



MARKSCHEME

May 2013

PHILOSOPHY

Higher Level and Standard Level

Paper 1

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

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

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 indicate possible areas candidates might cover in their answers. They are not compulsory points and not necessarily the best possible points. They are only a framework to help examiners in their assessment. Examiners should be responsive to any other valid points or any other valid approaches.

Paper 1 guidance (Core Theme and Optional Themes)

Examiners are reminded that in the examination paper it states that candidates are expected to demonstrate the following skills. Since these skills are encouraged within the assessment criteria, examiners should take them into account in their marking:

- *argue in an organized way using clear, precise language, which is appropriate to philosophy*
- *demonstrate knowledge and understanding of appropriate philosophical issues*
- *analyse, develop and critically evaluate relevant ideas and arguments*
- *present appropriate examples providing support for their overall argument*
- *identify and analyse counter-arguments*
- *provide relevant supporting material, illustrations and/or examples*
- *offer a clear and philosophically relevant personal response to the examination question.*

In the examination paper candidates are required to:

Write a response (of approximately 800 words) in which they:

- identify a central philosophical concept or philosophical issue in the passage or photograph that addresses the question, “what is a human being?”
- investigate **two** different philosophical approaches to the philosophical concept or philosophical issue they identified
- explain and evaluate the philosophical concept or philosophical issue they identified.

Using the assessment criteria

Candidates at both Higher Level and Standard Level answer **one** question on the Core Theme (Section A).

Candidates at Higher Level answer **two** questions on the Optional Themes (Section B), each based on a different Optional Theme.

Candidates at Standard Level answer **one** question on the Optional Themes (Section B).

Answers on the Core Theme and the Optional Themes are assessed according to the assessment criteria set out on pages 4 to 6 and 8 to 9.

Paper 1 Section A assessment criteria

A Expression

- Has the student presented the answer in an organized way?
- How clear and precise is the language used by the student?
- To what extent is the language appropriate to philosophy?

Achievement Level	Descriptor
0	The student has not reached level 1.
1	The student expresses some basic ideas but it is not always clear what the answer is trying to convey. The use of language is not appropriate to philosophy.
2	The student presents some ideas in an organized way. There is some clarity of expression but the answer cannot always be followed. The use of language is not always appropriate to philosophy.
3	The student presents ideas in an organized way and the answer can be easily followed. The use of language is appropriate to philosophy.
4	The student presents ideas in an organized and coherent way and the answer is clearly articulated. The use of language is effective and appropriate to philosophy.
5	The student presents ideas in an organized, coherent and incisive way, insights are clearly articulated and the answer is focused and sustained. The use of language is precise and appropriate to philosophy.

B Knowledge and understanding

- To what extent does the student demonstrate knowledge of philosophical concepts or issues arising from the core theme, prompted by the stimulus material?
- To what extent are appropriate cross references made between the stimulus material and philosophical concepts or issues arising from the core theme?
- How well has the student understood the philosophical arguments, concepts or issues used?

Achievement Level	Descriptor
0	The student has not reached level 1.
1	The student demonstrates a superficial knowledge of philosophical concepts or issues arising from the core theme. Cross references to the stimulus material are superficial. There is only a basic understanding of the philosophical arguments, concepts or issues used.
2	The student demonstrates some knowledge of philosophical concepts or issues arising from the core theme. Cross references to the stimulus material are only occasionally appropriate. There is a limited understanding of the philosophical arguments, concepts or issues used.
3	The student demonstrates satisfactory knowledge of philosophical concepts or issues arising from the core theme. Cross references to the stimulus material are satisfactory. Philosophical arguments, concepts or issues are satisfactorily understood.
4	The student demonstrates a good knowledge of philosophical concepts or issues arising from the core theme, which is used effectively to support the answer. Cross references to the stimulus material are good. Philosophical arguments, concepts or issues are largely understood.
5	The student demonstrates a comprehensive and in-depth knowledge of the philosophical concepts or issues arising from the core theme, which is used incisively to support the answer. Cross references to the stimulus material are well handled. Philosophical arguments, concepts or issues are well understood.

