IB DIPLOMA PROGRAMME
PROGRAMME DU DIPLÔME DU BI
PROGRAMA DEL DIPLOMA DEL BI

# MARKSCHEME

# November 2007

# PHILOSOPHY

# Higher and Standard Level

# Paper 1

22 pages

**SECTION A**

**Core Theme: What is a 'human' being?**

1.    (a)    **Identify a central philosophical concept or philosophical issue about the human person raised by this passage.**                    *[3 marks]*

This passage is meant to stimulate reflection on those aspects of 'being' the human person shares with other living beings and those that are particular to 'human being' itself. It also invites reflection of the unique claim each individual human being has on his or her own mode of existence. It allows for comment on the interrelationships that might exist among the human species and other living species and on the obligations that might exist between human beings and non-human beings. The passage might offer room for comments on responsibility to self for one's personal identity as opposed to responsibility to other beings for one's identity. Finally, the question also raises the possibility of comments on the status of pre-ordained, supernatural or divine perspectives on what 'human being' ought to be.

(b)    **Compare and contrast *two* different philosophical approaches to the philosophical issue or philosophical concept you identified in point (a).**                    *[12 marks]*

Candidates may make their choices from amongst a wide variety of philosophical approaches.

- **Existentialism:** I am a unique being-in-the-world responsible to myself for creating my personal identity from amongst unlimited possibilities. I am alone but inescapably live out my life-project with others with whom I establish relationships. I should neither appeal to nor depend upon preordained, pre-established plans that pretend to give me precise information on how I should live my life
- **Theism:** I am born into the human condition; a free and unique individual, created by God precisely in this fashion. It is possible for me to assume full freedom and responsibility for my personhood and self-identity without abandoning my freedom to a supernatural being. Moreover, God has given me responsibilities and obligations to other non-human beings. I can neither ignore nor violate these responsibilities and obligations

(c) **Critically discuss the claim that freedom is the particularly human capacity to establish and preserve one's identity as a unique person against all forms of power, coercion and persuasion.**  *[15 marks]*

- Nature, function and scope of freedom: positive *versus* negative freedom
- Nature of determinism: soft *versus* hard determinism
- Freedom as a condition, freedom as a capacity, freedom as a right
- Legitimate power, force, coercion *versus* illegitimate power, force, coercion
- Freedom as a promise *versus* freedom as a fact
- Relationships between freedom and personal identity: choice and personhood in a personal context, choice and personhood in a social context, choice and personhood in a global context
- Is freedom a peculiarly and specifically human characteristic?
- Can we completely escape all forms of power, force and coercion?  Should we?
- Is freedom incompatible with force and power?
- Is freedom an absolutely necessary element of personal identity?  If so, to what extent?
- Even if we are free, can we ever be unique individuals?  If so, to what extent and how?
- What forms of power are legitimate and how might they enhance personal identity?
- Is freedom always a blessing or might it also be a curse?

**2.**    (a)    **Identify a central philosophical concept or philosophical issue about the 'human' condition raised by this cartoon.**                    *[3 marks]*

This cartoon is meant to stimulate reflection on the human condition and, in particular, on the way an individual understands his or her own purpose in life both in relationship to him or herself and in relation to others. Thus, it focuses on the challenge each individual faces regarding making sense of personal and social experiences. It challenges the candidate to view these philosophical issues from the perspective of the other person as well. The cartoon offers the possibility of identifying negative or even nihilistic perspectives on the meaning of existence and of the human condition.

(b)    **Compare and contrast *two* different philosophical approaches to the philosophical issue or philosophical concept you identified in point (a).**                    *[12 marks]*

Candidates may make their choices from amongst a wide variety of philosophical approaches.

