

# Markscheme

November 2015

Philosophy

Higher level and standard level

Paper 2

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

It is the property of the International Baccalaureate and must **not** be reproduced or distributed to any other person without the authorization of the IB 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 5–7.

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 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 central in a text to an expected response by the candidate and examiners can use the markscheme to be aware of centrally relevant material.

**A reminder of candidate requirements for paper 2:**

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, and demonstrate an understanding of the author's specific terminology
- Show an understanding of the specific demands of the question
- Give references to the ideas and arguments presented in the text
- Present appropriate examples providing support for their overall argument
- Identify and analyse counter-arguments
- Provide relevant supporting material, illustrations and/or examples
- Develop a critical evaluation of the ideas and arguments of the text
- Offer a clear and philosophically relevant personal response to the position expressed by the author.

Candidates at both higher level and standard level answer **one** question.

**Paper 2 assessment criteria****A Expression**

- Has the candidate presented ideas in an organized way?
- How clear and precise is the language used by the candidate?
- To what extent is the language appropriate to philosophy?
- To what extent has the candidate understood the author's use of specific terminology?

<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 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. The candidate shows some understanding of the author's use of specific terminology but only in a limited way.
3	The candidate presents ideas in an organized way and the answer can be easily followed. The use of language is appropriate to philosophy and the author's use of specific terminology is satisfactorily understood.
4	The candidate presents ideas in an organized and coherent way and insights are clearly articulated. The use of language is effective and appropriate to philosophy. The candidate shows a clear understanding and use of the author's specific terminology.
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. The candidate shows an assured understanding and use of the author's specific terminology.

**B Knowledge and understanding of the text**

- How well does the candidate know the text?
- To what extent has the candidate understood the author's ideas, arguments and key concepts?

<b>Achievement Level</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>
0	The candidate has not reached level 1.
1	The candidate demonstrates a superficial knowledge of the text and there is only a basic understanding of the author's ideas, arguments and key concepts.
2	The candidate demonstrates some knowledge of the text, with a limited understanding of the author's ideas, arguments and key concepts.
3	The candidate demonstrates satisfactory knowledge of the text and the author's ideas, arguments and key concepts are satisfactorily understood. There is some insight into the author's arguments.
4	The candidate demonstrates a good knowledge of the text and the author's ideas, arguments and key concepts are clearly understood. The candidate is able to show an understanding of some of the more difficult or subtle points of the author's arguments.
5	The candidate demonstrates that the text has been thoroughly and carefully read. The candidate shows an in-depth understanding of the author's arguments, with a close attention to detail.

**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?
- How effectively does the candidate analyse the supporting material, examples and 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 given.
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 used.
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. Examples are appropriate and give some support to the 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. Examples are appropriate in their support of the overall argument. Some 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. Examples 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 the ideas and arguments of the text?
- 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 and there is little or no evaluation of the text.
3–4	The candidate develops some ideas and arguments but the development is simple, or is asserted without reference to the text. There may be some basic evaluation of the ideas and arguments of the text but it is not developed.
5–6	The candidate develops ideas and arguments in a satisfactory way and evaluates them to some extent. A limited critique of the ideas and arguments of the text is offered. There is some evidence of a relevant personal response.
7–8	The candidate develops ideas and arguments from a consistently held perspective, in close response to the ideas and arguments of the text. Evaluation is thoughtful and convincing and the candidate offers a critique of the text that goes beyond a statement of opinion or belief. There is good evidence of a relevant personal response.
9–10	The candidate develops ideas and arguments in an incisive and coherent way in detailed response to the text. Evaluation is compelling or subtle, and convincing, and the candidate offers a critique of the text that shows strong evidence of a relevant personal response. The candidate shows an ability to challenge the assumptions made by the author and explores different approaches to the text.

***Bhagavad Gita*****1. Explain and discuss the different meanings of *dharma* and its relation to heroism and war.**

This question focuses on a central concept of the *Bhagavad Gita*, which gives the opportunity to analyse other connected concepts, such as heroism, war, and the warrior. The question invites an explanation of the different meanings of the concept of *dharma* and its several uses in the text. The question especially calls for a philosophical analysis of the moral consequences of the concept of *dharma* connected to the concept of duty and right. Finally, the question gives an opportunity to investigate the properties and relationship between Arjuna and Krishna. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Possible meanings of *dharma* include duty, responsibility, spiritual knowledge for understanding duty
- Whether *dharma* is connected to war and struggle
- The different external and internal interpretations of heroism and war
- Whether duty is linked to personal or communal sacrifice
- The relationship between *dharma* and heroism
- The relationship between Arjuna and Krishna.



**2. Evaluate the meaning of *yoga* and its different types and functions.**

This question seeks an evaluation of the concept of *yoga*, which is expressed in different ways, showing that it has different meanings and is referred to in different parts of the *Bhagavad Gita*. Therefore, the question invites the explanation of the concept and the evaluation of the difference and meanings of the different types of *yoga*. Moreover, the references to the role of action, the presence of God, and the meaning of wisdom are important key points. The analysis might also refer to the concept of liberation (*moksa*), which *yoga* refers to as the consequent way to the union with ultimate reality. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The meaning of *yoga* is expressed in different ways in the text, eg, “archetypal light fuelled by love”, “sacrifice that elevates and motivates”, “a journey that does not end with death”
- The relationship between *yoga* and God
- Whether *yoga* concerns wisdom and knowledge
- The influence of *yoga* on individuals and communities
- The connection between *yoga* and *moksa* (liberation).

