Diploma Programme
Programme du diplôme
Programa del Diploma

Markscheme

November 2018

Philosophy

Higher level and standard level

Paper 2

35 pages

I. QIG availability

The following QIGs are available this coming session for which you can to attempt qualification:

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

II. Candidates who overlook the new Paper 2 rubric of answering <u>both</u> parts a and b of <u>one</u> question

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

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

Overarching principles

The following statements underpin our decisions below:

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

Example

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

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

Q7. (a) Explain Mill's view of the relationship between liberty and utility. (10 marks)

(b) To what extent are liberty and utility fundamentally conflicting concepts? (15 marks)

Q9. (a) Explain the view that morality has a clear and traceable genealogy. (10 marks)

(b) To what extent do you agree with the genealogy Nietzsche proposes? (15 marks)

Scenario 1. Candidate answers parts from two different questions.

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

Action:

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

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

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

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

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

Action:

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

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

Exception – where the nature of the two parts of the question means it is important to differentiate between the two answers, for example the first part should be done before the second part (in maths) or the candidate needs to show they understand the difference between the two parts of the question then examiners should use their judgement and only award marks if it is clear that the candidate has simply made a mistake in numbering their answers.

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

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

Action:

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

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

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

Action:

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

Exception – this only applies when there is no ambiguity as to which question the student has attempted, for example if they have rephrased the question in their opening paragraph. It is not the role of the examiner to identify which question is the best fit for their answer (i.e. which questions their answer would get most marks for). If the given question number is a plausible match with their answer

then the student should be marked according to that question. Only in exceptional circumstances should this rule be applied to sub-questions (i.e. assuming the candidate had mistakenly swapped their answers for Q7(a) and Q7(b)

How to use the Diploma Programme Philosophy markscheme

The assessment markbands constitute the formal tool for marking examination scripts, and in these assessment markbands examiners can see the skills being assessed in the examinations. The markschemes are designed to assist examiners in possible routes taken by candidates in terms of the content of their answers when demonstrating their skills of doing philosophy through their responses. The points listed are not compulsory points, and not necessarily the best possible points. They are a framework to help examiners contextualize the requirements of the question, and to facilitate the application of marks according to the assessment markbands listed on page 9 for part A responses, and page 10 for part B responses.

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

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

Note to examiners

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

Paper 2 part A markbands

Marks	Level descriptor
0	• The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–2	• There is little relevant knowledge of the specified idea/argument/concept from the text. • The explanation is minimal. • Philosophical vocabulary is not used, or is consistently used inappropriately.
3–4	• Some knowledge of the specified idea/argument/concept from the text is demonstrated but this lacks accuracy, relevance and detail. • The explanation is basic and in need of development. • Philosophical vocabulary is not used, or is consistently used inappropriately.
5–6	• Knowledge of the specified idea/argument/concept from the text is mostly accurate and relevant, but lacking in detail. • There is a satisfactory explanation. • Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately.
7–8	• The response contains accurate and relevant knowledge of the specified idea/ argument/concept from the text. • The explanation is clear, although may be in need of further development. • Philosophical vocabulary is mostly used appropriately.
9–10	• The response contains relevant, accurate and detailed knowledge of the specified idea/argument/concept from the text. • The explanation is clear and well developed. • There is appropriate use of philosophical vocabulary throughout the response.

Paper 2 part B markbands

Marks	Level descriptor
0	• The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–3	• There is little relevant knowledge of the text. • Philosophical vocabulary is not used, or is consistently used inappropriately. • The response is mostly descriptive with very little analysis. • There is no discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view.
4–6	• Some knowledge of the text is demonstrated but this lacks accuracy and relevance. • Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately. • There is some limited analysis, but the response is more descriptive than analytical. • There is little discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view. • Some of the main points are justified.
7–9	• Knowledge of the text is mostly accurate and relevant. • Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately. • The response contains analysis, but this analysis lacks development. • There is some discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view. • Many of the main points are justified.
10–12	• The response contains accurate and relevant knowledge of the text. • Philosophical vocabulary is mostly used appropriately. • The response contains clear critical analysis. • There is discussion and some assessment of alternative interpretations or points of view. • Most of the main points are justified.
13–15	• The response contains relevant, accurate and detailed knowledge of the text. • There is appropriate use of philosophical vocabulary throughout the response. • The response contains clear and well developed critical analysis. • There is discussion and assessment of alternative interpretations or points of view. • All or nearly all of the main points are justified.

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

1. (a) Explain de Beauvoir's idea of bad faith. [10]

This question invites an explanation of a central idea to de Beauvoir's argument concerning the oppression of woman. It is an idea that is developed through the works of other existentialists particularly Sartre. It is linked to her critique of both the biological and societal oppression of the woman. Bad faith is the inability to seize freedom for yourself and others. To escape bad faith, good faith has to be established and this is achieved within her argument toward the end of the work by embracing both freedoms. Both the social conditioning and language, which are dominated by man, create bad faith. It is seen in the form of portraying woman as an object whereas man appears as a subject. In bad faith woman is the other. Woman is a subset of man and not valued in and for herself. The escape from bad faith is rooted in the desire by the woman to be liberated and for woman to have "being" in herself. The traditional sciences of biology and psychoanalysis reinforce bad faith. The whole idea of femininity perpetuates bad faith.

Candidates might explore:
- How man has presented femininity as natural
- The idea of being an object in language and behaviour
- The existentialist idea of the other and consequent social interactions
- An analysis of the oppression of women
- Marxist aspects of simply seeing woman as another class; effectively making and continuing the category error
- The link to consciousness of the self
- Cross-cultural traditions that perpetuate the subordinate role of woman in society.

(b) Evaluate the degree to which a woman can bring about good faith. [15]

Possible discussion points include:
- The need to free the self as a woman and the other
- Social conditioning as causes of bad faith
- The need to move away from definitions and therefore to challenge the materialistic and psychoanalytical impositions of the world and how we view sex roles
- The rejection of Freudian interpretations of consciousness and self
- The new science insights in to the nature of sexuality; bisexual, transsexual and "femininity" within a man
- The ways in which language can be changed so as to change perceptions
- The rejection of biological necessities such as reproduction as a defining feature of woman
- The freedom granted in practical terms by more sophisticated birth control methods that allow the woman to be in command of her own sexuality
- Role models in society and choices to be what you want to be contrasted with media stereotyping.

2. (a) Explain the idea that "woman can be emancipated only when she can take part in creative work (production)". [10]

This question seeks an investigation of how de Beauvoir sees a concrete way out of the oppression of woman. A full involvement in economic activity, beyond the activity in the domestic world would allow woman not to be an object in a property driven world but an independent subject with equal rights and equality of conscience. The economic involvement would allow sexual sovereignty of her "self" and stop her resorting to acts of infidelity as the only weapon against dominance. The idea of infidelity would become redundant in a relationship of economic reciprocity. The removal of oppression and becoming free, would move woman to being a subject and not an object. It would allow her to be an "I" in her own right. The links to socialism (Engels could be questioned) in that the socialistic perspective to a degree sees woman as a proletariat. However, her role in the family and motherhood might be seen as the contradiction to this position.

Candidates might explore:
- Types of creative work that would free the woman
- Campaigns to become emancipated
- Whether work can present risks for emancipation, *eg* economic slavery, emotional dependence
- Ways to achieve work place reciprocity
- Ways to achieve sexual sovereignty
- Socialist views on the role of women and their place in society as a whole and more particularly in the work place
- The balance women might have to achieve between mother/family role and economic responsibilities
- The role of the state in creating opportunities for women to be free; equal pay laws, on site crèches (day care for children), maternity rights.

