

# Markscheme

November 2015

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 Assessment Centre.

## How to use the Diploma Philosophy markscheme

The assessment criteria constitute the formal tool for marking examination scripts, and in these assessment criteria examiners can see the skills being assessed in the examinations. The markschemes are designed to assist examiners in possible routes taken by candidates in terms of the content of their answers when demonstrating their skills of doing philosophy through their responses. The points listed are not compulsory points, and not necessarily the best possible points. They are a framework to help examiners contextualize the requirements of the question, and to facilitate the application of marks according to the criteria listed on pages 5–8 for the Core Theme and pages 11–13 for the Optional Themes.

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

- The IB Philosophy programme is designed to encourage the skills of *doing* philosophy in the students. These skills can be accessed through reading the assessment criteria in the subject guide
- The markscheme does not intend to outline a model/correct/good answer
- The markscheme has an introductory paragraph which contextualizes the emphasis of the question being asked
- The bullet points below the paragraph are suggested possible points of development that should *not* be considered a prescriptive list where necessarily all (or even some) should appear in the answer
- The names of philosophers and references to their work associated with the question help to give a context for the examiners and do *not* reflect a requirement that such philosophers and references should appear in an answer: they are possible lines of development with the emphasis being on *how* the material is used in support of the candidate's answer and *not* whether it appears in the answer
- Candidates can legitimately select from a wide range of ideas, arguments and concepts in service of the question they are answering, and it is possible that candidates will use material effectively that is *not* mentioned in the markscheme
- In Paper 1, examiners must be aware that a variety of types of answers and approaches, as well as a freedom to choose a variety of themes, is expected. Thus, examiners should not penalize different styles of answers or different selections of content when candidates develop their response to the questions. The markscheme should not imply that a uniform response is expected
- In markschemes for the Core Theme questions in paper 1 (Section A) the bullet points suggest possible routes of response to the stimulus, but it is critical for examiners to understand that the selection of the philosophical issue raised in the stimulus, and the two contrasting philosophical approaches that can be explored in light of the issue identified, are *entirely at the choice of the candidate* so it is possible for material to gain credit from the examiner even if none of the material features in the markscheme.

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

Examiners are reminded that in the examination paper it states that candidates are expected to demonstrate the following skills. Since these skills are encouraged within the assessment criteria, examiners should take them into account in their marking:

- Argue in an organized way using clear, precise language, which is appropriate to philosophy
- Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of appropriate philosophical issues
- Analyse, develop and critically evaluate relevant ideas and arguments
- Present appropriate examples providing support for their overall argument
- Identify and analyse counter-arguments
- Provide relevant supporting material, illustrations and/or examples
- Offer a clear and philosophically relevant personal response to the examination question.

In the examination paper candidates are required to:

Write a response (of approximately 800 words) in which they:

- identify a central philosophical concept or philosophical issue in the passage or photograph that addresses the question, “what is a human being?”
- investigate **two** different philosophical approaches to the philosophical concept or philosophical issue they identified
- explain and evaluate the philosophical concept or philosophical issue they identified.

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

Candidates at standard level answer **one** question on the Optional Themes (Section B).

**Paper 1 Section A Core Theme assessment criteria****A Expression**

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

<b>Achievement Level</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>
0	The candidate has not reached level 1.
1	The candidate expresses some basic ideas but it is not always clear what the answer is trying to convey. The use of language is not appropriate to philosophy.
2	The candidate presents some ideas in an organized way. There is some clarity of expression but the answer cannot always be followed. The use of language is not always appropriate to philosophy.
3	The candidate presents ideas in an organized way and the answer can be easily followed. The use of language is appropriate to philosophy.
4	The candidate presents ideas in an organized and coherent way and the answer is clearly articulated. The use of language is effective and appropriate to philosophy.
5	The candidate presents ideas in an organized, coherent and incisive way, insights are clearly articulated and the answer is focused and sustained. The use of language is precise and appropriate to philosophy.

**B Knowledge and understanding**

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

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

**C Identification and analysis of relevant material**

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

<b>Achievement Level</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>
0	The candidate has not reached level 1.
1–2	The candidate shows little awareness of a relevant philosophical issue in the stimulus material that arises from the core theme and identifies relevant material in only a limited way. There is little analysis and few or no examples are given.
3–4	The candidate shows some awareness of a relevant philosophical issue in the stimulus material that arises from the core theme and identifies some relevant material. Some appropriate examples are given.
5–6	The candidate shows an understanding of a relevant philosophical issue in the stimulus material that arises from the core theme and explores two different philosophical approaches to the issue. There is a satisfactory analysis of the material. Examples are generally appropriate and give some support to the answer.
7–8	The candidate shows an effective understanding of a relevant philosophical issue in the stimulus material that arises from the core theme. The candidate explores two different philosophical approaches to the issue in a convincing way. There is a compelling critical discussion of the issue. Examples are appropriate in their support of the answer. Counter-arguments are identified.
9–10	The candidate shows an in-depth understanding of a relevant philosophical issue in the stimulus material that arises from the core theme. The candidate explores two different philosophical approaches to the issue in a convincing, engaging and thoughtful way. There is an incisive and compelling critical discussion of the issue. Examples are appropriate and effective in their support of the answer. Counter-arguments are identified and analysed in a convincing way.

