

# Introduction to Philosophy Notes

Dr. Michael C. LaBossiere

[ontologist@aol.com](mailto:ontologist@aol.com)

Last Revised: 5/6/2013

These notes are provided as is.

## Contents

Part One: The Nature & Value of Philosophy .....	2
What is Philosophy? .....	2
Some Branches of Philosophy.....	3
Popular Misconceptions Regarding Philosophy.....	7
Argument Basics.....	9
The Origin of Western Philosophy .....	14
The Sophists .....	15
Socrates (470-399 B.C.).....	16
Plato .....	19
The Apology of Socrates.....	19
Part II: Philosophy & Religion.....	24
The Problem of Faith & Reason in Western Thought .....	24
The Nature & Existence of God .....	25
St. Anselm .....	27
An Answer To The Argument Of Anselm.....	28
Anselm's Reply to Gaunilo.....	29
St. Thomas Aquinas.....	29
Aquinas's Epistemology & Metaphysics.....	31
The Five Ways.....	31
Gottfried Leibniz .....	34
Leibniz's Arguments for God's Existence.....	34
Leibniz's Replies to the Problem of Evil.....	35
David Hume .....	37
Hume's Philosophy of Religion .....	37
Hume's Problem of Evil: God and Evil.....	38
Hume and the Immortality of the Soul .....	41
Immanuel Kant .....	43
Blaise Pascal.....	44
Pascal's Wager (1660).....	44
Standard Concerns Regarding Pascal's Wager .....	46
Part III: Epistemology & Metaphysics .....	48
Epistemology.....	48
Plato's Epistemology & Metaphysics ( <i>Republic, Theatetus</i> ).....	49
Plato's Line and Allegory of the Cave.....	50
Introduction to Skepticism .....	53
History of Skepticism .....	53
Rene Descartes .....	55
First Meditation: The Method of Doubt.....	57
Foundationalism and Coherentism .....	58
Foundationalism .....	59
Introduction to Metaphysics.....	60
John Locke (1632-1704).....	62

Locke's Theory of Substance and Personal Identity .....	62
Personal Identity .....	65
Buddha's No Self Doctrine .....	67
Ghosts and Minds .....	67
The Problem of Universals.....	69
Meeting Yourself -Michael C. LaBossiere .....	71
Taoist Metaphysics .....	73
Part IV: Value.....	76
Introduction to Ethics.....	76
Utilitarianism.....	79
John Stuart Mill (1806-1873).....	80
Utilitarianism.....	81
Problems with Utilitarianism.....	83
Deontology.....	84
Kantian Ethics: Introduction .....	85
Kantian Ethics: Good Will, Duty and the Categorical Imperative .....	85
Kantian Ethics: Three Postulates of Morality .....	88
Problem with Deontology & Kant's Theory.....	88
Introduction to Aesthetics .....	89
Oscar Wilde(October 16, 1854 – November 30, 1900).....	90
The New Aesthetics .....	90
Political & Social Philosophy.....	93
Liberty.....	93
Benito Amilcare Andrea Mussolini .....	94
Liberty.....	95
Emma Goldman.....	98

## Part One: The Nature & Value of Philosophy

### What is Philosophy?

Revised 6/20/2007

#### I Defining "Philosophy"

##### A. Literal Meaning

1. Literally means "love of wisdom."
2. The nature of wisdom has been extensively debated.

##### B. Subject Matter

1. An academic field can be defined in terms of its subject matter.
2. Like other academic fields, philosophy does not consist of a single, monolithic subject.
  - a. For example, people do not study a single thing called "history"; they study various parts of history, such as Hellenistic Greece, 12<sup>th</sup> century Japan, or the Second World War.
3. Like other fields, philosophy is divided into various branches based on specific content.
4. There is extensive debate about the proper subject matter of philosophy.

##### C. Questions

1. An academic field can also be defined in terms of the questions that it asks and seeks to answer.
  - a. For example, psychology asks questions about the mind and tries to answer these questions.
2. As is the case with subject matter, an academic field can also be divided into branches in terms of the specific questions that are being asked.
3. There is also extensive debate over what constitutes a 'proper' philosophical question.

##### D. Philosophy and Science

1. The sciences arose from philosophy, thus there is a special relationship between the two areas.
2. Both address similar (and even identical) questions and employ similar (and even identical) methods.

- a. Both are concerned with the origin of the universe, the nature of the mind, the nature of space-time, the foundations of ethics, the basis of human behavior and so on.
- b. Both employ observations, symbolic logic, mathematics, hypothesis testing and so forth.
- 3. Not surprisingly, the boundaries between science and philosophy are somewhat vague.
- 4. This often leads to controversy over what counts as scientific and what belongs in the realm of philosophy.
- 5. It is a common mistake to assume that science is concrete and provides definite answers and that philosophy is merely theoretical and provides no definite answers.
  - a. Both are highly theoretical.
  - b. Both are swamped in unanswered questions and intellectual controversy.

#### E. Philosophy and Religion

- 1. Faith (religion) is often seen as being in conflict with reason (philosophy).
  - a. Philosophy began by offering alternative explanations to those given by Greek religion.
  - b. Philosophers are often regarded as atheists and anti-religious.
  - c. Faith is often seen as irrational or beyond reason.
  - d. Early Christian thinkers blamed philosophy for many of the early heresies.
  - e. Reason is often seen as a threat to faith and something that misleads people.
- 2. Philosophy and religion address many of the same problems.
  - a. Examples: the existence of God, the nature of morality, the origin of the universe, and the purpose of existence.
- 3. Many philosophers have been religious thinkers and many religious thinkers have been philosophers.
  - a. Examples: Augustine, Anselm, Aquinas, Descartes, Locke, and Berkeley.
  - b. While reason has often been used to attack religion, reason has also been used to defend and support religion.
- 4. One key debate has been over defining the proper sphere of each.
  - a. Some thinkers take the spheres to overlap in some degree so that philosophy can address some, but not all, matters in religion and vice versa.
  - b. Some thinkers take the spheres to overlap completely so that one can address all the matters of the other.
    - 1. One view is that religion should be used to address all allegedly philosophical problems.
    - 2. Another view is that philosophy/reason should be used to address all allegedly religious problems.
    - 3. A third view is that religion and philosophy can be used interchangeably-truth is truth, no matter how one reaches it.
  - c. Some thinkers take the spheres to have no intersection at all-each must stick to its own domain.
    - 1. On this view, religious methods are useless in dealing with philosophical matters and reason has no role in religious matters.
  - d. Some thinkers take the religious sphere to be 'empty' and hold that religion should be studied purely in scientific terms.
    - 1. For example, religion should be looked at entirely as a psychological or sociological phenomenon.
- 5. For the purpose of the class, it is assumed that reason is useful in addressing some relevant theological matters-but the possibility is left open that this assumption might be incorrect.

## Some Branches of Philosophy

### I Branches of Philosophy

#### A. Introduction

- 1. Philosophy is divided into various branches based on content and questions.
- 2. While the divisions presented below are traditional, they are not without controversy.

### II Aesthetics

#### A. Aesthetics

- 1. General Definition: A branch of philosophy concerned with theories of art and beauty.
- 2. Descriptive aesthetics: A description of a culture's, group's or person's aesthetic views.
  - a. This simply states the characteristics of the aesthetics in question.
  - b. This is done in the social sciences, art history, etc.
- 3. Meta Aesthetics: The investigation of the creation and assessment of aesthetic theories.
- 4. Normative Aesthetics: The creation and application of aesthetic standards.
- 5. Applied Aesthetics The application of aesthetic standards to specific cases/situations.

#### B. Aesthetics

- 1. A rational and systematic attempt to understand aesthetic statements, principles and theories.
- 2. Analysis of aesthetic concepts and terms.
- 3. Creating and assessing principles relating to the arts.
- 4. Defining and assessing artistic value.
- 5. Creating and assessing aesthetic theories.

#### C. Classic problems in Aesthetics

1. The nature of art: aesthetics focuses on defining art.
2. The nature of beauty: since Plato, philosophers have attempted to define beauty and its role in art,
3. The problem of censorship: first addressed by Plato, the question of whether art should be censored.
4. The problem of objectivity: whether aesthetic value is objective or merely in the eye of the beholder.
5. The paradox of taste: presented by Hume who raises the following problem-
  - a. On one hand, tastes cannot be disputed-if a person likes or dislikes a work they cannot be wrong about this.
  - b. On the other hand, some aesthetic judgments seem not only wrong but also obviously absurd.

#### D. Some Questions in Aesthetics

1. What is art?
2. What is beauty?
3. Is beauty subjective or objective?
4. Should art be censored by the government?
5. Should artists censor their own work?
6. What makes one work of art better than another?
7. How are genres defined?
8. Do genres matter?
9. Is art important to society?
10. Is art education important?
11. What, if anything, makes art valuable?
12. Can a forgery have the same value as "real" art?
13. What distinguishes "real" art from a forgery?
14. Should art serve political or social purposes?
15. What is the distinction between pornography and art?
16. Should historical films be historically accurate?

#### E. Aestheticians, Art Critics and Artists

1. Analogy to Law
  - a. Aestheticians are like lawmakers-they create aesthetic theories.
  - b. Art critics are like judges, applying the theories created by aestheticians.
  - c. The artist is like the one on trial-they create the works of art.
2. Aesthetics involves, in part, developing theories or principles for assessing works of art.
3. The art critic applies a specific theory or principle when assessing a specific work of art.
4. The artist uses a specific theory or principle when creating her work.
5. One person might occupy all three roles.

### III Epistemology

#### A. Epistemology

1. Definition: A branch of philosophy concerned with theories of knowledge.
2. From *episteme* (knowledge) and *logos* (explanation).
3. A rational and systematic attempt to understand epistemic terms, statements, principles, and theories.
4. Analysis of epistemic terms, concepts, principles and theories.
5. Creating and assessing epistemic principles and theories,
6. Applying principles and theories to epistemic problems.

#### B. Some classic problems in Epistemology

1. The problem of skepticism; how do we establish that we can have knowledge?
  - a. General skepticism is the view that we do not have knowledge.
  - b. Skepticism comes in many varieties.
2. The problem of the limits of knowledge: determining the limits of knowledge.
3. Distinguishing between ignorance, belief and knowledge.
4. The problem of the external world: how do we know there is an external world?
5. The problem of other minds: how do you know that other people have minds?
6. The problem of justification: what justifies a belief?
7. The problem of justified, true, belief/the Gettier problem
  - a. Knowledge is often taken as a belief that is justified and true.
  - b. Gettier supposedly showed that one could have a justified, true belief without having knowledge.

#### C. Some Questions in Epistemology

1. What is knowledge?
2. What can be known?
3. How do we gain knowledge?
4. How do we know there is an external world?
5. How do we know other people have minds?
6. How do we know if God exists?

7. How do we distinguish dreaming from reality?
8. What is adequate justification for a belief?
9. Are we obligated to examine our beliefs?
10. What are the objects of knowledge?
11. What is skepticism?
12. Is it possible to refute the skeptic?

#### IV. Ethics

##### A. Morality and Ethics

1. Morality: the customs, precepts and practices that deal with matters of good/bad and wrong/right.
2. Descriptive morality: A description of an actual morality.
  - a. This simply states the characteristics of the morality in question.
  - b. This is done in the social sciences
3. Ethics: the entire realm of morality and moral philosophy.
4. Meta Ethics: The investigation of the creation and assessment of moral theories.
5. Normative Ethics: The creation and application of moral standards.
6. Applied Ethics: The application of moral standards to specific cases/situations.

##### B. Moral Philosophy/Ethics (as a branch of philosophy)

1. A rational and systematic attempt to understand moral terms, statements, principles, and theories.
2. Analysis of moral terms, concepts, principles and theories.
3. Creating and assessing moral principles and theories,
4. Applying principles and theories to moral problems.

##### C. Some classic moral problems

1. Objective/subjective dispute: the problem of determining whether ethics is objective or subjective.
2. The problem of the basis of morality: the problem of determining the foundation of morality.
3. The Euthyphro problem: Is something good because God says it is good, or does God say it is good because it is good?
  - a. First presented by Plato in a dialogue of the same name.
  - b. Originally a question about the nature of piety, but now presented as a problem for divine command theory.
  - c. This raises problems about the relationship between morality and religion.
4. The scope of morality: the problem of determining who and what counts morally.
5. Specific enduring moral problems: euthanasia, capital punishment, suicide, abortion, lying, stealing.

##### D. Some Moral Questions

1. What is good?
2. What is evil?
3. What is the correct life to live?
4. Is stem cell research morally acceptable?
5. What is the basis, if anything is, of morality?
6. Is morality objective or subjective?
7. Is it morally acceptable to use torture as a means of combating terrorism?
8. Is euthanasia morally acceptable?
9. Are there moral rights?
10. Is it morally acceptable to cheat in a serious relationship?
11. Is cloning morally acceptable?
12. Is there a moral obligation to test oneself for STDs?

#### V. Logic

##### A. Defined

1. Defined: The study and assessment of arguments.
2. Logic ranges from basic critical thinking to advanced symbolic systems.

##### B. Some varieties of logic

1. Critical thinking: deals with rationally assessing claims to determine whether one should accept, reject or suspend judgment in regards to a claim.
2. Categorical logic:
  - a. Logic of class membership.
  - b. Uses “all”, “no”, “some”, and “some are not”.
  - c. Developed by Aristotle.
3. Truth functional logic: A logic in which the truth of the more complex claims is based on the truth values of the simpler claims.
  - a. Truth value: the value of the claim in terms of being true or false.
4. Modal logic: A logic which uses possibility and necessity operators-a logic of what can, cannot and must be.
5. Fuzzy Logic: a logic that accepts values other than just true or false.

6. Attempts have been made to create “exotic” logics such as moral logics for ethical reasoning and “perfect” logics that reveal the nature and structure of reality.

#### B. Some General Questions.

1. What is a good argument?
2. What is a fallacy?
3. What is a valid argument?
4. What is a sound argument?
5. Do logical languages mirror reality?
6. Can logic be used to do significant and substantial work in philosophy?

### VI. Metaphysics

#### A. Metaphysics & Ontology

1. Metaphysics: The philosophical investigation of reality.
2. Ontology: The study aimed at determining the constituents of reality.
  - a. From the Greek “ontos” which means “thing.”
  - b. Ontological zoo: a collection of entities that a philosopher accepts as real.

#### B. Some classic metaphysical problems

1. The problem of universals: in virtue of what are individuals grouped into types?
2. The problem of personal identity: what makes a person the person who s/he is, distinct from all other things?
3. The problem of the mind: what is the mind?
4. The mind-body problem: what is the connection between the mind and the brain?
5. The problem of modality: what is the nature of modality (possibility and necessity)?
6. The problem of reality: what is truly real?

#### C. Questions in Metaphysics and Ontology

1. Does God exist and what is His nature?
2. What is a person?
3. What are space and time?
4. What is real?
5. Is time travel possible?
6. Do ghosts exist and if so, what are they?
7. Is there an afterlife?
8. Are properties metaphysical entities?
9. Do possible worlds exist?
10. Are there multiple dimensions?

### VII. Social Philosophy

#### A. Social and Political Philosophy

1. The philosophy of society and social sciences: economics, history, sociology, anthropology, political science, and the others.
2. Political Philosophy: The study of the nature and justification of coercive institutions.
3. Philosophy of Law: the study of the nature and justification of law.

#### B. Classic Problems in Social Philosophy

1. The problem of the state: what is the basis, if any, of the authority of the state?
2. The problem of rights: If there are rights, then what are they based on?
3. The problem of law: what should human laws be based on?
4. The problem of the individual and the state: to what extent should the state control individuals?
5. The problem of liberty and security: to what extent should liberties be restricted in order to provide security?

#### C. Some questions in social philosophy

1. What are rights?
2. What is justice?
3. What is the ideal society?
4. What justifies laws?
5. What is the basis of political authority?
6. Should limits be placed on the power of the state?

### VIII. Some Other Branches

#### A. Regional Based Branches

1. These branches are defined in terms of where the philosopher in question lives/lived.
  - a. While there are often similar views among people who live in the same area, there is typically a great deal of diversity.
  - b. Some thinkers have questioned the value of dividing philosophy by regions.
2. African Philosophy

3. Eastern Philosophy
  4. American Philosophy
  5. Continental Philosophy
- B. Gender/Ethnic Based Branches
1. These branches are often defined based on the gender or ethnicity of the philosopher, but sometimes the classification is based on the subject matter.
  2. Feminism
    - a. Philosophy that focuses on women and women's issues.
    - b. Sometimes assumed to be any philosophy done by a woman.
    - c. There are many varieties of feminism-it is a mistake to assume that feminism is a monolithic doctrine shared by all women.
  3. Hispanic philosophy.
    - a. Philosophy that focuses on Hispanics and Hispanic issues.
    - b. Sometimes assumed to be any philosophy done by someone who is Hispanic.
  4. African-American Philosophy
    - a. Philosophy that focuses on African Americans and African American issues.
    - b. Sometimes assumed to be any philosophy done by someone who is an African American.
  5. Native American Philosophy
    - a. Philosophy that focuses on Native Americans and Native American issues.
    - b. Sometimes assumed to be any philosophy done by someone who is a Native American.
- C. Other Content Based Branches
1. History of Philosophy
    - a. The examination of historical figures in philosophy.
    - b. Often focuses on interpreting their views, speculating on the origins of the views, and their impact on other thinkers.
    - c. Some claim the historical views should be treated the same way as historical scientific views: important as historical steps, but now obsolete.
  2. Philosophy of Language.
    - a. The philosophical examination of language.
    - b. Typically linked to logic.
    - c. Problem: determining the nature of meaning.
    - d. Problem: determining the relation between language, thought and the world.
    - e. Problem: creating an ideal language that mirrors reality.
  3. Philosophy of Literature
    - a. The philosophical examination of literature.
  4. Philosophy of Mathematics
    - a. The philosophical examination of mathematics.
    - b. Overlaps with logic.
    - c. Problem: the metaphysical status of numbers-what are numbers?
    - d. Problem: the epistemology of mathematics-how do we have mathematical knowledge?
    - e. Problem: determining the relation between mathematics and reality.
  5. Philosophy of Mind.
    - a. The philosophical examination of the nature of the mind.
    - b. Often regarded as falling under metaphysics.
    - c. Problem: determining the nature of the mind.
    - d. Problem: the mind-body problem-determining the relation between the mind and the body.
  6. Philosophy of Religion
    - a. The philosophical examination of religion and religious issues.
    - b. Some approaches apply philosophical methods to religious problems.
    - c. Some approaches regard religion as a social/psychological phenomenon to be studied.
  7. Philosophy of science
    - a. The philosophical examination of the sciences.
    - b. Typical focuses on meta-scientific issues as opposed to specific scientific problems.
    - c. Problem: Defining "science"-what practices, methods and issues are scientific?
    - d. Problem: methods of science-how should science be practiced?

## Popular Misconceptions Regarding Philosophy

### Misconception: Philosophy is Just a Matter of Opinion

I Opinions & the Misconception

## A. Opinion

1. An opinion is a belief.
2. To say "it is my opinion that X" is to say "I believe X."
3. An opinion is also typically taken as an unsupported opinion.
4. An adequately supported opinion becomes a fact.

