2224 – 5602M

Diploma Programme
Programme du diplôme
Programa del Diploma

Markscheme

May 2024

Philosophy

Higher level and standard level

Paper 2

32 pages

Candidates who overlook the Paper 2 rubric of answering both parts a and b of one question

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

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

Overarching principles

The following statements underpin our decisions below:

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

Example

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

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

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

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

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

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

Scenario 1. Candidate answers parts from two different questions.

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

Action:

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

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

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

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

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

Action:

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

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

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

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

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

Action:

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

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

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

Action:

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

Exception – this only applies when there is no ambiguity as to which question the student has attempted, for example if they have rephrased the question in their opening paragraph. It is not the role of the examiner to identify which question is the best fit for their answer (i.e. which questions their answer would get most marks for). If the given question number is a plausible match with their answer, then the student should be marked according to that question. Only in exceptional circumstances should this rule be applied to sub-questions (i.e. assuming the candidate had mistakenly swapped their answers for Q7(a) and Q7(b).

How to use the Diploma Programme Philosophy markscheme

The assessment markbands constitute the formal tool for marking examination scripts, and in these assessment markbands examiners can see the skills being assessed in the examinations. The markschemes are designed to assist examiners in possible routes taken by candidates in terms of the content of their answers when demonstrating their skills of doing philosophy through their responses. The points listed are not compulsory points, and not necessarily the best possible points. They are a framework to help examiners contextualize the requirements of the question, and to facilitate the application of marks according to the assessment markbands listed on page 6 for part A responses, and page 7 for part B responses.

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

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

Note to examiners

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

Paper 2 part A markbands

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

Paper 2 part B markbands

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

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

1. (a) Explain the claim that woman is a social construct. [10]

(b) Evaluate the claim that woman is a social construct. [15]

The question invites an explanation of the claim made by de Beauvoir that woman is a construct of society. This is a central claim of de Beauvoir's work and rests upon the idea that within the Bible and some other religious texts woman is seen as in a secondary position to man. "…one is not born ... a woman it is civilization as a whole that does this," (p. 295). She sets forth a position that argues the claim that this status is a product of cultural values and there is nothing natural about the second-rate status of woman. Woman is 'the other'. These cultural values have been perpetuating over time and are ingrained in most societies across the world. It is through a process of socialization that equally-born males and females learn that there is a gender difference being established. It is not natural but nurtured in girls as they mature. It becomes reinforced by their play, the expectation put upon them and their role within the family and later in the workplace. The consequences of this are the woman's lowly status relative to man. Woman is objectified, repressed and controlled. It is argued that 'woman' is not a fixed notion - as it is argued in social sciences that there are 'no fixed entities.' In an existentialist tradition it is argued that no essence is fixed as all essences can be determined. In the case of woman, it is society dominated by man that creates woman. Consequently, de Beauvoir suggests that with the chance to exercise freedom that which is determined by a society can be changed by the action of the individual. Also linked to the social construct of woman is humanity, which is equally constructed by man, and hence woman is not seen as part of humanity. Some challenges might come from the later 20th century feminist movements in the form of using feminism itself as a means of self-liberty, as opposed to a collective effort on behalf of others.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Issue of education and its role in creating woman
- The woman in the workplace and the economic status of women
- The role of play in many societies in forming the woman
- The role of the mother
- Marxist ideas of women and class and the perpetuation of the misrepresentation of the woman
- The role of science and a woman's freedom; the changing perceptions of sexual freedom
- Ideas of self and self-perception being influenced by social expectation, the mental wellbeing of oppressed woman
- Challenges to Freudian interpretations of woman
- The role of media and social networks and 'influencers' in resolving or reinforcing de Beauvoir's claim.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Feminist movements as effective attempts in addressing the claim
- The role of major social upheavals such as war or immigration in challenging the claim
- Biological sciences and the impact on freedoms for women; reproductive freedom possibilities
- The role of religion
- If woman is 'the other', is she different to other groups designated 'other'?
- Challenges to Kristeva's position that "woman does not exist" and therefore is not part of the natural order
- The position of women in politics – matriarchal societies as well as opportunities to break through glass ceilings
- The changing nature of childcare in some societies - paternity leave, childcare in 'socialistic' countries
- Changing expectations in the use of language and its effect on the notion of woman being inferior
- Butler's views on the relationship of sex and gender
- The autonomy of woman and its impact on the concept of humanity and human rights
- The extent to which difference interacts with equality - is female difference itself a route to emancipation?
- The degree to which the emancipation of all women is viable in all societies.

2. (a) Explain de Beauvoir's claim that females occupy a subordinate position in society. [10]

(b) Evaluate de Beauvoir's claim that females occupy a subordinate position in society. [15]

This question seeks an explanation of how de Beauvoir argues the case that females are subordinates in society. She claims that they are subordinate to man because of a collection of factors. She argues that it is wrong to use biology, historical circumstances, and psychoanalysis to justify the inferiority of the woman. The woman is seen as subordinate because man has used history to build an image of inferiority of woman as well as generating a myth of the 'eternal feminine'. The images of motherhood and bringer of life destroy her individuality. The social conditioning that takes place at each stage of human development for the woman creates the feminine. In adulthood the positions she holds within the home family and work all continue to reinforce the sense in woman that she is subordinate to the man. She finds it difficult to escape this repression and she became 'the other' – the object of a male society. This oppression is so great that the woman finds it difficult to find individual freedom and hence she can become complacent in her own objectification. There is a possibility of finding individual freedom through economic independence, but this opportunity can be limited by the cultural mores that she operates within. She questioned the institutionalizing of relationships e.g. in marriage. She also questioned Engel's idea that class alone is responsible for the oppression of women. Class can build the image of 'the other', of which she saw woman as the prime example, but one cannot reduce gender oppression to class.

Candidates might explore (part A):
- The different social and economic roles of women through history
- The biological issues that relate to women and their social role
- Freudian and other psychoanalytic views on the status of women
- Marxist interpretations of the status of women
- The significance of class with historical examples of female subordination
- Social conditioning through education, the family and marriage
- Legislative systems that limit the aspiration of women
- Artistic and media forms that reinforce the image of female servitude.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
- Educational and economic systems that suppress women
- Women, the law, and rights
- The pressure of motherhood
- Media pressures
- Historical circumstances that prevent transformation of role models in society
- The role of religion
- Psychoanalytic pressures of the social interpretation of the mentality of women e.g. de Beauvoir's critique of Freud
- Reproductive rights and sexual freedom
- Feminist liberation movements attempting to raise the status of the woman e.g. Greer
- Reflection upon Millet's feminist militantism
- Language forms and the male dominance in the perception of the woman
- The extent to which de Beauvoir exaggerates the real-life condition of the woman to reinforce her argument.

René Descartes: *Meditations*

3. (a) Explain the view that methodological doubt aims to eliminate reliance on the senses in order to arrive at indubitable truths. [10]

(b) Evaluate the view that methodological doubt aims to eliminate reliance on the senses in order to arrive at indubitable truths. [15]