C Identification and analysis of relevant material

- How clearly has the student identified a relevant philosophical issue in the stimulus material that arises from the core theme?
- To what extent does the student present and explore two different philosophical approaches to the issue in the stimulus material that arises from the core theme?
- How effectively does the student critically discuss the issue in the stimulus material that arises from the core theme?
- How effectively does the student identify and analyse relevant counter-arguments?

Achievement Level	Descriptor
0	The student has not reached level 1.
1–2	The student shows little awareness of a relevant philosophical issue in the stimulus material that arises from the core theme and identifies relevant material in only a limited way. There is little analysis and few or no examples are given.
3–4	The student shows some awareness of a relevant philosophical issue in the stimulus material that arises from the core theme and identifies some relevant material. Some appropriate examples are given.
5–6	The student shows an understanding of a relevant philosophical issue in the stimulus material that arises from the core theme and explores two different philosophical approaches to the issue. There is a satisfactory analysis of the material. Examples are generally appropriate and give some support to the answer.
7–8	The student shows an effective understanding of a relevant philosophical issue in the stimulus material that arises from the core theme. The student explores two different philosophical approaches to the issue in a convincing way. There is a compelling critical discussion of the issue. Examples are appropriate in their support of the answer. Counter-arguments are identified.
9–10	The student shows an in-depth understanding of a relevant philosophical issue in the stimulus material that arises from the core theme. The student explores two different philosophical approaches to the issue in a convincing, engaging and thoughtful way. There is an incisive and compelling critical discussion of the issue. Examples are appropriate and effective in their support of the answer. Counter-arguments are identified and analysed in a convincing way.

D Development and evaluation

- Does the student develop the argument in a coherent way?
- How well does the student develop and evaluate ideas and arguments?
- To what extent does the student express a relevant personal response?

Achievement Level	Descriptor
0	The student has not reached level 1.
1–2	The student develops ideas and arguments in a basic way with little or no evaluation of them.
3–4	The student develops some ideas and arguments but the development is simple, or is asserted without support or reference. There may be some basic evaluation of the ideas and arguments but it is not developed.
5–6	The student develops ideas and arguments in a satisfactory way and evaluates them to some extent. There is some evidence of a relevant personal response.
7–8	The student develops ideas and arguments from a consistently held perspective. Evaluation of the ideas and arguments is effective. There is good evidence of a relevant personal response.
9–10	The student develops ideas and arguments from a consistently held and well justified perspective. Evaluation of the ideas and arguments is compelling or subtle, and convincing. There is strong evidence of a relevant personal response.

SECTION A

Core Theme: What is a human being?

1. Susan Greenfield article

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

This passage encourages a reflection on the nature of human relationships, and how interaction with others brings about opportunities for human development and reflection on identity. The passage suggests that 21st century technological use is offering new possibilities of escape which might have a profound impact on the way we relate to each other. In addition, there are implications for the development of personal skills and identity. Candidates might reflect on notions like authenticity in the light of materialist understandings of the nature of human beings. Human beings may define themselves through their interaction with others and through their existence in time and place; through biological and social necessities; through gender and social conditioning. This might give rise to a reflection on what constitutes the essence of a human being and if that essence is subject to change as a result of interaction. Other possibilities might include a consideration of the claim in the passage that human beings are currently losing a sense of continuity in understanding our identity because of a concentration on the ephemeral, with the result that we understand ourselves in a different way (the role of time in human understanding); and of the implications for our understanding of what it is to be a human of living our lives moment by moment.

2. Picture: a human and a chimpanzee

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

The picture might invite a consideration of the nature of being human. Candidates might explore the differences and similarities between human and non-human animals. Candidates might take the opportunity to focus on what is the essence of being human or what must be the case for communication with others to occur. Issues that might be considered include the role of reason and emotion in understanding the human condition; capacity for empathy with others; language; agency; aggression; moral values. Other possibilities might include, could animals or machines be persons? Is human behaviour distinct from that of animals or programmed machinery? What is the role of learning and communication in developing the self? Can I be sure that I know the other? If so, how? What is the significance, for our understanding of humans and non-humans, of self-consciousness, self-awareness and consciousness?

