



MARKSCHEME

May 2012

PHILOSOPHY

Higher Level and Standard Level

Paper 2

29 pages

*This markscheme is **confidential** and for the exclusive use of examiners in this examination session.*

*It is the property of the International Baccalaureate and must **not** be reproduced or distributed to any other person without the authorization of IB Cardiff.*

Note to examiners

This markscheme outlines what members of the paper setting team had in mind when they devised the questions. The topics listed in the bullet points indicate possible areas candidates might cover in their answers. They are not compulsory points and not necessarily the best possible points. They are only a framework to help examiners in their assessment. Examiners should be responsive to any other valid points or any other valid approaches.

Using the assessment criteria

Candidates at both Higher Level and Standard Level answer **one** question on the prescribed texts.

Answers are assessed according to the assessment criteria set out below.

Paper 2 assessment criteria**A Expression**

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

Achievement Level	Descriptor
0	The student has not reached level 1.
1	The student expresses some basic ideas but it is not clear what the answer is trying to convey. The use of language is not appropriate to philosophy.
2	The student presents some ideas in an organized way. There is some clarity of expression but the answer cannot always be followed. The use of language is not always appropriate to philosophy. The student shows some understanding of the author's use of specific terminology but only in a limited way.
3	The student presents ideas in an organized way and the answer can be easily followed. The use of language is appropriate to philosophy and the author's use of specific terminology is satisfactorily understood.
4	The student presents ideas in an organized and coherent way and insights are clearly articulated. The use of language is effective and appropriate to philosophy. The student shows a clear understanding and use of the author's specific terminology.
5	The student presents ideas in an organized, coherent and incisive way, insights are clearly articulated and the answer is focused and sustained. The use of language is precise and appropriate to philosophy. The student shows an assured understanding and use of the author's specific terminology.

B Knowledge and understanding of the text

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

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

C Identification and analysis of relevant material

- How well has the student understood the specific demands of the question?
- To what extent does the student identify and analyse relevant supporting material?
- How effectively does the student analyse the supporting material, examples and counter-arguments?

Achievement Level	Descriptor
0	The student has not reached level 1.
1–2	The student shows little understanding of the specific demands of the question and identifies relevant supporting material in only a limited way. There is little analysis and few or no examples are given.
3–4	The student shows some understanding of the specific demands of the question and identifies and analyses some relevant supporting material. Some appropriate examples are used.
5–6	The student shows a satisfactory understanding of the specific demands of the question and identifies supporting material that is nearly always relevant. There is a satisfactory analysis of this material. Examples are appropriate and give some support to the argument.
7–8	The student shows an effective understanding of the specific demands of the question and identifies relevant supporting material that is analysed in a sound and thoughtful way. Examples are appropriate in their support of the overall argument. Some counter-arguments are identified.
9–10	The student shows an in-depth understanding of the specific demands of the question and identifies supporting material that is always relevant. The implications of this material are analysed in detail. Examples are well chosen and compelling in their support of the overall argument. Counter-arguments are identified and analysed in a convincing way.

D Development and evaluation

- Does the student develop the argument in a coherent way?
- How well does the student develop and evaluate the ideas and arguments of the text?
- To what extent does the student express a relevant personal response?

Achievement Level	Descriptor
0	The student has not reached level 1.
1–2	The student develops ideas and arguments in a basic way and there is little or no evaluation of the text.
3–4	The student develops some ideas and arguments but the development is simple, or is asserted without reference to the text. There may be some basic evaluation of the ideas and arguments of the text but it is not developed.
5–6	The student develops ideas and arguments in a satisfactory way and evaluates them to some extent. A limited critique of the ideas and arguments of the text is offered. There is some evidence of a relevant personal response.
7–8	The student develops ideas and arguments from a consistently held perspective, in close response to the ideas and arguments of the text. Evaluation is thoughtful and convincing and the student offers a critique of the text that goes beyond a statement of opinion or belief. There is good evidence of a relevant personal response.
9–10	The student develops ideas and arguments in an incisive and coherent way in detailed response to the text. Evaluation is compelling or subtle, and convincing, and the student offers a critique of the text that shows strong evidence of a relevant personal response. The student shows an ability to challenge the assumptions made by the author and explores different approaches to the text.

Bhagavad Gita**1. To what extent is there a need to be in control of one's physical body in order to encounter one's true self?**

This question invites an assessment of the need to become isolated from, and controlling of, all bodily aspects in order to reach an understanding of inner, higher, mental (soul) states.

Key Points

- The need to control the physical functions and human perception of the physical world so as to see the self without distraction, to minimize bodily functions and so become isolated from the world
- The need to control physical desires and passions
- Krishna's training of Arjuna to take control of himself physically and separate himself from the physical world
- Enhancing generally weak aspects of cognitive skills as an aid to focus on the non-physical self, the mind
- The ability to reflect upon one's self in a detached way
- The results of a greater understanding and appreciation of self; deeper awareness of one's role in the universe, a refinement of interaction with others, caring and support and a curtailment of violence
- The relationship of the physical world and its actions in all its forms to the soul
- The difference between the soul and the inner soul
- Other ways of encountering one's true self, perhaps through social interactions
- The need for physical sustenance, detachment and control

Discussion

- Is the seeker of the self dependent on others for physical sustenance? To what extent are the seeker and the sought one the same? Or, are these two separate people?
- Does control mean ultimate loss of human desires and passions?
- How far are passions and desires essential aspects of humanness and the self?
- How far can the physical be detached from the state of self-reflection?
- Is there real value to oneself, others and the environment from having gained more self-awareness?
- Are social interactions a better route to self-realization than isolation?
- Is the soul or the self, self-sustaining, or is it dependent on the physical conditions of the body?
- Are Arjuna, and others who follow the same path, better prepared to deal with the physical world and their bodies, by having been isolated physically and mentally?

