

Philosophy HL/SL paper 1

CONFIDENTIAL ***MARKSCHEME*** **May 2003**

This markscheme is confidential and for the exclusive use of IBO examiners. It is the property of the International Baccalaureate Organization and must not be reproduced, shown or given to any other person without authorization from IBCA.

Essential reading:

Philosophy guide (February 2000)

Receiving and marking examination material

Writing reports

Instructions for marking scripts

Forms:

Sample materials record form (SMR) - one copy

Discrepancy report form (DRF1)

Problem report form (PRF)

Examiner report form (ER)

Examiner claim form (CF1)

1 The structure of the papers

Paper 1 for both higher level and standard level consists of two sections: Section A, based on the core theme and Section B, based on the optional themes. Section A has two structured questions based on stimulus material and each has three parts. Section B has two essay questions on each of the optional themes.

1.1 Higher level paper 1

Candidates are required to answer one question in Section A and two questions in Section B. The maximum mark for each question is 30 and the maximum mark available for the paper is 90.

1.2 Standard level paper 1

Candidates are required to answer one question in Section A and one question in Section B. The maximum mark for each question is 30 and the maximum mark for the paper is 60.

2 The nature of IBO philosophy

The emphasis of the IBO syllabus is on doing philosophy. Candidates are expected to show in their answers an ability to reason and to argue and take a personal and independent position on philosophical issues.

3 Approach to marking

Mark positively and consistently, giving candidates credit for what they have achieved without being influenced too much by omissions. Apply the same standard of marking to higher level and standard level candidates.

Use the full range of marks available. Do not use decimals or fractions for individual answers. Do not subtract marks for material which is irrelevant or incorrect: you are looking for evidence of what candidates know and understand.

Refer to **Instructions for marking scripts: section 4.1** for additional guidance on marking scripts.

4 Comments on scripts

It is important that you write comments on every script so that it is possible to see how you arrived at the mark you gave the candidate. These comments should be in the left-hand margin or in the body of the script and should identify well-made points or significant weaknesses in the candidate's answer.

At the end of each answer write a comment which summarizes its general quality and explains the mark awarded, for example:

- interesting and original comments
- thoughtful and carefully developed arguments
- misunderstanding/repetition/irrelevance/contradiction
- unclear or underdeveloped arguments.

These comments are particularly helpful to the senior examiner reviewing your scripts for moderation and at the later stages, including the grade awarding and enquiry upon results.

As a general rule in group 3 examinations there will be a comment of some kind on each page. On those few occasions where you have made no comments you should indicate that you have read each page by writing your initials at the bottom of that page.

Candidates may now request the return of scripts. It is therefore essential that any comments you make are appropriate, constructive and professional.

5 The use of descriptors

In addition to the notes for individual answers in the markscheme there are assessment criteria. For each assessment criterion, there are a number of descriptors each describing a specific level of achievement. The aim is to find, for each criterion, the descriptor which conveys most adequately the achievement level attained by the candidate. Having read the response to be assessed, read the descriptors for each criterion, starting with level 1, until you reach a descriptor which most appropriately describes the achievement level of the work being assessed.

Example: If when considering successive descriptors for a particular criterion you decide that the standard described by the level 3 descriptor has not been reached by the work, you should record level 2.

If, however, a response seems to fall between two descriptors, only partially fulfilling the requirements of the higher descriptor, then you should reread both of the descriptors in question and choose the one which more appropriately describes the candidate's work. You may only record a whole number; partial marks, fractions and decimals are not acceptable. The highest descriptors do not imply faultless performance but should be achievable by the candidate. You should not hesitate to use the extremes, including zero, if they are appropriate descriptions of the work being assessed.

A candidate who attains a high level of achievement in relation to one criterion will not necessarily attain high levels of achievement in relation to the others. Conversely, a candidate who attains a low level of achievement in relation to one criterion will not necessarily attain only low levels of achievement in relation to other criteria.

In the margin next to the candidate's response you are marking, record the achievement level you have awarded for each criterion. Also record the total of the achievement levels and circle this total. This circled total represents the final mark out of 30 awarded for the response.

