

Markscheme

November 2020

Philosophy

Higher level and standard level

Paper 1

21 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 <https://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/ib-publishing/licensing/applying-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 suivante : <https://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/ib-publishing/licensing/applying-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: <https://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/ib-publishing/licensing/applying-for-a-license/>.

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 6 for the core theme and page 9 for the optional themes.

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

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

Note to examiners

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

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

Paper 1 Section A markbands

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

Section A

Core Theme: Being human

1. Image of examination hall and accompanying caption

With explicit reference to the stimulus and your own knowledge, discuss a philosophical issue related to the question of what it means to be human. [25]

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

This question requires candidates to identify and discuss philosophical issues and/or concepts in the set passage related to the fundamental question of what it is to be human. The picture might be seen as an examination hall at a school, or another collective experience. Other interpretations of the stimulus may also be valid, such as issues surrounding culture, the individual, society, the role of education, personhood, freedom, determinism, technological enhancement, the nature or nurture debate, authenticity, the self and other, responsibility and agency. It is open to numerous interpretations in relation to the core theme. Candidates might discuss the guiding role of education within society and in shaping culture. They might ask whether this constitutes indoctrination, or whether it is legitimate for society to use education to shape its future citizens. The examination hall might prompt reflection on the relationship between the self and others, or the primacy of the individual since everyone taking examinations is in competition with one another. It might lead to questions about the authenticity of fulfilling parental expectations, or about whether young people have any freedom within the confines of the school system. Candidates might reflect on whether examinations are redundant given technological advances which seem to bring the importance of remembering facts under timed conditions into question. Candidates might consider the importance of examinations in the search for employment and further education; this might lead to questions about the nature of society, particularly in a rapidly changing world.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Education and culture
- Whether education fosters thinking, creativity and identity, or whether it is a product of social conformity
- Society, social change and the role of education
- The legitimacy of shaping society through education and the possibility of indoctrination
- Whether society encourages favouring the individual or self over “the other”
- Whether examinations are a culmination of learning and hard work
- Whether examinations are an effective mechanism for assessing learning and hard work
- Moral issues, eg: cheating
- Collaborative activity *versus* individual pursuits
- Questions about agency, responsibility and authenticity
- Issues around free will and determinism
- The mind in relation to what it is that examinations are examining for
- Subjective experiences/memories of examinations, eg: issues about anxieties
- Questions about technological advances and the place of education in society
- Issues surrounding personhood in relation to technological changes
- Whether technology improves the shaping of individual thinking, or whether it could be a means to social control
- Whether society favours nature or nurture, and the relationship between the two
- Issues linking education with social justice
- Alienation
- Mass experience, the role of “the other” and identity.

2. Manifesto for the Tokyo 2020 Olympic Games

With explicit reference to the stimulus and your own knowledge, discuss a philosophical issue related to the question of what it means to be human. [25]

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

This question requires candidates to identify and discuss philosophical issues and/or concepts in the set passage related to the fundamental question of what it is to be human. The image is from the Tokyo 2020 Olympic Games “vision” statement. It might be used by candidates to explore a range of ideas from the core theme. Social, metaphysical and ethical ideas are all evident. Candidates might choose to focus on identity, the cultural differences evident in an international competition and the claim that sport can provide “unity in diversity”. They might reflect on what it means to say that there is diversity amongst humans and refer to ideas relating to human nature. In relation to personhood, candidates might choose to explore the meaning of “striving for your personal best”. They might consider virtue ethics, or even questions about transhumanism, the use of performance enhancing drugs or the use of technology to alter ability. This raises questions about the nature of identity, such as when identity itself is lost. Candidates might reflect on the nature *versus* nurture debate in relation to sporting ability. They might question whether spending resources and time on competing in the Olympics is worthwhile and whether training the body is a legitimate life-goal. Candidates might question the relationship between the individual and the nation state which they are representing. They might ask whether the division of Olympic competitors into nationalities is harmful or whether it truly can provide the unity referred to in the text. Candidates might question whether it is possible to “connect to tomorrow” and what that might mean, in relation to human nature, culture and technology.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Human nature, personhood and identity
- What it means to be a human, in physical terms
- The significance of technological advances
- Culture and identity
- Multiculturalism, nationalism and internationalism
- The consequences of “winning at all cost”
- Social change and social justice
- The relationship between having a healthy body and being virtuous, eg: as seen in Plato
- Ethics, eg: virtue ethics
- Moral issues regarding cheating in sports
- Politics in sport, eg: governments sanctioning cheating
- Ideas relating to the international nature of the Olympics
- Discussion of individualism in modern and/or historical Japanese society
- The malleability of human nature
- The relationship between mind and body
- “Healthy mind, healthy body”
- Sport and lifestyle, the importance of being healthy
- Whether sport helps to shape our response to the environment
- Individualism and competitive sports
- Competition *versus* cooperation, self *versus* other
- Competition as a means to the progress of society, eg: Kant
- Competition as a product of egoism and vanity
- The role of body image and “perfection”
- The importance of effort, training and exercise as a means to get the best results
- Aristotelian virtues and the importance of practice.