- **Virtue Ethics:** Notwithstanding the challenges and difficulties I face as a unique human person, I am free to choose and develop the pattern of my life in the light of certain virtues. The behavior patterns I choose to practice and the values I choose to live up to help me develop a virtuous character. As a result of a virtuous life, I am able to improve the human condition as well as the life-condition of all other living beings
- **Nihilism:** I am alone – a unique individual with no set direction in life to follow, no pre-established goals to attain, no responsibilities for any other human or non-human being except for myself. There is no God, no after-life, no final judgment. In the end, seeking to improve the human condition may be pointless and without meaning
- **Solipsism:** While I am a human being like all other human beings, I am unable to communicate my experience of the meaning of life to others just as they are unable to communicate their experiences to me. I remained locked in my own subjectivity assured only of my own selfhood
- **Consequentialism:** The meaning and purpose of life can be reduced to increasing happiness and pleasure for the greatest number while minimizing pain and suffering. It is hoped that this same perspective is shared by all humans and that we can improve the human condition not only for ourselves, but for all others as well

(c)   **"Human existence is characterized by the fact that the individual is alone and separated from the world.  Unable to stand the separation, the individual seeks relatedness and oneness at the same time."  Critically discuss.**                    *[15 marks]*

- Alienation, isolation, fragmentation: the experience of existential anxiety
- The challenge of creating one's life-project by assuming full personal responsibility for the task
- The encounter with others; the other as subject; the other as object
- The other's encounter with me; myself as subject; myself as object
- The need for human relationships
- Concern for self = concern for others
- "No man is an island" *versus* "I am the master of my fate"
- The dilemma of seeking simultaneously for independence and interdependence; for oneness with others and uniquenes
- Is it always the case that an individual experiences human existence as characterized by alienation, isolation and fragmentation?
- How can one balance the need for independence and uniqueness with the need for interdependence and solidarity?
- Are we fundamentally social beings or are we always alone?
- How can one successfully establish authentic relationships with others?
- Are the experiences of alienation, separation, fragmentation and isolation specific to western cultures?  Do other cultures approach and experience the human condition in different ways?
- How do authentic relations with others help us overcome the experience of loneliness and separation?
- Personal and social human experience from the point of view of religions

**SECTION B**

**Optional Theme 1: Political Philosophy**

3.    **"Political power is one thing, but legitimate political power is justified power, or authority."
Discuss and evaluate.**

This question invites an exploration of the concepts of power, authority and legitimacy in the political
context.  It also allows for a consideration of the justified use of power as opposed to the abuse of power in a
political context.

**Key points**
- What is power?  What is authority?
- Power *versus* authority: personal, social, political aspects
- Sources of power and authority
- Legitimation: By whom, for whom?
- Legitimacy and justification of political power and authority
- Forms of political organization and the use/abuse of power and/or authority: democracy, aristocracy,
  monarchy, meritocracy
- Anarchism and political power and authority
- *De facto* and *de jure* authority
- Might makes right as a form of legitimacy
- Authority and rights; authority and obligations
- Legitimacy and the social contract; legitimacy and the constitution; legitimacy and revolution

**Discussion**
- Do power and authority go hand in hand?
- Is authority simply a matter of justified power?
- What does legitimacy mean in a political context?
- How does one test legitimacy?  How does one confer legitimacy?
- Is it always and only the strongest who rule whether legitimately or not?
- What makes a government's power legitimate?  Who makes it legitimate?
- Does legitimate power exist to serve the people?
- How does legitimate political authority serve justice?  Liberty?  Freedom?  Rights?
- Does legitimacy proceed from the people?
- How does anarchism address questions of power and legitimacy?
- What rights, obligations and responsibilities does legitimate political power enjoy?
- How is illegitimate political power to be dealt with?

4.  **"There will always be numerous answers to the single question of justice."  Discuss and evaluate.**

This question invites a discussion and evaluation of possible approaches to the problem of justice, a key notion in political philosophy.  It also allows for a consideration of how definitions of justice might change in different political contexts or in differing types of government.