**D Development and evaluation**

- Does the candidate develop the argument in a coherent way?
- How well does the candidate develop and evaluate ideas and arguments?
- To what extent does the candidate express a relevant personal response?

<b>Achievement Level</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>
0	The candidate has not reached level 1.
1–2	The candidate develops ideas and arguments in a basic way with little or no evaluation of them.
3–4	The candidate develops some ideas and arguments but the development is simple, or is asserted without support or reference. There may be some basic evaluation of the ideas and arguments but it is not developed.
5–6	The candidate develops ideas and arguments in a satisfactory way and evaluates them to some extent. There is some evidence of a relevant personal response.
7–8	The candidate develops ideas and arguments from a consistently held perspective. Evaluation of the ideas and arguments is effective. There is good evidence of a relevant personal response.
9–10	The candidate develops ideas and arguments from a consistently held and well justified perspective. Evaluation of the ideas and arguments is compelling or subtle, and convincing. There is strong evidence of a relevant personal response.



## Section A

### Core Theme: What is a human being?

#### 1. Passage from *Beyond Freedom and Dignity*

This question offers the possibility of exploring two different philosophical approaches to the concept or issue identified, and to explain and evaluate that philosophical concept or issue. Responses might explain and evaluate the issues that centre upon the nature of humans and their position in the natural world. It could be that treating humans as primates dehumanizes them. The relations of humans to animals might be raised, as well as the question of whether the existence of the metaphysical characteristics of humans might make them unique within the world. Possible philosophical approaches might be comparisons between behaviourism and existentialism, a religious perspective contrasted with a humanistic perspective on humans. Possibilities might arise to discuss how the issue of self-consciousness and mind separate humans from animals. “Mentalism” and introspection might be contrasted with clinical psychology. The subjectivity of self-consciousness might be developed into reflection on whether any investigation of the nature of humans can be objective. Explorations could also investigate the status of humans within the environment and if they are seen as “gods” the respective responsibilities that would arise with such a status. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Whether humans can be objectively investigated
- If humans and animals are granted the same status, what impact does this have on ethical codes?
- Does the notion of self-consciousness make humans unique?
- Is “mentalism” a myth – a “ghost in a machine”?
- The impact of divinization of humans and its impact on self-consciousness and identity
- Could humans be seen as machines and if so, are they programmable?
- Freedom *versus* determinism
- The differing interactions of humans and animals towards the environment
- Darwinian perspectives on humans.

## 2. Photograph of busy commuters

This question offers the possibility of exploring two different philosophical approaches to that concept or issue identified, and to explain and evaluate that philosophical concept or issue. Responses might explain and evaluate the perceived isolation of the individuals in this environment; the alienation of individuals in a modern urban society might be seen along with the effect of others on how we see ourselves. The seeming lack of communication might be seen. The crowded perhaps inhuman conditions might be equated to being treated like animals. It might be detected that no one looks at each other, are the individuals trying to hide? Might they not desire interaction? Possible philosophical approaches might be Marxist theories of alienation or the oppression of individualism. Ideas of the loss of self might be developed. The exploration of contrasting Western and non-Western views of community and the individual could be used. Existentialist theories of the futility of life and angst could be contrasted with behaviourist views of defined functions of people within urban society and the atomization of people. Similarly, ideas on aspects of the human condition such as action/dialogue, the search for meaning or a critique of modernity, might be developed. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The possible inhumanity of mass human interaction
- Alienation and isolation in modern industrialized societies
- Human living in a world of mechanical, artificial constructs
- The degree to which people have become units of production or cogs in the production process
- The effect of work on the changing nature of the human condition
- The role of the “other” and interaction with the “other”
- Has urban isolationism diminished the dialogic nature of humans?
- Atomization and society.

**Paper 1 Section B Optional Themes assessment criteria****A Expression**

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

<b>Achievement Level</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>
0	The candidate has not reached level 1.
1	The candidate expresses some basic ideas but it is not always clear what the answer is trying to convey. The use of language is not appropriate to philosophy.
2	The candidate presents some ideas in an organized way. There is some clarity of expression but the answer cannot always be followed. The use of language is not always appropriate to philosophy.
3	The candidate presents ideas in an organized way and the answer can be easily followed. The use of language is appropriate to philosophy.
4	The candidate presents ideas in a clear and organized way and the answer is clearly articulated. The use of language is effective and appropriate to philosophy.
5	The candidate presents ideas in an organized, coherent and incisive way, insights are clearly articulated and the answer is focused and sustained. The use of language is precise and appropriate to philosophy.

