2025 ASSESSMENT REPORT
PHL315118 PHILOSOPHY

General Comments

The 2025 Philosophy exam saw students move confidently through a wide range of ideas, from classical thought to modern theories. Strong responses showed how philosophical reflection remains relevant today, especially when students focused on a small set of ideas rather than attempting broad coverage. Within the exam's time limits, concentrating on two or three positions consistently produced clearer, more purposeful work.

High-quality essays maintained a balance between explanation, analysis, and evaluation. Weaker pieces tended to summarise thinkers without engaging with their arguments, sometimes echoing introductory online content instead of offering original insight. Long lists of names or dictionary-style definitions rarely strengthened a response. More effective scripts kept explanations tight and used the saved space to probe assumptions, weigh arguments, and address objections. As stated in last year's report, a rough division of one-third explanation, one-third analysis, and one-third evaluation can help ensure this depth.

The best essays also stated a firm philosophical stance supported by reason and evidence. By contrast, weaker answers leaned on unexamined claims. While science, religion or strong moral principles can inform philosophy, they cannot resolve questions without being supported appropriately.

The responses to the 2025 exam underscored that philosophy is not just a body of knowledge but an active, creative process: a dialogue through which students clarify their convictions and test them with thoughtful argument.

Section A: Mind/Body

Question 1

This question gave candidates the opportunity to explore two positions on the Mind/Body problem. The question involved several elements, and not all responses engaged carefully with the question to address all those elements. Firstly, candidates needed to explain Descartes' position on the Mindy/Body problem by using the provided quote. Candidates then needed to choose an alternate dualist or monist position, and then they needed to discuss two strengths and one weakness of their chosen position. There were a number of essays that contained a strong analysis of Descartes' position but did not incorporate discussion of an alternate viewpoint, or candidates outlined an alternate viewpoint but did not consider two strengths or a weakness. This question serves as a timely reminder to use the reading time to carefully break down the question and ensure candidates understand what they need to address in their work.

Stronger responses used Descartes' quote to set out and analyse that Cartesian or Substance Dualism argues for two metaphysically distinct substances and the implications of this. They then

brought together their analysis of Descartes' position and synthesised it with their chosen alternative viewpoint, interrogating the two different perspectives and using that interrogation to build a clear argument for their preferred position. Popular alternative positions were biological naturalism, identity theory, and panpsychism. Stronger responses demonstrated a strong understanding of both positions and their strengths and limitations.

Weaker responses tended to provide an explanation of Substance Dualism and an alternative viewpoint but offered little analysis of either position. These responses tended to be quite general in nature, and it was not clear what position the candidate was arguing for in their discussion. Some weaker responses did set out two strengths and a weakness, but they weren't clearly defined or signposted, meaning that the reader had to infer that the candidate was arguing something was a weakness. The more clearly candidates can present their arguments, the more likely the reader will get the most out of their discussion.

Question 2

Most candidates were able to articulate a thought experiment and its relation to the mind/body problem. Typical responses involved Mary's Room or Nagel's Bat thought experiments; the latter generally not explained in a way that adequately supported the concept of consciousness or proposed an alternative to reductionism. More complete answers to the question showed thought experiments as illustrative of philosophical argumentation, rather than stand-alone demonstrations of information recall.

Phrases such as, '…is a widely discussed problem' or '… is heavily debated' are redundant and should be avoided, as should complete recollection of the thought experiments.

Question 3

This question presented students with the opportunity to express their understanding of a complex metaphysical concept/phenomena: qualia. Answers to the question ideally should have analysed how and why qualia challenges materialist accounts of the human condition and evaluate whether Chalmers is right to insist "we have to go beyond the resources it (materialism) provides".

Relevant content

A clear definition of qualia set up papers to respond well to the question. It is important to note that the qualitative, ineffable, private, and subjective phenomena of conscious experiences are not, of themselves, proof of Dualism, nor do they necessarily disprove Materialist explanations. Qualia are a problem for the debate that can be responded to in many ways.

