8823 – 5602M

Diploma Programme
Programme du diplôme
Programa del Diploma

Markscheme

November 2023

Philosophy

Higher level and standard level

Paper 2

42 pages

International Baccalaureate®
Baccalauréat International
Bachillerato Internacional

© International Baccalaureate Organization 2023

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 2023

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, 2023

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/.

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 the idea that woman is "a womb, an ovary". [10]

(b) Evaluate the idea that woman is "a womb, an ovary". [15]

The opening chapter of *The Second Sex* explores the biological basis of womanhood. It starts with the idea that woman is "a womb, an ovary". De Beauvoir concludes that biological facts are extremely significant because they will determine how a woman perceives and experiences the world. However, those biological facts do not determine a fixed destiny or justify why women are the Other, and they do not condemn women to be forever under subordination. This quote highlights the existentialism in de Beauvoir's thinking: that we see the world through our own personal circumstances, but also that we can shape our place in it. Furthermore, it highlights the importance of the question. She points out that there is no getting away from biological facts, that these necessarily shape the lives people are able to live. This is reflected in her detailed exposition of the reproductive basis of sex in different animals and in humans.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Examples from the text about different animals *eg*: termites
- The broader relationship between biology and social identity as discussed throughout the book
- De Beauvoir's existentialism, the idea that one is not born a woman but becomes one
- The role of reproduction to women and to men
- The claim that from the onset of a woman's puberty to menopause, she is the stage for a narrative that happens within her, but is not necessarily about her as an individual
- The relationship between reproduction and other themes in the book such as work, relationships, psychoanalysis, sexuality, and the sense of Otherness
- The role of male biology in determining womanhood *eg*: the fact that de Beauvoir depicts men as active agents in reproduction and women as passive objects
- The difference between sexual identity in the natural world, and sex and gender for men and women in society.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The extent to which women are determined by their biology
- Whether the detailed explication of sex and reproduction in the natural world is useful when talking about women
- How far the fact that we see the world through our bodies means that our reproductive biology determines what we see
- Whether society and biology can be separated
- The extent to which being a woman is determined by society, *eg*: Haslanger's (2000) definition of gender in terms of how society views individuals as opposed to biological facts
- The relationship between society and reproduction
- If woman is 'a womb, an ovary', then how can the sexual hierarchy that they are subjected to be eradicated?
- Whether biology leads to subjugation
- Childbearing and whether this limits women's roles in society
- How far men's views about women's sexuality and biology are responsible for problems that women face
- Changes to the role of women as a result of advances in contraception *eg*: the pill
- Whether technological advances such as artificial wombs could play a role in fighting women's subjugation, whether there are elements of a woman's biology which ought to be celebrated and supported
- The politics of surrogacy, and the potential exploitation of women's bodies for money

- An assessment of whether de Beauvoir's claim that "her body is something other than her" could lead to an excessively negative attitude to sexuality or body image. This could be linked to *eg*: body positivity movement
- Whether de Beauvoir's understanding of gender and the body is compatible with transgender identities.

2. (a) Explain the view that work is a complex issue for women. [10]

(b) Evaluate the view that work is a complex issue for women. [15]

De Beauvoir describes work as a complex issue for women. On the one hand, through work women have bridged the gap that has separated women from men. Through work women are able to guarantee their freedom. On the other hand, de Beauvoir sees work in a nonsocialist system as inherently exploitative. She argues that in a non-socialist system, work is enslaving, it is not freedom; only in a socialist system are women guaranteed freedom through work. De Beauvoir describes a tension between feminists and anti-feminists about work, where the former overstate the achievements of emancipated women and are overlook their frustrations, while the latter argue that liberated women achieve little of significance, and have difficulty finding an inner equilibrium. De Beauvoir is sympathetic towards both positions. She thinks that the world of work forces women to occupy traditionally masculine roles whilst still pressuring them to keep up feminine standards such as personal appearance and maintaining the home. This leads to a tension where women want to live as both male and female, which results in the burden of work and fatigue to multiply. Coupled with the impossibility of being independent during motherhood where "even one child is enough to entirely paralyse a woman's activity" de Beauvoir makes a case for being skeptical about the ability of work to free women.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- De Beauvoir's claims about socialism
- The relationship between female biology and the world of work
- The claim that "her femininity leads her to doubt her professional judgement" where de Beauvoir explains that women are brought up to believe that their abilities are limited
- The view that work can lead to independence
- De Beauvoir's aim in Part 4 of the book of discussing women's liberation and the idea of the independent woman
- Why de Beauvoir thinks that without socialism, workers are always exploited
- The claim that the world of work is suited to men because "his vocation as a human being in no way contradicts his destiny as a male"
- The relationship between childbearing and work
- The idea that women are under pressure to be both feminine and masculine at once if they are to enter the world of work successfully
- The constant tension between professional and sexual vocations for an independent woman.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Whether work has proved more liberating for women since *The Second Sex* was published than de Beauvoir thought was possible
- An evaluation of socialism *eg*: through exploring Adam Smith's account of the free market, or Marxist perspectives
- De Beauvoir's criticism of Engels's view
- A discussion about the role and value of state intervention to support women in the workplace *eg*: maternity pay, the use of quotas to select job candidates, subsidized child care
- Norms surrounding childcare and the unrecognized work of women in the home
- The role of men when it comes to supporting independent women
- Whether a working woman sacrifices "finding her balance" if she chooses independence through work
- Whether it is still true that "the world has always belonged to men and still retains the form that they have imprinted on it"
- The idea that patriarchy is damaging to both men and women and that changes to the world of work might benefit both genders
- Whether it is still true that "the world has always belonged to men and still retains the form that they have imprinted on it" *eg*: Perez's book 'Invisible Women: Exposing Data Bias in a World Designed for Men' arguing about biased measures to assess human standards taking the male as example and standard
- The relationship between gender equality and socialism.

René Descartes: *Meditations*

3. (a) Explain Descartes's analogy of the piece of wax. [10]

(b) Evaluate Descartes's analogy of the piece of wax. [15]

This question seeks an explanation of Descartes's analogy of a piece of wax. In the Second Meditation Descartes tries to resolve the issue of the nature of the physical world and the mental world and the role of the mind. He suggests that the mind can perceive the actual essence of things and can 'see'—understand—things beyond the physical. The analogy uses a piece of bee's wax which is solid, and then when exposed to heat it changes its consistency: from solid to liquid, from something which had a distinct smell and taste to a tasteless flexible substance. Yet Descartes claims that we as observers still know the substance to be bee's wax because our mind has gone beyond what we physically sense—sense data—to understanding the very nature of wax. He then goes further with another illustration of people in a road being seen as moving hats and coats, yet the observer knows them to be people. Descartes is trying to show that humans can go beyond sensory experiences to knowing and understanding, because of the actions of the mind. He shows in the analogy that the senses might confuse the perceiver, yet our intellect can resolve this confusion as we have a mind that comprehends the fundamental properties of, in the analogy, wax—the extension, flexibility, and changeability of the wax, and so it is the mind that processes information and imposes meaning. The true nature of the wax "is perceived by the mind alone". The analogy demonstrates the ability of the intellect to perceive independently of the imagination and other mental attributes. Descartes then moves on to apply this awareness of the role of the mind to his own identity in that if he is aware of his perceiving and understanding, interpreting—if he knows he is thinking—he can relate knowing/thinking to proving his own existence. Candidates might make mention of Sartre's later arguments of his existence related to surroundings and physical objects, and Searle's comparisons between human thinking and computer activity. Candidates might also question Descartes's reliance on 'clear and distinct ideas', and his aim to try to establish 'undeniable truths'. Challenges to the validity of the analogy might be presented from the perspective of doubting the claims that arise from the analogy as to whether one can doubt the *cogito,* as the whole argument could be tautological and that thinking, or cognitive activity, can occur in many forms, such as doubting and judging.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Issues of how we know something rather than what we know
- The role of the intellect, the mind in knowing something beyond sense data and imagination
- The unreliability of sensory experiences compared to intellectual activity
- The degree of reliability of knowing our mind compared to knowing the physical world
- Whether there are two separate worlds; the physical and the mental, which is implied by Descartes's argument
- Descartes's challenge to the Aristotelian position that all knowledge is derived by sense experience
- The part reason plays in the acquiring of knowledge
- Whether we know our mind better than our body
- Geeche's argument about the nature of the 'I' in the Cartesian claim that 'I think therefore I am'.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The extent to which at this stage in the Second Meditation Descartes is avoiding the discussion of God's existence and how he can be sure of his own existence
- 'Brain in the vat' arguments that raise the issue as to whether we have all our experiences externally controlled
- Skepticism arguments about the nature of the mind
- The nature of 'clear and distinct ideas'
- The degree to which Descartes is favouring a Platonist view of the nature of knowledge compared to that of Aristotle
- The mind-body problem and the nature of the mind as mental substance
- The nature of Descartes's *cogito* compared to imagination

- Whether a mechanistic view of the world and humans challenges Descartes's view of the role and power of the intellect (*eg*: Hobbes's challenges to Descartes)
- The possible relationship of intuition and the *cogito* (Hintikka's argument)
- Is the claim that we are thinking beings valid?
- If a thinking thing "doubts, understands, [conceives], affirms, denies, wills, refuses, that imagines also, and perceives", does the wax analogy remain valid when the assumption is that the intellect has superseded imagining?
- Is Descartes's assumption that the mind, that which is thinking, as one entity valid?
- Descartes's uses the substance wax effectively proving his argument. Would his argument still hold had he used wood or water?
- Is questioning that 'I am a thinking being' absurd, because by definition it is self-verifying?

