destroyer; *Vishnu*: The Preserver.
- *Brahman* is in all things and is present in the self as *Atman*.
- Hindu sacred scripture, especially the *Vedas* (*sruti*: that which is heard; *smriti*: that which is remembered), imparts knowledge about the deities along with a variety of other matters relating to human existence. Additional sources of information include the *Upanishads*, the *Mahabharata*, and the *Bhagavad-Gita*.
- The nature of God (Brahman) in Hinduism includes the admonition to live one's life in such a way that one unites with God (Brahman). Hindu theology implies an ethics of duty, law, the acquisition of merit and righteousness, and order (*dharma*) and the following of the three paths to salvation (the three *margs*: Duty, Knowledge, Devotion).
- *Atman* is bound to a cycle of rebirth (*samsara*). By acquiring knowledge, one breaks through the veil of illusion (*maya*) and achieves liberation (*moksha*). With liberation, the *Atman* merges with *Brahman*.

(b) Islam

- The monotheism of Islam is absolute and exclusive. Allah's oneness is central (*Tawhid*).
- Allah (God) is unlike anything else that exists and is beyond human understanding.
- The belief in the absolute uniqueness of Allah and the importance of Muhammad as his prophet is contained in the *Shahadah*, the central belief of Islamic theology.
- Islam is literally submission to Allah who demands our obedience, prayer and worship.
- Allah is an eternal and infinite spirit. Allah is the transcendent, omnipotent, omniscient, and all-present creator of all things that exist.
- Islamic monotheism is an ethical monotheism. Allah is a merciful and just God who will sit in final judgement over all human beings.
- Allah has laid down a pre-determined plan for the world and knows the destiny of every being (*Al-Qadr*).
- Allah has, however, created humans as his agents on earth (khalifahs) and has given them the freedom to make decisions, obey and submit to Him.
- Allah will judge all on the basis of these decisions.

- Allah has communicated through his prophets (*risalah*). Muhammad is the last and greatest prophet who has received God's revelation to humankind (*Qu'ran*).
- Additional knowledge and information is found in the *Hadith* (sayings and rules of life) and in the *Sunna* (the customs by which belief and practice are regulated – *Shari'a*).
- Angels exist and are the servants of Allah; Satan is a fallen angel who tempts humanity away from Allah.
- Islamic theology is a religious tradition, a way of life, and the foundation of a civilisation.

Discussion

- The rich polytheism of Hinduism differs radically from the absolute monotheism of Islam.
- The many gods and goddesses of Hinduism and the one God of Islam each have their own specific characteristics and functions in the religious experience of believers.
- The notions of God and ideas about the nature of God in Hinduism and Islam have developed in culturally specific conditions and serve culturally specific purposes.
- Much of the knowledge about the nature of the deities of Hinduism and the God of Islam is derived from collections of sacred writings and traditional teachings.
- In Both Hinduism and Islam contact with the deities or the one God is possible in prayer, meditation and ritual worship.

10. Explain and discuss the similarities and differences between the Buddhist and Hindu views of the path to salvation.

In this question, candidates are expected to highlight the points of divergence between the two world philosophies. In doing so, they must avoid turning their essay into a declaration of faith, or an attack on one or both faiths. The exercise is focused on demonstrating a fairly detailed understanding of the key points related to each world philosophy, and an ability to analyse them. Though Buddhism originates in Hinduism, it proposes significant differences with Hinduism. In their discussion, candidates must make them clear.

Key Points

(a) Buddhism

- The universe and everything in it is subject to change and decay.
- All things in the universe are composed of many individual elements combining with each other in endless permutations. The strict laws of *karma* (action or works, also the moral order of the universe) govern them and determine the nature of the individual's rebirth. This is closely related to *dharma* or the physical laws governing the ways every part of the universe interacts in constantly changing ways.
- There exists no permanent, unchanging self Buddhism teaches the non-self (*anatta*).
- The human being is bound in the moral and physical dimensions to the cycle determined by the good and bad effects of his or her actions
- Rebirth is governed by the consequences of good and evil. One's previous life determines the circumstances of rebirth. This is not *transmigration*.
- A correct understanding of the human situation (desire, suffering, clinging to material existence) and obedience to the right conditions will release the person from the grip of karma.
- The Buddhist path to salvation or liberation is summed up in *The Four Noble Truths* that provide an evaluation of the human condition focused on *suffering*, and in *The Noble Eightfold Path* that shows how to extinguish desire and suffering.
- The Buddhist path to salvation is a middle path, not a path of extremes. It leads to the extinction of the illusion of the self (*atta*) and an end to desire, suffering and the endless cycle of rebirth (*samsara*). This state is described as *nirvana*.

