

Candidate 2 evidence

SECTION 1 — ARGUMENTS IN ACTION — 20 marks

Attempt ALL questions

1. (a) The following list contains both arguments and statements.

4

Tick (✓) the four arguments.

He loves her and he has promised to marry her. That means he should marry her.

I have never liked Max. He is friendly with some people I know and he used to go out with my best friend. But I don't like him.

The cookie jar is empty because the children ate all the cookies.

The standards for the Most Amazing Dog prize at the village fete are agility, loyalty, cuteness and wagginess of tail. The prize is a year's worth of luxury dog food, a top-of-the-range dog bed and a dog grooming voucher.

The sewing machine needs electricity. So, because it is not plugged in, it will not work.

Storm clouds are coming in this direction, so it is definitely going to rain today.

I love going to the cinema with my friends. I also enjoy skate boarding and swimming but the cinema is my favourite.

All horses have four legs. Cloppy is a horse. Therefore, Cloppy has four legs.

1. (continued)

(b) What does it mean to put an argument in standard form?

2

Standard form is when an argument is put into logical form, the premises are numbered & premises & conclusions are labelled as such. Hidden premises are identified & are subtly added in.

(c) Put the following argument into standard form.

2

Eight out of ten people report having smoother and softer skin after using 'Smooth and Soft' skin cream for thirty days. Therefore, 'Smooth and Soft' skin cream actually makes skin smoother and softer. Buy it!

P1 - 8 out of 10 people report having smoother & softer skin after using

'Smooth & Soft' skin cream for 30 days

HP2 - If the majority of people who use a product agree that it works, it usually does

C - 'Smooth & Soft' skin cream actually makes skin smoother & softer

1. (continued)

(d) Explain what a fallacy is.

1

A fallacy is a fault in reasoning in arguments, which makes the argument invalid.

(e) Each of the following arguments contains a fallacy.

(i) He argued that all children should be given vitamin C. But I am not listening to him because he has no children of his own!

Name the fallacy Attacking the person 1

Describe the fallacy This is when, instead of attacking their argument & what you think is wrong with that, you attack the person who made the argument. 1

Explain, with reference to the above argument, why you think it is a fallacy. 1

The fact that the man has no children of his own has no bearing on the validity of his argument.

(e) (continued)

- (ii) Either you support the bombing of Syria or you support the terrorists. So, since you don't support the bombing of Syria, you must support the terrorists.

Name the fallacy False dilemma 1

Describe the fallacy When you are given only 2 choices & are told you can only pick one of them when there are other options available. 1

Explain, with reference to the above argument, why you think it is a fallacy. 1

Just because someone doesn't support the bombing of Syria doesn't mean they support the terrorists they could be anti-war, or ^{something completely} different.

1. (continued)

- (f) If I work for two hours then I will get ten pounds. I have not worked for two hours, so I will not get ten pounds.

Explain why the argument above is invalid.

2

It's a False Dilemma, there is no other information than they haven't worked for 2 hours, they may have worked for 1 hour or even 3 hours. There are more options, such as getting half the money or even more money. The boss might even just let them have it anyway.

2. (a) Explain why sceptics think that it is impossible to know anything for certain.

4

Skeptics are people who doubt knowledge is possible, either in a certain matter - local scepticism - or generally - global scepticism - René Descartes came up with 3 skeptical arguments which most skeptics agree with. 1) You can't trust the senses - they can be tricked by things such as optical illusions & therefore can't be trusted, so any information or knowledge that comes from the senses can't be trusted either. 2) You could be dreaming - how do you know if you're awake or not, so we can't even trust information as we could have dreamed the reason we 'know' it. 3) You could be being tricked

by an evil demon - any information or knowledge you think that you've gained could just be a fabrication from the evil demon

2. (continued)

(b) What is the difference between 'knowing how' and 'knowing that'?

2

knowing-how is knowing a skill or how to do something. Knowing-that is knowing a fact. Some people say that knowing a skill is just knowing facts about that skill. Others disagree, you may know exactly the angle you need to turn at to do a jump in ice skating but it doesn't mean you can actually do it.

2. (continued)

- (c) (i) Describe how Locke uses a blank sheet of paper to show how we acquire knowledge.

3

Locke says that when we are born we are like a blank slate (piece of paper) or tabula rasa & that we know absolutely nothing^{up} on our arrival into this world; Thus to learn or gain knowledge we use experience & our senses. This is an empiricists point of view - we learn from experience & the senses.

- (ii) Describe how Leibniz uses a block of veined marble to show how we acquire knowledge.

3

Leibniz said that we were like a block of veined marble - underneath there is already a ready made statue of Hercules we just need to chip away at it. This is the premise of innate ideas - that we already have some knowledge when we were born, a rationalist

point of view - we can only learn from our minds & reason.

2. (continued)

(d) What was Descartes aiming to achieve in his search for knowledge?

4

Descartes was aiming to prove that knowledge was possible & thus, the position of supreme scepticism ^(someone who doubts everything) is invalid & impossible to take. He did this by examining all of his foundational beliefs to see if they could be doubted & if they could be - he discarded them. He believed he found knowledge that survived his 3 sceptical arguments - 'I think, therefore I am' 'Cogito ergo sum.'

(e) After doubting the existence of everything, Descartes asks, 'Is it then the case that I too do not exist?'

Explain how Descartes arrives at the answer, 'I am, I exist'.