(b) Evaluate the degree to which women can enter into the economic system in their own right. [15]

Possible discussion points include:
- The role of motherhood and family as reinforcing the position of other
- As technology and the work place change, elements of choice appear, if the woman can escape her own consciousness. She would be bound by her body yet must also use her mind to be free from oppression
- Cultural mores that limit woman moving into the economic system, *eg* the role of Hindu women in the rural society
- Inequalities that the economic system perpetuates: Lack of equal pay and career limitation because of maternity in some traditions
- The need to overcome the societal conditioning about the nature of feminism
- The critique of both Marxist and Freudian perceptions of woman
- Equality meaning reciprocity and a new independent consciousness.

René Descartes: *Meditations*

3. (a) Explain Descartes's argument for dualism. [10]

This question arises from Descartes's assertion that mind and body (mental/physical) are two separate things. This is a result of the arguments Descartes puts forward in the Second Meditation and which he brings to a culmination in the Sixth Meditation. Descartes held that reality has two kinds of substances in it – "physical substance" (regular physical, material, corporeal matter) which has extension, and 'mental substance' (ideas, thoughts and sensations) which do not have extension. Descartes stated in the Second Meditation that he "was persuaded that there was nothing in all the world, that there was no heaven, no earth, that there were no minds, nor any bodies: Was I not then likewise persuaded that I did not exist? Not at all; of a surety I myself did exist since I persuaded myself of something [or merely because I thought of something]." The logical distinctions between mind and body are scattered throughout the text, but chiefly they centre on the exclusive properties we attribute to mind – indivisibility, non-extendedness, self-evidence which excludes those of the body. In the Sixth Meditation Descartes concludes "that my essence consists solely in the fact that I am a thinking thing [or a substance whose whole essence or nature is to think]."

Candidates might explore:

- The argument from the self-evidence of consciousness, the *cogito*. Here, consciousness is the necessary medium for the argument, that is to say, the argument is thought itself. So, self-evidently, there is something which thought is (and this is thought)
- Descartes's argument from doubt in which he concludes that although he can conceive the possibility that his perception of his own body could in fact be false, he cannot conceive the possibility that he is without a mind
- The argument from clear and distinct perception and the part of the *Meditations* where Descartes attempts to prove that the mind is without doubt distinct from the body
- Just because one can clearly and distinctly perceive the mind and body as distinct, does this mean that they actually are distinct?
- The wax example and its purpose
- The argument from simplicity which stems from the idea that everything extended is divisible into parts
- One of the main problems associated with Descartes's dualism is how exactly the mind and the body interact
- Descartes's conceivability argument for dualism.

(b) Evaluate Descartes's argument for dualism. [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Descartes thought it was conceivable (that is, something he could coherently imagine) that he could think and have thoughts and yet there is nothing at all material or extended
- For Descartes (and many other thinkers of his time) whatever is conceivable is possible
- Descartes claimed that there was one thing he could be sure of: If he thinks, then he exists (the cogito). You do not necessarily exist, since you might not have existed, and there will come a day when you will not exist but it is necessarily true that if you think, then you exist
- If something is physical then it must be physical, and if it is not, then it cannot be
- However, if anything physical must be physical (as Descartes posits) and he is physical then he could not possibly be some unextended mental thing. But since he could possibly be some unextended mental thing he is not physical at all. Physical substances have to be physical
- Why should we believe that conceivability is a good guide to what is possible? For example, can you conceive of time before the Big Bang? That is a physical impossibility because according to physics time did not exist before the Big Bang
- The mind-body problem: Physical-psycho interaction and if substance dualism is true then commonplace interactions are impossible
- Problem of other minds: Dualism apparently has the implication that it is impossible for us to know anything about the minds of other people – but we do often know what others are thinking, or how they are feeling, or what they intend to do. Therefore, dualism must be mistaken.

4. (a) Explain Descartes's causal argument. [10]

This question is prompted from the Third Meditation where Descartes argues that God must exist as the cause of his concept of God. Descartes states "[…] I would not have the idea of an infinite substance, since I am a finite being, unless the idea had been put into me by some substance which was truly infinite." The Trademark Argument is a type of cosmological argument that establishes God as a first cause. Descartes argues from the existence of the idea of God (the effect) to God as the ultimate cause of this idea. He starts by saying that he has an idea of God as a perfect or infinite being. He then claims that ideas need causes, just as much as material things like tables or chairs need causes. He then introduces what has been called the Causal Adequacy Principle: That there must be at least as much reality in the total cause as in the effect. He argues that God is the author of his being. He rejects that he is self-produced as he would have given himself all perfections. His lifetime consists of an infinite division of parts which are independent of each other; he is thus created afresh by some cause at every moment. If he were self-produced, he would be conscious of such a cause, he is not, therefore some other being is the cause. He appeals to the Causal Adequacy Principle to show that this being is a perfect being as he has the idea of perfection. He rejects the plurality of causes option as God's unity is itself a perfection.

Candidates might explore:

- Descartes's version of the cosmological argument: His Trademark Argument in that the idea of God is not derived from the senses nor self-produced; it is like a mark left by a tradesman
- Candidates might unpack what Descartes means when he states that "now it is manifest by the natural light that there must be at least as much reality in the efficient and total cause as in its effect"
- Descartes's understanding of degrees of reality (as being types of existence)
- The idea of God has two different types of reality: "Formal reality" and "objective reality"
- Descartes thinks that God is needed to sustain reality
- Descartes is a thinking thing with the idea of God: The cause must also be a thinking thing with the idea of the traditional attributes of God
- One could argue that the idea of God is not something that needs a divine origin
- Maybe humans, as Hume has argued, could have formed the idea of God themselves.

(b) Evaluate Descartes's causal argument. [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Although held in high regard in Descartes time it is now discredited
- Emergent phenomena: Often properties appear in an effect that do not exist in their cause Cottingham points out that a sponge cake has many properties not present in the ingredients (*eg* sponginess)
- Even if this Causal Adequacy Principle was accepted, it was intended to apply to physical objects not ideas
- The Causal Adequacy Principle suggests that causes have more reality than their effects
- Something that exists can have qualities but existence itself is not a quality that something possesses. This being the case neither is existence something that can be held in degree
- Kant's argument that existence is not a predicate
- Can something pre-exist before existing? Either something exists or it does not, *eg* issues of quantum physics
- Descartes gives no grounds for rejecting the concept that there could be an indefinitely long chain of ideas
- The Cartesian circle defeats Descartes's strategy of using God as the ultimate guarantee that clear and distinct ideas are indeed true.

David Hume: *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*

5. (a) Explain Philo's argument of the resemblance of the universe to an animal or organic body. [10]

The question refers to an argument that Philo illustrates from Part 6 to Part 8, against Cleanthes's position in favour of the argument from design. Cleanthes's theism is based on the analogy of the machines, which are created by intelligence; Philo's objections insist – among other elements – on the fact that it is possible to find other analogies contrary to the idea of an intelligent design. In Part 3, Philo had already affirmed that the kind of order we experience in organic bodies, caused by generation and vegetation, is not necessarily the product of an intelligence. Candidates might refer to Philo's arguments on the analogy between the universe and the organic bodies, which lead him to state that "the world is an animal" (Part 6) and, particularly, that "the world plainly resembles an animal or a plant more than it does a watch or a knitting-loom" (Part 7). Candidates might also analyse Philo's argument of the mind and how he explains that we do not have any experience of a mind without a body. Candidates might give account of how Philo uses inference in illustrating his argument and presenting the relationship between parts – namely animals and plants – and the whole system of the universe. As counterarguments, candidates might consider Demea's objections: One is based on "arbitrary suppositions", since it is difficult to take as standards objects that are so different in general; the other one is based on the meaning of the processes of generation and vegetation and, specifically, on the "vegetative quality" of the world, *ie* its capacity to sow the seeds of new worlds, which would be a further argument for design in Demea's opinion.

