



International Baccalaureate®
Baccalauréat International
Bachillerato Internacional

Philosophy

Higher level and standard level

Specimen papers 1, 2 and 3

For first examinations in 2016

CONTENTS

Philosophy higher level paper 1 specimen paper

Philosophy higher level and standard level paper 1 specimen markscheme

Philosophy higher level and standard level paper 2 specimen paper

Philosophy higher level and standard level paper 2 specimen markscheme

Philosophy higher level paper 3 specimen paper

Philosophy higher level paper 3 specimen markscheme

Philosophy standard level paper 1 specimen paper



**PHILOSOPHY
HIGHER LEVEL
PAPER 1**

SPECIMEN PAPER

2 hours 30 minutes

INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

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

SECTION A

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

Core Theme: What is a human being?

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

Who or what am I? I am a living, breathing organism signified by the words “human being”. I am a material or physical being fairly recognizable over time to me and to others: I am a body [...]. However, there is another aspect of me not directly visible or definable. This is the aspect of me which thinks and feels, reflects and judges, remembers and anticipates. Words used to describe this aspect include “mind”, “spirit”, “heart”, “soul”, “awareness” and “consciousness”. This part of me is aware that I can never be fully known or understood by myself or by others; it notices that although there may be some unchanging essence which is “me”, this same “me” is also constantly changing and evolving. So I am a physical body and an emotional and psychological (or spiritual) being. The two together make me a person.

[Source: adapted from K O’Dwyer, (2011), “Who or What Am I?”, *Philosophy Now* 84.
www.philosophynow.org accessed 1 July 2013]

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

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



[Source: A Griffiths, (1894), *Secrets of the Prison-House: Gaol Studies and Sketches.*]

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

SECTION B

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

Optional Theme 1: Aesthetics

3. Evaluate the claim that the role of the artist is merely to provide entertainment.
4. To what extent does the beauty of an object depend on how we see it, rather than the way that it really is?

Optional Theme 2: Epistemology

5. Evaluate the claim that the extent to which any group can exercise power in the world is determined by its access to knowledge.
6. To what extent is knowledge dependent on experience?

Optional Theme 3: Ethics

7. With reference to **one** area of applied ethics, evaluate the grounds on which we should justify our moral judgments.
8. To what extent do you agree with the claim that character based approaches are more useful in making moral decisions than consequence based approaches?

Optional Theme 4: Philosophy and contemporary society

9. To what extent do you agree with the claim that censorship is always an unjustifiable violation of people's basic freedoms?
10. Evaluate the claim that social networking technologies are fundamentally changing the nature of social interactions and relationships.

Optional Theme 5: Philosophy of religion

11. Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of **one** argument for the existence of God.
12. Evaluate the claim that all religious language is essentially meaningless.

Optional Theme 6: Philosophy of science

13. Evaluate the claim that the proper goals of science are simplicity, explanation and prediction, not truth.
14. Evaluate the claim that it is unfair to hold scientists responsible for the consequences of their scientific discoveries.

Optional Theme 7: Political philosophy

15. Evaluate the claim that freedom and equality are not just compatible, but that for there to be comparable freedom for all there must first be equality.
 16. To what extent do you agree that there are some areas of human life that governments should not attempt to regulate?
-



MARKSCHEME

SPECIMEN PAPER

PHILOSOPHY

Higher Level and Standard Level

Paper 1

Page is blank

Note to examiners

This markscheme outlines what members of the paper setting team had in mind when they devised the questions. The topics listed in the bullet points indicate possible areas candidates might cover in their answers. They are not compulsory points and not necessarily the best possible points. They are only a framework to help examiners in their assessment. Examiners should be responsive to any other valid points or any other valid approaches.

Paper 1 guidance (Core Theme and Optional Themes)

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).

Answers on the Core Theme and the Optional Themes are assessed according to the markbands set out on pages 4 and 6.

Paper 1 Section A markbands

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response is poorly structured, or where there is a recognizable essay structure there is minimal focus on the task. • The philosophical issue raised by the stimulus material is implied but not explicitly identified. There is minimal or no explanation of how the issue relates to the stimulus material or links to the question of what it is to be human. • There is little relevant knowledge demonstrated, and the explanation is superficial. Philosophical vocabulary is not used, or is consistently used inappropriately. • The essay is descriptive and lacking in analysis.
6–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some attempt to follow a structured approach although it is not always clear what the answer is trying to convey. • The philosophical issue raised by the stimulus material is implied but not explicitly identified. There is some limited explanation of how the issue relates to the stimulus material or links to the question of what it is to be human. • Knowledge is demonstrated but lacks accuracy and relevance, and there is a basic explanation of the issue. Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately. • There is some limited analysis but the response is more descriptive than analytical. There is little discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view. Few of the main points are justified.
11–15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a clear attempt to structure the response, although there may be some repetition or a lack of clarity in places. • The philosophical issue raised by the stimulus material is explicitly identified. There is a basic explanation of how the issue relates to the stimulus material and to the question of what it is to be human. • Knowledge is mostly accurate and relevant, and there is a satisfactory explanation of the issue. Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately. • The response contains analysis, but this analysis lacks development. There is some discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view. Many of the main points are justified.
16–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response is structured and generally organised, and can be easily followed. • The philosophical issue raised by the stimulus material is explicitly identified. There is good justification of how the issue relates to the stimulus material and to the question of what it is to be human. • The response contains accurate and relevant knowledge. There is a good explanation of the issue. Philosophical vocabulary is mostly used appropriately. • The response contains critical analysis. There is discussion and some assessment of alternative interpretations or points of view. Most of the main points are justified.
21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response is well structured, focused and effectively organised. • The philosophical issue raised by the stimulus material is explicitly identified. There is a well developed justification of how the issue relates to the stimulus material and to the question of what it is to be human. • The response contains relevant, accurate and detailed knowledge. There is a well developed explanation of the issue. There is appropriate use of philosophical vocabulary throughout the response. • The response contains well developed critical analysis. There is discussion and assessment of alternative interpretations or points of view. All or nearly all of the main points are justified. The response argues from a consistently held position about the issue.

SECTION A

Core Theme: What is a human being?**1. Article from *Philosophy Now***

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

The following paragraphs provide only a framework to help examiners in their assessment of responses to this question. Examiners should be responsive to a variety of philosophical perspectives and approaches. Examiners should be aware that candidates might respond to this passage in a variety of ways including ones not mentioned in the summary below.

This question requires candidates to identify and discuss philosophical issues and/or concepts in the set passage related to the fundamental question of what it is to be human. Responses are likely to focus on mind/body interaction. This could include discussion of dualist positions (*eg*, substance, property dualism) or monist positions (*eg*, idealistic, materialistic monism). Alternatively responses could focus on knowledge of the self (issues such as solipsism *versus* intersubjectivity), or focus on an exploration of the difference between terms such as human organism *versus* human being *versus* human person (philosophical, biological, or evolutionary perspectives).

Responses should make explicit reference to the passage. Candidates may for example pick up on the author’s comment that there is “another aspect of me not directly visible or definable” to comment on the limitations of language for naming and describing essential characteristics of being human. Alternatively candidates may pick up on the references to terms such as “spiritual” or “soul” and make links to religious perspectives on the human person or on mind/body issues. They may also make reference to the discussion of “this same ‘me’ is also constantly changing and evolving” and link this to discussions of the human person in time (chronological time *versus* synchronic time) or personal identity over time.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- What might account for the perennial philosophical interest in the question “who or what am I?” Is there a right or wrong answer to this question?
- Is there an “identity” or “person” outside a network of relations with others?
- Is it possible to arrive at a notion of the self through introspection alone?
- Are the issues of personhood, personal identity and mind/body relationships simply abstractions or non-problems generated by various philosophical systems and perspectives?
- Brain states *versus* mental states. Am I more than my brain? Is my body distinct from my mind?
- Is it not the case that the natural and human sciences have already identified the essential characteristics of a human being? Have they not already resolved the mind/body problem?
- What role do emotions play in being human?
- From where does my sense of individuality stem? Is it different from my self-awareness? Is it different from my experience of personhood?
- How do different cultures approach the relationship between the physical and the non-physical in the context of understanding what it means to be a human being, a person?
- How might philosophy, science and religion cooperate in an exploration of what it means to be a human being?

2. Image from “*Secrets of the Prison-House: Gaol Studies and Sketches*”

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

The following paragraphs provide only a framework to help examiners in their assessment of responses to this question. Examiners should be responsive to a variety of philosophical perspectives and approaches. Examiners should be aware that candidates might respond to this passage in a variety of ways including ones not mentioned in the summary below.

This question requires candidates to identify and discuss philosophical issues and/or concepts in the image related to the fundamental question of what it is to be human. Responses are likely for example to focus on the concept of pain and suffering as being defining characteristics of the human condition, or on the concept of freedom as being the defining feature of being human. These discussions could explore positive philosophical interpretations of pain, suffering, bondage, oppression (Stoicism, asceticism, mysticism, negative utilitarianism, *etc*) or negative philosophical interpretations of pain, suffering, bondage, oppression (nihilism, fatalism, philosophy of the absurd, *etc*). Alternatively the response may focus on the concept of individual identity, with discussion focusing on the relationship between the individual versus the group, or the individual *versus* the collective.

Responses should make explicit reference to the stimulus image. They may, for example, make reference to the uniforms being worn in the picture, making links to issues/concepts around depersonalization, impersonalization, alienation, or isolation. Alternatively they may focus on the authority figures in the image, making reference to ideas like society as the iron cage, or the relationship between freedom and societal influences (social control, social conditioning, power, *etc*). Responses could also, for example, pick up on the fact that all of the figures in the image are male, and link this to issues of gender identity or gender equality.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Are there any essential characteristics that define what it means to be human? Is being human characterized by a quest for meaning, freedom, identity?
- Does the human condition define culture or does culture define the human condition?
- Does free will play a role in overcoming the constraints of society and culture?
- Is it a characteristic of being human to constitute meaning and value?
- Even in the face of depersonalization, is my identity made meaningful by others? What are my responsibilities towards others? Towards myself? Which has priority, and when?
- In what way does work define the human condition?
- Is the value of personal identity threatened by routine, pointless and often painful activity?
- Is it characteristically human to struggle against the bonds which devalue life, and against values which are supportive of a meaningful existence?
- Is human nature defined by those in power?
- Do men and women share equal rights to all facets of the human condition?
- Can religion or spirituality bring solace in the face of pain and suffering?
- Will pain and suffering remain the major philosophical dilemma of the human condition?
- Does the need for cooperation and uniformity amongst individuals engaged in a task defeat the ability to establish authentic individuality?

Paper 1 Section B markbands

Mark	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response is poorly structured, or where there is a recognizable essay structure there is minimal focus on the task. The response lacks coherence and is often unclear. • The student demonstrates little relevant knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme. Philosophical vocabulary is not used, or is consistently used inappropriately. • The essay is mostly descriptive. There is no discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view. Few of the main points are justified.
6–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some attempt to follow a structured approach although it is not always clear what the answer is trying to convey. • The student demonstrates knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme, but this knowledge lacks accuracy and relevance. Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately. • There is limited analysis but the response is more descriptive than analytical. There is little discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view. Some of the main points are justified.
11–15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a clear attempt to structure the response although there may be some repetition or a lack of clarity in places. • Knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme is mostly accurate and relevant. Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately. • The response contains analysis, but this analysis lacks development. There is some discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view. Many of the main points are justified.
16–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response is structured and generally organised, and can be easily followed. • The response contains accurate and relevant knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme. Philosophical vocabulary is mostly used appropriately. • The response contains critical analysis. There is discussion and some assessment of alternative interpretations or points of view. Most of the main points are justified.
21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response is well structured, focused and effectively organised. • The response contains relevant, accurate and detailed knowledge of philosophical issues arising from the optional theme. There is appropriate use of philosophical vocabulary throughout the response. • The response contains well developed critical analysis. There is discussion and assessment of alternative interpretations or points of view. All or nearly all of the main points are justified. The response argues from a consistently held position about the issue.