Paper 1 Section B markbands

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

Section B

Optional theme 1: Aesthetics

3. To what extent can art be defined?

[25]

Candidates are invited to consider an age-old quest for a definition of art. The concept of art becomes ever broader and far-reaching as more and more eccentric and indeed eclectic works are considered to be “art”; pushing and questioning the limits of previously accepted definitions. Moreover, the general conception of art contains not only paintings but other areas such as: literature, poetry, music and sculpture etc, thus finding what is distinctly common to them might be considered an almost impossible task. This problem, it might be argued, is augmented if one reflects upon history and realizes that ideas of what art constitutes are ever changing and as such definitions have appeared which accommodate the art at any given point in time. This means that new definitions are constantly being formulated, begging the question of whether a timeless definition of art can ever be reached. Despite these problems, a number of definitions might be identified. Candidates could discuss a selection of these definitions, contrasting traditional with more modern institutional definitions. To evaluate the success or not of a definition, candidates could consider whether the definition is a necessary and sufficient condition of art as argued by Hanfling in *The Problem of Definition*, in order to discover whether art can ever really be defined. It could be posited that the only sense in which art can be defined, is the definition we have in our own minds, we define it in our own personal terms but this can never be accurately and sufficiently articulated in a public manner that everyone can recognize. As Wittgenstein noted, we recognize threads of similarity that run through all art but it is somehow unexplainable and therefore indefinable.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- It is taken for granted that we have a group of activities which come naturally together under the label of “art” because they all share the same common thread
- In the 18th century Batteux developed the modern concept of art by separating the “fine arts” from the “mechanical arts”
- Bell in his book *Art* introduced the phrase “significant form” and claimed that this and this alone was the distinctive characteristic of great art
- Hanfling’s test where definitions must be evaluated in terms of being necessary or sufficient conditions of art
- In Tatarkiewicz’s *A History of Six Ideas*, he gives six conditions (eg: the production of beauty or the production of shock) that if they were combined together into a well-articulated formula, then in relationship to each other they could provide a full definition of art
- The view that art cannot be defined because art does not have one single function, eg: Tolstoy, Gombrich
- Dickie’s suggestion of an institutional theory of art
- Art cannot be defined; it is just associated with other features that are recognized from other forms of art.

4. Evaluate the claim that to appreciate art properly it is “form” that is important. [25]

The question invites candidates to evaluate the way in which “form” emphasizes the relationships and organization that bring together the different elements that comprise a work of art. Candidates will probably identify a range of formal qualities such as balance, coherence, shape, proportion, structure, concord, symmetry, completeness, etc. Candidates might draw upon a number of philosophers, artists and critics, eg: Fry, Bell and Greenberg among others. It could be argued that “form” recognizes the essence of art and how it is understood in various ways across the range of what is labelled art. Candidates might successfully engage with the intent of the question by selecting a work of art (including literature, music or film etc) as an example of exploring what gives it aesthetic worth providing they concentrate on the question of “form” in relation to any other aesthetic features. Another approach to the question might result in candidates unpacking the term “properly” in the question and discussing whether its usage indicates an attempt to try and make the claim true by definition.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- In what way “form” may or may not explain how art can be appreciated
- The role of “form” in arriving at a definition of aesthetic beauty
- How aesthetic beauty might supervene in works of art
- Is “form” a necessary condition for aesthetic beauty?
- How formal qualities might cohere in a work of art
- “Form” aids the identification of aspects of a work of art that prompts aesthetic emotion
- If everything has “form”, then should “form” be used to differentiate art from other entities that are not considered art?
- The interaction of “form” and “function”
- Whether “form” affects accessibility to art in terms of perception
- Whether “form” is related to the aesthetic judgment, eg: Kant, Nietzsche
- The relationship between form and content; whether content affects the appreciation of art
- Theories of art, eg: Plato
- Possible references to specific examples of art, eg: Picasso’s *Guernica*, *The Matrix*, Shakespeare’s *Macbeth*
- A stress on “form” could invite a claim of artistic superiority with only a handpicked few able to appreciate it.

