International Baccalaureate®
Baccalauréat International
Bachillerato Internacional

MARKSCHEME

November 2014

PHILOSOPHY

Higher Level and Standard Level

Paper 2

32 pages

How to use the Diploma Philosophy markscheme

The assessment criteria constitute the formal tool for marking examination scripts, and in these assessment criteria 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 criteria listed on pages 5–8.

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 listed in the assessment criteria published in the subject guide, reflecting an engagement in philosophical activity throughout the course. As a tool intended to help examiners in assessing scripts, the following points should be kept in mind when using a markscheme as an examiner:

- The IB Philosophy programme is designed to encourage the skills of *doing* philosophy in the students. These skills can be accessed through reading the assessment criteria in the subject guide
- The markscheme does not intend to outline a model/correct/good 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 where necessarily all (or even some) should appear in the answer
- The names of philosophers and references to their work associated with the question help to give a context for the examiners and do *not* reflect a requirement that such philosophers and references should appear in an answer: they are possible lines of development with the emphasis being on *how* the material is used in support of the candidate's answer and *not* whether it appears in the answer
- 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
- 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 central in a text to an expected response by the candidate and examiners can use the markscheme to be aware of centrally relevant material.

A reminder of candidate requirements for Paper 2:

Examiners are reminded that in the examination paper it states that candidates are expected to demonstrate the following skills. Since these skills are encouraged within the assessment criteria, examiners should take them into account in their marking:

- *argue in an organized way using clear, precise language, which is appropriate to philosophy, and demonstrate an understanding of the author's specific terminology*
- *show an understanding of the specific demands of the question*
- *give references to the ideas and arguments presented in the text*
- *present appropriate examples providing support for their overall argument*
- *identify and analyse counter-arguments*
- *provide relevant supporting material, illustrations and/or examples*
- *develop a critical evaluation of the ideas and arguments of the text*
- *offer a clear and philosophically relevant personal response to the position expressed by the author.*

Candidates at both Higher Level and Standard Level answer **one** question.

Paper 2 assessment criteria

A   Expression

- Has the candidate presented ideas in an organized way?
- How clear and precise is the language used by the candidate?
- To what extent is the language appropriate to philosophy?
- To what extent has the candidate understood the author's use of specific terminology?

Achievement Level	Descriptor
0	The candidate has not reached level 1.
1	The candidate expresses some basic ideas but it is not clear what the answer is trying to convey. The use of language is not appropriate to philosophy.
2	The candidate presents some ideas in an organized way. There is some clarity of expression but the answer cannot always be followed. The use of language is not always appropriate to philosophy. The candidate shows some understanding of the author's use of specific terminology but only in a limited way.
3	The candidate presents ideas in an organized way and the answer can be easily followed. The use of language is appropriate to philosophy and the author's use of specific terminology is satisfactorily understood.
4	The candidate presents ideas in an organized and coherent way and insights are clearly articulated. The use of language is effective and appropriate to philosophy. The candidate shows a clear understanding and use of the author's specific terminology.
5	The candidate presents ideas in an organized, coherent and incisive way, insights are clearly articulated and the answer is focused and sustained. The use of language is precise and appropriate to philosophy. The candidate shows an assured understanding and use of the author's specific terminology.

B   Knowledge and understanding of the text

- How well does the candidate know the text?
- To what extent has the candidate understood the author's ideas, arguments and key concepts?

Achievement Level	Descriptor
0	The candidate has not reached level 1.
1	The candidate demonstrates a superficial knowledge of the text and there is only a basic understanding of the author's ideas, arguments and key concepts.
2	The candidate demonstrates some knowledge of the text, with a limited understanding of the author's ideas, arguments and key concepts.
3	The candidate demonstrates satisfactory knowledge of the text and the author's ideas, arguments and key concepts are satisfactorily understood. There is some insight into the author's arguments.
4	The candidate demonstrates a good knowledge of the text and the author's ideas, arguments and key concepts are clearly understood. The candidate is able to show an understanding of some of the more difficult or subtle points of the author's arguments.
5	The candidate demonstrates that the text has been thoroughly and carefully read. The candidate shows an in-depth understanding of the author's arguments, with a close attention to detail.

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 identify and analyse relevant supporting material?
- How effectively does the candidate analyse the supporting material, examples and counter-arguments?

Achievement Level	Descriptor
0	The candidate has not reached level 1.
1–2	The candidate shows little understanding of the specific demands of the question and identifies relevant supporting material in only a limited way. There is little analysis and few or no examples are given.
3–4	The candidate shows some understanding of the specific demands of the question and identifies and analyses some relevant supporting material. Some appropriate examples are used.
5–6	The candidate shows a satisfactory understanding of the specific demands of the question and identifies supporting material that is nearly always relevant. There is a satisfactory analysis of this material. Examples are appropriate and give some support to the argument.
7–8	The candidate shows an effective understanding of the specific demands of the question and identifies relevant supporting material that is analysed in a sound and thoughtful way. Examples are appropriate in their support of the overall argument. Some counter-arguments are identified.
9–10	The candidate shows an in-depth understanding of the specific demands of the question and identifies supporting material that is always relevant. The implications of this material are analysed in detail. Examples are well chosen and compelling in their support of the overall argument. Counter-arguments are identified and analysed in a convincing way.

