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**FRANCIS BACON**

Francis Bacon’s philosophy is a product of the renaissance period. (Renaissance: why s it called so? The medieval period is referred to as the Dark ages of philosophy. No pure critical reasoning took place in this era, Philosophy was used to interpret the faith, Philosophy was the handmaid of theology, philosophy was domesticated. This made philosophy suffocating for some people.

Eventually people went back to the original documents from ancient philosophy; ‘not translations’, There came a ‘rebirth’. Man became the principal focus of study, Humanism became in vogue. Philosophy was liberated from theology, there were inventions; printing press, discovery of virgin lands)

ABOUT BACON:

Francis Bacon was born in the **1561**, the son of **Sir Nicholas Bacon**, who was then Lord keeper of the great seal. He entered **Cambridge** and at the age of 12, he became a lawyer; he was a member of parliament, but he later lost his seat due to the alleged crime of bribery in his capacity as Judge. He died in 1626 at age 65.

**Bacon’s principal objective** was, as he said, ‘**the total reconstruction of the sciences, arts and all human knowledge**’ and this he called his ‘**great instauration’ or restoration**.[[1]](#footnote-1)

His famous work is called ‘Novum Organum’ and another is his ‘advancement of learning’. Here, he detailed out his scientific method. He is known for “**Knowledge is power**”… The purpose of knowledge is to conquer nature. **The sole purpose of science is to increase Man’s power over nature to dominate it**. His view of Knowledge is Empirical.

Bacon had no use for abstractions that are not based on experience; Hence, He criticized Aristotle seriously and rejected **Aristotelian Logic and syllogism**. In His view, it is worse than useless because **it can even be used to confirm error**.

For Bacon, deductive method cannot be used to dominate nature; we must employ the inductive method, which is based on empirical observation of particular things. For Him, The True knowledge is the knowledge gotten from experience, and not from abstractions (like Aristotle’s logic).

He also says we have to careful when dealing with experience, there are **preconceptions or prejudices that prevents us from making or gaining appropriate knowledge** from experience. These he called ‘**Idols’ or false phantoms… he said they are distortions of the mind. These distortions could only be corrected thru 1. observation and 2. experimentation--- that is through inductive method.**

1. IDOLS OF TRIBE: these are those tendencies that make us see things that appear in experience as true or real, without further investigation. Sometimes, experience deceives. This is also the tendency in man to cling to what he believes and rejects all other things. It is also fixed and constant ideas without effort to interpret. Here also, we find the tendency to cling to what we already believe and reject all contrary stances. Also, the tendency to see things the way we want to see them,
2. IDOLS OF THE CAVE: taken from the platonic allegory of the Cave; this include errors peculiar to each individual arising from one’s **temperament, education, background, environment** etc can prevent us from making proper assessment.
3. IDOLS OF THE MARKET PLACE: Language can be a barrier. Language have specific meanings attached to word\s, but they are not sufficient to express one’s intention. If one takes a word as exhaustive, then
4. IDOLS OF THE THEATRE: this refers to the philosophical systems of the past. Bacon refers to them to be like stage plays,

THERE ARE THREE KINDS OF FALSE PHILOSOPHY

1. Sophistical Philosophy: this is where Aristotle fell into.
2. EMPIRICAL Philosophy: based on a few and obscure observation
3. Superstitious Philosophy: represented by Plato and Pythagoras: those who mixed up religion and philosophy.

In order to extract sth from experience, you make use of inductive method. **The purpose for inductive method** is to **discover the form of things**; the form is used in a very scientific sense here **unlike** the Plato- Aristotelian form. Bacon rather means the **Law that governs a thing, the Law that constitutes the nature of a thing**. (Plato separated form and matter, form is in the world of ideas and what we see here are just representations of those in the world of form; however, Aristotle merged the two together; everything is made up of form and matter, both come together to form a substance)

The **best kind of demonstration** according to Bacon is the **demonstration of experience** and not abstract demonstration.

The Form of thing being referred to here is the “law of a thing”. How do you discover the form of a thing? Bacon says you go by;

* Stage 1: observation of facts, then a working hypothesis is formed on the basis of the facts observed.
* Stage 2: The hypothesis must be tested by further experimentation and observations
* Make deductions from what you have observed, then you discover **the** law.

**FRANCIS BACON’s theory ON FRIENDSHIP**

His Theory of Friendship {compare him with Aristotle and Kant). He began his essay with aligning himself with Aristotle.

Aristotle’s stand: that **anyone who alienates himself from the community, is either a beast or a God**. Man is the weakest being in the sense that he can hardly survive without the association of others. (This is obvious especially during infancy; when the mother breast-feeds a child, there is a current of love that flows therein between them).

However, Francis Bacon is of the opinion also that it is **not absolutely true** since some men live in isolation and yet come up with very unique helpful ideas for the common man; he also made reference to the Hermits, monks

FRUITS OF FRIENDSHIP (google it)

1. An essential fruit of friendship is the ease and discharge of the fullness and swellings of the heart which passions of all kinds do cause and induce. The internal organs have medicines with which to cure them,; **flowers for the lungs but only** **a friend for the cure of the heart much more than medicine.**

According to Francis Bacon, when people use money to make friends; there is still a chasm, gap; sometimes, the person in authority raises the status of his friend in a bid to make the ground level. However, there are some instances where friends have been frustrated and betrayed… e.g. Silas and Pompeo; Ceasar and Brutus; Augustus and Agripa.

Should we then bcos of these hardships fail to make friends?

He cited the case of Duke Charles Harvey…. who guarded everything about his life jealously, he didn’t have friends… it eventually impaired his thinking and understanding.

The same with Louis XI of France, at old age he was tremendously tormented with all the secrets he jealously guarded.

According to Bacon, Friendship is good, it helps to avoid problems esp. health and brings joy. Nurturing Intimacy excessively could turn out to be a double edged sword. On the minor side,…… there is no man who has shared all his grief with a friend and realistically had it reduced; and no man who has shared all his joys with his friends has had it realistically increased, and there is still some tensions that the friend can still use it against you.

1. **Health** and sovereign for **understanding**: friendship helps to increase our understanding; it helps to sharpen the intellect; it is therapeutic. When certain thoughts pop-up in your mind, one shares to a friend in order to help you make good decisions and judgement. How do you know the person to whom
2. **It serves as an aid in bearing a part in all actions and occasions. A friend in need is a friend indeed.** when one has a Friend, one should try to make him to continue living e.g. taking care of the family.

Two traditions emerged in philosophy with the renaissance:

1. Empirico-scientific method (British empiricists): John Locke, Bishop George Berkeley and David Hume – a;; genuine knowledge s gotten throught the senses.
2. Mathematical method (Continental rationalists): Descartes, Spinoza, Liebniz believed that reason alone using mathematical method, can attain truth without the aid of the senses.

RENE DESCARTES

Born in 1596, France. Descartes is known as the **father of Continental Modern Philosophy**. (Francis Bacon is regarded as the father of modern philosophy in England). Descartes main works include: **Meditations, Passion of the soul, Discourse on Method and principles of Philosophy**. Died in February 1650 at the age of 54.

He was enlisted in the army for a short while (army of Maximilian of Bavarian). He travelled around and eventually settled in 1628 in Holland. There, he wrote various books. Eventually he was invited by **Queen of Sweden** to come and teach her philosophy… but the only available time he could meet the Queen was 5am, and in the process he got fever because of the excess cold and he died.

