

# Markscheme

**May 2023**

**Philosophy**

**Higher level and standard level**

**Paper 2**

40 pages

© International Baccalaureate Organization 2023

All rights reserved. No part of this product may be reproduced in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means, including information storage and retrieval systems, without the prior written permission from the IB. Additionally, the license tied with this product prohibits use of any selected files or extracts from this product. Use by third parties, including but not limited to publishers, private teachers, tutoring or study services, preparatory schools, vendors operating curriculum mapping services or teacher resource digital platforms and app developers, whether fee-covered or not, is prohibited and is a criminal offense.

More information on how to request written permission in the form of a license can be obtained from <https://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/ib-publishing/licensing/applying-for-a-license/>.

© Organisation du Baccalauréat International 2023

Tous droits réservés. Aucune partie de ce produit ne peut être reproduite sous quelque forme ni par quelque moyen que ce soit, électronique ou mécanique, y compris des systèmes de stockage et de récupération d'informations, sans l'autorisation écrite préalable de l'IB. De plus, la licence associée à ce produit interdit toute utilisation de tout fichier ou extrait sélectionné dans ce produit. L'utilisation par des tiers, y compris, sans toutefois s'y limiter, des éditeurs, des professeurs particuliers, des services de tutorat ou d'aide aux études, des établissements de préparation à l'enseignement supérieur, des fournisseurs de services de planification des programmes d'études, des gestionnaires de plateformes pédagogiques en ligne, et des développeurs d'applications, moyennant paiement ou non, est interdite et constitue une infraction pénale.

Pour plus d'informations sur la procédure à suivre pour obtenir une autorisation écrite sous la forme d'une licence, rendez-vous à l'adresse <https://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/ib-publishing/licensing/applying-for-a-license/>.

© Organización del Bachillerato Internacional, 2023

Todos los derechos reservados. No se podrá reproducir ninguna parte de este producto de ninguna forma ni por ningún medio electrónico o mecánico, incluidos los sistemas de almacenamiento y recuperación de información, sin la previa autorización por escrito del IB. Además, la licencia vinculada a este producto prohíbe el uso de todo archivo o fragmento seleccionado de este producto. El uso por parte de terceros —lo que incluye, a título enunciativo, editoriales, profesores particulares, servicios de apoyo académico o ayuda para el estudio, colegios preparatorios, desarrolladores de aplicaciones y entidades que presten servicios de planificación curricular u ofrezcan recursos para docentes mediante plataformas digitales—, ya sea incluido en tasas o no, está prohibido y constituye un delito.

En este enlace encontrará más información sobre cómo solicitar una autorización por escrito en forma de licencia: <https://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/ib-publishing/licensing/applying-for-a-license/>.

### Candidates who overlook the Paper 2 rubric of answering **both** parts a and b of **one** question

However clearly the IB sets out its expectations on how candidates should answer exam questions, there are occasions when we receive work that does not match what we asked for. There is a specific case in exams where we ask students to select particular questions to answer and they fail to follow these rules (rubrics).

This note is intended to clarify how we deal with these situations through a series of scenarios. The actions have been checked to ensure that they are supported by RM Assessor.

#### Overarching principles

The following statements underpin our decisions below:

1. No candidate should be disadvantaged for following the rules.
2. Whenever possible candidates should receive credit for what they know.

#### Example

To help understand the different scenarios we will make reference to an example assessment.

#### Instruction: candidates must respond to both parts of one question.

- |         |  |            |
|---------|--|------------|
| Q7. (a) | Explain Mill's view of the relationship between liberty and utility.       | (10 marks) |
| (b)     | To what extent are liberty and utility fundamentally conflicting concepts? | (15 marks) |
| Q9. (a) | Explain the view that morality has a clear and traceable genealogy.        | (10 marks) |
| (b)     | To what extent do you agree with the genealogy Nietzsche proposes?         | (15 marks) |

#### Scenario 1. Candidate answers parts from two different questions.

Example: Candidate answers 7(a) and 9(a) or answers 7(b) and 9(a)

#### Action:

Mark all of the candidate's answers. The student will receive their best mark from one question.

In the second example this means the best mark for either 7(b) or 9(a).

This requires that examiners assign each mark to the correct question part (*ie* gives the mark for 9(a) to 9(a) and **not** 7(a) – if question is QIGed this will happen automatically).

#### Scenario 2. Candidate does not split their answer according to the sub-parts.

Example: Candidate writes one answer which they label as question 7 or they indicate they have only answered 9(a) but actually answer both 9(a) and 9(b) in that answer.

#### Action:

Examiners use their best judgement to award marks for all sub-parts as if the candidate has correctly labelled their answer.

In the example this means the candidate would be able to gain up to 25 marks despite only labelling the answer as 9(a).

**Exception** – where the nature of the two parts of the question means it is important to differentiate between the two answers, for example the first part should be done before the second part (in maths) or the candidate needs to show they understand the difference between the two parts of the question then

examiners should use their judgement and only award marks if it is clear that the candidate has simply made a mistake in numbering their answers.

**Scenario 3. Candidate duplicates their answer to the first part in the second part.**

Example: Candidate answers 7(a) and the repeats the same text as part of 7(b)

**Action:**

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

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

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

**Action:**

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

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

## How to use the Diploma Programme Philosophy markscheme

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

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

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

### Note to examiners

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

**Paper 2 part A markbands**

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

**Paper 2 part B markbands**

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

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

1. (a) **Explain de Beauvoir’s assumption that woman was seen as the weaker sex.** [10]  
 (b) **Evaluate de Beauvoir’s assumption that woman was seen as the weaker sex.** [15]

This question invites an explanation of how de Beauvoir argues that the vision of woman as weaker is wrong and not solely based on biological concerns but concerns of socialization. There is acceptance that woman might be physically different to man in terms of muscle structure, bodily function, and primarily their role in reproduction. However, the idea that they are fundamentally weaker stems from the social contracts that surround the relationship between men and women. The expectations of women established by society and education, and the acceptance of these, have established woman as the “other”, leaving man as the subject. This is because historically there is a male perception of the world. From birth, a social indoctrination process takes place which creates woman as subservient to man. Woman becomes in the eyes of all an “object”, as passive and mediocre. It is not the case that woman is born to this but that she becomes this by the values of the society she operates within. Even though here some may have an appreciation of what is happening, both man and woman have not allowed their consciousness to awaken and so reject this condition. The reason for women to accept the role is the fact that they are seen as “...inferior, passive, static, and immersed in themselves”. De Beauvoir attacks the misogyny of Freudian psychoanalysis. Freud’s descriptions are seen as the result of socialization that suppresses the true self of woman. With the aid of education and man’s desire to be aware of the source of his attitudes, then reciprocity in relationships can come about. For de Beauvoir what she describes as “immanence”, as the historic domain assigned to women, can be broken by a conscious awareness of reciprocity by both man and woman. By putting this argument forward, de Beauvoir has redefined existentialism in that the woman’s sense of being is of her own making but with the reciprocity of man.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The idea of being an “object” and not a “subject”
- The oppression of women
- The impact of Freudian psychoanalysis
- The consciousness of self in man and woman
- Reproductive controls
- The derivation of woman in language making her second to man
- The link to the consciousness of the self
- The notion of “immanence”
- The idea of equality
- Cultural traditions and the role of woman
- The impact of education
- Gender stereotyping.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Socialization processes in a male dominated society
- Historical and contemporary actions by men that deny women’s humanity
- Changes in the control of reproduction and the related economic/sexual revolution
- The idea of reciprocity
- De Beauvoir’s phenomenologist approach to gender issues
- Woman as the “other” and the consequences of this status
- Feminist movements and the economic and political challenges that result
- The role of religion and the status of women
- Contemporary discussions about sex and gender *eg*: MacKinnon, Butler
- De Beauvoir’s relationship with Sartre, and his interpretation of existentialism compared to that of Kierkegaard.

2. (a) **Explain de Beauvoir’s view of the relationship between property and the status of woman** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate de Beauvoir’s view of the relationship between property and the status of woman** [15]

