

# Markscheme

November 2016

Philosophy

Higher level and standard level

Paper 1

22 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.

## How to use the Diploma Programme Philosophy markscheme

The assessment markbands constitute the formal tool for marking examination scripts, and in these assessment markbands examiners can see the skills being assessed in the examinations. The markschemes are designed to assist examiners in possible routes taken by candidates in terms of the content of their answers when demonstrating their skills of doing philosophy through their responses. The points listed are not compulsory points, and not necessarily the best possible points. They are a framework to help examiners contextualize the requirements of the question, and to facilitate the application of marks according to the assessment markbands listed on page 4 for the core theme and page 7 for the optional themes.

It is important that examiners understand that the main idea of the course is to promote *doing* philosophy, and this involves activity and engagement throughout a two-year programme, as opposed to emphasizing the chance to display knowledge in a terminal set of examination papers. Even in the examinations, responses should not be assessed on how much candidates *know* as much as how they are able to use their knowledge in support of an argument, using the skills referred to in the various assessment markbands published in the subject guide, reflecting an engagement with philosophical activity throughout the course. As a tool intended to help examiners in assessing responses, the following points should be kept in mind when using a markscheme:

- The Diploma Programme Philosophy course is designed to encourage the skills of *doing* philosophy in the candidates. These skills can be accessed through reading the assessment markbands in the subject guide
- The markscheme does not intend to outline a model/correct answer
- The markscheme has an introductory paragraph which contextualizes the emphasis of the question being asked
- The bullet points below the paragraph are suggested possible points of development that should *not* be considered a prescriptive list but rather an indicative list where they might appear in the answer
- If there are names of philosophers and references to their work incorporated into the markscheme, this should help to give context for the examiners and does *not* reflect a requirement that such philosophers and references should appear in an answer: They are possible lines of development.
- Candidates can legitimately select from a wide range of ideas, arguments and concepts in service of the question they are answering, and it is possible that candidates will use material effectively that is *not* mentioned in the markscheme
- Examiners should be aware of the command terms for Philosophy as published on page 54 of the Philosophy subject guide when assessing responses
- In Paper 1, examiners must be aware that a variety of types of answers and approaches, as well as a freedom to choose a variety of themes, is expected. Thus, examiners should not penalize different styles of answers or different selections of content when candidates develop their response to the questions. The markscheme should not imply that a uniform response is expected
- In markschemes for the core theme questions in Paper 1 (section A) the bullet points suggest possible routes of response to the stimulus, but it is critical for examiners to understand that the selection of the philosophical issue raised by the stimulus, is *entirely at the choice of the candidate* so it is possible for material to gain credit from the examiner even if none of the material features in the markscheme.

### Note to examiners

*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.*

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

Answers are assessed according to the markbands set out on pages 5–6.

Candidates at both Higher Level and Standard Level answer **one** question on the Core Theme (Section A). Candidates at Higher Level answer **two** questions on the Optional Themes (Section B), each based on a different Optional Theme.

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

**Paper 1 Section A markbands**

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

## Section A

### Core theme: Being human

#### 1. Extract from *Enduring Love*

[25]

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

This question requires candidates to identify and discuss philosophical issues and/or concepts in the set passage that are related to the fundamental question of what it is to be human. Responses are likely to look at how human beings relate to, and what arises as a result of, those human relations. Some aspects of being human are given categorisation, like gender or race, and this applies to groups of people as well as individuals. Interest is also given to faculties like reasoning and language, and how they relate across and between different individuals. The relationship between individuals and society is of philosophical interest, as is the general question of the relationship between parts and a whole – and also the particular and the universal.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- “The object is greater than the sum of its parts” – metaphysical speculations about activity or matter when joined together
- Inter-relations and the other
- Reasoning in a group, reasoning as an individual
- Scientific and materialistic accounts of human motivation and behaviour
- Rational accounts of human motivation and behaviour
- The implications for understanding of the self in relation to others
- Accounts of social interaction *eg*, Plato, Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, Rawls
- “Every man for himself” – accounts of social formation and social activity and so-called progress
- Selfishness as a rational explanation for morality
- Cooperation and altruism as motivations for behaviour *eg*, game theory
- “We had failed ourselves” – what might this mean? The notion of self
- The role of language as “social glue”
- Reference to evolution for explaining human behaviour; the genetic fallacy.

