

1 Все темы

Задача 1.1. What prevents Plato from uniting the plural and the unified, as Plato understands knowledge and truth

Доказательство. That is a very interesting and complex question. Plato's theory of knowledge and truth is based on his metaphysics of Forms, which are the eternal and perfect essences of things that can only be grasped by reason. According to Plato, the sensible world of changing and multiple phenomena is only a shadowy reflection of the intelligible world of Forms, which is the true reality. Therefore, knowledge and truth are only possible when one ascends from the realm of opinion and perception to the realm of understanding and reason.

However, Plato also faces some difficulties in explaining how the Forms relate to the sensible things that participate in them. One of the main problems is the so-called 'third man argument', which challenges the idea that there is a single Form for each kind of thing. For example, if there is a Form of Man that is the essence of all men, then what makes the Form of Man itself a man? If we say that it participates in another Form of Man, then we have an infinite regress of Forms. If we say that it does not participate in anything, then we have a contradiction, since the Form of Man is supposed to be the cause of manhood in all men.

Another problem is the 'one over many principle', which states that there is one Form for each group of things that share a common property. For example, there is one Form of Beauty that is the cause of beauty in all beautiful things. However, this principle seems to imply that there are too many Forms, since there are many different ways of grouping things together. For instance, there could be a Form of White Horse, a Form of White Animal, a Form of White Thing, and so on. Moreover, some Forms seem to be incompatible with each other, such as the Form of Odd and the Form of Even, or the Form of Rest and the Form of Motion.

These problems prevent Plato from uniting the plural and the unified, as he understands knowledge and truth. He cannot account for the diversity and complexity of the sensible world without compromising the simplicity and purity of the Forms. He also cannot explain how the Forms interact with each other and with the sensible things without introducing some kind of intermediary or principle that bridges the gap between the two realms. Some of Plato's later dialogues, such as the *Parmenides* and the *Sophist*, attempt to address these difficulties, but they do not offer a definitive solution. □

Задача 1.2. what is the difference between phrases "oak is a tree" and "oak has green leaves" from Plato standpoint

Доказательство. From Plato's standpoint, the difference between the phrases "oak is a tree" and "oak has green leaves" is that the former is a statement of predication and the latter is a statement of attribution. Predication is the act of judging that one term is subsumed under another, such as when we say that a particular oak is a tree, or that the Form of Tree is the essence of all trees. Attribution is the act of judging that a thing has a certain property, such as when we say that an oak has green leaves, or that the Form of Greenness is the cause of greenness in all green things

Predication and attribution are both ways of expressing the relation between the Forms and the sensible things that participate in them, but they are not equivalent. Predication implies a kind of identity or sameness between the subject and the predicate, whereas attribution implies a kind of difference or diversity between the thing and the property. For example, when we say that an oak is a tree, we mean that the oak shares the same nature or essence as the tree, or that it is a member of the same kind or class as the tree. But when we say that an oak has green leaves, we do not mean that the oak is identical to the green leaves, or that it belongs to the same kind or class as the green leaves. Rather, we mean that the oak possesses or exhibits a certain quality or characteristic that is distinct from its own nature or essence.

Plato's theory of knowledge and truth is based on the idea that predication is more fundamental and reliable than attribution, since it reveals the essence or nature of things, whereas attribution only reveals their accidental or changing properties. Plato argues that only the Forms, which are the eternal and perfect essences of things, can be the objects of true knowledge and predication, whereas the sensible things, which are the changing and imperfect phenomena, can only be the objects of opinion and attribution. Therefore, the phrase "oak is a tree" expresses a higher and more certain kind of knowledge than the phrase "oak has green leaves", since it refers to the Form of Tree, which is the true reality of all trees, whereas the latter refers to the property of greenness, which is only a shadowy reflection of the Form of Greenness □

Задача 1.3. Reconstructs the arguments against Plato and Aristotle's concept. How does he understand the cause-and-effect relationship: in the sense of inference or in some other way?