Example:	Section A (structured question) Core theme	A	(2)
		B	(9)
		C	(12)
			(23)
	Section B (essay) Optional themes	A	(3)
		B	(4)
		C	(6)
		D	(8)
			(21)

6 Assessment criteria

Paper 1 Core Theme

A: Identification of a philosophical issue

- *How precisely does the candidate identify a philosophical issue related to the stimulus material of the question?*

Achievement Level

- 0** The candidate has not reached level 1.
- 1** The candidate identifies a philosophical issue with limited relation to the stimulus or the Core Theme.
- 2** The candidate identifies a philosophical issue which is relevant to the stimulus and central to the Core Theme.
- 3** The candidate identifies a philosophical issue which is directly relevant to the stimulus and the Core Theme, and which is subtle or insightful.

B: Comparison and contrast

- *How well does the candidate illustrate different approaches to the same philosophical issue?*

Achievement Level

- 0** The candidate has not reached level 1.
- 1-2** The candidate identifies two different philosophical approaches to the same issue but makes only one or two basic points of comparison and contrast.
- 3-4** The candidate identifies two different philosophical approaches to the same issue and makes the obvious points of comparison and contrast.
- 5-6** The candidate identifies two different philosophical approaches to the same issue and makes a number of relevant points of comparison and contrast.
- 7-9** The candidate identifies two different philosophical approaches to the same issue and compares and contrasts them in a convincing way.
- 10-12** The candidate identifies two different philosophical approaches to the same issue and compares and contrasts them in an assured and thoughtful way.

C: Critical discussion

- *How well has the candidate understood the specific demands of the question?*
- *To what extent does the candidate provide relevant supporting material?*
- *To what extent does the candidate provide appropriate examples?*
- *How effectively does the candidate analyse the supporting material?*

Achievement Level

- 0** The candidate has not reached level 1.
- 1-3** The candidate discusses the issue in a superficial way, showing limited understanding, with no examples or critical evaluation. The language and format are generally inappropriate to philosophy.
- 4-6** The candidate makes some attempt at analysis but the discussion of the issue does not go beyond a common-sense approach. Examples, when used, are often irrelevant and do not particularly help the development of the argument. The language and philosophical terminology are often inappropriate and the argument is fragmentary or disorganized.
- 7-9** The candidate discusses the issue in a critical way and there is evidence of knowledge and understanding of philosophical concepts. There is some attempt at analysis and there may be the beginnings of evaluation. Relevant examples help in the development of the argument. Appropriate language and philosophical terminology is used and much of the argument is clearly presented.
- 10-12** The issue is analysed and evaluated in a thoughtful and convincing way and there is evidence that philosophical arguments and concepts are largely understood. Relevant examples and counter-examples are presented. The use of language and philosophical terminology is appropriate. The argument is presented clearly and coherently.
- 13-15** The candidate demonstrates knowledge which is comprehensive and in-depth, and philosophical concepts and arguments are fully understood. Relevant examples and counter-examples are well-chosen and compelling. There is evidence of detailed analysis and the evaluation of the issues indicates thoughtful personal reflection. The use of language and philosophical terminology is always appropriate and may be sophisticated. The argument is well-organized and presented clearly and coherently.

Paper 1 Optional Themes

A: Expression

- *Has the candidate presented the argument in an organized way?*
- *How clear and precise is the language used by the candidate?*
- *To what extent is the language appropriate to philosophy?*

Achievement Level

- 0** The candidate has not reached level 1.
- 1** The candidate expresses some basic ideas but it is not always clear what the argument is trying to convey. The use of language is not appropriate to philosophy.
- 2** The candidate presents some ideas in an organized manner. There is some clarity of expression, but the argument cannot always be followed. The use of language is not always appropriate to philosophy.
- 3** The candidate presents ideas in an organized way and the development of argument can be easily followed. The use of language is appropriate to philosophy.
- 4** The candidate presents ideas in a clear and coherent way and insights are clearly articulated. The use of language is effective and appropriate to philosophy.
- 5** The candidate presents ideas in a coherent and incisive way, insights are clearly articulated and the argument is focused and sustained. The use of language is precise and fully appropriate to philosophy.

