

# Markscheme

November 2018

Philosophy

Higher level and standard level

Paper 1

22 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.

## 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 7 for the core theme and page 10 for the optional themes.

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

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

**Note to examiners**

Candidates at both Higher Level and Standard Level answer **one** question on the core theme (Section A).  
Candidates at Higher Level answer **two** questions on the optional themes (Section B), each based on a different optional theme.

Candidates at Standard Level answer **one** question on the optional themes (Section B).

**Paper 1 Section A markbands**

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

## Section A

### Core theme: Being human

#### 1. Image of an android.

[25]

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

This question requires candidates to identify and discuss philosophical issues and/or concepts in the set passage related to the fundamental question of what it is to be human. The image of the android might give place to deal with almost all issues and concepts involved in the core theme. Responses are likely to focus on human identity, human nature, where the boundaries of being human lie, and whether machines could be considered persons. Are persons immaterial (non-spatial) souls only contingently attached to their bodies (as Plato and Descartes believed)? Are persons wholly material beings? If so, are persons necessarily animals of a certain sort, or might there be robot persons? The discussions may include religious, psychological, neurological and metaphysical accounts of the human person and behaviour. Responses might also look at the possibility of drawing comparisons between human and human-like devices, and the possibility of artificially replicating brain activity through computing and other technological advances. Artificial intelligence tries to make computer systems do what minds can do: interpreting a photograph as depicting a face; offering medical diagnoses; using and translating language. Further, artificial intelligence might help us to understand human (and animal) minds, or even intelligence in general.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Man and robot? Man or robot? What is it to be a person? Could machines be persons?
- Are robots socially isolated or social beings?
- Do robots have self-reflection? The robot is reading about robots
- The relationship between the body and the mind; the possible technological replication of both
- Robots as products of artificial intelligence
- The view that instantiating a computer programme is sufficient for having mental states that are full of content
- The extent to which being a body and having feelings and emotions is constitutive of being human, and even being a person
- Discussions on artificial intelligence; the Chinese room argument; Searle's argument
- Is technology a way of transforming the human nature? Is there any sense in keeping the idea of "human nature"?
- Would androids have consciousness, intentionality?
- Sequences of 'mental states' and human experience
- Are we imprisoned by the technological development?
- Human nature and human future.

**2. Image of Fernando Botero's painting *A family*.**

**[25]**

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

This question requires candidates to identify and discuss philosophical issues and/or concepts in the picture related to the fundamental question of what it is to be human. The painting of a family presents the nuclear starting point of the relation between human beings and triggers a series of questions connected to the relation between the self and the other as being constitutive of the human condition. Responses are likely for example to focus on some of the possible approaches to family. A metaphysical approach draws on the commands of a deity or the needs of a nation. A biological approach appeals to physical resemblance, blood or genes. An economic approach focuses on family property, income, division of work and resources, and inheritance. A related political approach attends to power, subordination, and rights within a family, as well as to their regulation by the state. A psychological approach takes affection, identification, intimacy, and emotional needs as morally decisive. A narrative approach makes recalling and revision of family stories the basis of moral education and the definition of family ties. Responses could also refer to more general issues involved in the social dimensions of the human life, *eg* civil society, political contract or conceptions of human nature. This could include discussion of issues such as individuality and universality, the opposition between freedom and determinism, or focus on issues such as identity and personhood, exploring questions in relation to social and cultural identity.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Interpretations of the human condition: Biological and social necessities; social conditioning
- Solipsism and intersubjectivity
- Is how we interact with others what makes us human?
- A human being is a social creature, because essential human capacities and aims are completely fulfilled only in a human community
- The individual's well-being or happiness must involve the good of fellow members of a community
- Contrast between traditional, various cultural interpretations of family, and modern understanding of the concept of family
- Family as a group of individuals compared to clans and tribes
- Philosophical views, *eg* Plato, Rousseau, Mill, de Beauvoir
- For Confucius the life of every human being is played out within the context of his or her particular family, for better or for worse. It is one's family and the complex of relationships that constitute it; one is one's roles and relationships
- Many other species are described as possessing a social way of life. However, human society would go beyond mere gregariousness, cooperation or some form of order or division of labour
- Ways in which human society is characterized: Social action, or interaction, in terms of the particular kinds of awareness it involves; social order as a form of order that arises spontaneously when rational and mutually aware individuals succeed in solving coordination problems; the role played by communication in achieving collective agreement on the way the world is to be classified and understood, as a precondition of coordination and cooperation
- We depend on others when learning language; it helps us perform various social functions and many of its uses have become institutionalized.

