



MARKSCHEME

November 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.*

How to use the Diploma Philosophy markscheme

The assessment criteria constitute the formal tool for marking examination scripts, and in these assessment criteria examiners can see the skills being assessed in the examinations. The markschemes are designed to assist examiners in possible routes taken by candidates in terms of the content of their answers when demonstrating their skills of doing philosophy through their responses. The points listed are not compulsory points, and not necessarily the best possible points. They are a framework to help examiners contextualize the requirements of the question, and to facilitate the application of marks according to the criteria listed on pages 5–8 for the Core Theme and pages 11–14 for the Optional Themes.

It is important that examiners understand that the main idea of the course is to promote *doing* philosophy, and this involves activity and engagement throughout a two-year programme, as opposed to emphasizing the chance to display knowledge in a terminal set of examination papers. Even in the examinations, responses should not be assessed on how much candidates *know* as much as how they are able to use their knowledge in support of an argument, using the skills listed in the assessment criteria published in the subject guide, reflecting an engagement in philosophical activity throughout the course. As a tool intended to help examiners in assessing scripts, the following points should be kept in mind when using a markscheme as an examiner:

- The IB Philosophy programme is designed to encourage the skills of *doing* philosophy in the students. These skills can be accessed through reading the assessment criteria in the subject guide
- The markscheme does not intend to outline a model/correct/good answer
- The markscheme has an introductory paragraph which contextualizes the emphasis of the question being asked
- The bullet points below the paragraph are suggested possible points of development that should *not* be considered a prescriptive list where necessarily all (or even some) should appear in the answer
- The names of philosophers and references to their work associated with the question help to give a context for the examiners and do *not* reflect a requirement that such philosophers and references should appear in an answer: they are possible lines of development with the emphasis being on *how* the material is used in support of the candidate's answer and *not* whether it appears in the answer
- Candidates can legitimately select from a wide range of ideas, arguments and concepts in service of the question they are answering, and it is possible that candidates will use material effectively that is *not* mentioned in the markscheme
- In Paper 1, examiners must be aware that a variety of types of answers and approaches, as well as a freedom to choose a variety of themes, is expected. Thus, examiners should not penalize different styles of answers or different selections of content when candidates develop their response to the questions. The markscheme should not imply that a uniform response is expected
- In markschemes for the Core Theme questions in Paper 1 (Section A) the bullet points suggest possible routes of response to the stimulus, but it is critical for examiners to understand that the selection of the philosophical issue raised in the stimulus, and the two contrasting philosophical approaches that can be explored in light of the issue identified, are *entirely at the choice of the candidate* so it is possible for material to gain credit from the examiner even if none of the material features in the markscheme.

A reminder of candidate requirements for Paper 1 (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.

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).

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. Passage from the *History of Animals*

This question provides an opportunity to identify in the set passage a central philosophical concept or issue related to the question “what is a human being?”, to investigate two different philosophical approaches to the concept or issue identified, and to explain and evaluate the philosophical concept or issue. Responses might consider whether there exist any essential characteristics that distinguish a human being from other animals. Rationalist approaches might suggest that humans differ from animals in their ability to reason and to reflect upon causal connections, speculate, determine relevance, and control inclinations and passions instead of being controlled by them. Theories of recollection and reminiscence might argue that humans, unlike animals, have memory enabling them to focus reflectively on images, while reminiscence sifts systematically through memories to locate images not immediately accessible to the senses. Social contract theories see human beings as social/political animals constructing organized communities, cities and states, a trait not present in the other animals. Cognitive science argues that animals have immediate needs satisfied according to the limitations of their species while humans have an infinite number of needs—including artificial, abstract and metaphysical needs—which we create for ourselves. A Nietzschean perspective might argue that human beings differ from animals in their ability to make promises. Animals are locked into the present; humans can commit to the future. Humans demonstrate the power of *will*. Philosophies of culture might suggest that humans deal with the world and other people through symbolization while animals live in direct acquaintance with the sensible world. Environmental philosophers might submit that human beings share the environment with all other animal species and might assume the role of responsible stewardship. Existentialism might suggest that humans are distinguished from animals by their freedom and by their meaningful encounters with others. Finally, other factors might include perspectives that explore friendship, love, technology, reciprocity, language, spirituality, the Aristotelian notion of ends, and the continuity between non-human and human animal experience. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Whether the determination of the differences between a human being and an animal is simply a matter of degree with regard to certain characteristics. Is it a matter of quantitative or qualitative differences?
- What might constitute a useful set of defining characteristics of a human being? What criteria would be used to select these defining characteristics?
- To what extent is human nature determined by strictly biological factors that differ from those biological factors which determine animal nature?
- Might we not say that the claim that human nature is different in kind from the nature of animals is just a case of human conceit and/or speciesism?
- Are self-consciousness and rationality sufficiently convincing characteristics to distinguish human beings from other animals?
- What are the roles of reason and emotion in distinguishing humans from animals?
- Is the presence of a “first-person perspective” the key characteristic which distinguishes humans from other animals?
- What aspects of personal identity and/or human nature do we share with other living beings?
- Are human beings fundamentally just animals?
- Does Aristotle’s stress on the bodily features of human and non-human animals diminish the distinction of human from non-human animals as compared with the Platonic-Cartesian stress on non-bodily features, like the mind?