Paper 1 Section B assessment criteria**A Expression**

- Has the student presented the answer in an organized way?
- How clear and precise is the language used by the student?
- To what extent is the language appropriate to philosophy?

Achievement Level	Descriptor
0	The student has not reached level 1.
1	The student expresses some basic ideas but it is not always clear what the answer is trying to convey. The use of language is not appropriate to philosophy.
2	The student presents some ideas in an organized way. There is some clarity of expression but the answer cannot always be followed. The use of language is not always appropriate to philosophy.
3	The student presents ideas in an organized way and the answer can be easily followed. The use of language is appropriate to philosophy.
4	The student presents ideas in a clear and organized way and the answer is clearly articulated. The use of language is effective and appropriate to philosophy.
5	The student presents ideas in an organized, coherent and incisive way, insights are clearly articulated and the answer is focused and sustained. The use of language is precise and appropriate to philosophy.

B Knowledge and understanding

- To what extent does the student demonstrate knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme?
- How well has the student understood the philosophical arguments and concepts used?

Achievement Level	Descriptor
0	The student has not reached level 1.
1	The student demonstrates a superficial knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme. There is only a basic understanding of the philosophical arguments and concepts used.
2	The student demonstrates some knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme. There is a limited understanding of the philosophical arguments and concepts used.
3	The student demonstrates satisfactory knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme. Philosophical arguments and concepts are satisfactorily understood.
4	The student demonstrates a good knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme, which is used effectively to support the answer. Philosophical arguments and concepts are largely understood.
5	The student demonstrates a comprehensive and in-depth knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme, which is used incisively to support the answer. Philosophical arguments and concepts are well understood.

C Identification and analysis of relevant material

- How well has the student understood the specific demands of the question?
- To what extent does the student identify and analyse relevant supporting material?
- To what extent does the student provide appropriate examples and use them to support the overall argument?
- How effectively does the student identify and analyse relevant counter-arguments?

Achievement Level	Descriptor
0	The student has not reached level 1.
1–2	The student shows little understanding of the specific demands of the question and identifies relevant supporting material in only a limited way. There is little analysis and few or no examples are provided.
3–4	The student shows some understanding of the specific demands of the question and identifies and analyses some relevant supporting material. Some appropriate examples are provided.
5–6	The student shows a satisfactory understanding of the specific demands of the question and identifies supporting material that is nearly always relevant. There is a satisfactory analysis of this material. The examples provided are generally appropriate and give some support to the overall argument.
7–8	The student shows an effective understanding of the specific demands of the question and identifies relevant supporting material that is analysed in a sound and thoughtful way. The examples provided are appropriate in their support of the overall argument. Counter-arguments are identified.
9–10	The student shows an in-depth understanding of the specific demands of the question and identifies supporting material that is always relevant. The implications of this material are analysed in detail. The examples provided are well chosen and compelling in their support of the overall argument. Counter-arguments are identified and analysed in a convincing way.

D Development and evaluation

- Does the student develop the argument in a coherent way?
- How well does the student develop and evaluate ideas and arguments?
- To what extent does the student express a relevant personal response?

Achievement Level	Descriptor
0	The student has not reached level 1.
1–2	The student develops ideas and arguments in a basic way with little or no evaluation of them.
3–4	The student develops some ideas and arguments but the development is simple, or is asserted without support or reference. There may be some basic evaluation of the ideas and arguments but it is not developed.
5–6	The student develops ideas and arguments in a satisfactory way and evaluates them to some extent. There is some evidence of a relevant personal response.
7–8	The student develops ideas and arguments from a consistently held perspective. Evaluation of the ideas and arguments is effective. There is good evidence of a relevant personal response.
9–10	The student develops ideas and arguments from a consistently held and well justified perspective. Evaluation of the ideas and arguments is compelling or subtle, and convincing. There is strong evidence of a relevant personal response.