**Paper 1 Section B markbands**

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



## Section B

### Optional theme 1: Aesthetics

#### 3. Evaluate the claim that “art is ruled uniquely by the imagination”. [25]

The claim is by Benedetto Croce and represents his view of art and the role that imagination plays in it. Candidates might consider the relationship between art and imagination by starting from the ancient philosophical traditions, eg pre-Socratic conception of images as imitation of reality, Plato’s view of images as *phantasies* or false appearances, or Aristotle’s distinction between *poiesis* and *praxis*. Candidates might also refer to the role played by imagination in religious art, by mentioning different uses of art images as representations of deity, eg in Christianity, or leading to a misrepresentation of it, eg in iconoclasm. Another path might lead candidates to pinpoint the importance of imagination as a crucial element of creativity, and as such, a powerful tool for art production. Candidates might also refer to the difference between “imaginative” and “imaginary”, eg in Dewey’s view, which presented a negative and a positive function of imagination: For imaginary refers to an arbitrary understanding of things, while imaginative is grounded in the surrounding environment – similar distinction is the one between “imagination” and “fancy” operated by Coleridge. According to these or comparable views, candidates might consider the relationship between imagination, art, and truth and evaluate whether art should circulate truths according to a social order or not. Candidates might also analyse imagination within the art production process, by referring to the relationship between creativity and technique: Eg Croce’s definition of art leads to a balanced combination of technical skills and imaginative spirituality.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Pre-Socratic conceptions of imagination and images
- Plato’s view of imagination; *phantasies*
- Aristotle’s distinction between *poiesis* and *praxis*
- Imagination in religious art, eg iconography, iconoclasm
- Imaginative versus imaginary, eg in Dewey’s view
- Imagination and truth
- Imagination and social values
- Imagination and creativity *versus* technique.

4. Evaluate the claim that “the art challenges the technology, and the technology inspires the art”.

[25]

The claim is by John Lasseter, co-founder of Pixar, and focuses on the relationship between art and technology, how they mutually affect each other, and the effects that they produce. Candidates might focus on the first historical examples of the relationship between art and technology and/or on the first philosophical distinctions between technical production and art, eg Aristotle’s view on *poiesis* and *praxis*. Candidates might also refer to distinction between means and ends as a classical way to interpret the gap between art and technique. Croce’s view on the possession of technical skills and spiritual inspiration might be another element of analysis. Candidates might consider the “digital revolution” as the new development that art has experienced thanks to the application of new technologies and devices, eg computer graphics, digital photography, lifecasting, etc. Candidates might also evaluate the impact of new digital technologies on the art production process and whether they help art spreading or overworking. The focus on the use, misuse, or abuse of social network as a product of technology and its effect on reception and perception of art might be another point of discussion. Another path that candidates might follow is offered by Ortega y Gasset’s view on the “revolt of the masses”: Candidates might take into account the concepts of massification, homologation, conformity, alienation and the likes. A similar approach might lead candidates to mention other philosophical views, such as the Frankfurt School and/or Structuralism.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Ancient philosophical views on technology and art: Eg *techne* and art; *poiesis* versus *praxis*
- Croce’s view on technical skill and art inspiration
- Digital revolution: Computer graphics, digital photography, lifecasting, etc
- Spread of art: Positive and negative effects
- Social network and presence of art
- Ortega y Gasset’s view on the “revolt of the masses”
- Alienation, homologation, conformity
- The Frankfurt School; Structuralism, eg Althusser.

