Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

SKU: 9780190089580-TEST-BANK

Instructor's Manual
and
Online Resources

Exploring Philosophy: An Introductory Anthology

Steven M. Cahn

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

Table of Contents

Table of Contents 2
Introduction to Online Resources 10
Part 1: Introduction 11
What Is Philosophy? 11
The Value of Philosophy 11
Defence of Socrates 12
Part 1 Questions: Introduction 14
What Is Philosophy? 14
The Value of Philosophy 16
Defence of Socrates 19
Part 2: Reasoning 22
The Elements of Argument 22
Improving Your Thinking 22
Necessary and Sufficient Conditions 23
Scientific Inquiry 23
Antiscientism 24
Part 2 Questions: Reasoning 26
The Elements of Argument 26
Improving Your Thinking 28
Necessary and Sufficient Conditions 30
Scientific Inquiry 34
Antiscientism 36
Part 3: Knowledge 40
Knowing vs. Thinking 40
Caring and Epistemic Demands 40
What Is Knowledge? 41
Is Justified True Belief Knowledge? 42
Conditions for Knowledge 42
Appearance and Reality 42
What Can I Know? 43
The Problem of Induction 43
Induction without a Problem 44
Puzzling Out Knowledge 44

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

Historical Sources 45
Meno 45
Meditations on First Philosophy 46
An Essay Concerning Human Understanding 47
A Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge 47
An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding 48
Critique of Pure Reason 49
Part 3 Questions: Knowledge 51
Knowing vs. Thinking 51
Caring and Epistemic Demands 53
What Is Knowledge? 56
Is Justified True Belief Knowledge? 58
Conditions for Knowledge 59
Appearance and Reality 61
What Can I Know? 63
The Problem of Induction 64
Induction without a Problem 66
Puzzling Out Knowledge 67
Meno 71
Meditations on First Philosophy 73
An Essay Concerning Human Understanding 75
A Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge 76
An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding 78
Critique of Pure Reason 80
Part 4: Mind 82
The Ghost in the Machine 82
Body and Soul 82
The Mind–Body Problem 83
What Is It Like to Be a Bat? 84
The Qualia Problem 85
Knowing What It's Like 86
Computing Machinery and Intelligence 86
Do Computers Think? 87
The Body Problem 88

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

Historical Source 88
Meditations on First Philosophy 88
Part 4 Questions: Mind 90
The Ghost in the Machine 90
Body and Soul 91
The Mind–Body Problem 93
What Is It Like to Be a Bat? 96
The Qualia Problem 98
Knowing What It's Like 101
Computing Machinery and Intelligence 103
Do Computers Think? 104
The Body Problem 106
Meditations on First Philosophy 109
Part 5: Free Will 112
Free Will 112
Free Will and Determinism 112
Freedom or Determinism? 113
The Principle of Alternative Possibilities 114
The Capacities of Agents 114
Do We Have Free Will? 115
Historical Sources 116
An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding 116
The Dilemma of Determinism 117
Part 5 Questions: Free Will 119
Free Will 119
Free Will and Determinism 120
Freedom or Determinism? 122
The Principle of Alternative Possibilities 123
The Capacities of Agents 125
Do We Have Free Will? 127
An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding 129
The Dilemma of Determinism 131
Part 6: Identity 134
A Case of Identity 134

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

The Problem of Personal Identity 134
The Unimportance of Identity 135
Historical Sources 136
An Essay Concerning Human Understanding 136
A Treatise of Human Nature 136
Essays on the Intellectual Powers of Man 137
Part 6 Questions: Identity 139
A Case of Identity 139
The Problem of Personal Identity 140
The Unimportance of Identity 141
An Essay Concerning Human Understanding 144
A Treatise of Human Nature 146
Essays on the Intellectual Powers of Man 148
Part 7: God 150
Does God Exist? 150
Why God Allows Evil 150
Pascal's Wager 151
Pascal's Wager: An Assessment 152
Faith and Reason 153
God and Morality 153
Historical Sources 154
The Ontological Argument 154
Summa Theologiae 154
Dialogues concerning Natural Religion 155
The Wager 156
Natural Theology 156
The Will to Believe 157
Part 7 Questions: God 159
Does God Exist? 159
Why God Allows Evil 160
Pascal's Wager 162
Pascal's Wager: An Assessment 163
Faith and Reason 166
God and Morality 168

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

The Ontological Argument 171
Summa Theologiae 173
Dialogues concerning Natural Religion 174
The Wager 176
Natural Theology 178
The Will to Believe 179
Part 8: Moral Theory 182
Moral Isolationism 182
Kant's Ethics 182
Assessing Utilitarianism 183
Virtue Ethics 184
The Ethics of Care 184
Egoism and Moral Skepticism 185
Historical Sources 186
Nicomachean Ethics 186
Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals: The Categorical Imperative 187
Utilitarianism 188
Part 8 Questions: Moral Theory 190
Moral Isolationism 190
Kant's Ethics 193
Assessing Utilitarianism 195
Virtue Ethics 197
The Ethics of Care 198
Egoism and Moral Skepticism 200
Nicomachean Ethics 202
Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals: The Categorical Imperative 204
Utilitarianism 206
Part 9: Moral Problems 208
A Defense of Abortion 208
Why Abortion Is Immoral 209
Famine, Affluence, and Morality 209
A Reply to Singer 210
The Morality of Reparation 211
Reparations and the Problem of Agency 212

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

Sexual Harassment in the University 213
Sexual Harassment in Public Places 214
The Trolley Problem 214
Turning the Trolley 215
The Divestiture Puzzle 216
Part 9 Questions: Moral Problems 217
A Defense of Abortion 217
Why Abortion Is Immoral 218
Famine, Affluence, and Morality 220
A Reply to Singer 222
The Morality of Reparation 223
Reparations and the Problem of Agency 226
Sexual Harassment in the University 229
Sexual Harassment in Public Places 231
The Trolley Problem 234
Turning the Trolley 236
The Divestiture Puzzle 239
Part 10: Society 242
Democracy 242
What Is a Liberal Education? 242
Cultivating Humanity 243
Letter from a Birmingham Jail 244
Historical Sources 245
Crito 245
On Liberty 246
Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844 246
Part 10 Questions: Society 248
Democracy 248
What Is a Liberal Education? 249
Cultivating Humanity 251
Letter from a Birmingham Jail 255
Crito 256
On Liberty 258
Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844 260

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

Part 11: Social Justice 263
A Theory of Justice 263
Distributive Justice 264
Non-contractual Society: A Feminist View 265
Historical Sources 266
The Republic 266
Leviathan 268
Part 11 Questions: Social Justice 270
A Theory of Justice 270
Distributive Justice 271
Non-contractual Society: A Feminist View 273
The Republic 275
Leviathan 276
Part 12: Art 279
Aesthetic Concepts 279
Speaking in Parables 279
Fearing Fictions 280
Historical Sources 281
The Republic 281
Poetics 282
Part 12 Questions: Art 284
Aesthetic Concepts 284
Speaking in Parables 285
Fearing Fictions 287
The Republic 289
Poetics 290
Part 13: The Meaning of Life 293
The Meaning of Life 293
Meaning in Life 294
Meaningful Lives 294
The Afterlife 295
How the Afterlife Matters 295
The Significance of Doomsday 296
Historical Sources 297

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

Phaedo 297
Writings 297
The Handbook 298
Part 13 Questions: The Meaning of Life 300
The Meaning of Life 300
Meaning in Life 302
Meaningful Lives 304
The Afterlife 306
How the Afterlife Matters 308
Phaedo 314
Writings 315
The Handbook 317
Part 14: Asian Outlooks 319
The Buddha's Message 319
The Confucian Way 319
The Tao 320
Twelve Zen Stories 320
Part 14 Questions: Asian Outlooks 322
The Buddha's Message 322
The Confucian Way 324
The Tao 326
Twelve Zen Stories 328

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

Introduction to Online Resources

Welcome to Oxford's *Exploring Philosophy*, 6th Edition! Here you will find various resources to assist you.

In the *Instructor's Manual* you will find:

> *Summaries of every reading* for main ideas and argumentative structure, available in Word format.
>
> *Essay questions* for each reading in the work.
>
> *Multiple choice* and *true/false* questions for each part, covering every reading (half of which, indicated by asterisk, are included in student self-quizzes in the *Student Resources* section of the companion website).
>
> *Weblinks* for each part.
>
> *Glossary of key terms* from all of the readings in the book.

Also for instructors are *PowerPoint lecture slides* covering the main ideas of each part of the book.

In the *Student Resources* you will find:

> *Essay questions* for each reading in the work.
>
> *Self-quizzes* for each part and for every reading in the book.
>
> *Glossary of key terms* from all of the readings in the book.

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

Part 1: Introduction

What Is Philosophy?

