# *Norton Introduction to Philosophy 2nd edition Rosen Test Bank*

SKU: 9780393624427-TEST-BANK

## Chapter 2 Is It Reasonable to Believe Without Evidence?

**TRUE/FALSE**

1. Pascal thinks that there is no argument that can settle the question of whether God exists or not.
   a. True
   b. False

   ANS: T DIF: Medium REF: p. 69
   TOP: The Wager, Pascal | Chapter 2: Is It Reasonable to Believe Without Evidence?
   MSC: Understanding

2. According to Pascal, if you wager that God exists, you risk nothing.
   a. True
   b. False

   ANS: T DIF: Difficult REF: p. 71
   TOP: The Wager, Pascal | Chapter 2: Is It Reasonable to Believe Without Evidence?
   MSC: Understanding

3. According to Hájek, the objection to the validity of Pascal's Wager may affect our reasoning in general.
   a. True
   b. False

   ANS: T DIF: Medium REF: pp. 83-84
   TOP: Pascal's Ultimate Gamble, Hájek | Chapter 2: Is It Reasonable to Believe Without Evidence?
   MSC: Understanding

4. Clifford thinks that we should not take anything on the authority of others.
   a. True
   b. False

   ANS: F DIF: Medium REF: pp. 90-91
   TOP: The Ethics of Belief, Clifford | Chapter 2: Is It Reasonable to Believe Without Evidence?
   MSC: Understanding

5. According to Clifford, our beliefs only affect us.
   a. True
   b. False

   ANS: F DIF: Easy REF: p. 87
   TOP: The Ethics of Belief, Clifford | Chapter 2: Is It Reasonable to Believe Without Evidence?
   MSC: Understanding

6. According to James, in general it is permissible to form beliefs because of our passional nature.
   a. True
   b. False

   ANS: F DIF: Difficult REF: pp. 100-101
   TOP: The Will to Believe, James | Chapter 2: Is It Reasonable to Believe Without Evidence?

Norton Introduction to Philosophy 2nd edition Rosen Test Bank

MSC: Understanding

7. Plantinga's position that belief in God is properly basic is a kind of natural theology.
   a. True
   b. False

   ANS: F DIF: Medium REF: p. 108
   TOP: Is Belief in God Properly Basic? Plantinga | Chapter 2: Is It Reasonable to Believe Without Evidence? MSC: Understanding

8. Buchak claims that your faith can remain epistemically rational as long as the utilities are high enough to warrant your acting in accordance with your faith.
   a. True
   b. False

   ANS: F DIF: Medium REF: p. 120
   TOP: When Is Faith Rational, Buchak | Chapter 2: Is It Reasonable to Believe Without Evidence?
   MSC: Understanding

9. According to Buchak, one way that faith is important is that it can help keep us from being misled over time.
   a. True
   b. False

   ANS: T DIF: Medium REF: p. 127-128
   TOP: When Is Faith Rational, Buchak | Chapter 2: Is It Reasonable to Believe Without Evidence?
   MSC: Understanding

**MULTIPLE CHOICE**

1. Pascal argues that our knowledge of _____ is analogous to our knowledge of God.
   a. our own minds
   b. the series of numbers
   c. the thoughts of others
   d. the world around us

   ANS: B DIF: Medium REF: p. 68
   TOP: The Wager, Pascal | Chapter 2: Is It Reasonable to Believe Without Evidence?
   MSC: Remembering

2. According to Pascal, if Christians try to prove that God exists, they are
   a. going against their own claims.
   b. doing what is rationally required of them.
   c. performing their duty as Christians.
   d. doing the will of God.

   ANS: A DIF: Medium REF: p. 69
   TOP: The Wager, Pascal | Chapter 2: Is It Reasonable to Believe Without Evidence?
   MSC: Understanding

3. One way to challenge Pascal's argument is to question
   a. whether God exists.

Norton Introduction to Philosophy 2nd edition Rosen Test Bank

b. whether God rewards believing that God exists.
c. whether we can understand an infinite.
d. whether we can prove that God exists or does not exist.

ANS: B DIF: Difficult REF: pp. 69-70
TOP: The Wager, Pascal | Chapter 2: Is It Reasonable to Believe Without Evidence?
MSC: Analyzing/Evaluating

4. In decision theory, _____ occur(s) when you know how good or bad an outcome is, but not how likely it is.
a. dominance reasoning
b. expected utility
c. decisions under uncertainty
d. decisions under risk

ANS: C DIF: Medium REF: p. 75
TOP: Pascal's Ultimate Gamble, Hájek | Chapter 2: Is It Reasonable to Believe Without Evidence?
MSC: Understanding

5. According to Hájek, if you play a fair game you should expect in the long run to
a. win significantly more times than you lose.
b. lose significantly more times than you win.
c. lose about the same amount of times that you win.
d. win slightly more times than you lose.

