

Candidate 3 evidence

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	SECTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
2)	<p>In Hume's enquiry concerning human understanding he tries to find out how we gain our knowledge. Using an empiricist viewpoint he theorises that all our knowledge comes from our senses.</p>	
	<p>Hume believes that all our knowledge fits into two categories: impressions which are vivid and come from an experience and ideas which are less vivid and are memories of the initial experience. Impressions can be further split into two categories: inward impressions which are internal emotions such as anger or happiness and outward impressions which are ones we get through our senses ^{physically}. Hume believes no matter how strong an idea is it'll never be stronger than an impression. "the most vibrant idea is still dimmer than the dullist sensation." Hume uses heat as an example, no matter how hard you try to imagine the sensation of it, it'll never be as strong as the actual experience of touching something hot. This helps to support Hume's theory as we know this to be true that memories of pain are never as bad as the firsthand one. However Hume</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
<p>argument is that ideas can never be as vivid as impressions which isn't always the case. Hallucinations for example, are sensations created by the mind that someone perceives to be true. Subjectively, these ideas created by the imagination are just as vivid as impressions. This weakens Hume's theory as it proves against the point he was trying to make how ideas can never be as vivid as impressions as there are some cases such as hallucinations that prove otherwise.</p>	
<p>Hume then goes on to explain how imagination works using impressions and ideas. Our imagination uses ideas to make up images by using simple ideas which is just the memory of an impression or complex ideas which are 2 or more simple ideas put together. Hume explains how the imagination is limited to 4 categories - The first is compound where it takes 2 or more simple ideas and puts them together. For example, the a golden mountain is made up of ideas of a mountain and the colour gold. The next one is transposing where it changes the position of ideas such as a horse with eagle's wings. Then</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>there is enlargement which is making something bigger such as an ant the size of a bus. And the opposite to that is diminishing which is making something smaller like an elephant the size of your palm. These are all things the imagination can do and no matter what you think it is limited to that. Hume believes there is one thing the imagination cannot do which is an absolute contradiction. Something can't be red and not red at the same time. It's impossible to imagine no matter how hard you try. This supports Hume's theory as it's an easy test anyone can do and once you try it you know it doesn't work.</p> <p>Hume goes on to explain how ideas cannot exist with impressions. Hume believes that without an impression or experience we have no idea of it whenever it is and he gives us 4 scenarios to prove this. The first is the lack of senses, where if a blind man born blind has never seen colour he has no idea what colour green is as he's had no impression of it. Another is the lack of experience for example, a Laplander</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>will never know the taste of wine so therefore he's had no impression of it so doesn't have an idea of what wine tastes like. Another is when an act conflicts with a person's personality, a selfless person won't know the best need to be selfish so has no idea of what it's like. And lastly animal perception, a snake can taste the air thus having different perception of the world to us which we will never know or understand as we have had no impression of it. All these scenarios are those that lack ideas as they never had no impressions and Hume believes this to be true and these points do support his theory well and are valid arguments. However you can argue that there are something's that exist without an impression using our senses. Whodunnit, for example, is not something you can see or use any of your senses to perceive it but according to Hume's logic because of that, whodunnit, something we know to be real, doesn't exist. This heavily weakens Hume's theory as whodunnit is a prime example of ideas existing without an impression which disproves his point that ideas cannot exist without impression.</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>there is a counterexample that helps to further disprove Hume's theory on how ideas can exist without impressions called the missing shade of blue. In his scenario it is questioned that if shades of blue were lined up from darkest to lightest and the one in the middle was missing, would someone, with no prior impression of the missing colour, be able to guess the missing shade? Hume believes that they could but he states that the example is so singular it doesn't affect his theory. I believe this counterexample should affect his theory as not only is it valid in disproving his theory but this concept can be used for any of the senses, e.g. a missing note on a scale. I believe by not including the missing shade of blue into his theory and ignoring it, it heavily weakens his entire theory as by ignoring it he isn't taking into account anything that doesn't fit what he likes and isn't much of a scientific theory as instead of taking in his information and weakening his theory, he chose to ignore it.</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>	