**B Knowledge and understanding**

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

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

**C Identification and analysis of relevant material**

- How well has the candidate understood the specific demands of the question?
- To what extent does the candidate identify and analyse relevant supporting material?
- To what extent does the candidate provide appropriate examples and use them to support the overall argument?
- How effectively does the candidate identify and analyse relevant counter-arguments?

<b>Achievement Level</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>
0	The candidate has not reached level 1.
1–2	The candidate shows little understanding of the specific demands of the question and identifies relevant supporting material in only a limited way. There is little analysis and few or no examples are provided.
3–4	The candidate shows some understanding of the specific demands of the question and identifies and analyses some relevant supporting material. Some appropriate examples are provided.
5–6	The candidate shows a satisfactory understanding of the specific demands of the question and identifies supporting material that is nearly always relevant. There is a satisfactory analysis of this material. The examples provided are generally appropriate and give some support to the overall argument.
7–8	The candidate shows an effective understanding of the specific demands of the question and identifies relevant supporting material that is analysed in a sound and thoughtful way. The examples provided are appropriate in their support of the overall argument. Counter-arguments are identified.
9–10	The candidate shows an in-depth understanding of the specific demands of the question and identifies supporting material that is always relevant. The implications of this material are analysed in detail. The examples provided are well chosen and compelling in their support of the overall argument. Counter-arguments are identified and analysed in a convincing way.

**D Development and evaluation**

- Does the candidate develop the argument in a coherent way?
- How well does the candidate develop and evaluate ideas and arguments?
- To what extent does the candidate express a relevant personal response?

<b>Achievement Level</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>
0	The candidate has not reached level 1.
1–2	The candidate develops ideas and arguments in a basic way with little or no evaluation of them.
3–4	The candidate develops some ideas and arguments but the development is simple, or is asserted without support or reference. There may be some basic evaluation of the ideas and arguments but it is not developed.
5–6	The candidate develops ideas and arguments in a satisfactory way and evaluates them to some extent. There is some evidence of a relevant personal response.
7–8	The candidate develops ideas and arguments from a consistently held perspective. Evaluation of the ideas and arguments is effective. There is good evidence of a relevant personal response.
9–10	The candidate develops ideas and arguments from a consistently held and well justified perspective. Evaluation of the ideas and arguments is compelling or subtle, and convincing. There is strong evidence of a relevant personal response.

## Section B

### Optional Theme 1: Grounds of epistemology

**3. Evaluate the claim that certainty of the truth of a proposition should be proportionately dependent on the strength of the evidence it presents.**

The question asks for an evaluation regarding the grounds for certainty of the truth of a proposition. If we want to proceed rationally, we ought to examine the grounds for a proposition to be true. Some classical positions endorse a strong foundationalist thesis about the grounds of evidence. For these positions the hallmark of knowledge is certitude. You accept a proposition to the extent that it is certain for you. These propositions constitute your evidence, and you are rational in your opinions just to the extent that the firmness of your opinions is proportionate to the strength with which your knowledge supports them. The question opens many issues to be analysed and discussed, such as: the nature of certainty, truth, and evidence. The process of providing reasons for the truth of a proposition might have three possible structures: 1) foundationalism: not every reason is supported by another reason because there are basic reasons which have no need of further reasons supporting them; 2) coherentism: the process of giving reasons could have no reason that is not supported by another reason, but there is not an infinite number of reasons, and beliefs are mutually supporting; 3) infinitism: the process of giving reasons could have no reason that is not supported by another reason, but there is an infinite number of reasons. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- A formulation of the claim: it is rational to believe a proposition  $p$  just in case it is rational to have a degree of confidence in  $p$  that is sufficient for belief that  $p$  is the case
- One can rationally believe  $p$  even if the specific degree of belief in it, given the evidence, is somewhat higher or lower than it should be
- Similarities and differences between certainty, truth, and evidence
- Notions of certainty, truth, and evidence; theories of truth
- Is it too much to expect to believe very many propositions with exactly the degree of confidence that evidence warrants?
- Types of epistemic beliefs, *eg, a posteriori* or *a priori*, empirical, analytic
- Kinds of evidence (*eg, probabilistic, self-evidence*) in relation to the sciences and areas of knowledge
- What degree is sufficient for you to have confidence in a proposition? It does not seem easy to say. There does not seem to be any principled way to identify a precise threshold
- Examples from the history of ideas
- Examples from the history of science.