This question focuses on one of the key themes set out in the text and asks for an explanation of the nature, scope and application of Descartes's method of doubt specifically with regard to the unreliability of the senses as sources of knowledge. As a rationalist, Descartes is concerned in *The Meditations* to show how reason and not sense experience constitutes the only source of certainty, knowledge and truth. In this regard, Descartes's enterprise in *The Meditations* is to argue that methodological, systematic, hyperbolic doubt is the surest procedure of replacing error with truth. Therefore, an exploration of the various steps outlined by Descartes in the application of the method can be developed. These steps include Descartes's expansion of his consideration of the senses as sources of knowledge per se to his treatment of dreams and the evil genius hypothesis. While the question focuses fundamentally on the arguments set out in Mediations 1, 2 and 3, it allows for a treatment of topics and themes drawn from other sections of the text.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Methodological, systematic, hyperbolic doubt as the process of replacing error with truth
- Methodological doubt as the most reliable procedure to lead the mind away from the senses and to identify and eliminate preconceived opinions and previously held beliefs
- As the senses do not constitute the source of knowledge any knowledge claims based upon the senses are rendered epistemologically suspicious
- Reason is the only reliable source of truth and knowledge, and reason alone yields new intellectual cognitions
- The fallibility and unreliability of the senses as sources of truth and knowledge during our waking state is extended to include any sensory vividness experienced while dreaming
- The evil demon hypothesis extends to the extreme Cartesian consideration of the mind's reliance on the senses by calling into doubt our experiences of external objects, the truths of mathematics and the experience of one's own physical body
- The application of methodological doubt to any reliance on the senses is not meant to lead to scepticism but to establish certainty.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- To what extent is methodological doubt effective in dealing with opinions and beliefs initially held as true and certain? e.g. Pyrrho's skepticism
- Is Cartesian doubt convincing as a means of dealing with the conflict between rationalism and empiricism? e.g. Abelard's claim that doubt was the first step in rational inquiry
- In developing and applying methodological doubt does Descartes have specific objectives in mind? What might those objectives be?
- Is Descartes successful in exposing a non-sensory source of cognition which provides the means of attacking and rejecting the senses and sense-based beliefs?
- Does the removal of dependence on the senses establish knowledge and truth which are absolutely beyond doubt? e.g. the mysticism of Al-Ghazali
- Is it possible or even desirable to eliminate entirely dependence on sense experience, e.g. the empiricism of Hume and Locke?
- Is all sense-based information by its very nature fallible, uncertain and misleading?
- Is Descartes justified in claiming that because sense experience is dubitable it is also utterly false?
- Does Descartes, in the end, re-establish a place for the operation of the senses in his epistemology?

4. (a) Explain how Descartes uses the wax example to demonstrate how the mind knows things with certainty. [10]

(b) Evaluate Descartes's use of the wax example to demonstrate how the mind knows things with certainty. [15]

This question asks for an explanation and evaluation of one of Descartes's most famous examples set out in the text addressing the questions of what we know and how we know it. Descartes introduces his wax example in the final chapters of the second meditation in the context of the second meditation's more general exploration of the nature of the human mind and how the mind is more easily known than the body. In the opening arguments of the second meditation Descartes arrives at what he considers to be the indubitable knowledge that he exists and that he exists as a *res cogitans* (thinking substance) without concluding that he might exist as a *res extensa* (extended, physical substance). Descartes also concludes that, as *res cogitans*, we possess the powers of sensing, imagining and understanding. The wax example is used by Descartes to reject the belief that we know things via the senses and imagination better than we know things via understanding. The senses only provide us with a vivid picture the qualities of which quickly disappear when the wax is heated. Imagination cannot yield indubitable knowledge of all possible shapes, sizes and properties from which we would come to the more general knowledge of ideas of extension, flexibility and mutability. Descartes argues that we only know the wax through understanding and judging which tell us that the wax is something extended, flexible and mutable but not something that actually exists apart from the content of the thoughts we have in our mind. Responses can go on to include a treatment of the nature of the *cogito*, the operations of the mind, and the difficulties that arise in the relationship of sense perception and knowledge.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Cartesian doubt calls into question all previously held knowledge and finally leads to the absolute certainty that I am, I exist
- Careful reasoning demonstrates that I exist as a thinking thing (*res cogitans*) that is, a mind (*mens*), intellect (*intellectus*), with understanding, or reason (*ratio*)
- A thinking thing (*res cogitans)* is a thing that doubts, understands, affirms, denies, wills, refuses, and that also imagines and senses
- The wax example shows that even physical things that we presume to know can only be clearly understood by inspecting them with the mind, not by relying solely on the senses nor upon imagination
- Sensory perception and imagination cannot account for an understanding of the nature of an object. They only reveal for inspection by the mind the object in its various forms
- The mind (*res cogitans*) in its operations of judging, thinking and understanding arrives at a clear and distinct knowledge of the nature of an object like a piece of wax in its various forms and sensed in a variety of forms.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Is Descartes arguing that it is more precise to claim that sense perception relies on the mind rather than claiming that the mind relies on sense perception? e.g. views of Aristotle, Augustine, Averroes
- Is the view that certainty is only achieved by means of judgment, thinking, and understanding an adequate argument against the role of sense perception in the acquisition of knowledge?
- To what extent is the mind an authority in determining what is true and real?
- What role does God play in guaranteeing what is true and real? e.g. Meister Eckhart, Augustine, Ernst Cassirer
- How effective is the example of the piece of wax in an evaluation of the epistemological status of sense perceptions? What of the ontological status of objects of sense perception?
- Does Descartes's argument leave us with the inevitable conclusion that the only thing we can know with certainty is our own mind? What are the advantages or disadvantages of such a conclusion? e.g. counter positions of empiricists, Locke, Hume, Russell, Quine
- Does Descartes understand sense perception as the inspection the mind makes of an object rather than the reception of empirical data from an external object which exists independently of the mind which knows it?
- Does Descartes's epistemology endanger the ontological status of material objects?
- In what ways and to what extent does Descartes's argument have contemporary philosophical relevance?

David Hume: *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*

5. (a) Explain Cleanthes's view of theism. [10]

(b) Evaluate Cleanthes's view of theism. [15]

This question invites an explanation of the position held by Cleanthes that is often seen as empirical theism. This is often seen as an *a posteriori* argument, as it is based on the investigation of the world. Hume is often seen as an empiricist and consequently uses this character of his dialogue to, perhaps, put forward his views and his approach to religion and religious belief. Empirical theism investigates the existence and nature of God by using experiential evidence. This popular approach is often seen as an argument from design whereby evidence exists within the natural world to reveal the nature of God. It sees the universe as mechanistic and hence concludes that there must be an intelligent designer at play as all our experience tells us that a mechanistic system has a designer. Consequently, Cleanthes puts forward the case that God must have intelligence like humans. This position mirrors the contemporary argument presented by Paley that God is like a master watch maker, and therefore something so complex as the world could not come into exist by chance. Other characters in the dialogue put the case that empirical theism is a weak position because it does not explain the nature of suffering and evil that seems to exist in the world and therefore empirical theism is an inadequate argument upon which to base the nature of God. Equally a case can be made for *a priori* arguments concerning the nature of God. Also, Fideism and a cosmological argument for the existence of God would challenge Cleanthes's stance of empirical theism.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The use of analogies to illustrate the ordered nature of the universe
- Teleological proofs of God
- The weakness of teleological proofs to resolve the issues of suffering and evil
- Whether order is a necessary condition for the existence of God
- The contradictions between the nature of God and the nature of the universe
- Various versions of design theory; intelligent design
- The nature of Aquinas's cause argument
- Application of the principles of empiricism to questions about God
- The nature of *apriorism* and *a posteriori* claims and God
- Challenges to the design theory from Philo the skeptic and Demea and his fideism.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Human desire to see and create patterns might be challenged as having no relationship to God's existence
- A mechanistic approach to organic systems
- The degree to which organic analogies can apply to design theory
- 'Mini Intelligent Design' theory compared to 'Intelligent Design theory'; where the former only requires some design by God, whereas the latter looks for evidence of design in everything
- The simplest answer: the application of Occam's Razor
- The problem of attributing human mind qualities to God; God might then have the flaws of humans
- The problem of who created the creator, Dawkins's challenge, and Swinburne's rebuttal
- Aquinas's claim - 'God is the same as his essence'
- Chaos theory that might randomly establish order
- The Dysteleology Argument where evidence of design is taken to suggest an incompetent creator, e.g. Mill and Haeckel.

