

Markscheme

November 2016

Philosophy

Higher level and standard level

Paper 2

29 pages

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

It is the property of the International Baccalaureate and must **not** be reproduced or distributed to any other person without the authorization of 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 part A responses, and page 5 for part B responses.

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

- The Diploma Programme Philosophy course is designed to encourage the skills of *doing* philosophy in the candidates. These skills can be accessed through reading the assessment markbands in the subject guide
- The markscheme does not intend to outline a model/correct answer
- The markscheme has an introductory paragraph which contextualizes the emphasis of the question being asked
- The bullet points below the paragraph are suggested possible points of development that should *not* be considered a prescriptive list but rather an indicative list where they might appear in the answer
- If there are names of philosophers and references to their work incorporated into the markscheme, this should help to give context for the examiners and does *not* reflect a requirement that such philosophers and references should appear in an answer: They are possible lines of development.
- Candidates can legitimately select from a wide range of ideas, arguments and concepts in service of the question they are answering, and it is possible that candidates will use material effectively that is *not* mentioned in the markscheme
- Examiners should be aware of the command terms for Philosophy as published on page 54 of the Philosophy subject guide when assessing responses
- In markschemes for Paper 2 there is a greater requirement for specific content as the Paper requires the study of a text by the candidates and the questions set will derive from that text. The markscheme will show what is relevant for both part A and part B answers. In part B responses, candidates may select other material they deem as relevant
- Responses for part A and part B should be assessed using the distinct assessment markbands.

Paper 2 Part A markbands

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

Paper 2 Part B markbands

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

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

1. (a) **Explain de Beauvoir’s claim that the body “is the instrument of our grasp upon the world, a limiting factor for our projects”.** [10]

This question focuses on a basic and initial assumption in de Beauvoir’s *The Second Sex*: The role played by the body in defining different sexes. The answer should take into account the meaning given to biology and physiology by de Beauvoir. The reference to some concepts linked to the body, such as weakness, muscular power, skeleton, might be considered. Another important path might retrace those philosophers referenced by de Beauvoir such as Aristotle, Hegel, and Heidegger in her discussion of gender and identity. The question also invites the exploration of the different biological reproductive systems and the consequences that they have on the definition of the female. The answer might also consider the differences between biology and society and the origin of values.

Candidates might explore:

- The importance of biology and physiology
- The role played by the body in defining the gender, particularly the female
- De Beauvoir’s use of philosophical approaches to gender and identity, *eg*, Aristotle, Hegel, Heidegger, Sartre
- The meaning given to some physiological elements, such as muscles, skeleton *etc*
- The relation between body and world
- The connection between weakness and female.

- (b) **Evaluate the extent to which biology affects the structure of society.** [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Consequences of biological and physiological facts on social structures
- Difference between species and societies
- Body as enslavement of the female
- Whether values are based on physiology only
- The meaning of customs, laws, taboos.

2. (a) Explain de Beauvoir’s view of the formation of the adolescent girl. [10]

This question invites the analysis of de Beauvoir’s view of a girl, in the passage from childhood to adolescence. The formative years are very significant in the definition of the “second sex”. Answers might consider the differences between childhood and adolescence and the new elements that alter the situation. Also, the reference to the concepts of independence (as a child), comparison (with boys) and enslavement (caused by a sense of inferiority) might be useful. The importance of bodily facts that are typical of the female, such as hormonal and nervous elements, might be considered. The concept of responsibility, the relation with future projects and the weight given to a male’s expectation might be important points.

Candidates might explore:

- Differences between childhood and adolescence
- Loss of independence
- Enslavement and sense of inferiority
- Kleptomania and sexual sublimation
- Lack of responsibility
- Destiny and future projects.

(b) Evaluate the role of males in this process. [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- The role of erotic transcendence
- Female self-consideration as an object
- Sense of inferiority with respect to males
- Weight of male expectations
- The metaphor of the mirror
- Beauty as a means to charm
- Makeup and clothing as a mask
- Female body as homage to males
- Passive conception vs the role of the heroine
- Romantic views
- Marriage as a woman’s only career.

René Descartes: *Meditations***3. (a) Explain Descartes’s method of establishing certainty. [10]**

Descartes uses skepticism to dispense with his old beliefs before putting it aside and finding new beliefs. His aim was to reject empiricism and accept rationalism.

Candidates might explore:

- Descartes’s dissatisfaction with scholasticism; a mostly empiricist philosophy that fused Christianity and Aristotelianism
- Descartes launches rationalism as a new and better way to gain knowledge
- His technique is the “method of doubt” – taking something he believes (or even does not believe) and asking whether it could be false even if believing it to be true
- Descartes asks if there is any way that he could have arrived at his belief(s) mistakenly
- The “waves of doubt” are an exercise in methodological hyperbolic skepticism: The first wave undermines perceptual belief – the distant tower; the second wave undermines all perceptual beliefs – dreaming; the third wave undermines all beliefs – the deceiving God/malignant demon
- The rationalist approach in establishing the *cogito* through being a *res cogitans*, with clear and distinct ideas that reflect the truth.

