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**Section 1**

**2.** British Empiricism is a constructive intellectual philosophy that emerged throughout the mid-1800s, primarily in the United Kingdom, around the Age of Enlightenment. Empiricism is the belief that all understanding is derived from sensory perception. It stresses the importance of encounter and understanding gained, particularly sensual awareness, towards the creation of notions, whereas dismissing the concept of innate ideas, thus claims as the sole understanding people would possess is that which is founded in experiences. It is sometimes associated with Rationalism which claims that thinking can properly comprehend certain facts despite the need for the perceptions, which emerged throughout Europe simultaneously, thanks to the writings of Descartes and many others. George Berkeley as well as David Hume, especially John Locke are the key figures in this approach to philosophy.

Descartes is adherence to innate ideas as a skeptic. Human thoughts are pre-loaded with a range of cognitive conceptions and notions, as per Descartes, their substance is regardless of experiences. The mind, rather than the perceptions, provides an understanding of the essence of existence. Order to reason using intelligence is thus a fundamental aspect of philosophical investigation. All the perceptual concepts, according to Descartes, possess innate ideas. Materials, according to the interpretation of modern fundamental principles, possess no genuine attributes like human perceptual conceptions of colors, scents, flavors, and such, meaning that the substance of these thoughts comes from human intellect alone. According to Descartes' fundamental teaching, thoughts are intrinsic since their meaning originates solely from the constitution of the thought, rather than from sensory perception.

However, the notion of innate ideas has been criticized by John Locke. He believes that feeling is the source of all conceptions. According to John Locke, human intellect is just as vacant as a blank sheet in infancy. There are no innate ideas within the mind of an infant rather; concepts are communicated to the intellect via human perceptions. The brain's role now becomes receiving and distinguishing each concept over the other. In different words, Locke believes that conceptions are formed by experiences. Exterior things, on the other hand, provide the intellect with notions of perceptible attributes. However, comprehension is provided by the intellect. Furthermore, he mentioned two modes of idea; simple idea and complex idea. Simple ideas are the building blocks of all understanding. There are several ways in which they are conveyed or delivered to the intellect. Many concepts are exclusively accessible via one sensation, such as appearance and brightness through the vision; audio and melodies through the hearing; temperature, coolness, and substance through contact. Complex ideas, on the other hand, do not imply that they can exist on their own. Some variations are distinct variations on the identical simple ideas that do not include any other elements. Others are made up of a variety of simple ideas, as well as a mixture of simple ideas used to portray separate specific entities that exist on their own. In addition, He split the source of perceptions further into two categories: Sensation, which is caused by external objects, humans just direct the perceptions onto the surroundings and acquire knowledge in the manner of visuals, audio, scents, and contact, and Reflection, which is caused by human thoughts. Sometimes the experience is a replica of the genuine nature of objects, while in other instances it is a kind of indication or emblem of a genuine feature that is not accurately mirrored in the sensation. Lastly, he claims that each perception is accompanied by a concept that is similar to the experience but differs only within power and liveliness.

Moreover, Hume disagreed with Descartes' notion of innate ideas. He claims that notions are acquired via perceptions, which demonstrates how notions are not innate; someone should recognize that individuals have previously encountered such concepts. Hume strengthens his conviction because all notions are the result of perceptions.  Each concept, he said, seems to have a simple perception, and likewise. Hume classified human perceptions into two groups. He believed that impressions had more energy and liveliness than, ideas. He also believed that ideas are temporally reliant on duplicates of impressions.

The basis of Hume's study of human character is his opinions on impressions and ideas, as well as the laws of association. He seeks a strictly empirical analysis of human origins based on these. Simple or complex perceptions, including impressions or ideas, are feasible. Complex perceptions, on the other hand, are amenable to greater distinction and differentiation. To back to the previous example, the experience of fruit is complicated in the sense that it is made up of basic sensations of form, color, touch, and scent. It is noteworthy noting that, as per Hume, each simple perception relates to a simple idea that varies mostly in firmness and liveliness, as well as likewise. Whereas the complex perception of a fruit relates to the complex notion of fruit, no sensation relates to the complex thoughts of Unicorns; such complex ideas have no counterpart in actuality. Likewise, there is no complicated thought that corresponds to the complex sensation.

Besides, He separates the types of knowledge humans possess into two categories: Relations of Ideas and Matters of Fact. Relations of Ideas are the kind of topics that humans may learn without prior understanding, namely math and geometries. For instance: “rectangles have four corners” is valid since, well, a rectangle seems to be an item with four corners, this form of knowledge falls under Relations of Ideas. To understand, if people reject that rectangles do not possess four corners, Hume would assert that is a logical inconsistency since a rectangle is simply a configuration with four corners, therefore individuals who are asserting rectangles do not possess four corners, are truly just telling configurations with four corners do not possess four corners, that's a logical inconsistency since they are telling that there is a configuration in which both does have three corners and does not have three corners. These are Relation of Ideas.