D   Development and evaluation

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

Achievement Level	Descriptor
0	The candidate has not reached level 1.
1–2	The candidate develops ideas and arguments in a basic way and there is little or no evaluation of the text.
3–4	The candidate develops some ideas and arguments but the development is simple, or is asserted without reference to the text. There may be some basic evaluation of the ideas and arguments of the text but it is not developed.
5–6	The candidate develops ideas and arguments in a satisfactory way and evaluates them to some extent. A limited critique of the ideas and arguments of the text is offered. There is some evidence of a relevant personal response.
7–8	The candidate develops ideas and arguments from a consistently held perspective, in close response to the ideas and arguments of the text. Evaluation is thoughtful and convincing and the candidate offers a critique of the text that goes beyond a statement of opinion or belief. There is good evidence of a relevant personal response.
9–10	The candidate develops ideas and arguments in an incisive and coherent way in detailed response to the text. Evaluation is compelling or subtle, and convincing, and the candidate offers a critique of the text that shows strong evidence of a relevant personal response. The candidate shows an ability to challenge the assumptions made by the author and explores different approaches to the text.

Bhagavad Gita

1.   **Evaluate the view that the *Bhagavad Gita* might contribute to world peace by providing insight into the nature of, and a possible solution to, conflict and war.**

The question asks for an evaluation of the possible contribution of the text to the understanding of peace. The situation which gives rise to the dialogue refers to a military conflict, involving power issues and spiritual aspects. Arjuna's hesitation to battle is centred on the personal consequences of fighting and guilt about the decimation of his people. Krishna speaks with him and he resolves to fight. After the war is fought, the Pandavas emerge victorious due to devious tactics suggested by Krishna. Whoever applies Krishna's yogic attitude behaves traditionally, participating in existing institutions and helping to sustain the community. The idea of *dehin*, the "one in the body" ("spirit", "soul"), also known as *atman* ("self") and *purusa* (literally "person"), cannot be killed, and will repeatedly take another body after the death of the current one. Salvation is centred on the possibility of *moksa* or *nirvana*, an end to a sequence of lives. This approach to future life might give grounds for a positive evaluation regarding the contribution of the text to peace. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Wars as being fought in the minds of people: cultivate peace in their minds and there will be no wars
- Arjuna's objection to fighting: his actions will produce an unpleasant afterlife for himself and his family
- That the human being is considered as an extended sequence of individual lives. This may be reflected in the understanding of war and peace
- Krishna's attitude is particularly conducive to social harmony and cultural continuity within a diverse, organized and potentially enormous community
- Interpretations of the *Bhagavad Gita*: rejection of quietism, justification of violent action against tyrants, and encouragement to revolutionary activity
- Gandhi: the *Mahabharata* war as an allegorical representation of the internal struggle between the human soul and worldly temptations. He saw his principles of non-violence and politics of passive resistance as deriving from the text.

2. **"Meditation is a method to go beyond one's reality, to gain greater wisdom of [the] self and a newer insight into who one is." Discuss and evaluate.**

The question asks for a discussion and evaluation of what meditation might imply, *eg,* renunciation, and its implications with regard to the development of self-awareness. The self that transcends bodily identification transmigrates from one body to another in a seemingly endless series of incarnations. Knowledge is more important than exercises, and meditation is more important than knowledge, but renouncing personal profit is more important than meditation, it leads to greater wisdom of oneself. The self is related to or constituted by consciousness, which is the most fundamental part of human experience; nothing is more intimate or more immediate and, at the same time, more transcendent. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- That meditation teaches renunciation of attachments to the material, one becomes free from the earthly passions
- That meditation enables the performance of actions as sacrificial offerings to a higher power, merging human actions with the harmony of the entire creation
- Whether meditation is a kind of method which can be taught and learned
- Meditation attempts to transcend the limits of one's belief system and experiences and goes beyond the ego-based reality. How can someone be himself or herself without being the same self?
- Whether meditation is a means of escape from reality.

Confucius: *The Analects*

3. **Explain and discuss the view that Confucius's version of the Golden Rule consists of two notions, *zhong* (loyalty, truthfulness to oneself, self-regard) and *shu* (reciprocity), which form the "one thread" running through the *Tao*.**

This question asks for an explanation and discussion of a central tenet of Confucian ethics, its relation to its constitutive notions of *zhong* (loyalty, truthfulness to oneself, self-regard) and *shu* (reciprocity), and their interrelationship. Confucius's version of the Golden Rule relates to the key concepts of *li* (ritual), *ren* (benevolence, humaneness) and the *Tao*. The Golden Rule invokes principles of constraint and recommendation: do not treat others as I would not like to be treated (constraint); treat others as I would like to be treated (recommendation). This is central to the *Tao*. *Zhong* concerns what I should do to others because I would like others to do the same to me. It focuses upon moral self-discipline and attention to the specific duties of one's roles. Those who are *zhong* are conscientious about their obligations and seek to understand and fulfil them by imagining how they would like to be treated by others. *Zhong* is an ethical imperative to do one's best at implementing the course of action revealed through *shu*. *Shu*, on the other hand, concerns that which I should not do to others because I would not like others to do it to me. *Shu* complements the practice of *zhong* as a disposition of moral discretion sensitive to how the practice of one's role-specific duties affects others. By imagining how one would like to be treated if one were in the other's place, we can see when it is appropriate to amend, bend, or even suspend the practice of the rites and norms of the *Tao*. *Shu* connects oneself with others and identifies which actions satisfy the ethical criterion of the Golden Rule. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

*   Whether *zhong* and *shu*, as the best way to practice righteousness, which function as two strands of a single thread, constitute the only way to practice and achieve righteousness
*   *Zhong* as a necessary and preliminary stage of ethical development that must be refined and guided by the possession of *shu*. In this perspective, we would examine two virtuous attitudes of how to act rather than assess the quality of the actions themselves
*   *Zhong* and *shu* as intimately connected to the practice of the correct rites (*li*) and to the study of traditional wisdom; together *zhong* and *shu* enable us to achieve discernment and make progress along the *Tao*
*   How *li* (rites) prescribe what is proper but the practice of *shu* ensures that in exercising the prerogatives of our position, we temper our application of rules
*   How *zhong* supplies one half of the Golden Rule by governing conduct toward one's peers and social superiors. It involves the act of imaginatively putting yourself in the position of one's equal or superior and, in light of *li*, seeing how one would want to be treated; *shu* supplies the other half of the Golden Rule by governing conduct toward one's peers and subordinates. It inspires the care and concern that one should adopt when in a position of authority
*   How reciprocity is able to be defended on rational grounds as opposed to liturgical or dogmatic/scriptural grounds
*   Is Confucius's version of the Golden Rule a convincing enough basis to form the unifying thread in the *Tao* as claimed?

