

Markscheme

November 2019

Philosophy

Higher level and standard level

Paper 2

32 pages

No part of this product may be reproduced in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means, including information storage and retrieval systems, without written permission from the IB.

Additionally, the license tied with this product prohibits commercial use of any selected files or extracts from this product. Use by third parties, including but not limited to publishers, private teachers, tutoring or study services, preparatory schools, vendors operating curriculum mapping services or teacher resource digital platforms and app developers, is not permitted and is subject to the IB's prior written consent via a license. More information on how to request a license can be obtained from <http://www.ibo.org/contact-the-ib/media-inquiries/for-publishers/guidance-for-third-party-publishers-and-providers/how-to-apply-for-a-license>.

Aucune partie de ce produit ne peut être reproduite sous quelque forme ni par quelque moyen que ce soit, électronique ou mécanique, y compris des systèmes de stockage et de récupération d'informations, sans l'autorisation écrite de l'IB.

De plus, la licence associée à ce produit interdit toute utilisation commerciale de tout fichier ou extrait sélectionné dans ce produit. L'utilisation par des tiers, y compris, sans toutefois s'y limiter, des éditeurs, des professeurs particuliers, des services de tutorat ou d'aide aux études, des établissements de préparation à l'enseignement supérieur, des fournisseurs de services de planification des programmes d'études, des gestionnaires de plateformes pédagogiques en ligne, et des développeurs d'applications, n'est pas autorisée et est soumise au consentement écrit préalable de l'IB par l'intermédiaire d'une licence. Pour plus d'informations sur la procédure à suivre pour demander une licence, rendez-vous à l'adresse <http://www.ibo.org/fr/contact-the-ib/media-inquiries/for-publishers/guidance-for-third-party-publishers-and-providers/how-to-apply-for-a-license>.

No se podrá reproducir ninguna parte de este producto de ninguna forma ni por ningún medio electrónico o mecánico, incluidos los sistemas de almacenamiento y recuperación de información, sin que medie la autorización escrita del IB.

Además, la licencia vinculada a este producto prohíbe el uso con fines comerciales de todo archivo o fragmento seleccionado de este producto. El uso por parte de terceros —lo que incluye, a título enunciativo, editoriales, profesores particulares, servicios de apoyo académico o ayuda para el estudio, colegios preparatorios, desarrolladores de aplicaciones y entidades que presten servicios de planificación curricular u ofrezcan recursos para docentes mediante plataformas digitales— no está permitido y estará sujeto al otorgamiento previo de una licencia escrita por parte del IB. En este enlace encontrará más información sobre cómo solicitar una licencia: <http://www.ibo.org/es/contact-the-ib/media-inquiries/for-publishers/guidance-for-third-party-publishers-and-providers/how-to-apply-for-a-license>.

I. QIG availability

The following QIGs are usually available for qualification, but this will be confirmed at the start of the marking session:

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 Paper 2 rubric of answering 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 candidate's 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 assign each mark to the correct question part (*ie* 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:

Examiners use 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 Mill's (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 (*ie* 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 (*ie* 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 9 for part A responses, and page 10 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	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	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 the role of childhood in shaping a woman’s identity.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate the view that a woman’s identity is shaped by her childhood.** [15]

In *The Second Sex* de Beauvoir describes childhood as the source of much of a woman’s identity. Young girls are treated differently from their male counterparts, despite being their equal in terms of strength and mental ability. De Beauvoir uses the physical and mental similarities of children to point out that gender identity is the result of “the influence of others upon the child... she is indoctrinated with her vocation from her earliest years”. Candidates might talk about de Beauvoir’s discussion of “penis envy”, or the infantilization of the young girl, particularly in contrast to boys who are expected to act like adults and take responsibility for their own lives. Girls are expected to please their parents and act as passive objects, whose identity is imposed on them by others. Candidates might reflect on the tension between a girl’s hopes and ambitions and the expectations of society. They might also mention biological traits which contribute to gender, such as the expectation of childbearing and the role of sexual intercourse. The section on childhood begins with the claim that “one is not born a woman but becomes one”. Candidates may refer to the existential philosophical elements influencing de Beauvoir and Sartre’s idea that existence comes before essence. De Beauvoir cites Heidegger, Sartre and Merleau-Ponty as she develops an existentialist response to the restrictive nature of womanhood.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Similarities and differences between male and female children
- The importance of a child’s upbringing in determining their future identity
- The biological basis of sex and differences between the sexes
- The experiences of boys as opposed to girls, as described by the text
- Whether gender is physically determined or socially determined
- The effect of the female anatomy and physical traits on her identity
- The experiences of the adolescent and adult woman and how they shape her identity
- The idea that individuals can create their own identities and are not truly restricted by the identities imposed by society
- How women might overcome the effect of society on their identities.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The extent to which men and women are determined by their physical attributes
- Whether gender is objective or subjective, innate or societal
- Whether people can choose their own modes of existence
- Links to modern philosophical work on gender bias
- Broader critiques of existentialism such as Marcuse’s view that it projects anxiety and meaninglessness onto people’s lives
- Changes in society since de Beauvoir published *The Second Sex* and whether these have an impact on her arguments
- The extent to which women can escape the constraints of their physical and societal bounds and how this might be accomplished.

2. (a) **Explain de Beauvoir’s discussion of whether women are subjects or objects.** [10]
- (b) **To what extent is the woman an object and the man a subject?** [15]

De Beauvoir frequently describes the man as a subject and the woman as an object. To be a subject is to be an agent, in control of and responsible for one’s own life. The man is described as physically and socially a subject. He has physical and societal power, so experiences no conflict between his sense of agency and his place in society. The woman, on the other hand, is an object; sexually, she is the object of a man’s actions. Reproductively, her body is an object, which gestates life. These physical facts contribute to her treatment as an object rather than a subject. However, in order to move away from the restrictions placed on her by society, she must become a subject and an agent. De Beauvoir presents this tension between the woman’s treatment as an object and her desire to be a subject as a tension to be overcome. One solution is de Beauvoir’s discussion of the importance of women being economically active and independent in relation to agency where being economically active gives control over the direction of her life.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Physical ways in which the woman is an object and the man is a subject
- What it means to be a subject, as opposed to an object
- The importance of being a subject and an agent
- The differences between the experiences of men as subjects and women as objects
- How women can move towards being subjects.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Whether anyone is truly a subject or an object (candidates might offer a critique of existentialism)
- Whether women can ever become subjects
- If de Beauvoir’s arguments about the experiences of women are still true today and whether this weakens her arguments
- The extent to which sex and gender determine whether a woman is a subject or an object
- Whether anyone is really an object and what this would mean
- Candidates might refer to other philosophers to provide counter-arguments, eg Freud, Marx, Ortega y Gasset.