(b) Hindhuism

- The greatest goal for Hinduism is *moksha* or release, deliverance, emancipation.
- *Moksha* negatively indicates release from the cycle of rebirth and attachment to the material world (*samsara*). Positively, *moksha* can indicate a state of calm security and attainment.
- The cycle of *samsara* is a universal, recurring and never-ending process that, unless broken, leaves the *atman* trapped in this permanent cycle.
- The *transmigration* of a soul into another body after physical death is governed by the rules of *karma* that focus on the sum of a person's actions and deeds in successive lives. One lives in the context of *dharma* conceived both as the unchanging universal law of order that says that each being must act according to the laws that govern its nature (*sanatan dharma*) and as the code of ethics that applies to everyone (*sadharan dharma*).
- Personal and world histories are the results of either individual or collective *karma*. The mechanisms of *karma* and *samsara* can be brought to an end and the *atman* can be integrated with *Brahman* by means of *The Three Margs* (paths to salvation).
- The *jnana-marga* is the "Path of Knowledge". Here ascetic practices, yoga and meditation bring release (*moksha*) from the bonds of ignorance that tie a person to *samsara*.
- The *karma-marga* is the "Path of Duties". Here we attain *moksha* by means of ritual performances, social obligations and faithfulness to duty.
- The *bhakti-marga* is the "Path of Devotion". We attain *moksha* through faith and commitment to a personal god who confronts us as the absolute in personal form.
- The *guru* who dispels darkness and leads to light can help the individual travel from the unreal to the real.

Discussion

- Buddhism and Hinduism both address the questions of the nature of the human person, the meaning of human existence.
- Buddhism and Hinduism share a pessimistic view of the human condition viewing it as illusory, impermanent, tainted by desire, or characterised by suffering (*karma*).
- Buddhism and Hinduism differ radically in their conceptions of the *self*.
- Buddhism and Hinduism share similar views on the impact actions have on one's future existence but differ in their views on rebirth / reincarnation (*moksha*).
- Buddhism and Hinduism offer systematic approaches and methodologies to attain salvation or liberation from the human condition.

Optional Theme 5: Nature, Work and Technology

11. **“Technology is the engine of progress enabling human beings to force nature to serve their well-being and further their happiness.” Critically discuss this statement.**

Key Points

- Examination of hidden assumptions in question, *i.e.* technology as progress and progress as positive.
- What is “progress”? What are the hidden assumptions about progress in the question? Material well-being and comfort? What do “well-being” and “happiness” consist in? Explanation and examples of how science and technology have used nature to expand human welfare and manage resources rationally.
- “Forcing Nature”, “to serve” humans; hidden assumptions about relation of humans to nature, anthropocentric and utilitarian view.
- Happiness as stereotypical material and professional success *versus* Aristotle’s *Eudemonia*.

Discussion

- A more critical look at the contribution of technology. Is it an unconditional source of progress, or is there an underside? Environmental problems, waste, pollution, problems generated by technology. Genetic engineering is a possible example, or mass industrial production of food, cars, *etc.* Can it keep on delivering the goods?
- A critical examination of the sense in which technology increases our welfare: is its contribution overly materialistic, leaving out a broader conception of well-being? One involving spirituality, balance, and a broader enjoyment and communion with nature, living in a beautiful and ecologically rich environment? Is human emancipation possible in an impoverished, worn out and polluted natural environment?
- A critical examination of the dominating and utilitarian approach to Nature. Is Nature there merely to serve human interests? Does Nature have any rights/intrinsic value of her own? Animals? The wilderness? Is the attitude of domination and instrumental use of Nature so self-evident? Moral?

12. “Is work valuable?” Analyse and assess this question with the help of examples.

The intention of this question is to bring candidates to evaluate the various contributions of work, especially those other than the obvious economic value. In their discussion, candidates could reflect on the fact that work, in the developed world, creates a dichotomy in individual lives: private and public life. Their private life is not meant to interfere with their work life, as if it did not exist.

Key Points

A good answer to the question is based on qualifying the answer in a number of ways.

- What does work mean?
- For whom is work good? For the worker? In what sense? (To live, to earn one’s lunch, no free lunches, to support oneself, increase one’s wealth and well-being, to be independent, responsible, achieving, entrepreneurial, self-determined, autonomous; to fulfil oneself, express oneself, achieve self-worth, create – under what conditions is this latter set of values possible? Is it possible for everyone?)
- Is work good for society? In what ways? Increase of wealth and well-being, prosperity, responsible citizenship (everyone has a stake in production); when people work they are off the streets, less crime. “Productive and docile bodies”.
- Is work made valuable because it meets the criteria of good work ethic?