Some of the philosophical positions covered included:

- Daniel Dennett's Illusionism/Functionalism and explanation of his Joycean machine analogy for consciousness as an explicable and purely physical phenomenon
- David Armstrong's Certain State Theory, arguing that qualia is a pseudo-problem
- Gilbert Ryle's Logical Behaviourism, and his assertion that the mind's existence in the Cartesian sense is a category error/nothing more than a ghost in the machine
- Identity Theory and its reductive physicalist approach to identifying consciousness with a given pattern of brain activity – often challenged or evaluated in light of a qualia thought experiment

- David Chalmer's distinction between the 'easy' and 'hard' problems of consciousness
- John Searle's Biological Naturalism, which argues that the felt qualities of consciousness is an emergent phenomenon, escaping reductive explanation
- Thomas Nagel's 'What is it like to be a bat?' and the what-it-is-likeness of conscious experience.

Students who did well against:

Criterion 1

- Offered a clear contention in response to Chalmer's claim with relevant counter arguments, evidence, and concepts from other philosophers/philosophical positions, in a complete essay that supported their discussion/contention with analysis of relevant ideas and arguments.

Criterion 2

- Acknowledged the shift in philosophy of mind from the classical mind/body problem to the contemporary focus, led by Chalmers, to the 'hard' problem of consciousness.
- Discussed the perceived 'explanatory' gap for materialism in attempting to explain how physical properties give rise to the way things feel subjectively.
- Engaged thoughtfully with the contemporary responses to the hard problem of consciousness and qualia. For instance, by:
  - contrasting Dennett's Illusionism and Chalmer's advocacy for Panpsychism and/or Information Integration Theory
  - outlining Searle's critique of Panpsychism for presenting consciousness as 'a jam spread thinly across the universe' and or Dennett's assertion that it faces the combination problem
  - deploying Galen Strawson's argument from a 'Real Physicalist' perspective that because qualia is real, the universe is physical, that a physical explanation of consciousness that is not reductive is necessary
  - using First Nations philosophy adroitly to strengthen Western Scientific Panpsychism, e.g., Mary Graham, a Kombumerri philosopher, argues that we human beings are not conscious isolates as Descartes would have it, but rather another part of country ourselves, synonymous with it through scientific, spiritual, and philosophical ways of being.

Criterion 3

- Outlined Dennett's definition of qualia as ineffable, intrinsic, private, and directly apprehensible in consciousness, as well as his assertion that they are ultimately an illusion – an epistemic fallacy confused with metaphysical revelation.
- Backed up Materialism and the idea that the mind is the brain with evidence about how electro-shock therapy, drugs and other physical effects lead to mental changes.
- Included specific arguments and/or thought experiments (Mary's Room, Philosophical Zombies, What is it like to be a bat? etc.) to elucidate their points in support of their discussion and contention that either consciousness can or cannot be explained via Materialism.
- Evaluated qualia thought experiments, such as noting that Jackson's Mary's Room begs the question, and noting how and why Jackson himself later changed his position on the

problem. Or Patricia Churchland's strong claim that Mary doesn't learn anything new, but rather is just accessing the same knowledge (of red) in a new way; a difference that can explain the qualitative felt variance of the experience, that is not necessarily physically different.
- Used Occam's Razor well in support of their evaluation that their position on qualia favoured the balance of analysis, whilst not necessarily itself being the most decisive factor.
- Included syllogisms followed by detailed analysis of the relative merits of the claims in the premises and the logic of the argument.

Students who struggled against:

Criterion 1

- Did not have a genuine contention to the question they had chosen to answer.
- Wrote out Chalmers' quote, or paraphrased it, (or both) without adding anything like a response to the claim, or a position that showed an understanding of the course content, and instead simply retraced the question in a way a student who has not studied the course might do.
- Composed an incomplete essay with no conclusion.
- Included overly lengthy introductions that hindered the time students (should have) had in the body of the essay to analyse and evaluate specific ideas and arguments in the detail necessary for higher grades. Students are advised to spend more of the limited time they have to extend their body paragraphs, as introductions should generally set the scene for an interesting discussion, whilst conclusions reaffirm their evaluation. Instead, what often happened, was that a lengthy summary of the unit set the scene for an interesting discussion that ultimately never arose, as students clearly ran out of time.
- Despite asserting a clear position on the question, some students largely went on to write an essay that lacked a sense of a discussion that developed a case for this, instead producing a scattered list of content without analysis.