4. **Explain and discuss the view that Confucian ethics sees *ren tao* (the human way) in relation to *tian tao* (the way of heaven) through the practice of *li* (ritual).**

This question asks for an explanation and discussion of the relationship of *ren tao* to *tian tao* and the ways in which the principal ethical factor *li* sustains that relationship. *Tao* is "the way" of proper relations for all earthly and heavenly contexts. *Ren tao* is a microcosm of the *tian tao*. *Ren tao* is the way of *li* conceived as benevolent conduct ritualized into formal practices. *Ren* and *li* are unified in these practices so that humaneness, goodness and decency (*ren*) are communicated through ritual conventions (*li*). The unity of *ren* and *li* facilitates human flourishing consistent with and descended from the way of heaven and expressed through one's roles in life. Thus, *li* links the human way with the greater way of heaven itself and is the vehicle for its expression. The connection of the human way with the way of heaven cultivates excellence that seeks high ideals, even divine perfection. *Ren tao* unifies the human community situating it in relation to *tian* and to the heavenly ancestors and spirits. The most perfect expression of *li* issues from divine sages, ancestors and descendents of heaven who serve humanity with excellence and transform the world into a better place. Our sublime relations with them and with the wisdom of the ages as realized by us in the present are the means by which we make the *Tao* great. In so doing, the human way becomes an expression of the great way of heaven. Humanity improves when *ren tao* expresses the harmony and order of *tian tao*, making moral agency and spiritual power inseparable. *Ren tao* is linked to *tian tao* insofar as we are noble in spirit (*ren*) and action (*li*). *Ren* is the greatness that *li* expresses and makes human life sacred. The secular conventions of ritual express the sacred human spirit. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The extent to which Confucianism sees humanity (macrocosm) in relation to the larger scheme of things. The "self" or "person" (microcosm) is also established relationally – in connection with family, friends, colleagues, community, nation, and with heaven
- How *li* literally is the "ritual vessel" through which human excellence is realized. *Li* can be lofty and grand, as in the case of an elaborate religious or political ceremony, or *li* can be down to earth, as in the case of a handshake, a bow, or even a smile
- The extent to which *tian tao* is nothing more than a rarefied and transcendental version of *ren tao*
- How through *li* humanity can fine-tune its relation with the natural harmony and grace of the way of being itself (*Tao*) and with the way of heaven. Is this ethical perspective a bit too mechanical and/or simplistic?
- How failure in our duties to our ancestors can bring about imbalance in our lives. If we genuinely fulfil our obligations to them with rituals that are proper and reverent, will we be assured of achieving and maintaining harmony between heaven and earth (cosmic harmony)?
- How the importance of moral character is the means of demonstrating how the goodness that extends from *tian* is put into practice on earth
- What criteria are available to distinguish the authentic from the inauthentic practice of ritual? Is this a problem for Confucian ethics?
- How ritual translates into ethical behavior; is the supposed translation plausible?

Lao Tzu: *Tao Te Ching*

5.   **Evaluate the claim that in the service of heaven there is nothing better than limiting oneself and one's actions.**

This question allows for the evaluation of aspects of the nature of the *Tao* in terms of heaven and how by limiting action one can better serve the *Tao* "in heaven". The nature of heaven (*tian*) compared to the physical world of nature (*ti*) and the human world (*tien-hsia*) could be explored. The idea that heaven is pure is because the *Tao* is within it, unlike our world, which is unstable, changing and self-oriented. Limiting can be seen as *wu wei* (non-action). By being non-active the *Tao* can best be seen and be reached. Humans should be striving to be nearer to heaven because of its purity. *Wu wei* encourages humans not to be competitive and not to strive against natural forces. Limiting oneself allows time for reflection and seeing things as a whole which is in tune with the *Tao*. It might also allow humans to return to a "golden age" where selfishness and cunning did not exist and with the absence of these two, seemingly negative qualities, humans would come closer to heaven. A challenge could be put that with non-action and a non-competitive spirit, a fundamental drive to success and progress might be missing from human society. Human activity would stagnate. It is possible that as a result of this non-interfering, humans might not be effective in a modern industrialized/post-industrialized world. Moreover is it within the nature of humans to limit themselves in the ways suggested? If they, as individuals, could not, who would, when it is also suggested that the ruler and government should equally not interfere in the patterns of nature? Harmonious relationships and a containment of emotion might reduce conflict but might also not be an effective counter to reason. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:
- The non-action of humans, their passivity, raises the issue of how they change things or whether they change anything
- Whether the attempt to reach heaven means that human progress and the control of the natural environment should be limited
- How far the qualities of human nature and ideas of heaven are mutually exclusive or are part of the same phenomena, which might be seen as simply different aspects of human nature
- Whether Lao Tzu's desire to move towards the *Tao* in heaven is far too idealistic in a materialistic world. Could humans survive without being materialistic?
- Whether humans are meant to serve heaven. Are humans capable of limiting their own capacities?

