**Answer to the question number 5:**  
Descartes is regarded as one of the the founders of modern philosophy. After Aristotle, when the new era of science and technology started, Descartes became one of the significant philosophers of that time. Although like his previous philosophers his search for knowledge was there. But in a different way. Like plato he was not into the search for unchanging and eternal knowledge. He was more into the idea of certainty. And here the doubts came that made him significant amongst the philosophers. According to Descartes, certainty is something that can not be doubted. However almost everything can be doubted until anyone can find the reality.   
To find the certainty Descartes has his own methods and the base of these methods are doubting. In step one Descartes simply doubts the sensories. It comes with the idea that our own senses do not detect certainty of things. For example, conducting extreme heat or cold in a small part of the skin feels exactly the same for some moment at the very beginning. At that time it is impossible to detect which one someone is feeling. This doubting is connected to doubting our own sensories. Also optical illusion like the mirage also proves that point. Another type of doubting can be the doubting of realities. For example, the doubting between a very realistic dream and reality is often confusing to understand. Both experiences feel extremely realistic that creates confusion. Another type of doubting can be doubting very certain seeming things like mathematics. Unknowingly Committing a mistake in a mathematical problem creates a belief that it is right, which also questions the certainty of it. According to Descartes, these uncertain things that create doubts cannot be a base for knowledge. To find out the base of knowledge he decides to doubt everything and he establishes a systematic way of doubting anything to figure out the uncertainty of a situation. This way of systematic doubting is descartes’ “method of doubt”.  
For example, if I am given a situation where I am sitting in front of a desk and reading a book, I would choose not to believe about the certainty of the situation. Because according to descartes’ methods, part 1 and 2 of step two makes me realize the uncertainty of it. I can strongly doubt the experience because I am not sure if it is a vivid dream or a reality. Which connects to the 1st part of step two. On the other hand,like what Descartes says in his part 2 of step two of the methods of doubting, it is also possible for the evil genius to trick me to believe that the situation of sitting in front of a table and reading a book is real. Because of all these reasons, I can doubt the certainty of this situation.   
The method of doubting is divided into three steps. Doubting the senses, doubting the physical world and doubting mathematics. doubting the physical world in general. A very good example of this situation can be the idea of dreaming and living. We are very uncertain about the certainty of our lives. Because often it happens the dreams become so vivid that every sense from those dreams seems real that after waking up from that dream we begin to doubt which one was real. The other part of step two describes things about an evil identity whom he refers to as an evil demon or evil genius who is using us to believe in the illusion of experiences as reality,Just like the “Matrix” movie. the reality might be an illusion that we are experiencing through dreams. It is like a dream in a dream. However, like the movie “Matrix” there is nothing outside the illusion that the evil demon is trying to make us experience. According to Descartes, because of that we can't be sure about the certainty of it, however, because of this reason these experiences can not be a base for knowledge. For the third step of his methods of doubting he states about the uncertainty of mathematical problems. **E**ven though it is known that mathematics is certain and it can be used as a base of knowledge. However, if we make any mistakes in mathematical problems we believe that we got the correct answer. Even sometimes multiple people end up having the same wrong answer from the same problem that they all have the same mistake. In another part of step three Descartes mentions another side of doubting mathematical problems. He states, it might be possible that the evil genius is tricking us to believe a certain type of mathematical solution to a certain problem. There is no way to find out the real answer.   
Situations like conducting heat or cold to skin creates confusion at first. With this situation it is not possible to detect certainty. Also it is not possible to find out what is actually happening in the name of reality. The existence of evil genius is very possible and creates a big doubt for the experience of life. Even in mathematical problem solving, apart from the coincidence of commiting mistakes, the idea of the evil genius is making us believe the answer to a problem is an answer is quite believable. For example, with some other mathematical solutions we can find that the same problem might have different answers. Like, 1+1 can be 2, and 3 in different solutions. As an individual when I am looking at these situations to find whether I am going to believe in the things that I experience or not, I choose to agree with the methods of descartes’ doubting to figure out the certainty of the situation.   
By discussing all these doubts and methods of doubts, descartes tried to find out about the information that can not be doubted. Because every thought and belief that we currently have, has been passed down from centuries after centuries by our ancestors. In most cases we do not doubt before thinking and believing any of these. But there is no proof of those beliefs and thoughts to be true. Even our own senses confuses us and convinces us to believe something not true. Because of this reason, Descartes discovers the importance of questioning and doubting before thinking or believing anything, Which helps to figure out the certainty of a thought or a belief.   
Through all these confusions, doubts and questions, Descartes discovers we can doubt everything and there is no way to find certainty of anything without doubting at first. However, Descartes realizes, even if everything is just an illusion, and he can doubt everything, the idea of himself or “me” is something that exists. Which means all these doubts prove the existence of his mind and it proves somewhere he exists. Therefore, he stated his famous quote, Cogito ergo sum. Which means, “ “I think; therefore I am”. And this realization is something like this comes with clear and distinct ideas.   
‘The clear’ part of the clear and distinct idea comes with a mind that is not being distracted by anything else and concentrating entirely when it is thinking. Basically it is an attentive mind when it thinks. With a clear idea the thinking might be true, those ideas do not require any proof. And ‘the distinct’ part is something that is clear and nothing else. Which means none of these thoughts are confusing. And for Descartes clear and distinct ideas makes him realize about the thoughts that he exists and it does not require any proof.   
The clear and distinct idea helped Descartes to realize his existence. However, this idea can help anyone to find out anything without proving anything. Moreover, all thoughts and beliefs that come with clear and distinct ideas, are true. It proves the certaining of a thought; however, certainty is the foundation for knowledge. Thus, the idea of clear and distinct sets the foundation for every kind of knowledge.   
  
