Diploma Programme
Programme du diplôme
Programa del Diploma

Markscheme

November 2022

Philosophy

Higher level and standard level

Paper 2

44 pages

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 *The Second Sex*, Vol. 1 part 1, Vol. 2 part 1 and Vol. 2 part 4		
02	René Descartes *Meditations*	✓	✓
03	David Hume *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*		
04	John Stuart Mill *On Liberty*	✓	
05	Friedrich Nietzsche *The Genealogy of Morals*	✓	✓
06	Martha Nussbaum *Creating Capabilities: The Human Development Approach*		
07	Ortega y Gasset *The Origin of Philosophy*		
08	Plato *The Republic*, Books IV–IX	✓	✓
09	Peter Singer *The Life You Can Save*	✓	
10	Charles Taylor *The Ethics of Authenticity*	✓	✓
11	Lao Tzu *Tao Te Ching*		
12	Zhuangzi *Zhuangzi,* 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	• 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	• 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	• 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	• 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	• 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	• 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	• 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	• 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	• 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	• The response contains relevant, accurate and detailed knowledge of the text. • There is appropriate use of philosophical vocabulary throughout the response. • The response contains clear and well-developed critical analysis. • There is discussion and assessment of alternative interpretations or points of view. • All or nearly all of the main points are justified.

Simone de Beauvoir: *The Second Sex*, Vol. 1 part 1, Vol. 2 part 1 and Vol. 2 part 4

1. (a) Explain de Beauvoir's claim that "men are the Subject and women the Other". [10]

(b) Evaluate de Beauvoir's claim that "men are the Subject and women the Other". [15]

The question invites candidates to engage with the situation of a woman, as described by de Beauvoir as that of the inessential Other compared to man as "the Subject". Responses might demonstrate that de Beauvoir makes clear that the Other is also the label of those groups who are marginalized by society. Responses might identify de Beauvoir's argument that society views women as the Other, because they are viewed only in relation to men; they are treated as objects of desire for men; as mothers to their future heirs; or as the ones who look after everyone else. Denying women their own subjectivity (the right to view themselves as individuals) with their own perspective is dehumanizing and leaves them powerless. Candidates might discuss de Beauvoir's use of historical materialism (specifically Marxist) to explain why women occupy the position of Other. Discussion about the structure of the Subject and the Other being universal and inevitable whilst women being positioned as the Other is not the case might be explored. Also, Simone de Beauvoir's argument on how the division into the Subject and the Other becomes manifest and is itself a product of specific material circumstances. Responses might develop a line of engagement demonstrating de Beauvoir's argument that advocates the historical contingency of any given manifestation of the Subject and the Other.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The ontological concept of the Subject and the Other
- Division into the Subject (dominant) and the Other (dominated) as a feature of consciousness
- An outline of de Beauvoir's notion of woman as Other
- Historical materialist perspectives to explain why women occupy the position of Other
- The structures of the Subject and the Other may be universal, but women positioned as the Other is historically contingent
- The extent to which the Other is subordinate to the Subject
- Woman as Other, in a number of ways such as: cultural representation; existential recognition *etc*
- The context of society structures and its whole organizational framework around the male norm
- Woman as Other to Herself.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Why is woman always in the position of Other?
- Why are the dialectical shifts whereby which group counts as the Subject and which as the Other is not apparent for women and men?
- Why for de Beauvoir, did this domination take the form of patriarchy, where men became the Subject and women the Other?
- Is this submission of women another source of tension between existence as historically contingent, and essence as a universal structure?
- How far is who counts as the Subject and who counts as the Other open to change?
- Why does the historical account emphasizing capitalism and patriarchy fail to explain, even with the addition of the existential ontology of the Subject and the Other, why men are still the Subject, and women are still the Other?

- Does de Beauvoir succeed in combining Hegelian existential concepts, which focus on relations between consciousnesses, together with Marx's picture of material, social structures, in positioning women as Other existentially, materially and culturally?
- How far does de Beauvoir's interest in arguing that woman is regarded as an object and consequently socially inferior imply that the suffering of women is analogous to the suffering of slaves due to their oppression?
- Haslanger's contention that gender is a social status within a hierarchical social structure rather than a biological category
- Witt's account of the metaphysics of gender
- Meyer's assertion that the cultural imagery of women is a fundamental threat to female autonomy.

2. (a) Explain de Beauvoir's view of the biological body. [10]

(b) Evaluate de Beauvoir's view of the biological body. [15]

The opening sentences of Vol. 2 part 1 around one not being born woman, but becoming woman, reflect embodiment as a central feature of de Beauvoir's theory, which is bound irrevocably with concepts of sexual difference, and which emphasizes both the constraints of biology and the way societies shape what nature can become. Responses can be expected to address de Beauvoir's view of the biological body. This is important for de Beauvoir as the material body is of particular significance for a woman and her relation to the world. Candidates might also address de Beauvoir's view of the lived body and explore de Beauvoir's development of Marx's concept of woman's biology as not determinative of her current subordinate social position. This develops a view of the lived body by gender orientation, which stresses that male and female bodies are lived differently. Candidates might demonstrate that de Beauvoir offers biological data with regard to differences between male and female bodies and explore her claim that stresses that different biological bodies will experience the world in different ways and so our biology is a fundamental part of our existence. For de Beauvoir, it cannot be denied that woman is "weaker" than man. However, despite this fragility, de Beauvoir insists that woman has a relationship with her biological body that is difficult to ignore. For de Beauvoir a woman's body is interconnected not only with her choices but with the possibilities that society offers, and with the choices that she views as possibilities. Candidates might reflect on the significance of this in relation to practical concerns and political struggles over women's bodies, and over biology and its meaning.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- De Beauvoir's view that biology is fundamental; this is particularly relevant to a woman's biology as she experiences biological constraints; she is prey to the species.
- Biology cannot define a woman; biology only becomes fundamental within a cultural context
- Issues surrounding the claim that biological facts, de Beauvoir argues, are only significant because of the meanings that society attaches to them
- The body for a woman is experienced as alien as it is viewed as a biological function
- Understanding of biology is mediated; understanding of reproduction is also mediated and socially arranged to prioritize heterosexuality
- De Beauvoir's awareness of the way in which images describing biological processes are laden with cultural meaning
- That biological facts have been described to effectively equate activity and passivity with man and woman
- De Beauvoir's argument that actually within the sexual act and subsequent reproduction, both male and female play an equally important and inter-dependent role
- De Beauvoir insists that woman has a relationship with her biological body that is difficult to ignore
- The struggle for woman to maintain her subjectivity
- De Beauvoir's view that the strength of alienation of woman from her body is felt most strenuously.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The development of the female body into the maternal body is described as a crisis by de Beauvoir; how does de Beauvoir resolve this perceived crisis?
- The idea that women have been tied and trapped by their biological bodies and cycles of reproduction, pregnancy, childbirth, rearing children, caring for others, and the social significance attached to biology
- The claim that de Beauvoir's language is excessive, in the sense that many women might not recognize themselves and their experience; it is unfamiliar, strange and disturbing
- Might such negative rhetoric actually serve a function; its purpose being to draw attention to the way a woman's biology is lived under oppressive circumstances, and the difficulty in maintaining any sense of self within that
- The implications might be explored as some would argue that what de Beauvoir is doing is to argue against biological determinism
- Issues surrounding the claim that biological facts, de Beauvoir argues, are only significant because of the meanings that society attaches to them
- How crucial is materiality of the body, as well as the materiality of social structures and the effects they have on individuals and their possibilities to de Beauvoir?
- Might de Beauvoir's concept of bodily alienation be fruitfully extended in a more materialist or Marxist-inspired analysis of the continuation of patriarchy
- How successful is de Beauvoir in drawing attention to patriarchal ideology as the source of a portrayal of woman's situation?
- Does the distinction which de Beauvoir makes between the data of biology and the lived body suggest that she endorses the sex/gender distinction?
- Sally Haslanger's contention that gender is a social status within a hierarchical social structure rather than a biological category
- Julia Serano on the connection between gender, feminism, biology, and sexuality.

