

Markscheme

May 2026

Philosophy

Higher level and standard level

Paper 2

© International Baccalaureate Organization 2026

All rights reserved. No part of this product may be reproduced in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means, including information storage and retrieval systems, without the prior written permission from the IB. Additionally, the license tied with this product prohibits use of any selected files or extracts from this product. Use by third parties, including but not limited to publishers, private teachers, tutoring or study services, preparatory schools, vendors operating curriculum mapping services or teacher resource digital platforms and app developers, whether fee-covered or not, is prohibited and is a criminal offense.

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

© Organisation du Baccalauréat International 2026

Tous droits réservés. Aucune partie de ce produit ne peut être reproduite sous quelque forme ni par quelque moyen que ce soit, électronique ou mécanique, y compris des systèmes de stockage et de récupération d'informations, sans l'autorisation écrite préalable de l'IB. De plus, la licence associée à ce produit interdit toute utilisation de tout fichier ou extrait sélectionné dans ce produit. L'utilisation par des tiers, y compris, sans toutefois s'y limiter, des éditeurs, des professeurs particuliers, des services de tutorat ou d'aide aux études, des établissements de préparation à l'enseignement supérieur, des fournisseurs de services de planification des programmes d'études, des gestionnaires de plateformes pédagogiques en ligne, et des développeurs d'applications, moyennant paiement ou non, est interdite et constitue une infraction pénale.

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

© Organización del Bachillerato Internacional, 2026

Todos los derechos reservados. No se podrá reproducir ninguna parte de este producto de ninguna forma ni por ningún medio electrónico o mecánico, incluidos los sistemas de almacenamiento y recuperación de información, sin la previa autorización por escrito del IB. Además, la licencia vinculada a este producto prohíbe el uso de todo archivo o fragmento seleccionado de este producto. El uso por parte de terceros —lo que incluye, a título enunciativo, editoriales, profesores particulares, servicios de apoyo académico o ayuda para el estudio, colegios preparatorios, desarrolladores de aplicaciones y entidades que presten servicios de planificación curricular u ofrezcan recursos para docentes mediante plataformas digitales—, ya sea incluido en tasas o no, está prohibido y constituye un delito.

En este enlace encontrará más información sobre cómo solicitar una autorización por escrito en forma de licencia: <https://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/ib-publishing/licensing/applying-for-a-license/>.

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 students 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 4 for part A responses, and page 5 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 students *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 students. 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.
- Students 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 students will use material effectively that is *not* mentioned in the markscheme
- Examiners should be aware of the command terms for Philosophy as published in 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 students 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, students 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

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

Paper 2 part A markbands

This task requires students to answer a two-part question on the prescribed text that they have studied in-depth in class. Students are presented with a choice of two questions per text and must answer both part A and part B of their selected question. For this task, students are permitted to have access to a clean/non-annotated copy of the prescribed text throughout the examination. It is expected that students will make explicit references to this text in their responses.

Part A question requires students to explain a specified concept, issue or argument from the prescribed text. It is expected that students will include explicit references to the text to support their explanation.

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–2	• Little understanding of the specified concept/issue/argument from the text is demonstrated. Philosophical vocabulary is not used, or is consistently used inappropriately. • The explanation of the specified concept/issue/argument from the text is minimal. Points made are superficial and frequently unclear. There are few, if any, references to the text.
3–4	• A basic understanding of the specified concept/issue/argument from the text is demonstrated. Philosophical vocabulary is used, but often inappropriately. • The explanation of the specified concept/issue/argument from the text is basic and underdeveloped. Points are often imprecise or vague, and it is often unclear what the response is trying to convey. There are occasional references to the text.
5–6	• Some understanding of the specified concept/issue/argument from the text is demonstrated. Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately. • There is a satisfactory explanation of the specified concept/issue/argument from the text, although the explanation lacks clarity and development in places. Relevant points are made but lack accuracy and detail. Specific references to the text are made, although these are sometimes ineffective.
7–8	• Good understanding of the specified concept/issue/argument from the text is demonstrated. Philosophical vocabulary is used, mostly appropriately. • The explanation of the specified concept/issue/argument from the text is clear, but is in need of further development. Points made are relevant and accurate but lack detail. There are specific references to the text.
9–10	• Very good understanding of the specified concept/issue/argument from the text is demonstrated. There is accurate and precise use of philosophical vocabulary. • The explanation of the specified concept/issue/argument from the text is clear and well developed. Points are relevant, accurate and detailed. There are specific and effective references to the text.

Paper 2 part B markbands

Part B requires students to undertake a critical discussion of a specified concept, issue or argument from the prescribed text. As part A and part B of each question are based on the same specified concept, issue or argument from the prescribed text, students are not required to repeat explanatory material from their part A response.

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–3	• Little understanding of and critical engagement with the specified concept/issue/argument from the prescribed text is demonstrated. • Philosophical vocabulary is not used or is consistently used inappropriately. Points are frequently inaccurate and unclear. There are few, if any, references to the text. • The response is descriptive. Any analysis present is superficial or incoherent. Examples are not included or are irrelevant. There is little or no discussion of different points of view. Where a conclusion is included, this is very superficial or is not consistent with the rest of the response.
4–6	• A basic understanding of and critical engagement with the specified concept/issue/argument from the prescribed text is demonstrated. • Philosophical vocabulary is used, but often inappropriately. Points are frequently imprecise or vague, and it is often unclear what the response is trying to convey. There are occasional references to the text. • There is limited analysis present and overall the response is more descriptive than analytical. Examples are included but are ineffective. There is limited discussion of different points of view. A simplistic conclusion is included.
7–9	• Some understanding of and critical engagement with the specified concept/issue/argument from the prescribed text is demonstrated. • Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately. Relevant points are made but lack accuracy and development. Specific references to the text are made, although these are sometimes ineffective. • The response contains analysis, although this analysis lacks development. Examples are included. There is some discussion of different points of view. A conclusion is included.
10–12	• Good understanding of and critical engagement with the specified concept/issue/argument from the text is demonstrated. • Philosophical vocabulary is used, mostly appropriately. Points made are relevant and accurate but lack detail. There are specific references to the text. • The response contains critical analysis, although this analysis lacks development. Examples are used to support the discussion. There is discussion of different points of view. The response argues to a conclusion that is consistent with the arguments presented.
13–15	• Very good understanding of and critical engagement with the specified concept/issue/argument from the text is demonstrated. • There is accurate and precise use of philosophical vocabulary. Points are relevant, accurate and detailed. There are specific and effective references to the text. • The response contains well-developed critical analysis. Relevant examples are used to support the discussion. There is critical discussion of different points of view. The response argues to a reasoned and clearly stated conclusion that is consistent with the arguments presented.

Alfred Jules Ayer: *Language, Truth and Logic*

1. (a) Explain Ayer's approach to the outstanding philosophical disputes. [10]
- (b) Evaluate Ayer's approach to the outstanding philosophical disputes. [15]

The question refers to the title of Chapter VIII of *Language, Truth and Logic*. Ayer's approach to the outstanding philosophical disputes is based on the argument that there is nothing in philosophy that justifies the existence of different philosophical parties or schools. A disagreement about a proposition is only justified if the available evidence is not sufficient to determine the probability of such a proposition. But regarding the propositions of philosophy, this can never be the case, because "the questions with which philosophy is concerned are purely logical questions" (p.144). Ayer rejects metaphysics as meaningless. Philosophical disputes are always unjustified because "they involve either the denial of a proposition which is necessarily true, or the assertion of a proposition which is necessarily false" (p.144). Some answers may give reasons that support Ayer's argument, while others may present different alternatives, for example challenging the sharp distinction between logical analysis and empirical research.

Part A: When explaining, students may refer to:

- Usually, at least one party to the dispute is guilty of a miscalculation, which a sufficiently close examination of the reasoning will reveal
- There are cases in which the logical error of which one party is guilty is too subtle to be easily detected
- The extent to which the question at issue cannot be resolved on the on the evidence available
- If the questions on which the parties are arguing are logical, they can be answered definitively. If the questions are not logical, they must either be dismissed as metaphysical or made the subject of empirical investigation
- The 'great issues' about which philosophers have disagreed in the past: rationalists versus empiricists, realists versus idealists, monists versus pluralists, and Ayer's solutions.
- The controversies between the positions are partly logical, partly metaphysical and partly empirical.