SECTION B

Optional Theme 1: Grounds of epistemology

3. Evaluate the claim that having a justified true belief is not sufficient for having knowledge.

This question asks for a critical appraisal of the claim that knowledge is no more than justified true belief. Candidates might give explanations and defences of the three conditions supposed to be sufficient for knowledge, *viz.*, the truth condition, the belief condition and the justification condition. Justification of beliefs often has a normative character, roughly, a person's belief is justified when she/he does well in holding that belief – hence, if she/he knows that p she/he could not do better, epistemically speaking. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- Knowledge as an internalist matter (where the conditions for knowledge can only be satisfied by one who is aware of them, as in, *eg* causal connectionism); knowledge as an externalist matter (where the conditions for knowledge can be satisfied by one who is unaware of them, as in, *eg* coherentism)
- Foundationalism, according to which, knowledge of the world is dependent upon a foundation of indubitable beliefs
- Reliabilism, according to which, a justified belief is one that has resulted from a reliable process
- Coherentism, according to which, a belief is justified if it renders the world more coherent than it would be without it
- Causal connectionism, according to which, knowledge is true belief that bears an appropriate causal connection to the information at issue
- Gettier examples countering the justified true belief analysis of knowledge
- Relationship between justification and truth
- Can there be degrees of justification of our claims to knowledge?

4. Evaluate the sceptical view that until we have answered all questions about all aspects of the world we cannot be said to have knowledge of any aspect of the world.

This question asks for a critical appraisal of a specific sceptical claim, which is usually dubbed “global scepticism”. Openness to genuine enquiry means that never-ending questioning must always be possible. Even supposing that the world's complexity may work against it ever being entirely knowable, there is the issue of whether it follows that particular discoveries made in the course of our investigations of the world cannot count as knowledge. The issue is whether we have to know everything to know that our evidence for the answers referred to in the previous sentence is not undermined by parts of the whole that are as yet unknown (*eg* our exploration of space is far from complete). In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- Testimony as our greatest source of knowledge
- Can there be incorrigible knowledge?
- Can there be indubitable knowledge?
- The differences in how knowledge is conceived in the rationalist and empiricist traditions, especially regarding the importance of certainty
- The riskiness of open enquiry as a means to obtaining knowledge
- Conjecture *vs.* knowledge; Popper on conjectures and refutations
- Refinement through testing as the best measure of reliability
- Inductive scepticism and the denial of the previous point
- Is there a place for pragmatism? Pragmatism and truth.

Optional Theme 2: Theories and problems of ethics

5. To what extent should individuals and their actions be held accountable for the economic life of their communities, for example, distribution of wealth?

Actions including ethical actions usually develop in contexts that involve economic life; they involve consequences for others. There might be a conflict between the good for individuals and the good for communities. Notions of ethical responsibility might be investigated from the point of view of ethical positions, *eg* teleological ethics, utilitarianism, deontological ethics, virtue theories. Is ethical responsibility for economic affairs completely covered by business ethics? In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- The role of social, political, cultural and religious values in shaping the notion of ethical responsibility
- Well-being as a central goal of individual life. Different views on individual life goals. The idea that a person is the best judge of his or her own well-being
- The extent to which individual actions are an exclusive concern of the individual agent
- Views which concentrate on economic efficiency understood as an ethically neutral conception
- Ethical issues in relation to economic life are of central international concern
- Is economics a branch of ethics?
- Justice being seen in terms of equality of outcome or opportunity
- Individualism *vs.* communitarianism
- Is moral responsibility a matter only of individual ethical concern or an element within collective ethical concern? Or both?

6. Evaluate the claim that we have a moral obligation to try to be happy.

Common meanings and uses of “happiness” refer to one’s situation (one is fortunate) or one’s state of mind (one is glad, cheerful) or both. Happiness or human fulfilment is seen from the point of view of ethical positions in, *eg* teleological ethics, deontological ethics, virtue theories. Living in accordance with moral standards is an important part of human nature and living in accordance with one’s human nature is key to attaining happiness. If there is a desire for happiness, the question asks can it ever reach the status of a moral obligation. Simultaneously, the question opens the possibility of a wider discussion on what happiness might mean. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- Virtue and happiness, from Aristotle onwards; *eudaimonia* or happiness as the supreme good attainable in our actions
- Conceptual constructions related to happiness: wellbeing, welfare, utility and quality of life
- A utilitarian principle (with happiness as the measure of utility): actions are right as far as they tend to promote happiness and wrong in so far as they tend to promote unhappiness
- Is there the possibility of a definition of happiness that lists its essential properties?
- Does happiness mean the same as pleasure?
- Freedom as the key to happiness
- Foundations for moral judgments: belief in a Higher Being, rationality, emotion, natural law, gender, environment
- Non-Western perspectives on happiness.