(b) To what extent does Descartes’s method of establishing certainty succeed? [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Concerning the use – it would be paradoxical to claim that he was certain that nothing certain could be known
- A thoroughgoing skepticism would have explored the idea of a deceptive memory; Descartes refers to this but does not develop it
- That something has let us down on some occasions does not permit the inference that it may always do so; Austin/Ryle-type arguments might figure here; the crucial issue concerns how we know we have been deceived on some occasions
- A similar point can be made in regard to the dreaming argument; we must have a concept of reality, not only to compare the dream with, but also to formulate the concept of a dream
- The claim that there are no distinguishing features between dreaming and being awake can be questioned; structure, sequence and order, coherence, and our memories of dreams as dreams appear to be such features. The problem of lucid dreaming
- It is not clear that the demon is a meaningful hypothesis. Doubt requires a background or context, not the obliteration of all possible ones
- How does Descartes acquire the language to express such doubt?
- If I am always deceived, how could I know this and how would I have the concept of a deception? References to *The Matrix* might be used
- Descartes was wrong to restrict “to know” only to those propositions which are logically certain: The mere logical possibility of doubting a proposition is not in itself sufficient grounds for rendering it dubious
- The method can, at best, result in the discovery of the existence of thought – nothing else can be known; *cf* solipsism.

4. (a) **Explain Descartes’s ontological argument for the existence of God.** [10]

Having established previously what Descartes considers to be “clear and distinct” ideas he turns his attention to the existence of God with a reformulated version of Anselm’s ontological argument. Descartes concentrates on the idea of God as the most perfect being. This argument states that a God who does not exist would be less perfect than one who did. From this point of view, existence is considered as one of God’s perfect qualities.

Candidates might explore:

- God is defined as the perfect being and existence is derived from perfection – if He did not exist, He would not be the most perfect
- “God exists” becomes a necessary truth; you can no more conceive of God not existing as you cannot a triangle without three sides or a mountain without a valley
- He considers an objection that granted he could not think of such things without their logically necessary properties, this does not entail that there are such things
- However, the concept of God is a unique one – the only one with existence built into its definition
- The relation between God and existence is internal/necessary.

(b) **Evaluate this argument in its attempt to establish the existence of God.** [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Kantian criticisms are likely to figure prominently; existence is not to be regarded as a property or predicate
- We do not add to the conceptual content of anything when we say that it exists. It is not a property like, say, red, cold or hard. The subject-predicate form of the sentence is superficial and confuses us
- In response to the above, would not the attribution of existence to, eg, the Yeti, make a difference to our knowledge? Does Kant’s analysis do justice to examples like this? One might appeal to a difference between adding to knowledge and adding to conceptual content. Kant’s own example of 100 real thalers affecting his financial position in a way that 100 imaginary ones do not might be discussed
- An analysis of existence might be discussed. To be is to be the value of a propositional function. In saying that something exists we are not attributing a property to a thing; we are talking about a propositional function and saying that it has at least one instance
- You can define anything into existence by incorporating existence into the concept of the thing. Gaunilo’s island might be discussed. These examples concern contingent existents
- Descartes should not have used the term “perfect being”, where perfect includes existence, until after he knew such a being to exist
- Standard points within the empiricist tradition: Cannot bridge the gap between ideas/real existence, no existential proposition is logically certain, *a priori* arguments cannot establish existential propositions, such arguments are bound to be circular as conclusions are pre-supposed by premises
- Any appeal to “clear and distinct ideas” fails as God is the ultimate guarantor of such ideas
- Hume argues that the only claims that can be known *a priori* are “relations of ideas” (analytic truths) and that it is possible to think of God not existing – does not possess existence essentially (and still be thinking of God)
- Are Descartes’s arguments convincing/rational for someone who does not come from a monotheistic background, and does not share this idea of God?

David Hume: *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*

5. (a) **With reference to the standpoints of Cleanthes, Philo and Demea, explain skepticism regarding religious matters.** [10]

Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion as a whole weighs the evidence for and against religious belief in considering whether the subject matter of religion comes within the scope of reason and empirical observation. The question whether religious belief belongs to reason or observation at all introduces the wider question of skepticism, a subject that is omnipresent in the work.

Candidates might explore:

- Skepticism, which appears in different forms and strengths. One way to identify it: The view that, apart from the merely formal truths of logic and mathematics, and the indubitable contents of our own immediate consciousness, we are incapable of knowledge
- To Cleanthes, skepticism is an inherently absurd position. Philo counters with a distinction between extreme and mitigated skepticism. The latter, being sensible of the weakness and narrow limits of human reason
- Demea's argument based on causation and causality
- The three friends acknowledge, for different reasons, that the existence of God is evident. Philo, a skeptic, and Demea, as orthodox theist, support that the nature of God is incomprehensible. Cleanthes, as empirical theist, rejects their skepticism as excessive.

- (b) **Evaluate skepticism regarding our natural wonderment about order throughout the universe.** [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- The conflict between our tendency to try to answer ultimate questions and the conviction that such questions far exceed the reach and power of our understanding
- Philo's idea that human beings are psychologically impelled to form beliefs on the basis of probability and that philosophical reasoning is no more than an "exacter and more scrupulous" method for determining degrees of probability than what we employ in everyday experience" (1.9). He rejects extreme skepticism, recommending only cautious steps in all philosophical reasoning and the limitation of inquiry to topics suited to the reach of our faculties
- Cleanthes proposes an argument based on the systematic order in nature to establish both the existence of God and his possession of human-like intelligence.

6. (a) **Explain the discussion on the existence of vast amounts of seemingly pointless evil.**

[10]

In Parts 10 and 11 the existence of vast amounts of seemingly pointless evil is a central issue under scrutiny. It includes various malfunctions and other disorders in nature. The facts of evil raise serious questions about the idea that the world was originally designed by a powerful, intelligent, good, just, benevolent, personal being.

