

Markscheme

November 2017

Philosophy

Higher level and standard level

Paper 2

33 pages

This markscheme is the property of the International Baccalaureate and must **not** be reproduced or distributed to any other person without the authorization of the IB Global Centre, Cardiff.

I. QIG availability

The following QIGs are available this coming session for you to attempt qualification for:

QIG number	Text/author	English QIG availability	Spanish QIG availability
01	Simone de Beauvoir <i>The Second Sex</i> , Vol. 1 part 1, Vol. 2 part 1 and Vol. 2 part 4		
02	René Descartes <i>Meditations</i>	✓	✓
03	David Hume <i>Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion</i>		
04	John Stuart Mill <i>On Liberty</i>	✓	
05	Friedrich Nietzsche <i>The Genealogy of Morals</i>	✓	✓
06	Martha Nussbaum <i>Creating Capabilities: The Human Development Approach</i>		
07	Ortega y Gasset <i>The Origin of Philosophy</i>		
08	Plato <i>The Republic</i> , Books IV–IX	✓	✓
09	Peter Singer <i>The Life You Can Save</i>	✓	
10	Charles Taylor <i>The Ethics of Authenticity</i>	✓	✓
11	Lao Tzu <i>Tao Te Ching</i>		
12	Zhuangzi <i>Zhuangzi</i> , Inner Chapters		

II. Candidates who overlook the new Paper 2 rubric of answer both parts a and b of one question

However clearly the IB sets out its expectations on how candidates should answer exam questions there are occasions when we receive work that does not match what we asked for. There is a specific case in exams where we ask students to select particular questions to answer and they fail to follow these rules (rubrics).

This note is intended to clarify how we deal with these situations through a series of scenarios. The actions have been checked to ensure that they are supported by RM Assessor.

Overarching principles

The following statements underpin our decisions below:

1. No candidate should be disadvantaged for following the rules.
2. Whenever possible candidates should receive credit for what they know.

Example

To help understand the different scenarios we will make reference to an example assessment.

Instruction: candidates must respond to both parts of one question.

- Q7. (a) Explain Mill’s view of the relationship between liberty and utility. [10 marks]
 (b) To what extent are liberty and utility fundamentally conflicting concepts? [15 marks]
- Q9. (a) Explain the view that morality has a clear and traceable genealogy. [10 marks]
 (b) To what extent do you agree with the genealogy Nietzsche proposes? [15 marks]

Scenario 1. Candidate answers parts from two different questions.

Example: Candidate answers 7(a) and 9(a) or answers 7(b) and 9(a)

Action:

Mark all of the candidates answers. The student will receive their best mark from one question.

In the second example this means the best mark for either 7(b) or 9(a).

This requires that examiners assigns each mark to the correct question part (i.e. gives the mark for 9(a) to 9(a) and **not** 7(a) – if question is QIGed this will happen automatically).

Scenario 2. Candidate does not split their answer according to the sub-parts.

Example: Candidate writes one answer which they label as question 7 or they indicate they have only answered 9(a) but actually answer both 9(a) and 9(b) in that answer.

Action:

Examiner uses their best judgement to award marks for all sub-parts as if the candidate has correctly labelled their answer.

In the example this means the candidate would be able to gain up to 25 marks despite only labelling the answer as 9(a).

Exception – where the nature of the two parts of the question means it is important to differentiate between the two answers, for example the first part should be done before the second part (in maths) or the candidate needs to show they understand the difference between the two parts of the question then examiners should use their judgement and only award marks if it is clear that the candidate has simply made a mistake in numbering their answers.

Scenario 3. Candidate duplicates their answer to the first part in the second part.

Example: Candidate answers 7(a) and the repeats the same text as part of 7(b)

Action:

Only give credit for the answer once (in the first part of the question). The assessment criteria should assess distinct skills when there are parts to a question so this problem should not occur.

Scenario 4. Candidate provides the wrong question number for their answer.

Example: Candidate states they are answering 7(a) and 7(b) but their response clearly talks about Nietzsche (Q9) rather than Mills (Q7).

Action:

Mark the answer according to the mark scheme for the question that they should have indicated.

Exception – this only applies when there is no ambiguity as to which question the student has attempted, for example if they have rephrased the question in their opening paragraph. It is not the role of the examiner to identify which question is the best fit for their answer (i.e. which questions their answer would get most marks for). If the given question number is a plausible match with their answer then the student should be marked according to that question. Only in exceptional circumstances should this rule be applied to sub-questions (i.e. assuming the candidate had mistakenly swapped their answers for Q7(a) and Q7(b)).

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 8 for part A responses, and page 9 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.

Note to examiners

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).

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 idea that it depends on the human being to establish “the reign of liberty in the midst of the world of the given”, therefore “men and women should unequivocally affirm their brotherhood”.** [10]

The question asks for an explanation of this central idea that articulates the argument of de Beauvoir’s as stated at the very end of the concluding chapter. In this final part de Beauvoir starts from the fact that today neither men nor women are satisfied with each other.

Candidates might explore:

- The question is to know whether there is an original curse that condemns them to separate each other or whether the conflicts in which they are opposed merely mark a transitional moment in human history
- Society, being codified by man, decrees that woman is inferior
- The social oppression of woman by man creates a state of war where each free being wishes to dominate the other
- Woman as trapped in the master-slave dialectic
- The quarrel will go on as long as men and women fail to recognise each other as equals
- The possibility of recognition and equality among sexes: If this possibility becomes real, new forms of individuality would arise.

- (b) **Evaluate de Beauvoir’s idea that it depends on the human being to establish “the reign of liberty in the midst of the world of the given”.** [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Humanity is something more than a mere species: It is a historical development; it is to be defined by the manner in which it deals with its natural, fixed characteristics, its *facticité*
- Sex does not define a destiny
- The battle of the sexes is not implicit in the anatomy of man and woman: One takes for granted that in the timeless realm of ideas a battle is being waged between those vague essences “the eternal feminine” and the “the eternal masculine”
- The issue of biological determinism
- Women’s experience in terms of an ethical concept
- Identity as based on freedom, will to communicate and inter-subjectivity.

2. (a) **Explain de Beauvoir’s discussion of the psychoanalytical point of view.** [10]

The question asks for an explanation of de Beauvoir’s analysis of the psychoanalytical point of view as presented in the second chapter of the first part. Psychoanalysis represents a “tremendous advance over psychophysiology” because it directs the attention to the factors involved in the psychic life in relation to their human significance; it is not the body-object described by science that actually exists, but the body as lived in by the subject.

Candidates might explore:

- “Sexuality as coextensive with existence” might mean: a) Every experience of the existent has a sexual significance; b) every sexual phenomenon has an existential significance. It is possible to reconcile both statements
- *Libido* as a force of virile character
- A significant Freudian contribution: Masculine eroticism is located in only one zone (penis) whereas in women there are two distinct erotic systems (clitoral and vaginal)
- There is no need to take sexuality as an irreducible fact
- The idea of liberty is not incompatible with the existence of certain constants as presented by psychoanalysis.