SECTION B**Optional Theme 1: Aesthetics****3. Evaluate the claim that the role of the artist is merely to provide entertainment.**

This question offers candidates a chance to consider different views of the role of the artist, and to discuss the wider meanings and definitions of the role of art and the artist. The view in the question is the specific view that the role of the artist is merely to provide entertainment; this could be contrasted with other views; *eg*, the artist as keeper and perpetuator of traditional stories, images, and histories; the public role of the artist; the political role of the artist; *etc*.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- If the role of the artist is purely to entertain, could other entertainers, athletes, *etc* be regarded as artists?
- Rather than being embraced by society as entertainers, artists have sometimes been outcasts and sometimes ostracized. Sometimes they have simply been lone individuals asserting the autonomy of the creative act in opposition to the standards set by society
- Is there a purpose to art apart from its own sake?
- Is there no place for strong passion or moral outrage in art? Does this make art a purely escapist activity offering easy pleasures and comfort?
- What makes an “artist”? The different ways in which artists are considered by the public: as genius, craftsman, visionary, producer *etc*
- The work of the artist reflects society. People can look at themselves and at the ideas of their society in the artist’s mirror. The artist makes clear what people do not ordinarily see
- The idea that the artist is not just entertaining, but creating and imagining; the artist is never content to do what has been done before. He/she is always exploring new ground, new ideas. The artist uses his/her imagination to see new possibilities
- The distinctions, if any, between high art and popular culture; the tension, if any, between great art and popular acceptance.

4. To what extent does the beauty of an object depend on how we see it, rather than the way that it really is?

This question offers an opportunity to discuss and evaluate the extent to which the beauty of an object depends on how we see it, or on how it really is. This could include discussion of what we mean by the term “beauty”, as well as opening up more general discussion and evaluation of what an aesthetic experience might or should be. Responses are likely to focus on the distinction between objectivity and subjectivity. On a subjective view there are no objective standards to judge beauty. Each person is the best judge of what beauty is. A radical subjectivist view would be that the audience does not define but actually creates the beauty. An objective view of beauty holds the view that there are objective standards of some kind which beauty can be judged by, such as balance, proportion, forms, *etc.*

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- What is the origin and nature of a sense of beauty? Is this sense specific to the individual or to the culture, or is it universal?
- Objective/subjective view of beauty
- Absolute/relative views of beauty. The absolute yet abstract idea of “pure beauty” *versus* the relativistic nature of what people understand as beauty
- Art as a representation and imitation of nature; an attempt to capture the beauty in nature
- Issues around the use of intuition as a means to appreciate beauty
- Does the descent from beauty produce a loss of ability to stimulate the human imagination?
- Is the idea of pure beauty false, and merely a feature of the beholder? If so, art is subjective and has no value; in contrast, if art is only subjective, then by definition it creates a unique individual response
- What are the relationships between pure beauty and social cause? Are they always irreconcilable? Can one ever think of them together?
- Is it essential, or even important, to think about art in terms of beauty? What would be gained (or, lost) if we did not?
- If we assume a subjectivist position, and we consider that art is in the eye of the beholder, then everything could be considered as a work of art.

Optional Theme 2: Epistemology

5. Evaluate the claim that the extent to which any group can exercise power in the world is determined by its access to knowledge.

This question focuses on the issue of access to knowledge, and invites an evaluation of knowledge around the world and the idea that knowledge is power. Answers might challenge the claim and focus on knowledge in relation to other epistemological issues. The value of knowledge in advancing the interests of a group, and the social production, ownership, and mediation of knowledge might be evaluated. Candidates may focus on power through the perspectives of class, gender, or ethnicity, and their access to knowledge; the institutions or social constraints that inhibit the dissemination of knowledge, *eg* professional bodies, universities, economic ownership of ideas, *etc.* They may also discuss the social production of knowledge, epistemological relativism, and the possible connection between epistemological pluralism or perspectivism and democracies. They may also discuss things which are obstacles to accessing knowledge; patents, research grants, the institutionalization of knowledge restricted to universities and other special educational institutions, *etc.*

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Language as a patriarchal construction, with generation, production and ownership of knowledge being a male domain
- Objective claims for knowledge based on science, or on Platonic epistemology
- The market value of knowledge; the categories of knowledge that generate economic benefits and power *eg* science *versus* religious knowledge
- Intrinsic values of knowledge; ethical, religious, humanist
- The dissemination of knowledge and marketing of knowledge
- Is it the case that knowledge is determined by those in power, or that knowledge bestows power onto those who possess it?
- Are societies or cultures without technological knowledge doomed to extinction?
- Are the factual claims of science the only ones that can have a global market value because of their “objectivity”?
- Is social knowledge based primarily on tastes, whims and values, rather than on strictly rational beliefs?
- If “real” knowledge of the world, as opposed to opinions or beliefs about it, is independent of the thinker, then is it the case that, with enough time, all groups can access all knowledge?
- Is it justified that private companies own patents over knowledge?

6. To what extent is knowledge dependent on experience?

This question creates a platform for a discussion of a number of different issues to do with knowledge: acquisition, possession, sources of knowledge and justifications of knowledge. It invites discussion of different forms of knowledge *eg*, deduction, induction, introspection and intuition and how these allow access to bodies of knowledge. The question focuses on the claim by the empiricist that all knowledge is based on experience, and asks candidates to evaluate the extent to which they agree with the empiricists' claim. Responses are likely to explore the different types of knowledge that might be acquired and the state of life that is necessary for various types of knowledge – for example, exploring the distinction between *a priori* knowledge, that is knowledge without experience, *eg*, propositions of logic (tautologies, analytic propositions) and *a posteriori* knowledge.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Rationalism and the concept of innate knowledge or ideas
- Consideration of Platonic “Forms”; the idea that knowledge can only be reached beyond the physical world
- The Kantian critique of empiricism and the Kantian perspective on the relation between knowledge and experience
- Concepts of experience; empiricism, phenomenology or other holistic views
- The idea that in some eastern traditions “imaginative mind states” are a result of knowledge prior to birth
- Are there different qualities of knowledge dependent upon by what means they are acquired? Is deduction a stronger form of knowledge than induction – knowledge gained by experience is better than inference?
- The problem of a *tabula rasa* approach to acquiring knowledge
- If knowledge can be acquired prior to birth does an embryo have the ability to acquire knowledge? How valid is the claim that “there is nothing in the mind that has not been in the senses”?
- Is consciousness and intentionality a prerequisite for gaining knowledge? Do we just absorb knowledge or do we personally seek it?
- The possible difference between information and knowledge and the role of “truth” as a possible differentiator; if so, is mere information perhaps not knowledge?
- How far does knowledge of metaphysics, morality and logic rely upon experience of the physical world?

Optional Theme 3: Ethics

7. With reference to one area of applied ethics, evaluate the grounds on which we should justify our moral judgments.

Answers should clearly identify an area of applied ethics from the three areas identified in the philosophy subject guide: bio-medical ethics, environmental ethics, and distribution of wealth. The question then asks candidates to discuss and evaluate the grounds on which we should justify our moral judgments, making explicit reference to the area of applied ethics identified. The question is deliberately open to the development of many different lines of argument, and focuses on the nature of moral judgments. When we decide on ethical issues we make explicit or implicit moral judgments. The question asks for the ways in which it is possible to justify moral judgments, and, simultaneously, whether it is possible to base morality only on a kind of absolute decision without any other justification. The question is also concerned with metaethics, which deals with ethical discourse itself. In this case the issue refers to the legitimacy of the values or criteria that can be established as ground for judgments on specific moral issues. Good answers should focus on the main issues intended in the question, which are not, for instance, whether moral values are relative or universal, subjective or objective. If responses introduce these issues, they should clearly show their relevance to the question or to the arguments developed in the answer.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- How can we justify our moral judgments? Can moral judgments be justified on the same grounds that we use to justify non-moral judgments?
- Can moral judgments be proven, justified or shown to be valid? If so, how? On what grounds?
- Ethical skepticism; is it possible to have any rational or objective justification of moral judgments at all? Some existentialists might argue that ethical judgments are arbitrary and cannot be justified
- The claim that a moral judgment is only a decision predicated on non-examined assumptions
- Ethical naturalism; can we justify moral judgments by grounding them in an appeal to the nature of things?
- Intuitionism; are moral judgments self-evident and intuitive?
- Religious ethics; approaches which ground the justification of moral judgments in religion
- Often we justify moral judgments by reference to ethical rules or standards
- Ethical standards are used not only for moral evaluation of the actions of individuals, but also for moral evaluation of the laws of governments and societies.

8. To what extent do you agree with the claim that character based approaches are more useful in making moral decisions than consequence based approaches?

This question enables an exploration of the contrasting emphasis on character and consequences in different ethical systems. Answers might draw on specific examples of character based approaches, *eg*, virtue ethics. Sometimes referred to as an *aretaic* system, Aristotle places the realization of “excellences” as the defining attribute of moral living and he promotes the fulfilling of human potential as one that leads to *eudaimonia* (“happiness”, “flourishing”). Answers may also draw on specific examples of consequence based approaches, such as utilitarianism.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- What are character based approaches to ethics? What are consequence based approaches to ethics?
- Should ethics be a matter of character rather than judgment?
- Why might it be important not only to focus on the moral quality of a person’s actions but also on the moral quality of a person’s character?
- Whether character based approaches are more individualistic, and neglect the community
- The idea that approaches such as virtue ethics observe empirically the human condition and draw conclusions from the way we actually live, as opposed to seeking a final rational principle to govern all actions
- Is there a danger of circular argument in character based approaches? *eg*, the question of what is virtuous is answered by “doing actions that are virtuous”?
- The danger of ethical elitism in character based approaches; is it easier to flourish given a good education or good fortune in life?
- Is the de-emphasis on the role of actions in morality acceptable?
- Do approaches such as virtue ethics suffer from the danger of relativism and too much consideration of an individual’s circumstances?
- Perhaps no single moral theory/approach suits all circumstances, all problems, all persons. Or perhaps an alternative to both character or consequence based approaches is needed?

Optional Theme 4: Philosophy and contemporary society

9. To what extent do you agree with the claim that censorship is always an unjustifiable violation of people’s basic freedoms?

This question focuses on discussion of whether censorship is always an unjustifiable violation of people’s basic freedoms. This links to the wider questions of if, when, and on what grounds, the state should limit individuals’ freedom. In support of their argument candidates may make reference to specific examples such as: Salman Rushdie; burning the American flag; bans on pornography; banning or burning of books; totalitarian censorship *eg*, Nazi Germany; modern day internet censorship *eg*, controls on internet in China. It is important to note that answers given to this question need to be explicitly philosophical rather than sociological/anthropological in nature.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Does the state have a duty to protect society even if it means violating individuals’ freedom?
- On what grounds might the state be justified in limiting people’s freedoms?
- How should matters of intellectual freedom be decided?
- De Tocqueville – censorship has no place in a democracy
- Mill in *On Liberty* – argued for freedom of opinion on all subjects, but argued that there are some justifications *eg*, harm principle for certain restrictions on the exercise of freedom
- Socrates – free discussion has a public value; charged with corrupting the youth
- Voltaire – “I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it”
- Censorship as control, a way to quash subversion, and a violation of freedom
- Plato in *The Republic* argues society should control what children are exposed to
- Legal moralism; legal paternalism
- Protection of minority viewpoints
- Freedom of expression.