On the contrary, Matters of Fact seem to be opinions concerning how usually entities in the outer environment seem to be, and as such the simple truth that “chickens can't fly” is something that we believe, and yet Hume will make an argument that they are not accurate just because of how the concepts of penguins and flying match up around each other. We cannot figure it out by ruminating around our individual beliefs, since we will not be able to refute a reality without running into a disagreement. For instance, “chickens cannot fly”. If we refute that assertion, we might assume that chickens can fly, that it is feasible that chickens can fly, and that there's no logical inconsistency in simply stating that chickens might fly. We might even envision that there's a genus of chicken that has not been found so far and could indeed fly, thus we cannot just think of a chicken. We have to find out if it can take flight or otherwise; we have to travel out as well as take a glance at every one of the chickens to see.

Here, Induction is a method of argumentation in which an individual analyzes things that have consistently occurred previously and afterward predicts that the future would act similarly, or in different phrases, that the tomorrow would reflect the yesterday, depending on such prior experiences. The “problem of induction” is named after Hume's argumentation with such a type of logic. Whenever individuals construct inductive reasoning like these, Hume believes they are presuming that the future would constantly act similarly to the previous. In other words, they came to believe that environment is consistent, permanent, and follows a certain pattern. As a consequence, Hume regards inductive logic as routine or habit, implying that the proclivity to rationale inductively is merely a spontaneous predisposition that people possess, lacking any basis. Simply two occurrences are often combined does not imply that they have a logical link and indicate they are connected in some way. So there is no compelling basis to believe that occurrences A and B are inextricably linked, so there is no compelling motive to believe that things should happen within this sequence in the coming. To establish that the tomorrow constantly would act precisely as the previous, we must first demonstrate that reality is consistent.

Lastly, whenever one considers the analytical synthetic difference, or even a priori and a posteriori, Kant claims as one begins in Hum’s stance, which is the sole analytic a priori, and the declarations of ideas are synthetic a posteriori. Whenever one discusses mathematics, he continues, one categorizes within the domain of relations of ideas, as well as for analytic a priori. Kant claims that calculating mathematics is not analytic a priori, but rather that the domain previously supposed to be devoid of synthetic a priori now contains mathematics. Induction, or the conviction that the tomorrow will be like the previous, is supported exactly as mathematics is reasoned, in that mathematics' premises are synthetic and contribute knowledge, just as the fundamental induction as the tomorrow will be like the previous. It is a must for us to have any significant memories; however, the notion that tomorrow will be similar to the previous is synthetic. Thus, cause and effect induction concepts are still not analytic; one cannot simply analyze them apart; instead, they contribute new knowledge, but they're still identifiable a priori is how Kant overcomes the dilemma of the problem of induction.

**Section 2**

**1.** The belief of people’s ethical and social duties exist contingent on a contractual arrangement between individuals to construct the structure of the community is known as social contract theory. According to social contract theory, mankind resided within the state of nature from its origin. They possessed no authority and no laws to keep people in control. Segments of the population faced difficulties and injustice. Humans formed pacts to safeguard their livelihoods and possessions to surmount such difficulties. As a consequence, a community emerged in which individuals pledged to accept one another as well as dwell in tranquility. This is rightfully identified with contemporary social and ethical thought since it has been Thomas Hobbes who gave it its earliest thorough explication and justification. Following Hobbes, John Locke and others are the most well-known advocates of such a hugely important idea, which has dominated ethical and social philosophy all across the development of sophisticated Europe.

Throughout a collection of writings, Hobbes outlines his social contract theory, the finest renowned of them being *The Leviathan* (1651). Thomas Hobbes discusses the ideas on our character and offers the concept of the perfect governance that is most fit to those beliefs throughout *The Leviathan*. The mighty ruling authority that humans build as safety, according to Hobbes, is comparable to the “Leviathan,” a giant legendary mythical beast represented throughout the Hebrew Scriptures and older Canaanite legend. The enormous marine beast is described inside the Hebrew Scriptures as “king over all the children of pride.” Likewise, Hobbes regarded the administration as the monarch among proud humans, in a sense of inherent natural ambition leads us to build a society to defend ourselves.

As a result, he believes all people are inherently but also solely self-interested. They are simply interested in whatever they believe to have been in their personal finest benefits. Humans react mechanically through becoming attracted to what individuals want while repelling what they do not want. As per him, humans resided within the “State of Nature” before the “Social Contract”. Danger and greed characterized a person's natural lifestyle. Mankind exists in a place of perpetual terror and chaos. “Solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short,” would have been the whole existence. He claims that humans are rational in contrast to being completely selfish. People possess the reasoning ability to seek their interests in the most effective and maximum manner feasible. He continues further to create a surprising and powerful case for why people should be prepared to surrender to authority based on such humanistic principles. He accomplished this by picturing people in a pre-society condition known as the State of Nature.

