

NAME: _____

LANGARA COLLEGE

Philosophy 1101: Introduction to Philosophy

Solutions to Practice Quiz #4

TIME: 20 minutes

1. Match each claim to the philosopher(s) who agree(s) with it (either Leibniz, Hume, or both). [3 marks]

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Leibniz <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hume	The mere fact that coal has always burned in our past experience does not by itself logically entail that it will continue to do so in the future.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Leibniz <input type="checkbox"/> Hume	The way that animals form beliefs about the future is just from noticing simple patterns and expecting them to continue. This is quite different from the scientific reasoning that some humans do.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Leibniz <input type="checkbox"/> Hume	It is obvious that if some events can be foreseen before any test has been made of them, we must know some things innately.
<input type="checkbox"/> Leibniz <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hume	Knowledge about causes is never acquired through a priori reasoning, and always comes from our experience of finding that particular objects are constantly associated with one other
<input type="checkbox"/> Leibniz <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hume	Our beliefs about the future arise from a kind of natural instinct, which no reasoning or thought process can either produce or prevent.

2. What does Hume mean by 'custom', or 'habit'? [1 mark]

- A natural instinct to expect an observed pattern to continue
- A rule imposed by polite society
- An addictive behaviour
- A rational inference, based on understanding

3. In the table below I have summarised four different accounts of how humans can have innate (a priori) knowledge. Next to each view, write down the philosopher(s) who held that view. Choose from: *Plato, Descartes & Kepler, Kant, and Darwin*. [2 marks]

<i>Kant</i>	Things in the world owe their fundamental structure to our mind's own conceptual activity. All we can know about things <i>a priori</i> is what we have "put into them".
<i>Descartes and Kepler</i>	God implanted rational principles in us, to enable us to understand the world he made.
<i>Plato</i>	Before entering the physical world, our souls lived in the realm of the Forms, and had knowledge of them. This knowledge, though now hard to access, is still within us.
<i>Darwin</i>	Our minds have been shaped by natural selection over thousands of generations, so that our innate convictions come from this source.

4. Which of the following sentences express a 'relation of ideas', and which ones a 'matter of fact', according to Hume? [2 marks]

<i>Relation of ideas</i>	The angles inside a triangle add up to 180 degrees
<i>Matter of fact</i>	There are mountains on the moon
<i>Relation of ideas</i>	All tailors make clothes
<i>Matter of fact</i>	Sloths are good swimmers

5. Which of the following statements are theories (or hypotheses), and which are observations? [2 marks]

<i>hypothesis</i>	Iron atoms each have exactly 26 electrons.
<i>observation</i>	When Stevin and de Groot dropped lead balls of different sizes from the top of a church tower, they landed at the same time
<i>hypothesis</i>	Swim bladders evolved from lungs
<i>observation</i>	This shark has neither a swim bladder nor a lung

6. Hume writes, “Adam, even if his reasoning abilities were perfect from the start, couldn’t have inferred from the fluidity and transparency of water that it could drown him, or from the light and warmth of fire that it could burn him.”

What philosophical conclusion does Hume draw from examples of this sort? [2 marks]

Hume concludes that the effects of water and fire cannot be figured out by any kind of reasoning. (So, knowledge of cause and effect is only from experience.)

7. According to Hume, “All reasonings concerning matters of fact seem to be founded on the relation of *Cause* and *Effect*, which is the only relation that can take us beyond the evidence of our memory and senses.”

Give one example that illustrates this claim, i.e. describe a case where we use our knowledge of cause and effect to infer something we cannot observe. [3 marks]

We know from experience that fire turns a piece of wood black, and eats it away. So, if we find a piece of wood that looks like that, we infer that it was burned at some time in the past.

8. One day you’re touring a balloon factory, and you see one worker ask another, “What colour are the balloons in that box?” The second worker pulls out a random balloon from the box, and sees that it’s red. “The balloons in this box are all red”, he replies.

Suppose that the second worker’s belief (that all the balloons in the box are red) is *rationally justified*. In that case, explain why his observation of the single red balloon cannot be his only source of information about the box’s contents. [1 mark]

It’s logically possible that the box contains balloons of varying colours, and that he pulled out a red balloon by chance. If the worker is rationally justified in ruling this out, he must have extra information.

Suggest a possible piece of “background knowledge” that would (together with the observation of one red balloon) render the worker’s belief rationally justified. [1 mark]

“In this factory, the balloons in a given box are all the same colour”

9. Summarise Leibniz's argument that our ability to know universal scientific laws shows that we innately know some "inner principles", or "eternal laws of reason". [3 marks]

Leibniz says that universal laws, which describe what must always happen, don't logically follow from observations. (Observations only tell us about particular cases.) He also assumes that scientific conclusions are based on logical reasoning of some kind. Then, since logical reasoning cannot create new information, we must have some extra (innate) information that doesn't come from the senses.