Candidates might explore:

- Possible reconciliation between the existence of evil with the orthodox conception of God as an all-powerful, all-knowing, and morally perfect being
- Different strategies to resolve this problem; one is to deny the reality of evil: What we consider evil from our limited perspective is actually good in so far as it is part of a system
- Demea affirms that evil is real, but still compatible with God's perfect goodness because whatever evil exists will be rectified at some future time, if not in this life, then in life after death
- Cleanthes rejects this solution because expectations about what will exist in the future or an afterlife are arbitrary without evidence from present experience. Further, he claims that Philo and Demea's depiction of the hopelessness of the human condition is exaggerated. The evidence of human experience shows that happiness predominates over misery, and this predominance in turn proves God's perfect benevolence.

(b) **Evaluate the claim that the existence of widespread horrendous evil in the world makes the existence of a supremely good, knowing, and powerful deity impossible.**

[15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Philo's argument that the world's abundance of evil blocks the design theorist's inference to a personal source of order who is all good, benevolent, and cares about us individually
- The usual distinction between natural and moral evil
- What hypothesis best explains the distribution of happiness and misery actually found in the world? Is the mixture of good and evil best explained in terms of moral intentions of a deity, or by morally indifferent forces of nature?
- Does the existence of evil in the world tell us anything about God's qualities, including moral attributes?
- Classical responses to the problem of evil: God would create the best of all possible worlds, but that such a world may contain evil as an indispensable element. Alternatively, evil may be an unavoidable consequence of the benefit of free will, or it may be part of a divine plan to ensure that all attain perfection
- The impact of evil on the design argument for God
- If the question of God's moral perfection is subjected to empirical evidence, even the lowest mixture of evil with good counts as evidence against God's existence
- Evil appears avoidable.

John Stuart Mill: *On Liberty*

7. (a) Explain Mill’s support for freedom of opinion and belief. [10]

This question asks for a treatment of one of the central aspects of liberty with which Mill is concerned. Mill offers other areas of life in society where liberty is to be maintained but the importance of individual freedom of thought is paramount.

Candidates might explore:

- We might be wrong about the opinion of someone with whom we disagree
- Culture affects beliefs, and different people at different times may have been convinced of their rightness when it subsequently turned out their opinion was incorrect
- Mill asserts the importance of truth and its link to utility, but maintains that no state has the right to suppress an individual’s thought or discussion, because truth could suffer as a result
- The case of religious bigotry or persecution
- Mill is a supporter of science and the scientific method, and accepts that only in the field of mathematics can there be certainty
- Conflicting opinions can both contain and thus share truth within them
- Even offensive opinions are better discussed than repressed.

(b) Evaluate Mill’s belief that to suppress an individual’s opinion and belief is to deprive the individual, and his/her society, of the chance to develop. [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- If an opinion is correct, then the world is better for knowing it; if an opinion is wrong, then there is a chance for the truth to be discovered
- Censorship stops the chance of progress
- Mill criticized conformity in society
- Even in accepting what is a truth Mill warned against mindless acceptance of belief causing “dead dogma”
- The issue of social conformity and social custom
- Human fallibility
- How does causing offence stand with Mill’s Harm Principle?
- Mill encourages diversity as having great utility.

8. (a) **Explain Mill’s Harm Principle in its account of the limit of society’s authority over the individual.** [10]

In expounding the Harm Principle, Mill attempts to draw up the limit of society’s authority, by defining the only grounds by which an individual’s actions could be interfered with. In receiving protection from society the individual must in turn not harm others, thus satisfying the individual’s interest and that of others. Society has no interest in what does no harm to a person, and it is not appropriate for society to exercise any authority over those matters in which it has no interest. Individuals know what is in their own interests far better than they know what is in another person’s interest.

Candidates might explore:

- Mill not only encourages a limitation of legal interference, but also exhorts social acceptability of an individual’s actions or thought, so long as it does no harm to others
- Mill encourages the exhortation for individuals to develop their faculties but the individual knows what s/he wishes and no-one should interfere in this
- Mill regards liberty as the best method of guaranteeing utility; liberty is subservient to the principal good of utility.

(b) **Evaluate Mill’s Harm Principle in its account of the limit of society’s authority over the individual.** [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Are there situations when an individual can harm himself simply through individual action or the possession of thoughts or intentions? Examples might include drug use or use of pornography; Mill uses the example of drunkenness – is this convincing?
- Is Mill criticizable for allowing that harm to society justifies punishment? What form would such harm of society take?
- Mill proceeds from a position that assumes the fallibility of society, paying more regard to the direct experience of the individual, consistent with his empiricist stance
- Is Mill fair in his treatment of the inability of society to judge what might be good for the individual?
- It is acceptable that some criticisms of individual action can stem from social sense of norms, according to Mill, but there is a limit to what society can do? Is this credible?
- Mill makes a lot of what is natural for humans to do and think. Is this convincing?

Friedrich Nietzsche: *The Genealogy of Morals*

9. (a) Explain Nietzsche’s use of the term “*ressentiment*”.

[10]

Nietzsche’s main project in *The Genealogy of Morals* is to question the value of our morality. Ultimately Nietzsche argues that our existing morality was brought about by a “slave revolt” in morality through the feeling of *ressentiment*. This is a reactive feeling to a sustained and repeated condition of powerlessness of the priestly class against the more powerful social class, the noble class. Nietzsche maintained that the triumph of slave morality, morality of *ressentiment*, was so complete that its values are still relevant today.