Descartes wanted to make a new beginning on a solid foundation. He rejected Aristotle’s Logic **because; it does not lead to new knowledge** but only explains to others what is already known. Descartes wanted to begin philosophy afresh by using only those truths he could know through his own powers as the foundation for all other knowledge. He introduced **mathematical method** into philosophy i.e **moving step by step from what is clearly known, without doubt to the unknown**. Just find one truth that is indubitable and irrefutable; then from there start up with inferences. He wanted a Truth that is clear, certain and indubitable. He is chiefly concerned **with the problem of intellectual certainty**.

Descartes methods

He found out that the **mind functions in two ways in the search for truth:**

1. **Intuition:** clearly and distinctly apprehended truths by the illuminating light of reason. The truth are basic, simple and irreducible. By intuition we grasp the connection between one truth and another.
2. **Deduction:** the mind now makes inferences and discover new truths which necessarily follow from those gotten through intuition**. It** can also be referred to as all necessary inference from facts that are known with certainty.

By intuition: the mind grasps the truth through **illumination of reason**. When the truth has been established and accepted; then one moves to make inferences …. This is what is referred to as Deduction. What makes intuition and deduction similar is that both **involve truth**. By intuition we grasp the simple truth completely and immediately, whereas by deduction we arrives at a truth by a process, a continuous and uninterrupted action of the mind.

**Difference between deduction and syllogism.**

Syllogism involves the relationship of concepts to each other while deduction involves relationship of truth to each other.

**The key components of Descartes method**

* First principles are given by intuition alone while the remote conclusions are furnished only by deduction.
* Rules to guide intuition and deduction.

**The Methodic doubts**

Descartes used the method of doubt in order to find an absolutely certain starting point for building up our knowledge. He began with ‘**methodic doubt**’… **doubting everything he knew while searching for this indubitable truth**. Everything which was previously known but can be put to doubt, is to be set aside. ‘Do I have a body?’ perhaps, I do not have, maybe I am dreaming for there are times I have dreamt of having things I do not actually have in reality. He sought for the primordial truth which is not subject to any possible doubt.

After doubting everything, there was one thing he was unable to doubt… ‘That **he was doubting**’. And when one is doubting, he is thinking. There he is thinking. When he tried to doubt that he was doubting; he was just confirming it, for doubting involves thinking. Even if an evil spirit is deceiving me, it also confirms the fact of my existence since I have to exist in order to be deceived.

In order, to think; one should exist; hence: **Cogito Ergo Sum**. I think therefore, I exist. This then formed the foundation and core of his philosophy— the first principle of philosophy, the primordial truth. He used the method of doubt in order to find an absolutely certain starting point for building up our knowledge.

**CRITERION OF CERTAINTY**

What makes a proposition certain? What is the criterion for certainty?

According to Descartes; the **criterion of certainty is if that truth is perceived clearly and distinctly, then that is certain.**

He went on to say: Perhaps, God has conditioned him to think the way he thought of, thereby making him to believe that he exists. Perhaps God is a deceiver; this lead him to a quest to establish the existence of God. Can God be a deceiver?

PROOF OF THE EXISTENCE OF GOD

DESCARTES prove the existence of God solely in terms of his rational awareness of his own existence and internal thoughts.

Descartes said “**By the name God, I understand a substance which is infinite, independent, all-knowing; all powerful; by which I myself and everything else; if anything else exists, have been created.”**

Descartes asked: How did this idea of an infinite being come into my mind? How can the idea of an infinite being come from a finite being?

Ans: As a finite being; I am incapable of having an infinite idea. Hence, this idea of an infinite being must have been implanted in me by an infinite being; for it cannot come out from a finite being like Man; An infinite idea can only come from an infinite being. therefore God exists.

**Am I the author of my own being?** Did I create myself?

If I had the idea of an infinite being at the time of creating myself; why didn’t I make myself an infinite being; why did I make myself to be a finite being with all these imperfections? I would have created myself to be an infinite being; but he did not make himself to be an infinite being, he is a finite being; therefore an infinite being must have made him.

ONTOLOGICAL ARGUMENT OF GOD (first done by Anselm).

Remember that **Descartes wanted to know whether God is a deceiver**; however he eventually established that God is perfect, therefore God cannot deceive.

Whatever I perceive clearly and distinctly; I perceived that God has the idea of infinite perfection

Descartes argued: **We perceive clearly and distinctly that infinite perfection belongs to the ideas of God.**

**The idea of God implies attributes and specifically the attributes of existences. The idea of God signifies perfect beign, but the very idea of perfection implies existence.**

If God has infinite perfections, and existence is perfection; therefore God exists. God is a perfect being; therefore he has all perfections; if he has all the perfections, existence is one of the perfections which God has, therefore God exists. For Descartes, the essence of God is existence.

**Kant countered this and said that existence is not perfection**.

Descartes seems to be in a vicious circle.

**Descartes Problem**:

WE can see the **vicious circle** in Descartes’ procedure.

He used reason to prove that he exists; but he later doubted whether he was being deceived by God. And when He has not yet proved that he was not being deceived,

he used that same reason to prove God’s existence. What he used to prove the existence of God is the reason which he has not yet proved whether he is deceived or not.

He uses this very reason which he has not yet proven to be reliable to prove the existence of God, and then using the existence of God to prove the reliability of his reason.

**Mind and Body**

He proves that he has a mind; which is a thinking substance which can exist independently of the body. He has to establish the existence of the body: he was able to notice that he makes movements**…. Descartes is a dualist. Cartesian dualism**

My body and other things in the world:

He established the existence of the external world: **the ideas and impressions which he has do not come from within; they come from outside,** he is not responsible for them; they come from external objects and the external world; **therefore the external world exists**. if one says that there is no external World, then God is deceiving him(Descartes) to believe That those impressions are external; and God is a perfect being therefore he cannot deceive.

**What is substance**? Substance is made up of form and matter. According to Aristotle and the Scholastic philosophers: **Substance** is defined as sth who exists on its own and not dependent on another.

For Descartes: **Substance is an existent thing which requires nothing but itself in order to exist.**

It is opposed to Accidents which is “that which does not exist on its own, but on another”. Colour for example is accident, for it cannot exist on its own, but in other beings. Aristotle and Plato has different approaches to matter and form. For Aristotle, the matter and form is not independent on their own; but they come together to form substance.

Plato said that there is world of form, that matter and form are separated and stay independently. Thomas Aquinas came and resolved the argument against Aristotle (since there cannot be immortality of the soul, based on Aristotle’s theory). According to his theory: Aquinas said ‘the form has more being than the matter’.

**What does Descartes mean by the thinking thing**? It is that which doubts, thinks, understands; affirms, wills, refuses, imagines, feels.

When He said that there is a part of the body which exists independently of the body; he was tilting towards dualism. **Descartes defined Substance** as an existent thing which does not need any other thing in other to exist (browse it up it ‘Descartes definition of substance’)

We therefore have two substances (according to Descartes)

1. Spiritual substance: this one has an attribute; and **its primary attribute is thinking**. The spiritual substance is said to be ‘res cogitans’—thinking thing
2. Corporeal /material substance: **the attribute primary of material substance is extension**. the corporeal is said to be ‘res extensa’—extended thing.

What is the consequence of separating the two elements? if you can separate the spiritual substance from the material substance; then you are separating theology from science. However, Descartes **agrees that there is interaction between the two different substance** e.g. Mind and body. Man is essentially a thinking being, Man is essentially mind; but the mind also reacts to what happens to the body.

**Where and how does this interaction take place**? Descartes said that it takes place at the **pineal gland** which is situated in the innermost part of the brain. It is here that the mind comes into contact with the body through the animal spirits.