**Confucius: *The Analects*****3. Evaluate the extent to which the emphasis on moral refinement as the primary purpose of education presents a conservative picture of education in *The Analects*.**

This question explores a central theme of *The Analects* and enables a consideration of the emphasis Confucius places on his account of education, and any contradictions of philosophical issues that arise from this. One scholar has identified Confucius's essential liberalism in his disdain for formal teaching while encouraging a love of learning for its own sake. But is this a contradiction? In placing such value on the imitation of wise practices conferred through learning tradition and proper ritual practice from the wise teacher, is Confucius actually encouraging an authoritarian view asking individuals to submit their independence to support the practices of the past? Is the love of moderation that is encouraged in Chun Tzu (the gentleman) an anti-educational message? Are practical wisdom and theoretical understanding incompatible? The reference to the past as the basis for learning does not strike the reader as a liberal educational message, and yet the example of Confucius and his emphasis on ethics and wisdom make learning and education central themes of the work. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The role of the teacher and the role of the student; what makes the teacher and the student good at their roles?
- The emphasis on integrity and character in the gentleman; does this make the acquisition of knowledge seem of secondary importance?
- The importance of looking to the past in Confucius's vision of learning
- In his treatment of *ren*, Confucius refuses to offer the definitions his students seek, rather, he teaches instead by offering illustration and example
- Conceptual wisdom *versus* practical wisdom
- Does excellence in any particular activity militate against the vision of learning encouraged by Confucius?

**4. Evaluate the use of familial relations as an essential part of encouraging good rapports in society.**

In *The Analects* there is a central theme that good familial relations, especially in the notion of filial piety, supply the framework for a virtuous society. Not only is society generally improved when proper familial relations are established, but also government itself is positively affected. Is the analogy, which moves from individual relations to relations between large numbers of people, a sound one? The familial relations, which serve as an example, revolve around the respect for the father figure by sons, and these relations have a virtuous, almost religious, quality summed up in the phrase “filial piety”. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The role of *li* and *ren* in encouraging virtuous character and in guaranteeing good relations in the family and society
- Submitting to *li* involves living in proper relations with one’s family, suppressing the individual desires and needs in favour of living in the family unit and serving the needs of the group
- *Li* governs relations in the small family unit while *ren* applies more widely in general society
- Are there echoes of the primacy of respect for one’s elders in modern day societies? Are there societies where there is an inverse of this teaching? How do you judge in the modern age your preference for tradition or modernity?
- The essential references seem to relate to father–son relations; can this be a barrier when applying the teaching of *The Analects* today?
- What happens to gender relations in this scheme? What about mother–daughter relations?
- Does the teaching on familial relations encourage the establishment of differences between people based on age or relationship, as opposed to harmony and equality?

## Lao Tzu: *Tao Te Ching*

### 5. “The Taoist sage exercises non-intrusive or non-interfering action in the government of the empire.” Discuss and evaluate.

The question asks for a discussion and evaluation of the way of government proposed by the Taoist sage, an evaluation of the conduct and ideals related to the sage, and an exploration of the political implications of the *Tao Te Ching*. When a person who follows the *Tao* attains an administrative or advisory position in government, the *Tao* he possessed would inform the policies he promoted, and above all his leadership style. Those whose *wu wei* may become one with the *Tao* would be the sages. The sages (*sheng ren*) act naturally (*wu wei*) (chs 2, 63). They are like newborn infants, who move without planning and reliance on the structures given to them by others (ch 15). Sages empty themselves, becoming void of simulation. Sages concentrate their internal energies (*qi*). They live naturally and are free from desires given by men (ch 37). They settle themselves and know how to be content (ch 46). The *Tao* as the highest reality gave whoever possessed it the spiritual status of pattern for the world. As a distinctive feature, the *Tao Te Ching* presents a profound union of spiritual and political interests, which might be illustrated by the image of the uncarved block. It symbolizes the original state of man and represents the ruler. The ruler must keep the people in a state like the uncarved block. To keep the people free from their desires, the ruler must be aware of his own. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- How the *Tao Te Ching* gives advice about how to rule, probably reflecting its origins in a group of *shi* (men aspiring to administrative or advisory positions in government)
- What makes a great state is its being like a low-lying, downward-flowing stream; it becomes the centre to which tend all the small states under heaven. This might be illustrated by the case of all females: the female always overcomes the male by her stillness (ch 61)
- Those following the *Tao* do not strive, tamper, or seek control (ch 64). The rulers should govern the state without resorting to action, *ie*, acting naturally. The sages know the value of emptiness as illustrated by how emptiness is used in a bowl, door, window, valley or canyon (ch 11). They preserve the female (*yin*), meaning that they know how to be receptive and are not unbalanced favouring assertion and action (*yang*) (ch 28). They shoulder *yin* and embrace *yang*, blend internal energies (*qi*) and thereby attain harmony (*he*) (ch 42)
- In which sense should we understand “doing nothing” as a way of ruling society? The text states that in “doing nothing” one could “accomplish everything”. Is this paradox a problem or an advantage?
- The behaviour of the sage-ruler seems to involve contradictions. He seems quite deliberately to create a utopia, which will turn the world back to the simplicity of the *Tao*, without preference, without rejection, and without deliberate choice. However, political and moral action seems to imply a conscious project
- Do the Taoist political views tend to make people politically passive, and so experience a life of intellectual and material poverty?
- Comparison with other models of political leadership, *eg*, Machiavelli’s prince, or Plato’s philosopher king, political leadership in the present world.