René Descartes: *Meditations*

3. (a) Explain Descartes's use of philosophical doubt in his search for knowledge. [10]

(b) Evaluate Descartes's use of philosophical doubt in his search for knowledge. [15]

The question arises from Descartes's attempt to achieve indubitable knowledge and, as he states at the beginning of the First Meditation, the need to rid himself of opinions and start anew. The intended to cast doubt upon everything formerly believed, and culminating in, the hypothesis of an all-deceiving evil genius and the *cogito*. Candidates might argue that Descartes is considered a foundationalist philosopher, looking for something that needs no further justification, and cannot be doubted and thus, as indicated in his introduction, he is writing for both the skeptics and the scholastics of his day. If even one thing can be proved for certain, he can prove the sceptics wrong because as a rationalist philosopher he will base his entire project on reason alone. According to Descartes, empirical knowledge is always uncertain: our senses deceive us. True knowledge can accordingly come only from reason. The role of reason is therefore to take doubt to its extreme in order to find something that reason cannot doubt, which can then become the basis for constructing an accurate representation of reality. Candidates might explore the progressive nature of the three "waves of doubt" and the fact that doubt is a kind of thinking, so if he attempts to doubt that he is thinking, he is in fact thinking. Hence there is one thing that cannot be doubted – "I think, therefore I am". With this argument, Descartes believed that he had demonstrated that he was a thing (*res cogitans*) whose sole essence was thinking (or consciousness). Candidates might explore the criticism that Descartes's epistemology relies on a confused understanding of Leibniz's Law of Identity. Some candidates might argue that it is illogical for Descartes to claim that just because something can be doubted in one instance, we can doubt it in all instances (quantifier shift fallacy). Responses might claim that the use of philosophical doubt is carried out through the use of language, but what are the presuppositions of doing this? Counter arguments might feature private rules and/or definitions, public criteria, whether expressions have a use, and thus, a meaning (Wittgenstein). Descartes, it might be argued, is inconsistent because he fails to doubt his memory and consequently fails to consider the implications of this, especially in regard to the *cogito*.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Descartes's purpose as indicated at the start of the First Meditation
- Descartes's understanding of his claim to "withhold assent"
- What does it mean to be certain?
- Descartes's concept of knowledge
- Philosophical doubt as a tool to achieve certainty
- Descartes's foundationalism; Descartes's house built on a foundation analogy
- The stages of doubt: senses, dreaming and the malevolent demon
- Illustrations of the stages of doubt
- How Descartes links each stage of doubt to its successor within the context of his overall purpose
- How Descartes arrives at the *cogito*
- Descartes's use of philosophical doubt results in the discovery the "self" as an indubitable certainty.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Whether Descartes's claim, that he was certain that nothing certain could be known, is paradoxical
- Equating knowledge with logical certainty is mistaken
- If Descartes's philosophical doubt had been more thorough, then he should have explored the idea of a deceptive memory; Descartes refers to this but he did not develop it
- The argument that Descartes's method results in an isolated "self" and therefore we are unable to go beyond this to construct a theory of knowledge even though Descartes implicitly admits this when he states that his arguments for the existence of body are "probable"
- Descartes's concept of knowledge is limited in that logical certainty is too stringent a condition and invokes the problem of narrow content; basic foundational certainties do not have sufficient content to generate systems of knowledge
- The exclusion of *a priori* principles from Descartes's doubting process as a central weakness in his method
- Empiricists' critiques regarding the impossibility of deducing *a priori* truths about the world in relation to Descartes's rationalism and the emphasis he attaches to absolute certainty
- Whether the validity of the *cogito* might be questioned
- Leibniz's Law of Identity as a critique of Descartes's method
- Criticism of the stages of doubt such as the view that just because the senses have let us down sometimes does not permit the inference that they may always do; there needs to be a concept of reality in order to articulate the concept of a dream; is the malignant demon hypothesis meaningful? Doubt needs a background or context and not the elimination of all possible ones
- The use of the film *The Matrix* to critique Descartes insofar as if deceptions are allowed within a deception, then those who control *The Matrix* could be deceived and therefore the issue of infinite regress arises
- Wittgensteinian arguments with reference to the presuppositions and language that Descartes employs
- William James' claim that genuine Cartesian doubt is psychologically unrealistic.

4. (a) Explain Descartes's reasons for assuming that mind and body are separate and distinct substances. [10]

(b) Evaluate Descartes's reasons for assuming that mind and body are separate and distinct substances. [15]

The question invites responses to focus on the reasons for Descartes's claim that the mind and body are separate substances. Whilst the distinctions between mind and body are peppered throughout the text, Descartes proves his own existence as a mind or thinking thing (*res cogitans*) in the Second Meditation; he proves the existence of his body (*res extensa*) in his broader proof of material things by the end of the Sixth Meditation. The essential principle of Cartesian dualism is that mind and body are not identical but quite distinct, separate substances. Responses might identify Descartes's epistemological argument, self-evidence of consciousness, (the *cogito*); matter, or body is the necessary medium for extension but what cannot be concluded is that there is any particular body which is extended (Descartes's own body therefore is not self-evident); mind is boundless in that it can understand and apply *a priori* truths without limit whereas body is finite. Responses might consider the argument from clear and distinct ideas. Candidates might discuss the main conclusion of the wax analogy showing that there is a distinction between mind and body. Candidates might explore problems with Descartes's reasoning such as the interaction between mind and body, his appeal to the pineal gland, occasionalism where interaction between mind and body is caused by God *etc*. Candidates might discuss the misapplication of Leibniz's Law of Identity in intentional contexts, *eg*: "doubting". Or they might refer to Kripke, who holds the idea that identity is a necessary relation in his work *Naming and Necessity*. Epistemological priority does not imply ontological priority or causal independence. Candidates might contend that some form of dualism is needed in order to accommodate undeniable features of consciousness, qualia, intentionality, subjectivity, the possibility of ordered and structured meaningful experience.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Descartes's view that "substance", existing in its own right, can only be destroyed by God
- Descartes's arguments for the distinction between mind and body; different essential natures; Cartesian dualism
- What is meant by "essence" of mind – "thinking" and "essence" of body – "extension"
- Issues surrounding Descartes's appeal to God's omnipotence
- Indivisibility argument
- The wax analogy as a means of arguing that we can use our reason to reach conclusions about the identity of something
- Interaction in reference to Descartes's understanding of the role of the pineal gland
- Intermingling argument, as opposed to the pilot in a ship example
- Descartes's reasons that intended to show that mind is not identified with body, it is separate and distinct, not causally dependent
- Detail of the arguments, *eg*: indubitability of mind, God can do whatever is logically conceivable
- Divisibility/indivisibility and Descartes's treatment of the faculty's response.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Descartes's arguments for separateness and distinctness are not consistent with the intermingling proposition
- Viewing the mind as essentially an immaterial substance is inconsistent with the usual way of talking about persons
- Dualism is inconsistent with the concept of ontological simplicity as epistemological priority does not imply ontological priority or causal independence
- The unsolvable problem of interaction and the failure of the pineal gland explanation
- The mind cannot be spatially located
- The concept of an immaterial substance is counterintuitive because 'substance' infers materiality; materialism might be explored
- Problems accounting for how brain changes affect the mind; resultant problems for the materialist, how the mental can produce physical effects
- Leibniz's Law of Identity; Masked Man Fallacy
- Kripke's *Naming and Necessity*
- Descartes's appeal to God's omnipotence fails to establish that God has used that power
- Split/multiple personality counterexamples
- Freud's tri-partite division of the mind as a counterargument against Descartes's indivisibility argument
- Descartes's position contrasted with other theories of mind, *eg*: identity theory, Ryle's behaviourism, epiphenomenalism
- Descartes's probable responses to these theories of mind
- Various forms of dualism in order to accommodate indisputable aspects of consciousness.

David Hume: *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*

5. (a) Explain the claim that the Dialogues are about the essence of God rather than God's existence. [10]

(b) Evaluate the claim that the Dialogues are about the essence of God rather than God's existence. [15] The question arises from Parts 2 and 3 of the *Dialogues* and invites candidates to focus on why Philo, Demea, and Cleanthes appear to accept that God's existence is self-evident and undeniable and therefore their discussion revolves around the issue of God's essence. Their dialogue is focused more on whether God's attributes can be known, and if they can be known, what are these traits. Cleanthes implies (according to Demea) that the existence of God is a "fundamental principle". Demea claims that the existence of God is "certain and self-evident". Philo asserts that the existence of God is "unquestionable". While all three do not question the 'being of God', each of them has a different take about the 'nature of God', as confirmed by Demea and Philo in Part 2, paragraphs 1 and 3. Candidates might be expected to develop their responses by exploring Demea's claim that God's essence, while it is mysterious, can be affirmed *a priori* (*ie*: cause and effect argument); Cleanthes's assertion that God's presence can be known *a posteriori* (*ie*: design argument); Philo's stance that God's essence cannot be comprehended at all.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Can God's existence be proven? Is belief in God valid even with the absence of proof?
- Is the essence of God knowable?
- Demea's affirmation of God's nature through the *a priori* argument which he argues removes doubt and difficulty
- Cleanthes contention that we can know God's essence or nature through our experience of the world (design argument)
- Cleanthes' use of analogy (machine, watch, house)
- Divine attributes/characteristics
- Philo's assertion that all we know about God is that he exists (*qua causa* of the universe) but beyond this we have no idea or understanding of his nature or attributes
- Philo rejects the arguments of Cleanthes because they reduce God to anthropomorphic ideas
- Philo's claim that a dysfunctional and problematic universe makes the idea of a perfectly good, loving, wise, and powerful deity doubtful.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Issues surrounding the question of God's existence being outside the realm of proof
- Is it even possible to know what God is like? Can we know God as *per se*? Is God benevolent or malicious? Is he powerful or limited? Is he an intelligent designer?
- Are attempts to define God's nature based on human finite experiences, emotions, or explanations simply reducing this unfathomable, inexplicable, infinite God to nothing but a man-made illusion?
- Are divine attributes such as goodness, mercy, justice, and religious affirmations such as an all-loving, all-knowing, all-powerful God nothing but mere imaginations of the frail human mind?