If we have two substances then, what can be said about living bodies (other living things, animals and trees)? Is there the combination of two substances?

Descartes said; No. that animals do not possess these two substances. animals do not think. However, Humans are made of these two substances.

1. There are some activities that are controlled by the body independently of the mind e.g. Respiration, Digestion etc.
2. There are also some activities that occur in the mind independently of the body e.g. Thinking, Ratiocination.
3. Also, the mind influences the body—Danger, pain and 4.
4. also the body influences the mind e.g. Hunger.

Then, there is a problem since Descartes claims that they are independent of each other. **How can sth that is material interacts with what is immaterial**?

Descartes; inorder to solve the problem argues that the **mind and body meet at the Pineal gland through the vital spirit.**

What is this Vital spirit??

His disciple; **Arnold Geulinex** criticized this and used the theory of **occasionalism or parallelism** to argue against Descartes. He says that there is **no actual contact**; on the occasion of my wlling sth and the body responds; that it is God that is moving my body. God has arranged the mind and the body in such a way that bodily movements follow mental acts as if there were interaction between them. He compared it to two clocks both of which are arranged by the clock maker that whenever one of them points to any hour, the other strikes although there is no connection between the two.

Malebranche also talked on this in his own way.

Spinoza( claims that there is only one substance—Monist)

SPACE AND TIME

Space, according to Descartes is inseparable from the material substance that occupies it. Since the essence of material substance is extension, and every space is occupied by a substance; it follows that space can be nothing else than the extension of material substances.

Like Aristotle; Descartes considers **time as the measure of motion.**

‘Every definition, or clear and distinct idea is true’[[2]](#footnote-2)

Spinoza begins his philosophy with the problem of the nature and existence of God.
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The **two traditions** that developed from Descartes are

1. **Idealism and**
2. **materialism**.

Also know about **Occassionalism of Arnold Geulinex and Malebranche**

**SPINOZA**

He was born in Amsterdam in 1632. He was born as a Jew; he studied the Tamul… which is the new testament…

He related with Maimonides. At a time, he developed his own unorthodox views about God and religion; then he was excommunicated from the synagogue at the age of 24. He later went over to Austria, and led a very quiet life. He later died young in 1677, at the age of 45. He suffered of Tuberculosis.

**His Epistemology**: (SSI)

In his theory of knowledge; Spinoza classified the level/degrees of knowledge into three

1. **The Level of the senses**: this level is one in which one has inadequate knowledge of a thing, Why? Because the thing is understood in isolation of every other thing in the universe. Spinoza believes that things are interconnected
2. **Level of Reason**: here, we make use of **logical deduction**. The level of knowledge acquired here is scientific; just like what Descartes did. In this level, one moves from one premise to another.
3. **Level of Intuition**: this is the highest level. At the level; Knowledge comprises of things coming from God. At this level of knowledge, all things are seen and known as existing in God, derived from him or modifications of God. God exists in all things; and all things exist in God. Things in the universe emanate **necessarily** from God (according to Spinoza). When we understand that things are modifications of God, then one is at the intuitive level of knowledge.

HIS ONTOLOGY

Spinoza’s main work is titled ‘Ethics’. Just like the stoics; Spinoza’s philosophy is **Pantheistic** and **deterministic**. We have Ordo cognoscendi (order of knowing) and Ordo essendi (order of being).

1. In the Ordo cognoscendi: people hold that Man should understand Man first then other things will follow.
2. In the Ordo essendi: some people suggest that we should first understand the One at the supreme position; then other things would follow. While Descartes began with Ordo cognoscendi, Spinoza began with Ordo essendi. He defined God as Causa sui—Cause of itself. And so; he defined **Substance as ‘cause of itself**…..etc.

If God is cause of itself, and substance is cause of itself; what does it mean?

It means that they are eternal, infinite and divine. The other implication is that we cannot have two substances, we have only one substance – God, whom I understand to be a being absolutely infinite; i.e. a substance consisting of infinite attribute, each of which possess in itself ……………… This one substance he calls : **Deus sive Natura( God or nature)**. They are two names of the same reality. **Things are not separated from God, rather they are parts, modes, modifications of God.**

Inorder to make a slight distinction between God and Nature; he would use

1. Natura Naturans – (the naturing nature) substance and its attributes of God insofar as God is considered to act by the requirements of his own nature.
2. Natura Naturata – (the natured nature) everything which follows from the necessity of the nature of God. Or of any one of God’s attributes.

Attribute is that which a mind understands as belonging to a thing. The infinite substance has infinite attributes, but we know of only two attributes that are ascribed to God, amongst others:

1. Extension(body)
2. Thought(mind)

N.b: this are the **two aspects of the same thing**. For him, the mind and body are the same thing. The mind is the idea of the body; what is happening in the body is happening in the mind. You cannot divorce spirit from matter.

All things are in God, and God is in all things; and all things are in all.

Hence, there is no finality; and no independence and taking decisions freely by the creature.

Spinoza categorically denies Human freedom and free actions. For Spinoza, the claim of freedom is the confession of Ignorance.

HIS ETHICS

**Notions of Good and Bad:**

For Spinoza, we say that sth is good when it is in accordance with our desires and satisfies them, so that when it frustrates our desires it is bad. Therefore, **Goodness or badness is not a property inherent in the action, it is subjective; depends on the individual** (when he satisfies the individual person, then it is Good and vice versa. There is **no objectivity** of good or bad.

Hence, good or bad are based on emotions. He however said that our emotions are caused, that it is determined. Hence, one does not make free moral judgement.

We have

1. Active emotions (derive from the mind and they cannot bring about God) and
2. Passive emotions (they are passions: pleasure, desire, and pain). Spinoza held that we are **enslaved by passions and must work to liberate ourselves through ‘Reason**”.

Spinoza sees virtue as knowledge. Progress in rational life, stimulates progress in moral life.

**The problem of Evil’**

**For Spinoza, there is no evil at all**. For him, it is because we don’t know the function of that thing that is why we call it ‘evil’ out of inadequate knowledge. Spinoza tried to banish the fear of death, just like Epicurus. (Read up on Epicurus- On creation).

Spinoza held that **Man is ‘fundamentally ‘selfish’**……. Just like Hobbes postulated “Man is by nature gregarious”. Because of the selfishness, they would be chaos and anarchy; that is why Man came together to form a civil society to keep everything in check. Hence, the necessity of the ‘**formation of civil society’**. Then, Laws are made so that we can seek those self-interests and satisfy them in the proper way. The people will come together and relinquish their rights to a sovereign authority so that the sovereign authority will sit down, consider what is right and will come out with rules of what is right or wrong and then the people will follow. (This is the advent of moral rules, which according to Thomas Hobbes and John Locke, comes after the formation of the civil society).

**Spinoza on Natural law**:

Natural Law for Spinoza, is **the law of necessity** (this is opposed to …………… view) whereby things are conditioned to behave in a certain way, (Spinoza’s understanding of Natural law is different from Thomas Aquinas’ natural law which is talking **of moral law-** and not law of necessity as portrayed by Spinoza).

**Spinoza on Natural Rights:**

Natural rights for Spinoza, is co-extensive with **natural power**. That is, they go together; this means ‘**Power is right’** – very dangerous (a big fish has right over the small fish).
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**Spinoza’s Political Philosophy**

According to Spinoza; the leader or sovereign authority should be careful not to abuse his position or else, he will lose the trust of his subjects and they would remove him.