Criterion 2

- Used philosophical ideas, concepts, and philosophers inaccurately. For instance, conflating Property and Substance Dualism, or Reductive and Non-reductive Physicalist positions.
- Failed to express an understanding of specific metaphysical concepts, ideas and arguments. Some responses articulated a vague grasp on the content that could feasibly be said by any thoughtful person who had not formally studied the course. For instance, simply asserting that Materialism is 'backed by science' and Substance Dualism is 'supported by religion' not only presents the complex debate in an overly simplistic fashion, it also fails to engage with the arguments themselves or the rationale used by philosophers to support specific positions.
- Made irrelevant observations on general consensus/common sense of people/society rather than a philosophical analysis of argument and evidence. On one occasion a student wrote a response about materialism as if the topic were about consumerism and late-stage capitalism rather than the material conditions of being human. Their points were impassioned and articulated a principled position that was unfortunately not tied to any philosopher or as a response to the Mind/Body problem.
- Confused Materialism and Hard Determinism, whilst one may entail another, this is not always the case, and shows a lack of control of different metaphysical questions.

- Included too much content/too many thought experiments or positions, without any analysis or evaluation, simply listing many philosophical ideas and concepts without sufficient detail or analysis does not support philosophical discussion.

Criterion 3

- Tended to summarise many important arguments without analysing them, which detracts from the time students have to describe and explain the philosophical reasoning and rationale that surrounds these concepts.
- Simply recited a relevant episode of Crash Course Philosophy, which is a sound beginning point for study, but as a resource is designed to introduce and outline content; higher grades than a C require not just explanation of content or identification of arguments, but detailed and precise analysis and evaluation.
- Memorised syllogisms for philosophers without any analysis.
- Asserted a position without addressing/raising any critiques.

Section B: Free Will

Question 4

Most candidates were able to explain how libertarians or hard determinists account for belief in freedom. Whilst the question could have been answered discussing only a single philosophical point of view, most candidates discussed one or more additional philosophical positions, which was a perfectly acceptable approach to the question.

However, a substantial number of responses tried to cover too many arguments. While many of these essays demonstrated good knowledge of the arguments of other thinkers, they were largely descriptive rather than analytical. It is virtually impossible to give a detailed account of the evidence/reasoning supporting more than three arguments in 45 minutes, leading to lower ratings on Criterion 4.

There was a tendency in weaker essays to discuss strengths/weaknesses of arguments in superficial terms, sometimes confusing them with the implications of a philosophical position. For example, some students asserted that a strength of libertarianism is that it preserves moral responsibility. By itself, this assertion is superficial because evidence/reasons are needed to support the claim that this implication is a strength.

An excellent way to discuss strengths of an argument is to show that it can withstand scrutiny. This could take the form: a strength of philosophical position A is that objection B is successfully overcome by argument C. Similarly, a weakness of an argument can be that no adequate reply can be made to an objection. Responses that took this approach were rewarded on Criterion 3. These observations hold for addressing any question using the language of strengths/weaknesses/limitations.

Question 5

It was clear that some students were thrown by the specific focus on one particular philosopher. Students need to remember that, while they should never ignore the question (a few students were prepared to write on Frankfurt and Stace and didn't mention Dennett – which was not ideal), they can provide more than what the question asks for.

Some students were not prepared for Dennett specifically, and so their panic reaction was to write at length about the one thing they could remember – the story of the Sphex wasp. It's fine to talk about wasps, but it shouldn't be longer than a few sentences and certainly not a short story running over a page.

Some students spent more or less time considering the alternatives (forms of Hard Determinism or Libertarianism). This is fine and could be very appropriate, provided they keep an eye on the time/have an appropriate balance of content.

To their credit, students who were prepared to address Dennett on the whole did a pretty good job. There were some interesting ideas around biological capacity, emergent behaviour, social organisation, and the difference between 'cause' and 'control'.

Question 6

The question required candidates to apply their understanding of Hard Determinism in relation to moral responsibility and how Libertarians or Compatibilists would challenge this view. Importantly, it was a requirement to include at least one real world example of a crime attracting a legal penalty.

In general, there was a lack of philosophical evidence which affected the Criterion 4 assessment. Many papers showed only surface-level argumentation with an emphasis on recall rather than evaluation.

Some excellent papers discussed Dennett's Compatibilism as a holistic approach to the question. An agent's ability to control their actions in a deterministic universe through reason was a feature of these papers, supported by the Sphex Wasp experiment.