## Optional theme 2: Epistemology

### 5. Evaluate the claim that “any statement we make about the world is, in one way or another, a belief”.

[25]

This question invites an evaluation of the concept of belief. Human knowledge is grounded in multiple aspects and it is supported by diverse methodologies: along with experience, observation, deductive and/or inductive reasoning, and emotions, humans build their own view of the world according to their beliefs. Humans tend to believe things to be true, independently from the content of truth of the trusted beliefs or from any verification. Different fields of knowledge call for different levels of certainty and different roles played by beliefs. It is important to make these distinctions to understand the concept of belief. It is of course a complex concept with a complex use. Beliefs are not a matter of religion only; faith and beliefs can also be present in science, as it happens in the case of theory-ladenness. Beliefs usually play a basic role in motivating human action. Candidates might consider how beliefs contribute to the human knowledge and whether for humans it is more important to believe than finding out the truth. In this way, a response might explore and analyse nature, different aspects, practical use and limitations of beliefs.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- What is a belief?
- Knowledge is justified true belief
- How can we differentiate between belief and other ways of understanding the world?
- Is all knowledge a species of belief?
- Is any statement really an expression of faith and/or trust in a personal experience, person, power or other entity?
- Are we really able to know the world in a sustainable way?
- What could be the role of perception in this process?
- How could we measure the difference between a simple belief and a strong belief?
- Can we draw a distinction between acceptance and belief? Are there cases in which one accepts a proposition without believing it and cases in which one believes a proposition without accepting it? *Eg*, a scientist doing research
- Plato’s idea of belief (*eg* the Divided Line), Descartes’s consideration of belief
- Could some ways of measuring or testing the strength of a belief that a certain thing is the way it is actually be believed to be the case?
- To what extent do we depend on belief to handle the daily life we undertake?

**6. Evaluate the claim that “if no defeaters of one’s justification exist, a subject would be epistemologically justified”.** [25]

This question invites an evaluation of the ways of justifying knowledge. The question offers the chance of discussing some aspects of the indefeasibility theory. Justification of beliefs and knowledge is a central aspect of epistemology and, as such, has recently implied a specific epistemic approach, which is based on the concept of defeat or defeasibility. Some, for example, argue that a definition of knowledge that could ever be immune to all counter-examples is in effect the infallible one. From this standpoint, beliefs call for their justification, which means that they must be true and, as such, they lead to infallible knowledge. But others support the indefeasibility theory, maintaining that there should be no overriding or defeating truths for the reasons that justify one's belief. This epistemological position is based upon an analogy with the legal and ethical concept of a defeasible, or *prima facie*, obligation. The indefeasibility theory states that knowledge can solely rely upon beliefs, which are justified and true: this is a necessary, though not sufficient, condition. The reason why the condition is not sufficient is ascribable to the fact that a previously justified belief can turn into a false belief, in the light of new evidence and facts, which would work as defeaters. Candidates might evaluate the role that justification and truth play in human knowledge. Candidates might also evaluate whether a defeasible knowledge is possible or undefeated beliefs only can be assumed to be true.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- How could we understand the indefeasibility theory?
- To what extent is the theory important in contemporary philosophy?
- Is the indefeasibility definition of knowledge a strong one?
- Do we need to rely on it?
- Popper’s falsification
- Ayer’s verificationism
- Descartes’s “malevolent demon”
- Socratic method
- The possibility of a valid Gettier counter-example as a contrast
- Sociological and Foucaultian approaches to knowledge
- Could an individual’s justified true belief fail to count as knowledge because the justification is defective as a source of knowledge?
- Could we support a definition like the one proposed by the indefeasibility theory for practical reasons?
- Is defeasible reasoning a route to the process of justification?
- What might be some limitations to defeasible reasoning?