- Is Philo correct when he argues that human perception is limited and has no access to what God is like?
- Any attempts to describe divine essence through human language and human ideas tend to become illusory assumptions thus reflecting that human experience is limited by its sensory perception of the world
- Is Hume right (as he appears to be arguing through Demas, Cleanthes and Philo) when he particularly warns against, in respect of the issue of God's perfection, that we cannot begin from the assumption that God is perfect, then assume that his creation is worthy of him, and then argue, on this basis, that we have evidence that God is perfect?
- Candidates might critique inferences about the causes of unique effects; the universe is a unique effect; hence it is difficult to make inferences about its cause
- Wood's contention that Hume is not necessarily arguing against the existence of God in the *Dialogues*, but instead on whether anything can be known about the nature of God
- Gaskin's contention that Hume's approach is problematic in that he seeks to impute anthropomorphic characteristics that reflects essence, onto an incomprehensible God.

6. (a) Explain Philo's regress objection to the design argument. [10]

(b) Evaluate Philo's regress objection to the design argument. [15]

The question arises from Part 4 of the *Dialogues* and invites candidates to explore Philo's objection to the design argument on the basis that it leads to an infinite regress of causes. Philo's objection targets problems with attempts that try to explain order and purpose in the universe. Philo contends that if an intelligent agent was needed to explain order in nature then the intelligent agent in turn needs to be explained. Responses might consider whether Philo's regress objection addresses the motivation behind the design argument that seeks to explain order/purpose in terms of a divine agency. Candidates might identify the infinite regress objection as that the existence of an intelligent designer requires explanation every bit as much as the existence of the world does. This explanation must have some central origin or source for the order/purpose in the world otherwise infinite regression occurs. Candidates might counter the regress objection by noting that theists want the explanation to result in God who they consider to be the ground of all being but their problem is they do not have good grounds for doing so. If order itself needs to be explained then there needs to be an explanation for God and thus infinite regress ensues.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Philo's regress objection appeals to the principle that everything that exists has a cause for its existence
- Issues surrounding the claim that the cause is God
- Philo's attempt to cast doubt on Cleanthes's theory of an intelligent creator
- The inference of a divine mind as the cause of the order of the universe brings about a cause of a cause of a cause *etc* and eventually to infinity
- Existence of an intelligent designer needs an explanation as does the existence of the world
- Philo's aim in the dialogue is Cleanthes's anthropomorphic notion of God as evidenced by his comment: "…The inconveniences of that anthropomorphism, which you have embraced" (Part 4 para 5)
- Philo's regress objection depending on Cleanthes's rejection of the traditional theological doctrine of divine simplicity
- Philo's concession that his regress objection is only successful against theists like Cleanthes's that reject the doctrine of God's absolute simplicity but maintain that God's existence is capable of *a priori* reasoning
- That the regress of causes envisioned by Philo is an infinite series of minds.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Does there have to be some fundamental origin of the order/purpose we see in the universe and does that origin have to be God?
- Is it logical to appeal to God to explain one type of order in terms of another type of order?If so, then, if order itself needs to be explained, there will be a need to find some explanation for God
- If it is accepted that there cannot be an infinite regress of explanations, to what extent will it be necessary then to justify going beyond the laws of nature in explaining the order/purpose found in the universe? (*ie*: Philo's questioning of why we should not stop at the material world)
- How far can it be justified in seeking a further explanation for the laws of nature if the explanation posited provides greater insight and understanding of those laws when Philo argues that God does not provide the additional insight?

- To what extent are appeals to the God as an explanation little more than an attempt to explain one mystery in terms of something even more mysterious?
- Does it necessarily follow that to infer a divine intelligence as a cause of the order of the material universe commits one to an infinite regress of causes?
- To what extent does Philo's regress objection depend upon Cleanthes's rejection of the traditional doctrine of divine simplicity?
- How far does Philo's regress objection show that the divine mind must have a cause that is itself a mind similar to the human mind?
- Following on from the previous point does Philo's regress of causes envisage an infinite series of minds?
- Aiken's assertion that Philo's regression argument is a decisive element of Hume's overall purpose
- Pike's discussion surrounding Philo's regress argument failing on the grounds of Philo's inconsistency with the use of the word "order".

John Stuart Mill: *On Liberty*

7. (a) Explain Mill's claim that "there should be different experiments of living". [10]

(b) Evaluate Mill's claim that "there should be different experiments of living". [15]

In Chapter III *On Individuality, as one of the elements of wellbeing*, Mill talks about the contribution of liberty to individual and societal flourishing. One claim is that allowing people to choose their own ways of living maximizes wellbeing. This is qualified by the Harm Principle, which stipulates that such experimentation is only permissible if it does not harm others. Conversely, intervention in someone's lifestyle is only permissible if that person's lifestyle is itself causing harm. Mill says that "in things which do not primarily concern others, individuality should assert itself". This is because "the free development of individuality is one of the leading essentials of well-being". Like the importance of free speech as a method of ensuring societal progress, freedom to experiment with ways of living also contributes to societal progress. It encourages originality, and allows for genius to express itself.

Candidates might explore (part A):
- Mill's Harm Principle
- Mill's arguments for freedom of expression
- What Mill might mean by "experiments of living"
- The idea of societal progress as driven by liberty
- The link between liberty and well-being
- The claim that there is a danger of a tyranny of the majority over the minority
- The limits of the idea that there should be different experiments of living
- Mill's view that people only possess small aspects of the truth, and that it is only through experimentation that we can discover more.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
- Whether certain ways of living are harmful to others and how we can know whether they are, *eg*: considerations about consumption and climate change
- Restrictions imposed on lifestyle, *eg*: laws against homosexuality
- The Covid-19 crisis in relation to liberty and harm
- The relationship between experiments in ways of living and societal progress
- The strengths and weaknesses of paternalism. Perhaps there are some ways of living which are known to be better than others, and so it might be a good thing to promote them
- The limits of freedom, *eg*: whether alcoholism is a way of living which harms others
- Whether the state can or should define acceptable styles of living
- Examples of ethical systems which disagree with Mill, *eg*: Christian ethics, Kantian ethics
- The importance of accommodating many different life choices *eg*: Rawls.

8. (a) Explain Mill's view about the liberty of children. [10]

(b) Evaluate Mill's view about the liberty of children. [15]

Mill argues that liberty is of central importance to both individuals and society. Mill claims that the state should not intervene in the lives of its citizens, and that citizens should be free to act, speak and live as they wish. The exception is if their liberty causes harm to others. However, Mill does not think that children should be given the same degree of liberty because they lack the capacity to make the right decisions for themselves. The state has the right to intervene to prevent children from coming to harm. This means that the state can mandate that children go to school, do not drink alcohol, and so on. Mill explains the importance of "maturity of faculties" when understanding who the doctrine should apply to. More controversially, Mill also says that "barbarians" may legitimately be coerced into "their improvement" by the state. The question invites a discussion of this paternalistic strand of Mill's thinking.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The concept of liberty
- The view that the individual is sovereign
- Mill's view that children should not have the liberty afforded to adults
- The role of the Harm Principle in this decision
- How children are different from adults with respect to harm and liberty
- The implications of restricting children's liberty, *eg*: compulsory education
- Other groups of people who might be considered lacking "maturity of their faculties".

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The difficulties of denying liberty to some members of society but not others
- How to judge when someone lacks "maturity of their faculties"
- Who might make such decisions?
- Advantages of restricting the liberty of children, *eg*: preventing alcohol drinking, compulsory education, providing care and basic needs
- Whether adults are also at risk of harm and need protection, regardless of their maturity and rationality
- Mill's claims about "barbarians" and the implied lack of respect for other cultures and societies
- The concept of paternalism
- The concept of childhood, ideas about its value
- The idea that people should be treated equally, and what this might be with regard to liberty and children
- How to balance liberty with harm
- Discussions of justice in society and how to balance equality and liberty with care and protection, *eg*: Rawls, Nozick
- Other accounts of childhood, *eg*: Kantian ethics, which would not treat young children as moral agents, or Christian ethics, which sees all life as sacred.

Friedrich Nietzsche: *The Genealogy of Morals*

9. (a) Explain Nietzsche's idea of justice. [10]

(b) Evaluate Nietzsche's idea of justice. [15]

This question invites an investigation of how Nietzsche sees the origins and nature of justice and its relationship to *ressentiment.* He considers justice to be the last to be affected by both revenge and *ressentiment.* The two groups of humans that Nietzsche defines, *ie*: the nobles and the slaves, have different ideas of justice. The noble will react and seek revenge and retribution in a ruthless way, considering the protection of his self-interest to be more important. In contrast, the man of *ressentiment*, the slave will be considerate and reflective. Justice within the slave morality is removed from the individual and the group and is guided by laws and therefore has become institutionalized. Nietzsche links the ideas of justice to that of punishment and to the relationship between guilt and debt. He argues that a society that is strong does not need justice so much as weak society, one that is morally weak. A strong noble society does not need a strict judicial system, and mercy can be exercised when appropriate. For Nietzsche there are links between justice and punishment and the notion of paying the debt to society because of the guilty. Consequently, there are links to his idea of bad conscience and remorse. Within a complex society Nietzsche argues justice is rarely swift as the exercise of justice is in the hands of the powers within such a society, and it must be seen to be more objective and not reflective of revenge. The aim of the justice system is to keep stability and the vengeful act might lead to instability. The rights and wrongs of human action are not established in a state of nature but are defined and understood within a legal system. These rights and wrongs could be perhaps arbitrary in contrast to other views on justice.