## 2. Image of the brain

[25]

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

This question requires candidates to identify and discuss philosophical issues and/or concepts in the image related to the fundamental question of what it is to be human. Responses are likely to use the image to discuss the way a physical entity like the brain can influence a person's behaviour or an activity like thought. Assigning different human abilities to parts of the brain, suggests that a materialist explanation of human behaviour might be appropriate, but many thinkers disagree. Thinkers have speculated on the relationship between the body and the mind for centuries and responses are likely to reflect that and to engage with different types of approach to the issue. These may include religious, psychological, neurological and metaphysical accounts of the human person and behaviour. Responses might also look at the possibility of drawing comparisons between human and non-human animals with brains, and the possibility of artificially replicating brain activity through computing and other technological advances.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- What might account for the perennial philosophical interest in the question of what the relationship of the brain to the mind or the person is?
- Accounts of the mind-body relation *eg*, dualism, monism, idealism, materialism
- The problem of other minds
- Consciousness, qualia and intentionality
- Theories like behaviourism, functionalism *etc*
- The impact of science on understanding the mind, cognitive science, neurological science
- The impact of psychology on understanding the mind
- The differences between scientific and psychological methodologies and philosophical activity
- Religious accounts and the different assumptions involved in religious and other metaphysical accounts of the human person
- Non-Western accounts of the person
- Non-human minds
- Artificial intelligence
- Emotion, intuition, and creativity in relation with reasoning.

**Paper 1 Section B markbands**

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



## Section B

### Optional theme 1: Aesthetics

3. **Explain and discuss Picasso’s claim about the function of art, that “[a] painting is not made to decorate apartments. It’s an offensive and defensive weapon against the enemy.” [25]**

This question invites a wide analysis of the meaning of art and its possible social function(s). An approach might take into account the dichotomy between a conception of art as autonomous from any moral or political judgment vs. a conception of art having moral or social weight. From a standpoint, Croce’s idea of art as independent leads to the statement that “there is no penal law that could condemn an image to prison or death;” and “to judge Dante’s Francesca as immoral or Shakespeare’s Cordelia as moral is just like to judge a square as moral or a triangle as immoral” (B. Croce, *Breviario di estetica*). This point of view offers the chance to investigate the possibilities of judging art and a discussion on taste. From another point of view, art is part of society and it is a direct expression of its culture and people. So, art plays a social, political or moral role. For Dewey, the aesthetic experience is “a manifestation, a record and celebration of the life of a civilization, a means for promoting its development, and also the ultimate judgment upon the quality of a civilization”, (J. Dewey, *Art as Experience*). The analysis might consider the connections between art and politics and how art has been historically used as a means of propaganda, indoctrination, and communication by totalitarian regimes or religions (eg, movies, architecture or specific alphabet typefaces by Fascism; painting, sculpture and philatelic art by Socialism or Communism; painting, architecture and music by the Roman Catholic Church; iconoclasm by the Byzantine Empire). This approach might also refer to the role played by cultural values as in Marx’s concept of dominant class or in Gramsci’s concept of hegemony. Moreover, the consideration of the relationship between art and politics might pinpoint cases of censorship. One more possible argument might take into account the use of art as a means of purification of the soul, as in Aristotle’s view.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Autonomy of art and whether it is possible to judge it
- Possible moral judgments of art
- Connections between art and politics
- Social role of art
- Art and education
- Art as a measure of the development of a civilization
- Historical cases of the political use of art for propaganda
- Cases of censorship
- Art as purification of the soul, eg, in Aristotle’s view
- Art as a means of communication
- Art and language.