René Descartes: *Meditations*

3. (a) **Explain the importance of doubt as a methodological tool.** [10]
- (b) **To what extent do you agree with the idea that Descartes’s doubt is a solid, rational and methodological tool?** [15]

The question focuses on a central argument of Descartes’s philosophy, with particular reference to the methodology he outlines, in which his views are grounded. Doubt is the basic tool Descartes deeply describes and uses, since he ends up in a wide skepticism. The reason why Descartes highlights the importance of doubt as a methodological tool lies in his belief in the faultiness of senses and the knowledge stemming from them. Candidates might explore the examples and topics Descartes illustrates about faultiness of senses and the subsequent falsehoods and might analyse the concept of the “evil demon”. Candidates might consider an explanation of doubt as a methodological tool, by referring to how Descartes sets it up. Also, candidates might consider the grounds of certain knowledge and the distinction of the different kinds of ideas. The idea of “infinite” might lead candidates to explore the concept of God and how Descartes uses it within his methodology. Candidates might refer to the ontological argument and make a comparison to other similar arguments offered by other philosophers, *eg* Anselm. Responses might also contrast Descartes’s view by referring to other philosophers: from the empirical standpoint, *eg* Berkeley, Hume, which considers senses in a radically different way, to the contributions of modern epistemology and philosophy of science, which pinpoint the relativity of knowledge, the role beliefs play even in science, *eg* theory-ladenness, up to the necessity to consider senses and emotions as key-elements of the cognitive processes, *eg* Damasio, Nussbaum.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The methodological proposal of doubting all things
- The general quality of the examples offered to doubt our senses
- The feeling of certainty that he is awake and sitting by the fire
- The possible confusion between dream and reality
- The idea of doubting simple or composite things
- The idea that doubts are not just probable, but that their possibility can never be entirely ruled out
- The idea of God as a supremely good being
- The idea of creating some evil demon and putting aside the possibility of criticism of God as the cause of confusion.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Doubt employed as a powerful tool against Aristotelian philosophy and the old Physics tradition
- Descartes’s criticism of the weight given to the testimony of the senses
- The First Meditation as the foundation of modern skepticism
- Can we doubt studies based on composite things, like astronomy but not doubt those based on simple things, like geometry?
- The true power of the dream argument raised by the author
- The painter’s analogy and the place of mathematics in Descartes’s rationalism
- The connection to other texts (*ie* St Ignatius of Loyola’s *Spiritual Exercises* and his invitation to purge oneself of one’s attachment to the material world)
- The central invitation to leave behind error and prejudices
- Descartes’s doubt as a methodological and rational doubt (not just doubting everything at random, but providing solid reasons for his doubt at each stage)
- Links to others philosophies (Hume, Kant, Wittgenstein)
- Criticisms of doubt, for example from James who says that Cartesian doubt is a psychological impossibility.

4. (a) **Explain the link between God’s existence, power, goodness and the impossibility of deception.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate the link between God’s existence, power, goodness and the impossibility of deception.** [15]

In the first part of the Fourth Meditation Descartes reflects on the ground he has covered so far, observing that all his certain knowledge, and in particular the most certain knowledge that God exists, comes from the intellect, and not from the senses or the imagination. He is certain of God’s existence and also that God would not deceive him, since the will to deceive is a sign of weakness or malice, and God’s perfection would not allow it. Besides, if God created him, God is responsible for his judgment, and so his faculty of judgment must be infallible so long as he uses it correctly. He can be mistaken from time to time but he explains that he finds himself somewhere between God—a perfect, complete, supreme being—and nothingness. He was also created to be only a finite being. When he is wrong, it is not the result of some faulty faculty created by God, but is rather the result of his non-being, his lack of perfection. Finitude leaves room for error. Even if perfect, God’s motives and reasons to create a finite being are incomprehensible to finite beings such as himself. For this reason also, he rejects the search for final causes in physics: it would require a great deal of arrogance to try to read God’s mind or understand God’s motives. Rather than look at one isolated part of the universe, the Meditator suggests he might find perfection if he looks at God’s creation as a whole.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The way Descartes reasons and gives support to his ideas
- In the denial that God could be a deceiver, a particular conception of power and existence familiar in his day is used
- The idea that evil and negative qualities result from a lack of being an infinite being
- The link between infinite being and infinite power and goodness
- The idea that God cannot be a deceiver since he is supremely real and does not participate in any way in nothingness
- The view that human beings are finite and as a result they also participate in nothingness
- The in-between situation of human beings and our ability to err as beings that participate in nothingness
- The inheritance of an ancient Greek conception of virtue: what is real, what is true, and what is good are all closely linked.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Is Descartes entrenched in the ancient worldview that he inherited from the Greeks and the Scholastics?
- Is being good simply a matter of participating in what is real?
- Is evil necessarily linked with unreality?
- Why existence and the power to act are both conceived by Descartes to be positives
- Offer a comparison to other philosophers, for example, Kant (where reason and purpose are things that we apply to the world)
- Goodness as an idea that our reason imposes upon a morally neutral universe
- Why Descartes—through his meditator—suggests that God’s motives are beyond our limited comprehension and – in one way or another – he stops to question
- The role of (his) faith in his philosophy.

David Hume: *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*

5. (a) **Explain the empirical nature of Cleanthes’s design argument.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate Cleanthes’s design argument.** [15]

This question invites an explanation of the classical argument from design as presented by Cleanthes and further discussed in the text. Cleanthes states that since the effects resemble each other, we infer, by analogy, that the causes also resemble each other; and that the author of nature is similar to the mind of man; though possessed of much larger faculties, proportioned to the grandeur of the work. The presentation of the argument starts in part 2 (2.5), but related aspects are further discussed later in the text. In general the design argument is an empirical or *a posteriori* argument for theism. Given the evidence of experience it inductively infers the existence of an intelligent designer of nature. In other words, it attempts to prove the existence of God by demonstrating the high degree of organization and purposive order in the universe. Philo shows that Cleanthes’s facile manner in applying rules of analogy more strongly supports a variety of pagan hypotheses that have important explanatory advantages. In Part 5, he amusingly proposes polytheistic scenarios of universes created by intelligent but juvenile, senile, or underling deities. While fanciful, they have the advantage of explaining apparent imperfections in the universe. Demea asserts that Cleanthes’s empirical argument gives advantages to atheists by conceding the existence of God is not *a priori* certain. Philo objects that Cleanthes’s argument falls far short of empirical certainty. Alternative views might refer to *a priori* arguments, ontological arguments. Contemporary criticisms of the design argument coming from modern scientific understanding, eg evolutionism.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The version presented by Cleanthes in Part 2 relies on the machine analogy rooted in the systems of Galileo and Newton
- Cleanthes characterizes the inference to an intelligent designer, not as a conclusion drawn by weighing evidence, but as an instinctive, immediate feeling that strikes with “a force like that of sensation” (3.7) when contemplating nature’s order. Cleanthes concludes that even if the inference is “irregular” or “contradictory to the principles of logic” by Philo’s account, it is sufficiently supported by “common sense and the plain instincts of nature”
- In Part 6, Philo proposes a pantheistic hypothesis according to which God is the soul of the universe and the universe is God’s body. The suggestion has the advantage of conforming to the uniform evidence of experience that minds exist only in bodies
- In Part 7, Philo proposes that the same features of the world, which lead Cleanthes to see nature as a machine, can be found in the effects of biological generation.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Advocates of the design argument themselves acknowledged that the feeling of intelligent design, while common, is not entirely universal, typically conceding that incurious “savages” and excessively curious skeptics fail to experience it
- In inferences from analogy any deviation from an exact resemblance between objects weakens the probability of inferences based on their resemblance
- If experience shows that ordered effects are produced by non-intelligent as well as intelligent causes, it is arbitrary to conclude that every ordered effect, including nature as a whole, must ultimately be produced by an intelligent cause
- We would need to observe a constant conjunction between intelligent causes and the generation of universes. However, we do not have this kind of evidence regarding the universe since it is a unique, single entity
- Being a classical empirical or *a posteriori* argument for theism, the design argument might be compared with other *a priori* and *a posteriori* arguments.