This question seeks an explanation of the relationship that de Beauvoir sees between the position of property in society and the status of women. It focuses on her critique of a Marxist perspective in Part 1, Chapter 3 of the existence of private property and the oppression of women. De Beauvoir seems to lack full conviction of a Marxist stand point in that “...it is impossible to deduce the oppression of woman from the institution of private property...” (Part 1 Chapter 3) because she is in the end more convinced that the root cause of female oppression is the existence of the concept of the “other” and the link to consciousness and lack of reciprocity within relationships. The Marxist position and equation with private property sees the status of women as not merely resting on her sexuality but on the economic situation she acts within. Her control of her world is seen as not as tight as that of man’s. The rise of property ownership means that men, but more so “man” in general, have seen themselves as able to have the dominant role in economic life. Perhaps as presented in Chapter 3, historically, there had been a necessity for partnership to survive but this was lost when metal working appeared. When ownership of property comes about, women are reduced to property. The master controls the slave, the means of production, and therefore in the new economic environment the master controls the woman. When man owns woman, it is the “the great historical defeat of the feminine sex” (Chapter 3). Woman is reduced to the workplace of the home or later the lesser paid “slave” in the manufacturing process. For de Beauvoir, woman can only be freed if she is also able to break the present economic system as well as change her consciousness and gain reciprocity. Without this change she remains, “like the proletariat”, oppressed. Her sexuality might reduce her value as labour, but it is more that her conscious acceptance of the role and the shackles of the economic system keep her in place. The status of private property ownership in society and the equating of woman to land and goods means that the system prevents any change in her status. The right of property remains, in many traditions, sacrosanct hence the woman is dominated. For de Beauvoir, private property is the foundation of relationships, property, personal, family, legal, and cultural factors that restrain women. For most men these are not seen as restraints.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The institutionalization of marriage in western traditions reinforcing the idea of woman as property
- The biological issues that might reduce the labour value of the woman
- The right to property
- Reducing fellow humans to the status of property
- The need for woman to be fully active and equally rewarded in the workplace to achieve freedom
- Marxist views on property ownership and Marxist views on equality in society
- The equation of woman equaling proletariat.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The relationship between the woman and the institution of a nuclear family
- The degree of the feasibility of the changed economic status for women in a modern society
- Private property as a bedrock of a market driven society
- The role of private property in the development of a sense of self eg: Hegel
- The transformational effects of birth control, that were not foreseen at the time of de Beauvoir’s writing (legal birth control was denied to French women until 1967, and legal abortion, until 1975)
- The consequences of woman being seen as property and parallels with particular racial and ethnic groups equally being seen as property

- Campaigns for equal payment and the removal of glass ceilings
- Religious and cultural/psychological views on the status of woman
- Inconsistencies in de Beauvoir's view on women and property, eg: "...if society rejects the family by denying private property, woman's condition improves considerably." (Part 2 Chapter 3)
- The degree to which de Beauvoir was against private property
- The degree to which classical Marxism might not be compatible with liberated women (the free woman)
- Vogel's view that only with the socialist revolution, and its transformation of domestic labour and the ability of woman to enter into "public production", can the woman cease to be oppressed.

**René Descartes: *Meditations***

3. (a) **Explain Descartes’s distinction between mind and body.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate Descartes’s distinction between mind and body.** [15]

In the Sixth Meditation Descartes declares that he can “...clearly and distinctly understand one thing apart from another” and this “is enough to make me certain that the two things are distinct...”. This builds on the material already covered in the work stemming from Descartes’s initial skepticism about what he can and cannot know. Descartes has established the indubitability of knowledge in the mind due to its resting on the reliability of God as the guarantor of the correspondence (“I know that everything which I clearly and distinctly understand is capable of being created by God so as to correspond exactly with my understanding of it”). But Descartes does not just rely on his initial method of doubt to establish this distinction. He goes on to probe the difference between the action of thought alone in contrast to the body. His view that the mind could not be divided plays a big role in his assertion of the distinction. Many think Descartes fails to give a convincing account of interrelation of the mind and the body, but he acknowledges their causal interactivity and offers a “place” in the body where the interaction occurs – the pineal gland.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- God as the guarantor of the reliability of “clear and distinct” ideas
- The characteristic of mind – that it has consciousness but is not in space and has no physical form
- The characteristic of body – that it is in space and has physical form but has no consciousness
- Descartes’s argument for the distinction starts with the pursuit of doubt, covered earlier in the *Meditations*
- The challenge to the indubitability of ideas (when it is clearly possible to think wrong things) is addressed by the knowledge of existence – or essence – through thought alone, as opposed to the knowledge of extended, physical things
- Thus, the prime argument for Descartes is the dependency on “clear and distinct perception” of our existence or essence, which is a thinking “thing”
- Mind is indivisible, the body is not
- The issue of the relation between mind and body – the causal nature from body to mind and the other way around
- The “intermingled” mind and body
- The characteristic of mind – that it has consciousness but is not in space and has no physical form
- The characteristic of body – that it is in space and has physical form but has no consciousness
- The counter-example of the sailor in a ship
- The pineal gland.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The reliance on “clear and distinct ideas” – is this enough to maintain the distinction?
- Why cannot the mind be divided into parts like the body?
- Just because Descartes can clearly and distinctly see that he could exist without a body, does it follow that this is actually the case?
- The dependence of the mind on the brain; see modern neurology and cases of altered personality after brain trauma
- How much can the “whole mind” be considered fully “united to the whole body”?
- See other accounts of mind-body relation, eg: Hume and modern empiricist accounts
- Malebranche’s occasionalism following Descartes’s inability to explain the interaction of mind and body

- How convincing is Descartes's use of the pineal gland as the "place" of interaction between mind and body?
- Alternative approaches that do not separate the body and mind so sharply, eg: Heidegger on embodiment and being in the world, Merleau-Ponty on perception, sentience and the body, Grosz's account of corporeal feminism.

4. (a) Explain Descartes’s claim that God would not deceive him. [10]
- (b) Evaluate Descartes’s claim that God would not deceive him. [15]

At the end of the Third Meditation, Descartes concludes that having proved God’s existence he can now assert that God would not deceive him – as had been raised as a possibility in the First Meditation. “I have perceived that God exists, and at the same time I have understood that everything else depends on him, and that he is no deceiver; and I have drawn the conclusion that everything which I clearly and distinctly perceive is of necessity true”. In the Fourth Meditation Descartes claims that a perfect God would not deceive him as part of that perfection, which Descartes has established. But Descartes appealed to “clear and distinct ideas” as the route to his knowledge of the existence and perfection of God, but it is God who guarantees the reliability of those clear and distinct ideas. This is widely referred to as “the Cartesian circle” where either the proof of God’s existence is unnecessary, or it does not work as a proof. What appears lacking is a sufficiently independent guarantor of clear and distinct ideas, separate from God.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The reliance on Descartes’s proof of God for the claim that God would not deceive him
- The Cartesian circle – a conclusion about God resting on the assumptions of the argument about clearly and distinctly conceiving of God
- Necessary truth
- Descartes attempts to show some truths might be able to deflect the doubts (even) of a hypothetical deceiving God when we are attending to those truths – like mathematical truths or the *cogito*
- See Descartes’s ontological argument
- The proof of God helps with solidifying knowledge for humans who are otherwise subject to the problems of shifting memories and “changeable opinions”
- God is thus used as a guarantor over time of the consistency of knowledge, otherwise gained through “clear and distinct” ideas
- A distinction between intuiting a truth and the foundation of that truth.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Is the reasoning circular? Is this Cartesian circle problematic?
- Is Descartes’s proof of God and the perfection of God convincing?
- Is the defence of God guaranteeing the stability of knowledge convincing? Does it offer a way out of the charge of circular reasoning? eg: Williams (who sees the argument for God’s existence and perfection as invalid) and Kenny
- What are the foundations of knowledge and how do we access them or come to know them as such foundations?
- Descartes relies on an assumption of God’s existence to deliver his argument.

**David Hume: *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion***

5. (a) **Explain the limits of human reason when contemplating the divine.** [10]  
 (b) **Evaluate the limits of human reason when contemplating the divine.** [15]

The limits of human reason when contemplating the divine are discussed by Demea and Philo in Part 1 of the *Dialogues*. At the earliest stage of the work, the question arises of when the best time would be to start an education about the divine. Demea points out the limits of philosophy in approaching the subject and that human reason would not be something capable of overthrowing religious belief. In this, Demea is often described as representing the fideist position. Philo extends this and seeks to point out the more basic limits of human reason whatever the field in question, but especially in questions about the divine. Thus, the *Dialogues* begin with an acknowledgment of the problematic relation between reason and faith. Philo sets out to Cleanthes (who is concerned that reason should be dismissed as helping to confirm divine belief) that any conclusions must be based on evidence – and his outline of that process characterizes the inductive process. For Philo, any conclusion or belief must be dependent on the evidence on which it is based. Philo outlines what might be discussed using evidence, but reminds Cleanthes that we have no direct experience of the divine or world-making, meaning divine matters cannot be argued about like other features of human reasoning. Philo thus limits human knowledge to what can be concluded through a posteriori reasoning, and even then, humans are limited by what they can conclude, given it must come from direct observation. Cleanthes challenges Philo with his (Philo's) willingness to accept obscure theoretical science, theories with which he has no direct experience. "Is skepticism not the same as atheism?", asks Cleanthes. But Philo does not directly answer this, responding, however, that religion often embraces skepticism when it suits itself and does not have a stable relationship with evidence and knowledge. Thus, Philo outlines the moderate skepticism characteristic of Hume in other works, more directly concerning epistemology. We can only know what evidence available to us helps us confirm, and this rules out the possibility of confirming faith in the divine through human reason.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The fideist position of accepting that faith cannot be explored by human reason
- The limits of reason when discussing the divine
- The denial of direct experience being available to humans of the divine
- Hume's "moderate" skepticism about knowledge generally, as outlined by Philo
- Inductive reasoning
- *A priori* and *a posteriori* reasoning.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Is Philo's separation of human experience and evidence of the divine fair?
- What about religious experience for individuals' knowledge of the divine?
- The problem of induction – we can never observe enough instances of a theory to confirm absolutely its validity
- Attempts to use a priori reasoning for confirmation of religious belief, eg: the ontological argument
- Russell's problem of induction, building on Hume's work
- Fideism
- William James's arguments from religious experience
- *A posteriori* reasoning backing arguments for religious belief, eg: teleological arguments like the design argument
- Pascal's discussion on human reason and faith.