Derived from Aristotle: there are six forms of government or constitution

1. Monarchy- by one person for the welfare of the people.
2. Aristocracy- a govt. of a few who are out for the good of the people.
3. Timocracy- govt of the many.

The first three is described to be good.

1. Tyranny- rule by one person who is out for his own selfish gain
2. Oligarchy
3. Democracy-

How did Aristotle come out with this classification? It all stemmed out from the **family setting.**

In Monarchy, he likened it to the relationship between the Father and the Son.

In Aristocracy, is from the relationship between the Husband and Wife who has mutual understanding, and has particular duties for each.

In Timocracy- relationship between brothers

Tyranny- relationship between the father and the slave

Oligarchy- between Man and Woman but here, they lack understanding and one dominates the other.

Democracy- this one is like a household without any master.

Amongst the good ones; the best is Monarchy (in good times). For the perverse ones, the best among them is Democracy…

Spinoza subscribes to the Aristotelian view that Democracy is the best form of government.

Spinoza holds that the **ideal state** is that which the individuals can operate rationally, and be free to speak out their ideas.

Read up the Criticisms of Spinoza.

Esp. the idea of God.
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LIEBNIZ

He was a rationalist. He was the son of a professor, coming from an educated family. He was a mathematician even more than he was a philosopher. He discovered the **infinitesimal calculus** and he published it (but it has already been discovered by Newton). He was a **Christian who tried to unite the Catholics and the Protestants**; it appears he didn’t succeed. He was born in 1646…. and died in…. At the age of 15, he entered university; he did philosophy, jurisprudence etc. At the age of 21, he hard-earned his doctorate degree.

He was offered a seat of the professor to the university, but he declined it. Note that most of the modern philosophers did not take up university posts; they rather chose to be independent. He rather founded a learned society – **Prussian Academy**.

Many of his known works include Monadology; new essays in Human understanding, discourse on metaphysics, Essays in theodicy.

When we divide the world into tiny particles… monads

LIEBNIZ’S EPISTEMOLOGY AND METAPHYSICS

God --- Spinoza started his philosophy from God.

Man --- Descartes (what is the problem created by Descartes in his philosophy? the problem of Mind and Body; which philosophies developed from Descartes--- Idealism and Materialism

External World---- The lecturer feels that this is where Leibniz’s philosophy took roots.

Leibniz is an **eminent logician** and he based his metaphysical theory on his LOGICAL ANALYSIS.

**He proposed the notion of indefinable terms**, and the **combination of indefinable terms to make a proposition**. A Proposition is a statement with one idea. So, the world we are in can be broken up into smaller parts.

A Proposition can be divided into: (Two kinds of truths)

1. **Truth of Reason**: is that proposition which cannot be denied, if you deny it you involve yourself in a contradiction. e.g. A Husband is a married man( when you want to deny it, then you contradict yourself) It is **A priori**…… The predicate is contained in the subject, therefore it is said to be **Analytic proposition**. There is no new information gotten from the outside…. The Truth of Reason is based on the **principle of contradiction** (sth cannot be and not be at the same time)
2. **Truth of Fact**: There is no necessity of truth, it is not necessarily true, and the predicate is not contained in the subject. It is said to be **contingently true**, that is the opposite may as well be true. The truth of fact is dependent on experience, it is **a posteriori**.

All the Truths of facts are found existential proposition (it goes with existence)

They are said to be **Synthetic-**-- there is a NEW information, the Predicate is not contained in the subject. Truth of Fact is based on the **principle of sufficient reason.**

In Metaphysics: in relation (All truths of facts are existential propositions) ----- God is an exception. The existence of God is inseparable from his essence.

There are principles which guide Leibniz are

1. Principle of Contradiction
2. Principle of Sufficient reason (both are known as Basic principle)
3. Principle of Perfection

There is another principle: **The Principle of perfection**: which states that God is an infinite being, therefore God is a perfect being, so whatever God does is the BEST.

Therefore, it follows that this **World which God has created is the Best possible world. God surely had many**

**Coming to Man:** using the principle of Perfection; Man also chooses what he thinks is the best (though it may not actually be the best). It means that God knows everything which we do and will still do many years to come.

**When you want to define Man;** Man is a continuation of the past, present and the future.

**Liebniz’s theory of Monadology**: for Monads

Monads (basic elements of which all things are made).

‘Understand

**Monads** are substances from which all things are made (a complete being). Monads are unextended, immaterial

Each monad is self-contained, and is said to be windowless (no way to penetrate), a source of its own energy, self-contained, sizeless, shapeless, invisible.

Any corporeal substance is made up of infinite number of monads, and each monad is self-distinct and does not relate to the other monads. There is one monad that dominates others,: **In Man--- the mind is the dominant monad**

HOW DO YOU EXPLAIN MOVEMENT IN THE WORLD?

When we are told that each monad is independent, each of them are distinct, and do not affect one another; how do you explain causality in the world?

The Harmony in the monads is likened to the operation of different independent clocks, the clock maker has made it in such a way that each works independently, and yet give the same result.

Each of the monads is acting on its own, and yet they are working in harmony which Leibniz called **pre-established harmony.** God have already established it that way by God.

The MONADS mirrors and reflects the universe. It is called perception.

When the reflection is done unconsciously, it is called **perception**.

When the reflection is consciously done, it is called **apperception**.

These things come up again in the Arguments in God.

Liebniz has four arguments on the existence of God.

1. **What is the ontological argument of God**? Generally, Ontological argument defines God as an infinite being, therefore he is perfect, and he has all the perfections, and existence is part of the perfection; therefore God necessarily exists. God’s existence cannot be divulged from his nature.

**Though, Immanuel Kant says**… Existence is not a predicate.

Anselm

1. 2nd Argument of Liebniz, there are **Eternal and necessary truths**. If they exist eternally and they are necessary, then the source must be eternal and necessary being. The Source is God; therefore God exists.
2. 3rd … based on the **Principle of Sufficient reason**. whatever happens must have a cause, if then sth exists , there must be sufficient reason for that
3. Based on **Order and Harmony** in the universe

Whatever happens must have a cause, if then sth exists, there

ETHICS

He classified evil into:

1. **Metaphysical evil**: this kind of evil is inevitable because of the finite nature of creatures (created things). Whatever is finite is imperfect, and the creatures because they are imperfect in nature, they can make mistakes. Leibniz would say that if we want to remove metaphysical evil, then we must remove finite creatures. God had the option either to create finite beings or not to create at all. He being perfect went for the best.
2. **Physical evil**: they are part of mechanisms of the world. e.g. tsunami, hurricane, volcanoes, earth-quakes etc. The basis of physical evil is metaphysical evil, because we are finite, we can fall sick.
3. **Moral evil**: This is because of the freedom on the part of Human beings; we cannot talk of moral evil without mentioning freedom. Because Man is rational, being moral is just innate in Man. Our survivability also depends on it since Man is a social being and Man does not live in isolation. Aristotle….. Nature makes Man a rational moral being. Morality originates from the nature of Man. We choose to be just or otherwise.

But in the philosophy of Leibniz, he subjugates and denies the freedom of Man since he views man as a subject with predicates (analytic). Leibniz also states that God will punish those who do evil and reward those who do good; but he had previously claimed that Man’s action have already been known. Inorder to resolve this two arguments, he made reference to metaphysical necessity, even though our actions have already been know, in a form of determinism, we still have option to choose to do good over evil, hence exercising our freedom. Therefore, we have freedom to do good or bad

Metaphysical necessity means that something is not free because it can be influenced by other things. When Leibniz talks of metaphysical necessity, he is not denying human freedom.
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JOHN LOCKE

He is an Empiricist who believe: ‘**Nihil est in intellectu quod non prius in sensu**’ -- Nothing is in the intellect that was not first in the senses.

