(( recall )) ⇒ dox[((thoughts and feelings)) & (( sciencia ))]

* **philosophy of action**
  + If P wishes to do action X, with manner m, but does it with manner n, then P did not do X intentionally.
  + One can have a reason to do X, and do X, without that reason being the reason X was done.
  + *guise of the good – do we ever do bad*
  + We find reason for our actions, but they are not always why we act. A future entity—the reason—cannot be the cause of a past entity —the action.
  + Do all actions stem from a purpose? Even if a minimal or unaware one? If there is no purpose, why was it done?
* **mysticism and mind**
  + *Philosophical God*
  + *God as Good or Love*
  + *Corruption as absence of God, or The Good*
  + Our world as in imperfect image (monads, forms, …)
  + How would the immaterial (a soul) interact with the material (a body)?
  + God as a thinking thing
  + the ego
    - problems of identity
    - non-self
  + a universal mind
  + cause(idea(X)) > idea(X) [ how only infinite-being could cause an idea of infinity ]
  + If immaterial is more real than material, what use does the material serve? As a housing to experience? Akin to software needing a machine in executing its abstractions? The physical as change, whereas the mental is static. Matter as the potentiality for all actuality.
  + soul not as a separate entity of the body, but they are necessary complements (one cannot be without the other; has relationship akin electricity & magnetism)
  + (immaterial is full actuality, so there is nothing to change. matter is full of potentiality though, so there is much to change)
  + (nous nousing nous ⇒ best being doing the best activity of the best object, which is pure actuality [and pure actuality has no potentiality] ⇒ only activity done, can be done, all simultaneous as temporal schism would imply potentiality )
  + ( [?] changing the accidents of a mind, such as its beliefs and sensations, does not change the mind. However, the body does change it)
* **perception**
  + visual priority – senses and contact
  + we are our theaters – why direct realism falls short
    - I do not doubt that external objects can exist. I am quite familiar with coffee and computers, not once doubting that I interact with them often. However, all that I experience is what is reported to me by the brain, through perception, messaged by my senses. Imagine each sense of yours, vision and sound alike, having switches. Those blind have their vision switched off; those deaf have sound switched off. You can imagine that the faculties, such as the eyes and brain, still remain while the switches are off. A blind man has eyes after all. Do this switching-off for your own senses, slowly one after the other. What would you be then, once each sense is silenced? A thought process? A body without a monitor to relay information? Nothing? We depend on these sense processes to determine what we are and what we can know. Every fact you’ve heard, every person you’ve seen, all has been given to you by what you have collected from the senses. Senses appear fairly reliable – they help us interact in the world in a way that seems accurate. My eyes will reliably lead me where I need to go. But be humble, as you are assigning the senses some serious trust.
  + qualia – qualities as additional knowledge
  + Is order an element in an array of a collection versus its set ([abc] [cba])?
  + can matter be without predicates? can primary qualities be without secondary qualities?
  + predicate or predicated first?
  + do relations, such as *in* and *left of*, exist without thought or awareness? or are they mental constructs?
  + sensation vs perception (e.g. sound vs soundwave)
  + solipsism and nihilism
  + hard questions of consciousness – how senses arise from organs
  + the mind as a blank slate vs innate ideas
  + ( we do not *see* objects themselves but come to interpret them from shape, color, cues,..)
