Markscheme

May 2015

Philosophy

Higher level and standard level

Paper 1

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 for the Core Theme and pages 12–15 for the Optional Themes.

It is important that examiners understand that the main idea of the course is to promote *doing* philosophy, and this involves activity and engagement throughout a two-year programme, as opposed to emphasizing the chance to display knowledge in a terminal set of examination papers. Even in the examinations, responses should not be assessed on how much candidates *know* as much as how they are able to use their knowledge in support of an argument, using the skills 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 Paper 1, examiners must be aware that a variety of types of answers and approaches, as well as a freedom to choose a variety of themes, is expected. Thus, examiners should not penalize different styles of answers or different selections of content when candidates develop their response to the questions. The markscheme should not imply that a uniform response is expected
- In markschemes for the Core Theme questions in Paper 1 (Section A) the bullet points suggest possible routes of response to the stimulus, but it is critical for examiners to understand that the selection of the philosophical issue raised in the stimulus, and the two contrasting philosophical approaches that can be explored in light of the issue identified, are *entirely at the choice of the candidate* so it is possible for material to gain credit from the examiner even if none of the material features in the markscheme.

A reminder of candidate requirements for Paper 1 (Core Theme and Optional Themes):

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
- demonstrate knowledge and understanding of appropriate philosophical issues
- analyse, develop and critically evaluate relevant ideas and arguments
- present appropriate examples providing support for their overall argument
- identify and analyse counter-arguments
- provide relevant supporting material, illustrations and/or examples
- offer a clear and philosophically relevant personal response to the examination question.

In the examination paper candidates are required to:

Write a response (of approximately 800 words) in which they:
- identify a central philosophical concept or philosophical issue in the passage or photograph that addresses the question, "what is a human being?"
- investigate **two** different philosophical approaches to the philosophical concept or philosophical issue they identified
- explain and evaluate the philosophical concept or philosophical issue they identified.

Candidates at both Higher Level and Standard Level answer **one** question on the Core Theme (Section A).
Candidates at Higher Level answer **two** questions on the Optional Themes (Section B), each based on a different Optional Theme.
Candidates at Standard Level answer **one** question on the Optional Themes (Section B).

Paper 1 Section A Core Theme assessment criteria

A   Expression

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

Achievement Level	Descriptor
0	The candidate has not reached level 1.
1	The candidate expresses some basic ideas but it is not always 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.
3	The candidate presents ideas in an organized way and the answer can be easily followed. The use of language is appropriate to philosophy.
4	The candidate presents ideas in an organized and coherent way and the answer is clearly articulated. The use of language is effective and appropriate to philosophy.
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.

B   Knowledge and understanding

- To what extent does the candidate demonstrate knowledge of philosophical concepts or issues arising from the core theme, prompted by the stimulus material?
- To what extent are appropriate cross references made between the stimulus material and philosophical concepts or issues arising from the core theme?
- How well has the candidate understood the philosophical arguments, concepts or issues used?

Achievement Level	Descriptor
0	The candidate has not reached level 1.
1	The candidate demonstrates a superficial knowledge of philosophical concepts or issues arising from the core theme. Cross references to the stimulus material are superficial. There is only a basic understanding of the philosophical arguments, concepts or issues used.
2	The candidate demonstrates some knowledge of philosophical concepts or issues arising from the core theme. Cross references to the stimulus material are only occasionally appropriate. There is a limited understanding of the philosophical arguments, concepts or issues used.
3	The candidate demonstrates satisfactory knowledge of philosophical concepts or issues arising from the core theme. Cross references to the stimulus material are satisfactory. Philosophical arguments, concepts or issues are satisfactorily understood.
4	The candidate demonstrates a good knowledge of philosophical concepts or issues arising from the core theme, which is used effectively to support the answer. Cross references to the stimulus material are good. Philosophical arguments, concepts or issues are largely understood.
5	The candidate demonstrates a comprehensive and in-depth knowledge of the philosophical concepts or issues arising from the core theme, which is used incisively to support the answer. Cross references to the stimulus material are well handled. Philosophical arguments, concepts or issues are well understood.

C   Identification and analysis of relevant material

- How clearly has the candidate identified a relevant philosophical issue in the stimulus material that arises from the core theme?
- To what extent does the candidate present and explore two different philosophical approaches to the issue in the stimulus material that arises from the core theme?
- How effectively does the candidate critically discuss the issue in the stimulus material that arises from the core theme?
- How effectively does the candidate identify and analyse relevant counter-arguments?