6. **Explain and discuss how if one "puts away morality and throws away duty" life will be better.**

This question seeks an explanation and discussion of whether being amoral and not fulfilling one's duty will produce a better life which is more harmonious and closer to the *Tao*. "Better" in this tradition is seen as in harmony with the *Tao* and maintaining natural relationships – those that relate to nature, as opposed to social interactions. The rejection of morality and duty is a rejection of what is necessary for directed and controlled social order. What is sought is an individual in harmony with the *Tao,* not a civically responsible individual. Therefore it might be questioned as to how, with no morality and duty, confusion in the state could be avoided since the normal role of servants (meaning both those that wait on others and civil servants of the state) is to interfere in the natural behaviour of the individual for the greater good. In contrast if morality and duty were upheld then civic responsibilities would drive action. The solution that is offered involves removing materialism and property ownership as well as the application of *wu wei.* With *wu wei,* competition, greed and selfishness will be removed and with them the need for morality and duty. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Whether an amoral society relies on the fundamental good nature of humans. Is this feasible?
- How far, in urban industrialized environments, civic responsibility can simply be ignored
- Whether *wu wei* is a natural condition of humans or whether humans are naturally competitive and materialistic
- Whether Lao Tzu's notion of a "better" society is compatible with the modern world
- Who, without morality and duty, would care for the poor, disadvantaged and disabled of our societies?

Plato: *The Republic*, Books IV–IX

7. **Evaluate Plato's claim that it is because those suited to be workers are ruled by their appetites rather than their reason, that they should be governed by those in whom reason rules.**

The question asks for an evaluation of a claim sometimes attributed to Plato, namely that those ruled by their appetites should be slaves to those who are governed by reason. This claim has been attributed to Plato on the basis of what Socrates says at 590c–d. Gregory Vlastos, for example, did so even though he construed what Socrates had in mind as "idealized slavery", while Terry Irwin contended that, according to Plato, while it is best to be ruled by one's own reason, where this is not possible the next best option is to be subject to someone else in whom reason rules. Candidates defending the claim might appeal to the image of the steersman of a normal ship (who has superior knowledge of seafaring) who is likened to the steersman who rules the ship of state at 527c. Candidates arguing against the claim might point out that nowhere is it claimed that farmers, artisans and handicraftsmen (who are all numbered among the *demos*) have weak rational parts. Moreover, it is said to be possible (see 590c–591a) to strengthen a person's rational part (relative to his/her appetitive part) by habituation and practice. Finally, at 547b–c it is said that the rulers are not despotic and that the workers only become slaves in the event of the downfall of the ideal city and control subsequently falling into the hands of the property-owning class. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The nature of, and relations between, appetite and reason in Plato's philosophy
- The simile of "the ship of state"; does what is said to hold for individuals apply via analogy to the state?
- Plato's view concerning the rationality of the individual members of the *demos*
- Whether an intellectual capacity ought to legitimize a form of (political or other) power over others?
- The circumstances in which the workers would, in fact, become governed.

8.   Evaluate the claim that an individual with a just soul will refrain from unjust activities.

The question asks for an assessment of the view that one whose soul is just will not act unjustly. Socrates describes the individual with a just soul as having inner harmony because he/she is ruled by reason, which alone can ensure that all of his/her rational, spirited and appetitive parts are satisfied. But if justice has to do with a person's relations with others (not just with his/her inner harmony) what reason is there to think a just soul will refrain from actions that show disregard for the interests of others? Two main suggestions have been made about closing this gap. First, it has been claimed that an individual with a just soul will have no interest in acting unjustly because he/she will act on values and desires whose satisfaction is incompatible with unjust actions (485d–486b). Second, it has been claimed that an individual with a just soul knows what is objectively good and is directly motivated to bring it about (479a–c). The first view proposes implausibly that the individual's reasons for refraining from injustice are independent of his/her concern for others; the second allows for the possibility of the just individual sacrificing his/her self-interest for the good which runs counter to Socrates's claim that it is always in our best interest to be just. A way of improving on these flawed suggestions might be to see Socrates as arguing for consideration of the good of others on the ground that it is necessary for personal harmony, in which case an individual cannot be just without seeing the good of others as an element of his/her own good (462b–e, 463e–464d). In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The requirements for someone to have a just soul
- Whether a just soul can be motivated to act unjustly
- Whether a just soul can be motivated to act against his/her best interest
- Whether concern for the good of others is among the properties constitutive of acting justly
- Whether Plato is right to tie knowledge of the good to motivation to act justly and what implications this might have for Plato's moral cognitivism
- Connections to virtue ethics.

René Descartes: *Meditations*

9.   **Evaluate Descartes's arguments for God's existence.**

This question requires an explanation of the proofs for the existence of God offered in the Third and Fifth Meditations. The trademark argument is based on "the causal adequacy principle" in which God places the *a priori* idea of himself inside us. The idea of God is innate and is caused efficiently since "there must be at least as much reality in an efficient cause and the total cause as in the effect of that cause". The causal adequacy principle applies to ideas as much as material things. If an idea represents an object with a certain property then the cause of the idea must possess as much of that particular property as is actually contained in the idea. The properties Descartes mentions are God being "eternal, infinite, immutable *etc*". The idea of God is also "clear and distinct" and there is no idea which is truer for Descartes. The other proof is about deriving existence from less perfect sources. Descartes asks if he could exist if there were no being more perfect than himself. Descartes cannot derive existence from himself for if he did he would endow himself with perfections only God has, *eg,* Descartes raises the possibility of not having a beginning, but even then he would need the power to keep himself in existence. The ontological argument claims that God cannot fail to exist given it would be a contradiction to think of a perfect being without existence, since existence is a perfection. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Whether a lesser formal reality could not cause a greater objective reality
- Whether it is arbitrary to demand as much formal reality in the cause of an idea as the objective reality in the idea itself; cases of causes not being like their effects, *eg,* two cold sticks rubbed together to make heat
- Whether existence can be compared in such a way that one existence is inferior to another
- The notion Descartes uses of bringing himself into existence, when his objection is not being aware of being able to keep himself in existence – but why might he not have this power without being aware?
- That the ontological argument claims that existence is a property of perfection
- Possible existence *versus* necessary existence
- Whether Descartes seems to rely on God to supply support for his thesis in *Meditations*; is this justified?