## B. The Misconception

1. It is assumed that there are no better or worse opinions on philosophical matters.
2. So, any position is as good as any other and there is really no point in discussing it.
3. Once you have stated your opinion, that is enough and it should be accepted as being as good as anyone else's opinion.

## C. The misconception typically involves two assumptions:

1. Philosophical positions are simply opinions.
2. All opinions are equally good.

## II. Assumptions

## A. Are Philosophical positions simply opinions?

1. Philosophy does begin with an opinion-what a person thinks about a particular issue.
2. However, the practice of philosophy involves reasoning about and arguing for the position in question.
3. A position backed up with arguments is not simply a matter of opinion-the position is now supported with evidence.
4. Given that logic and reasoning are not simply matters of opinion, these supported positions cannot be dismissed as being simply matters of opinion.
5. If someone wishes to disagree with a supported position, they will need to provide arguments of their own-otherwise there is no reason to accept their opinion over the supported opinion.

## B. Are All opinions are equally good?

1. It is often assumed that since people are "entitled" to their own opinions, then all opinions are equally good.
2. This view seems implausible.
  - a. In regards to treating cancer, the opinion of medical doctor is better than that of a 5 year old.
  - b. In regards to designing airplanes, the opinion of an aeronautical engineer is better than that of a 1<sup>st</sup> year PE major.
3. This view is logically self refuting.
  - a. If all opinions are equally good, then the opinion that *not all opinions are equally good* is as good as the opinion that *all opinions are equally good*.
  - b. This is a contradiction that arises from the assumption that all opinions are equally good.
  - c. Therefore, the claim that all opinions are equally good must be rejected.
4. This view is often based on the more sophisticated views of relativism and subjectivism.

## C. Relativism &amp; Subjectivism

1. Relativism is the view that truth is relative-typically to a particular culture.
  - a. There are specific types of relativism, such as moral relativism-the view that moral truths are culturally relative and not universal.
  - b. Truth varies from culture to culture.
2. Subjectivism is the view that truth is completely subjective-it is relative to the specific individual.
  - a. There are specific types of subjectivism, such as moral subjectivism-the view that moral truths are entirely dependent on individual opinion.
  - b. Truth varies from person to person.
3. It is often assumed that philosophical issues are all relative or subjective in nature, so philosophy is a matter of opinion.
4. While relativism and subjectivism are defensible positions, to simply assume they are correct is to beg the question.
  - a. Begging the question is a mistake in reasoning in which a person actually assumes what they need to prove.

D. Plato's Reply to Relativism (*Theatetus*)

1. Plato agrees that some things are relative.
  - a. for example, a wind that seems chilly to one might seem pleasant to another.
2. Plato argues that relativism is self-refuting.
  - a. Protagoras, a sophist, claims that all opinions are true.
  - b. This includes the opinions of his opponents who believe he is wrong.
  - c. So, his belief is false if those who disagree with him have true beliefs.
3. Protagoras charged for his teachings and justified this by claiming he was teaching people what they needed to know.
  - a. But once he claims that his teachings are better than those of others, he has abandoned his relativism.

## E. Conclusion

1. It cannot simply be assumed that philosophy is just a matter of opinion.
2. It should also not be assumed that every philosophical issue is objective in nature-some things might be relative or subjective.

**Misconception: Philosophy is Useless**

## I. Useful or Useless?

## A. Useless

1. It is often assumed that philosophy is useless.
2. It is often believed that philosophers simply split hairs and debate endlessly about meaningless problems.
3. These charges do have some merit-philosophers, like all academics, often get lost in their ivory towers and become needlessly isolated from the world.

## B. "Useful"

1. Often this misconception rests on how people define "useful."
2. People who have this misconception often define usefulness in a very narrow and very concrete way.
  - a. Often in terms of directly making money, or baking bread, or killing people.
3. Even under these narrow and concrete definitions, philosophy is still useful.
4. There are broader definitions of "useful" that seem quite plausible.
5. Under the limited definitions of "useful" most of the sciences would not be useful either.

## II. Some contributions of philosophy/philosophers:

## A. Science

1. Science originated in philosophy.
2. Many philosophers were also scientists.
  - a. Thales, Descartes, Bacon, Newton.
3. Science is based on and utilizes philosophical methods.

## B. Logic &amp; Mathematics

1. Mathematics and logic were developed by philosophers.
  - a. Pythagoras, Plato, Aristotle, Descartes, Leibniz, Pascal.
2. Science, technology, and engineering depend on mathematics and logic.
  - a. Logic is the basis of computers-ranging from PCs to car chips to digital phones to hand held game systems.
3. Critical thinking was developed by philosophers.

## C. Society

1. Philosophers have laid the foundation for rights, reform and revolution.
2. Aristotle developed political science.
3. Hobbes developed the theoretical justification for the modern state.
4. Locke developed the notion of God-given human rights.
5. Adam Smith laid the theoretical foundations for capitalism.
6. Henry David Thoreau created the concept of civil disobedience.
7. Marx and Engels developed the theory of Marxism.
8. Martin Luther King, Jr. refined and applied the concept of civil disobedience.

## D. Ethics

1. Philosophers developed the notion of formal ethics and ethical reasoning is philosophical.
2. Ethics and ethical debates are a critical and unavoidable aspect of life.

## III. Some Benefits of Philosophy

## A. The study and practice of philosophy develops essential skills.

1. Critical thinking and logical thought.
2. Problem solving.
3. Writing skills.

## B. The study and practice of philosophy broadens the mind.

1. It enables a better understanding and appreciation of your own views.
2. It enables a better understanding and appreciation of other views.
3. It encourages intellectual tolerance.
4. It encourages the development of intellectual imagination.

## C. Side Effects

1. Philosophy can result in some confusion, doubt and distress.
2. These can be natural side effects of thinking and questioning previously held beliefs.

**Argument Basics**

## I Argument Concepts

## A. Defined

1. An argument is a set of claims, one of which is supposed to be supported by the others.

2. Conclusion: The claim that is supposed to be supported by the premises.
    - a. An argument has one and only one conclusion.
  3. Premise: A claim given as evidence or a reason for accepting the conclusion.
    - a. An argument can have many premises.
  4. Inductive Argument: An argument in which the premises are intended to provide some degree of support but less than complete support for the conclusion.
  5. Deductive argument: An argument in which the premises are intended to provide complete support for the conclusion.
  6. Fallacy: An argument in which the premises fail to provide adequate support for the conclusion.
- B. General Assessment of Arguments: Reasoning
1. Do the premises logically support the conclusion?
  2. If the argument is deductive, is it valid or invalid?
    - a. A valid argument is such that if the premises were true then the conclusion must be true.
    - b. An invalid argument is such that all the premises could be true and the conclusion false at the same time.
    - c. Validity is tested by formal means, such as truth tables, Venn diagrams and proofs.
    - d. A full discussion of deductive arguments is beyond the scope of this class.
  3. If the argument is inductive, is it strong or weak?
    - a. A strong argument is such that if the premises were true, then the conclusion is likely to be true.
    - b. A weak argument is such that if the premises were true, then the conclusion is not likely to be true.
    - c. Inductive arguments are assessed primarily in terms of standards specific to the argument in question.
- C. General Assessment of Arguments Are the premises true?
1. Are the premises true or at least plausible?
  2. Testing premises for plausibility:
    - a. The premise is consistent with your own observations.
    - b. The premise is consistent with your background knowledge and experience.
    - c. The premise is consistent with credible sources, such as experts, standard references and text books.

## Some Useful Valid Deductive Arguments

### I Introduction to Deductive Arguments

- A. Defined/Uses
1. An argument in which the premises are intended to provide complete support for the conclusion.
  2. The premises are offered as evidence that the conclusion must be true.
  3. The conclusion is not supposed to go beyond the premises.
  4. Deductive arguments are often used as a “logical frame” to present points established in other (typically inductive) arguments.
    - a. Example: After arguing that sexist art is harmful, one might build an argument using that claim and the claim “if sexist art is harmful, it must should be censored” as premises.
- B. Assessment
1. Analogy method-any argument with the same form of a valid argument is valid.
  2. Truth tables, proofs, Venn diagrams.
- C. Valid/Invalid, Sound/Unsound
1. Valid: an argument such that if all the premises are true, then the conclusion must be true.
  2. Invalid: an argument such that even if all the premises are true, then the conclusion can still be false.
  3. Sound: the argument is valid and has all true premises.
  4. Unsound: the argument is invalid or has one or more false premises or both.
- D. Modus Ponens (Affirming the Antecedent)
1. Form
    - a. If P, then Q.
    - b. P
    - c. Q
  2. Example:
    - a. If killing in war is like murder, it is immoral.
    - b. Killing in war is like murder.
    - c. It is immoral.
- E. Modus Tollens (Denying the Consequent)
1. Form
    - a. If P, then Q.
    - b. Not Q.
    - c. Not P.
  2. Example:
    - a. If reality is just a dream, it should seem fairly incoherent.

- b. Reality does not seem fairly incoherent.
  - c. Reality is not just a dream.
- F. Hypothetical Syllogism
1. Form
    - a. If P, then Q.
    - b. If Q, then R.
    - c. If P, then R.
  2. Example
    - a. If cheating is wrong, then cheating in a class is wrong.
    - b. If cheating in a class is wrong, cheating on this test is wrong.
    - c. If cheating is wrong, then cheating on this test is wrong.

G. Disjunctive Syllogism

1. Form
  - a.  $P \vee Q$
  - b. Not P (or not Q)
  - c. Q (or P)
2. Example
  - a. Bill can lose weight through surgery or diet and exercise.
  - b. Bill decided not to diet or exercise.
  - b. Bill has decided to lose weight through surgery.
3. Note: this assumes that P and Q are the only two options.

H. Dilemma

1. Form 1
    - a. If P, then Q
    - b. If R, then S
    - c. P or R
    - d. Q or S
  2. Form 2
    - a. If P, then Q
    - b. If R, then S
    - c. Not Q or not S
    - d. Not P or not R.
  3. Form 3
    - a. If P, then Q.
    - b. If not P, then not Q.
    - c. P or not P.
    - d. Q or not Q.
  4. Example
    - a. If lying is wrong, then people should not lie.
    - b. If lying is not wrong, then it is okay for people to lie.
    - c. Lying is either wrong or it is not.
    - d. So people should not lie or it is acceptable.
- I. Reductio ad Absurdum (Reducing to Absurdity)
1. Form
    - a. Goal: to prove P
    - b. Assume Not P (that P is false)
    - c. Derive Q from Not P.
    - d. Prove that Q is false (a contradictory, false, implausible, or absurd)
    - e. Conclude that not P is false (that P is true).
  2. Example:
    - a. Goal: To prove that God is not all good, all powerful, all knowing and does not intervenes in our lives.
    - b. Assume: God is all good, all powerful, all knowing and intervenes in our lives.
    - c. Derive: Nothing wrong or evil would happen to anyone since God would prevent it,
    - d. This is absurd, since bad things happen all the time.
    - e. God is not all good, all powerful, all knowing and does not intervene in our lives.

## Some Useful General Inductive Arguments

### I Introduction to Inductive Arguments

#### A. Defined

1. An inductive argument is an argument in which the premises are intended to provide some degree of support, but less than complete support, for the conclusion.
2. The premises are offered as evidence that the conclusion is likely to be true.
3. The conclusion goes beyond the evidence presented in the premises-this is the inductive leap.

#### B. Assessment

1. They are assessed in terms of how strongly the premises support the conclusion.
2. They are also assessed by standards specific to the type of argument.
3. The standards are also used in assessing your own arguments when creating them.

#### C. Strong and Weak Arguments

1. Strong argument: An argument such that if the premises are true, then the conclusion is likely to be true.
2. Weak argument: an argument such that even if the premises are true, the conclusion is not likely to be true.

### II Analogical Argument

#### A. Introduction

1. Defined: An argument in which one concludes that two things are alike in a certain respect because they are alike in other respects.
2. Analogies are often used in cases in which X is understood and Y is not, to conclude something about Y.
  - a. These are typically called explanatory comparisons/analogies.
  - b. Example:
    1. Email is like mail sent to a post office box.
    2. Just as mail is delivered to the PO box and you go to pick it up, email is delivered to your email in box and your software “goes” and picks it up.
3. Often used as an argument in cases in which X is accepted/seen as plausible and Y is not, to get the audience to accept Y or see it as plausible.
  - a. Example:
    1. If a person has the blood cut off to her brain for too long, she’ll suffer brain damage.
    2. The education system is like the “brain” of society and money is the blood of this brain.
    3. So, cutting off money to the education system will damage society.

#### B. Strict Form

1. Premise 1: X has properties P,Q, and R.
2. Premise 2: Y has properties P,Q, and R.
3. Premise 3: X has property Z as well.
4. Conclusion: Y has property Z.

#### C. Assessment-The strength of the analogy depends on

1. The number of properties X and Y have in common.
  - a. The more the better.
2. The relevance of the shared properties to property Z.
  - a. The more relevant, the stronger the argument.
  - b. Property P is relevant to property Z if the presence or absence of P affects the likelihood that Z will be present.
3. Whether X and Y have relevant dissimilarities as well as similarities.
  - a. The more dissimilarities and the more relevant they are, the weaker the argument.

#### D. Example

##### 1. Argument

- a. Attacking your next-door neighbors, killing them and taking their property is immoral.
- b. War involves going into a neighboring country, killing people and taking their property.
- c. So, war is immoral.

##### 2. Assessment

- a. War and violent theft share many properties:

1. Intrusion.
2. Violence.
3. Killing.
4. Taking the property of others.

- b. War and violent theft share relevant properties.

1. Violence and taking of property are relevant to moral assessment.

- c. War and violent theft have some relevant dissimilarities.

1. War often takes place between mutual antagonists, unlike the case of violent theft.

- a. Analogy to boxing.

2. In some wars, one side is not fighting to take property.

- a. The Allies in WWII were fighting to liberate the conquered nations and defeat the axis powers, not to take property or kill people.

### III Argument from/by Example

## A. Introduction

1. Defined: An argument in which a claim is supported by providing examples.
2. The strength of the support depends on the quality of the examples.

## B. Form

1. Premise 1: Example 1 is an example that supports claim P.
2. Premise 2: Example 2 is an example that supports claim P.
3. Premise x: Example x is an example that supports claim P.
4. Conclusion: Claim P is true.

## C. Standards

1. The more examples, the stronger the argument.
2. The examples must be relevant.
  - a. The more relevant the examples, the stronger the argument.
3. The examples must be specific and clearly identified.
4. Counter-examples must be considered.
  - a. Counter-example: an example that counts against the claim.
  - b. The more counter-examples and the more relevant they are, the weaker the argument.

## D. Examples

1. Example #1
  - a. Premise 1: The painting Oath of the Horatii shows three brothers ready to take action, while the women are painted as passive observers.
  - b. Premise 2: In action films, such as typical Westerns, women are cast as victims that must be protected and saved by men.
  - c. Conclusion: Art reinforces gender stereotypes.
2. Assessment of Example #1
  - a. More examples should be used.
  - b. The examples are relevant.
  - c. Specific Westerns should be named and described.
  - d. There are counter-examples, especially in modern films and TV.
2. Example #2
  - a. Premise 1: The Egyptians believed in an afterlife as shown by their funeral preparations.
  - b. Premise 2: Plato's writings indicate that the ancient Greeks believed in an afterlife.
  - c. Premise 3: The Chinese practice of ancestor worship indicates they believed in an afterlife.
  - d. Conclusion: People of ancient cultures believed in an afterlife.
3. Assessment of Example #2
  - a. More examples should be used, but the mix of diverse cultures strengthens the argument.
  - b. The examples are relevant.
  - c. The examples could be more detailed but are reasonably specific.
  - d. There are some limited counterexamples, such as periods of doubt about the afterlife in ancient Egypt.

## IV Argument from Authority

## A. Introduction

1. Defined: An argument in which the conclusion is supported by citing an authority.
2. The strength of the support depends on the quality of the authority.
3. It is a relatively weak form of argument.
4. They are used when a person lacks the knowledge or expertise and needs to rely on an outside source.
5. They are also used to add extra weight to the author's position.
6. Arguments from authority are often used as part of a larger argument.

## B. Form

1. Premise 1: Person A is an authority on subject S.
2. Premise 2: Person A makes claim C about subject S.
3. Premise 3: Therefore, C is true.

## C. Assessment

1. The person has sufficient expertise in the subject.
2. The claim is within the expert's area of expertise.
3. There is an adequate degree of agreement among experts.
4. The expert is not significantly biased.
5. The area of expertise is a legitimate area or discipline.
6. The authority must be properly identified.
  - a. This typically requires citing a source.

## D. Examples

1. Example 1
  - a. Premise 1: If violent art has a harmful psychological effect on people, then it should be censored.

- b. Premise 2: However, the study by Loeb and Wombat shows that violent art has little, if any psychological effect on people.
- c. Conclusion: Hence, there is no need to censor violent art to protect people from harm.
- 2. Assessment of Example 1
  - a. The source needs to be properly identified (applying many of the other standards requires this identification).
  - b. There is a great deal of disagreement among the experts within the field of psychology, especially over the matter of the effects of violent art.
- 3. Example 2
  - a. Premise 1: According to medical science, there is no life after death.
  - b. Premise 2: Since medical science is well established, it is clear there is no life after death.
- 4. Assessment of Example 2
  - a. More information is needed about medical science, such as the exact source of the claim.

## The Origin of Western Philosophy

Based on the *Voyage of Discovery* by William F. Lawhead, Wadsworth, 2002.

### I Greek Poets

#### A. The Poets

1. Poets occupied a central place in early Greek culture.
2. They developed and presented history, science and religion.
3. They dealt with cosmological matters: origins, structure and nature of the universe.
4. It was believed they were inspired by the Muses.
5. They provided ethical guides to life via their tales of heroes and gods, success and failure.

#### B. The Greek Gods

1. The gods were presented in the myths of the poets.
2. The poets explained things in human terms-thus their gods were similar to humans.
3. The gods had human flaws.
4. Each god had a specific domain.

### II Homer & Other Poets

#### A. Background

1. 8<sup>th</sup> Century B.C.
2. The *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are attributed to him.

#### B. The Natural Order

1. The order of nature is due to the actions and goals of the gods.
2. The disorder of nature is due to the impulses and flaws of the gods.
3. The gods are not omnipotent.
4. The fates are the ultimate force in the universe, but are mysterious and random.

#### C. Morality

1. The virtues are those of warriors.
2. Virtue was defined in terms of excellence: success, power, honor, wealth, moderation, and security.
3. Honor was one of the key virtues.
4. The gods were concerned with honor and status.
5. The gods were primarily motivated by flattery and bribery as opposed to virtues.
6. People served the gods out of fear and self-interest.
7. Zeus was occasionally presented as being concerned with justice and Hesiod presented him as judging actions based on a principle of justice.

#### D. Four Concepts of Order

1. Some events are caused by purposeful agents-humans, gods, and other such beings.
2. Some events are random in nature and lack purpose.
3. All things are subject to the amoral fates.
4. The gods sometimes act/judge on the basis of objective moral principles.