**4. To what extent does technology change art, the artistic process and production? [25]**

This question calls for an analysis of the impact of technology on art, the artistic process and production. Has technology provided artists with new materials? How has this affected the artist's work? Digital production, which emerged as an increasingly persistent form of art in the last decades, has affected the artistic process and the art content itself. The analysis might consider how digital art relates to creativity and imagination and whether they are threatened or improved by it. Is human touch still present or is its role reduced? The question might also invite an introductory analysis on the meaning of art as production, therefore on the universal connection between technique and art: What is the weight of technical skills in the artistic process? For example, Croce stated "Raphael would have been a great painter even without hands; but he wouldn't have been a great painter without a sense for drawing and design" (B. Croce, *Breviario di estetica*). Art as production might recall the ancient Greek concepts of *poiesis* (creation and production) and *techne* (handcraft) *eg*, linked to Plato and Aristotle or to contemporary views, such as Heidegger's. Another path of analysis might take into account the role played by technology in the development of specific forms of art, *eg*, pop art, computer animation films, and photography, also considering historical examples of the past, such as lithography. One more aspect might consider the effects of the increase of production offered by the availability of new devices, such as smartphones, tablets and digital cameras, the spread of software for the social sharing and the overproduction of works of art.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Art as production: *techne* and *poiesis*
- Technical skills and artistic expression
- Technology and new forms of art
- Digital art
- Technological improvement and creativity
- Historical cases of technological improvement applied to art
- Spread of new devices and software in relation to art
- Does art represent or transform reality?
- New technologies enabling the global sharing of art; globalisation and art
- The impact on inter-relationships through art shared by technology
- New technologies as fostering the appearance of new artists.

**Optional theme 2: Epistemology**

5. **Evaluate the claim that knowledge of our world gained through our senses is unreliable.** [25]

This question invites an evaluation of the critique of an empiricist approach to seeking knowledge. It raises issues at different levels from the argument that all sense-data can be questioned to issues of categorization of the data received creating the uncertainty. Both a rationalist and idealist position might be developed, while a counter might be a common-sense approach along with the stance that we do not have direct experience of the world but rely on interpretation, so the certainty of the information might be questioned. Issues of perception and illusion might be pursued as examples to show how errors arise. Another response might focus on accepting what generates the sense-data as certain, so what it is that is questioned are the propositions and statements about the sense-data.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- How we conceptualize the world we encounter and operate within
- The problems associated with abstract concepts which might not be related to sense-data
- How reliability can be verified
- Direct realism, representative realism, idealism
- Plato, Descartes, Locke, Hume, Kant, James *etc*
- Differences between knowledge by acquaintance and description and the problems of communicating the seeming certain knowledge gained by acquaintance
- The certainty difference between rational and empirical conclusions.

**6. Evaluate the claim that all knowledge should be freely available to all groups within a population. [25]**

This question gives the opportunity to evaluate how access to knowledge might be controlled and the consequences of that control. It raises issues as to whether some types of knowledge should be limited in access, and the reasons for that limiting of access. Also, there are possibilities of an evaluation of how cultural and economic factors could limit access to knowledge. Equally with free access to knowledge there arises the use and abuse of the knowledge that is available. Other responses might venture into the use of knowledge as a social control tool.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Plato's argument for restricting access to knowledge to certain types of trained people
- The moral dilemmas faced by scientists who fear the abuse of the application of knowledge by non-scientific groups *eg*, the application of atomic knowledge in the production and use of weapons
- Knowledge and ideology; received knowledge
- Issues of selection and who makes knowledge available *eg*, censorship of books or controls on the internet
- Access to information especially in the digital age
- Protection of the innocent relating to pornography might be seen as control of knowledge access
- Political interference and manipulation of knowledge to a given end
- Bacon's "knowledge is power"
- Social control through knowledge; the panoptical nature of modern society means the state has increased knowledge and consequently increased power.