4. (a) Explain the difference between imagination and intellect. [10]

(b) Evaluate the difference between imagination and intellect. [15]

This question seeks an explanation of how Descartes differentiates between the imagination and the intellect. For Descartes, imagination is not seen as a creative activity, but the sense of perceiving or imaging something. The explanation can be drawn largely from the Sixth Meditation but can also come partly from the First Meditation. Descartes uses the distinction between imagination and the intellect to suggest that his substance theory establishes the idea that the mind and body are separate. The imagining of sensations received through the body is the action of imagination, while the effective process of the intellect is the looking at the actions of thinking and confirming the existence of a separate substance, the mind. Physical objects which are determined by laws, are quite separate from the mind, which is non-extendable (not existing in space and time). He claims that he is aware of imagining, imagination, because the intellect 'sees' it is happening. Consequently, imagining is a thinking activity but at a low level. He claims that the link between the mind and body, the former mental and the latter physical, like a 'pilot of a ship'. There is a difference between a captain and pilot. However, his argument seems unconvincing when it comes to explaining quite how the 'pilot' works and is located, seemingly in the pineal gland, which is by definition physical. He also reinforces the argument for the difference between the imagination and the intellect by referring to mathematical figures. He uses the triangle to show that humans can imagine objects, while when referring to a chiliagon (a thousand-sided figure) he suggests that because it is such a complex figure it cannot be imaged but only encountered by the intellect which reflects upon its properties. This he parallels to how humans can reflect upon their own mind and its properties using the intellect. There are still elements of doubting in his argument as with the use of imagination, as the imaging of sensations seems only to suggest a possibility of physical world. In contrast the intellect can establish more certainty because it is dealing with what he refers to as 'clear and distinct ideas'.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- 'Clear and distinct ideas' which are certain and encountered by the intellect
- Imagination, with the aid of intuition, can image objects in the 'mind's eye'
- The limitations of imagination compared to the intellect; imagination could be vague and imprecise
- The uniqueness of imagination to use a facility different to that of understanding which might be outside the mind "turns toward the body, and contemplates in it some object conformed to the idea which it either conceived of itself or apprehended by sense", whereas the intellect, the act of understanding, is the mind 'turning on itself'
- The analogy of the 'pilot in the ship'
- Descartes's views on physics and the nature of physical objects which he explores in other writings
- Whether activities such as interpretation and judgment also have a role in defining both the mind and a world picture
- Alternative sources that create experiences introduced by Descartes are God and angels, and actual objects in nature. God and angels cannot deceive and be as uncertain as imagination. Similarly actual objects in nature could have a causal act and have more validity than the imagining, because they appear without the use of my will
- Whether it is the case that it is both senses and mental interpretation that clarify our perceptions of the world.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Descartes's arguments from the imagination and the senses are supposed to show that his intellectual faculties seem to be linked to something outside of the mind. While his argument from the imagination only leaves the existence of body as a reasonably good guess, his argument from the senses leaves him ultimately satisfied

- The problem of ‘imagining’ sensations, which might not be within the ‘body’ and these then have ‘secondary qualities’, relying on senses—sense data—which Descartes had questioned in earlier Meditations
- Can any certainty be achieved because of the weakness of Descartes’s argument? He himself refers to imagination as ‘only probably’ and ‘only suggesting’ an external physical world
- Is it justified to conclude that the mind and body interact and are separate substances as Descartes suggests?
- Descartes’s reluctance or inability to explore the composition of his two substances
- The motivation or stimulus of thought might be actual physical sensations or the memory of such. Might this contradict what Descartes is claiming?
- Is there a hierarchy of thinking or thought with imagination, for Descartes, being at a low level and understanding at the highest? If so, what is the relationship of ‘doubting, affirming, denying, …willing’ …as well as evaluating and judging.

David Hume: *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*

5. (a) Explain Hume's account of a child's educational programme as a preparation for his investigation of religion. [10]

(b) Evaluate Hume's account of a child's educational programme as a preparation for his investigation of religion. [15]

This question invites an explanation of the beginning of the Dialogue when the question is asked as to how and why children should study religion. The discussion that follows addresses the issues that relate to the shortcomings of other bodies of knowledge, as well as showing that their shortcomings are a way of suggesting the superiority of religion. The argument is put that it seems to be prudent to expose children to literature and sciences first before any encounter with Philosophy. Parallels might be drawn here with the approach to the education programme outlined in the *Republic* by Plato (physical fitness through to understanding mathematics and harmonics to dialectics) but for Hume "… students of philosophy ought first to learn logics, then ethics, next physics, last of all the nature of the gods." Demea, the traditional orthodox Christian in the dialogue, claims that the child's mind needs to be 'seasoned' by the study of sciences. By studying the sciences, they are exposed to the associated problems and uncertainties of acquiring knowledge through the senses and experiences, compared to pure reason. After this a child is ready to investigate the 'greatest mysteries of religion'. It might well be considered that all people need a broad education to grasp the complexity of the arguments and positions put forward by the three characters in the Dialogue. The philosophical reasoning of Cleanthes, the design theories outlined in the book, the references to astronomical activity, and the orthodox positions of Demea, require a breadth of knowledge to appreciate their implications. The Dialogue, with its approaches of pure reason, empiricism and blind faith in exploring the nature of God, is in stark contrast to a 'profane and irreligious age' claimed for the time of writing. The education programme that questions the certainties of the sciences allows religion to be protected and acquire 'a superior force and authority'. In doing so, Hume feels safe to question the existences and essence of God though the dialogic method.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The nature of uncertainties in different forms of knowledge
- The nature of empiricism and rationalism
- The differing stances of the dialoguers Cleanthes the empiricist, Philo the skeptic and Demea and his traditional fideism
- Foundationalism and indubitable truths
- *A priori* knowledge
- *Fideism*
- Whether conventional ways of investigating the world can be a source of knowing about God
- Contrasts between Plato's education programme, for a ruler, with the programme outlined in Hume's Dialogue
- Contrasts with Rousseau's experiential education programme for *Emile*
- The value of a broad education
- The nature of Skepticism
- The nature of and value gained from religious education.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The merits of differing approaches to investigating religion
- Whether reasoning about God is preferable to doctrinal acceptance of religion and dogma
- Contemporary views on how religious issues could be questioned without incurring criticism and censorship or even persecution
- The dialogic method as a means of philosophical investigation contrasted with perhaps those of Plato and Cicero
- Whether Hume was mirroring earlier dialogues and had learnt how to hide controversial views *eg*: Giulio Cesare Vanini and Pierre Bayle

- The role of Pamphilus as narrator allowing for Hume's personal position to be disguised
- The strengths and weaknesses of the classic proofs of and nature of God; design theory, ontological positions as well as revelation
- The success or otherwise of a dialogic method to explore the major arguments concerning the existence and nature of God
- The nature of Hume's own belief
- Is the child's education programme a sort of metaphor for everyone in preparation of religious exposure and experience? The idea that you cannot know God unless you have first investigated the natural world or/and you know God better by fully understanding the nature of the natural world
- The position of the role and status of religious education in the general education of a children through time. Contrasts might be drawn from the secular positions of public education in the USA compared to required religious instruction under the UK 1944 Education Act and the status of doctrinal studies within Islamic countries
- The relationship of religious content in education programmes to the rights of children, *eg*: Article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

6. (a) Explain the claim that "religion, however corrupted, is still better than no religion at all". [10]

(b) Evaluate the claim that "religion, however corrupted, is still better than no religion at all". [15]

