



JBF.



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

57

SYLLABUS

9 7 7 4

COMPONENT

0 1

ANSWER BOOKLET

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS

Write your Centre Number, Candidate Number, Name, Syllabus / Component as written on your statement of entry, at the top of this page.

Write in dark blue or black pen.

DO NOT WRITE IN ANY BARCODES.

Use both sides of the paper.

Write the question number in the left-hand column provided on each page.

Use a ruler to draw a line across the page after each answer.

Write the numbers of the questions you answer in the order attempted in the left-hand column of the boxes on the right of this page.

Do all your rough work in this answer booklet and cross it through without making it illegible. Do not tear out any part of this booklet. All work must be handed in.

Check that you have written the information required on each additional booklet used and have attached them to this booklet.

Write here how many booklets you have used, including this one.

Question number	Mark
1	21
4	20
3	16
Total	57

This document consists of 16 printed pages.





UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

CANDIDATE
NAMECENTRE
NUMBERCANDIDATE
NUMBER

SYLLABUS

9 7 7 4

COMPONENT

0 1

SIGNATURE

ANSWER BOOKLET I

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS

Write your Centre Number, Candidate Number, Name, Syllabus / Component as written on your statement of entry, at the top of this page.

Write in dark blue or black pen.

DO NOT WRITE IN ANY BARCODES.

Use both sides of the paper.

Write the question number in the left-hand column provided on each page.

Use a ruler to draw a line across the page after each answer.

Write the numbers of the questions you answer in the order attempted in the left-hand column of the boxes on the right of this page.

Do all your rough work in this answer booklet and cross it through without making it illegible. Do not tear out any part of this booklet. All work must be handed in.

Check that you have written the information required on each additional booklet used and have attached them to this booklet.

Write here how many booklets you have used, including this one.

Question number	Mark
1	
4	
3	
Total	

This document consists of 16 printed pages.



1. Plan

Critically Examine Plato's Theory of Forms.

- Empiricals against view (like Aristotle)

Reaction of polystyrene

Realis of force

We can distinguish degrees of
'abstract'

Fear of everything?

Fig. 1

Miniature
~~Fea-coop~~ pig, miniature disabled?
Both

Bollenhuis p.t
nursery

Forms = immutable.
If changed, implies imperfection

It is a sign of a
different to our world.

Powell

Plato she put his definition
somewhere saying many looking
has a few other ones

Case Sin = Absolute good.

NOESY &
dimer a

- Beats, mls, juice etc.

epidemic Blued

— multiple reflections

Kunde:

Cikasia

— Sholom

As this world is always changing, we cannot learn from it, instead we learn from recollection.

Relative - No absolute goal

We gain knowledge of good a posteriori.

philosophischer Struggle out
runs back to liberate forward wie das eigene Innere.

Cont. \rightarrow Putting thought over experience

= eugenics

= orb censorship.

So heavenly minded, he was
no earthly good.

Critically assess Plato's theory of the forms

Plato's theory of the forms is widely acknowledged as the foundational upon which rationalism is set. Plato believed that our knowledge which appear to gain in this world is actually an act of recollection, not from this realm, but the realm of the forms.

This thought process follows from his thoughts as to the properties attached to particulars in this realm. Usually
 If one were to explain the realm of the forms through beauty, one would explain that we know beautiful things to exist.

As we know this to be true, if we destroyed all objects that were beautiful, the form of beauty would not disappear it would still exist. This displays the five properties which he gave the forms, the fact that they are permanent, perfect, simple, independent from particulars and

• He believes they are immutable as if they changed it would imply imperfection

Empiricists like Aristotle would argue against this claim, instead criticising the concept of the realm of the forms as a mistaken ^{definition} ~~conclusion~~ of the words with which we describe objects

Taking the example of beauty again, Plato showed that whereas some people enjoy flowers, others do not, thus demonstrating that they are transient. He attempted to further explain his theory of the forms by ~~the~~ his analogy of the cave. He starts by comparing us to prisoners, chained securely together, facing a wall. A fire is behind us, projecting shadows of things we assume are real. He called these shadows Eikasia, representing art, poetry, and all things that he saw attempted



Question
number

For
Examiner's
Use

to replicate our less than perfect world. Finally being unchained, the philosopher is blinded by the light of the fire, in which he sees the real things in the cave, the _____, representing the particulars. He is led out of the cave, and like the attempt of enlightened this trip too is arduous. He is led into the sunlight where he directs his eyes to the Damnora, which ~~symbolize~~ the reflections of the true things he sees in the puddles on the ground. This Damnora was meant to replicate his glimpses at the forms that we see in this realm, such as the perfect circle, or the perfect equilateral triangle. Finally, he sees the forms, ~~which~~ such as Truth, Beauty, Justice, all of these ~~repres~~ illuminated by the sun, which is the symbolification of the form of the Good. He called this Noesis.

