

Markscheme

November 2017

Philosophy

Higher level and standard level

Paper 1

This markscheme is the property of the International Baccalaureate and must **not** be reproduced or distributed to any other person without the authorization of the IB Global Centre, Cardiff.

How to use the Diploma Programme Philosophy markscheme

The assessment markbands constitute the formal tool for marking examination scripts, and in these assessment markbands 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 assessment markbands listed on pages 7 and 8 for the core theme and page 11 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 referred to in the various assessment markbands published in the subject guide, reflecting an engagement with philosophical activity throughout the course. As a tool intended to help examiners in assessing responses, the following points should be kept in mind when using a markscheme:

- The Diploma Programme Philosophy course is designed to encourage the skills of doing philosophy in the candidates. These skills can be accessed through reading the assessment markbands in the subject guide
- The markscheme does not intend to outline a model/correct 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 but rather an indicative list where they might appear in the answer
- If there are names of philosophers and references to their work incorporated into the markscheme, this should help to give context for the examiners and does *not* reflect a requirement that such philosophers and references should appear in an answer: They are possible lines of development.
- 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
- Examiners should be aware of the command terms for Philosophy as published on page 54 of the Philosophy subject guide when assessing responses
- 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 by the stimulus, is *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.

Note to examiners

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 markbands

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response is poorly structured, or where there is a recognizable essay structure there is minimal focus on the task. • The philosophical issue raised by the stimulus material is implied but not explicitly identified. There is minimal or no explanation of how the issue relates to the stimulus material or links to the question of what it is to be human. • There is little relevant knowledge demonstrated, and the explanation is superficial. Philosophical vocabulary is not used, or is consistently used inappropriately. • The essay is descriptive and lacking in analysis.
6–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some attempt to follow a structured approach although it is not always clear what the answer is trying to convey. • The philosophical issue raised by the stimulus material is implied but not explicitly identified. There is some limited explanation of how the issue relates to the stimulus material or links to the question of what it is to be human. • Knowledge is demonstrated but lacks accuracy and relevance, and there is a basic explanation of the issue. Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately. • There is some limited analysis but the response is more descriptive than analytical. There is little discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view. Few of the main points are justified.
11–15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a clear attempt to structure the response, although there may be some repetition or a lack of clarity in places. • The philosophical issue raised by the stimulus material is explicitly identified. There is a basic explanation of how the issue relates to the stimulus material and to the question of what it is to be human. • Knowledge is mostly accurate and relevant, and there is a satisfactory explanation of the issue. Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately. • The response contains analysis, but this analysis lacks development. There is some discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view. Many of the main points are justified.
16–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response is structured and generally organised, and can be easily followed. • The philosophical issue raised by the stimulus material is explicitly identified. There is good justification of how the issue relates to the stimulus material and to the question of what it is to be human. • The response contains accurate and relevant knowledge. There is a good explanation of the issue. Philosophical vocabulary is mostly used appropriately. • The response contains critical analysis. There is discussion and some assessment of alternative interpretations or points of view. Most of the main points are justified.

21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The response is well structured, focused and effectively organised.• The philosophical issue raised by the stimulus material is explicitly identified. There is a well-developed justification of how the issue relates to the stimulus material and to the question of what it is to be human.• The response contains relevant, accurate and detailed knowledge. There is a well-developed explanation of the issue. There is appropriate use of philosophical vocabulary throughout the response.• The response contains well developed critical analysis. There is discussion and assessment of alternative interpretations or points of view. All or nearly all of the main points are justified. The response argues from a consistently held position about the issue.
-------	---

Section A

Core theme: Being human

1. Excerpt from Emotions – the Science of Sentiment

[25]

