



MARKSCHEME

May 2014

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 7 and 10 to 13.

Paper 1 Section A Core Theme assessment criteria

A Expression

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

Achievement Level	Descriptor
0	The candidate has not reached level 1.
1	The candidate 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 candidate 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 candidate presents ideas in an organized way and the answer can be easily followed. The use of language is appropriate to philosophy.
4	The candidate 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 candidate 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 candidate 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 candidate understood the philosophical arguments, concepts or issues used?

Achievement Level	Descriptor
0	The candidate has not reached level 1.
1	The candidate 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 candidate 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 candidate 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 candidate 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 candidate 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 candidate identified a relevant philosophical issue in the stimulus material that arises from the core theme?
- To what extent does the candidate present and explore two different philosophical approaches to the issue in the stimulus material that arises from the core theme?
- How effectively does the candidate critically discuss the issue in the stimulus material that arises from the core theme?
- How effectively does the candidate identify and analyse relevant counter-arguments?

Achievement Level	Descriptor
0	The candidate has not reached level 1.
1–2	The candidate 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 candidate 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 candidate 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 candidate shows an effective understanding of a relevant philosophical issue in the stimulus material that arises from the core theme. The candidate 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 candidate shows an in-depth understanding of a relevant philosophical issue in the stimulus material that arises from the core theme. The candidate 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 candidate develop the argument in a coherent way?
- How well does the candidate develop and evaluate ideas and arguments?
- To what extent does the candidate express a relevant personal response?

Achievement Level	Descriptor
0	The candidate has not reached level 1.
1–2	The candidate develops ideas and arguments in a basic way with little or no evaluation of them.
3–4	The candidate 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 candidate 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 candidate 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 candidate 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. Bursts: The Hidden Pattern Behind Everything We Do

Knowledge of others is the explicit issue from the stimulus, although other associated issues such as human nature, where skepticism about the knowledge of others is a fundamental element in the human condition, may also be identified as an issue for discussion. Hume’s account of the origins of moral language – natural empathy possessed by humans – might be discussed. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Behaviourist views, existential views of the Other, or any other view that provides a method of making a list of relevant features to determine knowledge of another. Is the knowledge of others gained from these perspectives necessarily incomplete? Is it effective, nonetheless?
- The human condition approach might explain the issue by defining the lack of knowledge in terms based on a Cartesian notion of self-consciousness, where direct and intimate knowledge of others is missing or impossible to access; the significance of this skepticism may be examined with reference to one’s moral obligations to others, or how it impacts on one’s knowledge of, and relationships with, the external world
- The problem of solipsism
- The alienation from ourselves and others may be explained from a religious perspective, where our alienation from our God, or, gods, is mirrored in our alienation from each other, or as a punishment for breaking the bond between humans and God, or, gods
- The concepts of solitude and loneliness may also be used as contexts for examining human nature and knowledge of others
- Whether there is anything paradoxical or inconsistent in the fact that the passage claims both that our knowledge of others is quite limited but also, allegedly, “what we might know most about”.

2. Image of Social Security surfer

Knowledge of the self, with a particular focus on personal identity, is the explicit issue from the stimulus. Responses should reflect this by identifying two senses of identity implicit in the stimulus: the legal view on identity, and the persistent or diachronic view, and it is the latter where the philosophical value lies (though candidates should be rewarded for identifying both). Some responses may concentrate on what the constituent elements of an identity are, but at some point in the discussion a more philosophically relevant response would address the question of persistence. There are several standard responses to the question of “who am I?”, or with the question “what are the grounds for re-identification?”, and these are psychological criteria, bodily criteria, and narrative arguments. Locke’s memory criterion is often cited, and most other explanations are variants on this; beliefs and desires are often used. Other responses might focus on how identity is imposed or constituted through political, religious or social organization, or experience, or by way of some other kind of social construction. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Physicalism and other forms of reductive materialism, may be used to explain self-consciousness as the infallible source and origin of identity, as it persists over time
- Some feminist views on self-identity give primacy to the persistence of the body
- Others may cite linguistic, religious, or other elements of a culture as constituent elements in an identity
- The moral obligations and rights of an identity; some responses may investigate the tension between the innate or pre-determined view of identity and such obligations or rights
- Skepticism concerning the certainty of knowledge of your own identity is sometimes drawn from the observation that our understanding of our identity is different to others’ perception of our identity
- The distinctions between identity and personality
- The performativity of personal and social identity as elaborated by Judith Butler, *et al.*

Paper 1 Section B Optional Themes assessment criteria

A Expression

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

Achievement Level	Descriptor
0	The candidate has not reached level 1.
1	The candidate 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 candidate 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 candidate presents ideas in an organized way and the answer can be easily followed. The use of language is appropriate to philosophy.
4	The candidate 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 candidate 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 candidate demonstrate knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme?
- How well has the candidate understood the philosophical arguments and concepts used?

