

Markscheme

November 2024

Philosophy

Higher level and standard level

Paper 2

© International Baccalaureate Organization 2024

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 2024

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, 2024

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 then repeats the same text as part of 7(b)

Action:

Only give credit for the answer once (in the first part of the question). The assessment criteria should assess distinct skills when there are parts to a question so this problem should not occur.

Scenario 4. Candidate provides the wrong question number for their answer.

Example: Candidate states they are answering 7(a) and 7(b) but their response clearly talks about Nietzsche (Q9) rather than Mill's (Q7).

Action:

Mark the answer according to the mark scheme for the question that they should have indicated.

Exception – this only applies when there is no ambiguity as to which question the student has attempted, for example if they have rephrased the question in their opening paragraph. It is not the role of the examiner to identify which question is the best fit for their answer (*ie* which questions their answer would get most marks for). If the given question number is a plausible match with their answer then the student should be marked according to that question. Only in exceptional circumstances should this rule be applied to sub-questions (*ie* assuming the candidate had mistakenly swapped their answers for Q7(a) and Q7(b)).

How to use the Diploma Programme Philosophy markscheme

The assessment markbands constitute the formal tool for marking examination scripts, and in these assessment markbands examiners can see the skills being assessed in the examinations. The markschemes are designed to assist examiners in possible routes taken by candidates in terms of the content of their answers when demonstrating their skills of doing philosophy through their responses. The points listed are not compulsory points, and not necessarily the best possible points. They are a framework to help examiners contextualize the requirements of the question, and to facilitate the application of marks according to the assessment markbands listed on page 8 for part A responses, and page 9 for part B responses.

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

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

Note to examiners

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

Paper 2 part A markbands

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is little relevant knowledge of the specified idea/argument/concept from the text. • The explanation is minimal. • Philosophical vocabulary is not used, or is consistently used inappropriately.
3–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some knowledge of the specified idea/argument/concept from the text is demonstrated but this lacks accuracy, relevance and detail. • The explanation is basic and in need of development. • Philosophical vocabulary is not used, or is consistently used inappropriately.
5–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge of the specified idea/argument/concept from the text is mostly accurate and relevant, but lacking in detail. • There is a satisfactory explanation. • Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately.
7–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response contains accurate and relevant knowledge of the specified idea/argument/concept from the text. • The explanation is clear, although may be in need of further development. • Philosophical vocabulary is mostly used appropriately.
9–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response contains relevant, accurate and detailed knowledge of the specified idea/argument/concept from the text. • The explanation is clear and well developed. • There is appropriate use of philosophical vocabulary throughout the response.

Paper 2 part B markbands

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is little relevant knowledge of the text. • Philosophical vocabulary is not used, or is consistently used inappropriately. • The response is mostly descriptive with very little analysis. • There is no discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view.
4–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some knowledge of the text is demonstrated but this lacks accuracy and relevance. • Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately. • There is some limited analysis, but the response is more descriptive than analytical. • There is little discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view. • Some of the main points are justified.
7–9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge of the text is mostly accurate and relevant. • Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately. • The response contains analysis, but this analysis lacks development. • There is some discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view. • Many of the main points are justified.
10–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response contains accurate and relevant knowledge of the text. • Philosophical vocabulary is mostly used appropriately. • The response contains clear critical analysis. • There is discussion and some assessment of alternative interpretations or points of view. • Most of the main points are justified.
13–15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response contains relevant, accurate and detailed knowledge of the text. • There is appropriate use of philosophical vocabulary throughout the response. • The response contains clear and well developed critical analysis. • There is discussion and assessment of alternative interpretations or points of view. • All or nearly all of the main points are justified.

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

1. (a) **Explain de Beauvoir’s understanding of transcendence.** [10]
 (b) **Evaluate de Beauvoir’s understanding of transcendence.** [15]

This question invites an explanation of the idea of transcendence. It appears throughout *The Second Sex* and is used by de Beauvoir in the context of the development of the girl as well as the application to female adult activities. For man, transcendence is almost taken for granted. It is seen, essentially, as activity that is creative and fulfilling and are activities that go beyond the maintenance of life. For de Beauvoir most activities of a woman are described as immanence. These are activities that lack creativity and are seen by de Beauvoir as cooking, cleaning, and bureaucratic paperwork. These are the circumstances for the woman both in the workplace and in the home and, is for de Beauvoir, often a consequence of marriage. For de Beauvoir, transcendent activities give meaning to life; are creative, constructive and enlightening. They essentially give essence to existence. The restriction to immanent activities makes woman an object. Simone de Beauvoir could be said to be somewhat biased in her application of these terms and her understanding of work. However, she does acknowledge that transcendent activities can in themselves be boring and repetitive. The lack of transcendent activities means that the woman has lost her ability to take her own existence seriously, and to control and develop her own future.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The relationship between transcendence and immanence in terms of male and female roles
- How the woman might build her own essence
- The nature of ‘bad faith’ and the need to break conditioned self-perceptions
- The need for freedom of action within the female adult life
- Productivity and creativity as drivers toward selfhood
- The role and effects of marriage
- Educational opportunities
- Cross-cultural issues that restrict the action of the woman eg marriage, religion and legislative systems
- Challenges to perceived narcissism of the woman and whether it could be a route to objectification
- The role of the media and stereotyping
- The psychological need for purpose in life with the possible consequences for female mental health.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The degree to which transcendence and immanence are separate ideas, but activity-related
- The relationship of ‘bad faith’ to transcendence and immanence - the effect of limiting the happiness of a woman
- The ‘nameless terror’ of the housewife and reference to Betty Friedan and her idea of limiting freedom by being unable to ‘exist seriously’
- Whether de Beauvoir’s idea of freedom assumes that the woman should want to be free. Is this a moral dilemma?
- Ways of striving for liberation; economic factors such as pay or educational opportunities
- Sexuality and femininity and the relationship to selfhood
- Sartre’s view on transcendence and facticity; the inability of the woman, in present society, to be dynamic and redefine herself
- Challenges to Husserl’s view that the woman, unable to define her consciousness, remains an object
- Technological changes that effect the role of woman and maternity.

2. (a) **Explain how de Beauvoir uses reciprocity as a vehicle for change.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate how de Beauvoir uses reciprocity as a vehicle for change.** [15]

This question seeks an explanation of the idea of reciprocity that can be used to develop change. This change would be transforming the woman from an object to a subject. It is removing the woman from being ‘the other’. The action of the male can create opportunities for the woman to have both voice and agency. It is a societal change that would allow woman to become less oppressed, and rather, to become free. However, it is also linked to the psychological state within a woman; firstly, of being aware that they are oppressed, and then consciously desiring to be free. Central to de Beauvoir’s argument is the idea that the woman has to experience a change of consciousness, and this can be encouraged by both direct actions of the male, and fundamental societal changes that diminish the masculinity of society as a whole. For de Beauvoir there needs to be a fundamental and positive shift of power so that all recognize the equality of consciousness of ‘the other’. This inability to give up power over ‘the other’ can also be seen in the treatment of non-gender issues such as race and ethnicity. This is well-seated in the cultural environment, and is often openly denied. It is this denial that is often linked to societal pressure for woman to exaggerate their sexuality; this explains why the little girl is “occupied with the mysteries of sexuality” - and motherhood. A move to freedom through reciprocity will create a society of equals and not one where there exists the “slavery of half of humanity” (pg. 740).

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Reciprocity and mutuality
- Female inferiority in the workplace; pay, equality of opportunity, ‘glass ceilings’
- Parallels between the treatment of women as ‘the other’ compared to ethnic and racial minorities
- How woman might transform their consciousness and challenge all oppression
- How gender role can be reversed in some cultures
- Simone de Beauvoir’s philosophy of consciousness or her phenomenology of oppression
- Power/domination in gender relationships
- Femininity and sexuality awareness; girls’ education, maternity, motherhood
- Social conditioning across a variety of cultures and the role of education and religion
- Ingrained subservience within the woman’s psyche controlling her values and actions “she will miss her womanly destiny” (pg. 391)
- Changing perceptions on marriage and property.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Simone de Beauvoir’s struggle with male perceptions of the world
- The impact of other change factors such as technology and conflict issues in society impacting the role of the woman
- The role of the media in circulating stereotypical images of the woman
- Power dynamics in society; property, money, access to knowledge
- Asymmetric attitudes to sex, limiting reciprocity
- Transcendence and immanence
- The nature of maternalistic communities, either disguised as paternalistic ones or actual ones, and the role of the matriarch
- Sexual power within male dominant communities; abuse of women
- The power of the woman behind the man
- The existence of ‘love’ in a relationship defining mutuality.

