

Markscheme

May 2021

Philosophy

Higher level and standard level

Paper 2

37 pages

© International Baccalaureate Organization 2021

All rights reserved. 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 the prior written permission from the IB. Additionally, the license tied with this product prohibits 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, whether fee-covered or not, is prohibited and is a criminal offense.

More information on how to request written permission in the form of a license can be obtained from <https://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/ib-publishing/licensing/applying-for-a-license/>.

© Organisation du Baccalauréat International 2021

Tous droits réservés. 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 préalable de l'IB. De plus, la licence associée à ce produit interdit toute utilisation 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, moyennant paiement ou non, est interdite et constitue une infraction pénale.

Pour plus d'informations sur la procédure à suivre pour obtenir une autorisation écrite sous la forme d'une licence, rendez-vous à l'adresse <https://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/ib-publishing/licensing/applying-for-a-license/>.

© Organización del Bachillerato Internacional, 2021

Todos los derechos reservados. 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 la previa autorización por escrito del IB. Además, la licencia vinculada a este producto prohíbe el uso 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—, ya sea incluido en tasas o no, está prohibido y constituye un delito.

En este enlace encontrará más información sobre cómo solicitar una autorización por escrito en forma de licencia: <https://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/ib-publishing/licensing/applying-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 8 for part A responses, and page 9 for part B responses.

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

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

Note to examiners

Candidates at both Higher Level and Standard Level answer **one** question on the prescribed texts. Each question consists of two parts, and candidates must answer both parts of the question (a and b).

Paper 2 part A markbands

Marks	Level descriptor
0	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)

Removed for copyright reasons

(b)

Removed for copyright reasons

2. (a)

Removed for copyright reasons

(b) Evaluate de Beauvoir's view on women's creative activities.

[15]

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Can art have a salvific function?
- Whether a different view on the role of women and men in art is justifiable
- Whether the lack of professional success in art is related to the lack of a creative genius or artistic talent
- Does de Beauvoir's view on the way society limiting women's approach to art contradict her statement that women can achieve professional success by social recognition (ie: without approaching art as mere self-expression)?
- Is it justifiable to assert that art as self-expression is an amateur's activity only?
- Whether women's approach to art and their visibility in art production has changed in comparison with past times
- Art as original, though irritating, production *versus* art as adaptation to conformism; art in relation with authorities and power; censorship and self-censorship.

René Descartes: *Meditations*

3. (a) **Explain Descartes’s argument regarding the distinction between “what pertains to [the mind ... and] what is to be referred to the body”.** [10]

The question looks for an explanation of a central issue in the *Meditations*. It is first presented in the Second Meditation, where the nature of the mind is in focus. The issue, as the synopsis makes clear, is directly linked to the possible “knowledge of the immortality of the soul”. The main line of reasoning is developed as a counterargument to the expectation that “at this stage of our progress, a statement of the reasons which establish the doctrine of the immortality of the soul” would be provided. Following the geometrical method, where the reasons of a proposition are established first, Descartes states that “the first and chief prerequisite for the knowledge of the immortality of the soul is our being able to form the clearest possible concept of the soul itself, and such as shall be absolutely distinct from all our notions of body”. Answers might refer to the development of the argument. Descartes specifies that further is required “the assurance that all objects which we clearly and distinctly think are true (really exist) in that very mode in which we think them; and this could not be established previously to the Fourth Meditation”. It is also necessarily a distinct concept of corporeal nature, which is given partly in the Second and partly in the Fifth and Sixth Meditations. In the Sixth Meditation, the conclusion is drawn: “all those objects which are clearly and distinctly conceived to be diverse substances, as mind and body, are substances really reciprocally distinct”.

[Source: *The Method, Meditations, and Selections from the Principles of Descartes*, translated by John Veitch (Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons) 1879.]

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The absolute distinction of mind and body is confirmed by showing that we cannot conceive body unless as divisible; while mind cannot be conceived unless as indivisible
- We are not able to conceive the half of a mind, as we can of any body, however small it is
- The considerations presented are sufficient to show that the destruction of the mind does not follow from the corruption of the body
- All things which can only exist in consequence of having been created by God are in their own nature incorruptible, and can never cease to be, unless God himself, by refusing his concurrence to them, reduces them to nothing
- A body, taken generally, is a substance, and therefore can never perish, but the human body, in as far as it differs from other bodies, is constituted only by a certain configuration of members, and by other accidents of this sort
- The human mind is not made up of accidents, but is a pure substance
- Although all the accidents of the mind be changed, for example, it thinks certain things, wills others, and perceives others, the mind itself does not vary with these changes
- The human body is no longer the same if a change takes place in the form of any of its parts: from which it follows that the body may, indeed, without difficulty perish, but that the mind is in its own nature immortal.

(b) Evaluate Descartes’s argument regarding the distinction between “what pertains to [the mind ... and] what is to be referred to the body”. [15]

[Source: *The Method, Meditations, and Selections from the Principles of Descartes*, translated by John Veitch (Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons) 1879.]

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Descartes states that this discussion is not further pursued in the present treatise, so its development is in principle open
- The natures of these two substances are to be held, not only as diverse, but even in some measure as contraries
- Given that the destruction of the mind does not follow from the corruption of the body, the arguments presented in the *Meditations* afford to people the hope of a future life
- What kind of distinction is there between mind and body? Is it what the scholastic tradition called a real distinction?
- Descartes states that the premises from which it is competent for us to infer the immortality of the soul, involve an explication of the whole principles of physics. What might that mean in the context of the present development of the knowledge?
- The mind-body relation: past and present positions (philosophical, scientific, religious), eg: Merleau-Ponty, Popper, Damasio
- The extent to which Descartes’s arguments depend on religious grounds
- The mind-body relation: diverse views and approaches.

4. (a) Explain the relationship between faith and reason according to Descartes. [10]

The question asks for an explanation about the role of reason and its relation to faith in the context of Descartes's new method. One way to develop the answer is exploring the issue in relation to the arguments related to the main concern of the *Meditations* as stated in the second paragraph of the opening "Letter to the Faculty of Theology at the Sorbonne": the questions relating to God and the soul. Both questions were clearly under dispute with many arguments and counterarguments, eg: in relation to God's existence or not or to the immortality or not of the soul. Further, Descartes declares his intention to pursue the issue following the light of natural reason. Within the wide scope of approaches to this question, the answers might also develop aspects of Descartes's new conception of the method and its rational basis.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The affirmation of the sufficiency of natural reason for the proof of the existence of God
- The method based upon reason holds that ideas are true when they are clear and distinct and there is no need to turn to faith in this case
- I do not "refer to matters of faith, or to the conduct of life, but only to what regards speculative truths, and such as are known by means of the natural light alone" (Synopsis Fourth Meditation)
- Most of the irreligious people deny the existence of God, and the distinctness of the human soul from the body, for no other reason than because these, as they allege, have never been demonstrated
- Descartes holds that almost all the proofs which have been adduced on these questions possess, when rightly understood, the force of demonstrations, and that it is next to impossible to discover new proofs
- He maintains that there is no more useful service to be performed in philosophy than if someone were, once for all, to seek carefully out the best of these reasons, and expound them so accurately and clearly that, for the future, it might be manifest to all that they are real demonstrations
- Central aspects of the method, eg: the application of analysis as in geometry, the method of doubt
- Descartes's argument that the idea of God is innate and cannot be derived from experience or imagination.