Доказательство. Plato and Aristotle both proposed theories of forms, which are abstract entities that exist independently of the sensible world. They also both developed accounts of the four causes, which are the factors that explain why something exists or changes in a certain way. However, their theories differed in important respects, and they faced various criticisms from later philosophers. Here are some of the main arguments against their views:

- Plato's theory of forms was challenged by Aristotle, who argued that forms are not separate from the sensible things that participate in them, but rather are immanent in them. Aristotle also rejected Plato's idea of a single form of the good, which he considered to be too vague and metaphysical. Aristotle preferred to base his ethics on practical reasoning and human nature.
- Aristotle's theory of the four causes was criticized by some of his successors, such as the Stoics and the Epicureans, who denied the existence of final causes, or purposes, in nature. They argued that natural phenomena are governed by mechanical laws or random events, and that teleology, or the study of ends, is irrelevant to physics and cosmology.
- Both Plato and Aristotle's theories of forms and causes were challenged by the empiricist tradition, which emphasized the role of observation and experience in acquiring knowledge. Empiricists, such as Locke, Hume, and Berkeley, questioned the validity and usefulness of abstract concepts and universal principles that are not derived from or verified by the senses. They also argued that causation is not a necessary or intrinsic relation between things, but rather a habit of the mind that infers effects from regular patterns of events.

The four causes are the factors that explain why something exists or changes in a certain way, according to Aristotle. They are:

- The material cause: This is the substance that something is made from. For example, a chair is made from wood or metal.
- The formal cause: This is the shape or structure that something has. For example, a chair has four legs, a seat, and a back.
- The efficient cause: This is the agent or force that produces or transforms something. For example, a chair is made by a carpenter or a factory.
- The final cause: This is the purpose or function that something serves. For example, a chair is made for sitting.

how Aristotle criticize Plato?

- Aristotle rejected Plato's theory of forms, which claimed that there are abstract entities that exist independently of the sensible world and that particular things participate in them. Aristotle argued that forms are not separate from the sensible things, but rather are immanent in them. He also denied that there is a single form of the good, which he considered to be too vague and metaphysical. He preferred to base his ethics on practical reasoning and human nature.
- Aristotle dismissed Plato's soul-body dualism, which held that the soul is immortal and distinct from the body, and that the body is a prison for the soul. Aristotle maintained that the soul is the form or principle of the body, and that they are inseparable. He also argued that the soul has different faculties or parts, such as the rational, the appetitive, and the vegetative, and that they are not independent of each other.
- Aristotle expressed severe reservations about the tenability of Plato's political philosophy, which envisioned a utopian state ruled by philosopher-kings, who would share their wives, children, and property in common. Aristotle criticized Plato's assumption that the state is prior to the individual, and that the individual's happiness depends on the state's happiness. He also objected to Plato's abolition of private property and family, which he thought would undermine the natural bonds of affection and loyalty among citizens. He advocated a more realistic and moderate form of government, based on the rule of law and the balance of different classes.

Задача 1.4. Try to reconstruct Bacon's scientific knowledge: how, in his opinion, nature and human abilities interact, what experience is and what its structure is (the difference between experience and scientific experience), how judgments are tested, the role of logic in finding the truth, what idols are and their role in carrying out inspections.

Доказательство. Bacon's scientific knowledge is based on his method of inductive reasoning and empirical observation of natural phenomena. He believed that nature is a book that can be read by human reason, but only if we free ourselves from the prejudices and errors that cloud our minds. He called these errors idols, and classified them into four types: idols of the tribe (common to all humans), idols of the cave (personal to each individual), idols of the marketplace (arising from language and communication), and idols of the theatre (derived from authority and tradition).

Bacon proposed a new way of conducting scientific investigations, which he called the *Novum Organum* or New Method. He rejected the Aristotelian logic of syllogism, which deduced general principles from particular cases, and instead advocated for a bottom-up approach, where general principles are derived from a large number of particular observations. He also distinguished between two types of experience: vulgar experience, which is the passive and superficial observation of common events, and learned experience, which is the active and systematic experimentation of rare and hidden phenomena.

Bacon's method consists of three main steps: observation, hypothesis, and confirmation. First, the scientist must collect a large amount of data about the phenomenon under study, using various instruments and techniques to enhance the senses. Second, the scientist must formulate a tentative explanation or hypothesis, based on the elimination of irrelevant or contradictory data, and the identification of common patterns or causes. Third, the scientist must test the hypothesis by further experiments, and either confirm or reject it.

Bacon's method is not purely empirical, however, as he also recognized the role of logic in finding the truth. He argued that logic is not a tool for discovery, but a tool for demonstration and communication. He also acknowledged that some general principles or axioms are necessary to guide the investigation, but they must be derived from experience, not from authority or tradition. He called these principles prerogative instances, and classified them into 27 types, such as crucial instances, migrating instances, and latent instances.

