

Markscheme

May 2015

Philosophy

Higher level and standard level

Paper 2

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 5–7.

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 markschemes for Paper 2 there is a greater requirement for specific content as the Paper requires the study of a text by the candidates and the questions set will derive from that text. The markscheme will show what is central in a text to an expected response by the candidate and examiners can use the markscheme to be aware of centrally relevant material.

A reminder of candidate requirements for Paper 2:

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, and demonstrate an understanding of the author’s specific terminology
- show an understanding of the specific demands of the question
- give references to the ideas and arguments presented in the text
- present appropriate examples providing support for their overall argument
- identify and analyse counter-arguments
- provide relevant supporting material, illustrations and/or examples
- develop a critical evaluation of the ideas and arguments of the text
- offer a clear and philosophically relevant personal response to the position expressed by the author.

Candidates at both Higher Level and Standard Level answer **one** question.

Paper 2 assessment criteria

A Expression

- Has the candidate presented ideas in an organized way?
- How clear and precise is the language used by the candidate?
- To what extent is the language appropriate to philosophy?
- To what extent has the candidate understood the author’s use of specific terminology?

Achievement Level	Descriptor
0	The candidate has not reached level 1.
1	The candidate expresses some basic ideas but it is not 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. The candidate shows some understanding of the author’s use of specific terminology but only in a limited way.
3	The candidate presents ideas in an organized way and the answer can be easily followed. The use of language is appropriate to philosophy and the author’s use of specific terminology is satisfactorily understood.
4	The candidate presents ideas in an organized and coherent way and insights are clearly articulated. The use of language is effective and appropriate to philosophy. The candidate shows a clear understanding and use of the author’s specific terminology.
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. The candidate shows an assured understanding and use of the author’s specific terminology.

B Knowledge and understanding of the text

- How well does the candidate know the text?
- To what extent has the candidate understood the author’s ideas, arguments and key concepts?

Achievement Level	Descriptor
0	The candidate has not reached level 1.
1	The candidate demonstrates a superficial knowledge of the text and there is only a basic understanding of the author’s ideas, arguments and key concepts.
2	The candidate demonstrates some knowledge of the text, with a limited understanding of the author’s ideas, arguments and key concepts.
3	The candidate demonstrates satisfactory knowledge of the text and the author’s ideas, arguments and key concepts are satisfactorily understood. There is some insight into the author’s arguments.
4	The candidate demonstrates a good knowledge of the text and the author’s ideas, arguments and key concepts are clearly understood. The candidate is able to show an understanding of some of the more difficult or subtle points of the author’s arguments.
5	The candidate demonstrates that the text has been thoroughly and carefully read. The candidate shows an in-depth understanding of the author’s arguments, with a close attention to detail.

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?
- How effectively does the candidate analyse the supporting material, examples and 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 given.
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 used.
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. Examples are appropriate and give some support to the 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. Examples are appropriate in their support of the overall argument. Some 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. Examples 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 the ideas and arguments of the text?
- 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 and there is little or no evaluation of the text.
3–4	The candidate develops some ideas and arguments but the development is simple, or is asserted without reference to the text. There may be some basic evaluation of the ideas and arguments of the text but it is not developed.
5–6	The candidate develops ideas and arguments in a satisfactory way and evaluates them to some extent. A limited critique of the ideas and arguments of the text is offered. There is some evidence of a relevant personal response.
7–8	The candidate develops ideas and arguments from a consistently held perspective, in close response to the ideas and arguments of the text. Evaluation is thoughtful and convincing and the candidate offers a critique of the text that goes beyond a statement of opinion or belief. There is good evidence of a relevant personal response.
9–10	The candidate develops ideas and arguments in an incisive and coherent way in detailed response to the text. Evaluation is compelling or subtle, and convincing, and the candidate offers a critique of the text that shows strong evidence of a relevant personal response. The candidate shows an ability to challenge the assumptions made by the author and explores different approaches to the text.

Bhagavad Gita

1. Evaluate the importance of detachment (or non-attachment) to the individual.

This question involves a central issue which has implications both for doctrinal and ethical teachings. At the centre of the *Gita* is a view that the correct attitude to the external physical world is one of non-attachment: “One should exercise discrimination and thereby realize that attachment to sense objects is the cause of bondage”. This has an important ethical dimension, and the text describes how attachment can involve the individual in inappropriate sensual desire, which in turn causes anger and delusion. The *gunas* are the forces of creation that cause different types of attachment, and Krishna is asked how to identify the person who has “gone beyond” these forces of nature in order to transcend them and find true liberation. This is stated as an attempt to go beyond earthly dualism, which separates physical and spiritual existence, and points towards a preferable kind of existence that sheds external physical limitations. Is such a metaphysical picture convincing in the contemporary world? Are the ethical and metaphysical assumptions at the heart of the *Gita* falsifiable? In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Physical senses and attachment
- The negative impact of attachment on intelligence and wisdom
- Dualism and non-dualism
- Liberation, *moksa*
- *Tamas* and darkness that affects the soul
- *Sattva* helps the individual achieve true knowledge, wisdom and happiness
- Impermanence and the external world
- Is the assumption of the strict separation between the external world and the inner world of the soul convincing?
- Is the account of liberation, resulting in the soul finally moving to a new state, convincing? What constitutes the soul which achieves liberation? If the aim is detachment and no self remains, what exactly is liberated?
- Is a proper ethical responsibility in the world best shown by attachment (say to family or friends or God) as opposed to detachment?