Achievement Level	Descriptor
0	The candidate has not reached level 1.
1–2	The candidate shows little awareness of a relevant philosophical issue in the stimulus material that arises from the core theme and identifies relevant material in only a limited way. There is little analysis and few or no examples are given.
3–4	The candidate shows some awareness of a relevant philosophical issue in the stimulus material that arises from the core theme and identifies some relevant material. Some appropriate examples are given.
5–6	The candidate shows an understanding of a relevant philosophical issue in the stimulus material that arises from the core theme and explores two different philosophical approaches to the issue. There is a satisfactory analysis of the material. Examples are generally appropriate and give some support to the answer.
7–8	The candidate shows an effective understanding of a relevant philosophical issue in the stimulus material that arises from the core theme. The candidate explores two different philosophical approaches to the issue in a convincing way. There is a compelling critical discussion of the issue. Examples are appropriate in their support of the answer. Counter-arguments are identified.
9–10	The candidate shows an in-depth understanding of a relevant philosophical issue in the stimulus material that arises from the core theme. The candidate explores two different philosophical approaches to the issue in a convincing, engaging and thoughtful way. There is an incisive and compelling critical discussion of the issue. Examples are appropriate and effective in their support of the answer. 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 ideas and arguments?
- 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 with little or no evaluation of them.
3–4	The candidate develops some ideas and arguments but the development is simple, or is asserted without support or reference. There may be some basic evaluation of the ideas and arguments but it is not developed.
5–6	The candidate develops ideas and arguments in a satisfactory way and evaluates them to some extent. There is some evidence of a relevant personal response.
7–8	The candidate develops ideas and arguments from a consistently held perspective. Evaluation of the ideas and arguments is effective. There is good evidence of a relevant personal response.
9–10	The candidate develops ideas and arguments from a consistently held and well justified perspective. Evaluation of the ideas and arguments is compelling or subtle, and convincing. There is strong evidence of a relevant personal response.

Section A

Core Theme: What is a human being?

1.   **Passage from *World Without Faith***

This question offers the possibility of exploring two different philosophical approaches to the concept or issue identified, and of explaining and evaluating those philosophical concepts or issues. The key issue is understanding the human condition through a consideration of human activity, freedom and creativity in relation to work. Responses might explain and evaluate the issues of work and its value; the interchange between work and leisure. There are ideas of a hierarchy of work, and/or a hierarchy or class division in society which might result from occupation. Philosophical approaches which might be developed and contrasted could focus on Marxist interpretation of the role of labour and class divisions in a society or the dominance of work at the expense of other human activities. Other approaches might develop an existentialist view of the need for purpose and meaning through one's role in work. Views about the differing perspective and value of activity in a rural, more natural environment compared to that of urban industrialized environments could result in an investigation into Thoreau's view of what could be worthwhile activity in life. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The difference between work and labour in understanding the human condition
- Whether freedom depends on the necessity of work
- Whether there should be a balance between work and leisure
- Whether there is a difference in worth attributed to agrarian work compared to manufacturing work
- The notion of work as a human end or *telos*
- Whether humans have a right to work or even be forced by the state to work
- The condition of unemployment in relation to human identity, humanity, the sense of belonging, and participation in society in trying to find meaning in life
- Whether work can provide fulfillment or purpose in life
- Whether work dehumanizes or alienates.

2.   Photograph of "identical" twins

This question offers the possibility of exploring two different philosophical approaches to the concept or issue identified, and of explaining and evaluating those philosophical concepts or issues. Responses might explain and evaluate the issues of identity, and consider what makes us different. The idea of uniqueness, individuality and selfhood might also arise. Issues relating to being the same on the surface but different, in a deeper internal sense, open possible discussion about the role that body and mind have in making us who and what we are. Another possible discussion might look at the persistence of the self over time (*eg*, Locke and Hume). Philosophical approaches which might be developed could hinge on theories of identity, theories of the self and more particularly with regards to the image, the role of the observer and "the other" in their understanding of the self and our interaction with the world. Responses could also investigate whether we desire to be the same, or whether we might strive to be different in an increasingly commercial and consumer-driven world. Some responses might move in the direction of research into the phenomena of twins and the balance between nature and nurture in formulating "us". Non-Western perspectives on understanding the self, and sameness could also be developed. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The concept of identity – physical, personal, character
- Whether it is possible to be different and yet look the same. What happens when other people behave towards you as if you were identical, even if "inside" you feel you are not the same?
- What might entail being different?
- How personal identity is established
- What is meant when people are described as "the same"?
- The interplay between genetic structures and upbringing
- The issues and associated morals of cloning
- The role of perception in interpreting our world
- The role of "the other" in forming our personality.

