Diploma Programme
Programme du diplôme
Programa del Diploma

Markscheme

May 2024

Philosophy

Higher level and standard level

Paper 1

International Baccalaureate
Baccalauréat International
Bachillerato Internacional

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 4 for the core theme and page 7 for the optional themes.

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

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

Note to examiners

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

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

Paper 1 core theme markbands

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–5	• The response is poorly structured, or where there is a recognizable essay structure there is minimal focus on the task. • The philosophical issue raised by the stimulus material is implied but not explicitly identified. There is minimal or no explanation of how the issue relates to the stimulus material or links to the question of what it is to be human. • There is little relevant knowledge demonstrated, and the explanation is superficial. Philosophical vocabulary is not used, or is consistently used inappropriately. • The essay is descriptive and lacking in analysis.
6–10	• There is some attempt to follow a structured approach although it is not always clear what the answer is trying to convey. • The philosophical issue raised by the stimulus material is implied but not explicitly identified. There is some limited explanation of how the issue relates to the stimulus material or links to the question of what it is to be human. • Knowledge is demonstrated but lacks accuracy and relevance, and there is a basic explanation of the issue. Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately. • There is some limited analysis but the response is more descriptive than analytical. There is little discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view. Few of the main points are justified.
11–15	• There is a clear attempt to structure the response, although there may be some repetition or a lack of clarity in places. • The philosophical issue raised by the stimulus material is explicitly identified. There is a basic explanation of how the issue relates to the stimulus material and to the question of what it is to be human. • Knowledge is mostly accurate and relevant, and there is a satisfactory explanation of the issue. Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately. • The response contains analysis, but this analysis lacks development. There is some discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view. Many of the main points are justified.
16–20	• The response is structured and generally organized, and can be easily followed. • The philosophical issue raised by the stimulus material is explicitly identified. There is good justification of how the issue relates to the stimulus material and to the question of what it is to be human. • The response contains accurate and relevant knowledge. There is a good explanation of the issue. Philosophical vocabulary is mostly used appropriately. • The response contains critical analysis. There is discussion and some assessment of alternative interpretations or points of view. Most of the main points are justified.
21–25	• The response is well structured, focused and effectively organized. • The philosophical issue raised by the stimulus material is explicitly identified. There is a well-developed justification of how the issue relates to the stimulus material and to the question of what it is to be human. • The response contains relevant, accurate and detailed knowledge. There is a well-developed explanation of the issue. There is appropriate use of philosophical vocabulary throughout the response. • The response contains well developed critical analysis. There is discussion and assessment of alternative interpretations or points of view. All or nearly all of the main points are justified. The response argues from a consistently held position about the issue.

Section A

Core theme: Being human

Excerpt

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

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

    The text invites an exploration of the concept of consciousness and how it is related to human nature. Candidates might consider the dualistic division of mind and body and refer to Descartes as one of the first attempts to define consciousness philosophically. Responses might take into consideration more recent perspectives in physiological and neurological terms and how they contribute to a philosophical analysis of consciousness, with particular reference to the concepts of will and freedom. Candidates might consider a unitarian approach, which considers mind and body in terms of unity or stream, as in Damasio's view opposing to Descartes. Positivism, intuitionism, existentialism might all be viable approaches to explore consciousness. The concept of will might be discussed with reference to Schopenhauer, Kant or Nietzsche. Responses might focus on the role of emotions and feelings and whether they can be considered sources of knowledge and self-awareness or illusion and deception.

    In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:
    *   The mind-body problem and Descartes's dualism
    *   The role of emotions and feelings, e.g. Scheler, Damasio
    *   The concept of will and its power, e.g. Schopenhauer, Nietzsche
    *   The concept of freedom and free will
    *   The concept of good will, e.g. Kant
    *   Consciousness as a matter of physiological phenomena, e.g. physicalism, determinism, positivism
    *   Consciousness as the source of authentic perception and expression of the self, e.g. psychoanalysis, existentialism
    *   Differences between humans and animals
    *   Consciousness as a means to shape identity and social relationships, e.g. Ortega y Gasset
    *   Whether technology limits or fosters consciousness and its expression
    *   Consciousness as a key element against AI
    *   Art experience and production as a means to express consciousness.