6. (a) **Explain Philo’s position that “a total suspense of judgement” is the best response to religious systems.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate Philo’s position that “a total suspense of judgement” is the best response to religious systems.** [15]

The statement which practically closes Part 8 gives an opportunity to explain Philo’s position as an instance of skepticism regarding religion. Philo’s proposal is that topics concerning objects beyond human experience, such as the nature of God, are so uncertain that it is not reasonable to trust any speculations about them. The *Dialogues* thus portrays skepticism regarding religion, from Philo’s point of view, as “entirely owing to the nature of the subject” (8.1). However, since the very point of dispute between philosophical theists and skeptics is whether questions about the nature of God are in fact beyond the scope of human reason and experience to determine, Philo’s skepticism is, from Cleanthes’s point of view, excessive at least with respect to religion, and so he teases Philo for acting like a Pyrrhonian. Philo has then the task of explaining why the evidence for theism does not warrant belief. “In subjects, adapted to the narrow compass of human reason, there is commonly but one determination [...] But in such questions as the present, a hundred contradictory views may preserve a kind of imperfect analogy; and invention has here full scope to exert itself” (224). Possible critiques of religion in contemporary philosophy might be raised: rational reconstruction of the practical intentions or semantic content of religious belief; the continuation of the interpretation of religion as ideological or illusory.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Different systems of cosmogony, which would have some faint appearance of truth, might be proposed, eg the old Epicurean hypothesis
- Philo’s position that every event, before experience, is equally difficult and incomprehensible; and every event, after experience, is equally easy and intelligible
- A supposition discussed: if matter were thrown into any position, by a blind, unguided force
- The idea that every individual is perpetually changing, and every part of every individual, and yet the whole remains, in appearance, the same. It happens that the parts of the world are so well adjusted
- Cleanthes’s insistence that there is a benevolent design, which gave rise to the order and arrangement of the universe.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- We are suspended between life and death, health and sickness. These unknown causes become the constant object of our hope and fear; and while the passions are kept in perpetual alarm by an anxious expectation of the events, the imagination is equally employed in forming ideas of those powers, on which we have so entire a dependence
- Anthropomorphism might lead to us seeing the cosmos as ordered in terms of our experience
- Ignorance as cause of religious explanation
- Religious systems tend to an offensive war exposing the absurdities, barbarities, and pernicious tenets of his antagonist
- Since we can have no guarantee that we possess a religious truth we are not justified in imposing on others our own beliefs about these matters. Toleration would be the only proper response to our fallibility or to the absence of any discernible truth with respect to religious beliefs
- The philosophical debate that began in the Enlightenment with regard to the criteria and arguments for a religion connected either to human nature or to public reason
- Arguments for the reasonableness of religion
- Views which argue the compatibility between religious belief and scientific knowledge.

John Stuart Mill: *On Liberty*

7. (a) **Explain Mill’s argument for the freedom to express an opinion.** [10]
 (b) **Evaluate Mill’s claim that no opinion should be suppressed.** [15]

“If all mankind minus one were of one opinion, and only one person were of the contrary opinion, mankind would be no more justified in silencing that one person than he, if he had the power, would be justified in silencing mankind” (Chapter 2). Mill presents a range of arguments for freedom to express an opinion. One of the most erudite is the fallibility argument, which Mill regards as decisive. To not allow the freedom to express an opinion would be irreconcilable with Mill’s notion of man as a progressive being. For Mill, freedom to express an opinion is a position, which will allow the truth to be assumed for the purposes of action. The supposed utility of a belief is in itself an opinion and thus requires discussion otherwise the infallibility assumption is simply moved from truth to utility. Mill supports a free market of ideas as he argues it is only when all possible views are allowed to compete that the truth may ultimately emerge. Allowing for the fact that mistaken views may contain features of truth, they too should be discussed. There is also the need to question accepted truths in order to maintain their veracity. Thwarting free discussion may inhibit experiments in living which would conflict with a healthy, liberal society as Mill intimated when he stated that “there ought to exist the fullest liberty of professing and discussing, as a matter of ethical conviction...” (Chapter 2). Candidates might consider some criticism, eg Ortega y Gasset’s view on “the revolt of the masses”.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Mill’s fallibility argument (refusing to listen is seen as an assumption of infallibility)
- Mill’s argument is logical rather than psychological
- Truth and utility (Mill believes such a distinction to be doubtful)
- Mill assumes that freedom of speech allows us to discover the truth rather than various forms of censorship
- To prevent free discussion may be bad for both the dissenter and the recipients of opinion
- The dead dogma argument (discussion is desirable in order to, at the very least, keep an opinion alive)
- Mill’s assertion that if a true opinion is not debated, the meaning of the opinion itself may be lost (this can be seen in the history of ethical and/or religious beliefs)
- Mill considers dissenting opinions as being of use socially because they help individuals to comprehend the genuine strength and weaknesses of their own beliefs.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Mill argues that deciding for others logically implies the assumption of infallibility but it is conceivable to suppress opinion without feeling infallible (Gibbs); Mill argued that any reference to what may or may not be “felt” is irrelevant psychology
- Whether Mill’s view of the protection needed for the weak and vulnerable is applicable in a media dominated society
- Mill’s stress and use of a logical approach (rationality) might invite the observation that Mill overestimates the level of rationality in a society
- Mill’s argument that by having diverse opinions, society might be improved
- Mill’s utilitarianism
- Mill’s claim that truth is part of utility (possible problems with claiming that truth is part of utility as there may be cases where they are separate and distinct for example where truth might be in conflict with the public interest)
- If truth is part of utility would this be a contingent matter?
- The free discussion of ideas advocated by Mill (this notion may be weakened in today’s world because some people do not have access to the mass media)
- Freedom of discussion is open to abuse under the appearance of free inquiry; however, only through free discussion can the abuse be exposed and so the possible abuse of a valuable principle does not imply that we should surrender that principle.

8. (a) **Explain Mill’s argument for regarding democracy with suspicion, because it could be seen as a “tyranny of the majority”.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate Mill’s claim that democracy can be seen as a “tyranny of the majority”.** [15]

The question focuses on Mill’s view on democracy and its flaws: despite not being sufficient to guarantee human liberty, Mill holds that freedom must be safeguarded against popular will just as much as it is against the will of a despot. Mill stated that “There is a limit to the legitimate interference of collective opinion with individual independence; and to find that limit, and maintain it against encroachment, is as indispensable to a good condition of human affairs, as protection against political despotism” (Chapter 1). Mill was not opposing majority rule *per se* but warning of the power of a dominant class that decides moral issues and so Mill argued that the majority must not dictate on moral issues. For Mill the will of the people can mean the will of the numerically greater or more politically active. Minorities could face oppression. This oppression could involve law, public opinion, prejudice and superstition. Mill asserted that this would amount to a “tyranny of the majority” (Chapter 1). It is likely that answers will be set within the historical context of democracy prior to and contemporary with Mill as well as democratic examples, both current and historical. The struggle between liberty and authority and Mill’s assertion that the people who have the power are not automatically those that are affected by the power. Mill comes to the conclusion that the will of the people is basically the will of the majority of the active governed people. Candidates might explore alternative views on democracy and citizenship, eg Rousseau, or tyranny of the majority, eg de Tocqueville.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The historical antecedents and the dangers associated with absolute rule
- It might appear that there cannot be any real objection to a democratically elected government that enacts the will of the people
- Problems concerning what is meant by the will of the people
- Mill’s position that majority views could be wrong and so there must be no dictating on moral issues
- Whether a nation needs protection from itself
- The move to a representative form of government and the notion that interests may coincide
- Mill’s position on perceived dangers not confined to liberal or libertarian position
- The issue of minority pursuits/interests as related to Mill’s conception of humans as progressive beings.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Whether present day democracies evoke the concept of “tyranny” or whether this concept is relatable to past or ancient conditions only
- Whether Mill overestimated the risks of the “tyranny of majority”
- Possible relations between political forms of tyranny and cultural forms of tyranny, eg de Tocqueville’s view on the risks of democracy, Ortega y Gasset’s view on the revolt of the masses, the School of Frankfurt’s views on cultural industry and conformism
- The relationship between individual claims and social powers
- Whether democracy implies that minorities have little power to support their claims
- The relationship between Mill’s view on democracy and utilitarianism
- The role that Mill’s Harm Principle may play.