**Key points**
- Views of justice: personal, liberal, socialist, libertarian, anarchist
- Retributive *versus* distributive justice
- Conceptions of justice: Rousseau and justice as contractual; Rawls and justice as fairness; Nozick and justice as entitlement; MacIntyre and justice as virtue
- Justice as merit; justice as right
- Justice and equality; justice and freedom; justice and liberty
- Origins of justice: state of nature, civil society, worker's state, kingdom of God
- Anarchism and justice; the minimal state and justice; global society and justice

**Discussion**
- Is any single definition of justice adequate to all situations?
- Is justice a universal right?  Is it an inalienable right?  Is it a conferred right?  Is it an acquired right?
- Can justice guarantee that all demands are fairly met for all parties?
- Can any single definition of justice guarantee equality?  Equity?  Equal opportunity?  Equal treatment?
- How can different conceptions of justice incorporate the notion of contractual, legal, civil and human rights?
- Are liberal, libertarian and/or communitarian views of justice and rights able to address the problems faced by individuals living in a variety of political situations?
- Should we attempt to develop a universally applicable definition of justice?
- How should we deal with violations of an individual's right to justice?
- Is it necessarily the case that the conception of justice changes as the form of government changes?

**Optional Theme 2: Knowledge**

5.  **To what extent is progress in science a result of refuting existing scientific theories as opposed to acquiring more knowledge and understanding of the world?**

This question encourages an investigation of different views of how and why scientific knowledge develops. It creates an opportunity to compare differing views about the nature of and acquisition of scientific knowledge.

**Key points**
- Definition of science and scientific knowledge
- Definition of what progress in science means, how theories are constructed and how models of the world are built to explain phenomena
- The notion of refuting and how this can be done. The way new paradigms of the world are developed
- The role of the scientific community in accepting and verifying scientific claims to know and explain

**Discussion**
- Is science a linear development and convergent in nature? – therefore it is very difficult for new ideas to develop as it would involve the creation of new scientific concepts, yet leaps and revolutionary changes do take place
- Does science move on as a result of conjecture and counter conjectures? In essence it is always an attempt to disprove the established position. Once disproof is achieved new models are created. There might here be mention of Popper and his falsification idea
- The creative thinking that is involved in scientific progress is contrary to conventional scientific method. The scientist might guess a new position or idea and then try to collect evidence to prove it
- The idea that there are two modes of scientific behavior; normal science, that which is done in classrooms and normal laboratory research, and revolutionary science, where paradigms are shifted. In the latter position nothing is fixed and science rather than being exact becomes relativistic, that is there are radical shifts in understanding
- Scientific theories within different paradigms cannot be compared, and therefore it seems progress is simply the development of sustainable models that have their logical boundaries and seem to explain aspects of our world. For example the principles of Newton are justified within context, just as much as Einstein's notion of relativity within their own. One is not superior to the other each but perform different tasks in explaining
- The difference between practice and theory; the notion that pure physics is an abstraction and might only deal with models of the world where practice is solving scientifically problems within the physical world
- Is science progressing towards one overarching theory of explanation?

**6.** **Discuss the claim that nothing can be known unless it is perceived.**

This question invites a discussion of how we know something and the role of perception in knowledge.

**Key Points**
- Empiricism *versus* rationalism
- The nature of perception could be explored; the nature of sense data as well as the process of thinking. What causes sense data, what is its nature-mental states, and what the act of thinking is constructing or experiencing mental acts
- The consistency of human perception might be developed, supporting the idea that external to that perceived is a common external world. This might be contrasted with the inconsistency within human perception
- The notion of idealism might be presented particularly with reference to Berkeley and arguments for and against might be developed based on the notion that physical objects are only clusters of ideas in the mind, and therefore the physical object only is known when someone does perceive it