Section C: Contemporary Conflicts in Moral Theory

Question 7

This question asked students to outline a contemporary ethical issue, analyse how the principles of two moral theories could be applied to it, and evaluate the 'right' approach to the issue.

Relevant content

Given the open nature of this elective unit (and the times we're living through/in/under) students engaged with a confronting cascading calamity of contemporary moral conflicts. Generally, students approached addressing their chosen issue through the frameworks of applied environmental, feminist, and political ethics, although a few took a more meta-ethical approach in discussing moral relativism or moral nihilism. The former essays were more precise in the principles applicable, given their normative ethical frameworks, and able to tackle specific issues in analytical detail in comparison to the more generalised discussion of the latter.

Students who did well

Outlined in precise detail the contemporary ethical issue, which they had clearly thoroughly researched, as evidenced by the depth of understanding of both the issue itself, as well as the implications of differing responses to it. Stronger responses also managed to provide a comprehensive overview of the ethical theories they had chosen to apply, to the level of specific principles. For example, outlining Deontology as not merely the view of morality as a duty owed to and through rational beings, but defining the categorical imperative in specific detail applied with precision and nuance: for instance, Kant's Ratiocentric views on which agents cannot be treated as a mere means are quite distinct from contemporary Sentientist and Biocentric deontologists such as Regan and Taylor who extend this principle to other animals and biotic life respectively.

Largely, students who incorporated ethical theories that had arisen to address the issues they were applied to did better than generalised applications of Kant's universalisability and the formula from humanity, or Betham's principle of utility to a poorly defined issue. For instance, Environmental ethics essays that used theories such as The Land Ethic, Deep Ecology, Ecofeminism, and the specific principles of these theories tended to be more thorough, readily applied to specific aspects of issues, and thereby attain higher marks than those who deployed older theories in vague terms. Students who articulated how the application of these principles would change depending upon whether the framework was applied in an Anthropocentric, Non-anthropocentric, or Ecocentric basis, as well as in an individual or holistic sense fared better than those who did not acknowledge or consider these distinctions.

Students who struggled

The most common pitfall for papers that struggled was the tendency to offer little in terms of analysis of ethical frameworks, and instead compose a response that put forth an impassioned position without using ethical principles or evaluating how different theories might approach an issue differently.

Some essays on the morality of A.I. – a genuine and pressing contemporary concern – had a tendency to use material more relevant to the Mind/Body unit without engaging in earnest with the ethical frameworks that might advocate for restrictions on the basis of specific principles of duty, consequence or similar.

Ill-defined (or simply too large) issues also hindered students' ability to apply principles to issues. For example, climate change is a phenomenon caused by many compounding issues and needs to be analysed as such – to say that Kant or Bentham would be against climate change, rather than, for instance, fast fashion or other industries that cause high emissions and care little for the rights of their workers/future generations etc. does not show an appropriate grasp of the material. Indeed, even such issues as fast-fashion, deforestation, sex work, euthanasia, whistleblowing, industrial animal agriculture and aquaculture etc. are best tackled by choosing specific instances of these that are under debate, to aid in the precise application of the principles. An essay about proposals to log and mine Takayna, with biodiversity threats to specific endangered species, the carbon it stores, emissions of the industries, political and cultural opposition, economic considerations and so on, amounts to a more sophisticated applied ethics essay than one on deforestation as a concept/global threat.

Similarly, more specific frameworks – such as Leopold's Ecocentic Land Ethic, which insists that humans, as members of the biotic community, have a duty to preserve the integrity, stability, and

beauty of ecosystems – tended to allow for more detailed application and further justified evaluations as opposed to attempts to make more Anthropocentric frameworks apply to issues they were not designed to address.

Question 8

This question was substantially similar to Question 7 and required students to evaluate the two ethical theories in relation to one ethical issue.

Most candidates were able to explain two ethical theories, though some weaker responses gave personal thoughts/feelings about an issue without reference to ethical theories. A range of relevant issues were discussed, mostly similar to those mentioned in previous examiners' reports.

The challenge of this question is balancing attention given to explaining the ethical issue, explaining ethical theories and their implications for the issue, providing evidence to support/challenge the theories, justifying a personal position, and considering the implications of the personal position for addressing the issue. Candidates who managed a roughly even spread across these tended to achieve fairly consistent ratings across the three assessed criteria.