René Descartes: *Meditations*

3. (a) **Explain how the claim “I am, I exist” leads to an understanding that I am a thinking thing.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate how the claim “I am, I exist” leads to an understanding that I am a thinking thing.** [15]

This question asks for an explanation and evaluation of arguments developed by Descartes in the Second Meditation. His views are also relevant to elements of the arguments for the existence of God in the Third and Fifth Meditation and arguments for the real distinction between mind and body in the Fourth and Sixth Meditations. The general argument follows upon the three phases of Descartes’s method of hyperbolic doubt — senses, dreaming and the “malicious demon” hypothesis. The arguments of the Second Meditation open with a re-examination of what Descartes previously held to be true about body and soul and the attributes of both. The possibility of a “malicious demon” who deceives me about everything, puts all of this presumed knowledge into radical and universal doubt. However, Descartes arrives at the conclusion that when he considers thought (thinking) he finds something that is certain and cannot be stripped from him. This conclusion is neither dependent on the senses nor upon the imagination. Descartes further concludes that the “I” that necessarily exists is a thinking thing (*res cogitans*) which doubts, understands, affirms, denies, wills and also imagines and perceives. Of these three faculties, thinking defines precisely and indubitably what I am and how I am. A reconsideration of all perceptions, sense-based experiences and imagination proves to me all the better the nature of my necessary existence as a thinking thing. Descartes reaches the conclusion that bodies are neither perceived by the senses nor the imagination. Rather, they are known by the intellect alone insofar as they are understood. Therefore, I know my mind better than anything else.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Descartes’s use and application of the method of hyperbolic doubt
- The impact of the “malicious demon” hypothesis on eliminating any question of sense experiences, information drawn from dreaming and the truths of Mathematics and Geometry
- The affirmation of the necessary truth “I am, I exist” provides me with the firm foundation to re-examine all previous knowledge of body and soul which I previously assumed to be true
- The soul as something in the body accounting for movement, growth, reproduction, digestion and senses; eliminating the body consequently eliminates the soul as something in a body
- The knowledge that “I am, I exist” does not initially yield knowledge of what I am or how I exist. However, it is clear that doubting, thinking and understanding define my existence as a thinking thing (*res cogitans*) which understands, affirms, denies, wills, senses and imagines
- Of all these faculties and activities, thinking is the activity that indicates what I am
- The attributes of the body do not define the mind
- The essence of the mind is thinking; the essence of the body is to be extended with shape and size.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- How effective is the method of hyperbolic doubt in arriving at the knowledge that “I am, I exist”?
- Does the knowledge that “I am, I exist” actually says something of what I am and not just that I am?
- How convincing is the notion of a disembodied mind? Compare with the non-dualistic views of philosophers such as, *eg* Spinoza, C. S. Pierce, James, Dewey
- Could I exist solely as mind without supposing the existence of physical objects?
- How convincing is Descartes’s view that the soul is something that exists in the body and that the elimination of the existence of a body entails the elimination of the soul?
- In coming to the knowledge of what I am does Descartes exhaustively identify all possible qualities or faculties?
- How convincing is Descartes claim that thought or thinking provides me with the complete answer to ‘what I am’? *Eg* consider the alternate positions of philosophers such as Hume or Locke

- Does Descartes involve himself in a circular argument when he utilizes reason after subjecting reasoning to radical doubt?
- How certain can Descartes be in claiming that the necessary truth of the proposition “I am, I exist” will yield indubitable knowledge of ‘what I am’?

4. (a) Explain Descartes’s account of the cause of error. [10]
- (b) Evaluate Descartes’s account of the cause of error. [15]

This question asks for an explanation and evaluation of Descartes’s treatment of the cause of error in the Fourth Meditation. Descartes begins his treatment by reviewing several of the main conclusions of the Second and Third Meditations, and then explores other issues including his knowledge that God does not and cannot deceive, a point that is essential in his treatment of the cause of error. He further observes that God has endowed him with the faculty of judging which, if used correctly, will not lead to error. As error cannot be dependent upon a perfect God who does not deceive, it must be accounted for by two distinct things — the faculty of acquiring knowledge and the faculty of free will. Descartes argues that the faculty of understanding can be limited while the operation of the will is not determined. Therefore, since the range of the will is greater than that of the intellect, it can extend itself to matters which I do not clearly and distinctly understand. Error cannot arise from the intellect alone especially since the intellect and the understanding do not judge or make choices. The cause of error is identified as the incorrect use by me of free will unrestrained by the limits of the intellect. In short, I am acting correctly whenever I am unable to clearly and distinctly perceive where truth is found and I refrain from making a judgement and subsequent choice on the possibilities. But if I freely affirm or deny amongst possible choices without clear and distinct knowledge, then I am acting incorrectly and can freely choose what is false and pass into error.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The nature of the human mind as a thinking thing (*res cogitans*)
- The existence of a perfect God as a being who does not and cannot deceive and has given me the faculties of understanding, judging and willing
- The “malicious demon” hypothesis as a cause of error
- Attention to God and the correct use of my God-given faculties would seem to mean that I can never be mistaken; attention to myself shows that I am an imperfect being prone to innumerable errors
- A consideration of the case of error requires an examination of the faculty of acquiring knowledge and the faculty of free will
- Error cannot arise from the intellect or understanding alone when used correctly, eg the wax example
- The operation of the will as wide-ranging and not determined; error as a deficiency in my own use of the faculty of judging and willing as the will can extend to matters that I do not understand clearly and distinctly
- Error emerges from an incorrect use of free will unrestrained within the limits of my limited understanding; error cannot arise from God nor from the God-given faculties of understanding and willing. It can only arise from my own incorrect use of these faculties

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Do the conclusions which Descartes arrives at in the first three Meditations justify the argument he creates in the Fourth Meditation regarding the cause of error?
- Why is Descartes convinced that God is not a deceiver and can never be the source of error, eg comparison with views of Augustine, Anselm, Aquinas
- Does Descartes’s view that the faculties of understanding, judging and willing are God-given entail that, when used correctly, they are not the cause of error, eg compare with Francis Bacon’s explanation of the causes of error in human reasoning (Bacon’s “Four Idols”)
- Even when the God-given faculties are used correctly does this mean I will never be mistaken?
- How convincing is Descartes’s view that when I do not clearly and distinctly perceive where the truth lies and, because of that, I freely refrain from passing judgement I will not fall into error?
- Why is Descartes convinced that error cannot arise from the intellect alone since the intellect *per se* does not judge or will?
- Does Descartes’s explanation of the cause of error as arising from a consideration solely of the operations of the understanding and of the will fail to take into account other factors that could

come into play, eg the views of Hume and Malebranche on erroneous views of causation proceeding from sense perception; the view of Baruch Spinoza that sense perception leads us to a belief which is occasionally erroneous

- Does Descartes's view that we should only act on what is clearly and distinctly known to be true actually restrict our free will in detrimental ways?