2. Discuss and evaluate the view of war that is encouraged by the story of Arjuna.

This question invites a discussion about two central elements of *Gita*, war and Arjuna. The story of Arjuna dominates the *Gita*, and the first chapter places Arjuna in a battlefield setting drawing the reader's attention graphically to issues about war and killing. Given this early setting it might be said that the *Gita* is glorifying war with Arjuna held as an example of a brave fighter from the warrior caste. Yet the chapter highlights Arjuna's distress in that he knows that he must kill and lose loved ones and friends as a result. In appealing to Krishna in this situation, Arjuna receives instruction that by the end of the text makes him ready to go to war. The teaching of the *Gita* can be variously interpreted and has been so over time. Many interpret the outward setting of the battlefield as an allegory of inward struggle (in a way reminiscent of *jihad* in some Muslim interpretations), thus in no way being seen as encouragement (or discouragement) of war. The role played by *karma* has also featured in interpretations which emphasize that the choices Arjuna had made prior to finding himself in a battlefield setting had determined that he be there. What he must do through his dialogue with Krishna is to adopt the right attitude throughout the inevitability of what he faces. Here an emphasis on duty is highlighted within the context of war. Responses might well make reference to different interpretations of the text as well as historical movements like Ghandi's famous pacifism as the question is explored. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Is the message one about attitude rather than outcome? In chapter 2:37: "...if you are killed (in the battle) you will ascend to heaven. On the contrary if you win the war you will enjoy the comforts of earthly kingdom. Therefore, get up and fight with determination..."
- 2:38: "With equanimity towards happiness and sorrow, gain and loss, victory and defeat, fight. This way you will not incur any sin."
- If the message is about an inner war, what are the features of life that the inner person must wage war on?
- How legitimate and convincing are allegorical interpretations of war in the text?
- Might war be echoing the context of a moral contest between the competing duties of caste and family?
- Is a less allegorical interpretation supportable? Can the *Gita* be used as a defence of war carried out under the right conditions?
- Hinduism and non-violence (*ahimsa*), specifically the example of Ghandi and the inspiration for the Indian Independence movement in early 20th century.

Confucius: *The Analects***3. Explain and evaluate the relationship between self-discipline and care for others.**

This question invites a discussion about the concepts of self-discipline and care for others and their relationship. For Confucius, self-discipline was an essential pre-requisite for altruism. The way to develop self-discipline was to follow ritual and through the observance of rites when worshipping, but it was also something to be learnt from the roles an individual is required to fulfil in the familial and social hierarchy. These roles, initially, involve deference to authority and age, and recognizing the position of others over them, such as a parent or senior family member over a child. These experiences condition individuals to recognize legitimate claims that others have over us, and in particular, to reconcile individual desires with the needs of others. This desire for deference does not mean passivity; *Chun Tzu* (the gentleman) was expected to speak up and admonish when and where appropriate. That is the consequence of knowing duty: there is a duty to the self to keep one's integrity. Though a life of moderation was the goal, it was important for the gentleman to experience desires, so that the need for social and personal restraints, as well as the observance of a moral code, is appreciated. A necessary trait for the gentleman was self-deprecation, and observing and practising the religious rituals used in the worship of ancestors was, for Confucius, the best training. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Rather than developing virtue, compliance to rituals and deference to authority breeds timidity and obedience. Confucius's gentleman is trained to accept orders
- Is there a guarantee that experiencing desires is just as likely to lead to a further pursuing of desires?
- Other ethical systems, eg, religions, have observance of rituals, duty and subjugation as either virtues or principles, and they may be compared and contrasted with Confucianism
- The grounds for making prudent judgments between deference and criticism are more than likely to be based on self-interest, and not out of a sense of acting virtuously
- Is what Confucius requires merely learning to perform a variety of roles without necessarily understanding their moral and social significance, a type of Pavlovian response?
- Is a progressive polity possible under the leadership of Confucius's gentleman?

4. Evaluate the role of education in the development of *Chun Tzu* (the gentleman).

This question asks for a discussion on the central importance of education for the gentleman. According to Confucius, without a love for learning, humaneness becomes folly, understanding becomes unorthodoxy, good faith becomes damaging behaviour, straightforwardness becomes rudeness, courage becomes rebelliousness, and strength becomes violence. Disparaging of intuition and innate knowledge, Confucius wanted a virtuous person with traits of self-deprecation and humility. These were learnt through the knowledge and practice of rituals; to develop self-knowledge and discipline, to carry themselves with grace, and to act always with integrity, which meant to speak correctly. On this last point, this did not just refer to public speaking; Confucius was concerned that names no longer were signifying their original meanings. He insisted on the gentleman knowing correct and proper names, and not using the tricks of rhetoric and partisanship. Though Confucius had physical activities as part of his system of education, morality was the most important subject. Virtue was heaven-sent, while humaneness could be taught and cultivated through mentoring, or learning by example. Character traits were developed in relationships with others. Learning and reflection were the basic tasks in education, but there must be a balance between the two; like Aristotle, Confucius thought that there must be a harmony with the virtues, as “he who learns but does not think is lost; too much reflection without learning, then one is in great danger” (2.15). In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Though ritual is important, Confucius does stress practical outcomes in harmony with theoretical ones, and that knowing that you do not know is the beginning of learning
- Is Confucius’s argument that humaneness, based on the knowledge that personal character is the consequence of cultivating one’s relationships with others, a coherent one?
- Is the premise that humaneness can be taught, true?
- Confucius’s own method of education, as represented by the text, is an interesting contrast to Western teaching style. There are no long discourses, but brief comments and examples
- Can Confucius be criticized for showing inappropriate deference toward elders, especially male ones?