Image

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

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

The image invites an exploration of the relationship between human beings and digital devices. Responses might highlight the different philosophical meanings of technology, with reference to Plato's view on *techne*, up to Heidegger's ideas on it. Candidates might consider the role that new digital devices play in shaping individuals' identity, in terms of homologation and alienation: possible reference to the School of Frankfurt and their Critical Theory, e.g. Adorno, Marcuse. Some responses might mention recent contributions in terms of critical theories and the meaning of individualism, e.g. Bauman, Taylor. Particularly, candidates might refer to Taylor's concept of the 'iron cage' to explain the role that technology plays in restricting life nowadays. Responses might consider the importance that direct experiences have in shaping human personality and whether mediated experiences are an impoverishment of them or not.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:
- The concept of *techne,* e.g. Plato
- Technology and human action, e.g. Ortega y Gasset, Heidegger
- The relationship between biology and technology, e.g. Gehlen
- Technology and Critical Theory, e.g. the School of Frankfurt
- Technology and individualism, e.g. Bauman, Taylor
- Technology and the self, e.g. Adorno, Foucault
- Whether technology fosters individuals' identity, e.g. Taylor's concept of the 'iron cage'
- Technological devices as *res extensa versus res cogitans*, e.g. Descartes
- The role of art and fantasy out of technological devices, e.g. Goethe, Adorno
- Technology and sex differences in shaping individuals' identity, e.g. de Beauvoir
- The role of perception in shaping reality, e.g. empiricism
- Subjectivity *versus* objectivity
- The mind-body issues, e.g. Descartes's dualism.

Paper 1 Section B markbands

Mark	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–5	• The response is poorly structured, or where there is a recognizable essay structure there is minimal focus on the task. The response lacks coherence and is often unclear. • The student demonstrates little relevant knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme. Philosophical vocabulary is not used or is consistently used inappropriately. • The essay is mostly descriptive. There is no discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view. Few of the main points are justified.
6–10	• There is some attempt to follow a structured approach although it is not always clear what the answer is trying to convey. • The student demonstrates knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme, but this knowledge lacks accuracy and relevance. Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately. • There is limited analysis but the response is more descriptive than analytical. There is little discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view. Some of the main points are justified.
11–15	• There is a clear attempt to structure the response although there may be some repetition or a lack of clarity in places. • Knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme is mostly accurate and relevant. Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately. • The response contains analysis, but this analysis lacks development. There is some discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view. Many of the main points are justified.
16–20	• The response is structured and generally organized, and can be easily followed. • The response contains accurate and relevant knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme. Philosophical vocabulary is mostly used appropriately. • The response contains critical analysis. There is discussion and some assessment of alternative interpretations or points of view. Most of the main points are justified.
21–25	• The response is well structured, focused and effectively organized. • The response contains relevant, accurate and detailed knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme. There is appropriate use of philosophical vocabulary throughout the response. • The response contains well-developed critical analysis. There is discussion and assessment of alternative interpretations or points of view. All or nearly all of the main points are justified. The response argues from a consistently held position about the issue.

Section B

Optional theme 1: Aesthetics

3. **Evaluate the claim that styles may change, but the demands of aesthetic judgment are permanent.** **[25]**

The claim invites an exploration of a central issue in aesthetics: judgment and its relationship with taste. Candidates might analyze the concept of taste and consider whether it is a matter of personal experience, or whether it responds to objective qualities, e.g. the Greek concept of measure and proportion, Kant's view on taste, Nietzsche's criticism of Kant's view. Also, responses might focus on the social habits that can shape specific aesthetic judgments, in terms of common sense or tradition, e.g. the School of Frankfurt, Horkheimer, Adorno, Marcuse. Candidates might explore the role of conformism and whether technology fosters personal interpretation of art or homologation, e.g. Debord's view on the society of the spectacle. Moreover, candidates might highlight the meaning of art as experience, e.g. Dewey, and the role that feelings and emotions can play in driving taste and judgments, e.g. Shaftesbury, Romanticism, Damasio. Finally, candidates might mention the concept of disgust as described by Nussbaum.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:
- Subjectivity *versus* objectivity in taste and judgments, e.g. the ancient Greek view grounded in measure and proportion
- The role of the beholder in interpreting art and whether different beholders make different aesthetic judgments, e.g. Croce, Dewey
- Whether art can convey social meaning and play social roles, e.g. Dewey, Croce
- The role of image in shaping taste and judgment, e.g. Debord's society of the spectacle
- Views on the aesthetic judgment and the nature of art, e.g. Hume, Kant, Nietzsche
- Different views on taste, e.g. Hume, Kant, Nietzsche
- The role of social habits in shaping taste, e.g. conformism, consumerism; the views of the School of Frankfurt
- Taste and judgment in relation with homologation and alienation, e.g. Horkheimer, Adorno, Marcuse
- Art as experience, e.g. Dewey
- The role of feelings in judgment, e.g. Scheler's concept of *Fühlen* (to feel)
- The relationship between personal taste and aesthetic judgment
- The role of emotions in taste and the view that if taste is based on emotions, it changes constantly, e.g. Shaftesbury, Romanticism, Damasio
- The specific feeling of disgust and its relationship with taste and the relationship between disgust and aesthetic judgment, e.g. Nussbaum.