David Hume: *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*

5. (a) **Explain Hume’s critique of the cosmological argument for the existence and nature of God.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate Hume’s critique of the cosmological argument for the existence and nature of God.** [15]

This question invites an explanation of the argument presented through the character Demea. Demea essentially takes the stance of arguing that God is revealed to humans and that all ideas of God are founded in faith. Demea claims that his argument is an “infallible *a priori* demonstration” and is akin to the arguments put forward by Aquinas. All things have a cause and the ultimate causal being is God. However, Hume uses the voice of Cleanthes to counter this position, in that there is no necessary reason to assume a “necessary being” exists, and as such this claim seems to undermine the cosmological argument at its root, and could be an oxymoron. Demea’s defence is that God’s/gods’ existence is unchallengeable. There might be mention of Hume’s fork that opens the idea that reason deals with either relationships of ideas or matters of fact (two positions, one intuitive and the other experiential). God’s existence then becomes self-evident by expression of the fact. Demea’s position is on one level unquestionable as it is based on faith. Hume is claiming that cause and effect, in a chain in themselves, justify each other and therefore offer no proof of God or God’s attributes. This might explain how at the end of the dialogue as much as he questions institutionalized religions, Hume, for practical reasons, accepts the existence of a god. Mention might be made of Descartes and his use of intuition to prove God’s existence: our thinking about God must mean that God exists as God causes the thought. God’s existence is beyond science and reason.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The cosmological argument for the existence of God
- Alternative proofs of God to counter the cosmological – the ontological and teleological proofs
- Hume’s fork and the application of reason to a metaphysical situation
- Aquinas’s argument and the issue of the final cause of all causes
- The role of dogma in institutionalized religion and its use of blind faith
- The resolution - or not - of the problem of suffering and evil with the attributes of God
- Demea’s claim that the mind of God cannot be comprehended by humans
- A skeptic’s position on religion in general
- The attributes of God.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Classical medieval arguments for the existence of God; St Augustine, Aquinas and Anselm- psychological proof, the consensual way, and the problem of human free will
- God is the simplest essence and Swinburne’s defense against Dawkins
- The issue of reason and religion
- The nature of belief and human rationality
- The essence of God argument
- The skeptics view of belief
- The existence of a devil and metaphysical conflict; the place of temptation
- The psychological need for God or a god
- Marxist views on the societal influence of religious belief
- Science and religion.

6. (a) **Explain Hume’s claim that religious belief needs to be supported by experiential evidence.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate Hume’s claim that religious belief needs to be supported by experiential evidence.** [15]

This question seeks an explanation of how Hume uses the discussions between his dialogic characters to explore possible justification for religious belief, and an empiricist approach to the issues of belief. What might be explained is how each of the characters present different perspectives on the nature of religion and the nature of God. The position of Demea, who rests essentially on faith can be presented and challenged by the skeptical position of Philo, and the teleological position of Cleanthes. Cleanthes’s position, sometimes seen as Hume’s personal position, is the one that presents possible experiential evidence, and draws heavily on the use of analogy to explain the nature of God, and God’s relationship to the existence of the universe. Challenges might be raised as to the dependence on analogies and the questioning of the empirical evidence that is put forward. Investigation might be made into the position of experiential evidence and its link to human perception of the nature of God: is confirmation bias playing a part? The reflections of Pamphilus might be used to show that Hume’s position is one shared by empiricists, but necessarily tempered so as not to isolate Hume from the political and cultural ideas of his time. Candidates may explore the technique of dialogue to disguise extreme views.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The teleological argument for the existence of God
- The nature of God; the three classical traits of omnipotence, omniscience and omnipresence
- The issues surrounding contradictory evidence concerning the nature of God; the existence of Good and Evil
- The moral dilemmas that surround arguments concerning the nature of God
- The skeptical challenges of Philo
- The fideism of Demea
- The associated problems with the use of analogies to explore issues with examples of the clock maker
- The relationship of reason and belief.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The relationship of human free will and reason to spirituality
- The role of suffering in a world possibly created by a perfect God
- The theist position of Hume compared to contemporary and modern deists
- The use of the dialogue form and its value and disadvantages; comparisons might be made to Plato or Cicero
- Skepticism and its challenge to a teleological approach to religion
- The interaction of science and religion
- Judgments on Hume’s personal views; atheistic, agnostic or deist
- The nature of revealed religion
- The “obscurity and uncertainty” of religion, putting it beyond the reach of reason
- Cross cultural perspectives on the evidential basis for a god
- The strengths and weakness of the use of analogies to illuminate metaphysical ideas.

John Stuart Mill: *On Liberty*

7. (a) **Explain Mill’s view that, however true an opinion may be, if it is not fully discussed, it will be held as a dead dogma.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate Mill’s view that, however true an opinion may be, if it is not fully discussed, it will be held as a dead dogma.** [15]

This question asks for an explanation and evaluation of what Mill describes in Chapter 2 as “dead dogma”. Mill’s position rests upon several key principles. First, there can be no justification for silencing the opinion of even one person whose views go against commonly held opinions and beliefs. Second, if an opinion is true, silencing discussion of that opinion will remove the chance of exchanging error for truth. Third, if the opinion is false, silencing discussion will remove chances of gaining a clear perception of truth when error clashes with truth. Mill’s notion of “dead dogma” is particularly applicable in a consideration of true opinions and beliefs which are not freely and openly discussed. Mill argues that there are those who have little or no knowledge of the grounds of an opinion, are unable to construct any sort of defense of it, and believe that there is no benefit from discussion and debate of the opinion. However, when we consider beliefs believed to be significant, people ought to believe correctly and construct arguments in support of the beliefs. In instances in which beliefs clash, free and open discussion about them will help people arrive at the truth. “Dead dogma” can be confronted and avoided only when all objections have been dealt with in a reasonably satisfactory manner. With the elimination of the rational discussion of the grounds of opinions and alternate views, the meaning of these opinions and alternate views is forgotten and “dead dogma” emerges. As Mill observes: “instead of a vivid conception and a living belief, there remain only a few phrases retained by rote [...] the finer essence being lost”. Mill closes his discussion of “dead dogma” and the necessity of the possibility of rational discussion asking whether there will inevitably be an increase in the number of dogmas that are no longer disputed or doubted.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The nature of true and false opinions and the dynamics of the conflict between true and false opinions
- The environment of challenging, questioning and discussing all beliefs and ideas develops the faculties required for personal and societal progress
- True ideas and opinions remain vital and vibrant only to the extent that they can be confronted by conflicting ideas, be they true or false, eg Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights on the right to hold opinions and the right to express them freely
- Debate and free discussion might have negative consequences, eg the views of Brian Leiter
- The essential nature of “dead dogma” as the prevalence of uncontested beliefs
- “Dead dogma” as a threat to the material, moral and intellectual development of the individual and of society
- “Dead dogma” as representative of the clash between rational, critical discussion of beliefs and the tendency to uncritically hold on to beliefs without rational justification
- “Dead dogma” as a belief or opinion which has become rigid and inflexible, no longer retains its original meaning and can be applied indiscriminately.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Does “dead dogma” inevitably lead to imitation and conformity in belief and action?
- In what ways can “dead dogma” be effectively combatted?
- Is it always the case that uncontested knowledge deteriorates into “dead dogma”?
- Is there a point at which unanimity of opinion can be reached regarding a belief or opinion and further discussion is no longer required?
- Are there any cases in which the silencing of discussion and debate is justified, eg the views of Brian Leiter on the negative consequences of debate and discussion
- What are the differences between “dead dogma” and the consolidation of true opinions?
- How does the notion of infallibility support the development of a “dead dogma”?

- “Dead dogma” as a threat leads to diversity in thought, action and styles of living, eg the views of Henry Hetherington and Julian Harney on free speech and discussion leading to the development of solidarity and social cohesion; the phenomenon of “ghosting” in social media contexts
- Enlightenment views (Voltaire and Condorcet) on the emergence of a trend to free rational discussion and the breaking of the chains of authoritarian structures of restraint (religion and political structures).