Candidates might explore:

- Nietzsche defines *ressentiment* as a psychic mechanism, more specifically, as a reactive feeling to certain experiences
- Nietzsche’s genealogical method shows how the terms nobles, priests, and slaves have evolved, thus countering a sense of continuity or absolute truth of our present moral concepts
- The man of *ressentiment* as a creation of society, a reaction which shows the creation having escaped its creator
- He defines the man of *ressentiment* in terms of negation
- The concept of happiness as problematic for the man of *ressentiment* since it is essentially artificial
- The man of *ressentiment*’s “cleverness” as a condition of existence.

(b) Examine the relation between “*ressentiment*” and the different types of moralities.

[15]

Possible discussion points include:

- The historical existence and activity of the noble morality, to which the slave morality arose as a reaction
- Combining historical facts with psychological insight, he insists that contemporary regnant values descended from the *ressentiment*-fuelled slave morality, while the values that are now shunned once represented the dominant noble morality
- Contempt for the feeling of *ressentiment*, or rather, the underlying weakness that causes and fuels *ressentiment*, works to the advantage of the noble morality as the source of superior moral values
- Not everybody whom the nobles consider bad deals with their subordinate position passively; these people constitute Nietzsche’s priestly class
- Nietzsche tells us, “it takes two for ‘*ressentiment*’”. The two parties involved are the frustrated, scheming priests and the carefree, almost reckless nobles; the feeling of *ressentiment* is aimed at the nobles, whom the priests blame for their oppressed secondary position in a society
- Nietzsche himself concludes his essay by saying that although the current victory of the slave morality is undeniable, he has high hopes for a future graced by the resurgence of noble values
- Is the assertion itself verifiable and equally would Nietzsche expect it to be?
- Might noble morality in a present-day context look like Social Darwinism? What might Nietzsche respond to this?
- Nietzsche’s critique of Christian or other religious values of love, compassion, humility and helping your neighbour.

10. (a) **Explain Nietzsche’s view that human beings have begun to feel bad about their instincts.**

[10]

That human beings have a bad conscience means for Nietzsche that they have begun to feel bad about what they are, to feel bad about their instincts. As a result, when the bad conscience creates, it creates ideas that Nietzsche considers “anti-life”. In particular, the man of bad conscience creates the idea of a perfect God before whom he feels guilty. He creates the idea of a God who sacrifices himself for the guilt of humanity.

Candidates might explore:

- Nietzsche sees history as a history of nihilism, of negation of man, world and life, so also the history of conscience is one of nihilism, of negation of conscience, which reveals itself in the sense that this history has been at the same time a history, a genealogy of a bad conscience
- Guilt and an image of God before whom one can feel such guilt are the creation of the bad conscience that has been made to deny one’s predatory instincts first by society and then by internalizing the restrictions first placed on one by society
- Society polices the individual and that is painful; but what is really painful, and really creative, is man’s own policing of himself
- An important point that Nietzsche makes in the second essay is that it did not have to be this way and it does not have to be this way
- Introversion of instinct.

(b) **Evaluate Nietzsche’s understanding of instincts.**

[15]

Possible discussion points include:

- The nature and role of instincts
- The creditor-debtor relationship
- The origin and purpose of punishment
- The tribal conscious debt is the original sin which every man is born with, and Nietzsche says, the Christian God has assumed this debt and become linked with the guilty feeling
- Atheism does away with an unknowable God and, thus, the guilt that plagues mankind
- Guilt itself is the essential problem Nietzsche has with Christianity and believes it is the source of humanity’s troubles
- Nietzsche shows the collective guilt of a whole culture, and applies it to each individual
- Nietzsche positing the “genetic fallacy” when he assaults morality by exploring its origins in the *ressentiment* of slaves *etc.*

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

11. (a) **Explain Nussbaum’s dual purpose of achieving social justice and assessing quality of life in the Capabilities Approach.** [10]

This question involves examining the part of the work where Nussbaum explains her purpose and also the purpose of her fellow capabilities writer, Amartya Sen. Nussbaum focuses on the issue of social justice, and Sen is the outstanding thinker in the field of comparative measurement of economics in a global setting. The purposes Nussbaum gives to the approach are related, and in Chapter 2 Nussbaum unpacks their essential relations. In Chapter 4 Nussbaum raises the philosophical issues that arise from listing capabilities as she does in Chapter 2.

Candidates might explore:

- Treating people as ends in themselves, not using statistical approaches that depersonalize
- The role of choice in achieving social justice and enhancing the quality of life experience
- Different capabilities not being commensurable with each other – this is being “pluralist about value”
- The challenge for government to address inequality
- The place of non-human animals in this approach
- The difference between this and utilitarian approaches
- The distinction between internal and combined capabilities
- Notions of human dignity
- Nussbaum’s Central Capabilities – a list of 10 key aspects
- Government guaranteeing that a threshold is reached in each capability.

- (b) **Evaluate the problems in arguing the Capabilities Approach as a method of ensuring social justice.** [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- The issue of human dignity
- Nussbaum’s political liberalism and the problems of measuring value
- Entitlements and the central capabilities – are they all central and how are they identified?
- The duties on governments given the identified “central capabilities” and the claim to universal entitlements
- Differing perspectives on the role of government
- The rational challenge in demonstrating the existence of capabilities, aside from cultural tendencies
- Sen’s use of the approach in assessing quality of life, and his lack of use of a threshold or the notion of human dignity
- Why should some capabilities take priority over others?
- The distinction between internal and combined capabilities – is it possible to distinguish as Nussbaum does?
- Issues with implementation.