Lao Tzu: *Tao Te Ching***5. Explain and discuss with reference to *wu wei* the claim that a “good runner/traveller” (wanderer) leaves no tracks.**

This question invites an explanation and discussion of doing things without interfering with the surroundings. It is the idea of *wu wei*, non action, of contemplative tranquillity that allows everything to be done without disturbing the existing harmony. Section 27 of the *Tao Te Ching* goes on to comment that “guards need no keys”, “mathematicians no abacus”, and “a speaker need not argue”. By taking a stance of *wu wei*, a larger perspective of events or situations are seen. Rather than focusing on the detail, it is seen as a whole, a larger context is appreciated and therefore a more holistic response can be developed. This holistic approach is more in balance with the *Tao*. It is an attitude of observing, evaluating and judging rather than acting and interfering. It is striving to be universal and knowing the *Tao*. In knowing the *Tao* no harm will result. The “good runner/traveller” leaving no tracks is not as competitive as the world about him/her; “good runners/travellers” are not obsessive, materialistic or self-seeking. By seeking the *Tao* one knows what one does not know and therefore one appreciates one’s own ignorance. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Does the recommendation of Lao Tzu to practise *wu wei* transcend cultures?
- How realistic is this light touch in our highly competitive world?
- Is the claim “whoever knows that he does not know, is supreme” naivety or common sense in our knowledge-driven world?
- Is Lao Tzu’s position so abstract/metaphysical that it could not realistically be justified?

6. To what extent are the qualities of the “man of calling” (the sage, *sheng ren*) desirable?

This question seeks an evaluation of the central issue of Lao Tzu’s work; the qualities that should be possessed by *sheng ren* and whether an individual is better for striving to acquire these qualities. Essentially the basic qualities are to put away worldliness and individual desires. He (*sheng ren*) becomes almost saint-like. Yet seemingly in contradiction, he becomes spontaneous. This is the secret of a life orientated toward the *Tao*. “Spontaneous” here implies no control, direction or premeditated plan or material objective. This striving might be seen as the ultimate goal of life itself. By holding back it would seem the individual is letting life live itself. *Wu wei* is allowed to happen. This allows receptiveness to life’s forces. Life therefore becomes good, selfless, “non-existent” and “empty”. For *sheng ren* these qualities are not nothingness but a reaching to the *Tao*; there is no negation but an affirmation, not “being” but “becoming”. Therefore the humbleness of *sheng ren* is not weakness but strength. *Sheng ren* takes no sides, does not place himself in a right or wrong position, but flows with the *Tao* – the way –, in harmony with nature. A counter position could be presented in that the *sheng ren* is naive and not fit to rule or even live in a competitive industrialized world. The saintliness of the person would lead to exploitation and in fact failure and possible dependence on others. In the world of individualism *sheng ren*’s qualities might not be valued at all. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Is becoming Lao Tzu’s Man of Calling achievable, or merely an ideal?
- Does an approach of *wu wei* make sense in the “urban jungle” of the 21st century?
- How much would the saintliness of *sheng ren* be respected and valued today?

Plato: *The Republic*, Books IV–IX

7. Explain and discuss the idea that the Form of the Good is the goal of dialectic.

The question asks for an explanation and discussion of the Form of the Good starting from its role as the aim of dialectic. The Form of the Good is characteristically named as the goal of dialectic (534b–c; *cf.* 532a), being the non-hypothetical beginning at the top of the Divided Line. Here the dialectic is linked to the ability to form an overview of every other subject (537c). Dialectic in Plato’s work started as a mode of getting clear about the way things are through the medium of conversation, and became the method of his philosophy. Practically everywhere in *The Republic* Plato outlines both the revolutionary political reforms he seeks to make and the classic form of his metaphysical theory, which in turn includes two threads, the new theory of philosophical method (dialectic), and the entities that method lets discover (the Forms). Understanding of Forms, and above all of the Good, the keystone of the system of Forms, is thus the essential condition of political order. The philosopher king, whose mind has been prepared for abstract thought about Forms by rigorous and comprehensive study of mathematics, is the only person with the knowledge and virtue necessary for producing harmony in society. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Intellectual training giving the ability to reason dialectically (511b–c, 533c–535a)
- Dialectic: pure thinking that “avails itself of nothing sensible but only of Forms, going by way of Forms to Forms and ending in Forms” (511c)
- Forms: the ultimate object of a philosopher’s search for knowledge, a kind of being that is quite unlike the familiar objects of the phenomenal world. Forms are eternal and changeless, eminently and exclusively whatever it is, not qualified in time or place or relation or respect
- Dialectic: by contrast with mathematics, neither rests content with hypotheses nor uses sensory images (510b, 511b–d). It investigates its own basic principles until it has arrived at an unhypothetical starting-point (510b, 511b); Socrates calls this investigation the work of “destroying hypotheses” (533c)
- A central role of the dialectic is to discover a philosophical foundation for mathematics. Ascending from the hypotheses amounts to finding more fundamental principles from which they can be derived. The unhypothetical beginning will be a kind of basic axiom which required no proof, from which every truth about the Forms and about mathematics can be derived
- After defining his mathematical curriculum, Plato returns to dialectic, the final phase of a philosopher’s education (531d–537d). Once it has been shown that the best guardians were progressing toward dialectic, the argument for the philosophical city would be completed.