Optional Theme 3: Philosophy of religion

7. Explain and discuss the nature of religious experience.

This question invites an explanation and discussion of the nature of different religious experiences. Candidates might consider the nature of religious experience in general. Personal religious experience might take the form of phenomena or encounters that can be expressed linguistically – sensations, prayer, conversion, miracles and mystical experiences. The qualities of mystical experience might include its ineffability (indescribability), being noetic, transiency, passivity, *etc.* There might be differences between soul mysticism and nature mysticism. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- Is there a difference between public and private religious experience?
- Direct experience of a Supreme Being
- Problems of verification of personal experience of any kind and the special nature of religious experience
- Principles of testimony and credulity
- Confusion between other emotions or mental states and personal religious experience
- Alternative explanations of religious experience involving influences of the physical condition of the person – drugs, alcohol, crowd hysteria, *etc.*
- Lack of a collective experience to verify the personal one; the subjective experience cannot be objectified
- Cross cultural accounts of experience might tend to verify the personal experience, *eg* the Buddhist transcendental state being similar to an evangelical “speaking in tongues”
- The inconsistency and variety of experience could be resolved by a Supreme Being who is omnipotent, omniscient as this eliminates conflicting causes. It would seem that unless existence can be disproved then inconsistency of experience has to be tolerated, *eg* Swinburne
- The influence of cultural and historical traditions on the formation of personal religious experience.

8. Explain and discuss the nature of faith in a Higher Being.

This question seeks an explanation and discussion of the nature of faith in a Higher Being. Candidates might consider faith as an attitude of mind and an act of will that forms the basis of a system of belief. Candidates might contemplate the relationship between faith and reason, and faith and certainty. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- Blind faith and rationality
- Ethnic/familial faith, ritualistic/cultural traditional faith
- The use and application of faith outside a religious context
- Fideism; an absence of reason
- Is faith essential for a belief in a god?
- Is faith a safety net? *Eg* Pascal’s Wager
- Is faith merely wish fulfilment? A Freudian interpretation
- Is faith restricted to a metaphysical, mystical world view? Can scientists demonstrate faith?
- Is the notion of a leap of faith simply an act of choice? *Eg* Kierkegaard
- Is the idea of faith the same across different religious traditions? Is faith like water in that it can take many shapes, but remain the same?

Optional Theme 4: Philosophy of art

9. Evaluate the claim that an experience of art is not just an aesthetic experience, it is also a moral and political experience.

At issue here is whether aesthetic experience is an expression of feeling without a cognitive content, or an experience which is wholly dependent on understanding the objective properties of an object. Aesthetic realists claim that aesthetic value lies in the object itself, independent of us (so statements about beauty are in some sense factual) whereas anti-realists claim that aesthetic judgments are based on responses from the observer. As an ethical ideal, some philosophers, *eg* Buber and Murdoch, have argued that by contemplating art, we glimpse a set of values beyond our own immediate world of experience, so art has a significance and means of evaluation that transcends individual tastes. The social/political experience of art usually refers to a culturally significant event which acts as the inspiration and point of reference for its value as art, *eg* Picasso's *Guernica*, where the artist is seen as a reporter/commentator/*agent provocateur*, *etc.* In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- Distinctions between art as political activism and art as propaganda
- Using art as a means of teaching virtues, *eg* the study of heroic literature
- The extent an audience participates, defines, or becomes part of the experience of an art work
- If artists promote their work as social commentary are they obliged to speak out on behalf of others, and to take up causes of justice? If the artist is to make art that is morally uplifting, is it necessary for the artist to be virtuous?
- If aesthetic judgments are based on subjective responses, is the role of the critic redundant? If so, how do we reconcile this with the requirement that knowledge is usually a pre-requisite for any judgment?
- How can art allow us to experience a moment of transcendence, if the experience is purely subjective? How do I verify these feelings?
- Must art allow for the considerations of majority tastes and preferences? Are communities entitled to ban art for its provocative or offensive content?

