

# Markscheme

November 2020

Philosophy

Higher level and standard level

Paper 2

No part of this product may be reproduced in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means, including information storage and retrieval systems, without written permission from the IB.

Additionally, the license tied with this product prohibits commercial use of any selected files or extracts from this product. Use by third parties, including but not limited to publishers, private teachers, tutoring or study services, preparatory schools, vendors operating curriculum mapping services or teacher resource digital platforms and app developers, is not permitted and is subject to the IB's prior written consent via a license. More information on how to request a license can be obtained from <https://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/ib-publishing/licensing/applying-for-a-license/>.

Aucune partie de ce produit ne peut être reproduite sous quelque forme ni par quelque moyen que ce soit, électronique ou mécanique, y compris des systèmes de stockage et de récupération d'informations, sans l'autorisation écrite de l'IB.

De plus, la licence associée à ce produit interdit toute utilisation commerciale de tout fichier ou extrait sélectionné dans ce produit. L'utilisation par des tiers, y compris, sans toutefois s'y limiter, des éditeurs, des professeurs particuliers, des services de tutorat ou d'aide aux études, des établissements de préparation à l'enseignement supérieur, des fournisseurs de services de planification des programmes d'études, des gestionnaires de plateformes pédagogiques en ligne, et des développeurs d'applications, n'est pas autorisée et est soumise au consentement écrit préalable de l'IB par l'intermédiaire d'une licence. Pour plus d'informations sur la procédure à suivre pour demander une licence, rendez-vous à l'adresse suivante : <https://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/ib-publishing/licensing/applying-for-a-license/>.

No se podrá reproducir ninguna parte de este producto de ninguna forma ni por ningún medio electrónico o mecánico, incluidos los sistemas de almacenamiento y recuperación de información, sin que medie la autorización escrita del IB.

Además, la licencia vinculada a este producto prohíbe el uso con fines comerciales de todo archivo o fragmento seleccionado de este producto. El uso por parte de terceros —lo que incluye, a título enunciativo, editoriales, profesores particulares, servicios de apoyo académico o ayuda para el estudio, colegios preparatorios, desarrolladores de aplicaciones y entidades que presten servicios de planificación curricular u ofrezcan recursos para docentes mediante plataformas digitales— no está permitido y estará sujeto al otorgamiento previo de una licencia escrita por parte del IB. En este enlace encontrará más información sobre cómo solicitar una licencia: <https://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/ib-publishing/licensing/applying-for-a-license/>.

### I. QIG availability

The following QIGs are usually available for qualification, but this will be confirmed at the start of the marking session:

QIG number	Text/author	English QIG availability	Spanish QIG availability
01	Simone de Beauvoir <i>The Second Sex</i> , Vol. 1 part 1, Vol. 2 part 1 and Vol. 2 part 4		
02	René Descartes <i>Meditations</i>	✓	✓
03	David Hume <i>Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion</i>		
04	John Stuart Mill <i>On Liberty</i>	✓	
05	Friedrich Nietzsche <i>The Genealogy of Morals</i>	✓	✓
06	Martha Nussbaum <i>Creating Capabilities: The Human Development Approach</i>		
07	Ortega y Gasset <i>The Origin of Philosophy</i>		
08	Plato <i>The Republic</i> , Books IV–IX	✓	✓
09	Peter Singer <i>The Life You Can Save</i>	✓	
10	Charles Taylor <i>The Ethics of Authenticity</i>	✓	✓
11	Lao Tzu <i>Tao Te Ching</i>		
12	Zhuangzi <i>Zhuangzi</i> , Inner Chapters		

### II. Candidates who overlook the Paper 2 rubric of answering **both** parts a and b of **one** question

However clearly the IB sets out its expectations on how candidates should answer exam questions, there are occasions when we receive work that does not match what we asked for. There is a specific case in exams where we ask students to select particular questions to answer and they fail to follow these rules (rubrics).

This note is intended to clarify how we deal with these situations through a series of scenarios. The actions have been checked to ensure that they are supported by RM Assessor.

#### Overarching principles

The following statements underpin our decisions below:

1. No candidate should be disadvantaged for following the rules.
2. Whenever possible candidates should receive credit for what they know.

### Example

To help understand the different scenarios we will make reference to an example assessment.

**Instruction: candidates must respond to both parts of one question.**

- Q7. (a) Explain Mill's view of the relationship between liberty and utility. (10 marks)  
(b) To what extent are liberty and utility fundamentally conflicting concepts? (15 marks)
- Q9. (a) Explain the view that morality has a clear and traceable genealogy. (10 marks)  
(b) To what extent do you agree with the genealogy Nietzsche proposes? (15 marks)

### Scenario 1. Candidate answers parts from two different questions.

Example: Candidate answers 7(a) and 9(a) or answers 7(b) and 9(a)

#### Action:

Mark all of the candidate's answers. The student will receive their best mark from one question.

In the second example this means the best mark for either 7(b) or 9(a).

This requires that examiners assign each mark to the correct question part (ie: gives the mark for 9(a) to 9(a) and **not** 7(a) – if question is QIGed this will happen automatically).

### Scenario 2. Candidate does not split their answer according to the sub-parts.

Example: Candidate writes one answer which they label as question 7 or they indicate they have only answered 9(a) but actually answer both 9(a) and 9(b) in that answer.

#### Action:

Examiners use their best judgement to award marks for all sub-parts as if the candidate has correctly labelled their answer.

In the example this means the candidate would be able to gain up to 25 marks despite only labelling the answer as 9(a).

**Exception** – where the nature of the two parts of the question means it is important to differentiate between the two answers, for example the first part should be done before the second part (in maths) or the candidate needs to show they understand the difference between the two parts of the question then examiners should use their judgement and only award marks if it is clear that the candidate has simply made a mistake in numbering their answers.

### Scenario 3. Candidate duplicates their answer to the first part in the second part.

Example: Candidate answers 7(a) and then repeats the same text as part of 7(b)

#### Action:

Only give credit for the answer once (in the first part of the question). The assessment criteria should assess distinct skills when there are parts to a question so this problem should not occur.

### Scenario 4. Candidate provides the wrong question number for their answer.

Example: Candidate states they are answering 7(a) and 7(b) but their response clearly talks about Nietzsche (Q9) rather than Mill's (Q7).

#### Action:

Mark the answer according to the mark scheme for the question that they should have indicated.

**Exception** – this only applies when there is no ambiguity as to which question the student has attempted, for example if they have rephrased the question in their opening paragraph. It is not the role of the examiner to identify which question is the best fit for their answer (ie: which questions their answer would get most marks for). If the given question number is a plausible match with their answer then the student should be marked according to that question. Only in exceptional circumstances should this rule be applied to sub-questions (ie: assuming the candidate had mistakenly swapped their answers for Q7(a) and Q7(b)).

## 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 page 8 for part A responses, and page 9 for part B responses.

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 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 relevant for both part A and part B answers. In part B responses, candidates may select other material they deem as relevant
- Responses for part A and part B should be assessed using the distinct assessment markbands.

### Note to examiners

Candidates at both Higher Level and Standard Level answer **one** question on the prescribed texts. Each question consists of two parts, and candidates must answer both parts of the question (a and b).

**Paper 2 part A markbands**

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is little relevant knowledge of the specified idea/argument/concept from the text.</li> <li>• The explanation is minimal.</li> <li>• Philosophical vocabulary is not used, or is consistently used inappropriately.</li> </ul>
3–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some knowledge of the specified idea/argument/concept from the text is demonstrated but this lacks accuracy, relevance and detail.</li> <li>• The explanation is basic and in need of development.</li> <li>• Philosophical vocabulary is not used, or is consistently used inappropriately.</li> </ul>
5–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge of the specified idea/argument/concept from the text is mostly accurate and relevant, but lacking in detail.</li> <li>• There is a satisfactory explanation.</li> <li>• Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately.</li> </ul>
7–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The response contains accurate and relevant knowledge of the specified idea/argument/concept from the text.</li> <li>• The explanation is clear, although may be in need of further development.</li> <li>• Philosophical vocabulary is mostly used appropriately.</li> </ul>
9–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The response contains relevant, accurate and detailed knowledge of the specified idea/argument/concept from the text.</li> <li>• The explanation is clear and well developed.</li> <li>• There is appropriate use of philosophical vocabulary throughout the response.</li> </ul>