For the empiricists, the Human mind is a blank slate; it is ‘***Tamquam tabula rasa*’**. The mind is ‘**Tabula rasa in qua nihil est scriptum**’— a clean slate on which nothing is written…

He is described as the **father of empiricism**. He studied in Oxford, he studied Medicine. He is known for two important works: Essay concerning Human understanding; and one other on politics. He is said to be behind the 1668 revolution.

The empiricists in general do not agree and criticize innatism – they maintained that if knowledge is innate, then everyone should know them including babies and idiots. Then, principles like Moral principles would be the same everywhere.

Somewhere in Stumpf, Locke said that all ideas come from experience and experience comes in two ways:

1. **Sensation**: we have 5 senses of eyes, ears, nose, skin, sense of taste—from these things do ideas come in. The ideas can enter through different sense e.g. Lily (the whiteness –through the eyes; and sweetness through the tongue; e.g. Two ideas can come from one sense. **We don’t get complex ideas through the senses**.
2. **Reflection**: this involves thinking, doubting, believing, and other activities that help to **develop other ideas**. The mind can actively work on the ideas that come through the senses. The **mind can join ideas, break them, or do abstraction**. For example: in judging the complex idea of ‘Sugar’ – it is a combination of qualities – sweetness, whiteness, solidity. The mind combines these qualities in order to create a complex idea. The mind can actively make an abstraction and then bring forth general ideas; when you remove the particulars of a person or a thing, then we get the general idea of Man or of that thing.

**When we get ideas from external objects; are the ideas exact copies of that external objects?**

Here, in order to answer the question; Locke makes a distinction between Primary qualities and Secondary qualities.

What is a quality? It is that by which things are made known to us; Secondary: Colour, sound, taste

1. **Primary Qualities**: They are those qualities that are **inseparable from the objects** themselves; e.g. solidity, extension, figure, motion, rest; shape; number.

**These qualities are exact copies of the external object**; e.g. a dust cleaner - is solid, only one in number; . E.g. of primary qualities include: extension, solidity, figure, motion and rest.

1. **Secondary qualities**: they are not really in things, they are simply **powers in the external objects**; **they are not exact copies as they are seen in external objects**. E.g. Colour, Taste, Sound and Odour

All These ideas that are coming from the external objects; Do these qualities exist on their own? e.g. Sugar, does the solidity, whiteness, sweetness; do they exist differently? are they subsisting in sth? What unites them?

They subsist on sth and that sth is SUBSTANCE. Locke says that **substance is ‘sth I know not what’**. This attracted criticisms; other empiricists like Berkeley and Hume denied Material substance. How then did he come with the idea of substance? Locke says that supposition that **there must be a substratum from whence these simple ideas stem out to impress on the human mind.**

Locke also **accepted the existence of Spiritual substance**; this is a contradiction because he, as an empiricist should not accept both material and spiritual substances since he holds that knowledge only comes through senses. Locke came up with this idea with the **supposition** that t**here must exist an immaterial substratum which sustains the simple idea** of thinking, doubting, reflection. There must be an immaterial substratum which is the source and the support of these.

Locke also accepted knowledge from ‘**Revelation**’ though he says we should not believe what comes from Bigots (Vision seers). When asked, he said that in so far as that knowledge from vision is not contrary to reason, them it can be accepted.

Kinds or Degrees of Knowledge: Locke’s Epistemology

1. **Intuitive**: the highest degree of knowledge, it is a mathematical knowledge which is gotten from **intuition.** We gain the idea of our existence intuitively. we caN know a square as different from a circle intuitively; 2 + 2=4 intuively)
2. **Demonstrative knowledge**: it is scientific knowledge – knowledge acquired through natural science (investigation and observation and experimentation). It is not unquestionably certain. There we have two kinds : Deductive process(through this process, we gain new knowledge) and Inductive. WE can know the existence of God through demonstrative knowledge. in particular—Induction.
3. Sensitive knowledge: this is the knowledge of particular things as they exist.

Our knowledge of our existence is unquestionably certain: Intuitive knowledge.

Our knowledge of God is demonstrative knowledge.

Our knowledge of other things around us is sensitive knowledge.

Accordign to Locke; All knowledge not only derives from sense experience but is also circumscribed within sense experience.

Locke used **Induction to prove the existence of God**. Being cannot come from non-entity; Non-entity cannot produce being; if that is clear, then there is a being that

MORALITY

Morality according to Locke is based on the command of God. Morality can be demonstrated just like mathematics (we move from the known to the unkiwn). After God has shown what should be done, then we make our own inferences.

Locke holds that **Goodness causes pleasure, but Evil causes Pain**. God will reward goodness. Morality, Locke says is the law of God and God supports his law with sanctions.

Locke’s position is similar to that of William of Ockham who also maintains that morality is based on the authority of God. However, William goes further to say that God has no particular reasons for issuing his moral command. God is simply exercising his absolute power and authority. Locke does not go to the extent l
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LOCKE’S POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

Social Contract of Hobbes: The state of nature of Thomas Hobbes is a state of War, confusion, anarchy; a state of **‘bellum omnium contra omnes’** – War of all against all. For Thomas, the concept of morality began after the formation of state, and not I the state of nature. Thomas Hobbes is not similar to that of Locke

In that of Locke’s state of nature, there was moral law, which is in reason; when reason is consulted. It will tell you that ‘no one has to hurt another person, and everyone is born equal and independent; life, health, liberty or possessions—all these are called ‘PROPERTY”… even in the state of nature. Even though Man has right to own property, but Man should not accumulate beyond our needs.

**For Locke, morality existed even before the formation of political society**. Thomas Hobbes holds a contrary view that the origin of morality is the formation of political society.

Since there is no leader yet, or a state with rules; how then would those properties be safeguarded --- Locke said that it is entrusted in the hands of everybody; therefore he empowers one to fight anyone who attempts to snatch his property; and then to punish the person.

The reasons for punishment include: Reparation and Deterrence.

However, Locke said that the punishment must not outweigh the offense committed, rather it must be commensurate.

He also said that this state of nature is encumbersome; when one is offended, in a fleet of anger, the person may punish the offender harshly. Also, when an offense is committed, people begin to judge their own cases thereby contradicting the latin adage **‘Nemo iudex in causa sua**”. Also, there are cases where the offender cannot be punished because the offender is more powerful than the person offended.

Because of all these complications; the property of an individual would be adequately secured. How then can we achieve this security? We have to enter into a civil society and submit our right to a superior or to a group of people.

He then suggested that the people who set the laws ‘legislature’ should be different from the executive; so that they would check each other; and not make laws that would favor them.

**Various reasons for forming a civil society**:

PLATO: Man is not sufficient. When we come together, we pull our resources and ideas together.

ARISTOTLE: Good life. So that people would live Good life, moral lives

THOMAS AQUINAS: For the common good.

JOHN LOCKE: Safeguard and security of property- life, health, liberty, possessions.

WHAT ARE THE LOOPHOLES OF JOHN LOCKE’S PHILOSOPHY??

The fact that Locke is an empiricist who believes that knowledge come from senses, then we have ideas which come from external objects, they have to subsists in sth, and because of that, he holds that substance exists; but which **he cannot not empirically proof**.

He also **believes in the existence of spiritual substances but with no material proof**. This seems to be a contradiction, and this constitutes the Achilles Heel of his philosophy.