The question seeks an exploration of the role of religion in society as argued by Cleanthes, along with its perceived value and consequences. The discussion of the role of religion and the effect of a God on societal behaviour appears at the end of the Dialogue, in part 12, after Demea has left. Cleanthes claims that religion has a vital function, that being "to regulate the heart of men, humanize their conduct, infuse the spirit of temperance, order, and obedience… and only enforces the motives of morality and justice". Philo the skeptic counters this position and suggests all the negative aspects of religion on humans - amongst other things, being: slavery, civil wars, oppression, persecutions. There is admittance of the differences between true belief and organized religion which might be more corrupt than the better form of religion which is seen as a 'philosophical and rational kind'. By declaring this there is a move on Philo's part to replace his skepticism with fideism. This could be seen as Hume attempting to moderate his critique of religion in general. It should be noted that Hume delayed the publication of the Dialogue because of fear of censorship and persecution by the authorities. There is a more positive spin on religion as it has the effect of being both a 'hope as well as a fear'. However. Philo is still allowed to claim that natural 'honesty and benevolence' has more effect on human behaviour than 'theological theories and systems.' It seems clear that throughout Hume's defense there is acceptance of a need for morals even though practiced religion across the world has many short comings. The criticism of religion becomes continually muted as Cleanthes closes, with the remark of "take care: […] push not matters too far: allow not your zeal against false religion to undermine your veneration for the true." The dialogues are a way of exploring the nature of God and Hume tries to avoid being labelled anti-Christian.

Candidates might explore (part A):
- The truth or otherwise of Philo's negative perceptions of religion
- Contrasts between 'pure religion' and practiced religion
- The origins of belief
- The relationship of empiricism to religion
- Weakness of the design argument in proving an omnipotent God
- Skepticism
- The problem of evil and the omnicompetence of God
- Theism
- The limits of reason in dealing with divine matters
- Contrasts between philosophy and religion.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
- The role of religion in modern urban, industrial, and post-industrial societies
- The relationship of religion and morals
- The natural spirituality of man that might not arise within or from organized religion
- The changing effects of morality (through time and across cultures) on the common man when morality is based on religion
- Contrasts between personal belief, 'pure religion' and institutionalized religion
- Can skepticism reveal the true nature of religion?
- Scientific knowledge and religion
- Religion as a doctrinal control of society
- Seneca's view that religion is true for common people but false to the wise and a tool for rulers
- Differences between Christianity and Christendom. Individual belief and faith, and institutional activity, *eg*: Kierkegaard
- Marxist views of religion and societal behaviour
- Nietzsche's perspective in rejecting Christianity as weakening humans but considering Dionysian pantheism as a resolution of issues of pain and death

- Religion as a form of abuse
- Whether rational humans can comprehend the true nature of a God
- Whether the problem of evil creates contradictions to our comprehension of the nature of God
- The mysteries of God that are beyond reason; Sufism, speaking in tongues, miracles.

John Stuart Mill: *On Liberty*

7. (a) Explain the idea that there is a struggle between liberty and authority. [10]

(b) Evaluate the idea that there is a struggle between liberty and authority. [15]

In his introduction to *On Liberty*, Mill claims that "the struggle between Liberty and Authority is the most conspicuous feature in the portions of history with which we are earliest familiar, particularly in that of Greece, Rome, and England". Mill says that the tension between liberty and authority used to be a tension between the ruling classes and the ruled. However, at the time of writing this needed to be revised because the ruling classes were being replaced by representatives of the will of the people: "What was now wanted was, that the rulers should be identified with the people; that their interest and will should be the interest and will of the nation. The nation did not need to be protected against its own will. There was no fear of its tyrannizing over itself". As Mill goes on to point out, the will of the people in practice is the will of the majority, and that the majority can oppress minority groups, and so people still require protection from authority. Throughout the book, Mill aims to establish the principle "that the only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilized community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others". This is Mill's answer to the relationship between authority and liberty; liberty comes to the fore and authority ought to be restricted so that liberty is maintained. In a system where people govern themselves, they must be protected from the tyranny of the majority.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The historical tension between authority and liberty, particularly the idea that individuals need to be protected from their sovereign
- The naïve conception of representative democracy where the people do not need to be protected from their own will
- The duty of care that the state has towards members of society, *eg*: restricting liberty for the general good not necessarily the individual good
- What Mill means by the tyranny of the majority
- Examples of liberties which might be restricted by the majority *eg*: religious freedom, sexual freedom, freedom of speech
- Ways in which liberty can be protected *eg*: rights, laws, constitutions, representative democratic measures
- The relationship between political power and those whose liberties are infringed upon *eg*: the historical oppression of women particularly before they were able to vote
- Mill's harm principle in relation to protecting liberty.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Alternative perspectives on liberty and authority *eg*: Hobbes's view that a sovereign's full authority is justified to prevent a war of all against all
- The extent to which the liberties of minority groups can or should be sacrificed for the will of the majority
- Minority groups in society who have been subject to oppression by the majority *eg*: the LGBTQ community, different religious groups in different countries, ethnic minority groups
- Mill's ideas about higher and lower pleasures in relation to liberty and authority *ie*: to Mill, lower pleasures of the majority cannot justify the loss of important freedoms to a minority. This might be compared to Bentham's principle of utility which might justify such an approach
- Difficulties with the harm principle *ie*: what constitutes harm?
- Whether preventing harm is sufficient for maximizing liberty and protecting from authority
- Alternative ethical perspectives such as care ethics (Kittay) which suggest that vulnerable members of society need more than just to have their liberty protected
- Modern examples of the struggle between authority and freedom *eg*: gun ownership in the US
- Paternalism, and the idea that authority has a right to make judgements about what is good for others, even if it goes against their will *eg*: vaccine mandates
- Whether libertarian political systems protect their subjects from harm.

8. (a) Explain Mill's account of "injury to others". [10]

(b) Evaluate Mill's account of "injury to others". [15]

Throughout *On Liberty*, Mill mentions the idea of injury, and particularly "injury to others". This idea of injury is central to the text because Mill argues for the principle that liberty should only be curtailed to prevent harm to others. This requires some account of what harm, or injury is. For example, when discussing freedom of expression, Mill says "there should be different opinions, so is it that there should be different experiments of living; that free scope should be given to varieties of character, short of injury to others; and that the worth of different modes of life should be proved practically, when anyone thinks fit to try them. It is desirable, in short, that in things which do not primarily concern others, individuality should assert itself". Mill points out that a person may cause injury to others through action, as well as inaction; that individuals can injure themselves; that injury can effect one person, or many people, and that injuring others is always a greater evil than restricting one's own liberty. On the other hand, Mill is concerned that restricting liberty for any reason other than to prevent injury to others is a form of despotism which 'crushes individuality'. In the balance between individual liberty, and limitations to liberty, the idea of harm or injury plays a central role. How injury is defined shapes the real-world implications of Mill's thesis.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Mill's discussion of the sale of poisons where the sale alone does not cause injury, but the likely outcome of someone buying poison is injury to others
- The example of the person who is restrained from crossing an unsafe bridge
- The worked-through examples on alcohol use and idleness. For example, in the case of idleness, Mill claims that it would be wrong to restrict the individual for simply being idle, but if a man "fails to perform his legal duties to others, as for instance to support his children, it is no tyranny to force him to fulfil that obligation, by compulsory labour, if no other means are available"
- The idea that failing to act can injure others
- Whether free speech can ever injure others
- Actions that constitute injury to others *eg*: violence, neglect
- The role of authority in preventing injury
- The view that society itself can be injured *eg*: if free speech is suppressed and society no longer progresses through sharing new ideas.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Whether Mill presents a clear enough account of injury to others to make his harm principle practical in real-world situations
- Paternalism and intervention to prevent children from injuring themselves from action or inaction
- The extent to which rational individuals should be allowed to experiment with different ways of living, and how to define when they begin to harm either themselves or others
- Whether Mill's claim that the idle person is injuring his children by failing to support them is correct
- Injury and physical harm
- Accounts of harm in society that are less libertarian *eg*: the view that structural injustice harms individuals. This implies a more strictly regulated society than Mill promotes where the state intervenes to actively support people, rather than just to prevent injury
- Discussions of contemporary issues, *eg*: hate crimes, discrimination, vaccine mandates
- Neo-contractarianism, *eg*: Nozick's free riders
- Human rights and injury to others.