2. Image: *Barcode Prisoner*

This question gives an opportunity to identify in the image a central philosophical concept or issue related to the question “what is a human being?”, to investigate two different philosophical approaches to the concept or issue identified, and to explain and evaluate the philosophical concept or issue. Responses might explain and evaluate the challenges technology and technological culture present to personhood, personal identity, and a sense of the self. The dilemma of digital identity as opposed to authentic personal identity might be considered. In this context, responses might investigate philosophically the impact of the collection and dissemination of personal data on personal identity and integrity, and the threats the mass digitalization of personal information present to human interaction. Philosophical approaches which offer a critique of anonymous regulation and centralized control of personal identity might be investigated along with philosophical approaches that contrast the dignity and integrity of the self with those factors that threaten interdependence, intersubjectivity and/or community. Responses might investigate philosophical approaches that highlight alienation, isolation, exploitation, nihilism, loss of identity, anonymity, dehumanization. Non-Western perspectives on understanding the self, alienation, desire for freedom, and freedom itself might be included in the investigation. The phenomenon of the dehumanization of individuals might be explored: names *versus* numbers; persons *versus* social units; digital convenience *versus* personal privacy. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Whether it is possible to understand the nature of the self in isolation from others
- Different forms of imprisonment
- Freedom *versus* determinism
- Whether there is any escape from digitalization. From computerization? From communication via digital media?
- Is the challenge to overcome isolation and establish authentic relationships with others unavoidably accompanied by anxiety and fear of alienation?
- How can the individual achieve balance between individuality and community? Can each individual work out that balance in freedom with a sense of authenticity or is this project threatened by mass, electronic, digital culture?
- Is nihilism a necessary consequence of the search for selfhood and self-constituted meaning in contemporary culture?
- Can personal identity be captured digitally?
- Will individual persons be absorbed into a seamless environment of computing, advanced networking technology and social interfaces?
- Are we imprisoned by faceless materialism?
- How free are we in digital, materialistic, mass culture?
- Foucauldian notions like “technologies of the self” and their relation to self-surveillance
- What other possible interpretations of the image might emerge regarding the question “what is a human being?”?

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. Evaluate the importance, in the process of gaining knowledge, of tracing the origins of ideas and concepts to experience.**

This question invites an exploration of tracing ideas to their origins. In the empiricist tradition minds are seen as original blank slates upon which experience subsequently writes content. In checking the empirical origin of the impressions that perception gives the mind, empiricists claim that knowledge can be verified or made clear. Responses will look at the empiricist handling of ideas, concepts, perceptions and impressions. Despite the reliance on sense-perception, empiricism defines a role for reason in abstracting, extending and manipulating original sense-experience. Hume splits mental content into “relations of ideas” (*a priori* manipulation of ideas) and “matters of fact” (that which is subject to perception). Locating the original experience associated with an idea offers criteria for clarifying how a claim is meaningful. Responses might discuss the verification principle and its development by the logical positivists of the 20th century. Some thinkers (*eg*, Popper) limit our checking of experience to the possibility of falsification. Responses might explore the rejection by empiricism of *a priorism* and the assumption by rationalism of a metaphysical world of principles able to be accessed via thought alone. Responses might also point to the problem raised by non-direct experience (complex ideas) and the issue of verifying facts in the past. In contrast, rationalism claims some knowledge comes innately. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The distinction between mental content and justification of that mental content as knowledge
- Logical positivism
- The need for sense-experience to say anything about the world; Kant on the need for a network of categories through which an objective experience can be made possible
- The incorrigibility of sense-experience
- The difference between vivid and indirect impressions
- The claim that knowledge about the world must be based ultimately on sense-experience.