[Source: *The Method, Meditations, and Selections from the Principles of Descartes*, translated by John Veitch (Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons) 1879.]

(b) Evaluate the relationship between faith and reason according to Descartes. [15]

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The extent to which rational argumentation is framed by and orientated towards the confirmation of the Christian faith
- Whether Descartes needed to show that his philosophy was consistent with Catholic or Calvinist doctrine
- Faith and reason, moments in the history: the confluence between the Bible and the texts of classical Greek philosophy. Aspects of their reception by Descartes
- The influence of Augustine on Descartes, eg: clearing the mind of images in order to experience union with God as present in the very idea of meditation
- Comparison and contrast with Aquinas, eg: the proofs for the existence of God
- The discussion on the extent to which a miracle can be explained by natural reasons
- Possible comparison with later approaches: Locke's connection between reason, responsibility and faith and its influence in the modern conceptions, eg: Swinburne
- The extent to which reason matters in religion according to Descartes; contrasted with the defence of irrationality in matters of faith, eg: Kierkegaard
- Faith and reason: Descartes in relation to the diversity of cultural traditions and present approaches.

David Hume: *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*

5. (a) Explain Philo’s and Demea’s views about knowing the nature of God. [10]

Philo and Demea both express skepticism about the prospect of coming to know God’s nature, but for different reasons. They are united in their skepticism about Cleanthes’s claim that the natural world reveals the nature of God. As such, they both provide critiques of Cleanthes’s teleological and cosmological arguments. To some extent, they also agree on the claim that “to be a philosophical Skeptic is, in a man of letters, the first and most essential step to being a sound believing Christian”. However, Philo and Demea also disagree, with Demea leaving the dialogue after Philo claims that God as creator may take many forms, including an infant deity or a team of deities. Demea declares that “I joined in alliance with you, in order to prove the incomprehensible nature of the Divine Being, and refute the principles of Cleanthes, who would measure everything by human rule and standard. But now I find you running into all topics of the greatest libertines and infidels, and betraying that holy cause which you seemingly espoused”. This question prompts a comparison between the perspectives of Philo and Demea and asks for critical analysis and evaluation of both views in relation to one another.

[Source: David Hume, *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*, https://archive.org/details/bub_gb_E7dbAAAAQAAJ.]

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Philo’s main stance in the dialogue
- Demea’s main stance in the dialogue
- The use of Cleanthes as a contrast to the views of Philo and Demea
- The difference in how Philo and Demea view God
- Why Philo thinks that Demea attributes too much to God
- Why Demea leaves the dialogue as a result of disagreeing with Philo
- Both Philo’s and Demea’s responses to Cleanthes’s use of natural theology to argue for claims about the nature of God.

(b) Evaluate Philo’s and Demea’s views about knowing the nature of God. [15]

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The relationship between faith, skepticism and the nature of God
- The assumption throughout the book that God exists
- Whether Demea’s stance is viable
- Whether Philo’s stance is viable
- Which account is most consistent?
- Why the book ends with an affirmation of Cleanthes’s point of view
- Whether Philo’s and Demea’s claims are compatible with one another
- How far it is possible to know God’s nature.

6. (a) **Explain Pamphilus’s conclusion that the views of Cleanthes are the most convincing.** **[10]**

At the end of *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*, Pamphilus declares that Cleanthes’s arguments about the nature of God, in particular the claim that the order in the universe provides evidence of God’s existence, are the most convincing. Pamphilus claims that “Philo’s principles are more probable than Demea’s [...] those of Cleanthes approach still nearer to the truth”. This is sometimes seen as surprising since throughout the book, Philo, who is seen as most likely to represent Hume’s voice, has erred on the side of skepticism. This question asks for candidates’ reflections on why Hume chooses to end the book on this note, and on how this view can be squared with Philo’s claims elsewhere. One area of interest is Hume’s care to distinguish between Cleanthes’s and Demea’s theological commitments and Philo’s theism. Philo rejects claims about the nature of God (eg: that God is the creator, or that God is all-good), and arguments from experience for the existence of God. This is not inconsistent with Hume’s initial statement (through Pamphilus) that his dialogue is an important exploration of the obvious existence of God: “what truth so obvious, so certain, as the being of God, which most ignorant ages have acknowledged, for which the most refined geniuses have ambitiously striven to produce new proofs and arguments? What truth is so important as this, which is the ground of all our hopes, the surest foundation of morality, the firmest support of society, and the only principle which ought never to be a moment absent from our thoughts and meditations?” (Letter from Pamphilus to Hermippus).

[Source: David Hume, *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*, https://archive.org/details/bub_gb_E7dbAAAAQAAJ.]

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Philo’s view that we cannot know about the nature of God
- Hume’s account of the teleological argument and associated objections and discussion
- Hume’s account of the cosmological argument and associated objections and discussion
- Hume’s account of the problem of evil and associated objections and discussion
- Details about the view that there is order in the universe
- The role of Pamphilus
- Which view Hume seems to have held
- The strengths and weaknesses of dialogue as a tool for philosophical inquiry
- What Hume means by natural theology
- Hume’s evaluation of natural theology
- Philo’s view that faith is central to religion.

- (b) **Evaluate Pamphilus’s conclusion that the views of Cleanthes are the most convincing.** **[15]**

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The strengths and weaknesses of the teleological and cosmological arguments
- The strengths and weaknesses of the problem of evil
- Discussion of how Hume evaluates the teleological and cosmological arguments, and the problem of evil
- Whether theism is compatible with skepticism
- Historical context in relation to atheism and natural theology
- Whether Philo’s views and Pamphilus’s conclusion are compatible
- The extent to which Philo, Cleanthes and Demea agree
- The strength of Pamphilus’s conclusion
- Which character the candidate feels makes the strongest case and why
- The importance of faith, as opposed to rationality in religion
- The extent to which Philo, Cleanthes and Demea disagree.