Friedrich Nietzsche: *The Genealogy of Morals*

9. (a) Explain the significance of the noble values of Nietzsche's man of the future. [10]

(b) Evaluate the significance of the noble values of Nietzsche's man of the future. [15]

The question invites an explanation of Nietzsche's use of the 'man of the future' to belittle and try and remove the values of the slave or herd and reveal that the man of the future will be/should be the man of noble values. Nietzsche's discussion of this appears at the end of Essay 2 in section 24 and it also appears in his preface to section 6. For Nietzsche the man of the future will be free of slave morality and break with the ideals that are made in the workshop observed by Mr Rash and Mr Curious (Essay 1, section 14). The man of the future will end the will to nothingness and the nausea, and bring about an end to nihilism that is created by bad conscience and guilt generated by an ascetic priest. The man of the future will be a reborn human who practices a will to power and is the victor over God. Nietzsche hopes for the arrival of this man because he sees this as the only way out of the dominance of morality and a lifestyle that values humility and self-sacrifice; a lifestyle that is dominated by religion. The new man is a 'good man' having the qualities of the masters that were defeated by the slaves. He is the overman or super-man. He will be a man that can be driven by the once suppressed animal instincts. Nietzsche concludes that the present day which is 'self-doubting' will decay and this will allow the rebirth of the new man. If slave morality were to continue it would be the 'danger of all dangers.' Those of slave morality, of course, would not welcome this future as it would not allow the kingdom of God, the reign of justice, or free will and it would not be guided by love and hope. Candidates might describe the positives offered by Nietzsche in the 'future man' as he would not abuse nature, as science would not be seen as supreme. Science would not remain the new religion. The fear of nihilism will not come about as life itself would be a will to power.

Candidates might explore (part A):
- The slave and master (the noble) divisions and differences
- Bad Conscience
- The 'will to power'
- The origins of morality according to Nietzsche
- The workshop of values and ideals as encountered by Mr Rash and Mr Curious
- The impact of religion and science on present lifestyles
- The ascetic priest
- The nature of the new reality that could be the future.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
- Nietzsche's relationship to Nihilism
- Postmodernist positions of lukewarm radicalism compared to the potentially new relativism and subjectivity of the future
- The degree to which a 'will to power' is life in action
- The interaction between the slave and the master in the future
- The return and lack of suppression of animal instincts
- Whether the qualities of the 'superman' should be valued as better than the slave
- Whether the human of the future is potentially a mad man or an artist-warrior
- The degree to which the Nietzschean future is the complete antitheses of the present western world and far more radical than postmodernists
- Whether the fear of a Nietzschean future is a fear of our human nature uncontrolled
- The status of the sage, 'will to power' and non-action
- Comparisons with interpretations of the Nietzschean future and other utopias or dystopias *eg*: 2001 (A. C. Clarke).

10. (a) Explain the nature of the reactive man. [10]

(b) Evaluate the nature of the reactive man. [15]

The question seeks an explanation of the description that Nietzsche gives to humans that are wedded in *ressentiment,* that is the reactive man. He uses this phrase in Essay 2, section 11 to contrast the aggressive man that he values greatly. The reactive man is a man of slave morality, and has all the associated qualities such as compassion, tolerance, humility and the inherent feelings of *ressentiment.* The reactive man is the exact opposite of the 'noble man' who Nietzsche says is closer to true justice, because he is aggressive, strong, active, and arrogant. The reactive man will not seek revenge for himself but appeals to established law to resolve a wrongdoing. This man is weak in society because he relies both on the law, and, for Nietzsche, the morality of Christianity to protect him from his fellow humans. Bad conscience, the guilt that he feels as the reactive man, is not seen by himself as a weakness, but for Nietzsche he is weak and becomes sick. It would seem that the reactive man almost enjoys suffering from sickness. By the process of always reverting to the law the reactive man has removed the 'will to power' that for Nietzsche is an essential for life. The law and the moral codes of the herd become sovereign. Justice is no longer in the hands of victim, but it has become systemized, objectified, and distant. In contrast Nietzsche would prefer the aggressive man who is able to discharge justice at his will, thence he, not the law, is sovereign. The reactive man has given up this 'will to power' and 'wills nothingness' and suffers.

Candidates might explore (part A):
- The nature of *ressentiment*
- Bad conscience
- The morality of Christianity the idea of not seeking revenge
- Views of justice and effect of justice on society
- The link between indebtedness and guilt and its linguistic origins
- The contrasted nature of the masters (nobles)
- The 'will to power'
- Suffering and neurosis in societies and the possible linkage to slave morality.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
- The extent to which conflict in society generates social progress
- The role of self-preservation and justice in society
- The potential weaknesses of slave morality. Does it have strengths that Nietzsche does not appreciate?
- The relationship of power to justice or whether power is just a desire to dominate others
- Reference to virtue ethics as an illustration of *ressentiment*
- The degree to which all interaction with others is a power and dominance game
- Can the reactive man's qualities of compassion and sympathy be seen as a strength or a weakness?
- Ways in which moral agency is demonstrated
- Is the reactive man, the member of the herd, less strong?
- Is social disorder in modern complex societies a result of men of action or a lack of social justice?

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

11. (a) Explain Nussbaum's view on the concept of dignity. [10]

(b) Evaluate Nussbaum's view on the concept of dignity. [15]

The question asks for an exploration of a central concept in Nussbaum's theory. The concept of dignity is disseminated across Nussbaum's whole book and is related to several other views. Candidates might explain that Nussbaum considers the respect for dignity, along with the respect for equality, a widely shared human value. Also, candidates might illustrate how Nussbaum presents Vasanti's story as a sample of mistaken standpoints on the concepts of equality and dignity. It might be noteworthy to consider that the lack of respect for dignity is often linked to violence: when bodily integrity and health are constantly at risk, dignity is violated. Candidates might explain how the concept of dignity is related to the reason why Nussbaum considers her list of Central Capabilities open and not final. If it is found to omit something fundamental that experience shows to be essential to a dignified human life, it can be revised. Another point of discussion might be grounded in Nussbaum's view that dignity does not concern poor nations only, but it is a global issue calling for all nations to struggle for it, along with equality and justice. Candidates might explain why Nussbaum judges all nations to be failing to ensure dignity and opportunity for all people. Candidates might compare Nussbaum's view to other philosophical interpretations of the concept of dignity, *eg*: Kant or Schopenhauer.

Candidates might explore (part A):
- Nussbaum's view on dignity
- Nussbaum's view on equality
- Nussbaum's view on justice
- Vasanti's story
- The concept of dignity as related to the list of Capabilities
- Dignity and wealthy nations
- Nussbaum's view of dignity in nonhuman animals
- Human dignity and political liberalism.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
- Nussbaum's criticism of Sen's view of dignity
- Human dignity and paternalism
- Human dignity in other philosophical views, *eg*: Kant, Schopenhauer
- Human dignity, social justice, and equality, *eg*: Rawls
- Dignity and liberty, *eg*: negative *versus* positive liberty
- Possible counter positions, *eg*: Nozick's "free riders"
- Extension of the concept of dignity to nonhuman animals, *eg*: Singer, Regan.

12. (a) Explain Nussbaum's claim that we can justify the state's intervention in the home if the rights of its members are violated. [10]

(b) Evaluate Nussbaum's claim that we can justify the state's intervention in the home if the rights of its members are violated. [15]

The question stems from the claim in Chapter 3, where Nussbaum presents the Human Rights Approach. The claim shows Nussbaum's standpoint on the possibility for a state to enforce human rights even at the home: against liberal views. Nussbaum affirms that households and families can be the object of the state's intervention for the sake of human rights, *eg*: against violence, or to guarantee dignity. This view is grounded in Nussbaum's claim that there is a connection between the capabilities and how a state is governed: candidates might consider Nussbaum's criticism of Sen, who does not see this connection. Candidates might refer to Nussbaum's statement against the distinction between 'first-generation rights' (political and civil rights) and 'second-generation rights' (economic and social rights): political and civil rights have economic and social preconditions. Candidates might also explore the related concepts of dignity, equality, justice. Also, candidates might explain the kind of connection that there is between human rights and duties, or the difference between "negative rights" and capabilities, including the concept of negative liberty. Candidates might explain why Nussbaum focuses on human rights and whether there is a connection between them and the Capabilities Approach. Candidates might also explore whether the two approaches substantially overlap, or whether the Capabilities Approach is broader, *eg*: including nonhuman animals. Hence, candidates might relate Nussbaum's view to other philosophical views, *eg*: Singer's or Regan's theories on animal rights. Candidates might explore what basic entitlements are considered as rights, *eg*: bare human birth instead of rationality, and compare them with other philosophical views, *eg*: Kant, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche.