Candidates might explore:
- Cleanthes's theism
- Argument for design, *eg* analogy of machines
- Philo's criticisms of Cleanthes's argument
- Analogy of the universe and organic bodies
- Relationship between parts and the whole
- God as the mind of the universe; possibility to know God's plans
- Order and chaos
- Inferential reasoning.

(b) To what extent do you agree with Philo's argument? [15]

Possible discussion points include:
- The value of using analogies
- Demea's criticisms of Philo's arguments
- Organic life and mechanicism, *eg* Descartes's view of animals as automata
- Mind-body issues, *eg* material versus immaterial substance
- Dualistic views versus holistic or organicist conceptions, *eg* Descartes, Dewey
- Independent and self-balanced functioning of the universe, *eg* entropy
- Hume as precursor of contemporary ecologic theories on Earth, *eg* Lovelock's *Gaia*, Leopold's *Land Ethic*
- Anthropomorphism, anthropocentrism
- Pathetic fallacy.

6. (a) Explain Cleanthes's claim that "religion, however corrupted, is still better than no religion at all". [10]

The question arises from Cleanthes's own claim presented in Part 12 and invites an analysis of the dispute between skepticism and dogmatism and, particularly, of the nature of religion. Candidates might analyse Cleanthes's motivation for his claim, which grounds in the opinion that – as he states – "the doctrine of a future state is so strong and necessary a security to morals that we never ought to abandon or neglect it". Nonetheless, candidates might pinpoint Cleanthes's distinction between a social and proper function of religion and an improper one, that is a religion as a means for regulation of human conduct and obedience *versus* a religion, which calls attention to itself. As counterarguments, candidates might also consider Philo's distinction between true religion and superstition, to which Cleanthes's claim is actually a response. Particularly, Philo states that "no period of time can be happier or more prosperous than those in which the religious spirit is never honoured or heard of". Moreover, candidates might consider Philo's arguments against superstition – as a source of dismal consequences – and those in favour of the philosophical and rational religion: Philo states that "the smallest grain of natural honesty and benevolence has more effect on men's conduct than the most grandly inflated views suggested by theological theories and systems", so making the philosophical religion the proper route to true Christianity.

Candidates might explore:
- Cleanthes's view on religion
- Philo's view on religion
- Proper and original function of religion
- Eschatological, teleological roles of religion
- True religion versus superstition
- Religion as convention
- Religion as source of dismal consequences
- Philosophical and rational religion.

(b) To what extent do you agree with Cleanthes's claim? [15]

Possible discussion points include:
- Religion as a means for power and authority
- Human need for social control, regulation, and obedience
- Examples of good conduct driven by social control, *eg* Bentham's Panopticon
- Religion as a means for genuine spirituality
- Religious institutions versus individual religious experiences
- Theism versus atheism
- Secularization, civic religion, human rights
- Christianity versus Christianism, *eg* Kierkegaard's view.

John Stuart Mill: *On Liberty*

7. (a) Explain Mill's views on individual liberty and social improvement. [10]

In the introductory chapter 1 Mill states: "The object of this essay is to assert one very simple principle, as entitled to govern absolutely the dealings of society with the individual in the way of compulsion and control, whether the means used be physical force in the form of legal penalties or the moral coercion of public opinion. That principle is that the sole end for which mankind are warranted, individually or collectively, in interfering with the liberty of action of any of their number is self-protection. That the only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilized community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others." This basic principle safeguards people's freedom to pursue their own goals, so long as they do not infringe on the legitimate interests of others: Power should not be exercised over people for their own good. Mill defended the principle on two grounds.
It enables individuals to realize their potential in their own distinctive way, and, by liberating talents, creativity, and energy, it institutes the social conditions for the moral development of culture and character. Practically all other positions, aspects and issues considered by Mill in this text are connected to this fundamental statement, which therefore might serve as a basis for the development of answers in different lines.

Candidates might explore:
- Mill's Harm Principle
- A society which respects Mill's principle enables individuals to realize their potential in their own way
- It liberates a mature diversity of interest and feeling, and it nurtures the moral freedom of reason and will
- Therefore, throwing open the gates to talent, creativity and dynamism, it produces the social conditions of moral and intellectual progress
- The Romantic-Hellenic ideal of human life inspired Mill's democratic ideals
- Mill had a long-term vision in which the emancipation and education of the working class could bring free self-culture to all human beings
- Mill sustained that all human beings have an equal potential to develop their higher faculties. This prevents the possibility that utilitarianism might recommend an extremely inegalitarian pursuit of higher forms of well-being as the equilibrium state of a fully-developed human society
- Mill seems to posit that freedom is part of utility and therefore they could not conflict. However, it is clear that freedom and utility can actually be in conflict at times.

(b) To what extent do you agree with Mill's views on individual liberty and social improvement? [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Millian argument remains the strongest defence of any liberalism founded on teleological ethics. It is a resource upon which teleological liberals will always be able to draw, whether or not they accept Mill's hedonistic conception of the human good or his aggregative conception of the good of all
- The one very simple principle of liberty has never gained acceptance
- Whether Mill's doctrine of liberty fits together with his account of justice
- Mill's position on democracy. Like other nineteenth-century thinkers, liberal as well as conservative, Mill felt a strain of anxiety about democratic institutions and the democratic spirit; bad forms of democracy could themselves pose a threat to it by drifting into collective despotism. His advice for preventing this threat was not less democracy but more liberty
- Criticisms of Mill's positions coming from conservatism and left-orientated thought as well
- Are there limits to toleration?
- Mill tries to found rights on utility in a very large sense, related to the permanent interests of humans as progressive beings
- Does the concept of utility really give an adequate account of this permanent interest?

8. (a) Explain Mill's use of specimens to show the application of the two maxims. [10]

Mill initiates in his last chapter the applications of the principles asserted previously. According to him these principles asserted should be generally admitted as the basis for discussion of details before a consistent application of them to the various areas of government and morals. The analyses on questions of detail are designed to illustrate the principles rather than to follow them out to their consequences. The maxims are, first, "that the individual is not accountable to society for his actions in so far as these concern the interests of no person but himself" (Chapter 5). The only measures by which society can justifiably express its dislike or disapprobation of the individual's conduct are advice, instruction, persuasion, and avoidance by other people, if thought necessary by them for their own good. The second one states that when the individual actions are prejudicial to the interests of others, "the individual is accountable and may be subjected either to social or to legal punishment if society is of opinion that the one or the other is requisite for its protection" (Chapter 5). This discussion is intended to clear up remaining ambiguities surrounding his doctrine, and to illustrate how the maxims can be consistently applied. Many situations arise in practice, he suggests, where it is not immediately clear which of the maxims applies. He offers lines of analysis to help how to go about arriving at reasonable practical conclusions in these sorts of situations.

Candidates might explore:
- The liberty principle is not intended to determine the convenient scope of individual liberty
- The purely "self-regarding" sphere, to which the maxim applies, is a minimum domain of individual liberty, the violation of which ought to be considered an injustice in any civil society
- In general, the adequate field of liberty will include more than that inviolable minimum
- Absence of harm to others, while sufficient, is not necessary for individual liberty to be generally convenient
- The helpful, convenient scope of liberty may extend beyond the ambit of the liberty principle, which tells us where the individual has an inviolable moral right to choose as he pleases
- The realm of private action; if by private action it is meant any action (including competitive market behaviour) that individuals are morally at liberty to perform, without interference by others (including government officials), then the proper domain of private action may extend beyond the purely "self-regarding" sphere.

(b) Evaluate Mill's use of specimens to show the application of the two maxims. [15]

Possible discussion points include:
- Competitive situations do not justify enforcement of social rules (legal or moral). Are the harms suffered by losing competitors of a less weighty kind?
- Social control of exchange and production is not illegitimate in principle
- No society which purports to value liberty and individuality can properly enforce slavery contracts
- Legitimate authority to tax sales and limit the number of sellers; criticisms of Mill's views on taxes
- The proper limits of society's police authority
- The *laissez-faire* doctrine and criticism of its application to social issues, which are limit cases, *eg* gambling
- Voluntary release and the permission to break contracts
- Education and birth control
- Liberty to refuse to co-operate and prevention of totalitarian state.