**4. Explain and discuss the view that reason plays a dominant role in our attempt to gain knowledge.**

The question is focused on a central epistemological approach to knowledge: rationalism. Rationalism is the view that reason is decisive in acquiring and justifying knowledge. Reason might be understood to be referring to our intellectual abilities in general. To use reason is to employ our intellectual abilities to seek evidence for and against potential beliefs. Rationalism might be understood in various ways. Different forms of rationalism are distinguished by different conceptions of reason and its role as a source of knowledge, by different descriptions of the alternatives to which reason is opposed, by different accounts of the nature of knowledge, and by different choices of the subject matter, eg, ethics, physics, mathematics, metaphysics, relative to which reason is viewed as the major source of knowledge. The term “rationalism” is used frequently to refer to the view which introduces reason as a distinct faculty of knowledge in contrast to sense experience. A way to understand how reason functions in knowledge: intuition is understood as a kind of intellectual grasping by which we comprehend a proposition in such a way as to recognize its truth; in a demonstration we reason through a series of intuited premises to a logically entailed conclusion. Here, propositions known by intuition are self-evident, while those known by demonstration are evidenced by the intuited premises; in either case the knowledge is *a priori*, independent of evidence gained from sense experience. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- If one conceives of knowledge as true, justified belief, then justification requires that a belief be beyond a reasonable doubt
- A version of rationalism: reason is the major source of knowledge in the rational sciences
- Reason might be taken to be a distinct faculty of knowledge distinguished from sense experience in particular. To employ reason is to grasp self-evident truths or to deduce additional conclusions from them
- Rationalism opposed to empiricism, the view that sense experience provides the primary basis for knowledge. The rationalist/empiricist division has traditionally played a major role in the understanding of knowledge issues
- One of the central theses associated with rationalism is that at least some of our concepts are not gained from experience but are instead innate
- The possible distinction between “knowing that” and “knowing how”
- Examples of rationalism in the history of ideas.

**Optional Theme 2: Theories and problems of ethics****5. Evaluate the claim that for utilitarianism the purpose of ethics is the increase of happiness.**

This question asks for an evaluation of a claim that is usually seen as the foundational principle of utilitarianism. In general terms, utilitarians are focused upon the increase of happiness. It is possible to outline a broad utilitarian approach that could argue that the whole purpose of ethics is the increase of happiness. However, this approach might be more characteristic of hedonists rather than utilitarians. Nevertheless, utilitarians and the various forms of utilitarianism would disagree on, for example, the definition of happiness, the question of happiness for whom or for how many, the means of assessing happiness in itself and the method of determining its quantity. Moreover, some utilitarians would argue that the main focus of ethical evaluation is not a matter of quantity, but of quality. Others would argue that ethics is not about increasing pleasure but about decreasing unhappiness or pain. Given the variety of interpretations of utilitarianism (eg, rule, act, ideal, preference, motive, negative utilitarianism), it would be difficult to accept the claim that utilitarianism sees the whole purpose of ethics to be the increase of happiness, but it is nonetheless upon notions of empirical pleasure that utilitarianism is based. Counter-positions which might effectively argue against this claim can be found in deontological moral theories and, to some extent, in the various interpretations of virtue ethics. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The defining features of utilitarianism
- The notion of happiness
- The relation of happiness to pleasure and displeasure; the relation of happiness to pain or discomfort
- The issue of a quantitative analysis of happiness (or any of its equivalents) *versus* a qualitative analysis of happiness
- The different approach to the question of happiness taken by the different expressions of utilitarianism
- The problem of hasty generalization
- Effective counter-positions to any form of utilitarianism
- Whether happiness should be a central feature of any ethical theory
- Moore's objection to utilitarian approaches: the naturalistic fallacy
- The identification of good with happiness as the ultimate aim of all humans makes happiness the ultimate good.