**Discussion**
- Whether physical and ideal objects exist independent of perception and may have more properties than we can ever perceive. For example the taste of an apple – does it exist before I taste it, does its color exist before I see it, does it exist at all if I hide it? These raise the issue of primary and secondary qualities. It might be that the claim in the question does apply to secondary qualities but not to primary qualities
- The questioning of our sense data and the idea that we can never be sure of what we know about the 'real' world
- The idea that the world is simply what each of us perceives creates problems of how we relate to each other. Am I living in a dream and everything is my construction?
- Can I create things I have no knowledge of beforehand?
- Knowledge of ideas and relations, *e.g.* the case of causality

**Optional Theme 3: Philosophy of Culture**

7.  **"A culture without an overt religion cannot be civilized." Discuss the philosophical implications of this statement.**

    This question invites an exploration from a philosophical perspective of the role of religion in defining civilization, and whether religion is the sole or most important fact in defining civilization. The implicit value judgments of 'overtness' might be challenged.

    **Key Points**
    *   What is meant by religion could be explored and perhaps include distinctions between simple forms and complex institutional forms of religion. The key would be to define the essence of religion; the idea of worship and the possibility of the metaphysical
    *   The concept of civilization could be explored with the notion of living in cities being one interpretation but also in a more straightforward way of it being collective human activities
    *   The idea that culture might not be defined solely by religion, but involves a complex matrix of cultural components such as value systems, myths, art and language, as well as types of science and technology
    *   The idea that the absence of religion might deem some human activity as not being civilized; the degrees of complexity of religion might produce a hierarchy of civilizations and cultures

    **Discussion**
    *   The issue of overt religion might be developed, in that if it is not institutionalized and complex then it is not a civilizing factor
    *   Can religion take many forms in the 21st century? The metaphysical might be replaced by materialistic activities that involve worship and pseudo-deification, for example temples of consumerism (shopping centres) and pop stars or media celebrates being 'gods' to segments of a community
    *   Is religion the sole defining factor of civilization, could it not be argued that art or language are more important or equally important as defining principles?
    *   Would the absence of religion be a deciding factor for labeling a culture uncivilized? How would one detect with any certainty the absence of religion? For example the Soviet Union's theoretically eliminated religion, was this culture or not at all civilized? In reality could the political regime eliminate the actual practice of religions? Can a regime remove the metaphysical from cultural activity?
    *   The issue of value judgments within the question, that is, one form of cultural activity can be defined as superior. Who decides this? Examples might come from the behavior of missionaries encountering societies in which religious activity is not recognized as active or not accepted in its current form, and therefore the imposition of religion or another religion might be seen as a civilizing act *e.g.* the historical impact of Christianity upon North American first nation peoples or missionaries at work in Africa in the 19th century

**8.** **Discuss the idea that xenophobia is a lack of cultural awareness and can be eliminated by education.**

This question creates possibilities for an investigation of what xenophobia is, how it comes about and how it can be reduced. The role of more information and education might be seen as influential in achieving this along with other activities.

**Key points**
- Definition of xenophobia, that is being fearful of foreigners and that which is strange and alien to one's own culture
- The idea of cultural awareness being increased knowledge of differences and similarities and an understanding of these factors
- The role of education imparting knowledge, therefore a broader more inclusive education would result in increased awareness of different cultures
- The idea of cultural diversity and how xenophobia might arise; cultural clashes, fear of oppression, lack of identity or certainty of identity