### Optional theme 3: Ethics

#### 7. Evaluate the view that human beings should be moral.

[25]

This question invites an evaluation of the reasons why humans should be moral. Why should we act well; be good; hold certain values? One of the main issues that must be considered is what we mean by morality: When we suggest that acting morally is important, what do we mean by that? How are morally correct and appropriate actions distinct from those, which are morally abhorrent? There are a variety of different concepts of morality, and a variety of different ways in which it is defined and considered. Further, like so many philosophical issues, quite often definitions of morality are framed only in terms of questions, or in terms of what they are not. In order to properly consider the question “why human beings should be moral”, then, we must consider a variety of different conceptions of what morality is, taken from a variety of different roots and traditions. Each of these stances and takes on what morality is will reveal a different perspective on why one should be moral. A subsequent consideration of all of these many conceptions will allow a broader perspective to be taken, involving an analysis of the value and validity of the perceptions considered, which will allow wider conclusions regarding why individuals should be moral.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- One of the main issues that must be considered is what we mean by morality: When we suggest that acting morally is important, what do we mean by that?
- The concept of morality as linked to law and to punishment, *eg* Nietzsche
- Is morality a weakness of humanity? *Eg* Nietzsche
- By considering whether being moral will bring happiness, overall – not just to an individual but to society as a whole, *eg* utilitarianism, Nussbaum, Sen, Singer
- Classical approaches to morality might be explored, *eg* teleological, deontological, religious, utilitarian, consequentialist
- Religion is for many individuals a key reason to be moral
- Are some values not moral?
- “Act only according to that maxim whereby you can, at the same time, will that it should become a universal law” – Kant’s suggestion that before you decide whether a particular action is the morally correct one, you should consider whether you would be happy for that action to be applied universally
- Ethics as a practical exercise, training, *eg* in Aristotle’s view
- Therefore, as citizens of the same world, we have a duty to act in a way that is appropriate to all societies and situations, because, unlike animals, we are capable of asking such questions as “What should I do in any given situation?”
- We must strive to be moral in order to prevent the arguably unthinkable alternative: Immorality
- Moral skepticism.

8. **To what extent are intellectual and moral virtues essential for living an ethical life?** [25]

This question invites an exploration of what is essential for ethical living. Candidates might look at the idea of what it means to live an ethical life. Candidates might refer to Aristotle, MacIntyre or Foot and their specific understanding of intellectual and moral virtues. For Aristotle there are two types of virtues. Intellectual virtues are qualities of mind. These are associated to the rational part of the soul, and are cultivated and accomplished through education, instruction and practice. Moral virtues are qualities of character and are linked to the desiderative or non-rational part of the soul, and are developed through practice and habitual repetition. MacIntyre explains a virtue as something human beings acquire and which then allows humans to achieve certain “Goods”. These “Goods” are valued outcomes for an individual or others. For MacIntyre ‘Goods’ that benefit a community are preferable to “Goods” which only benefit individuals. Foot believed that virtues are valuable characteristics humans should have. Just as people need to have strength and health, so they need virtues; but while strength and health are qualities of the body, virtues are qualities of the will. Foot also maintained that virtues appear to relate to a person’s innermost cravings. Not only do “virtuous” actions reflect attitudes but the virtues are seen as a corrective against temptation. In some cases, the virtues are there, Foot argued, to prompt us to act when we might not do so eg in the cases of justice or charity.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The nine intellectual virtues, developed by training and education and, in the case of *phronesis*, by living and maturing. The 5 primary ones are *techne*, *episteme*, *phronesis*, *nous* and *sophia*
- The twelve moral virtues including courage, generosity, magnanimity, proper ambition, patience, truthfulness, friendliness and modesty
- Aristotle believed that the soul was home to and operated these virtues
- The “golden mean” as indicative of behaviour, otherwise a virtue could easily turn into a vice. An excess or deficiency of a virtue was a vice
- For MacIntyre the most important virtues are honesty, courage and justice
- MacIntyre sees the “Goods” as being both internal and external
- A significant difference between Foot’s virtue ethics and Aristotelian virtue ethics is that Foot makes the point that when talking about “virtues”, we are referring to moral virtues, whereas Aristotle also included the arts and excellence of the intellect in his definition of *arete*
- Foot’s position that we have four cardinal moral virtues; courage, temperance, wisdom and justice. However, Aristotle claims just three cardinal moral virtues as he classed practical wisdom (*phronesis*) as an intellectual virtue.

