



International Baccalaureate®
Baccalauréat International
Bachillerato Internacional

Philosophy

Higher and Standard level

Specimen papers 1, 2 and 3

For first examinations in 2025

CONTENTS

Philosophy higher level paper 1: specimen question paper

Philosophy higher level and standard level paper 1: specimen markscheme

Philosophy higher level and standard level paper 2: specimen question paper

Philosophy higher level and standard level paper 2: specimen markscheme

Philosophy higher level paper 3: specimen question paper

Philosophy higher level paper 3: specimen markscheme

Philosophy standard level paper 1: specimen question paper

**Philosophy
Higher level
Paper 1**

Specimen paper

2 hours 30 minutes

Instructions to candidates

- Do not open this examination paper until instructed to do so.
- Section A: answer one question.
- Section B: answer two questions, each chosen from a different optional theme.
- The maximum mark for this examination paper is **[75 marks]**.

Section A

Answer **one** question from this section. Each question in this section is worth [25 marks].

Core theme: Being Human

1. Read the following stimulus and develop your response as indicated below.

Extract from *E Kore Au E Ngaro* (*I shall never be lost*), a traditional *Māori* folksong.

- I shall never be lost
Nor shall I be ashamed
For I am keen
to seek and search
5 from whence I came.
Should I roam the expanse of our nation
Or the expanse of the world
no matter where I happen to be
I shall never forget
10 Most precious to me is my identity
Knowing that I am a descendant of *Whakatōhea**.
I shall not be lost
I shall not be ashamed
because I am passionate
15 in the search, in the investigation
of “Who am I?”

* *Whakatōhea*: the name of a *Māori iwi*, or tribe

With explicit reference to the stimulus and your own knowledge, explore a philosophical issue related to the question of what it is to be human.

2. Look at the following image and develop your response as indicated below.



With explicit reference to the stimulus and your own knowledge, explore a philosophical issue related to the question of what it is to be human.

Section B

Answer **two** questions from this section, each chosen from a different optional theme. Each question in this section is worth [25 marks].

Optional theme 1: Aesthetics

3. Discuss whether something can be art if no one ever sees it.
4. Evaluate the claim that art is always an end in itself and never a means to an end.

Optional theme 2: Epistemology

5. Discuss whether there are any significant differences between self-knowledge and other types of knowledge.
6. To what extent do you agree that there is no satisfactory response to the claim that it is impossible to know anything at all?

Optional theme 3: Ethics

7. Evaluate the claim that all ethical language is essentially meaningless.
8. To what extent do you agree that virtue-based approaches fail to provide practical guidance on how we should act?

Optional theme 4: Philosophy of religion

9. Discuss the claim that the existence of God is impossible to prove or disprove.
10. To what extent do you agree with the claim that religious language may be non-literal but that does not make it nonsense?

Optional theme 5: Philosophy of science

11. To what extent do you agree that there is no satisfactory way to distinguish science from pseudoscience?
12. Discuss the role of social values in shaping the development of scientific knowledge.

Optional theme 6: Political philosophy

13. Discuss how the idea of punishment poses challenges for the relationship between the state and its citizens.
14. Evaluate the claim that there is tension between liberty and our obligations to others.

Optional theme 7: Social philosophy

15. Discuss the view that the primary concern of feminism is power over the self rather than power over others.
 16. Evaluate the claim that the family is the most influential social institution.
-

Disclaimer:

Content used in IB assessments is taken from authentic, third-party sources. The views expressed within them belong to their individual authors and/or publishers and do not necessarily reflect the views of the IB.

References:

1. Folksong.org.nz, 2019. *E Kore Au E Ngaro*. [online] Available at: https://folksong.org.nz/e_kore_au_e_ngaro/index.html [Accessed 19 March 2022].
2. Kirhagis, B., 2018. *Earth (#1)*. [electronic print] Available at: <https://treasongallery.com/brian-kirhagis-earth> [Accessed 28 April 2022].

Markscheme

Specimen paper

Philosophy

Higher level and standard level

Paper 1

This markscheme is **confidential** and for the exclusive use of examiners in this examination session.

It is the property of the International Baccalaureate and must **not** be reproduced or distributed to any other person without the authorization of the IB Global Centre, Cardiff.

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 pages 4-5 for the core theme and pages 8-9 for the optional themes.

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

Note to examiners

Candidates at both Higher Level and Standard Level answer **one** question on the core theme (Section A). Candidates at Higher Level answer **two** questions on the optional themes (Section B), each based on a different optional theme.

Candidates at Standard Level answer **one** question on the optional themes (Section B).

Paper 1 section A core theme markbands

This task presents candidates with an unseen stimulus in the form of either a short text extract or an image. Candidates are required to explore a philosophical issue related to what it is to be human, the focus of the core theme, that arises from this stimulus. Within their critical exploration of their chosen issue, candidates are required to make explicit reference both to the stimulus and to their wider knowledge from their study of the core theme.

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–5	- A philosophical issue raised by the stimulus is implied but not explicitly identified. There is minimal explanation of how this issue relates to the stimulus. Few, if any, references to the stimulus are made in the response. - The response demonstrates little relevant knowledge of the core theme. Philosophical vocabulary is not used or is consistently used inappropriately. Points made are poorly organized and frequently unclear. - The response is mostly descriptive and any analysis present is superficial or incoherent. Examples are included but are irrelevant and ineffective. There is little or no discussion of different points of view. Where a conclusion is included, this is very superficial or is not consistent with the rest of the response.
6–10	- A philosophical issue raised by the stimulus is identified but is imprecisely or vaguely stated. There is some limited explanation of how this issue relates to the stimulus. Occasional references to the stimulus are made in the response. - The response demonstrates basic knowledge of the core theme, but this knowledge lacks accuracy and/or relevance. Philosophical vocabulary is used, but often inappropriately. There is some attempt to organize the points made, but it is often unclear what the response is trying to convey. - The response contains limited analysis and overall is more descriptive than analytical. Examples are included but are ineffective. There is awareness but limited discussion of different points of view. A simplistic conclusion is included.
11–15	- A philosophical issue raised by the stimulus is explicitly identified. There is a basic explanation of how this issue relates to the stimulus. Specific references to the stimulus are made during the response, although these are sometimes ineffective or unclear. - The response contains some relevant knowledge of the core theme. Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately. There is an attempt to organize the points made, although there is some repetition and a lack of clarity in places. - The response contains analysis, although this analysis lacks development. Relevant examples are used to support the discussion. There is some discussion of different points of view. A conclusion is included.
16–20	- A philosophical issue raised by the stimulus is explicitly identified. There is good explanation of how this issue relates to the stimulus. Specific references to the stimulus are made regularly throughout the response. - The response contains relevant and accurate knowledge of the core theme. Philosophical vocabulary is used, mostly appropriately. Points are generally clear and organized, and the response can be easily followed. - The response contains critical analysis, although this analysis may lack development. Relevant examples are used to support the discussion. There is discussion of different points of view. The response argues to a conclusion that is consistent with the arguments presented.
21–25	- A philosophical issue raised by the stimulus is clearly and explicitly identified. There is a well-developed explanation of how this issue relates to the stimulus. Clear, effective and specific references to the stimulus are made regularly throughout the response. - The response contains relevant, accurate and detailed knowledge of the core theme. Philosophical vocabulary is used accurately and precisely throughout. The points made are clear, coherent and effectively organized. - The response contains well-developed critical analysis. Relevant examples are used effectively to support the discussion. There is critical discussion of different points of

	view. The response argues to a reasoned and clearly stated conclusion that is consistent with the arguments presented.
--	--

Section A

Core theme: Being human

1. Extract from folksong

With explicit reference to the stimulus and your own knowledge, explore a philosophical issue related to the question of what it is to be human.

[25]

This stimulus consists of an extract from a *Māori* folksong. There are a diverse range of philosophical issues arising from this stimulus that candidates could choose to explore, and examiners should be open to a wide variety of philosophical issues, perspectives, and approaches. Whichever philosophical issue is discussed, responses should include specific and explicit references to the stimulus.

This stimulus may prompt discussions of issues related to the concept of identity (a word used in line 10 of the song). For example, candidates might explore some core conceptual distinction in the history of the term and its meaning. They might discuss how cultural context shapes an individual's identity, or whether culture informs identity or identity informs culture. Or they might also discuss the extent to which cultural and/or societal changes are affected by globalization and therefore impact the concept of identity.

The stimulus may also, for example, prompt discussions of issues related to the concept of the self. For example, candidates could discuss the focus on first person reflection and consciousness. They could make links to examples such as Locke's contention that the human self is connected to memory and his argument that a person can be addressed as the same person if they are able to remember previous states of consciousness.

Candidates might explore:

- Human beings as agents
- The role of non-action, *eg*: the *Tao* (*wu wei*)
- The issue of worthiness, *eg*: Kant's "kingdom of ends"
- Self-consciousness and work: does the shaping of the 'self' depend on work?
- Social relations and productive relations, *eg*: Marx, the Frankfurt School
- Social recognition and work: do people recognize others according to their job? Do the others see what we do instead of seeing who we are?
- Work as a means to contribute to society, *eg*: Plato's just city, Singer's view on donation, Rawls's principle of justified inequality
- Work as a moral duty towards society
- The role of unemployed people in a productive society; the role of people who do not accept societal rules, *eg*: Nozick's "free riders"
- The issue of human rights within a productive society
- Human relations as useful and economic relations, *eg*: Taylor's "instrumental reason"
- Worth as related to non-utility, *eg*: Zhuangzi
- Religious traditions in defining human beings' work and production as a means to relate to deity or gain salvation, *eg*: Weber
- The meaning of knowledge in terms of utility, *eg*: Bacon, Dewey
- Whether technological society fosters a productive view of human worth
- Whether the view of life as production affects the meaning of human life and its quality, *eg*: Nussbaum.

2. Image

With explicit reference to the stimulus and your own knowledge, explore a philosophical issue related to the question of what it is to be human.

[25]

This stimulus consists of an image of a woman composed and constituted of natural elements such as plants, flowers, and trees. There are a diverse range of philosophical issues arising from the stimulus that candidates could choose to explore, and examiners should be open to a wide variety of philosophical issues, perspectives, and approaches. Whichever philosophical issue is discussed, responses should include specific and explicit references to the stimulus.

This image may, for example, prompt discussions of the human relationship with the natural world. This could include the degree to which we are part of, or products of, nature. Alternatively, candidates may focus on an issue related to the female figure presented in the image. This could include issues of gender identity or gender equality, or considerations of the relationship between gender and the environment. Candidates might consider the ability of philosophers to analyse and define embodied experiences, such as the unity expressed in the image between the woman and nature.

Candidates might explore:

- The relationship between the natural world and human beings.
- Concepts of the human as animal
- The ways in which human beings may distance themselves or separate themselves from the natural world
- The identification of the natural with the feminine
- Non-western conceptions of nature and the natural world
- Buddhist concepts of inter-relatedness
- Taoism and living in accordance with nature and the *Tao*
- Challenges that result from divorcing mankind from the natural world
- The personification of nature and the idea of Mother Nature
- Human identity in relation to nature and the natural world
- Human beings as composed of material constituents
- Human beings as connected and united through the natural world
- The impact of humanity on nature
- The distinction between that which is man-made and that which is natural as products of human activity
- The metaphor of nature as mother of humanity
- Engagement with others through engagement with the natural world - including rights, duties, and obligations
- Human nature as a product of natural processes, *eg* evolution.

Paper 1 section B optional themes markbands

This task requires candidates to write a thematic essay on the optional theme they have studied (SL) or two optional themes they have studied (HL). Candidates are presented with a choice of two questions per theme, with each question relating to one of the points of “required content” specified for that theme. Candidates are required to undertake a critical and explicitly philosophical discussion of the question posed, selecting and using specific examples drawn from their study of the optional theme to support their points.

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–5	- There is minimal focus on the question. Points made are poorly organized and frequently unclear. - The response demonstrates little relevant knowledge of the optional theme. Philosophical vocabulary is not used or is consistently used inappropriately. - The response is mostly descriptive and any analysis present is superficial or incoherent. Examples drawn from the study of the optional theme are included but are irrelevant and ineffective. There is little or no discussion of different points of view. Where a conclusion is included, this is very superficial or is not consistent with the rest of the response.
6–10	- There is some focus on the question, although the specific demands of the question may only be partially addressed. There is some attempt to organize the points made, but it is often unclear what the response is trying to convey. - The response demonstrates basic knowledge of the optional theme, but this knowledge lacks accuracy and/or relevance. Philosophical vocabulary is used, but often inappropriately. - The response contains limited analysis and overall is more descriptive than analytical. Examples drawn from the study of the optional theme are included but are frequently ineffective. There is awareness but limited discussion of different points of view. A simplistic conclusion is included.
11–15	- The response is focused on the question. There is an attempt to organize the points made, although there is some repetition and lack of clarity in places. - The response contains some relevant knowledge of the optional theme. Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately. - The response contains analysis, although this analysis lacks development. Relevant examples drawn from the study of the optional theme are included. There is some discussion of different points of view. A conclusion is included.
16–20	- The response is focused on the question, showing engagement with the specific demands of the question. Points are generally clear and organized, and the response can be easily followed. - The response contains relevant and accurate knowledge of the optional theme. Philosophical vocabulary is used, mostly appropriately. - The response contains critical analysis, although this analysis may lack development. Relevant examples drawn from the study of the optional theme are used to support the discussion. There is discussion of different points of view. The response argues to a conclusion that is consistent with the arguments presented.
21–25	- There is a sustained focus on the question, showing clear engagement with the specific demands of the question. The points made are clear, coherent and effectively organized. - The response contains relevant, accurate and detailed knowledge of the optional theme. Philosophical vocabulary is used accurately and precisely throughout. - The response contains well-developed critical analysis. Relevant examples drawn from the study of the optional theme are used effectively to support the discussion. There is critical discussion of different points of view. The response argues to a reasoned and clearly stated conclusion that is consistent with the arguments presented.

Section B

Optional theme 1: Aesthetics

3. Discuss whether something can be art if no one ever sees it.

[25]

This question enables a multifaceted discussion including what art is and the extent to which the role of the audience/spectator is essential to art. Some answers might take the route that something is art according to some set of properties which belong to the work itself, *eg* the property of beauty, whereas others might be more inclined to claim that there is no art independent of the reception of the work by part of the audience/spectator. The opposition between being seen or not shows the intrinsic connection between art and sense perception which was manifest in the origin of Aesthetics as a new discipline within philosophy when Alexander Baumgarten used the term in 1735. Then, “aesthetics” came to mean the study of our perception of the beautiful, both in nature and in works of art, however it still retained its root connection to sense perception. With an initial focus that can be characterized as ontological or metaphysical (the possible independent existence of art) the question is open to further discussion including concepts and theories within aesthetics; the nature and definition of art; standards for interpretation of works of art; mind, knowledge and art; and art and emotion.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- What kinds of entities in the world are works of art?
- Examples of art; including the earliest records of what can be considered art which date back to 40 000 years ago, and consist of cave paintings, such as those of Chauvet in France and Altamira in Spain
- Is art independent of anyone’s beliefs, linguistic practices, conceptual schemes, emotions and so on?
- The extent to which the role of the audience/spectator is constitutive of art
- In general realism related to the art sphere would sustain that there are such things as works of arts characterized by the presence of some distinctive properties, *eg* beauty
- The interpretation of beauty as the objective correlative of our subjective response, or as the reflection of the capacity of an object to stimulate us to aesthetic response
- Beauty not as a perception of a matter of fact or a relation, but as an emotion, an affection of our volitional and appreciative nature
- The view that beauty is a property that depends on other properties; when we appreciate the beauty of thing, we appreciate its beauty as it is realized in its other properties, *eg* form, harmony
- The perception of art, the role of the audience/spectator and the characterizations or definitions of art
- Is art an exclusive human product or can it be produced by non-human species, terrestrial or otherwise and recognized by other possible minds?
- The role of the audience/spectator within the challenges to traditional aesthetics posed by feminism, environmental aesthetics and popular art.
- The idea of “deep gender” (Carolyn Korsmeyer) as an attempt to include all factors operating in what might be valued as art
- Seeing as a kind of paradigmatic case of sense perception and its role in art
- The intent of the artist and cases where art becomes popular only posthumously *eg* Vivian Maier
- The role of the audience/spectator and the individual arts, *eg* music, painting, photography, film, videogames, comics, literature, poetry, theatre, dance, architecture, sculpture and design.

