نموذج مسابقة (يراعي تعليق الدروس والتوصيف المعدّل للعام الدراسي ٢٠١٦-٢٠١٧ وحتى صدور المناهج المطوّرة)

Choose <u>One</u> of the following subjects:

• <u>Subject One</u>:

Pleasure is the highest good; it isthe purpose of life.

- 1- Explain this judgment and state the problematic it raises. (9 points)
- 2- Discuss this judgment in the light of other theories.
- 3- Do you think it is morally desirable to renounce pleasures and social life? Justify your answer.

(4 points)

(7 points)

• <u>Subject Two</u>:

The struggle between science and philosophy is finished, the victorious science suppressed philosophy.

1-	Explain this judgment and state the problematic it raises.	(9 points)
2-	Discuss this judgment in light of other theories.	(7 points)
3-	Do you believe - that only philosophers can philosophize? Justify your answer.	(4 points)

• <u>Subject Three</u>: Text

The passage from the state of nature to the civil state produces a very remarkable change in man, by substituting justice for instinct in his conduct, and giving his actions the morality they had formerly lacked.

Then only, when the voice of duty takes the place of physical impulses and right of appetite, does man, who so far had considered only himself, find that he is forced to act on different principles, and to consult his reason before listening to his inclinations.

Although, in this state, he deprives himself of some advantages which he got from nature, he gains in return others so great, his faculties are so stimulated and developed, his ideas so extended, his feelings so ennobled, and his whole soul so uplifted, that, did not the abuses of this new condition often degrade him below that which he left, he would be bound to bless continually the happy moment which took him from it forever, and, instead of a stupid and unimaginative animal, made him an intelligent being and a man.

Let us draw up the whole account in terms easily commensurable. What man loses by the social contract is his natural liberty and an unlimited right to everything he tries to get and succeeds in getting; what he gains is civil liberty and the proprietorship of all he possesses.

If we are to avoid mistake in weighing one against the other, we must clearly distinguish natural liberty, which is bounded only by the strength of the individual, from civil liberty, which is limited by the general will; and possession, which is merely the effect of force or the right of the first occupier, from property, which can be founded only on a positive title.

We might, over and above all this, add, to what man acquires in the civil state, moral liberty, which alone makes him truly master of himself; for the mere impulse of appetite is slavery, while obedience to a law which we prescribe to ourselves is liberty.

Rousseau

1-	Explain the text and state the problematic it raises.	(9 points)
2-	Discuss the text in light of other theories.	(7 points)
3-	Do you believe - that man is bound to discharge his duties without demanding Justify your answer.	his rights? (4 points)



أسس التصحيح (تراعي تعليق الدروس والتوصيف المعدّل للعام الدراسي ٢٠١٦-٢٠١٧ وحتى صدور المناهج المطوّرة)

SubjectOne:

First question: (9 points)

Introduction (2 points)

- We can start with the importance of a moral debate, since no man can lose interest in the "quality" of his action ...
- Or see the changes in morality through time and time ...

Problematic (2 points)

General (0.5 pt.): How do we recognize the "Good"? On what basis is the moral system built? **Specific (1.5 pts.):** Can pleasure be considered as the basis of the morality of Good? Or...? (The question will be elaborated according to the theory chosen by the candidate as external critic)

Thesis (5 points)

Preliminary idea (0.5 pt.): This judgment adopts the point of view of Epicureans, the latter is a philosophical current that bases all morality on pleasure.

Explanation of the judgment (4 pts.): Hedonism: Aristippus (Pleasure is the ultimate good + sensation is the basis of morality), Hegesias (Pleasure is rarely realizable + avoiding pains by killing desires), Epicurus (There is no goodness without sensation + excess leads to pain).

Utilitarianism: Utility is the ultimate good + compare and calculate pains and pleasures.

Creativity and coherence (0.5 pt.)

Second question: Discussion (7 points)

Transition (0.5 pt.): All the doctrines which identify the Good with an empirical element encounter a common difficulty which is that of bringing out a moral requirement of an element which starts only from the fact.

Internal review (1 pt.): Pleasure is common to man and animal, therefore it cannot serve as a foundation for morality.