8. Explain and discuss Plato's conception of the soul.

The question asks for an explanation of the picture of the human soul which appears gradually in *The Republic*. According to a standard presentation, the parts or element of the soul are: appetite (*epithumetikós*), emotion (*thumós*) and reason (*lógos*). In analysing the soul into these three parts, *The Republic* is offering both a theory of human motivation and a theory of the constitution and structure of the embodied human soul. The theory of motivation demarcates a rational form of motivation as well as two non-rational forms. However, the soul, for Plato, is not just a principle of psychological states and activities such as thoughts, desires, and emotions. For Plato, the soul is itself the subject of psychological predicates: it is the soul itself that thinks, desires, and experiences emotions. *The Republic's* theory of the constitution and structure of the soul visualizes it as a composite entity, composed of three parts with their own ways of acting and being acted on; each with its own concerns, its own distinctive way of desiring, and its own emotions. Further, the analysis of the soul includes the parallelism between the structure of the souls and the structure of the city. Socrates applies to the individual soul his account of justice as it applies to the city. The soul contains three parts that correspond to the three classes of citizens (economic, military, governing) in the good city (*cf.* 441c 4–7). This state of political justice consists in the social harmony achieved when each class performs its own function. Accordingly justice and happiness for an individual are secured when each of the parts of the soul performs the role it should in mutual harmony. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The parallelism between justice in the individual soul and justice in the city which runs throughout *The Republic*
- The idea of justice. Justice as virtue or moral excellence in individual persons. Justice is in the best interests of the just person, even if it brings nothing ordinarily recognizable as happiness or success
- The well-organized soul, which Socrates calls just by analogy with the just city, is the healthy soul. A soul is in order when its reason rules, courageous when its emotional part acts bravely, moderate when all three parts accept the rule of reason
- Forms of unjust political order (oligarchy, democracy and tyranny), and corresponding conditions of increasing disorder, in the soul
- Whether the analysis of justice in the city serves only as an analogy to illuminate justice in the individual soul, or whether is it the other way around
- Does the notion of justice have ethical content or is it merely a formal characteristic of souls?
- To what extent is analysing political issues as individual (psychological or ethical) issues adequate?
- Whether Plato's analysis shows the correspondence between being a virtuous, just person and following objective rules
- How can we know how, and on what grounds, the soul of an individual adheres to rules?

René Descartes: *Meditations*

9. Explain and discuss Descartes's view of the nature of the mind.

The question asks for an explanation and discussion of the nature of the mind according to Descartes. It asks in the first place for Descartes's account of mind as developed in Meditation II, where he uses the method of doubt to develop his notion of the mind, in three stages. (1) He knows that he exists, the result of the *cogito*: "I have found it: it is thinking; this alone cannot be taken away from me. I am, I exist, that is certain. But for how long? For as long as I think, for certainly it could happen that if I cease to think entirely, I thereby entirely cease to be. I now do not admit anything unless it is necessarily true." (2) He is a thinking thing: "I am then strictly speaking only a thinking thing, that is, a mind, spirit, intellect or reason, words whose meaning was previously unknown to me. I am a real thing, and really exist, but what kind of thing? I have said it, a thinking thing." (3) Thinking includes a wide range of activities: "I am something that doubts, understands, affirms, denies, wills, is unwilling, and also imagines and senses." Associated with this depiction of the mind is the distinction between the mind and the body, one of Descartes's most celebrated positions. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Descartes's conception of the mind results from reshaping the boundaries between the mental and the physical in view of his commitment to mechanistic science
- Intellectual activity is an operation of the human soul alone, which requires that this soul is a subsistent entity, an entity that exists in its own right, and that can exist without the body
- Descartes expands the conception of the mind to will, imagination, *etc*; and narrows the role of the soul by making it the principle of thought and removing from it various traditional functions: nutrition, growth, motion
- Descartes thought that his own expansion of the scope of scientific explanation strengthened the defence of the immortality of the soul
- "By the sensations of pain, hunger, thirst and so on I am not merely present in my body as a sailor is present in a ship, but that I am very closely and, as it were, intermingled with it, so that I and the body form a unit" (Meditation VI)
- The mind is joined to the body in one specific place: the pineal gland, a single gland at the base of the brain, in which interaction takes place
- The Cartesian attempt to secure the legitimacy of knowledge finding its principle point of reference in the identity of the self-conscious subject
- The wide discussion with different positions regarding mind–body relations and interactions.

10. Evaluate the claim that knowledge of God plays a central role in the epistemological argument of the *Meditations*.

The question asks for an evaluation of the role of theistic conceptions in the epistemological argument of the *Meditations*, requiring an exploration of the Cartesian proofs for the existence of God. Descartes develops two main arguments for the existence of God – the causal argument of Meditation III and the ontological argument of Meditation V, leaving open questions about the order and relation between them. The line of argument of the *Meditations* requires establishing not merely the existence of God, but the existence of a certain kind of God, namely one who is supremely perfect and is the creator of all things. Only then can one who meditates be assured that he/she was created by an omnibenevolent being who would endow him or her with a faculty for attaining truth and who would not deceive. Both of Descartes’s arguments are adapted from traditional proofs. The causal argument presents a resemblance to the traditional cosmological argument. Descartes intended his theistic proofs to be quite simple, if indeed he regarded them as proofs at all. What matters for him is that the meditator acquires the proper clear and distinct perceptions. It seems decisive then to induce these perceptions in the meditator in an order that he thinks will best engender knowledge. This is important because one is tempted to force each of Descartes’s statements into the form of a premise, when what he is trying to do is to underpin his statements, from which only some might be seen as premises, being simple and few in numbers. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The ontological argument attempts to prove God’s existence from the fact that we define “God” as a being no greater than that which can be conceived
- The causal and ontological arguments proceed from the idea of God, an idea that is sufficiently rich to satisfy the epistemic needs of the Cartesian project and the theological requirements of religion
- The innateness of the idea of God is central to both the causal argument, which purports to show that God causes our idea of Him by implanting it in us at creation, and to the ontological argument, which is centered on the distinction between innate and fictitious ideas
- These two arguments for the existence of God play a central role in the validation of reason, and have implications on the further development of the arguments in the *Meditations*, eg, guaranteeing the existence of the world
- God as the first cause of motion and the sustainer of motion in the world
- The validation of reason, central as it is to Descartes’s project in the *Meditations*, seems to be circular: the validation of reason in Meditation IV depends on the proof of the existence of God which, in turn, depends on the proof of the existence of the self as a thinking thing
- Critiques to the ontological argument, eg, existence is not a predicate.