**6. Evaluate the claim that the concept of the *Tao* might be interpreted both in a metaphysical and in an ethical sense.**

The question asks for an evaluation of possible interpretations of the central notion of the *Tao*. The *Tao*, “path” or “way” is a complex concept, partly because of its use in both generic and specific terms and its applications in a wide range of domains including the religious, humanistic and naturalistic. Since the metaphysical and ethical senses are not mutually exclusive each may be seen in light of the other in order to generate a broader understanding of the philosophy of the *Tao Te Ching*. In a metaphysical sense the *Tao* has been identified by means of six dimensions (material reality, origin, principle, function, virtue and technique). The *Tao* also means a system of moral truth, in a broad ethical sense. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The disorganized compilation of short pieces in the *Tao Te Ching* reflects the diversity in interpretations of the *Tao* concept. It was applied to a range of different debates relating to mysticism, health and longevity, statecraft, government, metaphysics, epistemology and ethics
- The *Tao* has been described as natural, eternal, spontaneous, nameless and indescribable. There are two *Taos*, one real (*chang tao*) and the other apparent, superficial or impermanent (the *Tao* that can be told). The real *Tao* is beyond the reach of the ordinary – the *Tao* which can be told. According to this interpretation, the *Tao* is the underlying reality that evades transmission and even comprehension; its ineffability also frustrates attempts to understand the concept
- The *Tao* as the entirety of reality is greater than the sum of its individual parts (ch 14). The relationships between the individual entities are also an important part of the *Tao*. Individual entities inevitably act on and mutually influence others; the resulting whole is dynamic and ceaselessly transforming
- The *Tao* as ultimate reality is at times characterized as the origin and source of all things; *Tao* is the mother (*mu*) and ancestor (*zhong*) of all (chs 52 and 4). The biological–generative motif implies that *Tao* produces or evolves into manifold things, the “ten thousand things” (*wan wu*)
- Ethical interpretations of the *Tao* refer to the notion of *te*, which is commonly, and blandly, translated as “morality”, “goodness”. In its Taoist usage, *te* refers to the virtue of a thing (which is what it “gets” from the *Tao*)
- *Tao* as a way of teaching is a doctrine and perhaps even a process or method of attaining moral insight as part of the limited understanding of reality itself
- The concept of the *Tao* also involves responses to the ideas of other schools of thought. It implies views on issues concerning social organization, government and ethics. Taoist philosophy rejects the proposals of the other schools because they are far too intrusive and regimental; eg, it finds the Confucian values and methods problematic especially in their affirmation and pursuit of status, cultivation and moral authority. Some modern Taoist philosophy proposes in their place a non-intrusive, *wu wei* approach.

**Plato: *The Republic*, Books IV–IX****7. Evaluate the claim that one must look upon everyone he or she meets as a brother or sister, father or mother, son or daughter, or one of the children or parents of these.**

This question invites an evaluation of Plato's proposals about child rearing and the notion of the family in the ideal state. Gender equality leads to the abolition of the normal notion of family and the establishment of communal child rearing. There are hints here of selective breeding and extremes of exclusion of those not able to breed. The breeding process is seen as sacred as is common in many other rural pre-industrial cultures. The selection process is implied to be contrived and seems to be deceitful, which tends to be contrary to all other practices in *The Republic*. The aim of such activity is to transform the social structure so as to create a unity within the state. A feeling of collective sympathy comes about because of this engineered sense of community. Commonality as opposed to diversity is valued. The inevitable extension of "one big family" results also in common property ownership. The end of separate families and private property is presented as viable and beneficial to the improvement of humans. The beneficial aspects might be apparent in the strength of argument of common sympathy rather than common interest. It is possible to argue that this whole description of a "new society" could be an analogy because it seems so extreme. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Should the pluralistic nature of society be valued?
- Unity *versus* personal anonymity in the state
- Would the binding together of a community in the way Plato suggests water down love?
- The implications for the economic and social conditions of life for non-philosophers in the state
- Whether the direction of all aspects of life in the state by philosopher rulers results in efficiencies and overall benefits to society
- To what degree does Plato's new model produce a more caring society? An Aristotelian counter-position might be presented
- If it was an analogy what are the possible interpretations of the analogy?
- How far is this notion of communal existence akin to contemporary attempts at social engineering?
- Is Plato's approach to marriage realistic? What values would it enhance or endanger?
- Is Plato's approach to the communal rearing of children a realistic or viable aim for the betterment of society?
- The myth of the metals.

**8. Explain and discuss the nature of dialectic.**

This question seeks an explanation and discussion of dialectic in the system of education that Plato proposes to be appropriate for a philosopher king. It is the highest activity within an educational process that is quite abstract and mathematically orientated in the latter stages. The early stage of ethical education and physical training followed by differing types of mathematics might be described, but essentially the explanation should explore the nature of dialectic. The issue of claiming to be concerned with eternal truths and being a cooperative and freely assenting activity needs to be investigated. This is along with the claims that such a method and pursuit is superior to scientific inquiry. Whether it also embodies ethical reasoning to offset utility as a function of knowledge could be discussed as well as the way in which the dialectic points the learner toward the Form of the Good. The classic critiques for the valuelessness of pure reasoning as an activity might be balanced by a more reflective notion that knowledge pursuits tempered by ethical reasoning could benefit humans. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- How far can abstract argument be of value in a material-/production-orientated world?
- Is the end pursuit of Plato's education as idealistic as his state and ruler?
- Might the dialectic be justified in the same way that esoteric academic pursuits are valued today; it being good for the mind/soul and an indicator of the nature of society itself
- The role of opinion in Plato's overall account of knowledge
- Is dialectic a prerequisite for a philosopher king?
- Dialectic and the Divided Line
- Is dialectic a knowledge free of assumptions?