John Stuart Mill: *On Liberty***7. (a) Explain Mill's idea of individuality.****[10]**

The question asks in the first part for an explanation of the central traits of Mill's approach to individuality, whereas in the second one a more specific claim is presented where the weight of individuality is interpreted in stark opposition to society. Both parts of the question are clearly anchored in the subject of Mill's essay as it is stated at the beginning of Chapter 1: "the nature and limits of the power which can be legitimately exercised by society over the individual". Regarding the first part answers might refer to Mill's analysis and discussion on Chapter 3 following the idea of "individuality as one of the elements of wellbeing". According to one side, Mill's conception of individuality would require a fundamentally unsituated individual, radically liberated from any social convention. J Riley's opposite view maintains that Mill's idea of individuality does not require an individual to be completely unsituated because their liberty and individuality are closely connected to their culture. When evaluating the claim answers might refer to Chapter 4 of Mill's book, where the limits to the authority of the society over the individual are discussed.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Individuality as a disposition to prefer and act accordingly
- Individual liberty as the choices a person makes, in accordance with his own judgment and inclinations, without interference from others
- "In things which do not primarily concern others, individuality should assert itself"
- Individuality, as one of the elements of wellbeing, makes imperative that human beings should be free to form opinions, and to express their opinions without reserve
- This also requires that people should be free to act upon their opinions – to carry these out in their lives, without hindrance, either physical or moral, from others, so long as it is at their own risk and peril
- This last proviso is indispensable; no one pretends that actions should be as free as opinions
- Even opinions lose their immunity, when the circumstances in which they are expressed are such as to constitute their expression a positive instigation to some mischievous act
- Acts of whatever kind, which, without justifiable cause, do harm to others, may be, and in the more important cases are absolutely required to be, controlled by the active interference of people
- "The liberty of the individual must be thus far limited; he must not make himself a nuisance to other people"
- The "mob" or the tyranny of the majority – as in opposition to the individual.

[Source: Mill, John Stuart. *On Liberty by John Stuart Mill*. United Kingdom: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1867.]

(b) Evaluate Mill’s idea of individuality.

[15]

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- “What is the rightful limit to the sovereignty of the individual over himself? Where does the authority of society begin? How much of human life should be assigned to individuality, and how much to society?”
- “While mankind is imperfect there should be different opinions, so is it that there should be different experiments of living”
- When the traditions of customs of other people are the rule of conduct and not the person’s own character, there is a lack of one of the principal ingredients of human happiness, and the chief ingredient of individual and social progress
- Scope and implications of the idea of human nature
- The extent to which individuals might be unequal with respect to their endowed capacities
- Mill’s idea that the source of everything respectable in people either as intellectual or moral beings is that their errors are corrigible
- The conflict between the individual and the social and cultural norms in different contexts (past and present philosophical, scientific, religious positions); diverse views and approaches, eg: cultural traditions, feminist views
- The relation between individual liberty and social progress
- Mill’s position in relation to the Greek ideal of self-development, or Humboldt’s conception of individuals, as examples.

[Source: Mill, John Stuart. *On Liberty by John Stuart Mill*. United Kingdom: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1867.]

8. (a) Explain Mill’s idea of religious liberty. [10]

In the first place the question asks for an explanation of Mill’s idea on religious liberty and, subsequently in question (b), requires an evaluation of Mill’s view. Mill states in the introductory chapter that “the only case in which the higher ground has been taken on principle and maintained with consistency, by any but an individual here and there, is that of religious belief: a case instructive in many ways, and not least so as forming a most striking instance of the fallibility of what is called the moral sense”. Answers might relate the ideas of religious liberty to the “one very simple principle”, discussing whether in this way Mill gives an absolute priority to individual liberty over other moral or social considerations within self-regarding limits. When the answer is yes, the counterargument that the allegedly absolute character of individual freedom would go against different religions’ creeds might be advanced. A further possible matter to which answers might further refer is tolerance, an issue which appears at different moments in Mill’s essay. Further, answers might well connect these issues with other Mill’s arguments, eg: the liberty of thought and discussion.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- “The only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilized community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others”
- The essential position of Mill’s liberty principle: it implies that every civil society should accept it as a basic maxim, whatever the society’s cultural and moral circumstances are
- The principle of religious liberty has its departing point basis when each church or sect is unable to win “a complete victory” over its multiple competitors; then minorities considering that they had no chance of becoming majorities, “were under the necessity of pleading to those whom they could not convert, for permission to differ”
- Religious belief as a “battlefield”, where “the rights of the individual against society have been asserted”
- Intolerance is “so natural to mankind in whatever they really care about, that religious freedom has hardly anywhere been practically realized, except where religious indifference has added its weight to the scale”
- The right of the individual to religious liberty remains in an uncertain situation, since it might well fall down when a revival of religious enthusiasm sweeps over the majority
- Opposition to religion also looks for assertion of the right of spiritual domination: “M Comte, in particular, whose social system, as unfolded in his *Système de Politique Positive*, aims at establishing (although by moral more than by legal appliances) a despotism of society over the individual, surpassing anything contemplated in the political ideal of the most rigid disciplinarian among the ancient philosophers”
- Mill’s analysis of cases and practices, eg: religious abstinences.

[Source: Mill, John Stuart. *On Liberty by John Stuart Mill*. United Kingdom: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1867.]

(b) Evaluate Mill's idea of religious liberty.

[15]

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Whether the inalienable right of freedom of conscience should never be subject to interference by law or opinion
- Religion as the most powerful of the elements which have entered into the formation of moral feeling
- Whether religions have almost always been governed by the ambition of a hierarchy, seeking control over every domain of human conduct
- Historical, political, social and cultural circumstances related to where freedom of conscience takes place, eg: Emperor Marcus Aurelius and Christianity, Luther and Reformation
- Relations between religious toleration and free institutions
- The constant possibility of revivals of religious intolerance and the advent of despotic secular religions of the sort usually classified as totalitarianism nowadays
- Possible connections between religious forms and social and economic systems, eg: between Protestantism and capitalism
- Whether religion is always, in narrow and uncultivated minds, almost a synonym of intolerance
- Rights in the utilitarian perspective. As liberty leads to greater happiness, is it a right? Or is the right subordinate to the end of happiness?
- Religious belief, freedom of conscience and tolerance in different contexts (past and present philosophical, scientific, religious positions); diverse views and approaches; from various cultural traditions to, eg: feminist views.