B: Knowledge and understanding

- *To what extent does the candidate demonstrate knowledge of philosophical issues?*
- *How well has the candidate understood philosophical arguments and concepts?*

Achievement Level

- 0** The candidate has not reached level 1.
- 1** The candidate demonstrates a superficial knowledge of philosophical issues but there is only limited understanding of the concepts used.
- 2** The candidate demonstrates some knowledge of philosophical issues and there is a basic understanding of the concepts used.
- 3** The candidate demonstrates a secure knowledge of philosophical issues and concepts are generally understood.
- 4** The candidate demonstrates a wide-ranging knowledge of philosophical issues which is used effectively to support arguments. Philosophical arguments and concepts are largely understood.
- 5** The candidate demonstrates knowledge which is comprehensive and in-depth, and used incisively to support arguments. Philosophical arguments and concepts are fully understood.

C: Identification and analysis of relevant material

- *How well has the candidate understood the specific demands of the question?*
- *To what extent does the candidate provide relevant supporting material?*
- *To what extent does the candidate provide appropriate examples?*
- *How effectively does the candidate analyse the supporting material?*

Achievement

Level

- 0** The candidate has not reached level 1.
- 1-2** The candidate shows little awareness of the specific demands of the question and identifies relevant material in only a limited way. There is little analysis and few or no examples are given.
- 3-4** The candidate shows some awareness of the specific demands of the question and identifies and analyses some relevant material. Some appropriate examples are used.
- 5-6** The candidate shows a good understanding of the specific demands of the question and identifies material which is nearly always relevant. There is a sound analysis of this material. Examples are appropriate and give support to the argument.
- 7-8** The candidate shows a clear understanding of the specific demands of the question and identifies relevant material which is analysed in a thoughtful way. Examples directly support the overall argument in a persuasive manner. Some counter-arguments are presented.
- 9-10** The candidate shows a full understanding of the specific demands of the question and identifies material which is always relevant. The implications of this material are drawn out in a detailed analysis. Examples are well-chosen and compelling in their support of the argument. Counter-arguments are presented in a convincing way.

D: Development and evaluation

- *Does the candidate develop the argument in a coherent way?*
- *How well does the candidate test ideas and arguments?*
- *To what extent does the candidate express a relevant personal response?*

Achievement Level

- 0** The candidate has not reached level 1.
- 1-2** The candidate develops ideas and arguments in a basic way but there is little or no evaluation.
- 3-4** The candidate develops some ideas and arguments but the development is simple, or is asserted without support or reference. There may be some basic evaluation of the ideas and arguments.
- 5-6** The candidate develops ideas and arguments in a sound way and there is a consistent attempt to evaluate them, even if this is not fully developed.
- 7-8** The candidate develops ideas and arguments from a consistently held perspective. Evaluation of the ideas and arguments is thoughtful and convincing.
- 9-10** The candidate develops ideas and arguments from a consistently held perspective and well-justified perspective. Evaluation of the ideas and arguments is compelling or subtle with strong evidence of personal reflection.

7 Notes on individual questions

It is essential to approach the task of assessing the candidates' responses to the questions with a flexible and open mind. The response of each question must be assessed on its own merits, bearing in mind the criteria of evaluation, the notes on individual questions and the specific requirements of each question.

The notes on individual questions are for guidance only. Candidates' answers may vary considerably and it is possible to give a similar mark to different answers. Also, it is probably not possible for all elements indicated in the markscheme to be included in each answer.

MARKSCHEME

May 2003

PHILOSOPHY

Higher Level and Standard Level

Paper 1

*This markscheme is **confidential** and for the exclusive use of examiners in this examination session.*

*It is the property of the International Baccalaureate and must **not** be reproduced or distributed to any other person without the authorisation of IBCA.*

SECTION A

Core Theme: What is a “human” being?

1. (a) What idea about the self is suggested by this image? [3 marks]

Key points

- Cartesian (or other) dualism, *i.e.* man is a physical and thinking thing; man is a physical and mental substance; man is a physical being whose mental life is essentially private.
- Solipsism: the person as limited to knowing no one or nothing beyond himself.
- Self as the locus of reason competing with passions.