6. (a) Explain how Hume's dialogue deals with the issues of suffering and evil. [10]

(b) Evaluate how Hume's dialogue deals with the issues of suffering and evil. [15]

This question invites an explanation as to how Hume's dialogue tries to argue that a God can exist alongside the existence of suffering and evil in our world. Philo argues, having listed all the forms of misery and suffering that seem to exist, that with these God might exist but is not morally perfect. The purely evidential based argument does not negate the existence or nature of God. Hume also makes central an exploration of the discussion that if God cannot prevent evil then he is not omnipotent, whereas if he allows it then his moral attributes are questionable (the Epicurean dilemma). Hume through Philo argues that the four positions on evil both natural and moral do not negate the existence of God and the position taken by Demea confirms that the intentions and design of God are beyond human comprehension; 'But so near an approach we never surely can make to the Deity. His ways are not our ways.' (Part 3, p. 19), but this does do not diminish the nature of God. God's natural attributes; omnipotence, omniscience, and providence, cannot be questioned from Demea's perspective while God's moral attributes, of benevolence and righteousness '… regulated by wisdom, and limited by necessity, may produce just such a world as the present.' (Part 11, p. 78). The conclusion is evil, and suffering can exist in God's world as it is the human that sees evil, and it might not actually exist as we do not, as humans, comprehend the mind of God and his purposes. Cleanthes seems resigned to a position of saying that there is more happiness than suffering. Therefore, what seems to be the fundamental problem – the degree of unnecessary evil - should not be considered by humans as we cannot question the ways of God.

Candidates might explore (part A):
- Philo's critique as a skeptic
- The Epicurean dilemma: an all-powerful god could prevent evil but does not, why not?
- God's motives which are incomprehensible to humans; Demea's argument
- The differences between natural evil and moral evil
- Human's domain of a tangible world and God's intangible world
- The role of free will in God's world
- Classic views on the attributes of God and the activity of nature
- The problem of claiming to know the mind of God
- The quality of nature as a revelation of God.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
- The nature of God's view of a world and the view of humans reflecting human values
- Why Hume does not enter into a discussion of theodicies, the existence of the devil and the afterlife
- Whether God has given to humans the ability to remove evil but they, humans, have God given free will too, and so choose not to remove evil
- Religious texts that offer resolution to the existence of evil; God's use of evil and humans' inability to follow guidance
- The use of evil and suffering for improvement and enlightenment; reference might be made to Buddhism
- The balancing of happiness and suffering; Cleanthes's defense
- The role of free will within humanity and its consequences; Swinburne's theodicy.

John Stuart Mill: *On Liberty*

7. (a) Explain what Mill means by "the tyranny of the majority". [10]

(b) Evaluate Mill's use of "the tyranny of the majority". [15]

This question asks for an evaluation of Mill's use of "the tyranny of the majority", the explanation for which is set out in Chapter 1 of *On Liberty* in the wider context of the treatment of "civil, or social liberty" and "the struggle between liberty and authority". The idea of 'the tyranny of the majority' was explored by several other intellectuals and political thinkers including, for example, John Locke (*Two Treatises of Government*), Alexis de Tocqueville (*Democracy in America*), James Madison (*The Federalist Papers*) and John Adams (*A Defence of the Constitutions of Government of the United States of America*). Mill feared that as the development of democratic forms of government progressed, the notion of "the will of the people" could evolve into "the will of the most numerous" — the majority. This majority could oppress and negate the views of any minority and against this possibility, the possibility of "the tyranny of the majority" precautions needed to be put into place. Mill argues that at first, 'the tyranny of the majority' was a political or legal tyranny resting upon the laws, rules, and formal procedures of those holding political power. Later, a more threatening form of social tyranny took shape where the tyranny of the prevailing opinion of the majority and the majority's ability to impose its own ideas, practices, and rules of conduct with penalties for disobedience became more evident. These two expressions of tyranny would both have as their objectives the suppression of any form of dissenting opinion and the enforcement of unyielding conformity. Hence, legitimate limits were needed to control the interference of collective opinion with individual independence. This was not only for the good of the individual, but for society as well. Since custom, prevailing opinion and the subsequent "tyranny of the majority" require that all should think and act as expected, the end result would be the stifling of originality, creativity, and independent character. Given that Mill sees "an increasing inclination to stretch unduly the powers of society over the individual, both by force of opinion and even by that of legislation", he feared that the threat of "the tyranny of the majority" would only increase.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The history of the development of the notion of "the tyranny of the majority"
- The elements that constitute Mill's description of "the tyranny of the majority'" and his distinction between political and social tyranny
- Differences between "the will of the people" into the notion of "the will of the most numerous"
- Since the will of the majority will tend to oppress the views of the minority, it leads to the need for precautions to protect the minority
- The views and opinions of the majority set the standards, supported by law and legal penalties, for collective, acceptable thinking and behaviour
- "The tyranny of majority" as an inherently unavoidable aspect of democratic systems of government and the consequent need for protection against it
- The effect of "the tyranny of the majority" on the prevailing moral code, religion, law and approved cultural standards.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Democratic societies must be on guard against "the tyranny of the majority"
- "The tyranny of the majority" as an unavoidable and inevitable phenomenon of a democratic society, e.g. John Locke, Alexis de Tocqueville, James Madison, John Adams
- What does Mill fear about "the tyranny of the majority"?
- Is the division of a society into the majority and the minority somewhat simplistic? e.g. Liav Orgad and the contemporary status of the majority
- How does "the tyranny of the majority" threaten individuality, originality, creativity and genius?
- Mediocrity and conformity as results of "the tyranny of the majority"
- What are some other examples of "the tyranny of the majority", e.g. Ortega y Gasset's "revolt of the masses", Rousseau's "general will"
- What circumstance might warrant the majority view prevailing over that of the minority politically, societally, or socially?

8. (a) Explain Mill's views on the importance of genius. [10]

(b) Evaluate Mill's views on the importance of genius. [15]

This question invites an explanation and evaluation of Mill's notion of "the genius" and its importance for the development of full individuality for the best development of society. The notion of "the genius" rests upon Mill's more general arguments regarding liberty of thought and discussion set out in Chapter 2 and the opening arguments regarding individuality in the opening paragraphs of Chapter 3. Only by eliminating uniformity and conformity does human life become "a noble and beautiful object of contemplation … rich, diversified and animating, furnishing more abundant aliment to high thoughts and elevating feelings." The cultivation of individuality is capable of producing what he describes as "well-developed human beings" who are nearest to their fullest potential. These well-developed individuals will be of value to those seen as "undeveloped" who might learn from those new truths, innovative practices, and the errors of past truths no longer tenable. These "geniuses" are also capable of setting the stage for new modes of conduct, establishing new norms for taste and culture, and creating a fuller sense of the meaning of life. Mill argues that while the number of persons of genius might be small, they are what he describes as "the salt of the earth" who keep life from becoming stagnant and mediocre. Mill warns, however, that persons of genius require a political and social atmosphere of liberty and freedom of thought and practice. The power of public opinion and commonly held traditional views will always threaten originality and non-conformity and this must be held in check. However, Mill also cautions that the emergence of original, innovative, and unconventional thoughts and practices must always be tested by free and unfettered discussion and debate and kept within the parameters of "the harm principle".

Candidates might explore (part A):

- Freedom of thought, expression and action as foundational principles for individuals and society
- "Genius" provides variety, originality, diversity and innovation in thought, expression, and action for the betterment of life
- The notion of the "genius" as the embodiment of the "well-developed person"
- The "tyranny of the majority", public opinion, uncritically tested values, traditional moral values all pose threats to 'genius'
- The value of "the genius" to society in making each person more valuable to him or herself and to society at large
- The "undeveloped people" and the public at large can learn from the "genius"
- Anything that hinders freedom of thought, expression, and action, especially amongst persons of genius, constitutes despotism.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Is Mill's description of "genius" clear? Is it convincing?
- Are persons of "genius" the only persons who can innovate and improve society?
- Are energetic, innovative, and original individuals such as those described by Mill as a "genius" actually as rare as he believed to be the case?
- The positive effects of "genius" as a reflection of the utilitarian principle of the greatest happiness for the greatest number, e.g. the position of Bentham
- To what extent can the "genius" survive "the tyranny of the majority"?
- Circumstances that might legitimate restricting the thoughts and actions of the "genius". Will "the genius" inevitably be seen as an outsider, prone to ridicule or persecution?
- Originality and innovation as essential values in any society, e.g. Kant's views on the importance of genius in society
- Is Mill's view that only "well-developed persons" (geniuses) are able to keep customarily held beliefs and values from degenerating into meaningless traditions a realistic assessment of the value of the "genius"?
- Negative aspects of the idea of "genius", e.g. hero-worship, excusing poor behaviour for those labelled "genius"
- The view that "genius" is a gendered concept, where women are less likely to be considered a genius, and the practical implications of this e.g. the distribution of elite jobs and status
- Comparison with, for example, Schopenhauer's view of a genius having a clear vision of the world or with Hume's view of a genius as a person of creative insight.

