# Review Session

## Only one page and half is not enough

* Answer the prompt
* Explain your terms (Ex. criterion of knowledge)
* Explain your inferences, break down all the pieces of argument
* Original insight

Predicate subject

External existential

Why isn't Berkeley deterministic

1. What is Descartes’s method of doubt? How does the method guide the development of the Meditations?

Negative argument vs positive argument

Negative aim vs positive aim

Cartesian skepticism is a negative method employed for positive aims. Not so different form the Socrates’ method. “How much water it holds?” Cannot build epistemic structure on a bad foundation. Method of doubt is a kind of test. A claim x is going to be certain if and only if it is immune from any doubt. 1st meditation: destroying everything, negative phase. 2-6 positive phase. “I think therefore I exist” is the foundation of everything to come. Cogito: clear and distinct. The Cartesian double generates endurable proposition(Cogito) and then generates the criterion of knowledge (clear and distinct). All starts with negative Cartesian skepticism and then builds everything up. He is applying…

Destroys shady beliefs

Helps identify indubitable prop

Generates criterion

2. What does Descartes mean by clear and distinct perception. How does he arrive at the rule that whatever he perceives clearly and distinctly must be true. What does he regard as the main objection to this rule, how does he propose to deal with this objection, and how successfully.

He wants to know things beyond doubt (cognito, thinking thing) and summarize their characteristics

Criterion of knowledge:

Clarity: Beyond doubt, attempts to doubt utterly self destroy (doubt leads to no doubt) Once I start to doubt my own existence, then it is a property, so that I exist

Distinctness: Understanding the meaning of the proposition leads to certainty (distint concepts going to be fixed, not going to be any alternate meaning within proposition), ex. 2+2=4, no way to understand what +,2,= means, meanings has to be fixed and not vague, entertain the concept of x, cannot be confused of what x means, then you will understand y immediately

But,

last prop to be salvaged is the mathematic props, but maybe the evil deceiver

vs

2+2=4 -> CDP -> indubitable

It should be certain by criterion, but we are doubting it, so seems uncertain, so CDP maybe not a good criterion of knowledge

2 kinds of epistemic movements, slight metaphysical doubt problem:  
1. Direct entertaining the idea x (every time I focus on the meaning of these terms, it becomes certain)

2. Indirect: stop thinking about 2+2=4, I begin to doubt

How does he solve this problem? God

3. Explain and critically discuss Descartes’s arguments for what he calls the “real distinction” between mind and body.

D’s arguments for why mind and body is distinct is clear, not complicated, what is complicated is trying to understand what

Cogito: I think, therefore I am

Property must have a subject

Thinking 🡪 Thinking thing

Thinking is not presupposing physicality

Imagination is holding your mind an image of thing

We don’t have mind depending on consciousness, but we don’t have mind depending on external thing

Conceptual Distinction(mind dependent, how we think about things) 🡪 Metaphysical Distinction

How to help D out of this? Appeal to CDP, If CDP, maybe have existensial import

4. What does Leibniz mean by the “complete notion” of an individual substance? Why must an individual have a complete notion? Explain some consequences of Leibniz’s view. Does the theory of complete notions mean that everything that happens does so necessarily? Is it compatible with freedom of the will?

i). Complete notion: Listing of the totality of facts about individual

* Intrinsic: how many molecules I have, how tall I am
* Relational: I am 20 feet away from Adam (will not understand this if I only have intrinsic notion about me), temporal relational fact

If you list all of these facts about me, you will know all of the fact about the universe, you will also know what’s going to follow (If you know what I am reading in the computer, you will know what I’m going to say) 🡪 determined (given all the facts at time1, everything will be necessary at time2)

ii). Principle of the best: a set of possible worlds, God is going to look into all these worlds out of his benevolence, he chooses the best possible world

If we don’t have complete notion, there would be epistemic blind spots, something that we cannot know about, look at section 8