Candidates might explore (part A):
- The link between justice and punishment
- The idea of *ressentiment*
- The way Nietzsche argues for the links between the organs of a justice system and commercial activity; debt payment, and guilt and punishment
- The difference between nobles and slaves and their views of morality
- Cultural interpretations of guilt
- Bad conscience
- Nietzsche's seeming preference for a justice based on war of every man against every man.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
- Differing interpretations of justice, *eg*: Plato, Rawls
- Whether the action of mercy is within the nature of a strong societal system
- Perceived primitive justice systems and complex systems with links between justice and character reform
- The relationship of murder and capital punishment and guilt, *eg*: Rée, Mill
- Debt payment, *eg*: within some Islamic justice systems, and whether debt payment removes guilt
- Links between morality and religion, and religion and justice
- Whether justice suppresses human animal instincts
- Whether justice can be positive
- Utility and justice
- Possible links between free will, suffering and justice.

10. (a) Explain Nietzsche's understanding of the idea of sin. [10]

(b) Evaluate Nietzsche's understanding of the idea of sin. [15]

This question seeks an explanation of Nietzsche's view of sin. For Nietzsche humans were divided into two groups, the nobles and the slaves. The slaves were sick and suffered and were seen by Nietzsche as sinners. The slaves were sinners because they had bad conscience and were guilty. In Essay 3 section 20 it is the ascetic priest that justifies the suffering of the slave because of their sin (ie, "the animal's bad conscience"). Nietzsche equates guilt with indebtedness. In section 15 of the third essay the ideas of self-discipline and self-surveillance are presented as the consequence of being indebted, of being sinful. This sinfulness produces pain which is seen as a characteristic of slave nature. The ascetic priest presents redemption of sin through Christian faith (in particular), but for Nietzsche this route is not seen as an escape. For him it is merely a reinforcement of the indebtedness. The sin – suffering – becomes internalized and becomes a neurosis, and the sense of guilt (*schuld*, which arises and is explained in the Second Essay Section 4) is exploited. This sin could be self-destructive but is in fact the driver behind the development of morality. For Nietzsche, the seven deadly sins are fundamentally part of human nature, when humans are "nobles", and therefore any associated acceptance of sin would prevent self-affirmation and self-esteem. The sickness of sin which Nietzsche called a nausea undervalued positive qualities of power, strength and dominance (qualities of the masters/nobles). This might be negative and life destructive, but for Nietzsche it established a new affirming of life in its "noble" sense, striving to a greater sense of 'Being', free from sin and guilt. Sin might also be doubting. Nietzsche argues that science was to become the new religion and thus he linked this to original sin with the fall of man and the denial of access to knowledge (the forbidden fruit of the tree of knowledge).

Candidates might explore (part A):
- The relationship of the master and the slave
- The morality of Christianity and role of a sin and suffering
- The meaninglessness of suffering
- The ascetic ideal
- Bad conscience
- Internalization of feelings and emotions and the mental consequences; the mental pressures of guilt or of knowing one has sinned
- The replacement of religion by science and the desire for knowledge compared to a paradisiacal innocence
- The relationship of guilt and sin
- Nihilism
- Contrasting views of redemption.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
- Nietzsche's view of human nature and the role of sin as a human characteristic
- Suffering as part of the human condition and not a punishment for sin
- Whether life affirmation is too demanding; the approach of the master/noble accepting or ignoring sinfulness
- Whether master/noble characteristics are appropriate in any society
- The nature of a morality founded on sin
- Sin as the opposite of virtue
- The relationship between sin and the act of wrongdoing: which is the prime driver?
- Other factors than morality that might direct a lifestyle
- The meaninglessness of suffering
- Contrasting faith perceptions of sin: a consequence of disobedience, weakness of the human condition, not following Dharma
- Ways to remove sin: Moksha, redemptive faith, good works

- The degree to which sin is a socio-historic creation
- Acceptance of sin and suffering, for Nietzsche, was not an escape into nothingness but a '*amor fati*' (a love of fate). Contrasts might be made with Augustinian views of sin and redemption. Similarly, contrasts might be raised relating to Schopenhauer's views on redemption as a release from suffering.

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

11. (a) Explain how the capabilities approach applies to the inequality of women. [10]

(b) Evaluate how the capabilities approach applies to the inequality of women. [15]

The question stems from the last chapter in Nussbaum's book. Nussbaum considers the capabilities approach in relation with some contemporary issues, such as disability, gender, aging, education, and animal entitlements. Candidates might explore the particular case of gender and the inequality of women. Also, candidates might analyse Nussbaum's explanation of the better validity of the capabilities approach in facing this issue if compared to traditional approaches, such as GNP or utilitarian. Responses might explain Nussbaum's reference to Mill and her criticism of liberalism. Candidates might also evaluate the role of tradition in women's obstacles to equality. Responses might discuss the possible relation between tradition and religion in Nussbaum's view. This has to do with the issue of personal life and preferences: candidates might explain how it would be possible to grant women's equality within the sphere of private life. Responses might highlight the issues of domestic violence, child sexual abuse, child marriage, compulsory primary and secondary education and how the state can legitimately limit parents' autonomy. Candidates might explain how the list of capabilities helps enact policies against stigma, inferiority, and discrimination based on sexual orientation. Candidates might discuss these issues in the light of current state laws, which forbid or allow same-sex marriage or miscegenation. Candidates might evaluate whether the capabilities approach does better than other traditional views or whether feminism and gender politics offer a better approach to this kind of issue, *eg*: de Beauvoir, Gillard, Krook, Irigaray, Butler, Grosz, Collins, Hooks, Davis, Anzaldúa, Moreton-Robinson, and Stryker. Also, candidates might consider theories that reinforce the differences and discrimination between men and women, *eg*: aspects of Plato's *Republic*, or Rousseau's views about the role of women in *Emile.*

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Why gender is a central issue in the capabilities approach
- Nussbaum's criticism of liberalism
- The issue of the uncriticized views of tradition
- The relation between tradition and religion
- The specific issues of domestic violence, child abuse, education and the relation with state intervention
- Why the list of capabilities helps enact policies against discrimination based on sexual orientation.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Why the capabilities approach better focuses on the gender issues
- Other criticized approaches, *eg*: GNP, utilitarianism
- Whether Nussbaum's criticism of liberalism and Mill is justifiable
- Whether the inequality of women is related to an uncriticized family, tradition, and religion
- Whether religion could be considered a tradition
- To what extent states can legitimately limit parents' autonomy or regulate individuals' private life
- Whether gender discrimination is related to sexual orientation
- Examples of laws contrasting or fostering discrimination, *eg*: forbidding or allowing same-sex marriages or miscegenation
- Other possible approaches in favour of women's equality, *eg*: feminism, gender politics
- Other views reinforcing gender differences, *eg*: Plato's *Republic*.

12. (a) Explain Nussbaum's use of philosophical influences in her theory. [10]

(b) Evaluate Nussbaum's use of philosophical influences in her theory. [15]

The question stems from Chapter 7 of Nussbaum's book and invites an exploration of the several philosophical influences that she presents in relation to her development of the Capabilities Approach. After discussing the importance of Aristotle and the Stoics, Nussbaum refers to the specific use of these traditions by philosophers during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Candidates might explain the two main arguments from Aristotle and the Stoics – equal worth of all human beings and human vulnerability – and how they are blended by one or more philosophers, such as Grotius, Smith, and Kant. Candidates might also highlight the role of Christian beliefs in fostering this combination of old and new elements. Responses might pinpoint William's view of natural law and his contribution to the liberty of conscience. Candidates might also explain the role of republican thinkers and governments in spreading Stoic and Aristotelian ideas. Responses might explore Nussbaum's reference to Smith and "intrusive legal restrictions". Responses might also explore the role of education and habit in shaping human abilities, the pernicious effects of a lack of education – particularly in poor people – and the role of the state in granting an essential education at least. The central question arising from this specific issue surrounds what form of governmental action permits human abilities to develop while respecting human equality? Candidates might explore Paine's criticism of the state and his view on taxation. Responses might focus on the difference between negative and positive liberty, *eg*: Constant, Berlin, Bobbio. Finally, candidates might evaluate whether the philosophical influences that Nussbaum mentions are consistent with her Capabilities Approach or whether her theory is basically grounded in contemporary perspectives, *eg*: Rawls, Sen.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The Stoic and Aristotelian influences on Nussbaum's theory
- The basic arguments from the Stoics and Aristotle: equal worth and human vulnerability
- The role of Christian beliefs
- William's view of natural law
- Smith's view of human abilities and legal restrictions
- The role of education and habit
- The role of the state in granting essential education
- Paine's view on the state and taxation
- The influence of Sen on Nussbaum's views.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Whether the Stoic and Aristotelian arguments are central to the philosophers that Nussbaum mentions
- Whether Christian beliefs play a role in the spread of the ideas of equal worth and human vulnerability
- Whether the defence of free religion is a central capability
- Whether Smith's views on trade, labour, and education are compatible with the Capabilities Approach
- The difference between negative and positive liberty, *eg*: Constant, Berlin, Bobbio
- Whether the state can limit parents' autonomy in granting essential education; education as a fundamental right
- Nussbaum's philosophical methodology, and her willingness to consider the views of others to construct her own view
- Whether the Capabilities Approach is better conveyed by other views, *eg*: Rawls, Sen.