Candidates might explore (part A):
- The Human Rights Approach
- Central Capabilities and the relationship with governments
- Nussbaum's criticism on Sen
- 'First-generation' and 'second-generation' rights
- Dignity, equality, justice
- Negative rights and capabilities
- Human rights and animal rights
- Basic entitlements.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
- Nussbaum's approach and paternalism
- Social control, authoritarianism
- Issues related to other lifestyles and cultures; multiculturalism, relativism, minorities
- Other views on nonhuman animals, *eg*: Singer, Regan
- Other views on basic entitlements, *eg*: rationality or self-conscience
- The relationship between political/civil rights and economic/social rights, *eg*: Marx, Feuerbach, de Beauvoir, Adorno
- Other views on the state intervention in the individual sphere, *eg*: Nozick's "Free riders", Taylor's authenticity.

José Ortega y Gasset: *The Origins of Philosophy*

13. (a) Explain the new human figure of the thinker in the origin of the profession of philosophy. [10]

(b) Evaluate the new human figure of the thinker in the origin of the profession of philosophy. [15]

The aim of this question is to explain (part A) and evaluate (part B) the culmination of Ortega y Gasset's argument in the final chapter (The Historical Origin of the Profession of Philosophy), where he analyses the forming of a new type of man, the "thinker," as the origin of the transmitted forms of the philosopher and philosophy. Answers might be focused on this chapter but also take different routes based on other parts of the text. Ortega y Gasset argues that the ambiguity of the term "thinker" was suitable, because the reality to which it refers is similarly vague and ambiguous. The thinker as such has different chronological and geographical roots, *eg*: "Heraclitus' and Parmenides' generation found this new human figure, typified both in character and profession, already formed, though hazy". The first practitioners of this new social occupation, whose activities were mainly theoretical, were not yet able to perceive themselves as thinkers, just as Julius Caesar was not able to see himself as Caesar. A more distinct configuration of the thinker was apparent in Plato's Academy. Evaluations of Ortega y Gasset's idea that might be seen as counterarguments sustain that although Ortega y Gasset´s view on the origin of philosophy contains valuable intuitions and suggestions to be further explored, the textual basis, criticism of sources, and bibliographic research needs a substantial update.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The various chronological and geographical roots which contribute to the configuration of the thinker
- During the sixth century, among certain enclaves in colonial Greece, religion ceased to be a possible way of life and consequently a new position toward this changed nature of existence had to be devised in opposition to religious existence
- The change in relation to the religious existence and the underlying meaning of Thales's assertion that all things are full of gods
- Ortega y Gasset's claim that Thales's statement belongs to the epigrammatic style of the Seven Wise Men
- The transformation from religion into philosophy in Thales's statement: a) there is a kind of democratization and universalization of the divine and b) the gods were downgraded into causes
- Protagoras and atheism; the apparent claim that it is impossible to know whether or not gods exist, or "granting that they do exist what their forms are"
- The forming of the concept of the thinker implied a change towards religion: "The God who appears at the conclusion of an argument is obviously not a religious God, but a theoretical principle"
- The thinker felt compelled to seek through intellectual free choice a new foundation: "This free choice of principles has been called 'rationality'"
- When the name philosophy is given to this free choice of principles, the creation of philosophy presupposes a stage of atheism.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The great semantic mobility of the word "God"
- The role and conceptions of the Ionian natural scientists
- Philosophical thinkers-Heraclitus, Parmenides, and Xenophanes
- Ortega y Gasset's linguistic and philological approach to the origin of philosophy
- Comparison and contrast with other cultural traditions, *eg*: the parallelism between Amos, the first Hebrew "thinker," and Thales
- The idea that the socialization of the "thinker" came about during the fifth century

- Ortega y Gasset's explanation of the origin of philosophy as inscribed in the traditional discussion of religious belief and reason
- Socrates, Plato and the consolidation of the idea of philosophy
- Ortega y Gasset's suggestion regarding the understanding of Being
- The continuing discussion of the figure of the philosopher and the functions given to philosophy
- Ortega y Gasset considered in light of a variety of historical and contemporary approaches and views, *eg*: post-modernism, feminism, naturalism
- Does Ortega y Gasset offer a unified vision of the thinker and its effect in the origin of philosophy?

14. (a) Explain the function of history in Ortega y Gasset's account of the origin of philosophy. [10]

(b) Evaluate the function of history in Ortega y Gasset's account of the origin of philosophy. [15]

This question asks for an explanation and evaluation of the very backbone of Ortega y Gasset's account of the origin of philosophy, which is based on his idea of historical reason. Answers might make reference to the few explicit references in the text or take the various routes offered by almost all the chapters where Ortega y Gasset presents, from different angles, the function of history as to the origin of philosophy. Regarding this category of historical reason Ortega y Gasset states that it is "being in the form of having been". The idea has its origin in W. Dilthey who had sustained that physical reason would be supplanted by historical reason. Ortega sees this as an indication that the 20th century is the beginning of a new time in which the idea of life will come to maturity. And, explaining one significative application of historical reason to the conception of philosophy, he adds that without wanting to formalize a definitive stance on the issue, he proposes the idea that we are now engaging into something novel and distinct from previous philosophy. As counterargument one might analyse the extent to which Ortega y Gasset does provide a consistent and unified argument sustaining the idea of historical reason.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Historicity as a constitutive element in the human being
- Roots of historical reason: Hegel, Comte and Dilthey
- Historical reason attempts to capture the unity of these central traits of human life: a) "nothing truly human if it is at all real and concrete, can be permanent"; and b) "man has an invariable structure which traverses all of his changes"
- Religion, philosophy, and literature, vital functions of the human mind, appear as permanent possibilities in man
- Philosophy as something that was not always in operation in the history of human beings, but that emerged in Ancient Greece, has come down to us, but its continuation is not assured
- The history of philosophy as dialectical series
- Structure and meaning of the philosophical past
- Unity and diversity of the philosophy
- The names of philosophy and Ortega y Gasset's historical approach to language.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- What would "reason" mean when it has to be "historical?"
- The extent to which the past is always in the present
- The reality of chance as challenge to historical reason
- Causes, motives and narrations in understanding and explaining the past and the historical development of philosophy
- Ortega y Gasset's idea that chance is a central component of reality and history
- Historical reason versus physical reason. Ortega y Gasset's views on Descartes and modern philosophy
- Historical reason as a consistent attempt to balance the present with the past, discontinuity with continuity, plurality with unity, and concrete reality with abstract generality
- Historical reason allows to understand human life as the basis of reality making possible a new philosophy
- When seeking pre-Socratic roots in the origin of philosophy by combining historical, social and linguistic inquiry Ortega y Gasset proposes a methodology which presents similarities and differences with Nietzsche's and Heidegger's
- Ortega y Gasset's view of philosophy in comparison and contrast with present approaches to philosophy, *eg*: pragmatism, Foucauldian critique of power, feminism.

Plato: *The Republic*, Books IV–IX

15. (a) Explain Socrates's view that the form of the good is the most important thing to learn about. [10]

(b) Evaluate Socrates's view that the form of the good is the most important thing to learn about. [15]

In the first place the question asks for an explanation of this central idea of Plato's philosophical inquiry and subsequently in part B it requires an evaluation of Plato's argument. In this very heart of the *Republic* (502c–521b) Plato looks to show that what philosophers naturally do is directed toward politically valuable insight. It attempts to explain how a philosophical education prepares a guardian for political power. Accordingly, Socrates investigates the ultimate purpose of philosophical activity and reflects on the education of the philosopher, with Socrates stating that "the form of the good is the most important thing to learn about". In order to explain this idea, he uses a series of images: the Form of the Good is like the sun; the relations among the Form of the Good, all other Forms, and the objects of the visible world may be outlined along a divided line; and, human beings' relationship to the Form of the Good resembles the relationship of prisoners in a cave to the sun. As the highest principle for both ethics and metaphysics, at once the best thing in the world and the most real, the Form of the Good would justify the rule of philosophers. Given its scope the notion of the Form of the Good gives rise to a variety of arguments and counterarguments in relation to issues of interpretation: *eg*: the relation between the forms and the individuals. Further, a counterargument to the philosophical conception based on the Form of the Good states that the cost of this all-inclusive theory of reality and the good life is that it degrades the value of ethical behaviour practiced without philosophy.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The form of the good is the first principle of the entire theory, the greatest object of knowledge (505a) which seems to be an ideal of rational order or unity
- The Form of the Good interweaves questions of reality with questions of knowledge, metaphysics and epistemology
- The Form of the Good is intended to unite the pursuits of philosophers with the ethical knowledge that makes life worth living and by virtue of which philosophers are qualified to rule in the ideal city
- The image of the sun
- The Form of the Good is a condition of the intelligibility of other things
- The Divided Line
- The Allegory of the Cave
- The Form of the Good as Form of Forms; it makes knowledge of other Forms possible through the same ideality of Forms
- The role of the Form of the Good as guidance for education. The guardians' curriculum which includes: music and gymnastics, arithmetic, geometry, and dialectic.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The Form of the Good as a standard or paradigm, that enables the philosopher to determine what poetical, political, or any other kind of goodness is
- The role The Form of the Good as political guidance implies to lay out the plan for a good state in order to specify which features of existing states engender the injustices in which human beings have found themselves
- Can the Form of the Good be known?
- The Form of the Good and justice in the state
- The possible similarity between the theory of Forms and a scientific theory. All physical objects will obey the same general laws
- The role of the guardians to produce a harmonious whole
- Are philosophers just a kind of selected cast or do they represent best possible expression of human nature as such?