#### E. Starting Point for Greek Science and Philosophy

1. The tension between the four concepts lead to attempts to resolve these conflicts.
2. The principle of fate laid the basic foundations for the concept of laws of nature.
3. The occasional concern with morality laid the foundations for the notion of objective morality.

### III The Origin of Western Philosophy

#### A. Introduction

1. Traditionally dated around 6<sup>th</sup> century B.C.
2. It is difficult to define "philosophy."

#### B. Thales

1. Predicted an eclipse on May 28, 585 B.C.
2. Because he could predict natural events, it meant that they did not result from the unpredictable gods, mere chance or fate.
3. Thales concluded that such events resulted from a consistent, impersonal natural order and it can be studied in order to yield generalizations and predictions.

#### C. Influences

1. Egypt: mathematics.
2. Babylon: Astronomy.

### III Thales-The First Western Philosopher

#### A. Background

1. Approximately 624-545 B.C.
2. Lived in Miletus, a Greek port city in Ionia (western Asia Minor).
3. Miletus was a trading city with extensive contact with other cultures.
4. Thales solved engineering problems and developed navigational instruments and techniques.
5. He is credited with beginning the debate over the ultimate nature of reality.

#### B. Problem of The One and the Many

1. Thales sought to find the unity underlying the diversity of the world.
2. The problem of the one and the many involves determining the basic principle or thing that accounts for everything.
3. According to Aristotle, Thales claimed that water is the fundamental source of everything.
4. Aristotle claimed that Thales had this view because:
  - a. Water is essential to life, it can be transformed into solid or gas, and seeds are moist.
  - b. Rain falls, mist rises, evaporation leaves sediment, and digging down yields water.
5. His actual arguments, if any, are not known.

#### C. The Problem of Permanence and Change

1. If there is a single basic substance, what causes it to change into the other things?
2. Thales claimed that all things are “full of gods”, but this doesn’t seem to be religious.
3. He seemed to hold that animation and change reside in the things that change.
4. His explanation of magnetism was that it is an animate causal power in inert stone.

#### D. Importance

1. He presented the first known form of monism-the view that there is one basic ontological kind or principle of explanation.
  - a. Water.
  - b. Those following Thales adopted the assumption of monism.
2. He presented the first known form of materialism (material monism)-the basic kind or principle is physical, typically a substance.
  - a. Water.
  - b. Those following Thales adopted the assumption of materialism.
3. He asked questions aimed at theoretical understanding as opposed to merely practical questions.
4. He presented and supported a theory that could be examined and debated by others.
  - a. He did not appeal to tradition or authority.

## The Sophists

### I Historical Background 5<sup>th</sup> century B.C.

#### A. An Age of Gold

1. Athens was a center of culture and commerce.
2. The era was rich in advances in the arts, philosophy and science.
3. Athens was (at times) a democracy.

#### B. An Age of Irony

1. A moral and cultural malaise was in effect.
2. Respect for the ideals, laws, religion and custom began to fall apart.

#### C. Causal Factors

1. There was a decline in the respect for traditional secular and theological authorities.
2. Contact with other cultures led to the acceptance of relativism.
  - a. Herodotus declared that “custom was king.”
3. The democratic system led to an increased individualism and opened avenues of advancement.
4. The disagreement among the philosophers and scientists led to skepticism about metaphysical matters.
5. An increased focus on practical matters such as success and power.
6. Political power was no longer based primarily on birth but on the ability to sway the masses.

### II The Rise of the Sophists

#### A. Rise of the Sophists

1. They stepped in to address the practical matters.
2. The sophists offered education and training in the swaying of the masses in order to gain influence and power.
3. Protagoras claimed that he would teach men to order their affairs and those of the state, thus enabling them to be successful.

#### B. Sophia

1. "Sophist" is from "Sophia", which means "wisdom."
2. Due to Socrates, Plato and Aristotle, the sophists are generally presented as frauds and cast in a negative light.

#### C. Skepticism, Relativism and Success

1. The disagreements among the pre-Socratic philosophers resulted in sophists accepting skepticism.
2. The skepticism contributed to relativism—the view that truth, especially moral truth, is relative.
3. Skepticism and relativism lead the sophists to embrace the view that success is what matters.
  - a. This turned some from the search for truth to the marketing of their ideas.
  - b. This turned some from the desire to be morally right to the desire to simply succeed.

#### D. Nomos vs. Physis

1. Physis: nature, the aspects of reality that are objective.
2. Nomos: the subjective/relative that is based on human convention.
3. The sophists placed ethics in the realm of nomos.
  - a. Some advocated gaining success by following the morality of society.
  - b. Others endorsed adopting the appearance of being moral while actually acting in anyway that lead to success.

### III Importance of the Sophists

#### A. Influence on Socrates and Plato

1. The sophists focused too much on the subjective and accidental aspects of knowledge and ethics.
2. The sophists failed to realize that even critical judgments required objective standards.
3. The sophists did not define or examine the notion of success.

#### B. Important Contributions

1. Raised important philosophical questions in epistemology, ethics and political theory.
2. Placed their emphasis on human concerns and practical matters.
3. They undermined beliefs that were founded on mere dogmatism and tradition.
4. Their skepticism and relativism required later thinkers to develop better foundations for knowledge and morality.
5. Their concern with language led to advances in logic, rhetoric and grammar.
6. They undercut tradition and provincialism.
7. They motivated Socrates who in turn motivated Plato.

## Socrates (470-399 B.C.)

### I Background

#### A. Life and Death

1. 470-399 B.C.
2. The son of a sculptor and a midwife.
3. Eccentric in appearance and manner.
  - a. His clothes were rumpled.
  - b. Walked like a pelican.
  - c. Ugly, yet robust.
4. Served in the military.

#### B. Wisdom

1. A friend was told by the oracle and Delphi that Socrates was the wisest of men.
2. Socrates set out to prove the gods wrong by trying to find a wiser man.
3. He exposed the politicians, poets and craftsmen as all being less wise than they claimed.
4. Because of this he was eventually brought to trial.

#### C. Will the Real Socrates Please Stand Up

1. Socrates held that philosophy was a matter for conversation and not for books, hence he left behind no writings.
2. It is claimed that the early Platonic dialogues are accurate transcriptions of his conversations and that the later dialogues have Socrates serving as a mouthpiece for Plato's views.
3. However, the truth is not known and this remains a matter of debates.

#### D. Socrates and the Sophists

1. He studied under the sophist Prodicus but could only afford the cheap incomplete course.
2. He criticized the sophists for not seeking knowledge while presuming to instruct people about the nature of success.
3. He believed that the sophists were presenting people with images and illusions.
4. He believed that the sophists were a threat to the morality of society.

#### E. Ignorance

1. For Socrates, the greatest danger stemmed from ignorance.

2. The worst ignorance was not knowing that one does not know.
3. Socrates regarded his task as curing this ignorance.

## II The Socratic Method: Questioning

### A. The Dialectic

1. A conversational method involving a series of questions and answers.
2. The defects in the student's answers lead both the student and teacher towards a clearer and more precise answer.
3. The student is lead to realize his own ignorance and to begin the search for truth.
4. Socrates began his use of this method with the politicians who used moral terms without understanding them.

### B. The Stages of Questioning

1. Socrates meets someone and begins a conversation that soon enters the realm of philosophy.
2. Socrates focuses on a key concept that must be clarified before the discussion can progress.
  - a. Examples: justice, love, piety, friendship, virtue, knowledge
3. Socrates professes that he is ignorant of and confused by the concept and then asks for help in clarifying matters.
  - a. The other person then confidently provides a definition of the key concept.
4. Socrates then thanks the other person but says he needs some further clarification.
  - a. This leads to further investigation which reveals that the definition is flawed.
5. The other person presents a better definition which takes him back to stage four.
  - a. Socrates and the other person repeat stages 4 and 5.
6. The other person finally comes to the realization that he is ignorant.
  - a. The other person either finds an excuse to escape or agrees to join Socrates in seeking and answer.

## III The Socratic Method: Argumentation

### A. Introduction

1. Socrates had three main methods of showing the flaws in definitions.

### B. Finding a structural flaw in the definition

1. The definition is circular.
  - a. Example: "Piety is what a pious person has."
2. The definition takes a part to be the whole.
  - a. Example: Using justice to explain virtue when justice is a part of virtue.
3. The definition provides a list of specific examples without presenting the common property.
  - a. Example: When Euthyphro lists a few actions he takes to be pious without actually defining what all pious actions have in common.

### C. Reductio ad Absurdum

1. Goal: To disprove position/claim P.
2. Step One: Assume that P is true.
3. Step Two: Derive Q from P.
4. Step Three: Show that Q is absurd, contradicts P, or contradicts another claim held by the person who claims P.
5. Example from the *Republic*
  - a. Thrasymachus: Justice = doing what it is interest of those in power.
  - b. So, to be just is to obey the laws of those in power.
  - c. Those in power can make errors.
  - d. Those in power might, out of error, make laws that are not in their interest.
  - e. Obeying said laws is not acting in accord with the interests of those in power.
  - f. This leads to a contradiction: Being just is to do what is interest of those in power and is also to do what is not in the interest of those in power.
  - g. So, the definition is flawed.

### D. The Method of Counterexample

1. Socrates presents an example that goes against (counters) the definition and shows it to be too broad or too narrow.
2. Too broad: the definition of the term includes cases that should not be included.
3. Too narrow: the definition of the term excludes cases that should be included.
4. Example:
  - a. Meno: virtue is the capacity to govern.
  - b. Socrates: A child could be virtuous but lacks the capacity to govern so the definition is too narrow.
  - c. Socrates: A tyrant can also govern, though he would not be virtuous, so the definition is too broad.

## III Reasoning and Definitions

### A. Introduction

1. Aristotle said that Socrates contributed a type of inductive argument and universal definitions.

### B. Inductive Reasoning

1. Socrates would reason from some specific examples to a general conclusion about the entire class.
2. When a universal term is applied to a number of particulars either:

- a. The term has a different meaning in its different applications or it applies.
    1. But there must have been a common basis for the application or language would fall apart.
  - b. The term refers to a property shared by all cases in which it applies.
  3. This method leads to the development of universal definitions.
- C. Universal Definitions
1. Particulars can be grouped into natural categories.
  2. The universal concepts allow recognition and evaluation (in terms of fulfilling a purpose) of particulars.
  3. Socrates does not seem to have a metaphysical basis for the concepts, but they are developed into the Platonic forms.
- D. The Midwife
1. Socrates claimed that he was a midwife to ideas.
  2. He takes this to mean that he lacks answers and wisdom, but can help other find them in themselves.
  3. The truth was not found via the senses, but is “written in the soul.”
  4. This is the notion of innate ideas, which is a rationalist position.

#### IV Metaphysics

##### A. Introduction

1. Socrates did not appear to focus much on metaphysics, aside from his examination of the soul.

##### B. Earlier Greek Accounts of the Soul/psyche

1. The psyche was the breath of life and the body was the person.
2. The soul was not involved in the thoughts or emotions of the person.
3. The soul could exist as a type of ghost that could prophesize or seek vengeance.
4. The soul was not the person.

##### C. Socrates' Account

1. The soul is the self and the body is secondary.
2. Caring for the body and ignoring the soul is a critical mistake.
3. An excellent soul is properly ordered, wise and has due control over the emotions and desires.
4. In the Apology Socrates consider the possibility that the soul might perish while also considering the possibility of immortality.
5. When Crito asks how Socrates should be buried and Socrates jokes that they will have to catch him first.

#### V Ethical Theory

##### A. Virtue

1. The most important goal is not merely living, but living well (virtuously/justly).
2. To understand how to live justly, one must understand the standard of excellence (arête).
3. Arête: good at a specific task, having excellence or fulfilling its function well.
4. Socrates was concerned with what it meant to be a virtuous human being-having arête.
5. By speaking in terms of arête, Socrates indicates that he is taking morality to be based in non-moral, naturalistic factors.
6. Morality involves being a successful human.

##### B. Why be moral?

1. Being virtuous is being successful at fulfilling human nature.
2. Thus virtue is the only thing that will lead to happiness.
3. Happiness was accepted by Greek thinkers as an end that needed no argument
4. Socrates' conception of happiness differed from those of earlier thinkers.
5. For Socrates one's real interests lie in being moral and not in being selfish.
6. People can be mistaken about their best interests and act unjustly or give in to bodily desires.
7. Injustice corrupts the soul and leads to unhappiness.

##### C. Ethical Intellectualism

1. Ethical Intellectualism: knowledge and virtue are one.
2. Without knowledge, the other virtues are either ineffective or actually harmful.
3. Unity of the Virtues: Having only some of the virtues can create a harmful person.

##### D. Knowledge and Goodness, Ignorance and Evil

1. Each person pursues his/her good by nature.
2. Our good is being virtuous.
3. To know the good is to do the good.
4. No one chooses to do evil knowingly, only out of ignorance.
5. For Socrates knowledge is more than having factual information-true knowledge is wisdom.
6. This view was criticized in Socrates' own time.
  - a. The playwright Euripides claimed that people did wrong from sloth or due to preferring pleasure.
  - b. Aristotle claimed that Socrates' view “plainly contradicted the observed facts.”

#### VI Social & Political Philosophy

##### A. Distrust of Democracy

1. Since competence is a matter of knowledge, ruling requires knowledge.

2. People with such knowledge, which is philosophical, will be uncommon.
3. As we would not choose a doctor by voting, we should not choose leaders that way.

#### B. Laws

1. The state should be obeyed.
2. Those that disagree with the laws should either persuade the leaders to change the laws or leave the state.
3. Though Socrates was unjustly convicted, he believed that disobedience would be an injustice and harm him worse than death.
4. He did say that he would practice philosophy even if the state ordered him not to-but this would still show respect for the state. By trying to persuade the leaders to change and by his willingness to accept the consequences of his actions.

#### C. Social Contract Theory

1. We have an implicit contract with the state.
2. We receive certain goods in exchange for our obedience.
3. We should keep to our just contracts.

#### D. Natural Law Theory

1. There is a universal moral law that can be known via reason and experience.
2. This law is not created by people and is above the laws of specific states.
3. The laws of specific states can be judged against these laws.

### VII Socrates' Contributions

#### A. Plato

1. He had a significant and great impact of Plato.

#### B. Ethical Theory

1. Megarians.
2. Cyrenaics.
3. Cynics.

#### C. Personality

1. Socrates' main influence was via the person he was, as oppose to the doctrines he espoused.
2. The philosophic life-the desire to know, the belief in the supreme importance of wisdom, and the conviction to follow the Questions.
3. "Know thyself"-inscription at the temple of Apollo at Delphi.
4. "An unexamined life is not worth living."-Socrates

## Plato

### Background

#### I Background

##### A. The Death of Socrates

1. Socrates was Plato's mentor.
2. Phaedo: "Such was the end...of our friend, who was, I think, of all the men of our time, the best, the wisest and the most just."
3. Plato wondered why society could not tolerate the existence of Socrates and what sort of society would be needed to permit Wisdom to prevail.

##### B. Life

1. Born 428 or 427 B.C. into an aristocratic family.
2. Trained to be a political leader.
3. Traveled, perhaps even to Egypt, and went to Syracuse, Italy in 388.
4. He founded the Academy located in a grove sacred to the hero Academus.
5. In 368 and 361 he attempted to educate the ruler of Syracuse, Dionysius the Younger.
  - a. He failed and barely escaped with his life in 361.
6. he died in 348 or 347 B.C.

##### C. Comprehensive Philosophy

1. Plato was concerned with ethical theory.
2. The fate of Socrates, an ethical person, convinced him of the importance of political philosophy.
3. He held that the answers to the ethical and political problems were to be found in metaphysics.
4. He realized that to make progress in these areas of philosophy required a theory of knowledge.

## The Apology of Socrates

- Plato

Revised 6/20/2007

### I Opening of the Trial

#### A. Charges Against Socrates

1. Old Charges:
  - a. An evil-doer, a curious person, he searches into things under the earth and in heaven.

- b. Makes the worse appear the better cause.
- c. Teaches the above to others.
- 2. The 'charges' in "Clouds", a comedy by Aristophanes.
- 3. He is accused of being a paid teacher.

## II Wisdom & Socrates' Task

### A. Wisdom

- 1. Chaerephon asked the oracle at Delphi if anyone was wiser than Socrates.
- 2. Oracle: there was no man wiser.
- 3. Socrates, knowing he has no wisdom, wondered what the god meant.
- 3. Socrates thought of a test: if he could find a wiser man, he might refute the god

### B. The Search –Politicians

- 1. He revealed that a politician with a reputation of wisdom was not wise.
- 2. Socrates knows nothing but is better off than the politician.
  - a. The politician knows nothing but thinks he knows.
  - b. Socrates neither knows nor thinks he knows.
- 3. Socrates found the politicians most in repute were the most foolish and those less esteemed were wiser and better.

### C. The Search Continues-Poets

- 1. Poets do not write poetry by wisdom, but by inspiration.
  - a. They are like diviners who say many fine things without understanding.
- 2. Their poetry leads them to mistakenly think they are wise.
- 3. He saw himself superior to them for the same reason he was superior to the politicians.

### D. The Search Continues-Artisans

- 1. They knew many things he didn't and in this they were wiser.
- 2. Even good artisans fell into the same error as the poets.
  - a. Because they were good workmen they thought they knew all sorts of high matters.
  - b. This defect overshadowed their wisdom.
- 3. He would rather have neither their knowledge nor their ignorance.

### E. Wisdom

- 1. He is called wise since listeners imagine he has the wisdom he finds wanting in others.
- 2. Only God is wise and his answer is to show the wisdom of men is worth little or nothing.
- 3. The wisest know their wisdom is worth nothing.
- 4. Socrates tested the wisdom of all who appeared wise.
  - a. If someone is not wise, then in vindication of the oracle Socrates exposes this.

## III The Charges

### A. The Youth

- 1. Often imitate Socrates.
- 2. Find many who think they know, but know little or nothing.
- 3. Those examined are angry with Socrates instead of themselves.

### B. Accused

- 1. He is accused of being a villainous misleader of youth.
- 2. If asked, his accusers do not know and cannot tell what evil he practices or teaches.
- 3. To not seem to be at a loss, they repeat charges used against all philosophers:
  - a. Teaching things up in the clouds and under the earth.
  - b. Having no gods.
  - c. Making the worse appear the better cause.
- 4. They do not like to confess that their pretence of knowledge has been detected.

### C. Socrates' Accusers

- 1. Meletus- represents poets.
- 2. Anytus- represents craftsmen and politicians.
- 3. Lycon- represents rhetoricians.

## IV Meletus

### A. Charges

- 1. Socrates is a doer of evil, who corrupts the youth.
- 2. Socrates does not believe in the gods of the state, but has his own new divinities.

### B. The Corrupter of Youth

- 1. Meletus says Socrates is a doer of evil and corrupts the youth.
- 2. Socrates will prove that Meletus:
  - a. Is a doer of evil
  - b. Pretends to be earnest when only in jest.

c. Is eager to bring men to trial from a pretended zeal and interest about matters he never had the smallest interest in.