### Optional theme 3: Ethics

7. **“Moral claims are not true or false; they are just expressions of approval and disapproval.” Discuss and evaluate this claim. [25]**

The question which is concerned with meta-ethics makes two claims; the response might decide that moral claims cannot be true or false, but still hold that they are more than being merely expressions of approval or disapproval. The question calls for a focus on emotivism (ethical non-naturalism) as a by-product of the logical positivist restriction to what is either tautological, or empirically verifiable. Moral claims were said to be unverifiable and so were classed as meaningless. Ethical language is said to be non-cognitive and in an effort to rescue some meaning for ethical claims, defenders of logical positivism came up with the so-called emotivist theory – originally attributed to A. J. Ayer. Responses might engage with the concept of verifying ethical claims. Where do moral statements come in such a scheme? If they are known by definition then they are mere tautologies, claiming nothing. On the other hand, how can you point to facts that prove a moral statement? That, too, is impossible – you cannot derive an “ought” from an “is”. Hence, Ayer saw all moral statements as meaningless. Some discussion on R. M. Hare’s prescriptivism may be present in order to demonstrate meaning for moral judgments – although he does argue for the importance of moral principles rather than rules (as opposed to Kantian deontology). Counter examples might be explored on how Hume’s famous gap between factual and value language could be bridged.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Moral statements serve no real purpose, because they are an expression of feeling
- Some reject Ayer’s theory – suggesting a variety of causes for their moral beliefs, which some people believe justify their view
- Ayer’s approach developed by C. L. Stevenson who argued that moral judgments contain two elements: i) an expression of an attitude based on a belief, and, ii) a persuasive element which seeks to influence others
- Are Ayer and Stevenson wrong to remove reason from moral judgments as James Rachels argues (moral judgments appeal to reasons, just as any judgment appeals to reasons)?
- The claim “murder is wrong” is to make a factual statement which can be discussed and debated. If this were not the case then, as emotions changed, so would morality, causing an extreme form of relativism and subjectivism
- Language should not be simply about verifiability; language is much richer and more complex than scientific experiments or mathematical numbers
- Emotivism does not have much of a following; in part, because it seems to reduce moral discussions to, at best, expressions of opinion and, at worst, a shouting match
- Emotivism reduces moral reactions about atrocities such as genocide, murder or rape to subjective personal feelings
- How can we judge between two people’s moral opinions?
- Emotivism contrasted with intuitionism’s claim that all basic moral judgments are self-evident
- Prescriptivism takes emotivism and develops the concept into one of making recommendations to take a particular course of action
- J. L. Mackie’s argument that objective values, including objective moral values, do not exist because they are metaphysically anomalous and thus his assumption that moral objectivism entails non-naturalism, which Mackie considers ontologically queer
- Examples of bridging the “is-ought” gap *eg*, Kant, utilitarianism, virtue theory, social institutions (Searle)
- Counters to emotivism include Nussbaum’s theory of emotions
- The content of emotivism within the context of tradition and cultural influences, *eg*, Nietzsche’s account of the origin of moral language.

8. **“Always act so as to produce the greatest happiness for the greatest number.” With reference to one or more example(s) of applied ethics, discuss and evaluate whether this principle is a legitimate way to make moral decisions.** [25]