Paper 1 Section B Optional Themes assessment criteria

A   Expression

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

Achievement Level	Descriptor
0	The candidate has not reached level 1.
1	The candidate expresses some basic ideas but it is not always 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.
3	The candidate presents ideas in an organized way and the answer can be easily followed. The use of language is appropriate to philosophy.
4	The candidate presents ideas in a clear and organized way and the answer is clearly articulated. The use of language is effective and appropriate to philosophy.
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.

B **Knowledge and understanding**

- To what extent does the candidate demonstrate knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme?
- How well has the candidate understood the philosophical arguments and concepts used?

Achievement Level	Descriptor
0	The candidate has not reached level 1.
1	The candidate demonstrates a superficial knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme. There is only a basic understanding of the philosophical arguments and concepts used.
2	The candidate demonstrates some knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme. There is a limited understanding of the philosophical arguments and concepts used.
3	The candidate demonstrates satisfactory knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme. Philosophical arguments and concepts are satisfactorily understood.
4	The candidate demonstrates a good knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme, which is used effectively to support the answer. Philosophical arguments and concepts are largely understood.
5	The candidate demonstrates a comprehensive and in-depth knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme, which is used incisively to support the answer. Philosophical arguments and concepts are well understood.

C   Identification and analysis of relevant material

- How well has the candidate understood the specific demands of the question?
- To what extent does the candidate identify and analyse relevant supporting material?
- To what extent does the candidate provide appropriate examples and use them to support the overall argument?
- How effectively does the candidate identify and analyse relevant 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 provided.
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 provided.
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. The examples provided are generally appropriate and give some support to the overall 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. The examples provided are appropriate in their support of the overall argument. 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. The examples provided 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 ideas and arguments?
- 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 with little or no evaluation of them.
3–4	The candidate develops some ideas and arguments but the development is simple, or is asserted without support or reference. There may be some basic evaluation of the ideas and arguments but it is not developed.
5–6	The candidate develops ideas and arguments in a satisfactory way and evaluates them to some extent. There is some evidence of a relevant personal response.
7–8	The candidate develops ideas and arguments from a consistently held perspective. Evaluation of the ideas and arguments is effective. There is good evidence of a relevant personal response.
9–10	The candidate develops ideas and arguments from a consistently held and well justified perspective. Evaluation of the ideas and arguments is compelling or subtle, and convincing. There is strong evidence of a relevant personal response.

Section B

Optional Theme 1: Grounds of epistemology

3.   **Evaluate the claim that a belief is only justified if it is part of a coherent system of beliefs.**

This question offers an opportunity to explore the issue of coherentism and the idea that one belief has to be part of a wider system of beliefs. It is closely related to meta-beliefs and the question of how a belief can fit into a wider held system through both consistency and coherency. It might be necessary to show the difference between the logical consistencies involved in part of a system of belief. "Doxastic presumption" might be explained as to how there is an assumption that all basic beliefs are correct. A contrast might be made between the "internalist" approach whereby the justification for belief is subjective and the "externalist" approach which would involve a reflection upon our thinking process and some dependence on method to justify the belief. The shortcomings of coherentism might be explored and the claim challenged by explanations of the isolationists' objection, the problem of relevance to the real world and reliability issues of sources either empirical or otherwise. A counter-claim by reverting to a foundationalist approach could be made. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Whether a "web of beliefs" is really necessary to justify a belief
- Knowledge as "justified true belief"
- Whether it is necessary or even possible to know all beliefs
- How far is internal reflection possible and productive?
- Whether there are objective measures to arrive at coherency
- Is the method of acquisition or investigation sufficient justification for belief?
- What other justifications for belief might be applied?
- Coherentism and infinite regress.

4.   **Evaluate the claim that we derive all knowledge from experience.**

This question opens up a critical investigation of how knowledge is gained. A critique of empirical knowledge acquisition might be developed. The weaknesses of dependence on sense-data information might be explored and a skeptical perspective could be developed.   Contrasts might be made with other possible sources of knowledge as seen from a rationalist perspective. Differences between *a posteriori* and *a priori* knowledge could be explained. The difference between belief, opinion and knowledge might also be explained. A discussion about certainty might be pursued and questioned given the possible level of subjectivity involved in interpreting experience. Innate ideas and their role might be explored; Platonic Forms and "deep grammar" constructs may be discussed. Irrational sources of knowledge might also be presented as a counter-position, *eg*, intuition, faith, mysticism. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- How might our knowledge constructs be different from actual physical objects?
- The "veil of perception"
- If knowledge is gained by experience then how do we order and categorize this knowledge? Is there some innate structuring? Scheme *versus* content
- Illusion and distortion of sense-data and the interpretation of the data
- Issues related to solipsism
- Is there a hierarchy of value attributed to knowledge based on how it is derived?
- Can there be objective knowledge or is all knowledge subjective?
- Whether knowledge of sense-data is incorrigible because it is arrived at by direct acquaintance.