4. Evaluate the claim that art is always an end in itself and never a means to an end. [25]

The question invites an analysis of what the nature and aim of art might be. The idea that works of art are functional and serve certain ends has a long history that begins with Plato and has persisted in a variety of forms to the present day. The opposing view that art is nonfunctional, that it is autonomous and is produced for its own sake, is more recent. The claim can be seen as sustaining the view of “art for art’s sake” that was celebrated in various artistic and intellectual circles through much of the nineteenth century. Opposing views labelled this kind of position as “aestheticism” holding that works of art should convey social, political or moral values.

Developments of the Kantian approach propose that art is beyond the laws of nature and the moral laws following its own legislation based on the “pure feeling.” Furthermore, the claim offers layers open to further interpretation and discussion related to what art is, how aesthetic experience can be characterized or what could justify aesthetic judgments.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The extent to which the claim implies that works of art should be treated as persons like in Kant’s humanity formula
- Is freedom of expression as a central value in relation to art a way to confirm that works of art are end in themselves?
- Whether works of art exist only to facilitate the experience of a unique and intrinsically valuable feeling of beauty
- The end of aesthetic experience in general and art in particular as to allow us to experience a wide range of emotions
- The extent to which art might be an end within frames inspired by Wittgenstein in which art is a form of life constituted by characteristic practices and expectations on the basis of both artist and audience
- If art has the function of expressing emotions, can it still be considered an end in itself?
- Art as an end and not a means in the context of feminist arguments that artistic creativity is doubly bound up within the general patriarchal form of society and specific organization of the institutions of the artworld
- Heidegger’s idea that a work of art expresses a world
- Trotsky’s view that art should serve as a “hammer” for building the new society
- The place and function of the works of art within institutional theories of art
- Examples of arts associated to other ends, *eg* religious: the religious function of significant architectural constructions in Greece and Rome; singing as a form of worship, *eg* the use poetry in ancient Hebrew psalms; the possible religious purpose of the Paleolithic cave paintings at Lascaux in France.

Optional theme 2: Epistemology

5. Discuss whether there are any significant differences between self-knowledge and other types of knowledge.

[25]

The question invites candidates to consider the nature of self-knowledge and discuss whether self-knowledge is similar or different to other types of knowledge. Candidates are encouraged to consider whether any differences between self-knowledge and other forms of knowledge are significant. Stronger responses will therefore include discussion about what makes any differences that are identified significant.

Candidates may discuss the key features of self-knowledge or the sources of self-knowledge. They might also identify other forms of knowledge and discuss the key features of these other forms of knowledge, as well as the origins of them. In some cases, candidates may compare and contrast knowledge of the self with other forms of knowledge in terms of truth, and they may explore the extent to which self-knowledge and other forms of knowledge are coherent, correspond to other knowledge or are pragmatic. Candidates might also explore the similarities and differences between self-knowledge and other forms of knowledge in relation to the degrees of subjectivity involved, for example whether self-knowledge is more subjective than other forms of knowledge.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The unique features of self-knowledge, eg it is direct and privileged
- Access to one's own mental states; ownership of self-knowledge; infallibility of self-knowledge, permanent and continual access to mental states
- Self-knowledge and the subconscious, eg Freud
- Authority of self-knowledge
- Truth in relation to self-knowledge and other forms of knowledge
- Tools for generating self-knowledge and other forms of knowledge
- The idea that there may be no significant difference between self-knowledge and other forms of knowledge because we cannot see others mental states (behaviourism)
- Stich (1983) claims that our knowledge of mental states of others is purely theoretical
- Proximity to self-knowledge might mean that it does not qualify as knowledge, eg Wittgenstein.

6. To what extent do you agree that there is no satisfactory response to the claim that it is impossible to know anything at all?

[25]

Candidates might discuss the nature of knowledge; for example, some might use Plato's definition as 'justified true belief' in order to show why someone might claim that it is impossible to know anything at all.

Candidates might also discuss the paradoxical nature of the claim 'it is impossible to know anything at all' because if the statement itself is true then it *is* possible to know that something. An alternative approach taken by candidates might be to consider other responses to the claim, such as appealing to fundamental truths identified by different philosophers, *eg* Descartes 'I think therefore I am', axiomatic truths of mathematics, the role of 'clear and distinct' ideas in providing certain knowledge (Descartes), innate knowledge, intuitive faculty of the mind that gives us knowledge of space and time (Kant). Candidates might also evaluate the quality of the responses in order to reach a judgment about whether the responses are satisfactory or not.

Another approach that candidates might take is to claim that there is no knowledge, which is why it might not be possible to know anything at all. The nature of knowledge, opinion and belief might be explored, and this might invite responses to the claim which focus on definitions of knowledge that give rise to the existence of changing or relative knowledge.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The nature of knowledge, belief and opinion
- Reasons for claiming "it is impossible to know anything at all"
- Responses to the claim, leading to the conclusion that it is possible to have knowledge, including an exploration of rationalism and empiricism, synthetic and analytic knowledge
- Types of knowledge, *eg a-priori, a-posteriori*
- Sources of knowledge, *eg* empiricism, rationality
- Pragmatism
- Radical skepticism, *eg* brain in a vat thought experiments
- Responses to radical skepticism, *eg* Moore
- Cultural relativism and knowledge
- Postmodern approaches to knowledge which reject the idea that there is a single readily accessible standard for knowledge.

Optional theme 3: Ethics

7. Evaluate the claim that all ethical language is essentially meaningless.

[25]

The question invites an evaluation of the nature of ethical language and, particularly, whether it can be defined as meaningless or otherwise.

Candidates might consider the relationship between language and ethical values and whether they can be expressed, described, or defined by language. Candidates might explore different perspectives on the nature of ethical values, *eg* Plato's view on the Good and his Theory of Forms, or Aristotle's virtue ethics. Candidates might highlight the role of utilitarianism in shifting the value of the Good towards the value of the useful, where we can use our language to define what is good because of its usefulness or otherwise. Candidates might also mention Nietzsche's genealogy of morals in explaining how language is related to ethics and the role of etymology on specific terms, *eg* guilt, punishment.

Responses might pinpoint the views expressed by analytical philosophers and evaluate whether it is impossible to define ethical values by the means of language. Responses might explore emotions and emotional intuition as a means of grasping ethical values. Moreover, candidates might consider ethics in terms of social convention, *eg* Searle's collective intentionality.

Alternatively, candidates might refer to non-western philosophies, *eg* the *Tao*, and consider the skepticism towards any constructed ethical language, particularly by authority, and the necessity of following "the way".

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Different approaches to ethical values, *eg* Plato, Aristotle
- The Good and the Useful, *eg* utilitarianism
- Ethical values, ethical language, and etymology, *eg* Nietzsche's genealogy of morals
- Analytic philosophers and the definition of ethical values, *eg* Quine, Russell, Moore, Mackie
- The limits of language or otherwise, *eg* Wittgenstein
- The role of emotions in grasping ethical values, *eg* Scheler's Fühlen and intuition
- Whether ethics has a social and conventional nature and its language mirrors it, *eg* Mackie, Searle
- Whether ethics cannot be described, nor defined by a constructed language, and calls for wisdom, *eg* the *Tao*.

8. **To what extent do you agree that virtue-based approaches fail to provide practical guidance on how we should act?**

[25]

The question invites a discussion of the criticism on virtue-based approaches. Candidates might evaluate whether these approaches fail to provide practical guidance on our actions. Responses might explore virtue-based approaches, *eg* Aristotle, and describe the different categories of virtue. Candidates might consider other virtue-based approaches, *eg* Hume, or the *Tao*, which is grounded in the role of wisdom. Responses might compare other ethical approaches, *eg* utilitarianism, and explain how the focus shifts from the agent's character to their actions and the consequences of their actions. Candidates might also refer to criticisms of virtue-based ethics: the lack of specific principles or rules. Candidates might consider the role of will and good will, in making ethical decisions: no rule or principle would suffice in ethical terms without the interiorization (good disposition) of the norm. Candidates might consider this argument from the perspective of Christian philosophy, *eg* Aquinas's *synderesis*, or from non-western approaches, *eg* Confucius, Zhuangzi. Responses might consider that virtue ethics invokes the necessity of practical exercise in ethics, which is defined a practical science along with politics by Aristotle.

Candidates might mention the role that constant practice plays in Aristotle's virtue ethics. Finally, candidates might highlight that ethics calls for an ongoing assessment and a continuously refined process of evaluation, which cannot be condensed in a set of rules: candidates might mention situation ethics, *eg* Fletcher, and the criticism on deontological views, which might tend to end up in ethical legalism ("ethics of vending machine"), by exchanging what is good for what is right, or the role of wisdom in making ethical decisions, *eg* the *Tao*.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The definition of virtue ethics, *eg* Aristotle
- Whether other virtue-based approaches exist, *eg* Hume
- Comparison between virtue-based ethics and act-based ethics
- Utilitarianism and the criticism on virtue ethics as lacking principles and rules
- The risk of aiming to principles, *eg* situation ethics versus legalism
- The role of will and good will, *eg* Kant
- The role of conscience, *eg* Aquinas
- Ethics as a practical science and the role of constant practice
- Virtue ethics and wisdom, *eg* the *Tao*.

Optional theme 4: Philosophy of religion

9. Discuss the claim that the existence of God is impossible to prove or disprove.

[25]

This question invites an exploration of the nature, function and methodologies of a proof or of a disproof along with a consideration of arguments for and against the existence of God. It also allows for a consideration of traditional and contemporary understandings of what is meant by the notion of a God.

Candidates might discuss several of the arguments for and against the existence of God. In this light the ideas of some of the classical Greek and Roman philosophers, Anselm, Aquinas, Scotus, Descartes, Leibniz, Hume, Kant, Pascal, Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, Swinburne, Plantinga, Dawkins and Dennett among several other classical and contemporary philosophers and scientists. They might consider cosmological, teleological, moral, ontological arguments, or arguments from experience.

The interplay of faith, reason, science and human experience might also be considered in approaching the question. This question also invites a consideration of how non-Western views of reason, faith, science, proof and disproof function in exploring the existence of God.

In addressing these issues candidates might explore:

- Conceptions of the nature of God
- The presence or absence of the notion of God in a person's life
- The role of reason in exploring notions of God
- The nature and function of a proof
- The possibility, scope and limits of applying reason to prove or disprove the existence of God
- The nature and types of proof/disproof in affirming or denying the existence of God
- Types of arguments/proofs for the existence of God, *eg* ontological, teleological, cosmological, causal, design, moral, experiential, argument from miracles
- Types of arguments/proofs against the existence of God, *eg* Atheism, Agnosticism, Scientific positivism, nihilism, the problem of evil
- Contributions of contemporary sciences to proving or disproving the existence of God
- Non-Western approaches to proving or disproving the existence of God.

10. To what extent do you agree with the claim that religious language may be non-literal but that does not make it nonsense?

[25]

This question invites an exploration of the nature, meaning and function of religious language. It also invites a consideration of how reliable human language is when applied to the realm of concrete, natural, empirical, finite existence and experience as opposed to our ability to speak of the realms of non-empirical, numinous, supernatural and infinite existence and experience.

Regarding the non-literal quality of religious language, candidates might explore the notion that religious language is metaphorical, symbolic, figurative and poetic or that it is simply a 'mode of signification' that falls short of a full linguistic description of reality. Candidates might also explore the non-literal aspect of language within the context of 'language games' where the question of meaning is established more upon use than upon literal content or the view that only propositions that can be empirically verified can be considered meaningful.

The question also allows for a consideration of how the verification and falsification principles find their place in assessing the meaningfulness of religious language. Finally, candidates might consider that whether or not religious language is meaningful or meaningless, people do communicate their religious experiences.

In addressing these issues candidates might explore:

- The nature and function of language
- The nature and function of language in a religious context
- What does it mean to be 'meaningful: what does it mean to be nonsensical?
- Religious language as equivocal and unable to refer to the infinite, a view shared by mystics of Western and Eastern traditions and best seen in the *via negativa* of St. John of the Cross
- Religious language as univocal where words which refer to religious experience and, at the same time to human experience, have the same meaning, a view taken by Carl F. H. Henry
- Religious language as analogical where an analogy is established between what a word means when it applies to humanity and when it applies to God, *eg* Aquinas
- Religious language as moral discourse where religious language signifies how people ought to behave, *eg* Braithwaite, Kant, Ritschl
- Religious language as metaphorical and symbolic, *eg* Paul Tillich
- Religious language is a mode of signification not a mode on empirical description
- Metaphysical language as meaningless, *eg* Ayer, Carnap
- Religious language is a game used within a particular form of life, *eg* Wittgenstein
- Use of the verification principle by the Vienna Circle and Ayer and the falsification principle.

Optional theme 5: Philosophy of science

11. To what extent do you agree that there is no satisfactory way to distinguish science from pseudoscience?

[25]

This question invites a discussion on the difference between scientific and non-scientific theories. It is related to the problem of demarcation, which asks how we can know when something is scientific and when it is unscientific, or pseudoscientific.

This is an important question because claiming that a theory is scientific makes it more believable. We generally expect scientific claims to be well established through scientific methods, and therefore trustworthy. Karl Popper brought up the problem of demarcation in relation to Freudian psychoanalysis and Marxism, which both claimed to be scientific. Popper proposed that a theory is scientific if it is falsifiable and said that neither Freudian psychoanalysis nor Marxism provided falsifiable theories, and so were pseudoscientific rather than scientific.

Candidates might discuss problems with falsificationism, for example that observations are theory-laden and therefore difficult to falsify. They might also explore inductivism as a distinguishing feature of science, and the problem of induction. Or they might discuss Kuhn's view that science proceeds *via* paradigm shifts. Candidates might comment on the fact that scientific theories are often proved false, and question whether our theories of today will be pseudo-sciences of the future.

In addressing these issues candidates might explore:

- Definitions of scientific methods
- Possible examples of pseudoscience *eg* Marxism, Freudian psychoanalysis, astrology
- A comparison between a science and a pseudoscience, in terms of scientific method, and truth claims
- Inductivism and the problem of induction *eg* Bacon's inductivism and Hume's problem of induction
- Falsificationism, and related markers of science such as the ability of a theory to make predictions *eg* Popper
- Problems with falsificationism *eg* Kuhn
- Non-epistemic virtues of scientific theories such as simplicity, coherence, clarity *eg* Ladyman
- The idea that current scientific theories will be disproven in the future *eg* Laudan's pessimistic meta-induction
- The dangers of not being able to distinguish between science and pseudoscience in relation to broader problems such as fake news
- The view that science progresses anarchically and that there is no scientific method *eg* Feyerabend.

12. Discuss the role of social values in shaping the development of scientific knowledge. [25]

This question invites a consideration of non-scientific influences on science. Social values might influence what scientists choose to study, what sort of research receives funding, the sorts of conclusions scientists reach, and how well-known scientific work becomes. As an example, Helen Longino argues that social values shape how scientists view evidence. Depending on scientists' values, they might see some evidence as relevant or irrelevant. She is interested in how bringing different perspectives and values into scientific research makes it more objective; for example, feminist social values should contribute to the development of scientific knowledge too.

Candidates might discuss the importance of objectivity in science and consider social values as a threat to this. They might point to elements of the scientific method designed to counter the influence of social values, such as an emphasis on observation, falsifiability or standards of evidence. Alternatively, candidates might consider the place of social values in scientific communities, where peer-review shapes publishing and funding decisions. They might point to the lack of research in certain areas, such as women's medicine, which might be the result of social values.

In addressing these issues candidates might explore:

- Whether objectivity is possible in the sciences
- The value-ladenness of scientific theories and their components such as observations
- Aspects of the scientific method designed to ensure objectivity *eg* observation, inductivism and falsificationism
- Problems with inductivism and falsificationism
- The theory-ladenness of observations *eg* Van Fraassen
- Social values as contributing to scientific progress and objectivity *eg* Longino
- The historical silencing of minority groups in the sciences *eg* women, non-Western scholars
- The role of funding and money in scientific progress, and how social values shape funding
- The scientific community as determinants of what gets published through peer review
- Historical examples of suppressed scientific progress *eg* Galileo and church values
- Problems demarcating science from pseudoscience *eg* Popper
- The relationship between folk knowledge and scientific knowledge *eg* tribal knowledge of medicinal properties of plants.