4. **Evaluate the claim that art is the daughter of freedom.** **[25]**

The claim invites an exploration of the role and function of art. Particularly, candidates might discuss whether art embodies and fosters anti-conformist ideas or is grounded in the social habits and commonly accepted values. Hence, responses might consider the possible social and political role of art, e.g. Dewey, or its inner independence, e.g. Croce. Candidates might consider the cases of artistic production that stem from a struggle against accepted values or as a result of patronage, political propaganda, censorship. Responses might consider critical theory, e.g. the School of Frankfurt, and the meaning of tyranny of the majority, e.g. de Tocqueville, Ortega y Gasset. Candidates might explore the possibilities of aesthetic judgment, e.g. Hume, Kant, Nietzsche, and the role that conformism and homologation play in judging, e.g. Marcuse, Debord.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:
- The meaning of art as *poiesis* or *mimesis*, e.g. Aristotle
- Possible social and political functions of art, e.g. Mill, Dewey
- Art as independent from other fields and value systems, e.g. Croce
- Artistic production as linked to patronage, propaganda or censorship, e.g. Socialist realism, fascism
- Art as a form of rebellion against common values and ideas or as a result of conformism and social habits, e.g. the School of Frankfurt
- Conformism and homologation in shaping art production and the aesthetic judgment, e.g. de Tocqueville's tyranny of the majority, Ortega y Gasset's revolt of the masses
- The role of conformism in shaping the beholder's point of view, e.g. Debord and the society of the spectacle
- The possibilities of aesthetic judgment, e.g. Hume's view that with enough training people can develop the idea of aesthetic judgment, e.g. Kant, Nietzsche
- Whether technologies support freedom in art, e.g. new technologies fostering creativity or conformity
- Technology as a way to free art: digital and virtual art, e.g. Deleuze, Lévy
- Whether technologies limit freedom in art and art as a means to freedom, e.g. Benjamin and the reproducibility of works of art.

Optional theme 2: Epistemology

5.   Evaluate the claim that all justified, true beliefs are knowledge.   **[25]**

This question is about the justification of beliefs, and the empiricism vs rationalism debate. Plato's epistemology, where knowledge, belief and opinion are differentiated, provides a foundation for subsequent discussions. Rationalists such as Leibniz hold that knowledge is primarily a product of our *a priori* beliefs and rational capacities. On the other hand, empiricists such as Hume argue that knowledge is primarily the product of our senses and our grasp of the outside world. Sitting between these two opposing views, Descartes holds that indubitable *a priori* beliefs justify our *a posteriori* beliefs. Kant's emphasis on rational faculties that shape how we understand the empirical world is also sometimes seen as a fusion of empiricism and rationalism. Candidates might provide examples of fallible *a posteriori* beliefs, and seemingly infallible *a priori* beliefs. They might discuss the philosophy of science and the scientific method as a means of building knowledge based on the senses. They might also present an account of logical positivism and its attempt to reduce all knowledge claims to sense data.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:
- Knowledge as justified, true belief
- Plato's discussions of knowledge, belief and opinion in the Divided Line and Cave analogies
- Gettier cases which break the link between justification, truth, and knowledge
- The fallibility of the senses such as optical illusions
- The role of sense data and observations in the sciences
- The relationship between theory, rationality and observation e.g. Kuhn and the theory ladenness of observations
- The logical positivists and the use of sense data to determine the meaningfulness of statements e.g. Popper and falsification
- Empiricism e.g. Hume, Locke
- Rationalism e.g. Leibniz
- Descartes's use of rationalism and sense data to support the claim that we have true beliefs about the world. Here, *a priori* beliefs justify *a posteriori* ones
- The definition of knowledge as justified, true belief
- Correspondence theory, and whether sense data is a reliable means of accessing truth.