Optional Theme 2: Theories and problems of ethics

5. **Explain and discuss how we might justify the criteria which ethical principles should satisfy.**

   The question asks for an explanation and discussion on the foundational justifications of ethical principles. Moral principles have frequently been put in terms of what is required by duty. It is often argued that we need to make use of moral principles in order to satisfy the normative requirement of responsible moral action. This requirement implies that our decisions about how to live are not arbitrary, but justified or based on principles in an intuitive sense. Accordingly, an adequate moral theory must articulate and defend moral principles. Many of the ethical positions support the requirement of principles; amongst the many examples, Kant holds that the fundamental principle of morality is the Categorical Imperative, being one of his different formulations: "Act only on that maxim by which you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law." In general, within traditional deontology the principles stipulate: constraints (not to kill innocent people), duties of special relationship (duties of friendship or family), and options (the good we are morally required to bring about). Criteria which serve as a justification of ethical principles might include explanatory power and epistemological usefulness. This might be analysed in an intuitive way and presented within the variety of conceptual ethical frames. Since ethical principles rule moral action, it is also legitimate to discuss the basis of moral action. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

   - Whether moral principles exist, be they universal or relative to a particular situation or culture
   - Whether there are fundamental moral principles that apply in every situation
   - Particularism as the denial that there are true moral principles
   - The notion that some philosophers have sought to understand morality as itself constituted by a single principle, such as not to lie
   - Situation ethicists suggest that circumstances can lead to the abandonment of all moral principles, except love
   - Rule consequentialism, according to which an act is morally required if and only if it is required by the code of rules
   - The Golden Rule and deontological systems
   - Moral principles can be understood to rest on moral values, and debate continues about how to characterize these values
   - Principles concerning particular ways of living or acting, *eg*, a good life, a virtuous life, and concerning a possible "*telos*" or end for humans.

6.   "Personal autonomy forms the basis of a general right to act on one's own judgment."
Discuss and evaluate.

The question asks for a discussion and evaluation concerning the central ethical notion of personal autonomy. The interest in self-governance sits alongside other issues concerning the self, its moral nature and its ethical relation to others. In contemporary ethical theory, autonomy plays both a foundational and a normative role, as illustrated by Kant's ethical theory. The capacity for autonomy is so central to agency that respect for persons is plausibly construed as respect for the exercise of this capacity. The autonomy of a person is the basis of a general right to act on one's own judgment of what one has most reason to do, from which one can derive more specific principles, such as duties not to impede a person's freedom, duties to refrain from coercion, manipulation, or paternalistic interference, as well as positive duties to support autonomy. Autonomy-centred theories value the opportunity to guide one's actions by one's exercise of the capacity for critical reflection, which is significantly more complex than simply acting on one's own desires. While autonomy is more major in the Kantian and social contract traditions, it does also play a role in utilitarian theories. From this point of view one might argue that the exercise of judgment, choice and responsibility, and the development of individuality are essential to individual fulfilment. This conception of happiness permits an argument on utilitarian grounds against state paternalism and for a set of civil liberties that allow individuals to exercise autonomy. In this way, institutionalized liberties protecting individual autonomy will promote general happiness. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Autonomy has been centrally characterized by sovereignty over oneself, self-governance or self-determination: an agent is autonomous if it is self-governing or self-determining. The ancient Greeks applied the term to city-states. In the modern period, the concept was extended to persons, in particular by Kant
- According to Kant, moral principles, which limit how we may act, originate in the exercise of reason. They are thus laws that we give to ourselves; rational agents are bound only to self-given laws
- Basic senses of autonomy: a) self-governance or self-determination: it requires some control over the desires and values that move one to action. Thus, autonomy means the capacity to critically assess one's basic desires and values, and to act on those that one endorses on reflection; b) as a right, for example as the right to act on one's own judgment about matters affecting one's life, without interference by others
- Preference utilitarianism
- Autonomy might be related to discussions and issues such as: determinism and indeterminism, free will, self-deception
- The personal ideal or virtue of autonomy would be the set of character traits associated with the complete development of human capacity viewed as a component of a fulfilling life
- Whether the emphasis on autonomy ignores or fails to leave room for other important values, such as the value of ties and attachments to others, loyalty to groups, respect for tradition, or the value of community
- The relation of the moral concept of autonomy with its political correspondences, *eg*, social contract theories conceived of human beings by attributing to them an original sovereignty over themselves. The social contract theorists regarded individuals by nature as free, equal and independent, with authority to regulate their own conduct.

