



MARKSCHEME

May 2013

PHILOSOPHY

Higher Level and Standard Level

Paper 2

18 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 the IB Assessment Centre.*

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.

Paper 2 guidance

Examiners are reminded that in the examination paper it states that candidates are expected to demonstrate the following skills. Since these skills are encouraged within the assessment criteria, examiners should take them into account in their marking:

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

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 on pages 4–5.

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. Evaluate the claim that the best way to knowledge of *Brahman* is a corresponding love of God (*bhakti*).**

The whole world is God's play; there is a conception of a supreme personal good as a spiritual act of love-making. The world emanates from *Brahman* as its body. Love of God is one of the ways towards the knowledge of *Brahman*. In creating the world *Brahman* sacrifices infinity and becomes finite. Love of God is mystical knowledge of *Brahman*, which is a better way than meditation or asceticism (related to Yoga and Buddhism) to reach it. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- The notion of *bhakti*
- Love of God as the way of corresponding with *Brahman's* emanation and knowing it
- The paths to salvation: the way of knowledge, the way of works, and the way of devotion (*bhakti*) or loving adoration
- Incarnations of God through humans and animals, rocks and dust
- *Bhakti* and contemplative yoga
- Might *Brahman* or God be subsumed into other conceptions of divinity? How might *Brahman* be related to them?
- Through love of God and worship and devotion we eventually will find in every experience the embrace of the Divine
- Mystical awareness of *Brahman* as the solution to this-worldly ethical and political crises
- Is it possible to solve ethical and political problems faced in everyday existence by reference to such an abstract principle as *bhakti*?

2. Evaluate the significance of “one in the body” (*dehin*), spirit, or soul in the understanding of human identity.

Dehin acts as a witness of what takes place physically, emerging from the senses and sensations of a particular individual's body, and from the mental world of that individual, his or her thoughts and emotions. The *dehin* cannot be killed and will repeatedly take another body after the death of the present one. An individual life is short and precarious, it is not the unit to be considered. What is important is the extended sequence of particular lives as the reference of the human condition. *Dehin* signifies the unity of any particular succession of individual lives. The self-consciousness of the individual is the *dehin's* consciousness of the individual. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- The actual events, thoughts and feelings follow their own laws: they are causally related to each other, but not to *dehin*
- *Dehin* has no point of view of its own, it has the point of view of a particular individual
- *Dehin* is a hypothetical subject, intended to modify the simple, single-bodied subject identity of the individual
- The views implied in what humans should do, if one starts from the *dehin*. The possibility of changing all views and values which are centred on the individual
- Does *dehin* represent a universal point of view? Is it a fiction?
- Comparison with modern Western theories about the individual.

Confucius: *The Analects*

3. Evaluate Confucius’s claim that you should use your ears widely but leave out what is doubtful.

At issue here is how knowledge is acquired and used to guide behaviour. There is a link between learning and practice in what one knows and how one should act. Choosing what is good is achieved through thinking. This thinking might be influenced by learning from others but still independent personal thinking is involved; however, one should hesitate, think and reflect as to what is right and righteous by hearing and doing. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- The questioning of rites (*li*) by critical review
- *Wen* (hearing), *heueh* (action) and *ssu* (thinking) have to be balanced. Words translated into action without thought are wasted
- All action has to be righteous and therefore Rites (*li*) have to be tempered by rightness (*yi*)
- High levels of education and general awareness might be needed to make the correct choices over what is heard
- Advances in knowledge lead to progress as we build on our past experience
- Does the position of righteousness allow for individual choice or is there an absolute position? A fixed, absolute righteousness?
- Can the Confucian way really manage advances in knowledge? Are rites overriding in everyday actions?
- Tradition might be limited by consideration of righteousness
- Can individuals challenge tradition with any real effect? Does challenging produce a degree of arrogance? “I know what is right”
- Can the advice and observation of others be relied upon as a way of guiding choice? How do you know who to trust, who to seek advice from, who to observe?

4. Evaluate the importance of an understanding of Destiny or the will of Heaven (*ming*), in the development and behaviour of the “gentleman”.

