



MARKSCHEME

November 2013

PHILOSOPHY

Higher Level and Standard Level

Paper 1

25 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 1 guidance (Core Theme and Optional Themes)

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*
- *demonstrate knowledge and understanding of appropriate philosophical issues*
- *analyse, develop and critically evaluate relevant ideas and arguments*
- *present appropriate examples providing support for their overall argument*
- *identify and analyse counter-arguments*
- *provide relevant supporting material, illustrations and/or examples*
- *offer a clear and philosophically relevant personal response to the examination question.*

In the examination paper candidates are required to:

Write a response (of approximately 800 words) in which they:

- identify a central philosophical concept or philosophical issue in this passage/image that addresses the question, “what is a human being?”
- investigate **two** different philosophical approaches to the philosophical concept or philosophical issue they identified
- explain and evaluate the philosophical concept or philosophical issue they identified.

Using the assessment criteria

Candidates at both Higher Level and Standard Level answer **one** question on the Core Theme (Section A).

Candidates at Higher Level answer **two** questions on the Optional Themes (Section B), each based on a different Optional Theme.

Candidates at Standard Level answer **one** question on the Optional Themes (Section B).

Answers on the Core Theme and the Optional Themes are assessed according to the assessment criteria set out on pages 4 to 6 and 8 to 9.

Paper 1 Section A Core Theme assessment criteria**A Expression**

- Has the student presented the answer in an organized way?
- How clear and precise is the language used by the student?
- To what extent is the language appropriate to philosophy?

Achievement Level	Descriptor
0	The student has not reached level 1.
1	The student expresses some basic ideas but it is not always 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.
3	The student presents ideas in an organized way and the answer can be easily followed. The use of language is appropriate to philosophy.
4	The student presents ideas in an organized and coherent way and the answer is clearly articulated. The use of language is effective and appropriate to philosophy.
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.

B Knowledge and understanding

- To what extent does the student demonstrate knowledge of philosophical concepts or issues arising from the core theme, prompted by the stimulus material?
- To what extent are appropriate cross references made between the stimulus material and philosophical concepts or issues arising from the core theme?
- How well has the student understood the philosophical arguments, concepts or issues used?

Achievement Level	Descriptor
0	The student has not reached level 1.
1	The student demonstrates a superficial knowledge of philosophical concepts or issues arising from the core theme. Cross references to the stimulus material are superficial. There is only a basic understanding of the philosophical arguments, concepts or issues used.
2	The student demonstrates some knowledge of philosophical concepts or issues arising from the core theme. Cross references to the stimulus material are only occasionally appropriate. There is a limited understanding of the philosophical arguments, concepts or issues used.
3	The student demonstrates satisfactory knowledge of philosophical concepts or issues arising from the core theme. Cross references to the stimulus material are satisfactory. Philosophical arguments, concepts or issues are satisfactorily understood.
4	The student demonstrates a good knowledge of philosophical concepts or issues arising from the core theme, which is used effectively to support the answer. Cross references to the stimulus material are good. Philosophical arguments, concepts or issues are largely understood.
5	The student demonstrates a comprehensive and in-depth knowledge of the philosophical concepts or issues arising from the core theme, which is used incisively to support the answer. Cross references to the stimulus material are well handled. Philosophical arguments, concepts or issues are well understood.

C Identification and analysis of relevant material

- How clearly has the student identified a relevant philosophical issue in the stimulus material that arises from the core theme?
- To what extent does the student present and explore two different philosophical approaches to the issue in the stimulus material that arises from the core theme?
- How effectively does the student critically discuss the issue in the stimulus material that arises from the core theme?
- How effectively does the student identify and analyse relevant counter-arguments?