Part B: When evaluating, students may refer to:

- To what extent can propositions be reduced to logical or empirical ones?
- To what extent are philosophical propositions a single and consistent class of propositions?
- How the class of "philosophical propositions" is determined?
- The normative character of philosophy
- Other accounts of philosophical issues, e.g. naturalistic approaches, for instance, Quine
- Traditional views on the nature of philosophical inquiry from Plato to Nietzsche or Heidegger
- The debate between rationalism and empiricism
- The realist-idealist controversy
- The dispute between monists and pluralists.
- Whether Ayer's resolutions of the above three 'great issues' are satisfactory.
- To what extent is Ayer's account of the function of the philosopher plausible? ("... the function of the philosopher is not to devise speculative theories ... but to elicit the consequences of our linguistic usages." (p. 144))

2. (a) **Explain Ayer's statement that "it is impossible to find a criterion for determining the validity of ethical judgements".** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate Ayer's statement that "it is impossible to find a criterion for determining the validity of ethical judgements".** [15]

The question brings into play both Ayer's position on ethical judgements and their epistemological justification. It is framed within his account of the "judgements of value". This means showing that "in so far as statements of value are significant, they are ordinary "scientific" statements; and that in so far as they are not scientific, they are not in the literal sense significant, but are simply expressions of emotion which can be neither true nor false" (104). The core of the argument is that it is impossible to find a criterion to determine the validity of ethical judgements, "not because they have an "absolute" validity which is mysteriously independent of ordinary sense-experience, but because they have no objective validity whatsoever. If a sentence makes no statement at all, there is obviously no sense in asking whether what it says is true or false" (112). Responses may develop in several directions, including: upholding Ayer's emotivism manifest in this thesis or contradicting it, e.g. by upholding the knowledge dimension in ethical judgements.

Part A: When explaining, students may refer to:

- Sentences that simply express moral judgements say nothing. They are pure expressions of feeling and as such do not fall under the category of truth and falsehood
- Ethical judgments are neither true by definition nor empirically verifiable.
- They are unverifiable for the same reason that a cry of pain or a word of command is unverifiable. They do not express genuine propositions
- Normative ethical concepts are not reducible to empirical concepts
- Unless it is possible to provide some criterion by which to decide between conflicting intuitions, a mere appeal to intuition is worthless as a test of the validity of a proposition
- The rejection of the view that naturalistic theories provide the only alternative to absolutism in ethics
- The analysis of "You acted wrongly in stealing that money".

Part B: When evaluating, students may refer to:

- The ordinary systems of ethics, as they are elaborated in the works of ethical philosophers, are very far from being a homogeneous whole
- The extent to which propositions concerning the definitions of ethical terms can be said to constitute ethical philosophy
- The propositions describing the phenomena of moral experience, and their causes must belong to the science of psychology or sociology
- Functions of the ethical terms: to express feeling, to arouse feeling, and to stimulate action
- Emotivism and subjectivist theories
- To what extent does Ayer's explanation of ethics contribute to the realisation of ethical ideals, e.g. to lead a virtuous, a dutiful or a happy life?
- Moore's position is that if ethical statements were simply statements about the speaker's feelings, it would be impossible to argue about questions of value
- Ayer's emotivism and its comparison and discussion with other schools and ethical traditions.

The criterion may be contained within the specific 'language game' of which they are a part – Wittgensteinian approaches.

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

3. (a) **Explain the implications of Simone de Beauvoir's conception of woman as the Other for the understanding of gender relations.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate the implications of Simone de Beauvoir's conception of woman as the Other for the understanding of gender relations.** [15]

In *The Second Sex*, Simone de Beauvoir introduces the concept of "woman" as the Other in her analysis of gender relations. She argues that, throughout history, men have positioned themselves as the norm or the universal subject, while women have been relegated to the role of the Other, defined in opposition to men. This distinction is not biological but socially constructed, reinforced by cultural, religious, and philosophical narratives: "And she is nothing other than what man decides... She is determined and differentiated in relation to man, while he is not in relation to her; she is the inessential in front of the essential. He is the Subject; he is the Absolute. She is the Other" (pp. 26).

De Beauvoir asserts that this othering is foundational to the oppression of women, as it denies them subjectivity and autonomy. However, critics such as Luce Irigaray and Judith Butler have questioned whether De Beauvoir's existentialist framework sufficiently addresses the complexities of gender, particularly with regard to intersectionality and the fluidity of gender identities.

De Beauvoir stance raises crucial questions about how "otherness" perpetuates inequality in gender relations and whether it can be transcended.

Part A: When explaining, students may refer to:

- De Beauvoir's arguments that men have historically defined themselves as the essential subject, while women have been relegated to the role of the Other, a subordinate category dependent on male subjectivity.
- De Beauvoir's perspective on existentialist ideas, asserting that women's subordination stems from their lack of self-definition. Men define themselves through transcendence, while women are confined to immanence, limiting their freedom.
- The concept of gender, which for De Beauvoir, is not a natural or biological fact but a social construct. The roles and characteristics assigned to "woman" are determined by patriarchal structures, not inherent differences between the sexes.
- How De Beauvoir outlines the historical and cultural factors that have contributed to women's oppression, from religious texts to philosophy, which have reinforced the perception of women as secondary to men.
- The concept of "woman" as the Other which suggests that gender relations are fundamentally unequal, as men's subjectivity is privileged while women are denied autonomy and treated as objects.

Part B: When evaluating, students may refer to:

- While De Beauvoir's existentialist framework focuses on the need for women to achieve autonomy, some argue that her reliance on Sartrean concepts of subjectivity might still impose a male-centred notion of freedom.
- De Beauvoir's rejection of biological determinism has been widely accepted, but some argue that her theory may downplay the role of biology in shaping gendered experiences, which could be integrated into a more nuanced understanding.
- De Beauvoir suggests that women can transcend their status as the Other through solidarity and the assertion of their subjectivity, yet critics debate how achievable this is within entrenched patriarchal structures.
- While De Beauvoir highlights the role of social institutions, later feminist theorists, such as Bell Hooks, critique her focus on individual freedom and argue that collective action and structural change are necessary to dismantle these oppressive systems.

- Luce Irigaray critiques this binary view, suggesting that De Beauvoir's framing still defines women through the lens of male subjectivity. Irigaray believes that this reinforces the very male-centred discourse that De Beauvoir seeks to critique.
- Judith Butler critiques this existentialist framework arguing that De Beauvoir's focus on freedom and becoming overlooks the performative nature of gender. According to Butler, De Beauvoir assumes a fixed subject that "becomes" gendered, whereas Butler sees gender as a performance without a pre-existing essence.
- While Judith Butler agrees that gender is socially constructed, she extends De Beauvoir's claim by arguing that there is no pre-existing identity beneath gender—gender is a continuous process of becoming through performance. This challenges De Beauvoir's reliance on an underlying existentialist subject.
- While De Beauvoir emphasizes the historical subordination of women, some critics argue that her focus is Eurocentric and overlooks the ways that colonialism, race, and global inequalities intersect with gender. Kimberlé Crenshaw's intersectionality theory critiques the omission of race and class in De Beauvoir's framework, calling for a more comprehensive analysis of women's oppression across different social categories.
- Critics argue that this focus on autonomy reflects a Western, individualistic notion of freedom, which may not fully address collective or relational models of subjectivity. Some feminist scholars, like Iris Marion Young, critique this view, suggesting that autonomy should also be understood in terms of community and relationships, not just individual transcendence.

4. (a) **Explain Simone de Beauvoir's critique of the biological, psychoanalytic and historical perspectives on women's inferiority.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate Simone de Beauvoir's critique of the biological, psychoanalytic and historical perspectives on women's inferiority.** [15]

In *The Second Sex*, Simone de Beauvoir critiques the biological, psychoanalytic, and historical perspectives that have been used to justify women's inferiority. She rejects biological determinism, which claims that women's biology confines them to roles of reproduction and nurturance, arguing instead that biology does not determine destiny. De Beauvoir also critiques Freudian psychoanalysis, asserting that it views women as incomplete men, subject to their anatomy. Finally, she dismantles the historical narrative that presents women's subordination as natural or inevitable. De Beauvoir's analysis emphasizes that these perspectives are socially constructed and serve to reinforce patriarchal power.

