

# Markscheme

**May 2022**

**Philosophy**

**Higher level and standard level**

**Paper 2**

© International Baccalaureate Organization 2022

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 2022

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, 2022

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/>.

**I. QIG availability**

The following QIGs are usually available for qualification, but this will be confirmed at the start of the marking session:

| QIG number | Text/author   | English QIG availability | Spanish QIG availability |
|------------|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 01         | Simone de Beauvoir <i>The Second Sex</i> , Vol. 1 part 1, Vol. 2 part 1 and Vol. 2 part 4 |                          |                          |
| 02         | René Descartes <i>Meditations</i>   | ✓                        | ✓                        |
| 03         | David Hume <i>Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion</i>                                   |                          |                          |
| 04         | John Stuart Mill <i>On Liberty</i>  | ✓                        |                          |
| 05         | Friedrich Nietzsche <i>The Genealogy of Morals</i>  | ✓                        | ✓                        |
| 06         | Martha Nussbaum <i>Creating Capabilities: The Human Development Approach</i>              |                          |                          |
| 07         | Ortega y Gasset <i>The Origin of Philosophy</i>   |                          |                          |
| 08         | Plato <i>The Republic</i> , Books IV–IX   | ✓                        | ✓                        |
| 09         | Peter Singer <i>The Life You Can Save</i>   | ✓                        |                          |
| 10         | Charles Taylor <i>The Ethics of Authenticity</i>  | ✓                        | ✓                        |
| 11         | Lao Tzu <i>Tao Te Ching</i>   |                          |                          |
| 12         | Zhuangzi <i>Zhuangzi</i> , Inner Chapters   |                          |                          |

**II. 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) [10]
- (b) [15]

Questions and answers removed for copyright reasons

2. (a) [10]
- (b) Evaluate de Beauvoir's view on women's homosexuality. [15]

Question and answer removed for copyright reasons

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Whether women's homosexuality can be seen as a reaction to men's dominance
- Whether women's homosexuality can be seen in terms of a reaction to the conception of a passive body and a submitted flesh
- Whether women's homosexuality can be related to specific professions, eg: athletes, artists, writers

- Whether de Beauvoir's arguments on the lesbian woman are somehow linked to her views on art for women: both homosexuality and art as means to gain success and react to the males' dominance
- Whether de Beauvoir's view on the lesbian woman as a reaction to the males' dominance contradicts her statement that women can achieve success by social recognition
- Whether the relationship between the mother and the adolescent girl is a feasible way to interpret women's homosexuality
- The role of "the Oedipus Complex" in women's homosexuality
- The contrast between de Beauvoir's appraisal of the psychoanalytic explanations of women's homosexuality and her criticism presented elsewhere in the book
- Whether the homosexual choice offers women a complete solution or their sexuality still remains somehow "halfway"
- Whether de Beauvoir's viewpoint is still viable in the present times.

**René Descartes: *Meditations***

3. (a) **Explain Descartes’s proofs of God’s existence.** [10]

(b) **Evaluate Descartes’s proofs of God’s existence.** [15]

In the third Meditation there are two sections with arguments for God’s existence. The term for Descartes’s argument is known as the “trademark argument”. The general thrust is that God has placed the idea of him-/herself in us, as this is not an idea that an imperfect being such as a human could come up with her-/himself. This idea of the placing of the idea is based on a notion of cause that does not allow for a greater reality to be brought into effect than is present in the causal agency. Descartes offers the example of a stone, which cannot be made unless produced by some agency that contains all the elements of the stone, or some even greater elements than the stone (see Kenny). Such reasoning is applicable to ideas, which if they contain some property – such as perfection – then the cause of the idea must contain in them as much “causal efficiency” as would be required in the case of the making of a stone. Descartes looks at his idea of God and discounts the possibilities that the idea of God could come out of nowhere, or out of speculation about our own inadequacy (eg: Hume). Descartes concludes that his idea of God can only come from God, therefore God must exist. Later in the third Meditation, Descartes asks if he could exist if there was no being more perfect than him. Descartes asks, if so, from where would he get his existence? Descartes proceeds by eliminating himself, his parents and any other source less great than God. Descartes involves a form of the cosmological argument in eliminating his parents, since their existence is dependent on their own parents, and so on. The “trademark argument” is reliant on the principle that something greater must cause any effect. This is discussed by thinkers in light of Descartes’s argument. In the fifth Meditation Descartes offers his version of the ontological argument concluding God’s existence from the necessity of existence in a being whose nature has all the perfections. The issue of how perfection relates to existence and whether existence can be used as a predicate in the way Descartes does, is an issue that might be evaluated.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The causal principle at the heart of the trademark argument
- The need for a perfect source to create the effect of a perfect idea
- The relation of ideas to reality in the argument
- Reality as a part of perfection
- The necessity of God’s existence in the ontological argument
- Existence is wrapped up – and necessitated – in the idea of God.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The causal principle – is it convincing?
- Can the idea of something necessitate its reality?
- Can perfection be used as a predicate?
- Does it add anything to a concept to say that it exists? eg: Russell
- Does the ontological argument only apply in reality if something exists, as opposed to necessitating existence in the first place?

4. (a) Explain Descartes’s answers to the initial skepticism of the first Meditation. [10]
- (b) Evaluate Descartes’s answers to the initial skepticism of the first Meditation. [15]

Descartes begins his work outlining a general, and deep, skepticism about the possibility of certain knowledge. Descartes tests possible candidates for knowledge in three “waves of doubt”. In the first wave he recognizes that sense perception can sometimes deceive us. This is not a particularly global doubt because he sees no reason to condemn all sense knowledge on the grounds that occasionally we have been deceived. In the second wave Descartes speculates on the possibility that his knowledge of the external world is similar to the experience of a dream, where, during the dream itself, he has no means of distinguishing it from waking reality. But Descartes accepts there is a relationship between the imagery of dreams and what those dreams are depicting, so a relationship with reality is possible, even if not from within the experience of the dream at the time. Descartes moves to his third wave, which is more radical. Here, Descartes speculates about a deceiving God or a malicious demon planting the idea of reality on a subject like a brain in a vat. Following this radical wave, Descartes posits the basis of “the *cogito*” (the phrase itself does not appear here but in other works) as a response to show that in achieving doubt, he is achieving thought, thus at the very least he must exist. There is discussion to be had about whether Descartes is peddling an inference – a sense of “because I am thinking, therefore I exist”, or a more direct experience of “I am thinking, I exist to be doing this”. The earlier inference can be challenged as it says something general about any thinking thing to stand up. In addition, there can be a question of whether the “I” properly can refer to Descartes as an individual rather than, say, a network of thinking shared by more than an individual. In the end Descartes can say that as long as he is thinking he exists, and that is a proposition immune from the waves of doubt in the first Meditation.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Doubt through lack of trust in the complete reliability of the sense perceptions
- Doubt due to dreaming, and responses to that
- Doubt due to the malicious demon
- The response, termed “the *cogito*” but not used in the classic statement of the *cogito* in the second Meditation not containing the sense of “therefore” found in later works
- The question of whether there is inference in Descartes’s statement in the second meditation
- Descartes concludes he is a thinking thing and goes on to explore the possible nature of a thinking thing, concluding that a thinking thing could be termed a “substance” because it exists independently.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Responses to the waves of doubt – see objections to the idea that dreams or sense unreliability should cause the extent of skepticism Descartes is seeking
- Descartes deals with the inadequacy of the first two waves, but is he correct in seeing the malicious demon (or as more recently stated, the brain in the vat) as achieving the skepticism he must answer?
- Is the statement of the *cogito* in the second Meditation an inference? If so, what are the implications for Descartes’s quest for certainty
- How does the “I” work in the experience Descartes is exploring as a thinking thing?
- Descartes’s conclusion that a thinking thing is a substance and the origins of Cartesian dualism.