4. Explain and discuss the problems faced in justifying beliefs as knowledge.

This question invites an exploration of the ways in which mental content can be considered a faithful representation of the world outside the mind. It may involve an exploration of different ways beliefs are reckoned to rely on more foundational beliefs, or an exploration of the way beliefs provide mutual support in order to be justified as knowledge. Plato defines knowledge as “justified true belief” but this raises issues about truth and justification. Responses might discuss sense-data theories and might discuss the difference between sensations as simply given and incorrigible, and what is inferred about the world from them. Different approaches exist in an attempt to justify the basis of knowledge. Foundationalism attempts to find a basic, self-justifying basis for knowledge, while coherentism sees knowledge as consisting of a mutually supporting set of beliefs. Rationalism claims that only through reason can knowledge of the world be gained, but such knowledge is criticized as tautological and inapplicable to the world outside the knower. Kant attempts an account of knowledge through his synthetic *a priori* response to the issue, claiming the world is mind-shaped due to pre-existing mental schemes. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Skepticism – from global to partial approaches
- “Brain in a vat” type examples
- Concepts that do not need to be derived from experience and so can be confirmed *a priori*
- The claim that knowledge gained *a priori* is merely tautological
- Lack of certainty about the past or future if knowledge is based on sense-experience
- Are sense-impressions indubitable?
- All sense-impressions are subject to interpretation by the knower
- The difference between knowledge by acquaintance and factual knowledge
- Wittgenstein’s critique of empiricism’s reliance on “private” sense-data and beliefs.

Optional Theme 2: Theories and problems of ethics

5. Evaluate the claim that “morality is a sickness peculiar to humans”.

This question invites an evaluation of the nature, importance and purpose of morality in society and might lead to a challenge to the value of morality for humans. The idea of a non-moral stance by humans might be explored to see whether such a stance is human. There might be some evaluation as to whether the absence of controls or mores that influence and mould behaviour is beneficial. The attempt of humans to marry and control conflicting instincts and drives might be reflective of the complexity of society. The value and worthwhileness of issues of responsibility and accountability for actions might arise. There is also the possibility to contrast views on the nature of humans: essentially good or fundamentally bad. There might be a challenge to the claim in that morality might not necessarily be seen as a sickness, but rather a valued condition of humanness. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Whether morality is a fundamental or defining feature of humanness
- If humans would have a better life without imposed moral codes
- If an amoral or non-moral stance is possible in a complex industrial/post-industrial society
- Whether moral codes are a means of benefiting some in society at the expense of others
- Nietzschean concepts of morality
- Examples of societal behaviour that are deemed amoral or non-moral and therefore classified as inhumane, *eg*, cannibalism or torture
- Whether humans can negate or deny their self-interest.

6. Evaluate the claim that humans have moral duties beyond those they have towards other humans.

This question seeks an evaluation of the claim that humans might have moral duties towards non-humans or concerning the environment. There is need to explore the nature of moral duty and whether it can be applied outside the human domain. It raises the issue as to whether non-humans or the environment have value and what the nature of that value might be – instrumental or intrinsic concepts of value, *eg*, there might be seen to be an interrelationship of technology and the environment and a negative impact of destruction contrasted with the use of technology to protect nature. Applications of the Gaia hypothesis might be explored in terms of the overpowering regenerative features of the environment, along with the deep ecologists' underestimation of the balance of nature. Kant's conception of what duty is might be explored. Issues of duty and responsibility to future generations or questions about the treatment of animals, the distribution of wealth, bio-medical issues, *etc*, might be explored. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The limit or extent of duty
- Whether as part of nature we have an implicit responsibility to care for the environment or to treat animals in certain ways *etc*.
- Whether by attributing human qualities to nature or non-humans, we are making a category mistake
- Different perspectives about nature, humans and non-humans
- Whether international organizations establish laws or codes of practice that articulate universal moral duties.