10. **Explain and discuss the method of doubt which Descartes presents.**

This question invites an exploration of the doubt which Descartes deliberately raises in the First Meditation and which establishes the central task for his exploration of knowledge and certainty throughout the work. Descartes raises specific doubts but the general problem of global skepticism is raised throughout the work. Answers can range from a criticism of Descartes's expression of the doubts themselves to a treatment of his solution to the general issue of doubt expressed in the *cogito* and in his subsequent treatment of imagination and its relation to knowledge gained through the senses. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Descartes's response to the doubts of the First Meditation – the *cogito* and self-evident truth
- The difference between knowledge of the mind and knowledge of material objects – the wax illustration
- Sources of ideas and clarity/distinctiveness of ideas
- Sensory error and the faithfulness of God in guaranteeing knowledge gained by the senses
- Descartes's proposed solution.

John Locke: *Second Treatise on Government*

11. **Evaluate Locke's claim that since the main end of government is the preservation of the individual's natural rights it cannot justify killing, enslaving, or plundering its citizens.**

The question asks for an evaluation of Locke's contention that because the main end of government is the preservation of rights, then no government can be justified in killing, enslaving or plundering its citizens. Government is to protect and promote the public good by upholding the rights established by the natural law (which mirror the duties individuals have in relation to life, liberty, health and property). Accordingly, both negative and positive purposes are included within the goals of government. So, it is entitled to take such steps as constitute means to the goal of preserving (that is, protecting and promoting) human life and property. (Indeed, even in the state of nature, as conceived by Locke, any punishment meted out by an individual could only be justified as a means to the protection of human life and property.) The requirement to preserve human life and property may require making provision for increases in population, improving defensive capacities, strengthening infrastructure and the economy, *etc*. However, whatever rules are devised to govern the actions of citizens must be "conformable to the law of nature (*ie*, to the will of God)" (Ch. XI, para. 135). So, the killing, enslaving and plundering of citizens are prohibited and a government that does such things has no legitimacy. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:
- Locke's claims concerning the positive and negative obligations of governments
- The right of citizens to revolt against governments that fail to fulfil their obligations
- The means Locke envisaged governments employing for the preservation of life
- The relationship Locke maintained must exist between those means and "the law of nature"
- The obligations Locke thought this imposed on governments.

12.   **Evaluate Locke's claim that "Since [money] […] has its value only from the consent of men […] it is plain that men have agreed to disproportionate and unequal possession of the earth".**

The question asks for an examination of the relationship between the introduction of money to facilitate commerce and any ensuing inequality. The introduction of money (which results in barter being set aside) is dictated by reason. It nullifies the non-spoilage (non-wastage) proviso placed on the acquisition of private property, allows for differing degrees of industry, promotes the production of surplus goods and services, and facilitates their exchange and distribution on a wider scale than was previously possible. All of these advantages are consistent with the goal of the preservation of human life. Locke may seem (at Ch. V, para. 50) to endorse unequal appropriation of natural resources. Indeed, some, for example C B McPherson, have maintained that he did (although James Tully is widely agreed to have shown that Locke is, in fact, a persistent critic of self-interested motivation). Nonetheless, there are lines of argument against this position that candidates might examine. In particular, they might consider that Locke nowhere sets aside the proviso that those acquiring private property are to leave "enough and as good" for others. It remains a requirement even after the introduction of money and hence precludes unlimited appropriation. Moreover, the surpluses promoted by the introduction of money are said to be in the products of the land. So, there is no suggestion of a licence to appropriate vast tracts of land as such. Because land was to be productively utilized, and there was little by way of mechanical assistance for working it, the application of labour was required. Locke certainly allowed for wage-labour. However, he did not allow for the acquisition of land for the purpose of selling it off in smaller lots for profit, or for renting it out. Moreover, he was aware of the need to hold land back for future population growth. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:
- The significance for a polity, according to Locke, of the introduction of monetary exchanges
- Whether Locke's account of money fits with his general account of labour and natural rights
- The implications (if any) that the introduction of monetary exchanges has on the operation of "the Lockean provisos"
- Whether Locke (unwittingly) gave support to the idea of unlimited appropriation of land
- The implications for land ownership of Locke's provisos in light of his awareness of the need to provide for future population growth
- Whether Locke's account of money fits with his general account of labour and natural rights.

John Stuart Mill: *On Liberty*

13. **Evaluate the claim that the principles outlined by Mill support the criminalization of acts motivated by hatred but not of hate speech.**

The question asks for an assessment of the claim that support can be found in *On Liberty* for making acts motivated by hatred illegal but not hate speech. Hate crimes are crimes motivated at least in part by hatred of people because of their ethnicity, or their religious beliefs, or their gender, or their sexual orientation. Hate speech consists of verbal or written attacks on people because of their ethnicity, or their religious beliefs, or their gender, or their sexual orientation. Some liberals consider that Mill would have rejected the idea of criminalizing hate speech because even when it is intended to wound, subordinate or silence those at whom it is aimed, it is not harmful to them. It is offensive behaviour but not harmful behaviour. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The distinction between hate crimes and hate speech; whether such a distinction is maintainable and whether it should be maintained
- The extent to which freedom of speech should legally be protected; whether hate speech falls foul of Mill's Harm Principle
- Whether Mill is right to think that offensive behaviour is not a matter for the criminal law
- Ways in which the issue has contemporary significance, *eg,* in relation to the use of social media.