Responses will show an understanding of utilitarianism and its practical application in moral decision making. The theory may be described as consequentialist, teleological and hedonistic. Identification of the quotation with the utility principle and/or act utilitarianism should be made. Responses should engage with the view that the moral worth of each action is to be determined by its contribution to the sum total of human happiness. Responses might explore other versions of hedonistic calculation, in particular rule utilitarianism. Answers need to demonstrate understanding of a particular moral issue or dilemma and be able to apply utilitarianism to it. The example(s) to be discussed is/are open and can be drawn from any of the areas of applied ethics.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Utilitarianism provides a simple mechanism for making moral decisions; it is sensitive to the demands of particular situations since it requires consideration of the real life consequence of our actions which are objective and measurable
- Discussion of the specific consequences of different courses of action when applied to an ethical problem could be explored to show this
- Candidates might contrast the practicality of utilitarianism with the abstract nature of deontological principles
- Negative utilitarianism; the Harm Principle?
- The adoption of utilitarian principles by governments has the practical consequence of improving the general well-being, *eg*, relief of poverty
- Rule utilitarianism might be defended as being more effective than act utilitarianism in relation to the moral problem discussed
- Mill’s position that the happiness of all is also a good and is a basic human aspiration
- Practical difficulties *eg*, human happiness cannot realistically be calculated, because different individual’s pleasures are incommensurable, or the problem of comparing higher and lower pleasures
- It is not possible to determine how far into the future our calculations should be extended or to determine whether long or short term pleasures should weigh more heavily. The crudeness of the hedonic calculus
- Focusing on the consequences of particular actions opens the way to offending against important moral principles, such as those which defend individual rights
- Utilitarianism is too demanding: We cannot expect people to put majority happiness above their own or that of their family members
- Means-ends reasoning can be used to justify committing immoral acts
- Actions should be guided by the proper motive and not by considerations of the consequences
- Utilitarianism ignores the important role that individual responsibility and moral integrity play in ethical choices
- Utilitarianism confuses moral duty with conditional imperatives
- Standard objections to act utilitarianism which involve sacrificing individual rights to calculations of general utility, or the impracticality of individuals calculating each situation anew, may be used to argue for rule utilitarianism: The view that general rules for conduct, the adoption of which leads to the greater sum of happiness, should be adopted
- Happiness may be the consequence of achieving one’s goals in life, not the goal itself
- Happiness is not the only good; if we aim exclusively at human happiness other goods may be sacrificed, such as liberty, equality, justice, knowledge of one’s true situation, *etc*
- Criticisms of hedonistic utilitarianism may lead candidates to explore preference utilitarianism as an alternative
- Sen’s account of utilitarianism
- Counter positions *eg*, deontology, intuitionism, virtue theory, situationism.

#### Optional theme 4: Philosophy and contemporary society

**9. Explain and discuss the philosophical implications of showing tolerance towards minority groups or individuals. [25]**

The issue of tolerance is a fertile one for philosophy, for it involves the possibility of a logical contradiction if pushed to an extreme. Is it possible to tolerate the intolerable? What is the difference between showing tolerance and finding some person or state of affairs tolerable? The relationship between the liberty of an individual and the needs of a society is discussed by Mill who makes a case for tolerance in his major work *On Liberty*. Responses might look at the development of pluralistic societies and the challenges pluralism brings for the running of such a state or society. Mill sees tolerance as the only credible alternative to force in a society that offers difference of opinion and belief. Responses might consider how reason contributes to tolerance, and what problems reasoning might uncover in the call for tolerance to be shown in a pluralist society. Responses might look at the notion of tolerance as a virtue, displayed in a public sphere, but possessed by an individual. The issue of tolerance not being a state of neutrality might also be covered in a response to this question.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The limits of tolerance – tolerating the intolerable
- Is there a descriptive and normative difference between being tolerant and finding something/someone tolerable (or worthy of tolerance)?
- Causes of intolerance, *eg*, religion, human differences, cultural factors
- Locke
- The tolerant individual and the tolerant society – tolerance as a virtue providing a foundation for the good life
- Tolerance and neutrality; can there be neutrality?
- Is tolerance the absolute opposite of intolerance (*eg*, Paine)?
- Mill's defence of individual liberty against legislation and the opinion of the majority
- Pluralism and notions of the ideal society
- What is the definition of 'tolerable' and what might qualify as 'intolerable'?
- Multiculturalism, integration, immigrant experience, the rights of the minority
- Critical faculties and tolerance
- Tolerance and autonomy.