6. **To what extent should false claims be censored?** **[25]**

This question relates to the application of knowledge. Recently, the world has seen a proliferation of "fake news". Although this is nothing new, the visibility and wide-reach of the internet has made it a prominent issue. There is a tension between epistemological claims about truth and falsehood, and normative claims about whether spreading untruths should be regulated, and if so, who should do the regulation. This issue is prominent in Plato's Republic where epistemology and power are closely intertwined. From the Noble Lie to the rule of philosopher kings whose authority comes from knowledge. Candidates might also be interested in the place of testimony in epistemology, and issues such as testimonial injustice where research suggests that some social groups are routinely ignored. Various case studies might be appealed to such as the recent anti-vax movement, or the use of warning labels on social media. Candidates might appeal to political philosophy, such as Mill's view that robust debate of competing ideas supports societal progress, and as such, censorship is undesirable.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:
- The place of testimony in knowledge formation
- Power and knowledge e.g. Plato's noble lie, and the power wielded by those who are knowledgeable *i.e.* the philosopher king
- How to differentiate true beliefs from false ones e.g. Popper and falsifiability
- Debates about no-platforming speakers with controversial views
- Freedom of speech and the societal value of epistemic debate
- Misinformation and the value of censorship
- Relativism in relation to the idea that we know what is and is not misinformation and can censor correctly
- Testimonial injustice and unjust censorship e.g. Fricker
- The extent to which censors can tell what is and what is not a true or untrue claim
- Politicization of knowledge
- The role of the internet in spreading misinformation
- Case studies such as of the anti-vax movement or QAnon in response to Covid-19
- Technology companies as censors e.g. Twitter banning Trump, warning labels on Facebook.

Optional theme 3: Ethics

7. **To what extent should ethics be about doing the "right thing" more than doing the "best thing"?** [25]

Based on one of the discussion questions in the normative ethics topic as presented in the *Guide*, the question might be interpreted in different ways and, accordingly, the answers can be developed in various directions. One way would be relating the notions involved according to some of the ethical approaches, e.g. doing the "right thing" to deontological ethics, divine command or forms of naturalism and doing the "best thing" to utilitarianism, consequentialism, pragmatism, virtue ethics or teleological views, among others. Answers might take a different path and analyse the notions of "right" and "good" (and their opposites) highlighting their conceptual or linguistic dimensions. Answers might also introduce an alternative approach to the question and argue that ethics is, e.g. more about doing what is more convenient for the individuals or groups according to their adaptations to the *milieu*, presenting discussions in relation to forms of culturalism and relativism. Further, answers might also focus their arguments on some of the classical positions as found in Plato, Aristotle, Kant, or Nietzsche.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:
- The deontological approach to ethics: morality is concerned with duties and principles that require moral agents to behave in specific ways regardless of the consequences
- A common criticism of deontological ethics: there are times when duties should be abrogated in the name of a higher good
- Possible interpretations of the "best thing," e.g. "the good"
- Metaphysical traditions interpreting the concept of "good"
- By classic accounts, human reasoning possesses the capacity to determine the good, e.g. Aquinas's *synderesis*, an act of intellect by which we know the good
- The Platonic idea of intuiting the good itself and the good as the supreme goal of human life
- Pleasure and the good life: nature, varieties, and plausibility of hedonism
- Are the "good" and the "bad" linked to the "useful" and the "harmful"?
- Philosophical views that link the "good" to the "useful", e.g. utilitarianism, Nietzsche
- The happiness principle: to maximize the greatest happiness of the greatest number
- "Good" as a basic concept which is not analysable into other more basic terms or elements; Moore's argument that any analysis of what the term "good" means would remain open in this way
- Do the "good" and the "right" involve the same moral principles? Views that focus on this relation, e.g. legalism, casuistry
- Relativism, culturalism, and moral skepticism as alternatives to the opposition between doing the "right thing" and doing the "best thing"
- Pluralism: goods, duties, values, claims, and principles may be irreducibly plural and complex; there are many different values worth holding and many moral claims that may be made.