Monroe C. Beardsley and Elizabeth Lane Beardsley

Reading Summary

The questions of philosophy do not pertain to a distinctive subject matter; rather, they are arrived at by means of a distinctive procedure: critical examination of one's ordinary beliefs. This procedure involves searching for reasons that justify one's beliefs, reasons to think they are true. Upon further questioning, many of our ordinary beliefs (e.g., that some criminals are responsible for their actions) are seen to rely on general assumptions (e.g., that human beings have free will). These assumptions are *philosophical beliefs*. To ask a *philosophical question* is to request reasons to think a philosophical belief is true. Philosophical questions are highly general, concerning broad classes of things. They are also highly fundamental, concerning the truth of beliefs that support many other beliefs. To explore a philosophical belief's logical connections with other beliefs or to examine the reasons to think it is true is to engage in *philosophical thinking*. Philosophical thinking results from a pattern of questioning that moves from the more specific and common sense to the more general and fundamental. The study of philosophy develops the intellectual virtues of clarity, reasonableness, and consistency. Insofar as philosophical beliefs influence action, the study of philosophy may also help one to live a better life.

Weblinks

"Philosophy for Children," Michael Pritchard
http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/children/

"What Is Philosophy?" Bob Zunjic
http://www.uri.edu/personal/szunjic/philos/whystudy.htm/

The Value of Philosophy

Bertrand Russell

Reading Summary

What is the value of philosophy? Many scientists and "practical" people think it is useless and trivial. But they have the wrong conception of what is important in life and what the goods of philosophy are. The practical person is concerned only with what is good for the body, not also with what is good for the mind. The value of philosophy is among the goods of the mind. The scientist seeks knowledge in the form of definite answers to questions that are of value to humanity generally. But philosophy is good for those who study it and only indirectly good for the public. And the questions that concern philosophy do not admit of definite answers. When they do, they become a part of science and no longer a part of philosophy. Some questions that cannot be demonstrably

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

answered are still valuable to ask. And there is value in the uncertainty inherent in the study of philosophy. It enlarges the range of possibilities we can think and frees us from the grip of our customary beliefs and prejudices. The chief value of philosophy is in contemplating great questions free from the confines of one's personal aims. It is for the sake of these questions themselves that philosophy should be studied.

Weblinks
"Why Study Philosophy?"
http://philosophy.louisiana.edu/why.html/

"Hey—Become a Philosophy Major, Already!" Manuel Vargas (homepage)
http://www.usfca.edu/fac-staff/mrvargas/home.htm/

Defence of Socrates
Plato

Reading Summary
Socrates was tried and sentenced to death for being impious and corrupting the youth. His speech at the trial is an eloquent defense of his own life and of philosophy. Socrates considers two sets of charges, arguing that both sets of charges are false and that the first lends credence to the second. His long-time reputation as a teacher-for-hire concerned with gaining knowledge of heavenly bodies and giving instruction on argumentative strategy, the first set of charges, has led many to believe that he corrupts the young and fails to acknowledge the gods, the second set of charges. Socrates admits that his vocation, the examination of supposedly wise men, has made him many enemies. But the fault lies with those angry with him because he has shown that they are ignorant when they profess to be wise. His examination of Meletus provides an example of his method. His mission is to understand the meaning of the oracle's declaration that no one is wiser than Socrates. The best sense he can make of it is that he alone among men does not profess wisdom when he does not have any. That his is a divine mission and that he obeys a divine sign that warns him when he is about to go astray show that he is not impious. He obviously believes in gods. In fact, he thinks that he has been sent by a god to wake Athens from its complacent slumber. That he associates with those he is supposed to be corrupting shows that he does not intentionally corrupt them. Otherwise, he would be intentionally doing himself harm, which is impossible. Socrates maintains that a man of self-respect considers justice alone. This is why he has not performed and supplicated before the jury, but rather he has tried to inform and persuade the jury of why the charges are false. Socrates also has some interesting things to say about death. To fear death is to think one knows something that one does not because no living person knows what the afterlife is like. In fact, he is hopeful that death is good. He supposes it is either a long, deep sleep or an opportunity for eternal conversation with great people of the past. Thus, Socrates is not afraid of the death penalty the jury proposes. His counteroffer is that he be given free meals for life and allowed to continue his service to the city he loves. He is aware that the jury is not likely to accept the offer and submits to its judgment.

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

Socrates closes with an expression of ignorance as to whose destiny is better: his in death or the jury's in life.

Weblinks
"Socrates," Debra Nails
http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/socrates/

Aristophanes's plays
http://classics.mit.edu/Aristophanes/

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

Part 1 Questions: Introduction

What Is Philosophy?

Monroe C. Beardsley and Elizabeth Lane Beardsley

Essay Questions for Test Bank

1. Consider one of your ordinary beliefs. Now illustrate the Beardsleys' notion of philosophical questioning by examining this belief. What reasons do you have for thinking it to be true? What more fundamental beliefs underlie it? What philosophical questions are raised in the process?

A good essay will:

- State one of your ordinary beliefs clearly and succinctly.
- Provide several (more than one) supporting reasons for why you believe this statement to be true.
- Examine the more fundamental beliefs that must hold in order for your belief to be true.
- Examine several (more than one) philosophical questions that arise from holding your belief to be true.

2. Continue the line of questioning in either Dialogue I or Dialogue II by analyzing the meaning of a basic philosophical term.

3. Consider the example of contradictory fundamental beliefs, in the paragraph that begins "The third benefit which the study of philosophy can confer…" Explain why belief in free will conflicts with belief in causal laws of nature. Can you resolve the apparent conflict? If so, explain how. If not, explain why not.

Objective Questions

True/False

*1. Philosophical questions are about a particular subject matter. (F)
2. One's ordinary beliefs are philosophical beliefs. (F)
*3. Philosophical beliefs support many of one's ordinary beliefs. (T)
4. A philosophical question is usually highly fundamental. (T)
*5. Philosophical questions are usually narrowly restricted in their focus. (F)
6. The study of philosophy can help one to develop a more consistent set of beliefs. (T)
*7. Philosophy is related to many other fields of study. (T)
8. A reasonable belief is logically justifiable. (T)
*9. All fundamental beliefs are reasonable. (F)
10. Philosophical thinking begins from ordinary beliefs. (T)

Multiple Choice

1. Philosophical thinking is
*a. About familiar topics.
b. About a highly specialized subject matter.

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

c. Only for professional philosophers.
d. Irrelevant to physics.

*2. The study of philosophy is beneficial because
a. It makes you popular.
b. It is lucrative.
*c. It may help you act better.
d. It shows you that you believe only true things.

3. A reasonable belief
a. Is a belief for which a good reason can be given.
b. Is logically justifiable.
c. Has a better chance of being of being true than a belief that is not reasonable.
*d. All of the above.

*4. Philosophical questions tend to be
a. Highly fundamental.
b. Highly specific.
c. Highly generally.
*d. Both a and c.

5. To explore a belief is to
a. Consider its truth.
*b. Assume its truth and consider its logical connections with other beliefs.
c. Consider its popularity.
d. Assume it is false and consider the impact on one's other beliefs.

*6. To examine a belief is to
*a. Question whether it is based on good reasons.
b. Rephrase it in clearer language.
c. Look at it through a microscope.
d. Ask a professional philosopher whether she believes it.

7. Which of the following is a basic philosophical term?
a. Parents.
b. Question.
c. Pattern.
*d. Free will.

*8. Which of the following is *not* a benefit of studying philosophy?
a. Clarity.
b. Reasonableness.
*c. Fame.
d. Consistency.

9. A professional philosopher

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

a. Charges for lessons in public speaking.
*b. Tries to answer broad, fundamental questions.
c. Trains the physicist.
d. Must have a beard.

*10. Which of the following is a general rule for determining the generality and fundamentality of a belief?
a. Many people hold this belief.
b. It is a reasonable belief.
c. There is no good reason one can give for holding this belief.
*d. There are no such rules.

Essay Questions for Student Resources
1. The Beardsleys claim at the beginning of their essay that a reasonable belief is more likely true than one that is not. Is this a philosophical belief? Explore its logical connections to other beliefs they seem to hold and examine what reasons there are to think it true or false. Do they provide any justification for this belief?

2. Write a dialogue of your own similar to Dialogues I and II. Then continue the line of questioning in your dialogue by analyzing a basic philosophical term.

3. Do the Beardsleys make a good case for the value of the study of philosophy? Explain.

The Value of Philosophy
Bertrand Russell

Essay Questions for Test Bank
1. What sorts of questions concern philosophy, according to Russell, and why are they valuable ones to consider? Do you agree?

A good essay will:

- State several (more than one) questions that concern philosophy, according to Russell.
- For each, describe clearly why Russell considers them valuable issues to ponder, both for philosophers and for the public at large.
- Do you agree with Russell point of view? Would you add to or modify his list and definitions of issues that are of concern to philosophy?

2. Why does Russell think that the "practical" person has got things wrong about the value of philosophy? Do you agree?

3. Take a philosophical question considered somewhere else in this book and explain how it illustrates Russell's view about the value of philosophy.