6. (a) **Explain the objections to Cleanthes’s use of analogy in the argument from design.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate the objections to Cleanthes’s use of analogy in the argument from design.** [15]

At the time of Hume’s writing, the argument from (or to) design was the most prominent used in defence of belief in God in a world increasingly effected by the discoveries of natural science. Defenders of the argument pointed to the order being discovered in the natural world and in the planetary motions beyond the earth. In Part 2 of the *Dialogues*, Hume offers his skeptical view of the argument from design through the responses to Cleanthes by Philo and Demea. The argument from design features broadly in the work, but in Part 2 Philo accepts the *a posteriori* position of Cleanthes, but takes issue with the use of analogy to achieve the design argument’s conclusions. Demea first objects to the comparison between God and humans with the key problem of the analogy being the lack of any experience of the divine in the human knower, such that she can draw any conclusion about the divine from any human experience. This lack of prior experience means that any *a posteriori* argument will fail due to limitations that make ineligible any possible analogy. In Part 2, this problem is particularly important, since Demea starts the section by asking if it is God’s nature as opposed to God’s existence that is being subject to doubt. Given the absence of any *a posteriori* experience of God, the prospect of a successful analogy is dismissed in this section of the work. Philo characterizes the ascription of human qualities to God as simply using words we know, given we can do nothing else. So, the idea that God must be perfect in wisdom or knowledge cannot be verified due to lack of adequate means of comparison between the human and the divine. Given that our ideas are produced by our experience (a key tenet of Hume’s epistemology), we have no way of knowing how human qualities could be understood in the divine context. The analogy rests on comparing two distinct objects – a machine and a universe – but any machine must be a part of the universe, thus the analogy cannot work. Philo asserts that we cannot infer the unity or singularity of a designer from the products of design, given human artefacts are often designed by groups of inventors/craftspeople. Might designers need designers to design them? The better resemblance of this world to any other would be, according to Philo, not a man-made object but a vegetable or natural feature of the world. A further issue is the move to the perfection of the designer in the analogy, given the obvious points of imperfection and suffering in the natural world. The section ends with the objection to thinking that any inference can be made inductively about a unique event (the origin of the universe) given that it would require comparisons with other occasions of universe’s creation in order to draw an inductive conclusion.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The context of the argument from design in Hume’s time
- The use of analogy in the argument from design – the world/universe looks like finely-tuned machine; all machines are designed; therefore, the world/universe must be designed
- The epistemological assumption that humans can have no experience of the divine (Demea agrees), thus must rely on analogy for awareness of divine activity seen in human experience
- We have no experience of the beginning of the universe, or any other universe, so it is impossible to assess an analogy purporting to explain the origin of the universe.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Inductive issues with the analogy – moving from a machine to a universe; does the world resemble a machine?
- A machine in the world is a part of the universe, so positing the analogy between the universe and a machine – as if they are separate things – is illegitimate
- The argument from design and the universe, eg: Aquinas, Paley
- Can intelligence be ascribed as the cause of order in the world?

- There are explanations for order within the world that require no external agency *eg*: Darwinian evolution
- Why should we infer one designer from the existence of one universe?
- Is a machine a better point of comparison with the creation of the world than something organic like a vegetable?
- Can any moral or perfect quality be seen in a world with such suffering and imperfection in it?
- The issue of the uniqueness of the universe and its origin, rendering any form of inductive inference impossible.

**John Stuart Mill: *On Liberty***

7. (a) **Explain Mill’s claim that “all silencing of discussion is an assumption of infallibility”.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate Mill’s claim that “all silencing of discussion is an assumption of infallibility”.** [15]

In Chapter II, *Of the Liberty of Thought and Discussion*, Mill gives his reasons for holding that freedom of speech is a fundamental liberty. He starts with the claim that “if all of mankind minus one, were of one opinion, and only one person were of the contrary opinion, mankind would be no more justified in silencing that one person, than he, if he had the power, would be in silencing mankind”. This is because “if the opinion is right, they are deprived of the opportunity of exchanging error for truth: if wrong, they lose, what is almost as great a benefit, the clearer perception and livelier impression of truth, produced by its collision with error”. This view is premised on Mill’s conviction that people are fallible, that they possess at best half-truths, and that liberty promotes progress towards truth in society. Mill links the undermining of freedom of speech to the dominance of dogma, which he thinks harms society.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Mill’s use of the term “liberty”
- The idea that without liberty, society can become a tyranny of the majority over the minority
- Mill’s views about freedom of speech
- The idea that dogma causes societal harm
- The importance of liberty to progress
- The fallibility of human knowledge
- Mill’s view that a plurality of ideas, discussed openly, can lead to a better grasp of the truth
- Dogma, and the example provided by Mill of Marcus Aurelius, who in Mill’s view was true Christian but saw Christianity as evil due to societal norms
- The Harm Principle and its application when it comes to freedom of speech.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Whether free speech can cause harm, eg: hate speech
- Mill’s view that an individual’s opinion is as valuable as the opinion of the majority, and how this fits with modern democratic processes
- Whether humankind might ever consider itself infallible
- Epistemology, coherentism and foundationalism in relation to fallibilism, eg: Descartes, Bonjour
- How much doubt it is reasonable to place on commonly held beliefs eg: Moore on skepticism
- The limits of Mill’s claims
- The importance of allowing free discussion for political reasons
- Debates about issues such as the “cancel culture” and alleged “no platform” policies at universities
- Democratic processes and free speech
- The relationship between liberty and utility.

8. (a) **Explain Mill’s claim that the interference of the government should be restricted to avoid “the great evil of unnecessarily adding to its power”.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate Mill’s claim that the interference of the government should be restricted to avoid “the great evil of unnecessarily adding to its power”.** [15]

In Chapter V, *Applications*, Mill explains practical applications of his views about liberty. One such application is a discussion about the limits of the government in terms of its interference in people’s lives. Mill considers three objections. The first is that individuals who are personally interested in something are best placed to bring it about; the second is that giving individuals freedom is “a means to their own mental education”; the third is that the government should be restricted to prevent “the great evil of unnecessarily adding to its power”. Mill considers the possibility of a government which controlled “the roads, the railways, the banks, the charities... the municipal corporations and local boards”. Such a society would leave little room for liberty, dissent, experimentation, and progress. Rather than a society where change can be enacted easily and in line with changes in public opinion, a government with too much power could only be overthrown through revolution. Mill’s view that the government should be limited reflects his claims about the danger of dogma, the value of dissent, the importance of experimenting with different ways of life, and his Harm Principle.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The implications of the concept of liberty promoted by Mill on the limits of government
- Mill’s views about when the government can intervene, eg: in the lives of children, or to prevent harm
- The Harm Principle
- The dangers of dogma and how dogma limits progress
- The importance of allowing people to experiment with ways of living
- The value of being able to make your own decisions and how this might help people to develop their own sense of agency and rationality
- The danger of a democracy becoming a tyranny of the majority over the minority.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Libertarianism and paternalism
- The strengths and weaknesses of a strong, centralized, powerful state
- The strengths and weaknesses of a libertarian state with very little intervention in the day to day lives of its citizens
- Contemporary examples of libertarianism
- Contrasting contemporary examples such as China’s centralized response to the pandemic
- Differences between libertarian and authoritarian approaches to governing
- Different proposals about systems of government eg: Marx, Smith, Hobbes
- Political philosophies which call for widespread political interference, eg: Plato’s *Republic*
- The implications of Mill’s claim on debates between libertarians who want a minimal state and those who support more state intervention eg: by providing free health care, education, and basic benefits
- An assessment of the value of state intervention in light of positive contributes such as health care.

### Friedrich Nietzsche: *The Genealogy of Morals*

9. (a) Explain Nietzsche's approach to the origin of morality. [10]
- (b) Evaluate Nietzsche's approach to the origin of morality. [15]

The question asks for an explanation and evaluation of Nietzsche's approach to the origin of morality. It refers firstly to the genealogical approach as presented by Nietzsche in the preface, but answers might take different paths developing the explanation in relation to some of the main issues considered in the three essays: good and evil, good and bad, master and slave morality, guilt, bad conscience, ascetic ideals. Nietzsche's approach is rooted in his conviction of the need of a critique of moral values; to him the value of these values must itself be called into question, "for that there is needed a knowledge of the conditions and circumstances in which they grew, under which they evolved and changed (...), a knowledge of a kind that has never yet existed or even been desired" (Preface). The genealogical approach shows how morality is rooted in the needs, fears, and desires of human beings. In this sense genealogy gives an account of values and morality. Values and morality are formed in a similar way as other living things and the genealogy of morality involves identifying the basic components that give rise to morality and showing how these components came together in the course of human history.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Morality is a complex matter that developed in the course of human history; genealogy is a kind of moral inquiry which investigates the psychological collective motives involved in this development
- The starting point: we are unknown to ourselves
- Under what conditions did man devise the value judgments good and evil? What value do they themselves possess? Have they hindered or furthered human prosperity? Are they a sign of distress, of impoverishment, of the degeneration of life?
- Nietzsche's position regarding previous reflection on morality: Rée, the English moral genealogists, Schopenhauer
- The need of knowledge of the conditions and circumstances in which the values grew, under which they evolved and changed; morality as misunderstanding, consequence, symptom, and illness
- The origin of morality and the main issues of Nietzsche's discussion in the three essays: master and slave morality, guilt, bad conscience, and ascetic ideals.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The extent to which the genealogical approach is a kind of a medical one: etiological, diagnostic, therapeutic
- Nietzsche's approach to the origin of morality and the general and simple question whether he is right in his account of morality
- Evaluations of morality and of the history of morality other than Nietzsche's, eg: as progress of humanity
- The extent to which Nietzsche provides a unified account of the origin of morality: each essay is dedicated to a different moral phenomenon and each one turns out to consist of several different stories or parts of stories
- Is Nietzsche's genealogy a version of the genetic fallacy, attempting to explain the value of something by its origins?
- Effects and projections of the genealogical approach, eg: Foucault's theory of power
- To what extent Nietzsche's account of morality denies the possibility of an authentic set of moral values?
- The extent to which genealogy is actually philosophy rather than cultural history or sociology
- Genealogy as a way of doing philosophy that criticizes the whole history of metaphysics and sets out the view of a non-metaphysical way of doing philosophy.