**Paper 2 part B markbands**

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is little relevant knowledge of the text.</li> <li>• Philosophical vocabulary is not used, or is consistently used inappropriately.</li> <li>• The response is mostly descriptive with very little analysis.</li> <li>• There is no discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view.</li> </ul>
4–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some knowledge of the text is demonstrated but this lacks accuracy and relevance.</li> <li>• Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately.</li> <li>• There is some limited analysis, but the response is more descriptive than analytical.</li> <li>• There is little discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view.</li> <li>• Some of the main points are justified.</li> </ul>
7–9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge of the text is mostly accurate and relevant.</li> <li>• Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately.</li> <li>• The response contains analysis, but this analysis lacks development.</li> <li>• There is some discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view.</li> <li>• Many of the main points are justified.</li> </ul>
10–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The response contains accurate and relevant knowledge of the text.</li> <li>• Philosophical vocabulary is mostly used appropriately.</li> <li>• The response contains clear critical analysis.</li> <li>• There is discussion and some assessment of alternative interpretations or points of view.</li> <li>• Most of the main points are justified.</li> </ul>
13–15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The response contains relevant, accurate and detailed knowledge of the text.</li> <li>• There is appropriate use of philosophical vocabulary throughout the response.</li> <li>• The response contains clear and well developed critical analysis.</li> <li>• There is discussion and assessment of alternative interpretations or points of view.</li> <li>• All or nearly all of the main points are justified.</li> </ul>

**Simone de Beauvoir: *The Second Sex*, Vol. 1 part 1, Vol. 2 part 1 and Vol. 2 part 4**

**1. (a) Explain why private property is the “great historical defeat of the female sex”. [10]**

The claim arises from Chapter 3, Vol. 1 of de Beauvoir’s text, on historical materialism. Candidates might pinpoint the role that private property has played in this history, by referring to the dichotomy of master *versus* slave, which turns into man *versus* woman. Candidates might explain de Beauvoir’s interpretation of historical materialism in order to analyse the relationship between the woman and society. Particularly, candidates might refer to Engels’s point of view on woman’s history, from the Stone Age on. Candidates might consider the role of revenge in women, emerging from this status of oppression: the role of marriage and adultery within marriage might be explored. Candidates might take into account the economic and political aspects that foster women’s oppression. Candidates might refer to totalitarian and authoritarian political regimes, which embody the idea of woman as sexual object, whose only purpose is maternity. Also, candidates might mention the evolution of the division of labour and the advent of new tools, which made women’s domestic work lose its ancient importance. Candidates might highlight de Beauvoir’s critique of historical materialism. Women’s oppression cannot be explained through the concepts of slavery, proletariat, and class according to de Beauvoir. Candidates might compare de Beauvoir’s refusal of the points of view of both psychoanalysis and historical materialism, since they reduce man and woman to monistic entities (sexual or economic).

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Woman’s history according to Engels’s point of view
- Master *versus* slave and man *versus* woman dichotomies
- Private property and patriarchal family linked to women’s oppression and inequality
- Woman as a sexual object; maternity
- Adultery and marriage
- Socialist democracy, totalitarianism, authoritarian regimes in contributing to women’s oppression
- de Beauvoir’s critique of Engels’s point of view and historical materialism; men and women as monistic, economic entities
- Division of labour; new technologies; women’s domestic work losing importance
- Critique of the concepts of private property, class, proletariat as a means to explain women’s oppression.

**(b) Evaluate why private property is the “great historical defeat of the female sex”. [15]**

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Whether women’s oppression can be linked to a specific evolution of society and labour
- Whether private property plays a role in woman’s history and whether it is linked to the advent of the patriarchal family
- The concept of marriage and women as “property”
- Is adultery within marriage the only way for women to take revenge and benefit from their new condition of reciprocity?
- Whether maternity is the result of an objectified view of women
- Do totalitarian and authoritarian political regimes foster an oppressed condition for women?
- Whether de Beauvoir’s critique of Engels’s point of view is justifiable
- Is de Beauvoir’s critique of historical materialism comparable to her critique of psychoanalysis?
- Does the division of labour affect the oppressed conditions of women? How is the situation nowadays? What about women and domestic work?



2. (a)

Removed for copyright reasons

(b)

**René Descartes: *Meditations***

3. (a) **Explain Descartes’s view that the two questions respecting God and the Soul ought to be determined by the help of philosophy rather than of theology.** [10]

The question asks for an explanation of an issue which is present from the very beginning of the *Meditations*. Descartes presents the two sides in tension depending on the religious belief position: “for although to us, the faithful, it be sufficient to hold as matters of faith, that the human soul does not perish with the body, and that God exists, it yet assuredly seems impossible ever to persuade infidels of the reality of any religion, or almost even any moral virtue, unless, first of all, those two things be proved to them by natural reason”. Answers might tackle the issue directly, making reference to the function of philosophy, approaches to the issue considering one or both of the questions respecting God and the soul, or follow various possible paths relating the issue to the main arguments developed by Descartes in the text, eg: the method of doubt, *cogito*.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Descartes’s statement that he had cultivated a certain method of resolving all kinds of difficulties in the sciences and it was successfully used in other instances and he feels this to be his duty to make use of it also for the existence of God and the immortality of the soul
- Most of the irreligious deny the existence of God, and the distinctness of the human soul from the body, for no other reason than because they allege that these have never been demonstrated so far
- Reasons to sustain the convenience or necessity of presenting rational arguments for God’s existence or the immortality of the soul
- Since there are many demonstrations presented, philosophy might carefully seek out the best of the reasons, and expound them so accurately and clearly that, for the future, it might be manifest to all that they are real demonstrations
- Whatever certitude and evidence we may find in these demonstrations, they are not at the level of comprehension for all, just as in geometry
- The method of doubt as an instrument of reason as to withdraw from the influences of the senses in order to achieve certain knowledge
- Arguments for God’s existence in the Third Meditation or the immortality of the soul in the Second, Fourth, Fifth and Six Meditation.

- (b) **Evaluate Descartes’s view that the two questions respecting God and the Soul ought to be determined by the help of philosophy rather than of theology.** [15]

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Natural reason arguments as a way of being independent of religious faith; its implications for the different parties, eg: “infidels” and believers
- Some theologians not only affirmed the sufficiency of natural reason for the proof of the existence of God, but also, that it may be inferred from sacred Scripture, that the knowledge of God is much clearer than of many created things, and that it is really so easy of acquisition
- Descartes’s analysis and discussion of the relation between theology and philosophy as a chapter in the history of the “*Credo ut intelligam*” (I believe so that I may understand) and its noticeable predecessors Augustine and Anselm
- Was Descartes interested in intervening in theological disputes?
- Ways of linking the traditional discussion about reason and faith and Descartes’s position on reason and faith
- The extent to which reason might be important for religion in today’s world with the diversity of cultural traditions and present approaches
- Ways and scope of reason acting in geometry, metaphysics and theology.

4. (a) **Explain the role of imagination in relation to the distinction between mind and body.**

**[10]**

The question asks for an explanation of the role of the imagination in the Sixth Meditation which closes the general argument of the work including the discussion on the existence of material things. In the Sixth Meditation, “the act of the understanding (*intellectio*) is distinguished from that of the imagination (*imaginatio*)” and “the marks of this distinction are described”, where the distinction between mind and body has a central function. The whole analysis and discussion of this distinction is dialectical, since on the one hand “the human mind is shown to be really distinct from the body” and, on the other, “nevertheless, to be so closely conjoined therewith, as together to form, as it were, a unity”. The argument proceeds by bringing under review the whole of the errors which arise from the senses and by pointing out the means of avoiding them. Further, the grounds from which the existence of material objects might be inferred are shown. Imagination together with sense and memory are situated in relation to the intellect as modes or acts of the intellect. However, these acts are distinguished from pure intellect because they depend on bodily processes.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Imagination is simply a certain application of the cognitive faculty (*facultas cognoscitiva*) to a body which is immediately present to it, and which therefore exists
- Descartes’s claim that he is accustomed to imagine many objects, as, for example, colours, sounds, tastes, pain, and the like, with less distinctness; and, inasmuch as Descartes perceives these objects much better by the senses. Through the senses and memory, they seem to have reached the imagination
- The faculty of imagination of which Descartes is conscious that he makes use of when applying it to himself for the consideration of material things, which is sufficient to persuade him of their existence
- Imagination and thinking in the examples of geometrical figures: triangle, pentagon and chiliagon
- A special effort of mind is necessary to the act of imagination, which is not required to conceive or understand (*ad intelligendum*); and this special exertion of mind clearly shows the difference between imagination and pure intellection (*imaginatio et intellectio pura*)
- The inquiry as to whether material things exist: Descartes’s view that such things may exist, in as far as they constitute the object of the pure mathematics, since, regarding them in this aspect, he can conceive them clearly and distinctly
- Descartes’s claim that there can be no doubt that God possesses the power of producing all the objects we are able distinctly to conceive
- Descartes easily understands that, if somebody exists, with whom his mind is so conjoined and united as to be able, it may thus imagine corporeal objects.