(b) **Evaluate de Beauvoir’s discussion of the psychoanalytical point of view.** [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Criticism of Freud’s account of psychic development because it is based upon a masculine model. He assumes that a woman feels she is a mutilated man. But the idea of mutilation implies comparison and evaluation
- A symbol is not an allegory elaborated by a mysterious unconscious but the perception of certain significance through the analogy of the significant object. Psychoanalysis fails to explain why woman is the other. The tendency of the subject towards alienation is the ground condition for the development of the behaviours as identified in psychoanalysis, eg anxiety
- de Beauvoir accepts aspects of psychoanalysis but poses the problem of feminine destiny differently, she places woman in a world of values and gives her behaviour a dimension of liberty
- Sex, gender and the construction of human identity
- How can a genuine mutual recognition between subjects arise?
- Might the experience of mutuality break the dilemma of narcissism or masochism?
- The role of the existential philosophy of freedom and corporality by Sartre and Merleau-Ponty.

René Descartes: *Meditations*

3. (a) Explain Descartes’s view of the intellect and the will. [10]

This question arises from a specific passage in Descartes’s *Fourth Meditation, Of Truth and Error*. The main argument focuses on the possibility of error (in our judgments) and its causes. Responses might consider the role played by the intellect and the will in Descartes’s view and whether they can be evaluated as sources of error. Descartes’s assumption is grounded in the perfection of God, that cannot be a direct source of error (as a deceiver), nor can s/he breed imperfect creatures. Responses might mention Descartes’s argument to support human imperfection, which is justified by human nature itself: Humans certainly participate in God’s perfection, but at the same time they bear the hints of nothingness; and this makes them finite, and therefore imperfect. Responses might develop Descartes’s next analysis, focusing on the nature of two faculties, the intellect and the will. Candidates might outline the main qualities of the intellect and the will and discuss whether they can be sources of error or not, referring to Descartes’s view on the impossibility of attributing any fallacy to them. According to Descartes, not only cannot the intellect and the will be imperfect, inasmuch as they are created by God, but they are not actually imperfect because 1) the intellect only perceives ideas and does not produce any judgments, and 2) the will in its freedom to choose is as powerful and wide as God’s. So, the error in human judgments about the world can come from their limited capacities of knowledge, which do not make them properly distinguish and evaluate truth and falsity. Candidates might consider Descartes’s suggestion that in such cases judgments should be suspended, because they should be expressed on the basis of “clear and distinct” perceptions only.

Candidates might explore:

- Descartes’s view of the faculties of the intellect and the will
- Perfection of God
- Human imperfection
- Infinite and finite; nothingness
- Perceptions, ideas, knowledge.

(b) Evaluate whether the intellect and the will can be sources of error. [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Functions of the intellect
- Infinite possibilities of the will
- Truth, falsity, error
- Suspension of judgments
- Doubt *versus* certainty
- Body-mind issues.

4. (a) **Explain Descartes’s claim that we are driven to believe that “the star is not greater than the flame”.** [10]

This question arises from a sentence in Descartes’s *Sixth Meditation, The existence of material things, and the real distinction between mind and body*. The quotation stands for a central issue in Descartes’s theory of knowledge, which has been developed by Locke and Hume as the distinction between primary and secondary qualities: There are certain specific properties of the objects, such as heat, cold, colour, light, sounds, odours, tastes, hardness or other tactile qualities that the subject cannot consider as properties of the objects. In Descartes’s words, “I have no ground for holding that something resembling the heat I feel is in the fire”; the only grounded belief is that there must be something in the object, whatever it be, that stimulates in the subject the corresponding sensations. Responses might analyse Descartes’s view of the issue and might mention the distinction between sensationalism and physicalism, besides taking into account Descartes’s interpretation of senses, sensations, perception, and ideas, in relation to the different functions of the faculty of the intellect. Candidates might also mention imagination and memory as tools of the intellect, eg by underlining the difference between sensory perception and intellectual understanding. Further development might involve the origin of Descartes’s issues of external qualities of the objects: The existence and knowledge of the body and its relation with the mind. The body-mind issue might lead to the explanation of the divisibility of the body and the indivisibility of the mind. Responses might also consider the doubts, limits, and fallacy of human knowledge and judgments, as in the Dream Argument, with the distinction between waking experience and dreams, or as in the Wax Argument, where there is an attack on the reliability of the senses.

Candidates might explore:

- Sensationalism *versus* physicalism
- Theory of the primary and secondary qualities
- Intellect and senses
- Sensations and ideas
- Imagination and memory
- Mind-body dualism
- Divisibility of the body; indivisibility of the mind.

- (b) **Evaluate the extent to which the intellect has to distrust the senses.** [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Sensory perception and intellectual understanding; senses *versus* ideas
- Truth and falsity; certain/uncertain knowledge
- Judgments, doubts, certainty
- The Dream Argument; the Wax Argument.

David Hume: *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*

5. (a) Explain Demea's *a priori* argument for the necessary existence of God. [10]

Demea offers a version of the cosmological, or, first-cause argument. Unlike Cleanthes's probabilistic design arguments, Demea's aim is to show exclusively from first principles, not from experience, and beyond any possible doubt, that God exists; indeed that God could not possibly not exist. Basically this is an argument to prove that the cosmos or physical universe itself had a cause. If it did, then, being itself outside the physical universe, that cause would be something non-physical.

Candidates might explore:

- Demea makes use of a deductive rather than inductive argument and is convinced that, in replacing Cleanthes's inductive argument (in the previous section of the *Dialogues*) with the right type of deductive argument, the existence of the deity can be proven
- Demea thinks the lesson to be learned is that we had "better adhere to that simple and sublime argument *a priori*, which, by offering to us infallible demonstration, cuts off at once all doubt and difficulty"
- By offering an *a priori* demonstration, Demea intends that his argument will not rely on experience and he will use only propositions which, he thinks, have to be true, for instance, that nothing exists without a cause, together with logical relations among such propositions
- The role of logical necessity.

(b) To what extent is Demea's argument above weakened by subsequent objections? [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- A matter of fact, or state of affairs, cannot be demonstrated by an *a priori* argument
- The criticism that "nothing is demonstrable, unless the contrary implies a contradiction"
- Demea's argument is severely criticized by Cleanthes, with its ultimate dismissal turning on the distinction between *a priori* and *a posteriori* propositions
- The objection that "[t]he words, necessary existence, have no meaning"
- The problem for Demea's argument is that whatever can be conceived of as existing, can also be conceived of as not existing, including God. Therefore, it is impossible to demonstrate by pure logic the existence of any being
- If the idea of necessary existence were meaningful, then, for all we know, the universe would have as good a claim to it as the deity
- The fallacy of composition; Demea's point that, over and above the cause or explanation of each individual item in the universe, the universe itself needs a cause or explanation
- Russell gives a very good example. It is that to suppose the universe must have a cause, because each item in the universe has a cause, is like supposing that the human race must have a mother because each individual person has a mother
- The fallacy of composition objection is not decisive. It does not refute the cosmological argument
- It is not necessary to prove that something does exist either necessarily or eternally. What must be proven is that the universe could not possibly be such a thing
- A practical objection which Philo puts forward is that ordinary people are seldom convinced by *a priori* arguments. Philo suggests that only people who are accustomed to abstract reasoning, and who (illegitimately?) transfer mathematical practices and concepts to empirical considerations are likely to find this argument convincing.