### C. Questioning Meletus

1. Meletus claims to think a great deal about the improvement of youth.
2. Socrates asks Meletus to tell the judges who improves the youth.
  - a. He must know since he took pains to discover their corrupter.
  - b. He takes Meletus' initial silence to prove what Socrates is saying.
3. Meletus claims:
  - a. All the judges are able to instruct and improve youth.
  - b. The audience and the senators improve the youth:
  - c. Every Athenian improves the youth except Socrates, the sole corruptor.

### D. Socrates' Horse Trainer Analogy

1. One man is able to do the horses good, or at least not many.
2. The trainer of horses does them good.
3. Others who have anything to do with them injure them.
4. This is true of horses and any other animals.
5. The condition of youth would be happy if they had one corrupter and everyone else improved them.
6. Meletus shows he never had a thought about the young.
7. Meletus' carelessness is seen in not caring about what he brought against Socrates.

### E. Unintentional Argument

1. Meletus agrees:
  - a. It is better to live among good citizens than bad citizens.
  - b. The good do their neighbors good and the bad do them evil.
  - c. No one would rather be injured than benefited by those who live with him.
  - d. No one likes to be injured.
5. Meletus has accused Socrates of intentionally corrupting the youth.
6. Meletus admitted: the good do their neighbors good, and the evil do them evil
7. Socrates: he knows if he corrupts a man he has to live with, it is very likely he will be harmed by him.
8. Socrates: either I do not corrupt them, or I corrupt them unintentionally.
9. Socrates: either way Meletus is lying.
10. If his offence is unintentional:
  - a. The law has no cognizance of unintentional offences.
  - b. Meletus ought to have privately warned and admonished Socrates.
  - c. If he had been better advised, he would have stopped doing what he did unintentionally.
  - d. Meletus had nothing to say to Socrates and refused to teach him.
  - e. And now brings him to court, which is a place of punishment, not instruction.
11. Socrates: Meletus has no care at all about the matter.

### F. Religious Charges Against Socrates

1. Charge: Socrates teaches the youth not to acknowledge the gods of the state, but new divinities.
2. Socrates asks whether Meletus claims:
  - a. He teaches others to acknowledge some gods, and so believes in gods and is not an atheist.
  - b. Or they are not the gods the city recognizes.
3. Meletus claims Socrates is an atheist and a teacher of atheism.

### G. Socrates' Reply to the Religious Charges

1. Meletus contradicts himself as if he said Socrates is guilty of believing in and not believing in the gods.
2. Socrates: No one believes in the existence of
  - a. Human things and not human beings.
  - b. Horsemanship and not horses.
  - c. Flute-playing and not in flute-players.
  - d. Spiritual and divine agencies
  - e. And not in spirits or demigods.
3. Meletus: Socrates teaches and believes in divine beings.
4. If Socrates believes in divine beings he must believe in spirits or demigods (either gods or sons of gods).
5. Meletus' Facetious Riddle: The demigods or spirits are gods, but Meletus claims Socrates does not believe in gods.
6. Meletus claims Socrates believes in gods-if he believes in demigods.
  - a. If the demigods are the sons of gods, there must be gods.
  - b. Otherwise, one might as well affirm the existence of mules and deny that of horses and asses.
7. Socrates: Meletus made this charge because he had no real basis for an accusation.
8. Meletus cannot prove one can believe in divine and superhuman things and not believe in gods, demigods and heroes.

## III Wisdom

### A. Fear, Wisdom and Death

1. The fear of death is the pretence of wisdom-pretence of knowing the unknown.
2. No one knows if death may be the greatest good.
3. This is ignorance of a disgraceful sort- the conceit that a man knows what he does not know.
4. Socrates may be wiser in that he knows
  - a. A little of the world below, but does not suppose that he knows.
  - b. Injustice and disobedience to a better is evil and dishonorable.
  - c. He will never fear or avoid a possible good rather than a certain evil.
5. If they offer Socrates freedom if he stops being a philosopher, he will obey God.

#### B. The Gadfly

1. If they kill Socrates, they will injure themselves more than him.
  - a. Socrates is arguing for their sake, so they may not sin against the God by condemning his gift.
2. Socrates is a gadfly, given to the state by God.
3. The state is a great and noble steed whose size makes him tardy; who must be stirred to life.
4. Socrates is the gadfly which God has attached to the state-arousing, persuading and reproaching.
5. They will not easily find another, so he advises them to spare him

#### C. Why he did not advise the state.

1. If he had engaged in politics, he should have perished long ago, and done no good
2. None who honestly strive against the many lawless and unrighteous deeds done in a state will survive.
3. One who fights for the right, if he would live even briefly, must have a private and not public station.

#### D. The Vote

1. Socrates is found guilty.

### IV Penalties and Death

#### A. Penalty

1. Meletus proposes death.
2. Socrates first proposes maintenance in the Prytaneum.
  - a. A reward deserved far more than winner of the prize at Olympia in a horse or chariot race.
  - b. An Olympian gives the appearance of happiness, and Socrates gives the reality.
3. He then proposes to pay a fine-he offers to pay a mina and his friends bid him to say thirty minae.

#### B. Life and Death

1. He would rather die having spoken after his manner, than speak in their manner and live.
2. There are ways of escaping death, if a man is willing to say and do anything.
3. The difficulty is not to avoid death, but to avoid unrighteousness- that runs faster than death.
  - a. Socrates is old and moves slowly-the slower runner has overtaken him.
  - b. His accusers are quick, and the faster runner, unrighteousness, has overtaken them.
4. He departs to suffer the penalty of death; they go their way condemned by truth to suffer the penalty of villainy and wrong.

#### C. Prophecy

1. In the hour of death men are gifted with prophetic power: His murderers will be punished.
2. They killed Socrates because he wanted to escape the accuser, and not give an account of their lives.
3. By killing men they cannot prevent someone from censuring their evil lives-that is not possible or honorable.
4. The easiest and the noblest way: not disabling others, but improving yourself.

#### D. The Voice

1. His internal oracle, which kept him from error, did not give him any sign.
2. This indicates what has happened is a good, and those who think death is an evil are in error.

#### F. Dilemma: Death is Nothing to Fear

1. There is great reason to hope that death is a good.
2. Death is a state of nothingness and utter unconsciousness or a change and migration of the soul from this world to another.
3. If there is no consciousness, but a sleep undisturbed even by dreams, death will be an unspeakable gain.
  - a. Eternity is then only a single night.
4. If death is a journey to another place where the dead abide, no good can be greater.
5. If one arrives in the world below, is delivered from the professors of justice in this world, and finds the true judges who were righteous in life, then the trip will be worth making.
  - a. Socrates looks forward to conversing with ancient heroes who suffered death through unjust judgment.
  - b. He will be able to continue his search-he will find who is wise, who pretends to be wise, and who is not.
  - c. In another world they do not put a man to death for asking questions.
  - d. Besides being happier than we are, they will be immortal.

#### G. No Evil Can Befall the Good

1. No evil can happen to a good man, either in life or after death.
2. He and his are not neglected by the gods.
3. Socrates' approaching end did not happen by mere chance.
4. The time has arrived when it was better to die and be released from trouble.

5. So, the oracle gave no sign.

H. Favor from His Friends

1. When his sons are grown, he asks his friends to trouble them, as Socrates has troubled others.

2. If they care about riches, or anything more than virtue; or pretend to be something when they are nothing, reprove them for  
a. Not caring about what they ought to.

b. Thinking that they are something when they are really nothing.

3. If you do this, both he and his sons will have received justice.

I. End

1. The hour of departure has arrived, and we go our ways—I to die, and you to live.

2. Which is better God only knows.

## Part II: Philosophy & Religion

### The Problem of Faith & Reason in Western Thought

Based on the *Voyage of Discovery* by William F. Lawhead, Wadsworth, 2002.

Revised 6/20/2007

#### I The Problem of Faith and Reason: Early Christian Thought

##### A. Greeks

1. The Greeks had no real conflict between faith and reason.
2. Greek religion was not a revealed faith-religious ideas were passed on by poets and tradition.
3. Greek philosophers relied on philosophical reason and tended to either reject or downplay the religious traditions.

##### B. Jewish Tradition

1. The Jewish tradition lacked the conflict between faith and reason.
2. Jewish tradition emphasized the faithfulness of God to His people, thus making philosophical reasoning seem needless.

##### C. Cause of the Problem

1. There are two different sources of information: faith/revelation and reason.
2. As Greek ways of thought began to supplant Jewish influences, Christians had to address various concerns.
  - a. External philosophical attacks.
  - b. Internal controversies.
  - c. The Greek concern with a systematic approach to reality.

##### D. Classic Questions

1. Is religious belief rational?
2. What is the relation between faith and reason?
3. In cases where faith and reason conflict, what should be done?

##### E. Points of Disagreement

1. Christian thinkers rejected many of the views of the Greek philosophers.
2. For Plato, the highest goal was to achieve knowledge of the Good, as opposed to salvation.
3. Plato accepted reincarnation, as opposed to the Christian notion of a permanent afterlife.
4. The Epicureans advocated the life of pleasure and claimed the soul ceased to exist at death.

##### F. Points of Agreement

1. Plato claimed that the soul was immortal and that the transcendent is of greater concern than the material world.
2. Aristotle presented arguments that were later employed to argue for God's existence.
3. Aristotle argued that the universe had a purpose.
4. The Stoics argued for an orderly and meaningful world that was aimed at fulfilling a divine purpose.

##### G. Biblical Tradition: Anti-Philosophy

1. Paul's 1<sup>st</sup> letter to the Corinthians: the wisdom of the world is foolishness in God's eyes and Christ's gospel seems foolish in the eyes of pagans.
2. Paul: "Make sure no one traps you and deprives you of your freedom by some secondhand, empty, rational philosophy based on the principles of this world instead of on Christ."

##### H. Biblical Tradition: Pro-Philosophy

1. Paul told the Stoics and Epicureans that all three groups worshipped the same God-Christianity provided fuller information.
2. Paul quoted Stoics to support his theology.
3. Paul claimed that although the Greeks had not received a revelation, they had knowledge of God via his creation and the moral laws were "engraved on their hearts."
4. The Book of Proverbs praises wisdom.
5. The prologue to the Gospel of John mentions the Divine Logos.

#### II The Problem of Faith and Reason: 11<sup>th</sup> & 12<sup>th</sup> Century

##### A. Introduction

1. The problem of the relationship between faith and knowledge remained.
2. A variety of positions were held during this time period.

##### B. Reason as predominant.

1. Some had confidence in reason and let it guide their faith.
2. Examples: John Scotus Erigena, Roscelin and Abelard.
  - a. All three had their works in theology condemned by the Church.

##### C. Faith as predominant.

1. The monastic reforms of 1000 lead some to regard reason as dangerous.
2. Peter Damian (1007-1072) warned against the
  - a. "blind foolhardiness of these pseudointellectuals who investigate nonproblems."
  - b. Those who presume to diminish the power of God by trusting in logic and "arguments based on the meaning of words."

3. St. Bernard of Clairvaux (1091-1153)
  - a. A mystic and reformer.
  - b. Regarded philosophy as both useless and dangerous.
  - c. He prosecuted Abelard.
  - d. "I believe though I do not comprehend, and I hold by faith what I cannot grasp with the mind."
- D. Anselm's view
  1. Reason cannot be autonomous and must be guided by faith.
  2. Great confidence is placed in reason.
  3. Anselm believed he could prove all Christian doctrines via deduction, though he initially accepted them on faith.
  4. Faith must operate within the limits set by orthodoxy.
- E. Synthesis of Faith and Reason-Aquinas
  1. He made a clear distinction between theology and philosophy.
  2. The human mind could not grasp the rationality of some theological doctrines.
    - a. These doctrines must be known via revelation and taken on faith.
  3. Reason is effective within its own sphere.
  4. Faith is not a necessity for philosophical argument.
  5. Faith and reason overlap to a degree.
    - a. Some of what people take on faith can be proven by reason.
- F. Narrowing the Scope of Reason
  1. After Aquinas thinkers put less confidence in reason and narrowed its sphere.
  2. Siger of Brabant's doctrine of double truth.
    - a. Philosophy and theology could give different answers to the same question.
    - b. He did not make an extensive attempt to resolve the differences between faith and reason.
  3. Duns Scotus (1266-1308) maintained the balance between faith and reason.
    - a. Did not allow for much overlap between the two spheres.
  4. William of Ockham separated theology and reason to protect the truths of faith.
    - a. The existence of God can not be proven with certainty.
    - b. Logic reveals nothing about reality but only about the forms of the propositions asserted about reality.
  5. The separation of faith and reason was furthered by the robust resurgence of mysticism in the 14<sup>th</sup> century.
    - a. Knowledge of God and religious experience were placed beyond the realm of reason.

## The Nature & Existence of God

### I Questions

- A. Metaphysical Questions
  1. What is the nature of God?
  2. Does God exist?
- B. Epistemic Questions
  1. How do we know the nature of God?
  2. How do we know God exists?

### II Reason and Logic

- A. View
  1. Reason and logic can be used to determine God's nature and existence.
  2. This view includes the acceptance of rational arguments that are for and against the existence of God.
  3. The overall idea is that God falls, at least some degree, within the grasp of human reason.
  4. Two traditional approaches: *a priori* and *a posteriori* arguments.
- B. A Priori Reasoning and God.
  1. *A priori* reasoning: reasoning that involves evidence that does not depend on sensory experience.
  2. Such arguments typically depend on conceptual analysis or the use of innate ideas.
    - a. Innate ideas: ideas that are inborn or otherwise possessed prior to sensory experience.
  3. In this context, the *a priori* reasoning would be aimed at:
    - a. Attempts to determine God's nature.
    - b. Attempts to argue for or against God's existence.
  4. Examples: St. Anselm, Descartes, Leibniz.
  5. The acceptance of a priori arguments is a rationalist position.
  6. Rationalism: the view that not all evidence comes from the senses.
- C. A Posteriori Reasoning and God.
  1. *A posteriori* reasoning: reasoning that involves evidence that is ultimately grounded in sensory experience.
  2. Such arguments typically begin with empirical observations of physical phenomena and then lead to conclusions about God.
  3. In this context, the *a posteriori* reasoning would be aimed at:

- a. Attempts to determine God's nature.
- b. Attempts to argue for or against God's existence.
4. Examples: St. Aquinas, David Hume
5. The sole use of a posteriori arguments is an empiricist position.
6. Empiricism is the view that all evidence ultimately comes from the senses.

## II Rejection of Reason and Logic

### A. View

1. Reason and logic cannot be used to determine God's nature or existence.

### B. Various Approaches

1. God's existence and nature can be known through faith.
2. God's existence and nature can be known through mystical experience or divine revelation.
3. God's existence and nature cannot be known by any means.
4. Pascal's Wager: God's existence cannot be proven by logic or reason, but reason shows He is the best bet.

## Regresses & Absurdity

### I Regress and Absurdity Methodology

#### A. Introduction

1. Regress and absurdity arguments are commonly used in arguments about God.

### II. Circular Regress

#### A. Defined

1. A circular regress arises when the first step in a process ends up being a requirement for itself.
2. The regress creates an infinite loop in the form of a circle.
3. If the regress holds, then the first step can never occur because it requires itself.
4. The term "requires" is taken fairly loosely.

#### B. Form and Examples

1. Simplest Regress: A requires A.
2. More complex circular regresses are possible.
  - a. Example: A requires B, B requires C...Z requires A.
3. Example: You need experience to get a job, but you need a job to get experience.

### III. Infinite Regress

#### A. Defined:

1. A situation in which there is an infinite series.
2. Yet each item in the series is somehow dependent on a prior item in the series.
3. Thus, the first step requires that an infinite number of steps be taken.
4. If this is impossible, the regress is vicious and the first item can never come about.

#### B. Form

1. Item 1 requires item 2.
2. Item 2 requires item 3.
3. Item 3 requires item 4.
4. Item x requires item  $x+1$ .
5. And so on, into infinity.

#### C. The Evil Bureaucrat Example

1. In order to get your financial aid, you must get form A, the form for requesting financial aid.
2. To get form A, you must get form A1, the form for requesting the form for requesting financial aid.
3. And so on, into infinity.
4. Thus, you will never get your financial aid.

### IV. Reductio Ad Absurdum (Reducing to Absurdity)

#### A. Defined

1. An argument in which one proves that a claim is false by drawing an absurdity from the assumption that it is true.
2. A claim can also be proven to be true by assuming it is false and deriving an absurdity from this.

#### B. Form #1

1. Assume that a claim, P, is true.
2. Prove that this assumption leads to something false, absurd, or contradictory.
3. Conclude that the claim that P is true is itself false.
4. Conclude that P is false.

#### C. Form #2

1. Assume that a claim, P, is false.
2. Prove that this assumption leads to something false, absurd, or contradictory.
3. Conclude that the claim that P is false is itself false.
4. Conclude that P is true.

#### D. Example

1. Oppression is to best defined as the mistreatment of a minority by a majority.
2. In the case of sexism, a majority (women) is mistreated by a minority (men).
3. Therefore, sexism is not oppression.
4. This is absurd, so the definition is flawed.

#### V Using a regress in a Reductio Ad Absurdum

##### A. Introduction

1. A regress can be used as part of a reductio.
2. The method is to create a regress that leads to an absurdity, thus showing that something breaks or prevents the regress.

##### B. Example

1. Goal: to prove that humans must have originated from something non human.
2. Assumed (to be disproven): each human must have human parents.
3. Regress
  - a. Each current human must have human parents.
  - b. Each of those parents must have had human parents.
  - d. Those parents must have also had human parents.
  - e. And so on into infinity.
4. The Reductio
  - a. The regress requires that there be an infinite number of humans.
  - b. This is impossible, so if the regress is valid, then there are no humans.
  - c. However, there are clearly humans.
  - d. So it must be false that each human must have had human parents.
  - e. So, the first human must have originated from something non human.

## St. Anselm

Revised 6/22/2005

### Background

#### I Background

##### A. Background

1. 1033-1109, canonized in 1494.
2. Born to an Italian noble family.
3. Against his father's wishes, he became Benedictine monk in the Norman town of Bec.
4. He became an abbot and then, reluctantly, the Archbishop of Canterbury for 16 years.
5. He argued for the authority of the pope over that of the king.
6. His main work is the *Proslogium*

##### B. Goal

1. To provide conclusive, rational proofs for the Christian doctrines he had accepted initially on faith.
2. He had confidence in reason.
3. Reasoning should follow the deductive method and this would lead to all fundamental truths.
4. He believed he could provide rational arguments for the truth of the key doctrines.

### Anselm's Ontological Argument for God's Existence

#### I Anselm's A Priori Argument for God's Existence

##### A. The Fool Understands

1. Definition of "God": a being than which nothing greater can be conceived.
2. The fool has said there is no God.
3. The fool, when he hears of God, understands what he hears.
4. What he understands is in his understanding- though he does not understand it to exist.
5. It is one thing for an object to be in the understanding.
6. It is another to understand the object exists.
  - a. When a painter conceives of what he will paint it is in his understanding.
  - b. He does not understand it to exist- he has not yet painted it.
  - c. After it is painted it is in his understanding and he understands that it exists.
7. So, the fool is convinced something at least exists in the understanding than which nothing greater can be conceived.