Friedrich Nietzsche: *The Genealogy of Morals*

9. (a) Explain Nietzsche's concept of punishment. [10]

(b) Evaluate Nietzsche's concept of punishment. [15]

The question arises from one of the central concepts that Nietzsche illustrates in his Second Essay. The concept of punishment is linked to other key-elements of Nietzsche's book, such as bad conscience, guilt and debt. Candidates might explain the origin of the concept according to Nietzsche's view and analyse why he connects it to guilt and debt. The exploration of the concept of punishment might drive candidates to explain the concept of *ressentiment*. Another path of analysis might follow Nietzsche's view on the relationship between creditors and debtors, "which is as old as the very conception of a 'legal subject'". Responses might also focus on the concept of promise and how it relates to memory. Candidates might explain how all these concepts are linked to each other and give account of Nietzsche's linear reasoning. Responses might also consider how the concepts of bad conscience, guilt, debt, and duty are connected to violence and suffering: as Nietzsche states, "all began with a thorough and prolonged bloodletting, like the beginning of all great things on earth". This point might lead candidates to explain the role of cruelty within revenge and how cruelty has historically been a means to pleasure or joy: "No cruelty, no feast: that is what the oldest and longest period in human history teaches us – and punishment, too, has such very strong *festive* aspects!" Finally, candidates might analyse the relation of punishment with bad conscience, by explaining that "state organizations use punishment to protect themselves against the old instincts of freedom", pushing individuals against their own instincts: "Animosity, cruelty, the pleasure of pursuing, raiding, changing and destroying – all this was pitted against the person who had such instincts: *that* is the origin of 'bad conscience'." Counter-arguments might focus on criticism against Nietzsche's concept of "democratic idiosyncrasy": the importance of democratic free debate is the condition for every societal progress. Moreover, the straight defence of freedom, even by the use of violence and cruelty, can mean that someone else could get deprived of their own freedom. References to Kant's argument of peace or more recent examples of non-violent resistance might be presented. Finally, another counter-argument might focus on Nietzsche's misinterpretation of the legal and ethical spheres: to build the ethical reasoning on legal arguments is intended to be a moral distortion, *eg* legalism and casuistry.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The role of punishment as the origin of bad conscience
- Punishment within state organizations
- Human instincts and freedom
- Bad conscience as related to guilt and the creditor/debtor relationship
- Promise and memory with relation to guilt
- Bad conscience with relation to *ressentiment*
- Role of suffering and violence in human societies
- Cruelty as a possible means to pleasure and joy.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Is violence a necessary means to individual freedom?
- Is Nietzsche's definition of "democratic idiosyncrasy" ascribable to a general contempt of the "politically correct" approach?
- Is human history really grounded in violence and bloodletting?
- Is the free democratic debate not a better means to improve societal conditions?
- Similar views of state organizations as sources of punishment, *eg* Hobbes, Bentham, Mill, Weber, and Nozick
- Examples of social and political movements that are based on NVR (non-violent resistance), *eg* Gandhi, M Luther King, Wałęsa, Rose/Orange/Jasmine Revolutions, Cuban dissidents
- Relationship between legal and moral aspects of ethics: do law and morals have the same origin? Or are morals grounded in different principles? Possible distortions of reducing morals to law, *eg* legalism and casuistry.

10. (a) Explain Nietzsche's view on the origin of the value of "good". [10]
- (b) Evaluate Nietzsche's view on the origin of the value of "good". [15]

The question arises from the very beginning of Nietzsche's work. In the first section of the First Essay, Nietzsche pays an initial tribute to the "English psychologists", Locke and Hume, who have made a basic understanding of the human mind possible. Candidates might explain Nietzsche's criticism of the "English moralists" – the reference is to his former friend, Rée – by focusing on the concept of history. According to Nietzsche, these historians of morality "all think in a way that is *essentially* unhistorical". Candidates might explore the two main reasons why Nietzsche criticizes them and their explanation of egoistic/non-egoistic behaviour: 1) the fact that – according to them – the value of "good" arises from the value of "useful", which is created and attributed by the recipients of an action. Candidates might analyse Nietzsche's view that "the judgment 'good' does *not* emanate from those to whom goodness is shown!", but it comes from those who act and define themselves as noble and superior. Responses might pinpoint the importance of the concept of aristocracy and the concept of "pathos of distance" as the sources of any judgment of "good". 2) The fact that, according to the "English psychologists", the judgment "useful" is, at a certain point, forgotten and replaced by the judgment "good". Candidates might analyse Nietzsche's view on the connection between "useful" and "good" and his etymological explanation of the term "good". Therefore, responses might underline the importance of the distinction between noble man and simple man, or aristocracy versus "plebeianism". Candidates might also focus on the clerical caste and on the concepts of political and psychological superiority connected to it. Candidates might analyse the concept of *ressentiment* and the distinction between masters' and slaves' moralities. Possible counter-arguments might refer to evolutionism and evolutionary ethics and highlight the role played by change in the definition of what is intended to be "good", independently from a superior caste. Another possible criticism might consider the concept of "pathos of distance" as not an appropriate source of morals, which might be the result of a wide social consensus instead. Candidates might refer to alternative views of "useful" and "good", *eg* utilitarianism, consequentialism.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Nietzsche's criticism of "English psychologists"
- "Good" versus "useful"
- "Good" and aristocracy; "pathos of distance"
- Genealogy of "good"; etymological meaning of "good"
- Judgments of values are connected to power and superiority, *eg* clerical caste
- Masters' and slaves' moralities
- The concept of *ressentiment*.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Is a historical approach necessary in order to outline a genealogy of morals?
- Rée's view on the origin of the moral sentiments
- Is Nietzsche's criticism of the "English psychologists" well-grounded?
- Evolutionism and evolutionary ethics
- Role of "useful" according to neuro-ethics and neuro-biology of morals, *eg* Churchland
- Are value judgments grounded in aristocracy and superiority or rather do they arise from a free debate and social consensus?
- Are value judgments not ascribable to the action recipients?

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

11. (a) **Explain Nussbaum’s views on the utilitarian approach to measuring quality of life in a nation.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate Nussbaum’s views on the utilitarian approach to measuring quality of life in a nation.** [15]

This question seeks an explanation of Nussbaum’s challenge to a utilitarian approach that was advocated by Bentham and later Mill. Nussbaum puts forward four objections to Bentham’s pseudo-democratic stance of each person only counting for one, irrespective of their station in life, being an effective means of valuing people and their quality of life. The capability approach questions the assumption that underpins a utilitarian approach. The first objection is aggregating the nature of a nation resulting in high numbers of wealthy people overshadowing the needs of the poor. The second inadequacy of the approach results from aggregating across components so that varying types of happiness or pleasure or satisfaction could not be seen as comparable. Human life situations are complex and produce contradictions that might be resolvable. There are, for people, deeper concerns that might need to be accommodated. Preference utilitarianism does not necessarily follow rules of reason. The third criticism is to some extent about social conditioning, and particularly moving away from preferences and desires: women can be conditioned by society into not aspiring to certain roles. An unjust status quo cannot be broken. The fourth criticism is the way utilitarianism undervalues freedom. The freedom to choose and act can be restricted by limiting either the understanding of satisfaction, or being content with a certain role in society. Contentment could maintain women in certain roles; domestic bliss. Freedom is limited by passivity. Alternative comparisons might focus on Sen, Rawls, and utilitarianism in general.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The issue of measuring quality of life, particularly the quality of pleasure
- Can a formula for evaluating quality of life exist?
- The relationship of means and ends
- The problems associated with aggregating the perceptions of a population
- The problem of acquiring objective information that relies on perception of a person’s own condition
- Utility as a means of caring deeply about people.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Judging people’s self-perceptions: the degree to which they can be used to create a holistic picture
- The suitability of a single approach to evaluating human life and the human condition, when both are complex in nature
- The degree to which a “comparative quality of life assessment” tool works
- The degree to which Mill’s more pluralistic approach might resolve the problem of qualitative differences of utility
- How far is the capabilities approach an improvement for social justice?
- Social conditioning being changed by a capability approach
- Who or what institutions can or should be involved in trying to change aspirations?
- The degree to which social minimums are better than no minimums: does a capabilities approach eliminate minimums or simply raise them?
- Is it realistic to increase people’s freedom to choose?
- Is a “resources-based approach” more effective than utility?