  + ( “unicorns” do exist. Of course not physically. But why must being material be a pre-requisite? Mental states and ideas of objects are both existing things. Right now, you are thinking. But how many people would write off those thoughts as something false? They are not material objects but seem awfully real nonetheless. And the idea of a unicorn does exist – do we doubt that it has properties? It remains nothing more than idea, but ideas exist on the same grounds as thoughts. Is a story not anything more than the ink on its pages? )
* **happiness**
  + philosophy being the tool to happiness – happiness from wisdom
  + success is not fully defined for you expect by you
  + happiness is not your pleasures
  + happiness as a continual process and not a switch – happiness in the gloom
  + (pleasure is not self-sufficient. there can always be more)
  + happiness as the universal [goal] for which we all strive
* **philosophy itself**
  + defining philosophy itself
    - what philosophers do
    - etymology
    - hard to bound (though usually easy to detect)
    - learning how to die (i.e. learning how to live)
  + practicality of philosophy
    - theory (facts) vs application (uses), as with other fields
      * the process > the content
      * akin to a mere reader of cs vs one who practices programming
      * establishes modes of new thoughts to aid other fields of thought. Arguably related, Einstein’s imagination and abstractions of hypothetical situations, as well as the world among us, has provided great benefit.
    - nb philosophy vs philosophology
    - living the happy life
    - critical thinking, clear communication
    - nourishing the soul
    - easier to learn disciplines once foundation is built
    - used each day (even without acknowledgement)
    - how philosophy (study) leads to philosophy (principles)
      * meaning, changing our outlooks and reactions regarding thoughts of responsibility, the good life, what happens to us post-death have profound effects on the life we live now and could achieve
      * if we better understand our values, then we can demonstrate where changes ought to occur. We lay a path to remove from our stagnancy of things being and understood now to a life that flows to what is achievable. In short, the better we understand the world, the easier it is to navigate (just as exposure to a city leads to easier driving). The more we understand ourselves, the more we may determine where we are to where we ought to be.
    - …
  + hardest terms to define are the simplest (a, the, is, has, …)
  + validity and soundness (do true premises guarantee result? Are the Ps true?)
  + difference of is and has – Leibniz’s Law
  + all negatives as deficits
  + ~X =/= Y
  + being vs becoming – does existence require instantiation?
  + vice ⇒ vicious – pleasures hinder invaluable passions
  + absolutes having to exist as base (comparator) of partials
  + x appears so either because x is so or something causes the appearance
  + necessary & sufficient conditions
  + essence & accident
  + nominalism & universals
* **sciencia**
  + Gravity is for all: all things pull on all other things.
  + primary vs secondary qualities
  + materialism
    - vs alternatives (+ short ‘proofs’ for them)
    - what breathes the fire?
  + void vs plenum
  + relativity – reference frames
    - electricity = magnetism ≫ light
  + matter = energy ⇒ how matter is very, very slow-moving energy (models are just models)
* **knowledge**
  + defining knowledge – JTP + x? – why is it so difficult for something so familiar?
    - how do you know, with pure certainty? dismiss the unreliable (e.g. senses and illusions, dreams, history / testimony…)
    - luck as not knowledge
  + K(k) principle – forgetting knowledge
  + pure knowledge as restricted (+ skepticisms [~K(p), not K(~p)])
    - mentality regardless of external (e.g. vat, Matrix)
    - tautologies / logos (+ circularity error, systematic wrongness, inf. regress)
    - existence
    - …
  + knowledge as an art
    - knowledge of only probabilities or axioms (+systematic wrongness)
    - knowledge as an external asymptote
  + Can knowledge come from reason? Is Logos knowledge (or a tool)?
  + Can you imagine anything that you have not already fundamentally sensed?
  + You do not acquaint anything directly but through sense data (i.e. we can only experience firsthand our own experiences, reference or think about others’)
  + Knowledge as contextual / relational
  + Knowledge as pragmatic / practical
* **nihil**
  + *“nothingness* does not reference the non-existence of something. Existence does not have a negation or opposite. When we talk of nothing, we talk of a state of affairs of the world. For instance, if we claim nothing is in a box, we are not stating that there is in the box an object that does not exist. Rather, we convey the state of affairs such that there is nothing (visibly) there. For another example: fairies do contain a property of non-existence that they have *activated*. But we describe that there is a universe such that there is no true fairies.
  + Nothingness seems self-defeating for many reasons – one being that a void would remain a concept, which is a thing.
  + Non-existence seems self-defeating by definition. This is since non-being is not so, its very meaning, therefore all exists.