**Discussion**
- The possible link between xenophobia and the existence of nation states and/or states based on particular religious faiths. Did xenophobia exist before nationalism?
- Lack of knowledge might have reduced or not even allowed xenophobia to arise. The idea of if I am not aware of differences in the form of nations, cultural practices and peoples then I will not have a fear
- The idea that humans are suspicious and fearful of that which is not the same as them
- The idea of whether education alone can create understanding and appreciation, rather than simply factual information. Simply knowing does not mean an end of fear or apprehension. I know that my neighbors believe and practice a religion differently to me but I might still not trust them or relate to them in a positive way. What aspects of education need to be developed to create more understanding and acceptance? How is empathy developed?
- Whether the idea of separation is a solution. If I do not encounter foreigners I will not be fearful of them. Do single faith schools solve or accentuate the problem? Do ghettoes solve problem or make the problem worse?
- The role of myths and misinformation about the other. How can these ideas, which are often deep seated in cultures, be challenged and removed?
- Does a stress on increased national identity along with information and interaction address the problem of xenophobia? If I am sure of who I am, then I am perhaps less worried about interacting with those who are different
- What is wrong with xenophobia given that it is a well-established notion? Does the rise of supra-national units and globalization increase or decrease xenophobia?
- The notion that xenophobia is not desirable might be challenged

**Optional Theme 4: World Philosophies**

9. **Compare and evaluate the ethical attitudes to violence in Hinduism and Islam.**

This question explores the specific traditions concerning violence (and non-violence) in Hinduism and Islam. It also offers the chance to explore the tradition of Jihad – with its variety of interpretations in Islam. In comparing there may be comment on areas of similarity and difference.

**Key points**
- Knowledge and understanding of the non-violence tradition of Hinduism, specifically through the tradition of Jainism and its emphasis on Ahimsa – non-violence towards all living beings, which includes treading softly, wearing masks, straining water to prevent the accidental taking even of insect life
- In Jainism the ceasing to injure living things constitutes Nirvana
- The Muslim concept of Jihad – both inner and outer – and its role in the teachings of Islam; the teachings and historical context of the Qur'an
- The emphasis in Sufi traditions on the personal war against temptation

**Discussion**
- Historical examples of pacifism (*e.g.* Gandhi)
- Recent world attention as a result of interpretations of Jihad by extremist groups, and a mis-perceived emphasis on the importance to Islam of outer Jihad (the lesser) in the Western media
- Is there a difference between individual pacifism and that of communities?

**10.    Critically evaluate the concept of self in two of the traditions you have studied.**

This question explores the doctrinal approaches – and perhaps also the practical consequences of such theoretical discussions – to the self.

**Key points**
- Brahmin basis of the Hindu and Buddhist concept of the continuing life of self in several deaths through the *samsara* – the cycle of rebirth
- Buddhist rejection of a permanent soul in the individual, as in Enlightenment there is the destruction of continued individual existence – but not extinction
- Buddhist rejection of the austerity found in other traditions to promote the liberation of the self, in favor of meditation
- Buddhism rejects determinism to show we need to shape our destinies and we need to train our self-awareness to perceive the nature of events and their impact on our selves
- The role of suffering, *dukkha,* in shaping self
- Hindu emphasis on re-death of the self who has not attained the Ultimate
- The *atman* is the eternal Self which lies within – the ultimate creator is the same eternal substance within the personal self
- The world inhabits a unitary cosmos with many transitory souls; liberation occurs through unity with Brahman – encouraged by ritual sacrifice
- The Islamic notion of a single creator separate from His creation and the creating agent of souls through the lives of individuals
- In Islam the life of the human soul lived in separation (through sin) from the life of God; God's compassion in offering the soul redemption
- In Islam the self submits to Allah

**Discussion**
- Buddhist insight of impermanence and interrelatedness of all things in the world, meaning things do not have self-subsistence
- Are Brahman and soul strictly identical thus making the existence of individual souls an illusion, or do we have separate selves in which the one Lord dwells?
- The relation between soul and body in Islam – is the self a visitor to the body?  The notion of *ensoulment.*
- Practical issues that arise from the doctrines of the soul (*e.g.* the caste system in the Indian sub-continent; the Muslim doctrine on abortion *etc.*)

**Optional Theme 5: Nature, Work and Technology**

11. **What kind of action constitutes an action which produces technology and what kind of objects or devices are technological artifacts?**

    This question invites an identification and definition of technological artifacts and technology as the activity of producing them.