##### B. From Understanding to Reality

1. Whatever is understood exists in the understanding.
  2. That than which nothing greater can be conceived, cannot exist in the understanding alone.
  3. Suppose it exists only in the understanding-it can be conceived to exist in reality; which is greater.
  4. If that than which nothing greater can be conceived, exists in the understanding alone, it is that than which a greater can be conceived.
  5. This is impossible.
  6. There is no doubt that there exists a being than which nothing greater can be conceived, and it exists in the understanding and in reality.
- C. God cannot be conceived not to exist.
1. This being exists so truly that it cannot be conceived not to exist.
  2. It is possible to conceive of a being which cannot be conceived not to exist, and this is greater than one that can be conceived not to exist.
  3. If that than which nothing greater can be conceived, can be conceived not to exist, it is not that than which nothing greater can be conceived.
  4. This is an irreconcilable contradiction.
  5. There is so truly a being than which nothing greater can be conceived to exist, that it cannot even be conceived not to exist.
  6. This is God.
- D. God alone cannot be conceived not to exist.
1. God exists and cannot be conceived not to exist.
  2. If one could conceive of a being better than God, the creature would rise above the Creator; which is absurd.
  3. Everything, except God, can be conceived not to exist.
  4. God alone exists more truly than all others, and hence in a higher degree.
  5. Whatever else exists does not exist so truly so it exists to a lesser degrees.
  6. So, the fool denies God because he is a fool.

## **An Answer To The Argument Of Anselm**

-Gaunilo, A Monk Of Marmoutier

### I Challenge & Doubt

#### A. Gaunilo's Challenge

1. Suppose it is said a being which cannot be even conceived in terms of any fact, is in the understanding.
2. Gaunilo accepts that this being is in his understanding.
3. He will not accept that it has a real existence until a proof is given.

#### B. Gaunilo's Doubt

1. Anselm claims this being exists-otherwise the being which is greater than all will not be greater than all.
2. Gaunilo doubts that this being is greater than any real object.
4. The only existence it has is the same as when the mind, from a word heard, tries to form the image of an unknown object.
5. How is the existence of that being proved from the assumption that it is greater than all other beings?
6. He doubts Anselm's demonstration: he does not admit that this being is in his understanding even in the way which many objects whose real existence is uncertain and doubtful, are in his understanding.
7. It should be proved first that this being really exists.
- 8 Then, from the fact that it is greater than all, we would conclude it also subsists in itself.

### II Gaunilo's Perfect Island Argument

#### A. The Perfect Island

1. There is an island that is impossible to find, the "lost" island.
2. This island has inestimable wealth and no owner or inhabitant.
3. Hence it is more excellent than all other countries, which are inhabited.
4. If someone claims there is such an island, Gaunilo would understand his words.

#### B. The parity of reasoning: But suppose he said:

1. You cannot doubt that this most excellent of island exists somewhere.
2. You have no doubt that it is in your understanding.
3. It is more excellent not to be in the understanding alone, but to exist in the understanding and in reality.
4. Hence, the island must exist.
5. If it does not exist, any land which really exists will be more excellent.
6. Hence, the island understood to be more excellent will not be more excellent.

#### C. Gaunilo's Criticism of this line of reasoning.

1. If someone tried to persuade him by such reasoning, he would assume the person was jesting or regard him or himself a fool.
2. It ought to be shown that:
  - a. The hypothetical excellence of this island exists as a real and indubitable fact.
  - b. It is not an unreal object, or one whose existence is uncertain in Gaunilo's understanding.

#### D. A note of Gaunilo's method.

1. He is combining parity of reasoning with a reduction to absurdity.
2. Parity of reasoning: to use reasoning that parallels the reasoning in question.
  - a. In this case Gaunilo is using the same line of reasoning as Anselm.
3. Reducing to absurdity: to prove that a claim is implausible by drawing an absurd or contradictory conclusion from it.
  - a. In this case Gaunilo draws an absurd conclusion by using Anselm's method.
  - b. He thus concludes that the method is flawed.

## Anselm's Reply to Gaunilo

### I The Island

#### A. Anselm's Summary of Gaunilo's Objection

1. One should suppose an island in the ocean, which surpasses all lands in its fertility.
2. Because of the impossibility of discovering what does not exist is called a lost island.
3. There can be no doubt that this island truly exists in reality.
4. Hence one who hears it described understands what he hears.

#### B. Anselm's Challenge

1. If any shall devise anything existing in reality or in concept alone (except that than which a greater cannot be conceived) to which he can apply Anselm's reasoning, he will discover it.

### II Anselm's Reply

#### A. Part one: God cannot be conceived not to be.

1. This being than which a greater is inconceivable cannot be conceived not to be.
2. Because it exists on so assured a ground of truth.
3. Otherwise it would not exist at all.

#### B. Part Two: The dilemma

1. So, if one claims he conceives this being not to exist, at the time when he conceives of this either he conceives of a being than which a greater is inconceivable or he does not conceive at all.
2. If he does not conceive, he does not conceive of the nonexistence of that of which he does not conceive.
3. If he conceives, he certainly conceives of a being which cannot be even conceived not to exist.
4. If it could be conceived not to exist, it could be conceived to have a beginning and an end.
5. This impossible.

#### C. Part Three: It's inconceivable.

1. He who conceives of this being conceives of a being which cannot be even conceived not to exist.
2. But he who conceives of this being does not conceive that it does not exist.
3. If he does so, then he conceives what is inconceivable.
4. The nonexistence of that than which a greater cannot be conceived is inconceivable.

## St. Thomas Aquinas

### Background

#### I Background

##### A. Early Life

1. Born in 1224 or 1225 into a noble Italian family.
  - a. His father was the Count of Aquino.
2. His family hoped he would reach a position of ecclesiastical authority that would have political influence and wealth.
3. At 14 he enrolled in University of Naples and joined the Dominican Order in 1244.
  - a. The Dominicans were humble and poor preachers and scholars.
  - b. His family was displeased by his joining the order, so his brother kidnapped him and held him in a tower for a year.
4. After his release, he studied philosophy and theology at Paris.
5. There he was influenced by the Dominican theologian Albert the Great (Albrecht Gross).
6. Lectured and wrote in Italy and Paris.
7. Traveled often for the Church and Dominicans.
8. Appointed by the Pope as a theological adviser for communications with the Eastern Orthodox Church.
9. A few months before he died, he had a mystic experience that caused him to stop writing.
  - a. "I can write no more, I have seen things which make all my writings like straw."
10. He died in 1274 en-route to the Council of Lyons.
11. Canonized in 1323 and in 1879 Pope Leo XIII recommended his philosophy as a model for Catholic thought.

##### B. The Ox

1. He was large and rotund, but gentle.
2. He was nicknamed "the dumb ox" because he was quiet in class and did not engage in the active discussions.
3. Cow Story

- a. Other monks told him a cow was flying and he went to look, causing them to laugh and ask him if he thought cows could fly.
- b. He replied that he would rather believe that a cow could fly than that another monk would lie.

### C. Works

1. He wrote about 25 volumes and supposedly kept four secretaries busy transcribing different works.
  - a. Devotional works, sermons, lectures, and philosophy.
  - b. Commentaries on Aristotle, Boethius, and Pseudo-Dionysius.
2. The *Summa Theologica* is his major work and is longer than Aristotle's works.

## II Aristotle & Aquinas

### A. Complete Works

1. 12<sup>th</sup>-13<sup>th</sup> century the complete surviving works of Aristotle became available in Europe.
2. Aristotle's works presented a systematic and developed philosophy.

### B. Conflict

1. Aristotle claimed that the world was eternal and uncreated.
2. He apparently did not accept the notion of personal immortality.
3. Christian thinkers influenced by Ibn Rushd's commentaries on Aristotle tended to alter their theology to match their philosophy, which worried the church authorities.
4. Neo-Platonism had been the dominant philosophy for Christians for a long time, making Aristotle's empirical and naturalistic tendencies seem threatening.

### C. Aquinas's View

1. He held that one could adopt Aristotle's views without falling into heresy.
2. He regarded Aristotle's works as a rich intellectual resource.
3. He referred to Aristotle as "The Philosopher."
4. Aquinas was quite willing to be critical of Aristotle and regarded him as pagan lacking divine revelation when it came to distinct matters of Christian faith.

### D. The Shift from Plato to Aristotle

1. The Platonic notions of the eternal and the otherworldliness seemed out of sync with the changes of the 13<sup>th</sup> century.
2. The challenge was to retain the transcendent nature of God and the afterlife while reconciling this with the concern with the here and now.
3. Aquinas thought that utilizing Aristotle would enable a reconciliation that was theologically correct and philosophically rigorous.

## III Faith & Reason

### A. Reconciliation: Augustine

1. One task was to reconcile the two sources of knowledge.
2. Augustine held that sin has damaged reason.
3. The mind must be repaired by grace before reason can function properly.
4. So, faith is necessary condition for philosophical understanding and philosophy is subservient to religion.

### B. Reconciliation: Aquinas

1. Sin did not cripple our rational capabilities, but did affect our moral life.
2. Reason can be an autonomous source of knowledge.
3. He clearly distinguishes philosophy from theology while giving each its due.
4. There are two sources of knowledge:
  - a. Theology yields knowledge via faith and revelation.
  - b. Philosophy yields knowledge via human reason and experience.
5. Theology begins with God and proceeds towards knowledge of the natural world.
6. Philosophy begins with empirical evidence of the natural world and proceeds, via reason, to God.
7. For Aquinas there are three types of truth and two kinds of theology.

### C. Truth: Christian teachings that are matters of faith.

1. Known via revelation.
2. Beyond the realm of reason, yet not contrary to reason.
3. Objections and problems raised against them can be countered by reason.
4. Cannot be proven nor disproven by reason.
5. Examples: Trinity, Incarnation, original sin, the creation of the world in time, the sacraments, and the last judgment.

### D. Truth: Empirical knowledge and self-evident philosophical principles.

1. These scientific and philosophical truths cannot be known via revelation.
2. Example: Aristotle's laws of logic, the biological function of the heart.

### E. Truth: Overlap of philosophy and theology.

1. These truths can be known via revelation or reason.
2. Examples: God's existence, God's essential qualities, the existence of the soul, immortality, and natural moral law.

### F. Two types of theology

1. Revealed supernatural theology.
2. Natural theology: a philosophical discipline aimed at establishing theological truths by the use of reason and empirical evidence.
3. Where the two overlap, there can be no conflict since they both reveal truths originating in God.
4. Human interpretations and judgments of either can come into conflict.
  - a. True theology only conflicts with false philosophy.
  - b. True philosophy only conflicts with false theology.

## Aquinas's Epistemology & Metaphysics

### I Epistemology

#### A. Aristotle's Influence

1. Citing Aristotle, he claims that mind is blank state prior to experience.
2. He is regarded as rejecting innate knowledge-even that of God.
3. The senses provide reason with content.
4. The operation of the intellect originates in the senses in what the senses apprehend, but "the intellect knows many things which the senses cannot perceive."

#### B. The Intellect

1. Is passive and active.
2. In its passive operation it receives "raw data" from sensory experience.
3. Because God created the objects of experience they are intelligible and contain universals.
4. The active aspect of the intellect processes the particular sensory experience and recognizes the universals.
  - a. The senses give the intellect X things and it abstracts the universal X from the particular X things.
5. The mind is initially without content, but by nature it has the potential to receive the universals/forms.
6. This is a natural process that does not require divine illumination.
  - a. This is in contrast with Augustine's view.

### III Metaphysics: Hierarchy

#### A. Actuality and Potentiality

1. Prime matter is pure potential-it can take on any form.
2. Forms are actuality-they make matter into particular sorts of things.
3. God is perfect and hence He is pure actuality-imperfection is having potential that is not actualized.
4. God cannot change, but the created universe is dynamic because all created beings are between pure potentiality and complete actuality.
5. Each created being has a natural tendency towards fulfilling its potential, thus imitating God.

#### B. The Great Chain of Being

1. The universe is a hierarchy ranging from the lowest inorganic substances to God.
2. The variety exists because God created the universe to express his fullness.
3. He uses this to prove the existence of angels-they are like God in being purely spiritual, but like humans in having unrealized potentiality.
4. This world is orderly and intelligible, and hence can be known.
5. This world has a purpose because each created being aims at fulfilling its essence.
6. Objective value judgments are grounded by this hierarchy: beings are greater or lesser depending on their proximity to God.
7. Thus, humans have greater worth than animals.

### IV Metaphysics: Existence and Essence

#### A. Essence & Existence

1. Essence is what makes a thing what it is.
2. Essence is distinct from the fact that something exists, at least in the case of created beings.

#### B. God

1. God's essence entails that He exists.
2. God is a being such that no greater being can be conceived.
3. His nature is such that He exists necessarily.
4. Aquinas rejects this argument because although we understand "God" we do not directly grasp His essence.
5. If we could, we would know his essence contains existence.
6. Since we lack this knowledge, we cannot argue from His essence to his existence.
7. Given his epistemology, arguments for God's existence must begin with empirical experience.

## The Five Ways

### I Introduction

## A. Introduction

1. Aquinas makes use of arguments developed by Aristotle and some of his Muslim and Jewish commentators.
2. His Five ways are so well presented they have become a model for theistic argumentation.

## B. General Form

1. If the world has quality X, then God exists.
2. The world has X.
3. Therefore God exists.

## C. Cosmological Argument

1. Aquinas's first three ways rest on the assumption that an infinite regress of causes is not possible.
2. These three arguments are three versions of what is known as the cosmological argument.

## II THE EXISTENCE OF GOD can be proved in five ways.

## A. The First Way (The Way of Motion)

1. It is certain and evident to our senses, that some things are in motion.
2. Whatever is moved is moved by another.
3. Nothing can be moved except it is in potentiality to that towards which it is moved.
4. A thing moves inasmuch as it is in act.
5. Motion is the reduction of something from potentiality to actuality.
6. Nothing can be reduced from potentiality to actuality, except by something in a state of actuality.
  - a. That which is actually hot, fire, makes wood, which is potentially hot, to be actually hot, and thus moves and changes it.
7. It is not possible for the same thing to be at once in actuality and potentiality in the same respect, but only in different respects.
  - a. What is actually hot cannot simultaneously be potentially hot.
  - b. It is simultaneously potentially cold.
8. It is impossible that in the same respect and in the same way a thing should be both mover and moved (it should move itself).
9. So, whatever is moved must be moved by another.
10. If that by which it is moved is itself moved, then this must be moved by another, and that by another.
11. This cannot go on to infinity,
  - a. Because then there would be no first mover,
  - b. And consequently no other mover,
  - c. Because subsequent movers move only inasmuch as they are moved by the first mover.
    1. As the staff moves only because it is moved by the hand.
12. It is necessary to arrive at a first mover, moved by no other.
13. This everyone understands to be God.

## B. The Second Way (Efficient cause)

1. In the world of sensible things we find there is an order of efficient causes.
2. A thing cannot be the efficient cause of itself.
  - a. It would be prior to itself, which is impossible.
3. In efficient causes it is not possible to go on to infinity.
4. Because in all efficient causes following in order,
  - a. The first is the cause of the intermediate cause,
  - b. The intermediate is the cause of the ultimate cause,
  - c. Whether the intermediate cause is several or one.
5. To take away the cause is to take away the effect.
6. Therefore, if there is no first cause among efficient causes, there will be neither ultimate nor any intermediate cause.
7. If in efficient causes it is possible to go on to infinity,
  - a. There will be no first efficient cause
  - b. Nor ultimate effect.
  - c. Nor intermediate efficient causes.
  - d. All of which is plainly false.
8. Therefore it is necessary to admit a first efficient cause, to which everyone gives the name of God.

## C. The Third Way (Possibility and Necessity)

1. We find in nature things that are possible to be and not to be.
  - a. They can be generated and corrupted, so it is possible for them to be and not to be.
2. It is impossible for these always to exist, for that which can not-be at some time is not.
3. Therefore, if everything can not-be, then at one time there was nothing in existence.
4. If so, now nothing would exist, because that which does not exist begins to exist only through something already existing.
5. Therefore, if at one time nothing existed, it would have been impossible for anything to have begun to exist.
6. Thus now nothing would be in existence, which is absurd.
7. So, not all beings are merely possible, but there must exist something whose existence is necessary.
8. Every necessary thing either has its necessity caused by another, or not.

9. It is impossible to go on to infinity in necessary things which have their necessity caused by another.
    - a. As shown in regard to efficient causes.
  10. Therefore we must admit the existence of a being
    - a. Having of itself its own necessity.
    - b. Not receiving it from another.
    - c. Causing in others their necessity.
  11. This all men speak of as God.
- D. The Fourth Way (Gradation)
1. Among beings there are some more and some less good, true, noble, and the like.
  2. More and less are predicated of different things as they resemble in different ways something which is the maximum.
    - a. A thing is said to be hotter as it more nearly resembles that which is hottest.
  3. So, there is something which is truest, something best, something noblest.
  4. Consequently, something which is most in being, for those things that are greatest in truth are greatest in being.
  5. The maximum in any genus is the cause of all in that genus.
    - a. As fire, the maximum of heat, is the cause of all hot things.
  6. There must be something which is to all the cause of their being, goodness, and every other perfection.
  7. This we call God.
- E. The Fifth Way (Governance of the World)
1. Things which lack knowledge, such as natural bodies, act for an end.
  2. This is evident from their acting always, or nearly always, in the same way, to obtain the best result.
  3. It is plain that they achieve their end, not fortuitously, but designedly.
  4. Whatever lacks knowledge cannot move towards an end, unless directed by a being with knowledge and intelligence.
    - a. As the arrow is directed by the archer.
  5. Therefore some intelligent being exists who directs all natural things to their end.
  6. This being we call God.

### III Common Mistakes in Interpreting the Five Ways

- A. "Everything must have a cause."
1. Aquinas does not assume that everything must have a cause.
  2. His principle is that what is merely potential (and hence dependent) must be caused by another being that has actuality.
  3. All created beings thus require causes, but God does not since He is completely actual.
- B. "The world has a beginning in time."
1. Aquinas does not attempt to prove that the world has a beginning in time.
  2. Thus, showing that it is possible that the world always existed does not disprove his arguments.
  3. Aristotle held to an eternal world and the Unmoved Mover.
  4. Aquinas did not regard Aristotle's argument as conclusive, but did consider the logical possibility and theistic acceptability of an eternal universe.
  5. A universe that always existed would still require a first cause-it would depend on God like an eternal flame would depend on its fuel: there would be no flame without the fuel.
  6. Aquinas does not necessarily require God to be the first temporal cause of the world-He could be a continuously sustaining cause.
  7. Aquinas does not think it is possible to prove that the world is eternal.
  8. St. Bonaventure held we could logically prove the world had a beginning in time, but Aquinas rejects his argument.
  9. Aquinas does accept that the world had a beginning in time, but only because the bible states this.
  10. Thus this matter is a subject for revelation, not proof.