**(b) Evaluate the role of imagination in relation to the distinction between mind and body.**

**[15]**

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Descartes finds in himself diverse faculties of thinking that each have their special mode
- The stress on the difference that subsists between imagination and pure intellection or conception
- In pure intellection, only the mind in conceiving turns in some way upon itself, and considers some one of the ideas it possesses within itself; but in imagining it turns toward the body, and contemplates in it some object conformed to the idea which it either of itself conceived or apprehended by sense
- Descartes does not observe that anything necessarily belongs to his nature or essence beyond his being a thinking thing; he rightly concludes that his essence consists only in his being a thinking thing
- Although he carefully examines all things, nevertheless he does not find that, from the distinct idea of corporeal nature he has in his imagination, he can necessarily infer the existence of any body
- Whether all the judgments he had formed regarding the objects of sense are dictates of nature
- Nature teaches him by the sensations of pain, hunger, thirst, etc that he is not only lodged in his body as a “pilot in a vessel”, but that his mind and body are so intimately conjoined, and as it were, intermixed, such that his mind and body compose a certain unity
- There is a vast difference between mind and body, in respect that body, from its nature, is always divisible, and that mind is entirely indivisible
- Notwithstanding the sovereign goodness of God, the nature of man, in so far as it is composed of mind and body, cannot but be sometimes fallacious
- Imagination and the mind-body relation in different contexts (past and present philosophical, scientific, religious positions); diverse views and approaches; various cultural traditions.

**David Hume: *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion***

**5. (a) Explain the role of skepticism in *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*. [10]**

The question invites an exploration of the role of skepticism throughout the text. Cleanthes, early in Part 1, states that Philo "...[erects] religious faith on philosophical skepticism; ... whether your skepticism be as absolute and sincere as you pretend...". Skepticism appears to be a salient concern in the text. Cleanthes questions Philo's practice of skepticism and common sense and challenges Philo on the consistency of his skepticism asking him what he will do at the end of the dialogue. Anticipating Philo's retraction, Cleanthes argues that it is impossible" for Philo "to persevere in this total skepticism, or make it appear in his conduct for a few hours". The issue then arises as to whether Philo can consistently be skeptical, or be inconsistent and appear to engage in skepticism as a ploy during the dialogue. In effect Philo is being warned that how he ultimately ends the dialogue is what matters. This forecast illuminates Philo's final position on skepticism. Indeed, at the beginning of the text Hume focuses on skepticism and then again at the end along with, of course, related philosophical matters. This is clearly demonstrated in Philo's closing words almost at the end of Part 12, which take us back to the beginning of the text: "To be a philosophical Skeptic is, in a man of letters, the first and most essential step towards being a sound, believing Christian; a proposition which I would willingly recommend to the attention of Pamphilus: And I hope Cleanthes will forgive me for interposing so far in the education and instruction of his pupil".

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The nature of skepticism
- Distinctions between Pyrrhonian and mitigated skepticism
- How Cleanthes, Philo and Demea engage with skepticism
- Philo's view of skepticism as an aid to religious belief
- Consequences that might ensue when religious belief is based on skepticism
- Cleanthes's view on the inconsistency of skepticism
- Skepticism as a critique of both science and religion
- Hume's skepticism is aimed at philosophical thinking as well as natural religion.

**(b) Evaluate the role of skepticism in *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*. [15]**

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Skepticism is weak against commonplace, everyday observations but strong against metaphysical concepts
- Skepticism as being synonymous with atheism
- Skepticism has historically been a method of arguing for and against religion
- Is skepticism, as a means of questioning certainty, including certainty about the existence of God, a valid approach in the text?
- The extent to which skepticism is a recurring theme in the text
- Skeptical questioning, as found in the text, creates space for receptive interpretation rather than definitively trying to resolve questions
- Determining the success or not, as the case may be, of skepticism in the text needs to be understood within the context of dialogic structure
- Dramatic structure and asking how different characters might represent (or not) different positions the author considers relevant
- If Hume succeeds in his use of skepticism, then it could be argued that Philo represents the skeptical position that Hume wants us to take seriously.

**6. (a) Explain how suffering poses a problem for an anthropomorphic God. [10]**

The question is based on Part 10 of the Dialogues and invites candidates to explore the arguments from Philo in that suffering alters the conception and credibility of a God described as anthropomorphic by Demea and Cleanthes. The immediate context is of an anthropomorphic, omnipotent notion of God which weakens Cleanthes’s and Demea’s positions. Demea and Cleanthes have tried to establish in a logical and reasoned manner a designer and infinite God. They both try to withstand Philo’s skeptical questioning in his determination to ascertain God’s true nature, whether it aligns with a theist viewpoint or not. In Part 10, the suffering reality of humanity is unequivocal. Philo argues against an anthropomorphic God by implying that it is far more likely a pantheist idea of God exists. A further argument from Philo against an anthropomorphic God openly questions the very nature of such a God. He then contends that there are forces of “music, harmony, and indeed beauty of all kinds [...] Mirth, laughter, play, frolic seem gratuitous satisfactions” that are rather needless features of the world. Philo’s point being that it appears paradoxical that a morally good God would venture to create music, beauty, and laughter in contrast to fine-tuning all the occurrences of unnecessary suffering in the world. Cleanthes in responding to the problem of suffering argued that there is more happiness in the world than Philo (and Demea) believe there is. Cleanthes’s stance on the reality of pain and suffering is that “for one vexation which we meet with, we attain, upon computation, a hundred enjoyments”.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Philo’s claim that the way the world is organized does not seek to reduce the suffering that exists in the way a benevolent and anthropomorphic God might have been expected to have ordered the world
- Philo’s pantheistic idea of God
- Philo’s view of the nature of God
- According to Philo, if a divine and benevolent, anthropomorphic God really exists, then it appears that laughter is preferred rather than preventing needless suffering
- Philo’s view of God and suffering invoking the Epicurean quote about God and evil
- Demea’s claim that suffering exists because it will be fixed by an infinite God at some point in the future
- Demea’s claim that God created suffering is defenceless for Cleanthes’s anthropomorphic God
- Philo’s pantheistic God consists of all the physical material (matter) in the world and not being transcendent results in a God that can be indifferent to moral and natural notions of suffering.

**(b) Evaluate how suffering poses a problem for an anthropomorphic God. [15]**

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Cleanthes’s defence of his anthropomorphic notion of God in justifying the existence of needless suffering
- Demea’s position that no human being can ever have complete knowledge of God’s nature and thus can never know why such a God has allowed suffering
- Cleanthes’s necessity to avoid God being guilty of creating suffering in the first place because that would make God imperfect
- Cleanthes’s view that there is far more happiness in the world than Philo or Demea believe there is
- Suffering need not present a definitive objection against an anthropomorphic God
- Has Philo, and his undermining of Demea’s orthodox God, succeeded in proving that a restricted God is more dependable when facing the problem and existence of suffering?
- Cleanthes’s shift from an infinite to finite God in Part 11 reflects his desire to avoid God being blamed for suffering
- Towards the end of the text Hume notes that an anthropomorphic conception of God is how the majority of human beings see God.

**John Stuart Mill: *On Liberty***

7. (a) **Explain Mill’s claim that “the only freedom which deserves the name is that of pursuing our own good in our own way”.** [10]

This question seeks an explanation of Mill’s views on freedom and the possible restriction of freedom that he might entertain. For Mill freedom and liberty are often interchanged and therefore an explanation might also explore the nature of liberty for Mill. He argues primarily that individual adults are able to pursue their own freedom without the interference of others, in the form of either social groups in general or government. It allows the individual to define that which is his own good. Mill does not approve of paternalistic governments wishing to establish a better life for the individual unless the individual wishes it. The basic restriction that Mill puts forward is that individual’s actions should not deprive others of their own freedom of action nor cause harm to others. There are exceptions to the application of his Harm Principle, these being children, the insane and “backward (less educated) societies”. It also implies that the majority of a society should not impose their wishes or opinions on other individuals. For Mill the result of this freedom to act ought to be the development of human faculties which he values – perception, discriminative feelings, judgmental mental activity, and moral choice. By developing these through the exercise of freedom, he believed individuals would become “noble and beautiful objects of contemplation”.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Self-regarding acts and other-regarding acts
- The nature and definition of harm
- The Harm Principle and the point at which the state should intervene to limit harm
- The care and restrictions applied to children
- Attempts to prevent collective mediocrity by encouraging diversity of opinion and action
- The way in which the expression of freedom could increase the degree of happiness
- Mill’s personal perception that freedom expands human nature in innumerable and conflicting directions.