12. (a) **Explain the role of education within the capabilities approach.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate the role of education within the capabilities approach.** [15]

This question invites an explanation of the importance of education in addressing the ten main components of the capabilities approach: namely life, health, bodily integrity, senses-imagination-thought, emotions, practical reason, other species, affiliation, play and environmental control. Education at both a child and adult level is seen as fundamental in trying to remove the inequalities and disadvantages that exist within many societies. At a simple level, increasing levels of education raises employment aspirations, collective social activities and political involvement. The gender and ethnic gulfs in the accessibility of education become a major factor in restricting people's freedom of choice and self-enhancement. Education can change the power dynamic in the household and in local and national pursuits. The dignity of humans is developed by education and therefore in some nations it is seen as a fundamental right. Nussbaum uses India and the USA as examples to show how nations stress the importance of access to education in different ways, yet with the same end of securing human development and equal opportunity. Candidates might explore alternative views such as those of Plato, Rousseau and Dewey.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Ways in which education is crucial to a nation's success
- The need to have opportunities for progressive educational development in both institutional progress and skill progress: primary education leading to tertiary education as well as basic literacy and numeracy progressing to critical thinking, creativity and empathy
- Gender discrimination within education in some cultures resulting in social conditioning in terms of social roles and aspirations
- The need for education programmes to be culturally sensitive
- Whether nations see education as upholding their society or changing their society
- The economic impact on nations in offering a broad and inclusive education programme.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The status of soft and hard skills in national education programmes
- The status of vocational and abstract theoretical pursuits in national education programmes
- Hierarchies of education created by access to wealth and social status, as well as gender and ethnic factors
- The degree to which the capabilities approach moves away from just content toward methodology and thinking skills and imagination as a more essential route to creating an involved citizenship
- The need for education to try and break social mores and stereotypes
- Cultural issues related to the role of children: children not being seen as another member of the labour force but rather an immature, potential human who should be given dignity and the opportunity to seek alternative life styles
- National requirements for an educated and critical citizenship.

Ortega y Gasset: *The Origins of Philosophy*

13. (a) **Explain Ortega's view of the origin of the profession of philosophy.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate Ortega's view of the origin of the profession of philosophy.** [15]

The question asks for an explanation of Ortega's view on the origins of philosophy following Chapter 10 (The Historical Origin of the Profession of Philosophy), which provides an example of historical reason in operation on the central theme of the roots and historical justification of philosophy. One of the multiple tasks in which people have engaged is that of making philosophy, an occupation that has not been a permanent one for humanity, but as Ortega points out, "came about one fine day in Greece and has indeed come down to us, with no guarantee, however, of its perpetuation." And he further suggests "the possibility that what we are now beginning to engage in under the traditional *aegis* of philosophy is not another philosophy but something new and different from all philosophy". The experience of human impotence, life itself, constituted a mental blow and compelled one through "dialectical necessity" to devise another inherently different reality: one of unlimited potentiality, free from chance, and self-assured. This reality was "the divine", the numinous substance out of which were carved particular, specialized powers and gods. Candidates might explore alternative views such as those of Plato, Aristotle, Nietzsche, Jaspers. Further, candidates might refer to critical positions based on Ortega y Gasset's overreliance on historical perspective.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The meaning of Thales's assertion: "All things are full of gods". He is rectifying, a public opinion, or common *doxa*, according to which gods reside only in certain privileged phenomena
- Xenophanes and Heraclitus instead of the plurality of gods fundamental to Greek religion talked about one God whose primary attribute was his oneness
- Dating from Greek antiquity, the word "god" was imbued with great semantic mobility
- The god who appears at the conclusion of an argument is obviously not a religious god, but a theoretical principle
- The socialization of the "thinker" which came about during the 5th century
- The central form acquired by the term "philosophy" with Plato. His entire work is a dauntless attempt to render a rigorous meaning to the word "philosophy".

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The relation of the origin of philosophy with religious belief; the appearance of rationality
- Ortega's interpretation of Thales's assertion: it ought not to be interpreted in the sense that his ubiquitous gods are "divine" in nature, but exactly the opposite
- With the origin of philosophy the human life itself, both personal and collective, becomes worth understanding
- The role of the social and historical context: the name given to the philosophic profession would have been markedly different had it not been chosen with an eye to the "thinker's" social environment
- The history of the philosophical past catapults us into the still empty spaces of the future, toward a philosophy yet to come
- How convincing is Ortega's claim that that the creation of philosophy presupposes a stage of atheism?

14. (a) **Explain Ortega’s idea that philosophy allows us “to discern the persistent existence of two worlds, the manifest world and the latent or supra-world”.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate Ortega’s idea that philosophy allows us “to discern the persistent existence of two worlds, the manifest world and the latent or supra-world”.** [15]

The question asks for an explanation of Ortega’s idea, which synthetically presents the argument developed in Chapter 6 (Philosophy embarks on the discovery of another world). Since this chapter was the final one according to Ortega’s manuscript, it presents an attempt at closure of this text, which, according to Ortega, constitutes a decisive step in posing the problem of what philosophy is – its essential unity, in the same manner that historical reason is discovered through a retrospective contemplation of its total past and through the attempt to reconstruct the dramatic occasion of its origin. Philosophy begins by bisecting a seemingly single world; that is, in an apparently inverted operation, it duplicates the world that there was and elicits another behind or over it. The result, whether it be through bisection or duplication, is the same: philosophy leaves us with two worlds on our hands. The relationship between the two worlds can be highly disparate. They may show no contact whatsoever and appear to be back to back. The two worlds may be intermingled or encapsulated, so that the latent world is revealed by viewing the manifest world. In short, both may remain distant but connected, in continual cross-reference to each other, a reference that merely serves to corroborate their separation. Candidates might explore views such as those of Plato, Descartes, Hegel, Schopenhauer, Whitehead, and forms of contemporary metaphysical realism.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The case of Parmenides’s doctrine; Parmenides’s text itself will reveal what those two worlds are and why philosophy separates them
- The relation between the idea of two worlds and the understanding of philosophy
- Plato’s dividing line, like a frontier, separates philosophy’s “outside” from its “inside”, its outer image from its innermost essential condition, its interiority
- Ortega’s approach that he is not engaged in detailing the history of philosophy, but in reflecting upon it to discover amid its vast exuberance the unity of this discipline.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Ortega is not critical enough with regards to the idea expressed
- The idea of historical reason as a method to understand the philosophical past. Historical reason as opposed to “pure reason”
- Whether it is possible to outline a unity in philosophy
- Other ideas of philosophy which tend to see reality as one unique world, eg Aristotle, Nietzsche
- The connection between the idea expressed and the account of the philosophical past
- How a multitude of opinions and ideas might merge into a philosophical unit
- Necessity to operate a switch from the exterior to the interior of philosophy
- The role played by tradition, history, legends and myths with reference to the philosophical past.