2. Explain and discuss the nature of heaven and hell.

This question allows for an explanation and discussion of both the literal and metaphorical interpretations of heaven and hell as routes to the creation of a better condition for humans, both in the physical world and in the world of the soul.

Key Points

- Krishna’s account of the nature of heaven and its virtues
- The qualities of the soul that mirror heaven’s nature
- The nature of hell and its physical qualities; a world of no truth and no moral foundation
- The metaphorical mirror of this as humans with “dead souls”
- The interrelationship of the mental state of people without God with a godless world, hell
- The real battle that is the focus of much of the experience of Arjuna can be seen as the metaphysical battle to gain the heavenly qualities for his own soul. It might be a model for all people to fight the same battle and achieve heaven
- It is an ultimate conflict within the cycle of life, freeing one’s self from selfishness and human passions
- The difficulty of dealing with people who hate you because you have won the ultimate conflict
- The parallel of the dispute between those that have heavenly virtues and those who do not
- The nature of the three gates of hell
- The supreme path and joy that can be attained by humans who are in “the light”

Discussion

- Whether the joy and perfection of the “path supreme” is achievable by humans, there is an assumption that humans have the strength to conquer their baser natures
- If the passions of humans are driven out have we become gods or have we become just boring?
- How can this perfect person really live in an imperfect environment? Does it drive them to complete isolation or destruction by those who are imperfect?
- Can a perfectly cleansed soul be disguised so that normal physical activities are carried out, or will others who are unclean simply not understand the actions?
- Are saints unable to be comprehended by “normal” people?
- Parallels might be drawn from historical figures such as Gandhi, Martin Luther King and other radical reformers who challenged the established value systems of our world, a world of “dead souls”
- Parallels might also be made with other religious views of heaven and hell, saints and sinners
- Is a relativistic world hell with no fixed truths? Is all action justified, or can it be challenged by a morality of absolutes, absolute truths and the moral certitudes of heaven?
- Do all humans have the capability to change their nature, or is capability restricted to a few who might have special gifts?

Confucius: *The Analects*

3. “If one does not understand fate, one has no means of becoming a gentleman; if one does not understand the rites, one has no means of taking one’s stand; if one does not understand words, one has no means of understanding people.” Discuss and evaluate.

This question asks for a discussion and evaluation of ideas of virtue: ritual, education, and the role they play in preparing the individual for public life.

Key Points

- Much of *The Analects* is concerned with the business of learning from past experience in order to organize the future
- Without knowledge, one cannot hope to become like the gentleman and develop humaneness. Learning is essential to knowledge in its ritual acquisition through books and mentors, although Confucius does say that knowledge via copying and remembering is an inferior type of knowledge. The attitude toward learning is as important as what is learnt
- Definition of ritual; types (differences between hand washing and rending of clothes) and purpose (expression of honour or hygiene). The difference is between ritual as tradition and doctrine, *i.e.* the practice of long term custom compared to invented dictated rules
- Observing the inner life is a central concern of the gentleman; if the inner life is healthy, then there is nothing to fear and nothing to worry about under heaven; the gentleman accepts his fate as he knows there is nothing he can do when he is powerless
- The gentleman is a person who has certain morals and manners (rituals). This categorization is applied to an individual while also applying to a person as a member of a certain class
- One is defined by one’s roles and relationships. The goal of living is to achieve harmony and enjoyment for oneself and others through acting appropriately in those roles and relationships that define an individual
- The relation amongst rituals, the gentleman and the law of heaven
- The gentleman is a reflection of virtue and his social practice converts itself into a model of morality
- Rituals represent an essential value for the identity of the individual and for the structure of society

Discussion

- Does the action of the gentleman reveal his true attitude? If the attitude is wrong does it invalidate the action?
- How far can ritual itself show the highest ethical standards? With too many rituals does the purpose of the action get lost?
- Does Confucius really explore morality/good behaviour or does he explore merely a façade, an acceptable and agreed way of behaving? To what extent does he really want to get to the motive behind the action?
- How far is morality merely about patterns of behaviour?
- Does Confucius go too far in relating knowledge to ritual?
- Is it a problem with virtue ethics that you may not know why, or even if, your actions are ethical?
- Is a life without ritual possible?

4. Evaluate the claim that a humane person is hesitant in speech and deferential in attitude.

This question allows for an evaluation of a major idea of Confucius, that of the subjugation of the self. Other practices, such as reverence for tradition, love of learning, or broader issues such as the value of virtue ethics *etc.* might also be discussed.

Key Points

- Submission of the self: to a master, to learning, to sets of rituals both public and private, and to family and friends. It is an essential requirement for humaneness
- The difficulty of the task is evidenced by the many examples of rulers, bureaucrats, and students, who fail to meet the standard of humaneness in their attitudes and actions
- Ritual breeds deference and a sense of duty which are necessary qualities in the gentleman
- Though deference and humility are important and necessary, when appropriate, the humane will admonish, criticize, and correct. Being true to oneself is also an essential prerequisite for humaneness
- Learning and practising rites and rituals, as well as learning knowledge found in books, breeds perseverance and tenacity
- Confucius’s social philosophy largely revolves around the concept of compassion and loving others. Cultivating or practising such concern for others involves deprecating oneself
- The “I”: what does Confucius signify by this notion?

Discussion

- Is Confucianism a practical and valuable ethical code for governing?
- Rather than developing virtue, does compliance with rituals and deference to authority breed timidity and obedience?
- Other ethical systems, *e.g.* religious ones, have observance of rituals, duty and subjugation as either virtues or principles, and they may be compared and contrasted with Confucianism
- The grounds for making prudent judgments between deference and criticism are based on self-interest, and not on a sense of acting virtuously
- Is altruism a necessary quality for a virtuous person? Can selfless acts be explained by appeals to self-interest or to feelings of self-righteous pleasure?
- Is virtue ethics of the Confucian kind good for all? If not, what are the moral implications?