Friedrich Nietzsche: *The Genealogy of Morals*

9. (a) Explain Nietzsche's concept of the "master morality" and "slave morality". [10]

This question invites an explanation of two key concepts of Nietzsche's work, "master morality" and "slave morality". According to Nietzsche, the two types of morality refer to two different kinds of values: the "master morality" involves a reference to the traditional set of values appraised by the ancient Greek and Roman cultures, such as strength, beauty, power, and nobility, whereas the "slave morality" implies a set of values central to Christianity, such as humility, poorness, weakness, and kindness. This would confirm Nietzsche's view that morality is strictly dependent on the specific culture, which it stems from, and that a culture is informed by the struggle between those two fundamental moral structures. Candidates might explore a further distinction: the "master morality" entails a consequentialist ethical approach, which evaluates actions to be good or bad according to the good or bad consequences; on the contrary, the "slave morality" entangles a deontological ethical approach, which considers the good or evil of actions in themselves, independently from their consequences. Slaves morality or herd morality holds to the standard of that which is useful or beneficial to the weak or powerless. Slave morality is essentially negative and reactive, originating in a denial of everything that is different from it. It is inspired by "the most intelligent revenge" of the weak. Master morality, on the other hand, concerns itself very little with what is outside of it.

Candidates might explore:
- The concept of good and bad in Nietzsche's view
- The crucial opposition between master and slave morality
- The way master morality is weighted towards actions
- The way slave morality is weighted towards the standard of the powerless
- The idea of a long historical fight between two different moral structures
- The idea of connecting a moral structure to the products of a culture, *eg* the ancient Greek and Roman cultures and values
- The way in which the slave morality has undermined western culture
- The way Nietzsche values classical virtues.

(b) Evaluate Nietzsche's view that slave morality has triumphed. [15]

Possible discussion points include:
- What is the connection between the master morality and classical virtues and vices?
- In which sense is the slave morality connected to Christianity?
- Is it only Christianity that is connected to the slave morality?
- Is this opposition historically supported?
- How does Nietzsche evaluate this triumph?
- In what sense is co-existence between these two perceptions of morality impossible?
- Does modern morality endorse values that are harmful to "the higher man" and benefit the "the lower man"?
- In what sense are different elements of culture informed by these two moral structures?

10. (a) Explain the relationship between the ascetic ideal and *ressentiment*. [10]

The question invites the exploration of two key concepts of Nietzsche's work, the ascetic ideal and *ressentiment*, and the relationship between them. Nietzsche presents these two concepts in the Third Essay, where he also describes the power of asceticism, which can help an individual to achieve control over pain and despair and reach a full mastery of him/herself. Candidates might explore the role that pain and despair play in Christianity according to Nietzsche and how the ascetic ideal is a way priests take control over them. Candidates might also explain the relationship between asceticism and "will to power", which also implies the concept of *ressentiment*. According to Nietzsche, Christian asceticism does not serve the "will to power", but, on the contrary, results in a sort of hibernation and denial of the surrounding world. Slave morality, unlike master morality, which is sentiment, is based on *ressentiment*. This implies a devaluation of that which the master values and that the slave does not have. As master morality has its origin in the strong, slave morality has its origin in the weak and, as such, slave morality is a reaction to oppression. This struggle between master and slave moralities recurs historically.

Candidates might explore:
- The concept of ascetic ideal. The different possibilities of analysis that this concept might invite
- A brief development on what is opposed to the ascetic ideal in Nietzsche's views
- The concept of *ressentiment* or hostility and the idea of a historical "decadence"
- The way in which historical "decadence" can be traced
- The idea of a strong connection between both concepts and the negative attitude that the ascetic ideal gives origin to
- Nietzsche's suggestion that the "slave revolt in morality" begins with *ressentiment*
- The idea of the historical development of this morality
- The invitation to think in a new and different way as proposed by Nietzsche and reconsider traditional values.

(b) To what extent do you agree with the relationship established by Nietzsche? [15]

Possible discussion points include:
- Is *ressentiment* a historical experience as Nietzsche maintains?
- Is slave morality essentially negative and reactive?
- In which ways does slave morality affect any high culture development?
- What could be the consequences to society if the master morality prevails?
- Could master morality go beyond a limited number of human beings?
- What are the consequences of this relation through time?
- The idea that social practices and moral concepts have a genealogy: Has the author provided a merely historical narrative rather than a philosophical explanation?
- Can master and slave morality involve distortions of the truth?

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

11. (a) Explain Nussbaum's claim that "the Capabilities Approach can be provisionally defined as an approach to comparative quality-of-life assessment and to theorizing about basic social justice." [10]

Nussbaum holds that when comparing societies and assessing them for their basic justice the key question to ask is "What is each person able to do and to be?" (Chapter 2). In this chapter Nussbaum explains the central capabilities, which are the keystones of the capabilities approach. It is grounded on three main principles: It takes each person as an end; it focuses on choice and freedom; and it is concerned with fixed social injustice and inequality. The approach holds good societies should promote for their people a set of opportunities, or substantial freedoms, which people then may or may not exercise in action. Being resolutely pluralist about valuing the approach also holds "that the capability achievements that are central for people are different in quality, not just in quantity; that they cannot without distortion be reduced to a single numerical scale; and that a fundamental part of understanding and producing them is understanding the specific nature of each" (Chapter 2). The answers might take different paths, *eg*, they could refer to other concepts presented by Nussbaum, such as freedom to choose, welfare, political liberalism, pluralism about value and respect, to Amartya Sen's own theory of "functionings" and "capabilities", and to the different kinds of capabilities.

Candidates might explore:

- Human dignity is not conceived merely as a theoretical concept, but rather as a criterion to be fulfilled by humans to be able to live a genuine human life; if only theorized, dignity, is unable to serve humans
- Human dignity has to be filled up with a substantial content and translated into the real life of concrete human beings
- The ten central capabilities: Life, bodily health, bodily integrity, senses (imagination and thought), emotions, practical reason, affiliation, other species, play, control over one's environment
- The concern with capability failures is a result of discrimination or marginalization
- Governments and public policies should improve the quality of life for all people, as defined by their capabilities.

(b) To what extent do you agree with Nussbaum's claim? [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- The Capabilities Approach tries to meet the demands of some, if not all of these ten central capabilities.
- Any policy that aims at putting an end to poverty, injustice, and inequalities must fulfil the requirements of the ten central capabilities
- Nussbaum starts from the presupposition that all people are endowed with capabilities, the usage of which, can guarantee a dignified life
- In opposition to theories that objectify or mechanize the human person and reduces her to a mere human resource, Nussbaum's approach proposes to return to the basics of human life to explore the ways in which human flourishing might be possible
- People often do not make the most rational choices
- Comparisons with other capabilities approaches, *eg* Amartya Sen
- The problem of poverty and its implications
- The extent to which Nussbaum's approach might represent forms of economic and cultural domination.

12. (a) Explain the moral role that nations have in the context of Nussbaum's account of the requirements of global justice. [10]

Chapter 6 is focused on the requirements of global justice. Here, Nussbaum analyses the moral role of nations. Their moral role is securely "grounded in the Capabilities Approach, because the approach gives central importance to people's freedom and self-definition" (Chapter 6). Further she points out that "most democratic nations, wisely and efficiently administered, can do pretty well at securing for their people the capabilities on the list" (Chapter 6). However, today's world contains inequalities in basic life opportunities that are not reasonable from the standpoint of justice. Just as it is not admissible that a person's basic opportunities in life are limited by that person's race or gender or class, so too it is not acceptable that basic opportunities are significantly affected by the luck of being born in one nation rather than another. All the items on the list of capabilities vary to a great extent across national boundaries, and these inequalities are rapidly increasing. The influences that generate them are present from the very start of every human life – and even earlier, since maternal nutrition and health care are a major source of unequal life opportunities. Basic justice requires that a person's entitlements are not reduced by arbitrary features. There is clear evidence of inequality, pushing many people beneath the capability limit.