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

5. (a) **Explain Demea’s claim that “the science of natural theology is the most profound and abstruse of any”.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate Demea’s claim that “the science of natural theology is the most profound and abstruse of any”.** [15]

The claim is presented by Demea at the very beginning of Hume’s *Dialogues*. It invites an exploration of the different views that the characters of the dialogue have on the educational methodology for philosophy students and for the learning of theological doctrines. Candidates might consider Demea’s argument on the necessity for students to postpone the study of theology as a science and focus on the concept of piety only at the beginning. Responses might also discuss Demea’s method, which aims to induce students to distrust all sciences, in order for them to embrace religion. As he explains, “I imprint deeply on their young minds a habitual reverence for all the principles of religion. While they pass through every other branch of knowledge, I comment on the uncertainty of each branch, on the eternal controversies of men, on the obscurity of all philosophy, and on the strange, ridiculous conclusions that some of the greatest geniuses have derived from the principles of mere human reason” (Part 1). Candidates might present Philo’s view on Demea’s argument and discuss the reasons why the “common folk” have contempt for philosophy, while holding “even more firmly to the great points of theology” (Part 1). Philo’s skeptical position extends Demea’s argument, since he states that “our best protection against such arrogance in religious matters is ignorance” (Part 1). The central topic of Part 1 then goes beyond the educational issues presented at the beginning and ends up into a dispute on skepticism between Philo and Cleanthes. Responses might analyse Philo’s suggestion to adopt and improve Demea’s principles, in order to become aware of the weakness of human reasoning and “the errors and deceits of our senses [should] be kept in mind” (Part 1). Candidates might present Cleanthes’s reply to Philo’s argument and his criticism of Philo’s skepticism in making it a durable means to solve everyday issues, including a comparison between Stoics and Sceptics. Responses might pinpoint Cleanthes’s concern about the dangers of a “crude and ignorant” skepticism held by common people, grounded in “a general prejudice against things that they can’t easily understand [...] This sort of skepticism is fatal to knowledge, not to religion” (Part 1). Candidates might extend their discussion to other philosophical views of skepticism or focus on the role that opinions and senses play as means to knowledge for other philosophers, eg: Plato, Aristotle, Descartes, Locke, Kant.

[Source: David Hume: 1779, *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*, London, Unknown.  
[https://archive.org/details/bub\\_gb\\_E7dbAAAAQAAJ/mode/2up](https://archive.org/details/bub_gb_E7dbAAAAQAAJ/mode/2up).]

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Demea’s view on religion and theology
- Philo’s skepticism
- Cleanthes’s criticism of Philo’s skepticism
- The role of ignorance according to Philo
- The arrogance, weakness, blindness of mere human reasoning
- Differences between Stoics and Sceptics
- The dangerous kind of skepticism that Cleanthes highlights
- The role of senses and human reasoning.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The importance of an educational methodology for philosophy students, particularly with reference to theological issues
- Whether Demea's methodology is feasible for the proper understanding of theology
- Whether the theological doctrines stem from the uncertainty of human reasoning or they are a specific kind of reasoning, as Locke believed
- Whether Philo's view of ignorance is linked to a proper skeptical standpoint
- Whether skepticism can be a means for approaching everyday issues
- Whether skepticism is dangerous, as Cleanthes highlights
- The limits of human reasoning and the consequences for human knowledge, eg: Plato, Descartes, empiricism
- Whether senses are fallacious and hence not a valid source of knowledge, eg: Descartes, Spinoza, or otherwise, eg: Kant.

6. (a) **Explain Philo’s claim that “the world is an animal and that God is the mind of the world”.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate Philo’s claim that “the world is an animal and that God is the mind of the world”.** [15]

The claim is presented by Philo in the opening section of Part 6 of Hume’s *Dialogues*. Philo presents his argument in criticizing Cleanthes’s view on the impossibilities to attribute specific qualities to God, as presented in the previous parts of the text. Candidates might refer to Philo’s argument of the similarities: “Where several known circumstances are observed to be similar, the unknown will also be found similar” (Part 6). Candidates might explore Philo’s parallel of the universe and the animal or organic body, in which waste is repaired, circulation of matter is continuous. Moreover, according to Philo, “the different parts of the whole system are seen to act in harmony with one another; and each part of the world or member of an organism, in doing its proper job, operates both for its own preservation and for that of the whole” (Part 6). Responses might discuss Philo’s standpoint that matter cannot stay in a disordered state: “No hypothesis, whether skeptical or religious, should make room for chance; everything is surely governed by steady, inviolable laws” (Part 6). Responses might take into account the dualism of mind and body as an argument explaining the traditional misunderstanding of the nature of the universe, which could be structured differently from the human experience of a mind in a body. Candidates might discuss Cleanthes’s reply to Philo and the criticism grounded in the argument of a universe resembling more like a plant than like an animal. Also, responses might consider other Cleanthes’s argument against the eternity of the universe and evaluate his theory on the beginning of the universe and his proofs in favour of the idea that the world is young, eg: cherry-trees, Columbus. Candidates might highlight the fact that the arguments that Hume presents on the nature of the universe are the ground for the real scope of the discussion: the nature of God and the possibilities to attribute qualities to God. Candidates might include an evaluation of other philosophical views, from the idea of an ordered universe and a prefixed becoming, like in Plato, Aristotle or in the Christian philosophy, to the idea of change, transformation and probabilistic assumptions, like in evolutionism, pragmatism, or quantum theory. Bishop Butler stated that “probability is the very guide of life”.

[Source: David Hume: 1779, *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*, London, Unknown. [https://archive.org/details/bub\\_gb\\_E7dbAAAAQAAJ/mode/2up](https://archive.org/details/bub_gb_E7dbAAAAQAAJ/mode/2up).]

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The argument from design and the idea of a designer in the causation of the world
- Philo’s view on order, waste, circulation, matter
- Philo’s argument of similarities
- Parallel of the universe and animal or organic body
- Philo’s criticism of mind-body dualism
- Cleanthes’s criticism of Philo’s view; universe as a plant
- Cleanthes’s argument and proofs against the eternity of universe
- The role of steady and inviolable laws in the universe.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Whether Philo’s argument on matter is feasible nowadays
- Whether the argument of similarities is a strong one or it is ascribable to a mere inductive one
- Whether the argument of the universe as an animal or organic body has had further philosophical developments, eg: environmental ethics, deep ecology, the Gaia hypothesis
- Other views on the dualism mind-body, eg: Descartes, and possible criticisms, eg: Dewey, James, Damasio
- Whether Cleanthes’s proofs against the eternity of the universe are viable
- The role of change and mutation in the universe in contrast with the idea of a prefixed order
- Whether the design argument conflicts with the idea of evolution
- The theories of an ordered universe, as in Plato, Aristotle, or in Christian philosophy
- Order and disorder in the light of evolutionism
- Chaos, chance, probability as alternative structures of the universe, eg: quantum theory.