Optional Theme 3: Philosophy of religion

7. **Evaluate the claims about experience in arguments for the existence of God, or the gods.**

   This question involves an exploration of one of the most common arguments for the existence of God, namely the experience of the individual, even though the individual may claim that experiences can be shared in a public setting (*eg* one of worship). Some responses will reflect an awareness of William James's seminal work, *The Varieties of Religious Experience,* but it is not expected that this work should be referred to – though many of the issues James raises may be relevant in a sustained response. Experience might provide an inductive argument for the existence of God or the gods, but, even if the experience occurs in a public space, the experience remains an essentially private thing that individuals might find hard to communicate with others. Even if a personal experience is accepted by those considering the claim by the individual, it may be contested that the individual is mistaken as to the origin or true cause of the experience, so the interpretation put on the significance and content of the experience is philosophically relevant. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

   - Experience treated as empirical evidence for the existence of God, or the gods involving inductive argumentation and divine existence
   - The problem of verification of personal experience
   - Wittgenstein's view of language as public and fundamental in shaping what seems like individual, private experience
   - Ineffability and mystical experience of the divine, and the noetic quality of religious experience
   - Numinosity (characterization of something sacred or supernatural) and experience
   - I–it; I–Thou relationships
   - Prayer and miracles as conveying possible religious experience
   - The general debate about faith and reason, *cf*, fideism, which insists that faith can have no appeal to a rational basis, alternative empirical explanations – psychological projection, cultural causation.

8. **Discuss and evaluate the anthropocentric (human-centred) basis of language used when talking about the concept of God, or the gods.**

This question explores the formation of conceptions people have of the divine, especially those where the divine being is personified and possesses or uses faculties recognizable in the human experience. This will involve some discussion of the basis and use of religious language, how it is derived, verified or applied. The meaningfulness of the ideas that are discussed may also be considered, with regards to how different thinkers attempt to test the meaningfulness of ideas of the divine. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Conceptions of the divine and their possible origins and authority
- The role of scripture and its relation to reason
- The *via negativa*
- Aquinas and his work on religious language and the role he gives to reason; the analogies of proportion and attribution; God as source of all language and meaningful understanding
- Ramsey and his work on "models" and "qualifiers"
- Modern approaches to religious language; *eg*, Tillich and symbolic language, McQuarrie and existential approaches to religious language
- The "anthropic principle" as a route to proof of divine existence
- The self in different traditions and how it adapts to or rejects modern physical and psycho-material explanations of the self
- Counters to the personification of the divine, *eg*, process theodicy
- Non-personal traditions in non-Western thought.

Optional Theme 4: Philosophy of art

9.   Evaluate the role of imagination in an aesthetic understanding of an object.

This question invites an engagement with the question of aesthetic definition and the broader question of the existence or "mode of being" of a work of art. One common view is that an aesthetic object is distinct from a physical work of art; the relationship between the physical object and experiences of a cognitive agent is the source for the genesis of an aesthetic object's mode of being. A common argument is that, after the initial experience, a work of art persists in the active imagination of the viewer or the artist. This, it is argued, creates two different objects: the actual work of art, and the one that persists in the mind of the viewer. Some argue further that without the persistence of the "right" sort of attitude, then the aesthetic object ceases to be, though the physical object persists. This line of argument can end in a type of aesthetic idealism where the mental becomes "more real" than the physical. One argument against views such as these is that it conflates the object of the experience with the experience itself. The work of art is more than just "experience"; it is the artist using and interacting with materials; works of art have a provenance, a narrative separate from the viewer and the immediate experience of the object. It also ignores the public nature of the experience of art; it reduces it to a private experience. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- What authority, if any, does the artist have in defining the response and meaning of her or his work?
- What constitutes an experience of a work of art? Is it limited to the subjective, or is there a collective, and arguably, objective or universal character to the experience?
- Do different mediums of art have a different ontological status, *eg*, music can be played by a variety of musicians across different times, but a painting cannot be reproduced in this way. Is it wrong to place all art into the one ontological category?
- Is the expression "a work of art", an expression on which many different concepts hang?