Optional theme 6: Political philosophy

13. Discuss how the idea of punishment poses challenges for the relationship between the state and its citizens.

[25]

This question invites candidates to think about the relationship between state and citizen and how this relates to punishment. Successful answers might draw on theories of justice and theories of state and connect the two.

Candidates might consider what type of challenges might be posed; for example, challenges that individuals might face under the threat of punishment, challenges that legislative and judicial systems might face in deciding who gets punished and how, or social challenges that stem from law and order. Many of these challenges take the form of a dilemma in which two values must be traded off against each other, for example freedom vs security, or individual vs collective rights, which candidates might evaluate.

Candidates might draw from classical theories such as social contract theory, or more evidence-based approaches, such as historical observations or current events. They might also evaluate the wider implications of the challenges they have identified, for example by looking at how law and discipline can stimulate civil discourse, or how the law can become complicit in systemic injustice and oppression.

Some candidates might notice the word “idea” and distinguish the potential for punishment from its practice, for instance in how the mere presence of a police force affects a community even before any arrest is carried out.

In addressing these issues candidates might explore:

- Theories of retributive justice
- The right to a fair trial
- The claim that the state ought to have a monopoly on violence
- The tension between rights and responsibilities
- The difficulties in establishing which crimes deserve punishment
- The problem of legislators being above the law
- Mill’s harm principle
- The Confucian view that punishment implies a failure of the state to raise virtuous citizens
- Machiavelli’s view that a ruler must be either loved or feared by citizens
- Paternalism and the way children are brought up in society
- The abuse of power and the dangers of dictatorship, *eg* Berlin
- Hobbes’ claim that a citizen is allowed (and in fact obliged) to defend themselves when the state threatens their life or livelihood
- Rousseau’s paradoxical claim that you must willingly give up your life in the interest of the general will
- Foucault’s claim that punishment (and especially prisons) are public spectacles aimed at eliciting fear of and obedience to the state
- Discrimination and targeting of minorities.

14. Evaluate the claim that there is a tension between liberty and our obligations to others.

[25]

This question invites candidates to explore the relationship between liberty and obligation, and evaluate whether the tension between them is irresolvable. Care should be taken to distinguish this from the tension between liberty and equality, or other similar tensions which are often discussed in political philosophy.

In exploring the relationship between liberty and obligation, candidates may find it helpful to establish at least one example of where the two appear to be in tension, for instance in the obligation to refrain from public defamation and libel vs the freedom of speech. In analysing such examples, candidates may wish to invoke philosophical theories which explore the origin of obligation or duty, for example, in Kantian ethics or Plato's political philosophy. Candidates may also explore theories such as libertarianism which put individual liberties at the centre and claim that many or most political obligations are unjust. Alternatively, candidates may wish to challenge the assumption that liberty and obligation are in tension at all, exploring the "two sides of the same coin" theory in which one cannot invoke one without the other. Some may also wish to interpret "liberty" as "liberation" in the Marxist sense and explore how this can only come about through class solidarity. Successful answers to this question might further interrogate the word "irresolvable", for instance by pointing out that two opposing forces can be resolved by finding a balance.

In addressing these issues candidates might explore:

- Mill's claim that the only valid source of obligation is in the prevention of harm
- Kant's claim that duty (obligation) is the fundamental origin of all morality and by extension all just government
- The ethical Golden Rule as a way of establishing our obligations towards others
- Hobbes' argument that political obligation is necessary for our survival, and must be paid for at the cost of freedom
- Rawls' invocation of Pareto Optimality, and the idea that liberty and obligation, like other social goods, can be optimally balanced
- Nozick's view that personal liberty should be paramount in all political systems
- The Socialist view that society is obliged to liberate underprivileged classes
- Paulo Freire's view that obligation is a relic of oppression and liberation can only come from social transformation
- Socrates' argument in the Crito that political obligation is absolute, and his act of self-sacrifice.

Optional theme 7: Social philosophy

- 15. Discuss the view that the primary concern of feminism is power over the self rather than power over others.**

[25]

Many discussions of feminism relate to discussions of power - whether that be political, economic, social, cultural, *etc.* By raising the question of power in relation to feminism, this question prompts an exploration of the core relationship between and difference between power over others and power over self. Autonomy and self-determination may be fundamental considerations of the feminist critique of patriarchy as well as featuring in the discussion of what it means to be a woman. Establishing as a primary aim of the feminist project the assertion of power over oneself rather than power over others can both refocus feminism towards self-assertion and autonomy as well as countering any suggestion that feminism may be an attempt to exert control over men in any way. Candidates might consider applied examples such as the “pro-choice/pro-life” debate, or the issue of sex-workers. They might explore the balance between rights, duties, and freedom through, for example Nussbaum’s capabilities approach to liberty. Candidates might consider feminist issues from the perspective of broader power-struggles, *eg* de Beauvoir’s discussion of class struggle and its links to feminism.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- What is the relationship between feminism and power?
- What forms of power may feminism be connected with or interested in addressing?
- How might feminism be seen as concerned with power over oneself?
- What role do autonomy and self-determination play in feminism?
- What does it mean to have power over oneself?
- The question of what is intended by ‘women’ within the scope of the question
- The political significance of unity and collective action
- The relationship between power and responsibility
- Women as “Other” in de Beauvoir
- “I do not wish women to have power over men; but over themselves”
(Mary Wollstonecraft)
- Questions about the nature, form, and possibility of equality
- Discussion of the nature of power in various forms and contexts (social, political, economic, cultural *etc*)
- Power as a resource, “a kind of stuff that can be possessed by individuals in greater or lesser amounts” (Iris Marion Young)
- Power as a form of domination
- Power over oneself in relation to power over one’s body and bodily autonomy
- Forms of political oppression including marginalization, silencing, and violence
- Women’s rights as part of/in conjunction with other rights movements - including LGBTQIA+ rights, black rights, and workers’ rights movements.
- Marxist analyses of the subjugation of women in relation to capitalism.

16. Evaluate the claim that the family is the most influential social institution.

[25]

This question invites an evaluation of the claim that the family is the most influential of all the social institutions. The implication is to justify whether family is more important than other social institutions such as government, schools, religious institutions, and health care providers.

An evaluation could assume Aristotle's view that humans are not self-sufficient and need to be supported by family, yet when societies become more complex, and physically dispersed then other institutions might need to be set up to either replace or support the family.

Candidates might develop an evaluation of the various functions fulfilled by the family and show how these functions might overlap or conflict with actions dedicated to other social institutions. It might be seen that as societies become more complex or are culturally different, then other social institutions might overlap or even replace family. Candidates might discuss how different sorts of family such as extended, nuclear, or even dysfunctional families change the status of the family relative to other social institutions.

Candidates might discuss how societal shifts have changed the role played by extended families in relation to other institutions. This might lead to an investigation of the role and status of the family in Confucianised societies. Issues might arise about the relationship of the state to the family and candidates might move into a discussion about how the family might be a foundation, or a micro model of the state.

In contrast arguments might be presented about the need to substitute the family either because it has become dysfunctional or is culturally and ideologically seen as inadequate, with examples coming from experiments in the Soviet Union or reference to the role of Guardians in Plato's Republic. Family might be seen as vital to societal stability, continuity and the transfer of values when social structures are less complex, such as in rural or agrarian economic environments, but with the emergence of urban post-industrial societies, the family's role might need to be supplemented by other institutions. Candidates might also explore the role of care and love in society.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Differing functions of the family within a society
 - Differing forms of family structure; extended, nuclear
 - The role of family and the significance of *xiào* (filial piety) in Confucianised cultures
 - The varying functions of family in African traditions
 - The importance of family in Islam; preservation of its reputation and foundational status for producing social order and social responsibility
 - Attempts to replace the family for example in the Soviet Union or Plato's Republic
 - Increasing status of other social institutions because of complex societal needs, *eg* health care or education
 - Associated problems of state substitutions for family functions, *eg* issues related to care of the aged or the young with extended families
 - The role of the family in transmitting social values and norms
 - Contrasts between Plato and his aim to abolish family to produce social unity, and the Aristotelian position of the family being vital to create a community of friendship and love
 - The relationship of the family as a model of the state, *eg* Aristotle's Politics
 - Roles within the family and feminism *eg* Mill's views on the status of both women and children within the family, and de Beauvoir's views on the mother and family
 - The status of family and its members in differing economic systems and cultures, and its impact on property and wealth *eg* Roman law, feudal systems and varying traditions of inheritance
 - Challenges to the transmission of values by the family, from social media/networking influencers.
-

Philosophy
Higher level and standard level
Paper 2

Specimen paper

1 hour

Instructions to candidates

- Do not open this examination paper until instructed to do so.
- Answer both parts of one question.
- A clean copy of the prescribed text is required for this paper.
- The maximum mark for this examination paper is **[25 marks]**.

Answer **both** parts (a) and (b) of **one** question. Each question is worth [25 marks].

Alfred Jules Ayer: *Language, Truth and Logic*

1. (a) Explain Ayer's distinction between strong and weak verification. [10]
(b) Discuss the implications of Ayer's distinction between strong and weak verification. [15]
2. (a) Explain Ayer's claim that the traditional disputes of philosophers are "for the most part, as unwarranted as they are unfruitful". [10]
(b) To what extent do you agree with Ayer's claim that the traditional disputes of philosophers are "for the most part, as unwarranted as they are unfruitful"? [15]

Confucius: *The Analects*

3. (a) Explain Confucius's account of the relationship between ritual and morality. [10]
(b) Evaluate Confucius's account of the relationship between ritual and morality. [15]
4. (a) Explain Confucius's claim that "Man can enlarge the Way, but the Way cannot enlarge Man". [10]
(b) Discuss the implications of Confucius's claim that "Man can enlarge the Way, but the Way cannot enlarge Man". [15]

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

5. (a) Explain de Beauvoir's distinction between sex and gender. [10]
(b) Discuss the implications of de Beauvoir's distinction between sex and gender. [15]
6. (a) Explain de Beauvoir's claim that men frame women as "the Other". [10]
(b) Evaluate de Beauvoir's claim that men frame women as "the Other". [15]

René Descartes: *Meditations*

7. (a) Explain Descartes's dream argument. [10]
(b) Evaluate the success of Descartes's dream argument. [15]
8. (a) Explain Descartes's concept of clear and distinct ideas. [10]
(b) To what extent do you agree with Descartes's claim that there are clear and distinct ideas? [15]

Frantz Fanon: *Black Skin, White Masks*

9. (a) Explain Fanon's view of the relationship between language and identity. [10]
(b) Evaluate Fanon's view of the relationship between language and identity. [15]
10. (a) Explain Fanon's claim that blackness exists in relation to whiteness. [10]
(b) Discuss the implications of Fanon's claim that blackness exists in relation to whiteness. [15]

John Stuart Mill: *On Liberty*

11. (a) Explain Mill's view of the value of free speech. [10]
(b) Evaluate the claim that Mill overestimates the value of free speech. [15]
12. (a) Explain Mill's view of social progress. [10]
(b) Evaluate Mill's view of social progress. [15]

Friedrich Nietzsche: *The Genealogy of Morals*

13. (a) Explain Nietzsche's view of the relationship between guilt and the origins of morality. [10]
(b) Evaluate Nietzsche's view of the relationship between guilt and the origins of morality. [15]
14. (a) Explain Nietzsche's concept of the "ascetic ideal". [10]
(b) Evaluate Nietzsche's rejection of the "ascetic ideal". [15]

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

15. (a) Explain Nussbaum's view of the role of education in human development. [10]
(b) Evaluate Nussbaum's view of the role of education in human development. [15]
16. (a) Explain Nussbaum's claim that it is impossible for human beings to flourish with dignity if certain basic human needs and capacities are not met. [10]
(b) To what extent do you agree with Nussbaum's claim that it is impossible for human beings to flourish with dignity if certain basic human needs and capacities are not met? [15]

José Ortega y Gasset: *The Revolt of the Masses*

17. (a) Explain Ortega y Gasset's concept of the mass man. [10]
(b) Discuss Ortega y Gasset's claim that the mass man is like a "spoilt child". [15]
18. (a) Explain the claim that State intervention is the gravest challenge facing society. [10]
(b) Evaluate the claim that State intervention is the gravest challenge facing society. [15]

Plato: *The Republic*, Books IV-IX

19. (a) Explain Plato's distinction between knowledge and belief. [10]
(b) Evaluate Plato's distinction between knowledge and belief. [15]
20. (a) Explain Plato's claim that "we should expect tyranny to result from democracy". [10]
(b) To what extent do you agree with Plato's claim that "we should expect tyranny to result from democracy"? [15]

Charles Taylor: *The Ethics of Authenticity*

21. (a) Explain Taylor's account of the difference between self-centred narcissism and authenticity. [10]
(b) Evaluate the claim that self-centred narcissism distorts the idea of authenticity. [15]
22. (a) Explain what Taylor means by "soft despotism". [10]
(b) To what extent do you agree with Taylor's view that soft despotism should be considered a major problem for society? [15]

Lao Tzu: *Tao Te Ching*

23. (a) Explain the view of the state found in the *Tao Te Ching*. [10]
(b) Evaluate the claim that the view of the state found in the *Tao Te Ching* assumes an overly positive view of human nature. [15]
24. (a) Explain the claim that "in order to live in harmony we must not act". [10]
(b) Evaluate the claim that "in order to live in harmony we must not act". [15]
-

Markscheme

Specimen paper

Philosophy

Higher level and standard level

Paper 2

This markscheme is **confidential** and for the exclusive use of examiners in this examination session.

It is the property of the International Baccalaureate and must **not** be reproduced or distributed to any other person without the authorization of the IB Global Centre, Cardiff.

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 4 for part A responses, and page 5 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 in 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

This task requires candidates to answer a two-part question on the prescribed text that they have studied in-depth in class. Candidates are presented with a choice of two questions per text and must answer both part A and part B of their selected question. For this task, candidates are permitted to have access to a clean/non-annotated copy of the prescribed text throughout the examination. It is expected that candidates will make explicit references to this text in their responses.

Part A question requires candidates to explain a specified concept, issue or argument from the prescribed text. It is expected that candidates will include explicit references to the text to support their explanation.

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–2	- Little understanding of the specified concept/issue/argument from the text is demonstrated. Philosophical vocabulary is not used, or is consistently used inappropriately. - The explanation of the specified concept/issue/argument from the text is minimal. Points made are superficial and frequently unclear. There are few, if any, references to the text.
3–4	- A basic understanding of the specified concept/issue/argument from the text is demonstrated. Philosophical vocabulary is used, but often inappropriately. - The explanation of the specified concept/issue/argument from the text is basic and underdeveloped. Points are often imprecise or vague, and it is often unclear what the response is trying to convey. There are occasional references to the text.
5–6	- Some understanding of the specified concept/issue/argument from the text is demonstrated. Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately. - There is a satisfactory explanation of the specified concept/issue/argument from the text, although the explanation lacks clarity and development in places. Relevant points are made but lack accuracy and detail. Specific references to the text are made, although these are sometimes ineffective.
7–8	- Good understanding of the specified concept/issue/argument from the text is demonstrated. Philosophical vocabulary is used, mostly appropriately. - The explanation of the specified concept/issue/argument from the text is clear, but is in need of further development. Points made are relevant and accurate but lack detail. There are specific references to the text.
9–10	- Very good understanding of the specified concept/issue/argument from the text is demonstrated. There is accurate and precise use of philosophical vocabulary. - The explanation of the specified concept/issue/argument from the text is clear and well developed. Points are relevant, accurate and detailed. There are specific and effective references to the text.

Paper 2 part B markbands

Part B requires candidates to undertake a critical discussion of a specified concept, issue or argument from the prescribed text. As part A and part B of each question are based on the same specified concept, issue or argument from the prescribed text, candidates are not required to repeat explanatory material from their part A response.