Candidates might explore:

- Many of the problems of poorer nations were caused by colonial exploitation, *eg* of natural resources which prevented them from industrializing
- Does the current world order make redistribution of resources mandatory?
- The world economy is to a large degree controlled by the richer nations and by the corporations that influence their choices
- Individuals in countless everyday actions and choices form part of that same, allegedly unfair, global economy, affecting lives at a distance
- Do individual nations have a duty to entitle their citizens to a decent living standard?
- Do multi-national corporations, international agencies and agreements, non-governmental organizations play a part in securing the capabilities of all world citizens?
- The need for an institutional solution to global problems; key duties must be assigned to institutions.

(b) Evaluate Nussbaum's account of the requirements of global justice. [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Does the Capabilities Approach to global justice reject some consequentialist thinkers, (Peter Singer's and Peter Unger's), who see the solution as personal philanthropy?
- The extent to which richer nations bear responsibility for assisting the efforts of poorer nations in entitling their citizens to flourish
- Should the governments of richer nations be prescribed to give a fixed amount to poorer nations?
- Is Nussbaum's view too simplistic in trying to remediate the past by redistributing current wealth?
- Other theories of social justice, *eg* Rawls's principle of difference
- Would a one-world government better enact a Capabilities Approach?

Ortega y Gasset: *The Origins of Philosophy*

13. (a) Explain the nature and development of the "thinker". [10]

This question asks for an explanation as to how the "thinker" arises and develops within society. The discussion of the rise of the "thinker" is largely centred on the 10th Chapter, and Ortega is trying to explain how some people would eventually become a philosopher because they philosophized. He sees them initially as something of strangers within society, as they question everything and move from the "outside" to the "inside". They are often seen by others as too clever because they question too much. Once 'socialized' although they might be seen as questioning religious practice they also are seen as perhaps providers of secrets of the world.

Candidates might explore:
- The relationship of the thinker to tradition and religious belief
- The "thinker" as a step removed from prior Ionian scientists as they did not merely express opinions but they challenged every assertion
- The difficulty of being socially acceptable
- The illustration of the "thinker" in Aristophanes's *Clouds* where they were exaggerated and ridiculed
- How the thinker could detect and explain the "savour" of things. This can be seen as having a sense of the essence of things
- A comparison between the sophist and the thinker in their attitude towards knowledge.

(b) Evaluate Ortega's view of the nature and development of the "thinker". [15]

Possible discussion points include:
- The atheistic nature of the "thinker" relative to the religious stance of the populous
- The idea that new truths revealed errors in the old established truths
- The threatening nature of digging too deeply into the nature of knowledge
- The move from many gods, to gods in things, to one God
- The relationship of the new "thinker" to established scientists and scientific thinking
- The fate of Socrates as he is attributed by Ortega to be the first Athenian to publicly pronounce new ideas
- The Socratic stance of having "knowledge that does not know" and the worry/fear the populous might have of this
- The relationship between the "thinker" and authorities, *eg* Croce and fascism
- Contrasts might be made with other philosophers, *eg* Nietzsche's critique of Socrates's shaping of the idea of philosophy.

14. (a) Explain Ortega's views of skepticism. [10]

This question seeks an explanation of the nature of skepticism as defined in the 3rd thought of the First Chapter. It recognizes what has been described in the preceding thoughts in terms of describing how past truths are full of errors. The historical and linguistic development of the word could be explored and how it has lost its true meaning. The conclusion is that because it has lost its original meaning a new descriptor of "investigator" has to be coined, as a person who seeks truth and consequently questions things.

Candidates might explore:
- Skepticism is something that is acquired and not innate. It is not something spontaneous and natural
- How the seeking for "being" or truth might have declined?
- The role of the skeptic to reveal errors in past truths
- "The broken plate society" analogy
- The reconstruction of dissected parts of truth and reality can create a deeper understanding
- The degree to which the skeptic was/is obsessive, whose hope was to prove all things invalid.

(b) Evaluate Ortega's claim that the skeptic is "the seeker and scrutinizer of truths". [15]

Possible discussion points include:
- In seeking truths the "arsenal and treasury of errors" is revealed
- The transformation of errors into incomplete truths
- The skeptic believes something, that is all things can be questioned
- The transformation of the word skeptic from the original Greek derivation
- The value of being the seeker and the move to the seeking of "being"
- By dissecting truth new truths are revealed
- Ortega's notion that the skeptic is a "human drill"
- Comparisons to Cartesian hyperbolic doubt and Pyrrhonian skepticism
- Contrast between skepticism and cynicism
- Nietzsche questioning the western tradition of accepting values and perceptions of reality as valid.

Plato: *The Republic,* Books IV–IX

15. (a) Explain Plato's claim that "in all of us, even in good men, there is a lawless wild-beast nature". [10]

The claim is expressed by Socrates in the first part of Book IX and invites an analysis of one of the central topics of Plato's philosophy: Balance and harmony. Particularly, the claim refers to a specific kind of man who is slave to his own desires and appetites – mainly the erotic love: The tyrannical man. Candidates might explain how Socrates describes the tyrannical man and his nature and consider the difference between appetites and reason, sleepy and awakened rational powers, strong and weak persons. Candidates might also refer to Socrates's genealogy of the tyrannical man in relation with the democratic man, who, moderately indulging in various pleasures, could prepare the ground for his son and his degeneration into a tyrannical profile. In fact, as Socrates wonders, "a man who is deranged and not right in his mind, will fancy that he is able to rule, not only over men, but also over the gods?" Candidates might mention the relationship between the son-tyrant and his parents and friends, since Socrates states that "the tyrant never tastes of true freedom or friendship". Another element worthy of analysis might be the relationship between the tyrant and justice, for a city under a king and a city under a tyrant are the opposite extremes with respect to justice and to happiness. Finally, candidates might follow Socrates's parallel between the enslaved city under a tyrant and his soul, which is also the soul of a slave. As counterarguments, candidates might want to consider other views on tyrants, such as Machiavelli's prince, mention Plato's meeting with the tyrants of Syracuse, Dionysius I and II, and his attempt to establish a moderate government under them, or refer to the fact that Plato links tyranny to a slavery of emotions, desires, and pleasures, while tyranny could be fostered and supported by rational plans or ideologies.

Candidates might explore:
- Definition of the tyrannical man
- Role played by desires and appetites
- Strong *versus* weak persons
- Progress of degeneration of the democratic man into the tyrannical man
- Loneliness of the tyrannical man; relationship with his parents and friends
- Parallel between the city under a tyrant and the tyrant's soul
- Tyranny and justice
- Justice and happiness.

(b) Evaluate the role played by desires and appetites in the emerging of the tyrannical man. [15]

Possible discussion points include:
- Appetites and desires; erotic love
- Appetites and desires as a means for injustice and unhappiness
- Reason *versus* appetite
- The allegory of the Chariot
- Slavery of the city and of the soul
- Positive effects, if any, of tyranny on the development of the city/state, *eg* Dionysius I and II, Enlightened absolutists (*eg* Napoleon, William the Great, Peter the Great)
- Alternative views, *ie* tyranny as a product of rational conduct, *eg* Machiavelli's prince
- Historical examples of tyrants who were dominated by desires or otherwise controlled,
- *eg* Hitler, Stalin, Mussolini, Pol Pot.