Ortega y Gasset: *The Origin of Philosophy*

13. (a) Explain the significance of the concept of truth in Ortega y Gasset's account of the origin of philosophy. [10]

(b) Evaluate the significance of the concept of truth in Ortega y Gasset's account of the origin of philosophy. [15]

The question asks for an explanation and evaluation of the concept of truth in Ortega y Gasset's account of the origin of philosophy, which is central and runs all the way through the whole book. Ortega y Gasset uses the classical etymology to explore the origin of philosophy. *Aletheia* means truth and it presents philosophy for what it is: an endeavor at discovery and deciphering enigmas to place us in contact with naked reality itself. The thinking process is implied in the word *aletheia*: something akin to un-dressing, un-covering, removing a veil or covering, re-vealing (un-veiling), de-ciphering an enigma or hieroglyphic. This literally is what the word *a-letheia* meant in popular language: discovery, exposure, denudation, revelation. From this perspective truth, becomes the central feature of making philosophy, since it presents the new vital experience in the Greek thought, later to be known as philosophizing. Precisely truth or inquiry was the original name for the philosophical activity. In this original initial phase philosophizing was a new pursuit, one still unfamiliar to people, devoid of a public existence, unable to be seen from the outside. It was the authentic sincere name privately given by the philosopher to what he found himself doing, something that had not existed for him earlier: "his philosophizing".

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Truth pointed out to the original, intimate experience of doing philosophy
- This personal experience considered from outside as a repetitive occurrence, a habitual occupation, became, from the point of view of the "others", inquiry or philosophy
- Parmenides and Heraclitus in the very initial understanding of philosophy as truth; the reconstruction of the nature of the mental soil in which they were implanted
- The soil inhabited by Parmenides and Heraclitus was formed by an extraordinary complexity of intellectual initiatives, which like an eruption suddenly broke the traditional crust of Greek life in the year 600
- Elements that were part of this complexity: the Dionysian mysteries, Orphism, proto-geography and proto-history, Ionian physics, arithmetic, Pythagorean ethics and mysticism, tyranny and legislation
- Philosophy as discovery and deciphering enigmas to place us in contact with naked reality itself was initially a dialogistic way of thinking and discoursing.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- There could be no such thing as a perennial philosophy; truth means that we have to go on thinking
- Philosophy is only one historical, dialectical stage in the long series of human ways of thinking
- Ortega y Gasset's reference to scientific discoveries as new truths that suddenly confront us with an immediate vision of the world
- Ortega y Gasset's conception of philosophy based on the idea of historical reason in relation to other views, *eg*: Plato, Descartes, Kant, Heidegger
- Comparison with other philosophical traditions regarding the signification of understanding the origin and history of philosophy in order to project philosophy in the present, *eg*: analytical philosophy and forms descending from Hegel
- The extent to which Ortega y Gasset is successful in holding the possibility of truth combined with this central perspectivism.

14. (a) Explain Ortega y Gasset's view that "philosophy begins by bisecting a seemingly single world" and "leaves us with two worlds on our hands". [10]

(b) Evaluate Ortega y Gasset's view that "philosophy begins by bisecting a seemingly single world" and "leaves us with two worlds on our hands". [15]

The question asks for an explanation and evaluation of Ortega y Gasset's idea (directly addressed in the Chapter 6 *Philosophy Embarks on the Discovery of Another World*) that philosophy presents to us another or second world, which goes beyond our immediate experience of reality. Advancing from the analysis of the philosophical doctrines externally, since philosophy is thought, and hence interiority, Ortega y Gasset explains a more internal aspect of philosophical thought, which shows behind the diversity presented by the mass of philosophies: the persistent existence of two worlds, the manifest world and the latent or supra-world. The latent world beats beneath the manifest world and its revelation constitutes the supreme philosophical task. In this way, philosophy begins by bisecting a seemingly single world; that is, "the result [...]philosophy leaves us with two worlds on our hands". The relationship between the two worlds can appear in different ways - from distinct to intermingled (*ie*: the "latent world" and the "manifest world"). Briefly, both worlds may remain distant but connected, in continual cross-reference to each other, a reference that serves to corroborate their separation.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The perception of the aspects of an orange as illustration of the historical presentation of the philosophical doctrines
- The advance from the outside (names, doctrines) to the inside of history of philosophy (the unity of philosophy)
- The movement from the panoramic contemplation of the philosophical past to the penetration in it: studying and doing philosophy
- The convenience of a thorough analysis of the exemplary beginning of the philosophical profession to attain maximum understanding of early philosophy
- Parmenides as a perfect entry into the vast domain of philosophy through reason and logic

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Whether the distinction between two worlds is just a metaphysical approach to reality
- The two worlds: religion and science in the origin of philosophy
- The idea of the two worlds and the history of metaphysics, from Plato to Heidegger
- Conceptions of the history of philosophy and its unity, *eg*: Hegel
- Whether the history of philosophy has to be understood as whole
- Historical reason, its opposition to the pure reason and application to the origin of philosophy
- Nietzsche's point that Western philosophy is bifurcated and has created two worlds: the latent and the manifest
- The possible impact of approaches from the study of world philosophies and intercultural philosophies on the understanding of the Greek origin of philosophy.

Plato: *The Republic*, Books IV–IX

15. (a) Explain the Form of the Good in relation to living a good life. [10]

(b) Evaluate the Form of the Good in relation to living a good life. [15]

The question invites responses to focus on the Form of the Good and its implications including those that reflect moral qualities. Plato's Theory of Forms requires that a person's well-being aims for the highest level of morality, but a person's virtues provide the skills necessary to attain a desired level of morality. Candidates might argue that Plato believes happiness is the ultimate level of perfection and that there are objective moral answers to ethical issues and dilemmas. This implies a direct rejection by Plato of the predominant sentiment of moral relativism pervading Athens at the time. The sophists, who flourished in the democracy Plato disdains, appeared to take advantage of moral relativism. They taught their charges that the purpose of philosophy was not to discover truth, as there was none to discover. Plato's Theory of the Forms, including the Form of the Good, is a rebuttal: there are objective moral truths that can be discovered through the work of philosophy. This makes Plato's philosophy very attractive because he promises a direct path to the good life, through the examined life. Responses might argue that Plato's intention behind the Cave allegory and his Theory of Forms was to convey that it is possible to discover absolute moral certainty through pure reason and *a priori* knowledge; and this is likely the reason why Plato holds the virtue of knowledge in such high regard. He states, "To produce a true philosopher-guardian, we must vigorously pursue the highest forms of knowledge" (504d). "The highest form of knowledge is knowledge of the form of the good" (505a). The Theory of Forms is based on the belief that good is the highest form. Through pursuing the form of the good, people are simultaneously pursuing objective knowledge about morality and the good life.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Why Plato thought the Forms were necessary
- Properties of the Forms, *eg*: immutability
- Hierarchical structure of the Forms with specific reference to the Form of the Good
- Knowledge is virtue thesis; those who know the good will act accordingly
- Doing wrong is lack of knowledge
- Explanations such as the Cave analogy and Divided Line simile to illustrate Plato's line of argument
- Attaining knowledge of the Forms will enable individuals to know what is morally right
- Political implications connected to moral knowledge
- Justice and the form of the good
- Distinctions between appetite and reason and between appetite and spirit to explain wider human thought and action

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Evaluation of the knowledge is virtue thesis; has Plato redefined knowledge? Is Plato proposing a logical or psychological thesis? It is possible to do what is wrong and yet know what is right and still do wrong
- Discussion of Aristotle's points regarding weakness of the will
- Does Plato's knowledge of the Good solve moral dilemmas? Plato's thesis appears to imply that moral problems are soluble in terms of the acquisition of knowledge; is this the case, even when the knowledge is high-ranking knowledge?
- Is it ever appropriate to claim that I know that I should have acted differently?
- Understanding of the Good is problematic and the claim that no one can fully understand the Good is unhelpful
- Difficulties in choosing between different interpretations of what constitutes the Good; Plato's vision led him to advocate elitism and censorship

- Plato's thesis leads to moral experts; the notion of moral experts or objective morality fails to acknowledge the personal element in morality
- Aristotle's contention that there are too many diverse uses of "good" to suppose there is one Form in which they all partake
- The dangers intrinsic in claims to have absolute knowledge in respect of moral issues
- Social and cultural diversity in moral issues; equally it might be argued that there are some actions that should never be undertaken regardless of socio-cultural considerations
- The possibility of having objective judgements and correct actions without moral experts; moral judgements are inherently subjective and relative to the individual circumstances
- No such thing as moral knowledge
- Moral relativism
- Pappas's assertion that one reason for the Form of the Good's philosophical importance is that Plato's Theory of Forms is the "grand unification of all philosophical inquiries".