8. **Evaluate the claim that the interests of future generations should guide moral conduct.** **[25]**

The question brings an issue from the field of applied ethics and opens possibilities for arguments specifically related to environmental ethics and to its connection with issues of normative ethics (the greatest good for the greatest number) or meta-ethics (Are moral principles universal or relative to a particular situation or culture?). Further, answers might develop arguments in relation to other ethical central concepts, e.g. responsibility. Environmental ethics, which studies the moral relationship of human beings to the environment and the value and moral status of it, offers a path to reflect holistically and globally on the rights and interests of future generations. The 1987 publication by the World Commission on Environment and Development, *Our Common Future*, presents a clear example of this approach. All topics presented in the report, the agenda of which is still projected until today might be under moral examination and raise moral questions, e.g. the extent to which the greatest good for the greatest number includes future generations, or when moral principles go beyond a particular situation or culture, should they be conceived as valid for all times?

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:
- The increasing evidence that planetary systems, vital to supporting life on earth, are under strain
- Whether it is equitable to sacrifice options for future well-being in favour of supporting current lifestyles or diverse types of interest
- The global challenge of seeing whether different human groups, with widely varying perspectives, can accept responsibility to maintain a substantial care in the relation with the environment
- The extent to which non existing entities might have rights
- Whether the concern for the future is limited to the future of human beings only
- The non-anthropocentric focus of much environmental philosophy; a care for sustainability and biodiversity can embrace a care for opportunities available to non-human living things
- Parallelisms and cases from other areas of applied ethics: biomedical ethics e.g. genetic engineering and human enhancing
- Human technology as radical transformation of the environment
- Approaches such as: Kantian perspectives, Jonas's imperative of responsibility, Parfitt's reflections on future people
- The Gaia hypothesis
- Modification of the environment and creation and distribution of wealth
- The extent to which there is a moral dimension in relation to environment or nature
- Deep Ecology
- There does not need to be any intrinsic value in nature to want to save it; one just needs to consider humanity's self-interest
- The question of whether non-sentient objects can have interests or rights
- Human activities project themselves into the future on the basis of a past history. Living in the future is constitutive of the human beings
- The idea of potential or possible future good; political and various ways of utopias.

Optional theme 4: Philosophy and contemporary society

9. **Evaluate the claim that the increase of automation and control technologies in the workplace is removing the individual's right to work.** **[25]**

This question seeks an evaluation of the traditional notion of the right to work when technology is increasingly applied to tasks in the workplace. The right of all to work might now be seen as redundant when technologies are replacing activities that were once in the hands of the worker. The notion that work is part of the human condition might now be questioned or does the notion of work need to be redefined? The human role in production might now have to be rethought. Work as producing meaning and purpose in life might need to be redefined and replaced by activities that are not related to the idea of production and contribution to economic activity. Contrasts might be made with less developed economies where human work remains essential. A Marxist approach might be explored through questioning work as exploitation and an increasing alienation in the workplace. It could be seen that technological applications might be giving humans more opportunities to have a more meaningful life, which is being freed from having to work. Issues of identity might be explored in that work gives humans a defined place in society and this might now be being lost thus creating a crisis of identity. The ideas of Arendt might be brought in by claiming that the lessening of the role "work" could produce a reassertion of "action" within the *polis*. The removal of work might be seen as freeing humans to aspire to high pursuits and thus adding new dimensions to the human condition.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:
- Changing work practices and consequent increased exploitation, e.g. zone work, zero-hour contracts
- If there is a right to work, whose duty is it to provide it?
- Is the universal human right to work, e.g. in the Indian constitution, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, appropriate in a changing technological society?
- The application of technologies to positively enhance the human condition
- The positive impact of technology in increasing safety in the workplace
- Whether the reduction of work gives opportunities for humans to discover new aspects of themselves; creativity, self-awareness, and spirituality
- The relationship between work and identity
- The Frankfurt School
- Life/work balance issues: the impact of more leisure time and the rise and development of play as a more consuming activity
- The changing understanding of "unemployed" from a negative condition to a normal condition in one's life.