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

Objective Questions

True/False

1. Russell claims that philosophy is good for those who study it. (T)

*2. Russell claims that when a question has a definite answer it ceases to be a philosophical question and becomes a part of the sciences. (T)

3. Philosophy is similar to all other studies in that it aims primarily at knowledge. (T)

*4. Russell claims that there is value in uncertainty. (T)

5. On Russell's view, our personal aims are valuable because they restrict our pursuit of answers to philosophical questions. (F)

*6. Part of the value of philosophy, according to Russell, is breaking out of the confines of one's own cares. (T)

7. Perhaps the chief value of philosophy, according to Russell, is found in the greatness of the objects which it contemplates. (T)

*8. According to Russell, philosophy is to be studied for the sake of finding definite answers to one's questions. (F)

9. Philosophy, according to Russell, is to be studied for the sake of the questions themselves. (T)

*10. Philosophical questions, on Russell's view, enhance the dogmatic closure of the mind against speculation. (F)

Multiple Choice

1. According to Russell, philosophy is often misunderstood because of

a. A mistaken conception of the ends of life.

b. A mistaken conception of the goods philosophy strives to achieve.

c. A mistaken conception of the goods science strives to achieve.

*d. Both a and b.

*2. According to Russell, when a question has a definite answer, it

a. Ceases to be a philosophical question.

b. Is uninteresting.

c. Becomes a scientific question.

*d. Both a and c.

3. Russell claims that the "practical" person

a. Is really not practical.

b. Misses the value of the sciences.

*c. Is concerned only with material goods.

d. All of the above.

*4. The chief value of philosophy, according to Russell, comes from

a. Its high-minded rhetoric.

b. Transcendence of the universe.

*c. Contemplation of great things free from personal prejudices.

d. Religion.

5. The study of philosophy

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

*a. Increases the range of things one considers possible.
b. Increases one's IQ.
c. Increases one's credulity.
d. Increases one's ability to win lawsuits.

*6. Russell claims that thinking about questions that do not admit of definitely correct answers is a way of
a. Angering one's parents.
b. Becoming a fool.
c. Achieving world peace.
*d. Breaking free of customary beliefs.

7. Russell claims that some questions
a. Cannot be demonstrably answered.
b. Are valuable in themselves.
c. Help one break free from one's prejudices.
*d. All of the above.

*8. Philosophy seeks
a. Money.
b. Power.
*c. Knowledge.
d. Persuasion.

9. The value of philosophy, according to Russell, lies in goods of the
a. Body.
*b. Mind.
c. Heart.
d. Heavens.

10. Russel contrasts philosophy with
a. Theology.
*b. Science.
c. Mathematics.
d. All of the above.

Essay Questions for Student Resources
1. What kinds of questions do the sciences consider? What is different about philosophical questions?

2. Do you think that philosophy is for everyone? If not, what sort of person is uniquely suited to study philosophy? Are you one of those people?

3. Is philosophy beneficial for the general public? Explain.

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

Defence of Socrates

Plato

Essay Questions for Test Bank

1. What is Socrates's method of defense? What method do most men employ? Do you think that Socrates has chosen the best way of defending himself? Explain.

A good essay will:

- Clearly describe Socrates's method of defense.
- Clearly describe the method of defense most men employ, as recorded by Plato.
- Contrast the two methods by stating, in your words, whether or not Socrates has chosen the better method of defending himself. Explain your answer by providing examples that support your conclusion.

2. Why does Socrates say that he is not afraid of death? Why is he hopeful that death is good? What do you think about what he says?

3. What does Socrates mean when he says that "an unexamined life is no life for a human being to live"? Do you agree? Explain.

Objective Questions

True/False

*1. Socrates is formally accused of charging money for instruction. (F)
2. Socrates claims that if he is put to death, Athens will harm itself more than it harms him. (T)
*3. Socrates claims to be on a divine mission. (T)
4. Socrates fears death. (F)
*5. Socrates thinks that wealth is without value. (F)
6. Socrates argues that the values of Athenians are misplaced. (T)
*7. Socrates admits that he is wiser than most men. (T)
8. Socrates admits that he is not wise. (T)
*9. Socrates obeys the commands of a divine voice in his head. (T)
10. The jury is persuaded by Socrates' arguments. (F)

Multiple Choice

*1. According to the formal charges brought against him, Socrates is guilty of
a. Corrupting the young.
b. Turning the weaker argument into the stronger.
c. Failing to acknowledge the gods of Athens.
*d. Both a and c.

2. Socrates examines _____ during his defense.
*a. Meletus.
b. Anytus.

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

c. Chaerephon.
d. Lycon.

*3. According to Socrates, the Delphic oracle declared that
a. Craftsmen are wiser than politicians.
b. Athens will suffer if Socrates is found guilty.
c. Socrates should defend himself against the charges.
*d. No one is wiser than Socrates.

*4. Socrates claims that Athenians should be ashamed for valuing things like wealth, honor, and glory more highly than
a. Truth and understanding.
b. Goodness.
c. The state of their souls.
*d. All of the above.

5. Socrates thinks that we should not fear death because
a. That would make us worry too much.
b. The gods don't want us to.
c. We know death is good.
*d. We don't know whether death is good or bad.

*6. Socrates suggests that he be sentenced to
*a. Free meals for life.
b. Exile.
c. Death.
d. A new trial.

7. Socrates claims that for the jury to sentence him to death is to harm its members more than him because
a. They will accidentally kill themselves instead.
b. He is too strong.
*c. It is unjust.
d. They will be invaded.

*8. According to Socrates, the man of self-respect considers
a. Death.
*b. Justice.
c. Nothing.
d. Both a and b.

9. Meletus's self-contradiction is that he claims that Socrates
a. Is a man but not mortal.
b. Is both guilty and not guilty.
*c. Acknowledges no gods and acknowledges gods other than the ones Athens acknowledges.

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

d. Wants to harm himself and does not want to harm himself.

*10. Socrates hopes that death is a good thing because it is
a. An opportunity to examine many great people.
b. Like a deep sleep.
c. Intensely pleasurable.
*d. Both a and b.

Essay Questions for Student Resources
1. What are the charges against Socrates? How does he claim to show that they are false?

2. Socrates compares himself with a "gadfly" and Athens with a lazy horse. He also claims that for the jury members to put him to death is to harm themselves more than him. What is he trying to say, and do you agree? Explain.

3. In what way does Socrates admit that he is wiser than others? How does this relate to what he says about the fear of death?

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

Part 2: Reasoning

The Elements of Argument

Steven M. Cahn, Patricia Kitcher, and George Sher

Reading Summary

An argument, in logic, is a collection of statements consisting of one or more premises that support the truth of a conclusion. The task of logic is to understand and clarify this inferential relationship between premises and conclusion. A deductively valid argument is such that *if* the premises are true, it is impossible for the conclusion to be false. There exist many nondeductive arguments that are still good, however, while not fitting the definition of validity. An inductive argument demonstrates an inference from observed evidence to a generalized belief, one that is stronger or weaker depending on the number of positive instances cited in the premises. Hypothesis testing in science is an example of inductive reasoning, as is inference to the best explanation. The task of argument analysis is to reconstruct the premises and conclusion of an argument from an example of prose, and then to evaluate the strength of the inference.

Weblinks

"Blogic: A Web Logic Textbook," J. David Velleman
http://www.nyu.edu/classes/velleman/blogic/Logic/

"Inductive Logic," James Hawthorne
http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/logic-inductive/

Improving Your Thinking

Stephen F. Barker

Reading Summary

One way of improving one's reasoning ability is by learning different ways in which arguments can be bad. Several fallacies—tempting logical mistakes in reasoning—have special names. For example, an argument is called a *petitio principii* (or begging the question) when it takes the conclusion for granted. This is mistaken reasoning because it is useless for the purposes of convincing someone that the conclusion is true. Another common fallacy is that of the *ad hominem* argument. Such an argument attacks the person providing an argument rather than the argument itself. This kind of reasoning is often a mistake because bad people can make good arguments. There are many other fallacies worth avoiding as well (e.g., appeal to unsuitable authority, black-and-white thinking). One's reasoning will improve by avoiding such common logical mistakes. Another way to improve one's reasoning ability is to avoid ambiguous words. An ambiguous word may mean more than one thing. One may prevent ambiguity by defining the words one uses. There are at least three useful types of definition. Analytical definitions describe the meaning a word already has in language, whereas stipulative

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

definitions declare how one intends to use a word. Finally, revelatory definitions propose new ways of using words that have established usages. It can sometimes be tricky to determine when one should define the words one is using. It would be absurd to always define the words one is about to use before using them. But it is wise to define those words that are likely ambiguous, vague, or otherwise unclear. Doing this will allow one to avoid merely verbal disputes, which arise when a single word is being used according to different meanings.

Weblinks
An Illustrated Book of Bad Arguments
https://bookofbadarguments.com/

Necessary and Sufficient Conditions
Steven M. Cahn

Reading Summary
Condition A is necessary for B to happen if B cannot occur without A occurring. For example, being eighteen is a necessary condition for voting in the United States. Condition A is sufficient for B to happen if the occurrence of A ensures the occurrence of B. In an American presidential election, receiving 300 electoral votes is sufficient for being elected president. Misunderstandings about necessary and sufficient conditions are the source of many fallacies in arguments. It's important to note that a condition can be necessary but not sufficient: being eighteen is not *sufficient* for being able to vote, because one must also be a US citizen. A condition can also be sufficient but not necessary. Receiving 300 electoral votes will ensure that one is elected, but so would receiving 299 votes.