However, thinkers like Luce Irigaray and Judith Butler challenge De Beauvoir's existentialist framework, suggesting that she may still be trapped within male-dominated discourse, offering alternative ways of thinking about gender and subjectivity.

Part A: When explaining, students may refer to:

- De Beauvoir's critics on biological determinism, arguing that biology has been used to justify women's subordination by suggesting that their reproductive functions confine them to roles of childbearing and caregiving.
- How De Beauvoir challenges Freud's psychoanalytic view that women suffer from "penis envy" and are defined by their anatomy. She argues that Freudian theory reduces women to incomplete men, reinforcing male superiority and ignoring the role of social and cultural factors in shaping gender identity.
- De Beauvoir's stance that history has been written by men and for men, presenting women as passive and subordinate by default. This is not an inherent truth but a result of patriarchal social structures.
- How De Beauvoir critiques essentialist views that portray women as having a fixed, eternal nature that makes them inherently inferior. These essentialist views serve patriarchal interests by locking women into static roles, denying them the possibility of transcendence and freedom.
- De Beauvoir's existentialist philosophy which holds that women are free to define their own existence and should not be bound by the roles that biology, psychoanalysis, or history have assigned to them.
- How De Beauvoir argues that the inferiority of women is not biologically or historically determined but socially constructed.

Part B: When evaluating, students may refer to:

- Irigaray's critique of De Beauvoir's existentialist framework for still being rooted in male-dominated discourse. Irigaray argues that by defining women in opposition to men, De Beauvoir reinforces binary gender structures, limiting women's potential to articulate a unique feminine subjectivity.
- Butler's theory of gender performativity, that challenges the pre-existence of a subject that become gendered, arguing that gender is constituted through repeated actions and is not the expression of an inner essence.
- Critics who argue that De Beauvoir's rejection of biological determinism downplays the role that biology can play in shaping human experiences.
- Crenshaw's theory of intersectionality which highlights that De Beauvoir's focus on gender fails to account for the interconnectedness of gender, race, and class in shaping oppression. Crenshaw argues that De Beauvoir's critique of women's subordination is limited because it does not address the additional forms of marginalization experienced by women of colour and working-class women.
- Some contemporary psychoanalytic feminists have revised Freud's theories to argue that psychoanalysis can be a tool for understanding gender identity in a more nuanced way. For example, Juliet Mitchell argues that psychoanalysis, when reinterpreted, can provide insights into the unconscious processes that shape gender roles.

- How De Beauvoir's critique is seen as powerful in revealing how social institutions perpetuate narratives of women's inferiority. However, later feminist theorists, such as Bell Hooks, argue that De Beauvoir's emphasis on intellectual freedom does not adequately address how structural oppression, such as racism or economic inequality, impacts women's lives.
- While De Beauvoir's critique remains influential in feminist theory, some might argue that her focus on existentialism and the individual struggle for freedom may not fully address the collective efforts needed to dismantle patriarchy. Intersectional feminists push for a broader approach that includes race, class, and global perspectives in the fight for gender equality.

Confucius: *The Analects*

5. (a) **Explain the importance of the observance of ritual propriety (*li*) for Confucian ethics.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate the importance of the observance of ritual propriety (*li*) for Confucian ethics.** [15]

The practice of rituals or rites is one of the 5 main bonds of Confucian ethics. It seems fundamental to the proper enactment of courage, uprightness and carefulness. (*Analects* 8:2) It is also a fundamental aspect of social harmony. (8:2). Rites (*Li*) are not just a formal practical activity but can also be seen as a moral code, in that it is the right way to do all things in life. *Li* forms the bases of how people interact with each other and reflects courtesy and respect between people. The rituals show how young and older, family members, and upper- and lower-class people operate appropriately within a social space. *Li* is very much dependent upon the motive behind the action. The rite must be done in the right spirit (17:11) and then there is a sense of reciprocity of action or rite. In the 'Doctrine of Mean' Confucius expands the impact of *li* to include it as a fundamental facet of building the character of a person.

Part A: When explaining, students may refer to:

- Different type of rituals that relate to different aspects of social behaviour
- The need for rituals to be performed correctly to achieve goodness
- The other parts of the 5 Bonds that interact with *li*
- The qualities of the gentleman, of which *li* is one
- The way rites define proper conduct of different types of people ... a father being a father, a son being a son (12;11)
- Reciprocity of behaviour and social harmony

Part B: When evaluating, students may refer to:

- Whether *li* is conformity to tradition -the difference between tradition and doctrine
- Possible critiques from Mill on the 'despotism of custom', and responses on behalf of Confucius. The role of discretion in interpreting the application of rites (19:11) ... 'crossing Barriers' in minor affairs is possible
- The need to balance ritual with cultural context ... the role of the gentleman making the correct decision – c.f. Aristotle's *phronesis* (practical wisdom).
- Whether cultural conformity can maintain a dynamic society
- Links with Aristotelian *hexis* (habit)- doing the right thing is virtuous
- How does one find/learn the 'right things' to do - education or indoctrination
- The degree to which cultural sensitivity can/should modify *li*
- The role of civic education in Western education systems attempting to establish common behaviours and mores
- The need for balance in all behaviours: 'to go beyond is as bad as to fall short' (11:15)

6. (a) Explain how a Confucian ruler should govern. [10]
- (b) Evaluate how a Confucian ruler should govern. [15]

The Confucian notion of state governorship is based on the fundamental relationship between father and family. Consequently, the ruler is seen as the father of the state. The ruler therefore sets the examples of behaviour through virtue. The ruler is the virtuous person. Benevolence is a key factor and alongside with the practice of *de* (reverence) and *li* (ritual) as means to achieve a harmonious state. There is an implication that the ruler ought to be charismatic through the enactment of *de*. A reciprocity of goodness will lead to virtuous action by all citizens. Through self-discipline a prosperous and peaceful state is established. The ruler becomes the model of a *junzi* (gentleman). The ruler does not have to be authoritarian in governance, he should take an approach of *wu wei* (not interfering). Nonetheless, it is the task of the ruler to care about the *xiaoren* (little men), The main task of the ruler is to improve the human condition by encouraging a people to be akin to as a *junzi*. The ruler needs to strive for goodness and this might be at the expenses of wealth and rank (*Analects* 4:5) The ruler rewards by merit (a meritocracy) and hence there could be considerable social mobility as citizens can improve themselves through education. His prime objective is *ren* (humaneness). The ruler has the task of governing not killing (*Analects* 12:19)

Part A: When explaining, students may refer to:

- How a ruler gains power
- The nature of *de* and *li* in terms of the behaviour of the ruler
- The responsibility of citizens toward the ruler
- The nature of social mobility through an education system
- The nature of *ren* and its relationship with a ruler
- How the ruler can increase the prosperity of the people

Part B: When evaluating, students may refer to:

- The degree to which the principle that all citizens will strive of goodness is realistic: contrasts might be made with a Lockean or Hobbesian view of humans
- Whether a *wu wei* attitude is appropriate for a ruler; Can a non-paternalistic rulership be avoided?
- The degree to which Confucian based government could drive economic growth – is it compatible with a market driven economy?
- Whether a Confucian meritocratic system can entertain liberal values
- The degree to which a Confucian ruler creates a dynamic society or moribund system
- The practicality of a *junzi* (superior person) as a model for all citizens
- Can a Confucian ruler allow critically minded individuals?

René Descartes: *Meditations on First Philosophy*

7. (a) Explain Descartes's arguments for questioning the reliability of the senses. [10]
- (b) Evaluate Descartes's arguments for questioning the reliability of the senses. [15]

In *Meditation I*, Descartes points out a fundamental error in scholastic philosophy's approach to metaphysical truths: its reliance on sensory experience. He summarises this flaw by stating: "Whatever I have up till now accepted as most true I have acquired either from the senses or through the senses." Descartes argues that the senses, while useful for practical purposes, are not trustworthy sources of truth. He employs sceptical arguments in *Meditation I* to illustrate how sensory experience can be deceptive. One such argument is the dream argument, where Descartes notes that there are times when dreams feel indistinguishable from waking reality, leading to doubt about whether our sensory experiences can reliably inform us about the external world. Furthermore, he introduces the possibility of a malicious deceiver, a being capable of manipulating human perception and causing one to believe falsehoods even when reasoning seems sound. Descartes concludes that sensory perception is not a reliable foundation for knowledge and asserts that only clear and distinct ideas, accessed through the intellect, provide certainty. This leads to his famous cogito, ergo sum ("I think, therefore I am") argument, which is known with certainty because it is derived from intellectual reflection. To emphasise this, he remarks in *Meditation III*: "I will now shut my eyes, stop my ears, and withdraw all my senses." While his doubts about the senses are compelling, critics argue that Descartes underestimates the role of sensory information in shaping our understanding of the world, raising questions about whether the intellect alone can fully grasp reality.

