

Candidate 4 evidence

3. (a) What would Bentham's hedonic calculus be used to calculate? 1

The hedonic calculus
is used to calculate
the overall happiness outcome
of something.

- (b) Name any two of the components of Bentham's hedonic calculus. 2

Duration, the length of
something, how long the
happiness would last.
Intellectual value, where
the creature would be
seen as a better choice
than watching spongebob
(swine ethics), because
animals can enjoy
the simple things but
humans should be more
refined.

Eating, drinking, sleeping
= low.

Poetry, reading, theatre.
= high.

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

A Utilitarian intends to bring the most happiness to the most people. Therefore, they would take issue with this, as feeding the needy would bring happiness to a large group of poor in our society, rather than the small number of supermarket CEOs who prefer to discard of the food.

Furthermore, Utilitarians perceive all as equal, in that we all deserve happiness & the basic standards of living.

Therefore, Utilitarians would take more issue with the hungry being cast aside. As such, they would take an issue with supermarkets throwing away edible food, when some are starving.

(iii) State a second criticism of Utilitarianism.

1

Hedonism does not account for problematic ways of pursuing happiness.

3. (d) (continued)

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

2

There are many cases in which happiness is gained through injustice. Such as dog fighting, gambling illegally, and drug use. So can happiness really be the end goal? No. Not all happiness is good happiness and the hedonistic nature of Utilitarianism does nothing to combat this.

3. (continued)

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

Describe the key features of your other moral theory.

4

Kantianism;

- Duty Ethics - the theory that one should behave morally based on 'Duty', not instinct or a good, kind nature. E.g., a policeman catches the criminal because ~~it's~~ ~~his~~ ~~job~~, his duty, rather than needing to really care about the criminal impulse & arresting him out of a sense of justice socially. To Kant, acting out of Duty is just as morally commendable (even more so) than acting out of moral instinct.
- Universal Law Theory - this is essentially a 'don't do it unless you'd be fine with everyone doing it' rule. So, to Kant, running a red light is not the moral option as it would not be morally okay, because if we all did this, traffic would be hell.

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

A Kantian would refuse to let Katy take the blame. You are her friend, and your DUTY as her friend is to be loyal, honest, and supportive. A Kantian acts upon their Duty, and as a friend to Katy, they could not morally allow her to be blamed for their mistake. Furthermore, Kantian ULI states not to do something unless you'd be okay with EVERYONE doing it. You would not be okay with everyone breaking expensive tech and selling their friends out to cover for them. Universal Law therefore would push the Kantian to instead own up to damaging the laptop and likely apologise.

3. (continued)

- (g) Describe two criticisms of your other moral theory, with reference to the above scenario. 4

To begin, Kantianism's
Duty theory is super
bureaucratic. As a Russian
spy, it may be my duty
to sip tea with the
elitons and discuss
the best way to torture
prisoners of war as Bill
described his office decisions.
Would my DUTY as a spy
then condone my actions?
No, and following by DUTY
will get you in trouble
when you damage Katy's
laptops. Furthermore, this
idea of "Universal Law" is
weak. If we again revisit
my Kremlin spy part-time
gig, we can move into
the best possible way to
debunk UT. If I were
to kill a Bulgarian
Diplomat right as he was
pointing a gun to my
skull, if I were to
snap his neck (just once)

By Kant's theory, I am therefore condoning my action and implying that this is something which everyone should do. There are many more 'realistic' versions of this, as I'm sure we've all drunk underage, lied to our parents, sworn at someone over the internet, blamed our siblings for something they absolutely did not do. These are everyday occurrences. You've done all of these things, so by Kant's theory, you must believe that the rest of society should run around doing these things constantly. Universal Law theory sounds like a vague warning given to someone by their dad. It holds no actual merit in real life application. Everyone does bad things, Kantianism is slightly out of touch.