14. **Evaluate whether Mill is consistent in opposing people voluntarily selling themselves into slavery while at the same time approving people voluntarily entering into arrangements that significantly restrict their freedom (for example, certain types of employment contract, certain lifestyle choices).**

The question asks for an evaluation of the consistency of Mill's views about the legitimacy of paternalistic restrictions on various freely chosen options. Mill relies on a "negative" conception of freedom, that is, he conceives of freedom as not being interfered with by others. This conception of freedom has been heavily criticized. In particular, there have been criticisms concerned with how the idea of "non-interference" should be understood. Criticisms of the consistency of Mill's views have been directed at whether being enslaved necessarily involves greater interference with one's freedom than not being enslaved (*eg,* being enslaved by a kind slave-master when faced with a particularly dismal alternative like severe poverty, or homelessness, or joblessness, *etc*). As well, criticisms have been offered concerning the extent to which entering into certain types of employment contract can be considered to impact upon an individual's freedom by imposing significant restrictions (*eg,* in relation to diet, recreational activities, place of domicile, *etc*) in a manner parallel to that involved in certain forms of slavery. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Mill's idea of freedom; "negative" freedom *versus* "positive" freedom
- How the key element in the negative conception of freedom, namely, non-interference, should be understood
- The grounds for Mill's opposition to voluntary enslavement; his anti-paternalist views
- The accuracy of putative parallels between slavery and, for example, some employment contracts
- Lifestyle choices that predictably lead to addiction.

Friedrich Nietzsche: *The Genealogy of Morals*

15. **Evaluate Nietzsche's claim that genealogy is concerned with "a real history of morality" and not with mere "hypothesis-mongering".**

This question asks for a consideration of Nietzsche's genealogical method and its application to a possible history of morality. Genealogy can be seen as a new historic-philosophical method which provides a concrete critique of morality. Since genealogy claims to be a naturalistic history of morality, it proceeds without appeal to any supernatural or metaphysical factors. It examines, without prejudice, factors that accompany all beginnings. Genealogy is "a real history of morality" focusing on what can be documented, confirmed and has actually existed as opposed to any form of "hypothesis-mongering" about arbitrary interpretations of the origins of morality. Genealogy as a critical method demonstrates that the present value, meaning or purpose of an object (morality) allows no inference about the object's origin. It shows that morality had multiple purposes and meanings appropriated by different peoples and epochs, and that the present purpose or meaning is simply the latest functional meaning imposed upon the object under investigation. Finally, genealogy identifies the stable central element of morality as the practice of evaluating oneself and others. Thus, master and slave morality equally demonstrate that morality is not concerned with things but with human beings (both as actor and as acted upon). In this way, moralities are able to differ in origin, value, purpose and successful application while maintaining an identity of function. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Whether through three essays telling three different stories Nietzsche is suggesting one genealogy of one morality (the Judeo-Christian morality) or three genealogies of three different moralities (master-slave moralities in Essay 1, the morality of the debtor and creditor relationship in Essay 2 and the morality of the ascetic ideal in Essay 3)
- Whether genealogy is successful in preventing mistaken inferences from the present purpose of morality to any conclusions about its history or origin. Why or why not?
- The view that genealogy avoids the genetic fallacy of claiming that the origin of something demonstrates its value
- The extent to which it is actually possible to develop a method which provides for an analysis of the value of a value system
- Whether any history of morality, or of the origins of morality, only posits the development of a hypothetical situation for which there may be no hard evidence
- Whether Nietzsche is correct in arguing that we are unable to understand morality unless we understand the historical situation in which that morality takes shape
- Whether a genealogy of morality is meant to undermine the obvious connotations we associate with moral values and to demonstrate that traditional morality itself is just "a special case"
- Genealogy as positive valorization *versus* genealogy as critical practice
- Whether Nietzsche's use of genealogy is more a sociological than a philosophical methodology.

16. **Explain and discuss Nietzsche's view that understanding slave morality as the creation of a particular type of people at a particular historical moment and for particular reasons "has been lost sight of because this morality [slave morality] was victorious".**

This question asks for a discussion of Nietzsche's view that we are unable to identify and understand the origin, development and dissemination of the slave morality due to the victory of this morality over all alternative moral systems. Given the naturalistic, historical and psychological factors accounting for its victory, the emergence of slave morality is specific to the conditions of existence characteristic of a precise historical era. The dynamic interplay of such factors is the catalyst for the creation of new moral codes or the revaluation of competing codes. The development of slave morality is accounted for by the psychology of types of people (nobles/masters and slaves). Slave morality was the self-interested creation of a type of people who were reacting against their social and economic circumstances in the only way available: the creation of values that inverted those of the perceived oppressors. Driving this process of valuation-devaluation-revaluation was the psychological state of *ressentiment*. We have lost sight of the creation and spread of slave morality because: a) slave morality has two thousand years of history behind it, b) slave morality has been successfully embedded into the core of all modern civilizations, c) the misleading and misguided historical interpretations of English psychologists who commit the genetic fallacy in their analysis of morality, and d) the absence of precise intellectual tools for the critical analysis of morality, notably philological tools for the analysis of the "archeological evidence" of the word pairs "good and bad" and "good and evil". In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Whether Nietzsche is correct that our blindness to the victory of the slave morality accounts for the view that slave morality is the only valid morality
- Whether the supposed blindness to the victory of slave morality means that values require a stance which is fundamentally anti-nature
- Whether it is possible to remain blind to factors which account for the development of an important moral system. Is the claim that Judeo-Christian morality is itself the outgrowth of an earlier, triumphant and magnanimous lifestyle defensible?
- Whether the values of slave morality are omnipresent in political systems, scientific understanding, literature, arts and above all in religious beliefs, as Nietzsche claims
- Whether Nietzsche offers a credible explanation of how the victory of slave morality was possible
- Whether the victory of slave morality would demonstrate its superiority over competing moral codes.