Lao Tzu: *Tao Te Ching*

5. Explain and discuss the view that when the world loses the *Tao* then the “cavalry ravage the countryside”.

This question invites an explanation and discussion of the *Tao* and the need to live in harmony so as to reduce competition and frustrations in one’s life and the world.

Key Points

- The nature of the *Tao* and the need for the world to be in harmony with it
- The idea that when the *Tao* is the focus of all life then civil life is cultured
- The *Tao* could be interpreted as the dominance of reason and reasonable behaviour in human interactions
- The nature of humans in harmony is that they are contented, non-competitive and passive
- Humans should be non-active (*wu wei*)
- The non-possessive way of life leads to more gratification and a world without ambition
- The “cavalry”, sometimes seen as “warhorses of a warring army”, can refer to open conflict or to a competitive market-driven environment where exploitation might take place
- Possession and acquisition are the driving forces of behaviour
- War is, at a social level, competitive and involves social mobility, and can be contrasted to the condition of inner stillness when the *Tao* is present
- The wisdom of the *Tao* is not to compete
- Through inner stillness, nature and the higher qualities of the world and human relations are fully appreciated

Discussion

- To what extent does the metaphor “war across the countryside” portray a materialistically driven society?
- Are there benefits for humans in a competitive community? Do the weak get left behind?
- With the *Tao* present in society does harmony produce complacency and lack of progress?
- Is aggression and self-seeking healthy for social development?
- Is “the countryside” real rather than metaphorical?
- Can inner stillness and calm be achieved alongside, or within, aspects of the busy materialistic world?
- Is possessing, and desiring to possess, people and goods, fundamentally wrong?
- Is a lack of contentment a curse or a driver of modern life and progress?

6. Evaluate the claim that “by doing nothing everything gets done”.

This question invites an evaluation of the worth of doing nothing as a way to achieve more, which is the essence of the *Tao*.

Key Points

- The essence of Tao is non-action (*wu wei*)
- Non-action is non-interference and a reflection both on the self and on the world; it is having time to linger and see and to be free of busy-ness
- *Wu wei* can be taken further to explain harmony and being in step with nature. So, doing more work is done by following the flow of nature
- Action should be spontaneous, not pre-planned or pre-emptive, as actions are in nature
- A contemplative approach and a considered way of achieving an objective produces a more holistic and harmonious response to, and resolution of, situations and encounters
- Tranquillity is not acceptance, but a seeking of a deeper understanding
- Comprehensive views and perspectives might be better than specialized, highly focused responses that are not natural; nature is a complex interaction among many facets, not isolated parts competing and conflicting

Discussion

- Is passive acceptance and non-action tolerable or is it to be seen as laziness and indolence?
- Can a modern, socially active human find tranquillity in the busy-ness of the modern world?
- How far can Lao Tzu’s approach to challenges be good solutions to contemporary environmental issues and social conflicts?
- Is a human with the approach of *wu wei* a hermit or merely a non-interfering individual?
- If all individuals were spontaneous in all their actions what order would exist in society?
- Does *wu wei* work in small rural communities but become impossible to enact in complex urban environments?
- If humans strived for *Tao* and practised *wu wei* would societies transform themselves into less complex, less competitive communities and thus be better?
- Does *wu wei* rest on an assumption that humans are inherently good, moral and selfless individuals?
- If we all stopped rushing around, and being driven by the clock and our desire to have more, would we feel better and be more contented?

Plato: *The Republic*, Books IV–IX

7. Evaluate Socrates’s claim that, for those with just souls, behaving according to the conventional rules of justice is not the result of blind adherence to the rules, but of an intention to preserve the order in their souls.

This question asks for an evaluation of the central idea of justice from the point of view of the individual soul.

Key Points

- The central idea of justice: as virtue or moral excellence of individual persons; as acting in the best interests of the just person, even if it brings nothing ordinarily recognizable such as happiness or success
- The analogy between justice in the individual soul and justice in the city
- Justice for the individual soul is possible when each of the parts of the soul performs the role it should in mutual harmony
- The parts of the soul: reason (*lógos*), emotion (*thumós*), appetite (*epithumetikós*); relations among them
- The well organized soul, which Socrates calls just by analogy with the just city, is the healthy soul. A soul is in order when its reason rules, is courageous when its emotional part acts bravely, and moderate when all three parts accept the rule of reason
- Forms of unjust political order (oligarchy, democracy and tyranny) and corresponding conditions of increasing disorder in the soul

Discussion

- Does the analysis of justice in the city serve only as an analogy to illuminate justice in the individual soul or is it the other way around?
- Does the notion of justice have ethical content or is it merely a formal characteristic of souls?
- To what extent is it adequate to analyse political issues as individual (psychological or ethical) issues?
- Does Plato’s analysis show a correspondence between being a virtuous, just, person and following objective rules based on rational justification?
- How can we know, and on what grounds, that the soul of an individual adheres to rules?
- Platonic justice and other conceptions of justice; Platonic conception of virtue and other conceptions of virtue
- The notion of political order goes much further than is necessary for the purposes of inquiry into individual justice
- Knowledge of justice through knowledge of the Form of Justice
- Significance and implications of a Socratic version of virtue ethics

8. Evaluate the claim that in the Form of the Good the theoretical purposes of philosophers are unified with the moral expertise required of rulers.

This question asks for an evaluation of the relationship between political philosophy and theoretical philosophy. Since the question relates theoretical philosophy with political philosophy through the central notion of the Form of the Good, it might be developed in multiple directions.