Achievement Level	Descriptor
0	The candidate has not reached level 1.
1	The candidate 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 candidate 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 candidate demonstrates satisfactory knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme. Philosophical arguments and concepts are satisfactorily understood.
4	The candidate 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 candidate 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 candidate understood the specific demands of the question?
- To what extent does the candidate identify and analyse relevant supporting material?
- To what extent does the candidate provide appropriate examples and use them to support the overall argument?
- How effectively does the candidate identify and analyse relevant counter-arguments?

Achievement Level	Descriptor
0	The candidate has not reached level 1.
1–2	The candidate 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 candidate 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 candidate 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 candidate 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 candidate 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 candidate develop the argument in a coherent way?
- How well does the candidate develop and evaluate ideas and arguments?
- To what extent does the candidate express a relevant personal response?

Achievement Level	Descriptor
0	The candidate has not reached level 1.
1–2	The candidate develops ideas and arguments in a basic way with little or no evaluation of them.
3–4	The candidate 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 candidate 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 candidate 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 candidate 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. Explain and discuss what we should do in order to attain knowledge.**

The question opens a discussion on the conditions required for knowledge and might be approached from different positions (*eg*, foundationalism, relativism) or by focusing on different issues (*eg*, types of knowledge, the nature of knowledge). Its analysis is closely related to the question of knowledge itself. Descartes's foundationalism proposes that a belief counts as knowledge if it is either foundational or appropriately derived from what is foundational. A belief counts as foundational only if it is inconceivable that it be mistaken. Furthermore, knowledge is possible if it can be derived from foundations that are immune from error. This raises the issue of skeptical doubts concerning the possibility of knowledge. A naturalized alternative views knowledge as a natural phenomenon that can be investigated by whatever means are available, including empirical means. There are different answers according to different positions: knowledge initially gained through the senses (empiricism, *a posteriori* knowledge); the result of rational intuition (rationalism, *a priori* knowledge). In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The assumption that we do attain knowledge
- What we should do in order to attain knowledge; does this lend itself to purely *a priori* (non-empirical) investigation?
- Whether the issue ultimately rests on how we are to conceive the nature of epistemological inquiry
- Whether true beliefs are converted into knowledge because of the quality of the reasons employed in justification
- Whether to attain knowledge we just need to follow standard ways of accepting knowledge claims, *eg*, common sense or scientific procedures.

4. Explain and discuss whether our knowledge is objective, or restricted to our own subjective perspective on things.

The question is focused on a central epistemological issue – the possibility of objective knowledge – and asks for explanation and discussion. Can we know about the world as it really is, or are we restricted to knowledge of the world as it is shaped and coloured by our own thoughts and experience? Moderate realism: at least some of our beliefs are objective, that is, logically and causally independent of someone’s conceiving of that thing. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Possible interpretations of “objective”: as the result of a progressive construction that detaches us from our individual subjective viewpoints, and in this sense it would include interpretation; “objective” meaning that we are contained in a world or reality that transcends our minds; “objective” meaning objective facts
- Objectivity as being different from agreement; ways of justifying objective knowledge: the recourse to scientific knowledge
- The idea that our experience actually is objective in the sense that it is of real physical objects
- Discussions which might be related, *eg*, about colour and qualia
- Popper’s argument that objective knowledge is located in a “World 3”, the world of humanly created objective contents of thought, different from the world of physical things and the world of mental things
- The idea behind “I contradict myself”: the reach and possibilities of the idea of contradiction in the justification of claiming objectivity
- The extent to which usual positions (internalism, externalism, foundationalism, coherentism) might illuminate the subjective-objective discussion
- Forms of stating and justifying the subjectivity of knowledge claims
- What would a “subjective perspective on things” amount to?
- Is a subjective perspective on things the only realistic possibility (as is often suggested by Continental philosophers)?