Weblinks
Video explanation by Kelley Schiffman, published July 22, 2013:
http://youtu.be/5LqNm9d2__I/

For a LOT more detail:
http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/necessary-sufficient/

Scientific Inquiry
Carl G. Hempel

Reading Summary
Ignaz Semmelweis's work discovering the cause of a difference in mortality rates resulting from childbed fever in two nineteenth-century Hungarian maternity wards of the same hospital nicely illustrates the method of scientific inquiry. Semmelweis considered and tested various hypotheses before settling on the explanation that the doctors and

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

medical students had been spreading infectious material to the women because they had not properly disinfected their hands before examinations. There are several methods for testing a proposed hypothesis. Direct observation of the proposed cause of the phenomenon that one is trying to explain is the simplest. If the proposed cause is removed and the phenomenon persists, then one can reject the hypothesis as false. But often one must indirectly observe the expected effects of the proposed cause, rather than the cause itself. This may involve experimentation. For example, Semmelweis tested the hypothesis that the increased mortality rate was a result of the position the mother was delivered in, which differed between wards. But when the mothers in one ward were put in the same position as those in the other, there was no change in mortality rate. So the hypothesis was rejected. We can call the expected effect of the proposed hypothesis its test implication. If the test implication is false, the hypothesis may be rejected. This is an example of a deductively valid pattern of reasoning—*modus tollens*. It is more difficult, however, to establish the truth of a hypothesis by experimentation. If the test implication is shown to be true, then one cannot validly infer that the hypothesis is correct. This would be to commit the fallacy of affirming the consequent. The fallacy occurs even if many test implications of the same hypothesis are shown to be true. But this does not mean that experimental inquiry leads to no gains when test implications are shown to be true. Favorable results support the hypothesis, confirming it until it is shown to be false.

Weblinks

"Carl Hempel," James Fetzer
http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/hempel/

"Scientific Explanation," James Woodward
http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/scientific-explanation/

"Antiscience Beliefs Jeopardize US Democracy," Shawn Lawrence Otto
http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/antiscience-beliefs-jeopardize-us-democracy/?page=1/

Antiscientism

Gillian Barker and Philip Kitcher

Reading Summary

In "Antiscientism," Gillian Barker and Philip Kitcher discuss the nature and origins of the antiscience sentiments that they take to exist throughout the world today. Worries about the human implications of the scientific worldview date back to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries when the Scientific Revolution began to "disenchant" the word by replacing the traditional, human-centered view of the cosmos with a vision of a vast, impersonal world devoid of meaning and purpose. Subsequent scientific advances—including the advent of evolutionary biology, neuroscience, quantum physics, and cognitive science—served to further this disenchantment. Defenders of science, however, celebrate the liberation of humanity from its prescientific illusions, touting the intellectual

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

freedom science offers as well as the beauty, order, and richness of the world it reveals. Nonetheless, many people continue to see modern science as a threat to central aspects of their way of life and seize upon its predictive failures to generate doubt about the authority of its claims. People are also apt to reinterpret the theoretical bases for science's practical successes to make them consistent with traditional, non-scientific beliefs (such as the existence of God). According to Barker and Kitcher, antiscience sentiment is facilitated by public debates in the media, which often present the views of non-specialists as credible alternatives to positions put forward by scientific experts.

Weblinks

"Truth and Science," Philip Kitcher (video)
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NGjrISYITek

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

Part 2 Questions: Reasoning

The Elements of Argument

Steven M. Cahn, Patricia Kitcher, and George Sher

Essay Questions for Test Bank

1. What do the authors mean by saying that the direction of argumentation must always be from the more obvious to the less obvious? Explain.

A good essay will:

- Explain clearly what is meant by direction of argumentation.
- Which claims in the argument should be the more obvious and which less obvious, and why?
- Provide examples that illustrate your point.

2. How is it that nondeductive arguments can be considered good reasoning even though they do not pass the test of validity?

3. Why is Sherlock Holmes's use of "deduction" not the same as how logicians use the term, and how do the authors define this type of reasoning?

Objective Questions

True/False

*1. The task of logic is to establish rules of inference. (T)
2. Deductive arguments require valid premises. (F)
*3. A valid argument can only be a deductive argument. (T)
4. An argument with false premises can never be valid. (F)
*5. An invalid nondeductive argument can still be an example of good reasoning. (T)
6. Positive instances confirm an inductive generalization. (T)
*7. Hypothesis testing in science is an example of deductive reasoning. (F)
8. Inference to the best explanation is an example of inductive reasoning. (T)
*9. Argument analysis involves identifying premises and conclusion in ordinary language. (T)
10. Adding unstated assumptions to a reconstructed argument is not acceptable in argument analysis. (F)

Multiple Choice

*1. An argument in logic consists of
a. Obviously true statements.
b. Controversial statements.
*c. A collection of statements including one or more premises and a conclusion.
d. True statements.

2. The central concept of deductive logic is

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

a. Truth.
*b. Validity.
c. Inference.
d. Necessity.

*3. A valid deductive argument must have
a. True premises.
b. A true conclusion.
c. Both a and b.
*d. Neither a nor b.

4. A nondeductive argument is
a. Always an example of bad reasoning.
*b. Not necessarily an example of bad reasoning.
c. Valid.
d. Always an example of good reasoning.

*5. Inductive arguments rely on
*a. Observed cases to infer the recurrence of unobserved cases.
b. Unobserved cases to infer the recurrence of observed cases.
c. A valid inference from premises to conclusion.
d. Lack of evidence.

6. Our strength of belief should
a. Decrease with the number of positive instances of a claim.
b. Decrease with the variety of positive instances of a claim.
*c. Increase with the number of positive instances of a claim.
d. Depend on our inner certitude of a claim's truth.

*7. The successful test of a hypothesis
a. Counts against of the hypothesis.
*b. Counts in favor of the hypothesis.
c. Does not affect the confirmation of the hypothesis.
d. Means the hypothesis is true.

8. Inference to the best explanation requires that
*a. The truth of the conclusion gives us good reason to expect that the premises are true.
b. The truth of the premises gives us good reason to expect that the conclusion is true.
c. The conclusion follows from the premises deductively.
d. The conclusion could never be false given the truth of the premises.

*9. The initial step in argument analysis is to
a. Add unstated assumptions.
b. Evaluate the strength of the inference.
*c. Identify the premises and conclusion.
d. Discard rhetorical fluff.

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

10. The most important step in argument analysis is to
a. Add unstated assumptions.
*b. Evaluate the strength of the inference.
c. Identify the premises and conclusion.
d. Discard rhetorical fluff.

Essay Questions for Student Resources
1. Explain the difference between a deductive argument and an inductive argument.

2. Define "validity" in your own words. Then give an example of a valid argument and explain why it is valid.

3. Give an example of an invalid argument with a missing premise. Then put the argument into standard form. Now provide a counterexample to the argument and explain why it shows that the argument is invalid.

Improving Your Thinking
Stephen F. Barker

Essay questions for Test Bank
1. Give an example of an argument that begs the question. Explain why and exactly how the argument is fallacious.

A good essay will:

- State the premise(s) and conclusion of an argument that begs the question.
- Examine the role of the conclusion with regard to the premises.
- Explain the fallacious type of reasoning involved in this argument.

2. Provide an example of an ambiguous word and give its multiple meanings. Then provide an example of where this word gives rise to a verbal dispute. Explain how a definition might resolve the dispute.

3. What is an *ad hominem* argument? Can you think of any context in which such arguments are common? Explain whether you think they are a problem in this context and why.

Objective Questions
True/False
*1. It is always good to define one's words before using them to persuade someone else about something. (F)
2. As logicians use the term, "fallacy" refers to a mistaken belief or false statement. (F)
*3. A metaphor can provide a revelatory definition. (T)
4. Circular reasoning is called *ad hominem*. (F)

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

*5. The fallacy of *petitio principii* involves circular reasoning. (T)
6. Fallacious reasoning is often very convincing. (F)
*7. Ambiguous words are at the heart of verbal disputes. (T)
8. It is always a fallacy to appeal to famous people in support of one's conclusion. (F)
*9. An analytical definition may be arbitrary. (F)
10. A fallacy is an invalid argument. (F)

Multiple Choice
*1. A fallacy is
*a. A tempting logical mistake in reasoning.
b. The use of ambiguous terms.
c. An invalid argument.
d. A mistaken belief.

2. Any fallacy must include a
a. False premise
b. False conclusion.
c. Both a or b.
*d. Neither a nor b.

*3. The fallacy of complex question
a. Is not a fallacy at all.
b. Is a particular version of the *ad hominem* fallacy.
*c. Is a particular version of the fallacy of *petitio principii*.
d. Involves appeal to irrelevant authority.

4. An argument that fails to prove anything because it takes for granted what it is supposed to prove is
a. The fallacy of complex question.
*b. A particular version of the fallacy of *petitio principii*.
c. The *ad hominem* fallacy.
d. The fallacy of black-and-white thinking.