John Locke: *Second Treatise on Government***11. Explain and discuss the advantages for human society of moving from a state of nature into civil society.**

This question offers a chance to explore the key appeal for Locke of moving from a state of nature, which has many positive features, into a civil society in which a contract exists between free citizens. In contrast to his predecessor, Hobbes, Locke does not regard the state of nature *per se* as a negative state. It is a state of natural liberty granted by God and, due to our equal status in the eyes of God, in the state of nature we are actually granted equal treatment and freedom. It certainly is not characterized at the outset by the state of war attached to it by Hobbes, but it does have the potential to go wrong and unravel. Due to the issue of property, humans in society need protection from the possibility of theft of their property, or the products of their labour (also their property) being abused. Persons are safer to enter into a contract as only the civil society that ensues can guarantee authority to protect – absent from the state of nature which carries no civil authority. The state of nature pertains to moral communities like the family. Civil society represents a political stage when persons agree to surrender certain freedoms and powers granted by the law of nature, and hand the previously private powers to public government. A possible reason for leaving the state of nature is to guarantee the fair treatment of those who might be exploited by the strong. Despite the contract existing between individuals (as opposed to between the governed and the government) it is through the establishment of the contract that the will of the majority, represented by government, takes force. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The role of property in the forming of civil society
- The emergence of law and the management of laws in civil society
- The desirability of some aspects of life in the state of nature, but the need for protection in society with multiple “owners” of property
- Locke’s assumption about the inexhaustibility of resources
- The importance of the advantage of peace arising from the social contract
- The civil society enables the preservation of the “commonwealths” and the essential guarantee of prosperity thanks to the preservation of property
- The guarantee of equability in punishment
- The return to the state of nature is an option for Locke – what conditions would pertain and make this desirable?

12. Explain and discuss the role that the concept of property plays in the *Treatise*.

This question invites an explanation and a discussion of the central concept of property in Locke's *Treatise*. For Locke it is clear that the issue of property lies at the heart of the need for civil society and at the root of his political thought. For Locke, property is not just the material goods that are accumulated by people (especially in family units). In fact, property is characterized as the product of humans mixing their labour with the God-given natural resources available to them. This caused a controversial view that because early American settlers were farmers, they had more rights to the land of North America than the Native Americans whom Locke did not regard as having property, because they did not farm the natural world around them. Because of the central role of the sovereignty humans have over their property, many thinkers see in Locke a thorough-going capitalism, which focuses on an aggressive individualism based on the power to work and then own. Alan Ryan disagrees and says that among other aspects of property is the famously-quoted "right to life and liberty". Issues arise about Locke's concept of labour and the rights humans have to mix their labour with natural resources or raw materials. Where does the pursuit of happiness or the demand for equality, liberty and well-being sit precisely with the ownership of property? How can Locke guarantee fair distribution of property availability in a situation of increasingly scarce natural material available for humans to acquire as property? What of wage-labour as opposed to property-labour? These issues enable an evaluation especially of the place of property in political society, but for Locke property can exist in the state of nature as well, governed, as it is, by laws of nature. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- What property would have been in the pre-political state of the state of nature?
- The place of property in the formation of civil society and the need for protection
- Locke's concept of work/labour and production
- The importance of the concept of mixing our labour with raw materials around us and the resultant combination entailing property – does this mean we can simply aggrandize whatever natural thing we see around us? (eg, Nozick)
- Can we work but not own the resulting property? (eg, servants)
- What are the limits to the amount we can own? What is our fair share?
- The scarcity of land and its influence on the emergence of civil society
- Locke's view of money
- Locke and taxation
- What happens to property when civil society is threatened?

John Stuart Mill: *On Liberty*

13. Evaluate the claim that cultivation of individuality is essential for progress.

This question asks for an evaluation of the role of the concept of individuality in determining social progress. For Mill, individuality was the necessary and sufficient condition for progress, and by progress Mill did not just mean a material one but a moral one, and for the benefit of the many. By individuality, Mill was referring to a person's character; the traits of originality, inventiveness, self-assurance, curiosity, and courage. Their contribution, according to Mill, was to experiment in new ways of living, or expressing their creativity and originality in art, science, *etc.* In order to cultivate these traits, certain conditions are necessary: first, freedom of speech and thought. Without the ability to discuss with others radical ideas and concepts, or new arrangements in living, in an atmosphere of freedom, then the loss to the individual and society is considerable. The next feature is that he/she must have the liberty to put these ideas into practice. Mill also associates a lack of individuality in civilizations and cultures with their decline and eventual fall; without the geniuses, the eccentrics, and the inventive, the moral and intellectual vibrancy of a culture wanes and stagnates. Without choice to exercise the rational faculties, the individual cannot select the best way of life for him/herself if there are limitations on the choices. Without exercising our rational faculties necessary to select our good life, we lose some capacity to make proper assessments and decisions. If groups claim that other types of living are wrong, harmful or immoral, without engaging in a debate, then they are making a claim for infallibility. Without variety in ways of living, the choices available diminish. There are no new ideas, and no role models for others to emulate. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- With regards to individuality, Mill adopts the language of virtue ethics in his description of valuable character traits. Does this create a tension with his earlier stated position of utility as the guiding moral principle?
- Mill does not give the individual total license for action, as the Harm Principle and a collective set of norms learned from past experiences limit the experiments in living
- Though Mill describes a wholly rational individual, with complete self-autonomy, does this apply to most of the citizens? Is his advice to follow those wiser than yourself in uncertain situations another way of saying that when in doubt, conform?
- Just because some ideas, *eg*, human eugenics, have been discredited as a guide to intelligence or “superiority”, does that mean that they necessarily disappear as an option to some? Where does the authority to discredit ideas emerge?
- Are there private acts that are so offensive or dangerous that, even if there is no direct harm to others, these acts should still be prohibited? Would Mill's society necessarily allow for euthanasia, drug use, fascist and racist ideas, *etc*?