- (b) **Evaluate Mill’s claim that “the only freedom which deserves the name is that of pursuing our own good in our own way”.** [15]

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The link between the right to freedom and utility – increasing happiness
- Happiness seen, through Mill’s eyes, as developing a “progressive being”
- The ways in which the exercise of freedom will develop the valued faculties of humans
- The way in which free individuals will oppose the tyranny of the majority and uninformed opinions
- The tyranny of the majority in other views, eg: Locke, de Tocqueville
- Mill’s negative view of stereotypes
- Mill’s hope to prevent social stagnation
- The degree of self-awareness that Mill attributes to humans
- Humans’ responsibility and the need for humans to develop social awareness
- The diminishing of lower pleasures
- The notion of “small” government that would arise as a result of restrictive social legislation not being enacted
- Whether the term “backward societies” refers to separate countries or sections and regions of a given society and hence possible social engineering of “backwards societies”.

8. (a) **Explain Mill’s view that “truth, in the great practical concern of life, is a question of the reconciling and the combining of opposites”.** [10]

This question opens the possibility of an explanation as to how Mill sees truth being discovered. The explanation could explore his views on the need for diversity of opinion and freedom of speech. For him, clearly expressed, opposing opinions are to be valued, as through the mixture of correct and false views clarity of truth will come about. Any suppression of free speech would be “robbing the human race” of the means to find truth. There needs to be a clash of majority and minority views so that certainty can be challenged and infallibility questioned. Open-mindedness is his objective. Mill relies on the rationality of individuals not to abuse the freedom of expression that is granted, and therefore, within the greater scheme of things higher levels of education are necessary, as well as the existence of a democratic environment in which a variety of opinions on issues are sought. He also assumes the existence of forums in which opinions can be shared and debated.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The ability of humans to reflect and consider opposing opinions
- Pressures to be “politically correct” in expression and action
- The enactment of the Harm Principle in terms of expression of opinions to limit disturbing or hurting others
- The ways in which intellectual debate can be encouraged
- Ways in which dissenting voices have progressed knowledge and truth
- Toleration and hate speech
- Challenges to infallibility and the related social upheaval, eg: the role of religious groups in taking absolute positions on issues
- Issues of censorship.

- (b) **Evaluate Mill’s view that “truth, in the great practical concern of life, is a question of the reconciling and the combining of opposites”.** [15]

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The role of government intervention to prevent harm
- The role of slander and libel laws
- Issues of national security limiting expression
- Legislated societal values limiting expression, eg: holocaust denial
- The value of falsity to produce reflection and “a clearer perception of truth”
- Rationality and the ability to justify held opinions
- The link between truth and utility: does Mill see them as different?
- The ability of contrary opinions to limit the development of dogma
- Assumptions about the reasonableness of humans
- Censorship
- The role of the press and arguments for free expression and its relationship to the public interest
- The limiting of free expression by the argument that such expression does not contribute to the progress of knowledge and truth. Who takes responsibility for limiting the freedom of expression?
- The degree to which public disagreement and dissent are a dynamic and creative element of modern society.



**Friedrich Nietzsche: *The Genealogy of Morals***

**9. (a) Explain Nietzsche’s account of the role of debt in morality. [10]**

Nietzsche traces the origins of morality through history. One part of this analysis involves the claim that feelings of “guilt, of personal obligation [...] had [their] origin, as we have seen, in the oldest and most primitive relationship among persons there is, in the relationship between buyer and seller, creditor and debtor”. Nietzsche sees debt as the origin of other resulting moral constructions such as punishment, religious pleas for forgiveness and *ressentiment*. Importantly, the debtor-creditor relationship creates harmful power dynamics in society where the debtor becomes “possessed” by the creditor who “has power, for example [over] his body... or his freedom or even his life”. Nietzsche argued that within the creditor-debtor relationship human beings are engaged in a form of economics in order to support their survival. As such, debt plays an important role in morality through creating commonly held emotions, standards, commitments and consequences which shape how we understand morality today.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The etymological link between the words “debt” and “guilt”
- Nietzsche’s use of *Schuld* and *schulden*
- How guilt and punishment shape morals
- The relationship between guilt, punishment and *ressentiment*
- The relationship between punishment and debt
- The role that debt has to play in suffering
- The relationship between debt and master morality
- The relationship between debt and slave morality
- Debt and guilt in Judeo-Christian thinking
- Nietzsche’s critique of English psychologists.

**(b) Evaluate Nietzsche’s account of the role of debt in morality. [15]**

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Whether Nietzsche’s view that morality is a development from the debtor-creditor relationship is convincing
- Does it matter where morality comes from?
- Does it matter that *Schuld* and *schulden* have the same root?
- Is an etymological approach appropriate?
- Could there be other explanations for the development of morality?
- Different views of morality, eg: Aristotle, Stoicism, Epicureanism, Hume, Locke
- How is debt related to slave and master morality?
- Is this a valid critique of religion?

**10. (a) Explain the relationship between slave morality and Judeo-Christian ideals. [10]**

Nietzsche's exploration of the origins and genealogy of morals traces the evolution of Judeo-Christian values from the relationship between slave and master. Master morality represents the moral codes of the powerful in society, who act for themselves and have no loyalties to the weaker members of society. Slave morality is the result of a natural backlash to this position, which sees meekness, forgiveness and asceticism as "good". These are the hallmarks of the Christian faith, so Nietzsche sees Judeo-Christian morality as the morality of the slave revolt against their masters. Nietzsche also points out the difficulties of this moral stance, including how priests exercise master morality in the guise of slave morality, and subsequently take advantage of people. He points to the life denying nature of asceticism, which is held up as a moral ideal in Christianity but which leads people to live inauthentic, suppressed lives. Nietzsche asks: "In the faith in what? In the love for what? In the hope of what? These weaklings! – they also, forsooth, will to be strong some time; there is no doubt about it, sometime *their* kingdom also must come – "the kingdom of God" is their name for it, as has been mentioned: – they are so meek in everything! Yet in order to experience that kingdom it is necessary to live long, to live beyond death – yes, eternal life is necessary so that one can make up for earthly life "in faith", "in love", "in hope". Make up for what? Make up by what?"

Candidates might explore:

- Christianity as a major feature of the slave revolt
- Priests as new masters who enforce slave morality
- How Christianity has informed art, science and philosophy
- Ascetic ideals and practices as life-denying
- Limiting the "will to power"
- The role played by *ressentiment*
- The antithesis of master morality
- Christianity as suppressing progress, or authenticity
- The nature of humility.

**(b) Evaluate the relationship between slave morality and Judeo-Christian ideals. [15]**

Possible discussion points include:

- Is Christianity a slave morality?
- Is Christianity the antithesis of a master morality?
- Where else might slave morality have come from?
- Does Nietzsche undermine Christian ideals?
- Is there anything valuable about master morality?
- Does Christianity encourage asceticism? Is there anything wrong with asceticism?
- Does Christianity prevent progress or authenticity?
- The extent to which religion reflects slave morality
- Knowledge/experience of Judeo-Christian practices and ideals
- The relationship between the state, religion and morality.

**Martha Nussbaum: *Creating Capabilities: The Human Development Approach***

**11. (a) Explain Nussbaum’s application of the *capabilities approach* to animals. [10]**

The question is derived from the “Animal Entitlements” section in Chapter 8 of the text and invites candidates to explore Nussbaum’s understanding of her theory in relation to animals wherein she states “it seems to me that the idea of doing injustice to an animal makes sense in much the way that doing injustice to a human being makes sense”. Nussbaum goes on to claim that “The *capabilities approach* seems well suited to address the wrongs suffered by animals at the hands of humans.”). Candidates in developing a response might engage with whether the *capabilities approach* can do justice to the wide range and variety within the animal kingdom. The fact that we do kill animals, eg: for food or hygiene, is an issue that may have relevance in terms of applying the *capabilities approach*. A major focus of Nussbaum’s theory is to arrive at a global theory of justice and within that context the philosophical attitudes towards animals might be discussed. How Nussbaum’s approach relates to and connects with animal ethics is an area that candidates might develop.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Sentience in animals
- Nussbaum’s defence of the “the capabilities of all sentient creatures as ends in themselves, and all should attain capabilities above some specified threshold” (identified as the third basic position)
- Animals seen as agents in the *capabilities approach*
- Nussbaum’s view that “we need an expanded notion of *dignity*”
- Promotion of animal capabilities

[Source: CREATING CAPABILITIES: THE HUMAN DEVELOPMENT APPROACH by Martha C. Nussbaum, Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Copyright © 2011 by Martha C. Nussbaum.]