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

A response to this stimulus might relate to the difference between robots and humans and comments might be made about the fundamental differences which could be seen to centre upon the emotional, reflective traits of humans rather than their rational cognitive aspects. Areas that might be developed could relate to a definition of what makes a machine and contrast this to the attributes of ever increasingly sophisticated machines beginning to challenge simple definitions of machines. The whole issue of relationships with mechanical objects might be questioned in terms of relationships being the wrong concept as it implies mutuality and machines might not have the quality of mutuality. Similarly issues of self-awareness and consciousness could be investigated. Issues of the other and defining objects with agency, as the other, might be developed and consequently concerns about human relationships and relationships with other living or inanimate 'things' might be developed. The claim in the stimulus might be questioned as to whether there is some correlation between intelligence and emotional development. Similarly the idea of intelligence might be questioned in its application to a robot.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Emotion as a feature of humanity and conversely whether the absence of emotions is sufficient to be excluded from humanity
- Machines/robots and rights. Will machines acquire rights?
- Whether reasoning is the defining factor of humans and not emotion. Some machines appear to demonstrate reason; are they becoming human?
- Notions of self-awareness and self-development
- Differing theories of intelligence and particularly emotional intelligence
- Illustration of futuristic societies where machines dominate might be presented
- Fear of mechanisation through human development from Luddites in the early nineteenth century to job loss in the twentieth century to future notions of robots controlling society
- Positive applications of robotics in terms of health care solutions, exploration and maintenance of dangerous areas
- The removal of drudgery creating a flourishing of human creativity.

2. Image: “Just what are your intentions?”**[25]**

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

In response to the stimulus picture candidates might develop a discussion that focuses on issues of relationships, gender issues, gender equality and gender roles in society and the mind-body problem of how we might know what the other is thinking or feeling. The male and female images could generate an investigation of a view of women as objects and then a feminist philosophical position. As there seems to be a slight mirroring of behaviour and particular body positions this might lead to exploration of body language as a way of how we might know the mind of others. The actual title might lead to analysis of how we know people’s intentions and the consequences of our actions. Modern experimental philosophers might be presented to develop arguments about intentionality and the side effects of actions. In contrast, because the two figures are isolated, areas of existentialist angst might be pursued and the loneliness within modern societies might be investigated.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Gender politics
- Existentialist views of the role of women; de Beauvoir and other feminist philosophers
- Cultural variations on the gender roles in society and associated values
- Ways of knowing people’s intentions, thoughts and ideas
- The freedom to choose and act
- Theories of the mind/body
- Knowledge through interaction with others
- Theories of the other; knowledge of the other – the impossibility of making judgements
- Body language theories
- Theories of knowledge of the other, eg Wittgenstein’s Beetle in the Box
- The rising smoke could raise issues of environmental concerns or passive smoking and responsibilities to others resulting in modified behaviour
- Isolated images raise question of human interaction in our modern society; superficiality alongside fear and inability to communicate.

Paper 1 Section B markbands

Mark	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response is poorly structured, or where there is a recognizable essay structure there is minimal focus on the task. The response lacks coherence and is often unclear. • The student demonstrates little relevant knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme. Philosophical vocabulary is not used, or is consistently used inappropriately. • The essay is mostly descriptive. There is no discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view. Few of the main points are justified.
6–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some attempt to follow a structured approach although it is not always clear what the answer is trying to convey. • The student demonstrates knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme, but this knowledge lacks accuracy and relevance. Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately. • There is limited analysis but the response is more descriptive than analytical. There is little discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view. Some of the main points are justified.
11–15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a clear attempt to structure the response although there may be some repetition or a lack of clarity in places. • Knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme is mostly accurate and relevant. Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately. • The response contains analysis, but this analysis lacks development. There is some discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view. Many of the main points are justified.
16–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response is structured and generally organised, and can be easily followed. • The response contains accurate and relevant knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme. Philosophical vocabulary is mostly used appropriately. • The response contains critical analysis. There is discussion and some assessment of alternative interpretations or points of view. Most of the main points are justified.
21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response is well structured, focused and effectively organised. • The response contains relevant, accurate and detailed knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme. There is appropriate use of philosophical vocabulary throughout the response. • The response contains well-developed critical analysis. There is discussion and assessment of alternative interpretations or points of view. All or nearly all of the main points are justified. The response argues from a consistently held position about the issue.

Section B

Optional theme 1: Aesthetics

3. Evaluate the claim that reality can be discovered through art.

[25]