6. (a) **Explain Philo’s suggestion that there are four circumstances of evil which encompass most human misery.** [10]

Philo makes the point to Cleanthes that no reasonable person would predict that a world designed and made by a powerful, wise, and benevolent deity would turn out to be just like our world. Philo’s example of evil is pain and suffering and he suggests, cautiously, the four circumstances that arise – 1) pain as a cause of action, 2) “the conducting of the world by general laws”, 3) the weaknesses of various sorts in all living things and 4) flaws and faults in the workings of nature.

Candidates might explore:

- Why is pain necessary when the feeling of pleasure alone might be sufficient?
- The world operates by general laws rather than by some other system, such as subtle divine interventions: He who knows the secret springs of the world could influence sickness, weather and circumstances to reduce evil without our awareness
- The precariousness of life, in that all our faculties are required for mere survival without any faculties to prevent accidents, eg if humans were more industrious, this would mitigate many evils without exalting our status in the universe
- Examples of natural evil, such as when rains are often too much or not enough, tempests and hurricanes, extreme heat and cold as well as excessively strong passions and desires
- The world could have been different in significant ways from how it is, and, in being different in those ways, better
- On this basis, the existence of evil shows that we cannot infer that a benevolent and omnipotent creator exists
- A better hypothesis might be Manichaeism (primordial conflict between good and evil).

- (b) **To what extent is Philo’s understanding of evil convincing?** [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Is Philo’s distinction into four types of evil convincing?
- Cleanthes used items in the material world as evidence of design, but this empirical appeal allowed Philo to raise the issue of misery and suffering
- Philo admits the logical possibility of evil and a benevolent creator but he is also disallows Cleanthes from making use of this
- Philo employs the miseries of the world against the desire of Cleanthes to establish by an *a posteriori* argument a benevolent and just God
- Philo presented the traditional dilemma of whether God’s goodness and omnipotence were consistent with the abundance of suffering in the world
- Philo draws the conclusion that God is, at best, amoral – since Cleanthes argues from the experience of the world, then Philo, arguing that such experience is one of suffering as much, or more, than joy gives the conclusion of, at best, a morally indifferent Deity
- Hume aimed to show that if an *a posteriori* argument is employed to arrive at God’s nature, then it is the issue of God’s nature, not his existence that is being disputed
- Demea is instrumental in obtaining the concession from Philo that evil is logically compatible with God, but as Philo notes, this is hardly damaging to his case
- Cleanthes acknowledged that the existence of evil, if sustained, is fatal for his *a posteriori* attempts to arrive at the nature of the Deity.

John Stuart Mill: *On Liberty*

7. (a) Explain how Mill allows the flourishing of the individual. [10]

This question focuses on one of the fundamentals of Mill’s argument concerning the liberty and, hence, flourishing of the individual. By establishing the Harm Principle he created a mechanism to allow maximum freedom for the individual. Mill’s aim was to create space for individuals to blossom and be happy which is grounded in the “permanent interests of man as a progressive being”.

Candidates might explore:

- The individual’s right to speak freely and act as they wish as long as what they did would cause no harm to others or interfere with the liberty of others
- Guarding principles limiting the actions of an individual or the state against another individual
- Limiting paternalism, which Mill was against; the idea that someone else could decide what was in my own good
- Persuasion to change behaviour was allowed but coercion was not to be practiced
- Ways the Harm Principle did not relate to children and those who were deemed to be insane
- Mill’s perception of a hierarchy of societies and so in “backward societies” the Harm Principle did not apply. The Harm Principle allowed the individual to flourish in his or her own space, free, away from the direction of the majority
- For him “self-regarding acts” would not harm others and therefore individuals would become “a noble and beautiful object of contemplation” and, thus, flourish.

(b) Evaluate the effectiveness of Mill’s approach to the flourishing of the individual. [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Mill did not clearly define the concept of harm in both a physical and moral sense and whether harm is personalized or institutionalized
- Equally “private acts” might seem to become permissible but still might be seen as abhorrent to some societies, for example incest
- Mill does not seem to fully explore the difference between legality and morality, and that both could change with changing values within a society. The example of the man crossing the bridge illustrates how lack of knowledge might cause a reinterpretation of the Harm Principle
- In other cases he might be crediting individuals with a very high degree of rationality and reflection to know of themselves what is in their best interests in order to flourish
- At the time of writing he was not aware of psychological factors that might govern human behaviour and presently with our current knowledge it might be seen necessary to interfere more in human behaviour
- Does Mill really want a society that is full of individuals who are self-interested, and have no shared moral code which would by definition limit behaviour?
- For Mill the freedom that is created does have a purpose, a utility, which is happiness; for him this is moral progress.

8. (a) Explain why Mill was so opposed to social conformity. [10]

This question gives an opportunity to see the positive aspects of not conforming to social norms. For Mill the rise of individualism was essential for a healthy society that could progress and increase its collective happiness. The individual is free to act with very few constraints. Freedom of action and expression were to be only limited by the Harm Principle. Mill had a high view of human nature and the inherent rationalism of humans. Therefore he advocated increasing non-conformity without any worry of abuse or misguided actions that would harm individuals or society in general. For him this non-conformity was a positive influence in society, however for many it is seen as a negative influence that might produce instability and chaos; a lawlessness.

Candidates might explore:

- Diverse opinions were to be encouraged as they would generate new ideas and challenge accepted views
- Mill feared the ever increasing influence and control of the majority and therefore he advocated individual freedom. Conformity in all social areas and thought, for him, would produce decadence and lack of progress
- The state's existence was not to produce social conformity but to protect social diversity
- Possible opposition to the social trends of Mill's time, which were brought about by Christianity and increasing democratization. Similarly (in more modern times), the effect of the fear of those who have differing political and or religious views
- Middle class respectability would stifle creativity and change
- The idea that individuals were rational beings that could develop themselves freely.

(b) Evaluate the value of social non-conformity. [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- The clash between majority and minority rights
- Ways of producing common moral codes within a climate of increased diversity
- Is happiness increased with more freedom or is it diminished by increased responsibility?
- Does non-conformity produce a more dynamic society or simply dysfunctional groups with no harmony or common cause or drive?
- Under what circumstances can a state or another social institution require conformity? *Eg* at a time of war, civil unrest or economic upheaval
- Is utility, which for Mill drives human improvement, inherent in all human action or does it have to be enforced?
- Without non-conformists, society does not progress or change; new artistic movements and revolutionary ideas have their roots in non-conformity
- Darwinian notions of social progress through non-conformity.

Friedrich Nietzsche: *The Genealogy of Morals*

9. (a) Explain Nietzsche’s account of guilt. [10]

This question centres on the material in Nietzsche’s *Second Essay* in which he gives an account of the origin of guilt. Here he accounts for the origins of morality in terms of a genealogy and a feature of that genealogy is the role played by guilt and the so-called bad conscience. Guilt is described in terms of a debt and the repayment of this debt involves punishment. The majority of people accept the condition of guilt due to their following of others, in Nietzsche’s account this is termed “slave morality”.