ANS: C DIF: Medium REF: p. 74
TOP: Pascal's Ultimate Gamble, Hájek | Chapter 2: Is It Reasonable to Believe Without Evidence?
MSC: Remembering

6. What is the expected utility of a coin flipping game where, when you flip a fair coin, you get $2 if it lands on heads, and you pay $4 if it lands on tails?
a. +$1
b. -$1
c. +$2
d. -$2

ANS: B DIF: Difficult REF: p. 75-76
TOP: Pascal's Ultimate Gamble, Hájek | Chapter 2: Is It Reasonable to Believe Without Evidence?
MSC: Applying

7. Hájek thinks that the most significant objection to Pascal's Wager is that it
a. establishes too much.
b. establishes that you should not believe in God.
c. establishes that there are many Gods.
d. establishes that the probability of God existing is zero.

ANS: A DIF: Medium REF: p. 82-83
TOP: Pascal's Ultimate Gamble, Hájek | Chapter 2: Is It Reasonable to Believe Without Evidence?
MSC: Understanding

8. According to Clifford, the shipowner who correctly believes his ship is sound on the basis of insufficient evidence is _____ the shipowner who believes his ship is sound on the basis of insufficient evidence causing people to lose their lives.

Norton Introduction to Philosophy 2nd edition Rosen Test Bank

a. not as bad as
b. luckier than
c. just as morally blameworthy as
d. just as rational as

ANS: C DIF: Medium REF: p. 86
TOP: The Ethics of Belief, Clifford | Chapter 2: Is It Reasonable to Believe Without Evidence?
MSC: Understanding

9. When does Clifford think it is lawful to stifle doubt?
a. Most of the time
b. Never
c. Always
d. On rare occasions

ANS: B DIF: Medium REF: p. 89
TOP: The Ethics of Belief, Clifford | Chapter 2: Is It Reasonable to Believe Without Evidence?
MSC: Remembering

10. One way to challenge Clifford's view about it being always wrong to believe without sufficient evidence is to argue that
a. sometimes sufficient evidence does not exist.
b. it can be very difficult to gather sufficient evidence.
c. sometimes we must believe one way or the other without having sufficient evidence.
d. sometimes we might think that we have sufficient evidence when we do not.

ANS: C DIF: Difficult REF: pp. 88-90
TOP: The Ethics of Belief, Clifford | Chapter 2: Is It Reasonable to Believe Without Evidence?
MSC: Analyzing

11. According to James, a hypothesis is _____ when it is forced, living, and momentous.
a. an important one
b. a genuine option
c. a plausible option
d. an insignificant one

ANS: B DIF: Easy REF: p. 98
TOP: The Will to Believe, James | Chapter 2: Is It Reasonable to Believe Without Evidence?
MSC: Remembering

12. According to James, a hypothesis that is 50 percent likely to be true is
a. live.
b. dead.
c. insignificant.
d. momentous.

ANS: A DIF: Medium REF: p. 98
TOP: The Will to Believe, James | Chapter 2: Is It Reasonable to Believe Without Evidence?
MSC: Understanding

13. James thinks that Clifford
a. makes the mistake of being irrational.
b. makes the mistake of treating the twin goals of knowers equally.

Norton Introduction to Philosophy 2nd edition Rosen Test Bank

c. makes the mistake of treating our goal of avoiding error as more important than the goal of knowing the truth.
d. makes the mistake of treating our goal of knowing the truth as more important than the goal of avoiding error.

ANS: C DIF: Medium REF: pp. 101-102
TOP: The Will to Believe, James | Chapter 2: Is It Reasonable to Believe Without Evidence?
MSC: Understanding

14. In order to show that James is mistaken, one would need to provide good reasons for thinking that
a. in most cases we should believe only according to our evidence.
b. in no cases we should believe only according to our evidence.
c. in all cases we should believe against our evidence.
d. in all cases we should believe according to our evidence.

ANS: D DIF: Medium REF: p. 103-105
TOP: The Will to Believe, James | Chapter 2: Is It Reasonable to Believe Without Evidence?
MSC: Analyzing

15. According to Plantinga, your belief that you have a headache (when you do) is
a. based on evidence.
b. irrational.
c. basic.
d. groundless.

ANS: C DIF: Easy REF: p. 107
TOP: Is Belief in God Properly Basic? Plantinga | Chapter 2: Is It Reasonable to Believe Without Evidence? MSC: Understanding

16. What does Plantinga think the evidentialist objection to theistic belief presupposes?
a. The truth of classical deontology
b. The truth of classical foundationalism
c. The truth of classical coherentism
d. The truth of classical infinitism

ANS: B DIF: Medium REF: p. 107
TOP: Is Belief in God Properly Basic? Plantinga | Chapter 2: Is It Reasonable to Believe Without Evidence? MSC: Remembering

17. One objection to the claim that belief in God is properly basic that Plantinga addresses is that
a. belief in God cannot be basic.
b. no beliefs are properly basic.
c. properly basic beliefs are groundless.
d. we could make the same claim about bizarre beliefs.