The discussion allows a variety of approaches to be used: Plato disparages art for dealing in illusion rather than reality: All enterprise should seek the Good and the true. Kant argues that art should attempt to capture, without getting involved, the sublime (is that reality?). For Tolstoy art should try to find and convey simple moral and religious truths. Marx perceives that art can have an ideological function, albeit nebulous, yet allow an expression of reality about the human condition and inform the *praxis* of revolution. Formalists extricate art from anything outside the work itself and reject truth as an aesthetic standard. Postmodernists discard the notion of a universal artistic imperative.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Does art reveal reality? What kind of truth if it does? Consequently, is that why we value it?
- Non-representational art does not deal with attempting to capture reality
- Representational art, eg fiction, is not, in the main, concerned with proposing truths, even if it contains some true statements. Perhaps fiction is pleasurable entertainment enabling understanding of reality
- Art should be concerned with intrinsic aesthetic properties – truth is extrinsic to a work of art and therefore art should not pursue truth
- Art is a product of the imagination, concerned with constructing ideal possibilities not recording humdrum facts
- Art should pursue reality as its function is to inform and edify
- There is no universal imperative guiding art
- Art can aim at common realities regarding the human condition
- Art can capture what is shared in varied experiences
- Imagination and truth can coexist
- That we can praise a work of art for its truth-bearing qualities does not imply we must criticise another for not having them
- Croce's assertion that there is no distinction between truth and falsehood although the aesthetic experience itself is real although autonomous in nature
- The creative element of aesthetics for Dewey ensures that truth can be 'reached' when reasoning includes the imaginative aspect of art
- When used as propaganda is art consciously – or subconsciously – moulding 'reality'?
- Does censorship within aesthetics hinder the discovery of artistic truth?
- Art as a means for the social construction of reality
- Art as the means of considering the past.

4. To what extent is art judged because it reflects the mood and/or feelings of the artist?

[25]

Responses might make reference to Croce, Collingwood or Tolstoy as examples of theories that regard 'art proper' (*cf* mere craft or degenerate art) as the product of summarising feeling or as a means of communicating between artist and audience. Candidates might consider whether art is a 'sincere', 'authentic', or even 'genuine' expression of artists' disposition towards the world around them. The view of the artist as emotionally sensitive: Someone who has the capacity to convert inner feelings into a publicly accessible work of art. The intention of artists is relevant in shaping how we should judge their work.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The evaluation of art should restrict itself to focusing on the artwork itself and its intrinsic aesthetic quality, *eg* formalism
- Even if some works of art are best understood as expressions of feeling and emotion, this might not have anything to do with the artist's feelings
- The contributory origins of an art work are independent of the artistic product
- How would we go about finding out artistic intention? Is it interesting and relevant to read artists' writings or memoirs about a work?
- The judgements artists make in creating an artwork involve the application of genre specific techniques towards an evolving conception of the finished product – we can appreciate the artist's practical astuteness
- The intentions of the artist are often not known, but art can be appreciated nevertheless
- Some works of art can have applications to a situation that the artist might not have intended, *eg* Roland Barthes' famous postmodern thesis in talking about meaning and intention in art, that 'the author is dead'
- Art can have an emotionless, impersonal beauty divorced from feelings, *eg* Russell's comparison of mathematics with precisely defined sculpture
- A work could succeed in conveying emotions and feelings but fail as art; entertainment *versus* art
- The role of the observer in the conveyance of feeling in art
- How do we distinguish expressions of feeling which are conveyed by art from those that are not?
- What feelings are expressed by, *eg* nonsense poetry, abstract art, atonal music?
- Are form and structure merely useful devices for the focused expression of feelings or are they important in their own right?

Optional theme 2: Epistemology

5. Evaluate the claim that the limit of a human’s knowledge is the content of her or his mind.

[25]

This question offers the chance to explore different aspects of epistemology, but answers might concentrate on the claims of empiricism, notably Berkeley, that all that one can know is one’s perceptions. Some answers might concentrate on the issue of solipsism which is raised especially in extreme forms of empiricism, but is also addressed in the process Descartes undergoes when putting the content of his thoughts to the test of universal doubt. Kant’s use of the distinction between the *phenomenon* and *noumenon* of an object might be used, as well as the work of Hume which prompted Kant’s own work. Locke also treated the limitations of knowledge in his work. In more recent times Russell addressed the issue of the skepticism which arises from our realisation of the content of our thoughts, prompted by sense data which only the individual can experience.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The various accounts of the origins of the content of one’s mind
- The emphasis in empiricism on experience, but that experience can only be had by the individual (see qualia as an issue in knowledge by the individual)
- The central place of perceptions in empiricism
- The emphasis on introspection and immediate awareness in rationalism
- The notion of the a priori as essential for self-understanding – see the difference between perceptual experience and the mental state of self-belief or self-knowledge
- Berkeley’s idealism
- Hume’s treatment of the origins of knowledge through personal experience and ensuing habits of mind
- Kant’s distinction between the object in itself and what the human mind can know about the object
- Russell’s mitigated skepticism agreeing that there is no external validation of the content of one’s mind
- Solipsism.