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–3	- Little understanding of and critical engagement with the specified concept/issue/argument from the prescribed text is demonstrated. - Philosophical vocabulary is not used or is consistently used inappropriately. Points are frequently inaccurate and unclear. There are few, if any, references to the text. - The response is descriptive. Any analysis present is superficial or incoherent. Examples are not included or are irrelevant. There is little or no discussion of different points of view. Where a conclusion is included, this is very superficial or is not consistent with the rest of the response.
4–6	- A basic understanding of and critical engagement with the specified concept/issue/argument from the prescribed text is demonstrated. - Philosophical vocabulary is used, but often inappropriately. Points are frequently imprecise or vague, and it is often unclear what the response is trying to convey. There are occasional references to the text. - There is limited analysis present and overall the response is more descriptive than analytical. Examples are included but are ineffective. There is limited discussion of different points of view. A simplistic conclusion is included.
7–9	- Some understanding of and critical engagement with the specified concept/issue/argument from the prescribed text is demonstrated. - Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately. Relevant points are made but lack accuracy and development. Specific references to the text are made, although these are sometimes ineffective. - The response contains analysis, although this analysis lacks development. Examples are included. There is some discussion of different points of view. A conclusion is included.
10–12	- Good understanding of and critical engagement with the specified concept/issue/argument from the text is demonstrated. - Philosophical vocabulary is used, mostly appropriately. Points made are relevant and accurate but lack detail. There are specific references to the text. - The response contains critical analysis, although this analysis lacks development. Examples are used to support the discussion. There is discussion of different points of view. The response argues to a conclusion that is consistent with the arguments presented.
13–15	- Very good understanding of and critical engagement with the specified concept/issue/argument from the text is demonstrated. - There is accurate and precise use of philosophical vocabulary. Points are relevant, accurate and detailed. There are specific and effective references to the text. - The response contains well-developed critical analysis. Relevant examples are used to support the discussion. There is critical discussion of different points of view. The response argues to a reasoned and clearly stated conclusion that is consistent with the arguments presented.

Alfred Jules Ayer: *Language, Truth and Logic*

1. (a) **Explain Ayer's distinction between strong and weak verification.** [10]

(b) **Discuss the implications of Ayer's distinction between strong and weak verification.** [15]

A central tenet of Ayer's *Language, Truth and Logic* is that propositions are only meaningful if they can be verified. This leads Ayer to reject metaphysical statements, eg statements about the existence of God, as meaningless. Ayer introduces this idea in Chapter 1, and it is within Chapter 1 that he presents a detailed discussion of verification. He starts by stating that 'we say that a sentence is factually significant to any given person, if, and only if, he knows how to verify the proposition which it purports to express – that is, if he knows what observations would lead him, under certain conditions, to accept the proposition as being true, or reject it as being false' (p.16). Focusing on verification raises questions that Ayer then sets out to solve. The first is that some statements are verifiable in principle, but not in practice. Ayer uses the example of whether there are mountains on the far side of the moon. At the time, this was verifiable in principle, but not in practice as it was not possible to go to the far side of the moon. The second qualification to the verification principle is that a statement can be strongly verifiable, or weakly verifiable. Strong verification is when 'its truth could be conclusively established in experience' and weak verification is when 'it is possible for experience to render it probable' (p.18). These qualifications to Ayer's initial claim that statements must be verifiable to be meaningful mean that meaningful statements are merely those with some empirical content, however difficult to access or complicated by uncertainty.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Strong verification as claims that can be conclusively verified
- Weak verification as considering the probability of a claim being verified
- Theoretical verifiability versus having a practical means of verification; being verifiable in principle
- Examples of weak, strong, theoretical and in principle verification
- Rather than focusing on whether observations would make the truth (or falsehood) of a claim logically certain, in weak verification the focus broadens to whether any observations would be relevant to establishing the truth or falsehood of the claim
- Weak verification is less strict and demanding; "we fall back on the weaker sense of verification." (p. 38).

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- This question is asking for an evaluation of Ayer's distinction
- Ayer concedes that strong verification is overly restrictive and rigid
- Why might it be problematic that strong verification leads to, for example, rejecting all ethical statements as being meaningless?
- Ayer's weak verification enables us to make a wider variety of meaningful claims, for example about the past, predictions in science, or about other people's emotions
- John Hick, for example, picks up on weak verification as a way to allow for possible future verification of religious claims
- Criticism that the verification principle is itself unverifiable
- Does Ayer's weak verification provide a consistent account of what would constitute adequate evidence?
- Alternatives to verification such as falsifiability
- Criticisms of logical positivism and responses from the field of postmodernism etc.

2. (a) Explain Ayer's claim that the traditional disputes of philosophers are "for the most part, as unwarranted as they are unfruitful". [10]
- (b) To what extent do you agree with Ayer's claim that the traditional disputes of philosophers are "for the most part, as unwarranted as they are unfruitful"? [15]

The quote that "the traditional disputes of philosophers are, for the most part, as unwarranted as they are unfruitful" is the opening sentence of *Language, Truth and Logic*. It reflects Ayer's place in the history of analytic philosophy as an advocate of logical positivism, and the influence of the Vienna Circle on his thinking. Using the verification principle, Ayer rejects metaphysics as meaningless. He goes so far as to claim that ethical statements are also meaningless and unwarranted, seeing them instead as expressions of emotion. On Ayer's view, if a claim does not have some empirical content, then it is meaningless. Any philosophical debate without an empirical grounding is, therefore, unwarranted, and meaningless. Ayer describes these unfruitful philosophical disputes as either "produced by a philosopher who has been duped by grammar" or "the kind that is produced by a mystic who is trying to express the inexpressible". These are "literally senseless" (29). Ayer continues that it is not, therefore, the job of the philosopher to reason from first principles to certain truths, as he claims Descartes does. Instead, the role of the philosopher is to analyse and clarify the ordinary use of concepts.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Ayer rejects the view that philosophy is concerned with truths that transcend the everyday
- He rejects the view that philosophy is a search for first principles; he calls that view a "superstition that we are freed from by the abandonment of metaphysics" (62)
- Instead, the function of philosophy is seen to be critical analysis
- He argues that philosophers have often overcomplicated what the purpose and function of philosophy is
- Spending time with the members of the Vienna Circle, Ayer came to embrace their rejection of metaphysics – viewing metaphysical claims as being meaningless
- Ayer rejects religious language as meaningless and applies a similar approach to ethical language.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Are areas of philosophy such as metaphysics actually "unfruitful"?
- Is critical analysis the sole function of philosophy?
- Is meaning really the sole target of philosophy?
- Ayer later conceded that his own views in *Language, Truth and Logic* were too bold/ that the issues were not as simple as he made them seem
- Many philosophers from other traditions would reject this narrow view of the function of philosophy
- Ways in which religious language can be understood as meaningful eg Aquinas and metaphor, Tillich and symbols
- Whether ethical language is meaningful, and the important role it plays in everyday life
- The role of Ayer's verification principle, and whether the verification principle stands up to scrutiny.

Confucius: *The Analects*

3. (a) **Explain Confucius's account of the relationship between ritual and morality.** [10]
(b) **Evaluate Confucius's account of the relationship between ritual and morality.** [15]

The question looks for an explanation and evaluation of Confucius's account of the relationship between ritual and morality. It is told that Confucius's life was closely associated with rituals of two kinds: the religious rituals of the time, such as ancestral veneration, and second, the rituals of noble, polite and proper behaviour. Confucius integrated both into his own comprehension of ritual (*li*) as a moral action that ensures a proper, civilized society. In this way our interaction with others is marked by the moral dimension, where one party shows respect for the other, whether this is saying hello or standing in line. Rituals are learned, and they teach us; they are forms that help to shape our moral character. That is why Confucius argues that ritual should not be morally empty; ritual should be an external expression of an inward morality. In turn, ritual should teach us how to cultivate internal moral attitudes. Some later Confucians will also argue that ritual functions as a way to restrain our selfishness and channel our emotions. So, Confucius wanted the practice of ritual to be a constant in our lives. He said, "Do not look at anything contrary to ritual; do not listen to anything contrary to ritual; do not say anything contrary to ritual; do not move in any way contrary to ritual." (Analects 12.1). Our actions have to be an expression of ritual, not because it allows us just to play an empty socially acceptable role, but because ritual is a moral action that ensures a proper, civilized society. In this way Confucius reshaped the tradition of rituals into a broader conception of ritual as a moral action expressing respect for others. Thus, rituals are the external expression of an inner morality their practice leads to a civilized society. Doing a ritual properly teaches us to cultivate the attitude of humanity. Ritual acts as the exterior guide for humanity. In turn, carrying out the proper ritual with the proper attitude reinforces both. Moral actions mesh with ritual. To a question about humaneness (*ren*) Confucius responds: "Overcome the self and return to ritual in order to practice humanity." (Analects 12.1). Some interpreters of Confucius have characterized the rites as something like a code of conduct, leading to an understanding of them as the mechanical application of rules. Countering this view, it has been stressed that rites must be practiced in such a way as to convey and reinforce deeper moral principles. Nor can one simply follow the majority: laudable practice of the rites requires thinking for oneself. *Li* would best be understood then, as embodied virtue, the thoughtful somatic expression of basic moral principles, without which the ceremonies are void (cf. Analects 3.3 and 17.11). Far from a static code of conduct, *li* is the sum total of all the moral calculations that a thinking Confucian must go through before acting, and must be constantly reinterpreted.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The relationship between attitude (*jen*), which is goodness and love, and action manifested in rites (*li*), which is moral discrimination and ideal conduct
- The definition of ritual depends on its type (eg hand washing or renting of clothes) and purpose (eg expression of honor or hygiene)
- The difference between ritual as tradition and ritual as doctrine
- According to Confucius, correct attitude is based on intuition. For him attitude is conscious not unconscious
- The definition of morality is an acceptable agreed code of behavior. It leads to *Jen*. The Gentleman (*chui tin*) is also defended and defined by behavior; the idea that he is both a person who has certain morals and manners (rituals), while also describing him as a member of a certain class
- Rites as indication of the importance of exemplary conduct: "May the lord act as a lord, the minister as a minister, the father as a father, the son as a son." (Analects 12.11).

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- How far can ritual itself show the highest ethical standards?
- Does Confucius go too far in relating even knowledge to ritual?
- Does Confucius really explore morality or merely a façade, an acceptable agreed way of behaving? Does he really want to get to the motive behind the action?
- With too many rituals does the purpose of the action get lost?
- How far is morality merely patterns of behaviour?
- Is there a difference between conduct and action?
- Does the action of the gentlemen reveal his true attitude? If the attitude is wrong, does it invalidate the action?
- Whether some restrictions on action reflect cultural issues; if Confucius's idea of morality is reduced to *Jen*, is it at the expense of universality?
- Does Confucius's emphasis on the observance of ritual and tradition mean that the gentleman is inherently conservative and deferential to authority?
- Alternative accounts of virtues and ethics eg Aristotelian ethics where habit plays a similar role to ritual
- Contrasting views of society and ethics eg Taoism and non-action or *wu wei*.

4. (a) **Explain Confucius's claim that "Man can enlarge the Way, but the Way cannot enlarge Man".** [10]
- (b) **Discuss the implications of Confucius's claim that "Man can enlarge the Way, but the Way cannot enlarge Man".** [15]

The quotation in this question is taken from 15. 29 of *The Analects*. In some versions of the text, it is sometimes translated using the word "broaden" rather than "enlarge" or "person" instead of "Man." Interpretations converge toward the idea that the word "enlarge" refers to the act of realizing, perpetuating and promoting the Way (*tao*) on earth to future generations. Or, in other words, it refers to how we experience, understand, and influence the world in such a way as to reinforce and extend the way of life inherited from one's cultural predecessors. The possibility of enlarging the Way implies that the Way is not predetermined or transcendent; human beings have the capacity to realize the Way through their collective actions on earth. This capacity to enlarge the Way can be linked to the ancient Chinese belief that truth is more a way of being than a kind of objective fact. Accordingly, the Confucian *tao* consists of the process of generating an actual order in the world rather than an already fixed order. On this basis, Confucius commends the sage-kings/*sheng ren* for acting based on the straight Way because doing so served to enlarge the Way (Analects 15.9). This line of interpretation tends to underline the ability of human beings to enlarge the Way and to change the course of the human world individually and collectively. Further, responses might follow different lines of development explaining and evaluating the passage in relation to the central concepts of Confucius's teachings, *eg* harmony (*he*). Enlarging the Way on earth is to achieve harmony (*he*) on earth - harmony through the observance of the embodied virtue (*li*) (Cf. Analects 1.12). Internal harmony refers to the inner peace, contentment and delight found in a person who possesses harmony. This internal harmony guides a person in her thoughts, feelings and actions in accordance with virtue (*li*). In turn, external harmony, for example as represented by the joy in meeting up with friends from afar, relates to qualified human interaction.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- There are two understandings of the Way: (a) that of a personal set of moral maxims, and (b) a political system/ethos. Both are relevant to this topic. The Way, in both senses, refers to an ethos of incorruptibility. The first is a condition for the second
- The relationship between the Way (*tao*) and humaneness (virtue); Confucius claims that humaneness can flourish only when the Way prevails
- Confucius concludes that only via the deeds of gentlemen can there be good in a society where the Way prevails; the degree of moral prosperity in a society is wholly dependent upon the humaneness of the gentleman, and a good political system and ethos is not enough
- A gentleman is instructed not to enter a political system where the Way does not prevail, as they may become corrupted, or their deeds compromised.
- The gentleman, the one who is humane, or promotes humaneness is: active in learning, cultivates friendships, is observant of traditions and ritual, appreciates culture (music, drama, and art), respectful, humble, sensitive, yet forthright, courageous and honest
- Though maxims and rules are necessary in moral conduct, it is on their deeds and words that a gentleman is judged. Confucianism claims that if a man is virtuous, then his actions will also be virtuous.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- This question is asking for an evaluation of Confucius's claim
- If Confucius does not want the gentleman to enter a political system where the Way does not prevail, then how is reform possible? If the Way prevails, then what is the need for a gentleman?
- Are the qualities and practices that Confucius describes the essential/exclusive ones for virtue or are there others? *eg* Are there occasions when the virtuous must lie?
- Conversely, does possession of these traits necessarily make you good? *eg* The Nazis admired and valued ritual, authority, and music
- Does personal virtue guarantee political integrity, knowledge, ability and efficiency? Is the gentleman a civil servant with little knowledge of how others live? *eg* possible skepticism of civil services
- Enlarging the Way in comparison and contrast with other philosophical and cultural views *eg* Taoism where the way is undefinable
- Other views of societal progress *eg* Marxism and the idea of a fixed path for historical progress.

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

5. (a) **Explain de Beauvoir's distinction between sex and gender.** [10]
- (b) **Discuss the implications of de Beauvoir's distinction between sex and gender.** [15]

De Beauvoir discusses female and male biology, followed by the psychology and history of women. She comes to the conclusion, at the beginning of book two, that 'one is not born but becomes woman'. This is explored in subsequent sections about the stages in a girl's life which lead her to become a woman. The claim is that unlike the physical characteristics of each sex, gender is a social phenomenon. The term 'woman' is portrayed as derogatory by de Beauvoir, because it emphasises historical understandings of women as reproductive tools, companions or domestic labour for men. De Beauvoir cites Heidegger, Sartre and Merleau-Ponty as she develops an existentialist response to the restrictive nature of womanhood. This existentialist response, akin to Sartre's claim that existence comes before essence, is alluded to in the claim that 'one is not born but becomes a woman'. Although women are determined by their sexual features, it is how society reacts to these, othering them, that ultimately defines womanhood. De Beauvoir argues that women should be able to work, to play a prominent role in society and to be regarded as equals to men. This can be achieved by recognizing that assignment of gender determines life courses to a much greater extent than biological sex.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- This question focuses on de Beauvoir's distinction between sex and gender, and her view that gender is a part of identity that is gradually acquired rather than something one is born with
- In the opening line of Vol. 2, part 1, chapter 1, De Beauvoir claims that "one is not born, but rather becomes woman"
- De Beauvoir claims that pre-adolescent boys and girls have "the same interests and the same pleasures" and that it is societal expectation and influence which changes this
- De Beauvoir discusses the female body and female experiences such as pregnancy, but says that it is how these are seen, rather than the experiences themselves, that is most significant.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- This question is asking for an evaluation of de Beauvoir's distinction
- If one becomes a woman, how does this "becoming" happen?
- Is de Beauvoir correct that a child does not "grasp himself as sexually differentiated"?
- Relationship to existentialist freedom and self-creation eg Sartre, Heidegger and Merleau-Ponty
- Is de Beauvoir too pessimistic about the female sex?
- Influence of religion on girls, particularly religions dominated by male figures
- Why does de Beauvoir claim that the girl "makes her way towards the future wounded, shamed, worried and guilty"?
- Why does De Beauvoir claim that a woman's vocation is "imperiously breathed into her from the first years of her life"?
- Changes in the place of women in society since de Beauvoir published her work
- Comparisons between de Beauvoir's work and the transgender rights slogan "trans women are women"
- Contemporary feminist accounts of gender and sex eg Serano, Haslanger.

