

INTRO TO PHILOSOPHICAL THOUGHT
FALL '19
THE FINAL

DUE: In our last meeting Dec. 12

Each component of parts I and II should be answered in the order they're asked, type written. Please *do not restate the questions* for me. Your answers should be derived from class readings, lectures, and from your own reasoning. Be sure not to plagiarize material from the Internet, fellow students, or anywhere else. In other words, when appropriate use quotation marks and give credit to sources.

Note: Submissions containing any plagiarized content would receive no credit.

PART I: Short Replies

Address the following, making sure that your answers are put in complete sentences and clear to the reader.

1. What are the parts of an argument?
2. Define the difference between deductive and inductive arguments.
3. What are the requirements for a deductive argument to be sound?
4. In the first required philosophy of mind reading, what does Kim mean by "the mark of the mental"? You don't have to list all the proposals that Kim covers—just explain what the concept is.
5. One proposal (in that same reading) is that intentionality is the mark of the mental. How does Kim state that idea? Second, in your own words, what's your understanding of the idea? Third, do you think it's plausible that all mental states have this characteristic? If yes, give some examples of types of mental states exhibiting this feature. If no, then give at least one example of a type of mental state that doesn't seem to have intentionality.

PART II: Short Essay Replies

Depending on which one you are more prepared for, choose *one* of the following versions of #6, and then either way do that last part of it.

6. In the second required reading, Kim identifies four "major tenets" of Descartes' substance dualism. First, state and explain them; and based on that, according to Descartes, is the mind a physical or a non-physical entity? Second, in class, we discussed an argument that raises an objection to Descartes' dualism i.e. an objection to the claim that the mind is non-physical. We called it the "Problem of Mental Causation Argument." Restate that argument, including the supporting argument which we called the "Causal Principle Argument." Briefly explain in your own words why this is a serious objection to the idea that the mind is non-physical.

Now, do you think that argument is sound or not? (In the technical sense of "sound" we introduced this semester.) If yes, then explain which aspect or aspects of the argument give sufficient reason that the mind couldn't be non-physical. If no, then articulate your

explanation of how a non-physical mind could initiate motion into neurons to, for example, get the body to pick up a cup of coffee.

7. We covered key aspects of Morrision's article "A Critical Examination of the Kalam Cosmological Argument" Regarding that, do the following. First, briefly explain, from lecture or from the earlier pages of Morrision's article:
 - What a "cosmological argument" is
 - The Principle of Correspondence
 - "Euclid's maxim"

Now reiterate Craig's version of the Kalam Cosmological Argument, as we reconstructed it in class. Make sure to include the following: the "core" Kalam argument (also on p. 96 of Morrision). What is the supporting justification for premise (1) of the core argument? What's the justification for premise (2)? (That second item would be the supporting argument involving the infinite library example, which is meant to show that an infinite series of past events is impossible.)

Finally, state whether or not you think that the Kalam Cosmological Argument provides a successful demonstration that God exists. When addressing this question, make sure to state your argument for why or why not. In other words, state your specific, concrete reasons for why the argument succeeds or fails.

8. First, restate the problem of evil argument. Second, briefly explain why it makes a strong case against the existence of a being who is omnipotent, omniscient, and morally perfect. Third, logically evaluate the argument. In your view, does the argument establish its point or is there a flaw in it? At this point you should make sure to do one of two things:

Option1:

If you think the Problem of Evil Argument fails, then:

- a. Identify where you locate the flaw in the argument
- b. State your counterargument for why the existence of an omniscient, omnipotent, morally perfect creator is in fact compatible with the amount of innocent suffering in the world. If your counterargument is one of the Theist replies we considered in class, then you'll need to also respond to the rebuttal we articulated.
- c. Finally, what would you like to investigate about this overall issue if you were to look into it in the future? Why that in particular?

Option2:

If you think the Problem of Evil Argument succeeds, then:

- a. Explain in your own words why you think it shows that it can't be the case that there's an omniscient, omnipotent, morally perfect creator.
- b. Now explain what you think would be the most compelling case the Theist *could make* in response to the problem of evil. What's your evaluation of that approach?
- c. Finally, what would you like to investigate about this overall issue if you were to look into it in the future? Why that in particular?