**6. Evaluate the claim that moral judgments are simply expressions of positive or negative feelings.**

This question invites an evaluation of the central tenets of views that see moral judgments as expressions of the subject's feelings. Most central to this view is emotivism and prescriptivism, which both draw on the earlier work of Hume. This view asserts that value or moral claims do not express propositions but only emotional attitudes and feelings. Hence, such views as emotivism are a form of non-cognitivism, as such, emotivism would consistently claim that so-called moral or ethical statements are void of any truth value. This approach to ethical evaluation tends to be much too restrictive and narrow, discounting too quickly the contributions of teleological, deontological and virtue-based ethical theories. While it is certainly possible to construct an emotive approach to ethical judgments which applies the methodology of a non-cognitive approach to ethical matters, it remains necessary to consider counter-arguments. The central views of emotivism might include the claims that moral statements are meaningless, that moral statements only express a person's feelings about an issue and that the expression of feelings and emotions may influence the actions of another person with regard to an issue. Prescriptivism asserts that moral statements are intended to prescribe the behaviour of others. Such approaches have lost popularity as a result of a belief that moral statements are not meaningless and empty of truth value. Additionally, adhering to emotivism would lead to the inevitable conclusion that there is no point in discussing the truth value of moral judgments since there is no point in discussing the truth value of emotions. Approaches such as emotivism might not be able to provide the reasoning, explanation and foundational beliefs that engagement with serious moral issues demands. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The essential features of emotivism or prescriptivism and other emotive moral/ethical theories
- The philosophical background accounting for the rise of emotive moral/ethical theories
- The role of emotions in the formulation of moral/ethical judgments
- The fact-value distinction; the is–ought gap
- The criteria for determining truth and falsity in the field of ethics and morality
- Alternatives to emotivism, prescriptivism, *etc*
- Ways of preserving the insights of subjectivist approaches to moral language
- The issue of moral language being considered true or false
- Emotivism wraps ethics into our experience of the world rather than highlighting its autonomy and so allows for more concrete factors than “God” or “the good” to enter into ethical debate
- The positive role of emotions in a social setting shaping moral judgments.

**Optional Theme 3: Philosophy of religion**

7. **“Matters of religion are like matters of sexual preference: they are not discussed in public, and even the abstract questions are discussed only by bores.” Discuss and evaluate this claim with reference to social conformity and personal religious commitment.**

This question focuses on a traditional key point of philosophy of religion: the relation between social conformity and personal and individual commitment. It offers the chance to analyse the concept of value, its social function and its personal meaning. Beyond the claim, the question refers to historical debates and positions around the social meaning of religion, its historical and human origin and its political function. Hume, Marx or Nietzsche might be important references. Moreover, the question also gives the opportunity to discuss the different layers of religion, specifically with reference to public or civil religions and private spirituality. The presentation of different claims might be structured as the expression of counter-claims and critical views, which might refer to Western or non-Western traditions. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Are values embodiments of metaphysical entities?
- Does religion have a social function?
- What is the relation between personal commitment and social functions?
- Is religion the only space for spirituality?
- Do religions evolve?

**8. With reference to one or more of the philosophies of religion you have studied, evaluate the issue of relativism and its role within religion.**

This question invites an investigation of the different approaches of philosophy of religion and with reference to relativism. The analysis of the historical struggles and relations is an important aspect of the question. Reference to arguments for the existence of God, along with such issues as casuistry, jesuitical morals, Natural Law traditions, permissiveness, and *laissez-faire* morals are possible ways to structure the answer. Pascal, Nietzsche or the present-day debate might be possible backgrounds. The question also gives the opportunity to discuss recent moral issues emerging from bio-ethical contexts, or political issues connected to pluralism and integration, within a democratic framework. Reference to the concepts of tolerance, absolutism, negative and positive liberty or to the relation between science and religion might be interesting points. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Whether relativism is a risk for religious belief or for the practice of religion
- How is relativism connected to democracy?
- Religion and absolutism
- Are liberties and rights safeguarded by relativism?
- Situation ethics
- Are there historical examples of struggles between religion and relativism?
- Is relativism connected to nihilism, atheism, *etc*?

**Optional Theme 4: Philosophy of art**

9. **“When I see a tiger in a picture, I do not feel moved to run away; and the painted clouds in a Monet do not prompt me to check whether I have my umbrella with me. Art is about seeing for the sake of seeing, and realizing to the full the potential freedom of the see-er.” Evaluate this view of the process of art.**

This question invites an exploration of the purpose and appreciation of art. The quote can be used as a prompt to discuss the critical appreciation or reception of any particular form of art, and not just visual art as used as an example in the quote. At issue is the supposed separation of the receiver of art from the art itself and the difference between the representations of reality as mediated by art from other more literal communications of reality, as in the sharing of propositional knowledge in ordinary communication. The quote is suggesting that a view of art that explains it by, or reduces it to, some determined biological or psychological process is inappropriate, despite the modern interest in neurological scientific explanations for human experience. Is freedom, in fact, a requisite for the appreciation of art, or could a deterministic explanation account for human creativity and human enjoyment of creative products? In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Art as a creative human process, and what must be the case for such a process to occur
- Possible deterministic explanations for human creativity, eg, genetic theories of reproductive selection, sociobiological activity
- Artistic communication of ideas and “truth”
- The relationship between the artist and the audience; what the audience brings to art in receiving or appreciating it
- The nature of aesthetic judgment
- Possible functions of art
- Representation of reality in art
- The conception of art as having a social function or meaning
- Art and freedom.

