

## Spring 2020 Honors Philosophy of Human Nature Exam 2 Study Guide

**Concepts** *You should know both the definitions of these concepts and understand the role they played in the readings and lectures.*

- Rationality *vs.* Intelligence (I)
- Two Reasons to think that Rational Beings aren't Common (8)
- Uninteresting *vs.* Interesting Answers to the Question: Why are there Rational Beings? (8)
- Vaguely Scientific Problems with the Chance Answer (8)
- The Metaphysical Problem: the Fine Tuning Argument (8&9.1)
- Objection 1 to the FTA (9.1)
- The Merchant's Thumb Principle (9.1)
- The Main Problem with Objection 1 (9.1)
- Objection 2 to the FTA (9.2)
- Problems with Objection 2 (9.2)
- Objection 3 to the FTA (9.2)
- Problems with Objection 3 (9.2)
- Objection 4 to the FTA (9.2)
- Observation Selection Effect (9.2)
- Wormsley Glenn (9.2)
- What the FTA Shows (Arche, Chaos, Logos) (9.2)
- What the FTA Shows Probabilistically (Class)
- The Simulation Argument (B)
- The Posthuman Stage (B)
- Ancestor Simulation (B)
- The Assumption (B)
- DOOM (B)
- CONVERGENCE (B)
- SIM (B)
- The Core No Evidence Argument (H)
- The Four Main Problems with the Core No Evidence Argument (H)
- Testimony and Evidence (H)
- The Historical Conception of Faith *vs.* Fideism (H)
- Sociobiology (S)
- Why Sociobiological Explanations may have the Reverse of their Intended Effect (S)
- Altruism (S)
- The Unit of Selection (S)
- The Ambiguity in Saying that a Trait (like Altruism) has "Evolved" (S)
- Psychological Egoism (SL)
- Psychological Egoism and Traditional Morality (SL)
- Strictly Conscientious Actions (SL)
- The Argument from our Strongest Desires (SL)
- The Problem with the Argument from our Strongest Desires (SL)
- The Argument from Expected Benefit (SL)
- Foreseen *vs.* Intended Consequences (SL)
- The Appeal to Guilty Consciences (SL)
- The Problem with the Appeal to Guilty Consciences (SL)

**Short Answer Questions** *You should be prepared to answer every part of every one of these questions—you should write drafts or at least detailed outlines of your answers in order to be properly prepared for the exam.*

1. Please *explain* the two reasons PvI gives for thinking that rational beings are not common in our part of the cosmos.
2. Please *explain* the first objection to the Fine Tuning Argument discussed by PvI, and (explain) why he thinks it fails. Do you agree? Why or why not? Please defend your answer.
3. PvI thinks that there *is* an objection that works against the Fine Tuning Argument. Please explain this objection, and how/why it is supposed to work. Do you agree with PvI that the objection works? Why or why not? Please defend your answer.
4. Please *explain* Bostrom's simulation argument, and its conclusion. (Make sure to identify the conclusion correctly.) Do you find the argument convincing? Why or why not? Please defend your answer.
5. Please *explain* the general form of the "no evidence" argument for atheism and *one* objection to the argument discussed by Hawthorne. Do you find the **objection** convincing? Why or why not? Please defend your answer.
6. Please *explain* what sociobiology is and the "problem of altruism" it faces. What is the standard (most widely accepted) solution to the problem of altruism? What is the "disambiguation" solution to the problem? Do you find either solution convincing? If not, why not? If so, which solution do you find more convincing, and why?
7. Please *explain* what psychological egoism is, and how appealing to guilty consciences is supposed to support it. Please *explain* why Shafer-Landau doesn't think this appeal works. Do you agree with Shafer-Landau? Why or why not?
8. What is the Argument from Expected Benefit, and how does the existence of foreseen (expected) but unintended consequences undermine it? Please make sure to give an example of a foreseen but unintended consequence to illustrate the concept.