Optional Theme 2: Theories and problems of ethics

5. Evaluate the claim that our moral judgments are projections or expressions of our desires, attitudes and preferences.

This question invites an analysis of ethical non-cognitivism. Various versions such as Ayer's emotivism, Blackburn's projectivism (quasi-realism), Mackie's error theory, and expressivism (Gibbard) are the main examples. Non-cognitivism holds that moral judgments are neither true nor false as they are not appropriate for truth evaluations; they are not beliefs supported by cognitive/empirical evidence. In this sense, non-cognitivists are moral irrealists (non-realists). Moral judgments or assertions are expressions of emotions, or preferences. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- If moral judgments really are projections of emotions or attitudes, then how can these judgments be anything but a mistake or error?
- If we speak and act as if there is a property of goodness, although there is not, are our thinking and speaking not in this way flawed?
- Whether a projectivist can take rightness, duties, and wrongness seriously. On the one hand, they do not exist, but, on the other, I still act and believe as though I have moral commitments
- If rightness and wrongness are "children of our sentiments" as Hume suggests, then are right and wrong not dependent on my sentiments? If my sentiments change, do my concepts of right and wrong also change? If my sentiments vanish, does my morality also disappear?
- Some version of moral cognitivism may be offered as a contrasting position. Here, moral judgments are beliefs that are apt for truth or falsity. Moral properties supervene on physical properties, or are non-natural properties in themselves. Either way, these properties are discernible.

6. Evaluate the claim that knowing the consequences of an action can tell you what is best, but it cannot tell you what is right.

The aim of this question is to invite an analysis of how consequentialism may, or may not, reconcile the alleged conflict between pursuing the best outcome and pursuing the right outcome. It also invites discussion of the role of consequentialism as a decision-making tool rather than a moral guide. Traditional criticisms of consequentialism have been that it fails to acknowledge, or avoids endorsing, actions which are considered morally right; if moral rightness were founded on, for example, utility, then whose utility must be considered, and to what extent? Counter positions on what is right are usually based on deontological or virtue approaches or on a set of innate moral intuitions on what is right. Common arguments raised against classical consequentialism are that it ignores individual rights, *eg*, the taking of one innocent life to save others, and that if utility is the criterion of rightness, then it seems that no one can know what is morally right. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The claim of some consequentialists that their principles are not to be used as a device for making individual decisions, but rather as a standard for what is right
- Indirect or rule, motive, or virtue consequentialism can frame principles of action to correlate with morally intuitive notions of what is right, while some claim that it is my moral intuition which leads me to select and perform acts that maximize my utility (Hare)
- The issue of moral integrity, *eg*, its compatibility, or otherwise, with consequentialist approaches
- Actual consequentialism allows for the actual consequences of an act to determine rightness, while others use the foreseeable consequences as a guide to rightness
- Mill’s defence of “desirable” meaning both “worthy of being desired” as well as “capable of being desired” as a way of committing consequentialism to a criterion of rightness.

Optional Theme 3: Philosophy of religion

7. **Evaluate the claim that in order for individuals to rationally accept the existence of God, or, the gods, they have no more need to provide adequate evidence for their belief than they have to in order to rationally accept the existence of the past.**

The question invites an evaluation of the claim that it can be rational to believe in the existence of God (or, the gods), the past, *etc.*, without needing to provide evidence that others would judge adequate. The claim amounts to a rejection of the view that a belief can only be rationally acceptable if it is based on adequate evidence, or, on a good argument, *ie* it is a rejection of “evidentialism”, a position underpinned by classical foundationalism. According to classical foundationalism, a proposition is rationally acceptable only if it is certain for an individual, and it can only be certain for an individual if it is about either the individual’s mental states (*eg.* what he/she seems to see) or is self-evident. Much of the debate about the existence of God (which will be the focus here) has been conducted in response to the evidentialist requirement. Many atheists have cited the existence of evil as evidence against the existence of God (or, at least, God as traditionally conceived). It is clear, though, that this provides at most a probabilistic ground for denying the existence of God since there is no logical inconsistency between the existence of God as traditionally conceived and the existence of evil. Others (*eg.* Marx, Nietzsche, Freud, Dawkins) have unconvincingly advanced reductivist explanations for theistic beliefs. Some theists have relied on versions of cosmological, ontological, teleological and moral arguments to satisfy the requirements of evidentialism, but even the most impressive versions of these arguments are open to criticism. Other theists (*eg.* Plantinga, Wolterstorff, Alston) have rejected the evidentialist requirement and have maintained that certain of our beliefs (*eg.* in God, about what happened yesterday, *etc.*) should be seen as properly basic and so as not having to be supported by evidence or argument. According to them, our properly basic beliefs can be relied upon insofar as they are neither the product of cognitive dysfunction nor subject to defeating conditions (*eg.* that theistic belief results from projection, that there are unresolvable incompatibilities as between the religious beliefs of theists, *etc.*). Agnostics have urged that neither atheists nor theists have furnished strong enough evidence or arguments to justify their convictions. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Considerations for and against evidentialism
- Classical foundationalism and arguments for and against belief in God, or, the gods
- The requirements for the rationality of belief and the withholding of belief
- Reductivist and non-reductivist accounts of belief in God, or, the gods.