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

7. (a) **Explain Mill’s principle that self-protection is the only end for which mankind is warranted in interfering with the liberty of action.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate Mill’s principle that self-protection is the only end for which mankind is warranted in interfering with the liberty of action.** [15]

The question is focused on this central idea as it is presented in the introductory first chapter. Mill states that the object of his essay is to assert one very simple principle. It has come to be known as the Harm Principle, since it defines the limits of individual liberty in terms of harm to others. This principle has to govern the relations between society and the individual from the point of view of compulsion and control. The means used might be physical force in the form of legal penalties or the moral coercion of public opinion. That principle is that the sole end for which mankind are warranted, individually or collectively in interfering with the liberty of action of any of their number, is self-protection; “the only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilized community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others” (Chapter 1). His own good, either physical or moral, is not a sufficient warrant, “He cannot rightfully be compelled to do or refrain because it will be better for him to do so, because it will make him happier, because, in the opinions of others, to do so would be wise, or even right” (Chapter 1). According to Mill these might be good reasons to argue with him, but not for compelling him. He clearly stresses that the only justification for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilized community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others. His own good, either physical or moral, is not a sufficient reason. The obligation of non-interference that the principle imposes rules out two justifications for limiting individual liberty: paternalism (restriction on actions harmful only to self) and moralism (restriction on harmless actions on the ground that they are immoral).

[Source: John Stuart Mill: 1867, *On Liberty*, London, Longmans, Green, and Company.  
[https://archive.org/details/bub\\_gb\\_jUu6GjuSzOEC.](https://archive.org/details/bub_gb_jUu6GjuSzOEC.)]

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The only aspect of the conduct of any one, for which he is amenable to society, is that which concerns others. In that what merely concerns himself, his independence is, of right, absolute. Over himself, over his own body and mind, the individual is sovereign
- Since this principle defines the limits of individual liberty in terms of harm to others, it has come to be known as the Harm Principle
- The principle is meant to apply only to human beings in the maturity of their faculties
- A person may cause evil to others not only by his actions but by his inaction, and in either case she is justly accountable to them for the injury
- The exclusion of justifications for limiting individual liberty, eg: paternalism and moralism.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The possible implications of the principle. It requires liberty of tastes and pursuits; of framing the plan of our life to suit our own character; of doing as we like, subject to such consequences as may follow; without impediment so long as what we do does not harm others, even though they might consider our conduct to be foolish, perverse, or wrong
- From the liberty of each individual, follows the liberty, within the same limits, of combination among individuals; freedom to unite, for any purpose not involving harm to others
- The Harm Principle and utility. Utility as the ultimate appeal on all ethical questions; but it must be utility in the largest sense, grounded in the permanent interests of man as a progressive being
- The extent to which Mill (as critics have sometimes thought) was frightened by the prospect of a mass democracy in which working-class opinion would be oppressive and perhaps violent
- Mill’s principle rules out paternalistic interventions to save people from themselves, and ideal interventions to make people behave “better”
- Different views on liberty, some are grounded not in the individual but in social or collective realities, eg: Marxism.

8. (a) **Explain Mill’s statement that the subject of his essay is not the liberty of the will, but civil or social liberty.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate Mill’s statement that the subject of his essay is not the liberty of the will, but civil or social liberty.** [15]

The question gives an opportunity to explain and evaluate the core of Mill’s argument as stated at the very start of the text: “The nature and limits of the power which can be legitimately exercised by society over the individual.” From an historical perspective the issue can be framed within four stages of civil or social development. At the earliest stage, liberty meant protection against the tyranny of the political rulers. In the second stage, liberty came to mean not limitation of government power but the people’s self-rule (by means of temporary representatives revocable at the majority’s will). In the third stage, the struggle for liberty became a struggle for limited democratic government. Liberty now meant people’s self-rule within certain fundamental legal limits (constitutional checks) designed to secure minorities against injustice by the people’s majority. By means of constitutional checks, “the consent of the community, or of a body of some sort supposed to represent its interests” is made “a necessary condition to some of the more important acts of the governing power” (Chapter 1). Further, Mill is worried about a fourth stage of social development in which the people’s majority has vastly expanded power to ensure that all conform to its opinions and customs.

[Source: John Stuart Mill: 1867, *On Liberty*, London, Longmans, Green, and Company.  
[https://archive.org/details/bub\\_gb\\_jUu6GjuSzOEC](https://archive.org/details/bub_gb_jUu6GjuSzOEC)]

Candidates might explore (part A):

- According to Mill the question has been seldom stated, and hardly ever discussed. However, it deeply “influences the practical controversies of the age by its latent presence, and is likely soon to make itself recognized as the vital question of the future”
- The question is far from being new and has divided mankind, almost from the remotest ages, but in the stage of progress into which the more civilized portions of the species have now entered, it presents itself under new conditions, and requires a different and more fundamental treatment
- In the fourth stage protection is needed against the tyranny of the prevailing opinion and feeling; against the tendency of society to impose, by means other than civil penalties, its own ideas and practices as rules of conduct on those who dissent from them
- The different philosophical approaches between metaphysical analyses of freedom of the will (eg: freedom and determinism) and the social issue regarding the power which can be legitimately exercised by society over the individual.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Historical moments and political theories in relation to the stages, eg: Machiavelli’s *Discourses* and Locke’s *Second Treatise*, Rousseau’s *Of the Social Contract*, the United States as the first society that entered into the third stage, and de Tocqueville’s *Democracy in America*
- Mill feared that a prosperous middle-class society would care nothing for individual liberty: obedience to prevailing customs and norms typically regarded as important, not the freedom to explore diverse paths of self-development and to form one’s opinions and character as one thinks best
- Social and individual exercise of liberty as one of the elements of well-being
- Forms of civil liberty, eg: the liberty of thought and discussion
- The relation between liberty and social progress
- Mill’s principle of liberty aims to encourage individuality as an element of general utility. The principle of liberty and utilitarianism
- Mill’s principle of liberty as a classic statement of liberal feminism (*The Subjection of Women* 1869): if freedom is a good for men, it is for women; further, women should have access to everything to which men have access
- The idea of negative and positive liberty
- Different conceptions of autonomy
- Mill’s defence of liberty against different forms of totalitarianisms and totalitarian ideas: projections up to present days.

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

9. (a) Explain Nietzsche’s account of “bad conscience” in the second essay. [10]
- (b) Evaluate Nietzsche’s account of “bad conscience”. [15]

In the second essay Nietzsche employs the genealogical method to trace the origins of our conscience, and hence our moral sense. Interacting in society has the effect of making individuals predictable, using their memories to have the ability to make promises. Out of this process comes a “sovereign individual” able to make autonomous decisions, not based on guilt or a need to conform, but through a way of exercising individual free will. This comes with a sense of individual responsibility, which Nietzsche terms “conscience”. Nietzsche also identifies a “bad conscience” based on the language of debt and a sense of guilt. This arises when a promise is unfulfilled or a debt unpaid. Punishment is applied out of a sense of cruelty or pleasure in seeing suffering. This was the historical explanation for seeing debts paid, where the offender is harmed in some way as part of the advantage of being the one owed. Nietzsche sees such enjoyment of suffering as not being negative. Rather, he sees it as an explanation for the meaning of suffering in ancient times, before some divine figure was created in the minds of humans to oversee suffering. This ensured it had some purpose for the one who was suffering, as opposed to the one exercising the punishment. The bad conscience is created after the leaders of society force unwitting and “formless, still roaming about” humans, who are originally hunters, to be organized as a crowd in a society. In this state the majority of people are turned in and on themselves and the bad conscience occurs as the “will to power” is suffocated and given no chance to be expressed. This forms part of Nietzsche’s explanation for the invention of the gods/God. The essay ends with Nietzsche offering a role for the bad conscience with its destructive dynamic to work on the position humans find themselves in and to attack the sickness of the human condition in the modern state.