8. (a) **Explain Mill’s application of the “harm principle” to issues he believed to be of concern in his contemporary society.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate Mill’s application of the “harm principle” to issues he believed to be of concern in his contemporary society.** [15]

This question focuses on ideas developed in Chapter 5 of the essay and asks for an explanation and evaluation of Mill’s application of two central principles developed in his essay to specific issues of his contemporary society. Mill states that he is not interested in developing detailed descriptions of how these principles can be applied. Rather, he is setting out examples of how these principles might be applied in order to achieve clarity on the meaning of two principles. These two principles, set against the backdrop of his general views on freedom and liberty, are that an individual is not accountable to society for his or her actions insofar as they concern only him or herself and, secondly, that an individual is accountable to society for actions that could cause harm or injury to others. Mill explores the examples of free trade, the sale of poisons, the prevention of crime, drunkenness, contracts established between parties, distribution of goods for sale, slavery, parental obligations, the education of children and the need for state-mandated education for all citizens. In all cases, Mill attempts to set these examples into the context of the interplay between the rights and freedoms of individuals acting in their own interests and the impact of individual actions on the rights and freedoms of others. Additionally, the questions of the possibility of and the limitations on state interference are addressed.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The harm principle and the related principles of liberty and freedom are essential for personal and interpersonal behaviour and action and must be protected from unjustified interference or infringement
- Free trade and cases of admissible pain to others as opposed to cases that require state intervention (fraud, workplace safety, import/export of illegal goods)
- Sale of poisons and preventative intervention by police or government to prevent crime, accident or harm to others
- Drunkenness - harm to self and harm to others
- Violation of good manners and offences against public decency can legitimately be prohibited
- Cases that require governmental intervention that find themselves between the principle of individual liberty and the principle of harm to others as in the case of gambling houses and brothels
- The principle of liberty void in cases of voluntary or involuntary slavery
- In the case of the education of children, the state is free to legislate and mandate.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- How effective is Mill’s applications of the two principles of self-regarding and other-regarding actions to the cases he considers as illustrative examples
- Does free trade, as a fundamentally social act, inevitably involve situations that are harmful to trade partners, eg Adam Smith’s views on the benefits of free trade?
- Is it the best practice to allow trade partners to manage all matters without any government interference?
- How can the ‘preventive function’ of government serve the best interests of the principle of freedom?
- What measures could realistically be taken to avoid crime and accident without impinging upon the principle of liberty, eg Cesare Beccaria on advantages of preventative measures; views of Plato, Aquinas, Augustine and Kant on crime prevention and punishment systems
- Does the government have a duty to control certain substances and certain activities without a consideration of an individual’s free choice to avail him or herself of those substances and activities, eg Pickard on understanding addiction with a view to constructive treatment
- What are the rights of the parents over their children; what are the rights of children, eg Aristotle’s view of children as the property of the parents; Feinberg’s view that children have the right to an “open future”

- To what extent should a government mandate the elements of an educational programme for its citizens, eg Dworkin's view that the right to an education should be enshrined as a moral right in any society?
- Relevance of Mill's examples as illustrations of why the state should, in all circumstances, limit interference in the exercise of the principle of liberty?
- Possible applications to current issues in contemporary society, eg immigration, refugee status, environmental issues, authoritarian regimes, dissemination of conspiracy theories.

Friedrich Nietzsche: *The Genealogy of Morals*

9. (a) **Explain the importance of the creditor-debtor relationship in Nietzsche's account of morality.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate the importance of the creditor-debtor relationship in Nietzsche's account of morality.** [15]

This question invites candidates to explain and evaluate the creditor-debtor relationship in Nietzsche's account of morality. In this account he traces back the concept of responsibility to its origins in the context of the primitive relationship between creditor and debtor. In the Second Essay he shows moments in the development of the concepts of responsibility and obligation. The first stage is related to the emergence of legal obligations, referring to individual contracts and the development of civil law. The second stage describes the emergence of religious obligations, and the third stage describes the rise of moral obligations. The contractual relationship between creditor and debtor "is as old as the idea of "legal subjects" and in turn points back to the fundamental forms of buying, selling, barter, trade, and traffic." (Second Essay, section 4). In this frame promises are made that sustains the social bond. Answers might challenge Nietzsche's views by counter-arguing that the relationship between buyer and seller, creditor and debtor is not a primitive social bond, exploring other views on the genesis of basic social ties, *eg* the family.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The strong economic tone entrenched in this idea of the creditor/debtor relationship
- The concept of costs and prices not in a monetary sense, but a morality one
- Guilt, duty and bad conscience as rooted in the creditor-debtor relationship
- The creditor-debtor relationship, promises and memory as a condition of making the human being uniform to some extent, regular and consequently predictable
- Breaking contracts and not keeping promises results in the wrath of the disappointed creditor
- Basic feelings associated to punishment, *eg* cruelty
- The creditor-debtor relationship as the origin of the oldest and most naive moral canon of justice
- God as omnipotent creditor.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Whether Nietzsche's view that morality is a development from the debtor-creditor relationship is convincing
- Nietzsche's idea that the human being is a kind of animal, and that it is far older than most historians of morality were inclined at the time to suppose
- Life and moral development: the essence of life is not self-preservation, but will to power
- Could there be other explanations for the development of morality?
- Different views on morality, *eg* virtue ethics, deontological approach, forms of hedonism
- How is debt related to slave and master morality?
- The idea that Nietzsche's account extends his analysis of the creditor-debtor relationship into the spheres of ancestor worship and religion (D. Conway)
- The extent to which Nietzsche's account of the past is actually projection backwards.

10. (a) Explain Nietzsche’s claims about God(s) and atheism. [10]

(b) Evaluate Nietzsche’s claims about God(s) and atheism. [15]

The question elicits an exploration into Nietzsche’s claims about God(s) and atheism. The text offers different facets to be considered. Nietzsche suggests that “In order to rid the world of concealed, undiscovered, unseen suffering and deny it in all honesty, people were then practically obliged to invent gods” (Second Essay, section 20). He claims that the Christian God is “the maximum god attained so far,” and that it was “accompanied by the maximum feeling of guilty indebtedness on earth” (Second Essay, section 20). It further points out that “the complete and definitive victory of atheism might free mankind of this whole feeling of guilty indebtedness toward its origin, its *causa prima*.” (Second Essay, section 20). It also offers an opportunity to explain and discuss the central concepts of God, belief in God or gods, and atheism. Nietzsche thinks that mankind has gradually entered upon the reverse course of the dominance of the belief in God, which is clearly in connection with the idea of the death of God. However, while the victory of atheism may liberate mankind from the feeling of indebtedness to the Christian God, it does not eradicate the feeling of guilt before God. Counter-arguments might be directed against Nietzsche’s view on religion and Christianity eg Nietzsche mainly, or only, sees the Christian faith as based on guilt, when it ostensibly is articulated by love.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Nietzsche’s suggestion that Christianity, its God, and its rules are irrelevant
- The decline in faith in the Christian God should produce a considerable decline in human consciousness of debt
- Atheism might involve a second innocence, an erasure of the feeling of indebtedness because humans would no longer believe in the creditor, God
- The idea that Atheism is not a genuine “counter ideal” to the ascetic ideal
- “Innocence” (*Unschuld*) and the contrasting concept of *Schuld* that can be rendered both as “debt” and “guilt”
- Moralization of the concept of “debt” turning it into “guilt”
- Guilt, bad conscience and their entanglement with the belief in God
- The rise of the Christian God completes the transformation of the concept of debt into the concept of guilt.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Transformation and Nietzsche’s view on God
- Atheism “as an event” - a cultural event designated by Nietzsche with the expression, “God is dead” (The Gay Science, section 125; Thus Spoke Zarathustra, Prologue, section 2)
- Can atheism only eliminate the feeling of “indebtedness” (not guilt) towards God/god(s)
- Critique of Nietzsche’s understanding of Buddhism and Christianity as nihilistic religions, religions of decadence
- Discussion of Nietzsche’s claim that ‘God is dead’
- Broader debates about atheism and God(s) eg the new atheist movement: Dennett, Hitchens, Dawkins and Harris
- Theistic responses to Nietzsche eg Augustine or Leibniz’s responses to the problem of evil and suffering; or the New Testament emphasis on love and loving one’s neighbour.