Moreover, as per him, a State of Nature is the State of War. The access to everything encourages major confrontation, particularly when there is rivalry for commodities, and there would certainly be around at minimum limited items like the greatest desired properties, marriages, and so forth. Individuals would understandably worry whether someone might raid them, and they might reasonably plot to attack mostly as a defensive strategy. Furthermore, that small group of self-centered individuals who like wielding authority on individuals may prompt a protective reaction from everyone else.

Thus, Hobbes offers fifteen natural principles which aid in the resolution of a dispute and the establishment of harmony, with the first two being very essential. That's how he characterizes the first natural laws.

“Every man ought to endeavor peace, as far as he has hope of obtaining it, and when he cannot obtain it, that he may seek and use all helps and advantages of war.”

“That a man be willing, when others are so too, as far-forth as for peace and defense of himself he shall think it necessary, to lay down this right to all things, and be contented with so much liberty against other men, as he would allow other men against himself.”

The very first law of nature is that humans must pursue harmony but protect themselves when they are unable to do so. The law's compelling character is obvious: humans want to exist because harmony is the greatest method to accomplish so. Nevertheless, if harmony breaks, humans must protect themselves. The second law of nature explains whether humans might live in harmony among themselves. This notion of consciousness and self-protection is fundamental to a person's essence; therefore in need to accomplish it, individuals willingly relinquished a few of their rights as well as freedoms to a certain ruler who should demand loyalty through this agreement. The pact requires the most powerful entity to defend and protect individuals’ life plus properties. As a result, the idea of the leader as a “monarch,” whom would become the undisputed authority, arose. People seemed to have limited rights under the monarchy's total power, and therefore must be followed throughout whatever circumstances, regardless matter what evil and unfit he may appear. Hobbes, on the other hand, imposed ethical responsibilities upon the monarch, whom is obligated by natural law. To him, all legislation is subject to the monarchy's approval and the regulation that the monarch commands and enforces.

However, the “State of Nature” is a totally distinct kind of position for John Locke, as the arguments about the “Social Contract” and also the nature of humans’ connection to power reflect this. Though Locke, like practically other social contract thinkers, employs Hobbes' analytical instrument of the State of Nature, he does so for a very distinct goal.

The state of nature, according to Locke, is essentially the same as the state of war. The lack of governance characterizes the state of nature, yet never the lack of reciprocal responsibility. This is adequate and entertaining; however, the property seemed hardly safe. The State of Nature was a “Golden Age” for him. Despite its problematic essence, existence is regulated by a natural law recognized by reasoning, which instructs all humanity whoever would but consider it since, as equivalent and free individuals, nobody should hurt anyone for either safety, prosperity, freedom, or possessions. The natural rule is followed, and life stays calm; common thinking describes this situation as mutual love, from which the grand statements of fairness and compassion are founded. People choose to join a confederation and therefore depart the natural order in establishing an unbiased body competent in resolving all conflicts and righting damage. Theory of Locke as the principles of “life, liberty, and property” are inherent privileges that exist before the civilized community is established.

In Locke's defense of civilian administration as well as the agreement that creates it, the property is crucial. Personal ownership, as per Locke, is produced whenever an individual combines personal work using natural basic resources. Thus, if someone checkouts a plot of property from the wild and turns this into agricultural land which generates nourishment, that person has a right to that plot of property as well as the nourishment it provides. Because of inherent consequences of the Natural law, however, seem to be boundaries to the amount of ownership someone may possess; someone cannot extract extra off environment that someone reasonably utilizes without putting everyone having sufficient. Since God has provided the whole of people an equal part of creation for their shared survival, none of us may extract greater than the rightful number. Ownership has been at the heart of Locke's case supporting the social contract with a civilian administration since this is equal preservation of the ownership, especially the possessions in one‘s personal objects, which men desire whenever they choose to reject the State of Nature.

As a result, humans within the state of nature are considered compelled to safeguard their possessions, so then in order to do this, humanity engaged under the Social Contract. Mankind does not relinquish the whole of his privileges to a “monarch” underneath the agreement; rather, man relinquished merely the responsibility to retain peace and execute the laws of nature. Since such liberties are regarded as inherent as well as essential. The objective of regulation and governance, as per Locke, would be to maintain and safeguard men's inalienable rights. All regulations passed by the administration remain legal and enforceable as far as the administration fulfills this objective; however, if this fails to do this, the legislation becomes invalid, and also the administration may indeed be removed from authority. Absolute dominion, according to Locke, is incompatible with natural law. He pushed for a government that serves the common interest. He argued for a legally restrained state that protected the three basic privileges of “life, liberty, and property.”