10. Evaluate the claim that any interpretation of art must include the intention of the artist.

At issue here are the modes of artistic interpretation of works of art: aesthetic, cultural, emotional, moral, *etc.* Candidates might consider the structuralist view that intentionality and originality are all culturally specific constructs and, as such, must be considered separately from an interpretation of the work of art. If we accept that the intention of the artist is necessary in interpreting works of art, there is a standard by which we can make a judgment. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- Is intentionality only one of a number of other necessary criteria that frame a work of art?
- Similarly, the Romantic view of the artist as inspired by a muse, nature, or quasi divine source of inspiration, so the artist occupies a unique and authoritative position
- The public nature of art. The general view is that once an artist exhibits, publishes, or performs then as far as the meaning or interpretation of the work is concerned, it is beyond the control of the artist
- Is it legitimate for the critic to completely ignore the artist's intention?
- The role of the critic in art: as promoter, explainer, as a guardian of standards, merit, or taste
- The types of relationships between artist and the public; the degree to which the tastes and preferences of the general public need to be taken into consideration by the artist
- Are there different determinants for interpretation in different mediums of artistic expression?
- Has the announcement of the "death of the author" been made in haste? *Eg* in structuralism and post-structuralism.

Optional Theme 5: Political philosophy

- 11. Evaluate the claim that the justice of a society’s rules and practices (for example, the definition and regulation of property, the division of labour, gender relations, and political and economic competition) depends both on its treatment of those who are not citizens or authorized residents, and its impact on the interests of past and future persons.**

When appraising the claim that for a society’s rules and practices to be just, account must be taken not only of past, present and future interests of citizens but also of the interests of non-citizens and authorized residents. Justice is the fair and equitable treatment of individuals and groups; the issue arises of the connections, if any, with a society’s rules and practices. Consideration might be given to whether justice requires universalization, particularly in light of the diverse and interdependent character of the contemporary world. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- The importance for justice of protecting the enduring interests of past persons
- The importance for justice of protecting the interests of future persons; the environment
- The importance for justice of protecting the relevant interests of those who aren’t citizens or authorized residents; immigration; refugees
- Is the Rawlsian idea that social justice is measured by the rules established by society’s institutional structure (which regulate issues of property, the division of labour, economic competition, *etc.*), the best way to think of social justice? If not, what other options might there be?
- Should key institutions be designed to ensure the protection of globally shared basic human rights (*eg* for nutrition and hydration, for shelter, for education, for meaningful work, for health care, *etc.*)?
- Do special ties (*eg* of fellow feeling) take precedence over the universality of social justice claims?
- Is it socially just to allow a global economic order that engenders great poverty and inequality while at the same time refusing to intervene in poor countries to bring about changes in corrupt institutions, overcome tyranny and oppression, *etc.*?

- 12. Evaluate the claim that democracy is impossible without equality between the genders.**

This question asks for an appraisal of the claim that gender equality is a necessary condition for a democratic polity. Candidates might investigate the nature of democracy, asking, for example, whether it is a decision-procedure (as it is so often portrayed by those who consider it another name for “majority rule”) or a means for the achievement of self-government by a people? Democracy is the public embodiment of equality in collective decision-making and it follows that a shared-in-common society requires, at the very least, that the fulfilment of the fundamental interests of any one person be connected with the fulfilment of the fundamental interests of every other person. A shared-in-common society is one in which each person has a roughly equal stake with every other person. Clearly this means that discrimination on grounds of gender (*cf.*, racial origins, religious convictions, sexual orientation, *etc.*), cannot be allowed to undermine democratic deliberations. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- The relationship between the achievement of social justice and the creation of a shared-in-common society
- Social justice and the requirement *inter alia* of gender equality
- Obstacles to equal political participation by females (*eg* childbearing; childcare)
- The subordination of females resulting from regarding the public (political) realm as separate from the private (domestic) realm; whether this subordination results (as claimed by Carole Pateman and others) in the disenfranchisement of females by pushing gender issues into an a politicized private realm.