10. Evaluate the claim that social networking technologies are fundamentally changing the nature of social interactions and relationships.

This question focuses on the impact of social networking technologies on the nature of social interactions and relationships. Social networking is not a new phenomenon, as it has been seen previously in things such as clubs, churches, communication by letters, *etc.* However it is a particularly pressing issue in 21st century society because of internet technologies. It is important to note that answers given to this question need to be explicitly philosophical rather than sociological / anthropological in nature.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The different social relationships impacted by networking technologies, *eg*, friend to friend, parent to child, employer to employee
- How do social networking technologies change how we present our identity? How do they shape our identity?
- Being multiple people online, having multiple identities
- What are the differences between social interactions using networking technologies and face to face social interactions?
- Borgmann's claim in *Crossing the Postmodern Divide* (1992), that online social environments are ethically deficient and cut off the pleasure of face to face contact
- Can you have a friend you have never met? Has the internet changed the nature of friendship?
- Relationships are enhanced by the added possibilities. New ways of interacting, new possibilities for social relationships
- Link to authority/control
- Anonymity; privacy; ethical implications
- Technological determinism – technology as a driver of social change that is beyond our control
- Differences in commitment and consequences as compared with face to face relationships.

Optional Theme 5: Philosophy of religion

11. Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of one argument for the existence of God.

This question invites an evaluation of one argument for God’s existence. Any argument for the existence of God may be discussed, for example: the ontological argument, the cosmological argument/kalam cosmological argument, the teleological argument, *karma* as proof of God in Nyaya Hindu thought, the argument from miracles, the aesthetic argument, *etc.*

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- The view that worldly features and human reasoning offer a route to God’s existence
- Design argument: Hume’s discussion of the design argument – both for and against; the link between design or teleological arguments and notions like “intelligent design”; design *qua* regularity and design *qua* purpose; Paley’s watch maker analogy; the discussion of imperfections of design; is God responsible for disease and natural disasters?; is there sufficient epistemic distance for a human to infer design about a world of which s/he is a part?; Darwin’s contribution to arguments about design
- Kant’s treatment of the cosmological argument and other design arguments and his contention that our view of the world is shaped by the way our mind acts on it
- What counts as an observable experience in relation to God?
- Cosmological argument: goes back to Aristotle, but gets its classic statement in the famous “five ways” of Aquinas – in particular his arguments for a first uncaused cause, a first unmoved mover, and a necessary being; cosmological arguments start from some obvious and general but *a posteriori* fact about the universe – that there are contingent beings, for example, or that things move or change
- Ontological argument: Anselm’s formulation; Kant’s objection: “existence is not a real predicate”; relevance of Kant’s dictum to Anselm’s argument; what might it mean to say that existence is not a real property or predicate? If it is not, how is that relevant to the argument? Why should Anselm care whether it is or not?
- Agnosticism: the view that human reason is incapable of providing sufficient rational grounds to justify either the belief that God exists or the belief that God does not exist; justifying agnosticism as a philosophical position requires a careful investigation of the limits of our cognitive powers; specifically, it must be shown that human reason is simply incapable of reaching either affirmative or negative judgments concerning the existence of the God of traditional theism or any sort of divine reality responsible for the existence of the natural universe
- Fideism: reasoning to God’s existence is futile, pointless, doomed to failure *etc*
- Naturalism’s basic thesis is that the only things about which reliable knowledge can be obtained are things that can be investigated by the methods of science
- Aquinas’s view of reason as a gift from God, part of the order of creation and thus designed to point to God’s existence
- Are the traditional arguments for God’s existence only of philosophical interest? Do religious believers rely on them to give credibility to their beliefs or are they signs only of what Anselm described as “faith seeking understanding”?

12. Evaluate the claim that all religious language is essentially meaningless.

This question encourages an evaluation of the philosophical issues that arise when encountering religious language, especially in a modern, and in many places secular, world. Candidates may discuss the place of religious language in different cultures/traditions; for example, storytelling as the route to religious experience in native cultures, *eg*, Hopi Indian language and belief, or the emphasis in some Eastern traditions of religious understanding being transmitted through action rather than word. Answers are likely to focus on different views of religious language (*eg*, as symbolic, metaphorical, mythological, or analogous) and the inadequacy of language in capturing the divine (*eg*, *via negativa*; other traditions and their reflection on the gap between worldly language and the divine, *etc*).

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Claims that religious statements are meaningless if they cannot be verified, *eg*, Ayer and verificationism
- Religious statements as verifiable after death, *eg*, Hick
- Artistic, imaginative, or non-literal language as a route to conveying a religious worldview
- Religion as a legitimate language game, *eg*, Wittgenstein
- Criticisms of verificationist approaches to meaning and religious language; the verification principle itself cannot be verified by its own criteria for meaning
- Cognitive *versus* non-cognitive approaches to religious language
- Any criticism of language uses language itself to make its point
- Can any sense be made of notions that humans cannot experience, like perfection, infinity, ineffability *etc*?
- The problem of communicating or verifying private, personal religious experience
- Metaphorical, poetic, symbolic, artistic language in relation to religion
- Problems associated with anthropomorphizing God
- Knowledge of God directly or through feeling and talking about God's effects in the world
- Are the "problems" associated with the use of religious language similar, in some ways, to those encountered when reflecting on poetic, figurative or literary language? If yes, what can we infer from this?

Optional Theme 6: Philosophy of science

13. Evaluate the claim that the proper goals of science are simplicity, explanation and prediction, not truth.

This question invites discussion of the goals of science. Instrumentalists about science hold that scientific theories about unobservable phenomena (like electrons, viruses, *etc*) are not true descriptions of an unobservable world but useful instruments (at best) for generating observable predictions. Realists, by contrast, hold that science can, and does, discover truths about unobservable phenomena as well as about observable phenomena. Some question the claim that scientific theories are true descriptions of an independent reality by pointing to the fact that so many such theories have been discredited. Many naturalists have contended that the history of scientific theorizing attests to the fact that it is best to focus on goals like simplicity, predictive success, fruitfulness, *etc*. They do not thereby concede that the ultimate goal of science is something other than truth (since there is no incompatibility between focusing on those goals and the discovery of truth) but see those goals as easier to defend.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- What are/should be the goals of science?
- The distinction between realism and instrumentalism in science
- The relationship between scientific observation and truth
- The relationship between the methodological strategies employed in science and truth
- The Duhem-Quine thesis is often appealed to for support but it can be challenged by urging that even if a number of different theories are consistent with any given set of observations it does not follow that we cannot rationally choose between the competing theories
- Some (like Feyerabend and Kuhn) go further and claim that objective truth is not even possible for observable phenomena because they contend that prior theorizing influences the observations we make and the significance we attach to those observations
- The claim that observational data is always compatible with a number of mutually inconsistent theories about unobservable phenomena and thus that there can be no single compelling theory (that constitutes the truth)
- Even false theories may contain elements of the whole truth
- Convergence may be in evidence as succeeding theories get closer to the truth by building on predecessor theories.

14. Evaluate the claim that it is unfair to hold scientists responsible for the consequences of their scientific discoveries.

This question invites a discussion and evaluation of whether scientists should be held morally responsible for the consequences of their scientific discoveries. It invites an evaluation that might address, among other issues, the extent of the responsibility of scientists for their discoveries and the responsibility for the predictable consequences of actions. Answers may include some discussion of general issues relating to holding people morally responsible for the consequences of their actions, such as the unpredictability of consequences, or the difficulty of measuring and comparing positive and negative consequences. Answers should however focus specifically on discussing the case of scientists.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Can scientists be held morally responsible for not acting?
- Do scientists have special responsibilities above other persons?
- Can we hold anyone morally responsible for anything? If the world is determined is there any moral responsibility at all?
- Examples – *eg*, can we hold the inventor of the car responsible for the harmful emissions?
- Whether governments have a responsibility to regulate scientific research rather than it being the responsibility of individual scientists (*eg*, regulations concerning human cloning)
- Would holding scientists morally responsible for the consequences of their discoveries limit progress and risk taking in the sciences?
- How do we weigh up positive and negative consequences – *eg*, ammonia used in fertilizers, but also used by Germany to produce explosives, *etc* resulting in millions of deaths. Should Fritz Haber be held morally responsible for those deaths?
- Is there some scientific knowledge that is immoral to pursue, or is it just how scientific knowledge is used that can be immoral?
- Difficulty in predicting consequences of discoveries and actions, particularly long term consequences
- Where should we draw the line as to where the consequences stop? Should we consider the impact on non-human animals or the environment, or just humans? Should we include impact on future generations when assessing the consequences of scientific discoveries?

Optional Theme 7: Political philosophy

15. Evaluate the claim that freedom and equality are not just compatible but that for there to be comparable freedom for all there must first be equality.

This question invites an exploration of the relationship between freedom and equality. Those who believe that freedom and equality are incompatible generally rest their case on the contention that to achieve substantive equality among the members of a society requires coercive measures such as taxation to transfer funds from the better off to the less well off. Those who deny that freedom and equality are incompatible generally seek to turn the tables on their opponents by charging that equality is, in fact, necessary for the exercise of a comparable degree of freedom by all the members of a society. As well as arguing against the need for large incentive payments and the justifiability of claims of desert and entitlement, they point to the fact that significant inequalities in income and wealth lead to power being concentrated among the wealthy and that the concentration of wealth and power significantly obstructs the opportunity less well off individuals have to exercise their civil and political liberties and fulfil their life plans. In short, without substantive equality as between the members of a society the scope the less well off have to exercise their autonomy is greatly diminished as compared with the scope available to the better off.

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Is freedom best characterized negatively or positively?
- Is equality best characterized formally (procedurally) or substantively?
- The relationship (if any) between individual desert and entitlement and fairness in the distribution of income and wealth
- The impact of concentrations of wealth, and significant differences in incomes between the better off and the worse off, and the differences in opportunities and freedom available to the worse off
- Do coercive measures necessarily involve interfering with the civil and political liberties of individuals, with their capacity to exploit their talents and thus the returns they deserve for the exercise of those talents, and with their control over the income and wealth to which they are thus entitled?
- Examples of inequalities – *eg*, differences in the socio-economic classes into which people are born, and differences in their natural abilities or talents for tasks which are in demand; economic and educational disadvantages: some can overcome those disadvantages, but it is much harder than making good from a higher starting point
- Equality of opportunity and equality of outcome; some people will have a head start and will end up with greater benefits than others whose native talents are the same
- Might inequalities which seem wrong arise from causes which do not involve people doing anything wrong?
- Is equality possible? Desirable? Why might some inequalities be deliberately imposed?

16. To what extent do you agree that there are some areas of human life which governments should not attempt to regulate?