*5. An appeal to unsuitable authority is
a. A fallacy of irrelevance.
b. A particular version of the fallacy of *petitio principii*.
c. Occurs when there is no good reason to think this authority is an expert on the issue.
*d. Both a. and c.

6. An analytical definition should not be
a. Too broad.
b. Too narrow.
c. Circular.
*d. All of the above.

*7. A stipulative definition should not

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

a. Be too broad.
*b. Assign an arbitrary definition to a word with an established meaning.
c. Be arbitrary.
d. Be circular.

8. Revelatory definitions
a. Characterize the meaning a word already has.
b. Stipulate how a speaker intends to use a word.
c. Increase the ambiguity of a word.
*d. Perfect the usage of a word growing out of previously established usages.

*9. Defining all of one's terms at the beginning of a discussion is
a. Necessary to avoid confusion.
b. Possible to do but not necessary.
*c. Impossible because there will always be undefined terms no matter how far one proceeds.
d. The only way to make sure the speakers are discussing the same thing.

10. A verbal dispute arises when
*a. A word is being used with different meanings.
b. A word is clearly defined.
c. Two people disagree on an issue.
d. A fallacy of reasoning is used.

Essay Questions for Student Resources
1. Everyone is familiar with the scene in which a lawyer objects that the other side is "leading the witness" in a courtroom examination. What fallacy is being committed? Why is it pernicious in this context? Explain.

2. What is the fallacy of black-and-white thinking? Why is it a fallacy? Explain first by providing your own example of the phenomenon and second by explaining how things could go better if the fallacy were not committed.

3. Give your own example of a revelatory definition and explain why it is correct.

Necessary and Sufficient Conditions
Steven M. Cahn

Essay Questions for Test Bank
1. Explain why it is important not to confuse necessary and sufficient conditions. In your answer, provide an example of a condition that is necessary but not sufficient, an example of a condition that is sufficient but not necessary, and finally an example of a condition that is both necessary and sufficient for another condition.

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

A good essay will:

- Demonstrate the use of necessary and sufficient conditions correctly in the three examples;
- Explain why an understanding of these relationships is critical to logical reasoning.

2. Imagine that a dog trainer says, “My obedience course is sufficient to make any dog well-behaved.” A listener responds by saying, “My dog is already well-behaved, without taking your course, so that proves you are wrong.” Is the listener correct? Why or why not?

3. Imagine that a philosopher says, “Knowing how to read is a necessary condition for being a philosopher.” A listener responds by saying, “I’m a philosopher, but I don’t know how to read.” Has the listener proved that the philosopher’s statement is wrong? Why or why not?

Objective Questions

True/False

*1. Confusing necessary and sufficient conditions is a common mistake in reasoning. (T)
2. If A is necessary for B, then B is necessary for A. (F)
*3. If A is necessary for B, then B is sufficient for A. (T)
*4. For human beings, breathing is a sufficient condition for staying alive. (F)
5. It is a fallacy to reason that if A is sufficient for B, then A is necessary for B. (T)
6. If A is sufficient for B, then B is necessary for A. (T)
*7. Being at least eighteen is a necessary condition for voting in the United States. (T)
8. Being a rectangle with four equal sides is necessary and sufficient for being a square. (T)
*9. The presence of oxygen is a sufficient condition for a candle to be burning. (F)
10. A candle burning is a sufficient condition for the presence of oxygen. (T)

Multiple Choice

1. If one state affairs, A, is a necessary condition for another state of affairs, B, then
a. A cannot occur without B occurring.
*b. B cannot occur without A occurring.
c. Both a and b.
d. Neither a nor b.

*2. If A is a sufficient condition for B, then B is
*a. A necessary condition for A.
b. A sufficient condition for A.
c. Both necessary and sufficient for A.
d. Neither necessary nor sufficient for A.

3. For a human to live, being able to breathe is
*a. A necessary condition.

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

b. A sufficient condition.
c. Both a necessary and a sufficient condition.
d. Neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition.

*4. For a rectangle to be considered a square, having four sides of equal length is
a. A necessary condition.
b. A sufficient condition.
*c. Both a necessary and a sufficient condition.
d. Neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition.

5. To be a college student, owning a computer is
a. A necessary condition.
b. A sufficient condition.
c. Both a necessary and a sufficient condition.
*d. Neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition.

6. For a shape to be a triangle, having three sides is
a. A necessary condition.
b. A sufficient condition.
*c. Both a necessary and a sufficient condition.
d. Neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition.

7. For winning a race, crossing the finish line first is
a. A necessary condition.
b. A sufficient condition.
*c. Both a necessary and a sufficient condition.
d. Neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition.

8. “You can’t be a good athlete without studying ballet.” Which of these would be the best way to prove that this statement is false?
a. Show an example of a good athlete who has studied ballet.
*b. Show an example of a good athlete who has NOT studied ballet.
c. Show an example of a ballet student who is a good athlete.
d. Show an example of a ballet student who is NOT a good athlete.

*9. Claim: “Caring about students is a necessary condition for being a good teacher.” Objection: “Lots of people care about students and still aren’t good teachers.” Does this objection show that the claim is wrong?
*a. No, because the claim is only that caring is necessary, not sufficient.
b. No, because caring can be necessary and still be sufficient.
c. Yes, because caring about students is both necessary and sufficient.
d. Yes, because it’s true that caring is not sufficient to make one a good teacher.

*10. A certain college requires all students to have physical education credits to graduate. For this college, physical education is
*a. A necessary condition for graduating.

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

b. A sufficient condition for graduating.
c. Both necessary and sufficient for graduating.
d. Neither necessary nor sufficient for graduating.

11. A college offers an elective course in the history of philosophy. Students may choose to take it to fill a humanities requirement or they make take a different course. For this college, the history of philosophy course is
a. A necessary condition for graduating.
b. A sufficient condition for graduating.
c. Both necessary and sufficient for graduating.
*d. Neither necessary nor sufficient for graduating.

12. A philosopher says, "Studying philosophy is sufficient to teach critical thinking." Which would be the best response if you wanted to argue that this statement was false?
a. "Other disciplines, like literature or science, are just as good at teaching critical thinking."
b. "Other disciplines, like literature or science, also teach very important skills."
*c. "Other disciplines, like literature or science, are also necessary for teaching critical thinking."
d. "Other disciplines, like literature or science, could also be sufficient for teaching critical thinking."

13. "Practicing is necessary if you want to play guitar well." Which of these would be the best response if you wanted to prove that this statement is false? (Pretend for a minute that it's false.)
a. Talent is also necessary if you want to play well.
* b. Some people play well even though they have never practiced.
c. Some people learn to play faster than others.
d. Some people never learn to play well even though they practice.

*14. A job ad says, "Qualified candidates for this job must speak fluent Latin." This means that
a. Speaking Latin is sufficient for getting the job.
*b. Speaking Latin is necessary for getting the job.
c. Speaking Latin is necessary and sufficient for getting the job.
d. Speaking Latin is neither necessary nor sufficient for getting the job.

15. If a college degree is a necessary condition to be hired for a certain job, then
a. The degree cannot, logically, be a sufficient condition for being hired.
b. The degree must, logically, be a sufficient condition for being hired.
c. If you have the degree, you will definitely get the job.
*d. If you don't have the degree, you definitely won't get the job.

Essay Questions for Student Resources
1. How would you explain the difference between necessary and sufficient conditions to someone who was confusing them?

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

2. Imagine that your professor says, “Attendance every day is necessary to get an A.” You attend the class every day, but you don’t get an A. Has your professor been dishonest? Why or why not?

3. Imagine that your professor says, “A perfect score on every assignment is sufficient to get an A in this class.” A student objects, “It’s not fair to grade so harshly. You shouldn’t demand perfection just to get an A.” Do you think the professor’s statement is fair? Why or why not?

Scientific Inquiry

Carl G. Hempel

Essay Questions for Test Bank

1. Explain Semmelweis’s reasoning for the conclusion that the increased mortality rates in the First Division were the result of blood poisoning. Be sure to discuss some of his rejected hypotheses.

A good essay will:

- Distinguish between the evidence Semmelweis relied on and each of the hypotheses he tested;
- Explain why he abandoned each of his earlier hypotheses;
- Evaluate the overall strength of his conclusion about blood poisoning.

2. Why is it easier to establish that a hypothesis is false by the experimental method than that it is true?

3. Explain the difference between direct observation of a cause and indirect observation of its expected effects using examples from the reading.

Objective Questions

True/False

*1. *Modus tollens* and affirming the consequent are two forms of deductively valid argument. (F)
2. The scientific method uses logical reasoning to establish empirical propositions. (T)
*3. Test implications cannot be conclusively shown to be true. (F)
4. Affirming the consequent is a valid argument form. (F)
*5. If the test implications of a hypothesis are shown to be true, then the hypothesis is conclusively confirmed. (F)
6. It is easier to establish the falsity of a hypothesis than its truth by scientific inquiry. (T)
*7. Experiments require laboratory settings. (F)
8. Hypotheses are self-evidently true. (F)
*9. A test implication is an expected effect of a hypothesis. (T)
10. Hypotheses are most usually tested directly, by checking to see if they conflict with readily observable facts. (F)

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

Multiple Choice

*1. Semmelweis was concerned that more instances of childbed fever occurred in the
a. Vienna General Hospital than in other hospitals.
b. Vienna General Hospital than in home deliveries.
*c. First Maternity Division than in the Second.
d. Second Maternity Division than in the First.