Candidates might explore:

- Guilt as a debt and punishment as a means of repaying of debt
- Conscience arises from the “sovereign individual” having an ability to make promises and a freedom to will
- Humans have always visited cruelty on bad debtors, hence the negativity of modern experiences of guilt
- The tendency to accommodate a sense of guilt, due to the moral disobedience in ourselves, stems from a “bad conscience”
- Slave morality accounts for the present sense of guilt as a form of a moral lapse
- The bad conscience arises from the original setting of individuals gathering in society; individuals turn the animal aggression on themselves rather than on others
- Guilt depicts a submission of the majority of people to the powerful, which then causes self-hatred in return
- Guilt is primarily a social experience rather than an expression of metaphysical moral experience.

(b) Evaluate Nietzsche’s account of the relationship between guilt and the origins of morality. [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Is Nietzsche’s genealogical approach to the origin of moral concepts convincing?
- All that is objective about morality is the bending of people’s will to power; the content of morality is arbitrary
- Is Nietzsche’s “will to power” a credible underlying explanation for concepts such as guilt and bad conscience?
- Is Nietzsche’s assertion that the meanings of concepts have been subjugated to the will of the powerful convincing?
- Does Nietzsche suffer in the end from an overactive imagination about the past that cannot be verified or falsified?
- Does the relativism inherent in perspectivism make Nietzsche’s account more, or less, convincing?

10. (a) Explain how Nietzsche gives individuals greater responsibility for morality. [10]

Nietzsche's account of morality involves a discussion of possible historical roots that influenced the way people behaved and believed. In the majority people would follow the lead from others and it is the contention that only the individual can decide for him-/herself what the moral act is. Nietzsche emphasizes this individuality with his concept of the "will to power", which – he says – underlines the moral lives of all. Nietzsche claims that humans would rather will something than nothing – or not will at all.

Candidates might explore:

- Humans seek goals to make sense of life, hence the impetus to will
- Religion inculcated fear in ensuring that individuals turned in on themselves and neglected to assert their individuality
- With morality arising in a multiplicity of settings, the individual has more freedom to see him-/herself in a broader context and thus define what is moral
- Ultimately, there is nothing sacred about morality; it is something we can criticize and hold up to inspection for ourselves and it is something the individual can judge.

(b) Evaluate the view that Nietzsche gives individuals greater responsibility for morality. [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Nietzsche's historical analysis – is it convincing and justified?
- Nietzsche accounts for oral language not on the basis of an authoritative origin but from a process of human discovery
- The individual has more freedom in a broader context to define what is oral, than in a narrow authoritative context
- The meaning of morality can adapt over years and within different cultural settings at the same time, if the genealogical account of its origin is accepted
- Is Nietzsche's account of an unseen will convincing? Are Nietzsche's references to Schopenhauer persuasive? The genealogical explanation allows for an understanding that meanings of morality vary over time and also vary at any given time, allowing the individual to define meaning for him-/herself
- The winding route of moral understanding shows there to be no fundamental or objective reality to the concepts involved, the individual must rather assert her/his will
- The will dominating a thing gives it its meaning.

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

11. (a) **Explain how “what each person is able to do and to be” can be a measure of a nation’s development.** [10]

This question seeks an explanation of how a new measure of development can be established based on opportunities that are afforded to people. These opportunities create a threshold which people should aspire to and exceed. It is egalitarian as those who have difficulty to reach the threshold would be given extra help by the state. The measure of the degree to which government supports such development becomes qualitative as uniformity is not to be encouraged. What is to be encouraged is the creation of a life that recognises human dignity. The achievement of a list of capabilities that Nussbaum presents, might also be seen as a way of gauging progress. Such progress might be recognised as being culturally loaded.

Candidates might explore:

- Positive freedoms that create opportunities
- The arbitrariness of a definitive listing of ten capabilities as the measure
- Whether the listing should be adjusted as a result of time, habits or place
- Ways in which governments might develop freedoms that create opportunities necessary for human growth
- The degree to which such a measure of development is libertarian.

- (b) **To what extent does a nation’s development affect the individual?** [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- The issue of whether a majority opinion would decide or whether an elite group, influenced by a specific perspective, might impact on the individual
- The balancing of positive and negative freedoms of the individual within society, so as to protect human development against possible abuse
- The degree of choice in areas such as the use of drugs or abortion or home schooling
- Does the list of capabilities reflect the expectations of an elite or the ‘average’ person?
- Can alternative listings exist and can the individual be allowed to pursue a personalized list?
- The charge that the capabilities approach reflects an elitist view, heavily influenced by Western thought
- Are some restrictions on human action necessary to protect human dignity?

12. (a) Explain what duties a government has to fulfil for a capabilities approach to be enacted and successful. [10]

This question seeks an explanation of the role of government in fulfilling a universal fundamental political entitlement for individuals within society. There is a need to set up a framework for social justice. Economic growth is often seen as a means of improving the life of individuals but with the capabilities approach the discussion moves into a qualitative area and the development of perhaps a more paternalistic government so that entitlements can be achieved.

Candidates might explore:

- The ways to balance the duties of government with the individual choices of people
- The effectiveness of legislation to promote human flourishing
- The difference between direct government action and opportunity making, leaving action to the individual
- The relationship of a collective value overriding the well-being of an individual, eg individual sacrifices made to care for another
- Ways in which governments can expand social justice
- Whether governments can or should differentiate in approaches so as to increase the benefit/opportunity of action for the individual
- Whether government should abdicate their possible responsibilities and duties to other non-state institutions
- The conflicting responsibilities of a government and the distribution of available resources, eg quality education for all set against national defense
- Cultural variations in the role government plays in the lives of their citizens
- The appeal for rich governments to support poorer regimes so all can offer the same entitlements.

(b) Evaluate the claim that without government direction a capabilities approach will not be achievable. [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- The naivety of Nussbaum's view that governments would act to share resources internationally and therefore universalize entitlements
- The requirement of government to exercise negative liberty so as to allow positive liberty to flourish: If citizens are not safe they cannot achieve any of Nussbaum's central capabilities
- Equality for all might mean making decisions about what is acceptable or not and the need to put forward a rationale for these stances
- A critique of Nussbaum's concept of the inherent goodness of humans to care for each other and the wider environment
- The need for governments not individuals to define human flourishing as the individual might not be able to define or achieve it without conflict with others
- The degree to which equality, dignity and justice is achievable without government direction
- Positive *versus* negative liberty.

Ortega y Gasset: *The Origins of Philosophy***13. (a) Explain Ortega's idea of freedom as projection and realization of possibilities. [10]**

Freedom is the aspect assumed by humans' whole lives when the diverse components in it reach a point in their development to produce among themselves a particular dynamic equation, which relates the two great components of human life; human needs and its possibilities. The human is possibilities. Beyond needs it might appear the development of human possibilities, *ie* its freedom.