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

#### 9. To what extent is terrorism a justified means to produce cultural, social, political or religious change?

[25]

The question opens an evaluation of whether terrorism is a valid means of producing change in society. A simple but relevant way to focus the discussion is the common expression “The ends justify the means”. An analysis of the means to an end might provide different approaches to the use of terrorism. In discussing the violence associated with terrorism, it might help to begin with some obvious pre-theoretical examples, such as knife attacks, savage beatings, shootings, bombings and torture. Offering such cases is insufficient for the philosophical concept but they serve as a starting point to investigate the weave of issues and questions involved, one of which is the very definition of the notion of violence. Accepting or rejecting the use of violence involves a conception of it. A well-known idea treats violence as the illegitimate use of force. It involves a norm of political legitimacy characterizing violence as an illegal employment of methods of physical coercion for personal or group ends. In relation to the use of violence legitimate state is the only authorized agent that can employ force. Further, between the many problems involved in the discussion it appears the value of the human life, showing one of the various threats that connect this discussion with ethical issues and views.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Different types of terrorism
- Would any rational person agree that violence is not legitimate unless the consequences of such action are to eliminate a still greater evil?
- Whether it is possible to evaluate the reasons and ends of a group using violence
- The commitment to nonviolence and the justification that in almost all real circumstances there is a better way than resort to violence
- Examples of the use of terrorism in the past or in recent years
- A new form of society rises out of the actions that are taken to form it, and the institutions and the ideology it develops are not independent of those actions; actions that are cynical and vicious, whatever their intent, will inevitably condition and deface the quality of the ends that are achieved
- Is terrorism compatible with human rights and values?
- Is there a relationship between absence of terror and the degree of organization, meaningful programs and spontaneity, on the one hand, and success in achieving a just society on the other?
- The idea that there is a distinction between the use of terror by oppressed peoples against the oppressors, in comparison with the use of terror by their oppressors in the interests of further oppression
- The use of terror by the state
- Which is the heavier price, the price for violent revolution, or the price for peaceful stagnation?
- The concepts of structural violence and civil disobedience.

**10. Evaluate philosophically the claim that reality is changing as a consequence of the new media culture.**

**[25]**

The question paraphrases a central argument developed between others by Jean Baudrillard. As people spend more and more time with electronic communications, more time exchanging symbols through the mediation of increasingly smart machines, the world of face-to-face was becoming the world of the “interface”. Baudrillard called this emerging culture “the hyperreal”. Hyperreality was built upon new cultural principles. Symbolic constructions are no longer rooted in an original reference such as a spoken conversation or a written letter. Now language is increasingly “simulational” in the sense that the presentation is always both an original and a copy. The TV news does not really report about something in an “external world”: It makes important what it states, creating news as it reports about it. This communicational logic increasingly dominates the exchanges of words and images, gradually forming a new and different culture. The new form of communication moulded by the media is fundamental to the present human construction of reality. We are born in a world in which communication already exists; we learn what is characteristic of this world and its culture through the social interaction and communicative processes, *eg* learning to speak. In so doing we learn what reality means to us.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Communication involves the use of signs that humans learn during their socialization and which, as symbols, are for the most part entirely arbitrary, depending for their meaning upon conventionalized social rules
- The role of the new social media language changing the world
- Media cultures are cultures of mediatization: That is, cultures that are moulded by the media
- The society of spectacle, *eg* Debord
- Infotainment
- In the world of new social media, who defines truth?
- Hyperreality would be a dominant way of experiencing and understanding the world and itself is a kind of world without a real origin. It is produced algorithmically (or via mathematical formulae), like the virtual reality of computer code. Further, the hyperreal doesn’t exist in the realm of good and evil, because it is measured as such in terms of its performativity – how well does it work or operate?
- Reality and fiction; usual comparisons, *eg* Plato’s allegory of the cave and *The Matrix*
- The role of the media in modern societies and their relation to the functioning of democracy
- The concept of the public sphere, as the historically conditioned social space where information, ideas and debate can circulate in society, and where political opinion can be formed, *eg* Arendt
- The general public has been characterized by traditional apathy and obedience
- The media culture shapes our everyday reality at various levels: Ideas, feelings, models, values *etc*
- Is the actual non-disappearance of the book as a communicative form a kind of counter-argument against the new media culture pre-eminence?