Part A: When explaining, students may refer to:

- Descartes's method of radical doubt which leads him to question the reliability of sensory experience.
- The dream argument illustrating that dreams can feel indistinguishable from waking reality.
- The malicious deceiver hypothesis suggesting that a powerful being could manipulate our perceptions.
- Clear and distinct ideas serving as a criterion for truth derived from intellectual reasoning.
- The wax example showing that the essence of objects is understood through the intellect rather than the senses.
- The distinction between mind and body emphasizing that knowledge comes from the intellect.

Part B: When evaluating, students may refer to:

- The implications of the dream argument and whether it sufficiently demonstrates the fallibility of sensory experience.
- The role of scepticism in Descartes's philosophy and its effectiveness in undermining confidence in the senses.
- The potential for Descartes's conclusions about sensory unreliability to lead to radical scepticism and its philosophical consequences (Montaigne).
- The impact of external factors on sensory perception as a challenge to Descartes's assertion that senses are inherently deceptive (Merleau-Ponty).
- The relationship between Descartes's arguments and modern cognitive science findings about human perception and its inaccuracies (Daniel Kahneman).
- The relevance of Hume's empirical scepticism regarding the reliability of inductive reasoning and its connection to Descartes's ideas about sensory experience.
- The critique from phenomenology about the lived experience of perception and how it contrasts with Cartesian doubt (Heidegger).
- The challenge posed by social constructivist theories that argue sensory experience is shaped by cultural contexts, questioning Cartesian universality (Berger and Luckmann).

8. (a) **Explain Descartes’s belief that any act of judgement involves both the intellect and the will.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate Descartes’s belief that any act of judgement involves both the intellect and the will.** [15]

Descartes explores the relationship between the intellect and the will in the process of judgement. “I could not but judge that something which I understood so clearly was true; but this was not because I was compelled so to judge by any external force, but because from a great light in the intellect there followed a great inclination in the will.” He asserts that every act of judgement is a function of both faculties working together, as illustrated by the affirmation “I think, therefore I am”. Descartes emphasises that the intellect is responsible for representing ideas, while the will affirms or denies these representations. He argues that the will is not limited to what the intellect presents, highlighting the freedom of the will to choose between different judgements. Descartes believes this interplay is crucial for understanding knowledge and truth. The intellect presents clear and distinct ideas, which serve as the foundation for sound judgements. However, the will plays an equally important role by deciding whether to accept or reject these representations. This dual involvement ensures that judgements are not merely passive reflections but active choices made by the individual. He also notes, “I perceive that the power of willing which I received from God is not, when considered in itself, the cause of my mistakes,” prompting us to consider the nature of our mistakes and how they arise from the exercise of the will. Critics argue that Descartes may overlook the complexities of how emotions and external influences affect the will’s decisions. Moreover, some philosophers suggest that the intellect alone may not provide sufficient clarity in certain situations, raising questions about whether Descartes’s framework can fully account for the intricacies of human judgement.

Part A: When explaining, students may refer to:

- Descartes’s assertion that the intellect and will are both essential in the process of judgement
- The role of the intellect in representing clear and distinct ideas
- How the will affirms or denies the representations provided by the intellect
- The significance of conscious thought in the formation of judgements
- How the freedom of the will allows for the choice between different judgements
- The role of doubt in refining the process of judgement according to Descartes

Part B: When evaluating, students may refer to:

- The implications of Descartes’s definition of judgement as a confluence of the intellect and will for understanding the nature of belief formation (Kant).
- The relationship between Descartes’s dualism of intellect and will and contemporary discussions on the interplay between reason and emotion in decision-making (Daniel Kahneman).
- The potential circularity in Descartes’s argument, questioning whether the intellect’s representation can be trusted when it relies on the will to affirm or deny (Wittgenstein).
- The impact of modern psychology on the understanding of will and judgement, challenging Cartesian distinctions through evidence of subconscious influences (Sigmund Freud).
- The relevance of Hume’s views on passion and reason, examining how emotions may override rational judgement.
- The implications of existential philosophy particularly regarding the authenticity of choices made under social pressures (Sartre).
- The exploration of free will in the context of determinism, questioning whether the will genuinely operates independently of external factors (Compatibilism debates).
- How the relationship between intellect and will informs moral decision-making (John Rawls).

Frantz Fanon: *Black Skin, White Masks*

9. (a) **Explain Fanon’s view that assimilating the French language makes the Black Antillean closer to becoming a true human being.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate Fanon’s view that assimilating the French language makes the Black Antillean closer to becoming a true human being.** [15]

In Chapter One, Fanon explores the nature and impact of language as spoken by the colonised Antilleans and he makes a claim that the more an Antillean assimilates French, “the whiter he gets – i.e., the closer he is to becoming a true human being.” Fanon claims at the start that considering the role of language helps understanding of “the black man’s dimension of being-for-others” and that “to speak is to exist absolutely for the other”. Assimilating French enables a continuation of the different mode of behaviour when with White people. This is a key part of the colonial experience. Fanon claims that if you ‘possess’ a language, you “possess the world expressed...by this language.” Fanon explores the experience of the colonised islander who has spent time in France, and he claims a form of deification occurs on return, with language playing an enabling part. Fanon explores the use of Creole in different settings and describes diction in the communication of the self by the Martinican.

Students might explore (part A):

Part A: When explaining, students may refer to:

- Language and appropriation
Diction and how it conveys the colonised experience
- The development of language in scholars like Piaget, Gelb and Goldstein
- Sartre’s claim that “...the black poet will turn against the French language” and the claim this will not be the case for the Antilleans
- The phenomenon of speaking down to Black people; nonsense or childish language, and how it insults and imprisons the hearer
- To speak pidgin or colloquialism means: “You stay where you are.”, which is a form of imprisonment. The colonised has no culture or civilisation, which is conveyed in the language used by the coloniser towards them

Possible discussion points include (part B):

Part B: When evaluating, students may refer to:

- Is Fanon’s account of the role of language in the colonial setting convincing?
- What does Fanon mean by ‘being-for-others’ and the role language plays in this?
- Is Fanon’s psychoanalytical treatment of the change of personality for the Martinican who goes to France and returns convincing?
- Is Fanon’s treatment of the returning islander and the new use of language – “He proves himself through his language” – convincing?
- Is Fanon right that speaking a language is an appropriation of a world and its culture?
- Compare with modern expressions of language in ethnic communities, like rap music
- How does this fit in with Fanon’s use of the phrase ‘Being-for-others’?

10. (a) Explain Fanon's treatment of the so-called dependency complex of the colonized. [10]

(b) Evaluate Fanon's treatment of the so-called dependency complex of the colonized. [15]

In Chapter Four, Fanon discusses an essay by Mannoni in which the author claims that the colonised possess an inferiority complex prior to being colonised. For Mannoni there was a pre-existing structure of thought such that he would claim there was a desire to be colonised. This originates in childhood. Fanon disagrees and claims it is the process of colonisation that causes this sense of inferiority. Fanon explores antisemitism and racism among different groups, including an example of poor Whites in relation to Black people in South Africa. Fanon blames European civilisation for colonial racism. Fanon repudiates Mannoni by rejecting his claim about the Malagasy people gaining identity through colonisation. For Fanon their identity and culture were destroyed by the process. Fanon claims that it is through lack of opportunity – not a sense of inferiority – that Black people cannot achieve what White people do. Fanon quotes an author claiming it is the conditions of civilisation that determine "...the content of an individual's dreams." The chapter ends with a brief claim about how the trading ambitions of colonisers contribute to a native's sense of inferiority.