## René Descartes: *Meditations*

### 9. Explain and discuss Descartes’s claim that intellection (conception) is the essential feature of thought.

This question invites a discussion of Descartes’s analysis of the essential properties of the mind (*res cogitans*). It allows for an exploration of the development in Meditation 6 of a claim set out initially in Meditation 2 that the *res cogitans* is an intellectual (non-extended) substance. Descartes asks whether various mental faculties and modes of thought are essential to one’s existence as a thinking thing. He concludes that imagination and sense perception (or sensation), are not necessary for one’s existence as an intellectual substance but they cannot exist without an intellectual substance in which they must inhere. Descartes further argues that all instances of intellection are understood as perceptions and that “sense perception” and imagination are instances of intellection only to the extent that they are considered to be included in the notion of perception and, hence, intellection. Therefore, for Descartes, intellection, understood as perception, is the central feature of thought. Descartes claims that one could conceive of oneself as a pure intellect contemplating the three objects of cognition of a disembodied mind: God, the mind itself, and the objects of geometry but without sense perceptions, sensations or appetites. Curiously, Descartes additionally identifies the will as a feature of the mind allowing him to divide all modes of thinking into either acts of intellect (perceptions) or of will (volitions). This appears to contradict the original claim that intellection is the essential feature of thought. However, Descartes sees understanding and volition as having a special “affinity and connection”, and that “the thing that understands and the thing that wills are one and the same in virtue of a unity of nature”, a unity of nature provided by the overarching notion of intellection as the essential feature of thought. Descartes justifies this by claiming that an act of will requires an idea or object that results from operations of the intellect. Thus, the will presupposes intellection in its conception and falls within the claim that intellection is the essential feature of thought. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Descartes’s commitment to the role of reason in achieving clear and distinct knowledge
- The nature of *res cogitans* (thinking substance) and *res extensa* (extended substance) along with their characteristics
- The specific features of these two substances and their absolute independence of each other
- The notion of intellection as the essential feature of thought
- The *cogito ergo sum* argument as a pillar in *Meditations*
- The roles of sense perception, imagination, appetites and will within the general feature of intellection
- The arguments for the existence of a disembodied mind
- The nature of the three objects of contemplation of a disembodied mind
- The argument for the “affinity and connection” between understanding and will as activities of intellection
- The status of innate ideas.



**10. Explain and discuss Descartes’s claim that “natural light” guarantees the transparent clarity of cognition and is the ultimate ground for truth.**

This question invites a discussion of Descartes’s use of, and reliance upon, the notion of “natural light” (*lumen naturale*), an idea prevalent amongst many 16th and 17th century philosophers that referred to a faculty shared by all human beings in the pursuit of truth and knowledge. The “natural light” was a faculty of the mind given by God himself. Descartes argued that truths revealed by the “natural light” would be free from doubt and not open to denial. In short, what was revealed by “natural light” was not open to doubt; what was revealed by nature of the senses *was*. No other faculty of mind was equally trustworthy and therefore beliefs based on the natural light of reason cannot be shown to be false by any other faculty of the mind. Hence, the “natural light” would serve Descartes well whenever he wished to introduce and legitimate core and foundational ideas into any of his arguments. In particular, our “natural light” is the notion Descartes uses for our ability to arrive at all clear and distinct ideas and to assemble them into a larger set of clear and certain truths. The “natural light” would be used by Descartes to underpin questions of the knowledge of God, knowledge about efficient causality, the existence of independent substances, and more general questions of truth and falsity, especially in Meditation 3. The “natural light” served as a kind of indubitable inner illumination that would, if followed, reveal self-evident truths of reason. For example, it was by “natural light” that we come to know clearly and distinctly that from the fact of doubting, one must exist. Additionally, all other ideas attributable to my existence as *res cogitans* are known indubitably by “natural light” and would be impervious even in the face of the machinations of the evil genius. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The reliance of Descartes on philosophical trends prevalent during his time
- Descartes’s need to establish cognitional principles that would guarantee the truth of knowledge claims
- The possibility of establishing any sort of criterion for the determination of absolute truth
- The problem of circular argumentation: A principle of rational thought is used to justify the certainty of rational thought
- “Natural light” is used to arrive at the knowledge of the existence of God who is believed to be the source of the “natural light” of reason
- Descartes’s foundationalism rests upon the reliability of “natural light”
- The imperviousness of “natural light” to the possibility of doubt
- The reliance upon “natural light” in *Meditations*.

## John Locke: *Second Treatise on Government*

### 11. Explain and discuss Locke's concept of property.

The question asks for an explanation and discussion of Locke's conception of property. Locke conceives of a person's natural rights as something that a person owns. In his chapter on property he advances several arguments. The argument deployed in II.34–45 states that a system of rights over material things must be such as to encourage useful labour, so that the necessities of life can be created from the natural resources God has provided for us. Further he gives a general account of how natural rights are justified. From this he can show that if there are any natural rights at all, there must be natural rights to individual private property. The general justification of a natural law (and of a natural right) says: "The fundamental law of Nature being that all, as much as may be, should be preserved." (II.183). If it is sustained that a particular natural law holds (which in turn confers a certain natural right on certain persons), then the effect of this will be to further the end of the fundamental law of nature. From here it is possible to establish particular natural laws and their corresponding natural rights. Using this argument Locke can establish natural rights to property; for rights of control over material things crucially affect humankind's prospects of preservation. God has placed humankind in an environment from which we are able to draw our sustenance. Thus we have to preserve ourselves under the fundamental law of nature, but only if we are prepared to labour on what God has provided for us. Locke says that God gave the earth to humankind in common, so this equal right of all persons in the state of nature is unspecific. As the basis of the right which individuates the owner of property from non-owners, Locke proposes whether someone has laboured on a thing in such a way as to make it more useful for human life: "that labour put a distinction between them and common" (II.28). In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Property relations in civil society should always be governed by certain general principles, they must be so arranged: a) as to provide good incentives for the industrious to labour and produce the things necessary for the sustaining of human life; b) as to allow for the able-bodied to make a livelihood out of their own industry; c) that those who are unable to support themselves have an appropriate claim against another person or persons who can support them
- Those who are unable to work because of infirmity or age have a right to what is necessary for their preservation from the surplus of the producers. The claims of the needy people give rise to a countervailing right against the ownership rights of producers, not merely to a moral claim for charity
- The appropriate political institutions of the society will make the decisions concerning property. In governments the laws regulate the right of property, and the possession of land is determined by positive constitutions
- Why not say that in the state of nature there would be no right, and that what would ensue would be a Hobbesian free-for-all?
- The extent to which Locke shows satisfactorily how individuals can have a natural right to property in particular things
- Locke restricts the right of alienation: owners are not the only people who can legitimately decide to whom ownership of what they own passes
- Are property rights to be justified only by reference to operative social conventions or by reference to the requirements of political authority?