6. (a) **Explain de Beauvoir's claim that men frame women as "the Other".** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate de Beauvoir's claim that men frame women as "the Other".** [15]

In her introduction, de Beauvoir sets out the issue as follows: "A man never begins by presenting himself as an individual of a certain sex; it goes without saying that he is a man. The terms *masculine* and *feminine* are used symmetrically only as a matter of form, as on legal papers. The relation of the two sexes is not quite like that of two electrical poles, for man represents both the positive and the neutral, as is indicated by the use of man to designate human beings in general; whereas woman represents only the negative, defined by limiting criteria, without reciprocity" (p.15). In a world set up and seen from a man's perspective, women are deficient men. Men are subjects, who have autonomy and are rational actors in the world, whereas women are objects, to be seen, kept and even used by men. Women are thus seen as passive rather than active. De Beauvoir thinks that men define women, and that there is no reason why females cannot play the same social roles as males if they can only escape being seen as "Other".

Candidates might explore (part A):

- de Beauvoir's views on the oppression of women are based on her view that women are defined by men as "the Other". She expands this idea with reference to the notions of immanence and transcendence; society traps women in immanence and they therefore cannot achieve transcendence and freedom
- Men's perception of women; woman as the Other; man as the subject and woman as the object
- Human lives should involve the interplay of both immanence and transcendence, but men deny women their transcendence
- de Beauvoir's view that gender is a social construct, that one is not born, but becomes a woman
- The value of authenticity to de Beauvoir, and her existentialist influences.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Are women oppressed by being relegated to the status of the Other?
- Are women forced to relinquish their claims to transcendence? How?
- Do women really have a passive role whereas men have an active role?
- Is women's freedom destroyed by being denied transcendence or does it remain?
- Do women play a role in their own subjection?
- Whether women can live good lives if they are considered as "Other"
- Authenticity in Sartre's existentialism
- How far women are seen as "the Other" in modern society, and whether progress has been made.

René Descartes: *Meditations*

7. (a) **Explain Descartes's dream argument.** [10]
(b) **Evaluate the success of Descartes's dream argument.** [15]

Descartes's dream argument is part of the general strategy of Meditation I where "the grounds on which we may doubt in general of all things, and especially of material objects are" explained (Synopsis). This strategy, in order to make "it impossible for us to doubt wherever we afterward discover truth," attempts to deliver "us from all prejudice, and affords the easiest pathway by which the mind may withdraw itself from the senses" (Synopsis). Sometimes we have vivid experiences of touching objects right in front of us, even though the objects are not actually present and perhaps do not exist. Similarly, in dreams, we can have the experience of seeing things up close, yet those things are not there. Considering these cases, "I perceive so clearly that there exist no certain marks by which the state of waking can ever be distinguished from sleep" (Meditation I, 5). Accordingly, it seems possible to generalize the scope of the doubt by supposing that all our experiences are like dreams; perhaps the contents of our experiences never match a present reality. This could suggest the more radical proposal, that we cannot rule out a general discrepancy between the contents of our experience and the very structure of the world. A counterargument to this radical proposal is provided by the painter analogy, the visions which come in sleep are like paintings and they must have been fashioned in the likeness of things that are real. The comparison with paintings suggests that just as painters use models, our dreams have to be based on prior acquaintance with really existing objects which supply the constituents of our dream content.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Dreams as ground for doubting in general of all things, and especially of material objects
- We often dream of things that seem real
- The objects which appear to us in sleep are, as it were, painted representations which could not have been formed unless in the likeness of realities
- Example of dreaming about sitting by a fire and feeling the warmth from the fire, even though the fire does not really exist
- If we sometimes think things are real when they are just a dream, how can we know we are not dreaming now?
- Place of the dream argument within Descartes's wider endeavour; establishing the unreliability of sense perception
- If painters can produce wholly fictitious forms, then perhaps our dreams could too.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Is there sufficient similarity between dreams and reality to justify Descartes's position?
- The extent to which the dream argument is constructed under the assumption that undertaking the process of doubt would result in the gain of lasting knowledge
- Locke's criticism that we, for example, cannot feel real pain in dreams
- Do dreams involve different types of beliefs?
- The extent to which we must have a clear knowledge of the difference between dreaming and being awake
- Ryle's criticism that it would make no sense to talk about counterfeit coins unless there are also real coins to compare them with, and in the same way it would make no sense to talk about dreams unless there are also genuine waking experiences to compare them with

- The spatial and temporal character of the sensory experience and their transformation when dreaming
- The dream argument and its relationship with other central arguments of the Meditations, *eg* the deceiving-God hypothesis, the distinction of mind and body, the cogito argument
- The role of dreams in other philosophical and cultural contexts: indigenous traditions, metaphorical or prophetic meaning of dreams, psychoanalysis and other interpretative approaches
- The possible comparison between dreams and virtual reality.

8. (a) Explain Descartes's concept of clear and distinct ideas. [10]
- (b) To what extent do you agree with Descartes's claim that there are clear and distinct ideas? [15]

This question focuses on Descartes's concept of clear and distinct ideas, found particularly in his discussion of the nature and quality of knowledge in Meditation III, in which he undertakes to establish the existence of God. For that purpose, he formulates proofs from effects that are based on the idea of God. This process requires in the first place, the specification of what is meant by "idea." So far, Descartes has used related terms such as: opinion, thought and perception. Now he gives an initial definition: "Of my thoughts some are, as it were, images of things, and to these alone properly belongs the name idea; as when I think [represent to my mind] a man, a chimera, the sky, an angel or God." (Meditation III, 5). The passage opens a discussion about how to understand what ideas are. Based on this initial characterization, one might easily draw the conclusion that ideas are entirely imagistic or visual. However, on the other hand, the subsequent examples of ideas override the narrow definition given. In the course of these examples one thing seems to become clear: ideas are, in some sense or other, representatives of objects. Further, Descartes also establishes clearness and distinctness of ideas as criteria for secure knowledge: "In this first knowledge, doubtless, there is nothing that gives me assurance of its truth except the clear and distinct perception of what I affirm, which would not indeed be sufficient to give me the assurance that what I say is true, if it could ever happen that anything I thus clearly and distinctly perceived should prove false; and accordingly it seems to me that I may now take as a general rule, that all that is very clearly and distinctly apprehended (conceived) is true." (Meditation III,2).

Candidates might explore (part A):

- "Clear and distinct" ideas are those which are known in a direct way by the knower, not through the medium of sense experience or imagination
- Descartes looks at the way we can know the truths of mathematics and distinguishes between those known directly and those that are not
- "Clear and distinct" ideas are exemplified in the *cogito* and are the only certain route to truth
- The irresistibility of believing "clear and distinct" ideas as opposed to externally perceived ideas
- Matter, extension, body and their relation to clear and distinct ideas
- The rationalist tradition
- Descartes's wax example
- "Clear and distinct" ideas and "indefeasibility"
- The role of God, for example in guaranteeing that reason can be trusted.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Does Descartes provide rational criteria to know when an idea is clear and distinct, or is this principle a general comparison or metaphor?
- How do we determine which ideas are "clear and distinct" and which are not?
- Does/ should the fact that an idea is "clear and distinct" guarantee its veracity?
- Do clear and distinct ideas need God as the guarantor of their truth?
- Descartes's foundationalism and the clarity of mathematics which can account for the basis of true knowledge of the external world
- The role of the deceiver in generating Descartes's doubt
- Descartes assumes that intuition allows us to grasp truth in some immediate way, but why should we trust intuition?
- Why should we attend only to those objects of which our minds seem capable of having certain and indubitable cognition?

- Is there a circularity in Descartes's argument? (Do the arguments that establish the trustworthiness of reason themselves depend on the trustworthiness of reason?)
- The extent to which clearness and distinctness of ideas is more than an epistemological categorization to become a metaphysical one
- Descartes's understanding of clear and distinct ideas in comparison with other philosophical notions of idea, eg Plato and Kant.

Frantz Fanon: *Black Skin, White Masks*

9. (a) Explain Fanon's view of the relationship between language and identity. [10]
- (b) Evaluate Fanon's view of the relationship between language and identity. [15]

This question draws particularly on the ideas articulated in the first chapter of *Black Skin, White Masks*. In this chapter, Fanon explores the power dynamics involved in people speaking the language of colonizing countries, focusing particularly on the example of people in the Antilles speaking French. He discusses the impact on identity of, for example, being forbidden from speaking Creole at school, or the saying in Martinique "to speak like a white man" (p. 5). He also contrasts this experience with linguistic diversity that is not related to colonialism, for example, Breton being spoken in particular regions of France. Throughout this chapter, Fanon explores the idea that all colonized people position themselves in relation to the language of the colonizing country. He suggests that language is a key part of the idea of "being-for-others" and that "to speak is to exist absolutely for the other" (p.1), which he sees as an essential feature of black lived experience.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The relationship between language and culture
- Speaking a language as also involving possessing the world expressed and implied by that language
- The idea that "to speak is to exist absolutely for the other"
- The example of a young black Antillean who speaks French being viewed as "almost white".

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Language as a "cultural tool"
- Does speaking a language necessarily involve appropriating its world and culture?
- Power dynamics; language as a tool of oppression
- Language and self-image
- Language and self-loathing
- The association of language with social status; "In France they say to speak like a book. In Martinique they say to speak like a white man."
- Adopting a new language as involving a "shift and a split" in personal identity.

10. (a) Explain Fanon's claim that blackness exists in relation to whiteness. [10]
- (b) Discuss the implications of Fanon's claim that blackness exists in relation to whiteness. [15]

This question draws particularly on the exploration of the lived experience of the black man found in the fifth chapter of *Black Skin, White Masks*. The question requires students to engage with the Fanon's view that "not only must the black man be black; he must be black in relation to the white man" (p. 90). Fanon explores Hegel's view of "being for other" (p. 89). He outlines that "ontology does not allow us to understand the being of the black man, since it ignores the lived experience" (p. 90). In his exploration of this idea, Fanon discusses the impact of the "white gaze", and drawing on key concepts found in the work of Jean-Paul Sartre, contrasts the experiences to those of the Jewish people as "he is a white man, and apart from some debatable features, he can pass undetected" (p.95), as, quoting Sir Alan Burns, "colour is the most obvious outward manifestation of race" (p.97). Fanon also draws on key concepts found in the work of Maurice Merleau-Ponty.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The "white gaze"
- Alienation and objectification
- Fanon's claim that as a black man he is "overdetermined from the outside"
- "Being-for-self" and "being-for-others"
- The claim that it is only in opposition to whiteness that "the person of color becomes acutely aware of their race"
- The relationship between whiteness and blackness as a "relationship of transcendence".

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The view that race is constructed through social relationships and interactions
- Is being recognized by others a determining feature of being human?
- Fanon's development of key ideas from Sartre and Merleau-Ponty, for example the development of the idea of the gaze to the idea of the white gaze
- Fanon's criticism that "Sartre forgets that the black man suffers in his body quite differently from the white man"
- Fanon's lack of consideration of gender differences in the experience of race
- Does the gaze fix the identity of the recipient?

John Stuart Mill: *On Liberty*

11. (a) Explain Mill's view of the value of free speech. [10]

(b) Evaluate the claim that Mill overestimates the value of free speech. [15]

This question focuses on Mill's defence of absolute free speech as a benefit and necessity for a progressive and free society, and as a necessary element in the formation of a virtuous character in the individual. Mill discusses free speech in detail in Chapter 2 *Of the Liberty of Thought and Discussion*. Freedom of speech includes freedom of the press and freedom of individuals to express their views. Mill states that "if all 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 justified in silencing mankind" (p.17). The reasoning behind this is that "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" (p.17).

Candidates might also consider Mill's harm principle, and the extent to which free speech can cause harm. Mill's defence rests on four key points:

- (a) If an opinion is silenced, it may in fact be true. This denies the majority the benefit of the truth. Silencing opinion also assumes infallibility on the issue.
- (b) Even if the new opinion contains error, it may be partially true and can act as a supplement to the prevailing truth.
- (c) If the current opinion is wholly true it still needs re-justification to the majority otherwise it becomes a prejudice.
- (d) Truths need opposing ideas to keep them alive and vital.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Mill claims that "if all 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 justified in silencing mankind"
- False opinions have an important function as they encourage others to see different perspectives; knowing different opinions leads to a refinement in character and moral judgments
- We cannot say that an opinion is false before carefully considering it, which requires allowing its complete expression
- Open discussion with opposing opinions could prevent the development of dogma; Mill uses the example of organized religion as an example of how a noble institution can lead to ignorance in its followers by silencing contrary opinions
- Freedom of speech must only be restricted when it harms others. The expression of these opinions is not forbidden because they are false or go against customs, but only because they affect someone else's liberty.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Does Mill adequately consider the harm and/or offence inflicted on others by speech? (eg Holocaust denial, racial hatred)
- Whether Mill's views on freedom of speech for the individual are compatible with other aspects of his notions of liberty
- Whether Mill is unable to resolve the conflict between his harm principle and his support for freedom of speech
- Do false opinions really challenge and improve our true opinions?
- Is freedom of speech a necessary element for the moral progress of a society?

- Is it always possible to decide whether speech is harmful or only a legitimate expression of protest?
- Does freedom of expression really prevent an underground press and subversive expression of dissent?
- Are governments justified in silencing speech they deem as dangerous?
- Does Mill credit too much reasonableness to humans?
- Is toleration of opposition enough or must society have a constant conflict of ideas to be healthy and safe from non-democratic forces?
- Should there be different levels of freedom of speech for children and adults?
- The potential value of censorship eg its role in Plato's republic
- Alternative accounts of the state which place no emphasis on freedom eg Hobbes' Leviathan
- Contemporary problems such as the spread of fake news and conspiracy theories in relation to freedom of speech.

12. (a) Explain Mill's view of social progress. [10]
- (b) Evaluate Mill's view of social progress. [15]

Mill thinks that people ought to be free to experiment with their own ways of living. This includes being open to a plurality of cultural and social practices, alongside encouraging free speech. He says that "as it is useful that while mankind is imperfect there should be different opinions, so it is that there should be different experiments of living... it is desirable in short, that in things which do not primarily concern others, individuality should assert itself" (p.43). This is both an "ingredient" of human happiness, but also of social progress. Given that humanity does not have the answer to how to live a good life, how to govern a perfect society, or how to guarantee individual happiness, people should be afforded the freedom to work this out for themselves. Liberty protects the potential for individuals to live a good life. Perhaps more importantly, it is a fundamental ingredient in social progress too. If society is to progress, people need to experiment with ways of living, and people need to debate controversial ideas. So long as these experiments and ideas do not harm others, Mill thinks that they can only strengthen society. The alternative is social stagnation.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- This question draws particularly on Mill's view in Chapter 3 of *On Liberty*
- Diversity is key to liberty, and liberty is key to social progress
- Mill argues that without liberty mankind will stagnate into collective mediocrity
- Mill sets up a conflict between liberty and custom, arguing that custom can become social tyranny and impede social progress
- Conformity leads to a lack of diversity, a lack of liberty and ultimately a lack of social progress
- Mill draws on his no harm principle to argue that the state should only intervene when actions harm others
- This view links to Mill's views about freedom of expression and speech.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- On Mill's view, is progress an ideal or is it attainable?
- Is liberty really the sole driver of social progress?
- How does Mill handle the issue of vastly different historical and cultural contexts?
- Marx's view that progress leads to liberty, rather than liberty leading to progress
- The extent to which one's own experiment in living can easily be said not to harm others
- Examples of cases where even everyday actions cause harm *eg* driving a car and the climate crisis
- The clash between different cultures, religions, or people of different political leanings and whether this can be resolved
- The advantages and disadvantages of repression in society
- Examples of what would have been considered "experiments in living" at the time Mill wrote *On Liberty* that seem important to allow *eg* minority religious practices, or protecting the right to a family life for the LGBTQ+ community
- Counterarguments that value order and conformity in society *eg* Confucianism, Plato's *Republic*, Hobbes' potentially repressive social contract.