Friedrich Nietzsche: *The Genealogy of Morals*

9. (a) Explain the relationship between Christianity and slave morality. [10]

(b) Evaluate the relationship between Christianity and slave morality. [15]

The question asks for an explanation and evaluation of the relationship between Christianity and the slave morality. According to Nietzsche's explanation the slaves established an alternative morality in which unwarranted suffering was acknowledged as a reliable guide of goodness. In this revolt the psychological mechanism of the *ressentiment* which is in the very origin of Christianity and the morality associated with it has a central role: "The slave revolt in morality begins when *ressentiment* itself becomes creative and gives birth to values: the *ressentiment* of natures that are denied the true reaction, that of deeds, and compensate themselves with an imaginary revenge." (First essay, section 10). Precisely, this inversion of the orientation of the values constitutes the essence of *ressentiment*. It shows the core of the slave morality: the revenge against life. That the case Nietzsche builds against morality is personal and without intention of some balanced evaluation is a quite usual counterargument, which might be developed by some answers.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The opposition between master morality and slave morality
- Slave morality as the creation and persistence of a distinctive structure of evaluation and a system of values historically related to Christianity
- Nietzsche's attack on Christian morality as a diagnostic regarding life and instincts; it is not false, it enfeebles strong wills
- Master and slave morality and the contrasts between "good" and "evil" and "good and bad"
- The role of "the priests" in the triumph of slave morality: teachers, leaders of humanity, theologians
- The inversion of the orientation of the values changes what is considered as "high" and "low".

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The three fundamental psychological mechanisms that articulate the whole argument of the *Genealogy*: *ressentiment*, bad conscience, and will to power
- Is Nietzsche just stating that master morality is good, while slave morality is evil?
- How to define the precise scope of Nietzsche's critique of morality?
- The extent to which Nietzsche is justified when sustaining that the Christian morality is a sick one
- What does it actually mean that instincts and life can suffer from an illness?
- The extent to which Christian morality is a means to come to power
- Is Nietzsche postulating an idealized version of past forms of human life, the "higher type of man"?
- The extent to which Nietzsche's critique of morality is naturalist.

10. (a) Explain Nietzsche's assertion that "a moral genealogy seems to me a fundamental insight". [10]

(b) Evaluate Nietzsche's assertion that "a moral genealogy seems to me a fundamental insight". [15]

Nietzsche's statement (First Essay, section 4) offers an opportunity to explain and evaluate his genealogical approach to morality. Already in the preface the genealogy is shown as being in the service of a critique of morality. Nietzsche underlines that this approach looks "in the direction of an actual history of morality" aiming at what is "vital for a genealogist of morals," that is, "what is documented, what can actually be confirmed and has actually existed, in short the entire long hieroglyphic record, so hard to decipher, of the moral past of mankind!" (Preface, part 7). The genealogy as a new method of analysis of morality articulates a new demand: "a *critique* of moral values, *the value of these values themselves must first be called in question*" (Preface, part 6). The genealogical approach constitutes the backbone of the arguments developed on each of the three inquiries which deal with the origins of moral phenomena. Answers might also challenge Nietzsche's assertion analysing the extent to which the genealogical approach commits the genetic fallacy, i.e. the fallacy of thinking the origin of X demonstrates something about the value of X.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The need of a knowledge of the conditions and circumstances in which moral values grew, under which they evolved and changed
- Morality as consequence, as symptom, as mask
- Nietzsche's resolution to explain the origin of moral values without recourse to supernatural principles
- Genealogy as separating the various strands that may have become tightly woven together by the process of historical development
- The contribution of linguistics, especially the study of etymology, to the genealogical understanding of moral concepts
- The genealogical approach in relation to master and slave morality, guilt and bad conscience, and the ascetic ideals.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Genealogy seeks to identify not simply the motives that explain the origins of moral values, but the motives which are still operative in the present
- Comparison with conventional genealogies
- The genealogical approach and other views on values and morality e.g. deontological, pragmatic, utilitarian, teleological.
- The extent to which central to genealogical practice is a commitment to naturalism
- Genealogy as a form of investigation of the web of power in a society or an historical period, comparison and contrast with Foucault
- Whether Nietzsche's genealogical interpretation, rather than being solipsistic or particularistic, supplies the basis for the creation of a communal sense of identity and the exercise of communal judgment
- The extent to which Nietzsche's genealogy commits a genetic fallacy
- Comparison and contrast with other methods which reflect on morality e.g. analytical, hermeneutical, phenomenological, psychoanalytical
- Nietzsche's view that the late arrival at the genealogical approach is the fault of the retarding influence exercised by the democratic prejudice in the modern world toward all questions of origin.

Martha Nussbaum: *Creating Capabilit*ies*: The Human Development Approach*

11. (a) Explain the claim that the real wealth of a nation is its people. [10]

(b) Evaluate the claim that the real wealth of a nation is its people. [15]

The claim is from the first page of the Ch. 1 of Nussbaum's book, where she mentions the United Nations Development Programme. The claim clearly mirrors Nussbaum's focus on the development of human lives and the real possibilities that people enjoy "long, healthy, and creative lives" (p. 1). Nussbaum discusses different approaches to measuring the success of a country. For example, she critiques the use of GDP because it is insensitive to the quality of individuals' lives. Instead, she proposes her capabilities approach. When she says that the real wealth of a nation is in its people, she means that wealth is not about income of GDP, but about flourishing. Candidates might link the argument to social welfare, national agendas, governmental strategies, and other political issues, which are central in Nussbaum's view. Ch. 1 is also where Nussbaum presents Vasanti's case: candidates might explore it and explain how Nussbaum uses this case to illustrate the impact of government policy on one woman's life. Responses might refer to the gender imbalance as an issue in India, or to the role of education. Candidates might also analyse some central concepts of Nussbaum's text and philosophy, such as wealth, equality, freedom, and the capabilities approach. Candidates might discuss the relationship between equality and freedom and highlight the reasons why Nussbaum criticizes Sen's view of freedom. As possible counterarguments, candidates might consider Rawls's "theory of justice" and Sen's criticism.

Candidates might explore (part A):
- The United Nations Development Programme
- Vasanti's case and the use that Nussbaum makes of it
- The role of education and its relationship with freedom and equality
- Gender inequalities
- The role of social justice
- Domestic violence
- Life as opportunities: the "Capabilities approach".

Possible discussion points include (part B):
- Wealth in relation with the GDP
- Whether governments have a duty or a limit to support people, e.g. Mill, Nozick
- The concept of negative and positive freedom, e.g. Berlin, Bobbio
- The relationship between equality and justice, e.g. Rawl's theory of justice
- The different kinds of justice, e.g. Aristotle
- Sen's view on liberty; Sen's criticism of Rawls's theory of justice
- Alternatives to the "Capabilities Approach", e.g. utilitarianism, contractarianism, paternalism.