Plato: *The Republic*, Books IV – IX

15. (a) **Explain Plato’s view of justice in the soul and the state.** [10]

(b) **Evaluate Plato’s view of justice in the soul and the state.** [15]

Plato describes the just soul and the just state, drawing an analogy between the two. In both cases, harmony of the constituent parts of the soul and the state leads to justice. Plato compares the soul and the state’s constituent parts by saying that the soul has appetites, desires and reason while the state has different classes of people carrying out these different functions. Both a just soul and a just state have all of these three elements in harmony, guided by reason. This links to his wider understanding of universal terms, such as justice. While justice is encountered in the visible world in many different ways, ultimately all of these are instances of the form of justice which “resides” in the world of forms, as discussed in Plato’s cave analogy. Candidates might analyse the different levels of education and how they facilitate harmony in the state. They may also take into consideration Plato’s reliance on the world of Forms in arriving at his account of justice. Candidates may contrast Plato with contemporary views on justice, eg Rawls, Nozick.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The description of the tripartite soul
- The structure and function of the just state
- Wider implications of this, such as the myth of the metals and the need for philosopher kings
- The world of Forms in relation to defining “justice”
- The Allegory of the Chariot
- The idea of justice as harmony.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Whether the parallels Plato draws between the soul and the state are reasonable
- The validity of defining justice in terms of harmony
- Other philosophical views about justice such as Rawls’s veil of perception could provide useful counter examples
- Plato’s use of the world of Forms to support his definition of justice
- Wider implications for morality, eg is being in harmony a guarantee of behaving morally?
- Theological interpretations of Plato including Augustine’s *City of God*
- Contrasts with More, Hobbes, Rousseau.

16. (a) **Explain Plato’s view of democracy.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate Plato’s view of democracy.** [15]

Plato described five forms of government and concludes that an aristocracy, where an elite, well-educated “philosopher king” is in power is the ideal form of government. A timocracy is the next best form of government, and is one in which the state is ruled by the auxiliary class. This leads to a war-oriented society. An oligarchy ranks below a timocracy and is a society in which the ruling classes are the rich. Plato claims that a democracy is a poor form of government because it is prone to lapse into chaos. Once a society is in chaos, it is likely that a tyrant will take over, which is the worst form of government. Candidates might elaborate on the value of a meritocracy. The analogy of the ship, where the pilot is portrayed as the most appropriate person to guide it, might be referred to. They might also discuss the simile of the beast. Background information such as Plato’s concept of the just state might be elaborated on. Reference might be made to the theory of Forms and the importance of the Form of the Good in guiding the state. Candidates might reflect on the nature of democracy and differences between Plato’s understanding of direct democracy as opposed to modern representative democracies. Plato’s views might be contrasted to those of *eg* Rousseau and Mill. There may be discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of other forms of government, such as those listed by Plato and others such as fascism, anarchism, and contemporary democracies.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Plato’s reasons for criticizing democracy
- Plato’s idea of the “philosopher king” in contrast to democracy
- The move from democracy to tyranny and the problems of tyranny
- The relationship between democracy, timocracy, oligarchy, tyranny and aristocracy
- The nature of the republic and whether this is compatible with democracy, *eg* the control of reproduction, the education of the guardian class.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Whether Plato is correct to dismiss democracy
- The relationship between Plato’s idea of an aristocracy and the “philosopher king”
- Whether knowledge of the world of Forms leads to an ability to rule
- The education of the “philosopher king” and whether it would lead to the best form of government
- Counter-examples or other arguments by political philosophers, *eg* Hobbes, Rousseau, Mill, Marx, Dewey, Nozick.

Peter Singer: *The Life You Can Save*

17. (a) **Explain Singer’s basic argument about donating money to charities that are engaged with reducing poverty.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate Singer’s basic argument about donating money to charities that are engaged with reducing poverty.** [15]

Singer’s basic argument can be found in Chapter 1 where he states that “by donating to aid agencies, you can prevent suffering and death from lack of food, shelter, and medical care, without sacrificing anything nearly as important”. The argument consists of three premises and a conclusion. It is possible that answers might address all three premises of the argument but may focus more on the second and third premises. Singer puts forward an argument about what is moral and ethical from a logical perspective in respect to donating money to charities that are engaged with reducing poverty. Singer attempts to encourage his readers to challenge some of their own entrenched biases related to morality and ethics. In his view, giving aid in the form of donations to aid charities is more than something that you “ought” to do or something that good people do because Singer claims that it is ethically obligatory and morally necessary to do so. Singer begins his book with the scenario of a drowning child that is the context from which he establishes his basic argument and asks the question, “What should you do?” Singer subsequently, following his scenario and argument, asks “...while thousands of children die each day, we spend money on things we take for granted and would hardly notice if they were not there. Is that wrong? If so, how far does our obligation to the poor go?”

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The validity of the first premise (“Suffering and death from lack of food, shelter, and medical care are bad”) may be difficult to reject in its totality but the word ‘bad’ might receive some analysis. For example, its “relative” application and/or understanding
- However, it is certainly “bad” for those that actually suffer and die as Singer claims and, indeed, affirmed later in the chapter
- The second premise is based on the outcome of the scenario in the thought experiment
- The “something bad” in the premise is not the consequence of the individual’s fault (the person who may be late for work *etc*) and their action could have long term benefits
- Singer’s concept and use of the word sacrifice
- The second premise appears to allow an individual to enjoy some luxuries providing they demonstrate concern for the poor
- The phrase “wrong not to do so” in terms of whether the “wrong” is absolute or “relative”
- In the third premise there are implications as to what the word “can” might entail (Singer mentions this in a limited way by admitting that there are arguments against giving due to uncertainty in whether or not aid money “is really helping the people it’s intended to help”)
- The word “can” allows a wide variety of act and reaction situations.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The thought experiment Singer bases his argument on assumes aid is about giving direct relief but Singer argues later this type of giving is ineffective because it causes dependency
- However, Singer contends that uncertainty does not alleviate our obligation to give anyway
- It is difficult to repudiate that giving to charities can prevent suffering and death
- The premise’s language and structure support almost any sort of claim that has a chance of impacting global poverty in a positive manner, not just those concerning money
- Is it plausible that because a donation can help the poor you are obligated to actually do it?
- The argument that the type of aid that will help most is aid that gives to the development of infrastructure and institutions, in other words, aid that takes a long-term view of how donations can benefit the poor
- The possibility of the development of a culture of giving
- Whether Singer’s argument is only a partial and, to a degree, an ineffective way to help the global poor because it does not demonstrate that people are morally obligated to give aid.

18. (a) **Explain Singer’s concern that our fair share really is all that each of us is obliged to do.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate Singer’s concern that our fair share really is all that each of us is obliged to do.** [15]

The concern is addressed in Chapter 9. It is likely that answers might present in summary form the context of Singer’s concern, which was a variation on his pond scenario. The scenario indicated that ten children have fallen in a pond and there are ten adults available to rescue them but only five do so as the others walk on by. Singer does not think it is “acceptable for you and the four other adults to stop after you have rescued just one child each, knowing that this means that five children will drown”. Singer goes on to engage and debate the views advocated by three contemporary philosophers (Miller, Cullity, and Hooker) and accepts that “the obligations Miller, Cullity, and Hooker posit may be considerably more demanding than the fair-share view”. Answers might identify and draw upon material in Chapter 10 where Singer argues that “the rich in other nations should share the burden of relieving global poverty”. It is likely that some of the reasons why we do not do more that Singer identifies may be invoked in answers by way of evaluation.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- What a fair share actually might be or look like
- What sum(s) of money would it take to solve poverty?
- Why Singer thinks it is not acceptable to allow five children to drown in his modified scenario
- The argument against making donations to help save lives destroyed by extreme poverty is that not everyone contributes her/his fair share
- Singer’s discussion of how much we are obliged to give
- Singer’s suggestion of what might be a fair contribution
- Singer’s proposal that people who are comfortable should contribute a significant proportion of their annual income
- Some of the questions Singer raises about trivial and non-essential things that we and our children could do without, with no reduction of personal pleasure.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The tendency to be irrational when we recognize that we are not being treated fairly
- The tendency to be irrational when others are not taking their share of responsibility
- Why Singer thinks the views of Miller, Cullity, and Hooker are mistaken
- How far does our obligation to the poor go?
- The issue of whether it is “wrong” that while thousands of children die daily, we spend money on things we take for granted and would barely notice if they were not there
- Reasons why people may be less likely to help if they think that that would be doing more than their fair share
- Singer’s several suggestions on what we all might be considered to “owe” in order to meet the challenge of poverty
- Whether Singer’s sliding scale where world poverty could be abolished will actually make any difference to the lives of those who donate.