6. Discuss and evaluate what is claimed to be knowable through the use of reason alone.

[25]

The tradition of enquiring into knowledge gained solely through the use of reason has been around for centuries with particular work on it done by Plato and Descartes, described as rationalism. In ‘hard’ cases of rationalism there is a claim that only through the use of reason can knowledge claims be justified, the ideas caused by use of perception being relegated to the status of belief. Some empiricists, like Locke and Hume, speak of the work that reason does with knowledge once ideas have been taught or gained through experience. Such philosophers relegate the significance of *a priori* knowledge but do not deny its use; Mill thought that any knowledge was gained *a posteriori*.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Possible fields of knowledge claimed to come through the use of reason alone include mathematics, eg Plato’s slave boy example demonstrating pre-taught mathematical knowledge
- See geometry and algebra as specific mathematical examples
- Intuition and introspection
- Descartes’s “clear and distinct ideas”
- Plato’s theory of the Forms
- Leibniz and the ontological argument, and Leibniz’s ascription of all knowledge to the plan of God
- Knowledge of necessary versus contingent truths
- Reason and certainty
- Does reason only lead to tautological truth?
- Prior conceptual schemes filtering knowledge, eg Kant, Chomsky or culturally dependent knowledge as proposed by Sapir-Whorf
- Kant’s synthetic a priori thesis of knowledge.

Optional theme 3: Ethics

7. Discuss and evaluate the claim that “ethics is more a matter of knowledge and less a matter of decision”. [25]

The question arises from J L Mackie’s claim that he wrote in his *Ethics: Inventing Right and Wrong* (1977). Mackie does not agree with this claim, which is made to criticise the objectivist tradition and the linguistic approach. The question invites an exploration of the basic issues related to the foundation and nature of morals, asking whether ethics is mainly to do with principles, laws, rules, commandments and with the expectation to know them, or it has actually to do with decision-making processes, the involvement of conscience and responsibilities. From different approaches, different interpretations of what good and evil are, follow: *Eg* a matter of knowledge according to the Platonic-Augustinian tradition, or a matter of analysis and evaluations according to the empirical and existentialist approaches. Candidates might refer to one or more approaches and related disputes, *eg* cognitivism and non-cognitivism, objectivism and subjectivism, naturalism and non-naturalism, intuitionism and emotivism. Responses might also take into account the basic concepts of ethics, such as conscience, freedom, will, and/or consider the nature of good/evil and right/wrong, in relation to metaphysical, empirical or existentialist frameworks. Reference to analytical philosophy and linguistic issues might be helpful in order to outline possible interpretations and meanings of good and evil. Another path might follow the assumptions and consequences of one or more religious approaches to moral issues. The exploration of the possible meanings and structures of values and judgments is another possible aspect. Candidates might build their responses by starting from an analysis of Utilitarianism, consequentialism, or Situation Ethics. A possible development might consider the role of emotions or feelings in the decision-making processes or a typical rationalist methodology.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Nature of ethics: Do moral principles exist? Are they universal or relative to a particular situation or culture?
- Good/evil and right/wrong as a matter of knowledge *versus* decision-making processes; linguistic issues, *eg* as in analytical philosophy
- Role of emotions and feelings within morals
- Meanings of values and judgments
- Absolutism *versus* relativism; metaphysical/religious *versus* empirical/existentialist approach; cognitivism *versus* non-cognitivism; objectivism *versus* subjectivism; naturalism *versus* non-naturalism; intuitionism *versus* emotivism; utilitarianism; consequentialism; Situation Ethics; evolutionary ethics.

8. **“What’s the use of a fine house if you haven’t got a tolerable world to put it on?” Discuss and evaluate this claim in relation to one of the areas of applied ethics that you have studied.** [25]