Bertrand Russell: *The Problems of Philosophy*

17.   Evaluate the claim that an essential characteristic of philosophical knowledge is criticism.

This question invites an evaluation as to whether philosophical knowledge necessarily demands the activity of criticism. Criticism, which is not necessarily negative, is the use of reason, with the main purpose of reducing error.   Philosophical activity seeks to find inconsistencies. The application of absolute skepticism can be destructive, whereas with a Cartesian methodology skepticism becomes acceptable. Philosophical knowledge analyses the basic principles of science and those of daily life, and therefore belief and assumptions can and should be reflected upon and might be rejected. By practising criticism philosophy attacks dogmas so that knowledge might be clarified. By realizing there is no absolute certainty, philosophy shows unsuspected possibilities about matters of fact. Challenges to this essentially analytical approach to philosophy could come from the idea that the objective of philosophical knowledge is to provide answers to fundamental questions. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Whether absolute skepticism should be rejected as a non-productive activity
- Whether criticism is the only function of philosophy. Should philosophy not also concern itself with wisdom or the discovery of new knowledge?
- Whether philosophical knowledge should be concerned with making a radical difference to people's lives
- Whether philosophy gives an escape from narrow thinking and the practical activities which make up daily life.

18.   **Explain and discuss the nature of universals and their relationship to knowledge.**

This question invites an explanation and discussion of the nature of universals and their relationship to knowledge. Universals are the supposed referents of general terms (*eg,* red, tree) understood as entities distinct from any of the particular things described by those terms. This definition of universals might be seen as something similar to Plato's Ideas or Forms. As a result of universals we might have *a priori* knowledge within mathematics, logic and ethics. Our understanding of universals is necessary for us to have knowledge of truths. When in the form of adjectives it might not be necessary to define the quality of a universal as they help with understanding relationships. Universals allow us to take knowledge from the general and apply it to particular instances and make links to intuitive knowledge. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Whether Russell is simply confirming Plato's metaphysical world in his acceptance and discussion of the nature of universals
- Whether it is possible when dealing with universals that we are dealing with a set of particulars each of which is singular, suggesting universals do not have a universal property in themselves
- Whether the world is only indirectly accessible through sense-data, and what role universals play in clarifying our perception of the world
- How far universals are essential in conveying our understanding of our world.

Hannah Arendt: *The Human Condition*

19. **Evaluate the claim that the necessary element of plurality in action makes it "the condition of all political life".**

This question invites an exploration of Arendt's theory of action, in which she proposes there is a hierarchy of components, "in so far as it (human life) is actively engaged in doing something", namely the *vita activa*. In the *vita activa* "action" is placed at the top, and action is "the only activity that goes on between men without the intermediary of things or matter". The element of action that gives it its political context is its plurality. Action's plurality incorporates human speech and Arendt's contention is that in modern life the hierarchy of human action has been challenged by a rise in the significance of labour which has entailed a decline in political life. Action involves overcoming isolation, for action can only occur among a plurality of agents bringing a plurality of perspectives. Life without speech and action loses what is human about it, so speech is essential for human interaction and entails a plurality of perspectives from different speakers and agents. The significance of action arises from others being present to see it take place; without plurality action would be meaningless. To live in the condition of plurality is to live as a distinct being among equals, since others must sufficiently understand us while knowing we are unique. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The claim that without equality humans would not be able to understand each other; is this credible? See eras of inequality, *eg,* apartheid-era South Africa – is it impossible to understand others when inequality is imposed?
- The importance of disclosure to plurality, where speech most significantly discloses meaning and human identity
- Whether speech entails action both by being an act in itself, but also in the means by which the speaker's sincerity is checked
- How Arendt reflects an Aristotelian concern about public life and uses the term *bios politikos* for a life devoted to matters of the *polis*; see Arendt's conception of the space in which communication and disclosure occurs
- The importance of freedom alongside plurality as the vital characteristics of action.

20.   Explain and discuss what Arendt means by "loss of the world" in her critique of modernity.

This question invites a discussion of Arendt's stark depiction of modernity. Writing after the second world war, Arendt uses the phrase "loss of the world" to depict modernity. Loss of the world refers mainly to how the public aspects of human life have been restricted while in its place the pursuit of private needs and wants has emerged on a big scale. For Arendt, modernity is the new era of mass society where there is a toppling of the proper hierarchy of human activity, where labour replaces action as the dominant human experience. This involves the victory of the *animal laborans* over the *homo faber*, in that the world created by *homo faber* is threatened by the "rise of the social". Material concerns have forced society to abandon the pursuit of higher ends performed in a public space, a space now being eroded. This modern trend away from the public sphere has an individualistic economic aspect alongside Arendt's criticism of the rise of introspection. Responses might look at the (increasingly eroded) distinction between the public and private sphere where conformity has replaced plurality, and isolation is preferred to forms of public life. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Challenges to the public/private distinction, *eg,* feminism, political activity motivated by religious faith
- World alienation, the "rise of the social" and its relation to work
- There is little sense of enduring values or a chance of historical continuity, for in industrial modernity "all the values characteristic of the world of fabrication – permanence, stability, durability […] are sacrificed in favour of the values of life, productivity and abundance"; work and permanence
- Modernity's emphasis on battling to survive in the present rather than preserve things for the future
- Modern science and artificiality
- Arendt's account of economics and consumerism.