*2. Semmelweis considered and rejected explanations including
a. "Atmospheric-cosmic-telluric" influences
b. Overcrowding
c. Rough examination by medical students
*d. All of the above.

3. The first clue as to the cause of childbed fever came when
a. A priest bearing the last sacrament came to a woman's deathbed.
b. Women were delivered lying on their backs.
*c. A colleague received a puncture wound during an autopsy.
d. The medical washed their hands in a solution of chlorinated lime.

*4. The hypothesis of infected cadaveric material explained
a. The lower mortality among street births.
b. Why the women attended by midwives did not get childbed fever.
*c. Both a. and b.
d. Why the medical students refused to wash their hands in a solution of chlorinated lime.

5. Semmelweis's story illustrates
*a. The scientific method.
b. Affirming the consequent.
c. Good medical care.
d. Formal logic.

*6. A *modus tollens* argument
a. Is a deductively valid argument form.
b. Is one way of establishing a true hypothesis.
c. Is one way of reasoning to a false hypothesis.
*d. Both a and c.

7. To confirm a hypothesis is
a. To show that it is conclusively true.
*b. To show that it is supported by the best available evidence.
c. To show that it is false.
d. To show that it is supported by the laws of logic.

*8. A test implication
a. Is an expected effect of a given hypothesis.

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

b. May be true or false.
c. May be tested for by experiment.
*d. All of the above.

9. The mode of reasoning known as "affirming the consequent"
a. Is deductively valid.
b. Is a way of disconfirming a hypothesis.
*c. May involve a true test implication.
d. Is the same as *modus tollens*.

*10. When a test has a favorable outcome that means that
a. The proposed hypothesis is true.
b. The proposed hypothesis has been proven.
*c. There is support for the hypothesis.
d. Both a and b.

Essay Questions for Student Resources
1. Make up a hypothetical problem and construct a possible experiment to determine its cause. Explain exactly what your experiment establishes.

2. What is the fallacy of affirming the consequent? Give an example and explain what is wrong with it.

3. Provide an example of a *modus tollens* argument that is not in the reading. Explain why it is a good argument (e.g., persuasive).

Antiscientism
Gillian Barker and Philip Kitcher

Essay Questions for Test Bank
1. How do Barker and Kitcher explain the origin of antiscience attitudes? Is this explanation fully convincing in your view? Why or why not?

A good essay will:

- Provide a thesis at the outset that clearly states whether Barker and Kitcher's explanation is fully convincing.
- Provide a thorough and detailed exposition of Barker and Kitcher's explanation, focusing on how modern science gave rise to a disenchanted view of the world.
- Provide a careful critical evaluation of Barker and Kitcher's explanation that explains either (a) where and why it goes wrong OR (b) why it is convincing (this can include defending it from possible objections).

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

2. According to Barker and Kitcher, many people see modern science as a threat to central aspects of their way of life. Do you see science as threat in this way? Why or why not?

3. How do defenders of science respond to antiscience attitudes according to Barker and Kitcher? Is this response persuasive in your view? Why or why not?

Objective Questions

True/False

*1. According to Barker and Kitcher, antiscience attitudes began with emergence of evolutionary theory and quantum physics. (F)
2. Prior to the Scientific Revolution, Europeans understood the world as filled with meaning and purpose. (T)
*3. Defenders of science argue that the Scientific Revolution helped to undermine oppressive social orders. (T)
4. Barker and Kitcher claim that the media has played a role in the growth of antiscience. (T)
*5. According to Barker and Kitcher, modern science poses no threat to people's religious convictions. (F)

Multiple Choice

1. According to Barker and Kitcher, antiscience sentiments began
a. With the advent of quantum physics.
*b. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.
c. With Darwin's theory of evolution.
d. In the philosophy of Descartes.

*2. According to Barker and Kitcher, hostility toward science effects
*a. Public decision making about scientific policy.
b. The number of people interested in pursuing careers in science.
c. Both a and b.
d. Neither a nor b.

3. Before the Scientific Revolution, Europeans understood the world as
a. Centered around human beings.
b. Only a few hundred human generations old.
c. Filled with meaning and purpose.
*d. All of the above.

*4. According to Barker and Kitcher, the new sciences of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries revealed a world that was
a. Beyond human comprehension.
b. The center of the universe.
*c. Vast and impersonal.
d. All of the above.

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

5. In the writings of scientists and philosophers, the world as understood by modern science is often described specifically as
a. An *empty* world.
*b. A *disenchanted* world.
c. A *lost* world.
d. An *impersonal* world.

*6. According to Barker and Kitcher, _____ has brought the full force of the scientific worldview to bear on our understanding of ourselves.
a. Quantum physics.
*b. Evolutionary biology and neuroscience.
c. Cartesian philosophy.
d. Both a and b.

7. According to Barker and Kitcher, defenders of science respond to antiscience attitudes by pointing to the way modern science offers
a. Intellectual freedom.
b. A deep appreciation for the beauty, order, and richness of the world.
c. Liberation from social orders marked by oppression and religious dogmatism.
*d. All of the above.

*8. According to Barker and Kitcher, many people seek to retain their traditional beliefs in the face of scientific progress by
*a. Reinterpreting the theoretical bases of science's practical successes.
b. Ignoring science practical successes.
c. Personally attacking scientists.
d. All of the above.

9. According to Barker and Kitcher, central aspects of people's way of life including _____ are threatened by modern science.
a. Their religious beliefs.
b. Their commonsense beliefs about the world.
*c. Both a and b.
d. Neither a nor b.

*10. According to Barker and Kitcher, the growth of antiscience is facilitated when
a. Debates in the media make scientific issues seem more controversial than they are.
b. Scientific predictions and interventions are less successful.
*c. Both a and b.
d. Neither a nor b.

Essay Questions for Student Resources
1. Explain the image of the "disenchanted" world. What has led many scientists and philosophers to describe the world this way?

2. How prevalent do you think antiscientism is in the world today? Do you think it is

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

becoming more prevalent or less? Explain your answer.

3. Why do Barker and Kitcher think that discussions about science in the media contribute to the growth of antiscience attitudes?

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

Part 3: Knowledge

Knowing vs. Thinking

Jennifer Nagel

Reading Summary

In "Thinking vs. Knowing," Jennifer Nagel begins by describing the relativist theory of truth put forward by the Ancient Greek philosopher Protagoras. Protagoras denies that truth is objective and the same for everyone, claiming instead that truth is always relative to a subject. Nagel, however, points out that this view is difficult to accept. For one, if things truly are for each person as he or she sees them, then no one ever makes a mistake. More serious, however, is the worry that a relativist theory of truth appears self-refuting, since it attempts to formulate a general, objective truth while at the same time denying that there is any such thing.

Nagel then moves on to consider the distinction between knowing and thinking. According to Nagel, knowledge is distinguished by its essential link to truth. Whereas a person can think or believe something false, it is impossible to know something false. Nagel calls this feature of knowledge factivity. Nagel next considers the way confidence matters to knowledge. Although we often say that we *think* or *believe* something is true when we aren't entirely sure, we only say we *know* something when we are confident of its truth. Nonetheless, Nagel argues that knowledge requires more than a confidently held true belief. After all, an individual might correctly and confidently believe something is true on the basis of emotion or prejudice rather than evidence. We are then left with the difficult question of specifying what knowledge requires beyond truth and confidence.

Weblinks

"Protagoras," Carol Poster
https://www.iep.utm.edu/protagor/

"The Analysis of Knowledge," Jonathan Jenkins Ichikawa and Matthias Steup
https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/knowledge-analysis/

"Knowledge: A Very Short Introduction," Jennifer Nagel (video)
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=326Uq8oZUV0

Caring and Epistemic Demands

Linda Zagzebski

Reading Summary

Zagzebski argues that in domains we care about, we must care about having true beliefs. A belief governed by concern for truth is what she refers to as a conscientiously held belief. Caring about a particular domain imposes two kinds of demand for conscientious belief: first, to be conscientious in the beliefs you have in that domain, and second, to

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

acquire conscientious beliefs in that domain. If we are agents within that domain, we also want confidence in our beliefs—enough confidence to feel prepared to act on those beliefs. Furthermore, we want the ability to identify false beliefs, which are no doubt mingled with our true ones. We want trust in ourselves—that our conscientiousness is enough—and in others—that they are conscientious about the beliefs they pass along to us. Also, we want to be trusted in return, which is necessary for communicating with others and being believed. Finally, we want to be able to predict events within domains we care about. Zagzebski argues that we impose all of these values on ourselves by caring about a particular domain. Some of these values may also be a part of knowledge.