16. (a) Explain Plato's distinction between knowledge and belief. [10]

(b) Evaluate Plato's distinction between knowledge and belief. [15]

This is a question about the significance of Plato's answer to what it takes to move from belief to knowledge as discussed in Books V-VII. In the Divided Line, Plato sets out four categories of belief: *ekasia*, *pistis*, *dianoia*, and *noesis*. The former two are illusion and belief; these are beliefs about the visible world. The realm of forms allows more certainty through reasoning and finally understanding. Plato asserts that belief and knowledge are not the same thing and that the progression from belief to knowledge is transformative. In Book V, Plato presents a discussion that culminates in an argument that distinguishes between knowledge and belief, and that provides the basis for his Theory of Forms. Plato sees knowledge and ignorance on different ends of the spectrum and belief sitting somewhere in between. Plato's Theory of Forms is crucial for its application to Plato's distinction between belief and knowledge. Effectively, Plato noted the distinction between true knowledge and understanding and a mere belief in the state of things. Through his Allegory of the Cave, Plato showed that only philosophers can reach true knowledge and understanding, with the majority of society's view consistent with a belief (perception) of how things are. The connection between Plato's Theory of Forms and his conception of the distinction of knowledge and belief is not so much clearly established as the two concepts are intertwined. Plato's distinction between knowledge and belief is reflected in the notion that only philosophers can possess true knowledge, therefore a legitimate government will need to be that of philosophers as only they are fit to govern. Responses might focus on the major distinction between belief and knowledge, that of fallibility, and argue that perception, or belief is often based around the characteristics of what is being viewed. Plato's epistemology is tightly entangled with his metaphysics, and any discussion of Plato's epistemology will involve a discussion of his ontology. Candidates might reference Plato's own counter argument found in his dialogue *Parmenides* known as the Third Man Theory or his Hesiod's Wagon example; or Aristotle's argument that Plato considered only substance to have form, rather than all things.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Plato is considered the first western philosopher to focus attention on what exactly constitutes knowledge and how it is differentiated from belief
- Socrates and Glaucon conclude that knowledge and true belief are different powers so their natures cannot be the same (477c-478a); knowledge is the most effective power, while true belief is only what enables you to believe
- Knowledge is of the Forms, unchanging reality; knowledge is contrasted with belief which is of particulars and subject to change
- Knowledge is eternal and does not change or go anywhere, and belief is the opposite
- The person who contemplates reality has knowledge; the person who just enjoys beautiful things simply has opinions or mere beliefs
- Knowledge constitutes a different faculty from belief and, for Plato, their respective objects will also be different
- The *a priori* nature of knowledge (rationalism)
- Knowledge is of what is; ignorance of what is not: belief lies between these extremes
- Knowledge is concerned with what is real, with what is objective, *ie*: what is true irrespective of belief; belief concerns what is merely subjective
- Concepts of belief, *doxa*, knowledge and *episteme*
- The analogy of the ship and the sea captain
- The Allegory of the Cave illustrating the differences between knowledge and belief, and the Divided Line.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Differences in faculties will not establish ontological differences in their respective objects
- Plato's differentiation alters the notion of knowledge beyond recognition therefore we could only be said to know *a priori* propositions
- Knowing a state of affairs does not entail the necessity of that state
- The idea that there is no empirical evidence for the Theory of Forms, and more developed criticisms of the Theory of Forms. The consequences of Plato's notion that knowledge must concern that which cannot be false
- Plato's differentiation generates absolutes and this could have risky implications, *eg*: moral experts, political despots, closed societies, elitism
- It is not clear that anything can be known in the unqualified sense required by Plato
- The relationship between the Forms and sensible particulars is not clear
- Why should eternal existence carry any implications for what we can be said to know?
- Candidates may argue that believing is a component of knowing (justified true belief)
- Plato's own counter-example of Hesiod's Wagon
- Aristotle's argument that Plato considered only substance to have form.

Peter Singer: *The Life You Can Save*

17. (a) Explain Singer's view about wealth and affluence. [10]

(b) Evaluate Singer's view about wealth and affluence. [15]

In *The Life you can Save*, Singer claims that those who are affluent or wealthy have a moral duty to give to charity to save lives. He points out the growth of the middle classes means that there are roughly 3.8 billion people living at levels of affluence never previously experienced. This is before 2153 billionaires are taken into account. Singer discusses the extent to which the wealthy ought to give to charity. His basic argument states that it is wrong not to act when it is in your power to prevent something bad from happening. This suggests that perhaps those who are wealthy ought to give up their wealth so long as this does not involve sacrificing anything as bad as the problems they are solving in doing so. However, later on, Singer discusses the extent to which people are obliged to give. He suggests that a target of "roughly 5 % of annual income for those who are financially comfortable, with less for those below that level, and significantly more for the very rich" is realistic. This suggests that Singer does not think that wealth is immoral, but rather that people should be encouraged to give. On the other hand, Singer condemns the fact that we routinely spend money on luxuries such as bottled water where tap water is safe, rather than thinking about those whose lives could be saved. Finally, Singer suggests that a high salary is a good thing if the money is used to help others.

Candidates might explore (part A):
- Singer's description of wealth and affluence
- The contrast between affluence today and poverty
- Singer's basic argument
- The idea that if we can sacrifice something without harm to ourselves in order to stop something bad from happening, then we have a duty to do so
- Singer's conclusion that donating 5 % of income is realistic
- The moral status of billionaires
- The idea that spending money on luxuries such as bottled water compares to owning a yacht or a private jet
- The idea that earning a large salary and donating it is an efficient way of saving lives
- The idea of creating a culture of giving.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
- Whether wealth is immoral
- The extent to which wealth is acceptable and the morality of billionaires
- The permissibility of spending money on luxury goods
- Whether the basic argument's claim that we should give to the extent that we do not sacrifice anything as bad as what we will be solving is too extreme
- Whether the claim that donating 5 % of income is enough is too weak
- The role of justice in considerations about wealth
- Other utilitarian stances, *eg*: Bentham's hedonic calculus
- Views about wealth and poverty from political philosophy, *eg*: Marxism, or Rawls's veil of ignorance view.

18. (a) Explain Singer's view that we have obligations to strangers. [10]

(b) Evaluate Singer's view that we have obligations to strangers. [15]

Peter Singer's basic argument implies that we have an obligation to strangers such that it is better to fulfil the basic needs of a stranger than to provide a luxury to someone you know. Furthermore, Singer thinks that we should give to the charities that can save the most lives, rather than local charities which will help people nearer to us. This is discussed at length in the chapter *Your Child or the Child of Others*. Singer questions whether obligations to one's own children override obligations to others, when in the case of the latter the need or suffering could be greater. Singer starts with the story of the unnatural mother who sacrifices her child's life to save the population of a village at risk of flooding. Another example is Paul Farmer who sacrificed the comfort and lifestyle of his family to help people in Haiti. Our obligations to the basic needs of strangers are, in Singer's view, stronger than our obligations to the comfort of our own children when this goes beyond their basic needs.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The case of the unnatural mother
- Paul Farmer's attitude towards this family and guilt about not loving strangers as much as he loved his own family
- The idea that we should not provide ourselves or our loved ones with luxuries when these could be exchanged for the basic needs of strangers
- Singer's account of the novel *The Good German*
- A discussion of Kravinsky's claims that the children of others are as important to him as his own children
- Singer's basic argument which implies that we should make sacrifices in order to help others
- The idea that helping others should not be limited to your own friends and family
- Singer's list of effective charities which are international, rather than local.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The view of Judith Jarvis Thomson discussed by Singer, that someone who claims to care about the children of others as much as their own children is defective
- Whether a society which favoured strangers over acquaintances, friends and family would be a better or worse society
- The idea that having loving and caring relationships with people near to us is a virtue that should be cultivated
- The value of caring for those near to us
- Descriptions of societies where family relations are downplayed, *eg*: Plato's *Republic*
- The relationship between obligation, social ties and utilitarianism
- The sorts of goods we should allow and deny those we care about: what counts as a luxury?
- The nature of basic needs.

Charles Taylor: *The Ethics of Authenticity*

19. (a) Explain Taylor's view of subtler languages. [10]

(b) Evaluate Taylor's view of subtler languages. [15]