12. (a) Explain the claim that "the quality of the environment clearly plays a role in the Capabilities Approach". [10]

(b) Evaluate the claim that "the quality of the environment clearly plays a role in the Capabilities Approach". [15]

The claim is from Ch. 8, "Capabilities and Contemporary Issues" (p. 163). Nussbaum discusses several issues of the contemporary society, from gender inequalities to disabilities, from the animals' entitlements to the environment. Candidates might consider the relationship between healthy ecosystems and human well-being, particularly "if we think of human well-being as including commitments to future generations" (p. 163). Candidates might evaluate whether the "Capabilities Approach" entails interests in the environmental quality. Responses might also explore Nussbaum's reference to Rawls's theory of justice. Candidates might also focus on the distinction between wealth and health, highlighting the relationship between economic growth and health/environmental quality. Also, candidates might discuss whether a good quality of the environment is essential to exercise the capabilities. Finally, candidates might consider the pros and cons of anthropocentric approaches and the reasons why Nussbaum agrees with them. As counterarguments, candidates might illustrate some anti-anthropocentric views, e.g. Naess's deep ecology, or Singer's views on animal liberation.

Candidates might explore (part A):
- The contemporary issues that Nussbaum identifies, e.g. disabilities, gender inequalities, animals' entitlements, environmental quality
- The relationship between healthy ecosystems and human well-being
- The relationship between wealth and health: economic growth, GDP, governmental policies, welfare
- Why environment is important, e.g. Holland's anthropocentrism.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
- Whether the "Capabilities Approach" entails interests in the environment
- Nussbaum's reference to Rawls's theory of justice
- Whether economic growth and healthy ecosystems are necessarily in opposition
- The environmental issue as related to future generations, e.g. Jonas's imperative of responsibility
- Why Nussbaum agrees with Holland's anthropocentrism
- The environmental quality and anti-anthropocentrism, e.g. Leopold, Naess, deep ecology
- The environmental quality and animals, e.g. Singer, Regan.

José Ortega y Gasset: *The Origin of Philosophy*

13. (a) Explain the importance of the philosophical past according to Ortega y Gasset. [10]

(b) Evaluate the importance of the philosophical past according to Ortega y Gasset. [15]

The question offers an opportunity to explain and evaluate Ortega y Gasset's account of the philosophical past and its function when reflecting upon the origin of philosophy. Ortega y Gasset sees the past as an essential part of contemporary philosophy. In explaining what philosophy is for, he begins with its history. Man "is the only being who is a product of the past, who consists in the past, though not solely in the past" (p. 30). Other things do not possess it because they are only a consequence of the past. Man, however, preserves the past within himself, he accumulates it, he enables that which once was to subsist within "in the form of what has been" (p. 30). Past, present and future co-form a unified basic reality of human life; the line which theoretically separates them is just theoretical, and actually it serves more to join and unite them. This general approach to the human past provides a substantial frame rich in consequences for the analysis and discussion of the meaning of the philosophical past. The possible overestimation of the importance of the philosophical past and weaknesses in the explanation of Ortega y Gasset's more systematic account are usual counterarguments to which answers might refer.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The philosophical past is seen as consistently committing errors; but the errors are transformed into involuntary instruments of the truth
- The succession of philosophers appears as one single philosopher who lived for twenty-five hundred years during which he "continued thinking"
- The philosophical past is revealed as a vast melody of intellectual experiences through which man has been passing
- Philosophy is what it is because it finds itself mounted upon the shoulders of its predecessors
- Not one philosophical system among those formulated appears adequately true to us
- The efficacy of old ideas is perpetually restored in us and becomes everlasting.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The role of the past in shaping the idea of philosophy
- Historical reason as an approach to understand the philosophical past
- Since historical reason is discovered through a retrospective contemplation of its total past, to what extent philosophy might show a similar unity?
- The roots and historical justification of philosophy in relation to the profession of philosophy as an example of historical reason applied
- The connections between philosophy, its history and history as a discipline
- Dialectic as the articulation of the historical deployment, which drives us to continue thinking, and therefore as the articulation of the philosophical past
- Ortega y Gasset's conception of philosophy in relation to other views, e.g.: Plato, Descartes, Hegel, Heidegger.

14. (a) Explain Ortega y Gasset's view that knowledge is perspective. [10]

(b) Evaluate Ortega y Gasset's view that knowledge is perspective. [15]

Ortega y Gasset expounds his approach to knowledge, which is central not only to his reflection on the origin of philosophy but also to his whole philosophy, in Chapter 2, "Aspects and The Entirety." When explaining and evaluating Ortega y Gasset's approach to knowledge, answers might develop Ortega y Gasset's conception as presented there, including its relation to dialectic, or connect it with the several views offered in relation to the origin of philosophy along the book. Counter-arguments might be developed in relation to what is considered Ortega y Gasset's historical relativism. An important building block of Ortega y Gasset's conception is his interpretation of Plato's notion of idea: "The most exact rendering of the term Idea, as Plato used it, would be "aspect" and he was not concerned with psychology but with ontology" (p. 44). "Knowledge is perspective" means that knowledge is not a mere presentation of the thing itself in the mind, nor is it the thing itself in the mind through the form of apprehension or knowing (*per modum cognoscentis*), "as the scholastics maintained, nor is it a copy of the thing, nor a construction of the thing as supposed by Kant, the positivists, and Marburg's school" (p. 44); accordingly, knowledge is interpretation.

Candidates might explore (part A):
- Perspective and knowledge are almost equivalent
- Knowledge is an interpretation of the thing itself, which subjects it to translation as though from the language of being, a silent one, to the language of knowing, an articulate one
- Knowledge as not only a *modus cognoscentis*, but a positive modification of that which is known
- Knowledge is the thing transformed into "aspects", the essence of which is to be constructed into a perspective
- Knowledge, in its ultimate and radical conception, is dialectics (*dialegesthai*), to be talking about things
- "Dialectic" enunciates the views in which the aspects of reality appear before us.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
- The discussion with traditional theories of knowledge, e.g. Thomas Aquinas and Ortega y Gasset's dissolution of the reality of the essence
- To what extent we grasp aspects of reality but not reality itself?
- The nature of our knowledge of reality
- Perspectivism as epistemological position; relation to Nietzsche's views
- Dialectics and its function when explaining the origin of philosophy: the concept of "dialectical series"
- Ortega y Gasset's conception of dialectics and other theories: Plato, Hegel, Marx.

Plato: *The Republic*, Books IV–IX

15. (a) Explain Plato's view of dialectic. [10]

(b) Evaluate Plato's view of dialectic. [15]

This question asks candidates to explain and evaluate Plato's conception of dialectic which involves the methodological aspects and Plato's philosophical ideas as well. Dialectic is developed in *The Republic* as the distinctive philosophical method through which the guardians know the Forms and especially the Form of the Good (534b–c). The explanation of the idea of dialectic precisely consists in developing arguments and counterarguments. The key role of dialectic goes beyond the methodological aspects. It leads to the highest and purest stage of knowledge and insight, since its activity is based on intelligible Forms, through which it advances to the very first constituents of the intelligible world. This is exemplified in the Divided Line. This has essential consequences for the *polis*. The authority of the guardians to lead the ideal *polis* is grounded in the results of their acquaintance with, and love of, the Forms. Dialectic is the method through which they gain this acquaintance. Analysis and discussion of dialectic might also involve the counterarguments to Plato's political philosophy.

Candidates might explore (part A):
- The dialectician is able to give an account of the essence of each thing
- The movement of thought involved in dialectic is distinguished from that involved in mathematical thinking: intellection (*noesis*) *versus* discursive thought (*dianoia*) (511a–c)
- The dialogue structure of *The Republic* and the dialectic
- Dialectic as the capstone of knowledge (534e)
- Dialectic as "moving by means of Forms, through Forms, to its conclusions which are Forms" (511c1–2)
- Dialectic in the similes of the Divided Line, the Cave, and the Sun.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
- Forms of dialectic: the kind that argues both sides of the question; the kind that exhibits only the truth; and the kind that serves only to refute false beliefs
- Dialectic and the ground distinction between the perceptible and intelligible
- The theory of Forms as the attempt to provide humans with ultimate explanations by appealing to essences and dialect as a way to move towards them
- The extent to which dialectic is caused by the pursuit of the good, source of knowledge and the means by which knowledge of truth can be gained
- The extent to which dialectic is inseparable of the central ideas of the Platonic philosophy e.g. Forms, justice
- Comparison with further conceptions from Aristotle to Marx and Sartre
- Scope and implications of the view that dialectic is suitable only for genuine philosophers
- How the Platonic dialectic can say anything about the world of experience
- Does the soul, through the dialectic reach a final point or goal where nothing greater is desired or does dialectic imply a kind of perpetual spiritual movement?