**12. “In his *Second Treatise* Locke wants to show that there can be a legitimate state: one that is consistent with its citizens’ natural rights.” Discuss and evaluate.**

The question asks for a discussion and evaluation regarding the legitimacy of the state and its political power. It also asks for a discussion on the central goals of the *Treatise* following its central threads. A leading argument develops the idea of natural rights based on the conception of the law of nature which might be characterized as follows: a) it is a law prescribing conduct which is independent of the positive laws of states, and of established social conventions or customs; b) the law of nature is the law of reason. In acting in accordance with the law of nature people act in accordance with reason. Further, we can know what the law of nature requires of us by making use of our reason; c) it is the law God requires us to act in accordance with; d) the law of nature is universal. It applies to all persons at all times and in all places. All persons ought to be treated in accordance with the law of nature. All persons (who have reached the age of reason) ought to treat others in accordance with the law of nature. According to it the principles guiding the citizens’ natural rights might be formulated in the following way: a) the citizens of a state, no matter what differences might exist between them are equal in political standing (II.95); b) each citizen is equal to all the others in the individual rights each possesses; these rights also limit what the state may do to any of its citizens; c) government is instituted to ensure that the rights of all citizens are respected, and to promote the good of the citizens; d) the authority in a system of government, should be exercised in order to further the good of their fellow citizens; e) if the citizens no longer consent to how they are being governed and wish to be rid of their governors, the government ceases to have any moral right to be in power; the use of force by the people is morally justified as a last resort. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The idea of social contract. The constitution of civil society and political power. It has its origin only from agreement, and the mutual consent of those who make up the community
- The state is a device for ensuring that the law of nature in fact regulates people’s relationships with each other
- Political power is that power, which every man having in the state of nature, has given up into the hands of the society, and thereby to the governors, whom the society had set over itself, with this express or tacit trust, that it shall be employed for their good and the preservation of their property
- The end and measure of political power is the preservation of all society, that is, all humankind in general
- The laws of states and the social conventions and customs of communities ought to be consistent with the law of nature. However, the law of nature allows for possible variation in the positive laws of different countries, and for variations in social conventions and customs
- Locke wished to develop a theory of legitimate political authority, which repudiated his contemporary reactionaries and authoritarians such as Hobbes. He also stands in opposition to those anarchists who deny that a legitimate state is possible
- An objection to Locke: if it is held that government rests on the consent of the governed to an original compact, then it does prove impossible to show that legitimate political authority exists. Locke is unable to establish legitimate political authority on the basis of consent.

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

- 13. Evaluate Mill's view that the objective of humans ought to be seen as the cultivation of individuality, that is, the highest and most harmonious development of human powers to a complete and consistent whole.**

The question asks for an evaluation of Mill's position regarding the importance of the cultivation of individuality. Mill approves Wilhelm von Humboldt's doctrine that the end of humans ought to be seen as the cultivation of individuality, in other words, that the highest and most harmonious development of human powers is to become a complete and consistent whole. A wholly cultivated individuality is an ideal type of moral character, a character in which the many different sides of the individual's true nature have the possibility to grow as much as possible in mutually compatible ways. Mill insists on the intrinsic worth of individual spontaneity, which might develop over the majority, which is satisfied with the ways of humankind as they are at the given moment. In this situation the majority cannot comprehend why the given ways should not be good enough for everybody; even more, spontaneity forms no part of the ideal of the majority of moral and social reformers. This idea of the worth of the cultivation of the individual pervades almost all Mill's ideas, and is reflected in different ways in them. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- From the individual's viewpoint, his/her action should accord to his/her own inclination and judgment. The same reasons, which show that opinion should be free, also prove that he or she should be allowed, without harassment, to carry his or her opinions into practice at his or her own cost. While humankind is imperfect there should be different opinions; similarly there should be different experiments of living
- Choosing spontaneously, in accordance with one's own judgment and inclinations, is a constituent element of individuality and self-development. It is desirable that in things which do not primarily concern others, individuality should assert itself
- Absolute liberty ought to be guaranteed, by right, with respect to self-regarding acts which do not harm others. Similar to the case of thought and discussion, such liberty of action is essential for the individual to acquire and sustain a lively appreciation of a many-sided truth, namely, that of his own nature or character. The only way to gather this sort of warranted opinion about oneself, it seems, is to think, express, and act as one likes, short of injury to others
- Mill's Periclean ideal of self-development or individuality attempts consistently to combine Christian virtues with pagan self-assertion
- The faculties of perception, judgment, feeling, mental activity and even moral preference, are exercised only in making a choice. He who does anything because it is the custom makes no real choice
- Diversity is more congenial than forced uniformity and prevents social stagnation and decline. Individuals with a passion for liberty indicate to the majority over time which of the uncustomary things are fit to be converted into customs
- Development of individuality as a component of well-being and happiness.