Friedrich Nietzsche: *The Genealogy of Morals*

9. (a) Explain the role the ascetic ideal plays in determining moral values. [10]

The aim of this question is to discuss and assess the culmination of Nietzsche's argument in Essay 3, where he proposes a counter to the "will to power": the search for truth, and as a consequence, a position or role (priest, philosopher, scientist) by which to determine moral value. Although this ideal curtails humanity from expressing itself and seeking out conditions that enhance life, without an ascetic ideal, civilisation and communal living would be impossible.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The view of the ascetic ideal as a preserver of life as well as a denier to life: how the restricted conditions for life (morality) literally protects and preserves life, and sets up a clear distinction and appreciation of the values that make life bearable and dangerous
- Objective truth is the claim and promise of the ascetic ideal and this is the motive and source for the attenuation of the will to power. It is the claim of every ideology from Christianity to Science
- The form of the ascetic ideal comes in types or guises. In ancient cultures, this was the priest, and in contemporary cultures it is the philosophers and scientists. Characteristic of all types is their denial or rejection of the sensual aspects of life, and the creation of an ideal (based on the desire for truth) that is impossible for humanity to achieve
- The origins of the bad conscience as a consequence of failure to live up to this ideal
- The "will to power" as motive for the creation of such an ideal as an opposition.

(b) Evaluate the role of the ascetic ideal in the origins of morality. [15]

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Does Nietzsche's perspectivism necessarily deny the individual the concept of some authentic set of moral values?
- Is our search for truth the motive for an ascetic ideal?
- The possible connection to Mill in espousing the benefits of exploring new ways of living
- Does morality provide a safety net for social groups?
- Whether Nietzsche's psychological view of humanity implies an irrational and violent element to our lives
- Even if Nietzsche's analysis is true, is it not better to live in our current way, in a society without the exercising of naked power and where pity and compassion are valued, rather than in Nietzsche's alternative?
- Is Nietzsche wrong when he claims that even science is without an objective position for truth?

10. (a) Explain the role that ancestor worship plays in the origins of morality. [10]

The aim of this question is to engage candidates with the latter sections of Essay 2 where Nietzsche describes the development of ancestor worship into organized religion as the apotheosis of the bad conscience. An earlier connection is made to the role of fear; in punishment it was to help forge indelible collective memories; in ancestor worship it was fear of the accumulated debt of their sacrifice and toil to establish the group. Nietzsche's aim in this section is to describe briefly a connection of the concepts of guilt and duty to religious presuppositions. The debtor/creditor relationship described in Essay 1, and with the role of punishment in Essay 2, the fear associated with these relationships, Nietzsche's historical approach, and the subsequent moral position and method for moral evaluations that follow from the bad conscience, are all possible lines of analysis and evaluation.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The narrative on the origin of "religion"; initially from the debt owed to ancestors and founders of tribes
- The increase in the feeling of debt to ancestors as the distance in time between current and past generations increase. This only happens if the tribe is continually successful and increases its power
- The connection of debt and duty to the fear of punishment
- The ascension of the Christian god as the most powerful god is accompanied by a maximum feeling of indebtedness and fear
- The invention of the bad conscience; a will for self-tormenting when the will to power is turned inward
- Eventually, the concepts of guilt and duty subsumed within the bad conscience, are turned back onto the creditor (God)
- The sacrifice of Christ to assuage the guilt of humanity
- Nietzsche's comparison of Christian god to the gods of the ancient Greeks: the Greek gods were modelled on noble, aristocratic values. The result was the Greeks delayed the development of the bad conscience.

(b) Evaluate the role that ancestor worship plays in the origins of morality. [15]

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Is it fear that makes human capable of making and keeping promises?
- The ritual of punishment as a necessary cultural and psychological condition
- Does a bad conscience arise out of need for protection from fear and violence?
- The paradoxical and contradictory image of Nietzschean humanity – creature and creator
- Is it wrong to want to protect the weak from fear of the strong, and from the fear of the violent potential of general humanity?
- Is it naïve to think that love rather than fear motivates moral valuations?

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

11. (a) Explain how the *human capabilities approach* gives dignity to the individual. [10]

In the *human capabilities approach*, there is an emphasis on the way individuals might achieve various functions and outcomes, that would confer dignity on the individual by virtue of the process. Central to the issue of enabling human capabilities, Nussbaum lists the individual's ability to choose for themselves, political freedom and a non-hierarchical or authoritarian background to issues of value and respect. This draws on a major influence for Nussbaum, Amartya Sen, who drew out his own ideas about human functions in his own capabilities theory. For Nussbaum an added issue is the disparity in power, thus resulting in a compromise on dignity, between men and women. Nussbaum elicits three principles and a 10-point scale for measuring human dignity, taking into account different cultures that have a particular impact on the development of women. Nussbaum draws a distinction between "basic", "combined" and "internal" capabilities. In much of the discussion around the *human capabilities approach* there arises a critique of one culture criticising another, with Nussbaum representing the kind of liberal orthodoxy currently under fire in western political debate.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The three main principles to help individuals achieve dignity: each person to be an end in herself, the potential for individual choice, the ability for social injustice to be addressed
- The 10-point scale for measurement of human dignity
- The issue of objectification
- The challenge of maintaining traditional cultures that can cause conflict with the autonomy of the individual
- The issue of cultural imperialism and how it affects the life of the individual
- The impact of government policies on individual dignity, eg: policies on health, social welfare, political freedom
- The relationship between the individual and economic contribution to society
- How capabilities contribute to the individual's dignity
- Nussbaum's idea of combined capabilities
- Internal capabilities
- Basic capabilities

(b) Evaluate how the *human capabilities approach* gives dignity to the individual. [15]

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Can the *human capabilities approach* take sufficient account of differing cultures?
- Is the *human capabilities approach* too dependent on a form of western liberal political orthodoxy?
- Can Nussbaum successfully allow for the loyalty of individuals to some traditions and religions, while upholding a universal value of the autonomy of the individual?
- Can the capabilities be so tidily defined? eg: might an individual's "internalized" confident personality not be understood as a "combined" product of upbringing and early schooling?
- The issue of the imbalance between individual free choice and inequality
- Religion demanding more individual loyalty than rational political or cultural principles
- The issues of pluralism and paternalism as encouragers to or distractors from individual dignity
- The issue of gender and individual dignity
- Economics and individual dignity
- Health and individual dignity
- Welfare and individual dignity.