Principle of Indistinguishable Identity

Principle of Non Contradiction

Causation(section 8 and 26)

How individual substances don’t interact with each other causally, nothing goes beyond pre-established harmony, no passing over one property to another (come out of nowhere, contradicts principle of sufficient reason)

No causation but necessity?

iii) free will: It seems as if things cannot be any other way than it actually is. L: maybe it is true at this possible world, but look at other possible worlds, other things can happen. Metaphysical Possible vs Epistemic Certainty

Leibniz thinks metaphysical necessity

Distinction between Nec & Contingent: e.g. Nec: 2+2=4 nec in all worlds, it doesn’t depend on anything else. Cont: have chalk, is not necessary, so comparably free

He’s tweaking what it means to be free in terms of possible worlds

5. How does either (a) Leibniz or (b) Spinoza propose to overcome Descartes’s dualism of mind and body?

L’s answer: the denial of physical matter

Think of substance with existence

S: Mind and body are one thing, M=B, but Descartes has shown a lot of differences that thing in one is not inherent in another (M: subjective, logic, B: certain physicals that are not found in mind, ex. Motion, maybe you can represent motion in mind, but not real motion), S’s answer, these are all the attributes of the entity, expression?

Extension: physical events, electron from neuron to neuron

Subjective quality of physical event

Two possible description of one event: Subjective sense of what it is like and Mathematical logic description vs Neuro events, they are the same thing

Don't read ethics, read Stanford encyclopedia

Can also say conceptual and causal

Mode (modification of existence): You cannot understand external x using internal mind

Forget primary text

Empiricists vs Rationalists:

R: Thought/Judgement vs Imagination (not reliable)

E: Imagination is only form of thought we have (thought is like images of things flying), cannot form thought

Cause:   
God:

Substance (for Berkeley):

6. The purpose of Locke’s Essay Concerning Human Understanding is to investigate the “scope and limits” of human knowledge. What does Locke mean by “knowledge”, what sorts of knowledge does he recognize, and how does he think we get them? Give some examples of what Locke takes to be important limits to human knowledge, explaining how they are determined.

Locke’s general definition of knowledge: agreement and disagreement between ideas

“Conceptual Empiricism”: raw sensing (sound, black) is the building block of objects as battery of concepts 🡪 innate capacities(my capacity to generalize these), but no innate ideas at all

Locke: generalize a circle out of a clock

D: have idea of circle in the mind

(十八边型)

6. Explain Locke’s distinction between primary and secondary qualities and why he thinks that the distinction should be made. Why does Berkeley reject the distinction? What are the implications of this dispute for their conceptions of scientific knowledge?

Locke distinguishes primary quality and secondary quality of objects:  
primary: number motion (innate in itself)

Secondary: color, taste, smell, etc (relative to perceiver), a disposition causing a certain kind of sensation

Leibniz: color is innate, but Locke thinks it is a power

Locke doesn’t know why such things have cerain power but he believes science will get through

Why Berkeley rejects such distinction: There’s no distinction between 2 qualities because you cannot know primary quality if you don’t have secondary quality since you cannot make sense of it if you don’t know color.

Primary quality is also perceived. 1. Matter is just an inert and passive stuff, so it doesn’t have power, because it cannot be active as power has. 2. Secondary qualities are all mental, having such mental stuff has to be supported by primary quality doesn’t make sense to Berkeley

Berkeley: no distinction at all, everything is like secondary qualities, but he does not call it secondary quality

Instrumentalism

Locke: when you are we are trying to describe regularity, science is just the instrument, not explain things, we are getting ultimate nature of the world when we do physical science

8. Berkeley thinks that the very idea of material substance is contradictory: why? Does his rejection of material substance yield a satisfactory solution to Descartes’s sceptical problem about our knowledge of the external world?