Optional Theme 3: Philosophy of religion

**7. “Conceptions of the divine should not be reduced to only one notion of a higher being.”
Discuss and evaluate.**

This question asks for a discussion and evaluation of both the possible diversity of the divine and the core idea of a higher being. Furthermore, it opens the discussion on the relations between these polar opposites. The diversity of conceptions of the divine, *eg*, in non-Western traditions, might include: Indian traditions (Buddhism, Hinduism, Jainism), Chinese traditions (Taoism, Confucianism), African traditions (Kongo, Ifa, Vodun, Orisha), Japanese traditions (Shinto, Tenrikyo), Australasian traditions (Maori, Aboriginal), Native North, South and Central American traditions (Hopi, Inuit, Mayan, Aztec, Inca). A basic conception, common to both Eastern and Western religions is of God as an ultimate reality, the source or ground of all else, perfect and deserving of worship. There are different views of God from religious experience, revealed or authoritative texts, and rational reflection. Philosophical conceptions include: God as a perfect being; God’s relation to the universe (first-cause view); God as creator of the universe *ex nihilo*, that is, from no pre-existing material; God conserving the universe in being moment by moment. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Why should there not be a unified notion of a higher being?
- The extent of the diversity is significant even within a unified form of religion, *eg*, within Christianity some believers differ significantly on the nature of God. Some see God as all-controlling, others as self-limiting; some believe God to have infallible knowledge of all that has occurred, is occurring or will occur
- The variety of theistic conceptions of the higher being/s
- Perfect-being theology and criticisms of it; perfect-being theology has focused both on the possibility that the set of candidates for divine perfections may not be consistent or unique, and doubts as to whether human judgment can be adequate for assessing concepts of God
- The tension between monotheistic and polytheistic conceptions of the divine – is it legitimate to maintain, as some do, that monotheism is the superior conception?
- Whether multiculturalism might provide support for the claim in the question.

8. **“Attitudes such as belief, trust and hope allow various kinds of epistemic evaluation; they can be (or fail to be) rational, reasonable, reliably formed, warranted, and the like.” Discuss and evaluate.**

The question invites a discussion and evaluation of a central issue in the epistemology of religion: do religious beliefs and hopes have epistemic justification? Many issues might be associated with this concern and answers might address the general issue or discuss some more specifically. Taking part in a religion involves propositional attitudes: hoping, trusting, regretting and accepting different things. It also involves believing various things about God, the sacred, humanity, the past, present and future, glory and misery, and about the world. The ideal of justified belief and its questioning is prompted by Plato. To verbalize a religious belief is to express, often in metaphorical language, some aspect of a religious form of life while at the same time engaging in that form of life (*eg*, Wittgenstein, Tillich, Phillips). In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Areas of our cognitive lives which depend on beliefs formed through testimony
- Whether maintaining the idea that religious beliefs have epistemic merit implies a defence of religion
- Whether religious beliefs have epistemic merits even if they are not grounded in any evidence
- Religious beliefs are, at least in some forms and with regard to some issues, based on arguments and evidence, *eg*, verification and falsification
- The form and value of the negation of religious beliefs. Are religious skepticism and nihilism forms of religious beliefs?
- Epistemic value and other possible values of religious beliefs
- Whether religious beliefs, like any other kind of beliefs, need to undergo rational examination
- Different ways of coming to knowledge of a higher being, either through use of reason, revelation, mystical faith, or a combination.