Students might explore (part A):

Part A: When explaining, students may refer to:

- The hierarchy of racial dislike French, Jew, Arab, Black man
- The mix of psychoanalysis and interpretation of dreams relating these to social structures
- Fanon talks of advising his patient to 'choose' action in face of a feeling of inferiority, not to feel inferior or a desire to "whiten or perish"
- Fanon's view of 'destructuralization' in Madagascar as a result of colonization.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

Part B: When evaluating, students may refer to:

- How verifiable is Fanon's claims about this effect of colonization?
- How effective are his examples, especially in the treatment of the Malagasy mentality?
- Is the mix of psychoanalysis and philosophy convincing in Fanon's critique?
- Can the psychoanalytic passages of the text be read and critiqued in the same way as the philosophical assertions and analysis that Fanon provides?
- Can society and its structure be blamed for an individual's 'neurosis'? See the mention of Freud in the chapter, and see relationships between consciousness and social context'.

John Stuart Mill: *On Liberty*

11. (a) **Explain Mill's claim that the harm principle can function as the sole principle capable of protecting an individual's liberty in the face of any form of interference. [10]**
- (b) **Evaluate Mill's claim that the harm principle can function as the sole principle capable of protecting an individual's liberty in the face of any form of interference. [15]**

This question focuses upon the nature, scope, application and adequacy of the harm principle as the sole legitimate means of protecting individual liberty. Mill directly explains the harm principle in Chapter 1 of the text but references to the application of the harm principle can be found in Chapters 2, 3 and 4. Mill clarifies and specifies the harm principle in the context of his positive estimation of individual autonomy and freedom and the spirit of restricting governmental interference in private and public life. Mill sees harm as a violation of rights which include freedom of conscience, thought and opinion along with freedom of expression, freedom to develop a personal lifestyle and pursue happiness, and freedom to unite and assemble for free and open discussion. Mill argues that the harm principle can function effectively as the singular principle to protect those rights and to protect individuals against the 'tyranny of the majority', the 'despotism of custom' and infallibility as a justification for the silencing of opinions.

Part A: When explaining, students may refer to:

- Mill's views on the centrality of the freedom of thought, speech, discussion and action and the need to protect and preserve those freedoms
- The nature, scope, application and limitations of the harm principle as the sole principle governing the dealing of society with the individual
- The nature, scope and extent of harm: physical, psychological, economic, reputation; harming others vs. harming oneself
- The harm principle and positive and negative freedom
- The possibility of establishing and implementing a single principle applicable to all situations; personal vs. multiple interests; the 'harm principle' in pluralistic societies; multi-cultural concerns
- Mill's harm principle in relation to utility in Mill's thinking
- Legitimate/justified vs. Illegitimate/unjustified interference in the freedom and liberty of persons

Part B: When evaluating, students may refer to:

- Vagueness and ambiguity in defining harm; subjectivity and personal prejudice; harm actually done vs. harm intended, for example, Steven Smith on effects of long-term psychological and communal harm; harm in pluralistic and multi-cultural contexts, for example, John Rawls on the need for a respect for pluralism in protecting individual rights and freedoms
- Adequacy of the harm principle, for example, David Lyons's view that preventing harm is, in fact, the only morally good reason to restrict freedom of thought, speech and action
- Can the harm principle adequately take into account moral, legal, religious and cultural issues, for example, Joel Feinberg on the harm principle in criminal situations, Tom Regan on the harm principle and animal rights; blasphemy laws and the 'harm principle'
- The possibility and/or advisability of establishing a single, universally applicable principle to limit interference in the freedom and liberty of individuals, for example the principle of 'the rule of law' which guarantees equality, protection, accountability and transparency
- Legitimate interference in the rights and freedoms of individuals, for example, situations of
- public safety, welfare, public health, national security; preventative measures for the good of the individuals. Whether Mill's own limits on freedom are consistent, for example the limits on gambling houses in Chapter IV.
- The harm principle as an effective means of addressing positive rights to education, employment, health and well-being?
- The application of the 'harm principle' to harm caused by the spread of misinformation and/or disinformation via social media

12. (a) **Explain Mill's view that one of the strongest arguments against the interference of the public in purely personal conduct is that the public can interfere wrongly.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate Mill's view that one of the strongest arguments against the interference of the public in purely personal conduct is that the public can interfere wrongly.** [15]

This question, set in the context of Chapter 4, explores potential limits to purely personal conduct arguing that when the public does interfere, it usually does so wrongly since the public, especially when acting as the ruling majority, acts according to its own interests and preferences. His exact wording is: "the strongest of all the arguments against the interference of the public with purely personal conduct, is that when it does interfere, the odds are that it interferes wrongly, and in the wrong place". Mill argues that there exists a problematic relationship between the prevailing opinions of the majority supported more by custom and tradition than by critical reasoning and the opposing views of an individual who usually surrenders to the majority position which then takes on the character of moral law. Often driven by ignorance, prejudice and misinformation, erroneous or illegitimate interference by the public in personal affairs jeopardises the functioning of the 'harm principle', puts at risk the autonomy of the individual, impairs the moral and intellectual development of the individual, and hinders personal and societal progress and diversity. In support of his views, Mill explores instances of wrongful interference, for example, differences in religious beliefs and practices, the clash between democracy and socialism, the suppression of public amusements, and the prohibition of alcohol.

Part A: When explaining, students may refer to:

- The centrality of personal freedom; the sovereignty and autonomy of the individual; rightful limits to the freedom of the individual, for example, self-regarding and other-regarding acts, the harm principle
- The range of interference of the public in matters of purely personal conduct; references, for example, to 'tyranny of the majority', power of tradition and custom, 'dead dogma', suppression of discussion and debate, self-interest, prejudice, prevailing economic and political ideologies, force of prevailing laws and moral code
- Individuals are the best judges of their own interests and decisions even with the possibility of error; public interference can nullify the possibility of learning from error
- Misguided, misinformed, unjustified, unethical public interference can illegitimately increase the scope of the power of the government
- Interest of the public in the conduct of individuals does not always entail unjustified interference in the conduct of individuals
- Infallibility as justification by those in power for interference, for example the views of Friedrich Hayek's view that no authority possesses the infallible knowledge required to control others

Part B: When evaluating, students may refer to:

- Legitimate versus illegitimate/unjustified modes of interference in the conduct of individuals, for example, matters of public health, safety and security, commonly approved modes of behaviour, protection of marginalised groups
- The negative impact of public interference on diversity of opinion and lifestyle versus the positive aspects of public support of innovation, creativity and diversity
- Limits of public toleration of modes of personal conduct that undermine the stability of society and the common good; commonly agreed upon moral, legal and social norms and the freedom to dissent
- Utilitarian perspectives on contributing to the happiness of society at large, for example Mill and Bentham
- The efficacy of the harm principle in protecting against the interference of the public in personal conduct; problems in defining harm; ambiguity between direct and indirect harm; public protection of individuals from self-destructive harm; cultural differences regarding the notion of harm; distinguishing harmful actions from offensive actions
- Distinctions between harmless and harmful conduct; consensual and non-consensual harm

- Interference in personal conduct vs criminalisation of personal conduct; protection of the right to privacy vs. violations of privacy; doing harm vs enabling harm, for example Anna Folland's and Jason Hanna's reformulations of Mill's harm principle to expand its scope of application
- Absolute rights which can never be restricted vs limited and qualified rights which can be restricted in certain circumstances; difficulties in determining and applying those circumstances; relevance of social contract theories of Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, Edmund Burke, Alasdair MacIntyre

Friedrich Nietzsche: *The Genealogy of Morals*

13. (a) Explain Nietzsche's account of punishment. [10]

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

Using his genealogical methodology, Nietzsche examines the concept of punishment. Looking at the origins of punishment, he points out that it is only recently that it has come to be seen as a good thing. Previously, punishment made sense as "anger over some wrong that had been suffered, directed at the perpetrator". Nietzsche thinks that contemporary accounts of punishment as an expression of justice, a way of reforming criminals or a way of making a safe society make little sense because "life functions essentially in an injurious, violent, exploitative and destructive manner". Furthermore, "punishment makes men harder and colder; it concentrates, it sharpens the feeling of alienation; it strengthens the power to resist". It is the opposite of good. Nietzsche casts punishment as an example of the fabrication of ideals over time. Students might question Nietzsche's assumptions about human nature or consider justifications of punishment coming from other moral theories such as utilitarianism.