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

11. (a) **Explain Nussbaum’s reasons why the Capabilities Approach differs from utilitarianism.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate Nussbaum’s reasons why the Capabilities Approach differs from utilitarianism.** [15]

The question stems from Chapter 4, where Nussbaum discusses utilitarianism and, particularly, welfarism. The question invites an exploration of Nussbaum’s arguments in favour of the distinction between the Capabilities Approach and utilitarianism. Candidates might consider both the ‘simple’ forms of utilitarianism and the more sophisticated forms: Nussbaum refers to Harsanyi, Brandt, and Hampton. Candidates might consider Harsanyi’s claim that certain preferences might be “sadistic or malicious” (pg. 82), Brandt’s standpoint on autonomy and authority, or Hampton’s, who highlights preferences in women’s abusive or asymmetrical relationships. Nussbaum holds that these forms of utilitarianism fail to fully fall within welfarism, and candidates might discuss whether Nussbaum’s point is justified. Candidates might pinpoint the concept of desire and its relationship with personal development and human dignity. Finally, candidates might focus on other perspectives, *eg* Kantian ethics, and explain why Nussbaum criticizes it.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The Capabilities Approach and utilitarianism
- Different kinds of utilitarianism, *eg* rule, preference, act
- Nussbaum’s reference to Harsanyi, Brandt, Hampton
- Nussbaum’s Capabilities Approach and her list of the central human capabilities
- Nussbaum’s Capabilities Approach as being egalitarian in nature
- Utilitarianism and welfarism
- The overlap between Nussbaum’s Capabilities Approach and Welfarism
- Nussbaum’s criticism on Kant.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Whether the Capabilities Approach differs from utilitarianism in any form
- Whether rule or preference utilitarianism offer a closer view to the Capabilities Approach
- Whether more sophisticated forms of utilitarianism fail to fall within welfarism, *eg* Harsanyi, Brandt, Hampton
- Whether Nussbaum’s formulation of the capabilities approach allows for multiple realizability’
- The importance of desire for personal development
- Merits of utilitarianism in focusing on people’s personal preferences
- Limits of formalism and anti-utilitarian approaches, *eg* Kant, virtue ethics
- Other possible criticism on Kantian perspective, *eg* Scheler.

12. (a) **Explain the claim that endorsement of the international human rights movement is not a subordination of non-Western cultures to a Western ideology.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate the claim that endorsement of the international human rights movement is not a subordination of non-Western cultures to a Western ideology.** [15]

The question stems from Chapter 5, where Nussbaum discusses “Cultural Diversity”. Candidates might consider Nussbaum’s view on the Western origin of the human rights movement and analyse Nussbaum’s arguments against any possible idea of subordination of non-Western cultures to a Western ideology. Candidates might refer to Nussbaum’s examples of major cultural movements which “had specific origins in a given place and time but spread widely beyond their original location” (pg. 102), *eg* Marxism, Christianity, Islam, Buddhism. Moreover, candidates might challenge the concept of “imperialism” and discuss Nussbaum’s reference to Sen, who has shown that “the constituent elements of the idea of human rights exist both in Indian and Chinese traditions” (pg. 103). Hence, the human rights movement has little to do with colonialism and “Western values”: not only did the colonizing countries not show any interest in the human rights of the colonized people, but in some cases the defence of human rights was a way for the colonized people to resist to the colonizers, as in the case of Gandhi. Finally, candidates might highlight the importance of the concept of minorities and the relationship between the capabilities and cultural pluralism.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Nussbaum’s argument on the possible Western origin of the human rights movement
- Nussbaum’s examples of major cultural movements, *eg* Marxism, Christianity, Islam, Buddhism
- Nussbaum’s view on cultural imperialism
- Nussbaum’s reference to Sen’s view on human rights in Indian and Chinese traditions
- Nussbaum’s view on colonialism
- Nussbaum’s view on cultural pluralism.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Whether the human rights movement is Western in origin
- Whether it is possible to find constituent elements of human rights in other cultures and traditions, *eg* Sen’s view on India and China
- Whether cultural imperialism is more a myth rather than an issue
- Whether the current tendency to a “cancel culture” responds to a defence of cultural pluralism
- Other movements that foster pluralism, *eg* feminism, environmentalism, gender studies
- Human rights as a way to resist or struggle against colonizers, *eg* Gandhi
- Other views in terms of cultural values, *eg* communitarianism, paternalism
- Cultural values dependent upon social structures, *eg* Marx, the School of Frankfurt.

José Ortega y Gasset: *The Origin of Philosophy*

13. (a) Explain the role of religion in the origin of philosophy. [10]

(b) Evaluate the role of religion in the origin of philosophy. [15]

The question asks for an explanation and evaluation of the role of religion in Ortega y Gasset's account of the origin of philosophy. The examination of the religious attitude requires "to immerse ourselves in the preserved fragments of those early thinkers and, by gazing into the distance, try to discover the same horizon as it appeared to those writers" (pg. 78). This examination applies "vital reason" as method. It runs parallel to Dilthey's approach, that compares, connects, and contraposes the field of philosophy with religion and literature. To Ortega y Gasset, in this approach one thing is especially striking: religion, philosophy, and literature, vital functions of the human mind, appear as permanent possibilities in man. Various lines of counter-arguments might be developed questioning the historical accuracy of Ortega y Gasset's account of the origin of philosophy, eg the relation between religion and philosophy in Thales, Parmenides and Heraclitus.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Historicity as a constitutive element in the human being
- "Religion and "philosophy" have an equivocal meaning because it is uncertain whether they designate abstractions or real forms adapted by life
- The conceptual meaning of these nouns ought to be sufficiently vague and formal so that they may embrace the most diverse and even contrary aspects
- Religion, philosophy, and literature, vital functions of the human mind, as permanent possibilities in man
- Religion always implies transcendence, even in the least transcendent instance, as in Greece. Gods are ultra- or super-worldly powers
- The Homeric and pre-Homeric mythological tradition, the ancient popular gods and the gods of the city
- the Dionysian and Orphic mysteries
- The attitudes of Parmenides and Heraclitus regarding religion and their role in the origin of philosophy.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Religion and philosophy as possible ways of life
- The idea of reason and the origin of philosophy as opposed to religion. Does Ortega y Gasset's position show a simplistic view of their relation?
- The extent to which is it possible to reconstruct unified philosophical conceptions with the fragmentary legacy from Thales and Heraclitus
- Thales's assertion of gods as causes and the views of the world as animated by religious entities or resulting from natural causality
- The extent to which explaining the world by natural causes implies the abandonment of religious belief
- Philosophy as a methodical procedure for obtaining revelation (*aletheia*) in contrast to the gods' epiphany
- Views on the Greek religion and the origin of philosophy, eg W. Otto
- Religion, philosophy and science: aspects of their relations, conceptual and value orientated positions.

14. (a) Explain Ortega y Gasset’s assertion that “nothing truly human can be permanent”. [10]
- (b) Evaluate Ortega y Gasset’s assertion that “nothing truly human can be permanent”. [15]

The opposition between permanence and change is classically referred to by Parmenides and Heraclitus, which is the topic of Chapter 8. Explaining the assertion Ortega y Gasset says that “this does not mean that there is nothing constant in man. Otherwise, we could not talk about mankind, human life, the human being. In other words, man has an invariable structure which traverses all of his changes.” (p. 75). This structure consists of a system of abstract moments, which have to be integrated in each instance with variable determinants in order for the abstraction to be transformed into reality. Stating that man always lives from certain beliefs just enunciates “a truth that is a theorem pertaining to the Theory of Life, but that truth does not affirm anything real; rather it manifests its own unreality by leaving indeterminate the belief that he lives in every instance, and is like an algebraic formula, a constant appeal for us to fill in the empty places (*leere Stelle*).” (p. 76). The abstract structures are constant, but the human life, essentially historical, is concrete and diverse in its variable realization.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The opposition between permanence and change
- Gasset’s claim that “man has an invariable structure which traverses all of his changes”
- The nature of the mental soil in which Parmenides and Heraclitus developed their ideas and the origin of philosophy
- Parmenides: being and permanence
- Heraclitus’s respect of the mode of thinking initiated by Thales and the Ionian natural science
- The role of Orphism
- The cult to Dionysus and traditional mythology in Parmenides and Heraclitus, and the origin of philosophy
- Human life as possibility, its importance for the understanding of history.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Human experience: continuity, rupture, fragmentation, by chance connections?
- Are there contradictions in Ortega y Gasset’s initial claim that there are permanencies in humans?
- The degree to which viewing and analysing the past might fill the “empty spaces” when understanding human life
- Possibilities and limitations of the historical reason as methodology or approach to history
- Ortega y Gasset’s selection of the historical facts appears to be arbitrary to an extent
- The extent to which the categorical stages of a civilization are determined by the “modifications of the fundamental relation between the two great components of human life, man’s needs and his possibilities” (p. 96)
- The extent to which human life is essentially historical
- The extent to which philosophy is looking for permanence, eg various forms of Platonism.