### IV Common Criticisms

- A. Five Beings
1. Why not conclude that the five ways each prove the existence of a different being and not God.
  2. On his view, beings are distinguished by their qualities.
  3. The Five Ways point to a perfect and unlimited being.
  4. If two beings were perfect, they would be identical and would be the same.
    - a. However, it would still seem that they would be distinguished by their matter.
  5. There cannot be two unlimited beings-they would limit each other.
- B. "And this everyone understands to be God."
1. Critics claim that the abstract, metaphysical cause proven in each Way is quite different from the conception of a personal, loving God.
  2. Aquinas never claims the Ways give a complete view of God, which is why revelation is needed.
  3. The Ways do provide arguments for His important qualities.
  4. It could be argued that the Way of Gradation shows that a perfect being must be perfectly good, then the being would be loving and personal.

## Gottfried Leibniz

### Background

#### I German Culture

##### A. Stagnant

1. Prior to the 18<sup>th</sup> century German culture remained fairly stagnant.
2. Common people spoke German while the upper classes spoke French and scholars wrote in Latin.
3. The Reformation and the Thirty Years' War (1618-1648) disrupted the German states.
4. Aside from Leibniz, the German states did not produce any significant philosophical thinkers during this time.

#### II Background for Leibniz

##### A. Early Years

1. Born: 1646 in Leipzig Germany.
2. Learned to read Greek and Latin.
  - a. Bragged that at 13 he could read Scholastic texts as easily as people read romances.
3. Entered the University of Leipzig at 15 and graduated at 17.
4. Studied mathematics at Jena.
5. Returned to Leipzig to study law, but was blocked in his attempt to get his doctorate.
6. Received his doctorate in law at 21 from the University of Altdorf near Nuremberg.
7. Offered a professorship but decided to become a diplomat and administrator.

##### B. Professional Career

1. Traveled Europe as a diplomat.
2. Met many great thinkers:
  - a. Nicolas Malebranche, a French Cartesian.
  - b. Robert Boyle, an English chemist.
  - c. Henry Oldenberg, Secretary of the Royal Society.
  - d. Spinoza, in Holland.
3. Built a calculating machine that added, subtracted, extracted roots, multiplied and divided.
  - a. This earned him membership in the Royal Society.
4. Most of his philosophic work was not systematic, but scattered about in letters, essays, pamphlets, and unpublished works.

##### C. Diplomacy

1. He hoped to reunite the Catholic and Protestant churches.
  - a. Based on the view there would be theological propositions acceptable to both.
2. He hoped to unify the states of Europe.
3. He had an ongoing fight with Newton over who developed the infinitesimal calculus.
  - a. Leibniz' system was accepted.
4. He died in 1716 with just his secretary at his funeral.

##### D. Works

1. *New Essays Concerning Human Understanding*
2. *Theodicy*
3. *Monadology*

##### E. Logical Method

1. Logic and mathematical methods can yield the method needed to find truth.
2. He had great faith in logic.
3. He discovered that complex mathematical concepts can be reduced to combinations of simpler concepts.
4. He developed binary mathematics in which all numbers can be expressed as combinations of 0s and 1s.
5. He contended that this method could be extended beyond mathematics to all areas of knowledge, including physics, metaphysics and law.

## Leibniz's Arguments for God's Existence

#### I God

##### A. Proofs for God's Existence

1. An ontological argument along the lines of St. Anselm and Descartes.
2. An argument from eternal and necessary truths along the lines of St. Augustine.
3. A design argument with the unique twist that it is based on the concept of pre-established harmony.
4. A cosmological argument based on his principle of sufficient reason.

#### II Proof of God's Existence by Possibility and Necessity

##### A. God

1. God is the supreme substance
2. God is unique, universal and necessary.
3. Nothing else is independent of it.
4. Being a pure consequence of possible being, it must be incapable of limits and must contain as much reality as possible.

#### B. Perfection

1. God is absolutely perfect.
  - a. In God, where there are no limits, perfection is absolutely infinite.
2. Creatures' perfections are from God, but their imperfections arise from their own necessarily limited nature.
  - a. This distinguishes them from God.

#### C. Existence

1. God is the source of existences and essences, as far as they are real, or what is real in the possible.
  - a. Without God there would be nothing existing and nothing possible.
2. If there is a reality in essences, possibilities or eternal truths, it must be founded in the existence of the necessary being.
  - a. In whom essence involves existence.
  - b. Or it is sufficient to be possible in order to be actual.
3. God alone must exist if He is possible.
  - a. Nothing can hinder the possibility of what is without limits, negation, and contradiction.
  - b. This is sufficient to establish the existence of God a priori.

### III The Cosmological Argument

#### A. Two principles upon which our reasons are founded.

1. Contradiction: in virtue of which we judge
  - a. That to be false which involves contradiction.
  - b. That true, which is opposed or contradictory to the false.
2. Sufficient reason:
  - a. No fact can be real or existent, no statement true, unless there be a sufficient reason why it is so and not otherwise.
  - b. Although most often these reasons cannot be known to us.

#### B. Two kinds of truth

1. Those of reasoning:
  - a. Are necessary and their opposite is impossible.
  - b. Its reason can be found by analysis, resolving it into more simple ideas and truths until reaching those that are primitive.
2. Those of fact: are contingent and their opposite is possible.

#### C. Sufficient Reason

1. There must also be a sufficient reason for contingent truths, or those of fact.
  - a. The series of things in the universe of created objects.
2. The resolution into Particular reason might run into a detail without limits, because of the immense variety of objects and the division of bodies ad infinitum.
3. Since this detail only involves other contingents, each of which needs analysis for its explanation, we make no advance.
4. The sufficient/final reason must be outside of the series of this detail of contingencies, however infinite.

#### D. God

1. Thus, the final reason of things must be found in a necessary Substance,
2. In which the detail of changes exists only eminently, as in their source; this is what we call God.
3. This substance, being the sufficient reason of all this detail, which is linked together throughout, is but one God, and this God suffices.

## Leibniz's Replies to the Problem of Evil

### I The Best of All Possible Worlds

#### A. The Best World

1. He claims that this world is "the best of all possible worlds."
2. He is not claiming that each single event or being taken in isolation is the best thing conceivable.
3. He claims that the entirety of the world, from its creation to its end, is better than any other possible world.
4. On his view, God had a myriad of worlds to choose from and chose one.

#### B. God's Choice (from *Monadology*)

1. There is an infinity of possible universes in God's ideas, but only one can exist, so there must be a sufficient reason for his choice of one rather than another.
2. This reason is in the degrees of perfection of the worlds.
3. This is the cause of the existence of the Best.
4. His wisdom makes it known to Him.
5. His goodness makes Him choose it.
6. His power makes Him produce it.

## C. Diversity

1. Given that only God is perfect, the created beings will be imperfect-thus even the best world is an imperfect world.
2. So, God must pick the best world out of an infinite number of imperfect worlds.
3. The best world contains "as great a variety as possible, but with the greatest possible order."

II No Better World Possible (from *Theodicy*, #193-5)

## A. Intellectualist View

1. The Will of God is not independent of the rules of Wisdom.

## B. The Problem and Reply

1. Some claim God lacks goodness by saying He knows the best, can do it, but does not.
2. Those who, from the alleged defects of the world, infer an evil or neutral God have seen very little of the world.
3. If they waited until they knew more they will find there a contrivance and a beauty transcending all imagination.
4. We find in the universe some things not pleasing to us, but it is not made for us alone-It is made for us if we are wise and we shall be happy in it if we wish to be.

## C. The Best

1. Some say it is impossible to produce the best because
  - a. There is no perfect creature.
  - b. It is always possible to produce one more perfect.
2. Reply: what can be said of a creature or particular substance, which can always be surpassed does not apply to the universe.
  - a. Since it must extend through all future eternity, it is an infinity.

## D. Denial of Pantheism

1. There are an infinite number of creatures in the smallest particle of matter, because of the division of the continuum to infinity.
2. Infinity, the accumulation of an infinite number of substances, is not a whole any more than the infinite number itself, of which it cannot be said if it is even or uneven.
3. That serves to confute those who make of the world a God, or who think of God as the Soul of the world.
4. For the world or the universe cannot be regarded as an animal or a substance.

III Evil as privation (from *Theodicy*, #20)

## A. The Question

1. Whence does evil come?

## B. Origin of Evil-the Ancients

1. The cause of evil is attributed to matter.
2. Matter was believed uncreated and independent of God.

## C. Origin of Evil- Intellectualist View

1. In the ideal nature of the creature as it is contained in the eternal verities in the understanding of God, independent of His will.
2. There is an original imperfection in the creature before sin, because the creature is limited in its essence.
3. Thus it cannot know all and can deceive itself and commit other errors.

## D. Understanding &amp; Necessity

1. Plato said in *Timaeus* that the world originated in Understanding united to Necessity.
2. Others have united God and Nature.
3. God is the Understanding.
4. The Necessity, the essential nature of things, is the object of the understanding, as far as it consists in the eternal verities.
5. His object is inward and abides in the divine understanding.
6. Therein is found the primitive form of good and the origin of evil:
  - a. The Region of the Eternal Verities must be substituted for matter when seeking the source of things.
7. This region is the ideal cause of evil and good.
8. The formal character of evil has no efficient cause, for it consists in privation
  - a. That which the efficient cause does not bring about.
9. Hence the Schoolmen call the cause of evil deficient.

IV The Analogy of the Boat (from *Theodicy*, #30-1)

## A. Boats

1. The current of a river carries along boats, which differ only in cargo.
2. The boats most heavily laden go slower because of the matter which is inclined to slowness/privation of speed.
3. It does not lessen this speed, as that would be action, but moderates the effect by its receptivity.
4. Since more matter is moved by the same force of the current when the boat is more laden, it must go slower.

## B. The Analogy

1. The current is like the action of God, who produces and conserves the positive in creatures, and gives them perfection, being and force.
2. The inertia of matter is like the natural imperfection of creatures.
3. The slowness of the laden boat is like the defects in the qualities and action of the creature.

4. The current is the cause of the boat's movement but not its retardation.
5. God is the cause of perfection in the nature and the actions of the creature.
6. The limitation of the receptivity of the creature is the cause of the defects in its action.
7. Thus the Platonists, St. Augustine and Schoolmen were right that God is the cause of the material element of evil in the positive, and not of the formal element, which lies in privation.
8. The current is the cause of the material element of the retardation, but not the formal-it causes the boat's speed but not the limits to this speed.
9. God is no more the cause of sin than the river's current is the cause of the retardation of the boat.

#### C. Defects

1. God gives ever to the creature and produces continually all that in it is positive, good and perfect.
2. The imperfections and defects are from the original limitation the creature had to receive with its beginning, through the ideal reasons restricting it.
3. God could not give the creature all without making of it a God.
5. Therefore there must be different degrees in the perfection of things, and limitations of every kind.

## David Hume

### Background for Hume

#### I General Background

##### A. Life & Philosophic Writings

1. Born in 1711 in Edinburgh, Scotland to a Calvinist family.
2. Attended Edinburgh University.
  - a. Studied literature and philosophy.
3. Went to France and wrote *A Treatise of Human Nature*.
  - a. His hope of achieving literary fame as his "ruling passion."
  - b. The book was met with indifference from his contemporaries.
  - c. The work "fell dead-born from the press."
4. 1745-Because of his skeptical and religious views he was denied a position in ethics and Edinburgh University.
5. 1748-He revised the first two parts of the *Treatise* in a more popular style and released it as *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*.
6. 1751-He revised the third part of the *Treatise* as *An Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals*.
7. 1752-He was denied a position at the University of Glasgow.
8. 1757-Published his *Natural History of Religion*.
  - a. An account of the genesis of the religious impulse.
9. *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*-published after his death.

##### B. Other Publications & Career

1. 1754-1762 Six volume *History of England*.
  - a. An extremely successful work.
2. 1763 Went to Paris as the assistant to the English ambassador.
  - a. Was a celebrity.
3. 1776 Died in Edinburgh of cancer or ulcerative colitis.
4. He was well-liked and seen as kind and gentle.
  - a. Nicknamed "St. David" and his street bears this name.

## Hume's Philosophy of Religion

### The Existence of God

#### I Skepticism

##### A. Introduction

1. He takes a skeptical view of religion.
2. All a priori and a posteriori arguments for religious belief fail.
3. *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion* focuses on the theistic proofs and involves three characters.
4. Cleanthes is a theist who presents a posteriori arguments for God's existence.
5. Demea is pious and orthodox; he relies on faith and a priori arguments.
6. Philo is a skeptic and is Hume's mouthpiece.
7. Hume argues that all standard arguments for God's existence fail.
8. He argues that even if the arguments support the existence of a first cause, this first cause will be extremely different from the orthodox view of God.

##### B. Reason

1. In part IX Philo argues that reason is not sufficient to establish a matter of fact.

2. All claims about existence are claims about matters of fact.
3. Hence, a priori reasoning cannot establish the existence of anything.
4. Anything that can be conceived of as existing can also be conceived of as not existing.
5. "Consequently there is no being whose existence is demonstrable."
6. Necessity only applies to relations of ideas and not matters of fact, so there is no necessary being.

#### C. Causation

1. He attacks arguments based on the assumption that all events have a cause.
2. He makes use of his arguments regarding causation.
  - a. Causality is a habit based on the observation of constant conjunction.
3. Philo notes that it is rational to conclude a specific house had a builder because we have observed a constant conjunction between houses and builder.
4. In the case of the universe, we have only one instance to observe.
5. Hence, there is no constant conjunction between universes and their causes in human experience.
6. Thus, no empirical argument based on causation can succeed.

#### D. Rejection of Design

1. He questions the mechanistic assumption/metaphor.
2. "The world plainly resembles more an animal or a vegetable, than it does a watch or a knitting loom."
3. He argues that if an animal did not match its environment then it not survive.
4. Thus, animals that survive would be ideally suited to their environment.

## II Five Problems

### A. Introduction

1. Philo (Hume) accepts that like effects proof the existence of like causes and the conclusion that this proves there is a cause of the universe.
  - a. He is attacking arguments that include premises such as "there much be as much reality in the cause as the effect."
2. He argues that this proof creates five problems for traditional theism.

### B. First Problem

1. A finite effect does not justify concluding an infinite cause.
2. Even granting the assumptions, the cause need only be as great as the effect and hence need not be infinite.

### C. Second Problem

1. It cannot be assumed that the creator is perfect.
2. There is no reason to believe that the universe is perfect.
3. The universe falls short in many ways-improvements can easily be imagined.
4. We have no other universe to compare our universe to, so we lack a standard by which to evaluate its goodness.

### D. Third

1. Even if it is assumed that the world is as good as it could possibly be, this does not prove that the creator is perfect.
2. "Many worlds might have been botched and bungled, throughout eternity, ere this system was struck out:"
3. "Much labor lost: many fruitless trials made:"
4. "And a slow, but continued improvement carried on during infinite ages in the art of world making."

### E. Fourth

1. There does not seem to be adequate evidence that there is one God.
2. Using the human analogy, since many humans are involved in creating large and complex things, it seems reasonable to conclude that there are many gods who contributed to the creation of the universe.

### F. Fifth

1. Arguments that draw an analogy between humans and God would seem to lead to the conclusion that the creator of the physical universe is a physical being.

## Hume's Problem of Evil: God and Evil

Revised 6/20/2007

### I Establishing the Misery

#### A. Philo-Feeling

1. The only way to give a due sense of religion is by representations of the misery and wickedness of men.
2. Eloquence and strong imagery is needed more than reasoning and argument.
3. It is not necessary to prove what everyone feels-it is only necessary to make them feel it more.

#### B. Demea-Truth

1. People are sufficiently convinced of this truth.
2. The miseries of life are almost proverbial.
3. What all men declare from their own immediate feeling and experience cannot be doubted.

#### C. Philo-Agreement.

1. The learned agree with the vulgar.

2. The poets, who speak from sentiment and hence have more authority, abound in images of this nature.

#### D. Demea-Writers and Misery

1. Except writers of particular sciences, all extort a complaint and confession of human misery.

#### E. Philo-Leibniz

1. Leibniz denied it and was the first to make it essential to his philosophical system.

#### F. Demea-Leibniz

1. By being first he should have realized his error-philosophers cannot make discoveries on this in so late an age.

2. A denial (the subject precludes reasoning) cannot outweigh mankind's testimony.

#### G. Demea-Catalog of Evils

1. The whole earth is cursed and polluted.

2. Perpetual war exists among all creatures.

3. Necessity, hunger, want stimulate the strong and courageous; fear, anxiety, terror agitate the weak and infirm.

4. Birth gives anguish to the new-born and to its wretched parent.

5. Weakness, impotence, distress attend each stage of life and it ends in agony and horror.

#### H. Philo-Chain of misery.

1. The strong and weak prey on each other.

2. Insects torment animals and are also tormented.

3. Every animal is surrounded with enemies incessantly seeking his misery and destruction.

#### I. Demea-Man as exception.

1. Only man seems to be a partial exception to this rule.

2. By society he can master lions, tigers, and bears, whose greater strength and agility enable them to prey upon him.

#### J. Philo-Man creates his own demons.

1. Man can surmount all his real enemies and master all animals.

2. He then creates imaginary enemies, demons who haunt him with superstitious terrors and blast every enjoyment of life.

a. His pleasure is a crime to them.

b. His food and repose offend them.

c. His dreams furnish new materials for fear.

3. Even death, his sole refuge presents only the dread of endless and innumerable woes.

4. No wolf molests more the timid flock than superstition does the wretched mortals.

#### K. Demea-Society

1. Society raises new enemies: man is the greatest enemy of man.

2. Torments include: Oppression, injustice, contempt, contumely, violence, sedition, war, calumny, treachery, fraud.

3. People would dissolve society if not for the dread of greater ills.

#### L. Demea- Problems.

1. External problems are exceeded by internal ones of mind and body: disease and disorders of the mind.

2. Labor and poverty are the lot of most.

3. The few who enjoy ease and opulence never reach contentment.

4. All goods of life united would not make a very happy man and all ills united would make a wretch.

5. If a stranger visited this world he would see examples of its ills:

a. A hospital full of diseases.

b. A crowded prison.

c. A battle field strewn with caresses.

d. A fleet foundering in the ocean.

e. A nation languishing under tyranny, famine, or pestilence.

6. If to get a notion of its pleasure, he went to a ball, opera, or court, he might think he was seeing distress and sorrow.

#### M. Philo-Misery

1. Men have no reason to complain: complaints are from a discontented disposition.

2. If they are as unhappy as they claim why do they stay alive?

a. They are terrified, not bribed to stay alive.

3. Objection: It is only the false delicacy of a few which spread these complaints.

4. Reply: Delicacy is a greater sensibility to pleasures and pains, so if one of delicate temper is more unhappy, what of the others?

5. Objection: Let men be at rest and they will be easy-they are willing artificers of their own misery.

6. Reply: Rest leads to disappointment, vexation, trouble, their activity and ambition.

#### N. Cleanthes

1. Sees some of these problems in others, but not in himself and claims they are not as common as suggested.

#### O. Demea-Reply to Cleanthes

1. Cleanthes is unique-even the most prosperous have complained greatly.

## II Philo-The Problem of Evil

### A. Philo Challenges Cleanthes to

1. Maintain his anthropomorphism by asserting God's moral attributes (justice, benevolence, mercy, and rectitude) are of the same kind as the human virtues.

## B. Power Argument

1. His power is infinite.
2. Whatever he wills is executed.
3. Neither man nor any other animal is happy.
4. Therefore, he does not will their happiness.