14. Evaluate the Harm Principle as a limitation on actions and speech that is necessary for a happy life.

This question asks for an evaluation of the Harm Principle, the essential principle on the limitation of action upon others, either deliberately, or inadvertently, in order to have a good life. Mill believed that the best life for an individual is one which engages his/her rational faculties: to deliberate, assess, and reflect on making choices for her life now, and for the future. In regards to our actions, Mill makes a moral distinction between self-regarding acts and other-regarding acts. Though we are free to persuade, dissuade, cajole, admonish, and advise, we cannot stop a rational individual from harming themselves. Over themselves, rational individuals are sovereign. The only qualification to the principle is in regard of children, the insane and on “backward societies”. A central structural feature is Mill’s categorical approach: potential restrictions are placed in the categories of offence, paternalistic, moralistic, and those actions actually, or in immediate threat, of causing harm to others, when the Harm Principle dictates that the state intervene with sanctions. Mill is not a true libertarian in that he does not think liberty is a right that we intrinsically have a right to possess at all times; indeed, there are occasions when harm is a consequence of an action, but the cost of prevention may be too high to warrant intervention. There are occasions when the state has a right to enact laws that limit liberty when there is no potential harm to others such as the right to tax for social welfare and infrastructure, providing compulsory education, subsidizing the arts, *etc.* These do not prevent direct harm to others, but provide benefits. Serving on juries or giving evidence in a trial is an example where the state does have a right to impose a sanction where the absence of action leads to a harm in the process of law, and the accused directly, and the individual has a duty to a social obligation. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Whether Mill distinguishes clearly enough between harm and offence. Just as there are occasions when the principle is invoked when harm is either absent or minimal, are there occasions when invoking the principle for paternalistic acts which are beneficent, is not in the interests of an agent?
- Mill has not considered the harm to traditions and ways of life if the society is in constant growth and change. Is Mill’s preferred level of individualism and love of progress harmful to society?
- Mill’s argument assumes that individuals will possess the correct amount of self-control and act for the greater good. Does he credit individuals with too much self-awareness and self-discipline?
- Individual actions often have subsequent social and financial costs to society as a whole; drug-taking is physically harmful directly and immediately to the individual, but there are possible medical, legal, and penal costs to society, apart from the concern of those who care for the agent
- Mill is criticized for delineating benefits from a paternalistic or elitist perspective
- Is there a conflict between Mill’s stated basis of utility as the qualification of moral action, and his subsequent defence of the rights of the individual?

Friedrich Nietzsche: *The Genealogy of Morals***15. Evaluate Nietzsche's idea of punishment and its origin.**

This question focuses on a central Nietzschean concept, which offers the opportunity to analyse several aspects of *The Genealogy of Morals*. The concept of punishment should be described as other concepts within a historical and genealogical framework. The evolutionary principles, which Nietzsche extrapolates from Paul Rée, might be taken into account, since the origin of punishment and, generally, of the ideas of good and evil, is historical and social. The question also invites a view of the differences among the several meanings of the concept of punishment, linked to the will to power, debt, and guilt – as Nietzsche develops from an etymological standpoint. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Are there different uses and meanings of punishment?
- Is punishment linked to social behavior?
- Is there any room for an evolutionary explanation of punishment?
- Nietzsche's distinction between fact and value in an act
- Nietzsche's methodology of deriving historical and semantic understanding from an evolutionary standpoint (eg, the influence of Rée)
- Is punishment connected to Nietzsche's distinction between a thing and its meaning?

16. Evaluate Nietzsche’s claim that the slave revolt in morality is linked to *ressentiment*.

This question seeks an evaluation of the central concept of Nietzsche’s morality. The “slave revolt” topic gives the opportunity to analyse the difference between two main powers: creative and reactive. Also, the importance of the Greek origin of the dichotomy good/evil related to slave/master or noble could be presented and discussed. The concept of *ressentiment* arises out of social or class conflicts, which have expression in value judgments, such as happy, fortunate, and so on. The question might lead to a wide analysis of the concepts of truth and reality and their reversal operated because of resentment. Finally, the question invites a discussion about the evasion of the present reality in favour of a future, metaphysical one, rendering humanity less creative and lowering it to mediocrity. A basic key point is the connection made by Nietzsche between resentment and religion, especially Christianity, which tends to invert the traditional Greek-Roman values scale, putting the last as first, making a virtue of poverty, and taking into account the unhealthy or weak people. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Whether morality mirrors social or class conflicts
- Creativity as the basic human power
- Nietzsche’s treatment of traditional values
- Are values just transmitted or embodied in living existences?
- Do resentment and envy demonstrate the emotional origin of morality?

Bertrand Russell: *The Problems of Philosophy*

17. “The senses seem not to give us the truth about the table itself, but only about the appearance of the table.” Discuss and evaluate Russell’s claim concerning reality, appearance, and what he calls physical objects.

