Study Guide for Exam #2  
Phil 1000, Fall 2008

For Exam #2 you will be expected to know all the readings and be able to discuss intelligently the issues, arguments, and criticisms involved on the topics covered. As a suggestion for preparing for this exam, review all the points discussed in class and in the readings. You are expected to have familiarity with the different argument forms and fallacies in the Logic Handout, especially those discussed in the readings or lectures. Below are some of the issues worth highlighting for a more detailed review.

**EPISTEMOLOGY**
Authors: Descartes, Hume, Unger, Kitcher
Knowledge vs. Belief
Sources and Types of Knowledge
Justified True Belief (JTB)
The Skeptic’s Challenge
    Reliability of perception
    Problem of the criterion
    Dogmatism
Appearance vs. Reality
Descartes’s Method of Doubt
    Dreaming Conjecture
    Malicious Demon Conjecture
The Cogito Argument
Clear and distinct ideas
Rationalism and Foundationalism
Solipsism and the Problem of External World
Ideas and Impressions (Hume)
Relations of Ideas and Matters of Fact (Hume)
Problem of Induction
Principle of the Uniformity of Nature (PUN)
Empiricism
Foundationalism and Coherentism
Fallibility and Testable Hypotheses
Naive Falsificationism
Predictive Success
Confirming and Disconfirming Observations
Auxillary Hypotheses
Three features of Successful Science
Unification and the Principle of Parsimony

**MIND**
Authors: Russell, Descartes, Searle (x2), Lycan
Argument by Analogy for Other Minds
Evaluating the Analogy
Hasty Generalization Objection
Descartes’ Argument Against Animal Minds
Variability and “Real Speech”
Language (units of meaning and productivity)
Morgan's Canon
Psychological levels
Mechanism, Sentience and Sapience
Consciousness, Intentionality, and Thoughts
Behavior and Causes of Behavior
Artificial Intelligence
The Turing Test
Lycan’s Robot Arguments
Harry and Henrietta
Computational Machines
Strong AI and Weak AI
Chinese Room Argument
Systems Objection
Robot Objection
Essay Questions: The following are five possible questions that will be asked on Exam #2. Of these five, three will be selected to be on the exam; and of those three you will have to write on two of your choice. Each question should be answered as completely and thoroughly given the limits of space and time for the exam. Notice that each question is composed of a number of sub-questions you will need to address. I recommend at least one paragraph for each of these sub-questions. Your goal should be to demonstrate to me that you have a competent grasp of what the issue is and the various positions for and against the variety of views discussed in each issue.

A. Descartes has argued against skepticism. What is his argument that answers the skeptic’s challenge? How is this a form of foundationalism? Evaluate whether Descartes was successful in establishing a rational justification for all knowledge. Why did he succeed or fail?

B. According to Hume, why is the Principle of the Uniformity of Nature (PUN) essential to justifying inductive knowledge (generalizations and predictions)? Why is Hume skeptical of this type of justification? Evaluate his argument on this point: how would you attempt to answer Hume’s skepticism? (Does it answer Hume’s skepticism?)

C. According to Kitcher, the naïve falsificationist view of science is a popular but incomplete description of how science actually works. Briefly describe what this naïve view is, and then explain what the more complete picture is supposed to look like (according to Kitcher's account.) Identify one serious epistemological problem that faces this more complete account of science.

D. The argument by analogy for other minds suggests that other non-human animals probably have minds like us humans. Spell out this argument by analogy and then critically evaluate it raising at least one serious objection to the analogy (and a reply to the objection). Does the fact that animals don’t really have a language like humans suggest that non-human animals don’t have minds?

E. Assume we have constructed a computational machine that can pass the Turing Test. According to Strong AI this is sufficient to show that the machine has a mind. Do you agree or disagree? How does the Chinese Room argument attempt to show that Strong AI is mistaken? Do you agree or disagree? Explain your answers.