12. (a) **Explain the view that nations have a moral role in ensuring equality and justice in other nations.** [10]

Nussbaum asserts that the *human capabilities approach* is a global one transcending national barriers that might see the inhibition of the flourishing of individuals in one nation where in another, individuals prosper. Due to a combination of different factors (see the different basic, internalized or combined capabilities) there are fortuitous factors that might influence inequality, but there are also structural ones in global economic and political reality, and such factors should be addressed to bring about greater global equality and justice. Nussbaum does not just draw from a western tradition to assert her case for a capabilities approach, but also draws from the Indian tradition, thus attempting to maintain the rationale as supranational. Nussbaum addresses the issue of the difference between arbitrary and unavoidable gaps between basic individual entitlements and rights, and she looks at how different societies with different cultural histories possess differing thresholds for capabilities. Nussbaum asserts that the job of encouraging greater equality and justice is one for government, not one to be franchised out to unaccountable NGOs. Globalization and economics are major levers for inequality and consumers are part of the problem and should be a part of the solution.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The notion of the nation state and duties that might arise
- The basis of human freedom, cf references to the Aristotelian, Christian, Stoic, and other traditions
- Individual human freedom in different cultural or religious traditions
- Globalizations and the role of individuals in economic injustice or inequality
- Adam Smith and the ethical implications of economics
- Utilitarianism and economics
- Arbitrary features of birth, such as gender or nationality, and how redistribution might affect such features
- Governments and their relationship to individual freedoms
- Governments and their relationship to social welfare
- The treatment of different traditions and the assumption of a common framework.

- (b) **Evaluate the claim that nations have a moral role in ensuring equality and justice in other nations.** [15]

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The extent to which one nation can have a duty towards another
- The issue of cultural imperialism
- The way a market functions *versus* government intervention to help the poor
- Global economics and how markets reflect the priorities of different nations and people – or does the structure of global markets ensure markets are not free to express the needs of different peoples equally?
- Do supranational institutions, like the United Nations, contribute to global inequalities?
- Utilitarianism in addressing individual capabilities and how it ignores rights and individual dignity
- Dependency and international aid
- Responsibility for inequalities between nations – see historic and structural causes and how such causes should be addressed
- Is the account convincing in appealing beyond particular cultures and understandings, eg: women's rights?

Ortega y Gasset: *The Origin of Philosophy***13. (a) Explain Ortega's account of the unity of philosophy. [10]**

Ortega refers to the unity of philosophy throughout the book. The origins of philosophy are important because of its unity, since the question of the origins of philosophy only takes on significance if the past is relevant to the present. Ortega claims that the past is incorporated into the present because philosophy is a unity. The origins of philosophy are incorporated into what philosophy is today. This provides some context for Ortega's lengthy discussion of the origins of philosophy from Thales to the present. A grasp of the unity of philosophy is necessary if we are to understand the nature of philosophy, because without some unity it is impossible to offer a single account of its nature. To discover the unity or oneness of philosophy, he says that we need to discover what these opinions have in common. Ortega uses the analogy of a pyramid. This links to the *dialectical series*, where to continue to ascend the pyramid is to bring together differing opinions and to progress towards the unity of philosophy.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Ortega's account of the origin of philosophy
- How the origin of philosophy relates to the unity of philosophy
- The use of the dialectic to provide unity across different philosophical opinions
- The idea that we have access to aspects of reality, not reality as a whole
- The role of history in our understanding and knowledge of reality
- "Aspects" as perspectives
- The analogy of the pyramid which Ortega uses to illustrate the unity of philosophy.

(b) Evaluate Ortega's account of the unity of philosophy. [15]

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Whether candidates agree that there is some unity in philosophy
- How far history should be taken into account when doing philosophy
- Whether the origins of philosophy are significant to understanding what philosophy is
- The idea that perhaps there are many incommensurable philosophical theories and opinions, with no unity
- Discussion of whether Ortega's account of the origin of philosophy tells us anything about philosophy itself
- Comparison with other philosophical traditions, such as contemporary analytic philosophy which often rejects the idea that past philosophies should be incorporated into the present
- How far candidates agree that we are faced with aspects of reality, not reality itself.

14. (a) Explain the relationship of *dialectical series* to philosophical progress. [10]

Ortega explains what he means by a *dialectical series*, and how he sees it as central to philosophy. This is an important part of the book because his explanation of the *dialectical series* is tied to his central claim that the past is always in the present. It also provides a starting point for his answer about the origins of philosophy. When we examine an idea, or consider a subject, we can think of it from many different angles, or see different aspects of it. The *dialectical series* aims to “contiguity” so that aspects are arranged into a coherent series. The *dialectical series* makes sense of the confusing collection of aspects of reality that we have identified over the course of history, and aims to unite them into something coherent. This is important in terms of identifying the significance of the origins of philosophy. Examining the origins of philosophy ensures that important aspects of our understanding of reality are not left out of our *dialectical series*. This links to Ortega’s claim that the past is in the present.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Ortega’s account of the nature of philosophy
- The *dialectical series* as outlined in Chapter 3
- Links between the *dialectical series* and the origin of philosophy
- Links between the *dialectical series* and the unity of philosophy
- How the history of philosophy can contribute to the present and the future
- The idea that we grasp aspects of reality but not reality itself
- How the dialectic examines these aspects and puts them into a series
- Ortega’s example of the orange as an analogy for the *dialectical series*.

(b) Evaluate the relationship of *dialectical series* to philosophical progress. [15]

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Whether the *dialectical series* is worthwhile
- Candidates may favour other accounts of the dialectic and refer to these
- The nature of our knowledge of reality
- Whether different aspects of reality can be drawn into a unity
- The significance of the history of philosophy
- Whether the origin of philosophy is important
- How far philosophical ideas are a unity
- Other accounts of the dialectic, eg: Hegel, Plato
- Whether the *dialectical series* can contribute to progress.

Plato: *The Republic*, Books IV–IX**15. (a) Explain Plato’s claim that philosophers are lovers of truth. [10]**

Early in the work in Book 5 Plato raises the contrast between philosophers, who love the single truth and see “beauty” itself, as opposed to those who love a multiplicity about things. Plato engages in an argument that contrasts the loving of sensible objects by non-philosophers with the love of truth and beauty by philosophers. This inevitably raises the issue of Plato’s theory of knowledge, based as it is on a contrast between the sensory perception of non-philosophers and the love of ideal truth by philosophers. Plato gives examples such as a philosopher loving wisdom in itself, as opposed to loving a certain type of wisdom that would be the case for non-philosophers. There is an example later in the work of the difference between the appreciation of a piece of art where the philosopher can see the beauty beyond the actual instance of the painting. This ability to recognize true beauty and access truth in the world of Forms by the philosopher makes the philosopher qualified to rule. Plato’s conception of knowledge, thus, rests on a dualism between the world of sensible objects appreciated by most people, and the true ideal world of Forms, only known by philosophers. Knowledge does not attach to sensible objects. The world of sensible objects is appreciated only through the cognitive state of opinion or belief, whereas true knowledge lies beyond the sensible object to the Form in which that object participates. The world of Forms offers the basis of reality for all sensible objects, so philosophers are able to see beyond the changing, corrupt world of material things and appreciate the reality beyond that gives existence to all other objects. In this way a philosopher can understand not just the single beauty beyond the “sights and sounds” loved by non-philosophers, but can also understand what is required to bring justice to the state.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Plato’s world of Forms
- The philosopher’s love of beauty
- How beauty is known by the philosopher as opposed to the lover of “sights and sounds”
- The way the world of Forms reveals true knowledge as opposed to the opinions or perceptions of the world of sensible objects
- How knowledge or opinion attach to different cognitive objects
- Knowledge of the Good
- The rejection of the world of the sense by Plato in favour of dialectic reasoning more akin to Mathematics than empirical observation.