**14. Explain and discuss Mill's view on the liberty of thought and discussion.**

The question asks for an explanation and discussion of Mill's argument regarding the liberty of thought and discussion. Mill thinks it convenient to reflect upon the liberties of thought and discussion, partly because most people in more economically developed countries already take for granted that these freedoms are rightful. However, Mill considered them as being in danger. A central point of the argument is that freedom of thought and discussion ought to be protected. Mill insists that there ought to exist the fullest liberty of professing and discussing, as a matter of ethical conviction, any doctrine, however immoral it may be considered, except in the relatively few situations where such expression is a positive instigation to some mischievous act that is seriously harmful to others. Complete liberty of thought and discussion is the only way fallible beings can hope to develop the capacities required to infer, and retain, a lively understanding of warranted beliefs. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Mill excludes some expressions from protection, so that his liberty principle does not pretend to grant absolute protection to all expression of thought
- The prescription of absolute liberty for self-regarding expression is compatible with his claim that society has legitimate authority to control expression in the special cases
- The peculiar evil of silencing an opinion which may possibly be true. The silencers make an unwarranted assumption of their own infallibility: all silencing of discussion is an assumption of infallibility. They not only deny the truth of the opinion for themselves; they also presume to know for certain that the opinion is false, thereby deciding the question for everyone else
- Complete liberty of contradicting and disproving our opinion is the very condition which justifies us in assuming its truth for purposes of action; and on no other terms can a being with human faculties have any rational assurance of being right
- Complete liberty is the very test of such truth as humans are capable of acquiring
- Free and open discussion is essential so that fallible beings can rectify their mistakes: there must be discussion, to show how experience is to be interpreted
- Mill urges us to recognize the necessity to the mental well-being of mankind (on which all their other well-being depends) of freedom of opinion and freedom of the expression of opinion
- There is harm in silencing an opinion which may even be only partly true
- The illustration provided by a freely competitive party system has the generally beneficial effect of keeping received political opinion within the limits of reason and sanity.

**Friedrich Nietzsche: *The Genealogy of Morals*****15. Evaluate Nietzsche's claim that a man of action is closer to justice than a reactive man.**

This question asks for an evaluation of the man of action – the noble – and the reactive man – a member of the herd – to Nietzsche's ideas on justice. For Nietzsche the role of justice is to put revenge into the hands of the victim, according to a re-evaluation of values by slave morality. It links to the concept of indebtedness; justice is the mechanism to seek the debt, which is owed by those who committed the offence. Justice is seen as positive, an action of the strong. The reactive man, the man with slave morality, is weak, imposes upon himself self-guilt and turns the other cheek and pursues a route of mercy. The man of action is closer to justice as his reactions are immediate and do not consider longterm consequences. The contrast between the slave morality and noble morality might be stressed to show that the strong man of action is arrogant and hence a society dominated by the slaves would impose rules that curb that arrogance. Nietzsche's notion of justice might assume that conflict is an effective way of society progressing. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Is a desire for power related to wanting to dominate others?
- Can strength/power be seen in ways that might portray the reactive man as stronger than the man of action?
- If the man of action is dominant what is the place of compassion, friendship and sympathy in human relations?
- What is the role of self-preservation in a moral society?
- Whether might is right or wrong
- Nietzsche's methodology using an evolutionary historical view as the basis of his analysis
- Nietzsche's notion of *ressentiment*
- Whether Nietzsche is concerned with theoretical analysis rather than normal social interaction
- How does the notion of punishment dovetail with the question of justice?

**16. Evaluate Nietzsche's claim that slave morality begins when *ressentiment* itself becomes creative and gives birth to values.**

This question seeks an evaluation of the role that *ressentiment* has in the establishment of slave morality. *Ressentiment* is the opposite of the "will to power" that drives the morality of the nobles. When *ressentiment* becomes creative it changes the meaning of "good" from that associated with the noble morality; good being strength, dominance and believing in the self, to the "good" of the slave morality where good is selflessness, weakness and humility. The aim of *ressentiment* is to keep people passive and subservient. *Ressentiment* is the means by which people are kept down, preventing self-affirming acts and aggression. The classic image of slave morality and *ressentiment* in action is seen as Christianity; turning the other cheek rather than striking back. The claim might be challenged in that noble morality as much as slave morality exists in each individual and is not a quality of a particular group. It is the balancing of *ressentiment* with the more aggressive, dominant forces in humans that both releases creativity and generates progress. It might be concluded that Nietzsche's critique of Christianity and his historical interpretation of the development of morals as a whole is flawed. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Do differing and opposing drives exist in individuals?
- Is Nietzsche's historical and linguistic analysis sound?
- Are the behaviours of humans more complex than Nietzsche recognizes?
- The relationship between tradition, creativity and values
- *Ressentiment* as a sickness
- *Ressentiment* as the reactive mechanism of the slaves
- Are morals by definition self-less?

### Bertrand Russell: *The Problems of Philosophy*

**17. Evaluate Russell’s treatment of the problem with going beyond specific personal experience, or memory of experience, to knowledge of things that have never been personally experienced.**

This question raises the so-called problem of induction and is treated in Chapter 6 entitled, “On Induction”. Russell’s account owes much to the work done earlier by Hume and deals with the range of our knowledge, and how we might extend it beyond our personal and immediate experiences. Yet this process involves a logical difficulty and an issue with the justification and verification of this knowledge. Russell looks for a general principle that enables one’s field of knowledge to extend beyond one’s immediate perception and experience and it is found in his observation that one sort of thing is the sign of the existence of some other thing. Russell uses Hume’s example of the daily rising of the sun where continued experience leads a person to expect the same thing to happen in the future. Based on what has always been the case in the past, we are led to believe it will act the same way in the future. In favour of this leap into assumptions about the future, Russell encourages us to see how we can relate specific events like the motion of the sun to general laws of motion which we have observed and we have greater evidence to support the continuation of these general laws, than we do the specific events (like sunrises) which operate under the laws. Russell challenges the rational justification of using past experience to provide knowledge of – or expectation about – the future. Echoing Hume, Russell speaks of future expectations created through habit in a psychological process, which is devoid of rational justification for the content of the expectation/knowledge. Russell uses the example of a chicken expecting a feed but having its neck wrung on one day instead. Russell agrees with Hume in saying there is no logical proof available to accept knowledge of the future based on past experience. Russell compares inductive knowledge with the certainty gained through deduction and sees that both often cause unhesitating acceptance by people, but there is a deep difference in the way of arguing as shown in his treatment of “...our Knowledge of General Principles”. In the end, induction deals with empirical generalizations while deduction concentrates on *a priori* propositions. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- What induction is – moving from specific experience to housing general laws which in turn encourages knowledge of things not yet or currently experienced
- Rational objections to induction
- Habit forming as an explanation for claims to knowledge of things previously observed occurring in the future
- The difference between *a posteriori* and *a priori* knowledge
- Kant’s alternative view of the continuity of experience and the mental conditions necessary for having experience
- How genuine are claims to *a priori* knowledge when vocabulary, mathematics, *etc* are learned initially through education or experience?
- Russell agrees that nothing can be proved *a priori* and is in sympathy with empiricists on this – is this acceptable?
- Russell also agrees that the role of “knowledge by description” is going beyond our personal experience to access knowledge of things outside experience.