- (b) Explain and assess the philosophical issues implied in the idea you have mentioned in (a). [12 marks]

Key points

- (The point of this question format is to leave room for each candidate to develop whatever idea s/he exposed in (a) provided it is consistent with the prompt.)
- Problems that could be mentioned are: solipsism of Cartesian *cogito*; the interaction or coordination of mind and body.
- Cartesian dualism seems to adequately describe the subjective experience of consciousness. Materialism (scientific reductionism) does not.
- The self as developing in isolation of others or only within a social environment.

- (c) “Tell me who your friends are and I will tell you who you are.”
J W von Goethe.

To what extent, if at all, do you agree with the quotation above? [15 marks]

Key points

- Concepts of, and relationships with, the Other
- Identity
- Theories of friendship
- Influence of others who are **not** my friends

Discussion

- Am I like my friends, or is it the case that opposites attract?
- Is the behaviour of my friends the sole determinant (reflection) of what I am, or are there other factors that determine what and who I am, *e.g.* race, gender, class, religion?
- Is my identity initially *tabula rasa* or do I possess some degree of uniqueness?
- If it is true that I am a reflection of my friends, am I fated to keep the same friends all my life? If their values or behaviour change, am I compelled to change also?

2. (a) **What idea about the self is suggested by this image?** [3 marks]

Key points

- Existential concept of self: fear of the responsibility in making a choice for all when choosing for self; fear in the knowledge that we are condemned to be free; existential *angst*.

or

- Fear and frustration of not knowing other minds. Accepting the Cartesian *cogito* leads to an awareness that I cannot fully know others. I cannot bridge this gap.

(b) **Compare and contrast this idea mentioned in (a) with one other that you have studied.** [12 marks]

Key points

- The two ideas above can be compared with each other.
- With Sartrean existentialism the role of the Other is crucial in the development and understanding of the self; in Cartesian dualism the knowledge of the Other is problematic.
- The reef of solipsism in existentialism, and in Cartesian dualism.
- Comparison of one idea above with, say, Humean concept of self (self is an empty but convenient concept).
- Existential *angst* countered by belief in God.
- The interaction problem of mind and body in dualism.
- The contrast between Freudian conception of man as driven by impulses s/he is not immediately aware of and the conception of man as an ultimately rational being.
- Candidates could also mention Hume on the relation between reason and the passions.

(c) **Is it possible to conceive of a relationship with another person that is free from power.** [15 marks]

Key points

- Types of relationships we have with others: symmetrical and asymmetrical; public and private.
- Power as a necessary or sufficient condition for a relationship.
- Types of power exercised in relationships.
- The distinction between power and authority in a relationship.

Discussion

- If power is an essential element in relationships with other people does this mean that love and altruism cannot also be elements in the same relationship?
- How is power exercised in relationships? Is it always negative? Is it always one way? Does agreement to obey another necessarily mean an acquiescence of will or abrogation of personal autonomy?
- Is power also an essential element in the relationships we have with people who do not know us (for example, politicians, entertainers, or dead people)? Is power essential only in “living”, two-way relationships?
- If power is **not** essential in some relationships, then what are these relationships? How do they work? How are they constituted and maintained?

SECTION B

Optional Theme 1: Political Philosophy

3. **“The object of the State is always the same: to limit the individual, to tame him, to subordinate him, to subjugate him.” Is this assessment of the State a justified one?**

Key points

- Human nature, relationships, freedom and social institutions
- Liberty, rights and responsibilities
- Anarchist and classical liberal political philosophies

Discussion

- The role and purpose of the State (as a protector of liberty / property / justice / other rights)
- Is this claim relevant to modern democratic states that claim legitimacy and a mandate from the majority, both of which can be removed?
- Are rights and liberty the same thing?
- What are our responsibilities to ourselves, others and to the State? Are they necessarily different?
- Other possible discussion points: the state of nature and reasons for entering the social contract, Nietzsche’s slave morality, the Marxist perspective, *etc.*

4. **“Rule of the People by the People for the People.” Identify and critically discuss the political system modelled along the lines of this statement.**

Key points

- Identification and analysis of the notion of People
- Definition of democracy
- Democracy is not the same as the dictatorship of the masses: it implies the recognition and protection of the rights of minority
- The notion of division of power between: legislative, judiciary, executive as fundamental in a democratic system
- The checks and balance of power
- Direct democracy and democracy of representatives
- Can a People rule entirely for and only concerned with its own good?