This question invites discussion of the limits, if any, of the state's right and authority to intervene in the private sphere of individual citizens. The complementary question of the limits of individual liberty may also be discussed. Modern liberal ideas on the limits of government are based on a two-fold notion: that of a private sphere to the life of an individual that is inviolate, and the ability of an individual to make choices within that sphere. Answers may make use of specific examples of different cases for government regulation, for example: physical harm from drugs, suicide, euthanasia, *in vitro* fertilisation, genetic profiling, censorship of images and ideas, a welfare state for the economically harmed, care of the mentally impaired, *etc.*

In addressing these philosophical issues candidates might explore:

- Mill's prescription of harm to others is often cited as a justification for state regulation and intervention, and as a prohibition on individual choices. It is the degree and scope of harm that causes debate, particularly when applied to issues involving the tastes of individuals
 - The issues of "ownership" of the body and the limits of the self are central to determining the concepts of private/public, the rational selection of choices, and the rights and liberties of an individual
 - The role of the state in upholding the cultural values of a society; fascism, theocracy, communism, and other ideologies argue that this is a legitimate concern for the state, and thus the state is justified in intervening in the life of an individual
 - The claim that sometimes government regulation is necessary to protect humans from themselves because they are inherently bad
 - The libertarian mistrust of government regulation and intervention
 - The idea of freedom of the individual in relation to speech, ideas, *etc* is not absolute. In modern liberal democracies there are already laws that prohibit certain types of speech, images, and self-referential actions.
-



**PHILOSOPHY
HIGHER LEVEL AND STANDARD LEVEL
PAPER 2**

SPECIMEN PAPER

1 hour

INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

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

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

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

1. (a) Explain de Beauvoir’s claim that “one is not born, but rather becomes, woman”. [10 marks]
- (b) To what extent do you agree with this claim that there is a difference between sex and gender? [15 marks]
2. (a) Explain de Beauvoir’s distinction between immanence and transcendence. [10 marks]
- (b) Discuss the implications of this distinction. [15 marks]

René Descartes: *Meditations*

3. (a) Explain Descartes’s concept of clear and distinct ideas. [10 marks]
- (b) To what extent do you agree with Descartes’s claim that there are clear and distinct ideas? [15 marks]
4. (a) Explain Descartes’s argument for the existence of the external world. [10 marks]
- (b) Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of this argument. [15 marks]

David Hume: *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*

5. (a) Explain Demea’s argument that the nature of God can never be known. [10 marks]
- (b) Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of this argument. [15 marks]
6. (a) Explain Cleanthes’s account of the argument from design. [10 marks]
- (b) To what extent do you find this argument convincing? [15 marks]

John Stuart Mill: *On Liberty*

7. (a) Explain Mill’s view of the relationship between liberty and utility. [10 marks]
- (b) To what extent are liberty and utility fundamentally conflicting concepts? [15 marks]
8. (a) Explain Mill’s views of the value of free speech. [10 marks]
- (b) Evaluate the claim that Mill overestimates the value of free speech to individuals and societies. [15 marks]

Friedrich Nietzsche: *The Genealogy of Morals*

9. (a) Explain the view that morality has a clear and traceable genealogy. [10 marks]
- (b) To what extent do you agree with the genealogy Nietzsche proposes? [15 marks]
10. (a) Explain Nietzsche’s account of ascetic ideals. [10 marks]
- (b) To what extent does Nietzsche’s account of ascetic ideals sustain an idea of truth? [15 marks]

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

11. (a) Explain Nussbaum’s claim that it is impossible for human beings to flourish with dignity if certain basic human needs and capacities are not met. [10 marks]
- (b) To what extent do you agree with the claim that there is a correlation between the satisfaction of basic human needs and the achievement of human flourishing? [15 marks]
12. (a) Explain Nussbaum’s criticisms of using gross domestic product (GDP) as a measure of quality of life. [10 marks]
- (b) To what extent do you agree with Nussbaum that GDP is unsatisfactory as a measure of quality of life? [15 marks]

Ortega y Gasset: *The Origins of Philosophy*

13. (a) Explain how Ortega interprets Thales’s assertion that “all things are full of gods”. [10 marks]
- (b) To what extent do you agree with Ortega’s evaluation of this assertion? [15 marks]
14. (a) Explain Ortega’s view of the philosophical past. [10 marks]
- (b) Examine how Ortega’s view of the philosophical past serves the purpose of constructing a new philosophical synthesis. [15 marks]

Plato: *The Republic*, Books IV – IX

15. (a) Explain Plato’s distinctions between knowledge, belief and ignorance. [10 marks]
- (b) Discuss the viability of these distinctions. [15 marks]
16. (a) Explain Plato’s system of education. [10 marks]
- (b) Evaluate the claim that Plato’s system of education is crucial for preparing its citizens or leaders to create a just state. [15 marks]

Peter Singer: *The Life You Can Save*

17. (a) Explain Singer’s “Basic Argument” that we are obligated to give to aid agencies. [10 marks]
- (b) Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of this argument. [15 marks]
18. (a) Explain the common objections to giving to charity identified by Singer. [10 marks]
- (b) To what extent do you agree with Singer’s view on why people do not give more to charity? [15 marks]

Charles Taylor: *The Ethics of Authenticity*

19. (a) Explain Taylor’s argument that individuals need to find their authenticity through dialogue with others. [10 marks]
- (b) To what extent do you find this argument convincing? [15 marks]
20. (a) Explain what Taylor means by “soft despotism”. [10 marks]
- (b) Examine Taylor’s reasons for considering soft despotism as a major problem in contemporary society. [15 marks]

Lao Tzu: *Tao Te Ching*

21. (a) Explain the relationship between the principle of non-action (*wu wei*) and inner stillness. [10 marks]
- (b) Evaluate the claim that without the principle of non-action (*wu wei*) life will be competitive and unfulfilling. [15 marks]
22. (a) Explain the view of the state found in the *Tao Te Ching*. [10 marks]
- (b) To what extent do you agree that adopting the political teachings of the *Tao* would improve contemporary societies? [15 marks]

Zhuangzi: *Zhuangzi*

23. (a) Explain the distinction between “small knowledge” and “big knowledge” as described by Zhuangzi. [10 marks]
- (b) Evaluate the claim that “big knowledge” is unattainable. [15 marks]
24. (a) Explain Zhuangzi’s view on the unity and harmony of the world. [10 marks]
- (b) Discuss whether the claim that the world is a harmonious whole is inconsistent with our experience of evil and suffering. [15 marks]
-



MARKSCHEME

SPECIMEN

PHILOSOPHY

Higher Level and Standard Level

Paper 2

Page is blank

Note to examiners

This markscheme outlines what members of the paper setting team had in mind when they devised the questions. The topics listed in the bullet points indicate possible areas candidates might cover in their answers. They are not compulsory points and not necessarily the best possible points. They are only a framework to help examiners in their assessment. Examiners should be responsive to any other valid points or any other valid approaches.

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

Answers are assessed according to the markbands set out on pages 4–5.

Paper 2 Section A markbands

Marks	Level descriptor
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is little relevant knowledge of the specified idea/argument/concept from the text. • The explanation is minimal. • Philosophical vocabulary is not used, or is consistently used inappropriately.
3–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some knowledge of the specified idea/argument/concept from the text is demonstrated but this lacks accuracy, relevance and detail. • The explanation is basic and in need of development. • Philosophical vocabulary is not used, or is consistently used inappropriately.
5–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge of the specified idea/argument/concept from the text is mostly accurate and relevant, but lacking in detail. • There is a satisfactory explanation. • Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately.
7–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response contains accurate and relevant knowledge of the specified idea/argument/concept from the text. • The explanation is clear, although may be in need of further development. • Philosophical vocabulary is mostly used appropriately.
9–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response contains relevant, accurate and detailed knowledge of the specified idea/argument/concept from the text. • The explanation is clear and well developed. • There is appropriate use of philosophical vocabulary throughout the response.

Paper 2 Section B markbands

Marks	Level descriptor
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is little relevant knowledge of the text. • Philosophical vocabulary is not used, or is consistently used inappropriately. • The response is mostly descriptive with very little analysis. • There is no discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view.
4–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some knowledge of the text is demonstrated but this lacks accuracy and relevance. • Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately. • There is some limited analysis, but the response is more descriptive than analytical. • There is little discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view. • Some of the main points are justified.
7–9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge of the text is mostly accurate and relevant. • Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately. • The response contains analysis, but this analysis lacks development. • There is some discussion of alternative interpretations or points of view. • Many of the main points are justified.
10–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response contains accurate and relevant knowledge of the text. • Philosophical vocabulary is mostly used appropriately. • The response contains clear critical analysis. • There is discussion and some assessment of alternative interpretations or points of view. • Most of the main points are justified.
13–15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response contains relevant, accurate and detailed knowledge of the text. • There is appropriate use of philosophical vocabulary throughout the response. • The response contains clear and well developed critical analysis. • There is discussion and assessment of alternative interpretations or points of view. • All or nearly all of the main points are justified.

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

1. (a) Explain de Beauvoir’s claim that “one is not born, but rather becomes, woman.” [10 marks]

This question focuses on the distinction between sex and gender, and the view that gender is a part of identity that is gradually acquired rather than something one is born with. The quotation comes from the opening line of Vol. 2, Part 1, Chapter 1.

Candidates might explore:

- The female body as positive and negative; how it is perceived by society
- Men’s perception of women; woman as the Other; man as the subject and woman as the object
- De Beauvoir discusses female experiences such as pregnancy but says it is how they are seen that makes them a burden/disadvantage, not the experiences themselves
- De Beauvoir says that birth and weaning are the same for boys and girls, and that pre-adolescent boys and girls have “the same interests and the same pleasures” and that it is societal expectation and influence which changes this.

(b) To what extent do you agree with this claim that there is a difference between sex and gender? [15 marks]

Possible discussion points include:

- If one becomes a woman, how does this “becoming” happen?
- Relationship to existentialist freedom and self-creation
- Do you agree with de Beauvoir that a child does not “grasp himself as sexually differentiated”?
- Whether a woman’s vocation is “imperiously breathed into her from the first years of her life”
- Influence of religions on girls, particularly religions dominated by male figures
- Why does de Beauvoir claim that the girl “makes her way towards the future wounded, shamed, worried and guilty”?
- Whether de Beauvoir is too pessimistic about the female sex, or even guilty of misogyny.

2. (a) **Explain de Beauvoir’s distinction between immanence and transcendence.** [10 marks]

De Beauvoir’s views on the oppression of women are based on her view that women are defined by men as the Other. She expands this idea with reference to the notions of immanence and transcendence. Society traps women in immanence and they therefore cannot achieve transcendence and freedom.

Candidates might explore:

- Immanence as used to designate females, and as a passive, static realm
- Transcendence as used to designate males, and as active, powerful, *etc*
- Human lives should involve the interplay of both immanence and transcendence, but men deny women their transcendence.

(b) **Discuss the implications of this distinction.** [15 marks]

Possible discussion points include:

- Relationship to freedom; is women’s freedom destroyed by being denied transcendence or does it remain?
- Are women oppressed by being relegated to the status of the Other?
- Are women forced to relinquish their claims to transcendence? How?
- Do women really have a passive role whereas men have an active role?
- What role do women play in their own subjection and denial of transcendence?

René Descartes: *Meditations***3. (a) Explain Descartes’s concept of clear and distinct ideas.****[10 marks]**

Skeptical doubt is the fundamental method of enquiry. By removing from consciousness all images of corporeal things, then only that which is very clearly and distinctly apprehended or conceived is true.

Candidates might explore:

- The rebuilding of the world begins with the discovery of the self through the *cogito*, a self knows only as a thinking thing, and it does so independently of the senses
- Within this thinking self, Descartes discovers an idea of God, an idea of something so perfect that it could not have been caused in us by anything with less perfection than God himself. From this he concluded that God must exist, which, in turn, guarantees that reason can be trusted
- God also guarantees the reliability of the senses, but the notion of God is clearly and distinctly perceived thanks to its implantation by God
- Since we are made in such a way that we cannot help holding certain beliefs – the so-called “clear and distinct” perceptions – God would be a deceiver, and thus imperfect, if such beliefs were wrong
- Any mistakes must be due to our own misuse of reason and will.