Optional theme 2: Epistemology

5. Evaluate the claim that “the limits of my language mean the limits of my world”. [25]

The question stems from the famous sentence written by Wittgenstein in his *Tractatus*, though candidates do not need to make reference to Wittgenstein in their responses. The claim invites an analysis of the nature of language as a means to human knowledge. Candidates might evaluate whether knowledge has to do with facts only and whether language is the only way to access, describe, explain them. In Wittgenstein’s view, “this is connected with the fact that no part of our experience is *a priori*. Everything we see could also be otherwise. Everything we can describe at all could also be otherwise”. Candidates might explain the role that the subject plays in acquiring knowledge: is s/he part of the process or is s/he out of it? According to Wittgenstein, “the subject does not belong to the world but it is a limit of the world”. Does the observer belong to observation? Does s/he affect observation, perception and the final access to knowledge? Is a totally neutral observer possible in the processes of knowledge? Candidates might consider the role of senses in the process of knowledge and the possibility of verification through experience. Candidates might explain how language propositions themselves belong to the world of facts, though not being facts. Another possible path might focus on the limits of sharing knowledge according to the limits of language: different languages allow different understandings and descriptions of the world: how does this affect universal, objective knowledge? If knowledge depends on language, is knowledge also dependent on cultural backgrounds, eg: traditions, habits, beliefs? Candidates might mention studies which basically confirm the validity of Wittgenstein’s claim, eg: the studies on the colours and language, which show how language affects the different perception and description of colours; or the most recent studies on the relationship between cultural background–language included–and expression of emotions, eg: social emotions, use of “emoticons”, etc. As counterargument, candidates might evaluate whether there is knowledge which is accessible independently from language or whether words are the only tools for humans to know. Candidates might also refer to philosophical theories, eg: Plato’s analogy of the Divided Line or analogy of the Cave, empiricism, pragmatism, verificationism, social ontology. Candidates might mention the recent contributions made by neuroscientists, psychologists and philosophers about the role that emotions play in the processes of knowledge, eg: Nussbaum, Damasio, Churchland. Finally, candidates might discuss whether the absence of words, which means silence, implies that humans can communicate through verbal expression only: is not silence sometimes the purest and sincerest means to communicate, to genuinely express ourselves, and describe the world we are?

[Source: From Ludwig Wittgenstein (1992) *Tractatus logico-philosophicus*, published by Routledge, part of Taylor and Francis Informa UK Ltd -- Books. Used with the kind permission of the publisher.]

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The relationship between language and knowledge: the role of words, concepts, propositions
- How language affects the shaping of culture, and culture affects language
- How cultural diversity affects language and knowledge
- Wittgenstein’s view of the relationship between the subject and reality; possible reference to other positions, eg: Descartes’s *res extensa* and *res cogitans*
- Wittgenstein’s view of solipsism
- Knowledge is dependent on human possibility to describe facts: is this the only way humans can know? eg: the role of emotions as described by Damasio, Nussbaum, or Churchland
- The role of the observer: does s/he modify observation? Is a neutral observer possible?
- The dependence of knowledge from previously acquired knowledge and beliefs, eg: theory-ladenness
- The extent to which language impairments might affect knowledge
- Studies confirming the dependence of perception and description on language, eg: colours and language, colours and emotions
- Absence of words might mean the impossibility to know: is silence an empty status or is it conceivable as a means of communication, expression, description?
- Other philosophical views on language and knowledge, eg: Plato’s analogy of the Divided Line, empiricism, pragmatism, verificationism, social ontology
- Wittgenstein’s view of ethics and mysticism: are they outside of knowledge?

6. Evaluate the claim that technology as “the capacity to own, buy and sell knowledge, has contributed to the development of the new, knowledge-based societies”. [25]