Plato: *The Republic*, Books IV – IX

15. (a) Explain Plato’s view of education. [10]

(b) Evaluate Plato’s view of education. [15]

The first sentence of Book 7 introduces the Allegory of the Cave and shows the scope of Plato’s view of education. The cave is to be an allegory of “our nature as regards education (*paideia*) and lack of education” (514a). Our distance from fundamental truths could be illustrated in terms of mathematical education, but this is only the beginning. As Socrates presents it (504c ff.) the educational process should take the “longer way” that will perfect the guardian of the city, raising him to the status of a philosopher-king. In its external phases it divides into ten years of mathematics, five years of dialectic, and fifteen years of practical-political experience, all completed at about age fifty by the “vision” of the Good and the subsequent turn to the work of ruling. Socrates’s presentation of this “longer way” is at once the core philosophical idea of the *Republic* as a whole. Given the scope of the Platonic notion of *paideia*, answers might refer to the various issues which constitute Plato’s theory of knowledge. Answers might challenge Plato’s idea of education by means of counter-arguments based on what appears to some as an authoritarian or too rigid view.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Plato’s educational thought as found in his portrayal of the ideal society in *The Republic*
- The power to learn as present in everyone’s soul
- Outline of a curriculum to educate the guardians: arithmetic, plane and solid geometry, astronomy, and harmonics (522c–e, 525b–526c); two or three years of gymnastics (537b); synoptic study of all subjects (537b–c), from the ages of thirty to thirty-five, first introduction to dialectic (537c–d)
- Central to Plato’s educational idea: education about justice
- A crucial part of that the educational project: to develop an educational system that will produce philosophers with both practical and theoretical wisdom
- Education is necessary for all to be able to contribute in some way to the state
- The way the education programme separates pupils from familial contexts
- The Divided Line, the Cave, and the Sun.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The education of the philosopher as an educational model
- Scope and implications for the present of Plato’s educational idea
- To what extent should the education of the individual be determined by the needs of the state?
- The role of women, who are also to be educated to be of value to the state
- How can mathematics be a suitable framework for understanding or finding the truth on moral questions?
- How could the effectiveness of Plato’s educational idea be assessed?
- Positive aspects of Plato’s education: its inclusiveness, and that the pace of the programme is based on the intellectual and psychological maturity of the individual
- The extent to which creative activities/the arts are excluded in the overall educational process
- Comparison and contrast with other philosophical views eg Locke, Rousseau or Dewey
- Plato’s legacy in education, from the continuous presence of the Socratic “method” up to the multiple projections, eg Neo- Kantianism and P. Natorp
- Negative aspects: emphasis on elitism; individual needs are subordinated to those of the state.

16. (a) Explain Socrates’s view that the life of the just person is happier than that of the unjust. [10]
- (b) Evaluate Socrates’s view that the life of the just person is happier than that of the unjust. [15]

In Book IX (580a–c) Socrates presents the description of five cities and five corresponding character types. He develops an argument which concludes with the claim that: “the best and most just is the most happy, and that he is the one who is most kingly and rules like a king over himself” (580b). The philosopher-king is the happiest and most just of people, a timocrat second, an oligarch third, a democrat fourth, and a tyrant least happy and least just. Accordingly, the question opens the possibility of explaining and evaluating the deep connection between happiness and justice as it is interwoven into *The Republic’s* argument. The issue is discussed repeatedly from beginning to end, most distinctly in Books I, II, IV, IX and X. Socrates poses the choice between acting justly and acting unjustly, or a choice between leading a just or unjust life. The brief and practical answer is we are better and happier being just. Counter-arguments might be in relation to the alleged identification between virtue and happiness, virtue and knowledge, or opposing other views, eg hedonism.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The defective forms of ruling cities: timocracy, oligarchy, democracy, tyranny
- The partial theory of justice of Thrasymachus and the conception of justice for societies and human souls that Socrates advocates
- Socrates’ three arguments that demonstrate that a man who is just lives a happier and better life than an unjust man.
- The analogy between the state and the composition of the human soul
- The tripartite structure of the state and the human soul
- Knowledge of the form of the good as necessary for understanding the good of justice
- The soul that functions best by nature will also be the best-behaved
- The just soul is the happy soul.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The challenge to choose among kinds of justice and justify why a just life is happier
- A basic assumption in Plato’s theory of functional virtue and good: a virtue is a quality that enables something to function well, and that functioning well is an essential part of the good of the thing
- The extent to which Plato, similarly to Rawls, applies the concept of justice to many things: societies, persons, social and individual actions, laws, constitutions, perhaps even desires and intentions
- The idea that that justice can only be achieved in the state when rule is exercised by philosophers who know what true justice is
- How applicable is the analogy of the composition of the human being to the structure of the state?
- Is Socrates’s claim the just *versus* the unjust man by arguing comparisons and contrasts valid?
- Difficulties to know the form of the good and consequently to act in a way that is ruled by it
- The extent to which the achievement of justice needs equality between consenting members of society.

Peter Singer: *The Life You Can Save*

17. (a) Explain Singer’s rejection of moral relativism. [10]

(b) Evaluate Singer’s rejection of moral relativism. [15]

One common objection to giving raised by Singer is moral relativism. He points to a claim from a high school student that “there is no black and white universal code for everyone. It is better to accept that everyone has a different view on the issue, and all people are entitled to follow their own beliefs” (p.25). Singer holds that this attitude is wrong. He says “that is moral relativism, a position that many find attractive until they are faced with someone who is doing something really wrong” (p.25). Singer’s basic argument is designed to be objective, and its conclusions hold for all people, not just those who agree.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The validity of the basic argument
- The idea that relativism stops being appealing once faced with something wrong
- Examples of actions that seem universally wrong eg Singer’s example of hurting a cat
- Whether the claim that there is no black and white leads to relativism
- Singer’s account of what relativism is
- Personal circumstances and relativism
- Cultural relativism in comparison with moral relativism
- The example of the child in the pond and relativism.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The relationship between individuals’ circumstances and relativism
- Whether the basic argument is too black and white
- Singer’s view that giving is objectively good and his appeal to traditional views about poverty eg Christianity, Islam, Confucianism
- Moral relativism eg Harman, Prinz
- If relativism is rejected, then how are moral dilemmas to be solved?
- The source of moral imperatives eg divine command, Kantian rationality, Aristotelian virtues
- Utilitarianism and relativism eg Bentham and act utilitarianism and Mill and rule utilitarianism
- Preference utilitarianism and objectivity vs relativism.

18. (a) Explain the relationship between human nature and giving in Singer’s work. [10]
- (b) Evaluate the relationship between human nature and giving in Singer’s work. [15]

Chapters 4 and 5 of *The Life you can Save* come under the heading of ‘human nature’. Here, Singer first lists reasons why people do not give more, and then presents some ideas about how to create a culture of giving. In both cases, he draws on claims about human nature to diagnose the problem, and solve it. Singer initially cites a psychology study by Batson and Thompson showing that “there is a human tendency to favour our own interests” (p.45) but balances this by saying that “yet we often do kind and generous things” (p.46). Singer lists the identifiable victim effect, parochialism, futility, diffusion of responsibility, the sense of fairness, money, and psychology, evolution and ethics as aspects of human nature that stop people from giving. He then uses these parts of human nature to suggest ways of creating a culture of giving.

Candidates might explore (part A): The idea of human nature

- Singer’s claims about human nature
- The identifiable victim effect
- The psychology of giving
- Diffusion of responsibility
- Parochialism
- The role of futility
- Ethical considerations that stop people from giving
- How a study of human nature can be used to create a culture of giving.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Whether there is such a thing as a fixed human nature *eg* Sartre and existentialism
- Other accounts of human nature and what they tell us about giving *eg* Hobbes, Rousseau
- Moral relativism and objectivism in relation to human nature
- Evolutionary psychology and critiques of it *eg* Buller
- Hume’s fact-value dichotomy
- Whether Singer’s ideas about creating a culture of giving are manipulative
- Nature vs nurture *eg* Locke’s blank slate
- The role of morality and giving
- Whether Singer’s basic argument can overcome natural human tendencies
- The role of distance and the tendency to help others
- The example of the unnatural mother in Singer’s work.