10. Explain and discuss the distinction between positive and negative freedom for the individual citizen in the contemporary state. **[25]**

The difference between positive and negative liberty is a common theme in political philosophy and life in the contemporary state. Freedoms traditionally are described as coming in two types, 'positive' and 'negative'. Negative liberty is the absence of restraint and constraint, implying freedom from the interference of others and from the state. Positive liberty is the freedom to act and take advantage of choice and opportunity. Governments offer promises to citizens that they can be protected from the suppression of others. Governments can also offer citizens protection from state intervention. Additionally, they can act to allow choice and opportunity for the individual. The state might boast about the ways in which it deters acts that compromise negative liberty, while promoting the ways it has promoted – through education, health, culture, and law – the opportunities of citizens to have choice and thus to lead happy, autonomous lives. Positive liberty for the individual can be predicated on negative liberty being available for that individual, although they may also come into conflict. Policies by the government, like taxes on high-fat foods or tobacco and alcohol, might coerce an individual while encouraging a future benefit from a liberty to live more healthily and with more choice over work and leisure.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:
- Positive and negative liberty in the philosophical tradition, e.g. Mill, Berlin
- Responsibility and choice in action
- The limit of individual responsibility for others
- Authority of the state over individual liberty
- Differences between two kinds of liberty, e.g. Mill, Berlin; or Constant, Bobbio
- Guiding principles behind the promotion of the idea of liberty – for Mill it is its overall utility
- Positive and negative liberty and their relation to equality and the state
- Equality of opportunity *vs* equality of outcome
- The relationship between needs and merit, where social justice impinges on individual liberty, e.g. positive discrimination.

Optional theme 5: Philosophy of religion

11. **Evaluate the coherence of omnipotence as a characteristic of God/god(s).** **[25]**

This question involves an exploration and evaluation of the most basic belief about the nature and characteristics of God/god(s). Omnipotence forms the attribute around which others, like omniscience, immutability and the creation of perfect moral law revolve. While forms of Deism might jettison the insistence on God/god(s)'s almighty power, theism asserts God/god(s)'s omnipotence as a core characteristic, for if another being or concept held more power, or an alternative authority (e.g. the Good in Plato's world of the Forms), then that being or authority would be more worthy of worship, and alternatively designated 'God/god(s)'. In ontological arguments for God/god(s)'s existence, God/god(s)'s definition is, 'that than which nothing greater could be conceived', founded on the attribute of omnipotence. But if God/god(s) is omnipotent, then some other attributes might be inconsistent with that omnipotence. How could an omnipotent God/god(s) allow such suffering to exist in the created order, if this God/god(s) is also omnibenevolent? If part of God/god(s)'s omnipotence includes the characteristic of immutability, how could God/god(s) know the future without God/god(s)'s knowledge changing over time? How does the notion of omnibenevolence cohere itself? Could, for instance, an omnipotent God/god(s) make a triangle four-sided? And how coherent is the idea of an omnipotent God/god(s) who cannot create a stone too big for him/her to lift? Should our understanding of God/god(s)'s omnipotence be tempered by qualifications, as Aquinas does with any attempt to ask God/god(s) to break the laws of logic?

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:
- Omnipotence as God/god(s) being able to do anything (see Descartes, Geach)
- Aquinas's response to the claim that God/god(s) can do anything even something logically impossible
- The paradox of the stone and responses to that paradox (e.g. Savage, Mavrodes)
- The problem of the existence of evil and an omnipotent creator God/god(s) – can omnibenevolence and omnipotence be simultaneous characteristics of God/god(s) in a world with evil and suffering?
- For Anselm and Aquinas, God/god(s) being perfect then means more than just being ethically perfect but it means being good at all possible activities for a divine being to perform - in this sense 'being good' is not an extra quality like 'being all-powerful' – it means the property of having the necessary characteristics to perform as God/god(s)
- God/god(s)'s sovereignty and human freedom
- God/god(s)'s omniscience as a challenge to immutability
- Alternatives to traditional views of God/god(s)'s omnipotence (e.g. deism, process theology).