Bacon's scientific knowledge is aimed at achieving two main goals: understanding and improving nature. He believed that by discovering the laws and causes of natural phenomena, humans can gain more power and control over nature, and use it for their benefit and happiness. He also envisioned a utopian society, where science and technology are used for the common good, and where knowledge is shared and organized in a systematic way. He called this project the Great Instauration, and outlined it in his unfinished work, *The New Atlantis*. □

Задача 1.5. Try to reconstruct Descartes' method of reasoning. By what signs does he distinguish between a person and a thing, what is their interaction and the role of God? What is the rationale for this distinction? Consider the significance of this distinction and the vulnerabilities associated with it.

Доказательство.

- Descartes' method of reasoning is based on his famous principle of *cogito, ergo sum* ("I think, therefore I am"), which he derived from his radical doubt of everything that he could not be certain of. He used this principle as a foundation for his knowledge and a criterion for distinguishing between a person and a thing.
- Descartes argued that a person is a thinking substance (*res cogitans*) that can doubt, reason, and understand, while a thing is an extended substance (*res extensa*) that has dimensions, shape, and motion. He claimed that these two substances are completely different and independent of each other, and that they interact through the pineal gland in the brain.
- Descartes also believed that God is a perfect substance that is the cause of his existence and his innate ideas of mind, matter, and God. He argued that God is not a deceiver and that he guarantees the validity of his clear and distinct perceptions, which are the basis of his scientific and mathematical knowledge.

- The rationale for this distinction between a person and a thing is that Descartes wanted to establish a secure and certain foundation for his philosophy and science, and to avoid the skepticism and relativism that he saw in his predecessors and contemporaries. He also wanted to preserve the dignity and freedom of human beings as rational agents, and to reconcile his mechanistic view of nature with his religious faith. □

Задача 1.6. How did Descartes manage to make fundamental discoveries without resorting to experience (is this related to his method), what is the nature of the method (and in connection with overcoming errors), how he understands causality and experience

(Kant's Prolegomena) How Kant overcomes the difficulty of knowledge discovered by Descartes (two substances), what experience is and its relationship with the world, judgments of experience and judgments of perception, synthetic judgments a priori and a posteriori, the difference between synthetic and analytical judgments.

Доказательство. Descartes managed to make fundamental discoveries without resorting to experience by using his method of doubt, which aimed to find certain and indubitable truths that could serve as the foundation of knowledge. He relied on his innate ideas of God, mind, and matter, and on his clear and distinct perceptions, which he believed were guaranteed by God's veracity. He also used deductive reasoning and mathematical demonstrations to derive further truths from his first principles. He did not reject experience altogether, but he regarded it as a source of probable and contingent knowledge, not of absolute certainty.

The nature of Descartes' method of doubt is to question everything that can be doubted, even the most common and obvious beliefs, such as the existence of the external world, the reliability of the senses, and the validity of logic and arithmetic. He did this in order to find something that could not be doubted, something that he could be sure of even if he was deceived by an evil demon. He found this in his famous cogito argument: "I think, therefore I am." This was the first and most certain truth that he could not doubt, and from which he could rebuild his knowledge of himself, God, and nature.

Descartes understood causality as a relation of necessary connection between a cause and an effect, based on the principle of sufficient reason. He also adopted the principle of conservation, according to which the same quantity of motion is always preserved in the universe. He applied these principles to explain the phenomena of nature, such as the laws of motion, the formation of the solar system, and the functioning of the human body. He also used the concept of causality to prove the existence of God, arguing that the idea of a perfect being in his mind must have been caused by a being that is actually perfect and exists outside of him.

Descartes understood experience as the perception of the sensible qualities of objects, such as color, sound, taste, etc. He distinguished between two kinds of experience: external and internal. External experience is the perception of the external world through the senses, which are affected by the motions of the particles of matter. Internal experience is the perception of the internal states of the mind, such as thoughts, feelings, desires, etc. Descartes was skeptical about the accuracy and certainty of external experience, since he thought that the sensible qualities of objects do not correspond to their true nature, which is purely geometrical and mathematical. He was more confident about the clarity and distinctness of internal experience, since he thought that the mind is a thinking substance that is distinct from the body and can know itself directly.

Kant overcame the difficulty of knowledge discovered by Descartes by proposing a new way of understanding the relation between the mind and the world. He argued that the mind does not passively receive information from the world, but actively shapes and organizes it according to its own a priori forms and categories. These forms and categories are the necessary conditions of the possibility of experience, and they make it possible for us to have synthetic a priori judgments, which are both universal and necessary, and yet informative and not merely analytic. Kant also distinguished between the phenomenal and the noumenal world, the former being the world as it appears to us through our forms and categories, and the latter being the world as it is in itself, independent of our cognition. He claimed that we can only have knowledge of the phenomenal world, and that the noumenal world is beyond our reach.