Charles Taylor: *The Ethics of Authenticity*

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

The claim stems from Chapter 1, “Three Malaises”, where Taylor introduces the initial arguments of his view. The claim particularly refers to Taylor’s “first source of worry” (pg. 2), individualism. Candidates might discuss Taylor’s view on the ancient *versus* modern order: the parallel between a cosmic or divine order mirrored “the hierarchies of human society” (pg. 2). Responses might pinpoint Taylor’s balanced view: the ancient systems of values were the origin of a restriction of beliefs and, at the same time, the guarantee of stable meanings. Candidates might explore the concept of freedom and how it has changed, *eg* Constant’s view on the liberty of ancients and moderns, or Berlin’s and Bobbio’s distinction between positive and negative liberty. Candidates might present the diverse views on progress as a tendency to decadency, *eg* de Tocqueville, Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, or as new horizons of possibilities, *eg* Dewey.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The three malaises, particularly Taylor’s “first worry”: individualism
- Taylor’s claim that freedom came about from the discrediting of hierarchical orders
- Instrumental reason as a threat
- The concept of “order” and how it has changes from ancient to modern society
- Pros and cons of an order of values and beliefs
- Authenticity as a moral ideal
- Taylor’s view that technology contributes to the “flattening and narrowing” of our lives
- The concept of freedom and how it has changed with the weakening and questioning of ancient moral horizons.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The variants of individualism and the consequences of a slide to subjectivism; atomism, fragmentation
- Whether technology fosters the weakening and questioning of ancient orders of values and beliefs
- Whether human freedom calls for turning from cosmic or divine orders, *eg* Feuerbach
- Whether individualism is supported by economic initiative, *eg* Marx
- Whether individualism supports the democratic initiative, *eg* de Tocqueville, Mill, Ortega y Gasset
- The idea of progress as a tendency to decadence, *eg* de Tocqueville, Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, Bauman
- New orders and new horizons of possibilities, *eg* Dewey
- The different concept of liberty, *eg* Constant, Berlin, Bobbio.

20. (a) Explain the claim that individualism can result in the opposite condition of depending on new modes of conformity. [10]
- (b) Evaluate the claim that individualism can result in the opposite condition of depending on new modes of conformity. [15]

The claim stems from Chapter 2, “The inarticulate debate”, where Taylor presents his views on the effects of individualism and, particularly, of relativism. Candidates might consider what Taylor defines as “disenchantment” and an extensive weakening of ancient orders of values and beliefs: individualism in modern society has produced a narrowing of perspectives, which results in a wide disinterest in collective and general issues, up to apathy. Responses might discuss related issues, eg fragmentation and atomism, or central concepts in Taylor’s view, eg instrumental reason. Candidates might highlight the role that relativism plays in modern society, whose main value is self-fulfilment. Candidates might also mention the concepts of hedonism, narcissism, moral laxism. Responses might pinpoint that Taylor holds that it is important to distinguish between “what we happen to desire or need... and what we ought to desire” (p. 16). Finally, candidates might refer to the role that science and technology play in shaping individualism in terms of subjectivism, putting a necessary debate on authenticity in shade.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Taylor’s “first worry”: individualism
- Ancient *versus* modern orders: “disenchantment”
- Individualism and self-fulfilment as narrowing the individuals’ interests and perspectives; lack of participation, apathy
- The role of “instrumental reason”
- Taylor’s claim that social science research obscures the importance of authenticity
- Taylor’s stance that choice for the sake of choice is a deviant product because it is an inauthentic expression of the ideal
- Moral subjectivism
- The necessity of a debate on authenticity and the moral ideal behind it.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The origin of modern individualism in rationalism, eg Descartes, Bacon
- Whether science fosters an idolatry of efficiency and an approach to the result, or opposite views are viable, eg Dewey
- Whether individualism supports the democratic initiative, eg de Tocqueville, Mill, Dewey, Ortega y Gasset
- The concept of conformism in modern society, eg de Tocqueville’s tyranny of the majority, Ortega y Gasset’s revolt of the masses
- The meaning of technology in modern society, eg Heidegger, Gehlen, Ortega y Gasset
- Individualism as a source of alienation, eg the School of Frankfurt
- What is contradictory and self-defeating about the relativist appeal to the moral ideal of authenticity?
- Individualism as related to specific moral perspectives, eg relativism, laxism, hedonism.

Lao Tzu: *Tao Te Ching*

21. (a) Explain Lao Tzu's view that knowledge should be abandoned. [10]

(b) Evaluate Lao Tzu's view that knowledge should be abandoned. [15]

This question asks for an explanation and evaluation of the value of knowledge and education. The text deals with this question in sections 16, 18, 19, 20, 33, 48, 57, 58, 71 and 81. The text takes a somewhat negative view on the value of knowledge, learning and education. The abandonment of knowledge reflects the view that knowledge, active learning and education will distract from the pursuit of the *Tao*, and do not constitute the correct paths to enlightenment. As the *Tao* is fundamentally unknowable and cannot be named, knowledge can never penetrate the depths of the *Tao*. Knowledge will corrupt individuals and clutter their minds with useless information. Claiming to know the world and the consequent naming of things in the world do not constitute the authentic understanding of the essence of things. Knowledge and excessive learning are dangerous and distracting; only connection with the *Tao* empties the mind and leads to simplicity. Knowledge also distracts from *Wu Wei* which is more aligned with following the *Tao*. Lao Tzu believes that too much knowledge will also create problems for the ruler since people who know too much are difficult to rule. Their excessive knowledge might be false and lead to rebellion and revolution. Lao Tzu's position on knowledge and its value is summed up perfectly when he states: "to know yet to think that one does not know is best; not to know yet to think that one knows will lead to difficulty" (section 71).

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Knowledge as a useful; knowledge as detrimental
- Knowing the ways of the *Tao* as the only valuable knowledge
- Worldly knowledge and learning as obstacles to connection with the *Tao*
- *Wu wei* as the effective route to the abandonment of the search for knowledge and the true path to enlightenment
- False knowledge leading to unjustified interference with the natural order and leads to unpredictable and dangerous behaviour in private and public life
- Trusting in knowledge rather than not following the *Tao* leads to unfortunate errors and an interference with the natural order
- Knowledge as a corrupting element in the lives of the people, a source of pretentious behaviour and a threat to good government
- The uncarved block as the image of the pure, simple and serene mind uncluttered with useless information.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The utility or possibility of abandoning all knowledge, eg nihilism (Nietzsche), scepticism (Heraclitus, Xenophanes)
- Criteria for determining true from false knowledge, eg correspondence (Russell and Moore), coherence (Spinoza, Kant, Fichte, Hegel) and pragmatic (Pierce, Dewey) theories of truth
- Does knowledge always detract from authentic living, eg Heidegger, authenticity and knowledge of the fact of death
- The limitations of knowledge in appreciating the essence of things, eg Descartes, Hume, Nietzsche
- Possible relationships of knowledge to the *Tao*, eg similarities with Confucius's views
- *Wu wei* rather than knowledge as an effective approach to understanding the natural order of all things
- Does the acquisition of knowledge lead to an endless cycle of desiring more and more knowledge?
- Knowing that one does not know as a Socratic perspective
- Not knowing and connections with solipsism and nihilism, eg Gorgias, Descartes, Berkeley
- If you abandon knowledge, do you also need to abandon analysis, evaluation and application?
- Knowledge as an obstacle to good government; harmony in society requires an uneducated citizenry.