8. Evaluate the claim that what ultimately makes an action right or wrong is its being commanded or prohibited by God, or, the gods.

The question invites an evaluation of the claim that morality is consequential upon the commands and prohibitions of God, or, the gods. The notion of ethics being constituted by divine commands is usually traced back to Plato's *Euthyphro*, which raised the question of whether actions are holy because they are approved by the gods or are approved by the gods because they are (independently) holy. Contemporary philosophical discussions of the relationship between God and morality (which will be the focus here) have been centred on divine command accounts. Among the considerations that have been proposed in favour of such theories are the following: that in consequence of the dependency of humans on God as their creator, humans are dependent on God for morality in a manner similar to the way children are dependent on their parents for establishing standards of behaviour; second, that to deny the significance of God's commands for morality would be falsely to imply that the moral realm lies outside the province of an omnipotent being; and, third, that to reject a divine command account of ethics would bespeak an unwillingness to conform to God's will. Among the objections that have been made to grounding morality on God's commands have been the following: that merely having a reason for adopting a divine command ethic (or, merely judging that it would be appropriate to obey God) implies that there is reason to do what is right that is independent of what God commands; second, that acceptance of a divine command account of morality calls into question whether any moral virtues can be ascribed to God because it makes no sense to conceive of God as issuing self-directed commands about the right way to behave; and, third, that a divine command account of morality has counter-intuitive consequences in that it would commit humans to doing things we judge to be immoral were it found that God commanded us to do them. Supporters of divine command accounts deny this last point because they contend that all of God's commands flow out of God's nature. This has been the context for discussions of Kierkegaard's famous claim about "the teleological suspension of the ethical", in reference to God's command to Abraham to sacrifice his son, Isaac. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Plato's discussion of divine command morality in *Euthyphro*
- That if there are properties of actions that are right-making what are they?
- Reasons for, and reasons against, considering God's commands (the commands of the gods) as constituting the right-making properties of actions, including whether mere obedience to authority can ever be a sound motivational basis for moral action and responsibility
- Kierkegaard's discussion of "the teleological suspension of the ethical" in *Fear and Trembling*.

Optional Theme 4: Philosophy of art

9. Evaluate the claim that there is no factual basis on which judgments about the value of art can either be made or spoken of.

This question invites an exploration of the basis on which making judgments about art's value can be made. This will encourage a general consideration of whether there can be a factual basis to aesthetic judgments. Responses might engage with the traditional separation claimed to exist between value and factual language, as raised originally by Hume when he was considering the structure of ethical arguments. Candidates might look at possible natural responses in human beings, which might be said to trigger psychological responses to works of art. Answers could engage with the difference between natural and metaphysical explanations of aesthetic judgments and might analyse the difference between the disinterestedness of aesthetic pleasure in contrast to other experiences of pleasure. If a natural explanation is explored as a possible factual basis, how might this be empirically measured? If there is no basis in fact for such judgments, then are we left in a wholly subjective sphere where we speak only of taste when considering art's value? In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Kant's aesthetic argument
- Plato's treatment of art as an example of the universality of beauty; the difference between particular things and universal beauty
- Alternative accounts of aesthetic judgments, *eg*, subjective accounts.