Discussion

- What, if any, is the consequence of the divisions of responsibility, duty and roles relating this to democracy: rule by the People?
- Should society divide roles or are they actually overlapping, linking this to possible notions of the separation of power?
- Even in democracies there exist groups who are not recognized as citizens in their full rights, for example, the “aliens” in the USA, the Jews in Nazi Germany.
- Are there viable alternatives to democracy?

Optional Theme 2: Knowledge

5. The price of saying something about the real world is the possibility of error. What does this involve, in terms of our knowledge of the world?

Key points

- The ideal kind of knowledge: we want knowledge that tells us something about the world that has some degree of certainty and reliability. Empirical knowledge seems to fall short of this ideal. All of our claims to know something about the objective physical world are liable to error.
- What can we know with complete certainty? Perhaps only that I exist, and some mathematical, logical, self-evident truths.
- Error enters in the gap between thought and reality, between what we think things are like and what they really are. The only way to avoid the gap completely is not to make claims about the world at all.
- Two kinds of certainty: analytical (“tomorrow either it will snow or it will not”) and introspective (“it *looks* like a pool of water in the road ahead”, avoiding the possibility of a mirage).
- The empiricist account and the rationalist account are based on certainty and each avoids error by restricting itself to a special kind of knowledge which does not claim any sort of correspondence to an external reality – the rationalists by limiting claims to the relation of words to ideas, and the empiricists by restricting themselves to claims about the quality of internal sensations.

Discussion

- Is experience the only source of information?
- The claim does not apply to every kind of knowledge, but mainly or only to empirical knowledge.
- Assumptions of the statement: for instance, there are only two sources of knowledge: experience and reason.
- Is “absolute certainty” really possible?

6. Must science provide a rational, unified and systematic picture of reality?

Key points

- An answer from a traditional point of view would be affirmative. The metaphysics of science is concerned with what science can tell us about “reality”, if anything. Do scientific theories presuppose a stable picture of the universe?
- Science as organized system of knowledge. Is the order and organization in the universe which scientific knowledge seems to reflect, purposeful, or does it only reflect the organization of our system of categories?
- Analysis of the involved concepts in at least one line of philosophy of science. Here candidates can recur to different possibilities in the history of philosophy or to actual positions. Plato’s, Descartes’, Feyerabend’s or Putnam’s theories can be analysed here.
- A discussion about criteria of scientific knowledge can be expected. The usual picture of the scientific approach to knowledge indicates that scientific knowledge tends to be: empirical, systematic, controlled, objective, operational, accurate, valid and reliable, testable and critical.
- Possible analysis of different sciences as examples. Different branches of knowledge. Can or should the various branches of knowledge be arranged in a hierarchical order? Do all branches of knowledge adhere together harmoniously? Or, on the contrary, is the world of knowledge torn asunder by irremediable conflicts?

Discussion

- What could or should science, if anything, tell us about “reality”?
- Is or should science be based on rationality? And in that case, in which rationality? Are there not quite different concepts of rationality (technical, moral *etc.*)?
- Is there any sense in expecting a unified picture of reality? Is looking for unity basically a human way to understand?
- The development of sciences shows that system is mainly an epistemological ideal to some moments or philosophies of science, but not a characteristic of sciences as such.
- The issue of the relationship between “rational, unified, and systematic” on the one hand, and true and accurate, on the other. Would a unified, systematic “prediction tool” count as good science even if it is not literally true?

Optional Theme 3: Philosophy of Culture

7. **“Culture implies the feeling of being part of humankind and provides us with ways to fulfil our desire to communicate as deeply, intimately and universally as possible.” Assess this view of culture.**

Key points

- One concept of culture should be explained and developed. It can include the elements that make up culture, for example, language; taboos, rituals; beliefs and traditions; that which organizes everyday life.
- There are different dimensions of a culture. Every culture includes particularities and the possibility of a universal dimension. One idea to interpret the statement is: personal, individual “interiority” and universal exteriority go together. Musical experience can be a good example to analyse.
- The need for communication as a basic human necessity. Communication implies more than reason and even language implies emotions.
- The growth of a culture toward universality is the result of a continuing process, which began with institutions such as the family, schools, churches and law.
- When we cultivate, refine and analyse our conduct regarding humanity as a whole, we understand ourselves and the nature of moral consciousness better.