**(b) Evaluate Nussbaum’s application of the *capabilities approach* to animals. [15]**

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Is it appropriate to discuss capabilities of non-human life forms?
- What about non-sentient life forms such as plants if each form of life is worthy of respect?
- Should non-human life forms be included in a theory of justice?
- Social contract theories argue against claims that humans have obligations of justice to animals and other non-human life forms
- Is it feasible that non-human life forms are considered as ends in themselves?
- Controversies regarding various aspects of personhood that some argue are absent in non-animal life forms, such as self-consciousness and self-awareness
- Can non-human capabilities be equated with those that Nussbaum identifies in human beings?

**12. (a) Explain how Nussbaum’s *capabilities approach* allows humans to fully function as individuals. [10]**

The question is based on Chapter 2 of Nussbaum’s text and invites candidates to explore her argument that an individual should be able to live a genuine human life as Nussbaum’s position holds to the presupposition that all people have these capabilities and their use will bring about a dignified life. Nussbaum states that the “capabilities belong first and foremost to individual persons”. For Nussbaum, an individual’s life is fully functioning and flourishing (drawing upon Aristotelian influences) when the capabilities that she identifies as the “ten central capabilities” are collectively, and jointly appropriated. This suggests that no separate capability on the list can be dispensed for a larger percentage of another, because all capabilities are to be considered as equally valid in themselves, just as they are collectively instrumental on application. The *capabilities approach* is considered a method of approaching human rights and candidates might argue that this is her motive for developing the theory as it might be seen as interpreting or even attempting to be a substitute for the language of international human rights. Nussbaum’s theory demonstrates the potential for human development and thus the availability of choices and opportunities permits human development and empowers people to lead valued lives, therefore the *capabilities approach* can be viewed as an appropriate structure for society and marginalized groups within society.

Candidates might explore:

- Nussbaum’s conception of a human being and thus personhood
- Nussbaum’s Aristotelian influence
- Capability as a type of freedom, or a means to freedom
- The distinction between internal and combined capabilities
- Basic capability as innate
- Some of the individual capabilities such as “practical reason” or “affiliation” as being more important because of their use in organizing the others
- The provisional nature of the list of capabilities.

**(b) Evaluate whether Nussbaum’s *capabilities approach* allows humans to fully function as individuals. [15]**

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Nussbaum’s view that “capability” should be an appropriate public policy goal
- Nussbaum’s view that every nation should adopt the ten central capabilities for all citizens
- Nussbaum’s approach represents a necessary criterion for social justice
- The question of capabilities and human rights
- The relevance of the *capabilities approach* for marginalized sections in various nations, eg: the poor, disabled and women
- Nussbaum’s *capabilities approach* as a philosophical underpinning of a democratic society
- Whether the ten central capabilities are ambiguous and are only successful in individual cases rather than a section or the whole of society
- Does Nussbaum’s approach lack clarity on how conflicting capabilities in a society/nation might be resolved?
- Is Nussbaum’s theory counterproductive due to the selfish nature of the capabilities themselves?
- Whether the provisional nature of the list of capabilities might be seen as a flaw.

**Ortega y Gasset: *The Origins of Philosophy***

**13. (a) Explain Ortega’s idea of “historical reason”.**

**[10]**

The question asks for an explanation of Ortega’s idea of “historical reason”, which is central to his philosophical position in general and guides Ortega’s reflection on philosophy in this text. His view shows human beings as the only beings who are a product of the past, who consist in the past, though not solely in the past. “Man preserves the past within himself, he accumulates it, he enables that which once was to subsist within in the form of what has been”. Answers might refer to the two main sides of Ortega’s philosophical discussion on reason: “pure reason”, based on the development of physico-mathematical knowledge, and Ortega’s own conception of “historical reason”, constructed on the reality of human life constituted by the temporal articulation of its events. This conception of reason confronts us with the “reason of the future, which is markedly different from venerable “pure” reason, but nonetheless is the exact opposite of vagueries, metaphors, utopias, and mysticisms. It is therefore a reason that is much more rational than the old one, in which “pure reason” appeared as an insensate enchantress, and in accordance with this reason many things that heretofore were considered irrational will cease to suffer from this pejorative label”.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The characterization of “historical reason” as category: “being in the form of having been”; “the reason that is inherent in the historical reality”
- Nothing is truly human if it is concrete and permanent. This does not mean that there is nothing constant in humans
- The traditional usage of “reason”, which was exaggerated by logicians and mathematicians
- Humans are able to predict more and more of the future, and hence eternalize themselves more in that dimension. Meanwhile, they have also attained greater possession of their past
- This possession of the past and its preservation are equivalent to a modest attempt to gain eternity; for possession of the past in the present is one of the characteristics of eternity
- “Historical reason” as the proper way of understanding the reality of human life
- Hegel’s reference to past human life: the first thing we observe is ruins. Ruin, in fact, is the countenance of the past
- Human life itself, both personal and collective, as the centre of all things worth understanding. The content of this knowledge pertaining to the structure of human life and its vicissitudes was called “wisdom”.

[Source: From THE ORIGIN OF PHILOSOPHY by Jose Ortega y Gasset, translated by Toby Talbot. Copyright © 1967 by W.W. Norton & Company, Inc. Used by permission of W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., <https://www.barnesandnoble.com/w/origin-of-philosophy-jose-ortega-y-gasset/1102477522?ean=9780393001280>. This selection may not be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means without the prior written permission of the publisher.]

**(b) Evaluate Ortega’s idea of “historical reason”.**

**[15]**

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- “Historical reason” is prepared to incorporate reality without repulsion, squeamishness, or scruples. “Historical reason” manages to impose rationality even on chance events
- “Historical reason” is the enemy of the demon of irrationality
- Future historians will encounter chance as a component of reality, recognize it and emphasize its presence and influence, to the same extent as other historical forces
- The dawn of “historical reason” “man will probably engage in assimilating the past with unparalleled zeal and urgency, and display astounding scope, vigor, and accuracy”
- Implications of the idea of “historical reason” in the understanding of history as a series of events and science
- Comparison and contrast with similar positions, eg: Heidegger’s historical ontology and Sartre’s existentialism; Nietzsche’s criticism of history
- The extent to which the central idea of “historical reason” might be applied in other areas, eg: history of sciences, political or literary of ideas
- Influences in the configuration of Ortega’s idea of historical reason, eg: Dilthey
- Does human life have an invariable structure which traverses all of its changes?
- “Historical reason” and the cultural world today; Ortega’s idea in relation to present social and cultural developments, eg: multiculturalism, media, cyberspace.

[Source: From THE ORIGIN OF PHILOSOPHY by Jose Ortega y Gasset, translated by Toby Talbot. Copyright © 1967 by W.W. Norton & Company, Inc. Used by permission of W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., <https://www.barnesandnoble.com/w/origin-of-philosophy-jose-ortega-y-gasset/1102477522?ean=9780393001280>. This selection may not be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means without the prior written permission of the publisher.]

**14. (a) Explain Ortega's view of the role of the past in shaping the idea of philosophy. [10]**

The question asks for an explanation of the role of the past in Ortega's idea of philosophy as developed in the entire text. It "provides an example of historic reason in operation on the central theme of the roots and historical justification of philosophy. One of the multiple tasks in which man has engaged is that of making philosophy, an occupation that has not been a permanent one for humanity, but as the book points out, 'came about one fine day in Greece and has indeed come down to us, with no guarantee, however, of its perpetuation'" (Talbot, T. ed., 1967. *The Origins of Philosophy*. Toronto: George J. McLeod Limited. p. 8.). The tension between past and future in shaping the conception of philosophy might be reflected in the answers when they state one of the sides of this opposition, at least as a starting point. Ortega's conception of philosophy also includes a decisive incorporation of the future: "Without attempting now to formalize an opinion on this matter, I wish to suggest the possibility that what we are now beginning to engage in under the traditional aegis of philosophy is not another philosophy but something new and different from all philosophy".

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The idea of "historical reason" as a method to understand the philosophical past
- As "historical reason" is discovered through a retrospective contemplation of its total past, philosophy might be seen in a similar manner showing its essential unity
- The attempt to reconstruct the dramatic occasion of the origin of philosophy
- Chapter 10 provides an example of "historical reason" in operation on the central theme of the roots and historical justification of philosophy
- The narration of historical causes and conditions in the case of Thales as an application of "historical reason"
- Analytic and synthetic ways of accessing the philosophical past: a series of thoughts develops from an initial thought by virtue of a progressive analysis or each thought presents a new aspect which is synthesized in new and more complex forms
- The connections between philosophy, its history and history
- The dialectic shows the very fact of the human condition; the dialectic is the articulation of the historical deployment, which drives us to continue thinking.