Candidates might explore:

- The issue is radically broad: Defining the notion of freedom primarily or exclusively according to law and politics (as though these were the root from which the general configuration of human life known as freedom springs) is an error that reduces and flattens the enormity of the subject
- Choice assumes that the circle of one's possibilities is notably greater than that of one's needs
- The stages of a civilization are determined and discerned as modifications of the fundamental relation between the two great components of human life, human needs and its possibilities
- Historicity and its connection with human life as possibility
- Probably every civilization or individual life passes through that form of life known as freedom. It is a brief, glowing stage that unfolds like noon between the morning of primitivism and the decline of evening, the petrification and necrosis of its senescence
- In the primitive or early stage, humans have the impression that the circle of possibilities barely transcends that of their needs. Humans feel that what they can do in their lives coincides almost strictly with what they have to do
- Both juridical freedom and economic wealth are effects or manifestations of generic freedom and vital wealth
- When there are more possible things to do (*haceres*) than are needed, the problem is: One has to choose among many possibilities. One must select. The basic emotion of existence is now the opposite of resignation, for living means "having things in excess"
- Then humans deliberately begin to invent. Creating a new life becomes a normal function of life, something that would not have occurred to one during the primitive stage of life. Revolutions begin. Symptomatically the individual ceases to be totally inscribed to tradition, even though life is still partially governed by it.

(b) Evaluate Ortega's idea of freedom as projection and realization of possibilities. [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Is freedom equal to projection and realization of possibilities? *Eg* human existence consists in developing possibilities; however freedom might have grades or even be inexistent in some relevant sense. Although both concepts might be distinguished the value of Ortega's conception is in their inter-connection
- Comparison and contrast with similar positions, *eg* Sartre's existentialism
- Wealth in the economic sense means simply that the human is confronted with numerous possibilities for possession and acquisition, or concretely, with many things to own, buy, and sell. How much or how little must be interpreted in relation to the subjective consciousness that man has of his needs
- Doubt as a result of the possibilities of choice: Doubt is not simply non-belief
- Someone who holds no opinion about something is ignorant, but he does not doubt. Doubt presupposes that one is confronted with positive opinions. The human is stranded amid the various opinions, none of which is able to sustain him or her firmly
- Doubt according to Ortega in relation to Descartes

- To what extent might Ortega's belief that "human life is always insecure" (which he gives as a fact) be justified?
- Human life and freedom in relation to Ortega's central thought: "I am myself and my circumstance"
- Comparison of Ortega's idea with other positions, eg Merleau-Ponty, who expresses clear ideas on the concept of existence as open possibilities (he defines it as "possibilities of situations").

14. (a) Explain Ortega's view of the relation between philosophy and its history. [10]

The question invites an exploration of a central concern of Ortega's argument: The connections between philosophy and its history. Ortega's argument, developing as idea and method the notion of vital reason, looks after integration among two movements: One directed towards the past in an effort to reconstruct the dramatic origin of philosophy and the other orientated to the construction of a new philosophical synthesis.

Candidates might explore:

- The essential unity of philosophy is discovered through a retrospective contemplation of its total past by means of "historical reason"
- The philosophical past as a series of errors, but simultaneously as errors that contain some truth and help to discover the truth
- Ways of approaching the philosophical past: Analytically and synthetically – Analytically: A series of thoughts develops from an initial thought by virtue of progressive analysis. Synthetically: Each thought presents a complication and impels one on to the next thought
- In order to adopt a philosophy of the past one must transform it
- The case of Thales as an example of vital reason as a method: The narration of historical causes and circumstances is central.

(b) Evaluate Ortega's account of the relation between philosophy and its history. [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- The importance of linking together historical and conceptual analysis in order to understand the origins and advance of philosophy
- Ortega's analysis of the philosophical past serves the purpose of constructing a new philosophical synthesis
- Dialectic as the obligation to continue thinking. It shows the very fact of the human condition: Man genuinely has no recourse but to continue thinking
- The temporal articulation: Past borders on the future, present is a tenuous line that it merely serves to join and unite them
- We reflect on the philosophical past in order to act in the future
- The history of the philosophical past catapults us into the spaces of the future, toward a philosophy yet to come; we have no choice but to attempt to construct one of our own.

Plato: *The Republic*, Books IV – IX

15. (a) **Explain the relationship between universals and particulars as depicted in Plato's world of Forms.** [10]

Plato's theory of Forms holds that all particular things have something in common, and they have something in common because they are all instances of a universal idea. Plato argues that because the material world is constantly changing it is untrustworthy. Behind this constantly changing world of appearances is a world of permanence and reliability. Plato calls this the world of Forms or 'ideas'.

Candidates might explore:

- Relation of Forms to particulars, participation, hierarchical structure
- Differences between Forms and particulars, *eg* beautiful things and beauty itself
- Form of the Good
- Plato's view that the Forms are a condition for reason
- True and reliable knowledge is with those who can understand the true reality behind the world of our everyday experience
- Similes used to demonstrate theory – likely to be the Cave, the Sun and Divided Line.

- (b) **Evaluate why, in relation to the theory of Forms, Plato regards our senses as inadequate for the acquisition of knowledge?** [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- No objective judgements are possible. So we hold that some particular state of affairs out there in the world, in the realm of sensory experience, is, *eg* just or beautiful, it will always fall short of absolute Beauty or absolute Justice (absolute in the sense of that which is ideal and complete). Indeed, all particular instances of beauty and justice, can be defined as such because they partake in Beauty in-itself and Justice in-itself
- In the realm of sensory experience, all we can obtain are beliefs that are in a sense correct because they reflect what appears to be the case. However, beliefs involve just an appearance of reality
- In contrast, complete knowledge would entitle us to say that what we believe truly is the case. For Plato then, knowledge and belief belong in different realms and are very different in kind
- In Plato's theory the Forms are immaterial; they belong to the mind and appeal to the intellect
- Plato often contrasts the Forms with the objects of sight, and in doing so makes a distinction between the intelligible realm and the visible realm
- Plato's Forms are a metaphysical idea. Metaphysics aims to give us an understanding of the ultimate reality which lies beyond that which we confront in sensory experience; this understanding is not itself based on sensory experience, but on rational analysis
- Our understanding of the Forms is based on rational insight, rather than empirical observation
- Problems with the theory of Forms: Third Man Argument
- In contemporary metaphysics, debates surrounding universals have focused on the rival claims of realists (who claim universals exist or are real) and nominalists (who claim that only particulars exist in any meaningful sense). Contemporary realist philosophers tend to say that universals exist but only in and through the particulars that exemplify them (and thus advocate an Aristotelian concept of the nature of universals), rather than claim that universals exist independently of all particulars (the Platonic notion of universals).

16. (a) Explain Plato’s simile of the Ship in Book VI of the Republic. [10]

Plato’s purpose in offering the simile of the ship in Book VI is to explain why philosophers appear useless, and explain how the democratic mode of government is flawed. The simile is to account for why the philosopher was marginalized in society. Concerned in the first instance with the purported ‘uselessness’ of the philosopher, Socrates asks Adeimantus to imagine the state or polis as a ship.