The question stems from Gilbert’s book, *Catching the Knowledge Wave?* The claim invites an exploration of the new concept of “knowledge societies”: a possible interpretation of this concept implies “a new sustainable social market economy, a smarter, greener economy, where our prosperity will come from innovation and from using resources better, and where the key input will be knowledge [...] in which all actors (students, teachers, researchers, education and research institutions and enterprises) benefit from the free circulation of people, knowledge and technology (the 5th freedom) [...] to contribute to the knowledge-based economy” (*Consultation on the Future “EU 2020” Strategy*, European Commission). Candidates might refer to the scientific and cultural processes of production of knowledge, from theories of scientific discovery, eg: Popper, Kuhn, Koyré, Feyerabend, to the social and cultural models, which see knowledge as a product, eg: Adorno, Marcuse, Horkheimer. Knowledge societies are based on the production and sharing of knowledge, so considering knowledge as the new capital. Knowledge as a commodity implies the analysis of the relationship between knowledge—and its possession and management—and power, eg: as in Bacon’s or Dewey’s view. Candidates might also consider how technology has fostered the spread and sharing of knowledge through the diffusion of new devices and the internet. Also, candidates might evaluate whether technology has helped the circulation of proper, valid knowledge or not: candidates might discuss the possible meaning of valid or true knowledge; they might also take into account the issues emerged from the transmission of wrong knowledge, fostered by new technologies, eg: social media and networks. Candidates might refer to the spread of “fake news” and whether they can be used for the purpose of social and political control. Candidates might consider the philosophical positions on the theme of education, knowledge, technology, and democracy, eg: Chomsky. Candidates might mention one or more philosophical views on the relationship between science, as a source of pure and certain knowledge, and technology, as the application of knowledge: from Plato’s distinction between *episteme* and *techne* to more recent positions, eg: Bell, Lyotard. Candidates might mention the concept of postmodernism, since “it is now science, knowledge, technological research, rather than industrial production and the extraction of surplus value, that is the ‘ultimately determining instance’” (Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*). Candidates might also take into account behaviourism, cognitivism and connectivism, in trying to explain the shift from the know-how to the know-where: where to find the knowledge we need and how and whether it is accessible by all people.

[Sources: Republished with the permission of New Zealand Council for Educational Research from 'Catching the knowledge wave?: the knowledge society and the future of education', Jane Gilbert, 2005; permission conveyed through Copyright Clearance Center, Inc.; European Commission, *Consultation on the Future “EU 2020” Strategy*, COM(2009)647 final, 24.11.2009; From page xiii of Fredric Jameson’s foreword to *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge* by Jean-François Lyotard. Used with the kind permission of University of Minnesota Press. Republished with the permission of Manchester University Press, from *The Postmodern Condition*, Jean-François Lyotard, 1984, permission conveyed through Copyright Clearance Center, Inc.]

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Distinction between knowledge and technology, eg: *episteme versus techne* (Plato), Bell, Lyotard, Dewey
- Theories of knowledge, eg: behaviourism, cognitivism, connectivism
- Knowledge as source of certainty and prediction; the logic of the scientific discovery, eg: Popper, Kuhn, Koyré, Feyerabend
- Knowledge as possible product or commodity and as new capital: from the cultural industry (the Frankfurt School) to IT
- “Knowledge societies” and knowledge-based economies: production, access, control, distribution, sharing
- Whether technology helps to disseminate knowledge or not, eg: new media, new devices, social networks, web 2.0 (Participative and Social Web), fake news, conspiracy theories
- Knowledge access and education, eg: Chomsky’s view on democracy and education
- Knowledge access and technology: censorship, digital divide, information control, “flak” and newsmakers
- Knowledge as power, eg: Bacon, Dewey
- Knowledge and political power, eg: sources control, censorship, propaganda.

Optional theme 3: Ethics

7. Evaluate the view that a moral act is one that originates from a sense of duty. [25]

The question invites candidates to consider a deontological approach to making moral decisions. Candidates might engage with Kant's deontology and develop their responses by also engaging with modern deontologists such as Ross and his seven *prima facie* duties or even Kamm's deontological constraints. Some candidates might take the Divine Command Theory approach that posits moral obligations arise from God's commands, and therefore any moral action depends with that action being undertaken because it is a duty. Candidates might identify and discuss the concept of motivation in relation to moral acts and might advance the understanding that an act that is derived from one's duty is not moral unless it is motivated by duty in the first place. This sense of duty might be recognized as actions that respect others' rights and treat others as not means to an end but as an end in themselves. This sense of duty might be portrayed as altruistic and the role of reason could be examined in identifying one's sense of duty. Candidates might offer an explanation of deontology by contrasting it with other normative theories, such as consequentialism, virtue theory, and egoism. A further valid approach might be to contrast actions derived from self-interest with those motivated by duty.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The role of reason in Kantian deontology
- The importance of Kant's concept of good will as the only motive that is, of itself, intrinsically good
- The use of Kant's categorical and hypothetical imperatives
- Divine Command Theory and the concept that we do not have a duty to obey God merely by virtue of being God, but because what God commands is actually good
- Moral approaches to law and duty, eg: legalism, casuistry
- Non-duty-based approaches, eg: utilitarianism
- Prescriptivism and moral judgements as an encouragement in action
- Deontological reasons why we have special duties to specific people
- Difficulties associated with the conflict between duties
- Kamm's deontological constraints
- Problem of determining motivations for oneself or others
- Whether focus on the agent's motivation is narcissistic
- Ethical egoism and self-interested motives that some might argue are the only motives that are viable and therefore it is morally right to be so motivated
- Good intentions can produce bad consequences.