**18. Explain and discuss the distinction that Russell makes between knowledge by acquaintance and knowledge by description.**

This is a key issue in Russell's account of knowledge of truths. Russell's so-called "knowledge of truths" is what is usually denoted as propositional knowledge. At the end of Chapter 4 Russell asserts that knowledge in the end is rooted in knowledge by acquaintance. Yet in Chapter 5 he raises a distinction between this knowledge and knowledge by description. His account of knowledge by acquaintance starts in the context of discussing knowledge of things. For Russell the character of knowledge by acquaintance is immediate and non-inferential. We have acquaintance with sense-data which describe the appearance of matter through perception. So the direct knowledge we have is of sense-data not the object itself which produces sense-data. Knowledge of the object itself that causes the sense-data is knowledge by description. Russell distinguishes between definite/particular and general knowledge by description. Russell introduces the concept of the logically proper name, which Russell sees as descriptions but in disguise. The real issue with knowledge by description turns on the issue of the problem of public knowledge when acquaintance is a private world of sense-data. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- How do we actually achieve knowledge by acquaintance? Is Russell's theory deficient in saying how sense-data itself is transmitted to our minds?
- The existence of the objects that cause sense-data is not to be considered a truth as the object itself lies beyond perception and we cannot know the cause itself of the sense-data we perceive
- We are acquainted with both sense-data in particular, and universals (which forms its own chapter at the end of the text)
- The acquaintance with the contents of our minds is created through introspection which leads to self-consciousness but the proof that there is an "I" is only probable, as shown in Russell's critique of Descartes's *Cogito*
- Logically proper names and their problems
- The issue of the communication of knowledge between people
- The difference between human and animal awareness
- How can private sense-data experience of particulars be shared?

**Hannah Arendt: *The Human Condition*****19. Explain and discuss how freedom and plurality are central features of Arendt's idea of action.**

This question seeks an explanation and discussion of the interplay of freedom and plurality in one aspect of the *vita activa*; action. Action is the main feature of the political life of humans and is an aspect of the human condition that generates and needs pluralism. It is the ability to be equal and yet at the same time to be distinctive. Plurality helps construct our identity through immediate connection with our self and others. This plurality is degraded in modern times with the increased desire to conform, the desire to be politically correct and to fit in rather than be authentic in behaviour. Freedom is central as it is an activity that allows political power. This freedom formulates deeds and ideas that flourish in a new and spontaneous way. Freedom is grounded in natality; a new beginning, something new in the world, the unexpected. Action with the components of plurality (variety, diversity and freedom, newness and spontaneity) creates the vital matrix of human relations, which is inspired by communication. Out of the link of action to speech comes the potential for power; the ability to act in concert with the purpose of setting up new realities. These new realities should be focused on the public realm of political and interpersonal communication. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Is it essential for humans to strive to build anew?
- Does action really differentiate humans or is it work, having the ability to produce beyond the basic needs to survive?
- How far have advances in the connectivity through the internet transformed freedom?
- Is pluralism a desirable condition?

**20. Evaluate Arendt's claim that the modern age is a world of alienation.**

This question seeks an evaluation of the view that nature of the modern world is now such that humans have become alienated. It is centred upon the idea that labour and work have become dominant in the *vita activa* over action. Humans now gather together as a community of producers rather than communicators. A group of people who desire more goods as opposed to desiring creative dialogue with each other. The “political animal” (*zoon politikon*) has merely become the “animal” (*zoon*). As a result of this transition there is alienation in the world. The *polis* has been replaced by the market place. The interaction of humans has become consumer driven; a desire for more rather than a desire merely to interact and exchange opinion and political positions. The public realm has been transformed into a place of labouring. Our physical structures and objects are now designed to be used and decay and are no longer seen as vehicles to encourage political activities and culture. The young and their seeking of the new might seem to prevent this alienation, but with consumerism and commercialisation, even in our education and upbringing, our willingness to act might be being eroded. The will to come together and relate to each other is being lost. There might also be mention of “earth alienation” reflective of the time of Arendt’s writing in the way humans sought to escape the physical earth and also to transform life and life expectancy so creating a lack of distinction between private and public realms. The values of stability and lastingness along with plurality and togetherness are lost to productivity and a commitment to more is good. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Whether the blurring of private and public allows for the growth of equal rights and justice
- Whether increasing consumerism can be seen as positive if it is linked to justice in terms of a fairer distribution of wealth
- Does it naturally follow that dialogue and debate will improve the human condition? If you are poor and suffering from malnutrition, labour and work might be your prime concern
- Is the dominance of action a false notion of society? As society becomes more egalitarian might not action decline naturally? The rise of the individual might not be a bad aspect of human development.