Candidates might explore:

- The ship represents the state
- The captain – the citizenry, “larger and stronger than any of the crew, but a bit deaf and short-sighted, and similarly limited in seamanship”
- The crew – politicians “all quarrelling with each other about how to navigate the ship, each thinking he ought to be at the helm”
- The art of navigation – the knowledge of the good needed to rule properly; none of the squabbling crew possesses the true *techné* or art of navigation needed to guide the ship, indeed no one believes that such a *techné* exists
- The true navigator – on the other hand, who “must study the seasons of the year, the sky, the winds, and all the other subjects appropriate to his profession if he is to be really fit to control the ship” – and who represents the philosopher – is ignored
- The philosopher navigator does not simply appear useless to the likes of Adeimantus, he is useless
- On the democratic ship of state the natural order is inverted: “It is not natural”. Socrates maintains it is inappropriate “for the master to request the crew to be ruled by him... [It is] not for him to beg them to accept direction”. By right they ought to be asking him, as the only one who possesses the knowledge and qualities required to rule in the name of the good
- In a democracy the philosopher finds no place, or at least, he does not find his natural place.

(b) Evaluate Plato’s approach to democracy. [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- The use of the simile of the Ship and the Beast as criticism of direct democracy
- Plato’s criticism of sophists plying their trade
- Plato’s criticism of the nature of empirical study as not real knowledge
- Plato asks a number of searching questions about democracy and highlights many of its weaknesses
- One of Plato’s principal complaints about democracy is that its horizons are restricted to the present moment
- Plato does not offer an argument for democratic pluralism
- A distinctly authoritarian state is proposed in which political decision making is the preserve of a ruling elite whose legitimacy is based not on the consent of the citizenry but on their fitness to rule
- The ideal state can only be brought about once philosophers become rulers
- That the state should regulate every aspect of its citizens’ lives in order to provide for their best interests. Plato’s ideal society was divided into three classes: Workers to produce the necessities of life; soldiers to defend the state; philosophers to rule. This elite class of leaders would be specially trained to ensure order and justice. The wisest of them, a philosopher-king, would have the ultimate authority
- Because democracy for Plato had a significant role in the condemning of Socrates he appears to take a negative approach to it being a viable option for the ideal state
- Would philosophers necessarily make good rulers?
- Plato’s insistence that democracy is a perversion of the natural order

- Plato seems to say that in a democracy reason is usurped by desire, and any objective account of what is for the best is sacrificed to the subjective satisfaction of material desires
- What Plato would seem to be unsure about is whether or not democratic electorates get the politicians they deserve: The simile of the Ship suggests not, the simile of the Beast suggests that they do
- Plato describes the progressive corruption of the ideal state in four stages: Timocracy – military rule – degenerates into oligarchy, literally the rule of the few (but Plato understands it as the rule of the rich), which in turn degenerates into democracy and concludes in tyranny
- To appreciate Plato's analysis of democracy it is necessary to give attention to the account of its descent from oligarchy
- Plato's account of democracy is highly rhetorical, and, it might be argued, often lapses into unrecognizable caricature.

Peter Singer: *The Life You Can Save*

17. (a) **Explain how Singer rejects relativism as a response to the demand to donate to those in need.** [10]

Singer's thesis is an absolutist one. The duty to help those suffering when you have the ability to, is a universal duty regardless of the place you are at, or the personal circumstances you have. The analogy of saving the child drowning in the pond is extensively used and this might be disputed as an analogy, since the cost involved to the bystander in helping the child might vary from person to person, thus encouraging a more relativistic outlook on the duty to sacrifice to help others.

Candidates might explore:

- A response to Singer is to say that morality is a matter for the individual, not for prescription by any other person or body
- Singer rejects relativism with common sense examples of the need to intervene if one witnesses, say, animal cruelty or rape
- Singer attacks the view that we should only give what those around us give (he attacks Appiah in Chapter 9)
- Singer claims the duty to alleviate poverty as an absolute one and denies the appeal to special duties in the Chapter, *Your Child and the Children of Others*
- One response to the suffering of others might be to look at the circumstances of the cause of the suffering, thus encouraging a situationist perspective – you might respond to different situations you encounter differently.

- (b) **Evaluate the claim, “I don't know where I'd set it, but I would not let many kids die so my kids could live”, as a response to Singer's inclusion of who is in need.** [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- The issue of the moral demand of special duties
- The need to take situations into account in making moral judgments
- Utilitarianism and Kant's deontology encourage an absolutist approach to calculating moral action
- Virtue ethics would encourage a sensitivity to those around you allowing for different duties to your own family as opposed to those of others
- Judith Jarvis Thomson says, “A father who says, ‘I'm no more concerned about my children's lives than about anybody else's life' is just flatly a defective parent”
- Is Singer's demand too great emotionally as well as financially?
- The demand is not quite to love the children of others as much as one's own – but it is close, and is this calculation a reasonable one to ask any parent to make?
- Is Singer's demand realistic?

18. (a) **Explain what Singer describes as the “common objections to giving” and how he meets those “common objections”.** [10]

Singer devotes a chapter to what he describes as “common objections to giving”. He attempts to re-format these objections into types of philosophical argument, using examples including High School student responses and the line taken by a libertarian thinker.

Candidates might explore:

- Singer shows that the United States of America is generous, but that much of the large amount of annual charitable donations goes to institutions, some of which are wealthy, and not for aid towards the extreme poor
- The objection of there not being a black and white universal code of morality that applies to everyone
- Singer asks if we can leave the individual to decide what is moral for him-/herself
- Singer is not making a demand that must be followed (unlike a tax which could be used to give to the poor)
- The right of people to spend money on what they choose
- Narveson says, “..I have seen no plausible argument that we owe something, as a matter of general duty, to those to whom we have done nothing wrong”
- Singer attacks the libertarian view by outlining that the economic policies of the wealthy countries cause poverty in poorer countries
- Singer uses climate change and global warming as a further example of harm by the developed economies being caused to poorer countries
- Singer outlines the situation with regard to taxed income going to poorer people, and finds it is very low and not sufficient to enable people to think they do enough by paying taxes
- The argument that aid donation breeds dependency
- The defense of capitalism as a reason not to give money away
- The duty to provide for special relationships
- Singer later goes on to explain the lack of giving by evolutionary and psychological reasons.

- (b) **Evaluate Singer’s second premise for his main argument, “If it is in your power to prevent something bad from happening, without sacrificing anything nearly as important, it is wrong not to do so.”** [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Is there the same moral duty to prevent suffering that happens distant from oneself as opposed to that which you see directly?
- Could “something bad” mean any person being less well off – not just in monetary terms – than you, making the moral duty far too demanding and unreasonable?
- Is there a difference between doing something morally wrong as opposed to preventing something morally wrong occurring?
- Singer argues that much of the wealth of the developed world arises thanks to the structure of global economics, hence there is an increased duty for the rich to help the poor
- If the reason for the poverty of others is not our own cause, then how much responsibility must we have to alleviate the conditions created by others?
- Singer admits the phrase “nearly as important” is problematic, does it distract from the absolutist demand Singer makes? Who – or what – determines what sacrifice is “nearly as important”?
- Where is the place for special duties we have towards, say, family or loved ones in Singer’s account?