This question enables a treatment of the ethical issues that arise in behaviours in our particular world on this particular planet. The responses might focus on environmental ethics, but might also pursue problems in biomedical ethics or from the problems of the distribution of wealth and ethical responsibilities to humanity. The quote arises from a claim in Thoreau’s *Familiar Letters* (1894). As more recent philosophers have set the issues, eg Jonas, Leopold, Singer, there is a new, compelling assumption that cannot be avoided any longer: Humans are not a separate entity with respect to the planet where they live. Both holistic approaches, such as Leopold’s “land ethic”, and less strict models agree with an organicistic view, in which people are just a part of the whole living planet, a kind of gear in a complex mechanism. Responses might take into account one or more approaches to environmental ethics, biomedical ethics or wealth distribution issues. Candidates might consider an analysis of anthropocentrism and its counter-arguments or refer to theories of responsibilities, particularly applied to current or future generations. Ecology, animal rights, Gaia hypothesis, land and resources exploitation, pollution, distribution of wealth, health provision in different parts of the world, biomedical pressures caused by new technology, are some examples. Reference to the concept of commodity, as outlined by Emerson or Leopold, might be a further path of development. Exploration of past theories about the relationship between humans and nature might help understand some critics, eg Leopold’s and Passmore’s reference to the Abrahamic tradition (ie the Old Covenant) as legacy in any anthropocentric view; or the dispute between Voltaire and Rousseau after the disastrous earthquake in Lisbon (1755); or other perspectives such as in non-Western traditions, eg in Taoism or animism.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Holistic/organicistic approaches, eg Emerson, Leopold, Passmore
- Gaia hypothesis, “land ethic”
- Ecology *versus* exploitation of natural resources
- Pollution; need for new sources of energy; change in customary behaviours, eg food, transportation, waste
- Animal rights
- Rights of future generations; ethics of responsibility, eg Jonas
- Wealth distribution, eg Sen, Singer, Nussbaum
- Biomedical issues, eg Glover, Singer
- Anthropocentrism and its critics
- Reference to religious backgrounds
- Reference to theological views, eg pantheism, panentheism
- Examples of past philosophies of nature, eg Aristotle, Aquinas, Locke, Spinoza, Voltaire, Rousseau, Emerson
- Relationship between humans and nature in non-Western traditions, eg Taoism, animism.

Optional theme 4: Philosophy and contemporary society

9. Evaluate the claim that those who choose to attack and destroy the society of which they are a part should be denied their human rights. [25]

This question gives an opportunity to explore the link between the granting of human rights to people and their actions. This raises the issue as to whether a commitment to the values of a society are a pre-condition for the granting of rights and whether rights are linked to duty and responsibility within society. It could also raise the issue as to whether a rejection of common values might result in the denial of rights. In contrast, a position could be taken by which rights are universal, irrespective of actions and any lack of commitment to common values. Exploration of Mill's position on rights and liberty might be seen to be relevant as well as Rawls's position. Rawls's position that basic liberties and rights might be seen as inalienable could be challenged by an argument that requires reciprocity from individuals to society for rights and liberties to be granted. Mill's 'Harm Principle' might be evoked as a reason to restrict liberty and rights. In contrast Marcuse might be used to justify an attack on society to justify the only effective way to produce change. What constitutes an attack on society might be explored with the consideration that such attacks might be seen from a relativistic perspective. The role of the state in reacting to persons who attack society. The degree to which the state can/should act to restrain or punish individuals who act against society might be developed. Reference might be made to various forms of the social contract, eg Locke, Rousseau, Nozick and the "free rider" problem.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The position of 'home grown terrorists'
- The universality of rights and liberty irrespective of actions or belief
- Degrees of attack could be balanced by degrees of restriction on rights. *Eg* a verbal assault on societal values being seen as more acceptable than a physical assault on society itself
- The social contract
- If assaults on society result in restriction on liberty how then does change take place?
- Are human rights/liberties dependent upon commitment and acceptance?
- Are the granting of rights and liberty by definition unrelated to duties, obligation and responsibilities?
- Do the conditions within a society change the type of action permitted without consequence, such as actions in a time of civil unrest or war?
- Human rights and violence in liberalism, *ie* Zizek's view.

10. Evaluate the claim that the main enemy of women is patriarchy.

[25]