- The extent to which Plato´s educational model might be inspirational nowadays
- The weakness of the philosophical temperament; the philosophers' sureness of knowledge could be matched by their corruptibility, thus negating the value of knowledge
- The Form of the Good and the argument that the life lived according to moral principles is the life most worth choosing
- Issues in the organization of the state: property, gender, forms of government. Contemporary views and discussions: *eg*: liberalism and diversity, democratic theory, feminism, theories of power
- Criticisms of Plato's ethical and political conception: *eg*: Nietzsche and Popper.

16. (a) Explain Plato's account of the possibility of conflict between the parts of the soul. [10]

(b) Evaluate Plato's account of the possibility of conflict between the parts of the soul. [15]

The question asks for an explanation and evaluation of Plato's view on the role of conflict in the soul. Both parts of the question are anchored in Book 4 where a picture of the human soul starts to be presented. Three elements in the soul are distinguished: desire or appetite (*epithumia*), the rational part, reason or calculation (*logistikon*) and the spirited part or spirit (*thumos*), in some contexts referred to as emotions. The argument where the conflict appears as a central dimension of human existence runs at both levels, individual and social. The central traits might be presented as follows: 1) conflict in the soul implies different parts that are opposed to each other; 2) desire is opposed by the rational part of the soul; and 3) spirit is different from both desire and the calculating part. Two results are drawn from here: first, the parts of the soul are identical in number and function with the parts of the city, and second, virtue in the individual person will be structured the same way as virtue in the city. According to one line of interpretation justice in the city serves only as an analogy to illuminate justice in the individual soul, whereas counterarguments to this line of interpretation sustain that the main concern of the platonic argument is the city itself.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Socrates wants to show that the embodied human soul consists of three things, each one of which has, as it were, a mental life of its own, by which it has its own characteristic concerns and sensitivities and its own objects of pursuit
- In the context of Book 4 the three elements in the soul are distinguished principally by their functions: calculation calculates, desire desires, and spirit gets spirited
- If one tries to assign them an object or goal as well as an activity, the indications would be that calculation is concerned with the good (*ie*: with the best course of action); desire is concerned with pleasure; while spirit reacts to perceived slights or wrongs
- When we are motivated to exert ourselves in some way or other (*eg*: in the process of learning, or when we are angry and seek retribution, or when we are hungry and want to have a meal) do these motivating conditions belong to a number of distinct parts of ourselves, or does every one of them belong to the soul as a whole
- The larger context of the analysis of the soul in Book 4: the task to produce an adequate account of justice
- While it is Socrates's primary task to say what it is for a person to be just, he proposes to begin by trying to discover what it is for a city to be just, expecting that the larger scale will facilitate the task of discovery
- Things properly called "just" must be just by way of the same essential features; thus, just cities and just souls will be similar in structure and arrangement
- The virtues (*aretai*) of the city: wisdom, courage, self-control and justice, and their application to the individual soul
- The best city contains three classes of citizens: rulers, the military, and businesspeople of various sorts. Justice in the city consists in each class adequately performing, and strictly limiting itself to, its own proper function.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Is there only one desiring subject in every one of us or are there more than one?
- An interpretation of Socrates's analysis: that what corresponds to each one of the three classes of citizens in the best city is simply some tendency or capacity of the soul
- To what extent are the three parts of the soul related to distinct human actions?
- The extent to which Plato, like Freud, sees inner conflict as both the most important fact about human existence and the phenomenon that most reveals the structure of the personality
- The extent to which learning, and experience bring the psychic elements together into individual and distinctly personal human mental events; the functions of different parts, whether bodily or psychic, come together in the individual's activities

- The indivisibility of the soul
- The action of the individual is for the sake of the individual's own good or happiness as the guardian's actions are for the sake of the good or happiness of the entire city
- How and to what extent might the parallel between justice in the individual soul and justice in the city be justified? Might it be justified that there is a parallel?
- Plato's theory of the soul in the *Republic* in relation to others approaches: *eg*: *Phaedo's* theory of soul, presocratic thinking about the soul
- Plato's projections on the conceptions of the soul and justice from Aristotle up to modern day.

Peter Singer: *The Life You Can Save*

17. (a) Explain Singer's claim that individuals' moral intuitions are not always reliable. [10]

(b) Evaluate Singer's claim that individuals' moral intuitions are not always reliable. [15]

The claim is from Chapter 2, where Singer illustrates the "Basic Argument". The claim is a criticism of a commonly shared belief that we should aid other people when they are in distress and we are there, they are visible to us, and we are the only ones who can help them. Candidates might explain Singer's argument by referring to the three premises and the conclusion he presents as his logical argument. Candidates might also mention the stories of the drowning child and the one of Bob and the Bugatti. Candidates might analyse Singer's argument that ethics is all about putting ourselves in the place of others; hence, candidates might explore other views on ethical altruism or empathy, *eg*: Scheler, Stein, Rée. The argument might call for an exploration of the Golden Rule, that Singer defines "remarkably universal", by finding it in many religions and philosophies. Candidates might explain why affluence is a central term in Singer's view and how it is related to giving to the poor. Candidates might mention the religious views on helping the poor, *eg*: Christianity, Judaism, and Islam. Candidates might discuss the argument that Singer presents as a common objection to giving and consider whether philanthropic responses undermine real political change. Moreover, candidates might explore the "identifiable victim effect", parochialism, or futility (*ie*, focusing on the number of people we cannot help, rather than the number we can), which tend to limit people's will to give. Candidates might consider other philosophical views, with reference to utilitarianism, *eg*: Bentham, Mill, Sidgwick, situation ethics, *eg*: Fletcher, or, as a possible criticism of Singer, intuitionism, *eg*: Moore.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Singer's Basic Argument
- Stories of the drowning child and Bob and the Bugatti
- The Golden Rule
- Altruism and helping the poor in religions
- The 'identifiable victim effect'
- The concept of parochialism
- The concept of futility
- Sense of fairness.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Other views on altruism and empathy, *eg*: Stein, Scheler
- Altruism as masked egoism, *eg*: Hobbes, Helvetius, Rée, Nietzsche
- Philanthropy as undermining political change
- Morality and intuitions, *eg*: Moore
- Morality and calculation, *eg*: utilitarianism
- Morality and emotions, *eg*: Rée, Damasio, Nussbaum, Churchland.

18. (a) Explain Singer's view on the pros and cons of anonymous giving. [10]

(b) Evaluate Singer's view on the pros and cons of anonymous giving. [15]

The question stems from Singer's argument presented in Chapter 5. Singer's view on the necessity to create a culture of giving is grounded in the evaluation of the pros and cons of anonymous giving. Singer mentions Jesus's message in favour of secret donations, which suggests "not to sound a trumpet when we give to the poor". Candidates might explain that the risk of publicizing donations is related to hypocrisy: donors are motivated just by the desire of increasing their reputation and honour and not by a real interest in aiding the others, nor because of their generosity. Candidates might also mention Maimonides's recommendation for anonymity either of the donor or of the recipient: they should not know each other to avoid either the recipient's feeling of being indebted to the donor, or the possibility of a public humiliation for accepting charity. Candidates might explore whether Singer considers such arguments relevant or not. In a global world it is rare that donors and recipients of donations know each other. Moreover, Singer affirms that what we look for in creating a culture of giving is donor's money, not their motives: candidates might explore whether such a culture also calls for motives and not just for money. In fact, Singer refers to a sense of fairness: if we are less likely to give to others when we see that other people are not doing it, it is also true that we are more likely to give when we see other people giving. Hence, if the aim is to encourage more people to donate or to donate more, and if this aim is more easily reachable by knowing that others are donating, we should not be interested in also knowing their motives. Candidates might also consider that anonymity undermines the 'identifiable victim effect': knowing the people in need helps donors in avoiding a feeling of futility. Candidates might highlight the cons of identifying a specific person as recipient of the donation, *eg*: a child, because helping an individual is less effective than a more community-based approach. Candidates might pinpoint the concept of self-interest and explain that there is both a broad and narrow sense of it: Singer mentions Hobbes's argument after giving a coin to a beggar in supporting generosity as a way to express self-interest, *eg*: being happy in seeing beggar's happiness. Candidates might explore other philosophical views on self-interest, egoism, and altruism, *eg*: Rousseau, Rée, Nietzsche.