Key Points

- The key role of the epistemology and metaphysics of the Forms for political philosophy
- The relationship between the Forms and the Form of the Good: the dialectic
- The philosopher's mind has been prepared for abstract thought about Forms by rigorous and comprehensive study of mathematics and dialectics; rulers should have been properly trained and disciplined by the educational programme
- A philosopher-ruler is the only person with the knowledge and virtue necessary for producing harmony in society
- Only if virtuous and expert leaders rule the city is the good city possible
- Understanding of the Good removes illusions. The Allegory of the Cave depicts ordinary humanity as shackled by illusions which can be liberated by knowledge
- Combination of knowledge, practice and value

Discussion

- Should political order be grounded on moral reasons?
- Since the expansion of knowledge is possibly infinite, can political organizing be based solidly on knowledge?
- Can the opposing desires of reason, emotion and appetite be reconciled with the ideal of justice and order in the city?
- Provided we use the idea of the Good as an ideal for founding a just order within our own selves, might it not matter whether we can actually establish a truly just political order?
- Considering the development of political life in the real world, is it realistic to expect that people in political life can follow moral principles?

René Descartes: *Meditations***9. Evaluate the claim that error originates from the relation between intellect and will.**

This question asks for an evaluation of the relation between intellect and will, and the specific issue of error arising from judgment; however, in a wider sense, answers might refer to other possible causes of error in knowledge, and to the way of acquiring certain knowledge.

Key Points

- Error refers to that sort alone which arises in the determination of the true and the false. It does not refer to matters of faith, or to the conduct of life, but only to what concerns speculative truths, and those things that are known by means of the natural light alone
- Judgment depends on two faculties: the intellect or faculty of cognition, and the faculty of choice or freedom of will
- The intellect perceives ideas, whereas the will affirms or denies what is represented in the ideas. The judgment only occurs when the will leads to action
- The will's role is to affirm, deny, or refrain from judging when the ideas have been presented
- The distinction between what we actually see and what we intellectually judge to be the case
- The role of the senses; the knowledge of bodies; the wax example
- The role of imagination
- We should attend only to those objects of which our minds seem capable of having certain and indubitable cognition

Discussion

- Descartes's account of judgment compared with those of others, *e.g.* Aristotle
- Is error equated with false judgment?
- What does truth consist of?
- Error and the *cogito*
- Why is it necessary to refer to the will when dealing with speculative truths?
- Are mathematical truths related to the possibility of error caused by the conjunction of judgment and will?

10. Explain and discuss Descartes’s idea that from the fact that I cannot think of God except as existing, it follows that existence is inseparable from God, and hence God really exists.

This question offers an opportunity to explain and discuss Descartes’s ontological argument and idea of God.

Key Points

- After reflecting on the basis of geometric reasoning, that “everything which I clearly and distinctly perceive to belong to that thing really does belong to it”, Descartes concludes that this applies to the idea of God as well
- Descartes concludes that “it is quite evident that existence can no more be separated from the essence of God than the fact that its three angles equal to two right angles can be separated from the essence of a triangle”
- Because I cannot conceive a mountain without a valley, it does not follow that there is any mountain or valley in existence, but simply that the mountain and valley, whether they do or do not exist, are inseparable from each other
- Because I cannot conceive of God except as existing, it follows that existence is inseparable from my conception of Him as a perfect being, and therefore that He really exists
- This is not brought about by my thought, or that I impose any necessity on things; on the contrary, the necessity which lies in the thing itself, that is, the necessity of the existence of God, determines me to think in this way
- It is not in my power to conceive of God without His existence, just as I cannot conceive of a supremely perfect being devoid of an absolute perfection, and yet I am free to imagine a horse with or without wings

Discussion

- The ontological argument assumes that existence is a perfection
- Critiques of the ontological argument, *e.g.* existence is not a predicate
- The unique character of the idea of God as part of the ontological argument
- It is necessary for me to suppose God exists, but only based on the supposition that He has all perfection, since existence is one of the perfections
- The nature of necessity, the distinction between contingency and necessity
- Does Descartes’s ontological argument depend on the idea of God that he has?
- In what sense can the certitude of geometrical demonstrations be compared with the knowledge of God?

John Locke: *Second Treatise on Government***11. “The *Second Treatise on Government* restricts the extent and power of the state and gives the people sovereignty.” Discuss and evaluate this claim.**

This question invites a discussion and evaluation of a claim about a central theme of Locke’s work, which has brought it enduring significance, namely, its emphasis on the consent of the people.

Key Points

- Locke’s notion of the origin of the state and his use of the state of nature to illustrate it
- The state of nature sees natural law governing the interactions of people and grounds behaviour in biological and social necessities
- The emergence of laws developed by the commonwealth as a means to protect the life and property of individuals
- The state emerges to guarantee the welfare, and no more, of people and their property
- The protection of people gives the state its legitimacy and existence
- The giving up of rights to enter social agreement with others which brings about the protection provided by the state
- The right of the people to dissolve the government on grounds of what is considered the people’s best interest
- The contrast between monarchy and Locke’s conception of the people’s sovereignty
- The nature of the executive power; the modern division between the legislature and the executive

Discussion

- Does Locke ascribe natural rights to the people in a convincing fashion?
- Is Locke’s reliance on, and description of, the state of nature harmful to his arguments?
- Are the conditions by which the people can dissolve government convincing? Who decides?
- The relationship between the individual and her/his property
- The influence of the historical context of Locke’s view of the sovereignty of the people; the unrest in English society at the time of Locke’s writing
- The issue of consent to a contract that is essentially abstract
- The definition of “the people”; social equality and access to power in the modern age
- Is tacit consent a defensible form of consent?
- Modern social contract theories and their relationship to Locke’s ideas

12. To what extent does Locke’s conception of the role of the state rest on his conception of property?

This question invites an assessment of a central aspect of the reason for the establishment of the state: the protection of the property amassed through the natural activities of the people, as found in Chapters 2–7.