The idea of destiny is beyond the influence of man and therefore not worthy of worry. The will of heaven is beyond the influence of man. By accepting his Destiny the gentleman has a full and rich life that is full of *li* (righteousness). The gentleman realizes that any attempt to interfere with the will of Heaven and worrying about morality rather than worrying about honour is a waste of effort. The difference between *T’ien ming* and *ming* is the difference between what one ought to do and destiny. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- The problem of the subtle difference between *li* and *yi*, the former not being a proper object of pursuit and the latter being what one ought to do
- Is the following of rites (*li*) a way of controlling actions or does *yi* (rightness) override *li*?
- Issues such as wealth, honour and long life are part of one’s destiny and should not be the focus of any effort or activity as these areas cannot be changed by human action
- If key actions should not be carried out because they would conflict with the will of heaven, why act at all?
- Is the acceptance of the will of heaven compatible with a materialistic, market driven world?
- In a competitive world will the gentleman merely be swallowed up by the world, or will such a man change the world?
- Does this acceptance ask too much of an individual who might be the main driver of progress and change? Will it lead to frustration?
- Is the acceptance of Destiny (perhaps fate) going to produce passive individuals, as they realize their actions cannot change their life or the lives of others?

Lao Tzu: *Tao Te Ching*

5. Evaluate the claim that the way of the sage is bountiful and does not contend.

The ideal person is the sage (*sheng ren*). The sage does not contend because the sage practises *wu-wei* and is in harmony with the *Tao*. Sages are like newborn infants, who move naturally, without planning and reliance on the structures given to them by others; sages follow the excellence of water, or become like the uncarved block. Both images are used to convey the maxim that by observing harmony in nature, we will learn to live in harmony with nature and with others. *Wu wei* is not non-action or no action, but means something like acting naturally, effortless action, or non-wilful action. Living with the *Tao* means not interfering with the “flow” of nature, but acting in ways that cause minimal interference with this flow. This makes the sage’s life bountiful. *Tao* is often translated as “the Way” and is the process of reality itself, the way things come together. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- Change as the most fundamental feature of things
- The criticism that the concept of the *Tao* is too vague for an adequate understanding. Is it an organizing principle that underpins all reality? Is it a mystical principle? Is it a non-corporeal “vitality” of corporeal objects?
- The principle of *wu-wei* seems to imply a life of meekness, passivity and an acceptance of a fatalist attitude to life
- Is there a political role for the model of the sage?
- A criticism of virtue ethics is that following a role model may show me how to act, but without fully understanding why such actions are good, *ie* that acting ethically involves more than behaviour, it requires understanding.

6. Evaluate the claim that the essential element of living a life with the Way is passivity.

Lao Tzu teaches that all striving is futile and counterproductive. Passivity implies giving up one’s will in action; *wu-wei* means aligning one’s actions with nature. One should try, thus, to do nothing: *wu-wei*. *Wu* means “non-being”, and *wei* means “unnatural” action, therefore *wu-wei* implies that we should refrain from doing unnatural actions, and we should behave spontaneously. So, *wu-wei* does not mean that we should literally do nothing. On the contrary, it invites us to discover and follow natural forces. We should effortlessly adhere to the inherent flow of events, and avoid every opposition against the natural order of things (*Tao*). In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- Lao Tzu teaches two things: first, we should learn to master our circumstances by understanding their true nature or most important element. Second, we should endeavour to shape our actions in accordance with this true essence of things
- Water and the uncarved block are images used to explain how to interact and behave with the *Tao*
- Lao Tzu rejects Confucian models of a regulated society and life, and seeks harmony and contentment by a solitary contemplation of nature and *Tao*. He also emphasized that by doing so we could ultimately harness the powers of the universe. By “doing nothing” one could “accomplish everything”
- Is Taoist philosophy a guide for rulers or political leadership? Does it advise how to govern their countries, or is it addressed only to individual living? Is it possible to consider Taoism a peculiar political philosophy?
- Does learning the lessons and ways of nature mean that exploitation of others for self-interest and survival is permissible?
- Though Lao Tzu claims that a frugal life and contemplation of nature is the way to happiness and contentment, how can this be applicable to individuals living in contemporary society?
- Does living in harmony mean living with compromises?