22. (a) Explain the claim that “the Tao never acts, yet nothing is left undone”. [10]
- (b) Evaluate the claim that “the Tao never acts, yet nothing is left undone”. [15]

This question asks for an explanation and evaluation of the notion of *wu wei* or “no action”. The text focuses on several of the outstanding characteristics of *Wu Wei* in sections 2, 3, 11, 29, 37, 38, 43, 47, 48, 63 and 64. *Wu wei* is variously referred to as “no-action”, “non-action”, “effortless action”, and “acting with non-action”. Lao Tzu teaches that the *Tao* generates and regenerates the entire universe. This universe unfolds and evolves effortlessly and spontaneously without effort or force. *Wu wei* aligns us with that dynamic process. When we take the route of *wu wei*, we paradoxically act in accordance with the *Tao* and, therefore, we act in perfect accordance with a universal normative standard which permeates the natural order of all things that exist. Committing to the path of *wu wei* or “no action” allows us to act without a sense of self, conditions, or preferences. It is acting without excessive effort, forethought or desire. Through *wu wei* we enter into a state of enlightenment and a mode of living which is serene and tranquil, a mode of behaviour that is characterized by unburdened activity. *Wu wei* or “no-action” does not indicate complete and pointless inactivity. It is acting purposefully and cautiously in accordance with the *Tao*. *Wu wei* allows the *Tao* to act and when the *Tao* acts, all things get done and nothing is left undone. *Wu wei* also has political implications with regard to the character of the good ruler and the qualities of good government.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The notion of *wu wei* along with some of its central characteristics; when nothing is done nothing is left undone
- Through *wu wei* we enter into a state of enlightenment and a mode of living
- The *Tao* as the origin of the universe and as its principle of generation and regeneration
- The images of water and the uncarved block as metaphors for “no action”
- The sage acts by doing nothing; acting without action assures that order will prevail in all things
- Taking no action avoids excess, extremes, pretension and extravagance and brings the mind into a seamless unity unburdened by distracting factors
- The *Tao* takes no action but, nevertheless, all things get done
- No action guarantees that all things will be settled naturally and by their own accord.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Under what circumstances can action be combined with “no action”?
- Does the principle of “no action” resemble the principles of Stoicism (eg Marcus Aurelius, Zeno of Citium) or Asceticism (eg Nietzsche, Pythagoras)
- Contemporary scientific views of the evolution of the universe and the principle of “no action”, eg Edward Lorenz, James Gleick and chaos theory
- “Doing that which consists in taking no action” and environmental issues, eg action against the use of fossil fuels
- Penetrating the paradox of the view that when nothing is done nothing is left undone?
- “No action” as a way of life characterized by enlightenment and tranquility, eg Zen Buddhism, mysticism in major world religions
- The unknowability of the *Tao* and aligning ourselves with the principles of the *Tao*
- *Wu Wei* as self-knowledge and self-awareness
- Conditions under which it might be advisable to interfere with the unfolding of the natural course of events – examples from medical ethics or business ethics?

Zhuangzi: *Zhuangzi*

23. (a) Explain Zhuangzi's idea of transformation or change. [10]

(b) Evaluate Zhuangzi's idea of transformation or change. [15]

This question seeks an explanation of the idea of transformation – change which appears in many of the inner chapters. It first appears in Chapter 2 (2:28) where the butterfly and human seem to 'trans morph' and change with the death of the friends in several stories that relate to coping with loss. (6:39, 6; 4 and 6;42). The potential of his friend Ziva becoming a rooster or his arm becoming a cross bow pellet. What is the role of self in this scenario? The idea that transformation reflects the flow and transformational nature of the *Tao*; selfhood not being entertained when reaching for the *Tao*. For Zhuangzi's things flow into others; a human becomes a butterfly or the seeming cognitive confusion over whether you have become of butterfly in a dream of whether the dream has become reality. The transformational process challenges the presumed stance that humans have, that they are the most important facet of the universe. The "creation-transformation theory"-merely sees them as another thing - a 'clump'. With transformationalism there is an acceptance of the Way as change. All things are fluid. Equally an interpretation might be presented that suggests transformation as an awakening process. This can be drawn out of the butterfly dream at the end of Chapter 2 (2:48). Humans are not transformed in a physical sense but transformed so they see more clearly their role and status in the universe though fully appreciating the qualities of the *Tao*. There might also be links made to transformation being a realization of the difference between illusion and reality. Cross-reference might be made to Zen Buddhism and the Plato's Theory of Forms.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The death of one of the four friends and the links between death and transformation
- The butterfly dream and issues of the comprehension of reality
- Creation / transformation theory and the links to the *Tao*
- The nature of the *Tao* as seen by both Zhuangzi and Lao Tzu
- The status of humans in the universe as seen by Taoism compared to other philosophical stances
- Personal response to change and Zhuangzi's response to the death of his wife
- The problem of the soul and self-relating to the transformational process. Does the self, remain unchanged or is self to be negated?
- Issues of discontinuity of self; losing oneself or rediscovering one's self
- The idea of 'wandering' which arises in Chapter 1 and its links to change and appreciation of the constant fluidity of the world.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Change is inevitable and therefore is Zhuangzi trying to give hope to an insecure society
- Does the investigation of illusion and reality raise issues of perception and self-perception linking to psychiatry and self-knowledge?
- Links to environmental ethics and the status of human in nature and the associated responsibilities
- Ideas of self and whether the rise of individualism right or wrongly rises the status of self-hood in our current societies
- The nature of the *Tao* as indefinable and unreachable
- Plato's Theory of Forms and the link to the goals of a philosopher ruler. Would such a person be alien to Zhuangzi's stance on governing
- The relationship of memory and identity in transformation
- The consequences of transformational humans; lost or buried qualities and the effects on the psyche
- The degree to which nature and natural phenomena are transformational
- Reference to transformation and change in Hinduism and Buddhism.

24. (a) Explain Zhuangzi's use of animals in stories and analogies. [10]

(b) Evaluate Zhuangzi's use of animals in stories and analogies. [15]

This question invites an explanation of the use of animals that Zhuangzi presents throughout the Inner Chapters. For Zhuangzi animals are like Thought Experiments that give humans different perspectives on the world and give guidance as to how to practice *wu wei*; living in harmony with nature and being contented. In addition, they show ways to flourish, interacting positively with the world and managing complex issues. Zhuangzi's mention of animals is manifold, and frequently used to link to the ways of trying to reach the *Tao*; eg the caged animals in Chapters 1 and 3 display, reflect how humans need to respect nature more and interact with it in a more positive way; the caged animals in a metaphorical way reveal the need to be freed either in a physical sense from societal conventions and rituals, or mentally by breaking out of cognitive constraints and displaying more lateral thinking. In dreams animals often show ways of being free and wandering and being more unconventional; In relationship to self-transcendence the animal is often seen as a higher form of being, and thus able to get closer to the *Tao*. Animals are more sensitive to the natural surroundings and act more freely and in harmony with nature. The animal is also seen as good examples of *wu wei* by not overreacting to situations and letting things take their natural course. The carving of the ox is used to illustrate how living life, within *wu wei*, can improve one's flourishing. It is also possible to see the use of animals as a means of presenting new paradigms; that break perceived fixed ideas, or coping with death and loss (a contentment with death as it is a transformation within nature - Chapter 3).

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The attempt to define the *Tao* and the use of figurative and metaphysical means to illustrate the qualities of the *Tao* through animals
- The nature of fish free in the water
- The butterfly real or imagined (Chapter 2)
- Dreams and reality
- The ox and the butcher practicing *wu wei* and flourishing – going with the flow
- Death and transformation into other animals as part of a natural cycle
- Caging animals for slaughter and rituals paralleled with degrees of human physical and mental liberty
- The human reluctance to rest on the *Tao* through *wu wei* and the willingness of animals to see such behaviour as normal.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The Chinese tradition of animals taking on human form or being central to fables and myths
 - Challenges to rituals and conventions and the use of animals in sacrifices
 - Animal analogies to ease the understanding of complex issues. Parallels might be drawn with talking animals in various western literature eg Orwell's *Animal Farm*, Grahame's *Wind in the Willows*
 - Animal stories as thought experiments to show complex issues. Parallels might be drawn to Nozick's experience machine
 - Self-transcendence and the separation of world problems and reality
 - The nature of dream interpretation and human perception; parallels with Freud
 - Development of lateral thinking and thinking out side of the box
 - *Wu wei* and Westerns ideas of mindfulness.
-