Following this he goes back to the cave attempting to explain to ~~the~~ the prisoners what he has witnessed. They laugh at him, unable to understand about ~~the~~ he has witnessed, this was meant to be with the true philosopher's angst at the failure of understanding in the forms.

One of the criticisms of this was the question as to whether there is an absolute Good. Relativists would argue that all good is based upon experience and situation thus making the good something that is experienced *a posteriori*.

Plato would have been disabited by the Relativist claims, arguing that we cannot learn anything in this world, as it is flawed and constantly changing, thus we learn no recollection of the realm of the forms. He felt that this was proved by abstraction, seen when we identify two separate species, such as a terrier and a Labrador, but still find them to embody 'dogness'.

Russell would claim this is ridiculous. If there is a form for everything, surely there is a form for a pig, indeed also for a tawny pig, and also a disabled-lawyer pig. He argues that this logic falls into a bottomless pit of nonsense. Plato seems to suffer from indecisiveness as he vacates his opinion as to whether there is a form of everything or whether there are just a few.

Additionally, it has been criticised that if there is a form ~~of~~ for everything, what is the part in it at all, surely it is exactly like the realm we inhabit now?

It has been

Plato has been criticised for his display of putting theory over experience, and thus some may label his attempt at perfection to many problems labelling themselves to similar things. The aim of the perfect human was to be seen through eugenics. The hatred of the 'falsities' of art is seen through the ban and censorship of it. It would therefore seem that his attempt at achieving the 'Good' has resulted in these ~~bad~~ negatives. It has been said that 'Plato was so heavenly minded, he was no earthly good'.

For ()
Examiner's ()
Use ()

[illegible]



Question
number

For
Examiner's
Use

4

Soft determinism is only theory that
offers humans genuine possibility of free
will - discuss.

Pinchips
Radicals

Hume
↳ indifference
↳ spontaneity

Free to do what we do without
prior causes

God omniscient?

Hard determinism

↳ Incompatibilism

compatibilism

God sees everything at once
nothing is the future to him.

Believe that
freedom and
determinism
are incompatible

We do what we want
... free.

inverse made of causation?
Fails popper's verification principle

Sartre - we are either wholly
determined or wholly
free.

Newtonian physics

↳ Actually ^{universe} ~~quantum~~ where things on a quantum
scale act randomly.

Libertarians

If God does not know
what we will do, then
he is not omniscient

Kant, phenomenally
determined, noumenally free

↳ Chess master

✓ Soft determinism is really only theory
that gives possibility of free will.

↳ very good guess

~~Enlightenment~~ Kant
was a rationalist
Aristotle couldn't
win fight of the battle

Jesus' theory, peter could fail?
Not foresight, but very good
prediction

Question
number

Soft Determinism is the only theory that offers humans the genuine possibility of free will - Discuss

To help us understand what free will is, I have set out to define it, labelling a distinction between 'Liberty of Indifference' and 'Liberty of Spontaneity'. Liberty of Indifference was the ability to act without the influence of prior causes. Liberty of Spontaneity was the freedom to act according to our nature.

Those who do take the view that we are free and that we are determined are known as incompatibilists. Hard determinists and libertarians fall into this category. Although they agree upon the notion that they are not free, they disagree on their view on the liberty of indifference.

~~A. J. Ayer believes that the opposite of freedom is constraint to determinism, Rachels states~~

~~It is often thought that with this~~

Incompatibilists feel that ~~affected~~ with determinism, not only are we not free, but also that we are therefore not culpable, seeing as we are predetermined. Rachels would criticise this theory, arguing that 'If my desires form part of the action, we are still morally culpable.'

This has been criticized by Jones who argues that 'How can I exist if my desires are determined', saying that it gets stuck in a quagmire of evasion.