Part A: When explaining, students may refer to:

- The fabrication of ideals
- Other contractual concepts such as guilt and debt in relation to punishment
- The history of punishment e.g. punishment in the Old Testament
- Nietzsche's arguments against "good" functions of punishment such as reform
- Nietzsche's attitude towards "justice"
- Master morality and expressions of power and violence.

Part B: When evaluating, students may refer to:

- Nietzsche's views about human nature as violent and destructive
- Counters to these views e.g. Rousseau or Plato where there is more scope for harmony or goodness
- Whether punishment is a part of slave morality
- Different accounts of the value of punishment e.g. reform, retribution, safety, deterrence
- Utilitarianism and the importance of punishment for reform and deterrence e.g. Bentham's theory of punishment
- Deontological accounts of punishment e.g. Kantian ethics applied to punishment
- Considerations about the death penalty, political prisoners and other applied issues.

14. (a) Explain Nietzsche's views about the scientific conscience. [10]

(b) Evaluate Nietzsche's views about the scientific conscience. [15]

As part of his critique of modernity, Nietzsche claims that modern science contributes to an "impoverishment of life,- the emotions cooled, the tempo slackened, dialectics in place of instinct, solemnity stamped on faces and gestures". He calls it an extension of the Christian ideal of truthfulness. In searching for the truth, and denying the importance of religion, modern science is in fact embracing the same ascetic ideal embodied by Christianity and slave morality. He identifies "the confessional punctiliousness of Christian conscience, translated and sublimated into scientific conscience, into intellectual rigour at any price". This links to Nietzsche's views about the will to nothingness and bad conscience; embracing suffering and working against a more authentic master morality. Students might consider modernist stances such as those of the logical positivists who saw the potential for progress through clarity. They might consider progress in technology and medicine as reasons to embrace modern science.

Part A: When explaining, students may refer to:

- Nietzsche's account of fabricated ideals
- Slave versus master morality
- Christianity, the will to nothingness, and the ideal of truthfulness
- The ascetic ideal
- Nietzsche's other critiques of modernism and his view that it is leading to the decline of European people.

Part B: When evaluating, students may refer to:

- The value of truthfulness as a virtue e.g. Baehr, Cassam
- Modernism and scientific and intellectual progress e.g. Bacon, Popper
- Whether modern science really is an extension of the ascetic ideal, as Nietzsche suggests
- Points of divergence between religious and scientific ideals e.g. medical procedures such as abortion vs Christianity's emphasis on the sanctity of life
- Whether science is free of values or ideals e.g. Longino
- The value of scientific advances in technology and medicine
- Whether science embraces suffering and a will to nothingness, when it seems that some scientific advances attempt to alleviate suffering.

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

15. (a) **Explain Nussbaum’s claim that Rawls’s theory presents difficulties from the point of view of the Capabilities Approach.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate Nussbaum’s claim that Rawls’s theory presents difficulties from the point of view of the Capabilities Approach.** [15]

The question stems from Chapter 4 of Nussbaum’s text and invites students to explore the relationship between the Capabilities Approach and Rawls’s theory. Students might explain the reasons why Nussbaum dedicates a section of the chapter to social contract views, beginning with John Locke. Particularly, responses might pinpoint the role that Rawls’s theory plays in Contractarianism and, specifically, in relation to the Capabilities Approach. Students might explain the reasons why Nussbaum considers Rawls’s theory problematic. Moreover, responses might mention the fact that his theory “appropriates some assumptions from the classical Lockean theory of the social contract that Rawls himself saw as raising difficulties for his theory in four areas” (p. 85). Students might also refer to the Kantian elements that Nussbaum indicates as further sources of difficulty. Students might discuss the strengths of Rawls’s theory according to Nussbaum and compare her criticism to other views, e.g., Sen, Nozick.

Part A: When explaining, students may refer to:

- The Social-contract views which Nussbaum refers to, e.g., Locke
- The difficulty areas that Rawls pinpoints in his theory
- The difficulties of Rawls’s theory in relationship with Nussbaum’s Capabilities Approach
- The Kantian elements that create further difficulties, e.g., concept of person based on rationality and person with disabilities
- Issues of justice related to nonhuman animals in Rawls’s theory.

Part B: When evaluating, students may refer to:

- Whether Nussbaum’s criticism on Rawls’s theory is grounded on the Capabilities Approach only
- Whether Nussbaum’s view on positive elements in Rawls’s theory is consistent with her criticism
- Other social contract views, e.g., Richardson, Scanlon
- Whether the “overlapping consensus” is a common element of Nussbaum’s and Rawls’s views
- Kant and the concept of human dignity as linked to Nussbaum’s view on social justice
- Whether the Roman Catholic social doctrine is consistent with Nussbaum’s Capabilities Approach
- Sen’s theory as related to the Capabilities Approach
- Other Social-contract theories as compared to Locke or Rawls, e.g., Hobbes, Rousseau
- Other criticism on Contractarianism, e.g., Nozick’s concept of “minimal state”.

16. (a) Explain Nussbaum's claim that "the 'imperialism' objection to human rights falls flat". [10]
- (b) Evaluate Nussbaum's claim that "the 'imperialism' objection to human rights falls flat". [15]

The claim stems from Chapter 5 of Nussbaum's text and invites students to explore the origin of human rights theories and movements in relation to multicultural diversity. Particularly, responses might discuss Nussbaum's standpoints against the argument that human rights have a peculiarly Western historical origin, by referring to other cultures, e.g. India and China. "The idea of religious toleration, for example, can be found in the thought of the Buddhist emperor Ashoka" (p. 103). Students might also mention the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (1948) and the fact that it has been inspired by many different nations and cultures. Responses might explain the role of human rights against colonialism as an argument in favour of a multicultural character of human rights, e.g. Gandhi in India, and fights against apartheid in South Africa. Students might explain how the Capabilities Approach stands in relation to human rights – and the related arguments on imperialism: "The Capabilities Approach, by remaining close to the ground, enables us to bypass the confused and confusing abstract debate over rights and imperialism" (p. 106). Students might consider other views on multiculturalism, e.g. Okin and Fanon. They may also explore the relationship between human rights and individual liberty, considering philosophical views on the concept of liberty, e.g. Constant, Bobbio and Berlin.

Part A: When explaining, students may refer to:

- Historical origins of human rights: Western, non-Western, or overlapping
- Nussbaum's views against the arguments in favour of a Western dominion on the topic of human rights and a possible cultural imperialism
- Examples of human rights in non-Western countries according to Nussbaum, e.g. India, China, South Africa; Nussbaum's view on the role of the United States in human rights
- The relationship between the capabilities approach and human rights
- The origin and role of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights
- The capabilities list as related to the notion of human dignity.

Part B: When evaluating, students may refer to:

- Whether Nussbaum's argument on India, China, or South Africa is consistent with the development of human rights
- Human rights in non-Western or colonized countries as a means to resist or fight the colonizers, e.g. India
- Whether religion fosters or limits human rights, e.g. Buddhism, Islam, Christianity, Jehovah's Witnesses
- The role of the religious doctrines of non-Establishment and Free Exercise
- Whether the Capabilities Approach bypasses the dispute between human rights and imperialism
- Other views on multiculturalism, e.g. Okin, Fanon
- Pluralism and the role of freedom as freedom of speech or association, e.g. Mill, Nozick
- Human rights and individual liberty; philosophical views on liberty, e.g. Locke, Rousseau, Constant, Bobbio, Berlin, Taylor.

José Ortega y Gasset: *The Revolt of the Masses*

17. (a) Explain Ortega y Gasset's claim that "the mass is the assemblage of persons not specially qualified". [10]
- (b) Evaluate Ortega y Gasset's claim that "the mass is the assemblage of persons not specially qualified". [15]

The claim stems from Chapter 1 of Ortega y Gasset's text and invites students to explore the central concept of mass. Responses might explain why Ortega y Gasset relates the concept of mass to quality and quantity: "The mass is the average man. In this way what was mere quantity – the multitude – is converted into a qualitative determination: it becomes the common social quality, man as undifferentiated from other men, but as repeating in himself a generic type" (pp. 13-14). In relation to qualification, responses might also discuss the difference between multitude and minorities and the reasons why the mass is supplanting the minorities. Students might consider the effect of "plenitude" caused by the coming of the masses and the political outcome, also in relation to what Ortega y Gasset calls "hyperdemocracy": "The mass believes that it has the right to impose and to give force of law to notions born in the café" (pp. 17-18). Responses might explore the concept of "commonplace" and compare it to Ortega y Gasset's idea of nobility. Finally, responses might discuss other views on the role of democracy in terms of conformism, homologation, alienation, e.g. de Tocqueville's concept of the tyranny of the majority, the Frankfurt School's Critical Theory.