**10. Evaluate the extent to which the intellect should be involved in an appreciation of an artist's work.**

There has been a long association of intellectual and emotional faculties when appreciating the significance, impact, and even the aesthetic qualities of art. Plato claimed that beauty in art could be known only through the philosophical enterprise of the intellect which alone could identify the sphere in which the Form of Beauty resided. Accompanying the pursuit of art as a creative process by skilled practitioners is an equally fertile "industry" of academic criticism and appreciation, as the existence of history of art university courses, or undergraduate degrees in music, or film criticism testify. This suggests that appreciating art is not only a direct sensual experience but it also involves an intellectual capacity that somehow makes the reception of art explicable by reference to more than sense experience alone. Understanding the contextual background of the artist might help the audience understand the intentions or significance of a piece, especially literature or visual art or music which seeks to depict a historical situation (eg, the poetry of the first world war, music in the early Soviet Union). The lives of artists remain abidingly interesting as subjects of dramas or biographies, which suggests that the products of artists are greater appreciated when their lives are better understood. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The notion of the artist
- Aesthetic experience
- Art *versus* craft or design
- The beholder as having a place in the appreciation of art
- Installation or functional art in modernism
- The roles of emotion and intellectual understanding in appreciating art; are they interlinked or separate? Does one come prior to the other in the process of receiving art?
- Art criticism *versus* the production of art
- The creative process
- The artist as transforming understanding or reflecting/imitating reality.

### Optional Theme 5: Political philosophy

**11. “An earthquake achieves what the law promises but does not in practice maintain: the equality of all men.” Evaluate the idea that all humans should be equal before the law.**

The question asks for an evaluation of the idea of equality, which has long been a source of political and philosophical controversy. In political philosophy the idea of equality has been used in two central ways: as a principle of action claiming that persons should be treated as having equal moral worth, and to indicate a desirable set of social conditions, for example “one person, one vote” or a more equal distribution of income. A central issue regarding equality is how one might link empirical or moral claims about the extent to which persons are equal to judgments about the moral acceptability or unacceptability of social inequalities, and how far considerations of equality permit social action to bring about greater social equality. A traditional argument holds that approximate equality of human strength makes it prudent for humans to place themselves under a common political authority, thus producing a justification for equality before the law. The idea of equality needs to be set in a theory of politics and society to have a specific content. No political theory aims at equality pure and simple. It aims instead at specific types of equality thought to be morally or socially important. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Equality of worth is a principle recognized in many philosophical traditions, but its broad acceptance leaves open many problems of interpretation, eg, how far the principle calls for greater equality of social conditions
- The idea that one should treat persons with due respect is an important part of common sense morality
- Aristotle remarked that disputes over equality and inequality were generally behind conflict within states. Nowadays in topics as diverse as the distribution of income and wealth, access to public services, the distribution of work and employment opportunities, the political representation of different social groups and the control of natural resources among nations, the issue of equality plays a central and controversial role
- The idea of equality might be found in many traditions and positions: religious traditions, including Jewish and Christian political thought, the Stoic tradition, the Confucianism associated with Mencius, currents of thought within Islam, and groups separated from Hinduism. Associated with contemporary liberal political thought this idea has also found a place both in its utilitarian and its Kantian variants
- John Rawls and the opposite view of some libertarians who have claimed that equalization will require practices of redistribution that in effect treat the wealthy as mere means to the attainment of some social goal, in a way that is inconsistent with the respect for persons that the principle of equal worth requires
- A direct challenge to equality: goods have to be distributed in proportion to the merits of those receiving them
- The challenge to the principle coming from the appeal to the notion of difference: equality implies a uniformity of treatment, whereas interests in society are in fact plural. Thus, instead of basing public decision-making on the principle of one person, one vote, a principle of difference would require some groups to be given a special say in certain matters of public policy, for example women a veto over changes to the law on abortion. In what ways can laws legislate equality?
- Equal treatment *versus* equal regard.