10. (a) **Explain Nietzsche’s idea that humans would rather will nothingness than not will.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate Nietzsche’s idea that humans would rather will nothingness than not will.** [15]

The aim of this question is to explain and assess the culmination of Nietzsche’s argument in Essay 3. The idea is an almost but not quite exact quotation of the last words of the book, found also, near the end of the first section of the third essay. In the final essay Nietzsche presents an explanation of the significance of the idea that ascetic ideals have exerted such a powerful influence on the shaping of morality. The predominance of ascetic ideals does not mean that human beings are ascetic either by choice, nature or divine ruling. The ascetic ideal owes its prevalence throughout the moral period of human development to the fact that it grants meaning to suffering human beings. It encourages obscuring the value of life and enables a sickly will to project itself into the future. The key figure in providing protection and mutual aid of the sickliest of human beings is in ancient cultures the ascetic priest and in contemporary cultures the philosopher and the scientist. Common to all of them is the denial or rejection of the sensual aspects of life, and the creation of an ideal based on the desire for truth. When life in all its forms is denied and truth remains unreachable it is better to will nothingness than not will. Genealogy reveals the will to nothingness as the fundamental will of history and that the ascetic ideal is “an expression of the basic fact of the human will, its *horror vacui*, it needs a goal – and it will rather will *nothingness* than *not will*” (Third Essay, 1).

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The human will needs a goal; it prefers willing nothingness to having no goal
- The ascetic ideals offer goals to the will and meaning to human life
- Ascetic ideals might mean many things: for artists nothing or too many things, for philosophers an instinct for the most preconditions of higher spirituality, for women one more seductive charm, for the majority of mortals an attempt to see themselves as too good for this world
- With the ascetic ideal philosophers want to gain release from a torture; their rancour against sensuality
- The three great slogans of the ascetic ideal: poverty, humility, chastity
- The ascetic priest as the “the repulsive and gloomy caterpillar form in which alone the philosopher could live and creep about”
- The ascetic ideal as employed to produce “orgies of feeling”
- The ascetic treats life as a wrong road on which one must finally walk back to the point where it begins: the ascetic ideal springs from the protective instinct of a degenerating life which tries by all means to sustain itself and to fight for its existence
- The ascetic ideal as the way of offering meaning to human life.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The will to nothingness, the exploitation of the sense of guilt and resentment
- The will to nothingness and the will to power
- The will to nothingness as a way of having some form of superiority; the instinct of the sick for devious paths to tyranny over the healthy where can it not be discovered; this as the will to power of the weakest
- Ascetic ideals as ways of dominion over the suffering
- The extent to which ascetic ideals are wills to mutual aid, to the formation of a herd and the origin of the social bond
- Nietzsche’s physiological-psychological account of ascetic ideals is based on a too simplistic and reductive vision of the human emotions, where their entire wide gamut is practically reduced to a form of disguise and deception

- To what extent Nietzsche's criticism of religious and moral values like the "love of one's neighbour" is fair? Its contrast with present accounts of emotions related to basic forms of solidarity and values related to solidarity and commonality
- The ascetic ideal and the aesthetics: the case of Wagner; Kant's and Schopenhauer's accounts of the beautiful
- The extent to which the ascetic ideal is simply equated to spiritual or moral ideals in Nietzsche's account
- Are there no positive values at all in asceticism?
- Is Nietzsche's account of ascetic ideals genealogy a version of the genetic fallacy?
- Comparison and contrast with other approaches to moral life and ways of conceiving meaning to human life.

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

11. (a) Explain the claim that the capabilities approach could become the basis for an ‘overlapping consensus’. [10]
- (b) Evaluate the claim that the capabilities approach could become the basis for an ‘overlapping consensus’. [15]

The claim is from Chapter 4 of Nussbaum’s book and invites an analysis of the capabilities approach and its possible political impact. Candidates might present Nussbaum’s description of the approach and make a comparison with Sen’s view on the capabilities. Responses might consider the origin of Nussbaum’s argument for a political justification of the approach and refer to Rawls’s concept of “reflective equilibrium”. Candidates might also consider the reference that Nussbaum makes to Socrates and the Socratic process in the “attempt to attain clarity about the structure of one’s own moral judgments in the area of social justice”. Candidates might explain that Nussbaum sees that process not in terms of individual justification, but as the result of public debate. In presenting this Socratic process, Nussbaum echoes some elements of the “democratic spirit” that we can see in Dewey’s political philosophy and, more in general, a specific advancing process that modern sciences have adopted in shaping knowledge and embracing truth: “Nothing is held fixed: an initially compelling judgment may be modified”. Candidates might discuss what Nussbaum means by “overlapping consensus” and how she comes to it: within the context of a desirable open process, which allows individuals from different religious and secular frameworks to debate and come to a possible agreement, the “overlapping consensus” is the result of an agreed compromise. Candidates might discuss the role that individual preferences play in this process and why Nussbaum does not consider them as reliable sources for a political justification. Accordingly, responses might show why Nussbaum considers stories, such as Vasanti’s, having an educational function only. Finally, candidates might explore contrasting views within the democratic process or the neo-contractarian theories, eg: Rousseau, Mill, or Nozick.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The capabilities approach and the list of capabilities
- Sen’s view on the capabilities
- Rawls’s concept of “reflective equilibrium”
- The Socratic process of making judgments
- The concept of “overlapping consensus”
- The role that individual preferences play in the Socratic process
- The role that individual stories play for Nussbaum.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Stories that Nussbaum mentions, eg: Vasanti
- The concept of human dignity
- Rawls’s theory of justice
- Other democratic approaches, eg: Dewey, Rousseau
- Other neo-contractarian approaches, eg: Nozick
- The Socratic process as applied to other fields than political philosophy, such as moral philosophy or sciences, eg: Descartes’s “provisional morality”, Hume’s methods as in the *Dialogues*, Popper’s falsifiability, Kuhn’s “paradigm shifts”.

12. (a) Explain the claim that the “focus on capabilities as political goals protects pluralism”. [10]
- (b) Evaluate the claim that the “focus on capabilities as political goals protects pluralism”. [15]

The claim is from Chapter 5 of Nussbaum’s book and invites a discussion on the topic of multiculturalism in relation to the capabilities approach. Nussbaum presents pluralism as a key value in her approach and puts it in connection to her view on social justice and political process grounded in an “overlapping consensus”. Candidates might explore the points that Nussbaum presents in Chapter 5, in order to explain why she considers pluralism crucial. Responses might highlight the fact that Nussbaum defines personal choices as spaces that cannot be undermined or limited by any normative content of political values: “We need to be sure that this content does not inappropriately stifle people’s capacity for choice in areas of central meaning in their lives”. Candidates might compare Nussbaum’s and Sen’s views on this and pinpoint the differences: while Sen focuses on gender equality, education, and health, Nussbaum extends pluralism to every cultural and religious set of values. Candidates might discuss the possible connections between multiculturalism and relativism. Also, responses might explain why Nussbaum holds that different countries with different traditions can legitimately differ in their sets of values. Candidates might present the possible issues emerging from the adoption of the capabilities approach and the specific religious faith of people: “The Capabilities Approach seeks an agreement for practical political purposes and deliberately avoids comment on the deep divisive issues about God, the soul, the limits of human knowledge, and so on, that divide people along lines of doctrine”. Candidates might also focus on the relation between the capabilities list and the major liberties, such as freedom of speech, association, conscience. Finally, candidates might evaluate Nussbaum’s distinction between justification and implementation of the capabilities list and whether and how governments are required to intervene. As contrasting views, candidates might discuss different political models of participation, eg: Plato, Hobbes, Rousseau, Kant, Mill, and different views on individual freedom against social order, eg: Nozick.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Pluralism as key element in the capabilities approach
- The relation between pluralism and normative political content
- Pluralism and relativism; national cultural differences
- The role of personal choice as a key value
- Pluralism as a guarantee for major liberties
- The relation between pluralism and religious values.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The possible conflict between the political agenda and personal values
- Pluralism as a tool for the “overlapping consensus”
- Pluralism as a key element in contemporary societies
- Pluralism as a central value for understanding diversity, eg: race, gender, migration, marginalization
- Other possible ways to discuss personal freedom, eg: Mill
- Other possible ways to discuss participation and pluralism, eg: Rousseau, Kant, Touraine
- Contrasting theories that present different views on freedom, eg: Nozick.

