

Candidate 8 evidence

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
1)	Two Defining Features of an argument:	
	1) Premises 2) Conclusion.	
2)	p1- If a car has reliable brakes then it has	
	brakes that work on ice.	
	p2- The brakes on my car don't work very well	
	<u>on ice</u>	
	C- My car doesn't have reliable brakes.	
3a)	'If'	
	b) 'Therefore'	
4)	Convergent, as all premise act and work as	
	a separate reason for going to college, meaning all	
	premise work independently to support the conclusion	
5)	Serial, as the premises lead into one another to	
	support the final conclusion that eating meat is wrong.	
6) a)	The premise in the above argument is acceptable	
	as we know for a fact that 'all human beings	
	have a heart"	
	b) The premise is not sufficient to establish the conclusion	
	as we do not know if Fluffy is a human	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>being and if we accept that all human beings have a heart but do not know if Fluffy is human then we cannot know whether Fluffy has a heart or not.</p>
7a)	<p>A key feature in an inductive argument is that the arguer is trying to provide evidence for a conclusion that is not guaranteed.</p>
b)	<p>The above argument is deductive as the arguer is trying to provide absolute proof to a conclusion.</p>
8)	<p>The function of a counter-example is to go against an argument or example that has already been made showing that there is an case exception to the general rule that has been made.</p>
9) a)	<p>An argument is valid when the truth of the conclusion is guaranteed by the truth of the premises.</p>
b)	<p>The ambiguity within this argument is known as lexical ambiguity and occurs when a single word is misused in an argument and is understood in a different way to its original meaning.</p>
c)	<p>The ambiguity affects this argument validity as feathers can in fact be dark but due to the ambiguity we accept the premises in a different way than</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	intended.
10)	a) an analogical argument is an argument where similarities of two things are presented and then further assumes another similarity because of the previous ones b) The use of analogy is convincing in this argument as the similarity that both school and prison restrict a persons freedom is true as they both restrict what people can do. However the argument then makes the link between doing something wrong and prison and makes the assumption that school is the same due to the previous fallacy.
11)	A slippery slope argument is when the arguer assumes that one thing will lead to another and then another and so on. However for a slippery slope argument to be fallacious the arguer would have to make the jump from one small bad thing to an over exaggerated bad thing and so on. An example of this would be 'Don't drink alcohol as alcohol is a drug and you will want to take harder drugs like Metham or heroin. Drinking leads to drug overdose'. For a slippery slope argument to be admissible the links would have to be smaller and plausible.

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
12a)	The above argument is known as denying the antecedent. antecedent.	
	b). The above argument ^{Pitfall} Fallacy occurs when the first part of the conditional statement is ^{denied} denied which then causes the arguer to deny the second part, even though it does not have to be denied ^{denied} . Just as how just because people will continue to eat meat does not mean global warming cannot be reduced.	
13.	'I think, therefore I am'	
14.	Descartes Descartes is able to reach the conclusion of his cogito by understanding that by doubting all his knowledge he is actually proving his existence. Descartes explains how that for there to be some ^{about} or thoughts there must be something present to produce the thoughts, Descartes existence. Descartes then explains how doubting is a form of thinking, securing the fact that as long as Descartes doubts or thinks he exists.	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
15)	Descartes Cogito shows both weaknesses and strengths
	One strength to Descartes Cogito is that it is self
	affirming and hard to dismiss because as long as
	Descartes thinks then he exists and that is extremely
	hard to disagree with. One weakness however is
	the fact that Descartes just glosses over the Malicious
	demon argument when arriving at the Cogito, surely if
	a Malicious demon was present and set out to trick
	Descartes at every turn then Descartes and the Demon's
	existence would be one of the first things he would
	trick him with, especially if he is all powerful. Another
	weakness of the Cogito is that it is heavily circular,
	this is a weakness raised by those who state that Descartes already assumes his own existence from
	the start of the Cogito by using language such as
	'I', how does Descartes understand the use of language
	if the Malicious demon is tricking him with everything?
	The use of 'I' seems to assume Descartes' existence
	as 'I' would assume something there.

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
19)	The purpose of Bentham's hedonic calculus is to allow utilitarians to apply a situation to the Calculus and use it to figure out the best possible outcome / action to take.
20)	One of the components of the hedonic Calculus is Duration, which looks at how long such pain or pleasure will last, allowing you to further rate it 1-10 to find out the best outcome.

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 results 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>	