The question asks for an explanation and evaluation of Taylor's idea which is presented and discussed in Chapter 7, *Subtler Languages*. Here Taylor analyses a change that goes back to the end of the eighteenth century and is related to the shift from an understanding of art as mimesis to one that stresses creation. The core of this change is described by Taylor in the following way: "Where formerly poetic language could rely on certain publicly available orders of meaning, it now has to consist in a language of articulated sensibility" (p. 84). Until the end of the eighteenth century there was intellectual homogeneity which shared certain assumptions (the Christian interpretation of history, the sacramentalism of nature, the Great Chain of Being, the analogy of the various planes of creation, the conception of man as microcosm). The decline of the old order with its established background of meanings made necessary the development of new poetic languages in the Romantic period. Now, the poet must articulate his own world of references, and make them believable. This represents a qualitative change in artistic languages. This means that an important subjectivation has taken place in post Romantic art. But it is clearly a subjectivation of manner. It concerns how the poet has access to whatever he or she is pointing us to. It by no means follows that there has to be a subjectivation of matter. Subjectivation of manner and matter are distinguished. The effort of some of the best of modern poets has been precisely to articulate something beyond the self.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The languages of art constitute the publicly available reference points that poets and painters can draw on
- Shakespeare's example with reference to the act of regicide
- Rilke's angels: we cannot get at them through a medieval treatise on the ranks of cherubim and seraphim, but we have to pass through the articulation of Rilke's sensibility
- Pope could draw on age-old views of the order of nature as a commonly available source of poetic images. For Shelley, this resource was no longer available
- The Romantic poets and their successors have to articulate an original vision of the cosmos, *eg*: Hölderlin and Wordsworth
- Similarities in painting: Caspar Friedrich, distances himself from the traditional iconography. He is searching for a symbolism in nature that is not based on the accepted conventions.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The ideal of authenticity requires that we discover and articulate our own identity
- Authenticity is clearly self-referential: this has to be my orientation. But this does not mean that on another level the content must be self-referential
- Two important different facets in it: one concerning the manner and the other concerning the matter or content of action
- My goals must express or fulfil my desires or aspirations, as against something that stands beyond these: God, or a political cause, or tending the earth
- In blocking out the exploration beyond the self, there is also a deprivation of one of our main weapons in the struggle against the flattened and trivialized forms of modern culture
- When the self is characterized as essentially open to something different and greater than itself, to what extent it still makes sense talking of subjectivation?
- How convincing is Taylor that we need to worry about subjectivism and anthropocentrism?
- Whether Taylor can draw a clear distinction between form and content *eg*: Nietzsche
- Other forms of relating philosophical reflection, poetry and literature: from Plato and Aristotle to Heidegger and Murdoch.

20. (a) Explain Taylor's critical account of the claim that "a liberal society must be neutral on questions of what constitutes a good life". [10]

(b) Evaluate Taylor's critical account of the claim that "a liberal society must be neutral on questions of what constitutes a good life". [15]

The question asks for an explanation and evaluation of Taylor's critical account of this conception which Taylor names "liberalism of neutrality" and is discussed originally in Chapter 2, *The Inarticulate Debate*. Precisely, Taylor points out that the very notion of a good life and its moral significance is pushed to the margins of public debate. The hold of moral subjectivism in the culture and the normal fashion of social science explanation also conspires to intensify this silence. The result has been to thicken the darkness around the moral ideal of authenticity. The result is the general sense that these issues cannot and should not be talked about. Oppositely, Taylor sustains the need of a work of retrieval, through which the ideal of authenticity as a moral value can help us restore our practice. To go along with this, three things are to be believed: (1) that authenticity is a valid ideal; (2) that one can argue and reason about ideals and about the conformity of practices to these ideals; and (3) that these arguments can make a difference.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Relativism as a form of individualism, whose principle is: everyone has a right to develop their own form of life, grounded on their own sense of what is really important or of value
- Terms like "narcissism" (Lasch) or "hedonism" (Bell) imply that there is no moral ideal at work
- Authenticity as a moral ideal
- Moral ideal: a picture of what a better or higher mode of life would be; where "better" and "higher" are defined not in terms of what we happen to desire or need, but offer a standard of what we ought to desire
- Moral subjectivism: the view that moral positions are not grounded in reason or the nature of things but are ultimately just adopted by each of us because we find ourselves drawn to them. On this view, reason cannot adjudicate moral disputes
- Appeals to authenticity that justify ignoring whatever transcends the self: for rejecting our past as irrelevant, or denying the demands of citizenship, or the duties of solidarity, or the needs of the natural environment
- Taylor's suggestion: a position distinct from both boosters and knockers of contemporary culture.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Everybody has his or her own values, and about these it is impossible to argue
- One ought not to challenge another's values
- Taylor's claim that relativism, as is widely espoused today, is a profound mistake, even in some respects self-stultifying
- The idea that the culture of self-fulfilment has led many people to lose sight of concerns that transcend them
- Taylor's view that what we need to understand is the moral force behind notions like self-fulfilment
- That the ideal of authenticity might take the form of a kind of soft relativism. This means that the defence of any moral ideal is somehow off limits
- The idea that there is no objectivity to morality, and that Taylor is wrong to seek it
  eg: Nietzsche's genealogical account of morality

- Critiques of liberal society as prescribing certain ideals
- Since relativism itself is powered by a moral ideal there is something contradictory and self-defeating in it
- Taylor's proposal: authenticity as a moral ideal has degraded but is very worthwhile in itself
- The positions of Dworkin and Kymlicka as examples of banishing discussions about the good life to the margins of political debate.

Lao Tzu: *Tao Te Ching*

21. (a) Explain the claim that "the *Tao* that can be named, is not the eternal *Tao*" conveys the essence of the entire book. [10]

(b) Evaluate the claim that "the *Tao* that can be named, is not the eternal *Tao*" conveys the essence of the entire book. [15]

The lines within this First Chapter reflects fundamental Taoist thinking and some philosophical insights into the Taoist perception of how the universe flows and the concept of alignment to that natural flow. The question stems from the very first sentence of the book, "The Tao that can be named, is not the eternal Tao, the name that can be named, is not the eternal name." Responses might be focused on the way (*Tao*) cannot be 'named', and candidates might offer up the interpretation that this means *Tao* cannot be understood or even spoken of; consequently, the application of human understanding of something that is beyond human understanding has the effect of limiting it. Some might argue that 'Tao' is just a word, a label, a type of signpost that points to the ineffable. In evaluation candidates might discuss the limitations of language by drawing upon Wittgenstein's language games. The concept of paradoxical opposites is a salient theme of the first chapter and candidates might explore the continuum between two extreme points of view identified in the chapter such as: to be speaking of something that cannot be named or understood while also naming and attempting to understand it. The word 'Tao' cannot encompass what *Tao* is in reality; *Tao* is constant, it is eternal, so if something can be named this adds changeability. It is nothing more than an attempt at speaking of something that is unspeakable. Candidates might identify the idea that the *Tao* is a concept beyond reason and logic; it is the universal principle that permeates every action and every phenomenon, yet it cannot be sufficiently understood through the rational mind. Responses might identify the use of 'nameless' as a synonym for the Tao and therefore the Tao is the source or root of all that exists.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The *Tao* as the infinite, common source
- The *Tao* as being eternally present; no beginning and no end
- The *Tao* as the essence of wisdom
- Central human notions of who we are, how we got here, and the laws of the universe we live in
- The human psyche and the common rhythms that are conveyed in the imagery of the book
- Paradoxical opposites in the chapter
- The enigmatic nature of the content of Chapter 1
- The role of perception
- The role of language
- The use of analogies such as flowing like water which highlight the difficulty talking about the *Tao*
- Similarities with teachings from Buddhism, Hinduism, and Christianity and Islam.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- How can the *Tao* be constant and eternal and thus immutable, and yet at the same time be something that can be 'named' thus introducing the possibility of change?
- If the *Tao* cannot be understood, then by what understanding is it not understood? Is it an absence of understanding itself that gives the impression that it cannot be understood? Is it simply that there is no point in even attempting to understand it?
- Hermeneutic issues in terms of trying to explain the text itself; for example, the received text is believed to be corrupted (the text was originally written on one-line bamboo strips

linked with silk threads) and consequently it is virtually impossible to understand much of the text without moving the sequences of Chinese letterings/characters from one place to another; therefore, to know what the original author intended is difficult

- The implication of applying Wittgenstein's language games approach; is it possible for the words in the book to be meaningful when verification cannot be carried out (Ayer's verification principle)?
- If naming the 'Tao*'* is just a label or signpost, then issues surrounding their legitimacy and use might be explored, for example the role of symbols in language, *eg*: Tillich's claim that symbols can unlock dimensions and elements of the metaphysical
- Does the use of paradoxical opposites being part of the whole as applied in Chapter 1 (and all the text itself) contribute to the text's ambiguity and imagery?
- Issues surrounding perception and what 'reality' actually is: the *Tao*'s claim that there is 'no-thing' that exists and therefore everything is empty because it is all a process; however, do our senses tell us otherwise? Is having our everyday sense perceptions on one side and the truth of the *Tao* (reality) on the other simply a shift in perception and conscious awareness?
- Does the idea that the *Tao* is a notion beyond reason and logic make its claims counterintuitive?

