1: Define (a) acquaintance knowledge, (b) ability knowledge, and (c) propositional knowledge [3 Marks]

Negatives
- Confusing acquaintance with ability knowledge   - Incorrect account of acquaintance knowledge (ie saying it does not derive from experience)   - Propositional knowledge – knowing "is" – this could be applied to acquaintance (knowing who someone "is").

Acquaintance knowledge is knowing of
Ability knowing how
Propositional is knowing that.

2 Explain why justification truth and belief may not be collectively sufficient conditions for knowledge
[5 Marks]

Negatives
- Confusing sufficiency and necessity   - Looking at one of the conditions (J,T or B) and questioning whether knowledge is possible without them – this is looking at *individual necessity* not *sufficiency*   - Not stating why the JTB wasn't knowledge (element of luck, justification was based on the false belief/lemma that Jones would get the job)   - Incorrectly stating Gettier advocated reliabilism   - Incorrectly stating Gettier cases call into question individual necessity   - Job interview case: stating "Smith was told the person with 10 coins would get the job" – this is the conclusion Smith infers, he is not told it.   - Not making clear why the belief that "the person with 10 coins in their pocket will get the job" is justified (ie he counted coins and the boss told him)   - Redundancy: writing out what necessary and sufficient mean in contexts unrelated to JTB and knowledge   - Barn County – not making it clear why the True belief "that's a barn" is justified (perception)

Gettier-style cases demonstrate instances of justified true belief (JTB) that we would not count as knowledge. For example, Smith and Jones go for an interview. Smith counts out ten coins from Jones' pocket and then overhears the president of the company say Jones has got the job. From this he forms the belief that 'the person who got the job has ten coins in his pocket'. This is justified as the boss would be a ~~reliable~~ good source and using his perception and counting to ten are unlikely to be mistaken. It turns out he got the job

and he too had ten coins in his pocket so his statement was true. This demonstrates how the three conditions are not collectively sufficient to define knowledge as we have an example of JTB which was only luckily correct and should therefore not count as knowledge.

3 Explain Descartes first and second 'waves of doubt'. [5 marks]

Negatives
- Not linking the two – he concludes that he couldn't be suffering from an illusion in his current state, but that he *has* dreamt similar situations   - Explaining why he might worry his senses are not reliable (because they have been deceptive before – illusions) or that he may be dreaming (because dreams are sometimes indistinguishable from reality)   - Not putting the dreaming argument in context – him recognising that he could be dreaming *right now*.   - Saying the "evil demon" hypothesis is the first or second wave – that is the third wave.   - Adding in unnecessary/redundant context. You do not need to talk about related topics like philosophical scepticism/the cogito/evil demon (3rd wave)   - Claiming that either the first or second wave call into question the existence of the external world or **all** his knowledge/perception – in both cases Descartes says they are not enough to throw him into total doubt – it is the evil demon hypothesis which does that.   - Talking about sense-data. Descartes did not have such a notion in mind (the phrase didn't exist until 300 years later)

[5 marks]

In the ~~cogito~~ meditations, Descartes ~~uses~~ has 3 waves of doubt. His first wave of doubt questioned whether he can trust his senses as in the past may have decived him (illusions and hallucinations) He concludes that he cant deny all sense experience as ~~it provides him with sufficient~~ he identifies that

※ there must be veridical perceptions in order to ~~have~~ reailise examples when his perceptions have deceived him (~~or~~ you cant have a counterfeit coin without reall money)

Leading on from his first wave of doubt, Descartes questions whether all his sense experience could be a dream as when we are in a dream ~~it~~ we don't know we are in a dream. Descartes respons to this that our ability to distinguish between a dream and reality after the dream has happend suggens we arnt in a dream. Also there

Extra space must be veridical perception in order for there to be something to dream about (painter analogy)

