

## Candidate 9 evidence

| ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION | DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN  |
|--------------------------|--|
| 1.                       | 'You cannot be serious!' (1)   |
| 2.                       | Because  |
| 3.                       | To disprove universal claims   |
| 4                        | This is not an argument, but an explanation. It is explaining why someone has been a radiohead fan for 10 years. It is merely a collection of statements, it is not trying to convince us of anything or prove something to be true. |
| 5(a).                    | A conducive argument is one whose premises lead independently to the conclusion.   |
|                          | • They have convergent diagram.  |
|                          | • Their conclusions, like inductive arguments, are at best probable.   |

| ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION | DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN   |
|--------------------------|---|
| 5b)                      | <p>P<sub>1</sub> - the party on Saturday night is going to be really fun</p> <p>P<sub>2</sub> - all of our friends are going to be at the party on Saturday night.</p> <p>P<sub>3</sub> - I would really like it if you came to the party on Saturday night.</p> <p>C - You should go to the party on Saturday night.</p> |
| 6.1                      | <p>Professional tennis players get regular exercise</p>   |
| 2                        | <p>It's an established fact that regular exercise keeps people healthy</p>  |
| 3                        | <p>Healthy people will live long lives</p>  |
| 4                        | <p>Professional tennis players will therefore live long lives.</p>  |
|                          | <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px; display: inline-block;"> <math display="block">\begin{array}{c} 1 + 2 + 3 \\ \hline \downarrow \\ 4 \end{array}</math> </div>   |

| ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION  | DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN |
|---|-----------------------------|
| 7.a)  |                             |
| a) • A deductive argument aims to prove its conclusion for certain.   |                             |
| • As all deductive arguments are valid, if the premises are true, the conclusion must be true.  |                             |
| 7.b)  |                             |
| b) • No, it is inductive. The individual premises work independently to reach the conclusion - they do not rely on each other, eg. 'they are also bound to come down in price as soon as supply increases.' relies on nothing else. |                             |
| • The strength of the argument would decrease as we introduced evidence contrary to the conclusion.   |                             |
| • The conclusion is not proved as certain.  |                             |
|   |                             |
|   |                             |
|   |                             |
|   |                             |

| ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION |   | DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN |
|--------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| 8.                       | <p>The first premise 'human animals have rights' is acceptable (as it is known to be true) and relevant to the conclusion <del>is</del>.<br/> <del>As it is relevant and acceptable, it is sufficient.</del></p> <p>The second premise 'there is no morally relevant difference between human animals and non-human animals' is relevant to the conclusion, as it provides justification. However it is not acceptable as it is not known to be true (it is debatable).<br/> <del>As it is not acceptable, it cannot be sufficient.</del></p> <p>As the second premise is insufficient to prove the conclusion and the first premise relies on the second premise, these premises are not sufficient to prove the conclusion.</p> |                             |

| ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION | DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN  |
|--------------------------|--|
| 9.a)                     | <p>An <del>is</del> argument is valid if and only if there is no logically possible way for the premises to be true and the conclusion to be false</p>   |
| 9.b)                     | <p>P<sub>1</sub> - If you want a good job, you should work hard in school.<br/> P<sub>2</sub> - You want a good job<br/> C - You should work hard in school</p>  |
| 9.c)                     | <p>This argument commits an affirming the consequent fallacy: it mistakes a necessary condition for a sufficient one.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sammy might be kind and funny but a bad friend.</li> <li>• The argument <del>is</del> assumes that because Sammy has qualities possessed by good friends, he must be a good friend.</li> <li>• It is possible for the premises to be true (All good friends are kind and funny) but the conclusion (Sammy is a good friend) to be false.</li> </ul> |

| ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION |  | DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN |
|--------------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| 10.                      | <p>Post hoc ergo propter hoc is the fallacy that because X came before Y, X caused Y. It assumes causation from correlation. It is however possible that X and Y merely happen at the same time without a causal link. For example:</p> <p>P<sub>1</sub> - The car ran over the house<br/> P<sub>2</sub> - The house then fell down<br/> C - The car running over the house caused the house to fall down.</p> |                             |
|                          | <p>Here we can see two events occurred one after the other, and we then assume one caused the other. It is perfectly possible however for the house to have fallen down due to bad foundations or materials, indeed it is more likely. There is no evidence that the car caused the collapse of the house (or that X caused Y).</p>  |                             |

| ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION | DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN  |
|--------------------------|--|
| <del>11</del>            |  |
| 11d)                     | <p>A fallacious appeal to emotion occurs if the authority appealed to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- is not speaking in their area of expertise</li><li>- has vested interests or bias.</li><li>- is not reliable or trustworthy</li><li>- does not provide information agreed upon by similar authorities.</li></ul> <p>It is unlikely that Koyama's argument contains this fallacy, as they seem to have sampled a wide range of scientists, which reduces chances of the authority being unreliable or misrepresenting facts. We assume as they are scientists they do not have vested interests. However, it is possible these are not the right kind of scientists - they could be particle physicists, who know little about <del>the</del> environmental diet impacts.</p> <p>Ruti's argument is more likely to contain this fallacy, as not</p> |

| ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION  | DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN |
|---|-----------------------------|
|   |                             |
| <p>only it is new a. single source authority, increasing the chance of unreliability; and increasing the chance and impact of any bias, but also, this person is merely a 'researcher'; they could be researching anything, and might know nothing about dietary sciences. Overall then, Ruiz's is more likely to contain a fallacious appeal to authority, while Kajama's likely contains an <u>appropriate</u> appeal to authority.</p> |                             |
| 11b)  |                             |
| <p>In Ruiz's final statement, they say 'I still think?'. The inclusion of 'still' suggests this is what they thought before. When added to the fact they have stayed with their original opinion despite good contrary evidence, it suggests they have confirmation bias, where you search out evidence that confirms a preexisting belief.</p>   |                             |



| ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION | DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN  |
|--------------------------|--|
| 12.                      | This galaxy is affirming the consequent, which has the structure:  |
|                          | P <sub>1</sub> - If P then Q   |
|                          | P <sub>2</sub> - Q   |
|                          | C - Therefore, P   |
|                          | This galaxy mistakes a necessary condition for a sufficient one. It assumes that because wanting to reduce your carbon footprint is one reason to avoid international travel, it is the only one. So, if you have been avoiding international travel, you must want to reduce your carbon footprint, when in fact there are several reasons you might not be travelling abroad; you might be afraid of flying for example, which would be the real reason for not travelling abroad. |

| ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION |  | DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN |
|--------------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| 13.                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Descartes aims to rebuild his knowledge from only certain truths.</li> <li>• To find something indubitable</li> <li>• To build something lasting in the sciences</li> <li>• To find a certain or necessary truth.</li> </ul>  |                             |
| 14.                      | <p>a) Agree the reliability of the senses argument, Descartes reasons that while momentary, immediate sense based knowledge (a posteriori) are true, like <del>the</del> 'the gaze I am here, sitting by the gate' all other sense <del>knowledge</del> <sup>knowledge</sup>, like seeing a far off building, which is far less immediate <del>and</del> and impactful than observations about our immediate surroundings, is false.</p> <p>In other words, Descartes doubts some of his senses and the knowledge from them.</p> |                             |

| ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION | DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN   |
|--------------------------|---|
| 14b)                     | <p>after the dream argument, Descartes concludes that all sense-based knowledge can be doubted.</p>   |
|                          | <p>← answer continues on page 17.</p>   |
| 15.                      | <p>One way this response is wrong is it assumes Descartes really believes in a malicious demon. 'There is no evidence' suggests this person is trying to refute a claim Descartes is making about a specific, real, entity. The demon is purely hypothetical - it is a thought experiment Descartes introduces to stop himself getting into old habits of thinking. Descartes only introduces the demon at the end of meditation one to <del>stop himself believing what he used to</del> stop himself believing what he used to, but has now proved false.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The malicious demon does not prove everything to be false, only</li> </ul> |

| ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION | DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN  |
|--------------------------|--|
|                          | <p>that we cannot be certain of <sup>anything</sup> <del>anything</del>. Descartes distinguishes between obviously false and possibly dubitable. He also looks <del>back</del> on in meditation 2 to prove the cogito which is immune to the malicious demon.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Saying Descartes was 'wrong' is missing the point - Descartes cannot be 'wrong' about the demon, as it is merely an argument to be considered, not a statement to be judged true or false. Moreover, calling the demon argument 'false' would be incorrect, as logically speaking it is perfectly valid.</li> <li>• To a certain extent, claiming Descartes is 'looking for <del>truth</del> <del>the</del> certainty' is <del>not</del> slightly misleading. While it is true this was his main aim in meditation 1, to which this excerpt refers, Descartes only showed everything to be dubitable, he did not in meditation 1 find certainty.</li> </ul> |

| ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION | DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN   |
|--------------------------|---|
| 19.                      | <p>Kant argues only reason can be used to make moral judgements. Only reason, which is a priori, could make a universal, non-subjective moral system binding on all. If we used a posteriori knowledge, we would end up with a subjective moral system. Reason guarantees authority.</p>  |
| 20.                      | <p>Good will is the only thing good in itself because it cannot be corrupted for evil ends. Bravery and intelligence could be used for evil; you could for example have a cunning tyrant or a brave thief. Only Good will is necessarily good, as it is not possible to have it corrupted. Even a murderer acting out of good will would be acting morally. Moreover, even if what you did had bad consequences, if you acted out of good will,</p> |

| ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION | DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN  |
|--------------------------|--|
|                          | <p>you would still be acting morally, or<br/>         as Kant put it, <del>the</del><br/>         the good will would still<br/>         'shine through like a jewel'.<br/>         So, if I help a pensioner across<br/>         the street because I want<br/>         them to pay me or even because<br/>         I take pride in helping the<br/>         community, it would not be moral.<br/> <del>Only by acting out of good</del><br/> <del>will or respect for the m.</del></p>  |
|                          | <p>2) a) Sinead is taking these actions<br/>         not out of duty (respect for<br/>         the moral law?) or goodwill,<br/>         but because she <del>is</del> is<br/>         'satisfied' in doing it and 'enjoys'<br/>         it. Therefore they are not morally<br/>         praiseworthy. Only actions we have<br/>         'freely and consciously chosen to<br/>         do' are morally praiseworthy.<br/> <del>So even if Sinead</del></p> <p>As Sinead is acting out of<br/>         inclination and not duty, she</p> |

| ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION | DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN  |
|--------------------------|--|
|                          | <p>cannot be acting morally. An inclination is a tendency, desire or emotion that makes us tend towards a particular course of action, even if it is not moral. This example is similar to Kant's shopkeeper, who provides the correct change. Kant points out only providing the correct change as a duty is moral, <del>any</del> any other reason is not.</p>                                   |
| 21b)                     | <p>Many would argue Kant is very demanding in this respect, but I would agree with Kant's views. If we replaced Sinead's reasons with less positive ones, say because she wanted to put the work on her CV, we could see there is simply no altruism in her actions, which is disguised in the example. It makes sense that <del>there</del> only actions which are altruistic and not selfish</p> |

| ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION | DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN   |
|--------------------------|---|
|                          | <p>are morally praiseworthy, otherwise we give rise to the egoistic predicament, whereby people only act to benefit themselves. If this is the case, then why should it matter that Sinead's reasons are in one case positive <del>emotions</del> emotions and in the other prudential? As neither are altruistic, <del>or in</del> in Kant's terms are of Good will, neither should be deemed moral. So I would agree with Kant; his strict definitions of moral value clearly show Sinead is acting selfishly and so <del>therefore</del> <del>her</del> her actions are of no moral value.</p> |
| 15                       | <p>(continued) I will suppose that not God, who is supremely good and the source of all truth, but some malicious demon has employed all his energies to deceive me; this</p>   |



| ENTER<br>NUMBER<br>OF<br>QUESTION |                                  | DO NOT<br>WRITE IN<br>THIS<br>MARGIN |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
|                                   | shows the demand is hypothetical |                                      |
|                                   |                                  |                                      |
|                                   |                                  |                                      |
|                                   |                                  |                                      |
|                                   |                                  |                                      |
|                                   |                                  |                                      |
|                                   |                                  |                                      |
|                                   |                                  |                                      |
|                                   |                                  |                                      |