12. (a) **“As an international team of both Western and non-Western researchers..., we have been aware of a raging debate about the alleged value imperialism involved in universalism...” Explain the issue of cultural diversity with the Capabilities Approach.**

[10]

This question examines a problem raised specifically in Chapter 5. Nussbaum addresses the charge that a universal approach to social justice is drawn from the perspective of a dominant cultural approach to politics and value. In proscribing a universal approach to social justice, it is possible that cultural diversity will suffer. Here, the list of capabilities endorsed in the work will reflect a form of intellectual colonialism, where a Western thinker imposes on a non-Western setting a “value imperialism”.

Candidates might explore:

- The issue of gender in a plurality of cultural settings
- The Capabilities Approach and its relation to the international human rights movement
- The argument that the international human rights movement is a new form of Western imperialism is challenged given its original writers included contributions from Egypt and China
- The public sphere in which the Capabilities Approach operates
- The normative argument of the notion of human dignity
- The list of capabilities is drawn in an abstract way to aid adaptability to different settings
- The lack of grounding of the list in a metaphysical sense – “partial moral conception” – the list is drawn up for political reasons, not theoretical conceptual reasons.

- (b) **Evaluate the claim that the Capabilities Approach is a form of “value imperialism”.** [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- A part of the Capabilities Approach includes the ability of the agent to set her/his own objectives and values
- If the notion of universal human rights did originate in a Western setting, does this justify a charge that it is a form of colonialism?
- The British Raj as an example
- Nussbaum claims that she is culturally sensitive in the drawing up of her list – is this convincing?
- The normative aspect of the list and the criticism of mixing facts and values
- The issue of rights – *cf* utilitarianism as a movement that might disregard rights
- If human rights are not codified in a non-Western nation, does this mean the population does not want human rights or cannot see them as desirable?
- The rational problems of establishing a universal foundation for rights
- Is free practice of religion a problem for a vision of universal human capabilities?
- Is the allowance for “state sovereignty” a convincing part of the approach?
- Feminist postcolonial critic Gayatri Spivak’s question: Can the subaltern speak? How can one hear and listen to subaltern voices in one’s (Capability Approaches) epistemological and methodological framework?

Ortega y Gasset: *The Origins of Philosophy*

13. (a) **Explain Ortega’s metaphor of the pyramid with reference to the unity of philosophy.** [10]

This question emerges from the initial metaphor used by Ortega y Gasset to explain the unity of philosophy. The metaphor involves a specific methodology of investigation that Ortega y Gasset describes by the notion of “multitude”. The response might refer to the concept of philosophical past, to the idea of linear progress and the notions of chaos and harmony. The analysis might take into account the passage from an exterior view of philosophy to its interior. Reference to the philosophical past might include an analysis of the difference between seeing and hearing, the meaning of intuition, and the role played by tradition, history and legends. The question also invites the explanation of the importance of names as reference to things, particularly to past things.

Candidates might explore:

- Whether it is possible to outline a unity in philosophy
- How multitude of opinions and ideas might merge into a philosophical unit
- Chaos and harmony; confusion as the initial step of knowledge
- Necessity to operate a switch from the exterior to the interior of philosophy
- The role played by tradition, history, legends and myths with reference to the philosophical past
- The different approach to the philosophical past: Hearing vs seeing.

- (b) **Evaluate the metaphor in relation to the philosophical past.** [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- The use and importance of names to move along the past
- Different kinds of past; absolute vs relative
- Language as a symbol: Not a creation of individuals, but a social creation instead
- *Nomen omen*: Words as announcements and promises
- Realism vs nominalism
- The meaning and function of talking
- True knowledge in relation with silence.

14. (a) Explain Ortega’s view of freedom as a stage in philosophy. [10]

This question seeks an exploration of a central concept of Ortega’s theory on the origin of philosophy: Freedom. The response should investigate one or more aspects of it. Freedom is intended to be a contingent condition of every civilization. The question invites an analysis of the difference between primitivism or early stages of a civilization and its decline. Also, a reference to the distinction between human needs and possibilities might be useful. This point might relate to the passage from an era of limited possibilities to an era of new techniques, arts and pleasures. The description of concepts such as richness, poverty, wealth, lust, luxury, excess might be useful. The question also offers the chance to explore the passage from an ontological condition of dependence on a world of superabundant possibilities, where the individual could get rid of tradition and discover new lands, led by the power of personal choice. Another path might consider the role played by religion and the meaning of gods.

Candidates might explore:

- Stages in civilization, from primitivism to decline
- Meaning and function of freedom
- Importance of new discoveries; new techniques, arts and pleasures in relation with new possibilities for the human being
- Passage from poverty to luxury and excess: The symbol of the cornucopia
- Tradition vs innovation
- Freedom as possibility; the importance of personal choices
- Surrender the worldly life; the role played by religion and gods.

(b) Evaluate Ortega’s view that even a “life symbolized by the cornucopia” is not secure. [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Metaphors of torrent, fluctuation, waves
- Relation between superabundance and security
- Importance of contingency
- Impression of being lost
- The role played by doubt and opinions
- Security and certainty as reactions to doubt; method as reaction to doubt
- Probability vs certainty in guiding human life.