**Ortega y Gasset: *The Origin of Philosophy***

13. (a) Explain Ortega y Gasset's reflection on the name of philosophy. [10]
- (b) Evaluate Ortega y Gasset's reflection on the name of philosophy. [15]

The question asks for an explanation and evaluation of Ortega y Gasset's reflection on the name of philosophy with a first focus on Chapter 5, The Authentic Name. In this chapter Ortega y Gasset's reflection turns to the various names that have been given to the occupation of doing philosophy which, as he presents, western man has pursued for twenty-six centuries, to the books that have perpetuated it, and to the appellations and nicknames linguistically imposed upon its practitioners. Ortega y Gasset points out: "That which is naked is reality and denuding it is the truth, inquiry, or *aletheia*. This, the original name of philosophy, is its true or authentic name and thus its poetic name". Accordingly, Ortega y Gasset's account offers a linguistic angle or approach to the problem of what philosophy is and what constitutes its essential unity. It deals with the names for philosophy in the same manner that the occupation of doing philosophy is discovered through a retrospective contemplation of its total past and through the attempt to reconstruct the dramatic occasion of its origin. In this way, the question offers the possibility of connecting this linguistic angle or approach on the origin of philosophy with the other main themes developed in the other chapters.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Philosophy as such begins with Parmenides and Heraclitus. Parmenides and others of his day named the subject that they expounded *aletheia* (truth). This was philosophy's original name
- The moment a name is born, the moment something for the first time is called by a word, is a moment of exceptional creative purity. The thing stands before humans still devoid of designation, without a vestige of nomenclature, ontologically out in the raw, one might say
- Language is something not created by individuals but something that is found by them, previously established by their social environs, their tribe, polis, city, or nation. The words of a language have their meaning imposed by collective usage
- Speaking is a re-using of an accepted meaning, saying what is already known, what everyone knows, what is mutually known
- The question of creating a word. The name of philosophy as a new entity, something that had no usual name
- *Aletheia* names the new vital experience in the new Greek thought, later to be known as philosophizing
- *Aletheia* signifies truth; it presents philosophy for what it is: an endeavour at discovery and at deciphering enigmas to place us in contact with naked reality itself
- The thinking process implied in *aletheia*: something akin to un-dressing, un-covering, removing a veil or covering, revealing (un-veiling), de-ciphering an enigma or hieroglyphic. This literally is what the word *aletheia* meant in popular language: discovery, exposure, denudation, revelation
- *Aletheia* referred to the original, intimate experience of doing philosophy
- This personal experience considered from outside, from the point of view of the others became inquiry or philosophy.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The poetic function of the use of language in the origin of philosophy; philosophy, poetry and literature
- The search for truth as the main goal of philosophical activity
- Vital and historical reason as the main approach to the origin of philosophy; philosophy as finally dependent on a basic reality and point of view of life

- Vital reason offers an approach to history and to social action, eg: by means of the methodological idea of generations
- Ortega y Gasset underlined the role of philosophy in trying to anticipate the future, in relation to the idea of vital reason, his philosophy of life, supported by his theory of history and social thought; the structure of life as orientated towards the future
- The reflection on the origin of philosophy is directed not only to the past but also to the future. The utopian character of Ortega y Gasset's reflection: vital reason also aims at possible reforms of thinking, institutions, and culture
- The thesis that according to its origin, the everlasting name of philosophy should be "truth," or "inquiry"
- Ortega y Gasset's conception of philosophy in relation to other views, eg: Plato, Descartes, Kant, Heidegger, Sartre
- Ortega y Gasset's accent on the role of language in the origin of philosophy and the "linguistic turn".

14. (a) **Explain the significance of the past in Ortega’s historical account of philosophy.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate the significance of the past in Ortega’s historical account of philosophy.** [15]

The question arises from Chapter 1, The Philosophical Past, but its central issue is present through almost all of the book, in every step of Ortega’s reflection on the roots and historical justification of philosophy. Ortega’s reflection on the significance of the past is part of historic reason in operation, and here is applied to the problem of what philosophy is and its essential unity. Ortega points out that making philosophy is one “of the multiple tasks in which man has engaged, an occupation that has not been a permanent one for humanity, but came about one day in Greece and has indeed come down to us”. Being conscious of the philosophical past constructs the grounds for making philosophy for the future. Accordingly, Ortega states that “a final backward gaze invariably incites in us an alternate forward one. Unable to find lodging among the philosophies of the past, we have no choice but to attempt to construct one of our own. The history of the philosophical past catapults us into the still empty spaces of the future, toward a philosophy yet to come”.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Man is the only being who is a product of the past, who consists in the past, though not solely in the past
- One first thing is to cast a final retrospective gaze at the sweeping avenue of philosophical doctrines
- The first contact with philosophy stems from what “is said” about it: the series of terms, book titles, and individual names that was involved in philosophizing
- Philosophy as such begins with Parmenides and Heraclitus
- In both the style of expression was central; understanding of style is of prime philosophical importance
- Parmenides expressed his ideas in the form of a poem, which is in keeping with the most characteristic literary genre of the period, the theological-cosmogonic poem of the Orphic mystics
- Heraclitus expressed his ideas in spurts, in brief pronouncements, which were stylistically compressed; hence his renowned obscurity
- Mythology, the traditional religion of the Greek city constituted a subsoil and part of the vital horizon for the origin of philosophy
- Heraclitus and Parmenides constitute a common root, a proto-philosophy which produces its fruit about one century afterward, between 500 and 470
- Philosophy was one outgrowth, among others, that was born in Greece when its people entered the “period of freedom”
- The history of philosophy as dialectical series
- The history of philosophy *prima facie* reveals the past to us as a defunct world of errors
- Each new philosophy began with a denunciation of its predecessor, and further, that by its formal recognition of the latter’s invalidity, it identified itself as another philosophy
- Since 1800, philosophy has progressively ceased to be a component of general culture and hence a present historical factor.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Ortega’s idea that history signifies understanding the past as application of the historical reason
- History signifies not only recounting the past but understanding it. History is a rich repertory of possible operations that ought to be coordinated with events
- The idea that every historical period is understood as emerging from one or a couple of fundamental events

- The thesis that science and philosophy were originally colonial events and Athens delayed two centuries in creating a local philosophy
- It is impossible for a philosophy to be an absolute error; the error must contain some element of truth
- Skepticism as a response to the history of philosophy and to dogmatic philosophy
- Past philosophies persist and survive in our own philosophy
- Since the problems of philosophy are radical problems, there is no philosophy that does not contain them all
- Comparison with other philosophical traditions regarding the signification of understanding the origin and history of philosophy in order to project philosophy in the present, *eg*: analytical philosophy and forms descending from Hegel
- Ortega's conception of philosophy based on the idea of historical reason in relation to other views, *eg*: Plato, Descartes, Kant, Heidegger.

**Plato: *The Republic*, Books IV–IX**

15. (a) **Explain how justice in the state can bring benefit to an individual.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate how justice in the state can bring benefit to an individual.** [15]

Book 4 picks up the very first question of the whole work, namely addressing how justice can be achieved in the state. Plato has asked what the perfect or ideal state would be and without asking why this is the case, he has mooted that it excels in moral virtues, namely wisdom, courage, moderation and justice. The state is wise so long as rulers are ruling wisely, fulfilling a function – ruling – with the characteristic of wisdom. Because a state is ruled by the wise, this virtue will follow, thanks to the education of the rulers and this brings the benefit of good planning and exercising good judgment for the citizens of the state. In terms of bravery, the state is brave in so much as it is defended by brave rulers, fulfilling their function. Bravery is actions by people disposed to be brave. Moderation is the virtue of self-discipline and avoiding excesses. It is related to all other virtues in that it forms an appeal to a mid-way between excesses or deficits in the other virtues. Moderation can thrive when the citizens are in agreement about who should rule and when there is due respect to the rulers for fulfilling their function as rulers. Then Plato raises the issue of justice, which – like moderation – turns out to be about a relationship with other elements; it is about the relationship between parts of the state. Plato says that justice is about all elements of society fulfilling their proper function and role within the state. In this, Plato attempts to draw a parallel with the “ordinary” concept of justice as mentioned in Book 1 which is about people paying and receiving what is their due. Plato says that getting what you are due is based on what you do, hence the relationship with moderation. For Plato, all the parts of the state must work according to their function and he draws an analogy with the psyche – or soul – of the individual. Plato asserts that the individual is comprised of three distinct parts – like society is. We are made of different parts, because we sometimes desire conflicting things, and Plato can only account for this by different desires coming from different parts of the individual. Plato sees conflicts of desire as illustrating a difference between basic desire and reason. Reason is prime and studies abstract subjects like mathematics and logic. It is through this faculty that philosophers can come to know the world of the Forms, but in Book 4, Plato is more concerned about the role reason has in ordering the other parts of the individual. Reason is the principal part of the individual because it alone can decide what is in the interests of the individual as a whole. Reason controls our desires and rules the individual, just as the philosophers will rule the state. Reason leads the individual to pursue knowledge and truth, and hereby avoids the individual becoming a slave to the passions. So, Plato forms a comparison between ruling through reason in the interest of the whole state and reason leading the individual to make decisions about the best interests of the whole individual. Plato distinguishes between the base desires/instincts of the individual and her/his passions or emotions which regulate the desires. Through the proper functioning of the individual there follows health and well-being. In this way Plato answers why justice in the state is good for the individual, because it rests on the function and well-being of the individual in the first place. Thus, living a just life is its own reward.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The question of the ideal state, as posed in Book 4
- The assumption that the virtues of wisdom, courage, moderation and justice would excel in such an ideal state
- Rulers being wise, brave, moderate and just
- The analogy of the state, with its three parts – workers, auxiliaries and rulers, and the individual with its three parts – desires/urges, “spirit” and reason
- Justice in the state is its own reward just as living a life with one’s individual parts in balance and harmony confers its own reward of well-being.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- How convincing is the assumption of the virtues of the just state? Why does Plato not attempt to justify these virtues?
- The analogy between the soul and the state – is this convincing?
- The parts of the soul appear completely discrete – is this convincing?
- The importance of functioning properly in each part of the state or individual – is this justified or simply assumed?
- Counter-arguments to Plato include materialistic accounts of the human being and how different social constructions can achieve justice for an individual, eg: Hobbes, Rousseau, Mill, Rawls, Nozick.

