

Unit 2

PHI101: Introduction to Philosophy

Descartes, "New Foundations for Knowledge", pp. 21-25

1. List and explain three of the reasons Descartes gives for doubting what he thought he knew. Descartes provides three main reasons for doubting what he thought he knew. Firstly, he argues that the senses can be deceptive and cannot be trusted as a source of knowledge. Secondly, he points out that people often form beliefs based on the opinions of others, and these beliefs can be wrong. Finally, Descartes believes that the beliefs he has acquired throughout his life have been based on the opinions of others, and thus he cannot be sure that they are true. By doubting what he thought he knew, Descartes hoped to build a new foundation of knowledge based on certain and indubitable truths. Descartes had a goal of constructing a new foundation of knowledge based on certain and indubitable truths. To do this, he had to doubt what he thought he knew. He believed that by questioning his beliefs, he could uncover truths that were certain and could not be disputed. Descartes found a more reliable foundation for his knowledge by doubting his thoughts and beliefs.

2. While still in the realm of doubt, what does Descartes say about the general sciences and mathematics and their place in our knowledge? In his philosophical writings, the French philosopher René Descartes was one of the first thinkers to analyze the relationship between the general sciences and mathematics. While still in the realm of doubt, Descartes argued that mathematics is the most reliable form of knowledge and that it is the best foundation for the general sciences. He believed that they should build the general sciences upon the knowledge gained from mathematics as it is more certain and free from errors. Descartes argued that mathematics is more certain than the general sciences due to its reliance on concrete mathematical proofs and deductions. He believed that mathematics was a reliable foundation for the general sciences due to its ability to provide a surefire method of proof. He also argued that the general sciences are less reliable because they are based on theories and hypotheses, which can be easily refuted. Descartes believed that mathematics and the general sciences had different roles in our knowledge. While mathematics is a reliable way to gain certain knowledge, the general sciences are used to study natural phenomena. Descartes argued that the general sciences should be used to supplement the knowledge gained from mathematics and that the two should be seen as complementary rather than conflicting.

3. What does Descartes ultimately argue is a strong and unshakeable basis for knowledge? How does he make his case? René We widely regarded Descartes as the father of modern philosophy and the founder of the Cartesian method of reasoning. He argues that the only thing that can be known for certain is that one is thinking, and that this is the only true and certain knowledge. He makes his case by using a method of doubt, where he questions the validity of all his beliefs and assumptions.

Descartes argues that the only thing that can be known for certain is that one is thinking. He uses the phrase "I think, therefore I am" to express this idea, and states that this is the only true and certain knowledge. He believes that this knowledge is unshakeable, and that it is the foundation of all other knowledge. He also argues that this knowledge is not dependent on any external sources, such as the senses or the material world. Descartes makes his case by using a method of doubt. He questions the validity of all his beliefs and assumptions, and examines them to see if they can be trusted. He argues that since the only thing that can be known for certain is that one is thinking, then all other beliefs and assumptions must be questioned and examined. He believes that by using this method of doubt, he can establish a strong and unshakeable basis for knowledge. Descartes ultimately argues that the only thing that can be known for certain is that one is thinking, and that this is the only true and certain knowledge. He makes his case by using a method of doubt, where he questions the validity of all his beliefs and assumptions. He believes that by using this method of doubt, he can establish a strong and unshakeable basis for knowledge.

Locke, "The Senses as the Basis for Knowledge", pp. 25-31

1. Explain some of the reasons Locke believes there are no innate ideas. John Locke was a 17th century English philosopher who argued against the concept of innate ideas. He believed that all of our knowledge comes from experience and that nothing is known to us at birth. Locke argued that all ideas are derived from the senses and that they are not part of our original nature. Locke argued that if ideas were innate, they would be shared by all people, regardless of their experience. He believed that since ideas vary from person to person, they must be acquired through experience. He also argued that if ideas were innate, they would be clear and distinct, but instead, they are often confused and obscure. He believed that this was evidence that ideas were acquired through experience. Finally, Locke argued that if ideas were innate, they would be consistent, but instead,

they are often contradictory. He believed that this was further evidence that ideas were acquired through experience. He argued that since ideas vary from person to person, they must be acquired through experience. He believed that this was the only way to explain the variety of ideas that exist in the world. In conclusion, John Locke argued against the concept of innate ideas. He believed that all of our knowledge comes from experience and that nothing is known to us at birth. He argued that ideas vary from person to person and that they must be acquired through experience. He also argued that ideas are often confused and obscure, and that they are often contradictory, which is further evidence that they are acquired through experience.

2. What is the significance of "children" and "idiots" in Locke's argument? John Locke's argument in his *Second Treatise of Government* is that all people are born with natural rights, and that these rights cannot be taken away; it cannot take away these rights from them. To illustrate this, he uses the examples of children and idiots, who are unable to make rational decisions or understand the implications of their actions. He argues that, even though they are not able to make rational decisions, they still have the right to life, liberty, and property. This serves to emphasize the point that these rights are inherent to all people, regardless of their ability to make rational decisions. In this way, Locke uses the examples of children and idiots to illustrate the importance of the natural rights of all people.

3. Explain the concept of the "tabula rasa". The concept of tabula rasa is an ancient philosophical idea that suggests that people are born with a "blank slate" and that their experiences and environment shape who they become. This idea has been popularized by the 17th century philosopher John Locke, who argued that the mind is a "blank slate" at birth, and that knowledge and beliefs are acquired through experience. The concept of tabula rasa suggests that people are born with no pre-existing knowledge or beliefs, and that all of their knowledge and beliefs are acquired through experience. This means that people are not born with any innate knowledge or beliefs, and that their environment and experiences shaped their beliefs and values. This idea has been used to explain why people have different beliefs and values, as well as why people have different levels of intelligence. The concept of tabula rasa has been used to explain why people have different beliefs and values, and why people have different levels of intelligence. It suggests that people are born with a "blank slate" and that their experiences and environment shape who they become. This idea has been used to explain why people have different opinions and values, as well as why people have different levels of intelligence. It also suggests their environment and experiences can influence that people and that they can learn and grow from these experiences.

4. Describe in your own words what Locke means by "sensation" and "reflection" in describing the acquisition of knowledge. John Locke, one of the most influential philosophers of the Enlightenment period, believed that knowledge was acquired through two distinct processes: sensation and reflection. Sensation refers to the process of acquiring knowledge through the physical senses, such as sight, sound, taste, touch, and smell. This is the most basic form of knowledge, and it is the foundation for all other forms of knowledge. Reflection, on the other hand, is the process of acquiring knowledge through thought and reason. This type of knowledge is more complex, as it requires the individual to use their intellect to draw conclusions and form opinions.

Locke believed that knowledge could be gained through both sensation and reflection, and that both processes were necessary for a person to gain a full understanding of the world. He argued that knowledge gained through sensation was not enough, as it was too limited and could not provide insight into the complexities of the world. Reflection, however, was necessary to gain a deeper understanding of the world, as it allowed the individual to draw conclusions and form opinions based on their observations. In conclusion, John Locke believed that knowledge was acquired through two distinct processes: sensation and reflection. Sensation was the process of acquiring knowledge through the physical senses, while reflection was the process of acquiring knowledge through thought and reason. Both processes were necessary for a person to gain a full understanding of the world, as sensation provided the foundation for knowledge while reflection allowed the individual to draw conclusions and form opinions.