Discussion

- Is a work ethic an unquestionably good thing? Is it people’s duty to work? What is wrong with “free lunches”? What about leisure, personal life, expanding oneself in other directions, having time for oneself? In the trade off does work always come first?
- Is wealth production, which is thought to accompany hard work a necessary good?
- Does work really prove people’s worth, lead to independence, autonomy, self-esteem, fulfilment? Or is it some subtle form of slavery, discipline and submission to organizations and others who control our lives, and our time? For how many people is work fulfilling? How many have some control over their conditions of work? What is the implication for the question?
- Is reward for work always a question of “just deserts”? Who decides? (What about productions that command no market value, *e.g.* volunteer work.) What implications does this have for the answer to the question?
- Power relations. Who benefits from the work? Exploitation: someone else wielding more power appropriates the returns of labour? If exploitation is widespread, what are the implications?

Optional Theme 6: Philosophy of the Arts

13. **“All the so-called aesthetics and metaphysical values of art are only screens to mask its real function: that of a commodity on an exclusive trade market.” With the help of examples, discuss this assertion.**

Key Points

- The value of art can very well be different for the artist and the art consumer.
- What, if any are these metaphysical and aesthetic values of art? Examples?
- Should art have a function at all, beside that of producing art? Should we *use* art for other purposes (a political goal for example)?
- What is (are) the market(s) for art? Is it an exclusive market? How?
- Examples of impressionist painting sold for millions of dollars.

Discussion

- Art as an object of consumption: an undeniable fact when one takes for example the selling price of famous paintings at auctions.
- Should the market for art be an exclusive one reserved for the rich and powerful, or is there a case to be made that art, as the expression of a culture, belongs to a society and therefore should be kept in museums for public enjoyment?
- On the other hand, why should the value of art not be controlled by the free market?
- Are there any such things as aesthetics and metaphysical values of artwork? Art for art’s sake.

14. **In cases where art portrays child pornography or senseless brutality, should it be subjected to censorship? Should art ever be censored? Present your case with the help of examples.**

Key Points

- Censorship, its nature, its function, its utility.
- The question suggests that child pornography and senseless brutality are art. Is that so?
- Who should censor? The artist (self-censorship), the state, or the moral majority?
- Difference between erotica and pornography.
- Are there cases where the depiction of child pornography or senseless brutality can galvanize others to put a stop to it?

Discussion

- Is the argument against censorship the argument for freedom of expression? Why should the latter have precedence over what offends the majority of citizens?
- The line between a work of artistic merit and a piece of pornography is often tenuous.
- How are we to decide what is artistic and what is not?
- What consequences should be dealt upon those who would infringe the censorship restrictions, should there be any?
- The standards of censorship are not absolute, they change with time. For example, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* (D H Lawrence) was censored when first published.
- Example: Picasso’s *Guernica* is perceived by some as senseless brutality.

Optional Theme 7: Philosophy of Religion

15. **“If a concept of God combines perfect goodness, limitless power and infinite knowledge, our experience of armed conflict, terrorism, genocide, earthquakes and famine constitute a good reason not to believe in God.” Analyse and critically discuss this statement.**

The intention of this question is to allow students to demonstrate a breadth and depth of knowledge about concepts within the Philosophy of Religion. Specifically, it is intended to encourage students to explore differing conceptions of God and the problem of evil. It also asks candidates to consider the role of a divine being, the relationship between our experience of the world and religious faith, and the purpose of religious faith in a divine being.

Key Points

The focus of this question is the first part of the Theme: A. Concepts of a Higher Being. However, it also touches on several topics in other parts, including:

- The nature and value of religious experiences.
- Faith as subjective truth versus indoctrination, illusion, projection.
- Belief in a Higher Being as the basis of an ethical system.
- Faith and motivation for belief.
- The post-modern view of faith.
- Identification and differentiation between natural and human evils.

The problem of evil

The apparent conflict between the three characteristics of God, and our experience of the world as containing the degree of suffering it does.

Discussion

- Does our conception of God have to contain these three characteristics?
- What other conceptions of God are there?
- Where does our conception of God come from? (*e.g.* revelation can be seen as one type of literature)
- What is the status of our experience of the world (and especially the degree of suffering in it) in relation to God’s existence and/or character?
- Can suffering and God’s existence and character be reconciled?
- What purpose does believing in God serve?
- Is there any “point” in believing in a God whose character includes anything less than perfect goodness, limitless power and infinite knowledge?
- Platinga’s free will defence for the existence of God.