ANS: D DIF: Medium REF: p. 112
TOP: Is Belief in God Properly Basic? Plantinga | Chapter 2: Is It Reasonable to Believe Without Evidence? MSC: Understanding

18. Plantinga's response to the Great Pumpkin objection assumes that
a. classical foundationalism is true.
b. god exists.

c. there are good arguments for God's existence.
d. irrational beliefs can be properly basic.

ANS: B DIF: Difficult REF: pp. 113-114
TOP: Is Belief in God Properly Basic? Plantinga | Chapter 2: Is It Reasonable to Believe Without Evidence? MSC: Analyzing

19. Buchak claims that believing without any evidence is
a. a clear example of faith.
b. not an example of faith.
c. sometimes an example of faith.
d. often an example of faith.

ANS: B DIF: Medium REF: p. 117
TOP: When Is Faith Rational, Buchak | Chapter 2: Is It Reasonable to Believe Without Evidence?
MSC: Understanding

20. One way to challenge Buchak's position is to argue that
a. we should always act based on what we have faith in.
b. we should always act based on the actual utilities of our current situation.
c. we should always act based on the expected utilities of our current situation.
d. we should always act based on what we think is morally right in our current situation.

ANS: C DIF: Difficult REF: pp. 118-119
TOP: When Is Faith Rational, Buchak | Chapter 2: Is It Reasonable to Believe Without Evidence?
MSC: Analyzing

**COMPLETION**

1. Buchak claims that faith requires that you have a _____ toward the claim in question.

ANS: positive attitude

DIF: Medium REF: p. 116
TOP: When Is Faith Rational, Buchak | Chapter 2: Is It Reasonable to Believe Without Evidence?
MSC: Remembering

**ESSAY**

1. Would the sort of "properly basic" beliefs that Alvin Plantinga appeals to in his essay meet the requirements for epistemic rationality proposed by Lara Buchak?

ANS:
Answers will vary. A valid response should/might include a discussion of the two requirements for epistemic rationality (i.e., coherence and fit with the evidence) proposed by Buchak. A valid response should/might also include discussion of Plantinga's view of properly basic beliefs, particularly his claim that they do not have to be based on any evidence.

DIF: Medium REF: pp. 107-128
TOP: Chapter 2: Is It Reasonable to Believe Without Evidence?

Norton Introduction to Philosophy 2nd edition Rosen Test Bank

MSC: Understanding

2. How might Pascal (or someone who likes his view) best respond to the "many Gods" objection that Hájek discusses?

   ANS:
   Answers will vary. A valid response should/might include discussion of the many Gods objection. Additionally, a valid response should/might include discussion of how the potential for an infinite payoff that comes from believing in God may make it so that it is rational to believe in some God or other, rather than withholding belief.

   DIF: Medium REF: pp. 74-84 TOP: Pascal's Ultimate Gamble, Hájek
   MSC: Analyzing

3. Why does Clifford think that it is always wrong to believe contrary to one's evidence? How does James attempt to refute Clifford's argument?

   ANS:
   Answers will vary. A valid response should/might include discussion of Clifford's claims that our beliefs are necessarily connected with our actions. Additionally, a valid response should/might include discussion of Clifford's arguments that our beliefs (no matter how seemingly insignificant) have an effect on us and on society as a whole. Also, a valid response should/might include discussion of James's points that some decisions are forced (we have to choose); in such cases it may be rational to believe even without sufficiently strong evidence.

   DIF: Difficult REF: pp. 85-105
   TOP: Chapter 2: Is It Reasonable to Believe Without Evidence?
   MSC: Analyzing

4. Hájek suggests that Pascal's argument faces a problem because any action we may undertake seems to have infinite expected utility. However, he goes on to suggest that everyone may face this problem. Why does he say this? How is it that this problem could be a problem for everyone, not just those who accept Pascal's Wager?

   ANS:
   Answers will vary. A valid response should/might include discussion of how Hájek appeals to the problem of infinite expected utility to pose a problem for Pascal's Wager. A valid response should/might also include discussion of the fact that as long as the claims Pascal relies on in his argument do not have a probability of zero, any action we perform seems to have infinite expected utility. Finally, a valid response should/might include discussion of Hájek's point that it does not seem that we can reasonably assign a probability of zero to the claims of Pascal's argument.

   DIF: Medium REF: pp. 74-84 TOP: Pascal's Ultimate Gamble, Hájek
   MSC: Understanding

5. Are there important differences in how Pascal and Hájek each set up Pascal's Wager? How might these differences affect the plausibility of the argument?

   ANS:

Norton Introduction to Philosophy 2nd edition Rosen Test Bank

Answers will vary. A valid response should/might include discussion of how each of these authors sets up the Wager's argument. An important detail that a valid response should/might pick up on is the difference between how the two authors understand the outcome of believing in God in the case where God does not exist. Finally, a valid response should/might include discussion of how this difference can significantly affect what is being risked by believing that God exists.

DIF: Difficult REF: pp. 68-84
TOP: Chapter 2: Is It Reasonable to Believe Without Evidence?
MSC: Analyzing

Norton Introduction to Philosophy 2nd edition Rosen Test Bank