[Source: From THE ORIGIN OF PHILOSOPHY by Jose Ortega y Gasset, translated by Toby Talbot. Copyright © 1967 by W.W. Norton & Company, Inc. Used by permission of W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., <https://www.barnesandnoble.com/w/origin-of-philosophy-jose-ortega-y-gasset/1102477522?ean=9780393001280>. This selection may not be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means without the prior written permission of the publisher.]

**(b) Evaluate Ortega's view of the role of the past in shaping the idea of philosophy. [15]**

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Ortega's idea that we reflect on the philosophical past in order to act in the future
- Philosophy means doing philosophy; therefore, we have no choice but to attempt to construct a philosophy of our own
- The history of the philosophical past drives us into the future, toward a philosophy yet to come
- The significance of linking together historical and conceptual analysis in order to understand the origins and advancement of philosophy
- Is there conflict or integration between two ways of approaching philosophy? One directs towards the past in an effort to reconstruct the origin of philosophy and other is orientated to the construction of a new philosophical synthesis
- The philosophical past might be seen as a series of errors, but on the other hand these errors might contain some truth and help to discover the truth
- Is transformation a necessary way of adopting a philosophy of the past?
- Action as an intrinsic outcome of thinking
- Ortega's conception of philosophy in relation to other views, eg: Plato, Descartes, Kant, Heidegger.

**Plato: *The Republic*, Books IV–IX**

15. (a) **Explain the claim that “preventing excessive wealth and poverty among the citizens is fundamental to Plato’s idea of a just state”.** [10]

The claim stems from S K Vaughan’s book, *Poverty, Justice, and Western Political Thought* (2008) and invites an analysis of a central concept of Plato’s political theory: justice. The claim refers to what Socrates states in Book IV: “Wealth and poverty. One produces luxury, idleness, and revolution, the other meanness of spirit and poor workmanship – and of course revolution as well”. Candidates might explain Socrates’s view on the excess of wealth and poverty as sources of corruption. Candidates might relate this claim to the specific classes Plato depicts for his ideal city, by analysing the specific qualities of guardians, artisans, and philosophers. Candidates might mention the Myth of the Metals and the “noble lie”, though they are presented by Plato in Book III. Candidates might refer to the educational system that Plato proposes for the different classes of the state. Candidates might evaluate whether the claim about excessive wealth and poverty applies to the state as a whole and/or to the individuals as single citizens, and make reference to the parallel between the just city and the individual’s soul: “An individual who is ruled by the love of money or one who does not have the necessary tools to perform his craft cannot be just. In the same way, a state is not just when poverty is prevalent or when there are huge economic gaps between rich and poor since it violates the principle of moderation and creates disharmony” (Vaughan). Candidates might mention Plato’s Chariot Allegory and the theme of the tripartite soul, in relation with the concept of harmony and justice. Candidates might refer to Plato’s view on private property and familial arrangements and evaluate whether they support his view on the just state. Candidates might explain how Plato intends to prevent excessive wealth and poverty within the state and whether specific regulations are indicated – Plato never mentions distributive justice. Also, candidates might clarify whether the issue of richness and poverty applies to all citizens, to a multitude of them, or to specific classes only. Finally, candidates might evaluate other philosophical views on the theme of wealth, poverty, and private property, in relation with justice, equity, liberty, eg: Locke, Rousseau, Rawls, Nozick, Sen.

[Source: From S. K. Vaughan’s *Poverty, Justice and Western Political Thought*, published by Lexington Books. All rights reserved.]

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The issues of excessive wealth and poverty as sources of corruption and/or injustice
- The concepts of justice and harmony
- The three classes of the ideal state; the Myth of the Metals and the “noble lie”
- The division of labour
- The educational system for the three classes
- The parallel between the state and the individual: the Chariot Allegory and the tripartite soul
- Private property and familial arrangements: how private property is intended for the specific classes.

- (b) **Evaluate the issues of excessive wealth and poverty within Plato’s just state.** [15]

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Whether luxury and poverty corrupt the citizens, and whether they corrupt any kind of citizen or specific categories
- Whether the division in three classes is a solution for the issues of luxury and poverty
- Whether Plato offers specific arguments to prevent excessive wealth and poverty, eg: distributive justice, taxation, or otherwise
- Whether Plato’s view on private property and familial arrangements has to do with the prevention of excessive wealth and poverty
- Whether Plato’s view on private property counts for any citizen or class
- Possible comparison to other philosophical views on private poverty, wealth, and poverty, eg: Locke, Rousseau, Rawls, Nozick, Sen.



16. (a) **Explain Plato’s claim that “the sun is not sight, but it is the cause of sight and it can be seen by sight”.** [10]

The claim arises from Book VI of Plato’s *The Republic* and it is actually Glaucon’s question to Socrates. The claim invites an analysis of the analogy of the sun, which is presented by Plato in 507b–509c of Book VI. Candidates might explain the role that the sun plays in the analogy and how it is related to other concepts. Particularly, candidates might focus on the concepts of truth and knowledge: as Socrates states, when the soul “focuses upon what is illuminated by truth and by that which is shine forth, then it understands and knows what it sees [...]. But when it focuses on what is mingled with darkness, [...] then it resorts to opinion and is dimmed”. Candidates might explain the relationship between truth, knowledge, and the sun, by analysing another central concept: goodness. Candidates might illustrate the parallel Plato presents between the sun and the good. As Socrates states, “you can say that this thing which gives the things which are known their truth [...] is the form or character of the good. [...] It is correct to think of light and vision as sun-like, but incorrect to think that they are the sun, in the same way here it is correct to think of knowledge and truth as good-like, but incorrect to think that either of them is the good”. Candidates might link the analogy of the sun to other arguments that Plato presents in the immediately following lines, eg: the analogy of the divided line, the allegory of the cave. Candidates might also consider the whole theory of the Forms and their relationship with truth, knowledge, and reality. Candidates might evaluate whether Plato’s arguments are consistently supported by Socrates’s analogies and allegories. Finally, candidates might mention other philosophical views on truth, knowledge, goodness, eg: Augustine, Aquinas, Descartes, Hume, Kant, Nietzsche, and/or mention the role that other elements can play in the process of knowledge, eg: emotions, bodily senses, imagination.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The analogy of the sun: how the metaphor of the sun is used to explain what truth and knowledge are; light *versus* darkness
- The sun in relation to “the Good” and the beautiful
- The analogy of the divided line: knowledge, understanding, opinion, belief, imagination
- The allegory of the cave
- The theory of the Forms
- The role of the bodily senses, emotions, imagination.

- (b) **Evaluate Plato’s claim that “the sun is not sight, but it is the cause of sight and it can be seen by sight”.** [15]

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Whether knowledge can be explained in terms of light and darkness
- Whether and how knowledge is related to truth
- Whether knowledge and truth imply goodness and beauty
- Whether the analogy of the sun is linked to Plato’s other arguments, eg: the analogy of the divided line, the allegory of the cave
- How is the analogy of the sun connected to Plato’s theory of the Forms?
- Plato’s view on knowledge compared to other views, eg: emotivism, empiricism
- Whether knowledge, truth, and understanding exclude other elements beyond reason, eg: emotions, bodily senses, imagination.

**Peter Singer: *The Life You Can Save***

17. (a) **Explain Singer’s claim that “we favour our families and communities [...] rather than [...] the lives of the poor beyond these boundaries”.** [10]

[Source: From Peter Singer, *The Life You Can Save*, © and available for free download from [www.thelifeyoucansave.org](http://www.thelifeyoucansave.org).]

The question seeks an explanation for the reasons presented to describe why people are reluctant to give to the poor at an effective rate to make a difference to the life style of the poor globally. Much as the three main monotheistic religions advocate the giving to those in need, it remains evident that generally people do not easily give. An explanation of this behaviour, even though there should be a sense of identification and empathy with those in need, raises issues of people wanting to make their own judgments about whether to give or not. In a way the distance of the need from people’s everyday life means that they are more likely to react to the idea of charity beginning at home rather than giving to those in need far away. Parochialism might be seen as one of the main restrictions to large scale giving. Also, some awareness of the issues surrounding institutional support programmes and the condition of leadership and organization structures in places where the greatest need exists does not encourage giving on a necessarily large scale. Few see giving as a duty for humans. There seems to be a reluctance to recognize that wealthy nations could be seen as a causal factor of poverty.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Reactions to inefficient and corrupt regimes that misuse foreign aid
- The perceived task that governments ought to give and not individuals
- Inefficiencies and/or perceived misuse of resources by aid agencies
- The inability of individuals to comprehend the scale of the problem and the scale of response needed to produce a significant redistribution of wealth
- The idea that giving creates dependency instead of motivating to establish self sufficiency
- Whether aid to poor areas might prevent development rather than generate it
- The scale of the need prevents people from appreciating that every little helps
- People’s perception of fairness and individual and mass responsibility.