Achievement Level	Descriptor
0	The student has not reached level 1.
1–2	The student shows little awareness of a relevant philosophical issue in the stimulus material that arises from the core theme and identifies relevant material in only a limited way. There is little analysis and few or no examples are given.
3–4	The student shows some awareness of a relevant philosophical issue in the stimulus material that arises from the core theme and identifies some relevant material. Some appropriate examples are given.
5–6	The student shows an understanding of a relevant philosophical issue in the stimulus material that arises from the core theme and explores two different philosophical approaches to the issue. There is a satisfactory analysis of the material. Examples are generally appropriate and give some support to the answer.
7–8	The student shows an effective understanding of a relevant philosophical issue in the stimulus material that arises from the core theme. The student explores two different philosophical approaches to the issue in a convincing way. There is a compelling critical discussion of the issue. Examples are appropriate in their support of the answer. Counter-arguments are identified.
9–10	The student shows an in-depth understanding of a relevant philosophical issue in the stimulus material that arises from the core theme. The student explores two different philosophical approaches to the issue in a convincing, engaging and thoughtful way. There is an incisive and compelling critical discussion of the issue. Examples are appropriate and effective in their support of the answer. 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 ideas and arguments?
- 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 with little or no evaluation of them.
3–4	The student develops some ideas and arguments but the development is simple, or is asserted without support or reference. There may be some basic evaluation of the ideas and arguments but it is not developed.
5–6	The student develops ideas and arguments in a satisfactory way and evaluates them to some extent. There is some evidence of a relevant personal response.
7–8	The student develops ideas and arguments from a consistently held perspective. Evaluation of the ideas and arguments is effective. There is good evidence of a relevant personal response.
9–10	The student develops ideas and arguments from a consistently held and well justified perspective. Evaluation of the ideas and arguments is compelling or subtle, and convincing. There is strong evidence of a relevant personal response.

SECTION A**Core Theme: What is a human being?****1. Passage from the *Journal of Consciousness Studies***

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

This passage gives one account (amongst many) of the nature of the self. The passage identifies related philosophical issues. The passage is intended to be a stimulus for the candidate to identify a central philosophical concept that addresses the question, “What is a human being?”. Candidates might explore the accuracy and implications of the account as set out in the eight points, but might also develop a response that arises from considering other approaches mentioned in the account, *eg* Hume, Buddhism, phenomenology. Discussion might include the notions of existence at a time and persistence over time; the self as distinctive of human beings; materialism and the differentiation in ordinary thought and talk of the mental from the physical; the possibility of metaphysical presuppositions influencing our phenomenological grasp of the self; the place of self-consciousness and memory in our understanding of what it is to be human; ontological distinctness as requiring differentiation from other things. Other possibilities might include engagement with others, mind-body relations, notions of substance in relation to the human self.

2. Passage from *A Companion to Genethics*

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

This passage investigates the claim that there are significant, genetically-grounded differences in intelligence between people with different skin pigments. The passage raises related philosophical issues. The passage is intended to be a stimulus for the candidate to identify a central philosophical concept that addresses the question, “What is a human being?”. This passage raises notions of identity, individuality, and universality and the idea of race as genetically preordained. Candidates might explore the conception of “races” as complexes of traits that demarcate one group of human beings from another; the view of those convinced that different races have their own fixed and heritable genetic markers *versus* that of geneticists who hold that traits associated with particular genes remain environmentally sensitive; static *versus* dynamic understandings of differences between human beings; the superficiality and variability of traits on which racial categorization was historically based; the role and significance of IQ tests. Other possibilities might include an exploration of freedom and biological determinism; equality and genetic justice; the political uses of racial categorization. Candidates might consider notions of human essence being formed through experience; nature *versus* nurture; the identity of the individual and the identity of a type *eg* a race, a gender.

Paper 1 Section B Optional Themes assessment criteria**A Expression**

- Has the student presented the answer in an organized way?
- How clear and precise is the language used by the student?
- To what extent is the language appropriate to philosophy?

Achievement Level	Descriptor
0	The student has not reached level 1.
1	The student expresses some basic ideas but it is not always 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.
3	The student presents ideas in an organized way and the answer can be easily followed. The use of language is appropriate to philosophy.
4	The student presents ideas in a clear and organized way and the answer is clearly articulated. The use of language is effective and appropriate to philosophy.
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.