16. (a) Explain Socrates's claim that philosophers are lovers of truth. [10]

(b) Evaluate Socrates's claim that philosophers are lovers of truth. [15]

Socrates claims that philosophic natures love the learning "of the being that always is and does not wander around between coming-to-be." (485a-b). Following these lines, the question offers the possibility of explaining and evaluating more than just one central issue, e.g.: Plato's conception of philosophy, Plato's views on learning and education, and their epistemological and metaphysical foundations. One of the possible routes offered by it can be the explanation of the claim that philosophers are lovers of truth in relation to Plato's analysis in Book 5 where he raises the contrast between philosophers, who love the single truth and see beauty itself, as opposed to those who love a multiplicity about things. Other direction might be taken following the statement and defense at the end of Book 7 of the radical political idea, that either philosophers become kings or kings learn philosophy. A defense of this proposal presupposes a conception of philosophy, covering metaphysical and epistemological topics. Counter-arguments might be developed in both directions, or considering other views, e.g. Nietzsche's critique of the love of truth.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The philosopher as opposed to the lover of "sights and sounds" (476a); the Forms
- Philosophers love every kind of learning (474c–475c)
- The love of every kind of learning produces knowledge of ethical matters; the love of every kind of learning produces virtue (485a–486e)
- The love of every kind of learning makes one a virtuous and expert ruler
- The good city is possible if and only if virtuous and expert rule by its leaders is possible (484d)
- The simile of the Ship.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Plato's conception of knowledge rests on a dualism between the world of sensible objects appreciated by most people, and the true ideal world of Forms, only known by philosophers
- The extent to which philosophy inherently entails ethical knowledge
- Love of truth and knowing the essence of things
- The extent to which the theoretical knowledge associated with philosophy can promise practical knowledge of the kind that rulers need
- Why government of the city requires a philosophical foundation
- Is Plato a systematic philosopher with answers to give or a questioner only?
- Metaphysical and epistemological assumptions in Plato's argument
- Why rule through knowledge might be paternalistic
- The extent to which is it possible to relate the metaphysical world of the Forms to the physical world of the state.

Peter Singer: *The Life You Can Save*

17. (a) Explain Singer's attitude towards wealth. [10]

(b) Evaluate Singer's attitude towards wealth. [15]

Singer states that "there are about a billion people living at a level of affluence never previously known except in the courts of kings and nobles" (p. 9). He describes Americans as spending "only 6 percent of their income on buying food… That leaves far more to spend on consumer goods, entertainment, and vacations" (p. 9). At the same time, there are many people who are dying because they do not have enough money to survive. Singer uses this in his basic argument, where those who could give enough money without themselves suffering have a moral duty to do so. Singer also makes the point that having a high income is not itself a bad thing, it is failing to act on the suffering of others. He thinks that earning a high income might be the most efficient way of helping others, because excess income can be donated to effective causes. Singer is, however, very critical of those with lavish lifestyles.

Candidates might explore (part A):
- Levels of wealth in countries such as the USA
- Statistics about wealth provided by Singer
- The contrast between wealth and poverty
- Singer's accounts of traditional views about giving, particularly in relation to e.g. Christian attitudes towards wealth
- Singer's definitions of poverty
- Quantitative *vs* qualitative accounts of wealth and poverty in Singer's work
- Utilitarianism and wealth
- The relationship between suffering, wealth, and poverty.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
- How to define wealth
- Whether affluence is relative
- An evaluation of the view that many people today live more affluent lives than the monarchy of the past
- The morality of wealth e.g. Christianity
- Whether wealth and affluence are intrinsically wrong
- The idea that earning money and giving it away are effective ways to solve poverty
- Distributive justice e.g. Rawls
- The power of wealth and the market e.g. Smith
- Globalization and the morality of wealth
- Utilitarianism, the hedonistic calculus, preference utilitarianism and rule utilitarianism e.g. Bentham, Sidgwick, Mill.

18. (a) Explain Singer's account of traditional views on helping the poor. [10]

(b) Evaluate Singer's account of traditional views on helping the poor. [15]

Singer outlines a range of traditional views on helping the poor in the section of the same name at the end of Chapter 2. He starts with Christianity, where he says that 'helping the poor is a requirement for salvation' (p. 19) and cites the example of Jesus. He then draws on Islam and zakat where Muslims must give a proportion of their assets. Finally, he talks about Confucianism, and the story of Confucius' meeting with King Hui of Lang. Singer concludes that 'there is nothing new about the idea that we have a strong moral obligation to help those in need' (p. 22). This section is included in Singer's chapter on his basic argument. It precedes a section on common objections to giving, and a chapter on human nature.

Candidates might explore (part A):
- The motivation behind Singer's inclusion of this section
- The idea that the imperative to give is not unusual in traditional views on helping the poor
- The example of Christianity
- Examples from Judaism
- The example of Islam and zakat
- Confucianism and giving
- The place of this section as part of Singer's basic argument
- The idea that giving plays a role in many traditions
- Comparisons to modern attitudes to giving
- Contrasts between traditional views on helping the poor and contemporary common objections to giving.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
- Whether traditional views on helping the poor back up Singer's basic argument
- Traditions where the poor were not well looked after e.g. serfdom
- Traditional divisions between rich and poor e.g. monarchies
- Wealth and the church
- Limits of *zakat* where only a small proportion of someone's assets are required
- Whether Christianity, Islam, Judaism and Confucianism influence day to day practice
- The individual *versus* the state and giving
- Critical discussion of traditional views in the modern world e.g. Dawkins
- Divine command theory and religious ethics
- Sources of moral imperatives e.g. Ayer, Hume, Kant.

Charles Taylor: *The Ethics of Authenticity*

19. (a) Explain Taylor's account of the origins of the ideal of authenticity. [10]

(b) Evaluate Taylor's account of the origins of the ideal of authenticity. [15]

In Chapter 3, Taylor claims that authenticity 'is a child of the Romantic period. This claim stems from Taylor's argument in Chapter 3, on "The sources of authenticity". Candidates might explain the relationship between the Romantic period and authenticity: according to Taylor, authenticity, in its modern development has "its starting point in the eighteenth-century notion that human beings are endowed with a moral sense, an intuitive feeling for what is right and wrong" (Pp. 25-26). Responses might consider Taylor's reference to Descartes, Locke, or Rousseau, and explore the concept of morality in terms of feelings in other views, e.g. Smith, Rée, Sidgwick, Nietzsche, Scheler. Responses might focus on the topic of subjectivism and the related issues, with reference to the three malaises, particularly individualism. Candidates might also highlight the concept of self-determining freedom and the political consequences of it, e.g. totalitarianism, with an analysis of soft despotism. Finally, responses might mention the concepts of self-fulfillment and self-realization, with a reference to instrumental reason.