(b) To what extent do you agree with Descartes’s claim that there are clear and distinct ideas?**[15 marks]**

Possible discussion points include:

- Does Descartes provide rational criteria to know when an idea is clear and distinct, or is this principle a general comparison or metaphor?
- Descartes takes for granted that he has a faculty, intuition, by which he is capable of grasping truth in some immediate way, and what he knows by intuition is worthy of trust. But why should we trust intuition?
- Why should we attend only to those objects of which our minds seem capable of having certain and indubitable cognition?
- Different conceptions of truth and ways of apprehending it
- This central argument in Descartes’s philosophy is threatened with circularity; since the arguments that establish the trustworthiness of reason – the *cogito* argument and the argument for the existence of God – themselves seem to depend on the trustworthiness of reason
- Can clear and distinct ideas stand as truths and as bases of knowledge without appeal to God as the guarantor of their truth?

4. (a) **Explain Descartes’s argument for the existence of the external world.** **[10 marks]**

Skeptical doubt is the fundamental method of enquiry. By removing from consciousness all images of corporeal things, only that which is very clearly and distinctly apprehended or conceived is true. Because of this doubt, the existence of the external world could be an illusion, or, at the least, contingent upon something else. But because Descartes is certain of God’s existence he anchors the reliability of our cognitions in God, who does not deceive.

Candidates might explore:

- All ideas must be caused by something or someone different from the one who has the idea, and, because I am a finite being, I cannot have originally conceived of an infinite substance; it can only have been given to me by some being who is infinite
- The distinction Descartes makes between innate, adventitious and factitious ideas
- The idea of God is not drawn from the senses, nor is it pure production or fiction; it is innate in the same way as the idea of myself is, which I also received from God
- Descartes’s idea of God is a being that is eternal, infinite, all-knowing, all-powerful, and the creator of all things that are outside of Himself. The idea of God has in it more objective reality than those ideas which represent finite substances.

(b) **Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of this argument.** **[15 marks]**

Possible discussion points include:

- A problem for this argument is the status of the claim that “I cannot clearly and distinctly believe that there is no God”
- Descartes makes certain assumptions about God’s nature (as well as His existence), *eg*, His reliability in guaranteeing the correctness of our sense experiences. Are they well founded?
- Why must the idea of God be externally inspired and not a direct product of my desire or will?
- Descartes makes God’s existence and nature the guarantee for reality. Is he justified in doing this if science leaves existence contingent upon random forces and processes?
- How much of the argument about the existence of the external world holds or can be rescued without recourse to God? Is it still reasonable to believe in the existence of the external world without believing in God?
- Whether the idea of God is like the ideas of mathematics and extension (clear and distinct)? Is it dependent on being situated within a Christian cultural frame?

David Hume: *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*

5. (a) Explain Demea’s argument that the nature of God can never be known. [10 marks]

Demea argues that although we know that God exists, we do not and cannot know God’s nature. He argues that the nature and attributes of God are “mysterious to men”.

Candidates might explore:

- Sentiments such as love, resentment, *etc* all “have a plain reference to the state and situation of man” and cannot be transferred onto God. We cannot use human qualities to describe the nature of God, or cannot assume that they mean the same thing
- Demea says that when we read a book we enter the mind of the author, but this is not the case with God
- Demea quotes authorities such as Malebranche to support his argument.

(b) Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of this argument. [15 marks]

Possible discussion points include:

- Whether God’s nature is beyond the limits of human understanding
- Do any attempts to know/understand God inevitably fall into the trap of anthropomorphism?
- Cleanthes’s argument that we can know some aspects of the nature of God, using the argument from design – if the world is ordered and logical we can assume that it was created by a similar intelligence
- Can we only imagine the finite, not the infinite?
- Does the existence of evil in the world tell us anything about God’s moral attributes?

6. (a) **Explain Cleanthes’s account of the argument from design.** **[10 marks]**

Cleanthes is the character in the *Dialogues* who is often thought to represent the pragmatic skeptic. He states that the only rational way to argue for God’s existence is to argue from experience, and that the design and order found in nature demonstrate that there must be an intelligent designer or creator.

Candidates might explore:

- Whether this version of the design argument is an argument from analogy
- Cleanthes argues that the fact that nature seems advantageous to humans proves the existence of a benevolent designer
- Cleanthes asks us to imagine a voice from the clouds “much louder and more melodious than any which human art could ever reach”, and argues that we would have no hesitation in ascribing it intelligence. He argues that nature is equally indicative of intelligence and design.

(b) **To what extent do you find this argument convincing?** **[15 marks]**

Possible discussion points include:

- The criticism that the argument is based on a faulty analogy
- Argument that the universe is more like an organism than a machine
- The claim that since we did not witness the creation of the universe we have no way of knowing how it happened
- Counter-argument that just because we do not know whether the world is designed does not mean that it is not
- Philo’s arguments that we cannot validly argue by comparing what we observe in a small part of the universe to the universe as a whole, and that just because the world is ordered does not necessarily mean it is designed
- Natural selection can be argued to provide an explanation for why the universe seems well suited to humans
- Whether the existence of evil is compatible with the existence of a benevolent designer
- Demea’s argument that all *a posteriori* arguments are inconclusive anyway.

John Stuart Mill: *On Liberty***7. (a) Explain Mill’s view of the relationship between liberty and utility. [10 marks]**

Mill’s moral outlook is dominated by the notion of utility; the sole matter in consideration for the rightness or wrongness of any action is the amount, and quality, of the utility it produces. Mill’s main argument concerns the issue of liberty, in which he makes a general case that there is no justification for any other individual to limit the freedom of action of any individual except where that individual’s actions would cause harm - the harm principle.

Candidates might explore:

- Mill’s handling of liberty – positive and negative notions of freedom
- Mill believes liberty is not afforded a high enough estimation as a necessary part of civilization and he believes people’s attitudes and actions should reflect respect for liberty
- Mill also looks into the issue of the best conditions for individuality to grow, and appeals to the full development of the whole human being; does this require stepping out of the narrow confines of utilitarian calculation?

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

The two principles of liberty and utility may seem to come into conflict since it is very possible to conceive of occasions when guaranteeing liberty would not lead to the greatest accumulation of pleasure or utility. However Mill disagrees, not by maintaining a right to freedom, but rather by appealing to the long-term consequences of restricting it, eg, the dangers of conformity.

Possible discussion points include:

- How do Mill’s views on liberty fit with his views on the significance of utility?
- Generally if more utility can be produced from restricting liberty, then for a utilitarian that would seem to be desirable
- Sovereignty of the individual – Mill regards the effect on those around the individual of that individual’s self-harming activity as an “inconvenience [...] which society can afford to bear, for the sake of the greater good of human freedom”; many would object to this and claim that Mill disregards the effect of self-harming activity on close friends/others, thereby offending his law of utility
- Mill sets the utilitarian calculation beyond individual societies and regards it as “the ultimate appeal on all ethical questions; but it must be utility in the largest sense, grounded on the permanent interests of man as a progressive being” (Chapter 1); when Mill talks about utility in its largest sense he talks about “the Human Race” or even “species” – so in his casting of the utilitarian calculation net Mill adjusts his account by claiming that satisfying liberty is always maximally utilitarian; is this persuasive?
- For Mill, utility is the primary rule by which other rules are judged, thus the principles of liberty and utility are not in direct competition because one is subordinate to, and indeed contained in, the other.

8. (a) Explain Mill’s views of the value of free speech. [10 marks]

Mill defends absolute free speech as a benefit and necessity for a progressive and free society, and as a necessary element in the formation of a virtuous character in the individual. Mill’s defence rests on four points:

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

Candidates might explore:

- Knowing different opinions leads to a refinement in character and in moral judgments
- Individuals are better placed to know what is more useful for themselves than for others
- The complete liberty to contradict and disprove opinions is the very condition that justifies us in assuming the truth
- On no other terms can a person have a rational assurance of being right
- Mill uses the example of organized religion as an example of how a noble institution can lead to ignorance in its followers by silencing contrary opinions.

(b) Evaluate the claim that Mill overestimates the value of free speech to individuals and societies. [15 marks]

Possible discussion points include:

- Does Mill discuss the harm and/or offence inflicted on others by speech (eg, Holocaust denial, racial hatred)? Are these examples legitimate criticism of Mill’s argument for absolute free speech, or a criticism that ignores historical context?
- With the current focus of Western governments on terrorism, are governments justified in silencing speech they deem as dangerous?
- Whether freedom of speech is a necessary element for the moral progress of a society. Is the current social alienation in Western societies caused by a lack of firm and clear values and beliefs that everyone can hold?
- Has the proliferation of information in the modern technological age been of any long lasting social benefit?

Friedrich Nietzsche: *The Genealogy of Morals*

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

This question asks for an explanation of the basic claim made by Nietzsche that human morality has an origin that can be defined and traced. The First Essay sets out to investigate the origin of moral values through an etymological quest for the root meanings of ethical terms. By this means the genealogical approach traces morals and values back to their origins, and to the instinct to dominate.

Candidates might explore:

- Moral words in various languages are transformed from other concepts, *eg*, debt
- Refinement and nobility, in the sense of social standing, are fundamental concepts from which goodness is derived, *eg*, “good” in the sense of “having a refined soul”, “noble” in the sense of being “superior in soul”
- It is a frequent practice of those of higher rank to name themselves according to their sense of superiority; “masters”, “nobles”, “those who command”
- The noble, the powerful, the superior, and the high-minded were the ones who felt themselves and their actions to be good in contrast to everyone low, low-minded, common, and plebeian. These high-minded people claimed the right to create values and to coin the names of values
- The “will to power” of the nobles is the source of their claimed right to determine good and bad.

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

Possible discussion points include:

- The assertion that language originates from the “will to power” could be an exaggeration
- Language has different functions. Exerting power is only one possible function of language
- Nietzsche’s analysis is based on an alleged historical reconstruction, whereas it is only a record of semantic changes
- Nietzsche’s genealogy could be seen to divide society in an overly simplistic way, namely into nobles and members of the herd
- There are significant implications for the foundations of morality given that Nietzsche rejects conventional morality
- Should moral discussion go beyond an analysis of language?

10. (a) Explain Nietzsche’s account of ascetic ideals.**[10 marks]**

Nietzsche views the ascetic ideal (see the Third Essay) both as a preserver of life and as a denier of life. The restricted conditions of morality literally protect and preserve life, and set up a clear distinction and appreciation of the values that make life bearable. The ascetic ideal is an expression of the human horror of a moral vacuum, thus the ascetic ideal is an expression of a “will to power”.

Candidates might explore:

- Examples of ascetic ideals including atheism, philosophy, religion and science
- The form of the ascetic ideal comes in types or guises. In ancient cultures, this was the priest, and in contemporary cultures it is the philosophers, scientists, *etc.* Characteristic of both types is their denial or rejection of the sensual aspects of life, and the creation of an ideal impossible for humanity to achieve
- The “will to power” is an amoral drive that seeks out the best conditions to enhance life. What distinguishes humanity is its ability to exploit advantage. It is not to be understood as being driven by pleasure or hedonism, as it has no specific goal except to express itself
- Nietzsche identifies the desire for the “kernel of truth” as responsible for not only the death of God but as the motivation for adopting the ascetic ideal
- The three great catchphrases of the ascetic ideal are poverty, humility, and chastity. If we look closely at the lives of all “great, prolific, inventive spirits” we always discover these three to a certain degree.

(b) To what extent does Nietzsche’s account of ascetic ideals sustain an idea of truth?**[15 marks]**

Possible discussion points include:

- Nietzsche proposes the search for truth as a counter to the will to power
- It is debatable whether Nietzsche’s negation of the truth as an absolute value means a complete surpassing of it or his position opens a possible new or different conception of truth
- Objective truth is the claim and promise of the ascetic ideal and this is the motive and source for the attenuation of the will to power
- The extent to which it is legitimate to reduce truth and knowledge to basic beliefs
- A belief in an absolute truth or an absolute anything is to give in to one particular meaning, one particular interpretation of a thing
- Does Nietzsche’s perspectivism necessarily deny the individual the concept of an authentic set of moral values?