[Source: Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche: 1887, *The genealogy of morals*, New York, Boni and Liveright. <https://archive.org/details/genealogyofmoral00nietuoft/mode/2up.>]

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Nietzsche proposes a historical explanation for the organization of society and the experience of the majority of its members
- The link between freedom, free-will and conscience
- The account of bad conscience and its associations with punishment and debt
- The account of suffering and punishment
- The account of the need for the powerful to attribute praise to those who have gone before them and to set up their ancestors in a powerful light
- The implications for Nietzsche’s account of the creation of belief in the gods/God – the holding in the highest esteem of ancestors.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The genealogical account – is it convincing?
- Is Nietzsche guilty of committing the genetic fallacy?
- Is this philosophical argument or anthropology?
- Other cultural accounts of the formation of tribes and customs, eg: African and native Indian traditions
- Nietzsche describes the cruelty as in some sense “joyful”, like a festival – is this convincing? Can any of this be empirically demonstrated?
- Is Nietzsche basing his account too heavily on the notion – important at his time – of freedom, making a hypothesis about ancient cultures that had not considered this notion in their account of human life and organization?

10. (a) Explain how the ascetic ideal is related to the human “will to nothingness”. [10]  
 (b) Evaluate how the ascetic ideal is related to the human “will to nothingness”. [15]

In the third essay Nietzsche explores the issue of human will, and in this he discusses the nature of “the ascetic ideal”, a term with a very broad reach, given he finds a way to apply it to a wide variety of groups, ranging from artists to priests. The issue of humans preferring to “will nothingness than not will” gives Nietzsche a device, through the ascetic ideal, by which he can explore the activities of different sections of society. The main fulcrum of the ideal is the need for humankind to assert or believe in a goal – that humans will “rather will nothingness than not will”. Nietzsche talks about artists, philosophers, priests, women and saints. Philosophers share a view of the world with priests, who inhabit the modes of living, “poverty, humility, chastity” and in so doing move away from promoting the exercising of the will. He ascribes a different purpose to each group and then proposes so-called enemies of the ideal in the work of scientists, historians and those self-appointed experts who see themselves as contemplating the ideal but who, in fact, bring a mockery to it. The ascetic ideal is both a denier and preserver of the conditions by which life can be led. It involves a relationship with truth, but the scientist attacks the ascetic ideal through a wrong-headed approach to objective truth. Nietzsche makes assumptions about the violent condition of humankind and asserts that the ascetic ideal is a way of coping with this. This offers an alternative to humankind being ready to embrace full freedom and mastery, instead falling back into the slave morality of the crowd, led by the ideals of the priest and supported by the philosophers who attempt to deny the will. Nietzsche discusses the role of guilt and *ressentiment* in the masses, as a response to the ascetic ideal peddled by those they come across in society.

[Source: Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche: 1887, *The genealogy of morals*, New York, Boni and Liveright.  
<https://archive.org/details/genealogyofmoral00nietuoft/mode/2up.>]

Candidates might explore (part A):

- In the ultimate willing of nothingness, Nietzsche says philosophers, nonetheless, are exercising the will
- The ascetic ideal and the artist – Nietzsche’s example of Wagner and Schopenhauer where Wagner would not express his art without his leaning on Schopenhauer, who himself attributed parts of his philosophy to what music achieved
- Philosophers and the ascetic ideal – a seeking of power through knowledge and spreading of fear due to original mistrust in a contemplative, rather than violent, mode of activity
- For the priests, the ascetic life demands a turning away from pleasure
- The ascetic ideal’s role in allowing civilization and public life to occur – Nietzsche says that the ascetic ideal springs from a protective instinct as humans strive to survive in the face of hardship
- The relationship between the ascetic ideal and truth, where knowledge is cast as illusion and the subjectivity of humans denied
- The contrast between the ascetic ideal and scientists
- The ascetic ideal and the slave morality
- Nietzsche’s perspectivism.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The idea that the ascetic ideal is the “will to nothingness”
- The contradiction that the ascetic ideal is life preserving while endorsing a will to nothingness
- The strong and the view that they should not be curtailed by guilt over feeling strong and having power
- Is it fair of Nietzsche to condemn his fellow citizens as being sick, having sickness from our turmoil and hardship?
- The ascetic priest and the *ressentiment* of the crowd
- Nietzsche’s account of truth, the myth of objectivity in science and his perspectivism
- Is perspectivism acceptable in any quest for knowledge?
- Is Nietzsche convincing that we are all subject to deeply entrenched violent tendencies by virtue of being members of the human race?
- Is Nietzsche’s psychological account capable of falsification/verification? Is this philosophy or more like cultural anthropology from a psychological perspective?

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

11. (a) Explain the relationship between capabilities and human rights. [10]
- (b) Evaluate the relationship between capabilities and human rights. [15]

In *Creating Capabilities: The Human Development Approach*, Nussbaum introduces the idea of capabilities as an approach to “comparative quality-of-life assessment and to theorizing about social justice” (Chapter 2). A capability is an “area of freedom”, and the capabilities approach demands that the capabilities required for a dignified life should be provided for by nations. Nussbaum points out that “the Capabilities Approach is closely allied with the international human rights movement” (Chapter 3). She states that one way of understanding the Capabilities Approach is as a “species of human rights approach” (Chapter 3). This is because both approaches claim that all people have a core set of entitlements, and that this imposes duties on the state to uphold these entitlements. Furthermore, Nussbaum says that the capabilities overlap with those on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. She highlights the shared idea that both rights and core capabilities imply that the state has duties to protect the liberties of its citizens.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The contrast Nussbaum draws between human rights and general capabilities
- The relationship between capabilities and duties
- The duties of the state in relation to human rights, and whether comparable duties arise from core capabilities
- How the capabilities approach “supplements the standard human rights approaches”
- Nussbaum’s claim that “the very idea of “negative liberty” [...] is an incoherent idea [...] all require the inhibition of interference by others” (Chapter 3)
- How the case of Vasanti can be analysed in terms of both capabilities and human rights.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Whether human rights are central to a liberal society
- Sen’s idea that capabilities and rights are different, as contrasted to Nussbaum’s view that core capabilities overlap with rights
- Capabilities as stemming from the author’s arguments in the book
- How far the state has a duty to protect human rights
- Possible difficulties defining a list of core human rights
- Whether it is possible to come up with a set of rights which protect human dignity
- Whether all of the rights listed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights are consistent with Nussbaum’s core capabilities list
- The notion of duties in relation to human rights
- Deontological *versus* utilitarian ethics and the ethical foundations of rights
- The possible relationship between the capabilities approach and virtue ethics
- An evaluation of the idea of moral imperatives, such as those proposed by Kant.

[Source: CREATING CAPABILITIES: THE HUMAN DEVELOPMENT APPROACH by Martha C. Nussbaum, Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Copyright © 2011 by Martha C. Nussbaum. Used by permission. All rights reserved.]