## C. Wisdom Argument

1. His wisdom is infinite.
2. He is never mistaken in choosing the means to any end.
3. Events tend not to human or animal felicity.
4. So, it is not established for that purpose.

## D. Conclusion

1. In what respect does his benevolence and mercy resemble the benevolence and mercy of men?
2. Epicurus' questions are unanswered.
  - a. Is he willing to prevent evil, but not able? - then he is impotent.
  - b. Is he able, but not willing - then he is malevolent.
  - c. Is he both able and willing? - then he is evil.

## III More Problem of Evil

## A. Philo-Refutation of Divine Benevolence

1. Cleanthes claims nature has a purpose and intention.
2. But, the preservation of individuals and propagation of the species is enough for her purpose without care or concern for the happiness of the individuals.
3. There are no resources for the happiness of individuals:
  - a. No machinery to merely give pleasure or ease.
  - b. No fund of pure joy and contentment.
  - c. No indulgence without want or necessity accompanying it.
4. Racking pains arise from gout, gravels, megrims, toothaches, rheumatisms.
5. Mirth, laughter, play, and frolic seem gratuitous satisfactions.
6. How does Divine benevolence display itself in the sense of the anthropomorphites?
7. Only "the mystics" can account for this mixture by deriving it from attributes infinitely perfect but incomprehensible.

## B. Cleanthes

1. If Philo can prove mankind to be unhappy or corrupted, all religion ends.

## C. Demea-the big picture reply to the problem of evil.

1. This world is a point in comparison to the universe and this life a moment in comparison of eternity.
2. The present evils are rectified in other regions and in the future.
3. Eyes, open to larger views of things, see the connection of general laws and trace the benevolence of the Deity through all mazes and intricacies of his providence.

## D. Cleanthes-Enjoyments outweigh pains.

1. The only way to support Divine benevolence is to deny the misery and wickedness of man.
2. The representations are exaggerated; the melancholy views are mostly fictitious; the inferences contrary to fact and experience.
  - a. Health is more common than sickness.
  - b. Pleasure is more common than pain.
  - c. Happiness is more common than misery.
  - c. For each vexation we attain a hundred enjoyments.

## E. Philo-Pain exceeds pleasure.

1. If pain is less frequent than pleasure, it is infinitely more violent and durable.
2. One hour of pain often outweighs a month of common enjoyments.
3. Many spend days, weeks, and months in acute torments.
4. Pleasure hardly ever reaches ecstasy and cannot endure at its highest pitch.
5. Pain often rises to agony and becomes worse the longer it continues.
6. Nothing ends our misery but death.

## F. Philo

1. There is no foundation for religion unless
  - a. Human life is happy.
  - b. Existing in this world with present pains, infirmities, vexations, and follies is desirable.
2. This is contrary to everyone's feeling and experience-an authority so established there can be no decisive proofs against it.

## G. Philo-Not What We Expect

1. It is not possible to estimate and compare all pains and pleasures in the lives of all men and animals.
2. By basing religion on a point forever uncertain, it is made equally uncertain.
3. Even allowing that animal or human happiness in this life exceeds its misery does nothing.
4. This is not what we expect from infinite power, infinite wisdom, and infinite goodness.

## H. Philo-Why Any Evil at All?

1. Why is there any misery at all?
  2. It cannot be by chance, so it must be from some cause.
  3. Since God is perfectly benevolent, is it contrary to his intention?
  4. It cannot be contrary to his intention since he is almighty.
  4. The only possible attack on this reasoning is claiming:
    - a. These subjects exceed all human capacity.
    - b. Our common measures of truth and falsehood are not applicable to them.
- I. Philo-Compatibility
1. Pain or misery in man is compatible with infinite power and goodness in the Deity.
  2. But mere possible compatibility is not sufficient.
  3. The pure, unmixed, and uncontrollable attributes must be shown solely from the mixed and confused phenomena
  4. Even if the phenomena were pure and unmixed, being finite, they would be insufficient as proof.
  5. Being jarring and discordant, they are insufficient.
- J. Philo-Conclusion
1. There is no view of human life from which we can infer the moral attributes or learn the infinite benevolence, infinite power and infinite wisdom, which must be discovered by faith alone.

## Hume and the Immortality of the Soul

Revised 6/20/2007

### I Soul & Substance

#### A. Reason

1. It is difficult to prove the Immortality of the Soul by reason.
2. The arguments are derived from metaphysical, moral, or physical topics.

### II Metaphysics

#### A. Unknown Substance

1. The soul is supposed to be immaterial and a material substance cannot think
2. The notion of substance is confused and imperfect.
  - a. The only idea of a substance is of an aggregate of particular qualities inhering in an unknown something.
3. Matter and spirit are equally unknown and we cannot determine what qualities inhere in one or the other.
4. Cause and effect cannot be determined a priori and experience is the only source of such judgments.
5. No other principle can tell us whether matter, by structure or arrangement, is or is not the cause of thought.
6. Abstract reasoning cannot decide any question of fact or existence.

#### B. Spiritual Substance analogous to Material Substance

1. If spiritual substance exists, by analogy nature uses it as she does material substance.
2. Nature uses substance like clay: modifying it into various forms and existences and then dissolving it before modifying it again.
3. As a material substance may successively compose animal's bodies, a spiritual substance may compose their minds and be dissolved by death.
4. Those claiming a mortal soul did not deny the immortality of its substance.

#### C. Memory, Consciousness & Substances

1. Both immaterial and material substances may lose its memory or consciousness.
2. Reasoning from the common course of nature what is incorruptible must be ingenerable.
  - a. He does not suppose a new interposition of the Supreme Cause.
  - b. Because this cause should always be excluded from philosophy.
3. If the soul is immortal, it existed before birth and if the former existence did not concern us, neither will the latter.

#### D. Animals

1. Animals feel, think, love, hate, will, and reason, though less perfectly than man.
2. Are their souls also immaterial and immortal?

### II Moral Arguments

#### A. God's Justice

1. Moral arguments are derived from God's justice
2. This justice is supposed to be interested in further punishing the vicious and rewarding the virtuous.
3. These arguments assume God has attributes beyond what he exerted in this universe.
4. We are only acquainted with this universe, so whence do we infer the existence of these attributes?

#### B. Present Life

1. The scope and intention of man's creation, as far can be judged by natural reason, is limited to the present life.
2. Man only looks beyond the original, inherent structure of mind and passions with weak concern.

#### C. Fear the Future

1. Some fear the future, but fear would vanish if not artificially fostered by precept and education.
2. Those fostering such fears do so to gain a livelihood and acquire power and riches in this world.

- a. Their zeal and industry are an argument against them.
- 3. It is unjust to confine our concern and knowledge to present life if another of infinitely greater consequence awaits.
- 4. Should this barbarous deceit be ascribed to a beneficent and wise Being?
- D. Humans and Animals.
  - 1. Men's powers are no more than those of animals when compared to their wants and period of existence.
  - 2. The inference from parity of reason is obvious.
- E. Women
  - 1. Assuming a mortal soul, the inferiority of women's capacity is accounted for: domestic life requires no higher faculties.
  - 2. This vanishes on the religious theory: both sexes have equal tasks to perform.
  - 3. So, their powers of reason and resolution ought to be equal and infinitely greater than at present.
- F. No Object of God's Punishment
  - 1. Every effect implies a cause and that another-up to the first cause, the Deity.
  - 2. So, everything that happens is ordained by Him.
  - 3. Nothing can be the object of His punishment or vengeance.
- G. Punishment without Purpose
  - 1. Punishment without proper end or purpose is inconsistent with our ideas of goodness and justice and no end can be served by it after death.
- H. Proportion in Punishment
  - 1. Punishment should be proportional to the offence.
  - 2. Why eternal punishment for temporary offences of man?
  - 3. The chief source of moral ideas is reflection on the interests of human society.
  - 4. Ought interests, so short and frivolous be guarded by punishments, eternal and infinite?
  - 5. The damnation of one is an infinitely greater evil than the subversion of a thousand millions of kingdoms.
- I. Additional Concerns
  - 1. Heaven and hell suppose two distinct species of men, the good and the bad, but most are in between.
  - 2. Lenience suits our natural ideas of right even towards the greatest criminals.
  - 3. Nature has made human infancy frail and mortal; as if to refute the notion of a probationary state.
    - a. Half of mankind dies before they are rational creatures.

### III Physical

- A. Physical Arguments
  - 1. Physical arguments from the analogy of nature are strong for the mortality of the soul.
  - 2. These are the only philosophical arguments admissible regarding this question, or any question of fact.
- B. Sleep Argument
  - 1. If objects A and B are connected so alterations in A correspond to proportional alterations in B, then if greater alterations in A totally dissolve it, total dissolution of B follows.
  - 2. Sleep, a very small effect, is attended with temporary extinction or at least great confusion in the soul.
  - 3. Hume most likely is implying that death will dissolve the soul.
- C. Proportion Argument
  - 1. The weakness of body and mind in infancy are proportional.
  - 2. As are their vigor in manhood, sympathetic disorder in sickness, and their gradual decay in old age.
  - 3. The further step seems unavoidable-their dissolution in death.
- D. Condition Argument
  - 1. By analogy of nature, no form can continue when transferred to a condition very different from its original.
    - a. Trees perish in water; fishes in air; animals in earth.
    - b. Even a difference of climate is often fatal.
  - 2. Could an immense alteration on the soul by its body's dissolution occur without dissolving the whole?
  - 3. Everything is common between soul and body, so the existence of one depends on the other.
- E. Souls of Animal
  - 1. The souls of animals are said to be mortal.
  - 2. They so resemble the souls of men, that an analogy from one to the other is a very strong argument.
  - 3. Their bodies are not more resembling: yet no one rejects arguments drawn from comparative anatomy.
- F. Change Argument
  - 1. Nothing in this world is perpetual-Everything is in continual flux and change.
  - 2. The world shows symptoms of frailty and dissolution.
  - 3. It is contrary to analogy for one single form, frail and subject to great disorders to be immortal and indissoluble.
- G. Infinite Number of Souls
  - 1. How to dispose of the infinite number of posthumous existences ought to embarrass the religious theory.
  - 2. Every planet, in every solar system, could be peopled with intelligent, mortal beings.
  - 3. For these a new universe must, every generation, be created beyond the bounds of the present universe.
  - 4. Or the first must be large enough for this continual influx of beings.

5. Such bold suppositions ought not be accepted on the pretext of a bare possibility.

#### H. Lack of Argument Argument

1. If it is asked “is everyone who ever existed is now alive”, none can think a scrutiny of nature will furnish arguments strong enough to answer “yes.”
2. The lack of argument, without revelation, establishes the negative.

#### I. Insensibility Argument

1. Our insensibility before birth seems proof of a like state after dissolution.

#### J. Horrors & Passions

1. If our horrors of annihilation were an original passion, not an effect of our love of happiness, this would prove the soul’s mortality.
2. As nature does nothing in vain, she would not give us a horror against an impossible event.
3. She may give us a horror against an unavoidable event if our endeavors, as in this case, may postpone it.
4. Death is unavoidable; yet humanity could not be preserved without a natural aversion towards it.
5. All doctrines favored by our passions are to be suspected.
6. The hopes and fears which give rise to this doctrine are very obvious.

#### K. Defending a Negative

1. Defending the negative provides a great advantage.
2. If the question is out of the common experienced course of nature, it is almost always decisive.
3. What arguments or analogies could prove an existence no one has seen and that resembles none seen?
4. A new logic and new faculties of the mind to grasp it would be needed.
5. This shows the infinite obligations which mankind has to Divine revelation; since no other medium could ascertain this.

## Immanuel Kant

### I Background

#### A. Personal information

1. Born in Konigsberg, East Prussia on April 22, 1724.
2. Born into a Pietist family.
3. Pietism: A protestant sect.
  - a. Severe, puritanical lifestyle.
  - b. Faith and religious feelings were emphasized over reason and theological doctrines.
4. Attended the University of Konigsberg as a student and latter became a professor.
5. About five feet tall, frail and thin.
6. Knew much about geography and the events of his time, but never traveled more than sixty miles from home.
7. Helped his brother and sisters financially, but was not close to them.
8. He was known for being extremely orderly-so much so that the locals set their watches by his daily walk.
  - a. The place he walked is still known as the Philosopher’s Walk.
9. He had friends, but latter became a recluse.
10. He retired from public lecturing in 1797.
11. He died on February 12, 1804.

#### B. Contributions

1. Metaphysics, logic, aesthetics, and theology.
2. Mathematics, physics, geography, and anthropology.
3. He revolutionized philosophy.
4. His impact was so important that that some divide philosophy into pre-Kantian and post-Kantian phases.

### II Arguments for God

#### A. Introduction

1. Reason cannot be used to prove the existence of God.
2. Kant claims there are three ways a person might try to prove the existence of God.
  - a. An a priori ontological argument, as per Anselm, Descartes and Leibniz that is based on the idea of a perfect being.
  - b. Cosmological argument.
  - c. Teleological argument.
3. He argues that each proof fails.

#### B. The Ontological Argument

1. I can conceive of a perfect being.
2. What is conceivable is possible.
3. It is possible for a perfect being to exist.
4. If a perfect being exists, then it must have all perfections.
5. Existence is a perfection.
6. If there is a perfect being, then it must have existence as a property/perfection.

7. It is possible that a perfect being necessarily exists-its non existence is not possible.
  8. It is absurd to claim that there could be something whose nonexistence is impossible at the same time its nonexistence is possible.
  9. Thus, a perfect being must exist of necessity.
- C. Kant's First Refutation of the Ontological Argument
1. He agrees that the concept of God includes the concept of an absolutely necessary being.
  2. He then compares this with the nature of a triangle: if X is a triangle, then X must have three angles.
  3. This does not inform us whether triangles exist or not: if one denies there are triangles, then one does not need to affirm that there are three-angled figures.
  4. If there is a God, then there is a entity that exists by necessity-but if one denies that there is a God, then one may also deny that there is a necessary being.
  5. Thus, Kant attempts to deny that one can go from concepts to existence.
- D. Kant's Second refutation of the Ontological Argument
1. He claims that existence is not a predicate.
  2. Existence is not a property that adds to the concept of X.
    - a. Example: Thinking of "a coin in piggy bank" is indistinguishable from thinking of "an existing coin in a piggy bank."
  3. If existence is not a property, then it cannot be an essential part of the concept of God.
  4. Kant claims that arguing from our concept of God to His existence is like a merchant adding zeroes to his cash balance and supposing his wealth is thus increasing.
- E. The Cosmological Argument
1. The argument proceeds from the existence of things that need a cause to the existence of an ultimate or final cause which must, of necessity, exist.
  2. The argument rests on the principle that every event has a cause.
  3. Kant argues that this principle only applies within the realm of experience-it cannot be applied to what lies beyond experience.
  4. He also argues that by referring to a necessary being, the argument suffers from the same defect as the ontological argument.
- F. The Teleological Argument
1. This argument proceeds from the evidence of an ordered universe to the claim that the world was created by an intelligent designer.
  2. He claims that "it is the oldest, the clearest, and the most accordant with the common sense of mankind."
  3. He also suggests that it motivates scientists to look for connections within nature and that each discovery strengthens the proof.
  4. He claims that the argument can, at most, establish that a designer imposed order on pre-existing matter.
    - a. This view was accepted by many ancient Greek philosophers.
  5. To establish a creator of everything would require the cosmological argument, but that argument fails.
- G. Conclusion
1. All attempts to prove the existence of God are "altogether fruitless and by their nature null and void."
  2. He contends that his arguments also show that it is impossible to prove that God does not exist.
  3. Thus, the theist and atheist cannot claim to have knowledge.
  4. He claims that this leaves open the possibility for basing religion on practical or moral faith.
  5. He claims that his goal in the *Critique* is to "deny knowledge in order to make room for faith."

## Blaise Pascal

### Background

#### I Background

##### A. Life

1. June 19, 1623 – August 19, 1662.
2. A French mathematician, physicist, and religious philosopher.
3. He had a mystical experience in 1654 and began writing in philosophy and theology.
4. Suffered from poor health and died at age 39.

##### B. Contributions

1. He built mechanical calculators.
2. He studied fluids.
3. He clarified concepts such as "pressure" and "vacuum."
4. Worked in projective geometry and in probability theory.

##### C. Major Works

1. *Lettres provinciales* (around 1660)
2. *Pensées* (1660)

## Pascal's Wager (1660)

-Blaise Pascal

## I Part One

## A. God

1. Because he has neither extension nor limits, we do not know the nature of God or if He exists or not.
2. His existence is known through faith.
  - a. "In glory we shall know His nature."
3. We can know a thing exists without knowing its nature.

## B. God Cannot be Known

1. If there is a God, He is infinitely incomprehensible.
2. Having neither parts nor limits, He has no affinity to us.
3. Hence, We are incapable of knowing either what He is or if He is.
4. Since we lack affinity to him we dare not undertake the decision of this question.

## C. God's Existence Cannot be Proven

1. The Christians cannot be blamed for not giving a reason for their belief since they profess a religion for which they cannot give a reason.
  - a. They declare it is a foolishness.
2. If they proved it they would not keep their words.
3. Objection: this excuses those who put it forth without reason but not those who receive it.

## II The Wager

## A. Reason

1. "God is, or He is not"
2. Reason can decide nothing here.
  - a. There is an infinite chaos which separates us.
  - b. A game is being played at the extremity of this infinite distance where heads or tails will turn up.
3. What to wager?
  - a. According to reason, you can do neither the one nor the other.
  - b. According to reason, you can defend neither proposition.

## B. Choice

1. Don't reprove for error those who have made a choice, for we know nothing about it.
2. They might be blamed for having made, not this choice, but a choice.
  - a. He who chooses heads and he who chooses tails are equally at fault, they are both in the wrong.
  - b. The true course is not to wager at all."
3. Pascal agrees but says you must wager.
  - a. It is not optional-You are embarked.

## C. Which to Chose

1. Two things to lose: the true and the good.
2. Two things to stake,
  - a. Reason and will.
  - b. Knowledge and happiness.
3. Your nature has two things to shun: error and misery.
4. Reason is no more shocked in choosing one than the other, since you must choose.

## D. Wager for God

1. Let us weigh the gain and the loss in wagering that God is.
2. Estimating the two chances.
  - a. If you gain, you gain all.
  - b. if you lose, you lose nothing.
3. Wager them without hesitation that He is.

## E. Objection and Reply

1. Objection: though one must wager but perhaps one wagers too much.
2. As there is an equal risk of gain and loss, if you had gained two lives, instead of one, you might still wager.
3. If there were three lives to gain, you would have to play
  - a. It would be imprudent, if forced to play, not to risk your life to gain three if there is equal risk of loss and gain.
4. There is an eternity of life and happiness.
5. If there were an infinity of chances, with one chance to win, it would be right to wager one to win two.
6. It is stupid, as you must wager, to refuse to stake one life against three when the chance of winning is one in infinity, if there were an infinity of an infinitely happy life to gain.
7. But there is
  - a. An infinity of an infinitely happy life to gain.
  - b. A chance of gain against a finite number of chances of loss,

8. What you stake is finite.
9. Where the infinite is and there is not an infinity of chances of loss against that of gain you must give all.
10. If one is forced to play, he must renounce reason to preserve his life, rather than risk it for infinite gain, as likely to happen as the loss of nothingness.