22. (a) Explain the virtue of not striving (*wu wei*). [10]

(b) Evaluate the virtue of not striving (*wu wei*). [15]

The idea is from verse 68. Responses could identify that the virtue of not striving is also known as the virtue of *wu wei* and literally means non-action. Candidates might explore 'not striving' as the understanding that human beings are limited in abilities and that consequently "Nothing in the world can manipulate the great Tao". However, the Taoist also recognizes that we do affect the universe; but if we do not follow the way of nature and try to enforce our will against it, we will certainly fail. Responses might reference the current debate surrounding the environment and climate change. The 'not striving' principle in relation to society might be explored: we can affect society, but our ability is limited because when we go against society or other human beings, we may win a victory or two, but eventually it is better not to strive; those who strive generate opposition and thus expose themselves to danger. "Only if you do not fight, no one can fight against you". The virtue of 'not striving' based on the view that by identifying with the *Tao*, real strength can be gained; the philosophical basis of the virtue of 'not striving' is an understanding of the power of naturalness and spontaneity. The *Tao* has this power because it does things by 'not striving' (*wu wei*). This 'not striving' does not mean total inactivity. Responses might identify its meaning as when one has less desire, one has less constraint; when one does not try to do anything, one leaves nothing undone. A significant meaning that candidates might explore is that nothing should be done that goes against the nature of anything. For example, the ideal ruler treats ruling his people like frying a small fish, this implies directing rather than manipulating, and observing rather than interfering. Not striving might be likened to using a light touch and being guided by the nature of things, like water flowing.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The concept of *wu wei*
- Issues surrounding the idea that to forget about the self is part of the *Tao*
- The absence of external controls while holding a self to be unrealistic and fighting against external controls is a way to destroy one's freedom
- 'Not striving' in respect to the understanding that human beings have limited abilities
- Discussion of being in opposition to the great *Tao* and thus bound to fail (p.16)
- 'Not striving' and issues related to the environment
- 'Not-striving' and issues relating to society
- The role of spontaneity
- Issues surrounding self-control
- Desire and non-desire.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- *Wu wei* does not negate the concept of self
- Differences from other religious philosophies such as asceticism or quietism
- A comparison between the *Tao*'s concept of 'not striving' and modern concepts of striving to achieve goals to demonstrate that the two are not just different, but that they are practically opposite
- Implications of 'non-striving' not meaning total inactivity
- Does the *Tao* invite a philosophical and passive approach to life?
- To what extent does the *Tao* require the individual to be self-critical and at the same time to be in harmony with the environment?
- Is the Taoist concept of 'not-striving' just an illusion?
- If freedom, as understood in today's world, entails an absence of constraints and coercions, it follows then that freedom is to be achieved by striving against limitations, removing hindrances, and being protected from external interferences. Does this render the *Tao* and the idea of non-striving as an anachronism?

- Is it logical to infer that the fewer desires a person has, the fewer constraints they have? And if, taking it to its logical conclusion, a person who has no expectations at all will simply have no constraints and therefore attain a perfect state of 'non-striving' and thus in a sense omnipotence
- Does 'not-striving' contradict modern standards of living?
- Is the concept of 'not striving' simply a form of morality of being unselfish?
- Does the attainment of 'not-striving' as reflected in the *Tao* mean such an individual differs in physical or metaphysical aspects compared to that of an ordinary person?
- Concepts of the self *eg*: Locke, Hume, Sartre.

Zhuangzi: *Zhuangzi*

23. (a) Explain Zhuangzi's comparison of the fish in the water to the human in Heaven. [10]

(b) Evaluate Zhuangzi's comparison of the fish in the water to the human in Heaven. [15]

This question invites an explanation of how fish and humans can behave in a similar way as seen by Zhuangzi in an imagined discussion between Zigong and Confucius, in Chapter 6 section 47. There are many other fish/human references most often beyond the 'Inner Chapters'. Firstly, it is seen that fish in water swims freely and lives a good, nourishing life. Humans, while seeking the Tao, mirror the fish in that they serve no 'particular goal', and let their lives flow and settle into a stability that could not be found in a hectic stress driven world. Those humans who behave so in the world are seen as 'petty men' but in Heaven they are exemplary figures. The fish in water is equating water with the *Tao* both seemingly having regenerative powers allowing free movement, a sense of weightlessness and separated from the pulls of the world. The fish can well forget the medium of water and so too can humans, with the aid of the *Tao*, forget the *Tao* itself, and have a sense of 'non-being' thus losing the sense of self. Another approach that might be related, but which goes beyond the "Inner Chapters", could be the idea of the 'happy fish' which explores the nature of knowing. How we know the fish might be happy raises parallels with how we know about the knowledge and insights of others. The later point of reference can be linked to the fish in the pond in the story in 6.27 by questioning a sense of being and why fellow humans judge the 'petty man' – claiming both to know their state of being and attributing uselessness to them. Both these claims are contrary to Zhuangzi's perspective. He would value both uselessness and loss of self-awareness as indications of reaching for the Tao. Other parallels can be drawn in the way fish live in harmony with water, whereas non-harmonious human interaction results in destruction. Mention might also be made of Zhuangzi's reference to the fish out the pond and how it struggles to survive as similarly the human away from the Tao struggles and fights and wrestles with their own existence

Candidates might explore (part A):
- The parallel is between the freedom of the fish and the freedom of humans in a community setting. Is the pond the same as human society?
- The relationship between earth and Heaven for humans
- The nature of the 'petty man' in the earth
- The qualities of the exemplary man in Heaven
- Different problems of knowing that relate to an understanding of the other and how one who is not understood is given little or no value, or when one is not complete (Zhuangzi's frequent use of physical disabled people) one is seen as useless- not worth being taken into consideration (which is contrary to Zhuangzi's view)
- The use of parallels between animals and humans.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
- The way fish are free in water, with no need to think, and the similarities of human in the *Tao*
- The similarities of the way both respond to stress – struggling – a fish out of water, a human not in harmony
- The perceptions and reaction to danger
- The possible loneliness of the fish and human; the fish in the pond forgets the other fish as humans forget others when with the *Tao*
- The issue of isolation and whether it is desirable or even achievable in modern society, *eg*: Simmel, Cioran
- The possible human strength of adaptability to their environment, *eg*: Scheler, Dewey
- Knowledge of the other and communication with the other without complete understanding
- Parallels between the fish swimming and the wanderer of the First Chapter
- Whether humans are better than fish and other animals; contrasts might be made with Singer's views on morality and communication.

24. (a) Explain Zhuangzi's response to the question "How is the world to be managed (ruled)?" [10]

(b) Evaluate Zhuangzi's response to the question "How is the world to be managed (ruled)?" [15]

This question invites an explanation of how Taoism might be a guide to ordering the world or the ruling of States, in effect, political activity. Initially in Chapter 7:3 the nameless man rejects the question from Tian Gen and considers any response a waste of time and that he has better things to do. This rejection is a hint that any ruler who has to ask this question should not be ruling. Much of the attitude to political behaviour is that it is of little value and one should not get involved. This could well be a reflection of the times in which the text was written – a time of civil war and political upheaval. However, on the second asking, the answer reveals an application of the Way (the *Tao*) to politics. It is not a case of non-action as this would result in acceptance of the politics of the time and what is happening in the current political arena. It is more a sense of rising above the pettiness of the times and the self-interest that is driving actions. It is suggested to 'blend your vital energy with the boundless silence, follow the rightness of the way each thing is, without allowing yourself the least bias' (7:3, 7:4). This is not quite the *wu wei* approach that might be expected but is more a Zhuangzian approach of *ziran,* of being oneself, and allowing and encouraging others to be themselves. There is no self-interest in the actions of the ruler. The implication of this is to be 'one's own man' and not succumb to pressure groups or trends and fads; rather to objectively view unique situations and come to conclusions which might well not set policies but resolve only the current situation. A tendency to create policy would be counter 'to the Tao in that the Way is each thing' (7:3), each has to be considered separately (7:3, 7:4). If this is done then 'the world would be in order' (7:4). There are mentions elsewhere of letting 'horses run free' which suggests an approach to anarchy but this is not the case. The advice is to live in harmony both cosmically and socially and this can be achieved by measured judgment. The approach of the ruler separates them from the people. The "clear sighted rule" has the bigger picture, a world view and he is able to allow others to excel and fulfill their potential, to 'allow all creatures to delight in themselves' (7:5) without interfering. There might be comparisons between a ruler and the behaviour of the cook/butcher (3:4, 3:5) in dealing with the ox meat. The skill of the cook might be equated to the ruler. The cook might seem to be in harmony with the meat and does not need to re-sharpen his knife. So too the ruler, in harmony with the people, would not need the blunting knife of laws, punishments and constraints to rule. When eating meat, one does not consider the butcher and so too, in the harmonious state, the ruler is not at the forefront of the people thoughts.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The nature of the *Tao* and its presence in all things
- Whether fixed policies prevent flexible thinking and flexible problem solving
- The effect on rulers of advice and advisors. The relationship of ministers, administrators and advisors to the Ruler
- Whether decision-making processes can be bias-free
- The nature of a broad perspective (world view) on the everyday
- The effect of *ziran* (naturalness, spontaneity and just-so ness) on governing
- The role of the sage as a ruler, or an advisor, or the sage completely divorced from politics.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The degree to which any political act can be divorced from self-interest
- Whether a wise clear-sighted leader can relate to the general populace
- How such a clear-sighted leader would maintain their authority
- Cross reference might be made to a 'philosopher king', *eg*: Plato
- The degree to which people will take on greater responsibility, and the consequent effect on governance

- The degree to which a Zhuangzian style of leader is consultative
- Whether market driven societies allow for a Zhuangzian style of leader
- A comparison between *wu wei* and *ziran* leadership
- The degree to which a leader can be above politics
- Zhuangzi's view of the common people needing to be returned to their natural crude and simple condition, where they live in harmony with the world and themselves
- Comparisons to other forms of Taoist thought, *eg*: Lao Tzu and ruling like frying a small fish
- Confucianism as an alternative approach to ruling
- Forms of governance that are at odds with Zhuangzi's suggestions *eg*: Machiavelli
- Ways in which a benevolent, caring ruler can transform society; mention of the cook/butcher finding intuitively ways through the meat with a constantly sharp knife compared to the blunt knife which is the directive ruler – a legalistic, punishment driven approach.