10. **“The prime application of technology is as a tool for assisting human work.” To what extent can this claim be justified?** [25]

Responses to this question will grapple with the issue of whether technology’s primary influence is in supporting human work and industry, or if it has taken a new dimension, with its continuing advance, and now exercises a different influence. Responses might well consider how technology reflects human concerns in terms of what is invented and developed, and the political implications of manufacture might be covered. Marx offers a view of the role of technology in determining the structure of society, especially as a tool of economics, but more recently, technology has transformed inter-societal communication, and can be considered from a global perspective in the way that it links individuals across the world. Responses might develop ideas about what technology reflects, from being a reflection of human intelligence to human aspiration. The impact of technology might be considered and this can be developed from the perspective of the individual as well as society. The debate about artificial intelligence might feature in some responses, as might the work of philosophers like Taylor and Arendt who provide critiques of modern working conditions and the way human beings organize and see themselves in society.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The role and impact of technology in contemporary society
- Different approaches to the development and role of technology, *eg*, social constructivist approach
- Technological determinism – our technology determines our social structure
- Contributions including Dewey, Marcuse and Heidegger
- The Marxist interpretation of technology and the neo-Marxist critique provided by the Frankfurt School
- Jonas’s view on technology, society and future generations
- Does technology merely reflect human concerns and abilities, or does it create a challenge for human development to overcome?
- The contribution by technology to theories of the mind; artificial intelligence
- Technology and mass communication
- Inter-societal, global communication technology and its modern impact on perspectives and human interaction.



### Optional Theme 5: Philosophy of religion

**11. Evaluate the claim that essential attributes of God’s nature such as goodness, omnipotence and omniscience can be known through reason. [25]**

The question asks for an evaluation of a concatenation of issues which are related in various ways, and from which candidates might select one. One traditional approach to philosophy of religion sustains the possibility of establishing truths about God or the Absolute on the basis of reason. *Eg*, Aquinas: Some truths about God can be known only with the help of revelation; examples are his triune nature and incarnation. Other truths about him, such as his existence, simplicity, wisdom, and power, are included in his revelation but can also be known through reason. Responses might refer to some of the attributes mentioned in the question; others might be more focused on the issue of the possible rational demonstration of God’s existence.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Early modern philosophers like Descartes, Leibniz, and Locke were only incidentally concerned with purely theological issues, but they too insist that some important truths about God can be established by purely philosophical reflection
- The consequences of the new commitment to reason alone adopted by the eighteenth-century Enlightenment depended on whether important religious truths could be established by natural reason. Deists believed that they could. Human reason can prove the existence of God and immortality and discover basic moral principles
- Because religious beliefs are the only ones that can be established by unaided human reason, they alone are required of everyone; they are also the only beliefs needed for religious worship and practice; beliefs wholly or partly based on some alleged revelation, on the other hand, are needless at best and pernicious at worst
- Others, such as Hume, adopted a more skeptical attitude toward reason’s possibilities: Reason is unable to show that God exists or that any other important religious claim is significantly more probable than not
- Arguments for atheism, *eg*, Hume, Russell, Mackie
- Agnosticism as the view that human reason is incapable of providing sufficient rational grounds to justify either the belief that God exists or the belief that God does not exist
- Arguments for the existence of God which may be discussed, *eg*, the ontological argument, the cosmological argument, the teleological argument
- More recent arguments using inductive reasoning to draw probable conclusions about God’s existence and attributes, *eg*, Tennant, Swinburne, Polkinghorne
- Contemporary positions and discussions arising from or in relation to conflicting views on science and religion.