Kant defined experience as the empirical cognition of objects, which involves both intuition and understanding. Intuition is the faculty of sensibility, which provides us with the raw material of experience, namely, the sensations of space and time. Understanding is the faculty of reason, which provides us with the form and structure of experience, namely, the concepts and principles that govern our judgments. Experience is thus the result of the synthesis of intuition and understanding, which enables us to have objective and valid knowledge of the world.

Kant distinguished between judgments of perception and judgments of experience in the Prolegomena as two kinds of empirical judgments. Judgments of perception are merely subjectively valid, meaning that they express the relation between our sensations and our subjective state, without claiming any objective validity or universal applicability. Judgments of experience are objectively valid, meaning that they express the relation between our sensations and the objects of the world, and that they are governed by the a priori principles of the understanding, such as the analogies of experience and the postulates of empirical thought. Judgments of experience are thus more than mere judgments of perception, since they involve the application of the categories and the rules of the understanding to the intuitions of sensibility.

Kant distinguished between synthetic and analytic judgments in the Critique of Pure Reason as two kinds of judgments. Analytic judgments are those in which the predicate is contained in the subject, and thus they are true by virtue of the principle of contradiction. They are not informative, since they do not add anything new to our knowledge, but only explicate what is already contained in the concept of the subject. Synthetic judgments are those in which the predicate is not contained in the subject, and thus they are not true by virtue of the principle of contradiction. They are informative, since they add something new to our knowledge, by connecting two different concepts that are not analytically related. Kant also divided judgments into a priori and a posteriori, depending on whether they are independent or dependent on experience. He claimed that there are synthetic a priori judgments, which are both independent of experience and informative, and that they are the basis of mathematics, natural science, and metaphysics. He also claimed that there are no analytic a posteriori judgments, since they would be both dependent on experience and uninformative, and thus meaningless.

analytical, synthetical apriori and aposteriori statements (detailed):

- Analytical statements are those that are true by virtue of their meaning alone. For example, “All bachelors are unmarried” is an analytical statement, because the concept of being unmarried is part of the definition of being a bachelor.
- Synthetic statements are those that are not true by virtue of their meaning alone, but require some relation to the world to be verified. For example, “All bachelors are alone” is a synthetic statement, because the concept of being alone is not part of the definition of being a bachelor, and we need to observe the world to see if it is true or not.
- A priori statements are those that can be known independently of experience. For example, “All triangles have three sides” is an a priori statement, because we do not need to measure all triangles to know this; it is a logical consequence of the concept of a triangle.
- A posteriori statements are those that can only be known through experience. For example, “The triangle is blue” is an a posteriori statement, because we need to see the triangle to know its color.

□

Задача 1.7. morality according to Kant and questions about the difference between the laws and judgments of mathematics and the unscientific nature of judgments about God

Доказательство. According to Kant, morality is based on the idea of the good will, which is the only thing that is good without qualification. The good will is the will that acts from duty, which is the obligation to follow the moral law. The moral law is not derived from experience, emotions, or consequences, but from pure reason. It is a universal and categorical imperative, which means that it applies to all rational beings and commands them to do something unconditionally.

One way to formulate the categorical imperative is to act only according to that maxim by which you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law. This means that one should act consistently and impartially, without making exceptions for oneself or others. Another way to formulate it is to act in such a way that you treat humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of any other, never merely as a means to an end, but always at the same time as an end. This means that one should respect the dignity and autonomy of oneself and others, and not use them for selfish purposes.

Kant believed that his moral theory was compatible with his scientific and mathematical views, which were also based on the principles of pure reason. He argued that mathematics and natural science are synthetic a priori

judgments, which means that they are not derived from experience, but from the application of reason to the concepts of space and time. They are also not merely analytic, which means that they are not true by definition, but add new information to our knowledge. For example, the statement “ $7 + 5 = 12$ ” is not true by definition, but by applying the rules of arithmetic to the concepts of numbers. Similarly, the statement “every event has a cause” is not true by definition, but by applying the principle of causality to the concept of nature.