B Knowledge and understanding

- To what extent does the student demonstrate knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme?
- How well has the student understood the philosophical arguments and concepts used?

Achievement Level	Descriptor
0	The student has not reached level 1.
1	The student demonstrates a superficial knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme. There is only a basic understanding of the philosophical arguments and concepts used.
2	The student demonstrates some knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme. There is a limited understanding of the philosophical arguments and concepts used.
3	The student demonstrates satisfactory knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme. Philosophical arguments and concepts are satisfactorily understood.
4	The student demonstrates a good knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme, which is used effectively to support the answer. Philosophical arguments and concepts are largely understood.
5	The student demonstrates a comprehensive and in-depth knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme, which is used incisively to support the answer. Philosophical arguments and concepts are well understood.

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?
- To what extent does the student provide appropriate examples and use them to support the overall argument?
- How effectively does the student identify and analyse relevant 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 provided.
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 provided.
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. The examples provided are generally appropriate and give some support to the overall 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. The examples provided are appropriate in their support of the overall argument. 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. The examples provided 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 ideas and arguments?
- 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 with little or no evaluation of them.
3–4	The student develops some ideas and arguments but the development is simple, or is asserted without support or reference. There may be some basic evaluation of the ideas and arguments but it is not developed.
5–6	The student develops ideas and arguments in a satisfactory way and evaluates them to some extent. There is some evidence of a relevant personal response.
7–8	The student develops ideas and arguments from a consistently held perspective. Evaluation of the ideas and arguments is effective. There is good evidence of a relevant personal response.
9–10	The student develops ideas and arguments from a consistently held and well justified perspective. Evaluation of the ideas and arguments is compelling or subtle, and convincing. There is strong evidence of a relevant personal response.

SECTION B

Optional Theme 1: Grounds of epistemology

3. **“In epistemology, the notion of certainty can be defined and used in a variety of ways in the context of knowledge claims.” Discuss and evaluate.**

The notion of certainty, and how certainty functions in epistemology, can be understood in a variety of ways. The question asks for a discussion and evaluation of possible relationships of knowledge, truth, justification and certainty, for example, the rationalist claim that certainty is a necessary condition of knowledge claims contrasts with the skepticism on this point in the empiricist approach to knowledge justification. Approaches to certainty might include Plato’s definition of knowledge as justified, true belief, and a Cartesian perspective. Other approaches might investigate incorrigibility; absolute certainty; certainty and time; credibility; immunity to doubt; the foundationalist approach to grounding knowledge claims. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- Fallibilism as convincing justification for a knowledge claim which does not rest on possession of independent grounds or evidence
- Certainty and inductive and deductive argumentation; the presence of good reasons for establishing certainty
- Are there any knowledge claims that are immune to doubt? How? Why?
- Can we legitimately use particular instances of certain knowledge to justify claims for the certainty of additional knowledge claims?
- To what extent is it possible to establish an epistemological method for determining certainty?
- Is certainty a matter of intuition?
- Does the absence of certainty entail skepticism?
- Does “being certain of a proposition” differ from “a proposition being certain”?
- Are knowledge and belief compatible with uncertainty?

4. Explain and discuss the ways in which it might be possible to justify knowledge.

There is a variety of models and methods employed in the justification of knowledge claims. An exploration of the nature, strengths and weaknesses of proposed justifications might include a consideration of the nature of knowledge. Models of justification might include foundationalism, coherentism and pragmatism. Candidates might consider theories of verification and falsification. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- Knowledge as justified, true belief
- Rationalism, empiricism, realism, cognitivism, idealism, mysticism
- Knowledge by intuition; self-evident knowledge
- Doxastic justification as a property of beliefs: *being* justified in believing something; propositional justification as a property of propositions themselves: *having* justification to believe something
- Is any single method of justification more reliable than others?
- How is the dependability of foundational beliefs established?
- Is the understanding of the nature of knowledge and justification culturally relative?
- Are there criteria to determine the nature of evidence required to justify knowledge claims?
- Does justification provide absolute certainty?
- Are there any knowledge claims that are free from the need for justification? What are they? Why do they not need justification?
- Does the possibility of solipsism or skepticism require that we justify knowledge claims?