Caution: it is possible that a candidate would approach this question from a philosophical/religious tradition other than the scholastic/Judeo-Christian tradition, for example the Hindu tradition. If examiners do not feel competent to assess such scripts they should forward them to their team leader.

16. Do myth, religion, philosophy and science say essentially the same things, in different “languages”? Justify your argument.

The intention of this question is to allow students to demonstrate a breadth and depth of knowledge about the similarities and differences between myth, religion, philosophy and science, primarily from the perspective of language, and to come to a conclusion about their relationship to each other.

Key Points

- Myth as an ancient method of ordering the world through use of metaphor and analogy.
- Religious world-view as one founded on faith.
- Scientific world-view as one founded on (empirical) evidence.
- Religious language: similarities to differences with myth, philosophy and science.
- The significance of ritual and symbol in religious language.
- Religion as a purely social phenomenon.
- Philosophy in the non-western religious context.
- Faith as subjective truth versus indoctrination, illusion, projection.
- Religion and ethics: belief in a Higher Being as the basis of an ethical system.
- Religion’s claim to offer a meaning to life.
- Post-modernism and faith.

Discussion

- What is the primary message of religion – is it metaphysical, moral, social?
- What is the nature and limitation of religious language?
- Can religion give meaning to life in a way myth, philosophy and science cannot?
- Could religion be seen only as a social phenomenon?
- How should we understand philosophy in the non-western religious context?
- Does morality require religion and belief in a Higher Being?

Optional Theme 8: Theories and Problems of Ethics

17. **“If a being suffers, there can be no moral justification for refusing to take its suffering into account.” Could this proposition serve as a foundation for secular ethics. Justify your position with the help of examples.**

In this question, we are expecting candidates to examine the possibility of having a purely secular ethics and what its foundation should be. If they elect to say that suffering of being is not a sufficient basis for a foundation for secular ethics, then what would it be?

Key points

- A definition of secular ethics, and an examination of its value/importance in the world as a way to go beyond sectarianism in building world peace.
- Discussion of what it means, “to take into account”. How does it translate into action, if it does? Is it possibly just an intention, akin to Kant’s good will?
- The question talks of being, not specifically a human being. Therefore animals, plants, and even mono cellular organisms would be included in the category of beings. The question therefore suggests a moral duty towards all of these as well as to human beings.
- Categories of suffering: physical, mental, emotional, economical, *etc.* Would we have to be concerned with all of these?

Discussion

- How should we live with the inevitability of situations where I take a suffering being into account, yet I cannot do anything about it? If such a foundation for ethics were to be valid, could we escape the unavoidable despair that will come to haunt us as we are impotent to alleviate a suffering?
- If we were to accept this proposition as a foundation for ethics, would it necessarily entail that we must engage in some form of action to put an end to the suffering?
- What differences are there between this proposition and Kant’s good will as foundation for ethics?
- How would this fit in a consumerist society where the endless pursuit of pleasures seems to dominate the ethos?

18. Is it the case that a morally good person is also a happy person? Develop a philosophical response to this question.

In this question, candidates are expected to examine the compatibility of morality and happiness, or conversely, its incompatibility. Candidates are expected to identify theories of egoism and utilitarianism and contrast them with deontological theories. Examples would help illustrate the issue.

Key points

- How do we decide the moral quality of a person and the person's actions?
- Is morality a question of "what to do" or is it a question of "how to be"?
- What kinds of connections might exist between morality and happiness?
- Is happiness essential for an understanding of moral goodness?
- A focus on happiness as the experience of a morally good life focuses moral evaluation on an appreciation of the character of the human agent rather than on the analysis of human action.
- Happiness is the existential experience of a morally good life not the practical consequence of morally good actions.
- The performance of difficult, disturbing or unpleasant decisions, if morally compelling, may not disturb the happiness of the individual. Rather, these decisions flow from and enhance the character of the agent.

Discussion

- Some moral theories determine the moral character of a person based on an evaluation of his or her actions (*e.g.* consequential theories, deontological theories). Happiness in these views is considered a consequence of action and a subsequent characteristic of the human situation.
 - Other moral theories determine the moral standing of a person on the basis of an evaluation of his or her character (*e.g.* virtue ethics). Happiness in these views is considered a motive for action and an essential characteristic of the human person.
 - If happiness is considered the goal of life and the proper end of human existence, then happiness is not determined by the moral quality of actions but by the moral quality of the person performing the actions.
 - The connection between happiness and moral goodness rests on the development of those character traits that promote the flourishing of authentic personhood.
 - Happiness is the essential experience of the morally good person living a virtuous life.
 - Is it the case that only a moral person can experience happiness? Under what conditions and in what circumstances might this not be the case? Does our understanding of happiness determine the answers to these question?
-