**12. Explain and discuss what makes government legitimate.**

The question asks for an explanation and discussion of the central concept of political legitimacy. Legitimacy refers to the rightfulness of a power holder or system of rule. Questions about what makes government rightful and legitimate have been central issues of philosophical debate since ancient Greece. The significance of legitimacy lies in the moral grounds for obedience, which follow for subjects where power is rightfully acquired and exercised, and in the depth of loyalty which such political authorities can call upon. A necessary condition of legitimacy is that power should be acquired and exercised according to established rules, whether these are conventionally or legally defined. However, legal validity cannot be a sufficient condition of legitimacy, since both the rules and the power exercised under them also have to be morally justifiable. Usually two criteria for moral justifiability are identified: (1) political power should derive from a rightful source of authority; (2) it should satisfy the rightful ends or purposes of government. Most philosophical disputes about legitimacy take place either within or between these two broad positions. However, an adequate account of it should hold both. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The source and the ends of political authority were brought together in the early modern period by theorists of the social contract, such as Hobbes and Locke
- Historically, claims made for the rightful source of political authority have been enormously diverse, including: divine authority, mediated *via* religious doctrine and its interpreters; tradition and the principle of continuity with a society's past; some infallible truth about society's future destiny and its chosen agents; and the people as a whole, and the principle of popular sovereignty; *cf* the account of Weber
- Legitimate authority is one that realizes the law-given rights of and reason for government – whether government exists to guarantee basic societal needs for security and subsistence; whether they realize some ideal conception of the good society and virtuous citizenship; or protect specified individual rights
- The performance criterion of legitimacy establishes a standard against which individual rulers or regimes can be assessed
- Political legitimacy primarily refers to the authority of the state. Features which distinguish the authority of the state; the state claims and enforces compulsory jurisdiction over everyone within its territory; the authority of the state is always serious, and it regulates the most vital interests of everyone within its territory; political authority claims to impose obligations of obedience
- Social contract theory, government was a product of conscious human artifice; its legitimacy is derived from its authorization by the people themselves
- The view of the social contract as purely hypothetical: it is a device for establishing what social and political arrangements people would agree to, if they could imagine themselves ignorant of the social positions they would occupy or the individual characteristics and preferences they might possess. What makes government legitimate on this view is not its actual authorization by the people, but its conformity to standards which they would authorize if they were truly impartial
- Anarchists deny that political authority is justifiable at all
- Some religions claim that all political authority is ordered by God, eg, theocracy.

**Optional Theme 6: Non-Western traditions and perspectives**

- 13. With reference to one or more of the non-Western traditions you have studied, evaluate the distinction between, and meaning of, living beings and non-living objects.**

This question offers the possibility of evaluating and discussing the relation between living and non-living objects within one or more non-Western traditions, the role they play, the meaning they are given, and any reference to spirituality. Moreover, the question focuses on the scope of animate and inanimate worlds, their social and spiritual function and personal commitment to them. Presentation of different traditions and possible comparisons could be used in response to the question. The analysis of several concepts and philosophical categories, such as liberty, will, necessity, nature, existence, divinity, death, *etc*, might be another level of structuring the response. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- How important is the inanimate world in one or more non-Western traditions?
- Animism, fetishism, pantheism, *etc*
- What are the meanings given to nature?
- The role of *karma* in the cosmos
- What is the relation between human beings and animals?
- Are non-living objects treated as living or considered to be holy?
- Are there any references to afterlife?
- Specific roles played by soul and meanings given to it
- Connections with magic.



- 14. With reference to one or more of the non-Western traditions you have studied, evaluate the possible political and economic relations with other cultures and societies, especially considering liberty, equality and civil rights.**

This question focuses on the relation between non-Western traditions and Western societies. It also calls for a specific analysis of the differences on political and economic grounds, *eg*, civil and political rights, forms of government, individual liberties, private property, social equality or inequality, taxation. Moreover, the question invites a historical reconstruction of a possible rate of change. Another reference might be the historical, military, and diplomatic relation between two or more different traditions. A philosophical analysis might insist on the consequences of different developments and social organizations on individual growth, *eg*, education, socialization, values construction, free information, circulation of ideas and opinions, social openness. Finally, an interesting consideration might refer to the examples of deterioration and pejoration of some conditions of a non-Western society after establishing contact with a Western culture: this point might refer to the most recent themes of some neo-Marxist theorists of dependence, such as Dos Santos. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Are there possibilities of economic development in non-Western societies?
- The concept of modernity in non-Western (and Western) societies
- Is capitalism the only possible economic organization for developing societies?
- What is the role played by civil rights and individual liberties in the non-Western traditions?
- Is a connection to Western societies a way for the amelioration or pejoration of non-Western societies?

**Optional Theme 7: Contemporary social issues****15. Evaluate the claim that stratification (the ranking of different groups dependent on status) of a society is both inevitable and desirable.**

This question invites an evaluation of both the advantages and disadvantages of the factors that make humans group together in distinct units. The notion of inevitability implies that such structuring might be a natural type of human behaviour. Desirability might be seen in that such behaviour and organization brings particular advantages. The stratification might be related to shared values and/or perhaps a perceived need of order, stability and cooperation. Variations in values might mean that hierarchies might change over time. The notion of the right and properness of stratification opens up possibilities as to whether stratification defines and/or limits human rights and opportunities within a society. Foundationalist approaches would argue that stratification is inevitable due to the need for even the simplest societal models to have order, division of labour and direction in order to survive. A Marxist approach would put a case that such divisions generate alienation and encourage exploitation, leading to conflict and possible re-stratification. A market-driven perspective would see stratification as efficiency. Counter-positions could explore the consequences of perhaps a lack of social mobility, inequality of power and prestige and the effects of these on individuals and groups. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- A Marxist interpretation implies that such stratification would lead to conflict; how far is this a correct interpretation of the human condition?
- What criteria might be used to stratify society?
- Does the desirability of stratification depend on the economic base of the society and/or its cultural makeup?
- Factors that drive stratification, eg, education, distribution of wealth, class identity through birth
- The notion of an ideal society, eg, Plato's *The Republic*, More's *Utopia*
- Are knowledge-based societies likely to be stratified more or less than an agrarian or industrialized society?