-This theory misunderstands the greatness of man; it limits him to terrestrial existence, and reduces his aspirations to the sadly limited horizon of its pleasures.

-There are pleasures (sadism or masochism) that snatch the dignity of man.

External review (3.5 pts.): Other concepts will be explained later:

- Durkheim: moral values are inseparable from the collective conscience...

- Kant: morality of duty for duty...
- Bentham: Good is a calculation of our interests
- -Kant: Categorical imperative + Good will and Duty.

Plato: Intellectual perfection + Happiness cannot be reached through pleasure.

Buddhism: Appetites are evil and life is painful + killing desires to reach annihilation.

Christianity: Suppression of physical appetites + altruism + Thomas Aquinas (God is the ultimate good + realization of virtue)...

Synthesis (1.5 pt.): Golden Mean: Aristotle (Intellectual perfection and physical pleasure in order to reach happiness).

-All this leads us to conclude that despite the important differences perceived in the practice of ethics over the years, we can say that there are some values that form a strong and essential sector in this immense diversity.

Creativity and coherence (0.5 pts)

Third question: Personal opinion(4 points)

Explanation of the question (1 pt.)

Justification (2.5 pts):

The candidate could answer this question affirmatively or negatively or dialectically, provided that he/she justifies his/her answer.

- Yes, it rises to the level of the Spirit; it is dedicated to prayer ...
- No, the satisfied body is a prerequisite for mental health, and the man is a social being...

Creativity and coherence (0.5 pts) Subject Two:

First question: (9 points)

Introduction (2 points)

- Definition of philosophy and talk about its characteristics.
- The definition of science and talk about its properties.
- In this context, this provision comes to show us the contrast between science and philosophy.

Problematic (2 points)

General (0.5 pt.): What is the true relationship between science and philosophy?

Specific (1.5 pts.): Are they truly in opposition? Is it the end of philosophy in a time of science? Or is the completion of scientific activity need to be a philosophical exercise in looking forward to a better meaning and purpose and to make it more humane science?

Thesis (5 points)

Preliminary idea (0.5 pt.): Some philosophers considered that philosophy and science are two opposing parties on the grounds that the language of science is accurate and systematic. Scientific tests has become the standard of credibility of science. On the contrary philosophical language tends more to be a point of view or a metaphysical position of existence, while others philosophers considered that science and philosophy are complementary.

Explanation of the judgment (4 pts.): Talking about the difference between science and philosophy in details. The points of difference.

- It is stated that the subject of philosophy is comprehensive, while the subject of science is a partial one.
- It is stated that the approach in philosophy is logic and its instrument is the mind, while the methodology of science is observation, experiment and test, and its instrument is the mind and the help of auxiliary machines.
- It is stated that the results of philosophy are hypotheses and theories closer to the views. It is often complex because it expresses a personal conviction by the owner. The results of science are described and real evidence, and it becomes a reality agreed upon, clear, objective and public.
- Cite examples from real life at all stages of the explanation.

Creativity and coherence (0.5 pt.)

Second question: Discussion (7 points)

Transition (0.5 pt.): Starting by the following statement: "Philosophy is not a substitute for science or a competitor. Holding that philosophy is accountable by the standards of science is an ignorant approach of the facts of philosophy and its function."

Internal review (1 pt.): Show that the birth of philosophy was tied to science.

-It said that the relationship of philosophy and science is a dialectical relationship.

-Focus on philosophy as a positive knowledge which adds something to the world.

External review (3.5 pts.): It is not possible for scientists to ignore philosophy, its researches and problems which are completely ignored.

-Emphasized that philosophy and science together seek knowledge.

-Knowledge offered by scientists is not enough for philosophy, because they want a comprehensive universe as a whole.

-Science does not discuss the foundations or axioms upon which the science is based it is the job of philosophy.

-Questions on the means and value are philosophical questions. It is the role of critical philosophy. A need that has become urgent to research for, especially after the technological development that humanworries about (weapons of mass reproduction ... and ...)

-Scientific progress constantly provides exciting material for discussion and debate and mutual criticism.

-Cite examples from real life in all stages of the explanation.