GEORGE BERKELEY (12- 11- 19)

Born in 1685; in Ireland. did ….. in Dublin. He studied mathematics, logic, languages. When he went to Bermuda to set up a university with the resources of the American people; he did not succeed. He died in 1753, after travelling round, hen went bck to London.

**His Metaphysics and Epistemology**

He was a very unnatural philosopher; he is not a common sense philosopher like John Locke. For Berkeley, **To be is to be perceived**; “**Esse est percipi**”. He said that external objects are just ideas in the mind. **Samuel Johnson** – countered it.

For Berkeley, ‘to exist is to be perceived’; does it then mean that when one stops perceiving an object, does it then cease to exist?

He answers that even though no one still perceives an object; **it is still perceived by God**, the omnipresent and omniscient.

He shares with Locke that “ideas are objects of knowledge”- but they differ in the sense that for Locke; those ideas are copies and representations of what is in our minds, while for Berkeley- the ideas are the objects and things themselves.

**Where then do these ideas come from?**

Berkeley said that these ideas exist in the mind of God, God communicates these ideas to us. Locke said that ideas stems from the material substances (sensible objects). Berkerly denies and rejects the existence of material substances, which is in contrast to Locke’s stand. According to /Berkeley, there are no material substances because we do not perceive them.

However, there are spiritual substances (according to Berkeley). **How do we know that spirits and minds exists?** We know of the existence of our minds through **intuition** ie by inward feeling or reflection. Then we know about the **existence of other minds by inference** ie we perceive their activities from which we infer that thery are the activities of mind like ours**. We do not see a man, but we see figure, colour, size and motions from which we then infer that what we are seeing must be a man**.

Here, he also affirms the existence of God.

For Berkeley, if we believe that there are external objects then we are gearing towards ‘universal skepticism’.

Ideas come from God, therefore God leads to causality.

he affirms the existence of spiritual substances, beginning with himself. He affairs his existence through intuition; when I affirm the existence of mind, then from there we can infer that other minds exists.

**Here, Berkeley makes another loophole; as an empiricist he should not have accepted the existence of spiritual beings, since it cannot be empirically viewed.**

Locke --- affirms the existence of both material and spiritual beings.

Berkeley --- affirms the existence of spiritual beings only.

LAWS OF NATURE—sth

For Berkeley, the **Laws of nature are not necessary**. Laws of necessity is Law that is universal, applicable everywhere… For Berkeley, although Laws of nature are regular, they are nevertheless contingent and they depend on God’s activity.……… Contingent law – this is a law that may be or not be.

For Berkeley, while he subscribe to Law of necessity, he did not understand this law completely, because and the natural order, God can intervene directly.

**kCausality**: Efficient and Subordinate causes.

**God is the only efficient cause** (ideas exists in God’s mind, therefore he communicates these ideas to the Human mind). Then in some way, Human beings are also efficient causes (because Human beings combine ideas in order to create something). **Only spirits can be efficient causes. The divine spirit and, in a subordinate degree, the human spiris are the only efficient cause in the world.**

PRIMARY AND SECONDARY QUALITIES

Remember that in John Locke, he made a distinction between the Primary and secondary qualities.

But in **Berkeley, it is not possible to separate the primary qualities from the secondary qualities. All of them are existing in the mind;** that is why what when one gets a hot water, for some people; it is hot, but for another, it is not hot.

The same with ‘saltiness’—for some, a food may be salty, but for another it is okay. So, are the ideas in the senses? He said that they are in the mind.

Do you agree?

We have five senses: sight, hearing, taste, touch, smell. Each of the senses has it’s own proper object. The objects perceive correctly but the error comes with the judgment. The ideas are on the object itself, but then the judgment of the mind is wrong. The qualities remain in the object. this theory gears towards denying all forms of objective knowledge.

DAVID HUME (TEST)

Born in Edinburgh in 1711… his family wanted Him to be a lawyer, but they were disappointed because he showed his interest…… He went to Edinburgh University, although he did not graduate. He was one time ambassador to France

**He saw the science of Man as the foundation of all sciences, therefore he made use of the experiential method**. At a time, he moved away from John Locke(who talked about an unknown substance, which he should not talk of as an empiricist; even admitting material and spiritual substances); George Berkeley( though he denied material substances; he accepted the existence of spiritual substances which he should not refer to as an empiricist). Therefore, **Hume was careful not to allow any metaphysics to enter into his philosophy.**

His Epistemology

Just like all other empiricists, the Human mind is ‘Tanquam tabula rasa’

What are the contents of the mind?

**The contents of the mind are**

1. **impressions and**
2. **ideas (according to Hume).**

What is the difference between impression and ideas?

Acording to Hume, the difference between Impressions and Ideas is **difference of degree in vividness and force.**

**Ideas stem forth from impressions**; **impressions come from the external things**. e.g. when one sustains injury, the pain which the person feels is the impression, but the memory of the pain which comes from the hurt, is the idea. These ideas are copies, images or representations of the impressions.

Ultimately, every idea comes from impression (e.g. golden mouth; burning horse)

We have :

1. Simple impressions
2. Complex impressions

WE also have:

1. Simple ideas
2. Complex ideas

Simple ideas corresponds to simple impressions; while complex ideas corresponds to complex impressions.

**Hume rejects Locke’s idea of substance** (i.e. as unperceived, unknowable substratum which supports and sustains the qualities we perceive)—Hume did this on the ground that **all our knowledge derives from perception and we do not perceive substance**. According to Hume, the Human mind is not capable of forming ideas of non-existent realities.

For Hume, we generate the infinite **idea of God from augmentation of the ideas** within the Human mind about goodness (not that it is another being that puts it in his mind- like Descartes said).

Ideas gloom themselves. **Association of ideas and looping of ideas is what is called thinking.** Those things that helps ideas to come and loom together:

1. Resemblance
2. Contiguity of Time and Space
3. Cause and effect (Causality) give examples and explain them.

E.g. Resemblance: When you have a picture before you, it makes you think of the original. Ideas come together because of resemblance.

For contiguity: e.g. When you talk about an apartment, the mind goes to think of another apartment within the same building (Contiguity refers to things which are close to each other)

For Causality: When someone talks about ‘Wound’, what comes to mind is “Pain”. The Pain is seen as the effect of the ‘Wound’. That of causality is more prevalent than the others in the world. Causality is central to science, to mathematics, knowledge, thinking.

**Hume questions the validity of Cause and Effect. He argues that there is no rational justification for it, that this principle can neither be demonstrated nor is it known by intuition.**

**In Causality**; When we say that A causes B, there is three relations that

1. Contiguity – one is following the other
2. Priority – one comes before the other
3. Constant conjunction – They are constantly conjoined.

With the **three above reasons for the association**, people now seem to conclude that there is a necessary connection between the two.

Hume asks: Can we see the necessary connection? Can It be perceived? **And when the cause is defined independently of the effect, there is nothing that says that it must be the effect on this**…. No observable necessary connection.

Even when two things go together now, it is never an assurance that in the future, that they will still be necessarily combined.

According to Hume the principle of Causality is based on the assumption that the future will resemble the past.

This is an attack on science, cos science works on the presumption of the validity of cause and effect. It is also an attack on induction which is the method of science.

IMPRESSIONS have characteristics of 1**. Constancy** and 2. **Coherence**

The constancy and coherence of impressions make us believe they exist.

The constancy of impressions makes us assume the existence of material things.

Coherence – the similarity of what we have experienced in the past makes me think that these things are not happening outside, but within the Human mind.