This question invites an exploration of whether patriarchy was, and continues to be, the main factor affecting the status of women in society. Patriarchy is seen as the social, economic and cultural systems that stem from and help create male dominance. Consideration might well be given to differences between cultures and the perception of the role of women. Religious perspectives might be considered; some religious positions define the societal status of women. The effect of industrial/post-industrial societies compared to agrarian societies on the woman's role might be explored. The perspective as to whether it is appropriate for the rights of women to be granted by men, rather than women being seen to be worthy of rights in themselves might be discussed. The idea that woman is the other and perhaps an exploration of the views of, among others, de Beauvoir, might be developed. Women could be seen as a separate class. Is the gender conflict a disguised class conflict? Male dominance in some social structures can be subtle, demonstrated through economic and material factors (pay differentials) or physical and aggressive (sexual violence and deprivation of rights). The separatism approach might be contrasted with those of the postmodern feminism movement; sexual stratification of society compared to notions of equality related to private and public domains: Women control home, children and family well-being in strong working class societies where men remain the main wage earner, consequentially power and influence might not result in equality. Increasing changes in levels and availability of education and employment might be shifting patriarchal dominance. The role of a woman's self-image might be explored in line with the development of postmodern feminism views which link domination to a woman's self-perception, as well as the rejection of one common notion of what a woman is and how she is defined. A possible path might refer to the struggles and achievements that women and feminist movements have brought about.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Societal and cultural differences that affect the status of women
- The role of belief systems and religion in defining the role of women
- Whether economic factors and increasing numbers of 'DINKies' (double income no kids) relationships changes the position of women in society
- The issue of constraints imposed by childbirth and rearing
- Is equality of rights universally understood or culturally dependent
- Feminism and postmodern feminism; achievements and struggles, eg intersectionality
- The shifting role of men in many societies.

Optional theme 5: Philosophy of religion

11. Evaluate the claim that the idea of a deity is innate in all human beings. [25]

The question invites an exploration of the origins of the idea of a deity (it is not a question about whether or not belief in a deity can be justified) and explicitly whether the idea of a deity is an innate idea. If the idea of a deity is innate then it is in us from birth, inseparable from us, it is part of our nature to have this idea. If this is the case then the idea of a deity should be found in every human mind and the idea should find articulation in every human society.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The socio-anthropological aspect of whether the idea of a deity is found in all societies thus giving credence to pluralism
- Necessary truths as eternally true (Plato's theory of Forms) in contrast to Descartes's argument that 'ideas' refer to the contents of the human mind (rather than 'ideas' in the mind of God)
- Arguments for innateness, eg Descartes's trademark argument – just as an artisan leaves his mark on his work so God imprints the idea of him-/herself in us
- If the idea of a deity is innate, how is it possible to evaluate atheism?
- Descartes's use of the causal adequacy principle to demonstrate that God is the source of this idea – the cause must contain as much reality as is present in the effect
- Whether the causes of our ideas possess the same qualities as our ideas may be questioned
- Locke's view that if a proposition is innate its component elements must also be innate – but are we born with the idea of eternity, immutability, omniscience, omnipotence, *etc.*?
- Hume's view that the idea of God is formed by "reflecting on the operations of our own mind, and augmenting, without limit...qualities of goodness and wisdom". So then is experience the source of our ideas through sensation and subsequent reflection on sensation
- Feuerbach's claim that our idea of the divine being is an abstraction from the being of mankind
- Marx's socio-economic view that the idea of God is constructed in order to appease misery, distress, hardship
- Freud's psychological view that belief in God represents the desire for a father figure, protection, security, *etc.*

12. To what extent can claims of there being religious experiences be considered valid? [25]

The question invites candidates to consider if claims for religious experience of whatever kind are open to challenge. How can such experience be verified as authentic? Is there any reason to take them to be any more than subjective experience, or even hallucinations? This leaves the field quite open for candidates to explore different areas. Swinburne, James and others might figure prominently. Criticisms from Mackie to Dawkins as well as challenges from sociology and psychology might be explored.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The term ‘religious experience’ has different meanings. There is an experience that in many respects is an ordinary everyday experience, but for some may have a religious or ‘mystical’ dimension. David Hay has pointed out that such experiences need not be given a religious interpretation or be seen to have any religious significance
- Schleiermacher advocates the way of inner feeling, which arises from what he called the ‘sense of absolute dependence’
- Otto argues that we can experience what he calls the numinous, a sense of hidden mystery of the holy
- Ninian Smart used the word numinous to describe the everyday devotional experiences of believers during prayer, worship or the reading of scripture. Whether such meditative or prayerful experiences can qualify as recognised forms of religious experience is open to doubt
- The leap of faith against the objective truth, eg Kierkegaard’s view
- The sense of the numinous may be available to those who are sufficiently introspective to feel so deeply, like someone who can see patterns of beauty where others cannot
- There are the kind of experiences that are called mystical, which belonged to those who are called mystics. Well-documented experiences of mysticism are found in the lives of the saints Teresa of Avila and John of the Cross in Spain, Julian of Norwich in England and Meister Eckhart in Germany. In Judaism, the Kabbalah movement, and in Islam, Sufism might be mentioned
- In the absence of verifying proof to the contrary, empiricists such as Hume and Ayer predictably argue for the most likely natural explanation of such experiences
- It is possible to locate the religious experience in, and limit it to, the subjective consciousness of the recipient. Russell made this point when he said that “we can make no distinction between the man who eats little and sees heaven, and the man who drinks too much and sees snakes” Naturalistic explanations of religion received a boost from the psychoanalytical theories of Freud, who dismissed mysticism as evidence of regressive infantile obsessions, resulting in desired dream-like sensations
- Jung suggested that the Apostle Paul’s vision may well have had neurotic origins, related to his repressed guilt for opposing the new followers of Jesus. Jung’s explanation does not necessarily undermine the claim that the experience was a religious one
- Swinburne’s principle of credulity and testimony states that those who make such claims have a right to be taken seriously. If a recipient of such an experience is normally a person who is sincere and trustworthy, the likelihood is that their testimony has strong credibility.
- William James was impressed by the great variety of religious experiences. He thought that the heart of religion lay in personal experiences which for the individual would be “absolutely authoritative”, such as conversions, corporate experiences, near death experiences, or mystical encounters
- James rejected any attempt to interpret claims as evidence of some kind of mental incapacity (especially in respect of mystical encounters, and ruled out the idea that such experiences were signs of a “degenerative brain”). He saw them as noetic, transient, passive and ineffable

