

Candidate 1 evidence

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
①	<u>Knowledge and Doubt.</u>
	When Descartes started his meditations he gave
	himself aims of what he wants to achieve. He wanted
	to find something firm and lasting in the sciences. He
	wanted to prove the existence of God. Descartes wanted
	to find a piece of foundational knowledge. He wanted
	to prove sceptics wrong. Descartes ^{finally, ↓} wanted to ^{abs}
	make the distinction between the mind and the body.
	When Descartes is seeking for foundational knowledge
	he abolishes his current beliefs. He thinks he had
	to begin from the very start and find new
	beliefs that cannot be doubted or rejected. Like
	a rotting building, you tear down the structure and
	rebuild from the foundations. He ^{He applied his methodological} scepticism to find true
	knowledge.
	<u>Argument from illusion.</u>
	Descartes began his meditations with the argument
	from illusion. He believes our senses can deceive us ^(they have in the past)
	from our what we really believe in and we cannot
	trust them. Descartes was told a lot of falsehoods
	whilst growing up which when he grew up, he
	found out they were not true. Macneil criticises
	Descartes with only using sight deception examples.
	For instance, sticks looking bent in water or →

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p><u>Argument from dreaming</u></p> <p>Descartes states there is no distinguishing feature between awake and dreaming. Descartes believes when dreaming/sleeping, you are unaware that you are not awake. Thomas Hobbes, criticises Descartes that that people are too caught up in their dream to want to tell the difference in reality and being asleep. Here, Descartes ^{doubts} fully ^{and} rejects all A priori and A posteriori knowledge as it cannot be trusted. →</p>	
	<p>(illusion)</p> <p>→ towers looking small in the distance. Mairienne says there are ways for our sight sense to deceive us, however, our many other senses are able to correct the deception. For example, when I was in Tesco when I was younger, I thought I could see my mum in the distance but when I accidentally felt the person next to me, I easily corrected my deception and my mum was next to me the whole time when I thought I lost her. From my example, I agree with Mairienne. Descartes doubts but doesn't reject A priori posteriori knowledge yet as he retroactively would be a widower whilst sitting by the fire, feeling the heat on his face and the silk of his dressing gown against his body.</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN

→ (dreaming).

I agree with Thomas Hobbes as when those are asleep and dreaming, they won't want to feel the distinction between them sleeping and reality.

They'd want to be focused on their dream as if it ^{their} was reality.

Receiving God.

Descartes moves onto the possibility of God being a source of deception. Descartes believed in a God who is all-loving, all-knowing and all-powerful. (omni-potent, omni-scient, omni-benevolent).

He believes God is all-loving and cannot be a source of deception because he loves all. But if

God really is all-loving why would there be so ^{natural} much evil in the world we live in? Does God

really have these 3 characteristics? If God was all-powerful, he would have all the power in the

world to stop any disasters that affect us.

~~Is Descartes really all-powerful? Is God a source of deception?~~

I believe God is a source of deception because all of the terrible things that have happened in the world could've been prevented if God really did have ~~all~~ any of these 3 characteristics.

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN

Evil Demon

→

Descartes believes there is a being, more powerful than God, evil instead of good, trying to deceive him. The malicious deceiver is used as a tool for Descartes to not fall back into old habits of accepting knowledge that can be doubted.

Descartes believes the evil demon helps him to not allow knowledge to be trusted before applying his method of doubt. Some could argue that the malicious deceiver is controlling Descartes. That the demon is too strong and cannot be trusted. Should Descartes finish at ~~meditation 1~~ at ~~meditation 1~~ meditation 1? Is the malicious deceiver too strong? I believe the malicious deceiver is strong but in a good way. He is able to keep Descartes hesitant on accepting knowledge before testing if it can be doubted. I believe Descartes shouldn't finish at meditation 1 as he still needs to find a firm foundational knowledge.

Descartes' position at the end of meditation 1 is that the evil demon kept him to remain sceptical. He doubted and rejected all A priori and A posteriori

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>^{the found} posterior knowledge. the God can be a source of deception.</p>	
	<p><u>Moral Philosophy</u></p>	
	<p>Kantianism is also described as deontological. The rightness or wrongness of an action itself, not the consequences. For Kant, consequences are not based on something we can't control over. Kant begins his theory with the importance of morality. He believes morality should be the same for for everyone, no exceptions. Kant believes we are all unique ^{due to reason, and that} it is the most important in decision making.</p>	we cannot control the consequences of our actions ←
	<p>For Deontologists, there are certain actions that must not be acted upon as such as killing, cheating, lying and stealing. For Kant, if we abstain to such actions we would be acting immoral and illogical. This is ^{called} "duty ethics". If you carry out an action, it is because you have the duty to do so and are only praised if you act on the sake of your duty. "doing what you are obliged to do".</p>	
	<p>For good will, Kant states our good will can be put into a 'service of evil ends' Good or virtues</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p style="text-align: right;">Jean-Paul</p> <p>Another critique to Kantian ethics is the critique of Kantian ethics is that there may be a clash of perfect duties. He criticizes that there may be a clash of perfect duties. For example, if you had the duty to go to war to protect your country but you also had the duty to stay home and protect your unwell mother. Kant does not present an appropriate response.</p> <p>I agree with Jean-Paul Sartre as by referring to these perfect duties, they are both very important and are very important duties that both need to be fulfilled by but you cannot be in the same ^{different} places at the same time. For Kant not to propose a response to this proves it is an effective criticism it is an effective criticism.</p> <p><u>Evil demon continued</u> Knowledge & Doubt.</p> <p>To critique the evil demon, it allows Descartes to be in a state of hyperbolic doubt. If he continues to be controlled by the evil demon impacting what knowledge he believes in, will he ever escape the state continuous state of hyperbolic doubt?</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>means it is less time consuming than Act Utilitarianism which requires you to assess each possible consequence. Act Utilitarianism also uses the hedonic calculus which is too impractical to use especially when all the possible consequences are unknown. Act Utilitarianism can also allow for the potentially wrong acts to be justified. For example, if committing a crime needed the murder of an innocent man would lead to more pleasure as overall, it would be considered moral under Act Utilitarianism. However, rule Utilitarianism comes the general rule of 'never kill' and so it would prevent more acts such as murder from occurring. However, rule Utilitarianism can lead to too many exceptions of rules. This can make the rules become meaningless and would ultimately lead to act Utilitarianism if there were too many singular rules. Overall, Rule Utilitarianism is an improvement on Act Utilitarianism as it is more practical and prevents possibility of morally wrong acts such as 'tyranny of the majority.'</p>	