Part A: When explaining, students may refer to:

- The concept of plenitude
- The concept of mass as a qualitative term
- Differences between mass and minorities
- The concept of nobility
- The role of specialization
- The concept of hyperdemocracy

Part B: When evaluating, students may refer to:

- Whether Ortega y Gasset's view is rooted in an aristocratic view of society
- Political government as linked to specific competencies or people, e.g. Plato, Aristotle, Machiavelli, the Tao
- Democracy as fostering conformism, e.g. de Tocqueville's concept of the tyranny of the majority
- Outcomes of the massification of society in terms of alienation, e.g. the Frankfurt School's Critical Theory
- Massification in terms of liquid society, e.g. Bauman
- Massification as supported by specific approaches, e.g. Taylor's views on individualism, instrumental reason, soft despotism
- Democracy as supporting individual progress, not only conformism, e.g. Dewey, Nussbaum
- The role that technological progress plays in the coming of the masses, e.g. Foucault
- The massification of society as linked to specialization, e.g. Gehlen
- The role of the Internet as Web 2.0 or as social media in fostering the coming of the masses.

18. (a) Explain Ortega y Gasset's claim that "human society is such in the measure that it is aristocratic and ceases to be such when it ceases to be aristocratic". [10]
- (b) Evaluate Ortega y Gasset's claim that "human society is such in the measure that it is aristocratic and ceases to be such when it ceases to be aristocratic". [15]

The claim stems from Chapter 2 of Ortega y Gasset's text and invites students to explore one or more central concepts: mass, the mass-man, the self-satisfied man, aristocracy, nobility. Students might explain why Ortega y Gasset holds that "the epoch of the masses is the epoch of the colossal" (p. 19), mentioning the Roman Empire and Spengler. Responses might discuss Ortega y Gasset's view on aristocracy and explain the reasons why he speaks of genuine aristocracy against dissolute aristocracy: "Versailles – the Versailles of the grimaces – does not represent aristocracy; quite the contrary, it is the death and dissolution of a magnificent aristocracy" (p. 20). Students might highlight the role of political rights in relation to the coming of the masses and the fact that the possession of those rights does not require any special qualification, being a mere fact of birth. Responses might consider the outcomes of the fact the masses "are acquainted with [...] many of the technical accomplishments previously con-fined to specialised individuals. And this refers not only to the technique of material objects, but, more impor-tant, to that of laws and society" (p. 22). Students might pinpoint the role of technological progress, intended as "rise of the historic level", in the coming of the masses. Finally, responses might discuss other views on the role of democracy for the progress of individuals and their freedom, e.g. Dewey, Sen, Nussbaum, or consider critique of democracy, e.g. de Tocqueville.

Part A: When explaining, students may refer to:

- The concept of mass and mass-man
- The concept of the self-satisfied man
- The distinction between a genuine and a dissolute aristocracy
- The concept of nobility
- The of the "rise of the historic level"
- The role of specialization

Part B: When evaluating, students may refer to:

- Whether the masses taking the place of aristocracy and minorities has violence, vulgarity, incompetency as outcomes
- Whether political action calls for competency and should be limited to specific people or roles, e.g. Plato, Aristotle, Machiavelli
- Whether history presents other cases of masses taking centre stage, e.g. the Roman Empire
- Whether specialization supports massification, e.g., Gehlen
- Whether massification fosters conformism, e.g. de Tocqueville's concept of the tyranny of the majority
- Whether democracy fosters individual progress and freedom, e.g. Dewey, Sen, Nussbaum
- Whether technological progress supports massification.

Plato: *The Republic*, Books IV–IX

19. (a) **Explain Socrates’s claim that “in establishing our city, we are not looking to make any one group in it outstandingly happy, but to make the whole city so, as far as possible”.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate Socrates’s claim that “in establishing our city, we are not looking to make any one group in it outstandingly happy, but to make the whole city so, as far as possible”.** [15]

The claim is taken from 420b. Socrates presents this idea in connection with analysing a question from Adeimantus about the happiness of the guardians. He further precises that if the whole city develops and is well governed, it can be left "to nature to provide each group with its share of happiness" (421c). The development of the question makes it possible to consider from different angles both the purpose of common life in society and the interplay between different groups or classes. Answers might consider the notion of happiness and analyse the argument (518b-519d) that the fundamental aim of ethical or political education is to socialise desires to redirect people (as far as possible) from the pursuit of what they falsely believe to be happiness to the pursuit of true happiness. Other answers may explore how the issue of justice, which is central to the *Republic*, is implicated in this question. Some answers may develop arguments against the idea of putting the weight of happiness in the general or collective.

Part A: When explaining, students may refer to:

- The city, the relationship between the happiness of the groups and the common happiness
- If the city develops and is well governed, it can be left “to nature to provide each group with its share of happiness” (421c)
- If the whole city were as happy as possible, it would be most likely to find justice in it (420b)
- The guardians protect the system of elementary education, providing the training in political virtue
- The guardians should not have the kind of happiness that would make them other than guardians (420e).

Part B: When evaluating, students may refer to:

- The extent to which the happiness of particular groups should be developed “for the whole” (421b)
- The extent to which the happiness of individuals and groups can be brought into harmony with the interests of the city as a whole
- Plato's confidence in the education of the guardians to make them good rulers
- Is Plato too optimistic about the power of education to change human nature?
- To what extent could ordering the happiness of groups for the whole make Plato's position totalitarian?
- Is happiness something that has to do with justice in the city?
- The extent to which happiness and social order could be based on nature.
- The role of the philosophers in the good city; comparison with other views, e.g. Hegel, Marx
- The Form of the Good and its development, transformation and reception in the history of Western metaphysics, e.g. Aquinas, Heidegger

20. (a) **Explain Socrates’s statement that “What gives truth to the things known and the power to know to the knower is the Form of the Good”.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate Socrates’s statement that “What gives truth to the things known and the power to know to the knower is the Form of the Good”.** [15]

Statement taken from 508e. In Book 6 Socrates argues that real philosophers must master the most important subjects (503e), the ones that lead to knowledge of the Form of the Good (504e–505b). He cannot explain directly what this is, but in the sun and line analogies he tries to give an indirect account of it (507a–511e): “it is right to think of knowledge and truth as good like, but wrong to think that either of them is the good” (509a). The Form of the Good, then, is something like a self-illuminating object that can shed the intelligible analogue of light on other objects of knowledge - other paradigms - so as to make them intelligible - in such a way as to make them intelligible: it is an intelligible that is somehow a condition for the intelligibility of other things. Some answers may contradict what is presented in the passage by arguing that knowledge does not need the ethical dimension of the good. Students might also consider Plato’s distinction between knowledge and belief.

Part A: When explaining, students may refer to:

- As the highest principle for both ethics and metaphysics the Form of the Good promises to justify the rule by philosophers (506a)
- Anyone who has mastered the philosophical practice of searching for the most general principles behind a phenomenon will eventually arrive at the entity that explains the goodness of everything else
- Without knowledge of the Form of the Good, one can never think coherently about moral issues, much less plan a moral pattern for human life (505a-b)
- Knowledge and the Form of the Good in: the Divided Line and the Allegory of the Cave.

Part B: When evaluating, students may refer to:

- The extent to which the good itself is something like a rational or logical order, and that it is itself a paradigm of such an order
- What is the relationship between the Form of the Good and the Ideas or Forms?
- The role of the philosophers in the good city
- The extent to which the Form of the Good is the very ground of the cosmos
- The sun as a central image
- The Form of the Good and its development, transformation and reception in the history of Western metaphysics
- Criticism of Platonic metaphysics, e.g. Nietzsche
- The extent to which the Platonic metaphysical foundation of the State can become authoritarian
- The extent to which Plato provides a convincing cognitive account of the Good.