Key Points

- Locke claims that the state is established on the basis of the need to protect the amassed estates of individuals
- The nature of the right to property and its relationship with man’s natural state and survival
- The definition of property which includes human activity as well as possession
- Property is what can be properly assigned to the individual as a result of his or her own labours
- Property can be even more worthy of protection than life, given its possibility of outliving the owner
- Fundamentally, the individual is owned by herself/himself giving primacy to the individual
- Sovereignty and the state; the limits set by Locke
- The mixing of individual labour with objects to yield individual rights of ownership
- The responsibility to protect the other person’s right to property and the emergence of the state’s protection of the commonwealth

Discussion

- Individual freedom and equality in terms of consideration for protection by the state comes from the state of nature, but different individuals amass unequal amounts of property due to an unequal distribution of ability, possession, inheritance *etc.*
- The notion of the commonwealth, holding possessions in common and the common ownership of certain other goods
- Property as a means to survival; survival being man’s natural end established by God
- The role of reason in revealing the right to protection of property
- The philosophical significance of the historical context of Locke’s view of the state
- The state of nature and Locke’s justification for the establishment of the state
- Locke’s dependence on a false view of equality for the justification of the state in light of the property each human possesses

John Stuart Mill: *On Liberty***13. Explain and discuss the limits placed on the state in its involvement with the life of the individual.**

This question asks for an explanation and discussion of Mill’s essential principle of state limitation: the Harm Principle. The broader topic of the general relationship between the individual and the state might also be addressed.

Key Points

- The essential principle concerning the limitation of action is to prevent harm inflicted upon others, either deliberately, or inadvertently. The only qualification to the principle is in the status of children, the insane and of “backward societies”
- Mill views the state as a protector and arbitrator of common interests. The individual accepts a contract that contains the duty not to harm the interests of others and, in so doing, gains the right of protection for himself or herself
- An individual might harm himself or herself under this principle, as long as this self-harm did not produce harm to others
- Mill makes a moral distinction between self-regarding acts and other-regarding acts
- The concept of freedom implicit in Mill’s argument is that freedom is the ability to pursue and achieve benefits for oneself and others
- The individual pursuit of truth or an authentic life brings with it a plurality of views, enrichment of ideas and of culture. It is a necessary condition for social and technological progress
- With this level of freedom, there is a danger that civil life will diminish; Mill strongly argues for a social conscience to restrain baser instincts

Discussion

- Mill has not considered the consequence of psychological, emotional and moral harm. Is this a major weakness in his argument for the limitation of government action?
- Mill has not considered the harm to traditions and ways of life, if the society is in constant growth and change. Is Mill’s preference for individualism and love of progress harmful to society?
- Mill’s argument assumes that individuals will possess the correct amount of self control and act for the greater good. Does he credit individuals with too much self-awareness and self-discipline?
- Individual actions might have consequential social and financial costs to society as a whole; smoking and drug taking are only harmful to the individual, but they impose medical costs on the whole society
- Is Mill’s understanding of liberty able to shed light on the deprivations occasioned by class and race?

14. Evaluate the claim that dissent is essential for a civilized society.

This question invites an evaluation of a central tenet and assumption in Mill's overall argument, and so there may be comments on some possible connected issues; his concept of an autonomous individual, the benefits of free speech, the Harm Principle and the protection of minorities *etc.*

Key Points

- The silencing of an opinion robs the human race of a possible solution to a problem, not just for the current generation, but for future ones
- That we have reasons for any action is what justifies us in assuming the truth of those reasons for the action; but these reasons may be challenged. On no other terms can a being with human faculties have any rational assurance of being right
- Suppressing an opinion implies the infallibility of those who seek the suppression, and none of us is infallible
- Our opinions are formed over time and, as such, are given to necessary review and discussion with others. This either reassures us that the opinions we hold are correct, or it gives us the opportunity to change or refine them
- No political or social principle, except the very basic matter of human rights which is justified by its utility, has to be held as an absolute principle
- Dead dogma: reluctance of the majority to discuss minority views

Discussion

- Is Mill's idea of freedom and individuality one based on the assumption of a democratic society? Is this a model that is culturally and politically specific?
- Mill assumes that people are capable of rectifying their mistakes by discussion and experience, and not by experience alone. There must be discussion to show how experience is to be interpreted
- Mill distinguishes taking offence at an action from its legality. Has he missed the point that, in democratic states, often the tastes of the majority shape the laws, so that what is legal can change?
- Apart from social rejection and approbation, what protection do minorities have from vilification under Mill's scheme?
- Is a society without censorship a desirable one? Has the dissemination of information and propaganda through the internet increased the need for vigilance, or highlighted the need for more open debates?
- Under what conditions does the majority view become a tyrannical one?
- Is dissent a realistic possibility in societies where media ownership is concentrated in the hands of a few?

Friedrich Nietzsche: *The Genealogy of Morals*

15. Evaluate the claim that the values of justice, equality and compassion are the result of the violent struggle between master morality and slave morality.

This question asks for an evaluation of the outcomes of the confrontation of master and slave morality, and of the genealogical account of morality.

Key Points

- Morality is always rooted in drives, instincts and will or their failure; culture as illness of instincts and will
- Neither of these moralities is based in objective truths but reflections of the concrete interest of those who subscribe to them
- The aristocratic morality, historically the earlier of the two systems, is characterized by active self-affirmation
- Slave morality is the reactive and resentful response of the weak to the domination by the strong
- Aristocratic morality is driven by self-definitional actions; slave morality is driven by *ressentiment*; but both are expressions of the will to power
- The genealogy of morality aims to show that there are distinct aspects of morality, each with a separate pre-moral source. Genealogy traces the moral version of each strand back to pre-moral sources, thus to ancestors of morality, *e.g.* the senses of good and bad have varied, depending upon which class perceived it. For the dominant class, or “masters”, the primary sense of what is good is the self and that which resembles the self; for the “slaves” it is everything that is “other”

Discussion

- The issue of the historical evidence to support the genealogical claims
- How might genealogy be justified as method?
- To what extent does the genealogical approach help us understand the normative character of ethical criteria?
- Can morality be reduced to the basic opposition between two types?
- Is relativism an unavoidable result of the genealogical approach?
- The extent to which Nietzsche’s critique of culture might be a valid instrument to understand both the present forms of culture and the nature of culture itself
- Nietzsche’s critique of morality calls for a revitalization of life and forms of ethical life
- Will to power as a possible basis for a new moral life
- Is perspectivism a key to understanding Nietzsche’s genealogical method?