Plato: *The Republic*, Books IV–IX

7. Evaluate Plato’s distinction between knowledge and belief.

Plato makes a distinction between Knowledge (episteme) and Opinion (doxa). He establishes the distinction between these faculties of knowing by arguing that Opinion is the position between Knowledge and Ignorance. In developing the division of reality into the realm of Knowledge and Opinion, Plato argues in his description of the ‘Divided Line’, that Opinion is divided into Belief (pistis) and Illusion (eikasia).

Therefore, some candidates may write a response focusing on the distinction between knowledge (episteme) and belief (pistis) while other candidates might focus on the distinction between knowledge (episteme) and opinion (doxa). Examiners should accept and assess both possibilities.

Plato makes a crucial distinction between knowledge and belief, as separate cognitive faculties. He claims that belief lies “between” knowledge and ignorance, and he uses the argument from opposites and the faculties argument, along with the simile of the divided line to substantiate and clarify his position. In this perspective, belief (pistis) for Plato is the level of knowledge based in the direct perception of the realm of sensible things. It is a distinction which constitutes an aspect of the world of opinion (doxa). For Plato, knowledge enables awareness of the universal reality lying behind particular examples or instances. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- The different “fields and effects” of different faculties (episteme, doxa, pistis, dianoia and nous) – thus knowledge and belief grasp objects differently; the reason why the world perceived by the senses is not knowledge for Plato
- The problem of ignorance being about “what is not”, with belief half way between “what is” and “what is not”
- Different possible uses of the Greek word for “is”: existential, veridical, predicative
- The dependence of Plato’s epistemology on the existence of the world of the Forms
- Is it more reasonable to suppose knowledge to be a continuum starting as belief and being confirmed with further evidence as knowledge?
- The superiority of philosophers’ knowledge compared to “the lovers of sights and sounds”
- Can reason alone provide any knowledge about the world around us?
- The knowledge achieved with the absolute contemplation of the ideas/forms, especially the idea of The Good.

8. Evaluate the desirability of philosophers taking charge of the state.

The central thesis of the *Republic* maintains that justice will be achieved in the state only when philosophers rule. Only philosophers can comprehend true justice through their exclusive understanding of the Forms. The state should reflect the true nature of reality with its hierarchy of the supreme reality of the Forms. The philosopher, who alone loves truth, will ensure that justice is seen in the state. The philosopher’s exhaustive educational training will encompass practical knowledge and moral virtue. The philosopher has some unique qualifications for holding power, including a lack of material desires or personal affiliations which could lead to corruption (even though in reality some philosophers are indeed subject to temptation). Furthermore, the philosopher has self-control, wisdom and other civic virtues, making it desirable that he or she should rule. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- The simile of the ship which addresses the seeming uselessness of philosophers in contemporary society, as well as a criticism of democracy as a method of rule; perhaps the “ship of state” is not on a journey that requires navigation
- The necessity of the knowledge of the Form of The Good: what something is, its utility and its value
- The simile of the wild and dangerous animal and its implications for the good running of society, contrasting the sophist and the philosopher as the ideal ruler
- The problem of Plato’s elitism as a model of useful or desirable rule
- Is the pursuit of truth really such a central task for political rule? Can justice only be understood/known through philosophy?

- Is the lack of material desire so important in a ruler? The other-worldliness of philosophers makes them unlikely to relate to the problems of those whom they rule
- The relation between factual knowledge (of navigation) and value knowledge (of justice)
- Why are people suspicious of intelligence?