    **Key points**
    - The usual conception of technology is that it is the transformation or manipulation of naturally existing physical/material and biological environments to satisfy human needs and goals
    - Technology is conceived to be a specific form of purposeful (teleological) action that may result in a 'technological artifact': a human-made object or state of affairs that fulfils a utilitarian or practical function
    - This conception of technology appears too restrictive, for it does not fit certain domains which are considered to belong to modern technology, such as software engineering which deals with the transformation of something immaterial (information)
    - This conception of technology appears too broad, since it makes any object or state of affairs which satisfies a practical need, and is the result of intentional human intervention in nature, a technological artifact (for example, a wild tree planted deliberately at a certain place to provide shadow, or an organism with a slightly modified genetic structure)
    - The demarcation problem – what kind of action constitutes a technological action and what kind of objects or states of affairs are technological artifacts? – remains an open issue

    **Discussion**
    - The distinction between the artificial and the natural raises fundamental philosophical issues about the relation between the human race and nature. The distinction makes sense only if the human race is considered in some respect not to be part of nature
    - As an integral part of nature (and as a result of natural evolution), a human being cannot interfere with nature
    - In many parts of the world, human beings have come to consider themselves as independent from their natural environment and to regard it as an object they can use as they wish. Is this an acceptable position?
    - Are technological artifacts mainly (only) the application of scientific knowledge with practical purposes?

12.   **Critically discuss who or what should dictate the function and value of work.**

The question invites an analysis of the function and value of work from different angles.

**Key points**
- Usually work is characterized as an activity that has to involve significant expenditure of effort and be directed toward some goal beyond enjoyment
- The term 'work' is also used to signify an individual's occupation, the means whereby they gain their livelihood. Time spent at work in this sense – work as occupation – is distinct from time spent at leisure.
- Work is effort directed at some goal other than enjoyment taken in the experience of putting forth the effort. In contrast, play is effort that is not aimed at any goal beyond the enjoyable experience of that very effort
- With the rise of market economies work as occupation has become organized primarily by means of voluntary contracts among individuals
- Critics of market economies have maintained that one's occupation should be a realm of substantive freedom, in which work is freely chosen self-expression. Others have held that the freedom of self-expression is one good among others that work can provide, such as lucrative pay, friendly social contact and the satisfaction of the self-support norm, and that none of these various work-related goods necessarily should have priority over others

**Discussion**
- Some philosophers place responsibility on society for providing opportunities for good work for all members of society; others hold that the responsibility for the quality of one's occupational life appropriately falls on each individual alone
- Some emphasize that performance of hard work renders one deserving of property ownership (John Locke) or enhances one's spiritual development (Mahatma Gandhi)
- In the book of Genesis, God punishes Adam for sin by condemning him to unpleasant labor for his daily bread. In order to meet their basic needs many, perhaps most, people throughout history have had to work in ways that are onerous and unpleasant, recalling Adam's curse. But work can give intrinsic satisfaction without ceasing to be work
- A capitalist market economy is one in which owners of capital establish firms that hire propertyless workers to produce goods for sale
- In Marx's conception there are four aspects to alienated labor. One can be alienated from one's own activity of working, from the product one creates, from one's fellow human beings at work, and from one's true human nature

**Optional Theme 6: Philosophy of the Arts**

13. **Critically discuss the following statement: "The value of a work of art as art is always intrinsic to the experience it offers. It therefore does not include the beneficial effects, *e.g.* educative, moral or political, the work may have upon our lives."**

Stating one main thesis, the question simultaneously refers to various topics of the program: the artistic process, aesthetic experience and artistic judgment. Therefore, answers might legitimately present many different themes and approaches.