Charles Taylor: *The Ethics of Authenticity*

19. (a) Explain how the *Three Malaises* affect our understanding of authenticity. [10]
- (b) Evaluate the extent to which the *Three Malaises* affect our understanding of authenticity. [15]

The theme of authenticity is affected by several factors. The first ones proposed by Charles Taylor in Chapter One are what he calls the “Three Malaises”. These are: Individualism, Instrumental Reasoning and Social Atomism. Individualism, one of the greatest conquests of modern civilization, has made it possible to choose our own life models and an individual’s convictions have a place as the basis of authenticity and have brought a major freedom. This achievement came with a price as it swept away the old moral horizons. With the fall of these moral horizons, the individual no longer forms a part of the great chain of being. This brought another change in the social sphere with increasing mobility. The individual does not have a determined role in society. This change brought about an increase in social fragmentation. It also brought about the disenchantment of the world. Consequently, we have lost the meaning and deep sense of rites and of social norms. The individual has lost the heroic dimension to life and the sense of a higher purpose. Everyone began to concentrate only on one’s own individual life, which then brought about a loss of the social life. This results in a reduction of the meaning of one’s life. All this is connected to some of the problems in modern societies, problems such as social permissibility or narcissism. The disenchantment of the world brought about a second problem, which is instrumental reasoning. Instrumental reason is a type of rationality that one draws upon when one calculates the most economic application of a means to a given end. Maximum efficiency, *ie* the best cost-output ratio, is its measure of success. It is an active part of our mechanical way of living. It is a sort of iron cage. These then result in the third malaise, Social Atomism, which is adopted by our social structures and institutions. This will bring a loss of freedom and so being unable to choose our own path of life. In such societies, this might also lead to “Soft Despotism”. Candidates might raise alternative views, *eg* Arendt, Rawls, Nozick, and Nussbaum.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The ambiguous concept of individualism
- The real chance of choosing our own life in our complex modern world
- Consequences of individualism
- Exercising choice, human freedom and authenticity
- The impact of social fragmentation in modern societies
- Technology as an example of the triumph of “instrumental reason”
- The moral pragmatism of science
- Consequences of Social Atomism.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- An analysis of individualism in modern societies
- An analysis of the consequences of individualism
- The connection between the reduction of the meaning of one’s life and contemporary narcissism
- The impact of the constant search for maximum efficiency
- Can we live without recourse to “instrumental reason”?
- The situations that might lead to the so called “disenchantment of the world”
- Why losing the “sense of rites and of the social norms” is something to be aware of
- Links to other authors, *eg* Heidegger’s *Gelassenheit* (serenity), de Beauvoir.

20. (a) **Explain the importance of a dialogical life for truly authentic behaviour.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate the importance of a dialogical life for truly authentic behaviour.** [15]

Taylor poses the question of whether there is a need for an ethic of authenticity. There are people trying to live this ideal and so risk undertaking deviant forms of life. A necessary condition to live authentically is the dialogic life. This is precisely why there is the need to better articulate this ideal and to formulate an ethic about it. First, the author tries to show that the ideal of authenticity has a value which is worth living. Second, we can rationally establish what it includes and third is that we are not closed in an iron cage. Authenticity has a powerful moral source. He holds that every individualistic ideal calls the individual to work and develop his own potentialities, pushing us to live a responsible way of life. The moral source that underpins authenticity is to be true to oneself. In fact, authenticity opens an age of self responsibility. The individual who assumes the ideal of authenticity has an aim to be true to themselves and so seeks to accomplish it and realize it. Authenticity is also about originality which deals with creating something new or in the case of authenticity to find our own way of being. This takes us to the dialogical self where the individual defines himself amongst others. Taylor holds that identity depends very much on dialogic relations. In this way a possible rational debate of what we believe and who we are increases. Moreover inspirations and desires take their meaning from an entire context. People who are significant in our lives also give their contribution in helping us to interpret or understand ourselves better and who we are. All this contributes to giving meaning to our choices and actions. Authenticity needs to be expressed/exercised with others, by means of dialogue. Authenticity therefore requires the recognition of the identity of others and that others recognize our own identity.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The importance of dialogue in establishing links in a society
- Identity as something that needs to be built with effort and conquered through exchange with others
- The dismissal of the old horizons and the lack of people's own place in society
- The individual needs to interpret themselves first
- The need for recognition
- Recognizing each other as subjects and not as objects
- The concept of a true dialogue and not having a simple communication with others
- Instrumental relationships considered as self-destructive.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The impact of genuine exchange on building authenticity
- Could the individual ever define themselves without others?
- The sense in which other people make it possible for us to access our own inspirations and desires
- Self-realization as a social process and not as a selfish or isolated behaviour
- Does authenticity require the recognition of the identity of others and that others recognize our own identity?
- The need for recognition as a stronger characteristic of authenticity
- An analysis of how relationships cannot be understood as something instrumental or for one's own utility
- Characteristics of a true dialogue and the impact on any personal spiritual growth
- Reference to the relationship of "horizons of significance" with authenticity.

Lao Tzu: *Tao Te Ching*

21. (a) Explain the claim that “The *Tao* (Way) that can be told is not the eternal *Tao*”. [10]
- (b) Evaluate the claim that “The *Tao* (Way) that can be told is not the eternal *Tao*”. [15]

The question is drawn from the opening chapter and it asks for an exploration of the central notion evident in the text. It is likely that the literal and, indeed, usual meaning of *Tao* as “way” or “path” will be identified in answers and developed to bring out the meaning of *Tao* and what *Tao* refers to. Conventional interpretations are generally ontological coupled with ethical application. It is likely that the ontological denotation of “what there is” will figure in answers along with its ethical understanding as a certain practical standard as Lao Tzu clearly uses the term *Tao* in an ethical sense when he says “When the highest type of man bears the *Tao*, he practices it diligently” (Chapter 41). Answers might engage with three aspects of the *Tao*: as ‘the way of ultimate reality’, “the way of the universe” and “the way of human life”. The *Tao* might be a way of discovering truth and a way of doing things. It is likely that the idea of the *Tao* as Supreme Reality might be referenced in answers. The text presents the ethical and communal principles on how one lives one’s life in interaction with the family, community, state and cosmos. Candidates might explore alternative views on the concept of harmony, eg Confucius, Heraclitus, Plato, Zhuangzi, Leibniz.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The literal meaning of *Tao*
- *Tao* as “the way of ultimate reality” – unspeakable or ineffable and transcendent aspects as the basis for much of the text itself
- *Tao* as “the way of the universe” – aspects of immanence that are reflected in the fundamental understanding of nature
- *Tao* as “the way of human life” – when it dovetails with the *Tao* of the universe then much of the rest of the text reflects what the expected way of life is
- All things are unified and connected in the *Tao*
- A system of belief, attitudes and practices that facilitate a person’s own nature
- Ethics and morality emerge as central elements of the text.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- How can Lao Tzu be sure that everything revolves around the concept of *Tao*?
- *Tao* as an expression of the philosophical harmony of the universe and of the path human beings need to take to connect with that unity
- By observing the processes of nature, the *Tao* indicates that human beings can come to some understanding about the meaning of their lives and about their place in the world
- The paradox reflected in “Those who know, do not say. Those who say, do not know”
- If the *Tao* as an ontology advocates that the ultimate reality is unspeakable and thus unable to be actually conceptualized linguistically, then the claims of the *Tao* are hollow because it in essence denies the identity of reality
- The role that words and language play in describing reality, eg nominalism versus realism, Wittgenstein
- The extent to which the *Tao* was intended to be the basis of a stable, unified, and enduring social order
- The position that the *Tao* invites a fatalistic and passive approach to life
- The contradiction in the assertion that the *Tao* is all pervading and yet imperceptible.