10. **Evaluate the claim that all judgments of beauty depend on non-aesthetic features.**

This question asks for a discussion on the topic of beauty and where the sources of making such judgments lie, and this could lead into a discussion about aesthetic truth and error. Non-aesthetic dependence is an intuitively attractive position. Our own experience suggests that beauty is not solitary; beauty is not just the "canvas" or musical score, nor is it just the "experience" in the mind of the artist or viewer, but a fine web of interrelated events and objects that are non-aesthetic. The relation between the aesthetic and non-aesthetic here is one of supervenience. Other views are often varieties of the Kantian argument that aesthetic judgments are judgments of taste that are subjective and universal; subjective in the sense that they are based on pleasure, and universal in that they ask for agreement from others in a way that is different to expressing an individual preference, such as a dislike of liquorice. The pleasure of beauty is unlike other pleasures rooted in desire; the pleasure from beauty is disinterested. One difficulty with this line of argument is in the insistence of some sort of universality for the assent of others in making a claim of beauty. Mind-independent views often use the claim that thinking something is beautiful does not necessarily make it so. We are able to revise some of our earlier aesthetic judgments, which means we can be in a state of error regarding judgments of beauty. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- If the non-aesthetic properties of a work of art change, does that mean its aesthetic quality changes? Is the reverse position also true?
- In what manner are aesthetic judgments dependent on non-aesthetic features?
- Is it possible to separate aesthetic and non-aesthetic features when making an aesthetic judgment? At a simple level, all components of an aesthetic judgment are based on non-aesthetic features
- The use of scientific and/or mathematical language in describing beauty, *eg*, the golden ratio of the Greeks and the symmetrical understanding of the Renaissance
- Does it make sense to speak of error and truth, even in a highly qualified sense, when characterizing aesthetic judgments?

Optional Theme 5: Political philosophy

11. **Explain and discuss the differences between positive and negative liberty and their impact on individuals and society.**

    This question focuses on a traditional key point of political philosophy. It offers the possibility of analysing the concept of liberty and the historical models that developed different ways to conceive liberty. Montesquieu and Hobbes might be mentioned as references to a negative view of liberty, that is a liberty connected to the possibilities of individual and personal action within law (*silentium legis*), or the room given to individuals by laws (where laws end, negative liberty begins); while Rousseau or Kant might be analysed as closer to a positive view of liberty, that is the liberty to participate politically, to join the civil life as a citizen and not only as an individual: Rousseau's concept of *volonté générale* (the general will) could be helpful (citizens are the co-authors of laws, so by obeying laws, they obey themselves – this is the greatest liberty in Rousseau's view). Moreover, positive freedom is connected to the idea of an individual being enabled to do things, to flourish and develop capabilities. This has a practical side and impact in terms of social arrangements to enable this, like access to resources, opportunities, education, healthcare, basic amenities, and the right to work. Politically, positive freedom is associated with communitarian and socialist ideas. The historical perspective might refer to the ancient Greek democracy right up to the present social and political issues, such as the relation between liberty and individual rights. Benjamin Constant might be an important synthesis of both ways to conceive liberty, referring to his dichotomy liberty of Ancients compared with that of Moderns. Constant's work offers a precise and interesting analysis of the two concepts of liberty: the liberty of Ancients refers to Greek democracy, to the participation of citizens in the political life in any manner up to the concept of *volonté générale* (the general will) defined by Rousseau; the liberty of Moderns refers to the expression "freedom from/freedom to", being connected to the individual and personal liberty given by laws. Mill's treatment might be used as an example of positive liberty. The presentation of different claims might be structured as the expression of counter-claims and critical views. The question also gives the opportunity to investigate the consequences that different views of liberty have on the relation between individuals and society, possibly focusing on the concepts of autonomy, will, power, law, obedience. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

    - Are positive and negative liberty connected to value judgments?
    - What other connections to or differences between Ancients and Moderns might be found regarding liberty?
    - Is there a possible connection to democracy?
    - Is negative liberty linked to pluralism?
    - Is the present struggle for individual rights involved in any manner?

