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**Section 1 (2)**

A constructive intellectual philosophy known as British Empiricism was initially created in the UK during the age of Enlightenment. The fundamental tenet of empiricism is that all information originates from our senses. It states that people only have wisdom that is derived from their personal experiences. Many empiricists believe that relationships between earlier sensory experiences are why traditions or conventions develop in the world. Moreover, Empiricism has historically speaking, been somewhat linked to the idea of the mind as a blank slate. The human mind is empty at birth and only learns to think from experiences. Additionally, empiricism also emphasizes the need to test all hypotheses and theories against observations of the natural world rather than depending simply on intuition or apriori reasoning, which is a core component of the scientific method. The main figures in this empiricism-based philosophical movement are George Berkeley, David Hume, and John Locke.

Descartes was a skeptic who believed in innate ideas. Regardless of experience, according to Descartes, human minds come pre-programmed with a variety of cognitive notions and ideas. The intellect gives knowledge of the essence of existence in place of perceptions. Descartes contended that all clear and distinct ideas are intrinsic, that they are necessarily true, and that they may be understood directly by reason. On the other hand, Locke is an empiricist, distinguishing him from Descartes. He does not believe, as Descartes did, that there are truths that can only be known through reasoning. He thinks about ideas in a broad sense to indicate whatever is the objective of understanding when a man thinks, which could include everything from sensations to the contents of our memory, imagination, abstract concepts, our ideas of god, and so on. His initial inquiry is about how these concepts come to be in our minds since they are already there. John Locke has already critiqued the idea of innate ideas. He argues that all ideas come from experience. Locke believes that there are no such things as innate notions and that the way we gain knowledge is by rigorous testing and thorough observation rather than by reason functioning on its own. For instance, Newton derived his equations of motion by examining a large amount of material that Galileo had left behind. Essentially, Locke now makes two arguments in opposition to this theory of innate ideas. First, he claims that not everyone has these innate ideas; therefore, it is impossible that this is a common method by which we all acquire ideas. Again, John Locke claims that the infant mind is as empty as a blank sheet of paper in his first argument against Descartes's belief in innate notions. Infants don't have any innate notions; rather, concepts are introduced to the intellect through human perceptions. As a result, he suggests that we reject this innate belief since there isn't an agreement on it universally. Second, he claims that there are other possible explanations, as each situation can be illustrated by a story that shows how we can explain all of the human knowledge just based on our experience. Everything you believe to be true can ultimately be constructed from our experiences. Simple and complicated concepts are the two categories that ideas fall into. Ideas that are straightforward and directly derived from our experience are those that don't have any component pieces. Therefore, a basic thought might be something we instantly choose from our experiences, such as the shape of a cow, the color of the sky with time, or the sound of an airplane. Complex ideas, on the other hand, are essentially ideas made out of simple ideas. For example, the concept of a horse combined with the concept of an animal with a horn resulted in the concept of a unicorn, which does not necessarily exist.

Furthermore, he stated that simple ideas emerge from two sources: sensation and reflection. The sensation is the source of our ideas of external objects. For example, humans just focus their perceptions on the world and absorb knowledge through images, sounds, scents, and touch. Reflection, once again, is the root of our perception of our own mental life, which is caused by human thinking. In some cases, the sensation is a replica of the true nature of the items, and in others, it is a hint or emblem of a true quality that is not precisely mirrored in the sensation. For example, hearing, believing, doubting, etc.

Knowledge can be separated into two categories, such as impressions and ideas, in Hume's view. Impressions are what we perceive through our senses. For instance, when we bite into an apple, we taste it, when we watch a sunset, we feel the fresh vibe of it, or even when we directly experience certain pain, happiness, sadness, anger, jealousy, or any other type of sensory experience, those are all signs of the outside world, so these are what Hume refers to as impressions. He then compares his concept of impressions to concepts that Lock had previously classified as simple and complex. In contrast to Locke, Hume describes thoughts as copies of sensations. For instance, our recall of the flavor of that apple is just our basic idea of it, although our perception of it came from actually eating it. As a result, our impressions are based on real events and concepts that are essentially replicated versions of those real experiences. Once more, impressions might be thought of as being considerably more powerful and alive than concepts. To put it another way, the sensation of agony will be considerably more intense in my conscious experience if I get my hand jammed in a door while shutting it firmly than when I think back on it a week later. Ideas are dead-tree replicas of those forceful sensations. Hume believes that concepts are copied from impressions, contrary to Locke. Otherwise, they have no significance to him. For instance, even though unicorns don't exist, we may still have meaningful complex ideas about them since each of their component pieces has meaning because they are simple ideas that can be traced back to our sensory experiences through impressions.