22. (a) Explain the distinction between “good” and “evil” that emerges in the *Tao Te Ching*. [10]
- (b) Evaluate the distinction between “good” and “evil” that emerges in the *Tao Te Ching*. [15]

The question invites answers to demonstrate that there is a distinction between good and evil in Lao Tzu’s *Tao Te Ching*. Lao Tzu’s philosophy of *Tao* can be perceived as an effort to justify his view of good and evil. The text reflects that the philosophy of *Tao* is concerned to see the eradication of evil from the world. It is likely that answers will identify and engage with the concepts of suffering and the human will, the question of “natural” sufferings and the metaphysical status of evil in the *Tao*. Good and evil are defined with reference to actions, because they are not some substantial entities, eternal forms, or commandments of a deity: they are qualities of actions. It is likely that answers will highlight explicit examples of the condemnation of evil in the *Tao*, for example, war in Chapter 30, which states “Wherever armies are stationed, briars and thorns will grow. After the great wars, years of disaster will inevitably follow”. Similar to war, competition is condemned in the *Tao* as a significant causal evil. War is but the more extreme form of competition and competition is hostile to the spontaneity of *Tao*. Lao Tzu often terms *Tao*’s nature as non-competition and another way of saying *wu wei*. Lao Tzu finds the finest symbol of non-competitiveness in water and in Chapter 8 he says “Water is good because it benefits the myriad things and does not compete”. Candidates might explore alternative concepts of the problem of evil, eg Bhagavad Gita, Aquinas, Hume, Mill, Swinburne.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Good means any act that is in accordance with *Tao*; since *Tao* is fundamentally the source of life and the principle of spontaneity, an act is good if it sustains life according to spontaneity
- Good means any action that is not caused by the assertive will of man; non-wilful actions are spontaneous actions
- Good means the state of life without sufferings; there are no natural sufferings
- Evil is any act that is not in accordance with *Tao*; an act is considered evil if it interferes with or inhibits spontaneous life-processes, ie, if it is against life and spontaneity
- Evil means any action that is caused by the assertive will of man; wilful acts are unspontaneous acts; they are causal evils
- Evil means the state of life affected with man-made sufferings, which are the consequences of wilful acts
- In Chapter 75 he identifies the evils of starvation, social unrest, and irreverence for life among the people with the evils committed by the ruler
- Evil are things, events, or acts that are condemned in the *Tao*.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- If the universe is spontaneously produced, as claimed in the *Tao*, how can there be evils in the world?
- Why human beings use the will to assert something against the *Tao*, even though whenever the will is used it would be in accordance with the *Tao*
- Is the will free to interfere with *Tao*’s evolution?
- The assumption that evil and good are conceptually relative to each other
- It could be argued that all the causal evils that emerge in the *Tao* have apparently originated from the use of the human will and therefore all the sufferings that are identified in the *Tao* are the result of human action
- Because the *Tao* does not explicitly and directly deal with “natural suffering” it might be argued that there are no natural sufferings and therefore all the sufferings in the world are probably the result of human action
- However, Chapter 23 refers to the whirlwind and rainstorm and so by implication may be possible causes of natural sufferings although no actual mention of suffering arising out of them is made
- Is the distinction between “good” and “evil” a human construct?
- The “good” and “evil” according to other philosophies, eg Plato, Augustine, Nietzsche.

Zhuangzi: *Zhuangzi*

23. (a) Explain Zhuangzi's use of metaphors and allegories as a method. [10]
- (b) Evaluate Zhuangzi's use of metaphors and allegories as a method. [15]

Zhuangzi uses metaphors extensively; these are the primary form of philosophical discussion in his work. Examples include the opening story of the bird (*kun*), the monkeys and the peanuts, the butterfly and the dreaming man, the three friends, multiple stories about people who had found the Way, and so on. Some of these passages are clear and others are difficult to interpret and have led to multiple competing scholarly interpretations. This may reflect Zhuangzi's claim that "the *Tao* is hidden behind partial understanding, and the meaning of our words is hidden behind a screen of flowery rhetoric". Zhuangzi is widely seen as a philosopher of language who uses metaphor and allegory to show the absurdities of logical, language-based arguments. He can thus be read as a skeptical philosopher, taking apart the arguments of others and questioning common assumptions. This is seen when Zhuangzi says that "words are not just blowing wind, they have meaning. But if we cannot agree on what they mean are we really saying anything?". Candidates might explore alternative uses of language as a method to express philosophical ideas, eg Wittgenstein, Ayer, Heidegger.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Use of metaphor and/or allegories, eg the knife and the butcher, the butterfly, the image of the water
- Contrasting uses of metaphor
- What different metaphors show about Zhuangzi's philosophy
- Other methods of argumentation in *Zhuangzi*
- How Zhuangzi uses metaphor to criticize other philosophical methods such as those of Confucius or the Mohists.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Whether the method of metaphor and allegory is an effective philosophical method
- The different interpretations of *Zhuangzi* and whether this is a positive or negative feature of the method deployed
- How metaphor has been used to criticize other philosophical methods and arguments
- Evaluations of individual metaphors taken from *Zhuangzi* as case studies
- The contrast between *Zhuangzi* and Confucian and Mohist thought
- Similarities and differences between the metaphors used and other philosophical methods such as Platonic dialogue, conceptual analysis, aphorism.

24. (a) Explain the claim that “if the Way is made clear, it is not the Way”. [10]
- (b) Evaluate the claim that “if the Way is made clear, it is not the Way”. [15]

Zhuangzi presents many short stories and metaphors to demonstrate the difficulties resulting from defining the Way. Implicit, and sometimes explicit in these are criticisms of either Confucian and Mohist ethics. Zhuangzi problematizes ethical language when he states that “we understand right because of our understanding of wrong. Yet the sage is beyond all of this and dwells in the realm of true meaning”. Zhuangzi’s stories and metaphors demonstrate the possibility of either moral relativity or skepticism about whether or not ethics can be known. Interpreters differ in whether they read Zhuangzi as a moral relativist or a skeptic. One idea that is repeated is that people’s differing perspectives must be taken into account: “small knowledge cannot understand what great knowledge knows”. The opening story about the bird (*kun*) demonstrates this, as does the question of whether the person is dreaming that they are a butterfly or the butterfly dreaming that it is a person. Candidates might explore issues of describing or encountering reality and the contrast between the physical and metaphysical world, corporeal and incorporeal, eg Cartesian dualism. Candidates might explore alternative views such as Hegel’s view that concepts may mirror reality.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The story of the bird (*kun*)
- The story of the butterfly and the philosopher
- Zhuangzi’s criticisms of Mohism and Confucianism
- Zhuangzi’s approach to what it is to be a sage (*sheng ren*)
- The connections between Lao Tzu’s work and Zhuangzi’s.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Whether Zhuangzi is a moral relativist
- The extent to which Zhuangzi thinks that the Way is knowable
- Whether Zhuangzi’s criticisms of Confucius are valid
- Whether Zhuangzi’s criticisms of Mohism are valid
- The consequences of the claim that “if the Way is made clear, it is not the Way”
- Candidates might refer to other philosophers to provide counter-arguments.