12. **With reference to the social contract theories you have studied, explain and discuss the role played by one or more of their key element/s, for example, fear, liberty, safety, property and so on.**

This question calls for an investigation of the different theories of contractarianism, the analogies and the differences, critical views and counter-claims. Also, it calls for the analysis of the reasons that give origin to the different theories and mark their structures and aims. Reference to Hobbes, Spinoza, Locke, Rousseau, and Kant are the core of the analysis. Expression of the differences between the different theories should be the basic structure of the argument. The argument could focus on those philosophers who describe the state of nature as benign (*ie*, Locke or Rousseau) or analyse the normative theory that should produce a certain type of political and social body (*ie*, Hobbes or Kant). Recourse to Marsilius of Padua's theory on peace might be a significant argument. Connection to the concepts of liberty, equality, rights, law, and to the different forms of government (monarchy, democracy, republic) might be an important path of analysis. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- How do fear and safety influence the perception of society?
- How is the state of nature connected to peace keeping?
- What is the role played by private property?
- Is safety connected to internal and/or external issues (foreign policy)?
- Whether there is a connection between modern democracy and contractarianism
- What is the meaning of utility with the social contract theory?

Optional Theme 6: Non-Western traditions and perspectives

13.   **Evaluate the role of the self in the ethical imperatives and attitudes of one or more of the non-Western traditions and perspectives you have studied.**

This question can be observed both from an individual ethical perspective and from looking at the principles which govern the behaviour and attitudes of groups and the interactions of individuals, from units like families to larger social groupings. An important consideration is the view that the tradition under discussion has of the self in terms of life following physical death, and how this will influence ethical considerations. In some traditions there is of course a concept of non-self which is just as relevant to this title as any other perspective which understands the existence of a separate self. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The notion of self in different traditions
- Non-self or *anatta* in Buddhism and consequent implications for ethical thought
- The notion of *karma* in Eastern traditions
- The continuity of identity after death in other traditions and the basis of the afterlife deriving from the life that is lived by the self on Earth
- Dualism of material and mental/soul teachings in different traditions; non-dualism
- Animist traditions and their ethical implications
- Self-extinction and ethical considerations
- The self in the context of others
- The view of the self in relation to non-human life and non-animate objects or systems
- The self in different traditions and how it adapts to or rejects modern physical and psycho-material explanations of the self.

14. With reference to one or more of the non-Western traditions you have studied, evaluate the pressure on the traditions brought by life in "the modern age".

This question addresses the part of the syllabus that explores the adaptation and co-existence of different traditions with modern society and culture. This may involve philosophical speculation about preserving authority and purity of teaching in a world where communication with those of different perspectives is much easier, and populations are more transient. This may involve discussion of the kinds of pressures faced within a tradition by political, economic, social or cultural pressures. Thus the question may involve a discussion of pluralism in relation to different traditions and perspectives, or specific issues arising in the modern world for different traditions. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The pressure of modern political movements on different traditions; in the East the co-existence of traditional belief with Marxist ideology or an increasing consumer materialism will exert pressure on traditional practice and belief
- Globalization exerts a pressure through the power and reach of modern communication technology both in terms of media and social network technology; widespread immigration causes different traditions to come into contact with each other
- To what extent is "tradition" the "Other" of modernity?
- There might be pressure to bring different perspectives under one banner (more often unsuccessful than not)
- Eclectic mixing of different aspects of traditions can occur where populations mix – what determines such mixing?
- In throwing off colonial pasts, resurgent ideologies might re-invigorate previously stagnant belief
- Growing wealth will exert an impact on the vigour and kind of belief practised in a specific region; inequality of wealth can also ignite belief and action
- Specific political situations might hold influence, *eg*, the fight for independence in Tibet, the relationship of the Aboriginal communities in Australia with modern politics, environmental activism in areas being mined for new sources of wealth
- Science and its relation to traditional belief and practice.

Optional Theme 7: Contemporary social issues

15. **Evaluate the claim that in present societies, citizenship depends on free media and open access to information.**

    This question focuses on a central issue of modern democracies and present societies, which tend to merge into a global world: the meaning of citizenship, the possibilities of social and political participation and recruitment, and the struggle for rights are strictly connected to complete and free information (that is to say free communication media and wide access to them). The question offers the opportunity to analyse the nature of communication and information, the process of socialization and the models that focus on the idea that reality is a social construction. Reference to Chomsky, Searle, Popper, Taylor and so on might be useful to present similar views about the role played by media: how they affect our emotions and feelings or how they contribute to shape our reality or what is the connection between economic/political powers and media. Popper and Chomsky underline the dangerous role played by television as an educator for children. Counter-arguments might be based on the role played by individuals, their experience and personality, in contrast with neo-Marxist perspectives, such as structuralism and the Frankfurt School: that is, what is the role of the individual, if there is still a chance to shape different realities, to have personal opinions, or space for critical and public discussion? Is it still true (and if so, to what extent) that society determines conscience? In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

    - Whether media is important for our value judgments
    - Whether reality is a social construction
    - The role of social media in information exchange
    - The connection between receiving information and acting upon it
    - What is the relation between free information and privacy?
    - Are there not any limits to the right to inform?
    - Is it still possible to describe censorship and propaganda?