16. (a) Explain Plato's claim that those "who see the many just, and not absolute justice, and the like, – such persons may be said to have opinion but not knowledge". [10]

The claim is from the second part of Book V, where Plato introduces his theory of Forms. Candidates might explain the theory of Forms that Socrates presents through the examples of beauty and justice. Plato also uses the metaphor of the dreamer, which is counterbalanced by the figure of the awake, who is the person that "is able to distinguish the idea from the objects which participate in the idea". Candidates might refer to Plato's aim in illustrating the theory of Forms: To describe the true knowledge as a necessary step towards the definition of the philosopher king. In explaining the theory of Forms, candidates might also refer to the distinction between knowledge and opinion (*doxa*), which are intended as different faculties, since opinion is a sort of intermediate element between knowledge and ignorance; so, "opinion and knowledge have to do with different kinds of matter corresponding to this difference of faculties". In other terms, Socrates defines opinion "to be darker than knowledge, but lighter than ignorance". Therefore, candidates might mention the theory of the Divided Line and describe the allegory of the Cave. As counterarguments, candidates might refer to Aristotle's criticism of the theory of Forms, particularly against the idea that knowledge is innate and not coming from experience and against the notion of participation in the idea; candidates might also refer to the dispute between nominalism and realism, consider empiricism, or mention the most recent positions against innatism, such as non-cognitivism and conventionalism.

Candidates might explore:
- Theory of Forms
- Ideas of beauty and justice
- Dreamer *versus* the awake
- Opinion *versus* knowledge; ignorance
- Is justice a pre-requisite for knowledge?
- Being and not-being
- Theory of the Divided Line
- Allegory of the Cave
- The philosopher king and knowledge.

(b) To what extent do you agree that opinion is not knowledge? [15]

Possible discussion points include:
- Opinion as an intermediate element between knowledge and ignorance
- Opinion as a possibility of knowledge, *eg* Aristotle's *endoxa*
- Opinion *versus* truth; subjectivity *versus* objectivity
- Knowledge from sense perception *versus* innate ideas, *eg* empiricism *versus* idealism, non-cognitivism *versus* innatism
- Opinion in relation to belief and knowledge, *eg* Kant's view
- Opinion as linked to hypotheses in science; theory-ladenness
- Verificationism and falsificationism
- Knowledge as agreement, *eg* conventionalism.

Peter Singer: *The Life You Can Save*

17. (a) Explain Singer's view that we should give more of our income to help the poor. [10]

Singer considers that it is possible to do our part in what he metaphorically calls the epoch-making of climbing an immense mountain. He mentions important contributions made by famous and rich people around the world. These contributions in a way have been important but of course not enough facing the importance of the challenge that is raised by the problem. But immense as they are, they are only a small fraction of what people in rich countries could easily give without a significant reduction in their standard of living. As much more could be done following Singer's ideas, everybody should ask themselves what ought to be done to help and Singer wants to convince us about doing our personal contribution. He says he does not want to make us feel guilty. First of all, Singer wants us to raise our standards of ethical behaviour to reconsider if we are really living a morally good life and so to persuade us to change some of our ideas and attitudes by challenging our obligation to those in extreme need. But another goal of Singer's book is to specifically reduce extreme poverty by each of us giving a small part of our income.

Candidates might explore:
- The ethical impact of Singer's ideas
- The dramatic cost of ignoring what is happening around us
- The moral implication of ignoring what is happening
- The comparison Singer makes between death by extreme poverty each year and the millions caused by dictators and the horrors of twentieth century wars
- The ethical attitude of Singer, challenging our moral standards and questioning our "good lives"
- Singer's comment on the money we spend on things that are not really necessary but that could easily save so many lives
- The way in which societies distract themselves with unimportant things while such a major issue as poverty is clearly evident
- The impact of poverty on those that are not necessarily poor but live in a world where poverty grows.

(b) Evaluate Singer's ideas on donating more of our income to help others. [15]

Possible discussion points include:
- The importance of giving as a moral attitude
- The change of attitude that a new moral perspective would raise
- The idea of raising our moral standards by accepting this challenge
- Other approaches to social contribution, *eg* Rawls's principle of difference
- Singer's personal philanthropy contrasted to Nussbaum's nation-driven philanthropy
- Would we feel we are living a morally good life ignoring Singer's proposal?
- The difficulty of giving to unknown and distant people
- The difficulty to convince people to give in periods of economic uncertainty
- The process of moving from an egocentric world view to a more altruistic world view
- Social utility of altruism
- A connection between Singer's ideas and preference utilitarianism.

18. (a) Explain the psychological reasons that prevent us donating even though the cost is minimal. [10]

The question focuses on the psychological reasons why we humans, under certain conditions, do not have a spontaneous attitude to donating. Singer offers some evidence that people can be rationally persuaded to give and he will rebut those who would argue that "it's not in our nature" to give (evolution might explain why we have this natural intuition, but it does not justify us in relying on it or those of our feelings that are based on it). He previously mentions some psychological reasons why we do not donate. One is "the identifiable victim": People will do more to save a single, identifiable individual than they will do to save a group. Singer appeals to Slovic's research that highlights our affective system that is more likely to motivate us to act rather than cold deliberation (deliberative system). Another reason is "parochialism" (people are more likely to help their family, friends, and countrymen than they are to help those living far away from them). A further reason is "futility" (*ie* the smaller the proportion of people at risk who can be saved the less willing people are to send aid). The following reason mentioned by Singer would be "the diffusion of responsibility": We are less likely to help if others who are not in a position to help are not doing anything. Another reason would be "the sense of fairness" (people are less likely to help if they think that that would be doing more than their fair share). A final reason would be "money": As societies began to use money, the need to rely on family and friends is diminished, and people are able to become more self-sufficient.

Candidates might explore:
- The concepts of donation and the cost of donating
- An analysis of the importance of this moral attitude
- The opposition between nature, evolution and conscious human thinking
- The opposition between "affective and deliberative systems", as mentioned by Slovic
- The possibility of defeating or going beyond what Singer calls "our natural intuitions"
- The impact of a new conception that may change what we consider to be human nature
- Might our affective domain encourage the possibility of us donating?
- An empathetic response to those in need might change our way of thinking.

(b) Evaluate the difficulty in developing a spontaneous attitude towards giving. [15]

Possible discussion points include:
- Is it possible to talk about a "cost" when a life is in danger?
- Has society reached a point where everything is measured only in economic terms?
- Why a culture of giving is not easy to be found?
- Why this culture of giving is urgently needed?
- Can we fully trust that our donations are going to the intended cause?
- The efficacy of personal charity *versus* organized/institutionalized charity
- Would our moral attitude be against our natural intuitions?
- Is it possible to educate human beings to develop their "affective system"?
- Is it not possible to use our "deliberative system" to be persuaded of donating?
- Is Singer not making use of reasoning and arguments to make us to be more conscious about the value of donating to save lives?

Charles Taylor: *The Ethics of Authenticity*

19. (a) Explain Taylor's view that we should support a "culture of authenticity". [10]

The question is drawn from Chapter 7 of Taylor's book, *La Lotta Continua*. The chapter begins by restating the idea that the ideal of authenticity "suffers from a constitutive tension". There is the sense that the creation of an authentic self demands creativity, originality and, to some extent, opposition to social rules and norms, while at the same time it demands openness to horizons of significance and dialogue. This constitutive tension advocates that the metaphor for the modern condition is one of perpetual struggle (*la lotta continua*) wherein we must constantly fight to retrieve the ideal of authenticity from its inherent tendency towards degeneracy caused by the more debased individualistic forms of authenticity that lead to narcissism, subjectivism and atomism. Taylor contrasts the idea of struggle with the trend line thinking of the "boosters" and "knockers". This thinking sees the culture of authenticity as either good or bad - leading inevitably to improvement or debasement. Trend line thinking ignores the nature of life in a free society – it presumes an end when freedom implies constant struggle. Taylor contends that "The nature of a free society is that it will always be the locus of a struggle between higher and lower forms of freedom […] I suggest that in this matter we look not for the Trend, whatever it is, up or down, but that we break with our temptation to see irreversible trends, and see that there is a struggle here, whose outcome is continually up for grabs".