Weblinks

Do we really care whether our beliefs are true?
https://files.nyu.edu/mjr318/public/btk08/BTK%2019%20-%20Stich.pdf/

On the difficulty in uprooting false beliefs, even in domains you care about a lot:
http://www.newyorker.com/online/blogs/mariakonnikova/2014/05/why-do-people-persist-in-believing-things-that-just-arent-true.html/

What Is Knowledge?

A. J. Ayer

Reading Summary

We can define knowledge by giving necessary and sufficient conditions for knowing that something is the case. There are three individually necessary and jointly sufficient conditions on knowing that *p*. First, *p* should be true. Second, one must be completely sure that *p*. And, third, one must be entitled to be sure that *p*. This last condition is needed to distinguish between cases in which one is sure about a true belief arrived at by a process that is not generally reliable (e.g., superstition) and cases in which one arrives at the belief by a generally reliable process (e.g., perception in normal circumstances). It is hard to specify the standards by which we determine whether one is entitled to be sure about one's belief. It is a matter of making case-by-case assessments of the reliability of one's evidence. A way of approaching the question of whether one is entitled to be sure that *p* is to ask "How do you know?" A satisfactory answer justifies one's entitlement. But sometimes one will not be able to provide an answer. It is not always clear how one came to form a given belief about which one is sure. Sometimes it is a matter of judgment in the particular case whether one has the right to be sure that *p*.

Weblinks

"Alfred Jules Ayer," Graham MacDonald and Nakul Krishna
https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/ayer/

"The Analysis of Knowledge," Jonathan Jenkins Ichikawa and Matthias Steup
https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/knowledge-analysis/

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

Is Justified True Belief Knowledge?
Edmund L. Gettier

Reading Summary
Ayer (previous reading) does not provide necessary and sufficient conditions for knowledge. Justified true belief is not sufficient for knowledge because it may be that one is justified in believing that *p* and yet not know that *p*. In a case where (i) *p* is true, (ii) one is sure that *p* is true, (iii) one is sure that *p* is true on the basis of a valid inference to *p* from *q*, (iv) one has good evidence for *q*, but (v) *q* is false, one will be justified in believing that *p*, and yet one will not know that *p*.

Weblinks
"Gettier Problems," Stephen Hetherington
http://www.iep.utm.edu/gettier/

Conditions for Knowledge
Robert Nozick

Reading Summary
Knowledge is not just true belief. But what more is needed? To handle counterexamples, like Gettier's (previous reading), to the definition of knowledge as justified true belief, we can add a condition that connects one's belief that *p* and the truth that *p*. Knowledge is when one's beliefs vary with the facts. One's beliefs are sensitive to the facts in the right way when (i) one would not believe that *p* if *p* were false and (ii) one would believe that *p* if *p* were true. One's knowledge connects one to the world by tracking it. One knows that *p* when one's belief that *p* tracks the truth that *p*.

Appearance and Reality
Bertrand Russell

Reading Summary
Is there certain knowledge? Is there anything one cannot reasonably doubt? Philosophical answers to these questions involve critical appreciation of what makes them puzzling and how they betray our ordinary confusion. A natural place to begin looking for certain knowledge is in our experience of objects in the world. But one's experience may be reasonably doubted. For example, two people looking at the same table will have different experiences of it. One may see a certain pattern of colors, whereas the other sees a different pattern of colors. The color of the table appears differently to each of them. Call that which is immediately known to each in experience *sense-data* (e.g., colors). And call the experience of being immediately aware of these things *sensation*. These two

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

people have different sensations because they are immediately aware of different sense-data. But then how do they know what the "real" color of the table is? There is no way to know the real table by experience because no two experiences of the same table will be the same. The best one can do is to infer what the real table is like from the table as it appears to one in experience. Presumably, the properties of the real table cause one's sensations of it. But what is the relation between the real table, assuming there is one, and one's sensations of it? Experience gives one the truth only about sense-data, which depend on one's relation to the table. So one cannot know about the real table by means of experience. But then how can one know that there is an independently existing table? And, assuming there is one, how can one know what it is like in itself?

What Can I Know?

D. Z. Phillips

Reading Summary

A straightforward view of philosophy is that it is useful training. It helps to sharpen one's thinking. But reading philosophy can give the impression that it is a waste of time, a trivial game. Why is the philosopher prepared to doubt so much that seems so evident? To show that the philosopher's doubt is unwarranted, one must provide reasons to think he is confused. Consider how one comes to know something. Begin with an empty mind, ready to receive knowledge. Then add experience of sense-data caused by interaction with the external world. But how does one get beyond knowledge of the sense-data to knowledge of the external world? It seems as if we must begin with something that is beyond doubt, a minimal sense-datum (e.g., it seems to me now as if I were hearing a noise) and get from there to claims about the external world (e.g., there is a car). But it is a mistake to think that in general the only things beyond doubt are minimal sense-data. We must distinguish between *favorable circumstances* and *unfavorable circumstances*. In favorable circumstances there is no room to doubt that one's experience is of the external world. The skeptic's challenge is only sometimes justified. It rests on the dubious claim that there is always something between me and the world, namely, sense-data. But we do not need to postulate sense-data to make sense of our experience of the external world, even in unfavorable circumstances. We can make sense of illusory experience (e.g., a stick half in water appearing bent when it is really straight) without claiming that what we immediately experience is something other than the external world. The unfavorable circumstances themselves can explain illusory experiences of real objects.

The Problem of Induction

Bertrand Russell

Reading Summary

I believe that the sun will rise tomorrow because it has risen every day in the past. But is any number of past occurrences evidence that something will happen in the future? Perhaps I postulate a set of laws to explain the workings of the world. Is any number of

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

cases in which a law was fulfilled in the past evidence that it will be fulfilled in the future? Many of our everyday expectations are merely *probable*. We have evidence that they are *likely* to be fulfilled but not that they *must* be fulfilled. Past uniformities cause expectations about the future. But are these expectations justified? We believe in "the uniformity of nature." We believe that the world works according to general laws that admit of no exception. Science aims to discover such laws. But are we justified in believing that these laws will hold in the future?

Weblinks
"The Problem of Induction," John Vickers
http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/induction-problem/

Induction without a Problem
P. F. Strawson

Reading Summary
There are many possible methods of finding out about the world. There are different ways of inferring the facts from the evidence specific to different areas of inquiry. We might ask the meteorologist, say, whether her method is justified in practice. It is if its predictions are repeatedly successful. But it makes no sense to ask whether the inductive method itself is justified. There is no alternative. Every successful method of inferring facts from the evidence is inductively supported. It has met with repeated success. This does not amount to a justification of the inductive method itself, but rather relies on it. There is no noninductive method of finding out about the world, so there is no justification of induction.

Weblinks
"The Problem of Induction," John Vickers
http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/induction-problem/

Puzzling Out Knowledge
Susan Haack

Reading Summary
Susan Haack suggests that evaluating the evidence for our beliefs is like solving a crossword puzzle. When entering an answer into a crossword, we evaluate not only how well our answer matches the clue, but also how well it fits with any intersecting entries already completed and how reasonable those entries are, given their clues. Similarly, when we consider whether to believe a claim, we consider the evidence for that claim and also how well it fits with our background beliefs and how reasonable our background beliefs are. We can often make mistakes in this process, either through a failure of will or through a failure of ingenuity. Everyone who investigates, Haack says, can be seen as

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

working on part of the same vast crossword, and sometimes fields of inquiry connect with one another in unforeseen ways. Our progress is uneven and full of missteps, but each success enables further successes. No one has to work on the crossword alone and from scratch; inquiry is unavoidably social and cooperative.

Weblinks
https://www.princeton.edu/~achaney/tmve/wiki100k/docs/Theory_of_justification.html/

Four-part interview with Susan Haack:
https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLF8AFECF5BB312B06/

Historical Sources

Meno
Plato

Reading Summary
Plato's *Meno* begins with the titular character asking Socrates if virtue is taught. Socrates responds by professing his ignorance about virtue and asking Meno to define it for him. Meno proceeds to list a number of different kinds of virtue (the virtue of a man, the virtue of a women, virtue for children, etc.), but Socrates is not interested in examples of virtues. Rather, he is interested in the general essence of virtue, that is, the single characteristic common to all cases. With this in mind, Meno proposes several general definitions of virtue—for example, the ability to rule and the ability to attain good things—but each is found wanting under Socrates's questioning.

The conversation therefore reaches an impasse and Meno is led to wonder whether inquiry is possible at all. After all, if an individual is wholly ignorant of something, how could she even begin to look for it or recognize it if she were to find it? It would seem that inquiry requires that one already know what one is trying to learn. But how can one learn what one already knows? Socrates responds to this apparent paradox by introducing the theory of recollection, according to which each human soul is immortal and has lived many previous lives during which it learned all things. Inquiry and learning, according to this theory, is not an attempt to acquire new knowledge, but rather a process of remembering what one has forgotten from previous lives. Socrates attempts to prove this theory by questioning one of Meno's slaves about a geometry problem. When the slave ultimately arrives at the correct answer, Socrates interprets this as an act of memory stirred up by his questions.