René Descartes: *Meditations*

9. Explain and discuss the idea of certainty.

Descartes aims to produce certainty via an approach of doubting everything to discover what could not be doubted and then from this to build a more certain world. He had to out-doubt the sceptics and therefore tried to doubt the certainty of existence itself, arriving at the eventual certainty of *cogito, ergo sum*. He used an analytic method to establish his foundation of knowing and certainty. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- The application of reason to arrive at certainty
- The role of memory to help establish certainty
- Is it the case that doubt necessarily becomes certainty?
- The certainty of God from innate knowledge arrived at through meditation and reflection
- The role of God and how God might not have a role in perceiving physical objects because God would not deceive; what implications are there if the existence of God is not self-evident?
- The need for clarity and distinctiveness as a route to certainty; by self-inspection his own existence was clear and distinct
- Is certainty the same in an objective and subjective sense?
- Thinking includes all mental states: doubting, willing, understanding, imagining
- Is *cogito, ergo sum* so certain? The problem of the “I” as presupposed idea logically separates it from an actual proof of existence
- Thinking might not be a constant state; could, therefore, his foundation disappear?
- How can clarity and distinctiveness be verified?
- The nature of clear and distinct ideas.

10. Evaluate the claim that I do not inhabit my body in the way that a captain inhabits his ship.

This question invites an evaluation of the interaction of the mind and body, and whether the analogy of captain and ship is effective. I can doubt the existence of my body but not my mind because I think. Humans are composed of two substances independent of each other; one in non-extended and thinking – my mind – and the other is extended and material – the body. Descartes assumes a causal interaction between mind and body; interaction might seem to be intellectual not emotional. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- How do mind and body interact?
- Ideas of Dualism; the Cartesian view that the mind is transparent
- The role of the pineal gland in the proposed interaction between mind and body; since Descartes talks of intermingling, how can the mind and body be separate?
- Can the separation of mind and body be justified? The role of the body in relation to perception, motility, sensation and bodily image
- The intermingling of emotion and intellect in the experience of pain creates issues
- For Descartes thinking and intentionality are issues of consciousness
- If we are not aware of thinking has the mind ceased to exist?
- Does receiving information without actually being aware negate Descartes’ position, as such activity suggests unconscious mental states?
- Is the captain merely a ghost in the ship as Ryle might suggest? Does the captain give identity to the ship or does the ship have identity in its own right?

John Locke: *Second Treatise on Government*

11. Evaluate Locke’s claim that without consent and trust, nothing legitimate can occur in civil society.

Locke identifies two types of consent: explicit and tacit. The former is made by the individual and witnessed by others, the latter is assumed by others when no objections are raised. Explicit consent is primarily a feature of individuals in the state of nature as individuals negotiate directly with others in all matters of punishment, protection and property. Tacit consent is primarily a feature of individuals in political society as they give up this right of direct negotiation in connection with punishment, protection and property. Locke assumes that the natural rights of man need protection and are sovereign. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- What is the relationship between liberty and consent? Does engaging in one involve giving up the other? Are there limits to consent? Can citizens withdraw their consent?
- In withdrawing consent, will humans appear to be acting essentially in a pragmatic or utilitarian way, as opposed to acting according to inviolable rights? Can citizens overthrow the state? Under what circumstances?
- Are there other relationships, personal or public, that require no consent from the parties involved?
- Parental authority is a separate and inviolable authority either in the state of nature or in the political state, and the consent of the child is not required until they can employ reason
- Rulers can exercise prerogative power which is the power for doing public good without a rule, and is based on historical precedence
- What are the reasons for thinking the state exists for the good of the people rather than the other way round?

12. Explain and discuss Locke’s concept of the state of nature.

The state of nature is one where individuals are free and equal, though bound by the law of nature, which for Locke is reason. Reason teaches that no-one ought to harm another in their life, health, liberty, or possessions. The state of nature plays a heuristic role in constructions of social contract theories. A key distinction between individuals in the state of nature and in political society is that in the state of nature individuals are judge and executioner of punishments. Two significant inconveniences in the state of nature are that some punishments are unreasonable, and some criminals are too powerful to punish. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- In contrast to Hobbes’s state of nature, Locke’s is one where people are not at war with one another, but are inconvenienced
- Is Locke’s state of nature an informal version of the political state?
- Locke’s model for government: one designed for economic and limited physical protection of autonomous individuals
- No rational creature willingly moves to an inferior position, and the longevity of the political state relies on this maxim
- Is the requirement that the protection of property be a government’s purpose an inherently unfair one?
- Is it at all desirable, or possible, for individuals to return to the state of nature?
- Does Locke have an implicitly optimistic view of human nature in the state of nature? Possible comparisons with Rousseau and Hobbes, or Rawls
- For state of nature models, should individuals be treated as wholly rational? History shows the opposite is more appropriate.