Optional Theme 4: Philosophy of art

- 9. Evaluate the claim that any plausible conception of the value of art will have to be instrumentalist, non-essentialist, and recognize that there is no single value shared by all works of art.**

The question asks for an assessment of the claim that this conception of the value of art is correct. It is necessary and important to distinguish between something's being valued instrumentally (*ie*, being valued in terms of the benefits it provides – in the case of art, valuable for human beings, given that artworks are artifacts, which are always produced for human purposes or functions) and its being valued for its own sake. Typically the value of art is characterized instrumentally as providing pleasure, understanding, *etc.* When art is considered to have non-essentialist value this is because its value is not a matter of its possessing valuable properties—consider, for example, art that is intended to shock or disgust—nor of its possessing a distinctive value because of being unique and irreplaceable, since this is not true of all works of art, nor of there being some single value that is shared by all works of art (like evoking a particular emotional response or having a certain cognitive significance) since, again, this is not always the case. Finally, the sheer diversity of art—ranging from painting and sculpture through craft, literature, music, dance, architecture, film, photography and so on—speaks against its having a singular value. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The distinction between instrumental value and intrinsic value
- Essential properties *versus* non-essential properties
- Plural value *versus* singular value
- The bearing of the above notions on the value of art.

10. Examine the significance of our emotional responses for our understanding, appreciation and evaluation of works of art.

The question asks for an examination of the relationship between people's emotional responses to art and their appreciation, understanding and evaluation of art. On some views (*eg*, David Hume's, A J Ayer's), to appraise aesthetic qualities just is to respond emotionally. However, these views are implausible because emotional responses are not necessary for understanding, appreciating and evaluating works of art even though they are not precluded from them. It is clearly possible to have a dispassionate engagement with a work of art. On some other views (*eg*, Bertolt Brecht's Marxist view) emotional engagement is said to impede our understanding, appreciation and evaluation of works of art. A consideration that often lurks in the background of views like these is that emotional engagement is at odds with rational engagement. Such a consideration finds inspiration in the contention of William James that emotions are bodily feelings and sensations. It is nowadays better recognized, however, that in at least some emotional experiences there is a cognitive component and/or the exercise of reason because those experiences involve judgment. Once this is acknowledged our emotional experiences can readily be seen as relevant to our understanding, appreciation and evaluation of works of art. Puzzles still remain, however. One such puzzle that candidates might examine is how certain emotions can figure in our experience of works of art when we know the characters they portray do not exist (*eg*, how we can loathe Iago in Shakespeare's play *Othello*, or pity Anna in Tolstoy's novel *Anna Karenina*, or fear the psychopathic killer in Hitchcock's film *Psycho*, *etc*). In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The nature of emotions
- Emotions (or, passions) and their relation to human responses to art
- Emotions and their relation to reason; emotions and bodily engagement
- The puzzling emotional responses humans have to what they know to be fictional art objects.

Optional Theme 5: Political philosophy**11. Explain and discuss the role consent can play as a basis of political obligation.**

This question invites an exploration of whether any citizen should feel obliged to act in accordance with the directives of the state in which he/she lives. The dominant approach towards political obligation is found in theories of the consent established through social contracts. Political obligation refers to law-keeping by citizens where the obligation is established within the context of living in the state, not for any metaphysical or religious reason. Social contract theories attempt to show that the individual citizen agrees to keep the law as part of a contract he/she establishes with the state. The individual's part of the contract comes because he/she agrees to keep the law and thus sacrifices a certain amount of freedom. Consent offers a rational explanation for why a citizen should feel a duty to keep the law apart from any other specific moral motivations, however problems arise about how such consent is offered or taken. Theories of consent vary from explicit to tacit to hypothetical forms of consent, but in whatever form consent is granted there is much disagreement about why any specific individual should be obligated through this mechanism. Classic accounts of the social contract vary and place the stronger party in a partial position of power over the weaker. Candidates might draw on examples of anarchism, both political and economic, to use as illustrations of their response. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Consent through voting or residence; *cf* Hume's illustration of the person coerced to join a ship
- The use of the "state of nature" to justify the social contract; *eg*, Hobbes, Rousseau
- Rousseau's "general will"
- Dissent and justifying civil disobedience; *eg*, Locke
- Consent and democracy; is a government only legitimized by popular approval? The limits of democracy
- Modern contract theory of Rawls offering impartiality and equality in the state.