12.   Evaluate the view that religious language is meaningless because it is not factual.   [25]

The search for meaning in language was the prominent goal of the Logical Positivists, sometimes known as the Vienna Circle, in the first half of the 20th century. The claim that religious language is meaningless stems from a position taken on how assertions are verified, reflecting the surge of confidence in the scientific method as the ultimate tool for describing reality. The work of the empiricists, especially Hume, provided the background for the investigation of language, especially where statements of belief derive their origin and how they might qualify as statements of fact. Hume's fork divided the two ways in which statements derived their verification concluding that propositions were either 'relations of ideas' or 'matters of fact'. If a proposition could not fit into either prong of this fork, then it would not count as meaningful. Religious language makes – at least superficially – statements about the world that can be known (cognitivism describes language that derives its factual status from outside the mind of the person making the proposition). The Vienna Circle outlined the principle of verification as the test for meaning in language. If a statement was not true by definition or empirically demonstrable, then it was meaningless. However, traditional views of religious language are that it is cognitivist and thus capable of being shown to be true or false. Hick attempts to provide a form of verification in the after-life, to enable religious language to be verified. Flew used the falsification principle to try to show religious language as meaningless. Some more recent thinkers account for religious language through a non-cognitivist approach that understands the proportions as coming from the mind of the believer expressing personal value albeit sounding as if it was describing facts about the world outside. In this way, religious language could be non-factual but meaningful.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:
- Hume's empiricism and the origin of ideas in experience
- Hume's fork – matters of fact and relations of ideas
- The Vienna Circle and the verification principle – a proposition is meaningful according to analytic truth or empirical confirmation
- Hick's eschatological verification
- Flew's falsification principle and Wisdom's parable of the gardener
- Responses by Swinburne, Mitchell and Hare to show religious language as meaningful
- Aquinas and religious language as analogy
- Tillich and religious language as symbolic
- Non-cognitivist approaches giving religious language meaning – see Wittgenstein's language games theory
- Religious language as equivocal, or analogical (e.g. the *via negativa*, Aquinas).

Optional theme 6: Philosophy of science

13. **Evaluate the claim that there is a clear difference between scientific and non-scientific theories.** **[25]**

This question is related most closely to the nature and methodologies part of the subject guide. It asks candidates about demarcation criteria for science but might also be used as a starting point for describing the scientific method. Popper demarcated science from non-science or pseudoscience using his falsification criterion. He claimed that a scientific theory is falsifiable, and that any theory which is not falsifiable cannot be called scientific. This has since been brought into question by, for example, Kuhn who holds that the sorts of observations that could falsify a theory are themselves theory laden. Alternative accounts differentiating science from non-science include viewing science as inductive, and evidence based. Or realist accounts of science where scientific theories are scientific if they work e.g. Putnam's "no miracles" argument where he argues that it would be a miracle if scientific theories were false, but still worked as well as they do.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:
- Demarcation criteria for science
- Inductive reasoning and the problem of induction e.g. Hume
- Falsification as a method of demarcating scientific theories e.g. Popper
- Kuhn's account of scientific progress in terms of paradigm shift
- Problems with falsificationism e.g. Van Fraassen and the underdetermination of theories by evidence
- Pseudoscience such as astrology
- Whether Marxism and Freudian psychoanalysis are scientific
- The work of the Vienna Circle to tie science to empiricism
- Realism and anti-realism e.g. Putnam, Lipton, Laudan
- Epistemological concepts e.g. knowledge as justified, true belief.

14. **Evaluate the claim that cognitive science can explain everything about the conscious mind.** [25]

This question relates to cognitive science, and the ability of cognitive science to grasp the mind. Candidates might start with the history of thought about the mind, for example with Cartesian substance dualism where the soul and body are distinct. This might be likened to a distinction between mind and brain. They may discuss the problem of consciousness, where knowledge of the brain does not shed light on consciousness. Candidates might discuss qualia, and the problem of deriving qualia from physical facts, for example the thought experiment 'What Mary Didn't Know', or Nagel's 'What is it like to be a Bat?'. Alternatively, candidates might consider whether everything needs to be explained by science, and whether the mind really exists if science cannot explain it. They might reason, alongside Ryle, that the concept of mind is a category error. Contemporary examples from cognitive sciences may be used as case studies and to illustrate ideas.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:
- The division between science and philosophy
- Cases where philosophical thought determines the value of scientific work
- What empirical sciences can tell us about the mind
- Substance dualism e.g. Descartes
- Physicalism e.g. Jackson
- The mind and personal identity
- The hard problem of consciousness e.g. Chalmers
- Qualia and whether they can be accounted for by physical facts
- Thought experiments e.g. What Mary did not know (Jackson), What is it like to be a bat? (Nagel), Blockhead (Block)
- The relationship between cognitive science and the possibility of AI
- The idea that 'mind' is a category error e.g. Ryle.

