

Candidate 3 evidence

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
1	<p>Descartes begins Meditation 3 feeling confident after forming the Cogito. However, if he cannot undoubtly prove the Cogito and get it past the malicious demon hypothesis, he cannot progress past the Cogito to find firm, lasting knowledge. *1</p> <p>Descartes the begins by talking about his thoughts of 'clear and distinct' perception. He believes that if he can see perceive something clearly and distinctly it is undoubtly true. To have a clear perception of something it must be logically true and observed through the minds eye, to have a distinct perception it must be clear and also not be confused with anything not clear. Descartes uses this idea on hisself ^{himself}: He thinks he has a clear and distinct perception of his own mind his his own minds existence and therefore this means anything else that can be perceived clearly and distinctly must also be beyond doubt. Descartes</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
<p>then looks at forms of reality. He thinks that ideas can take different forms, such as formal reality and objective reality. Formal reality is when something is physically there and objective reality is ideas of your mind. These ideas hold the 'substance, accident and mode' then. For example, if you had a table table, the substance is the table itself, the accident could be the colour and the mode could be brown. However, surely there is no such thing as degrees of reality and clear and distinct perception. If something exists, it exists and if it doesn't exist, then it does not. There cannot be different forms of existing.</p>	
<p>Descartes then moves onto the causal adequacy principle. This principle says that 'something can't come from nothing'. what what Descartes means is that the cause has to be greater than the effect ^{effect}.</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
<p>For example, a matchstick candle, the candle will have been lit by a matchstick or a lighter, which has the same heat as the flame of the candle. This is Descartes argument for attempting to prove God exists as how can a world come from something smaller than it is now, it must have come from something much greater (God). However, this principle has been heavily criticised as examples have been brought forward where the ^{effect} order is much larger than the ^{cause} effect, such as 'a whisper creating an avalanche' or 'a matchstick creating a bonfire' meaning Earth could have certainly been created by something much smaller than it is and does not prove the existence of God and his greatness like Descartes hoped it would.</p>	
<p>To try overcome this, he forms the Trademark argument. The trademark</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>argument is a lengthy argument that comes to the conclusion of God's existence. It starts with Descartes wanting to prove God's existence, he then realised^{was} the idea that he knows he, himself is imperfect and finite. This means he cannot have an understanding as good as he does of God, a perfect and infinite being, without a perfect being giving the information to him. He believes that God must have given him this knowledge and understanding and comes to the conclusion ^{God must have} he trademarked it on his mind. This is what Descartes believes is the strongest argument for God's existence he has put forward. However, many people have found issues with it as not everyone's idea of God is the same, some people do not believe he is perfect and infinite. His reasoning also seems to be very circular. This criticism is called the Cartesian circle. Descartes presupposes what he sets out to prove. He begins by wanting to prove God's</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN

Existence and destroy a priori knowledge, to do this he says clear and distinct ideas help this, but to know clear and distinct ideas exist he uses his knowledge of God existing. It goes around in a circle and therefore isn't reliable.

In ~~his~~ conclusion, I think Descartes was unsuccessful in his attempts to prove God's existence in Meditation 3, he never truly used the diabolic doubt he said he would as he never truly doubted God's existence. He didn't use the same scrutiny he said we should have and his arguments are extremely circular.

* 1 of God's existence, which is what he sets out to do in Meditation 3. He is now certain of his own existence and that he is a "thing that thinks". Moving forward, he decides to withdraw from all his senses in the hope to prove

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
3	<p>Utilitarianism is an ethic ethical theory which has a test where you can prove the rightness or wrongness of an action by looking at its consequences. This essay will discuss how a Utilitarian may act in the situation where you must decide whether to give treatment for a life-threatening illness to countries where the illness is more dangerous, or to your own country where it may be less ^{less} severe.</p>
	<p>Part of Utilitarianism is the Greatest Happiness Principle, this means the more happiness and less unhappiness an action creates, the more morally praiseworthy praiseworthy/correct it is. The GHP is made up of 3 principles, the Consequentialist principle, the hedonic principle and the equity principle. The Consequentialist principle looks at the consequences an action may have and believes that is the most ^{an} important factor in deciding in whether or not</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
<p>you should do an action. In this scenario may say a utilitarian using the consequentialist principle may say that more happiness/less unhappiness would come from giving the treatment to a countries where it may be more dangerous to have the illness as it will save a lot of people desperately in need and families who may have had ^{had} to deal with lots of losses from it. However, this theory is hard ^{hard} to practice as there is so many consequences you need to look at to know what one is best, there is also no given limit in how far the consequence can go into the future, as you can't just look at immediate consequences there is also long term.</p>	
<p>The next principle is of the GHP is the hedonic principle, people who live a hedonic lifestyle indulge in all pleasures, the. The hedonic principle looks at all the different</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
<p>possible pleasures. The hedonic principle involves a quasi-scientific algorithm which is a test to see what action could result in the greatest amount of pleasure^{called the hedonic calculus}. It has 7 components, some of these are intensity, duration and certainty. If you took the scenario at hand and scaled it with one of the components such as duration, a utilitarian would see that giving the treatment to countries in danger from the illness would get a very high amount of pleasure for a very long amount of time as so many lives would be saved. However, in real life, this calculator is not practical to use in the moment ^{moment}. It is would take too long to use it on every action action to look at the consequences and therefore is not very beneficial to anyone.</p> <p>The last principle is the principle</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
<p>of equity. In this principle it it says you must treat everyone equally in the scenario. So, you should treat the people from the struggling countries the same as of the people from your own country when looking at the consequences. However, many people have a natural bias and would most likely choose their own country to have the treatment as perhaps in the future one of your own family or friends may get the illness. Although doing this might not bring the most happiness to the most amount of people.</p> <p>There are two types of utilitarians, Act and Rule. Act utilitarians believe you should look at every situation individually and analyse the possible consequences. A benefit of this is that every situation is unique in itself depending on where you are or who is involved. However However, this is difficult to do as it takes</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN

a lot of time to take each situation as its own and think about what one brings the greatest consequences. Also, different Act Utilitarians may have differing opinions on what act is most morally right. One may say giving the treatment to different countries will have the best outcome and others may say that giving the treatment to your own country will have the best outcome.

Rule Utilitarians believe a general set of rules should be followed when ~~then~~ deciding on an action. Rules such as 'Don't lie' or 'Always respect the elderly'. They think by following these set rules it will bring the best outcome most of the time for every situation. A rule utilitarian may use the rule 'Always help those in great need' and ~~to~~ decide the best action is to give the treatment to the

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
<p>countries to more danger. Although, it can be very is contradictory as there may also be the rule of 'Always help your loved ones' which would involve giving the treatment to your own country where your loved ones reside. Another criticism is that to have these set rules, you have to have experienced every possible scenario to know what rules best fit, which is impossible.</p>	
<p>In conclusion, I do not think Utilitarianism ^{would be} effective in deciding on the most morally correct action to take when deciding to give the treatment to at struggling countries where the disease is more dangerous or your own country where it is less dangerous as their rules practices in place to decide are too lengthy and very contradictory of each other as many consequences will bring lots of happiness/less unhappiness.</p>	

