



# UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

\* 4 2 3 3 3 8 8 2 2 6 6 \*

SYLLABUS

9	7	7	4
---	---	---	---

COMPONENT

0	3
---	---

## 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.

1

Question number	Mark
40	6
6	10
6	11
Total	27

This document consists of 16 printed pages.



Dec - duty  
Whi - great good / great ne

## Topic 2 Ethics

4a) Examine how Sartre defends his theory of choice in this passage.

Sartre defends his theory of choice by writing in depth about freedom and how we all can do only one thing that really counts and that is to know whether the injection is made in the name of freedom. ‡

He despises those who don't believe in this freedom and choice that we are presented with; those who hide ~~from~~ and believe their existence is necessary. Sartre does not believe in God and certainly not an Interventionist God. Our own thoughts, ideas, moves, what we ~~are~~ <sup>are</sup> going to make our-selves is down <sup>to</sup> us. The human race ~~are~~ <sup>engaged</sup> are presented with ~~freedom~~ <sup>free choices</sup>, these free ~~choices~~ <sup>are</sup> not given by God or an "authority", they are deduced in our minds. Nothing ~~was~~ is omnipotent, omniscient, omnibenevolent, omniscient, we make decisions using our own minds.

## He defends his theory of choice

Sartre's theory of choice, examines how people are free to make what ever decisions they want to, it is entirely up to them. A writer ~~is~~ <sup>can</sup> chooses to be a writer, just as anyone chooses their ~~own~~ own profession. In Sartre's eyes, and understandably, there is no path set out to try and help us make decisions, we are ~~born~~ and then we must make our own way in the world.



b) ~~What is general morality? Show you what you ought to do.~~

There is no rule in general morality that shows what you ought to do. This is a bold statement from Sartre certainly contradict. Kant strongly believes that achieving morality, is achieving your moral duty. Therefore he also states that anything that you ought to do, for example 'I ought to help my mother with the shopping bags'. Anything that is stated as 'ought' means <sup>good</sup> ~~can~~ (There is no freedom of choice and there is a <sup>good</sup> morality of freedom and that is that it is our moral duty to do good and to be moral, not left down to a choice.

Yet a utilitarian perspective that it is not about the duty but the physical action. When it comes to Mill or Bentham on Utilitarianism, they both ~~would~~ want to achieve the most happiness for greatest number of people. In the case that the Nazis determined the Jews to bring happiness to the rest of the country. There is no morality in killing the innocent, but who is to judge what innocence is. Sartre would suggest that we would make the decisions naturally without using any moral guidelines; the content of morality is variable.

This is correct of Sartre to state, as I have explained above that morality can be different to many different people, from many different walks of life; where by innocence just like many other words can be ambiguous, and you have to enter that particular language game to determine what

meaning of innocence could be according to Wittgenstein,

No rule or general morality can show you what you ought to do. This view from the satirist is opposed by many. It all depends on where the grounding for your beliefs lie. If you believe that we are unchosen and just born into a world to fend for your self, then morality will have no strings attached. On the other hand who has the strong belief that right means can and that morality has it's own rule as it's duty.

LS - 10



~~Critically examine Kant's attempts to put forward a theory of morality based on reason.~~

- deontological - opposite - utilitarian
- Morality is synthetically worked out - reason
- our duty - stays at the back of our heads.
- ought = can

Section B

⑥ Kant attempts to put forward a theory of morality based on reasoning in a synthetic way. Kant's whole approach is for reason, he wants to people to understand about their moral duties and that to achieve the 'summum bonum' (the supreme good), we have to carry out our moral duty by doing good and avoiding bad (basic moral law).

The reasoning is a huge part of Kant's theories as you have to judge and reason different things and even predict our courses in the future. The problem with prediction, is man's failure to have a good judgement of the future. So many times have we had errors in our judgement for reasoning.

Yet if morality is bear duty and everything that we 'ought' to do is transcribed into a can statement. The fact that you have said you 'ought' to do something, this means that immediately strikes a pose that it is possible to carry out the task.

The fact that Kant is just judging his morality of reason is completely going in a different direction to utilitarianism. Utilitarianism works through experience and consequence whilst ~~utilitarianism~~ Kant believes through theory.

Kant also believes in the supreme good and the Supreme good is there with God after death. Kant now dives into the realm of metaphysics, ~~who~~ people such as Sartre, strongly believe doesn't exist, it's circular. Kant's theory of morality is based on reason. Reasoning is a process by which we do every day and Kant's theory of morality based on reason. Reasoning is a process which is carried out each day. Therefore morality being reasoning is a good idea as it is something natural to everyone, to reason.

The problem with Kant's theory is that so many people have very different views on different subjects. For instance, some one might reason that cheating in an exam is morally okay as in the long run if the answer is correct, you could find your self on a three year course at university. Kant replies to this by informing us that Moral law is not just an 'ought' to do something, but is actually a duty. If the duty is carried out we shall reach the supreme good according.



In conclusion Kant's theory of morality based on reason is a good way to think of morality, ~~as~~ it is a process in which we can do on the spot and does not take much intellectual strength. The metaphysical side with reaching the summit ~~however~~ seems almost unnecessary. The fact that Kant has created a theory that is possible to achieve by reasoning is a strong idea and can be carried out by anyone.

L3 - 11