Optional Theme 2: Theories and problems of ethics

5. Evaluate the problems encountered when claiming that ethical judgments can be derived from a universal moral principle.

Some approaches to ethical judgments claim that they are made from a universal standpoint, which is a necessary condition for the truth of those judgments. For example, religious attempts, rationalist attempts or naturalistic attempts might be considered. In making a claim that there is a realist or cognitivist basis for ethical judgments, various problems might be encountered, including the issue of relativism, which raises the question of a plurality of moral beliefs. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- The difference between descriptive and normative relativism; meta-ethical relativism
- Attempts to define a universal moral principle
- The relationship between ethics and natural facts, *eg* utilitarianism, virtue theory, natural law
- Non-natural theories of morality; transcendent notions of moral reality, *eg* Plato, the analogy with Mathematics, intuitionism
- Kant’s use of reason; can reason provide a universal grounding for ethics?
- Attempts to define a universal ethical principle on rational grounds, *eg* utilitarianism; deontological ethics; virtue ethics; attempts at grounding morality in universal principles, *eg* human beings as ends in themselves; Universal Declaration of Human Rights
- The rejection of moral cognitivism, *eg* nihilism, emotivism, prescriptivism
- Subjectivism and objectivism
- The fact-value distinction, *eg* the is–ought gap; the naturalistic fallacy; the open question argument.

6. With reference to one or more applied ethical issues you have studied, explain and discuss the importance of evaluating consequences in coming to an ethical decision.

Consequentialist theories of ethics demand the assessment of consequences when coming to ethical judgments. There is a variety of interpretations of the use to be made of evaluating consequences, *eg* assessment of character *versus* assessment of acts, and the importance of doing so. Candidates might select from a wide range of applied ethical issues in order to develop their response. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- The different measures of consequentialist assessment, *eg* hedonic calculations, rule utilitarianism, preference utilitarianism, ideal consequentialism
- Psychological/ethical hedonism
- Egoism and altruism
- The notion of adopting present habits to pursue present and future flourishing (*eudaimonia*)
- The possibility of the calculation of future results
- The clash between consequentialism and deontology
- Individual and communitarian perspectives
- Situation ethics; “doing the most loving thing” as a specific act-based approach
- Different notions of the importance of humans and human reasoning to ethical judgments, *eg* those that place humans in a special position in considering the natural environment or other species
- Consequences *versus* rights; are they always opposed?
- The difficulty of applying virtue ethics to specific situations, *eg* in bio-medical ethics
- The use of an applied ethical example, *eg* bio-medical ethics, environmental ethics; distribution of wealth.

Optional Theme 3: Philosophy of religion**7. Evaluate the importance of human experience to arguments for and against the existence of God.**

Experience gained in the world is used in inductive arguments both for and against the existence of God. There is a variety of approaches that can be taken when using human experience in such arguments, and when considering the importance of such approaches, *eg* cosmological arguments, design arguments, miracles, religious experience, the problem of suffering and moral arguments. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- The concept of God being taught through experience, *eg* Locke
- The use of human reason in arguing about God's existence, *eg* Aquinas
- Different treatments of the notion of God from human experience and belief, *eg* Hume, Freud, Marx
- The free-will defence in sustaining arguments for God's existence in the face of suffering and evil
- The varieties of experience of God; discussions about possible alternative accounts for claims of religious experience
- Counter-arguments from ontological perspectives
- Counter-arguments from experience, *eg* Hume's challenge to design arguments, modern scientific treatments of claims about miracles
- Recent cognitive science and its attempts to contribute to arguments about religious experience and God's existence.

8. “Religious behaviour gets in the way of people becoming genuinely spiritual.” Discuss and evaluate.