Candidates might explore:

- Why Taylor thinks the struggle between the "boosters" and "knockers" is a mistake
- Taylor's belief that people need to be persuaded that self-fulfilment needs unconditional relationships and moral demands that go beyond the self
- Taylor's view that there should be an attempt to raise the culture's practice by making it more substantial to the participants than what they already have ethically
- Taylor argues the struggle ought not to be over authenticity, for or against it, but about it, defining its proper meaning
- Does authenticity open up an age of responsibility?
- The culture of narcissism
- Is it appropriate for a "genuinely free society" to embrace the slogan "*la lotta continua*"?
- Taylor's view on authenticity relies on certain assumptions such as: Authenticity is an ideal worth embracing and you can establish in reason what it involves.

(b) Evaluate the "culture of authenticity" as a worthy ideal. [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- One can reason about what the ideal of authenticity requires
- The worthiness of authenticity as an ideal needs to be placed in context
- If it is developed in an appropriate framework of values
- Taylor never makes it quite clear where his ultimate values originate – is it religion, reason, intuition, or something else?
- Taylor also appeals to the fact that "everybody in our culture feels the force of this ideal" not in its intrinsic worth but in its widespread influence
- How feasible is it that the culture of authenticity can be displaced by a return to religion
  or by the rise of some other set of moral ideals as Taylor seems to suggest?
- Is it not foolish to think that the tide can be turned against the deterioration of the ideal of authenticity that Taylor champions?

20. (a) Explain Taylor's concept of instrumental reason. [10]

The question refers to Chapter 9, An Iron Cage? and is the second of what Taylor calls the three malaises. He identified the rise of the idea of authenticity as a function of the first major malaise – individualism; he sees modern technological civilization as a function of the second major malaise - instrumental reason. What Taylor strives for here, as with the previous eight chapters on individualism, is a "stance towards modernity", a way malaise can be converted into something honourable. Just as he rejects the terms of the debate between the "boosters" and "knockers" of authenticity, equally he refuses to take a side on the debate of whether instrumental reason is a good thing or a bad thing: Taylor's interested neither in singing the praises of technology nor in railing against it as inherently bad. In this chapter he again calls for an act of "retrieval" to find the moral sources that fuel the dominance of instrumental reason. "Retrieving them might allow us to recover some balance, one in which technology would occupy another place in our lives than as an insistent, unreflected imperative" Taylor admits that his position is untenable if we are not really free to change or limit the effects of instrumental rationality.

Candidates might explore:
- Taylor's rejection of all "boosters" and "knockers"
- The validity of the Iron Cage metaphor
- What Taylor means by instrumental reason
- How the debate over instrumental reason parallels the debate over authenticity
- Does this debate lead to contradictions within the positions of each side?
- What Taylor means when he writes of the "domination" model of viewing instrumental reasons; why Taylor objects to this model?
- If there is no way to simply turn the clock back, and there is no way to return to traditional worldviews as if modernity never happened then is Taylor a victim of nostalgic fantasy?
- Instrumental reason is connected to the "affirmation of ordinary life" - reason should be put to the service of perpetuating life and family (rather than being purely unengaged thought for the sake of thought).

(b) Evaluate Taylor's concept of instrumental reason. [15]

Possible discussion points include:
- The moral ideals that gave rise to instrumental reason
- The ethical roots of instrumentalism (just as in the previous six chapters Taylor sought the roots of individualism)
- By understanding these roots we will be able to argue in reason about what is good and problematic about technology and instrumental reason
- Taylor posits that it is only when we lose sight of these roots that we begin to see technology as a means of domination and not as a means to improve the human condition. Taylor provides a good example of this misconception when he writes of instances where modern medicine has lost touch with its essentially humanistic goals
- Taylor does not see the inevitability of the Iron Cage: Taylor argues that to escape the Iron Cage, we must understand the moral ideals that underlie instrumental reason – Freedom and the desire to "relieve the condition of mankind"
- Instrumental reason springs both from a desire for greater responsibility and from a "practical and universal benevolence"
- Some of these good ideals identified by Taylor have been perverted, it might be argued, into the extreme individualism called "atomism" demanding freedoms to hammer upon traditional social ties; and worldliness, materialism and consumerism
- So is instrumental reason animated by moral ideals or by a blind self-propagating force?

Lao Tzu: *Tao Te Ching*

21. (a) Explain the role that the opposites play in the process towards knowledge and wisdom. [10]

The question arises from the content of Chapter 2 and invites an analysis of the process that drives a person to know, make judgments, and gain wisdom. Candidates might refer to the view that "when all the world recognizes good as good, this in itself is evil", because things can be known by comparison of the opposites. In fact, "the hidden and the manifest give birth to each other". Candidates might take into account the notion of the opposites and explain how knowledge proceeds – *eg* by comparing a beautiful thing to another one which is considered to be ugly, and so on. Candidates might also analyse the difference between the knowledge acquired by an ordinary human being and the one gained by a sage: A sage, differently from an ordinary human being, is in harmony with the *Tao* and, as such, is aware that knowledge is made of judgments, which are relative to the human being who makes them, and to the situation in which they are made, as much as they are relative to that which is judged. Candidates might also consider the profile of the sage, who acts and teaches with no efforts, spontaneously, thanks to his awareness and being in harmony with the *Tao*.

Candidates might explore:
- Ordinary human beings *versus* sage
- Knowledge through comparison of the manifestations of the natural qualities possessed by things
- Comparison of the opposites
- Sage as the human being who is in harmony with the *Tao*
- Knowledge as awareness of the judgments
- Relativity of judgments, human beings, situations, and things
- Spontaneity of sage's action and teaching
- Sage's teaching considered as everlasting.

(b) Evaluate the process towards knowledge and wisdom. [15]

Possible discussion points include:
- Possibility to know the natural qualities of things, through moving towards the *Tao*
- The existence and relation between the opposites, *yin-yang*
- Knowledge as a progressive path towards pure ideas, *eg* the Way
- Knowledge as experience, *eg* Aristotle's view or as in scientific methodology
- Different levels of knowledge, the ordinary human being encountering everyday things and the sage encountering the *Tao*
- Relativity of knowledge and judgments; relativism, situationism
- Distinction between knowledge and wisdom
- Contrasts can be made with Locke and Hume, platonic forms or Aristotle's scientific method
- Counterarguments considering knowledge as a progressive path towards pure ideas (Plato), or refer to specific theories, which deny the possibility to know the natural qualities of things (Locke, Hume).

22. (a) Explain the claim that "he who holds onto the Way seeks no excess and can grow old". [10]

The question arises from Chapter 15 and invites an analysis of the "ancient excellence". He who seeks the *Tao,* the Way, becomes more harmonious and grows old. Candidates might describe the qualities that the "ancient masters" possess by mentioning the metaphors that Lao Tzu uses, *eg* "cautious, like crossing a frozen stream in the winter", or "supple and pliant, like ice about to melt". Candidates might also refer to the view that the past epochs of human history are regarded as superior to the present times, not only in Lao Tzu's philosophy. In fact, many cultures share the idea that the ancestors were wiser: Ortega y Gasset's notions of "height of the times" and "fullness of the times" and, particularly, his idea of "rebellion of the masses". As counterarguments, candidates might counterbalance these ideas with the common sense of progress and innovation that have chronologically marked the whole of human civilization, producing significant enhancements and advancements in humans' living conditions: From medical and health improvements to socio-economic and political betterments, which made nowadays life longer and safer than in the past; or refer to the wider space of liberty that the individual can enjoy today for the achievement of his own life projects. On the contrary, in supporting Lao Tzu's view, candidates might also consider the role played by the new media and devices, which nowadays tend to produce an overwhelming milieu of news, sounds, and images, whose main effect is a sensorial and emotional dizziness; the consequence is that people progressively deviate from the *Tao* and get lost in chaotic and disordered lives. Lao Tzu's invitation is everlasting, for it is an invitation to sobriety.