Friedrich Nietzsche: *The Genealogy of Morals*

13. (a) Explain Nietzsche's view of the relationship between guilt and the origins of morality. [10]
- (b) Evaluate Nietzsche's view of the relationship between guilt and the origins of morality. [15]

This question focuses on the relationship between guilt and the origins of morality found in the Essay 2 of *The Genealogy of Morals*. Here Nietzsche employs the genealogical method to trace the origins of conscience, and hence moral sense. This method can be understood as a self-conscious attempt to analyse a concept with a complex history, and to disentangle originally independent elements that we no longer see as such. Nietzsche's history of morality is a genealogy because it is a kind of history of couplings. It suggests that concepts are formed in a similar way to living things. This method or approach provides the basis for his theory of the origins of morality which attempts to uncover the origin and trace the development of different and originally independent strands of morality that history has woven together. The origins of morality are related to bad conscience, initially characterized as "the consciousness of guilt" (II, 4). The customs become moral rules when they are connected with guilt. The origin of the ideas of justice, guilt, and punishment is located in early forms of commerce, specifically in relationships between debtors and creditors: "the feeling of guilt, of personal obligation" had its origin in the debtor-creditor relation (II, 8). Nietzsche derives the notion of guilt (*Schuld*) from that of debts (*Schulden*), being guilty originally was nothing more than owing a debt. The idea of having a debt or owing something then transferred itself to the first forms of social organization. The community is viewed as standing to its members in the same vital relation of creditor to its debtors (II:9). Guilt in its origins would be a debt or substitute payment owed to society for failure to obey the community's rules. Nietzsche's account as indicated opens the possibility of further discussion and evaluation of both the approach or method and specific story or explanation of the origins of morality.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The pivotal role of guilt in the origin of morality
- Conscience, bad conscience and moral bad conscience (guilt)
- Guilt and debt; the concept of guilt arises from the concept of debt according to Nietzsche
- Guilt is now associated with responsibility and free will in a way that it was not originally
- Guilt, suffering and punishment
- Guilt and religion
- Guilt, holding the highest esteem of ancestors and the implications for Nietzsche's account of the creation of belief in the gods/God.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Is the association of the concept of guilt with the concept of debt compelling?
- Does Nietzsche's account rest on particular preconceptions about God?
- Do you agree with Nietzsche's claim that humans took joy from making others suffer?
- The criticism that Nietzsche presents little evidence to support his claims about how things were in the past
- Does guilt have a particular point of origin?
- The genealogical account – is it convincing?
- Is Nietzsche guilty of committing the genetic fallacy?
- Nietzsche's account of the origins of morality and other ethical approaches

- Other approaches to ethics, particularly ethical language *eg* Ayer and emotivism which sees ethical language as meaningless.

14. (a) Explain Nietzsche's concept of the "ascetic ideal". [10]
- (b) Evaluate Nietzsche's rejection of the ascetic ideal. [15]

This question focuses on Nietzsche's argument in Essay 3 where he identifies a counter to the will to power; the ascetic ideal. "What do ascetic ideals mean?" is the leading question of the chapter. The argument that presents an answer to it is constructed, precisely, in relation to the will to power. An immediate and direct answer to more limited question of what ascetic ideals is: ascetic ideals are those norms that valorize "poverty, humility, and chastity" (III, 8). More generally, they are norms which valorize all states of self-denial in which one renounces to the satisfaction of desires, sensual desires, desires for wealth, fame, domination, sexual gratification, and all desires that might be related to those "great pomp words." Showing the success of ascetic ideals, the earth is "the ascetic planet par excellence" (III, 11). The will to power now comes centre stage in the argument. It is presented as an instinctive striving for conditions in which the agent achieves "his maximum feeling of power (*Machtgefühl*)" (III, 7). If every animal manifests this instinctive drive towards maximum feelings of power, then an explanation of the appeal of ascetic ideals will have to explain how those ideals, too, satisfy that drive. While the connection between, eg the will to power of philosophers and the ascetic ideal could be quite straightforward, it seems, at least initially, paradoxical that an ideal of self-denial could constitute the will to power of the vast majority of mortals. Here the nuances of Nietzsche's conception of will to power appear, and particularly in relation to views developed previously. By undertaking the first revaluation of values (the slave revolt in morals), the slaves of Essay 1 develop an imaginary consolation where ethical standing and ultimate rewards in the afterlife take priority over the power felt in the present. In this way the values of poverty, humility, and chastity are put in first place. The ascetic ideal clearly valorizes the kind of life ascetic priests lead. Further, through this ideal, the priest places himself at the head of the "herd," ie the majority of mortals, as their shepherd (Cf. III, 13). Thus, the ascetic ideal becomes the "best instrument of power" (III, 1). Nietzsche's argument develops further, showing other disguised forms that the ascetic ideal takes, eg science, politics, art. In general, the argument clearly opens various lines for scrutiny, discussion and evaluation, eg psychological analysis which supports the transformation of instincts in ideal, critical views of Nietzsche's account of the origins of morality or other approaches to the justification of moral demands and claims.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Nietzsche views the ascetic ideal both as a preserver of life and as a denier of life. The restricted conditions of morality literally protect and preserve life and set up a clear distinction and appreciation of the values that make life bearable
- The ascetic ideal is an expression of the human horror of a moral vacuum; thus the ascetic ideal is an expression of a "will to power"
- Although this curtails humanity from expressing itself and seeking out conditions that enhance life, without an ascetic ideal, civilization and communal living would be impossible
- The ascetic ideal arises out of the instinct for protection and salvation in a degenerating life seeking to keep itself going by any means and struggling for its existence
- Examples of types/ guises of the ascetic ideal, including philosophy, religion, and science
- Nietzsche identifies the desire for the truth as responsible for not only the death of God but as the motivation for adopting the ascetic ideal
- Poverty, humility, and chastity – the ascetic ideal is characterized by a denial or rejection of the sensual aspects of life creating an ideal impossible for humanity to achieve
- The ascetic ideal as the will to stop willing, resulting in a denial of reality

- Objective truth is the claim and promise of the ascetic ideal and this is the motive and source for the attenuation of the will to power.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- How the ascetic ideal functions differently in philosophy, science, religion, and art; ascetic ideals might mean diverse things according to different perspectives
- Is Nietzsche's critique on ascetic ideals in fact just a critique on ideals?
- Does Nietzsche's interpretation of ascetic ideals contribute to a better understanding of moral ideals?
- Is the opposition between strong people and weak people enough to understand morality as a whole?
- Is Nietzsche able to reconcile the contradiction of the will to power and the ascetic ideal?
- Asceticism as a reaction to a form of sickness in which the individual responds to challenge or disappointment by turning against life, avoiding responsibility, and blaming the wrong cause of their malaise
- "The ascetic treats life as an incorrect road" (III, 11). This is "a monstrous way of assessing values", for an ascetic life is a self-contradiction ("life opposing life")
- Does Nietzsche's negation of truth as an absolute value mean a complete surpassing of it, or does his position open up possible new or different conceptions of truth?
- To what extent is it legitimate to reduce truth and knowledge to basic beliefs?
- Does Nietzsche's perspectivism necessarily deny the individual the concept of an authentic set of moral values?
- Problematic possible consequences of Nietzsche's view, particularly in relation to his idea of the *Übermensch*
- Contrasting accounts of ethics eg Kantian ethics where something akin to the ascetic ideal is part of the categorical imperative in the form of the "good will".

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

15. (a) Explain Nussbaum's view of the role of education in human development. [10]
- (b) Evaluate Nussbaum's view of the role of education in human development. [15]

Nussbaum addresses the role of education in human development in Chapter 8, *Capabilities and Contemporary Issues*. She says that "At the heart of the Capabilities Approach, since its inception has been the importance of education. Education (in schools, in the family, in programs for both child and adult development run by non-governmental organizations) forms people's existing capacities into developed internal capabilities of many kinds" (p.152). The words 'capabilities' and 'human development' can be used interchangeably (p.17). Nussbaum introduces the importance of education in Chapter 1 *A Woman Seeking Justice*. Here, Vasanti, a woman who has been divorced by her husband and faces poor prospects, is helped by the Self-Employed Women's Organization. Alongside other help, the organization provides Vasanti with the opportunity "to learn to read and write and to acquire the skills necessary to promote greater social and economic independence and political participation" (p.3). Without an education, Vasanti also lacks other capabilities that are perhaps less essential to survival, but just as important to flourishing. She "is cut off from a full understanding of her nation's history and its political and economic structure... She is also unable to enjoy poetry, novels, or the many works of the imagination that would make her life richer and more fun" (p.7). Education develops capabilities central to flourishing.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Education is seen as key to all human development; it should seek to contribute to the general development of mankind
- Relationship of education to wellbeing, freedom and agency
- Education is crucial to being able to critically examine our own prejudices and to develop empathy
- Education as developing internal capacities, which in combination with external circumstances combine to become capabilities
- The relationship between education, dignity and freedom.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Is education a process of extending capabilities?
- How far can education help people to live good lives if economic and social conditions are poor
- The relationship between internal capacities and capabilities
- Duty of the state to provide education
- Capabilities approach to education versus a human rights approach to education
- Is education more about competition than creating capabilities?
- Does education have a primarily instrumental value with supporting economic growth being the primary objective?
- Other accounts of the value of education eg Plato and the attainment of truth, Aristotle and the development of virtues.

16. (a) **Explain Nussbaum's claim that it is impossible for human beings to flourish with dignity if certain basic human needs and capacities are not met.** [10]
- (b) **To what extent do you agree with Nussbaum's claim that it is impossible for human beings to flourish with dignity if certain basic human needs and capacities are not met?** [15]

Nussbaum seeks an approach to governance and society where humans can fully express their human powers. She argues that we have an intuition of a dignified life in which people have the capability to pursue the good. A life of dignity requires as a minimum ten central capabilities: life; bodily health; bodily integrity; senses, imagination and thought; emotions; practical reason; affiliation; concern for other species; play; and control over one's environment. It is the duty of each country to provide these capabilities for their citizens. Since all countries fall short of providing everyone with the capabilities they need to flourish, "all nations then, are developing nations" and the capabilities approach provides insight to help them to continue to develop (p.16). Capabilities are "not just the abilities residing inside a person but also the freedoms or opportunities created by a combination of personal abilities and the political, social and economic environment" (p.21). To truly flourish with dignity, people must be substantially free. This means that nations have a duty to provide people with basic human needs, to develop their internal capacities, and also to create the sort of environment in which someone is able to exercise those capacities in the form of combined capabilities. The aim, as demonstrated in the story of Vasanti, is to allow people to live dignified lives within which they can flourish.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- We should treat people as ends, focusing on the key question of what each person is able to do and to be (Chapter 2)
- Dignity; the difference between a focus on dignity and a focus on other things such as satisfaction
- Dignity and the concept of "active striving"
- There are some freedoms that are "so central that their removal makes a life not worthy of human dignity" (Chapter 2)
- The capabilities approach begins from a commitment to equal dignity of all human beings; people should be guaranteed a social minimum which will allow their capabilities to be realized.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Do theories of development tend to ignore basic human needs for dignity and self-respect?
- Are there certain basic needs, such as bodily integrity, which are crucial to human flourishing?
- Are the ten central capabilities the right capabilities to enable human flourishing? Are there things that are missing?
- Should people be regarded only as ends?
- What is the relationship between capabilities and freedoms?
- Are the capabilities really cross-cultural?
- Does the capabilities approach provide a more complex and sophisticated approach than is usually associated with approaches to human development?
- Does Nussbaum demand too much of the state?
- Alternative ideas about state intervention which are more minimal eg Nozick.

José Ortega y Gasset: *The Revolt of the Masses*

17. (a) **Explain Ortega y Gasset's concept of the mass man.** [10]
(b) **Discuss Ortega y Gasset's claim that the mass man is like a "spoilt child".** [15]

This question draws particularly on the discussion of the nature of the mass man found in chapter six of *The Revolt of the Masses*. In this chapter, Ortega y Gasset suggests that historically the lack of certainty and stability in the world meant that there was greater humility and gratefulness for social benefits, whereas the mass man now sees these benefits as a right and expectation. He argues that society now offers an increased level of security and prospects, to the point the mass man now has "everything ready to their hand, independent of any previous efforts on their parts".

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Expansion of desires and "radical ingratitude" as defining features of the mass man
- The concept of the multitude/ the "social mass"
- The mass man as the "average man" rather than being defined by social class
- The mass man as only concerned with their own well-being but lacking awareness of the causes of their well-being
- Mass man's viewing of social benefits as if they are natural rights
- The mass man as being incapable of directing their own personal existence, "still less rule society in general"
- The mass man as feeling happy to be just like everyone else.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The removal of restraint and limits
- The mass man "regards himself as perfect" (chapter 8)
- Nothing forces the mass man to realise "he is a second-class man, subject to many limitations"
- Lack of obligations
- The mass man as too focused on wants and rights, like a spoilt child
- The disassociation of past and present; "the spoiled child is the heir who behaves exclusively as a mere heir" (chapter 11).

18. (a) **Explain the claim that State intervention is the gravest challenge facing society.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate the claim that State intervention is the gravest challenge facing society.** [15]

This question draws particularly on the discussion of the State found in chapter 13 of *The Revolt of the Masses*. In this chapter, Ortega y Gasset suggests that the State has become increasingly formidable and powerful. He describes the ideal situation as being that the State “in spite of being all powerful, limits itself” and attempts to leave room “for those to live who neither think nor feel as it does.” He proposes that the mass man mistakenly identifies themselves with the State, and whenever they encounter a problem “will tend to demand that the State intervene immediately and undertake a solution directly with its immense and unassailable resources”. This leads Ortega y Gasset to his pessimistic conclusion that the mass man is incapable of maintaining the current social situation, let alone improving it, and that increased State intervention presents a significant danger to society.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The use of State intervention to crush creative minorities
- State intervention as a mechanism to break up any spontaneous social action
- The State expands to the point that society becomes “unable to live except in the service of the State”
- The State becomes a way for the mass man to act for themselves, which Ortega y Gasset views as dangerous
- Without limits on State intervention, mass man is “placing in imminent danger those very principles to which they owe their existence”.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Mass man has a “hatred of all that is not itself”, and increased State intervention becomes a tool to suppress and crush anything challenging
- Bureaucratization and militarization as repercussions of increased State intervention
- Why does Ortega y Gasset express concerns about developments such as the increase in the size of the police force in many European countries in the early twentieth Century?
- The claim that the eventual outcome of increased State intervention would be to send society “back to barbarism”.