**Key points**
- Someone could value and enjoy a work as art even though, due to complacency, forgetfulness or some other idiosyncrasy, they failed to respond to it in such a way that it benefited or informed their life
- Aesthetic experience is nonutilitarian
- Aesthetic experience is detached from ordinary self-interested pursuits (it is disinterested)
- Works of art are made to be viewed aesthetically and just to be enjoyed for no other purpose
- What is the proper function of the arts: to capture a perception of reality (might the arts be regarded as a representation of reality)?
- The notion that a work of art can be viewed as having any single or easily defined beneficial effect might be questioned since art can be interpreted from multiple points of view

**Discussion**
- It may be its intellectual or moral character that accounts for much of a work's impact as an object of experience; if it displays intellectual or moral shortcomings – philosophical immaturity, for example, or racist attitudes – then that is likely to diminish the value we place on the experience it offers
- Stating the presented claim is to drive a wedge between artistic or aesthetic value, on the one hand, and moral or intellectual value, on the other. Are these values in opposition?
- Regarding the artistic relevance of truth, we may indeed value a work less as art if we fail to be persuaded about the truth of a claim it implicitly makes about the world
- Nussbaum's view is opposed to the presented claim, she underlines the value of literary imagination as a part of public rationality

**14.** **Explain and evaluate what art is.**

One way to answer this question is attempting a definition of art, but given the characteristics of the artistic phenomenon it can be addressed in many other legitimate ways, *e.g.* analyzing functions of art or elements involved in it.

**Key points**
- Some issues involved: What, for example, is a work of art? Is it a physical object? What about a piece of music, is that a physical object?
- In characterizing art different aspects might be taken into account, *e.g.* context and conventions
- Historically many theories of art have been extrinsic, defining art in terms of its function in aiding other, non-art activities – that art is a form of communication, or self-expression, a way of representing the world, a source of relaxation or stimulation, and so on
- Theories which look to the intrinsic, internal character of art works are called formalist, since they pay attention only to the arrangement, pattern, or form of elements (line, color, shape, and so on) within the artwork
- Extrinsic theories stress the representational and expressive content which the artwork refers to, and so the debate between intrinsic and extrinsic theories is often expressed as the battle over form and content.
- Attempts to characterize art through objective or subjective elements

**Discussion**
- Art is defined by the artist's intention
- Could we have reliable knowledge concerning art? The essence of art lies in the unsayable
- Does art need to endure to be art?
- Instead of theories about the definition of works of art, or the proper ways to interpret art, what we should be doing is simply enjoying art

**Optional Theme 7: Philosophy of Religion**

**15.** **"A God who permits evil and suffering is not worthy of worship." Critically discuss this statement.**

This question enables a discussion of the problem of evil. It focuses particularly on the way suffering might challenge the traditional moral assertions about God's nature and God's relation to the world. It enables a consideration of the nature of worship and the problems involved in finite man relating to an infinite deity.

**Key points**
- The traditional statement of the problem of evil
- The distinction between suffering and evil
- Solutions to the problem of the origin of evil; from denial (monism) to *privatio boni* (Augustine) to the free will defence
- Protest Theology in the face of appalling suffering (*e.g.* the tale of the rabbis in the concentration camp who tried God, found him guilty for allowing such evil, then concluded the trial and went to pray to him)
- The notion of epistemic distance
- The nature of God and the nature of worship

**Discussion**
- Worship as action and expressive of relations to/with God
- Post-Theistic attempts to provide a solution *e.g.* Process theology
- Morality as a condition of worship
- Judgments of God's nature in this life as opposed to the next
- The meaning (or lack of meaning) of God being worthy of our worship

**16. Critically assess the ways in which language might play a role in shaping and describing religious belief.**

This question explores the key link between the cognitive content of religious belief and the language in which it is housed and by which it has been shaped. Various examples of contributions from past philosophers might be offered.