16. Explain and discuss Nietzsche’s statement that the person who makes a promise has to have a memory created for him or her.

This question asks for an explanation and discussion of Nietzsche’s account of memory and his view of its central role in becoming human.

Key Points

- To breed an animal that is entitled to make promises; surely that is the essence of the paradoxical task nature has set itself where human beings are concerned. Is that the real problem of human beings? This Nietzschean idea has been synthesized under the expression: man is the sole animal able to promise
- Forgetfulness is the power which works against this promise-making. Forgetfulness is not merely a force of inertia, as many people might think. Rather, it is an active capability to repress; something positive in the strongest sense
- In order to organize the future, a human being must have first become something one could predict, something bound by regular rules, so that finally he or she is able to act like someone who makes promises, who makes himself or herself into a pledge for the future
- That development is the history of the origin of responsibility. The task of breeding an animal with a right to make promises contains within it, as a condition and prerequisite, the more urgent prior task of making a human being necessarily uniform to some extent, one among many others like him or her, regular and consequently predictable
- The individual who really has the right to make promises, becomes free; he or she is the master of free will, is sovereign and enjoys superiority over the others
- There is nothing more fearful and more terrible in the history of human beings than the technique for developing their memory: “Only something which never ceases to cause pain stays in the memory”, that is a leading principle of the most ancient (and the most recent) psychology on earth. When human beings considered it necessary to make a memory for themselves, it never happened without blood, martyrs, and sacrifices

Discussion

- Making promises as the distinctive feature of human bonds. Keeping one’s word as the condition for granting contracts
- Accounts of memory as a condition for developing as a human being
- The struggle between memory and pride as a critique of illusion regarding oneself
- The influence of Nietzsche’s conception of memory in the twentieth century, *e.g.* psychoanalysis
- To what extent do we as human beings master our memory?
- Memory and will to power
- Memory and promising might be conditions for moral life, but moral action is something more, it requires free will

Bertrand Russell: *The Problems of Philosophy*

17. Evaluate the claim that all *a priori* knowledge deals exclusively with universals and their relations.

This question asks for an evaluation of how Russell attempts to prove this claim when analysing *a priori* knowledge, and so it invites a discussion of universals, or a broader discussion of any part, or all, of his distinction between empiricism and rationalism.

Key Points

- The context of Russell’s analysis stems from a question posed by Kant: how is knowledge of pure mathematics possible? Knowledge from mathematics is general, while knowledge from experience is particular, and it seems odd to have knowledge of things we are not acquainted with
- Kant was the first to recognise that *a priori* statements are not all analytic or tautological, but some, like mathematical propositions, are synthetic, and in all our experience two elements need distinction: one due to the object, and one due to our natures
- For Russell, universals are relations, qualities, and verbs; every complete sentence contains at least one universal. He is not as certain about the status of qualities as universals as he is about relations
- We are aware of universals that are qualities, relations, and concepts of resemblance and similarity, because of knowledge by acquaintance. Awareness of universals is called conceiving, and a universal which is known is called a concept
- Relations possess an existence that is neither physical nor mental, nor do they exist in time or space, but they do exist independently of us. By contrast, anything that can be apprehended by the senses or by introspection exists at a particular time and is contingent
- General propositions such as “two and two are four” are *a priori*, while the application of general propositions to particulars involves empirical elements

Discussion

- Russell criticized Kant on the issue of our nature determining the organization of sense data. Has Russell misinterpreted what Kant means by “our nature”? Furthermore, have genetics and clinical psychology confirmed the idea that we are hardwired to understand and experience the world in the way that we do?
- Russell seems to have assumed a type of correspondence theory when talking about relations and qualities, *i.e.* there must be some type of object or fact that corresponds to the concepts of relations and qualities. Does this model cause more confusion than clarification?
- Russell claims that “No fact concerning anything capable of being experienced can be known independently of experience”. In light of his discussion of universals and *a priori* knowledge, is he correct?
- Do rationalists have a better epistemological model than empiricists when it comes to the status of abstract ideas?

18. Evaluate Russell's analysis of matter.

This question asks for an evaluation of Russell's concept of matter. Russell's analysis reveals his scepticism about our knowledge of the external world. It thus necessarily combines several other key concepts such as sense-data, idealism and knowledge by acquaintance.

Key Points

- The label of sense-data applies to the things that are immediately known in sensation like colours, sounds, touches, smells *etc.*; moreover, objects seem to be the cause of our sense-data
- Though we may perceive objects in the external world, what we know of them are the subjective experiences of the sense-data we perceive
- It is the relationship between ourselves and the sense-data which provides us with our knowledge of objects
- The principles of organizing our experience, space and time, are private and so do not contribute to any objective knowledge of the external world
- Our belief in the independence of objects in the external world from our sense-data of them is rational, but is without any demonstrable reason
- As with Descartes, there is no logical absurdity in the idea that what we perceive is the product of a dream
- Science, religion, and philosophy all offer explanations of the external world, and, according to Russell, each is as logically possible as the other
- Russell ends with a mild sceptical acceptance of matter as it appears to us in the absence of any other data

Discussion

- Does Russell resolve the problem of appearance and reality? Is his insistence that there be a correspondence between our sense-data and the cause of the data, *i.e.* physical objects, philosophically sound, or is it a remnant of our common sense which insists that there must be a correspondence?
- Russell seems to follow the Cartesian model of self-consciousness and, hence, the infallibility of our personal experiences. Without this idea, are his explanations, particularly of sense-data, valid?
- Russell's scepticism is supported by his criticisms of idealism, monism, and monadism; is it possible that these ideas are more rational, more feasible, or offer a better alternative than his view on the limits of our knowledge?
- Is Russell's position similar to that of Kant's explanation of reality as phenomenon and noumenon?
- Just because individuals have their own experience of an object via sense-data, does it necessarily follow that the real object is somehow beyond our understanding?
- Does Russell's scepticism about objective knowledge give ground to argue that he is a solipsist?