(b) Evaluate Plato’s claim that philosophers are lovers of truth. [15]

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The discussion of philosophers loving true beauty not just “sights and sounds”
- The main issue with Plato’s conception is the undemonstrated assumptions about metaphysical reality that he makes
- The value of truth in the running of the state
- The ability of the philosopher rulers to know the truth
- The world of the Forms is assumed to be a truth and it is from the assumption of its existence that Plato builds a metaphysical, epistemological and ethical system
- The difficult notion of how a sensible object relates to its Form – is the Form “participating in”, “copying”, “being present in” the object?
- The rejection of empirical observation as a route to truth; eg: Aristotle
- Aristotle’s third man argument, where the need for a further Form to describe the link between the sensible object and the ultimate Form is endlessly required
- The possibility of trivial Forms existing
- The *reductio ad absurdum* argument that every existing sensible thing and all its requisite parts requires a Form for its existence
- The different types of knowledge experienced in the world, eg: knowledge of, how to – how do these relate to a possible world of Forms?
- How the world of Forms might handle different realities, eg: the difference between understanding mathematics, ethics and the material world.

16. (a) Explain how philosophers qualify to be rulers in the state. [10]

Socrates explains to Glaucon that justice can only be achieved in the state when rule is exercised by philosophers who know what true justice is. In his discussion at the end of Book 5 Plato asserts that philosophers are the only means by which what is best for the state can be brought about. Plato outlines a programme of education for young people selected to be guardians (earlier in the work in Book 3), and in Books 6 and 7 he sets out the basis for why philosophers should rule. The prime basis for this rule is the guardians' ability to recognise the world of the Forms and thus see truth (and thus what justice truly is). The philosophers have the requisite ontological and epistemological understanding. Philosophers also have the appropriate character and lack of worldly ambition or attachment, and the possession of such virtues leads to just rule. Plato accepts that in society philosophers are not accepted as they should be, and he explores the issues that philosophers face in being accepted in society in the Simile of the Ship and the example of the wild and dangerous animal. In this, he accounts both for the theoretical basis for rule by philosophers as well as the ills of contemporary society in its rejection of rule by philosophers.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Philosophers understand the world of the Forms, thus having the true knowledge that can only bring about justice in the state
- The Forms provide the template for the ideal state and only philosophers recognize how the state can participate in the world of truth
- Philosophers have the virtue of the love of truth after the rigorous process of physical and mental education that qualifies them for rule
- Philosophers have the personal qualities that qualify them for rule, eg: being truthful, unsensual, self-controlled, courageous, generous, balanced, clever, possessing good taste, just
- The simile of the ship
- The example of the wild and dangerous animal.

(b) Evaluate the argument that philosophers should rule. [15]

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The ontological and epistemological assumptions Plato makes
- Why rule through knowledge might be paternalistic
- The impossibility of relating the metaphysical world of the Forms to the physical world of the state
- The desirability of representation by our peers in rule
- Why should the disinterestedness of philosophers be a positive quality for rule?
- Why do ordinary people find philosophers to be useless?
- Why would propensities, such as that in Mathematics, qualify philosophers to rule?

Peter Singer: *The Life You Can Save***17. (a) Explain Singer’s view of the common objections to giving. [10]**

In Chapter 3 Singer explores reasons cited for not giving to those in need, following the stating of his “basic argument” in Chapter 2 that concludes that you are doing something wrong if you do not donate to aid agencies. There are further arguments explored for not giving in other parts of the book, but the principal treatment is in Chapter 3. Arguments are cited in terms of the ability of individuals to give, as well as more generalized objections in a modern capitalist global economy. Philosophical objections are raised. Answers might explore the different types of objections and explore the counter positions Singer might raise, although a personal evaluation of the strength of the objections is not expected.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- People have different personal views about giving and there can be no prescribed single demand that all people must give
- People have a right to spend the money they have earned in the way that they please
- People have no general duty to help those against whom they have not directly done anything wrong
- The government aid programmes funded through taxation take sufficiently from individuals with wealth to help the poor
- Philanthropy undermines real change
- Charity breeds dependency
- Charities are corrupt and not enough of donated money gets to those for whom it was intended
- Implications for economies of taking cash out and giving it elsewhere; see the Dutch problem
- The special duties to particular groups, eg: families.

(b) Evaluate Singer’s view about the possible objections to giving. [15]

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The possibility of an objective moral response to the issue of inequality
- The applicability of the moral response to all people regardless of personal link or relation
- Is futility an appropriate moral response to global inequality?
- The importance of fairness as a motivator for action. Overcoming psychological objections to giving
- The argument about evolution and our duty to give
- Means of improving charity efficiency and the efficacy of aid
- The possible moral entitlement of others, eg: family, friends, neighbours, workmates
- The view that being aware of money causes a distance from others.

18. (a) **Explain Singer’s claim that “no principle of obligation is going to be widely accepted unless it recognizes that parents will and should love their own children more than the children of strangers”.** [10]

[Source: From Peter Singer, *The Life You Can Save*, © and available for free download from www.thelifeyoucansave.org.]

Singer looks closely at the moral obligations of people regardless of their distance from suffering or need. In the age of the internet the suffering of those caught in a geographical event like a tsunami, many thousands of miles away, comes much closer. However, he recognizes that there is a difference between moral obligation to the stranger in need and one’s own children. In Chapter 8 Singer mentions a short story, “The Unnatural Mother”, and following that discusses real-life cases of individuals caught between the need to show due moral care to others and the special duties that are felt by being a parent. In the anecdotes of Kravinsky and Farmer, Singer looks at what might be justified from the perspective of special duties.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The passage about “The Unnatural Mother”
- The drowning child
- Special duties in utilitarianism
- Zell Kravinsky donating his kidney to a stranger and his wife’s objecting that it might be needed for his family
- Dr Farmer’s dilemma between the child he could not save and his feelings towards his own child
- The role of distance and number in moral obligation
- Singer’s approach in concluding we should do the best we can
- The calculation of how much more value you might place on your own child than another’s.