Optional theme 7: Political philosophy

15. **Explain and discuss the view that civil society is formed when a contract arises amongst people.** **[25]**

How civil society arises from human beings living together is a philosophical question associated with a particular tradition in western thought, although thinkers in the East have a long tradition of reflections on the organization of lives in the state. Theories of civil society arose in the work of early empiricists (Hobbes, Locke) and the early enlightenment work of Rousseau. Theories of the origins and purpose of a social contract vary. Hobbes proposed that a contract comes about when people accept government as a means to avoid personal destruction, which would be the case without such submission to rule. Where Hobbes feels a king or queen would provide the best mode of rule, Locke takes a view that the social contract comes about through consent to be governed, taking into account the wishes of the majority. Rousseau speaks of an idealized state of nature embodied in the picture of 'the noble savage'. However, individuals cannot realize their potential in lonely bliss. With a social contract, humans agree to preserve what is valuable in human freedom while adding a moral aspect, surrendering individual powers to the benefit of the whole community and the 'general will'. Modern views of civil society take into account cultural, economic, political, ethical, scientific, religious, and linguistic activity. Modes of rule of the society vary from monarchy to democracy, from meritocracy to dictatorship, but the social contract idea can be discussed about applying in different political settings.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:
- Consent to be governed
- Different versions of the social contract and what it achieves (e.g. Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau)
- Individual freedom and the social contract
- The general will and promoting general welfare
- Hume's criticism – no consent is ever given to a social contract by an individual – the analogy of being press-ganged to join a ship's crew and waking up to find the option to leave the ship (not agree to the social contract) is not there as the ship is at sea.
- See counter positions, e.g. Nozick
- Modes of government and sources of authority (e.g. Divine Right of monarchs, democracy, oligarchy, dictatorship).

16. Evaluate the view that social justice is an empty phrase without determinable content. **[25]**

This question involves a consideration of the notion of society, and, given the objections some thinkers raise to the very existence of an entity called 'society' – and how individuals interact – how social justice can be described or achieved. Hayek was a neo-liberal thinker who espoused the centrality of the needs and function of the individual above communitarian notions. One leading national politician during Hayek's time famously questioned the very existence of society, preferring to think about the core reality of the individuals whose living in a state had up to that time spawned the concept that together they formed an entity called society. In collapsing the notion of social justice, focus then turned to the needs of individuals, particularly in relation to realizing the most freedom for them. Justice must be sought between, and in relation to, individuals, not groups of individuals, and there must be no biases in the system to prefer one group against another. For Hayek, the arbiter of relations between individuals was the market and this enabled the greatest freedom possible in human affairs. Any intervention to bias certain groups would result in hampering that freedom. An alternative view was that held by Rawls who argued that there should be political and economic structures that allowed for greater social mobility, from a 'veil of ignorance' enabling the setting up of policy free from personal gain or bias. For Hayek, the market is not a moral agency, so notions of 'justice' should not be applied to how it operates. In contrast, perspectives from the left such as Marxism and socialism promote social justice through enshrining rights and duties within the state itself.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:
- What constitutes society? How far can the concept of society extend in incorporating the individuals of a state?
- Egalitarianism and its treatment by thinkers from the tradition of Rawls or Hayek and Nozick
- The veil of ignorance enabling unbiased distribution to help disadvantaged groups
- Private *vs* public ownership and the operation of free markets
- Justice as a moral feature of public life, and its relation to the market
- The distribution of benefits is a neutral function of human productivity and markets, and particular economic outcomes cannot be judged to be 'just' or 'unjust', for it has no ethical content
- See Plato's view on justice in the state
- Social justice as a feature of socialist states
- Marxism as an alternative response to social injustice.