Plato: *The Republic*, Books IV-IX

19. (a) **Explain Plato's distinction between knowledge and belief.** [10]
(b) **Evaluate Plato's distinction between knowledge and belief.** [15]

The question seeks an explanation of how Plato distinguishes between knowledge and belief. In Book 6 Socrates, having established the character of the true philosopher, sets himself to the task of showing why, in the ideal state, the philosopher would be the best ruler. Since the philosopher understands the Forms, he is best fitted to rule. Forms are different from ordinary objects, which is reflected in the distinction between knowledge and belief. The simile of the Divided Line offers a device to analyse this distinction. The levels of cognition and their objects may be mapped out along a divided line. Socrates argues that there exist two degrees of knowledge (*episteme*) and two of belief. The division of the kinds of cognition are: knowledge (*gnosis*) and opinion (*doxa*), being their objects of cognition: the intelligible and the visible. Within knowledge exists: intellect (*noesis*) and thought (*dianoia*). Within opinion exists: trust (*pistis*) and imagination (*eikasia*); their objects: plants, animals and artifacts, and shadows and reflections. The analogy provides a unified account of all objects and the corresponding levels of knowledge. The purpose of the Divided Line, however, is not simply to classify these kinds of cognition, but also to indicate how it might be possible to move from the lower to the higher states it represents. Therefore, this structure might be arranged into a path toward the Form of the Good. The Form of the Good is the ultimate goal of the understanding that philosophy pursues. Beyond explanation, this question requires candidates to discuss potential problems with this division between knowledge and belief, as well as evaluating the arguments and evidence Plato provides to support his position.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Plato makes a distinction between knowledge (*episteme*) and belief as separate cognitive faculties.
- Belief for Plato is the level of knowledge based in the direct perception of the realm of sensible things. It is a distinction which constitutes an aspect of the world of opinion (*doxa*). For Plato, knowledge enables awareness of the universal reality lying behind particular examples or instances
- Plato claims that belief lies “between” knowledge and ignorance, being clearer than ignorance but vaguer than knowledge
- Plato uses the argument from opposites and the faculties argument, along with the simile of the divided line, to substantiate and clarify his position
- Within their response, candidates might highlight how Plato's distinction between knowledge and belief is based on these other elements of his philosophy, particularly the world of the Forms
- Knowledge and belief are different faculties and attach themselves to different objects
- Knowledge is concerned with the intelligible world and is made up of mathematical reasoning, abstract thought (*dianoia*) and intelligence, and pure thought (*noesis*). Belief is concerned with the physical world
- The inferiority of the senses – which gives rise to belief – in comparison with knowledge
- The philosopher as the lover of truth via a knowledge of Forms, as opposed to being a lover of things via belief.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- How should we interpret what Plato means when he says that knowledge is of “what is” and belief of “what is and what is not”?
- Is it more reasonable to see knowledge as a continuum starting as belief and then being confirmed with further evidence as knowledge?
- Are belief and knowledge different aspects of the same cognitive faculty?
- It might be argued that Plato actually provides little real evidence to support his position
- The dependence of Plato’s epistemology on the existence of the world of the Forms – does Plato’s distinction rely too heavily on his metaphysical distinction between the world of the Forms and the world of things/objects? If true knowledge only attaches to the world of the Forms “above”, how does – or can – it relate to experience of the world “below”?
- The world perceived by the senses is not knowledge for Plato; Plato is a rationalist, but the perception argument of an empiricist for example could also provide a source of knowledge
- Plato’s distinction can be seen as hard to sustain; for most people, belief in something is not a process that can develop into knowledge of that something by further contemplation
- The problematic separation for Plato of knowledge and belief when both seem to require an encounter with the physical world
- Candidates might make reference to Aristotle’s argument that knowledge needs to relate to the physical world
- The problem of judgment
- The modern discussion of the separation of knowledge and belief
- While it is easy to understand us believing something mistakenly, can we know something mistakenly?
- Could knowledge just be a belief that happens to correspond to the truth ie, being an extension of the same faculty?
- Do Plato’s similes do enough work philosophically? Are they just illustrations that presuppose particular distinctions, not something that can be used as evidence of those distinctions?
- Can the universal truths of mathematics be applied to concepts such as beauty or justice, or to physical objects such as chairs?
- In our rapidly changing world is knowledge as fixed and unchanging as Plato argues?
- If all knowledge is already in our minds why does Plato entertain the idea of belief?
- Is Plato’s division of the intelligible world and the physical world really a division between direct perception and interpretation, judgment?

20. (a) Explain Plato's claim that "we should expect tyranny to result from democracy". [10]

(b) To what extent do you agree with Plato's claim that "we should expect tyranny to result from democracy"? [15]

In Book VIII, Plato returns to the examples of unjust societies and unjust men and Socrates presents the view that there are four main types of unjust states: timocracy, oligarchy (plutocracy), democracy, and tyranny (despotism). The development of the argument shows how democracy can originate from oligarchy and descend into tyranny. A simplified picture would say that oligarchy is a society where the rich are in control; the wealthy are extremely wealthy and poverty tends to be extreme. The poor see the rich as mortal enemies and accomplish a violent overthrow of the government enlisting the aid of their impoverished fellows. The result is an ancient democracy. In such a democratic state, everyone is more or less equally free. If money reigns in an oligarchy, in a democracy a kind of absolute and undetermined freedom rules, where no authority whatever, neither familial nor militaristic nor academic is recognized. No value predominates in the democratic city, unless it is a kind of general toleration (557b, 558a). The citizens can agree only to disagree, they do not appeal to common values nor encourage public virtue. The very idea of unity, or of a ruler superior to the citizens, becomes repulsive to them. Equally egalitarian, the democratic soul prefers not to choose among its desires (561b) and indulges each one as it arises. Desires may be necessary or unnecessary (558d–559c). Having lost the power to tell necessary from unnecessary desires, the democratic soul has no principle to guide its steps. Socrates sums up his reasons to state that in a democratic state citizens "take no notice of the laws—written or unwritten—in order to avoid having any master at all." (563d) and concludes that "tyranny probably does not evolve from any constitution other than democracy, then—the most severe and cruel slavery evolving from what I suppose is the most eminent degree of freedom" (564a); the greatest dictatorship arises out of the greatest anarchy. This paradoxical situation, at least from a contemporary point of view, opens the possibility of developing arguments and counterarguments regarding constitutive issues of democracy, eg whether democracy carries disunity to its logical extreme, insofar as it seems to presuppose disagreement, not as a temporary evil to be overcome in some unanimous final state, but as an inherent condition of society.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Plato predicts that democracy will ultimately lead to people supporting tyrants; democracy will eventually descend into tyranny and misery
- Education in a democratic state brings up the young to be fond of luxury, incapable of effort either mental or physical, too soft to endure pleasures or pains, and lazy (556b)
- Division into factions even without any external influence (556e)
- The tyrannical man as the son of the democratic man
- The desire for freedom leads to the breakdown of order
- Democracy is based on freedom and equality, but Plato argues that this leads to people becoming too focused on money and power.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Is it inevitable that democracy will descend into tyranny?
- Is Plato's view overly pessimistic?
- Whether Plato's characterization of democracy as one of the worst forms of imperfect political systems is accurate
- Whether Plato's claim that aristocracy is a preferable system to democracy is justifiable
- Why does Plato argue that a champion will become a tyrant once they taste power?

- Are many of us prejudiced in favour of democracy so we cannot objectively appreciate its shortcomings?
- Plato's views on democracy in the light of contemporary discussions of political philosophy
- Alternatives to democracy and their shortcomings
- Counterarguments emphasizing the value of freedom eg Mill, Berlin
- Affirmations of the value of democracy eg Dewey.

Charles Taylor: *The Ethics of Authenticity*

21. (a) **Explain Taylor's account of the difference between self-centred narcissism and authenticity.** [10]
- (b) **Evaluate the claim that self-centred narcissism distorts the idea of authenticity.** [15]

Taylor's account of the difference between self-centred narcissism and authenticity is developed in relation to what he calls "the culture of narcissism," which is characterized by "the spread of an outlook that makes self-fulfilment the major value in life and that seems to recognize few external moral demands or serious commitments to others" (55). In these two respects self-fulfilment appears very self-centred, hence the qualification of "narcissism." Taylor says that "we should see this culture as reflecting in part an ethical aspiration, the ideal of authenticity, but one that doesn't itself license its self-centred modes" (55). The culture of narcissism presents an ideal that it is systematically failing to reach. The explanation of this culture of narcissism implies analysis and discussion of the difference between self-centred narcissism and authenticity, which in turn requires at least a sketch of authenticity as a moral ideal. In Taylor's discussion of the difference is centrally at stake a fine discrimination of the common ground between narcissism and authenticity. Further, an assessment of a fair judgment on modernity itself and its historical origin is also at play. An 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. A deviation or unilateral exaggeration of it results in narcissistic self-fulfilment which disregards the demands of our ties with others or the demands from something different beyond the self. Authenticity involves: creation and construction as well as discovery, originality, and frequently opposition to the rules of society (66). Further, it requires openness to horizons of significance and self-definition through dialogue. The tension between these demands is clear to Taylor, but privileging of one over the other lapses back into self-centred narcissism.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Taylor's conception of narcissism as a contemporary worldview
- Narcissism as a false understanding/attempt at authenticity, confusing hedonism and self-fulfilment with authenticity
- The culture of narcissism makes self-fulfilment the greatest value in life, to the detriment of others surrounding us: family and friends; narcissism is self-centred and self-indulgent
- Narcissism as an element of the sliding scale into soft relativism
- Relativism and subjectivism are easy traps for people living in modern times. Taylor denies that they hold a moral value and sees them essentially as a rationalization of the pursuit of self-fulfilment
- The ideal of authenticity can best be achieved in a liberal society that remains neutral on questions of what constitutes a good life
- Taylor claims that you can argue in reason about ideals (inclusive of the ideal of authenticity) and about the conformity of practices to these ideals.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Does Taylor successfully avoid egoism when promoting authenticity?
- The extent to which the very idea of self-choice falls into triviality and hence incoherence unless some options are more significant than others
- Taylor claims that rational arguments can make a difference in morality: is this the case?
- Is the idea of authenticity a valid moral ideal for our time?

- The 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
- Taylor’s view on authenticity: descriptive, prescriptive or both?
- Taylor’s accent on authenticity might be in many ways an attractive ideal, but there are reasons to doubt that it provides a realistic model for organizing social and political life, eg it might conflict with common interest
- The ethics of authenticity in broader philosophical discussion: other philosophical, cultural and social views, eg non-Western perspectives, feminist approaches.

22. (a) Explain what Taylor means by “soft despotism”. [10]
- (b) To what extent do you agree with Taylor’s view that soft despotism should be considered a major problem for society? [15]

This question asks for an explanation of what Tocqueville calls “soft despotism” and Taylor qualifies as “the danger of a new, specifically modern form of despotism” (9). Its analysis is placed by Taylor within the frame of “the political level, and [...] the feared consequences for political life of individualism and instrumental reason” (8). Soft despotism means not a tyranny of terror and oppression but a mild and paternalistic government, which may even keep democratic forms, with periodic elections. However, in fact everything will be run by an immense tutelary power, over which people will have little control (cf. 9). A central danger implied is that we lose as citizens political control over our destiny, what Tocqueville called “political liberty.” The capacity and dignity of citizens is threatened. Impersonal mechanisms may reduce the degrees of freedom as a society and the loss of political liberty would mean that the choices would not be by agents as citizens, but by irresponsible tutelary power. Responses could go further explaining and evaluating the notion of soft despotism as loss of freedom in relation to the other malaises: loss of meaning and fading of moral horizons, and the eclipse of ends, in face of instrumental reason. Or they could explain and assess the defence against this, the development of a vigorous political culture in which participation takes a central role at different levels. This culture has to be developed against fragmentation where citizens can and should increase their capacity for forming a common purpose and carrying it out. The development of this political culture is a central part of the many-levelled struggle in which, “debates in the public arena interlink with those in a host of institutional settings, like hospitals and schools, where the issues of enframing technology are being lived through in concrete form; and where these disputes in turn both feed and are fed by the various attempts to define in theoretical terms the place of technology and the demands of authenticity, and beyond that, the shape of human life and its relation to the cosmos” (120).

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The problems of contemporary society: flattened individualism, instrumental reason, soft despotism and loss of effective political consciousness and action
- Soft despotism as a major illness deriving from and dependent upon flattened individualism and instrumental reason
- Soft despotism and the minimization and/or absence of rational discourse, dialogue, and horizons of significance
- Effective political action versus ineffective political inaction
- The patronizing nature of governmental and political institutions and organizations
- Small group versus large group approaches to political issues
- The search for and recovery of the ideal of authenticity and the contemporary political environment
- The place and role of the individual in the political arena: disenchantment within the “iron cage”.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Does Taylor’s view of what he describes as “soft despotism” fit well into his assessment of flattened individualism and instrumental reason?
- Is Taylor’s assessment of the contemporary situation convincing?
- Is Taylor’s argument regarding “soft despotism” relevant to the 21st century?
- How can the ideal of authenticity find expression in the political environment Taylor describes?
- What is the relation between the political aspects of Taylor’s views and his views on the dialogical character of life and relations with significant others?

- Can individuals come together in the way Taylor describes and can they effect political change?
- How can effective political activity be brought about in an authentic manner without falling into the confines of flattened individualism and instrumental modes of reasoning?

Lao Tzu: *Tao Te Ching*

23. (a) Explain the view of the state found in the Tao Te Ching. [10]

(b) Evaluate the claim that the view of the state found in the Tao Te Ching assumes an overly positive view of human nature. [15]

Throughout the Tao Te Ching, Lao Tzu emphasizes the importance of inaction, and in the case of the state, of non-interference. To live a good life is to live in accordance with the *Tao*. The state, similarly, must allow its citizens to live in accordance with the *Tao* by ruling with a light touch where “governing a large state is like boiling a small fish” (Book 2, Chapter 60). Too much effort is associated with deviating from the *Tao*. Here, “When the government is muddled the people are simple; when the government is alert the people are cunning... Therefore the sage is square edged but does not scrape, has corners but does not jab, extends himself but not at the expense of others, shines but does not dazzle” (Book 2, Chapter 58). Lao Tzu advises rulers to “govern the state by being straightforward... Hence the sage says, I take no action and the people are transformed of themselves” (Book 2, Chapter 57). It is important that the sage, or ruler, does not dominate the lives of his subjects, they ought to feel free to follow their own path. However, Lao Tzu seems to suggest that the state’s light touch can include careful manipulation: “in governing the people, the sage empties their minds but fills their bellies, weakens their wills but strengthens their bones. He always keeps them innocent of knowledge and free from desire, and ensures that the clever never dare to act. Do that which consists in taking no action, and order will prevail” (Book 1, Chapter 3).

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The idea of a great state being like a low-lying, down-flowing stream (Chapter 61), which becomes the centre which small states tend towards
- The idea that the state has a responsibility to unite and to nourish its members, freeing them from unnecessary action
- The state led by a sage has responsibilities towards its members
- The great state only wishes to unite men together and nourish them (Chapter 61)
- A state is made one’s own only by freedom from action and purpose (Chapter 57)
- Minimal interference of the state in people’s lives will produce more harmony between people and the state, and between people
- The state will not discriminate between male and female. Female behaviour actually illustrates how the state should behave (Chapter 61).

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Could the removal of personal ambition and materialism result in greater contentment and social harmony?
- Would eliminating passion and self-interest result in a lack of progress?
- Whether moderation (Chapter 59) is a central precept in general and in political life, and whether it is achievable or realistic considering the passions and interests involved in the political life
- Does the inactivity of the state (and its supposed consequence of harmony) assume an overly positive view of human nature?
- Parallels might be drawn with Plato’s philosopher king, in that rulers might not seek power or wealth for themselves
- Contrasts could be drawn with the more directive state and leadership imagined by Machiavelli.

24. (a) Explain the claim that “in order to live in harmony we must not act”. [10]
- (b) Evaluate the claim that “in order to live in harmony we must not act”. [15]

The principle of *wu wei* or “non-action” is central to the Tao Te Ching. It is through *wu wei* that people are able to live in accordance with the *Tao*. Since the *Tao* is unknowable, it is only through non-action that it can be accessed “let your wheels move along old ruts. Darkly visible, it only seems as if it were there” (Book 1, Chapter 4). Acting in accordance with the *Tao* through the pursuit of non-action also has an ethical dimension: “Do that which consists in taking no action; pursue that which is not meddlesome; savour that which has no flavour... do good to him who has done you an injury” (Book 2, Chapter 63). Not only is non-action in line with the *Tao*, and so the way of heaven, it also makes living easier and more effective: “it is because the sage never attempts to be great that he succeeds in becoming great” (Book 2, Chapter 63). Lao Tzu often uses the analogy of water. Water is soft, and yields, yet it is also capable of carving stone. Water flows effectively without actively taking action. Another repeated analogy is that of the uncarved block which maintains potential to take on numerous forms. The principle of *wu wei* is personified in the figure of the sage, who is able to maintain harmony through very gentle governance.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- This question focuses on the central concept of *wu wei* (meaning “non-action” or “no action”)
- *Wu wei* provides a principle for human behaviour that might result in “acting naturally”, “effortless action”, or “non-intentional action”
- *Wu wei* directs human behaviour towards non-interference with the flow of reality
- Those who follow the principle of *wu wei* may become one with the *Tao*
- Adopting *wu wei* can result in a state of inner stillness. This awareness allows you to pursue the path to becoming a sage, as sages appreciate the value of emptiness
- Competition, interference and aggression prevent inner stillness and the appreciation of contentment. Balance and harmony can only be achieved by less self-interest and ambition, less striving and more seeking of inner stillness
- This ideal presents a way in which to approach the problem of achieving harmony in the universe, in communities, and between and within individuals without any need for coercion or oppression.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Does *wu wei* produce harmony or just passivity? Might it result in humans who are uninvolved in their societies?
 - Is living in harmony realistic for humans? Are humans just naturally competitive and confrontational?
 - Is it realistic that people in a materialistic society might give up possessions and be content?
 - Contrasts with Confucianism where harmony is the result of strict adherence to rituals, and the development of morality
 - Parallels to liberal economic theories eg Smith and the invisible hand
 - Examples drawn from historical and modern-day events that illustrate problems with inaction eg the appeasement of Hitler in the run up to WW2
 - Ideas such as the welfare state, which aim to create harmony through robust action.
-

**Philosophy
Higher level
Paper 3**

Specimen paper

1 hour 15 minutes

Instructions to candidates

- Do not open this examination paper until instructed to do so.
- Read the text and write a response.
- Answer both parts of the question.
- The maximum mark for this examination paper is **[25 marks]**.