Optional Theme 6: Non-Western traditions and perspectives**13. With reference to at least one of the non-Western traditions you have studied, explain and discuss the moral obligations individuals have to themselves and others.**

In investigating moral obligations they have to themselves and others candidates might discuss how modern notions such as human rights, equality of the sexes, and the emphasis on the needs of the individual, *etc.*, can be reconciled with traditional or religious values, that stress the collective and the authority of leaders over the individual? Candidates might investigate how they are able to resolve conflicts between the duties and obligations of their tradition, and duties and obligations of the modern world. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- The *sramanic* traditions of Hinduism have a supreme good which is *moksa*, freedom from rebirth and *karma*
- Hinduism offers normative ethics in the form of *dharmas*. There are *dharmas* that are necessary (*nitya*) and others that are not. Some of these principles and virtues are honesty, charity, forbearance, non-violence, serenity, *etc.*
- Polynesian and many other indigenous cultures derive their ethical code from Creation narratives. In many instances, *eg* in Maori, Tongan, North American and Australian indigenous societies, violence has a place in the ethical code, as it mirrors the forces of nature
- Both in Hinduism and Buddhism, the moral laws are derived from a tradition and practice, not from the edicts of rulers
- Buddhism's goal is to be free from desire to achieve *nirvana*, and the true good is identical with happiness and the ending of unhappiness. The Four Noble Truths and the Eight-fold Way are the paths to *nirvana*. The basic assumption is that individuals are free to do what they want, but are wholly responsible for their actions
- Buddhist philosophers replaced the concept of purity by birth with that of purity by action, so the truly noble person is the one who performs pure and benevolent actions
- Comparisons with aspects of Western thought such as action, responsibility, freedom, determinism, *etc.*
- Is nature a suitable paradigm for the construction of ethical principles?

14. With reference to at least one of the non-Western traditions you have studied, explain and discuss what are the limits of authority in personal and social contexts.

There are different notions of law and authority with different sources referred to, with a possible cosmological or theological origin: many cultures impose different strictures depending upon the type of action or thought. In most traditional cultures the behaviour of the individual is not only controlled and determined by the community or environment, but the very existence of the individual is dependent upon the community or environment, both materially and spiritually. Although, in some traditions, there is no centralized doctrinal supervision or control this does not necessarily translate into more personal freedom and autonomy. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- In many traditional societies based on family or tribes, exile is a common punishment for social transgressions
- Traditionally, indigenous Australians retain the right of the victim to pronounce and administer retribution for “private” matters, like murder and adultery, while Elders often determine the punishment in “public” matters, such as incest, death by magic, breaking the sacred laws, *etc.* Shamanic traditions believe that the continuation of life is dependent upon the actions and interpretations of the Shaman. The failure of an individual to follow the advice of the Shaman often brings admonishment for endangering the community
- In Buddhism individuals are responsible for all their actions. As for doctrinal authority, there are the Three Jewels of Buddhism: the sayings and teachings of Buddha; the *dharmas*, or “truths”; and the *sangha* (community of monks and laypeople)
- Ancient Chinese political philosophy presupposes a tripartite universe comprised of: a Way (*Tao*) of the heavens; a Way of earth; and a Way of humankind; harmony is an essential goal for personal and social life and dissent is permissible if it is for a higher moral principle
- Should there be a tolerance of traditional practices that have been subsequently outlawed in Western countries?
- Is the growth of fundamentalist religious movements, and the adherence to traditional authority, proportional to the growth of globalization?
- Are traditional societies moribund and doomed to atrophy because of their rigid and outdated ways of social organization and adherence to authority?
- Modern political protests: *eg* by the religious community (principally of monks) in Burma and Tibet, the uprisings in Egypt, Libya, Syria, *etc.*

Optional Theme 7: Contemporary social issues

15. Evaluate philosophically the extent to which technological progress enhances or limits the possibility of living a better life.