**Optional theme 5: Philosophy of religion****11. Evaluate the claim that a god is nothing more than the being of man himself. [25]**

This question allows for both a discussion about the nature of a divine being as being different to man and also whether humans have and can construct a divine being in their own likeness. As much as this centres upon Feuerbach's aim to demystify god/gods, it also raises issues of the extent to which humans need a god as a psychological crutch. Humans give qualities to a divine being such as enduring love, omnipotence, omnipresence and as source of moral and temporal laws. It might be argued that a divine being is simply a part of the human make up and exists only within humans. Therefore, religious rituals as mystical superstition could be seen as harmful as they produce alienation, because they would create a separation of one part of human nature from another. Problems exist in the fact that some humans might create no god, many gods and/or different gods. Questions can be raised as to how humans can attribute to god qualities that they cannot fully comprehend. Issues of the rise of naturalism and scientific verification of external forces might lead to the conclusion that a god must be within a human's mind rather than external to them.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Humans need to have a psychological support; people need additional options in which they can find security, comfort inspiration
- The degree to which a god is a response to fear and uncertainty
- The cultural variation in forms of a god might confirm that god is a social construct reflective of the specifics of space and time
- A belief in god being rational/irrational
- The reverse argument be entertained, in that humans are constructs and extensions of a god
- The diverse qualities of a god could be claimed to make it impossible for a god to be a human construct
- God as a human construct for social control purposes; a Marxist stance
- Nietzsche's views on the significance of belief in a god creating weak and unfree peoples
- The idea that simple societies produce simple gods and more complex societies produce more complex gods confirms the idea that a god is a societal construct
- The degree to which the acceptance of a god is a manifestation of a collective consciousness, a "togetherness" of a society.

**12. Evaluate the role within religion of reason and faith.****[25]**

This question seeks an evaluation of the differing roles both reason and faith can play in religion. By evaluating both, the interactivity between them can be developed. A simplistic view might be taken to argue that they are polar opposites in the realm of religion. However, the biblical claims that it is human reason that affirms the existence and nature of God can be expanded into the argument from design and the teleological approach to proving God's existence. Plantinga's argument that it is rational and reasonable to believe in a god links the two concepts together. It is the belief-in and not so much a belief-that which is the basic characteristic of faith. Faith arises when an understanding of a god is taken from a scientific investigation to a more personable issue of sensibilities, feeling and attitudes as suggested by Pascal and Kierkegaard. Within this metaphysical/spiritual area there is a different reason at work. Within religion, reason might be used to support claims to truth rather than offer proof, as revelation and personal experience is blind. Language games might be used to show that the two concepts are operated by humans according to different rules. Flew's falsification approach might also appear and be challenged in that religious statements might not be open to thorough investigation as the foundations of them are personal conviction.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The limits of reason in that it seems not to be able to explore infinity and revelation
- Religious metaphors and symbolism move into areas beyond rational explanation. Qualities and sensibilities need and produce a different type of knowledge
- The degree to which a god is not within an empirical world; contrasts might be made with the arguments from design
- Difference between belief-in and belief-that might be developed
- Fideism
- Pascal's distinction between "*l'esprit de finesse*" and "*l'esprit de géométrie*"
- William James's "passional", an interaction of emotion, faith, and reason
- Grounded belief as a basis for faith that might be free from objection or challenge; Plantinga
- Humans can encounter and use different kinds of truths even when they come from very different kinds of sources
- The problem of evil and attempts to explain its existence; the use of both faith and reason.