**16. Evaluate the claim that the government of a state has a duty to grant equality to all members of its community.**

This question explores the concepts of duty and equality in relation to the government of a state. In evaluating this claim the issues of duty and implied moral responsibility might be developed. There could be an issue of defining types of rights and equality to be granted and to whom. Should all sections of society and members be granted the same rights? How are rights conferred? Answers might develop a variety of examples eg, a Rawlsian approach related to rights and opportunities, contrasted with Nozick's libertarian emphasis, or classic traditions such as Hobbes and Locke. International law and the UN declarations relating to rights might be explored in the context of whether outside agencies can require government to exercise such a duty.

The removal of rights from certain groups might also be explored in a context of security and the duty of the state to protect. Evaluations might also conclude that such intrusiveness and paternalism are beyond the duty of the state. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- How much does the duty of the state hinge upon a particular perspective of the nature of humans?
- Social justice, politics and equality
- Gender equality
- Rights and responsibilities
- Plato's opposition to equality in the state
- Do rights reflect a cultural heritage or are they universal?
- How far is it reasonable to restrict rights to equality; issues related to those who cannot be held responsible for action such as the young or insane?
- Could rights not be granted to those who are not citizens of the state?
- Do all members of a society possess a right to equality by default?
- Should equality be granted and upheld across state borders, thereby interfering with the sovereignty of a state?

**Optional Theme 8: People, nations and cultures****17. Evaluate the view that a nation can be defined as “a daily referendum dependent on the will of its people to continue living together”.**

This question explores the concept of the nation. Since the time of this quote there have been many imitations of this famous depiction of what the nation is. AC Grayling thinks the concept of the nation is an artificial construct and is often linked to conflicts of the past. He observes that nation states contain several co-existing cultures and concludes that, “cultural heritage is not the same thing as national identity”. What can be said to constitute the nation state? Is it primarily a political union and how can this be understood in different political systems operating at the same point in time? How vital are geographical borders or a shared historical narrative – and how reliable is our understanding of a shared history or where borders should be? A helpful reference might be B Anderson’s concept of “imagined communities” and the related “nation-ness”. The will of the people was worked on by Rousseau and discussed by Mill in their works exploring the relationship between the citizen and the state. Since their time, technological communication and a decline in shared religion greatly liberate the forces that bind communities living together. The question invites a critical exploration of the role that history, tradition, language, politics, culture and other shared narratives come together to bring an identity under the title, “nation”. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Are the shared narratives of a nation reliably recollected? Is it important that they should be so?
- How critical is the responsiveness to the will of the people to the functioning of a nation state?
- Are democracies the only way that the will of the people can be heard? Are democracies possible?
- How do supra-national identities (eg, European, Native American, Latin American) emerge and continue?
- Sub-groups within nations
- The role of religion in sustaining national identity
- Myths and “useful” narratives
- The role of combat and defence as a means of underpinning national borders, identities and allegiances
- Internationalism.

**18. Evaluate the grounds on which a member of one culture might claim to be able to judge the practices of another.**

This question relates to the criteria that any person might use when judging the behaviour, values and traditions exemplified in another culture. This is not so much about nationalism as testing whether there are any grounds – objective or otherwise – on which a person from one culture can legitimately make judgments about another. Such judgments do not just imply an interest in difference between practices and values, but the possibility of a superiority or inferiority concluded by the observer. How are such judgments made? Are such judgments indeed feasible given the essential links to culture that every person has and the inability of any human to make a judgment from a culturally neutral position? Issues such as cultural relativism or absolutism may be discussed as might the issue of multiculturalism which itself offers a view of the comparative worth of different cultures. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Cultural superiority / inferiority: what criteria could we use to make such judgments?
  - What are we judging when we judge another culture?
  - The role of disgust – psychological / moral / religious – and offence in forming judgments
  - Colonialism and the possession of artifacts of one culture by a dominant, ruling class/nation
  - Objective grounds for judgment *versus* subjective anthropological perspectives
  - Ethnocentrism
  - The debate between socio-biologists and Marxists in interpretations of the human condition and influence on culture
  - Anthropological fact *versus* value conclusions – deriving normative conclusions from descriptive information
  - What, if any, conditions or situations might justify the member of one culture judging the practices of another?
  - To what extent are such judgments of superiority also accompanied and backed in practice by regimes of colonialism, occupation, imperialism, invasion, direct or indirect rule?
-