This question asks for an evaluation of the relation between technology and improvements to life. For human beings, technology has implications in relation to social life and to nature in the present world. Can technological progress be equated with human improvement? Technology is the transformation or manipulation of nature (the existing physical and biological environments) to satisfy human needs and goals. Modern technology can also transform something immaterial, like information, in software engineering. Candidates might investigate contending accounts of what human life is, might be and should be. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- Interpretations of human life: biological and social necessities; social conditioning
- Nature, civilization and technology
- Artistic, social, political implications of technology in relation to the human condition
- The human being as an integral part of nature and as a result of evolution
- Is technology a means to an end or an end in itself?
- Issues about the relation between human beings and nature. The distinction between the artificial and the natural makes sense only if human beings are considered in some respect not to be part of nature.

16. Evaluate philosophically the extent to which we are entitled to practise civil disobedience and political protest.

This question offers an opportunity to discuss what might be good reasons to disagree with and challenge a government or society. Civil disobedience involves a public and non-violent breach of law, committed in order to change a law or policy, and to better society. The usual assumption is that acts of civil disobedience are easier to justify morally than other illegal acts. Some reasons given for civil disobedience might include social injustice, lack of rights recognition and the desire to protect the environment. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- The grounds of political or social obligations
- The importance of the categorization of what counts as civil disobedience
- Social justice and injustice
- Examples of civil disobedients might include: Mahatma Gandhi, Martin Luther King, opponents of the Vietnam War, the “red shirt” movement in Thailand; the “Occupy Wall Street” movement; the anti-Putin demonstrations; the “Free Tibet” movement; the “Arab Spring”
- Origins and extent of social discontent
- Must those classed as civilly disobedient be willing to accept punishment?
- Who is to be considered as the addressee of social protest? Always governments? Society as a whole? Other countries? International situations?
- Is civil disobedience guided by the attempt to promote human freedom?
- Differences and relations between social discontent, civil disobedience, protest, revolt and revolution
- Issues in assessing particular acts of civil disobedience: proportionality regarding the evil against which civil disobedience is aimed, distinction between tactics and evaluation of objectives.

Optional Theme 8: People, nations and cultures

17. Evaluate the extent to which the development of cultural identity is dependent on tradition.

This question invites an exploration of the relationship between culture and what is inherited from the past, offering the chance to consider and evaluate the significance of tradition to emerging cultural identity. At issue is what cultural identity is, and how it is related to tradition. Candidates might investigate whether culture is a joint set of skills, or a shared set of artefacts, or a shared history. Candidates might investigate the significance of language to cultural identity. How traditions are formed and understood, and how the significance and value of tradition is evaluated might also be considered. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- How the significance and value of cultural identity is evaluated
- Global communication in the modern world
- The relationship between society and culture
- The impact on a host nation’s cultural identity of immigrant groups and new traditions
- Is the individual a passive recipient of tradition? The relationship between tradition, innovation and the formation of cultural identity
- If culture emerges from the combination of people’s activities and values, how possible is it for a straightforward understanding of cultural identity to emerge?
- Is it possible to judge one’s own cultural identity?
- The method of historical enquiry and attempts to understand cultural development through social sciences
- The place of the individual in cultural settings
- How does culture change?
- The co-existence of several cultural identities in one place
- Is multiculturalism achievable?

18. Explain and discuss the possible criteria used in making judgments about cultural inferiority and/or superiority.

At issue here is how judgments of inferiority and superiority are made within, or about, diverse cultural settings. Candidates might consider how judgments can be made in the light of the possible criteria being discussed. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- Can judgments be made from outside a culture or about a culture other than one’s own?
 - Examples of possible criteria might include technical ability, wealth, institutional structures, education, health, cultural activity, notions of change, adaptability and “progress”, *etc.*
 - Are notions of inferiority and superiority invalid when assessing cultures? Phobias about other nationalities, religious groups, *etc.*
 - Cultural development and maturity; cultural relativism
 - Identifying a single culture or multiplicity of cultures; the impact of migration on culture
 - Nationalism, patriotism, loyalty to one’s country or culture
 - The role of race, gender, class and ethnicity in defining culture
 - Multiculturalism; why is it so often derided?
 - Conversions of individuals to different cultural values
 - Globalization and modern cultural identity
 - Sub-cultures.
-