## Optional theme 6: Philosophy of science

### 13. Explain and discuss scientific realism.

[25]

Scientific realists argue that observable facts provide good indirect evidence for the existence of a variety of unobservable entities such as atoms, viruses, photons *etc.* Realism is probably the most intuitive position, since most would probably assume that what our best scientific theories say about the world is true. However, the fact we don't really directly perceive those entities raises the question: Do we know they are really there, and if so how? These questions divide philosophers of science into scientific realists who believe in the reality of theoretical entities and anti-realists or instrumentalists (after the view that theoretical postulates are just instruments for generating predictions) who do not. In the 1960/70s philosophers like Smart and Putnam proposed the "miracles" argument for scientific realism. They argued that unless the theoretical entities employed by scientific theories actually existed and the theories themselves were at least approximately true of the world at large, the evident success of science (in terms of its applications and predictions) would surely be a miracle. Consequently, the most one could conclude from scientific success, however impressive, is that science is on the right track. That could mean, on the track to truth or it could just mean on the track to empirical success, perhaps with severely flawed representations of reality. The "miracles" argument is inconclusive. Nevertheless, during the next two decades it was compelling for many philosophers. Indeed, during this period realism became so identified with science that questioning realism was quickly put down as anti-science.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Scientific theories tend to be successful because their observational predictions usually come out true
- Scientific methodology is "instrumentally trustworthy" in that it leads to successful theories that make true observational predictions
- The unobservables of science exist and there are good explanations of the characteristics and behaviour of observed entities that otherwise might remain inexplicable
- Realism, as some argue, depends on an inference to the best explanation approach
- Instrumentalists posit that we are in no position to make firm judgments about imperceptible mechanisms
- One challenge for the realist comes from the fact that many theories in history were successful, whereas modern science tells us that they were fundamentally mistaken in the way they describe the world
- Anti-realists believe that science is full of theories that have been proved incorrect and in fact the majority of theories are either rejected outright or refined to some degree
- Quantum physics and realism
- Anti-realists believe that theories are merely useful tools, even used after they are proved wrong.

**14. To what extent can it be claimed that science progresses through “paradigm shifts”? [25]**

The term “paradigm shift” was coined by Thomas Kuhn. A paradigm shift is believed to happen when you start to think about something in a completely different way. The classic example is the shift from a geocentric world view to a heliocentric one during the Copernican revolution. For Kuhn the two main uses of “paradigm shift” are when considering scientific endeavour as a matrix and when considering it as a model. It can be seen as a conceptual model in which a theory is allowed to develop and matures. For Kuhn science is a social event and so it is important for scientists to congregate and share definitions, hypotheses *etc.* Scientists rely on each other to help explain science and thus allow for paradigm shifts to become a reality. Equally a paradigm shift can be seen as the appropriate approach of how to solve a scientific problem. In contrast to Popper, Kuhn denied being an anti-realist or even a relativist. Kuhn argued that new paradigms cannot build on old ones but supplant previous theories through a process of scientific revolution. For Kuhn conflicting paradigms are incommensurable. Conflicting paradigms rest on incompatible assumptions, and define many of their key terms differently. As a consequence, there is no common ground that can serve as a basis for resolving such a conflict between. Therefore, the concept of scientific progress may not be as clear cut as supposed because how one comprehends the notion of progress may be bound up with one’s view on matters such as truth, realism and the status of methodological principles *etc.*

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The concept of scientific progress
- Kuhn posits that science has characteristic phases that he terms “normal science” and “revolutionary science”
- Whether pre- and post-revolutionary science have different standards for comparison
- Whether pre- and post-revolutionary science provide different fields of data
- Whether pre- and post-revolutionary science for Kuhn occupy different worlds
- Whether pre- and post-revolutionary science harbour different meanings – the meaning of terms derives from their role in a scientific theory
- Is there one set of criteria valid for all scientists at all times? Or do the criteria differ from one period to another or between disciplines?
- Other ways of considering scientific progress
- Kuhn’s views have also been interpreted by some in a thoroughly relativistic way as undermining the idea of objective progress in science or any other field for that matter.