John Stuart Mill: *On Liberty*

- 13. Evaluate Mill’s claim that it is utility that gives individual liberty its value because utility is “the ultimate appeal on all ethical questions; but it must be utility in the large sense, grounded on the permanent interests of man as a progressive being”.**

Mill was fundamentally an “indirect” utilitarian, *ie* he believed that the principle of utility should be used to develop what he called “secondary principles”. Mill further believed that these secondary principles admit of exceptions. He thought the principle of utility should not be applied on a case-by-case basis (in the manner prescribed by act utilitarianism); hence the best policy for society to adopt is to leave competent individuals free to act on their own judgments. For Mill, the development of individuality (which is a key to understanding “utility in the large sense”) has to be grounded on “the permanent interests of man as a progressive being”. For Mill, competence to judge what is best comes from development, including self-development *viz.*, from freely choosing one’s own values and mode of existence. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- For Mill, appeal to the principle of liberty is the best way of dealing with conflicts between secondary principles
- How effective is a claim that there can be any factor which might constitute an ‘ultimate appeal on all ethical questions’?
- It seems obvious that there are instances in which utility can be maximized by restricting freedom; can this be reconciled with Mill’s claim?
- The issue of reconciliation remains pertinent even if, for Mill, self-regarding conduct does not fall within the sphere of morality
- The meaning of “utility in the large sense” (Mill means utility that is tied to the development of individuality)
- “If a person possesses any tolerable amount of common sense and experience, his own mode of laying down his existence is the best, not because it is best in itself, but because it is his own mode”
- Intervention to prevent harm to others is always relevant according to Mill, but intervention because of dislike or disapproval of others’ conduct is never relevant
- Harm to others is relevant to societal intervention but it is only a necessary not a sufficient reason.

- 14. Evaluate Mill’s case against the justifiability of paternalistic interference in the lives of competent adults.**

For Mill, paternalism is usually thought to be coercive (or, at least, forceful) prevention of harm to self but “coercion” should be understood broadly so that it can include the use of deception. The notion of a “competent adult” is central to his discussion. A competent person is the most reliable judge of her/his own best interests. A distinction can be made between “weak paternalism” and “strong paternalism”. This distinction is illustrated by Mill’s bridge-crossing example. He justifies weak paternalism in circumstances where an individual suffers from ignorance, lack of control, or being subject to undue influence. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- The claim that coercive (or forceful) interference stunts a competent person’s capacities
- The claim that when governments interfere they are apt to cause more harm than good
- The capacity for the individual to achieve self-determination
- Examples which demonstrate the relation between the weak and strong paternalism
- The example of someone selling her/himself into slavery
- The example of someone acting against her/his present interests to protect the interests of her/his future self
- Government intrusions in the lives of citizens via electronic and other modern technological means.

Friedrich Nietzsche: *The Genealogy of Morals*

15. Evaluate the claim that there is an inconsistency between Nietzsche’s idea of self-creation and his view that, like birds of prey and lambs, we are compelled to behave as we do by our instincts.