The concept of a universe defined by causation was perhaps ~~the~~ due to the discovery of Newtonian physics which in turn argues the case for pre-determination.

This theory that we are just a result of ~~our~~ our causes is undermined by Popper's falsification & Verification principle. He believes that for a theory to be

legitimate it ^{has to} ~~cannot~~ be able to be falsified, whereas

a. Libetian may say it can be falsified it is

further undermined by recent scientific research, showing that on a quantum scale events occur randomly, thus ~~raising~~ ^{questioning} the ~~argument~~ ^{question} of proof as to the pre-determination of a Newtonian universe.

However there are those that believe we are free. Sartre says that we are either "wholly determined or wholly free", later stating that we are indeed radically to do what we want.

Soft determinists, although they believe that we are determined, see freedom as a possibility. Kant argued that we are phenomenally determined, restricted by space, time and our actions, but are free in the noumenal realm in mind and reality.

He has been criticized as being too find this conclusion, or accidentally coming across his definition when attempting to define it. God has also been added

~~To conclude, soft determinism~~
to a 'Grand Chess Master' who can fairly accurately estimate your moves, but does not know what you will do. One might criticize this by questioning that Jesus knew Peter would fail him, where one would expect

Question
numberFor
Examiner's
Use

that this was not foresight, instead a display of his predictive ability.

To conclude, hard determinism is set against the concept of us having free will, it is too heavy taken by soft determinism that sides with us as to where we have the freedom to act as we please.

For
Examiner's
Use

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. A vertical margin line is present on the left side, creating a narrow left margin. The paper appears to be from a notebook or a standard ruled document. There are no markings, text, or drawings on the page.



Question number

For Examiner's Use

3

Moral Duty is defined solely by God's commands

Plan

Darwin command theory.

A

Enthymema

B

Calvin

God wills because it is good

Morality dependent
OCT fail.

It is good because God wills it.

⊕

God can make us do anything, it is really good.

Altruism ⊕ problem

⊕ Crit. how do we know what he wills is good

R. Crit.

God cannot make us do bad things as he is good, perfect. He cannot do things that are logically impossible.

God = Good.

R. Crit. Because he is interpreter of God, and things how we know it

Why not worship God? not worship God is pointless

Aquinas

we would be inspired by both horns of problem.

whims - moral vacuum - Russell

⊕

R. Crit. Based on love

Adherent.

Question
number

'Moral duty is defined solely by God's commands'
Critically assess this claim

The belief that moral duty is defined solely by God's commands is usually labeled as the divine command theory or the DCT. However, this theory has been a matter of controversial debate, first labeled in Plato's dialogues as the Euthyphro dilemma, - "Do the gods will things because they are good, or are they good because the gods will them?"

In our modern mono-theistic society, this is often addressed as one thing is good because God wills it, or ~~it is willed by God~~ does God will it as it is good? If one tackles the latter, one appreciates that there must be something that has preexisted God, thus putting his validity into question, and so as morality is then independent, the direct command theory fails.

This means that the Direct command theory is applicable only to the former, ~~just~~ placing god in the position of the moral law giver.

Garza criticises this, illustrating his point by referring to Genesis' treatment of Isaac and Abraham, where God deliberately ordered Abraham to kill his son, an act ~~which~~ which challenged Abraham's morality to act on.

This view is also criticised by Russell who

Question
numberFor
Examiner's
Use

argues that this places us under the subject of God's whims, placing us in a 'moral vacuum'. This is known as the arbitrariness problem, this criticism based on the case of well-bugs.

This also shows part of the problem of obnoxiousness. Anything ~~therefore~~ that God could be concerned as good, such as torturing the innocent and starving the poor.

This has been countered by saying that although God is omnipotent, he is not able to do the logically impossible as he makes the best for us. \wedge

~~Kant says that God invented morality so as to give us the possibility of Eudaimonia.~~

God is then interpreted as a medium by which we are given the moral, so we may understand it. This however faults the DCT as it shows morality to be independent.

Kant says that God has instead the morality which gives us the possibility of Eudaimonia.

This counters ~~the~~ the eudaimonism problem which criticises the view of God as good; says that as this is a contingency, it is false.

This in turn was rebutted by showing that fallacies can be useful, such as HCO = water.