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

- 11. (a) Explain Nussbaum’s claim that it is impossible for human beings to flourish with dignity if certain basic human needs and capacities are not met. [10 marks]**

Nussbaum’s capabilities approach draws on Aristotle and Marx. She seeks an approach where humans can fully express their human powers, and argues that we have an intuition of a dignified life in which people have the capability to pursue the good. A life of dignity requires as a minimum ten central capabilities: life; bodily health; bodily integrity; senses, imagination and thought; emotions; practical reason; affiliation; concern for other species; play; and control over one’s environment.

Candidates might explore:

- We should treat people as ends; key question should be: “What is each person able to do and to be?” (Chapter 2)
- Dignity: a focus on dignity is very different from a focus on other things such as satisfaction
- Dignity is closely related to the concept of “active striving”
- There are some freedoms “so central that their removal makes a life not worthy of human dignity” (Chapter 2)
- Begins from a commitment to equal dignity of all human beings; people should be guaranteed a social minimum which will allow their capabilities to be realized.

- (b) To what extent do you agree with the claim that there is a correlation between the satisfaction of basic human needs and the achievement of human flourishing? [15 marks]**

Possible discussion points include:

- Do theories of development tend to ignore basic human needs for dignity and self-respect?
- Are there certain basic needs, such as bodily integrity, which are crucial to human flourishing?
- The capabilities approach as a more complex and sophisticated approach
- Capabilities as being cross cultural
- Are the ten central capabilities the right capabilities to enable human flourishing? Are there things which are missing?
- Should people be regarded only as ends?
- What is the relationship between capabilities and freedoms?

12. (a) **Explain Nussbaum's criticisms of using gross domestic product (GDP) as a measure of quality of life.** **[10 marks]**

Nussbaum argues that theories of development which focus on GDP have been dominant, but are unsatisfactory because they ignore key things such as dignity and self-respect. She suggests the capabilities approach as an alternative.

Candidates might explore:

- Whether GDP is too crude a measure of development
- “Leaders of countries often focus on national economic growth alone, but their people, meanwhile, are striving for something different: meaningful lives” (Chapter 1)
- “Increased GDP has not always made a difference to the quality of people’s lives” (Chapter 1)
- Individual human examples, *eg*, Vasanti, to highlight the personal human element of development rather than the statistics
- The need to look at quality of life.

- (b) **To what extent do you agree with Nussbaum that GDP is unsatisfactory as a measure of quality of life?** **[15 marks]**

Possible discussion points include:

- Whether GDP is sufficient as a measure of development? Is progress more than just an increase in GDP?
- Can conventional economic measurements such as GDP tell us about individual human lives?
- What real opportunities are available to people?
- GDP does have advantages, *eg*, comparatively it is easier to measure
- Approaches such as GDP look at the aggregate, not at the distribution; which does not tell us if there are marginalized groups who are particularly deprived, *etc.*
- Nussbaum proposes the capabilities approach as the most attractive alternative to GDP based approaches. Other possible approaches include a utilitarian approach (which Nussbaum rejects, as it too “aggregates across lives”)
- What would be the implications for political life and for government of adopting Nussbaum’s views? What challenges would there be for existing dominant models of political life of adopting her views?

Ortega y Gasset: *The Origins of Philosophy*

- 13. (a) Explain how Ortega interprets Thales’s assertion that “all things are full of gods”. [10 marks]**

Thales’s assertion, “All things are full of gods”, identifies a central concern of the last chapter of Ortega’s text: the historical and conceptual origins of philosophy. This explanation might be seen as a case of the application of “vital reason” as method in which the narration of historical causes and circumstances is central.

Candidates might explore:

- During the 6th century BCE, in some enclaves in Greece, religion ceased to be a possible way of life, something which was particularly evident in the use of the term “god” for entities very different to the popular gods of Greek religion. Conceptually, in this context, deities had ceased to represent the exceptional and the extraordinary and had become ubiquitous and commonplace; “The gods were downgraded into causes”
- Thales’s assertion is contrasted with the enunciation of a geometrical theorem, which is directed to no one in particular, but to men in general, to the rational being. A theorem never conveys the impression of forming part of a dialogue. On the contrary, Thales’s assertion is essentially dialogic. He is rectifying, correcting a preexistent opinion – to be precise, a “public opinion”, or common *doxa*, according to which gods reside only in certain privileged phenomena
- Thales’s assertion ought not to be interpreted as implying that his ubiquitous gods are “divine” in nature, exactly the opposite
- The truth of beings is inherently concealed and must be revealed. The same thing happened to the gods, though the latter revealed themselves of their own free will and there was no means to control the authenticity of their epiphanies. Philosophy, in contrast, appeared as a methodical procedure for obtaining revelation (*aletheia*).

- (b) To what extent do you agree with Ortega’s evaluation of this assertion? [15 marks]**

Possible discussion points include:

- Does understanding textual meaning involve the integration of the two dimensions Ortega identifies? (What the text appears to be saying, *and* the fact that an individual is addressing his statement to another individual or group?)
- Why is it “unlikely” that Thales in this context refers to the term “gods” in “its usual direct sense”?
- Does philosophy consist of this “free choice of principles”?
- The figure of the thinker
- How does Ortega link Thales’s assertion to the historical origin of the profession of philosophy?
- Thales’s assertion as “mildly ironic and euphemistic”?
- The implications of Ortega’s approach for philosophical methodology. How successful is his approach methodologically?

14. (a) Explain Ortega’s view of the philosophical past.

[10 marks]

Ortega’s text poses the problem of what philosophy is, its essential unity, in a similar way that historic reason is discovered through a retrospective contemplation of its total past and through the attempt to reconstruct the dramatic occasion of its origin.

Candidates might explore:

- After finishing reading a history of philosophy, the first thing is to cast a final retrospective gaze at the sweeping vista of philosophical doctrines
- Anyone who adopts a philosophy of the past does not leave it intact but must, in order to adopt it, remove and add to it
- Two ways of approaching the philosophical past: analytically and synthetically. Analytically: a series of thoughts develops from an initial thought by virtue of progressive analysis. Synthetically: each thought presents a complication and impels one on to the next thought. The connection between them is thus much stronger than in analytic thought
- The dialectic is the obligation to continue thinking, and this is not merely a manner of speaking, but an actual reality. It is the very fact of the human condition. Man genuinely has no recourse but to continue thinking
- Ways of understanding the philosophical past: as a series of errors and as errors that contain some truth and help to discover the truth.

(b) Examine how Ortega’s view of the philosophical past serves the purpose of constructing a new philosophical synthesis.

[15 marks]

Possible discussion points include:

- Ortega’s very simple answer would be that we reflect on the philosophical past in order to act in the future
- Does historical reason explain decision-making? History as the discipline which will orient human beings in the universe through narrative by clarifying their beliefs, defining them and instructing them in the past
- Whether historic reason is in operation the root and historical justification of philosophy
- One of the many tasks in which man has engaged is that of doing philosophy; an occupation that has not been a permanent one for humanity, but “came about one fine day in Greece”
- The past borders on the future. The present, which theoretically separates them, is such a tenuous line that it merely serves to join and unite them
- A final backward gaze invariably stimulates an alternate forward one
- Unable to find understanding in the philosophies of the past, we have no choice but to attempt to construct one of our own
- The history of the philosophical past catapults us into the still empty spaces of the future, toward a philosophy yet to come.

Plato: *The Republic*, Books IV – IX**15. (a) Explain Plato’s distinctions between knowledge, belief and ignorance. [10 marks]**

This question asks candidates to explain the epistemological system on which Plato’s argument in *The Republic* is based. Responses may make reference to the idea that it is in the distinction between knowledge and opinion that Plato justifies his promotion of the philosopher and the relegation of those without knowledge. They may also refer to the idea that knowledge and belief are different faculties and attach themselves to different objects – knowledge attaches to the real (existence or quality) while belief attaches to that which is neither fully real nor fully unreal.

Candidates might explore:

- Plato’s view of belief being neither ignorance nor knowledge, being clearer than ignorance but vaguer than knowledge; a transition state
- The Similes of the Divided Line, the Cave, and the Sun or the analogy with mathematics
- Belief having two aspects; opinion (*pistis*) and illusion (*eikasia*) and being concerned with the physical world
- Knowledge is concerned with the intelligible world and is made up of mathematical reasoning, abstract thought (*dianoia*) and intelligence, and pure thought (*noesis*)
- The inferiority of the senses – which gives rise to belief – in comparison with knowledge. The objects of the senses, and thus belief, suffer from being what is-and-is-not at the same time; *eg*, an object may be beautiful and not beautiful at the same time, or at different times
- The philosopher as the lover of truth *via* a knowledge of Forms, as opposed to being a lover of things *via* belief or “sight” – the illustration of the painting and lovers of beautiful things as opposed to beauty-in-itself.

(b) Discuss the viability of these distinctions.**[15 marks]**

Possible discussion points include:

- Plato’s distinction is hard to sustain; for most people, belief in something is not a process that can develop into knowledge of that *something* by further contemplation – *ie*, are not belief and knowledge different aspects of the same cognitive faculty?
- While it is easy to understand us believing something mistakenly, can we know something mistakenly?
- Could knowledge just be a belief that happens to correspond to the truth *ie*, being an extension of the same faculty?
- Does Plato’s distinction rely too heavily on his metaphysical distinction between the world of the Forms and the world of things/objects? If true knowledge only attaches to the world of the Forms “above”, how does – or can – it relate to experience of the world “below”?
- Do Plato’s similes do enough work philosophically? They do not prove the existence of the distinction between the worlds and the faculties, rather they are illustrations which presuppose that distinction
- Can the universal truths of mathematics be applied to concepts such as truth or beauty or justice? Can the universal truths of mathematics be applied to physical objects like chairs?
- Do these distinctions rest on all objects having opposites?
- Can Plato rebut relativism with this distinction?
- Whether knowledge is really unchanging. In our rapidly changing world is knowledge as fixed as Plato argues?
- If all knowledge is already in our minds why does Plato entertain the idea of belief?
- Is Plato’s division of the intelligible world and the physical world really a division between direct perception and interpretation, judgment?

16. (a) Explain Plato’s system of education.**[10 marks]**

The basis for Plato’s education is the distinction between two types of perception: those that stimulate thought and those that do not. Mathematics is the prime example of “perceptions” that instigate abstract thinking; Plato rejects astronomy and harmonics because they rely on empirical methods.

Candidates might explore:

- Plato devotes a section of the dialogue to the qualities of a philosopher: loves learning, is honest, intellectually and morally courageous, *etc.* Although character is necessary for a philosopher’s education, it is not the only thing
- The last step in the education of the philosopher is the dialectic; this is when the mind is turned to the Forms and Plato suggests this occurs after eighteen years of age; it corresponds to the last part of the Cave when the prisoner looks directly at the Sun
- For those not fit to be philosopher kings, their education is still necessary as all must be able to contribute in some way to the state; women are also to be educated to be of value to the state, and they are not precluded from becoming philosophers.