At issue here is the relationship between Nietzsche’s idea of self-creation (*cf.*, self-mastery) and his rejection of “the self”. Central is Nietzsche’s attitude to individual responsibility and the feasibility of ascribing responsibility to a being that acts out of her/his instincts (nature). There appears to be an inconsistency between Nietzsche’s claims that we are compelled to act out of instincts and that we are capable of self-creation. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- The relationship between self-creation and free will
- Is the scorn with which Nietzsche speaks of free will, sovereignty, and responsibility, evidence that he rejects these notions?
- Is it possible to accept individual and social ethics which do not consider the value of and connections with instincts?
- Nietzsche’s account of culture and its bearing on his view of human nature
- If human beings are promise-making and promise-keeping animals can these characteristics be merely matters of instinct?
- Some scholars identify the *Übermenschen* of *Thus Spake Zarathustra* with the sovereign individual in *The Genealogy of Morals*. If Nietzsche’s picture of beings who are compelled to act in accordance with their natures is correct, how do the *Übermenschen* and the sovereign individual fit this conception?

16. Evaluate Nietzsche’s claim that there cannot be a valid universal morality because the history of morality, as with all practices, is that of a “will to power playing itself out”.

Nietzsche’s attack on morality originates from his account of *ressentiment*. He alleges that humans are driven by the “will to power” and that some moralities function to negate life. According to Nietzsche herd morality is exemplified, not only in religiously based morality, but also in non-religiously based moralities like utilitarianism. This contrasts with the morality of the masters. At issue is the question whether Nietzsche’s thesis of the will to power is just one perspective among many. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- The alleged superiority of thinking in terms of good *vs.* bad rather than good *vs.* evil
- The ideal of living in accordance with nature as an ongoing struggle; self-governance *vs.* reactive living
- Nobility as the realization of the struggle within ourselves
- Nietzsche’s endorsement of the struggle between the morality of the herd and the morality of the masters
- Is Nietzsche correct in claiming that the ascetic ideal against which he rails is evidence of people’s dissatisfaction with themselves and their lives?
- Does the flourishing of the ascetic ideal in various places at various times indicate its “insatiable instinct and will to power”?
- The meaning of the expression “the will to power”
- Are Nietzsche’s critical accounts of the moral histories of punishment and conscience plausible? *Eg* is his criticism of conscience (concerning its role in opposing natural instincts) plausible?

Bertrand Russell: *The Problems of Philosophy*

17. Evaluate the claim that we can know what is true and know what is false.

Since some of our beliefs are erroneous, we are led to inquire into what certainty we can ever have. A true belief cannot be called knowledge when it is deduced by a fallacious process of reasoning. Russell mentions psychological inference *viz.*, the many ways (besides logical inference) by which we pass from one belief to another. The chief difficulty in regard to knowledge arises over intuitive knowledge, and a theory of truth should supply the possibility of distinguishing certain truths as self-evident in a sense which ensures infallibility. A truth is self-evident, in the first and most absolute sense, when we have acquaintance with the fact which corresponds to the truth. There are two ways in which a complex fact may be known: (1) by means of a judgment, in which its several parts are judged to be related as they are in fact related; (2) by means of acquaintance with the complex fact itself, which may (in a large sense) be called perception. In derivative knowledge our ultimate premises must have some degree of self-evidence, and so must their connection with the conclusions deduced from them. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- Can we state that nothing is knowledge except what is validly deduced from true premises?
- The question of intuitive knowledge: in regard to intuitive beliefs, it is by no means easy to discover any criterion by which to distinguish some as true and others as erroneous
- How does Russell understand the terms ‘true’ and ‘false’?
- The greater part of what would commonly pass as knowledge is more or less opinion
- Does a psychological inference always lead to secure truths or only to transitory truths?
- Are all mental facts and all facts concerning sense-data, private to the mind?
- Facts about universals are not private; many minds may be acquainted with the same universals
- Scientific hypotheses acquire their probability by fitting into a coherent system of probable opinions.

18. Evaluate the role and importance of knowledge of general principles.

Russell asserts that the principle of induction is necessary to the validity of all arguments based on experience, but is itself not capable of being proved by experience. Hence, the use of principles of inference is important if a correct theory of knowledge is to be obtained. There is a difference between general propositions known *a priori*, such as “two and two are four”, and empirical generalizations, such as “all men are mortal”. Logical principles are self-evident but the scope and power of *a priori* principles are strictly limited; all knowledge that something exists must be dependent in part on experience. The process of deduction moves from the general to the general or from the general to the particular. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- Psychologism
- Induction *vs.* deduction
- The controversy between empiricists and rationalists
- What are, for Russell, “general principles”?
- The example of non-logical *a priori* knowledge: knowledge as to ethical or value judgments, knowledge as to the intrinsic desirability of things.

