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**Part 2: Short answer**

1. Intellectual Laziness: This is the habit that some people have, when they deliberately prevent themselves from addressing the important questions.
2. Curiosity: A desire for knowledge
3. Value program: A world view that leaves absolutely no space for flexibility. The values are absolute.
4. a) Appeal to tradition: when you argue for something simply because it’s the way we’ve always done it.   
   b) Red herring: When you bring up something totally irrelevant in an argument for the purpose of distracting the person you’re arguing with and making the argument shift.
5. Modernity puts an emphasis on cultural unity within countries. For example the country is united in one religion or cultural practices.
6. In post-modernity however we value the differences that we have in our culture and we value our multi linguistic communities and this is seen as something good and we value this.
7. To reach the conclusion of “I think therefore I am”, Descartes took everything he knew and threw away any knowledge that he thought he could not doubt. In the end the only thing he could not doubt was his own existence.
8. The premises for his argument imply that he already is aware of god’s existence and he uses the existence of god to come to the conclusion that god exists.
9. When you don’t explain something to someone because explaining it is going to cause problems.
10. Skulls were put into paintings to represent mortality and the constant presence of death.
11. The Ambassadors displays images of wealth by showing these men in eloquent clothing and lots of material possessions and this is something people wanted to show off and show everyone.
12. Mr and Mrs Andrews is a painting that portrays the idea of property and ownership, something that was really desirable, but unaffordable to most.
13. Advertisements want to make you desire an object, so they try to show you how your life will be with this object and they try to glamorize it for you so that you get the feeling of wanting the object.

**Part 3: long answer**

If you were among the jurors at the trial of Socrates, which way would you have voted? Why?

Socrates was smart in being able to be the kind of person who can admit to being wrong, and he was wise to be able to be able admit that he himself didn’t know all that much. But Socrates, regardless of the philosopher that he was really managed to get some other people mad, and with good reason. He made others feel foolish and he made them feel insecure about their professions. This is wrong, but does not warrant the sentence to death that Socrates received.

I wouldn’t have voted for Socrates to get sentenced to death, but I also wouldn’t have voted for him to be fully innocent. He went around and told people that they were wrong and didn’t know as much as they thought they did, which inherently there’s nothing wrong with that. I mean, Socrates has the right of free speech, but the people around him also have their rights as well. They have the right to their security and their comfort but Socrates was infringing on this right and not respecting it. He was making people feel horrible about themselves and the knowledge that they thought they had and he was being very outward, public and frustrating about this.

Looking at this from a current day perspective, Socrates had the right to free speech and he was exercising this right by going around and showing others that they don’t know quite as much as they thought they did. He went around and showed people that he was the wisest man in Greece, not by knowing everything but by being able to admit to knowing nothing. Now, there’s nothing wrong with this except that Socrates was forcing his thoughts and beliefs onto others and wasn’t giving others much of a choice but to listen to him, even if that was against their will. This is something that really pushed people to act against him and would to anyone in their positions. So because Socrates was infringing on the rights of others, I would have given him some sort of sentence, but sentencing someone to death is something that should so rarely ever get done. If ever.

If I was at the trial of Socrates, I think I would have wanted his sentence to be that he should sit down with all the people that he did this to and have them teach him how to do what they do and to do it just as well as them and let him realize how long it takes to learn to be a carpenter, or a mason, or anything. Let him realize how they’ve poured their lives into learning into learning theses different crafts and Socrates is coming in and saying that they know nothing, while in the end Socrates himself admits to knowing nothing either. And maybe being able to admit that he knows nothing counts for something, but it isn’t fair for him to come in and tell all these people who work hard that they don’t actually know what they’re doing. Especially when they know what they’re doing and yet being made to feel like they don’t by a man who outright admits to knowing nothing. I believe it’s important to be able to admit to being wrong when you are, or not knowing as much as you thought you did, I think it’s good to be aware of these things, but I don’t think it’s very fair for someone to come in and tell you don’t know these things.

In conclusion, I would have voted for Socrates to not get sentenced to death. It’s a sentence that shouldn’t be given out so lightly, even to someone who really frustrated as many people as Socrates did. I think that instead of being sentenced to death, Socrates should have gone with all of the people that he insulted or discomforted or made feel unsafe by him and they should have taught Socrates all that they know so that Socrates would have realized that maybe they don’t know anything, but they certainly know something. Which is a lot more than Socrates is able to say about himself.

Explain Beaudrillard’s idea of “the hyper-real”. Do you think his idea is sound or unsound (or something in between)? Why?

Beaudrillard’s idea of the hyper-real explores the idea that we maybe create environments for ourselves that mimic perfect versions of our reality. For example people love going to old town shopping districts outdoors and we make these huge malls to mimic perfect versions of these outdoor strips of stores. We go to these real places and we see that they’re dirty and the weather isn’t perfect and so we make these malls that we can control the climate, we can keep it clean because it’s indoors, and we can enforce rules and make the environment a ‘perfected’ version of reality.

I neither agree nor disagree with this idea. Sticking with the idea of shopping malls, they are not a hyper-reality, nor do I think that you can properly argue that they are today. While decades ago, when our shopping districts were outdoors and shopping malls were just starting to be made, then this idea could make sense. We made shopping malls to be perfected versions of shopping districts and maybe because you could control so much in an indoor environment it could have been considered a hyper reality. But because today shopping malls is all that we see, they’ve moved beyond the hyper-real and have become reality. They are no longer perfected versions of reality, but they are the reality we live in. Now we will attempt to create more perfect versions of shopping malls that will be considered a hyper-reality until the day that they simply become reality.

Before shopping malls were around, when we first started seeing shopping districts where the stores are in buildings, I’m sure we could’ve seen that as a hyper-reality too. We moved from seeing people setting up stands with products outdoors to everything being moved indoors. We had towns with squares in them filled with vendors who had their shops set up for the day and then they packed things up and brought them home. We still see shops like this today in farmer’s markets, but this kind of shopping was at a point in time the reality and outdoor shopping districts were improved versions of this. While keeping the streets clean wasn’t really possible, keeping the inside of your shop clean would’ve been quite easy. So that used to be a hyper reality, but then moved into becoming the reality and is now considered old.

Today, we’ve started shopping on amazon or eBay and kijiji, and some people shop much more online than they do in real life. When you’re shopping online you can buy stuff by simply clicking a button and having it delivered to your house. If you plan to go shopping 2 weeks before you go, then it takes 2 weeks for delivery, then in reality, you’re getting your stuff at the same time. The difference is that online, the store chooses exactly what you see. They don’t have to worry about other things influencing your decisions. People who detract from the image of the store, other people frustrating you or anything of the sort. They choose exactly what you see and based on what you shop for they can alter their ads to target you and make it into an experience directed towards each individual. This perfected version of shopping malls makes it into a kind of hyper reality.

But even if we view online shopping as a kind of hyper-reality now, we won’t always see things this way. We moved away from seeing shopping districts as reality and malls as a hyper-reality and moved into something new. Now we see malls as reality and shopping districts we see as being ‘quaint’ or ‘cute’, somewhere you might go to buy antiques or homemade products. They’re old. Now we see the internet as a hyper-reality, although as shopping malls did, they will someday become a reality too and we’ll see the shopping malls as ‘cool, but unnecessary’ or inconvenient.