Candidates might explore (part A):
- Singer's reference to Jesus and Maimonides
- Anonymity as a means to preserve both the donor and the recipient
- The 'identifiable victim effect' and the feeling of futility
- Individual aid *versus* community-based approaches
- The role of motives in giving
- Giving as a means to increase the donor's reputation
- The sense of fairness in motivating donors to give or to give more
- Broad and narrow sense of self-interest.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
- Hypocrisy as related to giving
- Egoism as masked altruism, *eg*: Hobbes, Helvetius, Rée, Nietzsche
- Self-interest and generosity, *eg*: Hobbes's argument on the beggar's happiness
- Generosity is not a virtue if it is imbalanced, *eg*: Aristotle
- Different kinds of self-interest, *eg*: Rousseau's two types of self-love, *amour de soi* and *amour-propre*
- Whether a culture of giving might be created without considering the motives of giving: different ethical approaches, *eg*: virtue ethics *versus* utilitarianism.

Charles Taylor: *The Ethics of Authenticity*

19. (a) Explain Taylor's view that language represents the modern tendency to subjectivation. [10]

(b) Evaluate Taylor's view that language represents the modern tendency to subjectivation. [15]

The question stems from the argument that Taylor presents in Chapter 8 on "Subtler Languages" and is a further analysis of what Taylor defines as a consequence of the slide to subjectivism: subjectivation is the tendency of things to "centre more and more on the subject". The question invites an exploration of the concept of subjectivation and its consequences, as a result of instrumental reason and self-centered fulfilment. Candidates might relate it to self-referentiality and pinpoint the two different facets of it, the "manner" and the "content", since "to confuse these two kinds of self-referentiality is catastrophic", according to Taylor. While the manner of this subjectivist tendency can be self-referential, the content must refer to other than the subject. Candidates might discuss Taylor's argument on art to show how modernity has led to the worst forms of subjectivism: it is about the shift from art as *mimesis*, that is in terms of imitation or reproduction, toward a more creative one (*poiesis*). Candidates might present Taylor's view on poetry, Renaissance and Romanticism, which illustrates the change of language: while poets and artists used to refer to shared knowledge and senses in the past — what Taylor calls "correspondences", modernity has loosened the references to a common background or system of beliefs. Hence, modern poetry cannot be the investigation of an 'objective' order in the traditional sense of a publicly accessible framework of references. Candidates might highlight the relation between subjectivism, anthropocentric language and ecological policies. Candidates might evaluate whether authenticity plays a role in interpreting correctly subjectivism towards a connection to a wider whole. Candidates might refer to other philosophical views, *eg*: Wittgenstein's view on language, Adorno's view on phantasy in terms of creative art, Aristotle's definitions of *mimesis* and *poiesis*, Ortega y Gasset's concept of the revolt of the masses.

Candidates might explore (part A):
- Subjectivation in relation with instrumental reason and individualism (self-centered fulfilment)
- The slide to subjectivism; the culture of narcissism
- Two different facets of self-referentiality: manner and content
- Shift from *mimesis* to *poiesis* in art
- Change of poetic language: from "correspondences" to personal sensitivity
- Anthropocentric language and ecological policies
- Knockers *versus* boosters
- Authenticity and transcendence of the subject
- Cosmic order and the "great chain of Being".

Possible discussion points include (part B):
- Other views on subjectivity, *eg*: Descartes, Kant, Kierkegaard
- Subjectivism as a result of socio-political changes, *eg*: Ortega y Gasset's revolt of the masses
- Aristotle's view on art and the distinction between *mimesis* and *poiesis*
- Whether technology affected art in terms of creativity or reproduction, *eg*: Benjamin, Adorno
- The role of phantasy to break homologation in art and language, *eg*: Goethe, Adorno
- The limits of language, *eg*: Wittgenstein
- Whether instrumental reason fosters subjectivism or homologation of values, *eg*: career, success, affluence.

20. (a) Explain the relationship between instrumental reason and the development of a technological society. [10]

(b) Evaluate the relationship between instrumental reason and the development of a technological society. [15]

The claim is from Chapter 9, "An Iron Cage?", where Taylor sets out his view on instrumental reason. Candidates might explain Taylor's view on technological development and his invitation to a balanced approach. Candidates might consider knockers and boosters and their polarized views in terms of optimism *versus* pessimism. Candidates might evaluate these positions in relation with environmental issues: on one hand, technology is seen as the solution to fix all, on the other hand, advocates of sustainability invoke a return to a genuine relationship with nature. Candidates might focus on Taylor's attempt to link authenticity to a better approach to technology, which may allow us to get back some balance, where technology could occupy a place in our lives other than a constant, unreflected mandatory one. Candidates might present and support their own views on the role that technology might play in modern societies and in relation to contemporary issues. Candidates might highlight that technology fosters instrumental reason not only because of a certain moral outlook, but because the market forces strongly influence a society, if economic agents wish to survive, they must give a lot of significance to efficiency. Modern society is technological and spreads the need for efficiency in all fields, from markets to scientism: atomism, instrumental reason, bureaucracy are a few tools of its advancement. Candidates might explore the concept of the "iron cage" and might refer to other views on technology, *eg*: Bacon, Heidegger, Ortega y Gasset, Dewey.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The "iron cage"; Weber's view on the "iron cage"
- Polarized views on technology: boosters *versus* knockers
- Authenticity in relation with technology
- Technology in relation with atomism, instrumental reason, bureaucracy
- Technology in relation with economic needs and markets (efficiency)
- Self-determining freedom
- Technology as domination, *eg*: in relation with nature
- Fragmentation and political participation of local communities.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Environmental issues in relation with technology
- Technology and feminism, *eg*: domination as a male approach
- Boosters and knockers as representing political left and right
- The role of liberalism and conservatism in setting the technological agenda
- Technology and alienation, *eg*: Adorno, Horkheimer, Marcuse, Debord
- Other views on technology and the human being as a technological being (including positive views), *eg*: Heidegger, Ortega y Gasset, Plessner, Gehlen, Dewey.

Lao Tzu: *Tao Te Ching*

21. (a) Explain the view that when people see some things as beautiful, other things become ugly. [10]

(b) Evaluate the view that when people see some things as beautiful, other things become ugly. [15]

The claim is from Chapter 2. Candidates might explore the connection of this claim to another one: "When people see some things as good, other things become bad." The whole chapter invites an analysis of the fact that proper knowledge of things cannot be reached but by the Sage. Also, the claims refer to a necessary relationship between opposites. Candidates might consider an exploration of the *Tao* as a balance of contrasting powers or other philosophical views, *eg*: Cusanus's *coincidentia oppositorum* and more recent dialectics, *eg*: Hegel, Jung, Eliade. Beyond the ontological theories, candidates might pinpoint the epistemic consequences of the claim, which implies the impossibility to know a thing without its opposite. Candidates might discuss the figure of the Sage and the ability to practice non-action in doing things, staying independent from them. Also, the Sage accomplishes things but claims no credit or merit for this: candidates might consider the role of words and claims as conventional elements whose function is requested by whom do not accomplish things, nor have any merit. Candidates might refer to the real meaning of showing off and displaying things and merits as a means to inadvertently show that they are not necessarily merited.

Candidates might explore (part A):
- The unity of opposites
- The *Tao* as a balanced combination of contrasting elements
- The ontological aspect of opposites: a thing exists because its opposite exists
- The epistemic aspect of opposites: it is possible to know a thing if its opposite is known
- The figure of the Sage
- The role of non-action (*wu wei*)
- Merits and credits as unrequested claims
- The role of words, *eg*: in teaching.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
- Other views on the unity of opposites, *eg*: Cusanus's *coincidentia oppositorum*
- Other dialectics of oppositions, *eg*: Hegel, Jung, Eliade
- The relationship between Being and Non-being in other philosophical views, *eg*: Parmenides, Heidegger, Sartre
- The role of words in language, *eg*: Wittgenstein
- The meaning of claiming credits and merits as a means to show off in the society of consumerism and spectacle, *eg*: The Frankfurt School, Debord.