- If faith is a form of insight into reality, as Wittgenstein granted, it is not illogical to allow that this insight might play a role in the way a person perceives that reality. However, this view veers towards a subjectivist account of how an ordinary experience can be mistakenly taken for a supposed religious experience
- The problem of mounting a public argument from a private experience
- Miracles as forms of religious experience
- Verificationism, Falsificationism, *cf* Ayer and Flew, might be explored when applied to religious experiences.

Optional theme 6: Philosophy of science

13. Evaluate the claim that the task of the logic of scientific discovery is to give an analysis of the method of the empirical sciences. [25]

The claim, which reflects a central concern of Popper's ideas, gives the opportunity to explain and evaluate the nature, aims, assumptions foundations and methodologies of science in its broadest possible range, starting from the idea that a scientist (whether theorist or experimenter) puts forward statements, or systems of statements, and tests them step by step. The scientist constructs hypotheses, or systems of theories, and tests them against experience by observation and experiment.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- What are central features of science?
- What are the methods of the empirical sciences? And what do we call 'empirical science'?
- The problem of induction, formulated as the question of the validity or the truth of universal statements which are based on experience, such as the hypotheses and theoretical systems of the empirical sciences
- Can a statement be justified? And if so, how? Questions of fact and questions of justification or validity
- The meaning of scientific statements arises from the method of its verification
- The deductive testing of theories
- The problem of demarcation: Finding a criterion which would enable us to distinguish between the empirical sciences on the one hand, and mathematics and logic as well as metaphysical systems on the other
- Falsifiability as a criterion of demarcation
- Can scientific laws be logically reduced to elementary statements of experience?
- Scientific objectivity and subjective conviction
- The relationship between scientific observation and truth
- The distinction between realism and instrumentalism in science
- Positivist and post-positivist philosophers, eg Feyerabend
- How does science develop? Progress of science, eg Kuhn
- Ways in which philosophy might impact physics, eg the possible link between Plato's theory of Forms and quantum physics
- Influences of physics in the public mind, eg social physics and the theory of the social atom.