This question focuses on a central issue of philosophy: what is reality? It invites a discussion of what Russell means by sense-data (the impressions on our senses), sensations (the operation or experience of having a piece of sense-data), physical objects and matter (existence of independent elements, distinct from ideas and mind). It also calls for a wider analysis of traditional issues, such as the concept of nature and reality. Reference to Descartes’s *cogito* and the difference between *res extensa* and *res cogitans* might be useful, especially with respect to Russell’s distinction between public and private experience. The issue concerning the existence of physical objects recalls other traditional philosophical arguments, such as the dispute between realists and nominalists or the oneiric and solipsistic theories. Kant’s transcendental aesthetic and the use of the categories of space and time might offer another path of reflection to describe what sense-data are and how perception works in grasping them. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Is it possible to prove reality?
- Is truth connected to instinctive beliefs?
- Russell’s treatment of sense-data and their relation to the objects which cause them
- Are there any risks in using an acceptance criterion for truth?
- Do sensations play any role for our knowledge of reality?

18. Evaluate Russell’s idea of truth and falsehood and the “requisites which any theory must fulfil”.

This question arises out of the central philosophical debate on truth and falsehood. The argument should refer to the three requisites indicated by Russell – relation between truth and falsehood, truth as property of beliefs, beliefs related to outer things – or to Russell’s general idea of truth as necessarily connected to its opposite, falsehood. The analysis of the concept of coherence could also be presented and discussed, with reference to Russell’s counter-arguments. The definition of the concept of belief, with respect to the difference between judging and believing, is another possible point to raise. The argument might conclude or underline the fact that in Russell’s view it is not possible to create truth or falsehood, but beliefs only, whose truth or falsehood depend upon facts. So, every theory of truth must take falsehood into account. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Is it possible to admit the existence of universal truths?
- Is coherence sufficient for truth?
- The influence of ideology and the notion of internal coherence private to the individual
- Is there any connection between truth and beliefs?
- Are facts a sufficient criterion for establishing the truth of beliefs?

Hannah Arendt: *The Human Condition***19. Evaluate Arendt's claim that "nobody is the author or producer of their own life story".**

This question seeks an evaluation of the degree to which humans need others. Life is to be made and lived with others in common activity; *praxis*. Therefore we cannot "make" ourselves, but need others to do things with. The *homo faber* of the human condition is restricted to material production and is a lesser component in the making of oneself. Similarly, "labour" is merely survival activities and not a development of self. It is wrong to assume that in isolation humans can gain "being". It is necessary for them to be in concert with others so that a dialogue can happen, and so by enacting the social nature of humans we develop ourselves. The two aspects of the human, the private and public realms have to be balanced with a sense of knowing and becoming oneself through the public realm. The rationale for this is that in the life of "action" and of "doing" humans become free. This freedom is authentic as it is empowered by others. It is through this freedom that meaning is acquired and therefore without others one cannot develop one's story. Humans are social beings and as such, self-development is dependent on being in a social arena: an arena of language, mutuality and doing. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Does dependence upon others create or decrease psychological insecurity?
- Can humans escape the modern day pressures to "work" and have time to build meaningful relationships with the other?
- Arendt's view of the public space, influenced by classical conceptions of civic life and the public and private
- Can meaning be found in a consumer/market-driven society? Is "more" a measure of goodness and success?
- Could *homo faber* be the more defining feature of human condition and not dialogue?

20. Evaluate the role of the *polis* in Arendt's understanding of the human condition.

This question focuses on the third aspect of *vita activa*: action. It is at the *polis* where action should take place. Originating from the place in the ancient world where political discourse happened, it has become the focus and space in which general human discourse and debate should take place. With the onset of modernity the argument is put that this dialogic nature of the human condition has become dominated or even superseded by “labour” and more so “work”. The enactment of action within a defined “space” is in essence the interaction of people in the public realm; it is the demonstration of humans as political, social animals, which Arendt argues is being lost and “withered away”. The enactment of action within the *polis* is the very essence of humanness in that there is a mutuality and natality. Action within the *polis* goes beyond language and towards “doing”; “doing” becomes superior to “being”. This action is power. For Arendt the modern consumer-orientated society has produced alienation as there is no *polis*; there is no space in which humans can gather. Humans have become isolated and focused on production and materialism. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- A counter to Arendt's view is that work and materialism can be seen as superior to human discourse and dialogue, as it might improve the physical condition of humans
- As the *polis* might only be a point of interaction and might not necessarily be a physical space, have advances in social networking internet sites created an alternative public realm?
- How much is the *polis* a place of the past because of pressure on the use of time rather than on rise of the private realm?

Simone de Beauvoir: *The Ethics of Ambiguity*

21. **“‘If God is dead everything is permitted’ is an incorrect assumption, as humans must face responsibility alone.” Discuss and evaluate de Beauvoir’s claim.**

This question seeks an evaluation as to whether, with the assumption of the death of God and the consequences of an end to divine pardoning for wrongdoing, there might be an increased responsibility for humans. The fear of this increased responsibility might often be seen as an existentialist angst; the fear of ultimate freedom. This freedom does not give a freedom of action, but creates inevitable individual responsibility. For de Beauvoir this ethical freedom is not in isolation but dependent upon the enactment of freedom for others. The anxiety that humans have develops as one moves out of adolescence; with maturation comes responsibility. The difference between ontological freedom and ethical freedom might be developed so as to make clear that the responsibilities that have to be faced are based upon mutual recognition of one’s interaction with others. A discussion of bad conscience and the weakness of humans who are dependent upon a god and the metaphysical, for moral guidance might be presented. Humans might revert to belief in a god to relieve themselves of full responsibility for their actions. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- De Beauvoir builds upon Nietzschean and Dostoevskian views of moral behaviour, but how far can a rejection of objective ethical codes be possible in a complex community?
- The influences of gender, age and environment on the development of human responsibility
- Does mutual recognition and interactivity establish collective responsibility?
- How can humans free themselves of the fear of taking responsibility?