10. Evaluate the claim that good art is art which portrays the world authentically.

This question invites exploration of the claim that good art involves accurate portrayals of the world. For most this means a faithful, or authentic, portrayal being judged by how lifelike an image or evocation might be. However, representation of the world can also be done in more abstract ways, which might still be judged as authentic. Responses might evaluate art's mimetic quality and ask if this is a basis for authenticity. Examples used to further the response might include a consideration of different art media in which the world can be imitated, including visual and aural forms: is the lack of a single medium of art a barrier to authenticity? The relationship between accuracy, portrayal and authenticity might be explored with a consideration of how this can provoke an emotional response. Candidates might look at the difference between form and content when considering authenticity in art. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Plato's world of Forms imitated by sensible representations which fall short of true beauty; his criticism of art as representation
- Aristotelian mimetic accounts of the function of art
- Possible limits society would impose on subject material for artistic representation (*eg*, abuse, torture, excessive crime)
- The technical expertise required to depict originals with accuracy
- Whether it can be claimed that not all good art is representational
- Art as expressive of emotion *versus* art as representational of the world
- Art forgery; are exact copies of originals of comparable value to the originals?
- The use of symbolism in art
- The idea that whether art is good is not a function of the qualities it inherently possesses, but of the constructions of its assessors
- The idea that good art shapes the world rather than representing it.

Optional Theme 5: Political philosophy

11. Evaluate the claim that in a modern democracy there should be toleration of all non-violent action.

This question invites an evaluation of the degree of toleration that can be allowed in modern democracies. It allows for the exploration of individual freedoms and rights within a democracy, contrasted with the rights of minorities. It raises the question of the role of the state in facilitating toleration and deciding areas of human activity that cannot be tolerated. An issue that might be considered is the degree to which hate speech and rights of assembly might, or might not, be tolerated, perhaps with reference to Mill. The role of education might be discussed as a way of raising awareness of the perceived need, and perhaps benefits, which result from toleration. The claim in the question can be challenged by sustained arguments putting the case that toleration is not necessarily a fundamental feature of a democracy. Ideas of “overlapping consensus” and “reasonable pluralism” might be developed. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The role of legislation and practice
- The scope for being able to give offence and take offence
- Reactions to hate speech, discrimination, and exclusion in everyday encounters
- The consequences for stability in a society where there is no toleration; does a strong authoritarian government produce more security and peace of mind?
- The clash between the freedom to protest and the ongoing economic life of a community (*eg*, the impact on economic interests of movements occupying city streets).

12. Evaluate the claim that increased political activism at a local level will result in a change in the legitimacy of the power of the state.

The question invites an evaluation of whether the power of the state will diminish if there is a rise in local and “grass roots” political activity. The locally based power of people, through “town hall meetings”, localized pressure groups, and the media, which operate within the boundaries of the law, might be seen to replace the actions and interests of centralized government. This raises the question about whether localized activity might result in abuse of power and limit harmonization with central government directives. The role of extreme liberal individualism in the form of anarchism might be explored along with the potential clash between these views and actions, and the potential coercive actions of the state aiming at protecting the people. “Grass roots” power might presuppose an inherent nature of humans, that of being good; while in contrast a strong centralized state might perceive humans as inherently bad, and needing protection from each other. It also raises issues of legitimacy and how local groups might be legitimate and truly representative compared to perhaps an elected central government. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Whether “people-power” effectively replaces the role of the state in a modern complex environment
- Whether the lesser role of the state is in keeping with some Eastern traditions, such as Taoism
- The role of globalization and removal of national identities, which might lead to a unity of people and to a “withering away” of the state
- The need to control and direct individual drives and passion through state power
- The issue of being unable to appeal to a higher authority when power and decision making is localized.

Optional Theme 6: Non-Western traditions and perspectives

- 13. With reference to at least one of the non-Western traditions that you have studied, explain and discuss the difficulties in achieving equality and justice in a multicultural society (when some groups within it understand their cultures to involve distinctive ways of life governed by the past, while others consider theirs fluid, open to change and not bound by the past).**

