

NAME: _____

Philosophy 1101: Introduction to Philosophy

Solutions to Practice Quiz #2

1. Write the name of each view of perception (either 'direct realism' or 'representative realism') to the left of the summary of it below. [1 mark]

Represent "Perception is a process of informed guesswork in which the brain combines sensory signals with its prior expectations or beliefs about the way the world is to form its best guess of what caused those signals."

Direct "People who accept this view of perception suppose that the very images that their senses present to them are the external objects that they perceive."

2. Which of the following statements best express the representative realist's view of colour? (Select *two*) [2 marks]

- The colours of percepts in the visual field don't represent anything at all.
- During visual perception we are directly aware of external objects. So the colours we perceive are properties of the objects themselves.
- The colours of percepts in the visual field represent *other* properties of the external objects they represent.
- The colours of percepts in the visual field *misrepresent* external objects. They give us false information.
- The colours of percepts in the visual field usually give us true information, but it is represented in a non-literal way.

3. Match each claim to the name of the view of knowledge that it best fits with. (Write 'internalism' or 'externalism' to the left of each statement below.) [1 mark]

externalism "A dog cannot even understand the basic idea of having a reason for a belief, so it has no explicit access to any reasons at all. And yet dogs do know things, such as the fact that there is a squirrel in the back yard."

internalism "A person can have knowledge only if the person is consciously aware of evidence that the belief is true."

4. Which of the following objects are *internal*, and which are *external*? [4 marks]

internal a tree percept in someone's visual field

external B.C. Place stadium, in downtown Vancouver

internal my idea of Miami, Florida

internal the redness of a ripe tomato

5. Fill in each of the blanks below with either 'sceptic' or 'radical sceptic'. [1 mark total]

In philosophy, a anti-realist is a person who says that there is no God's Eye Point of View that we can know or usefully imagine; there are only the various points of view of actual persons, reflecting various interests and purposes that their descriptions and theories promote.

In philosophy, a sceptic is a person who keeps an open mind, i.e. suspends belief, until there is sufficient evidence to settle the issue



In philosophy, a radical sceptic is a person who doubts (until there is sufficient evidence to settle the issue) some claims that ordinary people would regard as known for certain. Such claims include the general reliability of memory and the senses, the reality of the external world, the existence of the past, and the existence of conscious beings other than oneself.

6. Fill each blank in the statements below with either 'internalism' or 'externalism'. [1 mark]

Externalism says that if a person is a genuine clairvoyant, this means that their clairvoyant beliefs are the product of normal (for them) cognitive mechanisms, and so are warranted. They are really no different from beliefs arising from vision and hearing, which of course don't usually require independent verification.

According to internalism, even a genuine clairvoyant should not trust their clairvoyant beliefs until they have solid evidence of their clairvoyant ability. Without such evidence these beliefs are more likely to be hallucinations, and it would be irresponsible to accept them.

7. For each representing property below, say whether it represents (a) (approximately) truly or falsely, and (b) literally or non-literally. [3 marks total]

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>The <i>absolute size</i> of this representation of Stanley Park (derived from Google Maps).</p>  | <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> True <input type="checkbox"/> False</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Literal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-literal</p> <p>(since 1 cm represents 1 km)</p> |
| <p>The <i>shape</i> of this same representation of Stanley Park</p> | <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> True <input type="checkbox"/> False</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Literal <input type="checkbox"/> Non-literal</p> |
| <p>The positions of this woman's eyes, in the portrait drawn by her 3 year old daughter.</p>  | <p><input type="checkbox"/> True <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> False</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Literal <input type="checkbox"/> Non-literal</p> |

Explanation of the Answers

It is a standard map of Stanley Park, so it is intended to be true and presumably is true. The shape then should be the same as the shape of the real park, i.e. the shape is represented literally. Concerning the size, however, 1 km of the park is represented by about 1 cm of map, so it's non-literal. (Take note, Zoolander.)

I also would assume that the 3 year old is *attempting* to draw her mother's face accurately, so that it will "look like Mom". Thus the positions of the eyes should be interpreted literally. However, the positions are false, since the eyes of real people are close to the middle of the face, not close to the top as shown.

8. Explain why internalists have some difficulty in agreeing that the accurate perceptual beliefs formed by ordinary people count as knowledge. [2 marks]

Perceptual beliefs are formed by subconscious brain processes that we (ordinary people) have no understanding of. How then is it possible to oversee and supervise such processes? (as is required for knowledge according to internalists).

9. Summarise the ‘brain in a vat’ sceptical scenario, and explain why it might force internalists about knowledge to become radical sceptics. [3 marks]

A brain in a vat (BIV) is someone whose brain was removed from their body, and kept alive in a vat of nutrients. The brain is hooked up to a perfect VR simulation, so they have the same experiences as a normal person. Internalists say that knowledge needs justification, so if they claim to know (e.g.) that they have hands, then they need to have evidence against alternative beliefs, such as that they’re a BIV. But it seems that no such evidence is possible.