Weaker responses tended to focus on overly general issues (E.g. climate change) and tended to assert a personal position rather than offering an evidence-based argument.

Section C: Life, The Universe and Everything

Question 9

This question invited students to evaluate the scientific explanation for the origins of the Universe (the Big Bang Theory) against the cosmological arguments for the existence of God, in particular, the contemporary manifestations of the latter and how they have been impacted by scientific perspectives. There were only ten responses to this question.

Relevant content

Evidence supporting the scientific explanation for the origins of the universe included the observation of the 'redshift' of light from distant galaxies, indicating that they are moving away from Earth. Responses also noted the documentation of cosmic microwave background radiation, a faint light that fills the universe, and which scientists argue is the residual heat left over from the Big Bang.

Evidence used in support of the cosmological arguments included Thomas Aquinas' first two of his five ways: the Argument from Motion (Unmoved Mover), and the Argument from First Cause. The Kalam cosmological argument was also used here, with students tending to cite William Lane Craig's modern formulation.

Students who did well

Wrote detailed and even-handed evaluations of the scientific and faith-based arguments, and weighed how they might co-exist and clash in contemporary discourse. Rather than insisting upon

a basic binary (Either/Or) approach, the best responses noted how faith and science are different ways of knowing that do not necessarily have to be at odds. Others did well by justifying their

siding with one or the other ‘side’ via detailed analysis of specific syllogisms, fallacies, and the weight of empirical evidence.

Students who struggled

Confused cosmological with teleological arguments, and/or the Big Bang with Evolution. Some wrote about metaphysical problems, like free will and the nature of the self, did not include syllogisms or an explanation of scientific hypotheses and instead opted to discuss the general ‘merits’ of religion versus science. Many students made no direct reference to the impact of scientific theories on contemporary issues/debates.

Question 10

Only a relatively small number of candidates attempted this question. Most candidates were able to explain the theory of evolution to some degree and explain one or more teleological arguments for the existence of God.

Weaker responses did not explain the central claims of evolutionary theory. Although Criterion 2 is not assessed in this section, failing to explain the theory meant that candidates could not effectively use evidence to challenge/support the theory (Criterion 4) or articulate its contemporary implications clearly (Criterion 5). Also, some candidates misrepresented evolutionary theory as accounting for the origin of life, as opposed to being an explanatory theory of biological change over time. There was also a tendency to use quotations that express viewpoints as evidence to support this viewpoint.

Students are reminded to use the phrase ‘scientific proof’ with caution. More often than not, this misrepresents the nature of scientific knowledge and leads to superficial argumentation.

The question required students to assess the impact of the theory of evolution on contemporary teleological arguments, which was a difficult task for several reasons. One is that the theory of evolution pre-dates contemporary teleological arguments by more than 150 years. Another is that many students had studied even older teleological arguments, such a William Paley’s, watchmaker argument from 1802. This didn’t prevent students from demonstrating skills of philosophical analysis and argumentation, but it did make it difficult to address Criterion 5.

Stronger responses acknowledged that the theory of evolution informs contemporary teleological arguments, which seek to make evolutionary theory compatible with the existence of God(s) as a designer or ‘first cause’. Very few students took this further to discuss the implications of their argument for contemporary issues. A possible way to do this is to discuss the personal implication of their argument for their own religious belief, toleration of the views of others, appraisal of social issues with a religious dimension, etc.

Section D: The Good Life

Question 11

This question was addressed well, with some standout responses. To the extent it's possible, students should aim to give some insight into Montaigne's general methodology and overarching approach. While students aren't expected to have read every single Montaigne essay, it's good if they can give the impression of overall familiarity with his writing rather than giving the impression they only watched a few summary videos.

- Students should try to mould what their insights about the writer around the question they are given; but absolutely, they should not directly address the focus of a question from a previous year e.g. death and cabbages.

Question 12

This question presented students with a powerful statement from Beauvoir and directed them to discuss why and how women have been (and continue to be) prevented from living the good life. It called for a discussion of Beauvoir's ideas and concepts, her solution for how emancipation was to be achieved, and an evaluation of the relevance of her philosophy to young Tasmanians today.