Charles Taylor: *The Ethics of Authenticity*

19. (a) Explain Taylor’s claim that “our identity requires recognition by others”. [10]

The question arises from Chapter 5 of Taylor’s work, *The Need for Recognition*. It invites an analysis of some properties of authenticity and individualism, related to the concept of authenticity. Responses might consider Taylor’s view of the modern, socially structured world and the kind of undertakings it implies. For instance, candidates might consider the role that associations, social groups and relationships play in the modern society. In Taylor’s view, most of these social activities and relationships are basically carried on for the sake of self-fulfilment. Responses might explore the consequences of that view, by underlining Taylor’s concern about the more marginal role that those social activities play in relation to the political and social commitment within one’s community. Candidates might also recall Taylor’s distinction between two main kinds of individualism, the one of “*anomie* and breakdown”, and the other as moral principle. Besides underpinning the trend of modern society towards the shaping of social existences, responses might also consider how the self-fulfilment has taken the forms of “ordinary life, that is, the life of production and the family, of work and love”. Responses might also refer to the two changes that Taylor illustrates in the passage from the *ancien régime* society to a modern one: The collapse of “honour”, that is the decline of the status of privileges and inequalities, in favour of a new concept of “dignity”, that is the typical citizenry of a democratic society, where people’s identity is recognised regardless of their social position. Reference to Rousseau’s view of hierarchical honour and/or to Hegel’s idea of recognition might be another element in structuring the question. Candidates might well refer to the principle of “fairness”, that “demands equal chances for everyone to develop their own identity”: In other terms, Taylor underlines the crucial importance of recognising difference, or “recognising the equal value of different ways of being”. It might be possible to explore whether, and how, social recognition can coexist with individual models of life.

Candidates might explore:

- Social undertakings and relationships; dialogue
- Political and social commitment
- Two kinds of individualism
- Recognition; self-fulfilment; “ordinary life”
- Honour *versus* dignity; Rousseau’s view of honour.

(b) Evaluate the relationship between authenticity and recognition. [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Principle of “fairness”
- Equality
- Recognition of differences
- Authenticity and social conformity
- Whether and how social recognition can coexist with individual models of life
- Hegel’s view of recognition.

20. (a) Explain Taylor’s view of the “culture of narcissism”. [10]

The question arises from Chapter 6 of Taylor’s work, *The Source of Subjectivism*. It invites an analysis of the concept of narcissism and the related “culture”. Responses might consider Taylor’s distinction between narcissism as either responding to an ideal of self-fulfilment or just being the expression of self-indulgence and egoism. Either way, the culture of narcissism emerges from a culture of personal development, which is more and more in contrast with other elements, such as social constraints, family ties or adherence to high ideals. Candidates might refer to Taylor’s distinction between past cultures and the modern society in approaching and solving these kind of contrasts, which sometimes feature in moral conflicts. Reference to the origin of individualism as one of the emerging characteristics of modern society might be another point of exploration. Taylor’s explanation of individualism might lead candidates to mention the “entrenchment process” of the culture of authenticity, in which fulfilment is individual and self only: Thereby social relationships and associations collapse to mere instrumental activities and the demands coming from beyond the individual desires, such as tradition, society, nature, etc. are totally delegitimised. In responding to the question, candidates might focus on the concept of “atomism” and the causes of it: “Mobility”, intended as a quality of the modern society, renders social relationships absolutely casual, superficial, impersonal, with little or no room for deeper contact or ties. Moreover, the technocratic and bureaucratic essence of modern society fortifies atomism, since it tends to reward the “instrumental reason”, that is an instrumental conception and use of society. Anthropocentrism is a clear consequence of this culture, which is a typical aspect of the modern society. Responses might also consider the relationship between self-discovery and artistic creation, and the change that art has made from imitation of reality (*mimesis*) to creation as self-making (*poiesis*), as a path along the deconstruction of values.

Candidates might explore:

- Narcissism, individualism, self-indulgence, egoism
- Personal development and social constraints
- How individualism has changed from past to modern societies
- Creation of values, deconstruction of reality: Nietzsche, Baudelaire, Derrida, Foucault
- Art: From imitation of reality to creation as self-making; Herder, Schiller, Rousseau, Kant; Debord’s “society of the spectacle”.

(b) Evaluate the consequences of the “culture of narcissism”. [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- “Instrumental reason”
- “Instrumental society”
- Mobility: Superficial, impersonal contacts; Bauman’s “liquid modernity” and/or “pointillist time”; the “quick-fix” approach
- Atomism
- Anthropocentrism.

Lao Tzu: *Tao Te Ching***21. (a) Explain the concept of the Sage in the *Tao*.****[10]**

The focus is on wisdom and how it can be related to the *Tao*. The Sage is gentle and kind, but does not seek to be recognized for his or her gentleness or kindness. S/he is honest and sincere, but does not seek to be recognised for her/his honesty or sincerity. S/he works to improve the well-being of others because s/he truly wants to promote social justice and harmony. The sage is detached from all things, but takes care of all things.

Candidates might explore:

- The Sage, like a mirror, reflects impartially what is before it
- The Sage does not strive for any personal end; diminishes personal desire to the greatest possible degree; a person who acts selflessly, and who demonstrates both honour and humility
- The Sage relies on ‘actionless activity’; who teaches by not trying to teach, and who is able to do everything by not striving to do anything
- The Sage must become as much like the *Tao*, and consequently as less like an individual as possible
- The Sage has no personal desires, and so submits without protest to the unfolding of events (Fate)
- The *Sage* is highly regarded throughout the *Tao Te Ching*
- The Sage is a person who is able to promote social cooperation and harmony by acting in accordance with the *Tao*.

(b) Evaluate the claim that in the *Tao*, the Sage, like nature, treats everything impartially.
[15]

Possible discussion points include:

- *Tao* literally basically means, ‘way’ or ‘path’ the ‘way of doing something’ and the ‘principle’ or ‘set of principles’
- In the constantly changing everyday world of all that exists there lies an ultimate and eternal reality, the *Tao*. All things receive their *te* (virtue, power, capacity) from the *Tao*. For the Taoist, nature is in a sense divine
- There is something that is real, ultimate and at the same time the basis of all there is Impartiality is understood to be the root from which all manner of specific or individual differences have no real meaning
- That *wu wei*, ‘actionless activity’, has consequences for both moral and political philosophy. The implications could be discussed with relevant illustrations
- Candidates may offer a comparison and/or contrast with other traditions as part of the response; eg Christian or classical Greek concepts in respect of the role of imitating nature in shaping the personal/moral character
- The view on nature (and wisdom) conveyed by generations may (and probably should) become dated. Examples might be drawn from contemporary issues or contexts.

22. (a) Explain the theme of water in the *Tao*.**[10]**

Water is one of the two common symbols in the *Tao* (the other being the willow tree). It appears to be the preferred metaphor for the primary quality of the *Tao*. Water is yielding, which is exactly what makes it superior and so is indicative of one of the central themes in the *Tao*, that of the strength to be found in softness and pliability.