4 Explain innatism and explain how Locke argues against this view [12 marks]

Negatives
• Stating that innatism means "everything"/"all knowledge" is known from birth. Innatists believe *some* knowledge is present in the mind at birth.   • Circular definitions – eg "innatism is the view there is innate knowledge"   • Spending too much time explaining Plato and Leibniz's arguments in favour of innatism – these are not required.   • Not making Locke's view clear – the mind is a blank slate/tabula rasa and all ideas come from experience.   • Only explaining Locke's view (knowledge gained via experience, tabula rasa etc) and not explaining at least one of his arguments   • Imprecise explanation of the argument from lack of universal agreement/assent. Must make it clear that he tries to demonstrate there are no concepts/pieces of knowledge that all people agree with/assent to.   • Claiming that it is impossible for children/idiots to assent to *any* knowledge – this clearly isn't true.   • When discussing transparency of the mind making clear that Locke's view is that if an idea is present then it must be **accessible** (rather than the circular if something is knowledge it must be known)   • Critiquing the slave boy argument is not necessary

Innatism is the view that we are born with some knowledge or concepts; this is a view that rationalists hold. For instance, Plato believes that geometry and mathematics are innate ideas, and that all learning is recollection (we gained our knowledge from when we were in the realm of forms).

Locke is an ~~empirist~~ empiricist, so he believes that all knowledge is gained through experience; there are no innate ideas or concepts. He believes in a concept called tabula rasa: it literally translates to 'blank slate', and means that we are born without any knowledge.

Locke first argues that if there were innate ideas, they would be universal. However, he states that there are no universal ideas because some young children and people with severe learning disabilities do not understand these concepts (such as geometry and object permanence). Therefore, there cannot be any innate ideas. Leibniz, who is a rationalist, responded to this saying that there is some knowledge we have that we do not directly know about. For instance, before learning

how to use language to describe knowledge, an infant can understand that their teddy cannot be in their hand and in the toy box at the same time.

Locke then attacks this point saying that the mind is a transparent box, meaning that if it has contents of knowledge, then we would know about it. This point has been disproved as we have subconscious ideas, thoughts, knowledge and/or concepts that we do not know about.

Finally, Locke also states that it is too difficult to distinguish between innate knowledge and knowledge gained through experience. As all knowledge feels the same, it may be impossible to tell if we have innate concepts. Also, as all of our knowledge cannot be innate and it all feels the same, all knowledge must be gained from experience. Therefore, we do not have innate knowledge. Leibniz counters this by saying that the distinction is to do with the type of knowledge (such as a priori and a posteriori) rather than the feeling of it.

6: What is moral anti realism? [3 Marks]

Negatives
- Stating that moral anti-realism is the view that moral properties and facts are mind-independent   - Stating that moral views cannot be truth-apt (error theory, an anti-realist view, states that they can)   - Defining a specific moral anti-realist theory (eg error theory, emotivism, prescriptivism)   - Stating that moral anti-realism involves moral beliefs – beliefs are usually associated with realist views.   - Confused with another definition. Eg non-naturalism (the view that moral properties are not reducible to natural properties) or non-cognitivism (the view that moral statements do not express true or false claims.)   - Stating moral "values" or "statements" (rather than facts or properties are mind-dependent)

Moral anti realism is the belief that moral properties are mind dependant

7: Explain the criticism that utilitarianism could lead to the 'tyranny of the majority' [5 Marks]

Negatives
- Not linking the view that a moral act maximises pleasure to utilitarianism   - Not stating that utilitarians consider consequences/effects of actions   - Be clear it is the **total/sum/aggregate** pleasure of the majority which is greater (without this clarity it could be interpreted you think that there is just generally more pleasure to gain from denying someone their rights)   - Using an example which does not fit "tyranny of the majority" – eg the person injured by world cup final broadcast equipment. That shows an issue with the calculation/summing total pain/pleasure but is not an example of tyranny.   - Spending time on Mill's attempt to fix – this isn't what the question asks for (although I don't think it would be regarded as redundancy and lose marks as it so closely related)

Utilitarianism is a consequentialist theory that focuses on maximising utility. Some believe that it could lead to the 'tyranny of the majority', which is when minorities are harmed because they are the minority. Utilitarianism wants the greatest happiness for the greatest number, meaning that for example if there was a vote to legalize same-sex marriage and all the straight people voted against it, gay people would be denied their right to marriage as they are not the greatest number of the two groups.