- 12. Evaluate the claim that if one accepts pluralism (as the view that a single, ultimate religious reality is being differently experienced and understood in different religions, offering equally effective paths to salvation or liberation), then each person would be justified in upholding his/her own religion. [25]**

This question encourages an evaluation of a claim which raises issues relating to religious pluralism, giving an opportunity to reflect upon it. Since the characterization presented in the question might be considered an inexact or partial picture of actual versions of pluralism, answers might challenge it.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The diversity of religious experience and behaviour
- Approaches taken from the diversity of religious traditions
- A pluralistic view: Each of the major religious traditions offers a path to salvation or liberation that involves a transformation of human existence from self-centredness to reality-centredness; all of these traditions are of roughly equal effectiveness in producing this transformation; this suggests that a single ultimate reality is being differently conceived, experienced and responded to from within different traditions
- Is pluralism, once clearly stated, a rational option or does it lead to insoluble contradictions?
- The major religious traditions would reject the claim, as pluralism would state, that their beliefs are true only of ways in which ultimate reality appears to them, or of phenomenal objects it contributes to producing, and are not true of that reality as it is in itself
- Is there a case that some of the religions are more similar than others, *eg*, those that speak of the one God as in the Abrahamic tradition?
- Can the content of different religion's beliefs be assessed according to their anthropological origins?
- Religion in multicultural environments
- Contextualization as a means of understanding the grounds of the belief/culture
- Dialogue among religions or interfaith dialogue.

### Optional Theme 6: Philosophy of science

13. **“Contempt for experience has had a tragic revenge in experience; it has cultivated disregard for fact and this disregard has been paid for in failure, sorrow and war.” Discuss and evaluate Dewey’s claim. [25]**

This question focuses on the concept of experience and the role it plays in science. Dewey’s claim invites a consideration of experience as a final test bed for all our opinions, hypotheses, explanations, and theories. The question also offers the chance to analyse whether experience is necessary for all knowledge. Science has often relied on abstract or mental experiments – *Gedankenexperiment* – since Aristotle’s and Galileo’s times. The analysis of the role played by experience might lead to other topics, *eg*, the nature of experiment, results control, falsifiability of theories. This point might recall the significance of the relation between science and truth, from Plato to Popper. Another path might take into account the importance of observation and perception: If experience is the final test for our opinions, then it is important to define and understand how observation works and whether the observer alters observation somehow. Also, if experience can corroborate or reject a theory, then it is necessary to consider the criteria and methodology used in experience. Reference to theory-ladenness and the role played by theoretical presuppositions in interpreting observation facts and experiment results might be made. The question also invites a discussion on the dichotomy of ideology *vs.* experience, or principles *vs.* facts: The extent to which the progress of science is connected to the progress of knowledge, and how this is connected to the progress of society, *eg*, with reference to Kuhn or Feyerabend. This point might also refer to Popper’s view of an open society against a closed society. From another point of view, a reference to Rousseau’s critical view about the progress of sciences and arts and the debasement of society might be interesting.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Experience and knowledge
- Science and truth
- Control of hypotheses, theories, experiments
- Falsifiability
- Mental experiments
- Observation and perception
- Theory-ladenness
- Ideology *vs.* experience
- Whether science fosters the progress of society.

**14. Discuss and evaluate the claim that “biology gives you a brain. Life turns it into a mind” with reference to the relation between neuroscience and consciousness. [25]**