Hannah Arendt: *The Human Condition*

19. Evaluate the claim that modernity is the success of labour over work and action.

For Arendt, modernity is an age where history is not the recorder, rehearser and recaller of actions and words. Within modernity, conformity (rather than plurality and freedom) dominates; it is the loss of traditional value and standards. In modernity everything is orientated toward consumption and acquisition. Labour is a repetitive cycle that sustains life whereas work is the creative action of humans and action is the discovery and disclosure of discourse. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- Labour, work, action
- Ideas of what modernity is; mass society, increased bureaucracy, propaganda and the abuse of public opinion
- The polis, the public centre of discourse, has been replaced by increased introspection
- Alienation is produced when words and human discourse are lost, and this results in a loss of identity
- Alienation produces a divorce from the earth and a focus on life extension and other worlds
- Could the balance be reset to encourage human discourse within a consumer, market driven society?
- Does a focus on labour necessarily result in materialism and a rejection of nature?
- Might creativity and action also produce abuse of the natural world?
- Does the natural world really conflict with the idea of labour?
- Has Arendt ignored a Marxist interpretation of labour?
- Can modern scientific activity be reconciled with discourse? Is it not possible to see such scientific activity as work?

20. Evaluate the significance of freedom within action.

For Arendt, the spontaneity of freedom results in unpredictable activities; that is, man is not conditioned. Freedom should lead to difference, unpredictability and the unexpected. It should be more than psychological freedom of the inner-self and extend to freedom within the polis. Freedom needs others; it must exist in the public realm because it is a biological necessity. It is also change and revolution. When man is no longer locked into labour then he is free. Action is discourse and the interaction of free men with free men needs a collective environment – a polis, the place where action happens. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- Is Arendt's concept of freedom too narrow for a mass media world?
- Has the notion of the polis changed with the onset of information technology and therefore the public and the private realm are becoming one?
- Does freedom require motive and intention? If not, can it easily operate in the public realm?
- The forgetting and promising aspects of freedom, excusing the past and trying to control the future
- Is freedom more to do with choice than human discourse?
- Do humans want the level of freedom that she advocates?
- Has/can freedom from labour ever come about?
- Can freedom not be introspective?
- Does Arendt's idea of collective, communal, activity really create freedom, spontaneity and difference or in the end does it produce conformity?

Simone de Beauvoir: *The Ethics of Ambiguity*

21. Evaluate the claim that living alongside others offers the individual a response to the fact that we are alone in the world.

De Beauvoir offers a response to the essential loneliness of existence as conceived in the existentialist view of the human condition. She adopts the key existentialist theme of the lack of external meaning. However, the alone-ness of human existence is not the sole consequence of the human condition; freedom is an essential part of our condition that brings with it the chance to develop relationships with others. The intentionality of consciousness enables the individual to bring meaning to existence while rejecting external authority. Embracing ambiguity gives a meaningful context in which to pursue the future with hope. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- The role of others in defining meaning for the individual
- The role of others in willing freedom; “to will oneself free is also to will others free”
- Individual responsibility and relationships with others as inter-subjective beings
- Attempts to define conditions of human existence from different perspectives other than existentialism
- Absolutist approaches to ethics fail to address what kind of meaning humans seek to find in the world
- Are there no grounds on which to base an answer to how to act in the world apart from the individual’s existence alongside others?
- The roles of gender and historical perspectives in defining the individual
- The passage of the child into adulthood and the role of others in this process.