Something that is not mental cannot support mental properties

When you are writing essay:

Post what problem is

Give thesis

Defend

Ex. For this question:

state what Descartes’ problem is: Mind and body

World is clock like, how does mind fit into such world? Minds do not exist in space. Minds only interact with mental stuff, ideas, do not have direct contact with external world, so we only have copy of the external world, then how do we sure if the copy images are real?

Berkeley rejects the external world existence, so he rejects primary and secondary qualities, so in this way mind only interacts ideas, but the ideas will not go wrong anyways (Descartes says maybe deception there),

what it is in mind, even by the evil deceiver is just what world is

Successful? 1. Cannot ditch in order to resolve the line 2. Mind maybe have disagreements

9. Why does Hume deny that inferences from the observed to the unobserved are guided by “Reason”? Why does he think of this denial as sceptical? What is his “sceptical” solution to his own sceptical doubts? In what sense is it sceptical? In what way is it a solution?

Problem of Induction

Particular 🡪 general

Observed 🡪 unobserved

Everything upto now xxx 🡪 everything in the future yyy

Everything here xxx 🡪 everything there yyy

Hume: this induction not necessarily true, it is contingent, you can always imagine a deviant case, also circularity

So how to solve it? Skeptical solution: I cannot give you a reason why I use this, but I can give you an explanation of such solution(skeptical). This is what we do and we cannot do otherwise(solution).

Don't bring out inference as rational, just out of my psychology

10. According to Hume, what does the cause-effect relationship consist in and what sense can we make of concepts like “power” and “necessary connection”? Explain the implications of Hume’s view of causation, as he understands them, for the problem of free will versus determinism.

11. “A miracle can never be proved, so as to be the foundation of a system of religion.” Explain and evaluate Hume’s reasons for making this claim.

12. Kant asks “How is pure mathematics possible?” What, according to Kant, is so problematic about mathematics that the question of its possibility needs to be answered? What is Kant’s is the question to be answer?

Hume: two kinds of judgements: relations of ideas vs matters of fact

R: “All bachelors are male”, no need to experience

🡪 “nec true”

Test: imagine is the judgement: try to imagine a counterexample (triangle with != 3 sides)

🡪 “knowable aprori”

True by meaning

M: “My brother is tall”

🡪 Contingent

🡪 Not knowable aprori

Truth depends on how the world is

Mathematics: Truth depends on how the world is, but it is necessarily true, which straps the line

Kant’s answer (2 categories 🡪 4 categories):

A priori A posteriori/ Empirical

Analytic All brothers are male X

Synthetic 5+7=12, My brother is tall

every event has a cause, etc

Transcendental Idealism (Berkeley)

Aspects of the world are mind dependent

🡪 how’s spatiality, temporality, causation possible

🡪 first two questions are answered as pure forms of intuition, third basic conceptual category

endorsement? Judgement? Endorse

Two forms of judgement: intuition and ?

Present me already endorsed?

Conditions of possibility.

If no structure/space, no way to differentiate concepts

13. Kant claims to have answered Hume’s skepticism about causal reasoning. How does he understand Hume’s skepticism. Has he answered it? If so, how. If not, why not?

Is it different from Hume’s skeptical solution?

Kant: constituent to rationality

We form intuition, apply concepts, judge

We apply a priori to causal reasoning before we see them

Unless assess, don’t use critical input

Berkeley: idealist 🡪 standing of ideas 🡪 everything depends on minds

Kant: transcendental idealism

Aspects of the world are mind dependent

🡪 how’s spatiality, temporality, causation possible

🡪 first two questions are answered as pure forms of intuition, third basic conceptual category

Ans: you are not getting a priori look of deep structure of the world, you are just use your own cognitive capacity

Thoughts are Images

Hume: Beliefs: add endorsement to it, thought(image) does not involve judgement

K: all thought involves judgement: pops up as being judged

Intuition vs application of concepts judgement, synthesized judgement

So experience is not the only source of concept

If no raw materials, no way to apply space and time intuition to them

If these three answered, how the experience of the world must be is answered

Kant is not that that skeptical