8. Evaluate the claim that all morality is relative.

[25]

The question invites candidates to explore arguments for relativism. These arguments might include descriptive or cultural relativism which is the view that cultural diversity promulgates the position that morality is conceptually relative. The practice of polygamy, child marriages and cannibalism etc, in some cultures is common place whereas other cultures condemn such practices. This suggests that there may not be an absolute basis for these or any other type of moral judgement. Some candidates might argue from the perspective of the diversity thesis (not everybody agrees on what actions are not allowed in moral law) resulting in a dependency thesis (that right and wrong are influenced by the values of a society) and since these differ extensively, then all moral judgments are considered relative. The claim that morality is relative might also be argued from a meta-ethics standpoint, eg: in that the contradictory claims of naturalism, non-naturalism and non-cognitivism suggest agreement is not possible where moral language is concerned. Therefore, if there is no objective way of justifying the meaning of terms like “good”, “bad”, etc, then it follows that there can be no universal concept of good, and so “good” and “bad” are considered relative terms. Candidates might suggest the argument that moral relativism is a feature of some normative ethical theories (eg: utilitarianism and virtue ethics), and thus a range of differing interpretations indicating that there is no objective basis for moral rules. Counterarguments invoking weaknesses from a moral relativist view might be offered along the lines that there can be no genuine assessment of offensive moral practices because such activities often cease when challenged. Some candidates might point out that moral relativism appears to descend into subjectivism in that there can be no good basis for needing moral behaviour, because it is the individual who decides, and indeed delineates, what is good for them and them alone. Some candidates might contend that absolutism is right and offer supporting arguments from a Kantian perspective or even an intuitionist standpoint. Some candidates might make a case for moral objectivism as distinct from moral absolutism.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- If objective moral law actually exists, then why is there also diversity of moral views evident in the world?
- If there is no rational way to decide which moral code is the correct one, all moral codes must then be equally valid
- That cultural diversity concerning moral judgments does not necessitate the normative assumption that there are no objective moral truths (the implication violates Hume’s law in that you cannot move from is to ought; from the descriptive to the normative)
- Moral judgments do not describe any objective properties of the world
- The logical positivist argument that only judgments which can be verified are meaningful, therefore moral judgments are expressions of attitude and their source is individual culture customs
- Cultural differences are exaggerated by the relativist and that all human beings share certain basic moral values
- If moral relativism is correct then it would be impossible to condemn the actions or moral acts of other cultures and consequently moral relativists are unable to defend intervening in other cultures in order to stop atrocities
- Moral relativism undermines morality because the rejection of absolute values emboldens immoral acts
- Alternatives to moral relativism, eg: the Kantian categorical imperative.

Optional theme 4: Philosophy and contemporary society

9. Evaluate the claim that “everyone needs boundaries and a space they can call their own, therefore distinct societies and cultures need to be maintained”. [25]

This question invites an evaluation of the claim that societies and cultures need to be distinct and have their own identity and space. Boundaries, borders and separate traditions are claimed to be necessary. The necessity could be seen as the need to create a separate identity and this could be seen as a challenge to both the establishment of supra-states like the European Union and/or globalization in general. The blurring of boundaries might create a sense of insecurity as well as a decline of traditions and rites that give meaning and purpose to an individual and group. There could also follow an investigation as to whether loss of individual and group space might result in the loss of recognition of rights and status. Reference might be made to the historical loss of status and rights for minorities as large states were established, eg: indigenous peoples in North America or tribal groups in parts of Asia and Australasia. There might also be a discussion of the trend for autonomous regions within large states and the pressures to clearly define regional rights and status. There might be mention of the pressures to fragment established states with examples coming from Scotland, Catalonia, northern India and Quebec. There could be a critique of globalization from the perspective of one dominant culture overshadowing and eventually eliminating others. Also, space might be broadly seen as linguistic divisions and the trend of minority languages disappearing due to the dominance of one national language or one global language.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Mechanisms to create and maintain cultural identity
- The impact of globalization on minorities; their space and language
- Ways of establishing the rights of minorities, eg: Nussbaum, Mill
- The need for individual identity and sense of being and belonging
- National and regional tensions and the community stresses that result
- The right to self-determination
- The value or otherwise of small recognizable unities
- The role of loyalty and patriotism
- The role of education in valuing and understanding the new created spaces with which to identify, or the enforcement of loss in ethnic areas which accentuate tensions.