Additionally, He separates the various sorts of knowledge into Relations of Ideas and Matters of Fact. Relations of Ideas are the type of subjects that humans can learn without prior knowledge, such as mathematics and geometry. For instance, the claim that "Four corners make up a rectangle." is accurate since a rectangle seems to be an object with four corners; this kind of information is classified as belonging to the Relations of Ideas. Hume would contend that if people disagree that rectangles have four corners, this is a logical contradiction as a rectangle is merely an arrangement with four corners. People who assert that rectangles lack four corners are asserting that configurations with four corners lack four corners, which is illogical because they assert that a configuration with three corners exists.

Matters of Fact, on the other hand, appear to be assessments regarding how frequently entities in the external environment appear to be. For instance, we all agree that it is a simple fact that "cats can't fly," but Hume would argue that this is untrue because of the way the concepts of flying penguins and cats interact. Because we cannot dispute a reality without running into opposition, we cannot understand it by thinking about our ideas. For instance, "cats cannot fly." If we can disprove this assertion, we can proceed to the logical conclusion that cats can fly, that it is plausible for cats to do so, and that there is no logical inconsistency in saying that cats may fly.

The term "induction" refers to a technique of argumentation whereby a person examines past events and makes predictions about how the future would act, or how it will differ from the past, based on those observations. Hume's use of this line of reasoning in defense is where the term "problem of induction" originates. When people use such inductive reasoning, according to Hume, they are assuming that the future will always act in a way that is similar to the past. In other words, they eventually started to assume that the environment is predictable, steady, and stable. Inferring that people's predisposition for inductive reasoning is essentially an innate, unfounded disposition, Hume views inductive logic as a routine or habit. Simply because two occurrences are commonly combined does not mean that they are related logically or otherwise. Therefore, there is no compelling evidence to support the idea that occurrences A and B are indissolubly related, nor is there any evidence to support the idea that more events will follow this pattern. We must first establish that reality is consistent before we can demonstrate that the future will behave exactly as the past did.

Kant says that in order to properly understand the analytical-synthetic dichotomy between a priori and a posteriori, one must start with Hum's position, which he claims to be the only analytical a priori, and that the statements of concepts are synthetic a posteriori. He goes on to say that whenever mathematics is discussed, it is categorized as belonging to the category of relations of concepts and analytical a priori. According to Kant, the realm, which was once thought to be free of synthetic a priori, now includes mathematics, and he also claims that solving mathematics is not analytic a priori. The fundamental induction that the future will resemble the past is reinforced in this way, similar to the way how mathematical arguments are synthetic and add knowledge. We must have deep memories, but it is unreal to think that tomorrow would be the same as today. Cause and effect induction theories are thus still not analytical; they cannot be dissected in isolation. Instead, they make new discoveries while maintaining their apriori identity.

**Section 2 (1)**

The concept that men's moral and societal obligations are based on a legal agreement among individuals to establish the community structure is referred to as social contract theory. Humanity has always coexisted with nature, claims the social contract theory. They lacked the power and regulations required to uphold the law. Unfairness and misery affected a part of the population. To solve such challenges, humans created pacts to safeguard their means of subsistence and property. As a result, a community was established where people swore to embrace one another and live in harmony. As Thomas Hobbes offered the first thorough argument and account for it, this is appropriately associated with modern social and ethical theory. Hobbes, John Locke, and Jean-Jacques Rousseau are the most widely recognized proponents of this profoundly significant theory, which has influenced moral and social philosophy throughout the advancement of civilized Europe.