There is a distinction in accounts of what constitutes being religious and being spiritual. Many thinkers claim that one experience can lead to the other, but other thinkers believe the two notions are in opposition to each other. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- The nature of religious behaviour; ritual and shared practice, community identification
- The concept of spirituality and “the other”
- The application of orthodox doctrine to personal religious belief and practice
- Indoctrination and conformity
- Reductionist accounts, *eg* illusion, projection
- The place of authority in religious belief
- Teachings of salvation
- Perspectives other than the monotheistic tradition
- The role of reason in religion
- Post-modern concepts of faith with an emphasis on experience
- The connection between religious behaviour and the human searches for meaningfulness through symbolism and metaphor; cults, sects
- The idea that spirituality should transcend single belief systems and reflect a more multi-cultural approach to religious belief and activity
- Existential interpretations of religious faith; meaning derived from within, not by reference to any external ultimate reality.

Optional Theme 4: Philosophy of art**9. Evaluate the claim that the purpose of art is to shock its audience.**

There is a variety of accounts both of what constitutes art and whether it has a purpose. Candidates might investigate various interpretations of the purpose of art being to shock its audience. They might include examples from theories or forms of art, *eg* representative theory, expressionism, atonal music, sculpture, literature, surrealism; “form” driven art, universalizing at the expense of pure representation; challenging the establishment and convention; making political statements to produce action or reaction in a wider society. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- A counter position to these theories; the purpose of art being defined by the audience not the creator; the “New Criticism”
- The relationship between intention and effect
- The relationship of the audience with the work of art
- A counter position that art might not/should not have a purpose; art having no function but just being pleasing to the senses
- The idea that what shocks and disturbs one member of an audience may not affect another in the same way
- The idea that an audience cannot be controlled, therefore shocks might not be intended but still result
- Examples from literature, painting and other art forms might illustrate and support the claim
- Does purpose start to define what good art is?
- Social context and era might define what is shocking; might particular works of art not exist for all times and in all social contexts?
- If objects and actions do shock do they become art?

10. Evaluate the claim that some works of art are better than others.

The nature, scope and function of aesthetic judgment are central issues in the Philosophy of art. This question invites an exploration of ways in which judgments about works of art can be made. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- The difference between “high” art and “low” art
- The significance of the quality of technique
- The notion of folk art where the creator is unknown or the creation is a result of collective activity
- The role of the passage of time in judging works of art
- The role of expert opinion; if experts construct hierarchies, who evaluates the expertise of the experts?
- Definitions of better; pleasing the majority, conforming to certain fixed criteria, *eg* longevity, level of skill
- Examples from various art forms might illustrate possible hierarchies; a pop song set against an operatic aria
- The extent to which subjective feelings might establish hierarchies
- If forms of art are distinctly different how can they be compared?
- Could the interrelationship of form and content be a deciding factor in hierarchy?
- Are hierarchies subjective or are they universal?
- If the notion of hierarchies is entertained might there be a tendency then to produce a hierarchy of cultures or traditions?

Optional Theme 5: Political philosophy**11. With reference to the forms and ideologies of government you have studied, evaluate which is conceptually the most justifiable.**

The conceptual basis of the forms and ideologies of government is at issue here. Candidates might consider different forms of government; some examples of these might include one-party democracy, multi-party democracy, participatory democracy, totalitarian rule. They might investigate different ideologies of government which could include liberalism, conservatism, anarchism, communism and socialism. Candidates might also consider different types of justification, such as ideas of historical process, human nature, social contract. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- The variety of forms and realizations of political views, possible combinations among them
- Criticism of liberal individualism as associated with an egoistic and greedy account of human nature
- The objection that liberals subordinate politics to economics
- The idea that people develop their powers only through cooperation with others
- What would justify the claim that the materialist conception of history is true?
- What is the basis of the Marxist critique of capitalism?
- Who can be expected to carry through a socialist transformation?
- Support for the claim that the less government intervention, the better, *eg* rulers' ignorance and corruptibility
- A criticism of conservatism based on its tendency towards complacency and acceptance of the status quo even when it is unacceptable
- Defence and criticism of the idea of social contract
- An obvious difference between capitalism and socialism: common ownership leads to different pattern of distribution of the products of labour
- The idea of equality and its relation to democracy
- Non-democratic forms of government.