10. Evaluate the claim that technological advancements enhance human progress. [25]

This question seeks an evaluation of the extent to which human progress can be measured in terms of technological change and advancement. Significant changes in the development of societies have been related to technological changes and therefore the issue arises as to whether this is a valid means of measuring human progress. There might be challenges raised as to what is meant by human progress and whether technological change is the only driver of progress. In the early development of humans, technological change might be seen as crucial and positive in achieving progress, yet in more contemporary times aspects of technology might be seen to have damaging consequences. Humans are attributed with being one of few creatures that can create different technologies but there is also evidence that these technologies can destroy and hence hinder human development. Consideration might be given to other ways of measuring progress such as the refinement of values, eg: toleration, compassion and empathy being more significant in what might be the understanding of bettering the human condition. Issues about future technological development might be discussed in terms of both positive and negative consequences of new technologies such as machine learning and changes in the nature of work and the health and care benefits to humans.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Issues surrounding the definition of progress and its measurability
- The ways in which technology empowers humans
- Whether technology calls for responsibility, eg: Jonas's principle of responsibility
- Misuse of technology to destroy humans
- Alternative notions of progress contrasting material growth with harmony in nature
- Is progress always good? eg: Lao Tzu
- The use of technology in advancing human ability to control and adapt to the environment
- The effect of technologies on human relationships; communication technologies' impact on human interaction
- The control of the technological means of production; access to technology in relation with knowledge
- The application of progress to moral development and how technology might or might not relate to the development of happiness and love
- Whether technology is a defining feature of humanness
- Will humans progress to the extent that they become redundant because of technology?

Optional theme 5: Philosophy of religion

11. Evaluate the claim that there is a God because something exists rather than nothing. [25]

This question invites an exploration of the philosophical arguments on the existence of God. Candidates might discuss the Cosmological Argument, but they could also discuss other relevant material in their responses and engage with the different arguments for the existence of God (going through the various theistic proofs including the ontological argument). Candidates might present the ideas of Plato and Aristotle, Aquinas, Scotus, Descartes, Swinburne and Craig among others. Monotheistic religions such as Christianity and Islam, for example, espouse the central belief concerning the creation of the universe in that it was brought about by God *ex nihilo* – from nothing, which advocates that one response to the question is that God directed as such. Some candidates might discuss a widely promoted understanding of Genesis 1 (the biblical account of creation), that argues the Hebrew syntax undoubtedly supports the notion of God “creating” by setting pre-existent chaos into some kind of order. A popular counterargument that candidates might use is one usually associated with Russell’s observation that the universe is a “brute fact”, and that if the explanation of why “something exists rather than nothing” has to stop somewhere, then it is best to stop at the universe itself rather than to go beyond the immediate empirical context. Some candidates might take a more scientific approach and argue that the universe actually is self-perpetuating and consequently has always been here, thus invalidating the argument of the concept of “having been nothing”. Some candidates might even posit the view from an eschatological perspective by suggesting that there is something rather than nothing because that “something” is consistent with the religious viewpoint that God has a plan for the universe.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- First cause arguments from Plato and Aristotle
- Aquinas’s argument for the existence of God as the unmoved mover, uncaused cause, and uncreated Creator
- Scotus and his metaphysical argument for the existence of God that was inspired by Aquinas’s argument from motion
- Descartes’s argument from causation including his Trademark Argument
- Swinburne’s inductive cosmological argument
- Defence of the cosmological argument based on the principle of sufficient reason as advanced by Leibniz and Clarke
- The argument from contingency
- Craig’s Kalam argument
- Russell’s assumption to accept that the universe just “is”, therefore the question has no meaning
- Hume’s treatment of the various arguments for God and the universe
- Modern physics theories, eg: the “through inflation theory” and its concept of the universe as self-perpetuating.