16. (a) Explain Plato’s view that a genuine philosopher is a “lover of truth”. [10]
- (b) Evaluate Plato’s view that a genuine philosopher is a “lover of truth”. [15]

From Book 5 onwards Socrates engages in an extended examination of what qualifies a philosopher to rule, having established initially what a philosopher is. In Book 5, Socrates draws a distinction between the philosopher as a “lover of truth” and the non-philosopher who loves “sights and sounds”. Plato assumes the theory of Forms and never justifies this theory, but his distinction between the philosopher and the non-philosopher revolves entirely around the ability of the former to have true knowledge of the Forms, thus confirming the philosopher’s pursuit and love of “the truth”. In his account of what a “lover of truth” is, Plato draws a contrast between loving a single thing (like, justice or beauty) and loving a multiplicity of things, as the “lover of sights” does. He sees “sights” as physical things, like the paint on a work of art, where “the truth” is the beauty conveyed beyond the configuration of paints to a truth beyond the physical painting itself. In this way, Plato builds his epistemological system around the hierarchy of the world of the Forms, with the unseen, “higher” Form of any object of knowledge confirm its truth. Here a contrast between the sensible and the intellectual worlds arises, where “lovers of sights” look for physical experiences like pleasure in their experiences of art in contrast to the philosopher’s search for a single truth in the art beyond the sense experience it conveys. Later, Plato extends this analysis by showing that the person who recognizes, but does not know beauty is in a dreaming state, and from this position, Plato contrasts the philosopher’s knowledge with the non-philosopher’s opinion. Knowledge “attaches” to truth, where opinion “attaches” to sensible things. Thus, Plato’s epistemological account is founded on his metaphysical system of the world of the Forms, and Plato discusses the faculties needed for “truth” – or other objects of knowledge. Plato holds that truth is valuable for leading; he presents an analogy a ship’s pilot who “must of necessity pay attention to the seasons, the heavens, the stars, the winds, and everything proper to the craft if he is really to rule a ship”.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The distinction between philosophers and non-philosophers in terms of their relation to “truth”
- “Lovers of truth” – “Lovers of sights” and the use of art to illustrate
- “Truth” as being a single object of knowledge as opposed to a multiplicity of “things”
- The difference between sensible and intellectual cognition
- The world of the Forms
- Knowledge – opinion – ignorance
- How objects relate to Forms and vice versa
- The argument from opposites
- The Forms and relativism.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Plato assumes the world of the Forms and does not justify it
- Aristotle’s “third man argument”
- Trivial Forms and the extent of Forms to relate to all objects in the world
- The difference between sensible “opinion” and intellectual “knowledge” – is this convincing?
- Why does loving a multiplicity of objects count against knowledge of truth?
- How is ignorance attached to “what is not”?
- Counterarguments include the charge of intellectual elitism or the impracticability of philosophy in the public sphere
- Analytic accounts of philosophy, eg: Russell
- Existentialist accounts, eg: Jaspers
- Different perspectives on the concept of truth, eg: Heidegger.

**Peter Singer: *The Life You Can Save***

17. (a) **Explain Singer’s use of the story of the drowning child in the small pond to talk about global poverty.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate Singer’s use of the story of the drowning child in the small pond to talk about global poverty.** [15]

Peter Singer starts *The Life you can Save* with the story of the drowning child in the small pond. He claims that this is a starting point for practical ethics, and more specifically, for talking about global poverty. Singer gives examples of cases where children’s lives could have been saved with minimal intervention from those who are in a position to help. These are likened to the case of the drowning child in the small pond where “if you don’t wade in and pull her out, she seems likely to drown. Wading in is easy and safe, but will ruin the new shoes you bought only a few days ago, and get your suit wet and muddy”. Singer says that, analogously, by spending a small amount of money, “you could save a child’s life”. Since it would be clearly wrong to ignore a child drowning in a small pond, it would be clearly wrong to ignore global poverty and the suffering it causes. This question calls for students to explain the analogy between the pond story and global poverty. Part B invites a discussion about whether the story of the small pond is helpful when it comes to thinking about global poverty and practical questions about how we ought to act in response.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Information presented by Singer about global poverty
- An account of the story of the drowning child in the small pond
- How the small child can represent the plight of those in poverty, and how the person in the position to save the child represents affluent members of society
- The cost of saving lives
- Affluence today and the contrast with poverty in the world
- That saving a life is very easy for someone with money
- The story of Bob’s Bugatti which makes a similar point to the drowning child story
- Singer’s basic argument: (1) that suffering is bad; (2) if you can prevent suffering without suffering the same amount or more yourself then you should; (3) donating to effective charities can prevent suffering at little personal cost; (Conclusion) if you do not donate to effective charities, you are doing something wrong.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Similarities between the story of the child drowning in the small pond and affluent people faced with global poverty
- These might include the idea that affluent people can sacrifice very little in order to save lives
- The difficulty that people may have in extending compassion, care, humanity to those beyond their more immediate community, either beyond nations seen as close, or beyond a border of familiarity and perceived sameness
- A discussion of affluence, wealth and when a sacrifice becomes a burden
- Whether there is a moral duty to donate to charities
- The idea of suffering the same amount yourself, and whether it is a relevant factor in moral decision making
- Ways in which the story of the child drowning in the small pond is different from global poverty
- These might include the difficulty of establishing the most appropriate action when it comes to tackling global poverty, whereas in the case of the child drowning this is clear
- Reference to Singer’s discussion of psychological factors which inhibit giving to charity
- Comparisons might be made with act and rule utilitarianism
- Centralized approaches to tackling world poverty eg: Marxism
- Issues about justice in society eg: Rawls
- Whether Singer provides an overly simplistic account of how to live an ethical life
- An evaluation of the basic argument.

18. (a) **Explain Singer’s claim that “there is nothing new about the idea that we have a strong moral obligation to help those in need”.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate Singer’s claim that “there is nothing new about the idea that we have a strong moral obligation to help those in need”.** [15]

Singer claims that his basic argument appeals to traditional ethical views. In particular, he draws on Judaism, Christianity, Islam and Chinese traditions to make the case that “there is nothing new about the idea that we have a strong moral obligation to help those in need” (p.51). One such illustration of the traditional nature of Singer’s own view is that it appeals to the Golden Rule. Here, the Christian version, “do unto others as you would have them do unto you” is also attributed to “Buddhism, Confucianism, Hinduism, Islam, and Jainism, and in Judaism, where it is found in Leviticus and later emphasized by the sage Hillel”. Singer likens the Golden Rule to premise two of his basic argument: that if you can prevent suffering without causing yourself to suffer equally or more, then you should. This question invites a discussion of the traditional and historical basis of this premise. Part B allows for an evaluation of whether Singer is right to say that his view is a traditional view, as represented by various religious and ethical systems.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Singer’s discussion of the Golden Rule
- Christian, Buddhist, Confucian, Hindu, Muslim, Jain and Jewish teachings on charity and helping others
- Premise two of Singer’s basic argument: that if you can prevent suffering without excessively suffering yourself, then you should
- The fact that many different traditions from very different parts of the world all hold the same view
- An account of why Singer thinks that a strong moral obligation to help those in need means that more people ought to give to charity
- Singer’s use of Bob’s Bugatti and the drowning child in the small pond to illustrate his view.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The differences between the Golden Rule and Singer’s second premise in the basic argument. These might include that the Golden Rule sometimes seems to involve proximity to people. For example, in Christianity it is often phrased as “love your neighbour as you love yourself”. Singer would see this as inadequate and argue that proximity is not necessary to morality
- Whether the Golden Rule, or other traditional ethical systems are relevant today
- How Singer’s basic argument is new and different from traditional moral ideas
- Whether Singer’s argument is simple a re-statement of traditional ideas. If so, is Singer’s work valuable?
- An assessment of the similarities and differences between different traditional moral systems
- Whether traditional moral systems and associated practices go far enough, eg: a discussion of Zakat (the Islamic practice of donating a portion of ones’ savings to charity), or charitable organizations run by religious groups like CAFOD
- Whether the fact that different traditions from across the world believing the same thing makes it more compelling
- A discussion of the history of morality across the world, eg: drawing on Nietzsche
- Comparisons with Kantian ethics and the deontological basis of the Golden Rule
- Comparisons and contrasts between the Golden Rule and act utilitarianism or virtue ethics eg: Bentham, Aristotle.