Plato: *The Republic*, Books IV–IX

15. (a) **Explain how the allegory of the Cave provides an illustration of the points made in the directly preceding simile of the Divided Line.** [10]

Plato entertains the question of the difference between knowledge, belief and ignorance in his complex simile of the divided line. This simile is immediately followed by the allegory of the cave, and there is clearly overlap in the treatment of epistemological concerns in both similes. The cave provides an image of illusion and direct knowledge, suggested in the hierarchy of the simile of the Divided Line. The parallels extend to illustrate the ascent to knowledge from illusion to the possibility of direct knowledge of the Form of the Good.

Candidates might explore:

- The relationship between the Cave and the Divided Line
- There appears to be two stages of each realm of cognition in both
- Problems arise in the objects of belief in the two – one being objects available to sense experience (the Divided Line), the other being shadows of figures of real things, so the analogy is not close here
- Knowledge from sources other than direct acquaintance is handled in both, but it is hard to pin down Plato's view of illusion in each
- Plato may not be pressing the intricacies of the allegory and simile too far and relying on a general similarity to drive home his point about knowledge and belief
- The Line and Cave both picture knowledge in a vivid sense of ascent, even though in the Cave this requires an escape, not required in the ascent to knowledge in the Line
- A problem remains in that the Form of the Good is never fully defined by Plato and it is unclear exactly what it is in both the Cave and the Line.

- (b) **Discuss Plato's use of analogy.** [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Plato's similes and allegories are hard to pin down precisely and offer a more general account of the ascent of knowledge than a precisely detailed illustration
- It is always a challenge to ensure in an argument that the relevant parts of an analogy are being interpreted appropriately
- Analogies can be very effective and the cave is one of the most famous of all time providing material to critique the modern world
- It is always relevant to ask if the analogy is not just vivid but philosophically justified
- In the simile of the Sun the reader encounters Plato's best attempt to explain the nature of the Form of the Good – is this adequate, given the central role of the Form of the Good epistemologically, metaphysically and ethically?
- There remains a problem establishing the precise relationship between the world of the Forms and the world of sensible objects, in all the similes Plato deploys
- If Plato places the intelligible realm and intellection far above thinking based on the senses and perception, how come he uses a material analogy based on the senses and images (Cave) to illustrate precisely this point? Is he contradicting himself by doing so? Are the message and the medium used to convey it in discordance with each other? Does his use of analogy as an explanatory and illustrating device undermine, leave unaffected or strengthen his argument?

16. (a) **Explain what the philosopher is and what the attributes of the philosopher are.**

[10]

This question will involve discussion of a passage from the central section of the dialogue, especially the material in Books V and VI where the definition and qualities of the philosopher ruler are explicitly explored.

Candidates might explore:

- The philosopher's relationship with truth and the forms
- The philosopher loves truth, but there is a dispute about the use of the word *einai* ("what is") and whether this refers to something existential or veridical, when it comes to what exactly the philosopher knows about (475c–480a)
- The education of the philosopher
- The philosopher's soul: The philosopher is also defined by what he is not. Comparison with the soul of the unjust man, tyrant, *etc*
- Socrates talks of the philosopher as the lover of the object s/he desires, namely "the whole class of things" not "one particular example of it"
- The example of the philosopher and her/his love of beauty
- The philosopher is qualified to rule
- The philosopher possesses natural qualities like temperance, excellence of character and other virtues
- Philosophers are not swayed by physical desires and are governed by reason
- The simile of the ship
- How philosophers are received in contemporary society
- The simile of the beast.

(b) **Evaluate Socrates's view that philosophers should rule.**

[15]

Possible discussion points include:

- The complaint of democracy against any form of rule that does not enable the ruled to elect
- The usefulness of knowledge of the Forms in ruling a city of sensible objects made up of people who do not recognize the Forms
- The philosopher is intellectually and morally cut-off from the people – can s/he rule effectively?
- The account of the ordinary person that emerges in the dialogue
- The lack of practical knowledge of the philosopher
- The corruptibility of philosophers – as admitted by Socrates
- The similes of the ship and the beast offer contrasting pictures of democracy, one where the people are victims, and one where they get what they deserve
- Paternalism and elitism in rule
- The conflict with justice represented by Plato's disbarring from office of whole classes of people who are to be ruled
- Justice in the soul and justice in the city, and how it relates to the philosopher.

Peter Singer: *The Life You Can Save*

17. (a) Explain Singer’s analogical argument of Bob and the Bugatti. [10]

This question seeks an explanation of why Singer uses both the idea of an analogical argument and the actual example itself. The first investigation would be a discussion of the merits of using both an analogy and abstract logical argument. The former might be seen to produce both clarity of understanding and an appeal to emotions.

Candidates might explore:

- The analogy itself illustrates the argument that Singer is developing; that being the approach of giving aid to the needy at a level that is to the point where the difference between the affluence of the wealthy and the state of the poor narrows significantly
- The issue of a moral obligation of an individual to reflect upon the argument of diminished marginal utility
- The basic position of utilitarianism: The sacrifices of a few people will increase the level of happiness of the many.

(b) Evaluate Singer’s hypothetical situation of the actions of people in the real world. [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Different levels of sacrifice between the loss of expensive material objects and a child’s life
- The difficulties of forecasting from hypothesis to the real world
- The equation between a material object and a child
- Our individual moral culpability
- The possible ineffectiveness of an individual action
- The idea of negative responsibility.