Discussion

- The idea of universality is mainly the product of some cultures under the influence of their religious beliefs.
- Could we rise above local concerns and preoccupations and develop a world culture? Would this be desirable?
- Communication can turn into a merely mechanical relationship.
- The statement indicates only one aspect of culture.
- Universality would always mean the superiority of one culture over others.
- Culture is a string of actions which sustain us in the world. We should not look for any other finality beyond that.

8. Given that the practice of science is a cultural activity, is it a cultural activity at the same level as other cultural activities?

Key points

- Language, myth, art and religion are cultural products, but must a culture also include some form of technology or science? Science as human activity. Its connection to technic and technology.
- Candidates are expected to discuss the statement in the question that science **is** indeed a cultural activity.
- Science is a complex phenomenon, it implies a social dimension. Ever since human societies first began, people have developed explanations for why the world is like it is. Science operates with a particular set of explanations, which are accepted by the scientific community of the time.
- Science could also be seen as part of our practical relation with our medium. Possible functions of the scientific activity, for instance, prevailing over nature, securing a safe environment or extending human life.
- Science is set in different contexts according to more general conceptions. Possible different historical visions of science, *e.g.* Greek, Middle Ages, Modern.
- From a perspective of a “high” culture, science does not properly belong to culture.
- Different philosophical orientations can develop a concept of culture to support this view, for instance: pragmatism, Marxism, existentialism.

Discussion

- Science as human activity is mainly a modern European phenomenon, and therefore is attached to the values of this culture.
- Problems of the scientific vision of the world.
- If we conceive science as a cultural phenomenon, we can examine it from a moral or political point of view.
- The really important aspect of science is its content, the knowledge: other aspects are secondary.

Optional Theme 4: World Philosophies

9. In your opinion, which concept of duty in the ethics of Hinduism, Buddhism and Islam is most likely to produce a more harmonious society?

Key points

- All religious ethics can be regarded as deontological (duty-based) in some sense.
- In Buddhism, concepts of skilful (kushala) or unskilful (akushala) acts and the Five Precepts are guidelines that allow wisdom and compassion to arise and can be regarded as basis of one's duty towards oneself.
- In Hinduism, humans can maintain the natural order of things (rta) and sustain society by acting appropriately, according to their duty (dharma). Each person has a particular duty to perform (svadharma) but what it is varies, depending on one's position in society and stage of life. Together these duties are called varnasramadharmas.
- In Islam, human duty is to live according to the dictates of Allah and the Five Pillars of Islam – The Shahada (Witness), The Salat (Prayer), The Zakat (Alms), The Sawm or Siyam (Fasting), The Hajj (Pilgrimage).

Discussion

- Similarities and differences in understanding the concept of “duty”.
- Significance and function on ethical duty either to society or individual or both.
- Can duty-based ethics prevent or enable an individual to become a responsible, independent moral agent?
- Rational justification of religious ethics or deontological ethical systems.

10. Critically examine the notion of self and its liberation in the context of Hinduism, Buddhism and Islam.

Key points

- Concept of “self” in Buddhism (no self, anatta or anatman), Hinduism (eternal soul, atman – that is really Brahman, universal world soul) and Islam (individual soul responsible to Allah)
- Concept of “freedom” or “liberation” – in Buddhism the liberation of self happens in nirvana achieved through ego-less existence; in Hinduism when identity of Atman and Brahman is realised (moksha), and in Islam the self is liberated and the soul goes to heaven after death
- Candidates are expected to point out that the Buddhist concept of anatta (anatman) is historically posterior to that of the Hindu concept of Atman. Buddha developed the concept of anatman upon realizing that limitations and inaccurateness of atman.

Discussion

- The problems of defining “self”.
- Assumption of the question – that “I” is not free, and assumptions of the human conditions of Buddhism, Hinduism and Islam.
- Similarities and differences of the Buddhist, Hindu and Muslim view on this question.
- Definitions of freedom – negative and positive freedom.