12. To what extent can religious belief be challenged by psychological considerations? [25]

The question invites candidates to select any psychological considerations about religious beliefs of their choice. Most candidates will probably examine and explore the arguments arising from Freud and Jung on one side and James on the other. For Freud candidates might identify his central proposition that religion and religious belief are neurotic. Candidates might engage with Freud's writings on *Moses and Monotheism* and *Totem and Taboo*. Some candidates might claim that there was approval for his rejection of religious understandings of the conscience in support of a psychological analysis, and this line of response may then be extended with reference to Jung's theory of archetypes but, on the other hand, James's thinking that religion has a role in making aspects of life which are unbearable, bearable might also be examined. The role of Feuerbach, Marx and/or Nietzsche may be considered by some candidates; or Marx's explanation of the influence of religious psychology and Nietzsche's interpretation of religious belief as the will to power, as well as the power-base built up by the church as an instrument of control through psychological compulsion. Nietzsche also has relevance in terms of the psychology of the individual religious adherent and candidates might explore some of his views accordingly.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The function of religious belief is to protect the individual from the fear of Freud's claim that religion is an illusion
- The function of religious belief as a means to protect believers from the fear of death
- The role of religious belief, for some believers, as a sense of security in a hostile world
- Freud's developed thinking as contained in his writings such as *Moses and Monotheism*, and *Totem and Taboo*
- Whether there is good evidence for Freud's arguments in these writings
- Jung's theory of archetypes as a beneficial diagnostic tool
- James's psychological defence of religious belief and religion itself
- Marx's explanation of the influence of religious psychology
- Nietzsche's claim that human psychology played a large part in the genesis of religion.

Optional theme 6: Philosophy of science

13. Explain and discuss the impact of modern scientific research (such as biology, cognitive science, neuroscience and artificial intelligence) on the understanding of the self. [25]

The question asks for an explanation and discussion of the impact of modern scientific research on the understanding of the self. There is no expectation that the candidate addresses any of the examples listed in the question. It opens a wide variety of possibilities, starting with the research on the mind in the second half of the last century. A usual description under the heading of cognitive science explains that “cognitive science is the interdisciplinary study of mind and intelligence, embracing philosophy, psychology, artificial intelligence, neuroscience, linguistics, and anthropology. Its intellectual origins are in the mid-1950s when researchers in several fields began to develop theories of mind based on complex representations and computational procedures” (Thagard, *Mind. Introduction to Cognitive Science*). However, this question is not exclusively about the scientific research on the mind but also it is about considering what the philosophical implications of the various scientific approaches to the mind are. Accordingly, answers might well also present and discuss classical philosophical positions in the analysis of mind, eg: Plato, Aristotle or Descartes. Answers might also refer to the variety of metaphors for the mind, which over the centuries, philosophers and psychologists have widely used, comparing it, for example, to a blank sheet on which impressions are made, to a hydraulic device with forces operating in it, and to a telephone switchboard. Further, the answers which focus on science and the self may explore the more metaphysical elements of the philosophy of science.

[Source: Thagard, Paul., *Mind*, second edition, 67 words from p. 4, © 2005 Massachusetts Institute of Technology, by permission of The MIT Press.]

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Influences of the philosophical tradition in the origin and shaping of the cognitive sciences, eg: Plato’s *Meno*
- The agreement between most cognitive scientists that knowledge in the mind consists of mental representations
- Neurosciences and the brain: the study of memory, consequences of the new techniques (eg: magnetic resonance imagery), the neurophysiological research on emotions, neuropsychological syndromes
- Consciousness and the variety of approaches and discussions in relation to it, eg: Dennett, Greenfield
- The neurophysiological basis of emotion, eg: Damasio
- The neurophysiological basis of morals, eg: Churchland
- Thagard’s idea that “Cognitive scientists view thinking as a kind of computation and use computational metaphors to describe and explain how people solve problems and learn”
- Biosemiotics/biocommunicative approaches to language and communication
- The practical importance of understanding how the mind works
- The Chinese Room argument
- Approaches to the mind-body problem
- The idea that introspection has access only to a little part of what is going on in the self.

14. Evaluate the claim that whereas epistemology is focused on the study of knowledge, the philosophy of science is concerned with the practices of science. [25]

The question asks for an explanation and evaluation of the claim which opens a wide scope of discussion. The issue under scrutiny has been synthesized in the formula: *Philosophy of Science between Generalism and Particularism* (Bird, *Philosophy of Science and Epistemology*). From this point of view the relationship between philosophy of science and epistemology has been variable. In this sense philosophy of science is between opposing directions: the general account of knowledge and justification provided by epistemology (generalism) and the practices of actual scientists (particularism). The first direction tends to place the philosophy of science within a general epistemological framework, whereas the second one emphasizes the particular, special nature of science and even of the variety of individual sciences. Answers might seek to evaluate the relationship between epistemology and philosophy of science applying the discussions on demarcation. Alternatively, answers might offer an analysis of the various methodologies of science.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The claim that epistemology would benefit if reflected in discussions of the sciences
- Is the search for method and the adoption of one a distinctive feature between scientific knowledge and knowledge in general?
- The defence of scientific knowledge needs to do more than turn back the arguments of the opponents; it requires forms of validation (or falsification)
- Scientific knowledge needs to show the means used to make a case for truth, which would simultaneously serve to display the process of generating knowledge
- Nature of science: the aims, assumptions and foundations of science
- What is (if there is just one) the central feature of science? The nature of science (aims, assumptions and foundations) and that of knowledge (eg: sources of knowledge)
- Classic positions in both epistemology and philosophy of science, eg: Plato, Kuhn, Popper
- Examples, historical or present, eg: cosmology from Aristotle to black holes and DNA
- Philosophy of science and the diverse areas and methodologies: biology, physics, computer sciences, social sciences.