HUME went further to talk of **self-identity, attack on existence of God, denial of substance.**

According to Hume, **there is nothing like soul**. This is because one does not perceive any such entity. Hume is called the logical empiricist, a consistent empiricist – he did not adopt anything that cannot be perceived in his philosophy.

ABOUT GOD.

One of the arguments used to proof the existence of God is that of ‘design’. God is seen as the one who pts order in the universe, as the intelligent being to puts the order. Hume would say that this is an “**INAPPROPRIATE analogy**”.

All hose 1
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HUME’S ETHICS

We have two branches of Ethics:

1. Normative ethics
2. Meta-ethics: they are the analytic philosophers; Hume falls under this part of school of ethics. He does not teach how people ought to behave, for Hume, **morality is based not on reason but on natural tendencies, passions, feelings**; **man is moral being because he is a rational being**. He lives in association of others, he must live in the society and to live well he was of good and bad, he now begins to do good and avoid evil.

When Human beings live together to live with good; it is called a society; but that of animals is group.

However, Hume says that reason is not important in morality, that reason is a slave to passion. That reason has o do with thinking and cannot move people to action. Passions for him are those things that put man to motion.

What we approve as naturally good are those actions that appeal to our sentiments (when it displeases you – then it is evil; but when it pleases the person, then it is good).

**On what then do I base my judgement on what happens to another person**?

Hume says that NO; **Man is a sympathetic being**; so the action is good or bad depending on what the person involved feels. If the other person is pleased, then it is a good action.

however, there is a problem: for there are times when the person who is performing an action is pleased in doing the action, but the person to him the person is done to is displeased. So it does not follow.

HUME ON JUSTICE

For Hume, Motive is the very important part of every action. It is tge motive that determines the action.

Hume explains the origin of the sense of Justice in terms of sympathy.

Hume proposes his won ‘Theory of the state of nature.

Men soon realized hat if everybody were allowerd to use his freedom as He deems fit, many things would be at stake. thy therefore felt I would be in their best nteredt to make rules of conduct thatlimit their freedom inorder to protect

The criterion for virtue according to hume is Utility. Therefore, Hume dismisses celibacy, fasting, humility, penance, mortification silence, solitude, self-denial and other monkish virtues. Hume considers them to be no virtues at all since they sere no useful purpose.

Hume denies Human freedom, and maintains (like Sinoza) that human actions are determined.
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IMMANUEL KANT

Kant is a very important personality in Philosophy. Born in 1724. he did his university at Konisberg. He was a family tutor (Aristotle was the family tutor of Alexander the Grea – who then was ought out to be killed, but he escaped; for he was blamed for the actions of Alexander. he ran and said; you would not commit another abomination against philosophy the second time.)

he wrote textbooks; he was a lecturer at the university of Konisberg; he taught mathematics,

His works include the three great critiques.

1. Critique of Pure Reason
2. Critique of
3. Critique

His philosophy can be categorized into :

1. Pre-critical period: when he was under the spell of **Christian Wolff,** a great thinker who …… from liebniz.
2. Critical period: when he woke up from his dogmatic slumber; which is attriduted to David Hume (Enquiry into Human understanding). He then discarded his previous bias gathered from Christian Wolff. Then at this point, he departed from his initial stance in philosophy.

He then began to ask fundamental questions like: Can we really know? What can we know and what can we not Know? Can we really gain knowledge independently of experience or reason? He then went to study: What is the limit of knowledge? What can we really know?

He begins by making a distinction between

1. a priori Knowledge: Knowledge outside of experience. Knowledge that is **independent** of experience- A priori have two characteristics: 1. **Universality** and 2. **Necessity**)
2. a posteriori knowledge: knowledge that is dependent on experience. it has : 1. No universality and 2. It is not necessarily true.

From knowledge, we make statements and propositions. There are two types of propostion:

1. **Analytic proposition**: is one in which the predicate is already contained in the subject. It is tautological and necessarily true. no new information s gvens e.g. All bodies are extended, A husband has a wife; All triangles have three angles, A square has four equal sides.
2. Synthetic proposition/ judgment: Here, The apple is red; the bodies are heavy;

All seminarians in Bigard are Six feet tall: it is synthetic statement.
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**SYNTHETIC A PRIORI**

If we say that Knowledge comes from the conformity of the mind to experience; then Synthetic a priori is impossible. Then are all synthetic judgements a posteriori? This was the question of Kant. There are some statements that are synthetic but not a posteriori. Then he proposed the theory of synthetic a priori. It Is synthetic yet independent of eperiences.

Example 7+5=12. The statement is synthetic by one cannot get 12 simply by analysis, it is something we know from intuition. The math is universal and necessary. It is independent of experiencee.

Again, that a straight line between two points is the shortest: this is synthetic and it is true and universal. The word shortest does not contain a straight line. The knowledge is not gotten from experience.

Again in physics, in all changes of the material world, the quantity of matter remains unchanged.

Metaphysics: man is free to choose…

All knowledge begins from experience but that does not mean that it ends there. Knowledge is the combination of sensibility and understanding.

Therefore, Kant embarked on **redefining Knowledge to be the conforming of experience to the mind** (this reverse; is what made his philosophy to be viewed as revolutionary, because before Kant; it is widely believed that it is the mind that conforms itself to the object of knowledge but **Kant says it is the other way round – it is objects which conform themselves to the structure of the Human mind**) ‘**Copernican revolution’**. It can be likened as wearing blue-shaded goggles, which makes our perceptions to be received from such point of view.

**Kant defined Knowledge as the combination of Sense perception (intuition) and Understanding.**

Knowledge = Sense perception + understanding.

Sense perception is necessary but not sufficient for knowledge; Understanding is also necessary but not sufficient.

Forms of Perception (**Two kinds or frameworks in which perception takes place**)

When we perceive things, we perceive them under

1. space and
2. Time.

Space and Time are therefore a priori forms/ conditions of sense perceptions. the human mind is structured in such a way that no object can appear to us except in space and time.

SPACE: **Space is a condition for the appearance of phenomenon**. Space is sth prior to the perception of phenomenon. Sapce is defined by Kant as no*thing but the forms of all appearances of the external sense, that is, the subjective condition of……*

Space is the a priori form in which external objects appear to us.

TIME:

According to Kant; Time is not something which exists of itself, nor is it a quality inherent in things as a property. Time is merely the subjective condition under which all our intuitions take place. It is only in time that anything can be perceived as a phenomenon.

Two worlds of Kant:

1. Phenomenal world (Things as they appear to us)
2. Noumenal world (things as they are in themselves)

According to Kant, we can only know about the things as they appear to us ‘Phenomena’ and we can never know about ‘things as they really are – Noumenal world’ because they are not objects of sense perception and the categories of Human understanding cannot validly.

Kant’s critique on Speculative metaphysics

CRITIQUE OF SPECULATIVE PSYCHOLOGY

Rational Psychology describes the soul as a simple, immaterial, permanent substance, the subject of the act of thinking.……. They view the soul as a permanent substance, simple, immaterial (spiritual); **How did they come about these descriptions? Does the soul appear?**

Kant says that; the only way the psychologists came to this conclusion is probably through the act of ‘**Thinking**’; **but the soul is not empirical**.

According to Kant, when I say ‘I think’; the ‘I’ here, is not a phenomenon, it does not belong to the phenomenal world, but rather a Noumenon, and is outside the sphere of existence….. Therefore, the **categories of human understanding cannot be validly applied to it.** thinks… Kant refers to the I as self-consciousness. It is the ‘I’ who has to be conscious of himself, before being conscious of other things. It is wrong o apply the categories of understanding to supra-sensible things – Noumenal world.