18. (a) **Explain how Singer challenges the objections of giving to charity to reduce poverty.** [10]

This question allows candidates to explain the basic ways that Singer suggests that it is right and proper to give to charity very large amounts. It deals with the challenges that are presented against the moral obligation of individuals to give.

Candidates might explore:

- How aid is driven by economic and political motives rather than really improving the lot of the poor
- The sheer amount of money given is relatively very small compared to the income of the giver
- The “Dutch disease” is not seen as the main issue as it deflects the argument from the main issue of relieving the misery of the poor
- The better use of food products, female education and wide use of contraception can be funded by aid
- The individual’s right to choose how to use his or her own money
- The claim that our moral obligation to ameliorate the human condition is an absolute moral imperative.

- (b) **Evaluate Singer’s claim that the moral imperative is to give and improve the human condition.** [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- The idea of negative responsibility
- Analysis of the motive of giving: Is it to improve the quality of life of the poor or raise the status of those that give?
- Is the moral imperative to give absolute?
- Human nature or morality might favour supporting the person we know and love rather than a complete and distant stranger
- Is the motive to give part of human nature or are we inherently selfish creatures?
- Does a “global village” entail global responsibilities?
- Does the focus on charity to address and reduce global poverty mean that the realm of the political and the responsibility of states and political arrangements for social justice are side-lined?

Charles Taylor: *The Ethics of Authenticity*

19. (a) Explain Taylor’s view of personal authenticity.

[10]

Taylor asserts that the individual should be wholly oneself and not a duplication of someone else or even a manipulation of the self that is not true but “who you really are”. Taylor advocates a return to a pure form of authenticity that resists a selfish and almost hedonistic model. Taylor’s approach is his attempt to counter modern individualism and its shortcomings, while also holding on to a form of the ideal of authenticity.

Candidates might explore:

- Authenticity as a modern ideal
- Individual resistance in having to conform both on a universal basis and in smaller social contexts
- The true self from an existentialist perspective
- The contextual pursuit of authenticity
- Taylor is trying to retrieve damaged goods
- The “three *malaises*” as consequences of the decline in the personal authenticity that modernity has allowed to emerge.

(b) Evaluate Taylor’s view of authenticity.

[15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Communitarianism as a counter to the modern individualism
- Can the true self emerge?
- To what extent does Taylor succeed in his attempt to define authenticity?
- Philosophical context and background that embrace existentialist understanding of individualism. Is this a realistic or possible assumption?
- The impact of the three *malaises* – individualism, instrumental reason and soft despotism
- The philosophical debate between “knockers” and “boosters”
- Authenticity as a valid ideal
- The need for a dialogical approach
- The importance of “recognition”
- Subjectivism and social problems of authenticity
- Taylor’s apparent rejection of the concept of relativism
- Fragmentation and Taylor’s solution – “democratic initiative”
- Would individuals fare better if they forget about society and societal bonds and obligations, and focus merely on themselves? Is this not a form of solipsistic individualism? Is not society, and a person’s bonds, relations and obligations to it, also very important for a moral existence?

20. (a) “[With regards to (re)appropriating the modern turn inward] the right path to take is neither that recommended by straight boosters, nor that favoured by outright knockers”. Explain Taylor’s use of “boosters” and “knockers”. [10]

Taylor’s response to the vacuum, in the debate over the moral status of authenticity as one of extremes between “knockers” (those who are opposed to modernity) and “boosters” (those who support it), is a middle of the road position which grants that both groups are right in their criticisms of each other but deficient in their self-estimation.

Candidates might explore:

- Both “boosters” and “knockers” as being misguided according to Taylor
- “Instrumental reason”, “soft despotism”, “individualism” do have positive aspects for society
- Historical context
- “Knocker” arguments such that Taylor should not be engaged with trying to retrieve damaged goods but taking a different conceptual approach that brings about a total reversal in modern ethical thinking and practice
- Taylor is with the critics, in other words, in believing that certain historical conditions – industrialization, consumerism, *etc* – have negatively altered the veracity of authenticity in the eyes of the West, and promoted “deviant forms of [its] ideal”
- Taylor is against the critics in thinking that the radical subjectivism or relativism necessarily had to turn out this way (*ie*, that it was caused to be in such a way from the beginning), and for the continual practice of living authentically in light of, what he takes to be, authenticity’s moral validity.

- (b) Discuss to what extent Taylor succeeds in mediating a path between these two extremes (“boosters” and “knockers”). [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Taylor’s “work of retrieval”
- His reaction to Bloom *etc*
- Taylor’s understanding of the “inescapable horizon”
- The philosophical debate between “knockers” and “boosters”
- He does not advocate some sort of utopian and flawless solution
- Is Taylor trivializing authenticity?
- In practice is the dialogical and democratic solution realistic?
- How relevant is Taylor in a post-modernity scenario?
- “Booster” arguments that oppose Taylor such as his “*malaises*” are not as endemic as Taylor argues and his effort to moderate subjectivity may in effect limit personal freedom.

Lao Tzu: *Tao Te Ching***21. (a) Explain the relationship of spontaneity to both Life and *Tao*.****[10]**

This question asks for an explanation of how spontaneity is the secret of life in man, but also how *Tao* is the absolute spontaneity in the world. Spontaneity in *Tao* is beyond sensory experience, perhaps even beyond existence. It is therefore part of non-existence. Both the idea of spontaneity in life and *Tao* raise the problem of the acceptance and role of the negative in Chinese thinking. The positive and negative are not contradictory. They are merely two parts of the whole.