12. (a) Explain Nussbaum’s concept of freedom. [10]
- (b) Evaluate Nussbaum’s concept of freedom. [15]

Freedom is a central concept in Nussbaum’s work. She says that “the capabilities approach, in my version, focuses on the protection of areas of freedom so central that their removal makes a life not worthy of human dignity” (Chapter 2). She draws on the work of Sen, who sees a capability as “the substantive freedom to achieve alternative functioning combinations” (Chapter 2), and De Shalit and Wolff who talk about fertile functionings. Freedom requires “combined capabilities” on Nussbaum’s account. This captures the idea that an individual requires certain internal capabilities combined with external capabilities to possess a freedom. For example, having the capability to read, combined with the capability to access a library are both needed for the combined capability to read novels. The centrality of freedom to Nussbaum’s capabilities approach helps to set it apart from common approaches to assessing social justice and quality of life in nations. Nussbaum sets out the problem as such: measuring the GDP of a country is not sensitive to the lives of the people living in that country, as the measure is an aggregate and does not capture discrepancies between individuals, or capture the fact that sometimes wealthy individuals lack freedom. Nussbaum also considers the role of freedom in alternative accounts of social justice such as Rawls’s work, and the implications of utilitarian and deontological ethical theories.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Sen’s use of the term *freedom* as “the substantive freedom to achieve alternative functioning combinations” (Sen, in Nussbaum, Chapter 2)
- The idea of combined capabilities which “are the totality of the opportunities... for choice and action in... specific political, social and economic situation[s]” (Chapter 2)
- The close relationship between the capabilities and freedoms
- The relationship between justice and freedom
- The relationship between freedom and liberty
- The relationship between the Capabilities Approach and political liberalism
- The contrast between the role of freedom in the Capabilities Approach and the role of freedom in other accounts of social justice, eg: Rawls’s account.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- How well Nussbaum’s focus on freedom measures up against other accounts of social justice, for example Rawls’s focus on fairness
- Whether the sort of freedom Nussbaum holds in esteem is realistic for nation states to try to bring about
- Comparisons between Nussbaum’s conception of “freedom” and concepts of liberty such as Berlin’s concept of negative liberty, or Mill’s concept of liberty
- How people’s capabilities and freedoms can be balanced when individuals have conflicting desires
- Whether freedom is more important than economic stability
- The advantage the capabilities approach has over other approaches when it comes to taking differences between individuals, eg: gender, disability or wealth into consideration
- Alternative accounts of justice such as those proposed in Plato’s *Republic*.

[Source: CREATING CAPABILITIES: THE HUMAN DEVELOPMENT APPROACH by Martha C. Nussbaum, Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Copyright © 2011 by Martha C. Nussbaum. Used by permission. All rights reserved.]

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

13. (a) [10]
- (b) Evaluate the significance of the downgrading of the gods. [15]

Question and answer removed for copyright reasons

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Is Thales really referring to traditional Greek gods?
- Questioning Ortega's attribution of the rise of philosophical thinking to the change of status of gods. Might humans have questioned everything prior to this change?
- The appropriateness of the labelling the behaviour of the "thinker" as "excessive"
- How far does the "thinker", in Aristophanes's *Clouds*, reflect a true image of the "thinker"? Is the play defending the status of the gods?
- The degree to which the downgrading of gods establishes the nature of one god, be it rationality, nature or one God (a new theism)
- The degree to which the general population is always reactionary to any change, particularly when associated with a system of beliefs. Consider reactions to the rise of Protestantism or reactions to Confucianism
- The establishment of sophists. Were they a reaction to "true" philosophers?
- Can the common person manage a world with infinite choices?
- Is the use of the word philosophy an attempt to disguise or even water down the activities the "thinker"?
- The nature of Being, the question of it being linked to the demise of gods.

14. (a)

[10]

(b)

[15]

Questions and answers removed for copyright reasons

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

15. (a) Explain the depiction of justice in the state. [10]

(b) Evaluate the depiction of justice in the state. [15]

In Books 4 and 8, Plato raises the question of justice in the state and ways in which a state might become unjust, respectively. In the intervening Books, the implications of the attempt to establish justice in the state are explored from a variety of the implications of the answer in Book 4 to the main question. Candidates may use the account of justice in the state from Book 4 (and the counter-examples in Book 8), or they may choose to look at the discussions of specific matters that arise from the quest for justice, as discussed in Books 5-7. In Book 4 Socrates says that justice in the state involves a structure of society where there is harmony, but not equality. The structuring requires different sections of society to perform different functions according to certain abilities. Society, thus, is classified into the guardians, the auxiliaries and the workers, with the guardians qualifying for their role through their training to become philosophers. For Plato these classes are delineated by how people are naturally determined to perform, although the training for the philosopher/guardian is exhaustive. Plato uses an analogy of the composition of the human to reinforce the role of the classes in society. Thus, justice comes from the guardians performing as they are, not through a democratic, goal-orientated political process. Plato goes on to discuss the role of women and the family in the state and then explores various similes to drive home the requirements and epistemological framework for achieving justice in the state. In Book 8 Socrates discusses how the unjust rule occurs through some kind of disharmony in the function of the state or the ruler, and he underlines the reasons for not wanting the state to be unjust as much as the good reasons for why we should have justice in the state and in our lives.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The analogy between the state and the composition of the human soul
- The tri-partite structure of the state and the human soul
- The function argument for delineating the classes of humans in the state
- The function argument mixing “good” with “good at” or “good for”
- Philosophy as the route to achieving justice politically and socially
- How knowledge can qualify an individual to rule
- The role of women and the family in the rule of the state
- Similes of the ship and the beast in explanation of the role of the philosopher in society
- The counter-examples in Book 8 – where reasons for wanting justice in the state include benefits it can bring and disadvantages, if it is lacking.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- How applicable is the analogy of the composition of the human being to the structure of the state?
- How can justice be achieved without equality between consenting members of society?
- How much does Plato assume, rather than justify, in his epistemological justification for knowledge as the key qualification to rule?
- How much does Plato assume, rather than justify, in his metaphysical view, a view that gives rise to the world of Forms and knowledge of this world only by philosophers?
- Does rule in any society not require representation?
- In Book 8 Socrates gives reasons for wanting justice in the state and individual in terms of the happiness it confers – is this incompatible with what he argues elsewhere?

16. (a) **Explain Plato’s account of the Form of the good.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate Plato’s account of the Form of the good.** [15]

In various similes, Plato explores the nature of the good, which is at the heart of the object of knowledge for the training of the philosopher. Using similes including those of the sun, the divided line and the cave, Plato explores the nature of the Form of the good, and the impossibility of direct knowledge of it. Plato asserts that attaining knowledge of the good is vital in the education of the philosophers. In the world of the Forms, the Form of the good is the one shared by all other Forms giving it a primacy among all the Forms in the ideal world. Knowledge of this ideal world is distinct and is the only knowledge of reality available, thus critical for the philosopher in attaining knowledge of justice in the state. The Form of the good is the subject of an extended analogy in the simile of the sun, where the Form is characterized as being both the source and means of knowledge. In the simile of the divided line, there is a discussion of how the good is responsible for the ability of humans to know what is true, and indeed is the condition by which there can be any possession of the truth. In the simile of the cave the implications of this knowledge is brought out. In one passage, Plato discusses what the good is not and then leads to discussion of what the good is via similes – Socrates having accepted that he does not know what the good is directly.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The good is what humans pursue
- The good is the source of knowledge and the means by which knowledge of truth can be gained
- The good is the ultimate Form given all Forms “participate” in the good by virtue of being the “most good” exemplar/ideal of the thing to which they give reality
- The good is not a political concept, not pleasure, not knowledge in itself
- The simile of the sun
- The simile of the divided line
- The simile of the cave.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- How convincing is the world of the Forms, on which framework the good depends for its existence?
- Is knowledge of the good too abstract to help a ruler of a state in the world of objects?
- How useful is philosopher rule if the good they know is metaphysical rather than part of the life of the city in which they physically live and share with other people?
- How convincing is the simile of the sun – is it a workable analogy for Plato’s concept of the good?
- How convincing is the simile of the divided line, with divisions between knowledge and opinion being so difficult to pin down?
- Is there a confusion between moral and functional goodness – “good at”, “good for”, “good”?
- Are the epistemological and metaphysical assumptions of the world of the Forms too great?