The question asks for an analysis of the difficulties in achieving equality and justice in societies made up from groups with opposing conceptions of the importance of maintaining traditional ways of living. Answers might incorporate views from various non-Western traditions (*eg*, concerning their stances on pluralism, democracy, *etc*). Some (*eg*, Will Kymlicka) take societal culture to consist of an inter-generational community, more or less institutionally complete, occupying a given territory or homeland, and sharing a distinctive language and history. Taken this way, a culture is the entirety of a shared understanding and so the notion of a group’s culture is apt to become frozen, thereby entrenching the roles to be played by those inside the group, and widening the differences between those inside and those outside the cultural group. On this understanding of culture, in order to have equality of freedom, respect and justice for all it is likely that special provisions will have to be made by the state for: protection of language (*eg*, in educational institutions); maintenance of the group’s particular practices and institutions; public expression of the group’s commitments, *etc*. This has been, *eg*, a focus for some Native American and Inuit groups in the United States and Canada. If making these special provisions is sometimes at odds with the aspiration for equality of freedom, respect and justice (*eg*, in the ways in which the genders are treated) the society has to determine how those practices are to be regarded within its legal framework. This has been an issue in, *eg*, various sub-Continental cultures. Others (*eg*, Iris Marion Young) consider culture to be the meanings people make use of when they communicate and interact with each other and so to be fluid, always changing and lacking fixed borders. They trace inequalities of freedom, respect and justice to flawed social structures despite agreeing that at least some claims for support for “cultural expression” are independently warranted. Moreover, they think the first approach outlined above cannot account satisfactorily for inequalities stemming from disability, differences of race and class, *etc*. Thus, they hold that societies that aspire to equality for their members must confront the causes of these inequalities regardless of the legitimacy of the claims of national, ethnic and religious groups for special forms of support. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The most plausible way(s) to understand the notion of societal “culture”
- The justifiability of a society making special provisions for those within it who wish to uphold a distinctive culture(s)
- The forms such special provisions might legitimately take if they are justifiable
- The compatibility of making such special provisions with the aspiration of a society to ensure equal freedom, respect and justice for all
- The specifics for various non-Western traditions concerning the place of the individual as against the place of the group.

- 14. With reference to at least one of the non-Western traditions that you have studied, evaluate the claim that an internationally acceptable conception of human rights requires that social institutions be designed so that all human beings at least have reasonably secure, even if not legally recognized, access to their entitlements under those rights.**

The question asks for an evaluation of the claim that human rights are only effective when social institutions are set up to secure the benefits and protections to which rights holders are entitled. Answers might incorporate views from various non-Western traditions (*eg*, the stance on individual rights within Sharia law or within certain Asian cultures). Some claim that for a human right to be effective it needs to be incorporated within a society's legal (including judicial) arrangements. However, even though this will often be the case it is not required for at least some human rights. For example, a right to adequate nutrition can be given appropriate recognition without having to be protected by legislation. More importantly, though, even when human rights have been legally provided for there can be obstacles to exercising them. Lack of knowledge and lack of resources, for example, can prevent individuals from exercising particular human rights that are legally recognized (*eg*, rights to protection against bullying or harassment by an employer). In that event it is more important for an individual to have a supportive social structure that can assist him/her to gain access to the object of his/her right. One key human right is a right to live in accordance with our own plan of life. Exercising such a right requires various freedoms, including access to nutrition, clean water, clothing, shelter and basic health care, along with access to information and education, opportunities for political participation, *etc*. To obtain these freedoms it may be helpful to have the backing of the law without it being essential. It may, for example, be just as important that ownership of land not be concentrated in the hands of a few, that there be moral opposition to usurious lending practices, that there be access to start-up loans, that hoarding of food be frowned upon, that education and training be available, *etc*. Such issues have been prominent in both African and Asian societies. In societies that favour the community or the family ahead of the individual these informal support mechanisms are especially important because of the likelihood of there being opposition to enshrining (what will be thought of as) "individualism" within the law. This has often been said to lie behind opposition within some Asian societies in the promotion of individual rights. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The nature of human rights, including whether, and, if so, how, they are related to legal rights
- The importance for humans wishing to exercise their rights of being able to enforce their rights
- The importance of societal structures for the facilitation, exercise and enforcement of human rights
- The significance for human rights of societal beliefs about whether the community, the family, *etc*, should have precedence over the individual
- The specifics of particular non-Western traditions concerning the role of the law and the role of rights, both individual and group, within a particular tradition.