  
  
  
  
**Answer to the question number 1:**  
Aristotle as a philosopher was someone who took a different turn for his work. With him the world of philosophy took quite a different turn. Unlike any other philosopher of his time his specification of work was quite vast in volume.However most of his work related to one another at some point. One of his notable works amongst all is the “objects of knowledge”. For getting a clearer idea about knowledge he came up with theories about it.   
One of his most important parts of the discussion about knowledge is logic. Logic is something that makes an argument strong or weak using validation and correct reasons. In the realm of arguments, Here is a thing called syllogism, which means a strong argument which is false. With logic it is possible to identify “syllogism” in an argument. And an argument no matter how strong it is, if it is not true it can not provide knowledge. Aristotle thinks of logic as a very strong aspiration of any rational thinking or argument.   
Arguments come with two parts. Premises or assumptions and conclusions. A premise is a preceding claim on which an argument is built or on which a conclusion was formed and A conclusion is anything that arrives after the premises or the premise has been examined. For example, all women are beautiful. Enya is a woman. Therefore, from these two sentences we can tell, Enya is beautiful. Here the first two sentences are premises and the third sentence is a conclusion. Also there are two types of arguments. Deductive arguments and inductive arguments. Aristotle is very famous for his explanation of deductive arguments. Deductive arguments are those arguments which have a general premise that moves towards a specific conclusion and inductive conclusions is an argument which has specific premises but general conclusion. However according to modern philosophy the meanings of these arguments are slightly different. Here , an inductive argument means, if the premises are true, the conclusion probably be true. However, it might be false as well. On the other hand, deductive argument means if the premises are true, the conclusions must be true. Plato and aristotle both were concerned about the certainty of any information and they believed only certainty can provide knowledge. However, by inductive arguments it might be possible to get certain information, but if it establishes a false argument, it can never be counted as knowledge. Because of this reason deductive arguments mosty lead toward a good argument. However, validity and sound arguments are something that ensures the validity of all the premises. Which is only possible to achieve by a deductive argument.   
Syllogism is a kind of argument where two premises are present and from these two premises a conclusion is found. Along with that aristotle mentions about 4 kinds of categorical syllogism. Here Aristotle mentions about the subject ‘A’ and ‘B’. by using this technique Aristotle proves that most of the syllogism is invalid kind or argument. Which might lead to a false argument. For a example of syllogism, all humans can talk. Deaf and mute people are also human. By these two premises the conclusion like this can be found, Dead and mute people can talk. Which is an untrue statement. Aristotle made sure the premises used for a valid argument must be true, by that it is possible to ensure the conclusion to be true.   
The differences of valid and unvallied arguments from Aristotle's perspective is quite specific. In the deductive and inductive arguments valid arguments are already discussed. The modernized idea of deductive argument is valid arguments and However in short can be said, When all of the premises are true, then the conclusion must be true. On the other hand the invalied arguments are those whose premises are assumed to be true. If after assuming precimses to be truth and the conclusion is something that is true, then it is considered as invaled argument. A case that demonstrates that an argument could have accurate premises but a wrong conclusion is known as a counter-example.Simply put, this requires replacing essential phrases with letters and ensuring consistency. By replacing the other, we may construct a counter-example that demonstrates the argument's invalidity. For example, some artists are geniuses, some artists are druggies. Therefore druggies are geniuses. Which proves that this argument is invalied.

According to Aristotle it is not possible to exhibit everything knowable. It is not possible to prove everything. And if the seeking for answers continues, it is possible to get stuck in an ocean of endless questions that cannot be answered.

According to Aristotle, it is important to have a starting point. And these starting points are known as immediate premises. According to aristotle these immediate premises are the first principle. However detecting these first principles also can put into loops of questions. Thus, aristotle has his way of solving this issue. Aristotle mentioned that knowledge is available in different stages and different identities. The goal is to deconstruct complex issues into core ideas or concepts which are unquestionably true. The basic principles then serve as a framework or restrictions for developing a theory, or a forecast. Advancements have been made in knowing can be achieved by recreating components of fundamental principles in an unique way.