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

17. (a) **Explain Singer’s use of thought experiments to make the case that it is wrong not to help.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate Singer’s use of thought experiments to make the case that it is wrong not to help.** [15]

In *The Life You Can Save*, Singer argues that it is wrong not to help, and in particular, that when we are able to give time or money to those in need, it is wrong not to do so. He sets out his basic argument using a series of thought experiments. The first thought experiment is the case of the drowning child, where for a small personal sacrifice, you can save the life of a child. The second is whether Bob should sacrifice his Bugatti to save the life of a child. The third is Unger’s case of giving a lift to a hiker who has seriously injured his leg and “is likely to bleed onto the seats, which you have recently and expensively restored in soft white leather” (Chapter 2). Singer says that “the examples above reveal our intuitive belief that we ought to help others in need, at least when we can see them and when we are the only person in a position to save them” (Chapter 2). Singer uses these cases to ground his basic argument for the conclusion that “if you do not donate to aid agencies, you are doing something wrong” (Chapter 2).

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Whether the three cases provide reliable information about our intuitions that not helping is wrong
- Singer’s claim that the cases help to establish his basic argument
- The relationship between the thought experiments and the logical basic argument
- How the three cases relate to poverty and donating to aid agencies
- Similarities and differences between the three cases
- The idea that thought experiments tell us about our intuitions
- Singer’s view that “the case for helping others is stronger if it does not rest solely on our intuitions” (Chapter 2).

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Whether the thought experiments are relevant to the sort of conclusions Singer argues for
- The idea that the simplified nature of thought experiments disregards important considerations
- The view that this simplification of moral dilemmas is helpful in reaching conclusions about how we ought to act, as opposed to the view that they are too abstract to give real-life guidance
- Whether thought experiments have any value beyond identifying people’s intuitions
- Whether intuitions ought to guide moral decision making.

[Source: © Peter Singer, *The Life You Can Save*. The updated 2019 edition can be downloaded as an ebook for free at: <https://www.thelifeyoucansave.org/the-book.>]

18. (a) **Explain Singer’s considerations about how you can tell which charities save lives best.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate Singer’s considerations about how you can tell which charities save lives best.** [15]

Singer explores two questions in Chapter 6: “How much does it cost to save a life?” and “how can we tell which charities do it best?”. He provides a lengthy discussion of some of the worries people have about donating to charities with regard to whether their donations will be used effectively. He then sets out some cases where aid has been used to save lives in a cost-effective manner. These include, amongst other examples, the use of Oxfam money to fund a workers’ association for rag pickers in India, and Catherine and Reginald Hamlin’s work to set up a fistula hospital in Ethiopia. Singer also discusses more abstract ways of assessing the effectiveness of charities and aid organizations. He talks about Karnofsky and Hassenfield’s non-profit, GiveWell which is “dedicated to improving the transparency and effectiveness of charities”. Overall, these discussions contribute to Singer’s argument that we can “save the lives of people living in extreme poverty” and that we can make decisions about which organizations to donate to in order best to achieve this aim.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- How Singer thinks we can assess the effectiveness of charities by looking at their overall effectiveness, as illustrated by GiveWell
- How Singer thinks we can assess the effectiveness of individual campaigns, as illustrated by examples such as the building a well in a village, using microfinancing, and the Hamlin’s fistula hospital
- Why Singer thinks that saving lives is a useful measure of effectiveness, as illustrated by his discussion of the effect of providing mosquito nets
- Whether Singer thinks that problems with aid organizations and charities undermine his argument that we ought to donate to charity
- The importance of checking the efficacy of people donating to charity
- The relationship between the basic argument and the more concrete recommendations about donating.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Whether Singer’s view that where possible we should save lives is easily applied to donating to charities and aid organizations
- Whether the problems with charities mean that Singer is wrong about being able to use money effectively to save lives
- Evaluations of the effectiveness of the different charities discussed in Chapter 6
- Other considerations which ought to be taken into account when deciding how to help others, such as considerations of human dignity (Nussbaum), human rights approaches (UNDHR), or equality and social justice (Rawls)
- The extent to which it is the responsibility of individuals to donate and to police how well their donations are being used
- The role of the state in providing aid to other nations, and within their own nation
- How far Singer’s utilitarianism is an appropriate ethical framework for evaluating the effectiveness of charities.

[Source: © Peter Singer, *The Life You Can Save*. The updated 2019 edition can be downloaded as an ebook for free at: <https://www.thelifeyoucansave.org/the-book.>]

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

19. (a) Explain the idea of horizons of significance. [10]

(b) Evaluate the idea of horizons of significance. [15]

The question asks for an explanation and evaluation of the idea of horizons of significance. Taylor states that what might be called “a loss of meaning or the fading of moral horizons” (Chapter 1) is one of the three modern malaises. In this sense horizon means a background of intelligibility against which things take on importance. Taylor’s notion of horizon inherits a rich phenomenological and hermeneutical tradition according to which each epoch or cultural unity defines a life-horizon by which people orient their life; such a horizon places life, life-concerns, life-experience, and thought-formation in a certain proportion. Particularly it situates our life as beings in time. Accordingly, Taylor thinks that we interpret ourselves, we see ourselves as beings with a past that can be remembered, reconstructed, and reinterpreted. Similarly, we project ourselves, our purposes and wants into the future against something which is given to us. Horizons of significance are the result of human interaction and history. This is centrally related to the significant general feature of human life; its fundamentally dialogical character: “We become full human agents, capable of understanding ourselves, and hence of defining an identity, through our acquisition of rich human languages of expression” (Chapter 4). The discussion of Taylor’s central idea might include the comparison and contrast with other views, eg: arguments coming from materialistic approaches.

[Source: THE ETHICS OF AUTHENTICITY by Charles Taylor, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, Copyright © 1991 by Charles Taylor and the Canadian Broadcasting Company. Used by permission. All rights reserved.]