Finally, the conversation returns to the topic of virtue, specifically the question of whether it is taught. Socrates proceeds by what he calls the method of "hypothesis" and proposes that (a) if virtue is taught, then it must be knowledge and (b) if virtue is knowledge, then it is taught. Socrates initially expresses confidence that virtue is knowledge—since virtue must be something good and only knowledge is necessarily beneficial—but reconsiders in light of the fact that there are no teachers of virtue.

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

Socrates, however, does not deny that there are virtuous people. According to Socrates, there are people who have true opinions about virtue, which can guide their actions. But such people lack knowledge of virtue and so are not in a position to teach virtue to others. Socrates admits, however, that clarifying how these people come to have true opinions about virtue in the first place requires an inquiry into what virtue is. Meno breaks off the conversation at this point and the dialogue ends with virtue undefined.

Weblinks
"Plato's Meno," Glenn Rawson
https://www.iep.utm.edu/meno-2/

"Plato's Middle Period Metaphysics and Epistemology," Allan Silverman
https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/plato-metaphysics/

Meditations on First Philosophy
René Descartes

Reading Summary
To establish any lasting knowledge, I must begin from the foundations of knowledge and establish indubitable first principles. But first I must purge all of my false beliefs. I can do so by applying the method of doubt to all of my beliefs at once. I can doubt the basic principles on which all of my beliefs rest. Begin with the senses. All knowledge seems to begin with the senses, but they sometimes deceive. For example, there is no sure way of distinguishing between waking life and dreaming. But this does not put everything in doubt because the material from which the images I experience are formed (e.g., colors, shapes) may yet be real even if the particular images I experience are not. Consider, then, the possibility that God is a deceiver who created me with experiences that do not correspond to any reality. On the one hand, it seems that God's goodness would prevent this possibility. But that would prevent the possibility of even occasional deception, and it is clear that I am occasionally deceived about the reality of my experiences. On the other hand, to assert, as the atheist does, that I was created by chance only makes the possibility that I am globally deceived by my senses more likely. So all of my beliefs are doubtful. They are all possibly false. To avoid acquiring any false beliefs in the future, however, it is necessary not only to register this possibility but also to remember it. Suppose an evil demon has created me to deceive me. On this supposition, I will withhold assent to anything so as not to form false beliefs.

Weblinks
"Descartes' Epistemology," Lex Newman
http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/descartes-epistemology/

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

An Essay Concerning Human Understanding
John Locke

Reading Summary
To discover the nature of our *ideas*, perceptions in our minds, we should distinguish between them and *qualities*, powers that objects have to produce ideas in our minds. There are two kinds of qualities. *Primary qualities* are inseparable from the objects in which they adhere and independent of our minds. The five primary qualities are solidity, extension, figure, mobility, and number. When we have the sensation of a solid object, our sensation resembles a property of the body itself. *Secondary qualities* are powers to produce sensations in us by the object's primary qualities, but secondary qualities do not adhere in the objects themselves and are dependent on our minds. For example, color is a secondary quality. A red object is not red in itself, but rather it produces the sensation of redness in the mind of the perceiver by way of primary qualities of that object. When we have the sensation of a red object, our sensation does not resemble a property of the object itself. Objects produce ideas in our minds by impulse. Imperceptible particles move from the objects themselves to our organs of perception, and the motion continues through our bodies, to our brains, where particular sensations are produced in our minds. An object may effect changes in the primary qualities of another body and alter the latter's secondary qualities (e.g., the bright sun can cause a piece of wax that before appeared red to appear white). We can distinguish between primary and secondary qualities by altering an object's environment and observing which qualities remain constant and which vary. If an object appears to be one color in bright light and another color in dim light, then the color cannot adhere in the object itself. If it always appears solid, however, then our idea of its solidity resembles a property of the object itself.

We know of our own existence by intuition and of God's existence by reason. We know of the existence of external objects because they produce ideas in us. We can be certain that external objects produce our ideas for these reasons. If one lacks a certain faculty (e.g., sight), one cannot form the ideas produced by means of it (e.g., colors). Sometimes ideas are unavoidable and so are not up to us. And we often agree with each other's sensory reports. Above all, however, we can be sure, because of God's grace, that our faculties do not deceive us regarding the existence of an external world that produces sensations in us. This is because our senses aid in our greatest concern, preservation of life, by way of our sensations of pleasure and pain.

Weblinks
"John Locke," William Uzgalis
http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/locke/

A Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge
George Berkeley

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

Reading Summary

The objects of knowledge, *ideas*, arise in a mind by way of the senses, by attention to the internal operations of the mind, or by memory and imagination. In all cases, the *mind* is a separate thing that knows or perceives the ideas. Ideas exist only in being perceived. Thus, their existence is mind dependent. Because all sensible objects are perceived by our senses and all that we perceive are ideas, it follows that nothing exists independently of a mind perceiving it. There are no mind-independent objects. The only substance is mind, that which perceives. To suppose that there are *real objects* existing independently of being perceived and yet causing ideas in us that represent them involves a contradiction. An idea is only like an idea. If the supposedly real objects are perceptible, then we have ideas of them, and they are ideas. If they are imperceptible, then it is absurd to think we can have ideas that represent them as they are. An idea of solidity, for example, would then be like something intangible. And this is absurd.

We can prove that there are no mind-independent objects as follows. Try to conceive of a solid figure, say, that exists without the mind. This is impossible. It is impossible to conceive of something unconceived. The best you can do is to consider your idea of this figure. But then all you have proven is the existence of an idea, not the existence of a real object. It is no proof of mind-independent objects that we have ideas because we might have ideas even if there are no real objects. But how do we come to have ideas? The existence of real objects cannot explain how we come to have them, and ideas cannot cause anything. So our ideas must be caused by the activity of a mind, or its *will*, as opposed to its faculty of perception, or *understanding*. Because some of my ideas do not depend on my own will, there must be some other will to produce them. It seems that some ideas are produced by real objects because they are more vivid. But these ideas are produced by God, and we need not posit real objects to explain their vivacity. We know the existence of God by the existence of the many vivid ideas we receive from the workings of nature.

Weblinks

"George Berkeley," Lisa Downing
http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/berkeley/

An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding

David Hume

Reading Summary

We can divide perceptions in the mind into two classes. *Impressions* are more lively ideas derived from sensation, and *ideas* are less lively copies of these impressions. To prove that this is so, consider that any idea, no matter how complex, may be decomposed into simple parts that correspond to sense impressions. We cannot come up with an idea that does not have its source in sensation. Moreover, if one lacks a certain faculty of sense, one also lacks the corresponding ideas. For example, a blind man has no ideas of color, but if he were to gain sight, he would.

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank

We can divide the objects of reason into two classes. *Relations of ideas* are discoverable by the operations of thought alone. Consider the proposition that three times five equals fifteen. The truth of this proposition does not rely on anything outside the mind. It follows from the combination of the ideas of the numbers three and five and the relation of multiplication. Its contrary is impossible because it is contradictory. *Matters of fact* depend for their truth on the evidence of the senses and memory. The contrary of a proposition that is a matter of fact is conceivable, so the truth of the proposition does not admit of the same justification as in the case of a relation of ideas.

All reasoning about matters of fact relies on the relation of *cause and effect*. We constantly infer further facts from perceived facts. For example, we hear a voice speaking in the dark and infer that there is a person present because the sound of discourse is closely connected in our experience with the presence of people. But how do we know of the relation of cause and effect? We do not know it by *a priori* reasoning. Rather, we know it from experience of objects that are constantly conjoined. We know that people cause audible discourse because we always experience the two things occurring together. This holds for all propositions of cause and effect, even the laws of nature. We cannot infer its effects from any cause without past experience of their conjunction. The effect is distinct from the cause and cannot be discovered in it. It is conceivable that any number of effects might follow from one cause. Without experience as guide, there is no reason to privilege any one effect over the others. Our inferences on the basis of the relation of cause and effect are not founded on reason. Rather, they follow from the principle of *custom*. It is an instinctual principle of human nature that we expect the future to resemble our past experience. This instinctual principle, neither derived from nor preventable by reason, is the foundation of our knowledge of matters of fact and allows us to successfully get around in the world. Beliefs in matter of fact are derived as follows. We perceive an object (e.g., fire), in sense or memory, and by custom we move from the idea of this object to the idea of something constantly conjoined with it in past experience (e.g., heat).

Weblinks

"David Hume," William Edward Morris
http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/hume/

Critique of Pure Reason

Immanuel Kant

Reading Summary

All knowledge begins with experience. Objects affect our senses, producing representations, the raw materials that our understanding combines and separates into knowledge of objects. It does not follow, however, that all knowledge arises out of experience. We can distinguish between *a posteriori* knowledge, with its source in experience, and *a priori* knowledge, obtained independently of all experience. *A priori* knowledge concerns judgments and concepts that are *necessary* and *strictly universal*. For example, the judgment that a bachelor is an unmarried man is necessary because

Exploring Philosophy An Introductory Anthology 7th edition Cahn Test Bank