Simone de Beauvoir: *The Ethics of Ambiguity*

21.   Evaluate the claim that the human condition is ambiguous.

This question seeks an explanation and discussion of the problems and anxieties that humans face because of their nature. Human anxiety stems from them knowing that they are objects and struggling for a sense of being. This struggle for a sense of being and existence comes about by not being free. Freedom is seen as allowing others to make choices and take responsibility for their choices. If we deny their freedom we deny both their ability to make a choice and to face responsibility. It is realized that our individual freedom is linked to the freedom of others, but if we manipulate the freedom of others we lose our own freedom. We do not eagerly grasp freedom because of the associated responsibility. We must think of the freedom of others for us to fulfil our own freedom and face the responsibility for our actions. Our sense of being comes through a social reality which we can only achieve through subjectivity. The ambiguity of both seeking and yet rejecting the consequences of freedom results in anxious individuals; individuals who are fearful of themselves and others. This fear might be seen as counter-productive and restrictive of any actions by the individual. As a result of this fear the individual might become indecisive. However, by facing responsibility, confidence and the development of a greater sense of being might appear. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Whether humans might not wish to take responsibility and therefore will not achieve their own freedom, which is needed to allow the freedom of others
- Whether there might be a contradiction between working with others—increasing collective freedom and developing an ethics of caring—and the selfish nature of humans
- Whether there are objective criteria that might guide actions of freedom; the criteria might be based on caring for others
- Whether a better tomorrow might be brought about by the increase of freedom linked to responsibility
- Whether humans are inherently fearful and anxious about freedom because of the associated accountability.

22.   Explain and discuss the extent to which de Beauvoir justifies an "ethic of violence".

This question seeks an explanation and discussion of de Beauvoir's justifications for an ethics of violence. The central argument focuses on the idea that violence could be used to oppose those who wish to restrict the freedom of the individual and the freedom of the collective. Justifiable violence is that which opposes and challenges those who wish to oppress. The objective of a bigger cause can justify violence. Violence can be used to re-establish individual rights and restore dignity. The contradiction is that violence might not be like surgery, it might simply be the easiest solution rather than the best. An ethics of caring might inevitably entertain the use of violence to protect the Other. However, the essential proposal put forward is that of creating and increasing freedom. Violence then is justified within a longer scenario. A "greater good", of increasing the freedom of the Other, overrides arguments of pacifism. Yet the implicit contradiction of violence and ethics might be raised. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- How violence can be justified in any ethical system, if it is a crime
- Examples of the justifiable use of violence, like the prevention of genocide, the protection of the rights of a minority, stopping rape, self defence, *etc*
- Whether violence within an ethical system justifies crimes enacted by the state, even state terrorism
- Whether violence can ever be authorized
- Whether the freedom of the individual to make choices by definition allows the choice of violence, or whether there are some universal or absolute criteria that should prevent the choice of violence.

Charles Taylor: *The Ethics of Authenticity*

23. **"The ethics of authenticity holds the ethical imperative to be true to one's own self. Each person is seen as having his or her own mode of being human and is encouraged to realize this rather than conform to a pre-existing model or a pattern imposed from outside." Discuss and evaluate.**

The question takes a central dimension of Taylor's argument—authenticity as an ethical ideal—and asks for discussion and evaluation of it. Responses might explore three basic premises: a) authenticity is truly an ideal worth espousing; b) it is possible to establish by reason what it involves; c) this kind of argument can make a difference in practice. Authentic life is an ethical goal peculiar to modern culture, stemming from individualism. Some sources of individualism are the affirmation of the primacy of the person as self-responsible to find the truth (Descartes); a "voice within" or "the intimate contact with oneself" (Romanticism); also Rousseau and Kant. Horizons are the background of intelligibility against which things take on importance; authenticity implies maintaining the horizons which define us significantly. The development and realization of the self requires both individuality and community. Authenticity is fundamentally dialogical. The fragmentation of political life endangers the realization of the self. A fragmented society is one whose members find it harder and harder to identify their political society with a community. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The malaises of modern culture which threaten authenticity: individualism, disenchantment with the world, instrumental reason and soft despotism
- Whether the transformation of authenticity into an ethical ideal might mean emptying the specific contents or values of moral life
- Whether the search for authentic self-fulfillment can become incoherent and self-defeating when it is tied to atomistic individualism
- The success of Taylor's criticism of those who maintain that the collapse of external points of self-reference must necessarily lead to a false search for authenticity
- Whether authenticity requires rational dialogue and cannot be achieved by taking a "knocker" or "booster" approach.

24. Explain and discuss the idea of soft despotism as a way of losing freedom.

The question asks for an explanation and discussion of the notion of soft despotism, which Taylor develops starting from de Tocqueville's expression. Soft despotism refers to a type of society in which people end up as the kind of individuals who are "enclosed in their own hearts" and where few want to participate actively in self-government. They will prefer to stay at home and enjoy the satisfactions of private life, as long as the government of the day produces the means to these satisfactions and distributes them widely. There is no tyranny of terror and oppression, with a government keeping democratic forms and ruling mildly and paternalistically. But, in fact, everything will be run by an "immense tutelary power" over which people will have little control. The defence against this is a vigorous political culture in which participation is valued, at several levels of government and in voluntary associations. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The extent to which soft despotism refers to societies ordered by market relations. Is it possible to combine the action and results of the market with the possibility of a vigorous political culture with strong participation?
- Whether present societies are in danger of losing political control over their destiny, something individuals could exercise in common as citizens; this is what de Tocqueville called "political liberty". What is threatened here is the dignity of citizens
- Impersonal mechanisms which might reduce the degrees of freedom as a society, although the loss of political liberty would mean that even the choices left would no longer be made by people as citizens, but by irresponsible tutelary power
- The modern malaises related to soft despotism: a loss of meaning, the fading of moral horizons and the eclipse of ends, in the face of rampant instrumental reason
- Whether effective political action might require focus in smaller arenas, *eg*, local community
- Taylor's controversial picture of contemporary political life, *eg*, of social discontent and defiance.