Unseen text – philosophy and contemporary issues

Read the following extract and answer **both** parts (a) and (b) of the question.

Deep ecology is one of about nine major approaches to our relationship with the world around us that have been mapped out by environmental philosophers in recent years. Some of these approaches have attracted quite a lot of attention in philosophical circles, in the wider environmental movement and beyond. Deep ecology certainly has; for many people there is something quite intriguing about both the name and the ideas with which it is associated.

Deep ecology is associated with three central ideas. The first is that we should ask deeper questions about our relationship with the world around us, and indeed it is this idea that gives deep ecology its name.

The second central idea in deep ecology is the attempt to replace anthropocentric (that is, human-centred) forms of thinking, valuing, and acting with ecocentric forms of thinking, valuing, and acting. This shift is held to flow from the process of asking deeper questions about our relationship with the world around us.

The third idea is that of cultivating a particular kind of approach to our personal relationship with the world around us that Arne Naess refers to as “Self-realization!”. By this Naess means the realization of as wide and deep a sense of Self as possible. Self is spelt with a capital S to indicate that it is an enlarged sense of self that we are talking about, not a narrow, atomistic sense of self; and the term “Self-realization!” also carries an exclamation mark to mean “do it!” – that is, “realize a larger sense of Self!”. But how exactly are we to realize as wide and deep a sense of Self as possible? For Naess and the other advocates of deep ecology the answer is: through the process of coming to feel a sense of commonality with the world around us.

I don’t think this kind of ecocentric thinking came very easily to, for example, the early Greeks, as there is a very strongly anthropocentric flavour running through much of their work. The essence of this general orientation is captured by Aristotle in the *Politics* where he says “Plants exist for the sake of animals, and brute beasts for the sake of man ... Since nature makes nothing purposeless or in vain, it is undeniably true that she has made all animals for the sake of man.” Jumping to the present, however, we now possess an evolutionary and ecological understanding of the world that was simply not available to the early Greek philosophers. Moreover, we also have an ecological crisis on our hands to spur our thinking about the nature of our relationship with the world around us.

This opens out into a wealth of further questions, all of which require, and many of which have been given, much more detailed elaboration. For example: Are there various forms of identification? How can they best be cultivated? What are their relative advantages and disadvantages? Indeed, that is the nature of philosophy, always opening out onto further questions, encouraging the path of seeking, honouring the journey rather than the arrival itself.

- (a) With reference to the text and your own knowledge, explain how deep ecology seeks to change the relationship between humans and nature. [10]
- (b) With reference to the text and your own experience of doing philosophy, discuss the claim that philosophy focuses too much on asking questions rather than on solving real world problems. [15]

Disclaimer:

Content used in IB assessments is taken from authentic, third-party sources. The views expressed within them belong to their individual authors and/or publishers and do not necessarily reflect the views of the IB.

References:

Fox, W., 2000. Deep ecology & virtue ethics. *Philosophy Now*, 26 (April/May), p.21-23. SOURCE ADAPTED.

Markscheme

Specimen paper

Philosophy

Higher level

Paper 3

This markscheme is **confidential** and for the exclusive use of examiners in this examination session.

It is the property of the International Baccalaureate and must **not** be reproduced or distributed to any other person without the authorization of the IB Global Centre, Cardiff.

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 4.

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 in the Philosophy subject guide when assessing responses
- In markschemes for Paper 3, there are suggested pertinent points found in the text extract relating to philosophical activity. The markschemes include suggested questions that might stimulate analysis of those points. It is not intended that all possible points raised by the text are to be covered by the candidates. The markbands direct examiners to rewarding the responses accordingly
- The markscheme bullet points cannot and are not intended to predict how a candidate will relate his or her personal experience of the DP HL Philosophy course to the text extract, so the examiner must be aware that much of the response of the candidate will not be covered by material in the markscheme, but the candidate's response must relate to the text extract
- Responses for part A and part B should be assessed using the distinct assessment markbands.

Paper 3 part A

This task requires candidates to answer a two-part question based on an unseen text. The text will be of a philosophical nature and in each examination session it will focus on either philosophy and technology or philosophy and the environment. Candidates must answer both part A and part B of the question.

Part A requires candidates to explain a specified concept, issue or argument from the unseen text. It is expected that candidates will include explicit references to the text to support their explanation.

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–2	• Little understanding of the specified concept/issue/argument from the unseen text is demonstrated. Philosophical vocabulary is not used, or is consistently used inappropriately. • The explanation is minimal. Points made are superficial and frequently unclear. There are few, if any, references to the unseen text.
3–4	• A basic understanding of the specified concept/issue/argument from the unseen text is demonstrated. Philosophical vocabulary is used, but often inappropriately. • The explanation is basic and underdeveloped. Points are often imprecise or vague, and it is often unclear what the response is trying to convey. There are occasional references to the unseen text.
5–6	• Some understanding of the specified concept/issue/argument from the unseen text is demonstrated. Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately. • There is a satisfactory explanation, although this explanation lacks clarity and development in places. Relevant points are made but lack accuracy and detail. Specific references to the unseen text are made, although these are sometimes ineffective.
7–8	• Good understanding of the specified concept/issue/argument from the unseen text is demonstrated. Philosophical vocabulary is used, mostly appropriately. • The explanation is clear, although may be in need of further development. Points made are relevant and accurate but lack detail. There are specific references to the unseen text.
9–10	• Very good understanding of the specified concept/issue/argument from the unseen text is demonstrated. There is accurate and precise use of philosophical vocabulary. • The explanation is clear and well developed. Points are relevant, accurate and detailed. There are specific and effective references to the unseen text.

Paper 3 part B

Part B picks out a feature of the nature, function, meaning or methodology of philosophy highlighted by the unseen text, and asks candidates to engage in a critical discussion of how this feature impacts the usefulness of philosophy in helping us to engage with pressing issues. Candidates are required to respond to this question making reference to the text and also to their own experience of doing philosophy in the philosophy course.

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–3	- Little understanding of the nature, function, meaning or methodology of philosophy is demonstrated. There is limited reference to the candidate's personal experience of engaging in philosophical activity. There are few, if any, references to the unseen text. - The response is descriptive. Any analysis present is superficial or incoherent. Examples are not included or are irrelevant. There is little or no discussion of different points of view. Where a conclusion is included, this is very superficial or is not consistent with the rest of the response.
4–6	- Basic understanding of the nature, function, meaning or methodology of philosophy is demonstrated. There is some reference to the candidate's personal experience of engaging in philosophical activity. References are made to the unseen text, but these are more implicit than explicit and/or lack relevance to the question. - The response contains limited analysis and overall is more descriptive than analytical. Examples are included but are ineffective. There is limited discussion of different points of view. A simplistic conclusion is included.
7–9	- Some understanding of the nature, function, meaning or methodology of philosophy is demonstrated. There are specific references to the candidate's personal experience of engaging in philosophical activity. Specific references to the unseen text are made, although these sometimes lack relevance to the question or are more implicit than explicit. - The response contains analysis, although this analysis lacks development. Examples are included. There is some discussion of different points of view. A conclusion is included.
10–12	- Good understanding of the nature, function, meaning or methodology of philosophy is demonstrated. There are explicit references to the candidate's personal experience of engaging in philosophical activity. There are specific references to the unseen text. - The response contains critical analysis, although this analysis lacks development. Examples are used to support the discussion. There is some discussion of different points of view. The response argues to a conclusion that is consistent with the arguments presented.
13–15	- Very good understanding of the nature, function, meaning or methodology of philosophy is demonstrated. There are explicit references to the candidate's personal experience of engaging in philosophical activity. There are specific and explicit references to the unseen text. - The response contains well-developed critical analysis. Relevant examples are used effectively to support the discussion. Different points of view are identified and evaluated. The response argues to a reasoned and clearly stated conclusion that is consistent with the arguments presented.

Unseen text – philosophy and contemporary issues

- (a) **With reference to the text and your own knowledge, explain how deep ecology seeks to change the relationship between humans and nature.** [10]

This unseen text focuses on deep ecology, which is one of the pieces of prescribed content within the “philosophy and the environment” topic. It should be noted that in this 10-mark part A question, candidates are only required to explain how deep ecology seeks to change the relationship between humans and nature, they are not required to engage in critical discussion and evaluation. This is signalled by the use of the “explain” command term.

Responses should include specific and explicit references to the text. For example, candidates could make reference to:

- The focus in deep ecology on asking “deeper questions about our relationship with the world around us”
- The shift from anthropocentrism to “ecocentric forms of thinking, valuing and acting”
- Naess’s idea of “Self-realization!”
- The emphasis on fostering a “sense of commonality with the world around us”
- The move away from the Aristotelean view that animals exist for the sake of man
- The impact of the current ecological crisis on changing our thinking about the relationship between humans and nature.

Responses should also include explicit reference to candidates’ own wider knowledge of deep ecology and how it seeks to change the relationship between humans and nature. For example, candidates might include reference to:

- The focus in deep ecology on not just changing the relationship between humans and nature, but radically changing that relationship
- The shift of focus from extrinsic value to intrinsic value; the idea that “the wellbeing and flourishing of human and nonhuman life on Earth have value in themselves” (Naess and Sessions, 1984)
- The idea that deep ecology is different from other types of environmental movements because it focuses on deeper philosophical/ metaphysical issues and relationships
- The idea of the “ecological self” that acts in harmony with nature and is seen as part of nature rather than separate from it.

- (b) **With reference to the text and your own experience of doing philosophy, discuss the claim that philosophy focuses too much on asking questions rather than on solving real world problems.**

[15]

This question invites discussion of what the nature and purpose of philosophy might be, specifically focusing on whether philosophy focuses too much on asking questions rather than on solving real world problems. Candidates are required to explicitly make reference to both the unseen text and also to their own experience of doing philosophy in the DP philosophy course. It should be noted that in this 15-mark part B question candidates are required to engage in critical discussion and evaluation, signalled by the use of the “discuss” command term.

Candidates might explore:

- Why is philosophy sometimes characterized as a discipline that focuses on asking questions?
- Does this question presuppose a particular view of philosophy, or particular tradition within philosophy?
- Is philosophy rightly or wrongly characterized as being more concerned with questions than answers/ solutions?
- The normative element of many philosophical discussions (the focus on what people *should* do/ how people *should* act)
- Does asking and exploring questions have value even if there is no agreement on the answers?
- The differences between philosophy and other academic disciplines; for example, whether there are some questions that only philosophy can help us answer/ some problems that philosophy is particularly well placed or poorly placed to help address
- Is philosophy more of a method of inquiry into questions that do, or should, arise in all disciplines?
- Whether a focus on questions could be seen as a strength of philosophy rather than a criticism; for example, helping to reveal assumptions
- Is deep ecology an example of a philosophical approach focused on asking deeper philosophical questions, a social movement seeking social change, or both?
- The view of deep ecology as a social movement and call for radical social and policy change, including the platform/ principles developed in 1984 by Arne Naess and George Sessions.

Responses should include specific and explicit references to the text. For example, candidates could make reference to:

- Philosophy as a rich source of multiple possible approaches and interpretations; for example, as seen in the claim that deep ecology is “one of about nine major approaches” mapped out by environmental philosophers in recent years
- As a counter to the view that philosophy is only of interest to philosophers and does not have wider impact, candidates could, for example, refer to the claim that deep ecology has “attracted quite a lot of attention in philosophical circles, in the wider environmental movement and beyond”
- The point that a central tenet of deep ecology is that “we should ask deeper questions about our relationship with the world”, so asking questions is seen as fundamentally important
- The idea that philosophical thinking is not static but constantly changing, and that it evolves to take into account social issues; for example, the point that the current ecological crisis is a driver for new thinking
- The value placed on exploration in philosophy; “honouring the journey rather than the arrival itself”

- The idea that discussion of an issue can help to deepen our understanding by leading to discussion of “a wealth” of further related questions, or the counter point that questions can just lead to lots more questions rather than answers or solutions.

Responses should also include explicit references to candidates’ own experience of doing philosophy. For example, candidates might reflect on:

- Their personal experience of philosophical questioning during the course; for example, the benefits of engaging with the thinking of a variety of others who have thought about similar/the same problems in the exploration of the optional themes
 - The idea that philosophy is concerned with a special kind of question, such as fundamental questions arising from the human experience, connecting to their study of the core theme
 - The relationship between philosophy and social movements; for example, drawing on their study of texts such as de Beauvoir’s *The Second Sex* or Fanon’s *Black Skin, White Masks*
 - Their own experience of completing the internal assessment activity and the application of philosophy to non-philosophical features of the world
 - Similarities and differences between their experience of doing philosophy and their experience of the roles of questions and real-world solutions in their other subjects/ courses
 - Different views of the nature and purpose of philosophy as explored in their classroom discussions of the HL extension; for example, the idea that the focus on asking questions is just one narrow view of philosophy and could be contrasted with other views such as Pierre Hadot’s view of philosophy as a way of life and “an invitation to each human being to transform himself”.
-

Philosophy
Standard level
Paper 1

Specimen paper

1 hour 45 minutes

Instructions to candidates

- Do not open this examination paper until instructed to do so.
- Section A: answer one question.
- Section B: answer one question.
- The maximum mark for this examination paper is **[50 marks]**.

Section A

Answer **one** question from this section. Each question in this section is worth [25 marks].

Core theme: Being Human

1. Read the following stimulus and develop your response as indicated below.

Extract from *E Kore Au E Ngaro* (*I shall never be lost*), a traditional *Māori* folksong.

- I shall never be lost
Nor shall I be ashamed
For I am keen
to seek and search
5 from whence I came.
Should I roam the expanse of our nation
Or the expanse of the world
no matter where I happen to be
I shall never forget
10 Most precious to me is my identity
Knowing that I am a descendant of *Whakatōhea**.
I shall not be lost
I shall not be ashamed
because I am passionate
15 in the search, in the investigation
of “Who am I?”

* *Whakatōhea*: the name of a *Māori* *iwi*, or tribe

With explicit reference to the stimulus and your own knowledge, explore a philosophical issue related to the question of what it is to be human.

2. Look at the following image and develop your response as indicated below.



With explicit reference to the stimulus and your own knowledge, explore a philosophical issue related to the question of what it is to be human.

Section B

Answer **one** question from this section. Each question in this section is worth [25 marks].

Optional theme 1: Aesthetics

3. Discuss whether something can be art if no one ever sees it.
4. Evaluate the claim that art is always an end in itself and never a means to an end.

Optional theme 2: Epistemology

5. Discuss whether there are any significant differences between self-knowledge and other types of knowledge.
6. To what extent do you agree that there is no satisfactory response to the claim that it is impossible to know anything at all?

Optional theme 3: Ethics

7. Evaluate the claim that all ethical language is essentially meaningless.
8. To what extent do you agree that virtue-based approaches fail to provide practical guidance on how we should act?

Optional theme 4: Philosophy of religion

9. Discuss the claim that the existence of God is impossible to prove or disprove.
10. To what extent do you agree with the claim that religious language may be non-literal but that does not make it nonsense?

Optional theme 5: Philosophy of science

11. To what extent do you agree that there is no satisfactory way to distinguish science from pseudoscience?
12. Discuss the role of social values in shaping the development of scientific knowledge.

Optional theme 6: Political philosophy

13. Discuss how the idea of punishment poses challenges for the relationship between the state and its citizens.
14. Evaluate the claim that there is tension between liberty and our obligations to others.

Optional theme 7: Social philosophy

15. Discuss the view that the primary concern of feminism is power over the self rather than power over others.
 16. Evaluate the claim that the family is the most influential social institution.
-

Disclaimer:

Content used in IB assessments is taken from authentic, third-party sources. The views expressed within them belong to their individual authors and/or publishers and do not necessarily reflect the views of the IB.

References:

1. Folksong.org.nz, 2019. *E Kore Au E Ngaro*. [online] Available at: https://folksong.org.nz/e_kore_au_e_ngaro/index.html [Accessed 19 March 2022].
2. Kirhagis, B., 2018. *Earth (#1)*. [electronic print] Available at: <https://treasongallery.com/brian-kirhagis-earth> [Accessed 28 April 2022].