Synthesis (1.5 pt.): Let us conclude that between the sciences and philosophy there is not, to-day, the least motive of dissent; they both serve one and the same cause, and contribute to a common result: the happiness of man.

-The controversies of our time will pass away like so many others, without leaving any more traces; and above all they will not alter the essential relations of philosophy and science. But what one might expect from the scholars who delight in these polemics would be to show a little more tolerance.

Creativity and coherence (0.5 pts)

Third question: Personal opinion(4 points)

Explanation of the question (1 pt.)

Justification (2.5 pts):

The candidate could answer this question affirmatively or negatively or dialectically, provided that he/she justifies his/her answer.

- Yes, philosophy is founded by a terminology and rules that are not accessible to the public.
- No, because everyone needs more than one option to choose from. It is an attitude in life, we must philosophize.

Creativity and coherence (0.5 pts)

Subject three: Text

<u>First question: (9 points)</u> Introduction (2 points)

Paving theway to the issue of rights and duties and to emphasize its importance in the moral sphere.

Problematic (2 points)

General (0.5 pt.): What is the relationship between law and force? Specific (1.5 pts.): How to get out of the natural state to the civil state? Is it supported by the goodness and awareness of human? Or is it going to be by force?

Thesis (5 points)

Preliminary idea (0.5 pt.): In this text Rousseau refuses that force establishes the right. The force lacks legitimate foundation.

Explanation of the judgment (4 pts.): Analysis of the ideas contained in the text:

-These ideas represent the theory of Rousseau

-Rejecting the idea of the right to the strongest.

-Authority that is based on power and violence is not legitimate. It cannot be justified.

-To bow to a force is a necessary aspect and it is not willed.

-When the most powerful is always right then force turns to a right.

-Emphasis on the principle of justice according to the requirements of the mind.

-Justice replace instinct in human behavior and actions.

-The deal with Rousseau that everyone is united with everyone without there being a contrary interests of individuals that make up the whole.

-The social contract guarantees equality, because both partners have equal rights within the group.

-Man has his freedom by obeying the laws, and freedom is not threatened by authority.

Creativity and coherence (0.5 pt.)

Second question: Discussion (7 points)

Transition (0.5 pt.): However, all conventions are not acceptable and we do not see in the name of what Rousseau could draw a dividing line between the false contract of servitude and the real social contract, if it did not refer to a universal and eternal right called natural law.

Internal review (1 pt.): Discussing the ideas of the text based on other philosophical theories:

External review (3.5 pts.): Hobbes claims that the human instinct drives him to selfishness as he begins acting like an animal led by lust and desire.

-The human tendency is to control everything, have an access to power and possession of material wealth.

-"Man Wolf Man", there is no place for justice and peace because the master of the situation is violence.

-It is the strongest that sets the laws, but it does not apply to him.

-Human beings are forced to give up all their rights in exchange for their survival.

-Human being has no right to depart from obedience but to comply.

-No rights for people but duties, they are not citizens but refuges.

Synthesis (1.5 pt.): In short, the natural right is spontaneously lived by the natural man. Once the state of nature has been lost, this spontaneity will disappear: it is by recourse to reasoning that we formulate the rules of morality, intended to correct the error to which man is now exposed. Civilized man cannot live according to natural law; it must strive to be faithful to it according to a convergence and analogy ratio. Reasonable motivations, the imperatives of moral feeling, aim at the same goal (self-preservation, respect for the life of others) as the spontaneous movement of nature. The law will not have changed in its end, but in its source.

Creativity and coherence (0.5 pts)

Third question: Personal opinion(4 points)

Explanation of the question (1 pt.)

Justification (2.5 pts):

The candidate could answer this question affirmatively or negatively or dialectically, provided that he/she justifies his/her answer.

- Yes, because the "right" of a person is "a duty" to another individual (the right of children is the duty of parents, a worker's right is the duty of the employer ...) If each one did his duty, all wontheir rights.
- No, this is a fascist ideology. It is more correct to say that man has a duty to know his rights to safeguard them and promote them. Civilizations are measured by the rights to individuals and not by imposing duties.

Creativity and coherence (0.5 pts)