The ‘I’ who thinks is a transcendental reality which is not an object of empirical experience. All we can know about it is that it is **the subject of the act of thinking and the unity of apperception.**

CRITIQUE OF SPECULATIVE THEOLOGY

Kant criticizes all the traditional argument for the existence of God used by past philosophers as invalid.

He classified them into three:

1. Ontological Argument (Descartes, Liebniz, Anselm said something… ): Kant holds that the ontological argument is based on the concept of God as the ‘ens realissimum’ i.e. the most real being.
2. Cosmological Argument: the argument goes like this ‘If anything exists, an infinitely necessary being must also exist. Now I at least exist.’ According to Kant this argument really begins at experience and is therefore not completely a priori like the ontological argument.

However, the argument presupposes the principle that every contingent being has a cause and applies the concept of causality outside the phenomenal world. The concept of **causality** is one of the a priori concepts of human understanding which cannot be validly applied to the Noumenal world.

1. Physico-theologico argument

This is the argument from design: ‘the universe manifests order, harmony, wisdom and purposefulness. The universe must then be the product of an intelligent being who is responsible for the order’.

For Kant; at best this argument proves the existence of an architect or designer of the world and not of a creator.
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TRANSCENDENTAL IDEAS OF PURE REASON

Metaphysics, according to Kant centres around three ideas. What are the three main things that metaphysics study?

1. Idea of the soul (the mind or the self as the subject of thinking activity and the unity of all perceptions)
2. Idea of the world ( considered as the unity and the totality of all phenomena- reason unifies them)
3. Idea of God (considered as the unity and totality of all perfections. metaphysics studies the thing that unifies all perfections—which is God).

Man naturally tends to metaphysics. Is there anything corresponding to the soul? Or the world or of God in the universe?

Kant says:

NO. That is why these three ideas are called **transcendental ideas of pure reason**. Reason is pure. Reason moves beyond experience to transcend to these ideas which the mind unifies.

According to Kant, they constitute the subject-matters of the three main aspects of metaphysics namely: Speculative cosmology; Speculative psychology and speculative theology.

Who has seen the idea of God as the totality of all perfections? Are then these ideas useless? Kant says that they are useful, even though no objects correspond to them. They are pragmatic and they help man.

Sth that help you to correspond to other ideas is called --- **Heuristic Principle (google)**.

WE should accept these things for they are useful to man and they help us understand that everything is created for a purpose. The scientist through the transcendental idea of the world, he finds that the world was made by an intelligent being, and this encourages him to search more and to know that everything in the universe has a purpose. He now sets out to find the purpose for those things.

WHAT CAN BE SAID TO BE THE ARCHILLES HEEL OF KANT’S PHILOSOPHY?

CRITICISE KANT………

Remember that Knowledge is a conjunction of sense experience and understanding. kant warns that w do not use the categories of understanding beyond the Noumenal world( things as they appear, world of thing in themselves ). He said that those things in the Noumenal world are unknowable, therefore he has set the limit. He said that we cannot knowanything about the Noumenal world; but Kant posits that the Noumenal world exists, and that they are responsible for what appears to us. It is a contradiction because the fact that we know tha the Noumenal world exists, mean that we know sth about the Noumenal world.

He also applied the categories of thought, which is only to be applied to the phenomenal world; to the Noumenal world.

Synthetic judgement or propositions) statements with subjects and predicates). In this judgement, if The predicate is not contained in the subject, there is new information but the truth of this judgement is not necessary and universal.e.g the Apple is red

In general analytic proposition Is normally a priori.

The corpanican revolution: heliocentricism.

Before Kant, the word held that all that comes to the Ind comes from external obejects. But if this is positively, synthetic a priori is not possible.. He introduced the corpanican revolution in reason. He then proposes that rather than the mind, the object conforms to the mind.

(for test some sentenc3 can be written and one will be told to say whether is is a priori…..)

All bodies are heavy (synthetic)

(All bodies are extended (analytic)

(all triangles have three angles.. Analytic.)

How \do you prove synthetic a priori knowledge): the external objects conform Itself to the mind and not the other way round. It is called corpanican revolution.

KNowldedge is the conformity of external objects to the structure of the in. If this is true, then it ;means the mind cannot know the ramifications of the object.

For Kant, Knowledge is the combination of sense perception and understanding. Sometimes the sense perception is sense intuition or intuition. However non of them is enough to get knowledge. It is necessary but not sufficient. Each of them has its own form. In sense perception, the forms of perception happens under space and time. (Space and time is the a priori condition for the ability of perceiving everything).

Space is the condition for the appearance of a phenomena. Space is not an entity, It exists in itself. Time: we perceive something In time it is subjective condition for the perception of objects.

CATEGORIES OF UNDERSTANDING

KKnowledge according to Kant results from the joint operation of two faculties:

Faculty of sense perception +faculty of thought.

Faculty of sense perception can only operate within the apriori considtions of:

1. Space
2. Time

Faculty of Thought can only operate under certain a priori conditions and principles known as CATEGORIES.

To think is to Judge; the faculty of thinking is the faculty of judgement.

From the different forms of Judgement, we find out the caegories of Human understanding.

* FORMS OF JUDGMENT
* CATEGORIES OF UNDERSTANDING

1. Quantity – Unity; Plurality; Totality
2. Quality – Reality; Negation; limitation
3. Relation – Inherence and Substance(substance and accident); Causality and dependence(cause and effect); Community (reciprocity)
4. Modality – Possibilty-impossibility; Existence –Nonexistence; Necessity contingence

IT IS ONLY THROUGH THESE CATEGORIES THAT KNOWLEDGE CAN BE ACQUIRED.

The Categories can only be applied to objects that exists in Space and Time; and appear in the Phenomenal world. Categories of Human understanding cannot be validly applied to the Noumenal world.

Understanding is the ability to make judgement. It does the function of making judgements. This makes man different from animals. What helps us to understand is called the categories of understanding. The human mind makes four major judgements about what is perceived:

The phenomenal world is the world in which things appear to us

The noumena world is the world where things exist as they are.

The categories of understand cannot be applied in the noumena like world where things do not appear. It would lead to Antimonies

KANT’S CRITICISMS OF TRADITIONAL, SPECULATIVE METAPHYSICS

Three areas in speculative metaphysics: Speculative Cosmology; Speculative psychology; and Speculative theology.

CRITIQUE OF SPECULATIVE COSMOLOGY

CRITIQUE OF

1. O. C.

READ THE ARTICLE ‘’

The exams will be essay type. Be conscious of ‘Spellings’

English expressions. Effort to add something that is not given in the class.

If you summarize, I summarize your marks.

Do not manufacture your own; even the examples. Present the ones you have been taught.

1. KANT CRITICISMS ON Speculative theology
2. Hume ‘Ethics’
3. Locke’s Epistemology
4. Spinoza “Ethics’
5. Leibniz’s arguments (4) for the existence of God.
6. Descartes mind body relationship (occassionalism)

For some, there is no limit…. It is not good.

I don’t need **life History** at all.

Make use of OUTLINE>

Page Limit – write as much as you can, but on the main point, in addressing the question. After writing that which you have been taught; then you can add ideas from other recommended books; then give your own analysis, contribution and judgement.

1. Philosophy History and Problems , Enoch Stumpf pg. 192 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Samuel Enoch Stumpf, *History and problems of Philosophy* (London: )Pg. 216 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)