Optional Theme 5: Nature, Work and Technology

11. **“One of the major benefits of work is that it occupies us, relieving us from the tyranny of boredom.” Examine this statement and discuss the value that work has for us.**

Key points

- Definition of work as a way of passing time. Does it matter then if the work activity is either ethically worthwhile, personally enriching, or both?
- What other benefits does work yield, if any? How can they be ranked in order of importance (assuming that it matters at all, which it may well not do if the only value is to keep us occupied)?
- How does work deliver us from boredom? Can this not be turned on its head and it be said that work is boring? Are the ones who are “delivered from boredom” the lucky few who have the chance of an engaging and rewarding work?
- The statement assumes that boredom is a tyranny. Is it? Why do we so seek and value leisure time then?
- If all we seek is an alternative to boredom, is work of any more importance than volunteer work?

Discussion

- If we didn’t have to work, would we? An argument can be made that we would, given the number of people who simply cannot stop working even after they retire.
- The division of life from work is a post-industrialized reality. Previously, life and work were intertwined. Is this change a benefit?
- Is the “workaholic” person someone who, as the saying goes, doesn’t have a life? What then, is meant by life, if it is exclusive of work?
- A contrast with the Marxist view of work as alienating.

12. **A. said: “Unemployment benefits are regarded as progress in developed nations.”
B. replied: “I disagree. The best way to destroy a man is to pay him to do nothing.”
Do unemployment benefits constitute an improvement for societies, or contribute to the alienation of the unemployed?**

Key points

- Unemployment and the marginalisation, or exclusion, of the worker from the main stream of society
- Unemployment insurance as a way of paralyzing society or of living at the expense of society
- The difference between an unemployed person (a worker who is out of work for various reasons within or without his control) and a non-working person (a person who chooses not to work. For example, a stay-at-home parent). Are these two individuals equally subject to this “destructive force”?
- Unemployment insurance, a benefit only rich nations can afford, acts as a cushion to protect workers from the economic burden of not receiving pay while in between jobs

Discussion

- Unemployment insurance remains a phenomenon of developed nations only. It is intended to assist the workers who temporarily find themselves “in between” jobs. How can it then be construed to be self-destructive force?
- Does the destruction result from self-loathing for not contributing to society or from the perceived judgment (real or imagined) others pass on the unemployed person?
- Can it be realistically thought that the unemployed should be celebrated by the rest of society (*i.e.* those who work)? What conditions, if any, would render this possible?

Optional Theme 6: Philosophy of The Arts

13. **“The artist is one who makes things simpler.” Does this statement accurately reflect what an artist does?**

N.B. The concept of simplicity in art is a difficult one. Candidates may not have studied it specifically.

Key points

- Artist as distiller of ideas and emotions
- Artist as possessor of individual vision and individual genius
- Connection of the role of the artist to the “nature” of art
- Artist as polemicist or propagandist
- The reason why artists make things simpler is that the artist finds order in chaos, thereby simplifying it.

Discussion

- Is good art simple? If it is, then why is there so much conjecture on the meaning, value and significance of works of art?
- If the above statement is true, then what are the consequences for what passes as art? Is children’s art good because it is simple?
- Does simplicity in art mean the death of beauty as a valid requirement for art?
- Is art meant to be understood rationally or emotionally, and hence personally?

14. **“Art is art because it is beautiful.” Critically examine this statement.**

Key points

- Beauty as a subjective aesthetic experience.
- Beauty as “objective form” (or any other theory that attempts to make objective the criterion or criteria for beauty).
- The concept of beauty in non-visual arts.
- The role of the artist in creating beauty/art.
- Does it mean that unless an object is beautiful, it cannot be considered art?

Discussion

- Is beauty **the** necessary and sufficient condition that determines whether an object or event is a piece of art? Is it even necessary? What of the intention of the artist?
- Contrary views on art: art as polemical or political project; art as social or moral “cattle prod” (*i.e.* its ability to shock and disturb). In these instances, art may be unpleasant, ugly, even terrible (induces terror), *e.g.* Picasso’s “Guernica”.
- How can the market put a value or price on beauty if it is a private experience?
- If beauty is a necessary criterion (even if it is sufficient) does this mean that art must be primarily decorative? Does it also mean that trees, flowers, landscapes are also works of art because they are beautiful?