Candidates might explore:

- Water as the natural phenomenon that comes closest to a resemblance of the *Tao*'s meaning. Water, then, was the closest parallel to the *Tao* in the natural world
- Water illustrates the paradoxical nature and the power of the *Tao*
- Water as the prototype of *wu wei*
- Water describes the action that flows from a life that is grounded directly in the *Tao*
- Nurtured by a force that is infinitely subtle, infinitely intricate, it is a consummate gracefulness born from an abundant vitality that has no need for abruptness or violence
- Yet incomparably strong – these virtues of water are precisely those of *wu wei* as well
- One simply lets the *Tao* flow in and flow out again until all life becomes an event in which there is neither feverishness nor imbalance
- How water adapts itself to its surroundings and seeks out the lowest places. So too, “The supreme good is like water, which nourishes all things without trying to”
- Another characteristic of water that makes it an appropriate analogy to *wu wei* is the clarity it attains through being still.

(b) Evaluate the claim that the theme of water in the *Tao* is essentially a metaphor for an attitude toward life.**[15]**

Possible discussion points include:

- The aligning of one's daily life to the *Tao* is to ride its boundless tide and delight in its flow. The basic way to do this is to perfect a life of *wu wei*
- The pure effectiveness and creative quietude of *wu wei*
- Supreme activity and supreme relaxation. These seeming incompatibles can coexist because human beings are not self-enclosed entities; they ride an unbounded sea of *wu wei* that sustains them through their subliminal minds
- *Wu wei* is the supreme action, the precious suppleness, simplicity, and freedom that flows from us, or rather through us, when our private egos and conscious efforts yield to a power not their own
- Following the analogy of water, the *Tao* rejected all forms of self-assertiveness and competition
- People should avoid being strident and aggressive not only toward other people but also toward nature
- The relativity of all values and, the identity of opposites. This polarity sums up all of life's basic oppositions: Good/evil, active/passive, positive/negative, light/dark, summer/winter, and male/female. But though the halves are in tension, they are not opposed; they complement and balance each other.

Zhuangzi: Zhuangzi**23. (a) Explain Zhuangzi's metaphor of the butcher and the knife.****[10]**

The question arises from a metaphor that Zhuangzi illustrates in Chapter 3 of the *Inner Chapters, The Principle of Nurturing Life (Yang Shen Zhu)*. The metaphor is a clear example of the whole of Zhuangzi's philosophy, across all chapters. The central sentence of the chapter is presented by the butcher's words:

"A good butcher changes his knife once a year – because he cuts. A mediocre cook changes his knife once a month – because he hacks. I've had this knife of mine for nineteen years and I've cut up thousands of oxen with it, and yet the blade is as good as though it had just come from the grindstone. There are spaces between the joints, and the blade of the knife has really no thickness. If you insert what has no thickness into such spaces, then there's plenty of room – more than enough for the blade to play about it. That's why after nineteen years the blade of my knife is still as good as when it first came from the grindstone."

Responses might explain the main argument of the metaphor, consider its possible interpretations, and connect it to other similar metaphors and/or to the whole of Zhuangzi's philosophy. Candidates might underline the central role that skilfulness, mastery, and wisdom play in Zhuangzi's view and how they are linked to one's own "life force" (*sheng, xing*) and proper, natural life. So, responses might also underpin the importance of spontaneity and nature for a life to be proper, balanced, and harmonious. Zhuangzi's criticism of social life, civic involvement, artificial structures of city life are grounded in the risk not to attune oneself with the transformations and rhythm of nature: Candidates might refer to this aspect and relate it to the general spirit of the *Tao*. Responses might analyse the difference between mastery or skilfulness and wisdom: To achieve a mastery is not a guarantee of conducting a sage life, since a mastery implies the knowledge and possession of a mere technique, whereas wisdom has to do with "art" (the *Tao*), that is a "spiritual state of heightened awareness" (*xu*). Another possible path might develop the core theme of "balance", according to Zhuangzi's invitation to "follow the middle" and "stay away from fame and punishments".

Candidates might explore:

- Meaning of the metaphor: Butcher, knife, mastery of a technique, skilfulness
- Spiritual, natural life *versus* social, city life
- Nature as movement, change, transformation
- Personal attuning with nature
- Comparison to other philosophers/schools, eg Epicureanism, Stoicism, Aristotle, Locke, Hume, Rousseau, Emerson, Foot, MacIntyre.

(b) To what extent is the achievement of a mastery not a guarantee of wisdom?**[15]**

Possible discussion points include:

- Difference between technique and art; whether it is possible to learn/train art
- Concepts of wisdom and sage life
- Importance of balance, of the middle
- Fame and punishments
- Wisdom as a "spiritual state of heightened awareness".

24. (a) Explain Zhuangzi’s view of morality in relation to Ruist and Mohist ideas. [10]

The question focuses on an argument that is clearly expressed in Zhuangzi’s Chapter 4, *The Realm of Human Interactions (Ren Jian Shi)*. Candidates might illustrate Ruist and Mohist ideas of morality and refer to Zhuangzi’s criticism of them. Therefore, responses might analyse the meaning of Ruist concepts such as “humanity” (*ren*) and “rightness” (*yi*) and Mohist terms such as “correct” (*shi*) and “not correct” (*fei*). Also, the importance of other keywords might be underlined, such as “preference”, “pleasure”, “benefit”, “harm” and “pain”. Some responses might well connect Zhuangzi’s criticism of Ruist and Mohist moral ideas to his more general view of nature and society. In fact, Zhuangzi’s criticism is mainly grounded in the consideration of Ruist and Mohist as holding dangerous conceptions, inasmuch as they do not take into account Zhuangzi’s suggestion not to confront triggering situations: As a supporting argument, candidates might mention the story of Yen Hui, a Confucius follower, and his intention to “rectify” a corrupted state and its King. Responses might insist on Zhuangzi’s idea that people can barely face the intertwined situations of a complex social and artificial life, particularly in those cases of corruption, danger, or provocation. In these situations, sages should be skilful enough to avoid dangers and steer these situations to a less challenging point. Candidates might consider Zhuangzi’s idea that socialisation and civilisation tend to impede their capacity to attune themselves with the characteristics of nature: Change, transformation, development, whereas the aim is to perform the balanced behaviour of heart and mind (*xinzhai*).

Candidates might explore:

- Ruist and Mohist ideals: Humanity (*ren*), rightness (*yi*), correct (*shi*), not correct (*fei*)
- Zhuangzi’s view of nature; transformation and change
- Nature *versus* society
- Dangerous situations, social undertakings, corruption, provocation
- Appropriate behaviour in danger situations
- Story of Confucius’s follower, Yen Hui, and the King.

(b) To what extent might Ruist and Mohist ideas be considered dangerous? [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Zhuangzi’s criticism of Ruist and Mohist ideas
- Preference, judgment, pleasure, benefit, harm, pain
- Sage behaviour; balance, wisdom, attuning with nature, potencies
- Harmony as independent from passions
- Feelings as earthly, changing elements
- Comparison to other traditions, eg Epicureanism, Stoicism, Christianity.