(b) Evaluate the claim that Plato’s system of education is crucial for preparing its citizens or leaders to create a just state.**[15 marks]**

Possible discussion points include:

- To what extent should the education of the individual be determined by the needs of the state? Should I not be allowed to learn purely out of interest?
- How can mathematics be a suitable framework for understanding or finding the truth on moral questions?
- Does Plato’s general approach *ie*, an emphasis on physical activity in the early years, and the freedom to learn, make for a sound education for a philosopher? As a general programme for education?
- Are the virtues and education described by Plato all that are necessary for a successful leader? *cf*, Machiavelli: that a leader must be like a lion (courageous and terrifying) and like a fox (cunning and prepared wilfully to deceive)
- How can you properly assess the effectiveness of such a regime?
- Whether Plato is too simplistic in classifying only two types of perception
- Positive aspects of Plato’s education: its inclusiveness, and that the pace of the programme is based on the intellectual and psychological maturity of the individual
- Negative aspects: emphasis on elitism; individual needs are subordinated to those of the state.

Peter Singer: *The Life You Can Save*

17. (a) **Explain Singer’s “Basic Argument” that we are obligated to give to aid agencies.**

[10 marks]

Singer argues that there is a clear imperative for people in developed countries to give to aid agencies. He gives the example of a child drowning in a pond, and says that if you could easily save the child, despite it ruining your clothes and new shoes, or making you late for work, then you should do so.

Candidates might explore:

- Why suffering and death from lack of food, shelter, and medical care are bad
- Why if it is in your power to prevent something bad from happening, without sacrificing anything nearly as important, it is wrong not to do so
- How by donating to aid agencies you can prevent suffering without sacrificing anything nearly as important
- Why if you do not donate to aid agencies, you are doing something wrong.

- (b) **Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of this argument.**

[15 marks]

Possible discussion points include:

- Where do the boundaries of responsibility lie? Can we be responsible for refraining from acting?
- Property rights – some would argue that if our wealth is obtained legally and morally then we have a right to it
- What about cars and airplanes? They cause preventable, foreseeable deaths, but we do not hold the creators morally responsible for those deaths
- Giving to charity is not generosity, it is our duty; traditional views on helping the poor (for example in Christian, Jewish and Islamic teachings) agree with Singer’s conclusion that helping the poor is a duty
- Singer himself gives away about a quarter of his income, but acknowledges that he should give more. If even he cannot meet the demands of his own system, is it too demanding?
- Does giving to aid agencies limit our freedom to make our own decisions about what to do with our own money?
- Does the basic argument require us to act against our own self-interest?
- Do we have a duty to look after those close to us before trying to help people far away?

18. (a) Explain the common objections to giving to charity identified by Singer. [10 marks]

Singer identifies six major reasons why we do not give more to charity.

- “The Identifiable Victim” (people give less if there is no emotional tie to an identifiable victim)
- “Parochialism” (people are more likely to help their own families, *etc.*, than those far away)
- “Futility” (the smaller the proportion of people at risk who can be saved, the less willing people are to send aid)
- “Diffusion of Responsibility” (people are less likely to help people if others who could help are not doing so)
- “Sense of Fairness” (people are less likely to help if they think it would mean doing more than their fair share)
- “Money” (even thinking about money makes people less likely to give it away).

(b) To what extent do you agree with Singer’s view on why people do not give more to charity? [15 marks]

Possible discussion points include:

- Are people less likely to give to charity if there is no emotional tie to an identifiable victim? Success of advertising campaigns with emotive pictures, *etc.*
- Is it fair to criticize people for wanting to help their own families and friends before other people they do not know? Is this human instinct?
- Are there other reasons people do not give to aid organizations, such as concerns about the efficiency of those organizations, corruption *etc.*? Are people frustrated by the ineffectiveness of aid?
- Do people see foreign aid as a duty of governments rather than of individuals?
- Does giving aid foster dependency?

Charles Taylor: *The Ethics of Authenticity*

- 19. (a) Explain Taylor’s argument that individuals need to find their authenticity through dialogue with others. [10 marks]**

Taylor is reacting against the Enlightenment atomistic direction in understanding human beings; for Taylor we become individuals through our contact with others – we are only individuals in so far as we are social. He argues that being authentic – being faithful to ourselves – is being faithful to something which was produced in collaboration with others.

Candidates might explore:

- “Authenticity” as a way of life that has a purpose and feels right because one is true to oneself
- The value which most threatens to destroy us is our worship of the “me” separate from our dialogue with others; my beliefs, values, attitudes, loves, *etc* do not come from within, says Taylor, but in our public life together
- Modern social atomism encourages everyone to claim a right to hold any belief free from outside interference; in this system, authenticity takes the form of a “soft relativism” which disallows the claim that any way of being is better or “higher” than any other
- Because we are shaped by our contact with others, we do not stand and assess other cultures just because they are there; respect for difference does not require respect for every human and culture
- For the modern human the good life is whatever the individual feels subjectively good about; but this is no moral position, for morality becomes merely what you define it as and Taylor rails against choice as some inherent good in what he calls a “liberalism of neutrality”.

- (b) To what extent do you find this argument convincing? [15 marks]**

Possible discussion points include:

- By creating a dichotomy of “self-centred narcissism” and authenticity based on “horizons of significance” does Taylor ignore the possibility that a life that for him seems narcissistic may be authentic and well justified to the person who is leading that life?
- Taylor criticizes modern people who claim to live authentic lives but are, in his judgment, self-centered narcissists. Their authenticity is not rooted in any “horizon of significance” but on fleeting feelings. He also criticizes “instrumental reason” whereby social decisions are made on economic motivations alone
- Taylor fails to re-conceptualize authenticity in reference to “horizons of significance” because it is impossible for someone else to judge what being true to oneself means, only the person can make that judgment
- Whether individual choice is liberating (*eg*, the continental existentialist response which venerates freedom in the individual)
- Could different frames of reference really enable a common morality to be “discovered”?
- Does Taylor ignore the possibility that somebody may lead an authentic life in which ideas of “horizons of significance” or “narcissism” have no conceptual value?
- A discussion of the value that Taylor’s perspective offers to our understanding of authenticity, given that all our judgments can be interpreted to have some “horizon of significance”.

20. (a) Explain what Taylor means by “soft despotism”. [10 marks]

The problems of contemporary society: flattened individualism, instrumental reason, soft despotism and loss of effective political consciousness and action.

Candidates might explore:

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

(b) Examine Taylor’s reasons for considering soft despotism as a major problem in contemporary society. [15 marks]

Possible discussion points include:

- Whether Taylor’s assessment of the contemporary situation convincing is convincing, and whether it is justifiable
- Are the political aspects of Taylor’s argument convincing? Justifiable?
- Does Taylor’s view of what he describes as “soft despotism” fit well into his assessment of flattened individualism and instrumental reason?
- How can the ideal of authenticity find expression in the political environment Taylor describes?
- Whether Taylor’s argument regarding “soft despotism” is relevant to the 21st century
- Can individuals come together in the way Taylor describes and can they effect political change?
- How can effective political activity be brought about in an authentic manner without falling into the confines of flattened individualism and instrumental modes of reasoning?
- What is the relation between the political aspects of Taylor’s views and his views on the dialogical character of life and relations with significant others?

Lao Tzu: *Tao Te Ching*

21. (a) **Explain the relationship between the principle of non-action (*wu wei*) and inner stillness.** **[10 marks]**

The question asks for an explanation of the central principle of *wu wei* and its relationship to inner stillness, within the framework of the *Tao*. *Wu wei* means “non-action” or “no action”. It provides a principle for human behaviour. This might result in “acting naturally”, “effortless action”, or “non-intentional action”. It directs human behaviour towards non-interference with the flow of reality. Inner stillness results from humans being in harmony with nature, which could be the result of acting wisely and not interfering.

Candidates might explore:

- Those who follow the principle of non-action (*wu wei*) may become one with the *Tao*
- *Tao* means “the Way”, the process of reality itself; the way things come together, and the way things are transformed. This reflects the deep belief that change is the most basic character of things
- Inner stillness is a state of being which can result from adopting *wu wei*. This awareness allows you to pursue the path to becoming a sage, as sages appreciate the value of emptiness.

- (b) **Evaluate the claim that without the principle of non-action (*wu wei*) life will be competitive and unfulfilling.** **[15 marks]**

Possible discussion points include:

- Might *wu wei* produce passivity? Might it result in humans who are uninvolved in their societies?
- Competition, interference and aggression prevent inner stillness and the appreciation of contentment
- Balance and harmony can only be achieved by less self-interest and ambition, less striving and more seeking of inner stillness
- The *Tao* points to an ideal of naturalness specific to humans and society. This ideal presents a way in which to approach the problem of achieving harmony in the universe, in communities, and between and within individuals without recourse to external schemes, coercion, and oppression
- Are humans naturally competitive? How much is “one-upmanship” a permanent trait of society?
- Can people in a materialistic society give up possessions and be content? Can humans do without the idea of “more is better”?

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

The question asks candidates to explain the view of the state in the *Tao*. Candidates may refer to ideas in the text such as a great state being like a low-lying, down-flowing stream (Chapter 61), which becomes the centre which small states tend towards. They may identify the idea that the state has a responsibility to unite and to nourish its members, freeing them from unnecessary action.

Candidates might explore:

- The state led by a sage has responsibilities towards its members
- The great state only wishes to unite men together and nourish them (Chapter 61)
- A state is made one's own only by freedom from action and purpose (Chapter 57)
- Minimal interference of the state in people's lives will produce more harmony between people and the state, and between people
- The state will not discriminate between male and female. Female behaviour actually illustrates how the state should behave (Chapter 61).

(b) To what extent do you agree that adopting the political teachings of the *Tao* would improve contemporary societies? [15 marks]

Possible discussion points include:

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

Zhuangzi: *Zhuangzi*

23. (a) Explain the distinction between “small knowledge” and “big knowledge” as described by Zhuangzi. [10 marks]

This question focuses on the distinction between small/lesser knowledge (*xiao zhi*) and big/greater knowledge (*da zhi*) in the *Zhuangzi*. Candidates may include comments on the wider epistemological stance of the book, which is generally held to take a skeptical position on knowledge and to adopt a perspectivist position. However, the focus of the response should be specifically on the distinction between small and big knowledge. There is some ambiguity and thus scope for differing interpretations.

Candidates might explore:

- Big knowledge is wider and more encompassing; big knowledge is “wide and comprehensive” whereas small knowledge is “partial and restricted” (Chapter 2)
- Example of the contrast between the mushroom and the cricket. (“Small knowledge does not measure up to big knowledge, or few years to many. How do I know this? The morning mushroom does not know the waxing and waning of the moon, and the cricket does not know spring and fall. This is because they are short-lived.”)
- Example of the breeze and the quail
- Big knowledge encompasses small knowledge because it includes the perspectives of small knowledge
- Distinction between the kind of knowledge we can hope to attain and the kind we should be skeptical about.

- (b) Evaluate the claim that “big knowledge” is unattainable. [15 marks]

Possible discussion points include:

- Whether big knowledge is unattainable and why
- Whether there is a tension between the two types of knowledge
- Should people seek big knowledge, or be content with the amount of knowledge that they have?
- Knowledge is unlimited but life is limited, so we shouldn’t waste our lives pursuing the unlimited
- Whether big knowledge is preferable to small knowledge.

24. (a) Explain Zhuangzi’s view on the unity and harmony of the world. [10 marks]

The term harmony (*he*) is used frequently in the *Zhuangzi*. It is a central principle of Taoism that all life is part of an interconnected whole. *Tao* is an organic holistic process, of which man is just a part.

Candidates might explore:

- Harmony as made up of universal change (“In the transformation and growth of all things, every bud and feature has its proper form. In this we have their gradual maturing and decay, the constant flow of transformation and change.”)
- Harmony as pre-determined
- We tend to separate things and put boundaries between them when there are not any, which causes problems; “Everything can be a ‘that’; everything can be a ‘this’. Therefore, ‘that’ comes from ‘this’ and ‘this’ comes from ‘that’– which means ‘that’ and ‘this’ give birth to one another. When there is no more separation between ‘that’ and ‘this’, it is called being one with the *Tao*.”
- *Tian* as the underlying unity in the world.