This question focuses on the role played by neuroscience in relation to the concepts of consciousness and mind. Neuroscience has had a great development in the last decades and it is based on the increasingly detailed study of the brain. The question also invites an analysis of the methodology used by neuroscience, particularly the importance of brain imaging. The question offers the chance to analyse the relation between neurological processes and mind processes, such as the emerging of consciousness, the structuring of personality, and free will. Reference to philosophical theories that focus on this topic should be made, *eg*, to Descartes’s dualism or James’s theory of mind or Damasio’s critique of Descartes. The response might refer to the ideas of personal experience and personality to pinpoint the importance of individual choices and the fact that the relation between the brain and the personality is mutual: Not only does the brain determine our behaviour, but also, our experiences shape our brain and modify the neural connections. A related point leads to the consequences of brain imaging at a social level as a tool to classify models of behaviour or to prevent specific actions. Ethical judgment might also be a point of discussion, especially considering the possible social consequences of a brain imagining test bed to select or condemn people. Possible reference to eugenics might be useful. The analysis might also take into account the limits of any neuroscience, included the issues emerging from experiments and tests – such as brain rest or interference – and more general issues, such as the risk to fall into determinism and scientism, by reducing all life to neurological mechanisms. The response might consider the state of art of the discipline and present the possibilities of future research.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The current state of neuroscience as attempting to explain the mind
- Tools and methodology of neuroscience
- The tension between first and third person descriptions
- Brain imaging and its ethical and experimental issues
- Eugenics
- Body-mind theories, *eg*, Descartes, James, Popper, Damasio
- Consciousness, personality, personal experience, qualia
- Different types of equality
- Determinism and scientism, *eg*, Dennett, Midgley.

**Optional Theme 7: Political philosophy****15. Evaluate the claim that the state has the right to wage war against its own citizens. [25]**

This question invites an evaluation of the power of the state in respect to the rights of individuals in the state. The role of the state in maintaining order could be discussed and whether such an extreme measure as war could be justified; what degree of civil disruption is acceptable before the state steps in to restore order; how extreme can the state's actions be to restore order? Hobbes, contrasted with Locke and Rawls, allows the state to take action against its citizens in order to preserve itself. Responses might explore how individuals can challenge the power of the state. There might be references to Aristotle's view that he who rejects the state is either subhuman/animalistic or a god. Equally there could be a development of the types of citizenry action that would warrant extreme warlike responses from the state. Historical and contemporary examples might be referred in elaboration of the argument.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Definitions of citizenship
- What conditions might legitimate the waging of war by a state against its citizens?
- In what ways could such a war be seen as just?
- To what degree are my rights as a citizen subservient to the state?
- What are the limits of state power and who enforces the limits?
- What is the relationship, if any, between state power and human rights? Could other states legitimately intervene on the behalf of the citizenry of another state?

**16. To what extent can a government legitimately intervene to favour different people in order to guarantee equality of opportunity? [25]**

This question invites an evaluation of the degree to which a government might take steps to achieve the goal of equal opportunity. Responses might explore the role of just desert and merit in the overall exercise of social justice. Positive discrimination usually arises when inconsistencies in the enactment of justice arise in respect to particular groups of individuals in a society. The role of desert, merit, need, utility and basic human rights might be investigated as a base for distributive justice. The conservative position of natural justice based on desert might lead to extreme inequalities. A balance could be set by enacting social justice with the aim of establishing egalitarianism; the state would interfere to create a fairer society. The ignoring of merit and worthiness might in itself generate discrimination and not allow the natural development of talent. A socialistic approach of a needs-based perspective could also positively discriminate. Positive discrimination might be seen as necessary to reset the balance between equality of opportunity and equality of fair opportunity. Is positive discrimination an acceptable disruption to a natural order?

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The degree to which positive discrimination hampers the natural development of individuals and society as a whole
  - Is strict equality impossible?
  - Social rights and movements, *eg*, the civil rights movement, feminism
  - The difference between equality of opportunity and equality of outcome
  - Theories of justice and fairness, *eg*, Rawls, Nozick, Sen
  - Meritocratic vs. utilitarian emphases
  - Is positive discrimination of itself unfair?
  - The justification of and the possible limits of government intervention
  - Is there an objective standard for justice?
  - How far does positive discrimination move in the direction of social engineering?
  - Does positive discrimination generate indebtedness to society?
  - Is positive discrimination acceptable only when it addresses basic liberties?
  - Should the arbiters of equality of opportunity be themselves questioned?
-