Candidates might explore (part A):

- “Language” is taken in a broad sense, covering not only the words we speak but also other modes of expression whereby we define ourselves, including the “languages” of art, of gesture, of love, and the like
- We are inducted into these in exchange with others. No one acquires the languages needed for self-definition on their own. We are introduced to them through exchanges with others who matter to us what Mead called “significant others”
- The genesis of the human mind is in this sense not “monological”, not something each accomplishes on his or her own, but dialogical
- Horizons are given and in them something different from us is given to us. Even the sense that the significance of my life comes from its being chosen depends on the understanding that independent of my will there is something noble, courageous, and hence significant in giving shape to my own life
- The ideal of self-choice supposes that there are other issues of significance beyond self-choice. This ideal couldn’t stand alone, because it requires a horizon of issues of importance, which help define inescapable horizons.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The relationship between senses of the self and moral visions, between identity and the good. When we act, we need some orientation regarding the good: orientation toward the good is a central feature of human action
- The relation between horizons of significance and authenticity; authenticity requires openness to horizons of significance, for otherwise the creation loses the background that can save it from insignificance
- Nihilism as a form of negation of all horizons of significance. Although Nietzsche used the term “nihilism” in a different sense, to designate something he rejected, he is the major figure
- Aspects of this line of thinking found expression in some strands of modernism (the image of the “*poète maudit*”, Baudelaire), and in postmodernism (Derrida and Foucault). They carry their Nietzschean challenge to our ordinary categories to the point even of “deconstructing” the ideal of authenticity, and the very notion of the self
- The kind of self-defeating move frequently being carried out in our subjectivist civilisation: suppressing or denying the horizons against which things take on significance for us
- The slide to subjectivism: it exalts and entrenches anthropocentrism; by abolishing all horizons of significance, threatens us with a loss of meaning
- Any comprehensive “final” horizon would be only a temporary stage, because the possibility of new experiences cannot ever be ruled out
- Moral sources can be disclosed only with the help of cultural webs of meaning, in relation to Wittgenstein’s notion of “forms of life”
- Different cultures and different historical ages have different horizons of significance
- Understanding other cultures and the possible fusions of horizons (Gadamer)
- Recognizing differences (eg: sexual orientations) and acting accordingly requires shared horizons of significance.

20. (a) **Explain how the search for authentic self-fulfilment can become self-defeating when it is attached to individualism.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate the idea that the search for authentic self-fulfilment can become self-defeating when it is attached to individualism.** [15]

The question asks for an explanation and evaluation of this claim which brings into play central aspects of the ethics of authenticity in relation to two possible faces of personal achievement: self-fulfilment and self-deception. Taylor distinguishes among three different strands of experience (individualism, instrumental reason, and subjectivism) intending to show how each of these contains both destructive and creative possibilities. These destructive possibilities are a central concern of Taylor's: the malaises of modernity. These are features of our contemporary culture and society that people experience as a loss or a decline. According to Taylor sometimes people feel that some important decline has occurred during the last years or decades since the Second World War. Other times "the loss is felt over a much longer historical period: the whole modern era from the 17th century is frequently seen as the time frame of decline" (Chapter 1). Authenticity as a moral ideal involves three controversial beliefs: a) "authenticity is a valid ideal" (Chapter 2); b) one can "argue in reason about ideals and about the conformity of practices to these ideals" (Chapter 2); and c) "these arguments can make a difference." (Chapter 2). In Taylor's argument what is really at stake is a fair judgment on modernity, an assessment, a fine discrimination of both its nobility and ethical appeal, on the one hand, and its self-destructiveness, and self-flattening and demeaning tendencies, on the other.

[Source: THE ETHICS OF AUTHENTICITY by Charles Taylor, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, Copyright © 1991 by Charles Taylor and the Canadian Broadcasting Company. Used by permission. All rights reserved.]

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Authentic life is an ethical goal and peculiar to modern culture, stemming from individualism. Individualism comes from Descartes affirming the primacy of the person as self-responsible to find the truth. This morality is also anchored in romanticism. It is a voice within or the intimate contact with oneself. Sources of authenticity are also Rousseau, Kant and Marx
- Our individuality is grounded in sociality. We only become capable of understanding ourselves and defining our identity through dialogue. We are dialogical creatures and cannot develop into individuals without interaction with others. Through dialogue we are able to exchange our ideas with others and construct our values and belief
- The connection of individualism with the primacy of instrumental reason as a malaise of modernity. Instrumental reason means the kind of rationality we draw on when calculating the most economical application of means to a given end. Maximum efficiency is the best cost-output. Ratio is its measure of success
- Deception of a subjective, narcissistic self-fulfilment which disregards the demands of our ties with others or the demands from something different beyond the self
- Things take on importance against a background of intelligibility: a horizon. If we are to define ourselves significantly, we cannot suppress or deny the horizons against which things take on significance for us. This is the kind of self-defeating move frequently being carried in our subjectivist civilization.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- With modernity the individual is seen as having lost something important along with the larger social and cosmic horizons of action
- The current vision seems to be that lives are all equal. Taylor believes this causes people to become self-absorbed, and can bring about a loss of meaning in their lives
- Taylor opposes moral dimensions to economic and social phenomena. Is it realistic?
- Although Taylor states that moral authenticity is fundamentally dialogical in character, his view on authenticity, which is a main way to overcome instrumental reason, is still individualistic
- The ethics of authenticity in discussion: other philosophical, cultural and social views, eg: non-western perspectives, feminist approaches.

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

21. (a) **Explain how the sage rules without taking action.** [10]

(b) **Evaluate how the sage rules without taking action.** [15]

*Wu wei* is often translated literally, “non-being unnatural action” and at the heart of ruling, the sage is faced with a paradox, exemplified in the *Tao*. The ideal rule is non-interventionist as upholding political ideals in keeping with the *Tao*. Those who know the *Tao* know that it is the way of unknowing. There is an image of the state as a sacred vessel – a thing not to be tampered with. The image implies that the ruler should not interfere with the way the state is run, but, rather, work with the state to ensure the Way is established in the life of the state. All striving is counter-productive, indeed futile and in the face of this, the sage should restrain from doing unnatural actions and instead prefer spontaneous actions that do not come from deliberation or straining to achieve. The task for the sage is to shape actions according to the true essence of things both in the public and private spheres, looking at what is the most important element of any circumstances to master them in the right way. Action must, then, be shaped according to the true essence of things in their circumstances as learnt by the sage. The uncarved block serves as a symbol for the sage. It is a state untouched by humans, representing the original disposition of humankind and the ruler must keep people in this state, free from desires, led by the ruler’s own lack of desire. There is the image of water – nothing in this world being softer or weaker, but nothing better at attacking things that are strong and firm. Water benefits things without straining and serves as an example of a thing close to the *Tao*, which must be encouraged by the sage. The ruler puts himself last and his people first and is a shadowy presence among subjects who should be kept in a child-like state. The evaluation will look at the analogies set up about the way the sage applies the *Tao* to the state and will consider the picture of *wu wei* as the template for political rule.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- *Wu wei* as the principle of political rule
- The sage as a shadowy presence among his people
- Discovering the true essence of things – how is this done?
- The image of the state as a sacred vessel
- The image of water for the sage to learn from
- The uncarved block.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The frugal, simple way of life encouraged by the *Tao*
- The idea of non-action in political rule – is this convincing?
- Rulers not seeking power – is this convincing? See a comparison with Plato
- Is striving necessarily not to be encouraged in ruling?
- The passive picture of life in the state being ruled – is this undemocratic and authoritarian?
- The consequences of keeping subjects in a child-like state
- The sage as “a shadowy presence” – unaccountable to the people?
- Is there no role for desire or passion in politics?