12. Evaluate the view that we possess human rights simply by virtue of being human.

This question explores the notion of human rights and specifically of justifying how such rights arise. It encourages discussion of the concept of rights and might involve an evaluation of the implications of granting rights, and claims that rights are, or might be, inalienable. The UN Declaration of Universal Human Rights implies possession of rights simply by virtue of being alive, but some groups seek to stress the discussion of responsibilities alongside the granting of rights. Thinkers address what might constitute the minimum expectation in recognizing the rights of others. Responses might explore religious ideas that rights are given equally to all by virtue of the sacred nature of creation. Some might discuss Bentham’s relegation of rights as “nonsense on stilts” in the context of the primacy of utility. Alternatives to intrinsic notions of rights are that they are socially conferred through legislation or based on attributes of individuals. Such human attributes include autonomy, self-consciousness and awareness of individuality for informed choice. Responses might explore possible limits on rights, *eg*, children, the mentally ill or less able, criminals denied certain rights of freedom or democratic participation. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Basic rights involve freedom and notions of well-being; possessing rights may not guarantee their realization
- Rights and the Harm Principle
- Clashes of rights
- Whether it is possible to relinquish inalienable rights
- The relationship between legislation and inalienable rights; the relationship between the alleged universality of rights and the difficulties encountered in exercising them within particular states.

Optional Theme 6: Non-Western traditions and perspectives**13. With reference to at least one non-Western tradition that you have studied, evaluate philosophically the relation between appearance and reality.**

The question is focused on this core distinction, which might be analysed at different levels, *eg*, material, spiritual or personal, in evaluating the defensibility of the chosen view. According to Buddhism the constituents of all existence are mental as well as physical factors, and include inner consciousness as well as outer bodily existence. According to Hinduism the beings that we experience as real outside of us are just a series of instantaneous flashes of *dharmas*. In a school of Vedanta, *advaita* means literally “not two” or “non-dual”. In the idea of the “non-dual”, reality is one and not to be differentiated. This reality is *brahman*, divine power, knowledge of which leads to *moksa* or liberation. The central notion here is of a hierarchy of levels of viewing reality. The *Tao* is an attempt at transcending dualisms of nothingness/being, existence/non-existence, and reality/illusion. It is sometimes expressed in the analogy of emptiness existing like the eternal ocean, while being is its waves. A common cosmological idea in Native American conceptions tends to see the universe as a unity prior to the difference between appearance and reality: a primordial form which is fundamentally animate and permeates the entire reality. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- How the distinction between appearance and reality might appear at different levels: individual, cosmological, spiritual
- Different ontologies: ancient Japanese worldview understood the gods, the natural world and humanity to be an ontological continuum; some schools of Hinduism divided the world into the material (*prakriti*) and the conscious (*purusa*)
- Possible comparisons with aspects of Western thought by means of concepts such as substance, atoms, force.

14. With reference to at least one non-Western tradition that you have studied, evaluate philosophically the nature and purpose of human life.

This question invites an examination and evaluation of the origin, nature and purpose of human life in relation to ground notions (*eg*, universe, freedom, destiny, immortality) of at least one of the traditions chosen. The Confucian concept of freedom applies to all voluntary activities of humankind. The right of freedom is sacred as long as people do not deliberately violate the *Tao*. According to Hinduism in general the joys and suffering of a human life are of the person's own making; the destiny of the soul is immortality through self-realization. For Confucians, Taoists and many Buddhists, human nature as it is experienced by us is the launching pad for our eventual emancipation and self-transformation. A common view of India's religious and philosophical traditions is that human life is subject to *karma* and rebirth. The retributive power of actions and decisions generates a not necessarily endless succession of births and deaths for living beings. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Happiness and suffering as basic possibilities of human life
- The possibility of a radical notion of final liberation (*nirvana*) and the commitment to achieve it by eliminating the roots of karmic existence, that is, selfish desire and the illusion of the self (ancient Buddhism)
- Afterlife as a central aspiration of human life
- Some Buddhist philosophers argued that the only kind of happiness worth pursuing was lasting freedom from the pains and turmoil of life; this might be won only by bringing rebirth to an end. The only hope of any lasting freedom from the pains of existence is to remove oneself from the cycle of birth and death altogether
- Methods by which one achieves contentment, both intellectual and practical
- The role of dreams and visions in some Native American conceptions as the way to understand the purpose of human life within a context wider than the individual
- Eastern philosophic traditions which tend to see human life as an intrinsic and inseparable part of the universe, and think that attempts to discuss the universe from an objective viewpoint (as though individual life was something separate and detached from the whole) are inherently inadequate
- Comparisons with Western conceptions.