12. “[...] a theory of justice that can serve as the basis of practical reasoning must include ways of judging how to reduce injustice and advance justice, rather than aiming only at the characterization of perfectly just societies.” Discuss and evaluate Amartya Sen’s claim.

Practical reasoning is concerned with how what should be done can be realized. It is guided by impartial scrutiny which is essential to the effective realization of justice. At issue here is how justice is connected with the way people’s lives go, with the nature of the institutions surrounding them and whether it can serve as the basis for practical reasoning about how to achieve a certain kind of society. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- Examples related to the advancement of justice: the fight against oppression (like slavery, or the subjugation of women), protest against systematic medical neglect (through the absence of medical facilities in parts of Africa or Asia), the lack of universal health coverage in most countries in the world, repudiation of the permissibility of torture, rejection of the tolerance of chronic hunger
- Ideas or conceptions of justice; distributive and retributive justice; the right or will of the strong; substantive *versus* procedural justice; relations to fairness, truth, the moral and positive law
- Justice includes not only ideals but also demands effective realization in different domains: social, economic, legal, political; *eg* it applies to institutions and behaviour
- To what extent should something be done against inequality? Might it be a legal obligation? Is it an ethical imperative?
- Is the idea of justice innate?
- The suspicion of the demands of perfect justice being an obstacle to the effective realization of justice.

Optional Theme 6: Non-Western traditions and perspectives

13. With reference to one or more of the non-Western traditions you have studied, evaluate the nature, role and scope of ethics.

This question allows for a treatment of different ways of understanding, experiencing and applying ethics in various non-Western traditions. Candidates might show how ethics relates to an understanding of the self, relationships with others, one's position in nature and in the universe and one's relationship with the supernatural or divine especially in terms of the evaluation of decisions and actions. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- Ethics as concern for right and wrong, good and evil, wise or foolish, prudential or risky as learned from the past, and applied to the present or projected into the future
- Evaluation of actions, decisions, events, persons
- Ethical implications of the notions of salvation, transmigration, reincarnation, liberation, annihilation, sin, guilt, atonement and life after death
- Animistic, theistic, non-theistic, atheistic foundations for ethics
- Ethics and tribe, community, state
- Does religion legitimize ethics?
- Do the mandates of supernatural or divine beings and/or entities determine the nature of the ethics of a tradition or culture?
- What is the role of reason and emotion?
- Ethics and the relationships of humans to non-human entities and to the environment.

14. With reference to one or more of the non-Western traditions you have studied, evaluate the notion of time and its relationship to an understanding of reality.

This question allows for a treatment of different ways of understanding and experiencing time in various non-Western traditions. It also allows for a treatment of how time relates to an understanding of the self, relationships with others, one's position in nature and in the universe and one's relationship with the supernatural or divine. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- The nature of time: diachronic, synchronic, cyclical, linear, mythical
- The experience of time: enduring, erratic, static, deceptive, rhythmic, alternating; the idea of the absence of time
- Hierophantic and sacred time: temporal manifestations of the supernatural, divine, holy
- “In the beginning” time: creation, regeneration, destruction
- Time and the rhythms of life: initiation and passage
- Time and ritual
- Is the notion of time always relative to a particular tradition, culture or perspective?
- How does time help in understanding the self and its relation to the world?
- Are significant, but specific, finite moments in life eternalized by being experienced in sacred, ritualistic and mythical time?