22. Explain and discuss the extent to which an individual is defined by their relationship to the world and to others.

This question invites an explanation and discussion of the perceived ambiguity that exists for humans in the interaction with the world and others. The relationship of these two is dependent upon the interweaving of individual moral obligations. All actions are freely taken, but should be in response to understanding the aim of the actions, which should be to increase the corresponding moral freedom of others within the world. All actions, be they with the environment or with fellow humans, are not random or irrational and are not free without consequence; they must be actions that reflect choices that consider the consequence upon the freedom of others. Through a concern for the freedom of others, meaning in the world is disclosed and this meaning involves mutuality. Our actions must not be self-centred nor aimed at using others as means to our own freedom, but should be to enhance the freedom of others. The meaning that we seek in life comes not from external sources of value, but from spontaneous choices of action that reflect our responsibilities as rational beings. Through this approach we can move toward an authentic moral attitude. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- How far can the individual always consider others before acting? Spontaneous action might indeed be selfishly driven
- To what extent can others always only be seen as ends in themselves?
- Does responsibility always come hand in hand with freedom?
- Do we all seek meaning or are most humans content with material prosperity as a source of contentment?

Charles Taylor: *The Ethics of Authenticity*

23. Evaluate the ways in which instrumental reason is connected to our disenchantment with the world.

This question asks for a discussion of Taylor's concept of instrumental reason. Taylor includes in his list of the modern malaises a new way of thinking, which replaces older ones, which he calls "instrumental reason". This form of thinking develops the sense of disenchantment of the world that he addresses in the text. He describes this reasoning as aiming for maximal efficiency in all that we do, especially in economic measures of the way we lead our modern lives and value things and activity around us. This reasoning involves a shift towards individualism and a throwing away of the old and recognized paths to contentment or social structure, including the old order governed by God. The debate ensues about the significance of others in a world in which people and things are regarded primarily as instruments to be used in the pursuit of narrow economic and efficient goals. Where it could be argued that deference towards the past inhibits personal freedom and expression, Taylor warns about how such a process of thinking about the world threatens to overwhelm modern humans as they are overtaken by the permanence of things they create, which in the old days would have been shared enterprises and not outliving the use for which they were designed. The great theme is that of individualism and the goals and well-being of individuals, however loosely connected. In the new thinking other individuals can be used for our own purposes, thus becoming instruments towards our own goals. Technology, and the awe in which it is held in modernity, is used as an example. Taylor speaks about a flattening of human aspirations and the obsession with devices over activity, echoing the work of Arendt. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Whether individualism is the enemy of a full picture of human interaction
- Must individualism always be accompanied by using others instrumentally?
- The means-to-an-end reasoning embodied by instrumental reasoning resulting in the justification of inequalities of wealth distribution
- Relationships weakened through economic transactions with narrow purposes in mind
- Whether modern social structures force a weakening of more traditional relations in the community
- Forces in modern society: the market, the state
- Instrumental reason as forcing a simplistic explanation or interpretation of the human condition
- What forces militate against such reasoning in the modern world? See the anti-globalism movement, *etc*
- Authenticity as the way to overcome such instrumental reasoning
- The opportunity to rediscover a moral sphere of civilization that can restate our common understanding
- Examples in contemporary society criticizing institutional instrumentalism, *eg*, the demand for more openness in government, the world of finance, media, foreign policy.

24. Explain and discuss the claim that reason can be applied in opposition to the modern tendency towards relativism and neutrality.

This question invites a discussion about Taylor's view of reason and relativism. Taylor sees the criticism of modernity by reactionaries as often simplistically raising the demon of relativism. Taylor is not intent on challenging all aims of modernity, in its insistence on rights, subjectivity and the importance of the individual, but he warns against relativism and neutrality used as key weaponry in a battle to ensure mutual respect. Taylor dismisses neutrality as a useful position from which to regard society and its structures and manifestations. He underlines that even neutrality and relativism stem from a moral viewpoint, so society is not reduced to a new position of being “morally zero”. There is debate about the grounds of our moral life, be it in facts of existence or in a more ideal sphere like that espoused by Taylor with the ideal of authenticity. Taylor asserts that the ideal can be argued for rationally, however. Taylor’s insistence on reasoning and argument militate against the kind of relativism that denies the basis for such argument. But does Taylor successfully demonstrate that reason can lead to values outside the individual, as posed as a challenge by Hume? In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Taylor’s handling of relativism
 - The link between relativism and neutrality
 - The criticism of authenticity by those who see moral life as grounded in facts of existence as opposed to an ideal like authenticity
 - The debate in the arts about self-expression *versus* realism
 - “Horizons of significance” enable a slide to relativism and neutrality in values
 - Such horizons are not to be broken down or nullified as is the modern tendency, but in the end even self-choosing without regard to traditional horizons is not done from a morally neutral position
 - Dialogue with others must take on board the rise of individual expression, but if characterized by relativism will reduce to meaninglessness
 - Does Taylor prove an objective world of values? Does he make the case for reason being able to grasp an objective realm of moral significance and value?
 - In the end is Taylor dependent on a religious world view to uphold his account of the use of reason to determine value and authenticity?
-