**Key points**
- The difficulty of picturing the infinite using language housed through finite experiences
- Analogy – the *via negativa* and *via affirmativa,* equivocal and unequivocal uses of language
- The relationship of human experience to picturing the divine
- Symbolic language (including metaphors, models, parables, signs *etc.*)
- Myth and belief in God
- Empiricism, logical positivism and the verification principle
- Wittgenstein and language games, where meaning is found in the use of language rather than in narrow discussions about truth-value

**Discussion**
- Is religious language cognitive or non-cognitive?
- Religious experience as confining belief
- Rationality and language as expressions of the true nature of God
- Belief about God and belief in God
- Post-theism and existential notions of God and belief

**Optional Theme 8: Theories and Problems of Ethics**

17. **"The various moral theories are like a variety of lenses. Each one helps us focus on specific aspects of human behavior and when taken together, they give us the best means to evaluate leading a good life." Discuss and evaluate this claim.**

This question invites an exploration of the theoretical nature and the practical application of different moral theories. It also invites an assessment of their positive and negative aspects.

**Key Points**
- What is a moral theory? How is a moral theory applied?
- The good life: definition, characteristics, moral aspects, ethical aspects
- Teleological moral theories: focus on consequences
- Deontological moral theories: focus on duty/obligation
- Virtue ethics: focus on the character of the moral agent
- Non-cognitive moral theories: focus on feelings/emotions
- Buddhist approach to morality
- Feminist ethics
- Relation of theory to practice in moral evaluation

**Discussion**
- Are moral theories like tools that are individually suited to particular tasks/applications? How might this be the case? How might this undermine each theory?
- Is it important to be flexible in the choice of methods by which one evaluates a moral dilemma or ethical issue?
- To what extent do some moral theories focus on actions while others focus on the actor? What is the difference in philosophical terms?
- Why might it be important not only to focus on the moral quality of a person's actions but also on the moral quality of a person's character?
- What is the value of appreciating the positive and negative aspects of any particular moral theory?
- Is there an intrinsic moral good or is moral goodness relative to the moral theory used to establish its definition?
- Does a multiplicity of moral theories help assure a comprehensive view of the good life? How?
- What is the relation between theory and practice in morality?
- No single moral theory suits all circumstances, all problems, all persons

18. **"The case for animal rights rests upon the central assumption that animals, like humans, are sentient beings and, therefore, whatever rights we accord to humans cannot be denied to animals."  Discuss and evaluate.**

This question asks for an exploration of an issue in applied ethics and, therefore, invites a discussion of the relation of moral theory to practice regarding a specific issue.  The question allows room for a discussion of the definition of a human being, as opposed to the definition of any other type of being as well as for a discussion of the notion of rights.  The candidate can adopt a variety of approaches to the specified issue.

**Key Points**
- Life *versus* sentient life: definitions, distinctions, moral implications
- Relevant differences between *human* being and *animal* being
- The nature of rights: natural, inalienable, distributed
- The meaning of rights: obligations to self; to other persons; to other forms of life
- The rights of animals *versus* the special status of animals
- Animal experimentation *versus* animal rights and welfare
- Vegetarianism and veganism as means of insuring the protection of animal rights
- Humans *versus* Animals: conflicts of interests
- Rights and justice
- Animal rights and the law

**Discussion**
- Are animals aware?  Are they aware of themselves and of their status as sentient beings?
- Do/can animals have rights or do humans have obligations towards animals?
- Do animals possess moral or ethical status?  How?  Why?
- Is feeling pain a sufficient argument to grant animals rights?
- Do/can animals possess all the rights a human possesses?  What are the limitations or parameters to decide which are the rights, if any, animals do or do not possess?
- Should animals ever be used for experimental purposes?  In what cases might this practice be allowed?
- Is it not natural for *homo sapiens* to pursue, capture, use and feed upon animal species?
- Do humans enjoy superiority in the animal kingdom?  How?  Why?  To what extent?
- In a world in which many humans are denied basic rights is the issue of animal rights an irrelevant/unnecessary concern?
- Where do rights come from?  How are they acquired?  How can they be distributed?
- Does animal experimentation always mean mistreatment, maltreatment, abuse, and the denial of rights in the animal kingdom?