However, Kant also recognized the limits of human reason, and argued that there are some questions that reason cannot answer, such as the existence of God, the immortality of the soul, and the freedom of the will. These are the topics of metaphysics, which Kant considered to be beyond the scope of both experience and pure reason. He claimed that these questions are not objects of knowledge, but of faith. He also argued that they are not contradictory to reason, but rather presupposed by it. For example, he maintained that we need to assume the existence of God as the moral lawgiver and the guarantor of justice, the immortality of the soul as the condition for moral perfection, and the freedom of the will as the basis for moral responsibility. \square

Задача 1.8. Thomas Hobbes

Доказательство. TO DO \square

Задача 1.9. Explain the conceptual flaws in the concept of civil society as the basis of the state and the theory of the social contract (the method of state formation), and the conceptual flaws in the state of nature. What is morality in contrast to moralität (for Hegel this is fundamental), the signs of a moral state, the mechanism of the moral decline of civil society, the mechanism for the implementation of morality in the state. Criticism of public opinion and all forms of government (criteria for this criticism)

Доказательство. Hegel criticizes the concept of civil society as the basis of the state and the theory of the social contract as a method of state formation. He argues that these ideas are based on an abstract and individualistic notion of freedom, which ignores the historical and social context of human beings. Hegel thinks that civil society is a sphere of particular interests, needs, and rights, which often conflict with each other and create inequality, injustice, and alienation. The social contract theory assumes that individuals can voluntarily agree to form a state that protects their rights and interests, but Hegel questions the legitimacy and stability of such a state. He also rejects the idea of a state of nature, which is a hypothetical condition of human beings before the formation of the state. Hegel thinks that the state of nature is a fiction that contradicts the historical and rational development of human spirit.

Hegel contrasts morality (Moralität) with ethical life (Sittlichkeit). Morality is the subjective and formal aspect of human action, which is based on the individual’s conscience, intention, and duty. Ethical life is the objective and concrete aspect of human action, which is based on the social and historical institutions, customs, and values that shape the individual’s identity, character, and freedom. Hegel thinks that morality is not enough to guide human action, because it can be arbitrary, abstract, and contradictory. He believes that ethical life is the true realization of human freedom, because it expresses the rational and universal spirit of humanity in its historical and social forms.

Hegel identifies three main signs of a moral state: the constitution, the administration of justice, and the police. The constitution is the fundamental law that organizes the state and its powers, and reflects the rational will of the people. The administration of justice is the system that protects the rights and duties of the citizens, and ensures the equality and fairness of the law. The police is the agency that regulates the civil society and its needs, and maintains the public order and welfare. Hegel thinks that these three elements are necessary for the state to function properly and to secure the freedom and happiness of the people.

Hegel explains the mechanism of the moral decline of civil society as a result of the contradiction between the universal and the particular interests of the people. He argues that civil society produces wealth, culture, and education, but also poverty, misery, and ignorance. He thinks that civil society creates a class of people who are excluded from the benefits of the society and who become dependent on the state for their survival. He also thinks that civil society fosters a spirit of competition, individualism, and egoism, which undermine the social bonds and the common good. Hegel warns that civil society can become a source of corruption, crime, and revolution, if it is not balanced by the ethical life of the state.

Hegel proposes the mechanism for the implementation of morality in the state as a process of reconciliation between the universal and the particular interests of the people. He suggests that the state should provide a system of corporations, which are associations of people who share a common profession, interest, or purpose. He thinks that the corporations can help the people to develop their skills, talents, and virtues, and to represent their interests in the state. He also suggests that the state should promote a system of education, which can cultivate the moral and intellectual capacities of the people, and prepare them for their roles and responsibilities in the society. He also suggests that the state should encourage a system of religion, which can inspire the people with a sense of the divine and the absolute, and unify them in a common faith and worship.

Hegel criticizes public opinion and all forms of government that are based on it. He thinks that public opinion is a collection of opinions, prejudices, and passions that are influenced by the media, the masses, and the demagogues. He thinks that public opinion is often irrational, ignorant, and inconsistent, and that it does not reflect the true will and the rational spirit of the people. He argues that the forms of government that rely on public opinion, such as democracy, are unstable, chaotic, and tyrannical. He prefers a form of government that is based on the constitutional monarchy, which he thinks can balance the different powers and interests of the state, and represent the rational and universal will of the people. He criticizes the forms of government that are based on the absolute monarchy, such as despotism, or on the aristocracy, such as oligarchy, because he thinks that they are unjust, oppressive, and irrational. He evaluates the forms of government according to the criteria of freedom, rationality, and universality. □