**Optional theme 7: Political philosophy****15. Evaluate the claim that non-violence is a useful tool to produce political change. [25]**

This question invites a discussion on the use of non-violence as a specific political tool. Non-violence is a social and political practice that has historically contributed to social change, particularly to fighting oppression of minorities and inequalities. Candidates might mention one or more historical examples of non-violent action, *eg* Gandhi or Martin Luther King. Responses might also analyse non-violent principles of political philosophers and/or intellectuals, such as in Saint-Simon, Tolstoy or Thoreau. As counter-examples, candidates might take into account insurrections and revolutions and whether they imply the use of violence. Responses might also consider whether non-violence has played any role in achieving social and/or political change within religious contexts, *eg* Christianity, Islam, Buddhism, *etc*. In a wider sense, candidates might refer to philosophical views on the connection between political forms of government, involving public debate, limitation of powers, a system of checks and balances, and the promotion of non-violence, *eg* Dewey's stress on democracy. The power of some non-violent methods or forms (like education, mass non-cooperation or civil disobedience) may be analysed.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- How can we understand non-violence as a political attitude?
- To what extent is the non-violent attitude a useful tool in facing oppression or injustice?
- Historical examples of non-violent actions, *eg* Gandhi, Martin Luther King
- Political philosophers/intellectuals promoting non-violence, *eg* Saint-Simon, Tolstoy, Thoreau
- Is it possible to oppose non-violence to violence?
- How can we analyse the impact of this political practice?
- Can we differentiate between non-violence and passivity?
- What are some of the non-violent methods that could be used by the advocates of an activist philosophy of non-violence?
- How might some critics respond to this political alternative?
- What are the moral implications of fighting violence with non-violence?
- Non-violence action and religion, *eg* Christianity, Islam, Buddhism
- Philosophical views on political forms of government promoting non-violence, *eg* Dewey's democratic theory.

**16. Explain and discuss the role of ideologies within political action.****[25]**

This question invites a discussion of political ideologies, among the ones that candidates have studied, eg liberalism, conservatism, Marxism, and socialism. The question might analyse the difference between ideological approach and pragmatic and realist ones to political action. While political pragmatism tends to reject theories and ideologies for means-tested facts and reality, ideologies do not give attention to practical consequences. Political ideologies value principles over reality, refusing ways of finding a practical approach to problems and affairs. Political ideologies imply that political problems should be met with practical solutions rather than ideological ones, independently from the specific set of principles and rules pertaining to a specific ideology. Political realism is the willingness to strike a compromise whereby as many people as possible get as much of what they want as possible. It is the willingness to work with others on common goals, regardless of differences on other goals. With so many competing ideologies and systems of thought, agreement is time-consuming and not easy. However, when one looks for “what really works” then the pressure is taken off of needing to agree on political agendas. Candidates might refer to pragmatic political views, which reject ideologies in favour of a sort of political consequentialism, eg Dewey’s political philosophy, which claims the impossibility to ignore experience and results in evaluating political action, or Bell’s view on the end of ideology. As a counter-argument, candidates might consider the risks of not having an ideological framework, which guides political action: the stress on pragmatism and compromise might drive politicians to overlook their political agendas, eg Pareto’s theory of lions and foxes as two types of elites and political action.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Could an opposition be established between a practical approach to politics, which tests ideas, and the ideologist, who writes political theories from a general and sometimes distant perspective?
- Political realism versus utopistic politics, eg Plato’s *Republic*, Machiavelli’s *The Prince*, More’s *Utopia*, Campanella’s *City of the Sun*, Bacon’s *New Atlantis*, Bentham’s *Panopticon*
- Relevant Marxist theory
- Conservatism, liberalism, socialism
- Pragmatic political philosophies, eg Dewey’s view on democracy
- Is there more attention to complexity of reality in the case of the realist approach?
- Could realist politics be criticized for being sometimes opportunist and morally debatable?
- Could political realism turn itself into ideology?
- Are there ideologies that present some practical elements?
- Could we avoid ideology when attempting to solve problems?
- Whether ideology is necessary or it has come to an end, eg Bell’s end of ideology
- The role of compromise in politics
- Pareto’s view on the possibilities of government, theory of lions and foxes.