Optional Theme 7: Contemporary social issues**15. Evaluate the claim that social injustice legitimizes popular protest.**

This question invites an evaluation of the relationship between social injustice and protest. Factors that might constitute social injustice include, inequalities of rights, uneven distribution of wealth, discrimination caused by race, class or ethnic group, discrimination based on gender or age, dominance of society by one person or an elite group, discrimination by the State in providing health care and education, discrimination based on physical or mental differences. Types of protest include violent or non-violent, spontaneous or organised, ideologically driven or the result of popular frustration. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- The role of the majority and minority in determining what social justice is and what are acceptable levels of tolerance
- Factors other than social injustice that might legitimize protest
- The interaction of State and market
- The responsibility of the State towards an individual or group
- Equality of opportunity *versus* equality of outcome
- Reactions to types of protest
- Does social justice depend upon an agreed concept of human nature and/or human rights?
- Does social injustice produce alienation? Does a highly technological age produce social injustice?
- Is violence ever morally justifiable when protesting against social injustice?

16. Evaluate philosophically the claim that humans should control nature.

This question seeks an evaluation of the role of humans within nature and might involve a consideration of human influence and control of the environment. At issue are the possible definitions of nature, the status of humans in the natural world, and whether humans are a part of nature or somehow “above” nature. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- Religious perspectives of the role of man in nature
- Indigenous people’s relationships with nature
- Impact of technologies upon nature
- Limits of knowledge restricting degrees of control
- Control for the benefit of humans
- Speciesism
- “Cultural idealism”; human action as a response to the environment
- Does the idea of a “state of nature” establish a code of moral interaction with the environment?
- Are environmentalist campaigners naive if they fail to recognize that man’s rational capacity might be seen to exist so as to dominate and exploit nature?
- Is it possible to improve nature?
- Other purposes of humans might result in total disregard for nature: man’s drive to increase wealth; to survive; to reproduce; to reach a higher spiritual plane.

Optional Theme 8: People, nations and cultures**17. Evaluate philosophically the claim that human creativity might and should find productive ways to overcome the conflict between tradition and new forms of culture.**

The question is open to a multiplicity of approaches, where candidates might show a consideration of what culture and tradition are, and the nature and role of human creativity. Cultural activity might be described in many diverse ways, *eg* as bodily-mental activity or as a system of symbolic interaction. Candidates might include an investigation of elements of cultural stability, cultural diversity and cultural change. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- The roles of innovation and tradition in establishing and preserving a culture and cultural identity
- Examples of new cultural forms can cover a very broad spectrum including media examples or political institutions
- Cultural development and the interaction of individuals in a local or global setting
- The emergence of cultures: cultural evolution or cultural revolution; new cultural forms in the present day
- If there is a conflict, how could it be resolved? Would it be possible to maintain both new cultural forms and traditions?
- Other kinds of opposition that might be related: conflict between generations, power struggle between classes, gender differences
- The impact of immigration and emigration on established societies
- The challenges of multiculturalism.

18. Evaluate philosophically the claim that it is desirable that humanity converges towards only one common global civilization.

This question asks for a philosophical evaluation of the desirability of individuals being citizens of the world, especially in the context of globalization and its impact at different levels. Globalization has cultural, political, economic, environmental and religious dimensions. Definitions of citizenship might include reference to local, national, global contexts. Candidates might consider the basis of internationalism, for example, humanism, Marxism, the Enlightenment, the contribution of religious belief, the concept of world peace. Other possibilities include the challenges of multiculturalism, global culture, globalization, cosmopolitanism, and ethnic identity and diversity. In addressing these philosophical issues, candidates might explore:

- Self-identity and self-expression from a common global perspective
 - Every culture comprises inner structures and mechanisms that are responsible for the selection, transformation and adaptation of phenomena from other cultures. This could apply to the relation between particular cultures and global culture
 - What being a citizen of the world would imply as regards participation in world political affairs
 - Any reflection upon a common civilization is only possible from the perspective of a particular culture
 - Globalization is at least an historical, economic and social fact, which makes people subject to a common civilization, in a very basic sense, a fact of the present world
 - Are globalization and internationalism inevitable? Would they be dangerous to human well-being?
 - What is the value and impact of world institutions?
 - The impact of the idea of a common civilization on our understanding of being human
 - How does the role and responsibility of the individual change under globalization?
 - Is it possible to develop a globally acceptable definition of civilization?
 - The political expression and impact of internationalism, federalism, localism, globalism, colonialism, imperialism and capitalism.
-