Relevant content

Given the conceptual breadth of this unit, students were expected to work closely with Beauvoir's key existentialist distinctions – most notably the contrast between existentialism and essentialism – and apply these to her account of women's historical confinement to immanence rather than transcendence. Strong answers identified and defined core concepts such as Othering, bad faith, objectification, oppression, and the central role liberty plays in Beauvoir's vision of the good life. Many of the strongest papers also recognised how these ideas continue to map onto contemporary debates, weaving in discussions of issues such as the post–Roe v. Wade landscape, gender-based violence and discrimination, persistent wage and opportunity gaps, and broader systemic disadvantages across social, economic, and cultural institutions. Others drew on recent online sexist discourse and attempts to again conflate biology, gender, and one's purpose along traditional binary patriarchal lines through things like the 'manosphere', the romanticisation of 'trad-wife' ideals, anti-trans bigotry, and the mixed messages of social-media-driven 'empowerment' – to illustrate the ongoing relevance of Beauvoir's critique, especially when contrasted with her own socialist commitments.

Students who did well

Students who excelled outlined Beauvoir's ideas with precision and demonstrated how these concepts explain the structural limits placed on women's capacity for transcendence. They articulated Beauvoir's understanding of the good life as grounded not in happiness but in genuine freedom, and used this to evaluate the conditions under which women (and indeed all of us) might achieve emancipation from oppressive circumstances. Stronger responses also drew on related feminist traditions – such as maternal or difference feminism – and incorporated thinkers like Genevieve Lloyd to broaden and contextualise their arguments. Many of the best essays used concrete examples, including Beauvoir's well-known "doll" analogy, to illustrate the formation of feminine identity and to discuss the contemporary relevance of her ideas for young Tasmanians navigating gendered expectations today.

Students who struggled

Papers that struggled typically offered biographical summaries rather than philosophical analysis, recounting Beauvoir's life in detail but failing to connect these elements meaningfully to her theoretical work. These responses often lacked engagement with core concepts such as transcendence, immanence, Othering, bad faith, or oppression, instead relying on memorised quotations or generalised pro-feminist statements that were not grounded in Beauvoir's arguments. Some responses overemphasised Sartre – sometimes accompanied by the inaccurate claim that Beauvoir merely repeated his ideas – despite her clear criticism of aspects of his view of freedom and her insistence that women's situation under patriarchy constitutes a distinctive form of existential limitation that amounts to oppression.

Question 13

Candidates were asked to explain Nietzsche's position on suffering, and how this might be applicable to the lives of young Tasmanians in 2025. Better papers showed Nietzsche's philosophy as life affirming, rather than nihilistic, which is a common misconception regarding his approach. Concepts such as Amor Fati, the Will to Power, and the Eternal Recurrance were used to support the position of affirmation for life. Some discussed Ressentiment as foundational to the Master/Slave morality and key to the link between suffering with negativity, illuminating the life-denying perspective of Christianity.

Weaker papers either omitted the application of Nietzsche's philosophy to young Tasmanians or omitted the application altogether. This meant Criterion 5 was not addressed adequately. Other weaker responses concentrated on purely biographical details which missed the point of the question; that is, the application of Nietzsche's ideas and if they are indeed still relevant today.

Question 14

This was a fairly general question with no prompting quotation. The question raised three issues (simplicity, nature and solitude) and most students were able to explain Thoreau's account of why these are important in some way.

Stronger responses explained some philosophical concepts involved in Thoreau's thought, such as transcendentalism, ethical perception and civil disobedience. Other effectively explained concepts such as 'living deliberately' and were rewarded on Criterion 2. Responses that were overly biographical or that included quotations that were not analysed tended to do less well on Criterion 2.

Most responses effectively linked Thoreau's thought to the lives of young Tasmanians, emphasising environmental activism, bushwalking, problematic relationships with technology, urban farming, the distractions of consumerism, etc.

However, there was a tendency to dismiss Thoreau because of his privileged social position. This is a legitimate evaluative strategy, but tended to take the simplistic form that all privilege is bad; therefore, Thoreau's position is bad. As Peggy Macinstosh claims in her 1989 essay 'White Privilege: Unpacking The Invisible Knapsack':

[W]e need a more finely differentiated taxonomy of privilege, for some … varieties are only what one would want for everyone in a just society … We might at least start by distinguishing between

positive advantages which we can work to spread, and negative types of advantages which unless rejected will always reinforce our present hierarchies.

An interesting question to ask in the case of Thoreau is whether there is a moral imperative to extend the privilege of spending time alone in nature to all?