22. (a) Explain the difficulty involved in speaking about the *Tao*. [10]
- (b) Evaluate the difficulty involved in speaking about the *Tao*. [15]

A critical difficulty for understanding the *Tao* is the problems encountered in speaking about it. It is impossible for the *Tao* to be named, as this requires differentiation and the *Tao* serves as a template for the difficulty of naming anything in the world. Indeed, in a strict sense it is impossible to say anything about the *Tao*. Instead you must use indirect ways of speaking about the *Tao* and this can involve seeming paradoxes, such as “formless yet complete”. The ultimate reality of the *Tao* goes beyond the world of ordinary experience, and is treated like a metaphysical realm, rather similar to the world of the Forms of Plato or the supernatural imagery of the divine in world religions. The *Tao* is not a substance or thing, and has no cause, space, individuality and other modes of existence found in the material world.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The *Tao* as nameless
- The inability to say anything direct about the *Tao*
- Apparent paradoxes when speaking about the *Tao*
- The ultimate, metaphysical scope of the *Tao*, transcending physical limitations in the material world
- The limit of knowledge for people in the material world causing speaking about the *Tao* in negative terms – describing what it is not, eg: looked for but not seen; listened for but not heard
- Imagery of the *Tao* – the uncarved block and water.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Is speaking about the *Tao* able to be considered rationally?
- In what ways does the *Tao* submit to philosophical and public enquiry?
- Are the images of the *Tao* passive and indefinite?
- Are the indirect ways of speaking about the *Tao* paradoxical? (eg: the *Tao* described as “not-being”)
- Is the handling of the relationship between the *Tao* and naming convincing?
- A sense of the divine-like attributes of the *Tao*, if compared to world faiths, like the *Logos* in Judeo-Christianity, or the impossibility of picturing Allah in Islam
- Speaking of the *Tao* in negative terms, like the Aquinas’s *via negativa*; speaking of what God is not.

**Zhuangzi: *Zhuangzi***

23. (a) **Explain the significance of the Spirit Man/Sage “concentrating his spirit and straightaway all things are free from sickness and the harvest matures.”** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate the significance of the Spirit Man/Sage “concentrating his spirit and straightaway all things are free from sickness and the harvest matures.”** [15]

The question invites an explanation of how, by concentrating their spirit, humans can be freed from sickness and enjoy the benefits of the harvest. This allows humans to wander free and not be tied to social norms. The metaphor is being used to show how, by concentrating their spirit and freeing themselves from the expectations and demands of society, humans can both see the world better and be more at peace. This wandering with sensitivity and responsiveness without fixed preconceptions allows for more spontaneity and an increasing awareness of *wu wei*. The desire and ability to practise *wu wei* gives freedom. It is not doing nothing but more not becoming involved with the pressures and demands of society; not interfering in the natural flow of events. In so doing, humans are able to “wander” beyond the familiar and see more in the world of nature. By concentrating their spirit, humans see things in a new way, with a deeper appreciation. This will allow humans to get closer to the *Tao*. This closeness brings about a greater, higher understanding and no longer dwells on the petty. Consequently, the separation of the complex yet petty demand of society (the sickness) makes us free and our deep, more sophisticated, yet simpler, understanding of things, is the maturing of the harvest. The harvest is the reaping of benefits of the *Tao*. The quote comes from 1.11.

[Source: Zhuangzi: 2009, *The Essential Writings* trans. B Ziporyn, New York, Hackett Publishing.]

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The nature of the Spirit Man/Sage and how he seeks to wander and forget everything yet in so doing enlarges and transforms himself
- The nature of *wu wei*
- The qualities of the *Tao*
- The metaphor of the virgin girl
- The historical context of *Xu You* rejecting the status of emperor
- The act of rejecting the Empire as good, in that it rejects merit and status yet is still prone to the desire of identity, self, and therefore *Xu You* still remains far from the *Tao*
- The desire to develop a “flourishing life” focused on spiritual development not worldly success
- The value of a metaphorical approach in explaining how human behaviour can be changed.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The need for humans to be able to survive and be successful in a modern market driven society
- The benefits of the “harvest maturing”, that is the benefits of being free from and not conforming to the social and economic pressures of society
- Whether such separation is possible given the inherent nature of human competitiveness
- The extent to which practising *wu wei* can change humans
- The degree to which separation from society is possible in a complex increasingly urban environment. Whether such an approach to life is more possible in a rural setting
- The value of spiritual transformation compared to material wealth
- The degree to which “wandering” humans become parasitic on society
- Differing understandings of a “flourishing life”
- Modern notions of “mindfulness” being attempts to become more spiritual and “wandering”
- The benefit of seeing the world differently, uncombed by conventional perceptions and values
- The seeking of the *Tao* as valuable.

24. (a) Explain the claim that “if virtue is preeminent, the body will be forgotten.” [10]

(b) Evaluate the claim that “if virtue is preeminent, the body will be forgotten”. [15]

This question centres on an explanation of the role of people with disabilities in understanding the nature of virtue, and the higher qualities of those that strive to reach the *Tao*. In Chapter 5 both the Horse headed Hunchback and the Hunchback Limpleg, the lipless cripple, both argue a convincing case to the Duke Ling of Wei. Their argument is so persuasive that the Duke forgets their physical condition. Their virtue has excelled. “Where virtue excels, the physical form is forgotten” (Chapter 5). The qualities that should be valued in people supersede the physical attributes of the person and focus on their mental and spiritual qualities. “Virtuosity [...] gives a definite shape to the fullness of harmony within” (Chapter 5). This can be transferred, out of the story being told, to the qualities of the Spirit Man/Sage, and potentially is achievable by all humans. It can be suggested that those with physical challenges can develop a greater sense of inner strength and insight that can be a model for those without such challenges. Their virtue (*de*) seems greater than the norm and seems to demonstrate that all people should try to seek this greater level of *de* and so take them closer to the *Tao*. This closeness can then enhance and increase the level of humanity. There might be some reference to Chapter 3 and the nature of the Commander of the Right having only one foot doing a better job of increasing the level of virtue in the State compared to the courtly adviser in Chapter 4. Explanations might also reflect comments on Confucianism; the need to seek beyond the external practices and appearances, to reach into an internal sense of peace and harmony; the rejecting of societies’ ways. Human inclinations need to be put aside, and ideas of right and wrong or issues being seen as black or white, should be rejected for an approach which is perhaps more relativistic and able to change with the circumstance. Answers might also move into sections of Chapter 6 mentioning the relationship of *tian* (nature or heaven) and *ren* (human) and the nature of humanity and a flourishing life in harmony with nature.

[Source: Zhuangzi: 2009, *The Essential Writings* trans. B Ziporyn, New York, Hackett Publishing.]

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The nature of virtue
- The nature of the *Tao*
- Society’s perception of the causes of human deformity through time and place. Has society itself become deformed?
- Ways in which levels of humanity could be increased
- The role of the State in developing virtue
- A relativistic approach to issues and the questioning skepticism
- Heaven (*tian*) given qualities and the abilities of humans to transcend them. Those with physical disabilities having a greater intuition and human insight.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The degree to which visual judgments of people affect our treatment of them
- Ways in which society can or should develop humanity
- Whether human flourishing is culturally biased
- The role of the state in safeguarding and creating opportunities for those physically challenged
- Ways in which seeking the *Tao* enhances humanity
- Skepticism
- The Spiritual Man (Sage) as a perfect human. The idea of perfect might be disconnected from physical appearance and might be more reflective of the inner state of a person
- People’s own perceptions, feelings and judgements when encountering illustrative stories involving physically deformities
- Societal and cultural changes towards people with disabilities; the nature of inclusivity and equal opportunity and human dignity.