(b) Discuss whether the claim that the world is a harmonious whole is inconsistent with our experience of evil and suffering. [15 marks]

Possible discussion points include:

- Reality itself as being harmonious, even if this harmony is hidden
 - Nature as being amoral
 - Suffering should not be labelled as suffering, but instead seen as a natural part of life; death as part of the natural cycle of life; death and illness as inevitable aspects of human life rather than as evil or punishment
 - Suffering is often discussed on an individual level, rather than being seen as part of the bigger whole
 - The idea that we should free ourselves from the world, and therefore from its suffering and evil.
-



**PHILOSOPHY
HIGHER LEVEL
PAPER 3**

SPECIMEN PAPER

1 hour 15 minutes

INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

- Do not turn over this examination paper until instructed to do so.
- Read the text and write a response.
- The maximum mark for this examination paper is *[25 marks]*.

Unseen text – exploring philosophical activity

Compare and contrast the view(s) of philosophical activity presented in the text below, with your own experience and understanding of what is involved in doing philosophy [25 marks].

We asked a range of our interviewees for our *Philosophy Bites* podcast the simple question “What is Philosophy?” They had no warning of the question ... Here are some responses.

Janet Radcliffe Richards: I regard philosophy as a mode of enquiry rather than a particular set of subjects. I regard it as involving the kind of questions where you’re not trying to find out how your ideas latch on to the world, whether your ideas are true or not, in the way that science is doing, but more about how your ideas hang together. This means that philosophical questions will arise in a lot of subjects. And if you haven’t got philosophical training you may well misunderstand the nature of a lot of those questions. So that’s how I prefer to think of philosophy – as a method, a kind of enquiry rather than a particular set of questions. Although of course there are some questions that can only be answered by that sort of enquiry.

Julian Savulescu: Philosophy is in my view gaining knowledge through the use of reason and conceptual tools, *a priori* reason, and by reflecting about oneself and the state of the world. It employs the empirical sciences, but it’s not a version of science. It’s gaining knowledge through rational reflection. And in my own area philosophy is about understanding what people should do, what sort of person people should be, how people should act, by rationally reflecting on the courses of action or the nature of human beings. I also think philosophy should encourage people to gain knowledge, and reflect and to try to seek to understand the world and themselves through their capacity as rational animals.

Tony Coady: Oh, well I’m an analytic philosopher, so I’m committed to the view that philosophy involves a lot of analytic work: a lot of analysis of concepts. But I think some people think philosophy only involves analyzing concepts and getting clear about things. They also think you should have arguments for everything – it’s a very argumentative profession. These are all features of philosophy. But philosophy should also be aiming to do rather more synthetic large-scale sorts of things. Philosophy should be concerned with issues to do with meaning of life, ethical and political issues, and should be scrutinizing the basic assumptions of our society. Philosophy has always been something of a science of presuppositions; but it shouldn’t just expose them and say “there they are”. It should say something further about them that can help people. As I get older and older I’m more and more concerned that there should be more imagination in philosophy than there is. At one stage it was all very clever, but rather dry. Although I would never want to get quite as imaginative as the various post-structuralist philosophers who put such a premium on imagination that the analysis and argument drop out, I still think that there’s something in offering a big picture about our circumstances, and I think that that’s something that should be encouraged in philosophy.

[Source: D Edmonds and N Warburton, (2010), *Philosophy Bites*, pages xi, xxi, xxii]



MARKSCHEME

SPECIMEN

PHILOSOPHY

Higher Level

Paper 3

Page is blank

Note to examiners

This markscheme outlines what members of the paper setting team had in mind when they devised the questions. The topics listed in the bullet points indicate possible areas candidates might cover in their answers. They are not compulsory points and not necessarily the best possible points. They are only a framework to help examiners in their assessment. Examiners should be responsive to any other valid points or any other valid approaches.

Answers on Paper 3 are assessed according to the markbands set out on page 4.

Paper 3 markbands

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response is poorly structured, or where there is a recognizable structure there is minimal focus on the task. Philosophical vocabulary is not used, or is consistently used inappropriately. • There is a very basic understanding of the view of philosophical activity raised by the unseen text. Few, if any, references are made to the text. • There is limited reference to the student’s personal experience of philosophical activity but no comparison or contrast of this experience with the view(s) raised by the text. • The essay is descriptive and lacking in analysis. Few of the main points are justified.
6–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some attempt to follow a structured approach although it is not always clear what the answer is trying to convey. • There is a limited understanding of the view(s) of philosophical activity raised by the text. Few, if any, references are made to the text. • There is some evidence that the student has drawn on their personal experience of philosophical activity. • The response identifies similarities and differences between the student’s personal experience of philosophical activity and the view(s) of philosophical activity presented in the text, although the analysis of these similarities and differences is superficial. • The response contains some analysis but is more descriptive than analytical. Some of the main points are justified.
11–15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a clear attempt to structure the response, although there may be some repetition or a lack of clarity in places. Philosophical vocabulary is used, sometimes appropriately. • There is a satisfactory understanding of the view(s) of philosophical activity raised by the text. Some references are made to the text. • There is some evidence that the student has drawn on their personal experience of philosophical activity, with examples or illustrations used to support their points. • There is some analysis of the similarities and differences between the student’s personal experience of philosophical activity and the view(s) of philosophical activity presented in the text, although this analysis needs further development. • The response contains critical analysis rather than just description. Many of the main points are justified.
16–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response is well organized and can be easily followed. Philosophical vocabulary is used, mostly appropriately. • There is clear identification of the view(s) of philosophical activity presented in the unseen text. Some references are made to the text. • The student draws on their personal experience of philosophical activity, using examples or illustrations to support their points. • There is clear analysis of both similarities and differences between the student’s personal experience of philosophical activity and the view(s) of philosophical activity presented in the text, although this analysis needs further development. • The response contains critical analysis rather than just description. Most of the main points

	are justified. The response argues to a reasoned conclusion.
21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The response is well structured, focused and effectively organized. There is appropriate use of philosophical vocabulary throughout the response.• There is clear identification of the view(s) of philosophical activity presented in the unseen text. Effective references are made to the text.• The student draws explicitly on their personal experience of philosophical activity, using well chosen examples or illustrations to support their points.• There is clear analysis of both similarities and differences between the student’s personal experience of philosophical activity and the view(s) of philosophical activity presented.• The response contains well developed critical analysis. All or nearly all of the main points are justified. The response argues to a reasoned conclusion.

Unseen text – exploring philosophical activity

When responding to this extract candidates should focus on the activity of philosophy. In the course of analysing and evaluating the ideas in the extract candidates should reflect on their own experience of doing philosophy, and should therefore make explicit comparisons/contrasts between their experience of studying the HL Philosophy course and what the extract is saying about doing philosophy. Candidates should make explicit reference to the ideas and arguments in the text in their response.

Candidates might consider the following:

- The differences between philosophy and other academic disciplines, for example, by referring to Radcliffe Richards’s comparison between philosophy and science, or Savulescu’s comment that philosophy “employs the empirical sciences, but it’s not a version of science”
 - The role of questions in philosophy, for example, making reference to Radcliffe Richards’s comment that “philosophical questions will arise in a lot of subjects”, or discussing whether philosophy is rightly/wrongly characterized as being more concerned with questions than answers
 - The nature of philosophy, for example, by making reference to Radcliffe Richards’s comment that she thinks of philosophy more as a “kind of enquiry rather than a particular set of questions”
 - The scope of philosophy, for example, by picking up on Radcliffe Richards’s comment that “there are some questions that can only be answered by that sort of enquiry”, and discuss whether there are some questions that only philosophy can answer
 - The place of conceptual thought in philosophy (including examples such as empiricism *versus* rationalism; the contribution of key classical thinkers like Aristotle, Hume and Kant on examples such as causation, reason, *etc*) and making reference, for example, to Savulescu’s comment that philosophy is about “gaining knowledge through the use of reason and conceptual tools”; are there limitations to conceptual thought? Are there limits to rational and analytic approaches to philosophical issues?
 - The scope of philosophy in terms of the normative element of many philosophical discussions – for example making reference to Savulescu’s comment that philosophy focuses not only on understanding the world, but also on “what people should do” and “how people should act”. They might also discuss the scope of philosophy by discussing Coady’s comment that philosophy should engage in “scrutinizing the basic assumptions of our society”
 - The role of argumentation in philosophy; framing arguments and the appropriateness of argumentation in various spheres; for example making reference to Coady’s comment that philosophy is “a very argumentative profession”
 - Analysis as a philosophical tool; the contribution of language to philosophical activity
 - Imagination and philosophical activity; the possibility of philosophy “offering a big picture” (*N.B.* there is no need for an account of what post-structuralism has contributed, but of course students might want to explore this in their response)
 - The pursuit of meaning in the world and how philosophy contributes to the pursuit of meaning; *eg*, Coady’s comment that “philosophy should be concerned with issues to do with meaning of life”.
-



**PHILOSOPHY
STANDARD LEVEL
PAPER 1**

SPECIMEN PAPER

1 hour 45 minutes

INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

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

SECTION A

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

Core Theme: What is a human being?

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

Who or what am I? I am a living, breathing organism signified by the words “human being”. I am a material or physical being fairly recognizable over time to me and to others: I am a body [...]. However, there is another aspect of me not directly visible or definable. This is the aspect of me which thinks and feels, reflects and judges, remembers and anticipates. Words used to describe this aspect include “mind”, “spirit”, “heart”, “soul”, “awareness” and “consciousness”. This part of me is aware that I can never be fully known or understood by myself or by others; it notices that although there may be some unchanging essence which is “me”, this same “me” is also constantly changing and evolving. So I am a physical body and an emotional and psychological (or spiritual) being. The two together make me a person.

[Source: adapted from K O’Dwyer, (2011), “Who or What Am I?”, *Philosophy Now* 84.
www.philosophynow.org accessed 1 July 2013]

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

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



[Source: A Griffiths, (1894), *Secrets of the Prison-House: Gaol Studies and Sketches*.]

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

SECTION B

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

Optional Theme 1: Aesthetics

3. Evaluate the claim that the role of the artist is merely to provide entertainment.
4. To what extent does the beauty of an object depend on how we see it, rather than the way that it really is?

Optional Theme 2: Epistemology

5. Evaluate the claim that the extent to which any group can exercise power in the world is determined by its access to knowledge.
6. To what extent is knowledge dependent on experience?

Optional Theme 3: Ethics

7. With reference to **one** area of applied ethics, evaluate the grounds on which we should justify our moral judgments.
8. To what extent do you agree with the claim that character based approaches are more useful in making moral decisions than consequence based approaches?

Optional Theme 4: Philosophy and contemporary society

9. To what extent do you agree with the claim that censorship is always an unjustifiable violation of people's basic freedoms?
10. Evaluate the claim that social networking technologies are fundamentally changing the nature of social interactions and relationships.

Optional Theme 5: Philosophy of religion

11. Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of **one** argument for the existence of God.
12. Evaluate the claim that all religious language is essentially meaningless.

Optional Theme 6: Philosophy of science

13. Evaluate the claim that the proper goals of science are simplicity, explanation and prediction, not truth.
14. Evaluate the claim that it is unfair to hold scientists responsible for the consequences of their scientific discoveries.

Optional Theme 7: Political philosophy

15. Evaluate the claim that freedom and equality are not just compatible, but that for there to be comparable freedom for all there must first be equality.
 16. To what extent do you agree that there are some areas of human life that governments should not attempt to regulate?
-