Charles Taylor: *The Ethics of Authenticity*

21. (a) Explain Taylor’s claim that “modern freedom was won by our breaking loose from older moral horizons”. [10]
- (b) Evaluate Taylor’s claim that “modern freedom was won by our breaking loose from older moral horizons”. [15]

The claim stems from Chapter 1 of Taylor’s text and invites students to explore what Taylor defines “the first source of worry” (p. 2), namely individualism. Despite a possible focus on individualism, responses might present the three malaises of modern society, explaining the connections between them. Students might consider what Taylor calls “disenchantment of the world” and contrast it to the concept of a “great chain of Being”, i.e. a cosmic order that marked past societies, where “people were often locked into a given place, a role and station that was properly theirs” (p. 3). Responses might explore the risks of narcissism: a possible slide of individualism into subjectivism. Students might refer to the role that technology plays in modern society and whether it fosters individualism as freedom or as an “iron cage”. Responses might further explore this topic by mentioning the figures of “knockers” and “boosters” of modernity. Students might refer to the difference between modern and ancient freedom, as in Constant. Finally, students might compare Taylor’s concept of freedom to other views, e.g. Bobbio, Berlin, Nozick,

Part A: When explaining, students may refer to:

- Individualism as one of the three malaises of modernity
- The idea of cosmic order and the related concept of a “great chain of Being”
- The concept of “disenchantment of the world”
- Individualism and the slide into subjectivism
- Other malaises linked to individualism: instrumental reason, soft despotism
- “Knocker” versus “boosters”.

Part B: When evaluating, students may refer to:

- Whether technology fosters individualism; the concept of “iron cage”
- The relationship between individualism and democracy: de Tocqueville, Mill, Dewey, Ortega y Gasset
- Whether moral horizons can be seen historically or genealogically, e.g. Rée, Nietzsche, Dilthey
- Moral horizons as social conventions, e.g. Searle’s concept of institutionality, Mackie
- Whether it is possible to distinguish ancient and modern freedom, e.g. Constant
- Other views on freedom, e.g. positive versus negative as in Bobbio, Berlin
- Other views on individual freedom and society, e.g. Plato, Rousseau, Nozick
- Individualism as subjectivism, e.g. Frankfurt School’s Critical Theory.

22. (a) Explain Taylor’s claim that “the primacy of instrumental reason is also evident in the prestige and aura that surround technology”. [10]
- (b) Evaluate Taylor’s claim that “the primacy of instrumental reason is also evident in the prestige and aura that surround technology”. [15]

The claim stems from Chapter 1 of Taylor’s text. The question invites students to explore a central issue of his book: instrumental reason, with a focus on the role that technology plays in fostering it. Students might explore the connections between instrumental reason, technology and the first malaise of modern society: individualism. Responses might pinpoint the fact that “the fear is that things that ought to be determined by other criteria will be de-cided in terms of efficiency or “cost-benefit” analysis” (p. 5). Students might consider the approach focused on efficiency and maximization of the output in diverse fields, from economics to medicine. Mentioning Benner, Taylor holds that “the technological approach in medicine has often side-lined the kind of care that involves treating the patient as a whole person with a life story, and not as the locus of a technical problem” (p. 6). Students might also refer to Borgman’s concept of “device paradigm”, or to Arendt’s view on the permanence of the commodities, which last longer than the activities by which they have been produced. Responses might explore the reasons why this permanence causes a sense of threat or might highlight the importance of the concept of the “iron cage”. Students might discuss other views on the role of technology, e.g., Heidegger, Ortega y Gasset, Gehlen, Plessner. They might also evaluate counterarguments on the meaning of efficiency and output, e.g., utilitarianism, consequentialism.

Part A: When explaining, students may refer to:

- The meaning of instrumental reason
- The relationship between instrumental reason and individualism
- The approach to efficiency and cost-benefit analysis
- The relationship between instrumental reason and technology; “knockers” versus “boosters”
- Diverse fields where the cost-benefit approach operates, e.g. economics, medicine.

Part B: When evaluating, students may refer to:

- The relationship between instrumental reason and individualism
- Whether technology fosters instrumental reason, e.g. Weber’s “iron cage”
- The dependence from production and products, e.g. Borgman’s “device paradigm”
- Arendt’s view on the permanence of objects
- Primary needs, desires and technology, e.g. Ortega y Gasset’s view on technology as the production of the superfluous
- The role of technology as accumulation, e.g. Heidegger
- The role of technology as typical human activity, e.g. Gehlen
- Maximization of the output as a moral criterion, e.g. utilitarianism.

Lao Tzu: *Tao Te Ching*

23. (a) Explain how the concept of non-action (*wu wei*) contributes to harmonious living. [10]

(b) Evaluate how the concept of non-action (*wu wei*) contributes to harmonious living. [15]

A central theme of Lao Tzu's work is that non-action lies at the heart of the most harmonious personal and political life. One translation has the statement in Chapter 3: "Practise not-doing, and everything will fall into place". It is a concept that applies to how the individual can live and to the way the government can rule in harmony with the natural order, the Tao. Non-action is not passivity or negligence, but the active desire not to be governed by desire, both individually and in the state. In government, the best leader is the one whom the people do not notice, better than being the leader being loved. In the natural world, breathing, or a drop of water moving in a river, is non-action – it is not the absence of movement, but the absence of deliberate action. The Sage does work by not focussing on it.

Part A: When explaining, students may refer to:

- The application of non-action to personal and governmental life
- The notion of harmony as the state to aim for
- How non-action encourages the use of the intangible that lies in between tangible spaces (like the empty space to live in within the bricks and mortar of a house)
- Desire and non-action
- Non-action and work, with the example of the Sage
- The contrast between naming and non-action
- What actions there are should mimic nature in being spontaneous and free from

Part B: When evaluating, students may refer to:

- Is there a false extension of individual non-action and harmony to governmental non-action and harmony? Can *wu wei* be applied both to individuals and to the government with the same meaning? See the fallacy of composition
- Does the concept of non-action translate to the individual and social world of the 21st Century?
- On what basis can Lao Tzu's description of non-action be criticised philosophically? How verifiable or criticisable is such a concept when written in a poetic structure akin to wisdom literature?
- Can a Sage avoid acting deliberately, given what government requires?
- In a scientific age, is the account of nature credible? What about the way nature can destroy or be harmful?

24. (a) Explain the role of naming in the *Tao Te Ching*. [10]

(b) Evaluate the role of naming in the *Tao Te Ching*. [15]

There is a contrast between that which can be named and that which cannot. That which cannot has eternal and real existence, whereas naming is what is applied to particular things that can be possessed or desired and are not permanent. In the very first sentence of the work, it is claimed that the name that can be named cannot be the eternal Name, or Tao. Naming things gives them an existence of desire and particularity that is counter to the eternal flow of nature. Naming grasps at the perception of things rather than the experience itself. In naming the Tao or using language and descriptions about the Tao, we are not accessing the Tao itself, but understanding about the Tao. Naming can involve possession or judgement, which can never be applicable to the Tao. The Tao in itself is not known through names. Naming goes against the principle of non-action, as it is an active step of possession or arrangement of a particular, rather than a submission to the natural order. At the beginning of the *Tao Te Ching*, Lao Tzu writes “The Tao that can be told is not the eternal Tao. The name that can be named is not the eternal name. The nameless is the beginning of heaven and earth.”

Students might explore (part A):

- The contrast between the eternal and the particular
- The use of language and its relation to experience
- Knowledge of and knowledge about
- The nature of the Tao as an underlying principle of order that cannot be conceptualised, but only directly experienced

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- How convincing is this treatment of the contrast between permanent and eternal things? Is it vulnerable to charges of being whimsical?
 - Is the concept of naming like the work on perception in Western philosophy? Some thinkers distinguish between the description of an experience and the qualia of that experience
 - Language treatment by philosophers like Wittgenstein, members of the Vienna Circle, GE Moore
 - Are there parallels with dualistic philosophies like those of Plato and Descartes, where greater reality is assigned to that which is not a particular or a named entity?
 - Is the confidence in the goodness of the natural order justified?
 - Is the confidence in the unknowability and indescribability of the natural order convincing?
-