8: Explain why Hume thinks that moral judgements are not beliefs [5 Marks]

Negatives
- Need to explain both sides of Hume's view: that beliefs do not motivate and that moral judgements do.   - Some answers suggested Hume believed moral judgements were true or false, (or relations of ideas/matters of fact – both of which are truth apt), this is the opposite of what he believed   - Getting beliefs/judgements back to front   - Talking about moral judgements as opinions/attitudes/instructions. This doesn't capture quite what Hume says – you need to mention "motivation to act"   - If using Hume's fork, make the distinction that "beliefs" fit into the two categories, and anything that does not cannot be a belief.   - Be careful when using a non-moral example – (lots using examples like "believing orange juice is in the fridge" vs the judgement that one is thirsty, the second motivates us to drink and the first does not) – I haven't deducted marks for this but I am concerned it could be seen as redundant. If using example try and use a moral example (eg the belief that there are slaves vs the judgement slavery is wrong, or similar)

Hume thought moral judgements were not beliefs since beliefs alone do not motivate us.

P1: moral judgements motivate us
P2: reasoned beliefs do not motivate us
C: moral judgements are not reasoned beliefs

He said that reason was inert. We cannot reason that something is lovable, it is the passions that inform us of this.

9: Explain how a virtue ethicist might approach the issue of eating animals [12 marks]

Negatives
- Be careful when suggesting that V.E. is clear on the issue – V.E. does not provide a set of rules/guidance on specific issues.   - You should try and integrate Virtue ethics and the issue – the question is not looking for a paragraph or so explaining V.E. (with no mention of eating animals) followed by a paragraph or so on eating animals (with some or little mention of V.E.)   - Aristotle dismisses the moral relevance of animals because of the function argument – acting in accordance with rational principles is the (unique) function of humans, animals are not rational so do not have the same function.   - Stating that animals do not have a function – everything according to Aristotle has a function – it is just different to the function of humans   - Make clear that exhibiting virtue/vices is not what is right/wrong in itself – it is the impact on a person's character.   - Some responses did not use the language of Aristotle's ethics (eg function, eudaimonia, practical wisdom etc.)   - Some responses used language of Utilitarianism (satisfying preferences, maximising pleasure, consequences etc)   - Some responses used language of Kantian deontology (duty, treating as means not ends, universal maxim, contradiction etc)   - Using examples of virtue that were not to do with the issue you were explaining (eg honesty vs dishonesty/bluntness or courage vs cowardice/rashness)

A virtue ethicist ~~who~~ takes into account how virtuous a person is as well as how habitually and practically wise they are.

Aristotle may approach the issue of eating animals by first examining the application of his function argument. This states that there is something distinct about animals and humans, and that distinction is rationallity. Therefore we must act in accordance with rational principle. In light of this, ~~But Bo~~ virtue ethicists could argue that it is ok to eat animals because our rationallity gives us the right; unlike humans, animals are ~~not~~ incapable of setting goals, they are not self conscious of their own mortality like we are. ~~So As~~

Aristotle's function argument also ~~a~~ asserted that everything has a ~~teology~~ teleological purpose. So, the purpose of animals may be to serve humans.

On the other hand, if the animal was ~~kept~~ ~~a~~ treated badly and kept in inhumane conditions, the virtue ethicist may argue that it may not be virtuous, ~~kind or to sympath~~ that is, kind or sympathic, to eat this animal. ~~to~~ Also if this is done repetitably, this unvirtuous behaviour may become habituous. As virtues are defined to be the mean between the vice of excess and deficiency (according to the doctrine of the mean) eating animals that are ~~treated badly~~ ~~that~~ is developing the vice of greed and selfishness which is not the way a virtuous person leads a flourishing life of Eudaimonia.