In the years between the English Civil Wars (1588 and 1679), Thomas Hobbes lived and left many of his excellent works. In his well-known work The Leviathan, which was published in 1651, he outlines many of his beliefs and thoughts on social contract theory as well as general political philosophy. The ideal form of government, according to Thomas Hobbes, is one that best reflects these ideas and his discussion of our character. He discusses our habits of conduct as characteristics that either enable or hinder us from coexisting in harmony and peace. According to Hobbes, Humans have insatiable desires that are both instantaneous and continuous. Thus, in order to fulfill our needs and live a simple, satisfying life, everything we do is focused on accumulating material possessions. This competition for honor, wealth, command and several other forms of power is what causes animosity and even war. Hobbes claims that nature has made us equal in the faculties of my body and mind, and that from this equality of ability comes to the equality of hope. With every one of us following our objectives with equal capacity, we create three reasons for hatred, violence, and disagreement amongst ourselves. Firstly, competition for the same things such as glory, honors, status, and so on. Second, we develop a lack of faith in one another, which Hobbes defines as diffidence. Third, comes the glory-seeking. This natural state, which he refers to as the state of nature, can therefore be represented as a state of war. Additionally, in this environment of the battle against everyone, no one has any security other than what he can manage to establish for himself out of power and skill because it could all disappear tomorrow. However, what happens when a government fails, the condition of nature is being depicted here rather than as something that occurred before the development of civilized society.

Hobbes believes that by taking some of the acts he outlined, human beings can get beyond this harmful state of nature. The first stage is to obey nature's rights, which is each person's liberty to utilize their power for the existence and maintenance of their own life according to their own reason and judgment. Each of us has our own reason and judgment to determine what we want in life and how we want to live, and liberty is the ability to achieve it without external restrictions. Furthermore, a man is also prohibited from destroying his life or its preservation, according to his first law of nature. There can be no security for anyone to live out their entire life in a state of war where everyone has the right to everything, including another person's body and possessions. Thus, the first law of nature commands us to do everything in our power to work toward achieving peace because in a state of war even the strongest person will not be able to protect themselves. However, natural rights inform us that we have unrestricted rights to do whatever we choose, which creates this potentially insecure scenario. Hence, by establishing the second law, which states that each individual must give up some of his rights if others also give up that right, Hobbes illustrates one way around this problem. He will be pleased with the liberty he has against other men and that he would permit them to have against him as well. The second law is demonstrated in two different ways. First, renouncing, which involves sacrificing some of one's liberty to do as one pleases without caring about who will inherit those rights. Second, by transferring part of those rights to a specific individual in such a way that he is prepared to give up some of his unlimited rights as long as he is also willing to do so. However, we cannot give up all of our rights, such as the right to self-defense in order to achieve peace.

According to Locke, the state of nature and the state of war are nearly identical. The absence of government, but never the absence of shared responsibility, is what defines the state of nature. Although enjoyable and adequate, the property didn't seem to be very secure. He considered the present to be a "Golden Age" in nature. Existence is regulated by a natural law that reason has acknowledged, even though this law is complex. If mankind chooses to take this into consideration, it tells them that as equal and free people, they should not injure one another for their safety, prosperity, freedom, or belongings. The natural order is observed, and life continues in peace. According to conventional wisdom, this is the mutual love that serves as the foundation for lofty claims of justice and compassion. People who form a confederation deviate from nature's order by establishing an impartial authority capable of resolving any issues and mending any damage. According to Locke's theory, "life, liberty, and property" are intrinsic privileges prior to the foundation of a civilized community. Locke's defense of civilian government and the agreement that establishes it relies on property. According to Locke, personal possession is generated when an individual combines his labor with natural resources. As a result, if a person takes a piece of wild land and converts it into agricultural land that provides food, that person has a claim to both the land and the food it produces. As a result of the natural law's intrinsic consequences, there appear to be constraints on the amount of ownership a person may have; one cannot remove excess from an environment that another reasonably uses without depriving others of sufficient resources. Because God has given everyone an equal portion of creation for their mutual existence, none of us may take more than what is necessary. The idea of ownership is central to Locke's argument in favor of the social contract under a civilian government because whenever men decide to reject the State of Nature, they want to preserve their equal ownership, especially of their belongings in their personal objects.

Because of this, it is believed that people in the natural state have a duty to defend their property, and as a result, humanity made the Social Contract. According to the pact, humanity does not cede all of its rights to a "monarch"; rather, humankind just gave up the duty to uphold peace and uphold natural laws. Because these liberties are thought to be fundamental and inherent. Locke believed that laws and governments should exist to uphold and defend humankind's inherent rights. If the government achieves this goal, all law enacted by it stays legitimate and enforceable. However, if it does not, the government might be removed from power and the law declared invalid. According to Locke, complete dominion is inconsistent with natural law. He promoted the idea of a democratic government. He advocated for a state with constitutional restraints that upheld the fundamental rights to "life, liberty, and property."