Optional theme 7: Political philosophy

15. Evaluate the claim that the purpose of government is the preservation of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. [25]

This question seeks an evaluation of the three basic tenets of many governments and the degree to which these tenets can be achieved. The three objectives might be investigated and defined and clarified to try and resolve perhaps inherent contradictions. Much as they have been the drivers of many forms of government the relationship of government to individuals and groups means that compromises might have to be made in attempting to achieve all three. Protection of life might hinder or be contradicted by governments that need to enact punishment. Liberty for all might not be reconcilable with freedom for all to act as they wish. Here Mill's Harm Principle might be explored in an attempt to contain liberty. The pursuit of happiness could be interpreted in many ways but seems to be the most controversial and the one most likely to produce contradictions and the need for compromise. In the course of evaluation, historical references might be made to the Founding Fathers of the United States and the English monarchical conflicts of the 17th century. References might be made to Locke as well as Mill and more contemporaneously to Rawls's ideas of social justice in terms of the purpose of government. There might develop a discussion as to the merits of a democratic system being the best form of government to try and achieve the three objectives. A counter position might be that all three are ideals and that practical pragmatic government compromises on all of them and therefore frustrates the desires of individuals at the expense of the greater society.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The duty of government to strive to achieve preservation of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness
- Differing conceptions of liberty might be explored with reference to Locke, Paine, Rousseau, Rawls, Marx, Berlin
- Theories of justice that can be applied to preservation of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness
- Ways in which the state attempts a balance between the three objectives
- Alternative objectives such as the prime aim of a state being to preserve itself at the expense of individuals and group desires to pursuing the life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness
- Freedom of individuals within the context of the state
- Anarchic systems as better ways of trying to achieve the objectives, eg: Nozick
- Recent attempts to reconcile the inherent contradictions, eg: Sen, Nussbaum
- The fundamental nature of humans and whether such objectives are achievable with contrasts being made between Hobbes's views of the human predicament and those of Rousseau or Marx.

16. Explain and discuss the merits of “power to the people” as an idea in politics. [25]

This question seeks an explanation as to the understanding of power and a definition of the people along with degrees to which such participation in government is effective. It raises issues of what powers might be in the hands of the people. Definitions of people might involve consideration of restrictions of gender, age, residence and competence. Also, there could arise a discussion of the ideas of effective government. Power might be seen as degrees and frequency of participation as seen in democratic type systems contrasted with all power, in all its forms, resting with people as perhaps in a form of anarchy. Definitions of who constitute the people could raise issues of values and historical context. The body politic with any restriction poses the question as to who would define such a group; with all the challenges of self-definition and self-perpetuation. Examples might be given from forms of Athenian democracy, early stages of constitutional development in the USA or the role of the party in Soviet and communist style systems. The merits of such a distribution of power could be the will of the people being directly expressed making reference to Rousseau and the “general will”, alongside Mill. Increased involvement of people could reflect upon related problems with the use of complex communications technologies. Counters over both the merits and effectiveness of involvement of people might arise with an analysis of the usefulness or otherwise of social media. Contrasts might be made over the worthiness of the people whatever degree of involvement, and issues of level of education might be discussed: the views of Mill and Lowe might be brought in. The nature of the collective voice of the people might be explored with issues of degrees of comprehension of complex ideas and balance between rational and emotional response being put forward.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Definitions of power, people and effectiveness
- The nature of humans as individuals, inherently good or bad and the consequences of possible base desires of humans as individuals
- The mechanisms of involvement in societies with high levels of technology compared to societies that might not be urbanized and not rely on sophisticated technology
- Flaws in any democratic system
- Flaws in anarchy
- Whether “power to the people” can weaken democracy, eg: Dewey
- Issues of how change can be enacted and maintained when people have power. Is the constant swing of the mass opinion on issues a good thing?
- Pragmatic insights into the mechanics of the democratic charade of people power
- “Power to the people” as degeneration of traditional forms of government, eg: Plato
- The relationship between “power to the people” and populism
- Whether “power to the people” fosters the rise of tyranny or dictatorship
- Does the idea of “power to the people” imply massification, eg: Ortega y Gasset, Marcuse?