22. (a) Explain the claim that if you overvalue possessions, people begin to steal. [10]

(b) Evaluate the claim that if you overvalue possessions, people begin to steal. [15]

The claim is from Chapter 3 and invites an exploration of the function of government according to the *Tao*. Candidates might explore the role of the Sage as ruler, who promotes stillness and contentment in society. Candidates might compare this view to other philosophical theories, *eg*: Plato's *Republic*: the Sage must have an empty mind, directed to non-doing and not-desiring, not far from the philosopher-ruler depicted by Plato. Candidates might discuss the fact that not only the Sage's mind must be emptied, but the Sage's task is to empty the people's minds too. Candidates might consider the role of education and learning and discuss other views, *eg*: paternalism and communitarianism. Candidates might highlight that promoting and overvaluing possessions would make people desire them and would make inequalities and fights rise in society. Unity and harmony must be promoted for the society's sake. Candidates might present and compare other views, *eg*: contractarianism as in Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, or neo-contractarianism, as in Rawls and Nozick, or the role of property in governing and within society, as in Plato or Rousseau. Candidates might focus on the central concept of the *Tao*, non-action, as a ruling guide of the Sage: "Do Not-Doing and nothing will be left *un-governed*/Practice not-doing, and everything will fall into place"

Candidates might explore (part A):
- The figure of the Sage as a ruler
- The importance of stillness and contentment
- The task of emptying mind
- Promoting incentives and possessions as linked to more inequalities and less harmony
- Unity and harmony for the society's sake
- The importance of education and learning in society
- Government following non-action.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
- The ruler in other philosophical views, *eg*: Plato's *Republic*
- Criticism on possessions for the harmony of society, *eg*: Plato, Rousseau
- Education and authoritarianism, paternalism, communitarianism
- Contractarianism, *eg*: Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, and the importance of harmony in society
- Neo-contractarianism, *eg*: Rawls, Nozick
- Whether non-action can drive anarchy.

Zhuangzi: *Zhuangzi, Inner Chapters*

23. (a) Explain the metaphor of the magic bean and the giant gourd. [10]

(b) Evaluate the metaphor of the magic bean and the giant gourd. [15]

Zhuangzi frequently uses metaphors to draw out philosophical perspectives and this question seeks an explanation of the magic bean and the gourd. In Chapter 1 of the Inner Chapters the central theme of 'Going Beyond', humans are encouraged to move away from their preconceptions that bind them. The rapid growth of the magic bean and the resulting giant gourd show how humans should strive to 'go beyond' and consider new and alternative uses of things- breaking conventional thinking. What use can a giant gourd be put to illustrates the problem and the inability of breaking out of conventional thinking. Such thinking seems to limit the gourd's use and shows that there is failure to exploit the potentiality that exists. It is essentially an exercise in thinking 'outside the box'. The large gourd is eventually broken into small pieces and seems to become useless because it had failed to be a useful container or a dipper: Limited thinking resulted in limited use. The opportunities for creative uses of things are continued in the metaphor that follows the gourd; the use of the balm. Throughout, Zhuangzi is trying to show that the master cannot think clearly*;* our minds, our thinking, our solution finding, can be limited by our preconceptions and our lack of creativity. This creativity is seen as spontaneity *(ziran)* and the lack of it is seen as a shortcoming of humans, and it results in discouraging paradigm shifts. More spontaneity means more change, and the acceptance of a changing fluid existence which is the essence of the *Tao*. The suggested potential use of a great gourd as a sailing raft is reflective of a creativity, it is the result of spontaneity (*ziran*) which Zhuangzi sees developing from the freeing of the mind, perhaps through *wu wei.* Effectively this is allowing the *Tao* to lead. The difference is all in the way things are used. The essence of the metaphor is to show that humans should try and escape from their predispositions and their initial priorities and see things completely differently, going beyond and being free to explore intellectually, without constraints.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Zhuangzi's view of *ziran*
- The *Tao* and its ability to free humans from the everyday
- *Wu wei*
- The use of metaphors
- The parallels with the story of the use of the balm
- The relationship of failure and success in life
- The idea of a flourishing life which entertains a non-material, non-ambition, or non-striving based success - a contentment.
- Cultural influences on creative thinking and paradigm breaking; role of education and religion.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The extent to which Zhuangzi has fixed perceptions, as he does not fully hold with illimitability of potential experience, as is characteristic of Confucius, as he trying to challenge Confucian traditions
- Zhuangzi focuses on the exploitation of the gourd which is contrary to his more general position of stepping back and not interfering, *wu wei*- a non-engagement
- Whether the practical and creative aspects of the metaphor show that the philosopher needs to be practical, realistic, and able to win support from potential patrons
- Whether seeing useful aspects of the gourd is counter to *Taoism*
- The degree to which spontaneity is an effective way of thinking
- The appropriateness of a *wu wei* approach to living
- The uncertainty and lack of fixed knowledge as positive to increasing *ziran*. Zhuangzi's skepticism of knowledge is not doubting but, in the traditional Greek sense, an acceptance of uncertainty

- The relativistic nature of the metaphor and the fantasy aspect allowing freer thinking; effectively breaking the conventions of the time
- Whether Zhuangzi's relativism and spontaneity, seen in the metaphor, encourages paradigm shifts
- The psychological issues associated with 'categorical inflexibility' (E. Slingerland in The Way of Nature C.C. Tsai).

24. (a) Explain Zhuangzi's view of death. [10]

(b) Evaluate Zhuangzi's view of death. [15]

The question focuses largely on chapter 6 and invites an explanation of Zhuangzi's view that death is merely a transformative process. For the *Taoist* death is an aspect of fate (*ming*). Therefore, the ability to face death is a sign of great virtuosity (*de*). There is an interrelationship between life and death, and death is not to be seen as an end but a transformational step in a larger natural process. Mention could be made to the story of how when death approaches, Ziya contemplates a transformation with his left arm becoming a rooster and his right arm a cross bow pellet. What is being posed here is that death is another step and is an aspect of change. At the heart of understanding this change process is the *Taoist* understanding of humans being part of the universe and upon death the essence of the human continues, but in a different form. The contemplation on death creates a view that if life is good then death is good. Humans consider themselves as important components of the universe, but the "Creation - Transform" sees them simply as a 'clump of person', ready to be transformed again. For the *Taoist,* death is a return to nature. Life is achieving a balance between human activity and nature. What seems to continue through transformation is the essence. There is throughout Zhuangzi's views on death an implied criticism of the ritual approaches developed by Confucius. Mourning and distress at the loss does not seem appropriate in *Taoism*. There might also be reference to the 'Butterfly Dream' relating to life and death, and whether the processes of living are seemingly dreams. Similarly, there might be mention of Zilai's impending death and what transformations await, a mouse's liver or an insect's arm. There seems no need to challenge, question or even fear death as it is the way to heaven, to change. It is an acceptance of the *Tao*. This acceptance and non-response to death links to notions of *wu wei,* and a peaceful contentment to an ongoing natural process. Contrasts might be made to various religious views towards death particularly Christian ideas of an afterlife and Hindu views on reincarnation.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The 'clump of person' reference and links to the eternal black smith
- The images of transformation, the rooster, and positive future possibilities after human life
- The nature of the cosmos and a human's place within it
- Consideration of the essence of all things, the *Tao*
- *Taoism* and nature
- *Wu wei* and the idea of non-action, non-interference, accepting the flow of nature, the *Tao*
- 'The great clump' and the human physical form as just a chance encounter and perhaps a burden
- The personal experience of the death with reference to Zhuangzi's wife and his reaction to her death and mourning
- *Yin* and *Yang* and life and death
- The consequences of no deity and no notion of an afterlife
- Links between friendship and death.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Contrasts with Confucianism, rituals and death, and the *Taoist* views of filiality
- Contrasting views on Nature (*tian*), and the human relationship to nature; Confucius's view of the relationship to nature is one of ordering (*Li*), whereas for the *Taoist* it is one of acceptance of being part of or being within nature
- Whether close friendship gives justification for mourning (reference to Zilai's death)
- *Taoist* views on the cosmos and human's place within it
- Contrasts with Plato's views on the immorality of souls
- Reactions to Zhuangzi's understanding of continuity and change in the context of his wife's death; some would be perplexed by his lack of sorrow
- Humans as part of nature and the consequential perspective of death as a process

- Whether Zhuangzi’s approach to death provides solace
- The degree to which views of death are weighted by cultural mores and expectations
- Religious stances and death: the afterlife, heaven and hell, reincarnation, parallel universes
- New Age thinking and cycles of nature as a cosmological process.