2

Descartes believes that the fact he is thinking at all - to doubt his existence, proves that he exists. If he can think to be tricked ^{by the demon} he must exist in some form even without a body.

2. (continued)

- (f) Explain why Descartes thinks 'I am, I exist' is a truth he knows for certain.

2

Descartes' definition of knowledge is a clear & distinct idea. It is clear as it doesn't use the senses to be known & it's distinct as it isn't mixed with other ideas. He believed it to be indubitable & thus certainly true.

- (g) Explain two weaknesses of Descartes' Cogito.

4

Some people say that it is a circular argument the use of the 'I' at the start of 'I think, therefore I am' means that he's already assumed the conclusion is correct, to prove the conclusion. Descartes thinks that his cogito survives his evil demon argument but not everyone agrees. Some believe he underestimates how inclusive it is.

2. (continued)

(h) How does Hume think we acquire knowledge?

1

David Hume is an empiricist, so he believed we gain knowledge from the senses & experience.

(i) According to Hume, what are simple ideas copies of?

1

Simple ideas are just copies of impressions that we've had in the past.

(j) According to Hume, how is it possible for us to imagine things that do not exist, such as unicorns?

4

Hume says that these are complex ideas, things which we've never seen before. Complex ideas are just copies of impressions ^{mixed with} & imagination. So we take the impressions of white horses & horns or tusks (eg from a narwal) & combine them together, adding in goodness & purity ect. to get unicorns. Imagination can do 4 things, Hume says, 1) shrink, 2) enlarge, 3) move 4) combine.

3. (a) What would Bentham's hedonic calculus be used to calculate?

1

which action would cause the most happiness, last the longest, ect. if you took it. which action would cause the most good.

(b) Name any two of the components of Bentham's hedonic calculus.

2

1) Fecuridity - will this pleasure give you other pleasures in the future eg help someone out now - feel good about yourself, & they might help you later.

2) Intensity - how bad \ good is the pleasure \ pain on a scale from -100 to +100.

3. (continued)

(c) Read the following statement:

'Some supermarkets throw out food which is still edible, rather than donating it to people in need.'

Explain why a Utilitarian might consider this to be morally wrong. You should support your answer by referring to the key features of Utilitarianism.

6

This isn't following the greatest happiness principle - greatest happiness for the greatest number of people (or the other way around - least pain/suffering for the least amount of people). It would make lots of people in need very happy to have any of the food being thrown out & by not helping them the people at the supermarkets aren't maximising happiness or minimising suffering. Utilitarianism is made up of 3 ^{key} theories 1) consequentialism - what are the consequences of their actions? By not helping - they look back to the public, are making needless waste & not providing food that could potentially save lives. 2) equity - are all of the people being treated equally?

3c) No, by not providing good that could save someone's life, which would otherwise be going to waste. - their person & their life is being treated as if it were worthless & unworthy.

3. (continued)

(d) You have studied three criticisms of Utilitarianism.

(i) State a criticism of Utilitarianism.

1

How long are you meant to look into the future for the consequences of your actions?

(ii) Why is this a problem for Utilitarianism? Support your answer with an example.

2

If you only look into the short term consequences it could come back to bite you but it's hard to predict the future with any accuracy. For example, if I support Brittany in this argument I might get a girlfriend or even wife, whereas if I support Bill

he will stay my best friend. ~~But~~ So they support Bill & Brittany later becomes his boss & unfairly targets him & is prejudiced against him - how could they have known that would happen?

3. (continued)

- (e) You have studied another moral theory as well as Utilitarianism.

Describe the key features of your other moral theory.

4

Kantianism is all about doing one's duty - it's also called deontology (deon - greek for duty). Kant believed that for an action to be moral; it had to be done for the right reasons - such as doing one's duty, it had to be universalisable - eg 'steal what you want' wouldn't be viable if everyone followed it, & even if it's possible for it to be universalised you need to want to be in a world where it is universalised - eg even if 'steal what you want' was viable it wouldn't be a nice world to live in.

3. (continued)

(f) Read the following scenario:

You go to a party at your best friend Katy's house. You damage an expensive laptop belonging to Katy's parents, and you cannot afford to replace it. Katy offers to take the blame for you.

What would followers of your other moral theory think is the right thing to do in this situation?

Give reasons for your answer.

4

Kant would say you shouldn't, he says that you shouldn't lie no matter what even if it's to save a life. Lying is one of the examples he gave of things you shouldn't do, etc. Kant would also disagree because it's not the right motivation - you're doing it out of fear & wanting to escape punishment. Kant says that emotions aren't moral motivations & it's obviously wrong to try to escape a well deserved punishment.

3. (continued)

- (g) Describe two criticisms of your other moral theory, with reference to the above scenario.

4

Some people disagree with Kant, in that they think it's okay to lie for the right reasons. Some people might say it's right to lie in this case - as Katy won't get in as much trouble & you can't pay them back & even if you don't agree Kant says that even if it were to save your life - eg they're in the mafia & would kill you for losing valuable information on the laptop - lying would be wrong. Kant's decision that emotions aren't the right motive for making decisions is very controversial - he is saying

that Katy is doing something wrong by offering to help her friend because she wants them to be happy & loves them, as it is not her duty to do so - 'help her friend & lie', but to tell her parents the truth & leave her friend. He says helping someone out of love or pity is wrong & you should only help someone because it is your duty to do so.