22. Evaluate the view that exercising our freedom represents a flight from the security of childhood.

For de Beauvoir, human beings have a nostalgia for the security represented by the time of childhood. In casting off this security the true meaning of freedom asserts itself. Bad faith results from trying to flee from freedom, which itself is a reaction to the loss of the security of childhood in which we are dependent on others. The world of the child is a world of seriousness comprised of “ready-made values” and part of the security of childhood is the demand for obedience. There is no responsibility in childhood, which causes nostalgia later on in life. Children’s creativity and play help them learn about their future freedom but children are not responsible for the worlds they bring into being through their play and creativity. Children are “metaphysically privileged” in that they can experience the joys of freedom but do not have real responsibility. Children do not have subjectivity and look at others (their parents) believing them to be complete in themselves. Adults who crave security because of a nostalgic view of childhood commit bad faith by denying their subjectivity. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- Bad faith as the condition of adults who have not left the narrow vision of existence characterized by the child
- Why does de Beauvoir describe the world of childhood as “serious”?
- Security is a denial of freedom created in childhood
- Do people uniformly develop in such a clear way from childhood into adulthood via adolescence?
- Moral decision-making as marking the ending of childhood
- Is dependency such a negative human attribute?
- Parental authority over the child – de Beauvoir accepts this; is this contradictory?
- The next stages of development from child to “sub-man” to “serious man” and eventually to misusers and genuine users of freedom.

Charles Taylor: *The Ethics of Authenticity*

23. Evaluate the claim that without horizons of significance, authenticity becomes an ideal based in moral relativism.

Horizons of significance refers to basic principles; those concepts, values and ideas which are responsible for making situations intelligible for us, *eg* religious faith, humanism. This means that some ideas and actions are more important than others. Taylor’s argument is that without a horizon of significance, all moral choice becomes a shallow exercise and leads to moral relativism, which, for Taylor, entails that values are a matter of personal preference, and are beyond discussion and judgment. If authenticity is to have a moral value worthy of pursuit, it must be more than an exercise based in pleasure or short term interests. Authenticity requires social dialogue; withdrawal into subjectivism and narcissism ignores our responsibilities and ties with others and institutions beyond the individual. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- Choice is the indispensable condition of freedom, but it cannot become the standard by which to judge the worth of ideas and actions. Choice in itself is not enough. This is the slide that relativism makes in confusing an exercise in choice with authenticity
- Authenticity is an ideal possible only for those in modern democratic and technological societies
- Is Taylor being disingenuous when he at once acknowledges and celebrates the plurality of the modern world, but argues against even a soft version of relativism?
- Is choice the sufficient and necessary condition for freedom? What are some other possible signifiers?
- Does Taylor’s description of horizons of significance mean that so long as *some* ideas are used as a guide, then a search for authenticity is justified? What if my horizons of significance are morally suspect?

24. Explain and discuss the problems posed by instrumental reasoning to the ideal of authenticity.

The primacy of instrumental reason is a malaise of modernity. Instrumental reasoning has been of value in technological progress, but this has led to a view that our lives are now dominated by technology, and may compromise our relationships with others. By “instrumental reason” Taylor means the kind of rationality we draw on when we calculate the most economical application of means to a given end. Instrumental reasoning has led to progress in technology, it is also assumed to be of use in areas where other values might be of more importance and relevance. By contrast, authentic life is an ethical goal and peculiar to modern culture, stemming from Enlightenment views about the individual. The responsibility for finding the truth rests with the individual. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- One of the consequences of valuing means to end approaches is that all means lose their intrinsic value, including other sentient beings
- The reliance on technology, and a “means to ends” approach are responsible for the lack of permanence in manmade objects; a “disposable” society is the result
- Do material improvements made by technology necessarily come at a cost to the quality of life?
- Do institutions limit our freedom and “force” us to use instrumental reason, as Taylor claims?
- Though not all reasoning may be instrumental, is it true that instrumental reasoning is part of all forms of reasoning?
- The view of the individual is also influenced by Romantic notions of the virtues of originality and self expression for self identity
- The degree to which technology is becoming integrated with self identity, *eg* social networking sites
- What is in need of justification is the Kantian maxim that people are ends in themselves and should only be treated as a means to an end when, at the same time, they are treated as ends in themselves, rather than the utilitarian/pragmatic view of individuals which Taylor criticizes.