- (b) **Evaluate Singer’s claim that “we favour our families and communities [...] rather than [...] the lives of the poor beyond these boundaries”.** [15]

[Source: From Peter Singer, *The Life You Can Save*, © and available for free download from [www.thelifeyoucansave.org](http://www.thelifeyoucansave.org).]

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Psychological tendencies in humans to favour those they know and with whom they identify
- The need for humans to see relatively quick and/or effective results
- Marxist interpretations that market societies have corrupted human behaviour, therefore self-interest and self-preservation dominate
- The behaviour of governments having unrealistic aid programmes which reinforce individual perceptions
- A discussion of “nudge theory” and whether it can be applied beyond a localized environment
- The degree to which religious traditions are treated skeptically and therefore the giving component of these traditions declines
- Selfless acts of giving seem often to be misinterpreted and treated skeptically
- Ways of promoting empathy and compassion
- The degree to which humans can be altruistic. Discussion might include the “Hobbes example”.

18. (a) **Explain Singer’s claim that giving at reasonable levels reinforces “the link between giving and happiness”.** [10]

This question stems from the discussion in Chapter 10 and invites an explanation of the suggested link in humans between giving and increasing a sense of happiness. It rests on the premise that doing good creates a sense of well-being in the doer. The suggestion that there are limits to the level of giving by an individual before the sense of good will diminishes. The claims rest on empirical psychological research that might be described and challenged. However, the link seems to rest primarily on the ethical position of our sense of how we actually live and how we ought to live since “taking part in a collective effort to help the world’s poorest people would give your life greater meaning and fulfilment”. Within the individual the balancing of a moral position and an emotion response takes place. The moral sense of well-being might be generated by doing more good, giving more. Candidates might explore Singer’s idea of effective altruism. In particular, they might question whether giving at reasonable levels is sufficient to solve some of the problems that he highlights. Candidates might discuss the possible tension between Singer’s moral requirement to give to those in need and individual’s pursuit of happiness.

[Source: From Peter Singer, *The Life You Can Save*, © and available for free download from [www.thelifeyoucansave.org](http://www.thelifeyoucansave.org).]

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Sociological surveys and the evidence of how people feel about giving
- The extent to which feeling happy is the only motivating factor in generating acts of giving
- Examples of the very rich giving as guides for the behaviour of the person in the street
- The relationship between governmental giving and individual giving
- Possible selfless acts and psychological rewards
- Ways of measuring the achievement of happiness: qualitative data and self-fulfilment issues
- Calculations of reasonable levels of individual giving: estimates indicate 5 % of taxed income for those in wealthy nations.

- (b) **Evaluate Singer’s claim that giving at reasonable levels reinforces “the link between giving and happiness”.** [15]

[Source: From Peter Singer, *The Life You Can Save*, © and available for free download from [www.thelifeyoucansave.org](http://www.thelifeyoucansave.org).]

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Buddhism and the connection between doing good and the creation of personal joy
- The ideas of Plato and Epicurus focused on a just life
- The human desire to create harmony rather than discord
- A human’s desire to limit suffering in the world
- The degree to which amounts of giving can be mandated and a public standard established
- Whether relatively poor people in rich countries should be involved in the giving process
- Challenges to the effectiveness in the use of what is given
- Self-interest as a contrary driver of people’s actions
- Applying the actions and motivations of the super-rich to the ordinary person
- Parochialism *versus* globalism
- The moral responsibility of government as opposed to the moral responsibility of the individual.

**Charles Taylor: *The Ethics of Authenticity***

**19. (a)**

Removed for copyright reasons

**(b)**

Removed for copyright reasons

**20. (a) Explain Taylor’s assessment of the view that everybody has their own values. [10]**

The question asks for an explanation of Taylor’s assessment of what he calls the individualism of self-fulfillment, which is first discussed in Chapter 2, The Inarticulate Debate. Taylor’s assessment starts with a central stance of Bloom’s book *The Closing of the American Mind*. The position presented there is critical of the identified as a basic attitude of educated youth, a relativist position where everyone has their own values. This is not just an epistemological position, a view about the limits of what reason can establish, but was also held as a moral position. Taylor’s assessment presents two main sides of the issue. Relativism was partly grounded in a principle of mutual respect, it was itself an outcome of a form of individualism. However, this individualism involves centering the focus narrowly on the self and ignoring things beyond it. Answers might draw upon Taylor’s presentation of the sides and follow his further analysis.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Taylor’s approach to self-fulfillment as something we determine for ourselves
- The individualism of self-fulfillment is widespread in our times and has grown particularly strong in western societies since the 1960s
- A series of authors (Bell, Bloom, Lasch, Lipovetsky) are concerned about the possible dire political consequences of what Taylor calls the individualism of self-fulfillment, which represents a shift in the culture
- Taylor’s agreement with the criticism that these writers make of contemporary culture
- Taylor’s position that the relativism widely espoused today is a profound mistake, even in some respects self-stultifying
- It seems true that the culture of self-fulfillment has led many people to lose sight of concerns that transcend them. It seems obvious that it has taken trivialized and self-indulgent forms
- All this can result in a sort of absurdity, as new modes of conformity arise among people who are striving to be themselves, and beyond this, new forms of dependence, as people insecure in their identities turn to all sorts of self-appointed experts and guides, shrouded with the prestige of science or some exotic spirituality
- These arguments, particularly in Bloom, do not seem to recognize that there is a powerful moral ideal at work here, however degraded and distorted its expression might be
- The moral ideal behind self-fulfillment is that of being true to oneself, in a specifically modern understanding of that term.

**(b) Evaluate Taylor’s assessment of the view that everybody has their own values. [15]**

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Self-fulfillment seems to imply that one ought not to challenge another’s values. That is their concern, their life choice, and it ought to be respected
- A social being implies a value assumption or a value decision. Is this a challenge to the others’ values and decisions?
- The extent to which Taylor’s main claims might have a clear and distinct moral validity, eg: authenticity or “horizons of significance” seem more to be psychology or sociology of moral life. Taylor’s position seems clear and instructive as a relevant descriptive approach, but it fails to provide reasons to prescribe possible moral values or conducts
- The grounds for the view of self-fulfillment are complex and might go far beyond the moral reasons for “soft relativism”
- Subjectivism provides an important backing for relativism
- Taylor attempts to defend a non-subjectivist account of morality. This involves not so much detailed engagements with critiques of subjectivist approaches because Taylor attempted to construct a historical narrative about how ethical thinking is historically and culturally shaped
- Is Taylor’s position consistent? Can he accept that there is no single correct system of values, while at the same time holding that there could be several forms of valorizing that might be justified objectively?
- Taylor’s position in relation or comparison with other positions or approaches; from social and cultural movements to philosophies, past or present.

## Lao Tzu: *Tao Te Ching*

### 21. (a) Explain Lao Tzu's idea that in the whole world there is nothing softer than water. [10]

The question focuses on the theme of water which is central within the thinking of Lao Tzu (number 78). Often the purity and stillness of water is used by him to try and explain the *Tao*. However, here the question is drawing attention to the quality of water which is softness and weakness, and this quality of water is being suggested as a guide for our ways of behaving. Therefore, an explanation might well focus on the nature of the Sage (master, man of calling) if he were to allow the qualities of water to permeate his actions and thinking. There might also be an explanation of the elements of water that show it to be everywhere in the world and yet not confrontational. This clearly allows for comments on the link between water and *wu wei* (non-action). The Sage is a mirror of all humans and can therefore, according to Lao Tzu, achieve more by enduring suffering and being humble; in fact, practising *wu wei*. The qualities of water referred to in the question might also reveal aspects of the *Tao*. The contradiction that exists in the notion of water is perhaps the fact that it is one of the most active elements of the world, and not always soft and calming.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Lao Tzu's view that water is not a great destructive force but an element with qualities of weakness and softness that he wants to draw from nature and apply to human behaviour. It is the yielding, surrounding softness and weakness (non-resistance) quality that he wants to stress
- For him, as expressed in number 76, it is the weak and soft that are enduring aspects of life not the strong and aggressive elements which he links to death
- The slow continuous subtle efforts of water are suggested as models of human behaviour to achieve any objective
- It is not persistence of attack but the ability of water to go around challenges that allows success to be bought about
- The Sage, mirroring an ideal for all humans, can, according to Lao Tzu, achieve more by enduring suffering, being humble, and being water like; in fact practising *wu wei*
- The aspects of water revealed in this section also give insight into the nature of the *Tao*.