14. Explain and discuss the impact of modern physics on philosophical thought. [25]

The question invites an explanation and discussion of the results of the development of physical knowledge on philosophical reflection. It opens a wide agenda to be considered, including not only the various specific contents of physics and cosmology, but also its influence on the understanding of classical philosophical categories such as reality, matter, time, space and causality.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Viewed as arising within the framework of a more general theory of substance, philosophical treatments of matter have traditionally revolved around two issues: The nature of matter and the problem of elements
- In the seventeenth century, the work of Descartes and Newton led to a picture of matter as passive, inert and dead as opposed to minds and forces, both of which were conceived as being active. Many philosophical problems and doctrines have been formulated in terms of this distinction
- The problem of elementary constituents and the history of chemistry; the atomic theory. Atoms are now understood to be composed of more fundamental particles, electrons, protons and neutrons, the latter two consisting of still more basic particles, eg quarks
- Modern scientific studies of matter have introduced further departures from the Cartesian-Newtonian classical conceptions which are of profound relevance to philosophical discussions. While the concept of the indestructibility and conservation of mass is central to classical theories of mechanics and chemistry, relativity theories recognize that mass varies with frame of reference, and with velocity as measured in that reference-frame, and, further, that mass is interconvertible with energy
- While Newton sharply distinguished forces from matter, in quantum mechanics forces are conveyed by transfer of a certain type of particles (the bosons) which have mass, like classical matter-particles
- The sharp contrasts between inert, passive permanence and dynamic activity, ultimate constituency and change, matter and force, fail to appear in quantum-theoretical analogies of classical matter. The character of quantum fields as super-positions of possibilities and many other features of the quantum world, together with the existence of dark matter, all conspire to dictate the reformulation of many traditional problems of philosophy, such as the free will problem, the doctrines of materialism and determinism, and the distinction between actuality and possibility
- Einstein's theories, which have important repercussions for philosophical views on the nature of space and time, and their relation to issues of causality and cosmology, which are still the subject of debate
- Inspired by Einstein's work, physicists discovered that the Sun's energy output comes from the conversion of matter into energy. One of the implications of this theory is that matter and energy are related by the simple equation: $E = mc^2$
- Astronomers believe that the universe began as an exceedingly dense cosmic singularity that expanded explosively in an event called the Big Bang. The Big Bang led to the formation of all space-time, matter, and energy
- Heisenberg's principle of indeterminism
- The conceptual relation between Taoism and modern physics
- The four basic forces (gravity, electromagnetism, the strong nuclear force, and the weak nuclear force) might explain the interactions observed in the universe.

Optional theme 7: Political philosophy

15. Explain and discuss the reasons an individual could give for disobeying the authority and challenging the sovereignty of the state. [25]

The grounds on which an individual can base a decision to disobey the authority of the state is a matter of philosophical speculation. Particularly relevant has been the contribution of social contract theories to assist thoughts of how such contracts could be broken or considered – by the individual – to be null and void. The issue of what constitutes a claim of sovereignty by the state over individuals might be explored, as well as the conditions that could be argued for the rejection of that sovereignty by individuals. Critical philosophical discussion might emphasise the importance of the concepts that influence consideration of what constitutes acceptable authority in civil society, including the kinds of reasoning that allow for questioning of that authority.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The social contract and how it might be established
- Consent to authority – notions of tacit or hypothetical consent
- Hume’s objection to the contract model on the basis that the individual is never asked
- Power in the state and its relation to legitimacy
- Different forms of governmental organisation and the issue of disobedience that ensue
- Locke’s view of the grounds for civil disobedience
- Hobbes’s view that aggression is the inherent state of humans tamed by the formation of the contract founding the state
- Rousseau’s views of the citizen as law-maker and the significance of the ‘general will’
- The toleration of disagreement in the state – depending on the model of government
- Revolution and insurrection as legitimate responses by citizens to the state
- The allegiance of individuals to different authorities, *eg* theocracy, fascism and nationalism
- Marcuse and his view of the right to rebel
- The issue of minorities and their right to self-determination, *eg* the region *versus* the central government, the application of *shariah* law in a secular and multi-cultural environment.

16. Discuss and evaluate the view that an individual has human rights simply by virtue of being a human. [25]

This question invites exploration of the debate about how rights arise and on what basis they are claimed. Some traditions claim that rights arise simply by virtue of being alive, other traditions emphasise the social context which gives rise to them due to rational agreement, perhaps based on the need to survive or prosper economically. Different rights can be discussed including constitutional, legal or basic human rights. There might be discussion of a possible hierarchy of rights being in existence. The counter view that rights do not exist might be explored in response to the title. Are rights cultural, historical constructs that apply in only some settings?

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The common sense view that human life entails certain basic rights, as espoused in the *United Nations Declaration of Human Rights* and the constitutions of various nation states through the ages
 - Notions of freedom and well-being as central to rights – is there a substantive difference between (or contradiction in) the right to choose what one wants to do and the right to do something harmful to oneself? *eg* Mill
 - Mill and notions of personal liberty – founded on the utility principle as opposed to any metaphysical claims
 - Divine rights – given to believers by God and restricted to membership of religious groupings
 - Legal rights dependent on social agreement as opposed to being innate or natural
 - Universal rights and what responsibilities might arise
 - The issue of conflicting rights and how they can be judged
 - Pre-societal rights, *eg* Locke's state of nature
 - The implication of denying rights: Punishment or restrictions of individual liberty.
-