Optional Theme 7: Philosophy of Religion

15. Does religious language influence our view of the world? If so, how?

Key points

- Definition and examples of “religious language”.
- References to theories about religious language. For example: Aquinas—religious language can be understood analogically; Ayer—religious language is meaningless; Kant, Braithwaite—religious language is moral discourse; Wittgenstein—religious language is a “language game”; Tillich—religious language is symbolic.

Discussion

- Relationship between language and the world. For example, Wittgenstein’s “picture theory of meaning and “language games”.
- Religious language may not influence our view of the world but changes it with for example, the idea of leap of faith.
- Assuming that one accepts that religious language influences the view of the world, some explanation on how it influences the world must be given.
- Criticism of theories of religious language and relationship between language and the world.

16. Can we hold a religious belief and be logically coherent?

Key points

- Assumption in the question that there might be a problem between holding a religious belief and being logically coherent.
- Definition and examples of “holding a religious belief”—for example, believing that God exists or that miracles can happen, or that one will be reborn after death.
- The leap of faith and the extent of logical coherence—do not all systems of belief have some unfounded assumptions within them?

Discussion

- Is it ever possible to be completely logically coherent within one’s belief system?
- Examples of religious beliefs conflicting with logical coherence and possibility of explaining an experience or logical contradiction away within the given belief system.
- Incommensurability of belief systems, and the problem of making a judgment over logical coherence.
- One potential source of logical incoherence is, not religious belief as such, but its combination with our belief in science.

Optional Theme 8: Theories and Problems of Ethics

17. “Do good to those who do good to you, and harm to those who harm you.” Discuss and evaluate this statement as an ethical imperative.

Key points

- Ethics as a series of mutual and mutually destructive paybacks, and the danger of being exploited (P Singer).
- This is an ethics of retaliation, “Tit for Tat”, based on the continuous co-operation of partners. When do we start retaliating for lack of co-operation? How do we judge that the non-co-operation amounts to harm?
- This is a limited system for two reasons: if retaliating will ensure the destruction of both parties, it is absurd to retaliate. Also “if the evil that can be visited on the other party is so great that the other party cannot retaliate, this ethical system fails (e.g. nuclear weapons as retaliation)” (P Singer).

Discussion

- Such an ethical system precludes forgiveness and acting out of love and postulates that partners are of equal power to be effective. Is this a realistic assumption on which to base an ethical system?
- A contrast with other ethical systems: deontological and utilitarianist for example.
- Assuming that this ethical system could work in a given society, would it be a satisfying system to live by?
- This system postulates at best self-centredness of persons, at worse, egoism, as an unchangeable presupposition of human beings. Can this ethical system yield anything aside from the societal status quo at best, or, at worse, mutual destruction? (“An eye for an eye leaves the world blind”). What is different in a system based on mutual respect?

- 18. Does the Principle of Human Preservation, that privileges human beings over all other species, constitute an acceptable principle for environmental ethics even if it involves killing animal life to survive? If the Principle of Human Preservation, is not acceptable, what other principle is?**

Key points

- To live is to kill. Every species in the food chain victimizes another species in order to survive. Are we naïve or blind if we refuse to acknowledge this?
- The converse of this position is eco-fascism. Candidates should engage in evaluating alternatives to the Principle of Human Preservation and eco-fascism should be discussed (albeit not necessarily named as such).
- Can the Principle of Human Preservation be compared to the right to self-defence. Can we grant it the same ethical recognition?
- Does it make a difference if the aggression is against some individuals in the species (so many cows are slaughtered for food) or if the aggression is against the whole species? Is the difference only a quantitative one (*i.e.* so many more animals are being destroyed)?

Discussion

- This postulates the necessity for human beings to affirm their right to existence above the rights to existence of some other individuals or species. Can we survive as a species if we refuse to act in this way?
 - This principle of environmental ethics does not condone the killing of individuals or the destruction of species for non-basic or luxury needs of human beings. It limits the aggression to basic and necessary needs. Could we ethically justify its extension to include the satisfaction of non-basic and luxury needs? (The Principle of Disproportionality would argue against this).
 - This principle is predicated on the justifiability of killing in defence of human beings. This is a basic survival need.
 - What else, if anything, could serve as a categorical imperative for environmental ethics?
-