

## Exam 2

Turn in this test via Turnitin on Blackboard (under the tab marked “Exams”). Answer all 10 questions sufficiently. Due by end-of-day Friday, November 15.

- 1) Proponents of the fine-tuning argument say that the fine-tuning “calls out for an explanation.” What do they mean, and are they correct?
- 2) In class, Looney explained that the possibility of multiverse deflates the Fine-Tuning Argument for God. Explain why that is.
- 3) What is Pascal’s Wager supposed to show? How well or poorly does it show that (and why)?
- 4) What do you think Climacus would say to a proponent of the fine-tuning response (why do you think he would say this)?
- 5) Here’s the formal Argument from Gratuitous Suffering:
  - 1) An all-good God eliminates all the gratuitous suffering that that it knows about that it is able to.
  - 2) All all-knowing God knows about all the suffering.
  - 3) An all-powerful God is able to eliminate all suffering.
  - 4) There is gratuitous suffering.
  - 5) Therefore, there is no all-good, all-knowing, all-powerful God.

Here’s a [bad] response to the Problem of Gratuitous Suffering: “God allows suffering because suffering on Earth makes us able to fully enjoy heaven.” What’s the relationship between this response and the formal argument?

*6 and 7 are excerpts from Philosophical Fragments. Explain what these excerpts mean. Imagine your audience is someone else who read PF, but isn’t confident about what it means or the lingo in it. So, be sure to explain unusual terms. (I don’t think you can do all this just a few sentences.)*

6) “Now if the learner is to obtain the truth, the teacher must bring it to him, but not only that. Along with it, he must provide him with the condition for understanding it, for if the learner were himself the condition for understanding the truth, then he merely needs to recollect, because the condition for understanding the truth is like being able to ask about it—the condition and the question contain the conditioned and the answer. (If this is not the case, then the moment is to be understood only Socratically.)” (p. 14)

7) “Consequently, it is easy for the contemporary learner to become a historical eyewitness, but the trouble is that knowing a historical fact—indeed, knowing all the historical facts with the trustworthiness of an eyewitness—by no means makes the eyewitness a follower, which is understandable, because such knowledge means nothing more to him than the historical.” (p. 59)

8) Tillich seems to suggest that humans are the source of the holiness of holy things. BUT it seems that God would be holy, even if there were no humans. How should Tillich respond to this?

9) Tillich says that doubt is essential to faith. Imagine a religious person who exemplifies this. Explain how in their religion this doubt would be manifested.

10) Explain, how do *you* respond to the Problem of Gratuitous Suffering. Be very specific. (i.e. in what ways do you deny one of the premises or accept the conclusion or have some other response?) Also answer whether it makes theism more, less, or the same in terms of plausibility?