**Charles Taylor: *The Ethics of Authenticity***

19. (a) **Explain the claim that “the joint operation of market and bureaucratic state has a tendency to weaken democratic initiative”.** [10]

(b) **Evaluate the claim that “the joint operation of market and bureaucratic state has a tendency to weaken democratic initiative”.** [15]

The claim is from the last chapter of Taylor’s book and invites an exploration of some central elements in Taylor’s view. Particularly, the claim focuses on the role that bureaucracy plays in modern societies along with the other malaises that Taylor identifies in his book. Candidates might analyse the connections between bureaucracy and the malaises, specifically individualism and the instrumental reason, since they “favour an atomist and instrumentalist stance to the world and others”. Candidates might refer to the initial part of Taylor’s book in presenting the malaises and how they work together in shaping modern society. Candidates might explain Taylor’s view on the market and how it impacts personal and social relations. Responses might take into account de Tocqueville’s view of soft despotism and how Taylor refers to it: while even a soft version of despotism cannot be applied to modern societies, “because they are full of protest, free initiatives, and irreverent challenges to authority, and governments do in fact tremble before the anger and contempt of the governed”. A close consequence of soft despotism is still at work in modern societies: fragmentation. Candidates might explore Taylor’s view on fragmentation and how it is related to atomism: far from involving the whole society, social participation tends to be reduced to partial groupings, such as ethnic minorities, or the promoters of a special interest. Those interested in *eg*: first nations, Black lives Matter movements, environmental issues, feminist and LGBTQI movements, or disability movements might not agree with Taylor’s perspective of fragmentation, participation and democracy. Responses might highlight the main political consequence of this fragmentation: apathy. A fragmented electorate, mirrored by fragmented social participation, can barely succeed in mobilizing large groups around common programs and projects. The result is a vicious circle, where people feel less and less powerful, feel their vote to be not decisive, and tend to give up. Candidates might mention Taylor’s description of how politics changes in a fragmented society: as long as electors are not interested in political programs, the political parties and leaders tend to ignore their programs as well; their language becomes more emphatic and generally reaches dishonourable levels in attacking opponents at a personal and private level. Candidates might discuss other philosophical views on the weakening of democracy, particularly in the light of the developments of modern societies: from de Tocqueville’s “tyranny of majority” to Ortega y Gasset’s “revolt of the masses”. Also, a possible consideration of the consequences for democracy of cultural industry and mass production, from Marx to the Frankfurt School, and the related concept of alienation, might be taken into account. Candidates might reflect on the market and the power of huge corporations and its relation to democracy and despotism.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The malaises of modern society
- How individualism and instrumental reason are related to bureaucracy and market
- Soft despotism, fragmentation, atomism
- Social participation in small groups
- Fragmented electorate and political apathy.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Whether modern societies can be considered despotic
- Whether the vicious circle of social fragmentation and political apathy has a solution
- Possible reference to other market-centred views or theories grounded in the productive powers, *eg*: Marx, Engels, the Frankfurt School
- Other views on soft despotism and social control, *eg*: Foucault
- Other views on soft despotism, *eg*: de Tocqueville’s “tyranny of majority or y Gasset’s “revolt of the masses”
- Other views on political power and organization, in comparison with the disorganization of a fragmented mass, *eg*: Pareto, Mosca, Michels.

20. (a) Explain the claim that “the struggle ought not to be over authenticity, for or against, but about it”. [10]
- (b) Evaluate the claim that “the struggle ought not to be over authenticity, for or against, but about it”. [15]

The claim is from Chapter 7 of Taylor’s book and invites an exploration of what he calls “lotta continua”, meaning an ongoing struggle. Candidates might explain why Taylor uses the slogan of an Italian extremist organization (Lotta Continua and not Red Brigades, as he mistakenly affirms) and, above all, how he connects it to the ideal of authenticity. Taylor affirms that “there is already a battle going on between the boosters and the knockers as far as the culture of authenticity is concerned.

[...] This struggle is a mistake; both sides are wrong.” Candidates might explore the concepts of “boosters” and “knockers” and their different views on life and human beings. Responses might explain why authenticity calls for a struggle and where it comes from: Taylor connects it to “an ineradicable tension”, which comes from “the sense of an ideal that is not being fully met in reality.” Candidates might consider Taylor’s defence of the ideal of authenticity in itself, while he condemns its excesses. Candidates might explore the malaises that Taylor identifies in his book and, particularly, individualism. In doing so, candidates might highlight the pros and cons of individualism, as depicted by Taylor. Responses might underline the positive aspects of the ideal of authenticity, which “points us towards a more self-responsible form of life. It allows us to live (potentially) a fuller and more differentiated life, because more fully appropriated as our own.

[...] At its best authenticity allows a richer mode of existence.” Candidates might explore the connection between the ideal of authenticity and a sense of freedom and responsibility, that Taylor presents in Chapter 7. Basically, the struggle for the ideal of authenticity is a battle to maintain a balance between the possible shifts towards the distortions of it, in terms of decadence, slide into hedonism or alienation. Candidates might mention Taylor’s reference to the cultural and political context of the United States and how this differs from the rest of the western world. Finally, candidates might explain how the idea of a struggle allows Taylor to avoid any pessimistic position on the future developments of modern society. As contrasting views, candidates might refer to *eg*: Critical Theory, Foucault, Bauman.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The meaning of “Lotta Continua” and the kind of struggle Taylor describes
- The ideal of authenticity
- “Boosters” *versus* “knockers”
- The malaises of modern society, particularly individualism
- Positive aspects of authenticity
- Freedom and responsibility.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Whether the struggle avoids pessimism in future developments of society
- Whether individualism and authenticity apply differently to the United States and other western countries
- Whether authenticity allows self-responsibility and a richer life
- Other views of authenticity, *eg*: Heidegger, Sartre
- The possible sides of authenticity and individualism, *eg*: hedonism, apathy
- Contrasting views on the developments of modern society, *eg*: Critical Theory, Foucault, Bauman.

**Lao Tzu: *Tao Te Ching***

21. (a) Explain Lao Tzu’s view about how people should acquire knowledge. [10]
- (b) Evaluate Lao Tzu’s view about how people should acquire knowledge. [15]

This question invites an explanation of the Taoist views about knowledge acquisition. It rests primarily on the claim in verse 20:1 that says there should be an “... abandonment of knowledge (and it) will not lead to sorrow...”. What is being suggested is that the pursuit of taught knowledge, formal education, and formal teaching, distracts from seeking the knowledge of the *Tao*. The desire to know all things in the world is in fact to lose sight of the essence of things. To name things is not productive but to find the essence of things is to come close to the *Tao*. In verse 19 Lao Tzu encourages people to “...Discontinue sagacity, discard knowledge,” and they will benefit. It is the hope that by not seeking worldly knowledge one will become wiser. The rejection of knowledge and formal education also implies that the main aim is to learn what one does not know, to appreciate one is ignorant of many things and that being clever and informed is not wisdom. However, it might be that the rejection of knowledge and formal education is not to reject knowledge but to reject the social status that is given to one who knows a lot. It is essentially an application of *wu wei* and is a contrast to a Confucian stance of seeing knowledge as power. The non-action applied to education results in seeing a bigger picture of the world, seeing things through a natural lens and finding harmony and balance and a wholeness rather than dissecting the world into parts, and losing the natural order that can be discovered through the *Tao*. Lao Tzu might only be challenging factual accumulation and is not in conflict with a desire to acquire understanding.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The enactment of *wu wei* in education
- The role of *ziran*- self-awareness- in education
- The difference between knowing and understanding
- Contrasts between book-based learning and the use of natural intelligence
- Ways to move towards the *Tao*
- The limitations of taught knowledge as opposed to experiential knowledge
- The relationship between knowledge and ignorance: knowing that you do not know might be a strength
- The way Lao Tzu’s views on education reflect his view of humans being essentially good by nature.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Knowledge seen as power
- A knowledge-based society losing sight of holistic issues
- The relationship of balance and harmony with specialists forms of education
- Internal reflection and self-knowledge related to the *Tao*
- Whether child/student-centred approaches to learning and constructionism might be acceptable to Lao Tzu
- Whether people can attain *tian* (reaching the force within the universe) without proper education which would challenge Confucianism
- The ability of people to progress and fulfil themselves in a complex urban environment without formal education
- The possibility of institutionalized education working alongside a more naturalistic approach
- Whether mindfulness approaches in some modern education is to a degree compatible with Lao Tzu’s views
- The Lockean “blank slate” idea might be mentioned suggesting that there is no inherent knowledge base
- Dewey’s views on experiential learning might be discussed in contrast to education systems that focus on imparting knowledge.