16. **"Toleration is not the opposite of intolerance, but the counterfeit of it. Both are despotisms." Discuss and evaluate this claim with reference to a multicultural environment.**

This question focuses on the relation between toleration, intolerance, and respect in modern social contexts. It also calls for an evaluation of the arguments connected to cultural, religious, or political differences. The topic faces up to the multi-cultural and pluralistic issues, through a historical view or an analysis of the present day. Reference to the philosophers such as Locke, Hume, Kant, *etc* might be useful, just like the recourse to religions. Locke, Hume, and Kant gave great importance to tolerance on the basis of a possible civil coexistence supported by peace, individual rights (to life and property) and safety (protection from internal or external enemies). The importance of education and democracy as free circulation of ideas might be underlined, with reference to Dewey or Chomsky. Another key point might be the ontological analysis of the difference between toleration and respect and its moral consequences: is Kant's idea of *non contemnere* (do not harm or damage others, also known as the Golden Rule) enough for respect, or does respect involve a direct effort to listen to the others and spend our time to try to understand them? Reference might be made to Mill's Harm Principle. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Does toleration suffice for what respect is meant to be?
- How can toleration be seen as a "counterfeit" of intolerance?
- What has toleration got to do with social conventions?
- Whether democracy is the best solution to intolerance
- Whether religions are the only causes of intolerance
- How might education be connected to democracy and respect?

Optional Theme 8: People, nations and cultures

17.   **"The *vis inertiae* (power of inertia) of habit is tremendous, and when it is reinforced by a philosophy which also is embodied in institutions, it is so great." Discuss and evaluate this claim with reference to the role played by tradition in societies.**

This question calls for a deep analysis of tradition and its relation with societies. The concept of tradition refers to culture in a wide sense, so references to religions or science might be useful. The question also calls for a discussion about the relation between tradition and innovation, with reference to scientific and medical progress, facing up to bioethical or technological issues, such as therapeutic futility or overtreatment, pollution, responsibility for future generations, and so on. Another point might be the analysis of the relation between tradition and innovation with respect to the concepts of individual liberty, creativity, and imagination. References might be wide, going from Ockham to the Enlightenment, up to the most recent theories expressed by Searle, Dawkins, and Popper. Counter-arguments might be based on the dangers of scientism and a critical view of technology as independent from social utility. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Whether tradition and innovation are necessarily opposites
- Should science and technology be limited somehow?
- What is the contribution of creativity and free and critical thought to the concept of progress?
- Does tradition concern religions only?
- Is there any relation between tradition and evolutionary processes?

18. **Evaluate the claim that all peoples have the right to self-determination and to express their identities in a multicultural and multi-ethnic world.**

This question arises out of several issues, which are central in modern societies. First of all, it calls for an analysis of the relation between majorities and minorities, with reference to languages, ethnic, religious, or political groups. Another key point might be the discussion about the claim that all peoples have the right to self-determination and the conflicts that can emerge within a nation or between minorities and majorities. Examples of historical claims of that right might be presented and discussed, with reference to autonomist political movements, such as ETA, IRA, *etc*, or nationalist upheaval such as, ex-Yugoslavia, Chechnya, Crimea *etc*. The legitimate or illegitimate use of violence and terror might be another argument. Reference to political Augustinianism (the idea that religious institutions, such as the Catholic Church, could operate through military power or be served by a foreign army in order to defend their doctrines) or Kant's "perpetual peace" (*ie*, the "Preliminary Articles" on the independence of states, interferences of other nations, the cessation of standing armies, and so on) and the like might be useful. Finally, the analysis of the "tools" used to express an identity might be interesting, *eg*, specific idioms or new languages, alphabet, cultural heritage, and so on. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Do all peoples have the right to self-determination?
- If self-determination is a right, what kind of a right is it and how is it derived and provided?
- Is language a common way for a people to express its identity?
- Are violence, terror, and insurrections acceptable?
- Are peaceful protests efficacious?
- Should a nation fight against independence movements in order to save its integrity or survival?
- Can peoples express their identities without recourse to the right to self-determination?