Candidates might explore:

- How spontaneity is the highest order of life. It means there is no preconceived aim or ulterior motive or selfish desire that drives actions and thoughts
- Spontaneity although often seen as negative should be seen as letting life live itself, here there could be links to the notion of *wu wei* (non-action)
- Life when seen as female is open to ideas and actions and does not drive or direct the ideas and actions to a desired end
- Life is spontaneous because it will not impose
- The “man of calling” is a man who is spontaneous and responds to life rather than directs life
- As part of *Tao*, spontaneity is a qualitative component which cannot be seen as separate but is in the essence of *Tao*.

(b) Evaluate the claim that one should accept life as a series of natural and spontaneous changes.**[15]**

Possible discussion points include:

- The approach of *wu wei* (non-action) to life
- Controlling an action might be a myth as it is difficult to know the outcomes and consequences of actions in any precise way
- Fear might be the driver of interference and lack of spontaneity
- A desire to understand *Tao* will lead to an acceptance of leaving things alone
- The consequences of spontaneity as negative is a Western construct, Chinese thinking sees such behaviour as high quality of behaviour
- Changes are the norm so learn to live with them; this means the strategy of least resistance but also the acceptance that each change creates new opportunities rather than loses
- Letting go of resisting change will produce more harmony with *Tao*.

22. (a) Explain how the conformity to social order corrupts humans [10]

This question asks for an explanation of the interplay between society and humans. How education and socialization distorts the natural harmony of *Tao*. The social mores produce conformity. *Wu wei* in itself will produce the harmony of human interaction by the practice of selfless acts.

Candidates might explore:

- The difference between harmony and order: The difference between *li* (rules and regulations) and *wu wei* (non-action)
- An understanding of the whole, having a bigger picture, would in itself generate selfless acts and more care within the community
- Conformity arises out of a socialization process rather than self-realization
- The appreciation of the individual self as part of a greater whole; the sense of oneness with a community is a more authentic route to responsibility.

(b) Evaluate the claim that if society's role diminishes, human life becomes simple and full of harmony and contentment. [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- The advocated retreat from society to seek wisdom and the values of inner self (self-realization) would remove ambition, competition and selfish desire
- The seeming contradiction of humans as social creatures rejecting society
- Whether striving for self-satisfaction produces conflict in society
- The practice of *wu wei* (non-action) would lead to the embracing of love and harmony and the rejection of intolerance, hatred and violence
- Is the above a realistic or possible assumption?
- The assumption that with the non-assertive action of *wu wei* (non-action) the human will would diminish and as a consequence human suffering would decline
- *Te* (the power or virtue of spontaneity) within *Tao* would allow the natural flourishing of humans
- Contrasts to the claim might be that society would stagnate without competition, as this is often seen as a driver of societal change.

Zhuangzi: *Zhuangzi***23. (a) Explain the resolution of duality by the “True Man”. [10]**

This description of the “True Man” appears only in Chapter 6 of the Inner Chapters. The chapter sets up a duality between Heaven (what is natural and spontaneous) and man (what is social and premeditated), and while celebrating Heaven, its depiction of the “True Man” as an embodiment of a string of seeming contradictions creates as a model the person who is able to unify both unity and disunity themselves.

Candidates might explore:

- What constitutes true wisdom
- Zhuangzi’s “True Man” of antiquity
- Relationship with Heaven
- Zhuangzi’s treatment of plurality in the context of a “True Man”
- Relativism expressed through duality and contradiction.

(b) To what extent does Zhuangzi’s “True Man’s embodiment of opposites” reflect his skepticism? [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- “True Man’s” embodiment of opposites is indicative of the theme of aligning with *Tao*, which embodies that greatest of opposites, the transformations to life and to death
- This holistic identification with all the dynamic transformations of the cosmos, including the eternal changes that the elements of our bodies have undergone to reach human form and will undergo after leaving human form, seems to be the perspective grasped by the person who “hides the world in the world”
- Underlying assertions of universality and objectivity that normally accompany knowledge-claims
- Whether a particular perspectival view corresponds to truth, or reality
- His epistemology is self-reflective and encompasses a deep awareness of the limitations of individual points of view
- Zhuangzi’s apparent lack of concern about matters of fact.

24. (a) Explain Zhuangzi’s metaphor in the “butterfly story”. [10]

This story tells us about the relationships between soul and body, existence and non-existence, being and non-being, life and death, certainty and uncertainty, continuity and discontinuity, freedom of the will and spiritual freedom. Answers that are grounded in epistemological discussions on relativism and/or skepticism can be expected. The notion of “I” and “self” as an epistemic object might be discussed. Comparison and contrast with Cartesian epistemology might be evident but responses should be weighted towards Zhuangzi.

Candidates might explore:

- What human beings are
- The role of skepticism as an epistemic tool for knowledge of the self and others
- What truth is
- The role of the senses and perspectives
- The efficacy of dreams and their content
- The necessity of distinctions in the world.

(b) To what extent does this metaphor engage with the identification of “self” or “I”? [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- The meta-question of epistemology – the “I” or “self” as an epistemic object
 - Zhuangzi starts with doubt; he tries to solve this suspicion by affirming the distinction between the butterfly and Zhuang Zhou
 - Zhuangzi stresses the transformation of things
 - Zhuangzi’s use of skepticism as an instrument to reach a higher and deeper knowledge
 - Zhuangzi’s relativist methodology
 - Individuality and knowledge of others
 - Knowledge about the world.
-