Candidates might explore (part A):
- The cultural origins of authenticity: the Romantic period
- The specific kind of morality as the ground for the modern development of authenticity: morality as sentiment
- Authenticity as related to individualism and the slide to subjectivism
- Self-determining freedom and soft despotism
- Self-fulfilment and self-realization and the instrumental reason

Possible discussion points include (part B):
- Possible philosophical roots of individualism, e.g. Descartes, Locke
- The concept of "amour propre" in Rousseau
- Morality as a sentiment, e.g. Smith, Rée, Sidgwick, Nietzsche, Scheler
- The role of emotion in decision-making processes, e.g. Damasio, Nussbaum, Churchland
- Different views on liberty and the relationship between liberty and authenticity e.g. positive *versus* negative, as in Berlin, Bobbio
- Whether Taylor's view on totalitarianism in relation to freedom and authenticity is in line with other views, e.g. Arendt
- Whether modern society is dominated by individualism or massification as a result of how we conceive authenticity, e.g. de Tocqueville, Mill, Ortega y Gasset
- Individualism and self-realization as the scope of modern living, e.g. the School of Frankfurt, Bauman's liquid society.

20. (a) Explain Taylor's discussion of the claim that "the future appears to promise only ever-increasing levels of narcissism". [10]

(b) Evaluate Taylor's discussion of the claim that "the future appears to promise only ever-increasing levels of narcissism". [15]

The claim comes up in Taylor's argument presented in Chapter 7, "La Lotta Continua". Candidates might discuss Taylor's view on authenticity and issues related to the condemnable variants, e.g. narcissism, subjectivism. Responses might explore the distinction between "knockers" and "boosters". Also, candidates might focus on Bloom's criticism and explore Taylor's view. Particularly, candidates might explain what "la lotta continua" means and the reasons why Taylor uses it to defend the ideal of authenticity. Also, responses might highlight that the struggle should not be between "knocker" and "boosters", but on authenticity, promoting debate and discussion over it. Responses might analyse Taylor's view on the tension of modern society, which means that society does not go towards a predetermined direction: the slide to subjectivism is a possibility, not a destiny: "It is in the nature of this kind of increase of freedom that people can sink lower, as well as rise higher" (p. 77).

Candidates might explore (part A):
- Authenticity as a culture and as an ideal
- Authenticity and its condemnable variants, e.g. narcissism
- The distinction between "knockers" and "boosters"
- The meaning of "lotta continua" and its use by Taylor
- Taylor's view in terms of tension

Possible discussion points include (part B):
- Taylor's view on Bloom's criticism of authenticity
- Whether authenticity can be saved in terms of ideal or whether it inevitably leads to narcissism
- Modern society in terms of alienation, e.g. Marxism, Critical Theory
- Individualism, self-fulfillment, and liquid society, e.g. Bauman
- The role of dialogue, e.g. Buber
- Whether "lotta continua" could refer to political participation or citizenship
- Soft despotism as linked to the development of modern democracies and the role of narcissism, e.g. de Tocqueville, Mill, Ortega y Gasset
- Whether tension, struggle, and public debate are essential to modern democracies, e.g. Dewey
- Whether an ideal of authenticity that emphasizes narcissism fosters conditions that favour totalitarianism
- Whether other views offer more viable ideas in the context of increasing levels of narcissism, e.g. paternalism, communitarianism, Nozick's minimal state.

Lao Tzu: *Tao Te Ching*

21. (a) Explain Lao Tzu's claim that the Tao may be regarded as the mother of all things. [10]

(b) Evaluate Lao Tzu's claim that the Tao may be regarded as the mother of all things. [15]

This question asks for an explanation and evaluation of an understanding of the *Tao* in the context of the metaphors of femininity, the female, birth, motherhood, and the image of the mother, all of which are central to the development of key ideas of the *Tao te Ching.* Material relevant to the question is principally set out sections 1, 6, 25, 28, 51, 52 and 61. Lao Tzu distinguishes the *Tao* which cannot be named and is the beginning of heaven and earth from the named which is the mother of the myriad creatures. Using the imagery of childbirth and motherhood, the mother of all things contains all, gives birth to all and nurtures all. In other words, just as the female is the source of all things and without the female there is nothing, the *Tao* — described as the mother of all things — is the source of all things and without the *Tao* thus described there would be nothing at all. The image of the mother of all things relates to the mysterious female which is the root of heaven and earth. By abiding with the female one is able to reach the *Tao* and return to the infinite. Lao Tzu also sees a connection between the mother of all things and the principles of *yin* and *yang,* male and female qualities that coexist, interact, and produce the 10,000 things also referred to as myriad creatures.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The prevalence of imagery and metaphor related to the feminine, motherhood, birth, generation and regeneration
- *Tao* which cannot be named and naming the *Tao* understood as the mother of all things, the mother of the myriad creatures
- The mother of the world as the beginning of the world and the creative principle of all things
- The mother of the world as a womb and maternal force which nourishes, nurses and brings up the myriad creatures guiding them to fruition and maturity
- The mysterious female as the inexhaustible root of heaven and earth
- The relationship of the mother of all things to the dynamic interaction of the principles of *yin* and *yang.*

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- What is meant by the phrase the mother of the world?
- What is the relationship between the mother of the world and the *Tao?*
- What is meant by the nameless that was the beginning of heaven and earth; the named as the mother of the myriad creatures?
- What is meant by the *Tao* named as the mother of the myriad creatures?
- To what extent can the *Tao* be described as a mother?
- How is the *Tao* related to the female (*yin*) and male (*yang*) values?
- Are female values valued more highly than male values? E.g. Jia Cuixiang and the repression of female values, Confucius and his view of the feminine
- How does sexuality figure in the images of the mother of all things or of the mother of the myriad creatures?
- Contrasting views of the feminine and sexuality in Chinese philosophy, e.g. Confucius, Zhuangzi, Mencius, Xunzi

22. (a) Explain Lao Tzu's claim that weapons are instruments of ill omen, not the instruments of the gentleman. [10]

(b) Evaluate Lao Tzu's claim that weapons are instruments of ill omen, not the instruments of the gentleman. [15]

This question asks for an explanation and evaluation of a claim made by Lao Tzu regarding war and violence and the consequences that follow upon them. Lao Tzu lived and wrote during a turbulent period during which warfare and destruction were constantly in evidence. Therefore, Lao Tzu's text is fundamentally pacifist and generally marked by the rejection of war, violence, and force all of which were perceived to be in absolute violation of the *Tao*. While Lao Tzu might have perceived war as inevitable, it was always possible to avoid it. If it could not be avoided, it should be ended swiftly and with honour and compassion. In general, Lao Tzu clearly estimates the negative effects of war and the use of the instruments of war (weapons and arms) on the people, the land, and the state. Lao Tzu offers concrete advice regarding his views on war and violence in sections 30, 31, 36, 42, 46, 67, 68,7 6, 79 and 80 of the text. Moreover, war is not an alternative that the gentleman would consider since it threatens and violates the virtues that marks the character of the gentleman, e.g. compassion, frugality, humility, wisdom, sound judgment and the avoidance of the use of force.

Candidates might explore (part A):

- War and violence contradict the principles of the *Tao*; when the *Tao* is not observed war will follow
- Rulers and anyone advising rulers must not intimidate by the use of armaments
- War should be avoided at all costs but if war begins it must be ended quickly and honourably
- Battles always bring death and destruction and the land is ravished wherever armies are camped
- Ruling by *Wu Wei*, not striving, not seeking power, and not praising victory
- The virtue of non-contention and the way of heaven bring benefits, not harm and violence
- A sage who governs in the path of the *Tao* and with the virtues of compassion, humility, frugality, and wisdom will not choose the path of war and violence but will seek peace and honour the details of a peace treaty

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- Is there a contradiction between the prescriptions for avoiding war and the acknowledgement that wars can take place?
- If warring parties come to a peace agreement will bitterness and resentment remain?
- Do war and violence inevitably lead to the victors becoming even more aggressive and warlike?
- Is it possible to conquer by yielding to the *Tao*?
- How does a ruler who follows the *Tao* deal with the inevitability of conflict?
- Under what circumstances is war justified according to the text?
- Can leadership inspired by the *Tao* eliminate the possibility of war and violence?
- Can the wise ruler have no concern for him or herself but only concern for others?
- Confucius's view of war and violence as dangerous and abnormal behaviour as opposed to Sun Tzu's view of war as requiring clear strategy based upon deception and surprise.