- (b) **Evaluate Singer’s claim that “no principle of obligation is going to be widely accepted unless it recognizes that parents will and should love their own children more than the children of strangers”.** [15]

[Source: From Peter Singer, *The Life You Can Save*, © and available for free download from www.thelifeyoucansave.org.]

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Are your moral duties able to be separated from your situation in life?
- The cost of a child’s university education – can the payment by parents of such high fees be justified?
- Can measurements of how much more value you place on your own child, rather than another’s one, be made?
- Ancient stories of Isaac and Iphigeneia, sacrificed at the will of their parents
- The story “The Good German”
- Utopian communities with more shared links between parents and children – can they work?
- Is the objection to giving in a disinterested way here a practical one or a moral one?

Charles Taylor: *The Ethics of Authenticity*

19. (a) Explain Taylor’s view that it is individualism that makes authenticity trivial. [10]

This question asks for an explanation of the significance for Taylor of the changing nature of individualism in the modern era. He sees it as the first malaise of modernity, his first worry. It is alongside the other two malaises which he outlines, those of “instrumental reason” and loss of involvement in a public sphere of life (lack of involvement in politics and consequent loss of control). With individualism he sees a change beginning in the Romantic Movement from defined roles for people to people aspiring to find their self, and in so doing becoming isolated but also self-centred and self-seeking. This is the trivialization of the authenticity of self. The authenticity that exists within the modern world is shallow self-fulfilling and driven by moral relativism, the power of the market and commercialism that belittles the choices people make. Authenticity and non-trivialization must have a “horizon of significance”, a social dialogue, and not be subjective or narcissistic. For Taylor the triviality is produced by the socio-economic-technological pressures placed on the individual.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The need for “horizons of significance”
- The role of instrumental reason and the withdrawal from political involvement
- The reasons for the decline of social dialogue; social isolationism
- The judgments that surround the idea of the trivial; social superiority
- Individual choice and commercialism
- Pressures of conformity
- Authenticity in art as a guide to authenticity in a person through the need to have universalized reference points
- Ways to avoid narcissism.

(b) Evaluate Taylor’s view that it is individualism that makes authenticity trivial. [15]

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The advantages and disadvantages of the changing idea of individualism since the Romantic Movement
- “Atomization” and its consequences
- The value of increased social dialogue
- Involvement in the public realm, politics, the increase of democracy or a slide to oligarchy
- Ways to counter the market/commercial forces that drive narcissism
- Moral relativism *versus* universal standards
- Individualism and social responsibility
- An assessment of Taylor’s view of the modern malaise
- Skepticism of the power of individual action in the 21st century
- The interaction of social media and individuals.

20. (a) Explain Taylor’s view of fragmentation. [10]

This question asks for an explanation of the possible causes and consequences of fragmentation. When people can no longer come together because of “atomisation” they are unable to strive for and complete a common purpose. This is seen as weakening democracy and allowing the rise of “soft despotism”. Such a condition is brought about by the first two malaises that Taylor describes, those of “narcissism” and “instrumental reason”. Such fragmentation results in people not identifying with political activity and not entering into dialogue. Individual rights are stressed rather than common purposes and socially acceptable compromises are avoided. This results in the inability of societies to carry through programmes that enhance the human condition and better the lives of all. People have become isolated and have lost sight of “horizons of significance” because of the self-interest.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Factors that have produced a decline in dialogue, political involvement, eg: the rise of self-interest and self-gratification
- The nature of “soft despotism”
- The role of “horizons of significance” to focus common purpose
- Moral relativism
- The inability to see and appreciate larger communal objectives
- The significance of instrumental reason and the consequences of self-orientated freedom
- The nature of “good society” as an alternative view of modernity.

(b) Evaluate Taylor’s view of fragmentation. [15]

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Tocqueville’s views of the effect of lack of involvement in democratic processes resulting in a decline of community projects
- The need and value of a greater sense of communal responsibility
- Counter movements in democratic societies showing that people seek to be involved
- Skepticism with modern political party systems
- The effects of the rise of populism
- The use of communication technologies to mobilize people’s involvement contrasted with traditional forms of democratic activity
- A challenge to Taylor’s negative view from the perspective of not condemning self-fulfillment
- The view that “boosters” and “knockers” can establish a necessary balance
- The rise of paternalistic governments (nanny states) removing the need for individual responsibility
- The upholding of individual rights as either enhancing the negative aspects of individualism or checking the actions of government
- Examples such as the abortion debate illustrating a stimulated and intellectually active democratic community
- The pros and cons of decentralized political power to counter fragmentation and increase people participation
- Loss of meaning, passion, and purpose in our everyday life reinforces inaction
- Taylor’s skepticism about the protestant work ethic.

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

The question stems from the second chapter of *Tao Te Ching* and invites an exploration of a central topic of the whole *Tao*: the opposites. Candidates might analyse the relationship between the opposites and present some samples, eg: Yin and Yang. Candidates might explain the reasons why the opposites are important in the *Tao*, by referring to the concept of harmony: not only the opposites attract each other, they also generate each other. One element contains the seed of its opposite. Candidates might also mention *wu wei*, since it is linked to the ability to handle the opposites: action as non-action, or action without contrast or effort, is properly the meaning that the argument on the opposites has: harmony is the capacity to move between the opposites. Candidates might consider the figure of the Sage and explain how they get to know how to live in harmony. Candidates might also refer to some samples from other chapters, eg: the metaphor of water, in order to explain the nature and relationship of the opposites. Candidates might evaluate whether this argument is consistently supported by other topics in *Tao Te Ching* or it is unrelated to the general view of the *Tao*. Finally, candidates might evaluate whether this argument is linkable to other philosophers, eg: Heraclitus, or other philosophical concepts and positions, eg: “*coincidentia oppositorum*”.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The nature of the opposites and their relationship
- Samples of opposites, eg: beauty and ugliness, good and evil, Yin and Yang
- Possible metaphors to explain the relationship between the opposites, eg: water in Chapter 8, disgrace and calamities as pleasant in Chapter 13, empty and full in Chapter 22, perfection and imperfection in Chapter 45, wisdom and knowledge in Chapter 81
- The concepts of balance and harmony
- The concept of transformation
- The nature of the *Tao*
- The Sage and *wu wei*.