22. (a) Explain Lao Tzu's view on legal systems. [10]
- (b) Evaluate Lao Tzu's view on legal systems. [15]

This question seeks an explanation of how a legal system might work in a Taoist driven society. Much as an interpretation might be on the power of the executive, candidates may focus on the justice system and Lao Tzu's views on the use of law. Given that in a Taoist tradition a human is seen as inherently good, the imposition of laws on people does not have the desired effect. In Chapter 57 it states that "...the more restriction and prohibitions there are the poorer they (the people) become...". The government should attempt to enact *wu wei* and not interfere in the lives of individuals so the individuals would then take responsibility for their own actions and behaviour and regulate themselves. Laws produce an unnatural environment and prevent harmony. There is, when moving towards the Tao, a natural rhythm of life that is established and this creates an environment for all to "...love quietude and become righteous..." (verse 57). As the people are good, they will without further guidance align themselves with *tian* (the natural force of the universe). When people are self-regulated, they do not conflict with others. Lao Tzu's concept of justice rests on *wu wei*, the non-interference in the affairs of citizens otherwise "...The sharper men's weapons the more trouble in the land..." (Chapter 57). This seems to be akin to Confucianism however Confucius does not trust the people to regulate themselves and requires a society to be guided by a rigid legal system. It might be seen that Lao Tzu's advocacy of *wu wei* behaviour would produce anarchism. However, this is not the case as Lao Tzu would claim that it is the imposition of unjust laws that generate social unrest.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The notion that humans are inherently good and do not need regulation
- The nature of just and unjust laws
- *Wu wei* and its application to the judiciary
- The compatibility of Taoism and legal systems
- The need for a ruler to set an example as guidance for the expectation of people's behaviour
- Consensus and consultation processes in Taoist society
- The inner harmony of individuals creating a social harmony.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The function and effectiveness of laws to regulate a society
- Taoism as a way of life
- Alternative factors to *wu wei* that might establish social harmony
- How a Taoist deal with criminals/anti-social behaviour
- Anarchy and Taoism
- The nature of *tian* as a positive life enhancing force
- Market driven economies/societies that need regulation
- The role of the ruler in maintain order
- Comparisons to other views on the nature of humans and the role of laws, eg: Confucius, Rousseau.

**Zhuangzi: *Zhuangzi***

23. (a) Explain Zhuangzi's guidance on achieving a nourished (good) life. [10]
- (b) Evaluate Zhuangzi's guidance on achieving a nourished (good) life. [15]

This question refers to Zhuangzi's use of the story the King of Hui of Liang's cook/butcher, Cook Ting, to illustrate how the Tao can be applied to living a good life. In the conclusion of the story the King declares that he now knows "how to nourish life": Effectively how to have a more flourishing, better life. The story creates an analogy of life by describing how the skill of carving an ox involves complete understanding of the process of carving. It draws out the notion of intuition and an inner sense of grasping the essence of carving. The cook becomes, in a way, one with the carcass. He slices the meat at the points that are natural divisions, and therefore he does not have to hack. His knife remains sharp. The cook finds the easy routes to divide the meat and this relates to living without friction, hurdles or conflict, but finding one's natural route through life by seeking the *Tao*. He no longer thinks, he no longer sits back and reflects, he is not calculating the best ways to divide the meat, to control his life, but simply follows the natural structure of the meat, drifting with the flow of life. He "knows" the best things to do because he has sought the *Tao*. It is the unconscious process that has taken over, and a harmonious interaction has come about that allows the task to be completed: life is lived through harmony with all things. The skill, living, has become so refined that it is part of the person. Life is one with the person and the person is one with life. For Zhuangzi finding the nature, the essence of the things or activities-life in general, removes the need to think and to direct. For some it might be concluded that the skill has become an automated process requiring no effort. The application of this is that if one steps back and seeks the essence of things rather than striving ruthlessly then a more harmonious life can be lived. However, the King seems to assume that he knows and this for Zhuangzi is naïve, in that he would argue that complete attainment for the *Tao* is not possible and therefore life is more a journey of improving.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The suggestion that a highly specialized skill, like carving, when so refined, becomes mystical as does a quality of living within harmony with the *Tao*
- The loss of one's self when being so focused. One is in a form of a trance and awareness of the action/activity becomes irrational, unconscious
- The way the cook slows actions and discovers the best method; linking to life - not rushing through things but seeking care, precision
- How the *Tao* can give mystical insight; a Zen approach to activity and life
- Differing interpretations of a nourished life; the king seeing it in a narrow, perhaps wrong sense, as a method of government while others could see it as ways of reaching a more enriched life, a full life, a peaceful life
- The links between a Zhuangzian approach and mindfulness, and perhaps a way to a more balanced, less stressful lifestyle.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The use of stories to illustrate complex notion of the *Tao*
- The appreciation that a highly refined skill transforms itself into a natural normal way of doing things
- The contrasts between Mohism and Taoism and an absolutist view in that constant improvement might be possible, and yet the contradiction with the understanding a non-divisible *Tao*, so rationality and sensation cease, and the unconscious takes over.
- The idea that you do not know really how you have learnt how to do something and the inability to explain a process of "learning" a skill to another.
- Intuition might be discussed

- The idea that outstanding performance might involve an unconscious suspension of self-awareness of the components of the process
- The sense of stillness in a life that is nourished and lacking in competitiveness.
- Issues surrounding the competitiveness and the hurry of modern society and whether a “mystical approach”, a contemplative approach to living is possible
- There might not be one way to carve an ox and consequently there could be many *Taos* to guide life
- The use of the cook/butcher and his name Ting to show that even low-level members of society have opportunities for flourishing. Nourishing life is not class or intellect driven but open to all
- Zhuangzi’s criticism of absolute knowledge and know how
- The degree to which the skills of the cook/butcher raise the issue that there could be many separate *Taos*. The cook/butcher has the *Tao* of carving but perhaps not the *Tao* of skiing. Whether this opens a discussion of “a nourished life” is an encounter with a few or many *Taos* and more fundamentally can the *Tao* have parts?
- Links to Aristotle’s *eudaimonia* might be made in that the contentment of seeking the *Tao* is similar to *eudaimonia*.

24. (a) Explain the nature of uselessness for Zhuangzi. [10]
- (b) Evaluate the nature of uselessness for Zhuangzi. [15]

The question seeks an explanation of the nature of uselessness. The question draws reference primarily to the story of the useless tree that grew near a village. Zhuangzi tells this story to show that some things which seem to have no use can be valued. He claims that “Everyone knows how useful usefulness is, but no one seems to know how useful uselessness is.” (4.20) He challenges the position that all things, including people, need to have purpose, an extrinsic purpose and value. Trees seem to have defined functions and purposes in the life of the community: they provide wood, fuel or fruit. The useless tree simply grows and because it is seen as useless has lived a long, undisturbed life. This could be seen as “a talentless worthless tree” (4.17). There are parallels here with human life, in that a long life happens when things are not disturbed. It is quite contrary to modern perspectives where all things are seen as resources and must have use to be valued. Even humans in the form of human resources are reduced to functionality and purpose. It is the tree that becomes shamed because humans feel they are obliged to give it extrinsic value, the sheltering of the shrine. “What it (the tree) values is not what they (people) value” (4.17). Zhuangzi here can be seen to raise the issue of the role and status of the individual; he would consider it inappropriate for the individual to be reduced to a resource – the individual should be valued in themselves. To put usefulness as an important characteristic of an individual is to see them as a means to an end rather than an end in themselves. The contradiction in the story seems to arise when the villagers see the tree as protecting the shrine, but here it is others who have imposed value – usefulness – and it has not been sought by the tree. Again, the human according to Zhuangzi should not seek value for themselves and should shun the value imposed on them by others.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- How utility can be avoided in a market driven society
- The social values that are unvalued or even denigrated are seen as useless. They are seen as waste as they have no function or purpose
- Ways in which uselessness allows a sort of liberation, being freed from societal pressures
- By perhaps providing shade, the useless tree does have a function. It encourages people to shelter and then spend time considering the *Tao*
- The attempt to calculate uselessness might be a trap to use a rational approach to an area that should be left to the irrational. Instrumental reason is not seen as a route to the *Tao*
- Contentment as the benefit of uselessness
- *Ziran* illustrating uselessness. The idea that being oneself is sufficient there is no need to be even spontaneous and trying to be natural.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The nature of the *Tao* and how uselessness is a route to seeking the *Tao*
- Ways in which others impose usefulness which leads to exploitation of nature and humans
- Ways in which removing a utility factor allows great breadth and freedom in encounters with the world: examples might come from education and leisure (studying subjects that have no commercial/economic value or “doing nothing” to recuperate the spirit)
- Contrasts made between *wu wei* and *ziran*. Zhuangzi is inclined to favour seemingly being oneself rather than even non-action (*wu wei*)
- Complex urban societies’ view that economic worth must be present in all things and activities. The desire to quantify everything
- The western concept of resources and our interactions with our environment and that humans might be wrong
- Zhuangzi’s idea of uselessness as a challenge to the “protestant ethic”
- The view that lacking utility can be seen as being too indulgent, decadent, or even reflect laziness or complacency

- Contrasting references to Confucian thinking that would value utility, value actions (considering actions useful if they contribute to the community as a whole)
  - Discussions about whether people should be treated as means to ends, or ends in themselves eg: Kant
  - Schumacher's philosophy of "enoughness" and "Small is Beautiful" might be developed as a view that supports sustainability and counters a resource driven society.
-