Zhuangzi: *Zhuangzi*

23. (a) Explain Zhuangzi's views on friendship. [10]

(b) Evaluate Zhuangzi's views on friendship. [15]

This question seeks an explanation of Zhuangzi's ideas on friendship. It is primarily focused on the story of four friends and Zigong and the Three Friends in Chapter 6 (6:39 to 6:45 and 6:5). However, mention might also be made of the loss of the master in Chapter 3 (3:7). In Chapter 6 four friends (Ziji, Zayu, Zili, Zilai) meet, bond closely with each, but one dies, and yet to the consternation of the Confucian visitor the remaining three friends show no grief. Similarly with the death of Zisanghu, one of Zigong's friends (6:50) no ritual is shown. Death is not seen as the end to friendship, and the friendship relationship can transcend death if all friends buy into the same metaphysics; that being the shared values and understanding that all are in tune with the *Way,* and that there is an acceptance and understanding of transformation. A shared sense that friendship values human flourishing (the focus of Chapter 3). Friendship that lasts, has qualities of 'complete concord', the ability to having everlasting forgetfulness, of mutual caring and having the strength to ride adversity and differences. The 'forgetfulness' is not meant in a literal sense and should not been seen as contradictory, but complementary to the view that friendship goes beyond worldly, physical, materialistic qualities and rest upon a 'spiritual' sense of linked qualities. It is raising friendship to a level beyond self-interest or self-gain and sets it upon a selfless, mutually supportive, mutually reinforcing realm. By establishing a friendship life is lived in a shared stable way, not desiring to meet defined objectives and goals, but simply allowing life to flow. This ability to flow through life and with life means that attachments to other humans are beyond the physical world and are seen as part of the larger universe. Hence the loss of the friend in Chapter 6 is merely seen as a transformational stage in the cosmos and therefore not a loss at all, but just a change. It reflects contentment with one's condition or station in life and therefore within the cosmos. This can be linked to the latter part of Chapter 6 where the worry of a friend's plight is described (6:56 'After 10 days of freezing rain … he must be in distress') however, the worry of hunger and distress is not shared as there is a mutual reflection on the condition, and then an acceptance of fate: one's place in the cosmos (6:57 'I am in this extreme state … this must be fate.eh!'). Contrasts might be made with Buddhist and Stoic views with degrees of difference and similarity with the bond of friendship able to entertain change with a struggle to cope with loss (death of a friend). In addition, a contrast might be made to a wider *Taoist* tradition that plays down the importance of friendship with the infrequent use of '*you'* and *'peng'* (friend /friendship).

Candidates might explore (part A):

- The interaction of the friends prior to and after the death of one in Chapter 6
- The nature of friendship as described in Chapter 3 (3:7); acceptance that death is not losing a friend but a celebration and realization that one can escape the 'Lord 's dangle' ('Liberation from the Lord's Dangle' (3:8))
- The qualities of friendship based on shared values and caring
- Traditional (Western and Confucian) expectations on the loss of friendship: sadness, mourning, emptiness, ritual activity
- The ideas of transformationalism and the consequently no loss of friendship
- The nature of the *Way* as a basis for contentment with life
- The nature and role of 'forgetfulness'
- The issues of death and one's reaction to it: mention might be made of the death of the friend (6:39) or of Zhuangzi's wife or the death of the master, Quin Shi's friend (*you*) (3:7)
- The understanding of being part of the cosmos and merely passing through the human physical form
- The story of the fish in the pond as an analogy as to how human friendship might work (6:47)
- The psychological crutch that friendship might offer to humans. A contrast with other *Taoist* perspectives.

Possible discussion points include (part B):

- The nature of friendship in a variety of cultural settings contrasting *Taoist* views with Buddhism, Stoicism, Christianity, and Islam
- The status of friendship for a *Taoist*
- The variety of values that might be shared within a friendship and whether they include a common metaphysics
- Issues that seem always to link death and friendship for Zhuangzi. How much is he responding to Confucian ritualization of all relationships and human conditions?
- Whether friendship and human flourishing are interdependent
- The degree to which friendship is a facet of the human condition *per se*
- The extent to which the absence of *you* and *peng* in other *Taoist* texts reveals Zhuangzi as a *Taoist* outlier
- Critiques of Zhuangzi's metaphysical approach to friendship i.e. does it devalue personal connection, or undermine the ethics of friendship?

24. (a) Explain Zhuangzi's views on the nature of government. [10]

(b) Evaluate Zhuangzi's views on the nature of government. [15]

This question invites an explanation of how the world should be governed and the links of governing to the *Tao*. The explanation draws on the story of the cook (Chapter 3 and Chapter 7) when the question is asked about the nature of 'clear sighted rulers.' A ruler that is clear sighted can affect the world and gain support from people without effort. He can make '… all creature delight in themselves' (7:5) by resting in the Way (the *Tao*). 'There is something unnameable in him' - this is the nature of the Tao; the qualities cannot be named and therefore the ruler rests back and inspires the people and does not lead, drive, or command. It is 'unfathomable' (7:5) how such a person can transform society and its actions. The ruler fulfils the sentiments of *wu wei.* This can often be seen as apathy and raising issues of how a ruler can be disengaged from worldly affairs yet still rule. Zhuangzi is most probably rejecting the behaviour of his contemporary rulers, who claim to follow at best Confucian practices yet rule over a seemingly chaotic and inefficient state. He is seeing and refers in Chapter 4 to what happens if rulers conquer and seek fame; 'nations are laid waste and people slaughtered' (4:5). There might also be reference to the Cook Ding, and his cutting of the ox, as a metaphor for how to handle complex political issues; carefully going around obstacles, finding openings and efficient ways to part the joints. (3:4 'My knife has never had to cut through knotted nodes ... joints have spaces between them there being more than enough room for the play of the blade'.) It is the subtleties of the butcher to dissect yet maintain the qualities of the meat not the slaughtering, and so too with the ruler, not to challenge and act aggressively but to seek compromise and conciliation in ruling. Ding's butchery teaches the ruler how to nourish life and not to harm a fundamental, cosmic flow (the *Tao*) in his actions. The actions reflect the situation and therefore there is no fixed absolute method of cutting/ruling; a way is found through. A ruler needs to nurture common people so that they stay in harmony as 'the birds and the beast are in nature'. *Wu wei* in this context is more a sense of virtuosity, ethical practice, and a profound understanding of "nature" (*xing)* of things and an understanding of (*min xing*) the "commoners' nature."

Candidates might explore (part A):
- *Wu wei*; apathy compared with a sense of understanding the patterns of nature
- The nature of a sage
- Cook Ding's lessons on nourishing life and ruling
- The *Tao* and its unknownness
- Ideas of flow and change within the actions of a ruler; acts of transformation (7:5) needing not to be radical and a counter nature
- The nature of 'wandering' not being aimless but in harmony with natural forces
- Differences between striving to control through laws and rituals and the subtle taming of the animal or managing clay (Chapter 4)
- The consequences of rulers seeking expansion- property, conquests, and greatness/fame.

Possible discussion points include (part B):
- Whether a society can prosper with a ruler that practices *wu wei*. Does societal prosperity need to be redefined?
- Clear sightedness implying a harmony with the *Tao*
- Zhuangzi's actual experience of rulers and statecraft compared to his proposed ideal ruler, a 'clear sighter ruler'
- The nature of a state in the geopolitical competitiveness of the modern world if leaders followed Zhuangzi's guidance
- The relationship of cooking and butchery to leadership. Preparation, training, action and no action; the chemistry of cooking paralleled with the complexity of managing communities.
- Comparisons to Plato's philosopher king and /or Machiavelli's 'Prince'
- The negation of moral absolutes and the reliance on relative and shifting notions of justice; the flow of political action is the flow of nature itself
- Whether societal behaviour and its management- politics- is organic and self-generating and self-managing.