(b) Evaluate the nature of the opposites in the *Tao*. [15]

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Whether the argument of the opposites is related to *wu wei*
- Whether the knowledge and proper use of the opposites is related to the Sage
- Whether metaphors, eg: water, can explain the relationship between the opposites
- Whether the argument of the opposites is consistently supported by other topics in *Tao Te Ching*
- Whether the understating of the nature of the opposites is necessary for the proper approach to the *Tao*
- Possible reference to other philosophers, eg: Heraclitus, or other philosophical views, eg: “*coincidentia oppositorum*”.

22. (a) Explain the metaphor of the everlasting durability of Heaven and Earth. [10]

The question arises from the argument presented in the seventh chapter of *Tao Te Ching*. Particularly, candidates might explore this topic and explain the metaphorical use of it. Candidates might relate the argument on the durability of Heaven and Earth to the concept of selfishness and how it is linked to other elements, eg: self-interest, self-concern, egoism, altruism. Candidates might evaluate whether this argument supports an altruistic ethical view or it is just linked to the individual's own capacity to take control over their passions and keep her/his ends hidden, in order to achieve her/his own goals. Candidates might also refer to the figure of the Sage and explain how they handle self-realization and manages to accomplish her/his private ends. Candidates might also refer to another chapter, where the ethical implications sound clearer. Candidates might evaluate whether this argument is connected to *wu wei* and the ability to achieve a goal without striving for it. This quotation shows that the argument might be related to an elitist view, which might be based on the fact that most of the people are not able to achieve their goals properly or according to the *Tao*, whereas the Sage only knows how to and can also do it for them. Candidates might also evaluate whether this topic is consistently discussed in *Tao Te Ching* and whether it is a central point for the understanding of what the *Tao* is and what its requirements are. Finally, candidates might mention other philosophical views on genuine altruism, eg: Kant, or on an egoistic use of it, eg: Helvetius.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The metaphor of the durability of Heaven and Earth
- The concept of selfishness and other related elements, eg: self-interest, self-concern, self-realization
- The figure of the Sage and how they relate to self-concern and self-interest
- The relation between durability and *wu wei*: the ability to achieve a goal without striving for it
- Contrast between egoism and altruism
- Possible role of passions and desires and the necessity to take control over them
- Possible role of envy.

(b) Evaluate the metaphor of the everlasting durability of Heaven and Earth. [15]

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The ethical implications of this argument
- Whether the argument supports an ethical view or it refers to the individual's capacity to achieve their own goals
- Possible views on the role of egoism and altruism, eg: Kant, Helvetius
- Whether the figure of the Sage supports an ethical perspective
- Whether the argument has to do with passions and desires and other feelings, eg: envy, with the idea that they are out of control in most of the people
- Whether the argument is related to *wu wei*; does *wu wei* exclude an ethical interpretation of the argument?
- Does the argument support an elitist view, where only the Sage can manage to achieve the goals according to the *Tao*?
- Whether the argument and its understanding are necessary for the proper approach to the *Tao*
- Possible comparison to other philosophical views on egoism, altruism, etc, eg: Kant, Helvetius.

Zhuangzi: *Zhuangzi***23. (a) Explain Zhuangzi's claim that one should not try to master knowledge. [10]**

In the final chapter Zhuangzi distils the wisdom of the *Tao* in a poem; one of the key pieces of advice is to avoid the mastery of knowledge. Zhuangzi adopts a skeptical position on the traditional view of knowledge as a comprehensive, fixed understanding, and also with the authorities of knowledge. His views are closely associated with the role of language and naming in Taoist philosophy. Zhuangzi offers a perspectivist or relativist view of knowledge. Empathy was also an important part of living with the *Tao* and that any claims for final conclusive knowledge about X is foolish. Contexts and circumstances constantly change and the seeker of knowledge must adapt.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The obscuring of the whole by focusing on the parts and not seeing that the parts are the whole and whole are the parts
- The stories and metaphors employed often portray those who claim certain knowledge as foolish or in error, and also promote a perspectivist view, eg: the small bird that laughs at the giant bird's (Peng) journey cannot see that his inconsequential distances covered are also a source of amusement for Peng; the gnarled and twisted tree that initially seemed useless because it was not a source of timber for fashioning
- The importance of humans to begin to appreciate that understanding and empathy comes from seeing many sides of an argument
- The error that preconceived ideas can have: the example of the crippled man where the focus is on the negative aspect of his situation
- The pragmatic claim that positions can change due to a change in circumstances requiring a re-evaluation of knowledge and beliefs
- The fallacy of authority might be cited; because of the position and status of the speaker knowledge takes on greater meaning and significance
- Words obscure truth and knowledge; they can mask the possibility of an alternative view/perspective
- Similarly, the hearing of the word lends itself to individual interpretation and so understanding of one position can be grasped by considering and entertaining the opposite notion.

(b) Evaluate Zhuangzi's concept of knowledge. [15]

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- If we take Zhuangzi's edict literally, then the view of knowledge is a nihilist view and so self-defeating; how are we to interpret this view?
- Does this edict only apply to moral terms and to actions that determine virtue?
- Comparison to other perspectivist views, eg: Nietzsche
- How does a perspectivist position on knowledge improve our chances of acting virtuously?
- Is this skeptical view of moral knowledge applicable in other fields of knowledge?
- The Mohist claim that Taoism declares "all doctrines perverse" is itself a perverse doctrine.

24. (a) Explain Zhuangzi’s depiction of governance. [10]

The aim of this question is for candidates to engage with Taoist philosophy in regard to political leadership and governance. Zhuangzi advises that the Sage governs with an attitude and approach mediated by the principles of the *Tao*. This approach is summarised in the poem found in Chapter 7. This view of governance is often criticized for its inertia, and its encouragement of political disengagement.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The wise leader practices non-action as a part of good rule in order to facilitate the people’s ability to stand up for themselves and order their own lives
- The use of nature as a model for action
- How one can know something in a non-rational or non-cognitive manner
- Virtue as harmony and balance with nature and the self
- Effortless effort and wisdom
- The human desire for material needs and the *Tao*.

(b) Evaluate Zhuangzi’s depiction of governance. [15]

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- If nature is the model for our actions, then is the dominance of the strong over the weak an activity that must be mimicked?
 - How can one talk without the use of names? Is there any point discussing political or social concepts without language?
 - By “doing nothing” one could “accomplish everything”. Is this paradox a problem or an advantage of Zhuangzi’s philosophy?
 - Comparison with other models of political leadership, eg: Machiavelli’s prince, or Plato’s philosopher king, or political leadership in the contemporary world
 - Is there a possibility that the *laissez-faire* approach leads to a politically disengaged population?
-