Optional Theme 7: Contemporary social issues

- 15. Evaluate the claim that, by taking into account a variety of expressions of justice (such as multicultural, multi-ethnic, global), social justice can be relevant in a variety of social contexts.**

This question requires an evaluation of the nature of social justice and its incorporation into multicultural, multi-ethnic and even global contexts. Social justice incorporates notions of justice for the individual as well as justice for the social whole. In multicultural, ethnically pluralistic and global conditions, an adequate understanding of social justice might address the interactions within and amongst a multitude of peoples in a multitude of contexts. Social justice might consider how dominant and non-dominant conceptions of justice arise, how they are selectively institutionalized and are formally and informally applied, what persons and groups are protected by or deprived of its mandates, and how to facilitate its promotion in social contexts. Social justice might incorporate notions of distributive, retributive, restorative and procedural justice. As no single conception or practice of justice is adequate for all historical periods or for all forms of society, the notion of social justice changes and develops along with societies. Social justice should promote democratic discourse, the meeting of needs, the attainment of equality, and the equitable distribution of wealth and resources. It should also be relevant to political, economic and historical conditions, their local and global manifestations, the attainment of human well-being and development at the individual and social levels, and the development of evaluative criteria and legitimate processes by which the effects of these factors might be measured. Social justice resists inequality and institutionalized disenfranchisement both locally and globally. Social justice must guard against the tendency of dominant groups to translate resistance into legalistic and institutionalized responses to perceived harm that can discriminate, disenfranchise, and silence segments of the population in the struggle for social justice. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- How social justice emerges in the context of minority groups and their interests
- What is justice/social justice and who provides the definition: the few (elites); the majority; a minority and/or minorities?
- The challenges to social justice posed by globalism, multiculturalism, multi-nationalism, and post-colonialism. Can they be addressed successfully? Realistically? At all?
- To what extent, if at all, social justice can/should incorporate the concerns of indigenous societies, gender and sexuality issues, and environmental issues
- Whether social justice highlights the differences between asking what is fair and what is just in retributive and distributive forms of justice
- Whether there can ever be a just society. Can we ever view all people as inherently equal and entitled to the same rights and privileges?
- How multiculturalism affects our understanding of social justice.

16. Evaluate the claim that gender equality is just, is good for human society and will facilitate new ways of thinking and living together.

This question asks for an evaluation of gender equality as the measurable equal representation of women and men in their personal and social status especially in terms of rights, duties and responsibilities. Responses might evaluate the view that gender equality does not imply that women and men are the same, but that they have equal value and should be accorded equal treatment. Equality in the context of gender equality might be understood as: a) a qualitative or descriptive notion where equality is conceived in respect to some property possessed in varying degrees, b) an evaluative notion where equality is conceived according to some standard of value or merit, and c) a distributive or prescriptive notion where the focus is upon a clear policy of treating people, or the sexes, equally. This includes equal access to schooling, employment, legal standing, cultural enrichments, medical care, and any aspects of life that potentially or actually involve gender. Abandoning certain gender-based roles facilitates personal development and self-realization and maximizes opportunity. Equal contribution to every person's life does not equalize the success of each person. Abilities, social skills, mental acuity, and appearance differ. Gender equality requires changes in personal, social and business practices. Thus, greater socio-economic justice is a primary goal of a less gendered society. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- What is meant or intended by the notion of gender equality
- What factors account for the continuing prevalence of gender inequality wherever it is found
- The empowerment of women in order to alleviate social problems
- Whether there is a convincing line of reasoning for providing a justification for treating people equally (as a policy) when they are not descriptively equal (in fact)
- How and to what extent does gender equality produce conflicts between equal treatment and notions of justice and freedom
- The possibility of going beyond thinking about equality in terms of male experience, which tends to make equality mean the masculinization of women
- Whether we can philosophically justify gender equality, *eg*, Kant's practical imperative (treat all people as ends, never merely as means), Bentham's principle of utility (effect the greatest balance of pleasure over pain)
- Commonly used arguments for gender-based roles: they appeal to nature; they are efficient; they foster the well-being and happiness of women implying that women are weak and vulnerable because of physical and psychological differences between men and women; they highlight the attractiveness of certain differences between men and women.