Optional Theme 7: Contemporary social issues

15. Evaluate the role that gender differences play in forming an understanding of human identity.

This question invites an evaluation of the impact that gender differences – including their acknowledgement and any understanding that forms as a result – have on understanding human identity. The possibility of understanding human essence beyond gender differences might be raised in a consideration of what can be considered essentially human. Candidates might explore the possibility of understanding of alternative gender experience (eg, a male author writing a novel from a female perspective) and consider the epistemic distance between women and men. As humans are animals they can be empirically observed which might be relevant alongside the feminist critique of social structures in the past (and still in the present if the composition of power continues to be) formed by predominantly male agency. Examples might include a treatment of transgender awareness in contemporary society, as well as the concept of autonomy and its contribution to notions of human identity. Evaluation might include consideration of theories of identity based on psychological continuity, or perception of experience. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Positive discrimination *versus* accusations of tokenism
- The individual *versus* membership of a group
- The possibility of self-creation
- Recognition of people through physical awareness
- Possible issues for mind-body understanding, where the mind is conceived as separate from the body and psychological theories of human nature, where the mind is integrally related to the body
- Transgender issues.

16. “Notions of human stewardship of nature are unhelpful given the inevitable association such notions have with a hierarchy. It would be better for humans to understand themselves more as part of nature than standing above it.” Discuss and evaluate.

This question allows for an investigation of various models used to describe the human relationship with nature and the environment. A long tradition has humans standing in some sense “above” nature due either to a theological understanding of humans being placed at the apex of a hierarchy of creation, or due to the particular human ability to subdue, manipulate and subordinate the forces of nature. Thus answers might look at the domination of nature by humans, alongside notions of stewardship, and more recent ecological approaches which place humans inside, and as part of, a natural system, like that posited by the deep ecology movement or the Gaia hypothesis. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Stewardship as reflecting the natural order or as some kind of creation for humans to take care of for the creator
- Stewardship arising from the human ability to manipulate the natural order envisaging some sense of productive use of the environment
- Domination of the natural order so as to take maximum benefit for the species from the environment
- Modern theories of environmental citizenship, eg, the Gaia hypothesis, virtue theory, dependency, vulnerability
- The environment and economics
- The environment and democracy and power relations
- The impact of different religious or folk traditions on understanding the human place in nature.

Optional Theme 8: People, nations and cultures

17. Evaluate the claim that cultural identity is better than national identity as a basis for an individual's identity.

This question invites an evaluation of the claim that one's culture is a better identifier of who one is rather than one's nationality. It raises the issue as to whether nationality alone, or at all, can establish an individual's identity. The fact that nationality can be acquired by legal process, compared to cultural identity which might involve long term assimilation, could suggest that culture would be a better identifier. One's ethnicity and roots cannot be bestowed by bureaucratic process and therefore nationality alone might not be a good indicator of who "I am". Often cultural clashes are more deep rooted than national clashes, and this would suggest that one's identity stems from a cultural origin more than nationality. Cultures cross political/national boundaries and therefore identity imposed by a state seems inferior to an identity established by ethnicity. The phenomenon of globalization might accentuate cultural origin over national status. In a Marxist tradition identities can be seen as transnational; workers united across political boundaries. Fundamentally the non-imposed cultural heritage might supercede nationality in terms of true identity. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The extent to which cultural roots are being lost as a result of globalization
- Whether politics associated with nationhood offer a stronger tie than cultural heritage
- Whether in modern urban societies both national identity and cultural identity are being lost as individuals become isolated, especially those from minority cultures who reside unwillingly within a multicultural nation
- Whether humans now seek a sense of meaning and identity through other things than culture and nation such as work or friends
- The implications for the identity of individuals who are rendered stateless because neither the nation into which they were born nor any other will acknowledge them and accord them an identity.

18. Evaluate the claim that globalization necessitates the creation of more world institutions.

This question seeks an evaluation of the need to establish more world institutions because of the onset of globalization. The role and function of existing world institutions might be evaluated with the aim of concluding the degree to which they address global issues. Can new or existing world institutions embrace global values or do they merely reflect the values of dominant groups of nations? The potential clash between a world orientation and local views and needs could be seen as a counter position to the claim in the question. The potential advantages of efficiency, speed and cost effectiveness of world institutions might be considered; quick responses resolving issues and conflicts might be contrasted with world institutions and centralization establishing inefficiency and lack of action because of inability to establish consensus about actions, *eg*, the United Nations' Security Council. Might increasing ethnic mixing dictate the need for world standards controlled by world institutions? In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Whether world institutions ever fully understand local circumstances
 - Whether there should be protection of local traditions and expectations even though they may be contrary to some universal standard
 - Whether diversity is to be valued and celebrated
 - The question, "if we are one common humanity, are world institutions inevitable?"
-