**Simone de Beauvoir: *The Ethics of Ambiguity*****21. Evaluate de Beauvoir's distinction between ontological freedom and moral freedom.**

This question asks for an evaluation of two central notions in the prescribed text: ontological and moral freedom. De Beauvoir sensed a contradiction in Sartre's system. For Sartre, humans are inherently free and to be moral is to will oneself free. However, since not every human acts morally, is it not contradictory to suggest that all humans are free? In order to resolve this difficulty, de Beauvoir introduced two kinds of freedom: ontological freedom or the state of being free, and moral freedom or the response one chooses to make to one's condition of ontological freedom. This notion of moral freedom is the foundation for de Beauvoir's so-called ethics of ambiguity. De Beauvoir argued that willing oneself to be moral and willing oneself to be free are one and the same decision. We cannot will ourselves to not be ontologically free. However, we can choose not to will ourselves to be free in the sense of not choosing responsibility for our choices. On these points, de Beauvoir approaches Sartre's notion of "bad faith". We transcend our facticity by projecting ourselves into future possibilities through which we take on responsibility for our choices. Willing oneself to be free and responding to one's condition of ontological freedom is, at the time, to will others to be free. The world, the human condition and the others are all revealed in the act of freedom. Using the images of the sub-man, the serious man, the nihilist, the adventurer, the passionate man, the critical thinker and the artist-writer, de Beauvoir distinguishes two different approaches to her notion of moral freedom. The first approach is that of refusing to recognize the experience of freedom; the second approach is that of misunderstanding the meaning of freedom. Finally, de Beauvoir argues that acknowledging our freedom is a necessary requirement for ethical action. Moral freedom binds us to others in bringing values into existence and projects into being. Political and material distractions can either alienate us from or cause us to engage our free response to our ontological freedom. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The influence of Sartre's existential themes on de Beauvoir's notion of freedom
- The relationship between being free and acting freely
- The reasons for de Beauvoir's distinction between ontological and moral freedom
- The ambiguity of the condition of ontological freedom and moral freedom
- The reasons why willing oneself to be a free being is at the same time the choice of willing others to be free
- De Beauvoir's notion of inauthenticity: refusing to recognize one's condition of ontological freedom and misunderstanding the meaning of moral freedom
- Ontological and moral freedom bind us to others in working out our projects and bringing values into existence
- Gender issues.

**22. Evaluate de Beauvoir's understanding of ambiguity.**

This question asks for an evaluation of de Beauvoir's understanding and use of the notion of ambiguity as a defining feature of the human condition. Her philosophical position is built on the central existentialist claim that existence precedes essence. For her, ambiguity characterizes our existence as a radical indeterminacy, which is not equivalent to a sense of absurdity, ambivalence or meaninglessness. De Beauvoir sees ambiguity as a paradox. The ambiguity of human existence arises out of the tension between the "facticity" of our existence, our "situation" in a present, which brings with it our past, and our future, which we create by our choices and is indeterminate. On the one hand, ambiguity includes attachment to and joy with others. On the other hand, every moment of our existence is ambiguous in that each moment brings us closer to death, but every moment towards death is life. Ambiguity makes us conscious of the world and the part we play in it, but we feel crushed by the world. While we experience ourselves as unique and valuable, we know that we share this with all others. We feel ourselves to be sovereign, yet we are dependent on others. We are subjects to ourselves, but always objects to others. De Beauvoir acknowledges that our struggle for authenticity is not pessimistic since even in failure, there is optimism. Ambiguity includes the experience that we can choose to transform negativity into positive existence. While ambiguity includes up-rooting and potential alienation, our freedom makes an ethics possible and allows us to create goals, ideals, values and realize projects. We experience the ambiguity of regarding others as objects or of engaging with them as subjects in our project towards creative freedom and authenticity. In this regard, we experience the fact of our body against our awareness that our body is our connection to, and engagement with, the world. Finally, de Beauvoir acknowledges that while the meaning of ambiguity is never fixed, we must embrace rather than reject the ambiguity of the human condition. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Ambiguity as a defining feature of human existence and the human condition
- Ambiguity as a means of avoiding a negative interpretation of the human condition
- How ambiguity facilitates active, creative and constructive engagement with the world through engagement with others
- The tension between existing as a subject to oneself but as an object for others
- The engagement of ontological and moral freedom in the face of ambiguity
- The ways in which a person can embrace ambiguity without despair and alienation
- The role ambiguity plays throughout the arguments of the text
- The degree of ambiguity in the development of the person from childhood to adulthood.

**Charles Taylor: *The Ethics of Authenticity*****23. Evaluate Taylor's claim that modernity has three malaises.**

This question focuses on a starting issue of Taylor's book, *Modernity and its malaises*. The question invites a discussion on what Taylor means by modernity, what malaises it carries and why. Therefore, it calls for a wider analysis of the concepts of individualism, instrumental reason or rationality, and soft despotism. Those analyses might be connected to Taylor's views of society, government and the individual, especially to the construction of a new identity and self. Atomism, narcissism, and technological messianism are other important points that might be evaluated, along with relativism. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Is modernity connected to development or improvement?
- How is individualism linked to human life and society?
- Whether there is any connection between rationality and technological messianism?
- What are the consequences of the three malaises carried by modernity?
- How are the three malaises interrelated?
- Horizons of significance
- Whether there is a place for rational discussion of the problems facing individuals and societies.

**24. Evaluate Taylor's motto "*la lotta continua*" ("the ongoing struggle") and the concept of responsabilization.**

This question arises out of the seventh chapter of *The Ethics of Authenticity*. Taylor's motto refers to a continuing fight and invites the evaluation of its meaning and context. Also, the question calls for the explanation of the difference between fight and persuasion, and the concept of "fight about" versus "fight against" or "fight for". Moreover, the question invites the analysis of the concepts of responsabilization with reference to authenticity, culture, and people. Finally, the analysis of the concepts of cultural pessimism and optimism might be important points. In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- What are the differences between fight and persuasion?
  - What is the "age of responsabilization"?
  - Are cultural pessimism and optimism to be avoided?
  - Are debates to be oriented against men or issues (*ad hominem* theme)?
  - How do "boosters" and "knockers" figure in Taylor's perspective?
  - What effective changes can an individual bring about with regard to improving society?
-