Candidates might explore:
- Metaphors used by Lao Tzu, *eg* stream, ice, valley, mud
- Qualities possessed by the ancient masters, such as harmony, *wu wei*, practising of *ren*
- Comparison between past and present times; the past might offer better conditions for self-reflection, contemplation of nature, spontaneity and non-action, whilst present times seem chaotic, disordered and driven by market forces
- Notion of "Golden Age"
- *Tao* as harmony in making decisions and judgments
- Lack of excess in the ancient masters.

(b) Evaluate whether the Way is feasible in modern times. [15]

Possible discussion points include:
- The status of the elderly
- Wisdom linked to mature ages, experience; wisdom calls for tranquillity, contrary to undifferentiated and overflowing conditions
- Overwhelming conditions of the present times, *eg* speed, dizziness, chaos
- Present times shroud the *Tao*
- Progress as depriving humans' natural goodness or as a source of spiritual corruption
- The changing role of progress in past and present times
- Lao Tzu's understanding of the *status quo* contrasted with modern concepts of progress
- Candidates might also refer to critical views of progress, *eg* Rousseau's conception of it as depriving humans' natural goodness, Jonas's criticism of technology, or criticisms of modern work and cultural conditions, leading to alienation, homologation, and conformity, as in the Frankfurt School's theorists
- Condition of minority or debt of present times, *eg* Bertrand of Chartres's view that "we stand on the shoulders of giants".

Zhuangzi: *Zhuangzi*

23. (a) Explain Zhuangzi's metaphorical story of the ox. [10]

The question arises from Chapter 3 of the Inner Chapters. This story describes a complete process, consisting of three steps (and these reflect his epistemology and specifically what can be known about the world). First, the cook (butcher) recognizes the singularity of the ox; at this stage the ox was the ox as a whole in his eyes. He did not know much about the biological structure of the ox, which means that his knowledge about the ox was just at the perception stage of knowledge of the object. Second, after three years, the cook went beyond the phenomenon of the ox and attained insight into the inner structure of the ox by practicing slaughtering it over and over again. This indicates that the cook's knowledge was approaching an understanding of the object through empirical knowledge. Third, the cook acquired *Tao* of butchering the ox "by spirit." He states "Perception and understanding have come to a stop and spirit moves where it wants". When he acquired *Tao*, it became the guidance of his action. In this story, Zhuangzi not only hints that all things in the world, including *Tao*, are recognizable, but also describes the process of the knowing of all things and *Tao*. The knowledge of *Tao* is the highest form of knowledge, and *Tao* exists in all things. So with this story Zhuangzi identifies the interaction of the mind with the senses and the spirit, and so outlines three steps in his epistemic method: Senses, mind and spirit.

Candidates might explore:
- The intended meaning of the story
- The three stages within the story as being indicative of gaining knowledge
- Identify the mind as a link between the senses and the spirit
- What Zhuangzi's understanding of the mind might be
- The function of the mind as possibly signposted in the story
- The centrality of the story in Zhuangzi
- Whether the story embraces a particular way of doing one thing and so is absolute in doing so
- In fostering *wu wei* (the attitude one must have to get along in life) Zhuangzi is advocating a skeptical outlook on life.

(b) Evaluate how the story of the ox reflects Zhuangzi's epistemology. [15]

Possible discussion points include:
- Human beings cannot reach a complete and thorough knowledge of the world
- Zhuangzi emphasizes the question: "What can I really know about the world?"
- Zhuangzi suspects, but does not deny the possibility of acquiring knowledge about things in the world. This includes acquiring the highest knowledge – *Tao*
- The three steps of his epistemic method as identified in the story of the ox – senses, mind and spirit
- Zhuangzi's understanding of the relationship between the dividedness and the *Tao*
- Is Zhuangzi's perspective flexibility hard to follow if we also accept convention and work for single-minded mastery
- Is the relativism of Zhuangzi informing a skeptical approach to conceptual knowledge?
- Is Zhuangzi's epistemology a reductionist approach that overlooks the multi-faceted nature of the cultivation of skills in the story of the ox and in the text as a whole?

24. (a) Explain the fish-bird story. [10]

The concept of "free and easy wandering" is the title of first chapter of the Inner Chapters. Free and easy wandering is clearly about movement. The fish-bird story and the story about a dove and a cicada appears to indicate movement from, the big and the small, the far and the near, the common and the uncommon, the useful and the useless. There is clear identification with *Yin-Yang* within the text. This moving and wayfaring is not tense or worrying, but rather conveys peace and travelling at ease. How are we to comprehend this roaming and wandering? Zhuangzi does not literally advocate becoming a wandering vagrant although many Daoists have in fact done this. Rather, Zhuangzi is telling us first and foremost about what state of mind, and what emotional state we should be in. This follows naturally from what is understood about *wu wei*. When one views the self as a dynamic being with no permanent or determinate essence, the good or wise person is the one who can adapt to different situations, seeing any particular state of affairs from more than just one limited point of view unlike that of the cicada and dove where they state, "When we make an effort and fly up, we can get as far as the elm or the sapanwood tree, but sometimes we don't make it and just fall down on the ground. Now how is anyone going to go ninety thousand *li* to the south!"

Candidates might explore:

- The meanings and interpretations in the story of Peng
- *Yin-Yang* and *wu wei* as concepts within the Zhuangzi and clearly Ch. 1
- The number of dynamic shifts that occur: The story starts in the north and ends in the south, the fish starts below the world and the bird ends up miles above the world *etc*
- By accepting the *Yin-Yang* outlook and fostering *wu wei* Zhuangzi achieves a skeptical outlook on life
- The importance of animals/birds for Zhuangzi (for example having a more spontaneous lifestyle)
- Whether Zhuangzi is simply turning valuations on their head, and flipping them (the useless becomes useful and the uncommon becomes common *etc*)
- Whether Zhuangzi is prone to exaggeration in his use and application of parables/metaphors *etc*
- Whether Zhuangzi offers a realistic lesson in the uselessness of trying to figure out life
- Zhuangzi's understanding of *Tao* compared to other Taoists, in that he might be suggesting that the *Tao* is reachable whereas others have it as the ultimate aim, or it is a path, a way, not an end that is reached.

(b) Evaluate the concept of spontaneity and freedom suggested in the fish-bird story. [15]

Possible discussion points include:

- Whether Zhuangzi intends for us to think of our life not as a pre-determined goal, but merely to get through life without too much harm
- What Zhuangzi intends when he advocates we accept things as they are and to let the mind move freely
- Acting spontaneously on our natural impulses which for Zhuangzi is "judgmental attitude" that views some things as good and some as bad
- Is Zhuangzi right when he advocates elsewhere in the Inner Chapters that one should not give value judgments?
- Zhuangzi's rejection of the handing down of laws and customs because laws, customs, and rites have a tendency to become determinate and static
- By seeing the world in non-judgmental terms Zhuangzi enables us to see it in a myriad of different ways that are divorced from, and contrary to, the traditional interpretations of our particular culture and thus aid spontaneity and freedom
- Whether Zhuangzi's holistic notion of appreciating the experience of being alive brings about an absence of existential distress or worry
- Whether the advocated spontaneity and freedom is possible in complex modern societies
- This spontaneity and freedom is not something accidental or tangential to Zhuangzi's philosophy but rather Zhuangzi's view of rationality that leads directly to spontaneity and freedom.