Hannah Arendt: *The Human Condition*

19. Evaluate the distinction between work and labour.

This question invites an evaluation of a key theme in Arendt's work – the difference for the modern human between the activities of work and labour. Responses might look at the overall picture of how the human condition is related to life in the public sphere as well as the specific issues of work and labour.

Key Points

- Arendt seeks an account of the natural state of human activity and sees work as producing artificial objects and activities divorced from a natural setting
- Labour is natural in that it is linked to the biological necessities of the human condition, and is linked in some part to the life of animals
- Labour is depicted as a form of slavery because it is a necessity
- The products of labour do not last in the modern world and cannot provide for the consumption of modern human society
- The Aristotelian distinction between the private and public spheres; Arendt is critical of the modern practice of bringing the animal necessities of labour, properly a private matter, into the public sphere
- Work produces objects/things which endure beyond the actual act of making or fabricating
- Work produces a world distinct from nature; this activity involves man as *homo faber*
- Work violates nature by shaping and re-housing it
- Work activity is public and offers the chance to unite and divide humans in the public space
- The limitations of the products of labour

Discussion

- Arendt's emphasis on an experiential understanding of the human condition
- Arendt distinguishes the human act of work from the activity of labour, shared with animals, by reference to the creation of things to sustain man's ongoing needs; is this separation of man from animals justified?
- Is Arendt right in her critique that modern economic priorities have replaced what is properly the concern of the public realm?
- Is a shared public space desirable?
- Is Arendt's vision of public space, and the place of work and labour, based on an ancient republican model that no longer applies?
- Is modern human activity really skewed towards the kind of activity that Arendt asserts?
- Politics as able to occur when we can escape necessity; is this reasonable?
- Are we alienated from the product of our work?
- Are we consumed by materialism?
- Is the natural sphere of human activity so easily divorceable from cultural products and labour?

20. Discuss and evaluate the importance of the public sphere to the life of an individual human being.

This question invites a discussion and evaluation of a central thesis of Arendt’s work concerning the setting of modern political space and the implications for the individual.

Key Points

- Human beings are subject to certain inexorable conditions that involve biological necessities for each individual; human beings are “conditioned beings”
- Individual meaning is subordinated by the need for each generation to use the products of the previous generation in delineating its public space
- Action always requires the presence of others and politics arises out of public action, or people working together
- Life for the individual can only be lived in a state beyond the necessity of labour and must be lived in a durable, stable world that promotes the ability of the individual to emerge
- Politics involves the active participation of individuals as opposed to the task of defining a set of rights or theoretical entitlements for the individual
- The world is a public space because of the availability of things to be sensed or perceived by others
- For Arendt, modernity is characterized by the loss of the world – alienation; natural processes are overcoming shared historical processes which emphasize the public realm
- Alienation in the modern world denotes a loss of inter-subjectivity in the modern world
- Plurality as a feature of human action

Discussion

- The philosophical significance of the historical setting of Arendt’s critique; the world immediately following the Second World War
- The implications for science and technology of Arendt’s work on the public and private spheres
- Is Arendt’s definition of what properly constitutes the public sphere appropriate? Is she too willing to denote activity as being political when it could be properly understood to be private or individual?
- Arendt’s use of the classical tradition of republicanism for the definition of what constitutes the public space
- Has society invaded the public realm in the way Arendt asserts?
- Does Arendt make too strong a distinction between the private and the public realms?
- Are modern individual concerns, *e.g.* rights of the individual, not of general public concern?

Simone de Beauvoir: *The Ethics of Ambiguity*

21. Evaluate the claim that the individual is only defined by his or her relationship to the world and to other individuals.

This question asks for an evaluation of the roles of the individual and of the world in establishing freedom and a sense of responsibility.

Key Points

- The responsibilities that the individual has to face when being free; toward the world and others
- The way that these define the individual by defining his or her existence within the physical world and the world of relationships
- The account of intentionality which creates meaning is seen as needing to be defined in terms of both the other and of the world; through this the individual gains joy and hope
- The need to be defined is founded in the fear of aloneness and doubting one's essence. This essence is founded in a sense of being
- The relationship with other individuals creates a sense of self-fulfilment
- Our lack of positive relationships with the world and people can produce alienation
- I am nothing without the other; my own existence is questioned without the other
- The individual's passions and emotions are determined by the other, but the other must be protected from becoming a means to an end
- The interactions with the world define the person but must not be seen only in this light, as the individual has a stewardship of the world
- It must be accepted that our worries concerning our freedom should not produce either subjugation by, or dominance over, others

Discussion

- Can we be ourselves without others?
- Do the world and other individuals have, or warrant, similar status? Is one more important than the other in defining the individual?
- Does the meaning of our freedom come only through interaction with others? Are there ways of acquiring freedom without others?
- Should we be limited by our joint responsibility toward our fellows and the world?
- How far is de Beauvoir's view of the need for positive human interaction a reflection of her own personal experiences as a woman and as a person living under Nazism?
- Can individuals who are aware of the associated responsibilities be free or are they still confined by the need for positive feedback from others? Are they imprisoned by the necessity of interaction?
- How far are the interactions with the world and fellow individuals oppressive?
- Is it possible for an individual to be defined and to be free solely through introspection?