### (b) Evaluate Lao Tzu's idea that in the whole world there is nothing softer than water. [15]

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The softness and stillness of water compared to the destructive force of water
- Human appreciation of the contrasting qualities of water, and humans are well versed in using both aspects for the betterment of humans; contrasting cleanliness, clean water, and irrigation as softness, with the force of water as a means of power, in producing hydro electricity
- Issues arising out of how Lao Tzu might have seen these contrasting aspects of the applications of water in his own everyday life either in a rural or urban setting
- A counter understanding of how humans struggle to tame the power of water
- Reasons why Lao Tzu used water rather than air, which has similar qualities; water is lower and down to earth and less abstract than air and therefore more easily understood by humans
- Whether going around challenges is always the best solution
- The way Lao Tzu's thoughts contrast with other Chinese traditions which often stress confrontation
- The possible tendency of humans to exploit the weaker members of society. Sage/humans that behave as weak and yielding might not be rewarded or achieve goals in a modern market driven society
- The claim that a *wu wei* approach to life is simply naive
- Parallels might be made with aspects of Christian doctrine and the role of the weak
- The need of humans to have an arsenal of approaches to problem solving; both confrontational and non-confrontational and ways to achieve a balance of these approaches.



**22. (a) Explain Lao Tzu's idea that humans do not need laws and government direction to live a harmonious life. [10]**

This question asks for an explanation of how, by eliminating laws and directions from a government or ruler people would live in harmony together. They would find their balance. This is assuming a natural order and inherent desire of humans to live well together. It invites an investigation of the *wu wei* by which desire is reduced or removed and non-action becomes the order of the day. This is not passivity but simply an absence of desire. It is living selflessly. It is living in a spontaneous way with no planned objectives. It is living in an authentic way without reference to rituals and virtue. In such a societal model the ruler does not interfere by establishing rules and laws.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- How people establish and accept balance among themselves
- The nature of spontaneity of action
- Lao Tzu's understanding of harmony
- *Wu wei*
- The way in which all would practise *wu wei* and therefore strive to find the *Tao*
- The understanding of the *Tao* as the application of reason and reasonableness
- The understanding that non-action would in fact lead to more contentment; the removal of frustrations
- The need for rulers in such a social model
- The ability of humans to remove desire in all its forms.

**(b) Evaluate Lao Tzu's idea that humans do not need laws and government direction to live a harmonious life. [15]**

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Views on basic human nature and whether humans are basically good or bad
- The degree to which society moulds the nature of humans and therefore societal change would change human behaviour
- The absence of desire and a life of harmony might generate life without any motivation and therefore indolence
- Are there desires, such as love of beauty or music that are harmonious, and not contrary to *wu wei*?
- The role of leaders in a harmonious society
- Do humans develop through stress and competition?
- The ability to achieve such harmony and balance in modern urban environments
- Futuristic approaches to sustainable life styles might lead to people practising *wu wei*
- The basic practicality of Lao Tzu's libertarianism.

**Zhuangzi: *Zhuangzi*****23. (a) Explain Zhuangzi’s idea that if there is no “other” then there can be no “I”. [10]**

The claim arises from Chapter 2.3 in *Zhuangzi* and invites an analysis of some central concepts of Zhuangzi’s overall philosophy. Particularly, Chapter 2 presents several arguments on the self, the other, mind, and knowledge. Candidates might explain the relationship between the self and the other and how it is intended by Zhuangzi and the *Tao*. Are the self and the other in a dichotomous relationship? Is reality experienced and known from subjectivity? Is otherness a counter-position in relation to, and stemming from, subjectivity? Or is there an ineffable root within subjectivity, which resorts to something else? Candidates might explore the nature of the self and whether it is something apart from the subject and his/her physical body. Moreover, candidates might focus on Zhuangzi’s distinction between a “false self” and a “true self”: the false self is determined by the influence of external elements, including the others; whereas the true self is independent from social recognition and approbation, so making the individual free and unchained. It is worth considering that Zhuangzi describes the “perfect man” as self-less. Candidates might discuss whether the self should be considered as a “container”, a metaphorical place, or a locative space. Candidates might also discuss and evaluate whether Zhuangzi holds a dualistic view of mind and body; in doing so, candidates might also refer to other philosophical views, eg: Plato, Descartes, Spinoza, Kant.

Candidates might explore:

- The nature of the self
- The relationship between the self and the other
- The relationship between subjectivity and objectivity
- The nature of mind
- The nature of knowledge
- The distinction between a “false self” and a “true self”
- The role of social recognition in determining the nature of the self
- The “perfect man”, the Sage and the self.

**(b) Evaluate Zhuangzi’s idea that if there is no “other” then there can be no “I”. [15]**

Possible discussion points include:

- Whether “I”/the self is a metaphorical place, a physical “container”, or a locative space
- Whether “I”/the self has an ineffable origin
- Is the self linkable to the concepts of conscience or soul?
- Whether subjectivity and objectivity are in a dichotomous relationship
- Whether the self stems from external influences, eg: social approbation, social recognition, fame
- Is the “true self” a distinct self from the “false self” or is it selfless?
- Whether Zhuangzi holds a dualistic view of the self and the physical body
- Possible other philosophical views on the relationship between the self and the other or between a non-physical self and a physical body, eg: Plato, Descartes, Spinoza, Kant.

24. (a) Explain Zhuangzi's claim that life and death have the certainty of morning and night.

[10]

The claim stems from Chapter 6.2 in *Zhuangzi* and invites an analysis from the concepts of life and death. Candidates might consider an exploration of the relationship of the opposites in the whole *Tao*: from the *yin* and *yang* to life and death. Zhuangzi claims that human beings cannot influence the inherent natures of things: people believe that they can control many elements of their lives, including life and death, rise and fall and many kinds of transformation. Candidates might focus on the necessity of changes and transformation, which mark nature as a whole. Changes are the eternal movement that affects all physical elements, including the human body. Candidates might refer to the figures of the "True Man" and the Sage to describe what the correct perspective is: "The Sage wanders where things cannot get away and all are preserved. He takes death in youth to be good; he takes old age to be good. He takes life's beginning to be good; he takes life's end to be good." Candidates might highlight the necessity to adopt a holistic view on changes and opposites and consider them as part of the eternal process of transformation. It is by moving all things to a higher level that the opposites can be seen as co-existent elements, mutually dependent and generating each other. Zhuangzi uses the metaphor of the boat and the action of hiding: as he states, "hiding a small thing in a large place is well enough, but the thing may still get away. Now if you were to hide the world in the world it could never get away: this is the ultimate character of an unchanging thing." Candidates might explain that a universal perspective is the pre-requisite for understanding the *Tao*: "The *Tao* is without action (*wu wei*) and without form. It can be transmitted but not received; it can be grasped but not seen. It is its own root, rooted in itself, before heaven and earth, from antiquity it has persisted as it is. [...] It gives birth to heaven, it gives birth to earth. It lies above the great roof of the cosmos, yet it is not high; it lies beneath the six ends of the earth, yet it is not deep." Candidates might evaluate whether Zhuangzi's view is consistently presented in relation with the *Tao* and across his whole work. Candidates might also evaluate other philosophical views on the nature of the opposites, eg: Heraclitus, "coincidentia oppositorum", on the relationship between life and death, eg: Plato, Augustine, Aquinas, Pascal, Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, and/or on changes and transformation in life, eg: stoicism, Aristotle, Aquinas, Hume, evolutionism, Dewey.

[Source: Translation used with the kind permission of Professor Robert Eno.]

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Life and death: the necessity of changes and transformation
- The nature of the opposites in the *Tao*
- The opposites as part of the eternal process of transformation
- The possibility/impossibility to control transformation
- The changes affecting human life and the human body
- The "True Man" and the Sage in relation with transformation
- The necessity to adopt a holistic perspective; the *Tao* and *wu wei*
- The metaphor of the boat and the action of hiding.

**(b) Evaluate Zhuangzi’s claim that life and death have the certainty of morning and night.**

**[15]**

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Whether opposites are part of the same process of transformation and whether this includes their mutual generation
  - Whether humans can control the process of transformation and the changes affecting their lives, including the human bodies and death; does this possibility apply to the control of changes occurring to the world intended as environment?
  - Whether the understanding and the control of the process of transformation is prerogative of the Sage only or people can generally achieve them; has this to do with the understanding of the *Tao*?
  - Whether the process of transformation calls for a holistic perspective in order to be seen in the correct light and not as an issue
  - Whether Zhuangzi’s view on the ability to understand life and death as part of the natural process of transformation is comparable to other views, eg: stoicism, cynicism, eremitism, or linkable to other concepts, eg: ataraxia
  - Whether Zhuangzi’s view on the process of transformation, on life and death, and on the opposites can be related to other philosophical views, eg: Heraclitus, Plato, Aristotle, Aquinas, Nicholas of Cusa, Hume, Hegel, Nietzsche, Darwin.
-