Optional Theme 8: People, nations and cultures**17. Evaluate the claim that even though a state is entitled to design and enforce a selective immigration policy, it is not entitled to restrict the entry of political refugees.**

The question asks for an evaluation of the claim that a state is entitled to restrict the entry of political (as against, say, economic) refugees. “Political refugees” are those who seek protection from a state other than their own because of a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons to do with their race or ethnicity, their religious beliefs, or their political convictions, *etc.* Traditionally such refugees have been thought to constitute a special category among potential immigrants because of the urgency of their need to be afforded state protection. This urgency has been thought to take precedence over the right of a state to enforce its immigration policy. (In light of this tradition, candidates might consider whether so-called “economic refugees” should similarly be regarded as being in urgent need of state protection.) Despite this traditional contention some have questioned whether even the dire predicament of a (political) refugee is sufficient to require a particular state to offer assistance that has the potential to lead to citizenship. They accept that there are some obligations to assist those in peril, but they ask why borders must be unrestrictedly laid open to refugees instead of assistance being given in other ways (*eg*, via temporary protection orders until the oppressive circumstances in the refugee’s own country are overturned and it is safe to return). It has been suggested as well that poorer states have less capacity to take in refugees than do richer states. So, if poorer states are required to accept refugees without restriction, this is likely to have devastating impacts on their capacity to provide for their existing citizens. Richer states, which tend to be better able to protect their borders, are apt to be much less affected. These critics conclude that richer states should shoulder more of the burden by accepting as immigrants those refugees given temporary protection by poorer states. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- What it means to be a refugee
- The right (if there is one) of a national government to determine its immigration level (including its refugee intake)
- The financial and social implications for a nation in the event of there being no restrictions on immigration
- The obligations (if any) of wealthy nations to ensure that poorer nations do not have to bear a disproportionate share of the world’s refugee burden.

18. Evaluate the claim that the moral duty we have to aid foreigners who are starving or undergoing serious suffering has precedence over our obligations to our fellow citizens.

The question asks for an assessment of the compatibility of moral cosmopolitanism with our obligations to our fellow citizens. Moral cosmopolitanism is the view that to live a good human life requires that one provide aid to the suffering, promote the achievement of justice, and guarantee the human rights of all without regard to social and political affiliation. Communitarians (like MacIntyre) believe, by contrast, that our obligations to others arise out of sharing close relations with them. Accordingly, they are highly critical of moral cosmopolitanism. Other critics have advanced different criticisms of moral cosmopolitanism. In particular, they have claimed, first, that moral cosmopolitans neglect (or, at the very least, underplay) obligations of reciprocity stemming from the benefits provided by fellow citizens. Moral cosmopolitans have responded by claiming that the benefits that derive from societal cooperation are not straightforwardly attributable to fellow citizens as such and, moreover, that it is not obvious why the receipt of benefits should in itself be thought to give rise to social obligations. Moreover, it is denied that citizens (especially children) voluntarily enter into a social contract in the expectation of getting benefits in return. In consequence, no more can be demanded of citizens than social cooperation. A second line of criticism has been advanced by, for example, David Miller. He claims that certain sorts of relationship – for example, friendship – give rise to, or, may even be said to be constituted by, reciprocal obligations. He further claims that the relationship with one’s fellow citizens is one of these sorts of relationship. Moral cosmopolitans reject the claim that citizenship is relevantly like friendship. While acknowledging that it may not always be easy psychologically to do so, they contend that it is possible to lead a good human life without favouring their compatriots over other human beings. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The character and implications of moral cosmopolitanism (whether by that name or simply by a description of the view known by that name)
 - Criticisms of moral cosmopolitanism by communitarians
 - Criticisms of moral cosmopolitanism by social contractarians
 - Responses by moral cosmopolitans to criticisms, especially those concerned with whether fellow citizens should be favoured over non-citizens.
-