22. Explain and discuss the necessity to understand a child’s view of freedom in explaining human anxiety.

This question asks for an explanation and discussion of the relationship between anxiety and freedom in becoming human.

Key Points

- The idea that children represent an idealized form of human existence; dependence on others, in a world of meaning, without full responsibility for one’s actions and therefore an absence of anxiety
- De Beauvoir’s notion of a “serious world”, a world of fixed values and authority sources
- The world of the child has clear rules and parameters, but is not seen as alienating
- The notion of a child-created, imaginary world which does not hold the child responsible
- The contrast of the adult world in which responsibility should be/must be faced
- With adult responsibility comes anxiety as we face the consequences of our actions
- Adult avoidance of these essential responsibilities is “bad faith”; the rejection of freedom
- Avoidance can result in acceptance of authority figures and authoritarian regimes that control individuals
- The circumstances of our condition might remove accountability. If we are opposed politically or physically we might not be able to exercise the freedom that we would wish to
- The consideration that belittling adults to children is evil and immoral; depriving adults of making choices is fundamentally wrong
- Adults hiding from freedom because of anxiety is unacceptable

Discussion

- Are children so different from adults? Are they not also decision-makers? Are they not also anxious even before adolescence?
- Is the child–adolescent–adult model too simplistic?
- Can adults really enact their freedom because of the constraints of systems they operate within? They cannot live and act in isolation; is their freedom thus always limited?
- Is de Beauvoir’s model anti-religious in that religious models sometimes suggest that adults should view the world and their interactions with it as children do?
- How far is de Beauvoir’s view of the amorality of children a consequence of her own experience?
- How far are attempts to encourage sharing, group work and team work basically attempts to create greater responsibility and prepare children for adulthood, and so diminish anxiety
- Is “bad faith” really so bad? Might it be normal? None of us like to make tough decisions

Charles Taylor: *The Ethics of Authenticity*

23. Explain and discuss the “worry” raised by individualism.

This question asks for an explanation and discussion of the first of the three principal “worries” that Taylor identifies at the outset of the book. Individualism is at the core of what he considers to be a principal malaise for society.

Key Points

- The issue of individualism is the first major theme Taylor wants to deal with
- In the modern world “people are no longer sacrificed to the demands of supposedly sacred orders that transcend them”
- “Flattened individualism”; the focusing on the self as a cause of the modern malaise
- Many believe that it is an achievement to release the individual from supposed limits on freedom, *e.g.* economic arrangements, family structures, traditional societal hierarchies: “modern freedom was won by our breaking loose from older moral horizons”
- But some of the supposedly restrictive social orders, which reflected an ancient view of humanity’s place in the “Great Chain of Being”, also give the opportunity and possibility to discover meaning and purpose in social activity
- Society’s rituals and norms have more than instrumental purpose, and discrediting these rituals is described as “disenchantment”, thus implying that magic has been lost
- Taylor says the individual has lost something in modernity; there is a loss of a “heroic dimension” where there is a lack of a higher purpose or cause worth dying for, and there is a loss of passion
- In focusing on the individual, humanity has narrowed and lost a broader dimension
- The “centring on the self ... both flattens and narrows our lives, makes them poorer in meaning, and less concerned with others or society”
- The challenge and creative potential of subjectivism and relativism for the individual
- The challenge and creative potential of the ideal of instrumental reasoning for the individual
- Authenticity as the ideal which can help restore the modern individual

Discussion

- The role of Taylor’s communitarian position in his critique of modern society
- Taylor’s optimism that modernity can offer something noble for the individual, a challenge from God to live authentically
- Reasoning is involved when asking what exactly counts for a significant life; to ask “Who am I?” is to engage in reasoning and thus use a modern approach to the individual
- Should individuals avoid instrumental modes of reasoning?
- Is Taylor’s idea about the dialogical character of life, and the possibility of relations with significant others, convincing?
- Is the sort of individualism Taylor opposes as objectionable as he claims? Does it have no redeeming features?

24. Explain and discuss the problems associated with attaining authenticity in the modern age.

This question invites an explanation and discussion of Taylor’s ethic of authenticity and the ensuing problems that attaining it brings.

Key Points

- Taylor’s ethic of authenticity is defined by the modern situation of humanity; an issue arises about the interpretation of modernity and the extent of the analysis required for a treatise on the human condition
- The priority of the individual over society in modernity
- The justifiability of Taylor’s assumption that individuals have a moral sense
- The defensibility of Taylor’s assertion that individuals must engage in dispassionate reasoning about themselves
- Is Taylor’s historical analysis a justification for his thesis about authenticity?
- Taylor’s criticism of the individual subjective choice offered in the modern world – the “subjectivized self”
- The lack of awareness of an objective reality to guide moral choice
- The language of resonance for the individual which challenges the individual not to criticize or praise modernity, but to find an authentic resonant language
- Articulating beyond the self and the need for public references
- The individual’s inner voice
- Taylor’s “horizons of significance”
- The three “sicknesses”
- The challenge of liberal neutrality and relativism

Discussion

- In encouraging individual authenticity Taylor runs the risk of a relativism with which he disagrees
- Is Taylor bound to end in a relativist *cul-de-sac* given the pursuit of individual authenticity?
- Are Taylor’s cited sources relevant to the question of authenticity in the modern world?
- The relationship of the inner person to the external world
- What counts as a legitimate source for authenticity?
- Does the phrase “horizons of significance” have meaning?
- Taylor’s assumption of the need to relate judgments to external realities or higher authorities
- The assumption about the “Great Chain of Being”
- The restrictions of modernity can be overcome by the discovery of an inner voice; is this reasonable?
- The tradition of common values which Taylor believes in; is it convincing?