#### F. Uncertainty

1. It is useless to say
  - a. It is uncertain if we will gain.
  - b. It is certain that we risk.
  - c. The infinite distance between the certainty of the stake and the uncertainty of the gain, equals the finite good which is certainly staked against the uncertain infinite.
2. This is not so: A player stakes a certainty to gain an uncertainty, yet stakes a finite certainty to gain a finite uncertainty, without transgressing against reason.
3. There is not an infinite distance between the certainty staked and the uncertainty of the gain.
4. There is an infinity between the certainty of gain and the certainty of loss.
5. The uncertainty of gain is proportioned to the certainty of the stake according to the proportion of the chances of gain and loss.

#### G. Risks

1. If there are equal risks on both sides the course is to play even.
2. The certainty of the stake is equal to the uncertainty of the gain, so far is it from the fact that there is an infinite distance between them.
3. The proposition has infinite force, when there is the finite to stake, there are equal risks of gain and of loss, and the infinite to gain.
4. This is demonstrable; and if men are capable of any truths, this is one.

### III How to Make Yourself Believe

#### A. Seeing the Cards

1. Is there no means of seeing the faces of the cards?
2. Yes, scripture and the rest, &c.

#### B. Believing

1. I am forced to wager, and am not free, but so made that I cannot believe. What should I do?
2. Learn your inability to believe, since reason brings you to this, and you cannot believe.
3. Endeavor to convince yourself, not by proofs of God, but by abatement of passions.
4. You would like to attain faith, and cure yourself of unbelief.
5. Learn from those who have been bound like you and who stake all their possessions.
  - a. They know the way which you would follow, and are cured of an ill of which you would be cured.
6. Follow the way they began acting as if they believe, taking the holy water, having masses said, &c.
  - a. This will naturally make you believe, and deaden your acuteness.
7. "But this is what I am afraid of"- Why? What have you to lose?
8. This is what will lessen the passions, which are your stumbling-blocks.

## Standard Concerns Regarding Pascal's Wager

### I Disjunction

#### A. The Disjunction

1. Pascal claims that either God exists or God does not.
2. This is a tautology.

#### B. False Dilemma/Many Gods

1. While it is true that God exists or God does not, it is also true that Thor exists or Thor does not, and so on for all possible gods.
2. Thus, Pascal is presenting a false dilemma in that he assumes there are but two options and one is the better choice because the other is flawed.
3. The problem is that there are many more options-perhaps an infinite number.
4. However, given Pascal's view, even if the odds of being right are one in an infinity, God is still the best bet.

### II Knowledge of God

#### A. Lack of Knowledge

1. Pascal argues that we cannot know God.
2. This is why we need the wager.
3. The way to bet is based on the pay off and loss.

#### B. Problem

1. If we cannot know God, we cannot know how He would react to our belief or lack of belief.
2. Without this knowledge, the potential payoff and potential loss if God exists cannot be known.

3. Without knowledge of the payoff and loss, there is either no rational way to bet or it might seem that betting against God is the better bet.
4. When combined with the Many Gods problem, the problem becomes even worse.

### III Ethics

#### A. Abandoning Reason

1. Pascal advises people to suppress their reason and, in effect, brainwash themselves into believing.
2. He claims there is no loss in doing this.

#### B. Ethics

1. Many writers have questioned the ethics of believing that something is true solely for the sake of gain.
2. There is also the moral question of intentionally impeding one's own rationality.

# Part III: Epistemology & Metaphysics

## Epistemology

### Introduction to Epistemology

Last Revised: 7/5/2005

#### I Introduction

##### A. Epistemology

1. Definition: A branch of philosophy concerned with theories of knowledge.
2. From *episteme* (knowledge) and *logos* (explanation).
3. A rational and systematic attempt to understand epistemic terms, statements, principles, and theories.
4. Analysis of epistemic terms, concepts, principles and theories.
5. Creating and assessing epistemic principles and theories,
6. Applying principles and theories to epistemic problems.

##### B. Some classic problems in Epistemology

1. The problem of skepticism; how do we establish that we can have knowledge?
  - a. General skepticism is the view that we do not have knowledge.
  - b. Skepticism comes in many varieties.
2. The problem of the limits of knowledge: determining the limits of knowledge.
3. Distinguishing between ignorance, belief and knowledge.
4. The problem of the external world: how do we know there is an external world?
5. The problem of other minds: how do you know that other people have minds?
6. The problem of justification: what justifies a belief?
7. The problem of justified, true, belief/the Gettier problem
  - a. Knowledge is often taken as a belief that is justified and true.
  - b. Gettier supposedly showed that one could have a justified, true belief without having knowledge.

##### C. Some Questions in Epistemology

1. What is knowledge?
2. What can be known?
3. How do we gain knowledge?
4. How do we know there is an external world?
5. How do we know other people have minds?
6. How do we know if God exists?
7. How do we distinguish dreaming from reality?
8. What is adequate justification for a belief?
9. Are we obligated to examine our beliefs?
10. What are the objects of knowledge?
11. What is skepticism?
12. Is it possible to refute the skeptic?

#### II Some Basic Concepts

##### A. Rationalism

1. The view that at least some knowledge is a priori.
2. A priori knowledge is knowledge that is obtained through reason, prior to or independently of experience.
  - a. Logical and mathematical truths are said to be a priori.
  - b. Some rationalists take truths about God, metaphysics or ethics to be a priori as well.
3. The mind contains innate ideas or a rational structure complete with logical categories.

##### B. Empiricism

1. The view that all knowledge of the world is empirical or a posteriori.
2. A posteriori knowledge is knowledge derived from experience.
3. The mind does not contain any innate ideas-it is a blank slate.

##### C. Justified, True Belief

1. Knowledge is taken to require a belief that is true and justified.
2. True-Correct.
3. Justified-adequately grounded.
4. A belief could be true without being justified (a lucky guess, for example).
5. A belief could be justified without being true, on some systems of justification.

**Plato's Epistemology & Metaphysics (*Republic, Theatetus*)**

Last Revised 6/16/2007

**I Introduction****A. Knowledge and Opinion**

1. Plato draws a distinction between opinion (belief) and knowledge.
2. In developing his theory he argues against relativism, empiricism, and the view that knowledge is merely true belief.

**B. Argument Against Relativism (*Theatetus*)**

1. Plato agrees that some things are relative.
  - a. Example: a wind that seems chilly to one might seem pleasant to another.
2. Plato argues that relativism is self-refuting.
  - a. Protagoras claims all opinions are true.
  - b. This includes the opinions of his opponents who believe he is wrong.
  - c. So, his belief is false if those who disagree with him have true beliefs.
3. Protagoras charged for his teachings and justified this by claiming he was teaching people what they needed to know.
  - a. But once he claims that his teachings are better than those of others, he has abandoned his relativism.

**C. First Problem of the Senses**

1. The senses only provide information about a constantly changing world.
2. One cannot say what is true with certainty due to this change.
3. One can only report how things appear to him/her at a specific moment in time.
4. He argues that the objects of knowledge cannot be so fleeting and uncertain.
5. Thus, the senses cannot be a source of knowledge.

**D. Second Problem of the Senses**

1. Plato argues the objects of knowledge must be universal and unchanging.
2. He also claims that suitable, unchanging definitions for said objects are necessary.
3. If there were not such definitions (and objects) and language only referred to the fleeting, changing objects of the world, then meanings would constantly change and language would not work.

**E. Perfect Standard Argument**

1. Physical things fall short of perfection, such as justice in this world or hand drawn shapes.
2. In order to know that they fall short, we must have knowledge about something perfect.
3. This knowledge cannot come through the senses.

**F. Knowledge is Not Right Opinion**

1. Plato distinguishes between having a true belief/right opinion and knowledge.
2. A true opinion "is not willing to remain long."
3. True opinions must be "tied down by giving an account of the reason why."
4. Thus, the difference between true opinion and knowledge is that knowledge has a rational justification.

**G. Knowledge is:**

1. Objective.
2. Not obtained by the senses.
3. Universal.
4. Changeless.
5. Based in reason.

**H. The Forms and Ideas**

1. Though the realm of particular things (tokens) is in constant flux, they fall under categories (types).
2. A Universal/Form is eternal, unchanging and perfect.
3. Particulars participate in the Forms, which makes them what they are.
4. Plato also used the term "Ideas" to refer to the Forms, but these Ideas are not things that exist simply within minds.

**I. The Doctrine of Recollection (*Meno*)**

1. Meno presents a paradox: If you do not know what you seeking, then you will not know if you have found it; if you do know what you are seeking, there is no need to seek since you already know.
2. Plato claims people have innate knowledge acquired before the soul enters the body.
3. When the soul is not within the body, it 'communes' with the Forms and brings this knowledge with it when it enters a body.
4. The soul then forgets that it knows.
5. Through the use of the dialectic people can be lead to recollection.

**II Plato's Metaphysics****A. The Forms**

1. If the Forms are the true objects of knowledge, they must be real, objective, independent, and unchanging.
2. The Forms are not spatial-temporal entities.
3. This conception has lead to various problems regarding how they interact with the world of particulars and the soul.

**B. Change**

1. The paradox of change: to change, a thing has to also remain the same-if it did not, it would be destroyed rather than changed.
2. Heraclitus regarded change as the ultimate reality-permanence was an illusion.
  - a. Knowledge, in Plato's sense, would be impossible.
3. Parmenides regarded change as the illusion.
  - a. But, change seems to be a fact.
4. Plato regarded them as partially right and partially wrong.
5. His solution was to reject their versions of monism and accept dualism (the view that there are two basic kinds).
6. The particulars are in constant change, are imperfect and are fit only for opinion.
7. The Forms are unchanging, perfect and can be known.

### C. Particulars

1. Reality comes in degrees.
2. The Forms are the cause of the particular things.
3. The particulars resemble the Forms.
4. The particulars participate in the Forms in varying degrees.
  - a. For example, a very beautiful thing participates in the Form of beauty in a greater degree than something that is less beautiful.
3. The forms group particulars (tokens) into types, making them intelligible.

## Plato's Line and Allegory of the Cave

Revised: 2/20/2008

### I Lovers of Opinion and Lovers of Wisdom

#### A. Philosophers

1. The true philosophers are lovers of the vision of truth.

#### B. The One & The Many

1. Since beauty is the opposite of ugliness, they are two.
2. Being two each is one.
3. The same holds of just and unjust, good and evil, etc:
4. Taken singly, each is one.
5. From combinations of them with actions, things and each other, they appear many.

#### C. Sights, Dreams, Opinion & Knowledge

1. Lovers of sounds and sights are fond of tones, color, forms and artificial products made from them.
  - a. Their minds cannot see or love absolute beauty.
2. One's life is a dream who believes in beautiful things but does not believe in absolute beauty.
  - a. Asleep or awake it is dream-like to mistake the image for the real thing.
3. One is awake who:
  - a. Recognizes the existence of absolute beauty.
  - b. Is able to distinguish the idea from the objects which participate in the idea.
  - c. Does not put the objects in the place of the idea nor the idea in the place of the objects.
4. The mind of the one who knows has knowledge and the mind of the other has opinion.

#### D. Being and Non-Being Argument for the Distinction

1. One who has knowledge knows something.
2. Absolute being may be absolutely known, but the utterly non-existent is utterly unknown.
3. If anything can be and not be it will be between pure being and absolute negation of being.
4. Knowledge corresponds to being and ignorance corresponds to not-being.

#### E. Spheres and Faculties Argument for the Distinction

1. Faculties, such as sight and hearing, are powers in us by which we do as we do.
2. What has the same sphere and same result is the same faculty, and what has another sphere and another result is different.
3. Knowledge and opinion are both faculties, but are not the same.
4. Knowledge and opinion have distinct powers and distinct spheres/subject matters.
5. Being is the sphere of knowledge, and knowledge is to know the nature of being.
6. Opinion is to have an opinion.
7. If difference in faculty implies a difference in the sphere and if opinion and knowledge are distinct faculties, then the sphere of knowledge and of opinion cannot be the same.

#### F. Not being is not the subject-matter of opinion.

1. When one has an opinion, he has an opinion about something.
2. He cannot have an opinion about nothing.
3. One who has an opinion has an opinion about some one thing.
4. Not-being is not one thing but nothing.

#### G. Opinion as Intermediate

1. Ignorance is the correlative of not being.
2. The correlative of being is knowledge.
3. Opinion is not concerned with being or not-being, hence is neither ignorance nor knowledge.

4. Opinion is intermediate.
5. Its correlative is and is not at the same time and is between pure being and absolute not-being.
6. The corresponding faculty is neither knowledge nor ignorance, but opinion.

#### H. The Object of Opinion

1. The beautiful will in some point of view be found ugly and the same for the rest.
2. The ideas of the multitude about the beautiful and all things are half-way between pure being and pure not-being.
3. Anything of this kind is a matter of opinion not knowledge.

#### I. Lovers of Opinion vs. Lovers of Wisdom

1. Those who have opinion but not knowledge:
  - a. See the many beautiful things but not absolute beauty.
  - b. See the many just, and not absolute justice, etc.
2. They are lovers of opinion rather than lovers of wisdom.
3. Those who see the absolute, eternal and immutable have knowledge and not merely opinion.
4. Those who love the truth are lovers of wisdom and not lovers of opinion.

### II The Objects of Knowledge

#### A. The many and the one

1. There is a many beautiful and a many good, and so too for every thing described and defined.
  - a. To them "many" is applied.
2. There is an absolute beauty, absolute good, and for all things the to which "many" is applied there is an absolute;
  - b. They are under a single idea (form)- the essence of each.
3. The many are seen but not known.
4. The ideas (forms) are known but not seen.

#### B. The Eye Analogy

1. In moonlight and starlight the eyes see dimly.
2. In the sunshine, the eyes see clearly.
- 3 The soul is like the eye:
  - a. When resting on what truth and being shine, the soul perceives, understands and has intelligence.
  - b. When turned towards the twilight of becoming and perishing she has opinion and seems to lack intelligence.

#### C. The Sun Analogy

1. What imparts truth to the known and the power of knowing to the knower is the idea of good.
2. Light and sight are like the sun but not the sun.
  - a. So science and truth are like the good, but not the good.
  - b. The good has a higher place of honor.
  - c. Pleasure is not the good.
3. The sun is the author of visibility, generation, nourishment and growth.
  - a. The sun himself is not generation.
4. In like manner the good is the author of knowledge to all things known and of their being and essence.
  - a. The good is not essence, but far exceeds essence in dignity and power.

### III The Four Levels of Knowledge: The Line

#### A. Ruling powers

1. There are two ruling powers.
2. The good is set over the intellectual world.
3. The Sun is over the visible world.
4. This is a distinction of the visible and the intelligible.

#### B. Division of the Line

1. Take a line cut into two unequal parts, and divide each again.
2. The two main divisions correspond to the visible and the intelligible.

#### C. Segments A & B: the Visible World of Opinion

1. Segment A
  - a. Faculty: Imagination
  - b. Objects: Shadows, images, reflections.
2. Segment B
  - a. Faculty: Belief
  - b. Objects: Physical things.

#### D. Segments C&D: The intelligible world of Knowledge.

1. Segment C
  - a. Faculty: Thinking
  - b. Objects: Lower Forms, mathematical
- c. The mind uses objects in the visible world as ways to understand the intelligible world-for example, using geometric

diagrams to understand geometry.

d. This knowledge is fragmented and based on assumptions that are taken as self-evident (as opposed to being based on a non-hypothetical first principle).

## 2. Segment D

a. Faculty: Rational Intuition

b. Object: The higher Forms.

c. The mind does not rely on assumptions or visual aids.

d. The mind has a rational intuition of the Forms and reaches “the first principle of the whole.”

## E. The Good

1. “The first principle of the whole.”

2. It is the ultimate source of knowledge and reality.

3. Plato draws an analogy between it and the sun.

4. The Good goes beyond the partial truths that words can convey.

5. It is understood via a sort of enlightenment after a long period of “instruction” and “close companionship.”

## IV The Allegory of the Cave

### A. Description

1. People living since childhood, in a cave with an opening towards the light.

2. They are chained and can only see before them.

3. Above and behind them is a fire.

4. Between the fire and the prisoners is a raised way and a low wall.

5. Men carry vessels, statues and figures of animals which appear over the wall.

6. They see only shadows thrown by the fire on the opposite wall of the cave.

7. They think they were naming what was actually before them.

8. To them, the truth would be nothing but the shadows of the images.

### B. Release of the Prisoners-1<sup>st</sup> Step: Free in the Cave

1. Looking towards the light is painful and distressing.

2. He cannot see the realities which he had previously seen the shadows.

3. He will approach nearer to being and have a clearer vision.

4. He will be perplexed if his instructor requires him to name the passing objects.

5. He will initially think the shadows are truer than the objects he now sees

### C. Release of the Prisoners-2<sup>nd</sup> Step: Outside in the Sunlight

1. In the sunlight he will be pained and dazzled.

2. He will need to grow accustomed to the upper world seeing, in order:

a. Shadows.

b. Reflections in the water.

c. Objects.

d. Light of the stars and moon.

e. The sun.

3. He will argue the sun is the cause of all which he has become accustomed to behold.

### D. The Freed Person

1. He would praise himself and pity the dwellers of the cave.

2. He would not care for the honors given those who best observe, remember, and make inferences about the shadows.

3. If he returned to the cave, his eyes would be full of darkness.

4. Before recovering, he would fare poorly in such contests.

5. Men would think it was better not to think of ascending.

6. If any tried to free another and lead him to the light, they would put him to death.

### E. The Allegory

1. The prison-house is the world of sight.

2. The light of the fire is the sun.

3. The journey upwards is the ascent of the soul into the intellectual world.

## V The Good

### A. The Good

1. The Good is the universal author of all things beautiful and right.

2. It is the parent and lord of light in this visible world.

3. It is the immediate source of reason and truth in the intellectual.

### B. Those Who have seen the Good

1. Are unwilling to descend to human affairs.

2. Going from divine contemplations to the evil state of man, he will behave ridiculously before he is accustomed to the darkness.

a. If compelled to fight in courts or other places about the images or shadows of images of justice.

b. If attempting to meet the conceptions of those who have never seen absolute justice.

3. The bewilderments of the eyes are from coming out of the light or from going into the light,

4. He who remembers this when he sees one whose vision is perplexed will not be too ready to laugh and will ask if
  - a. Has come from the brighter life and hence cannot see in the dark.
  - b. Has come from the darkness to the day is dazzled by excess of light.
  - c. He will count the one happy and pity the other.

#### C. Source of Knowledge

1. One cannot put knowledge into the soul which was not there before-like sight into blind eyes.
2. The power and capacity of learning exists in the soul already.
3. As the eye was unable to turn from darkness to light without the whole body:
  - a. The instrument of knowledge can be turned from the world of becoming to that of being only by movement of the whole soul.
  - b. And learn to endure the sight of being and the brightest and best of being-the good.
4. An art that effects this conversion.
  - a. This art doesn't implant the faculty of sight- it exists, but is turned in the wrong direction so it looks away from truth.
5. The other virtues of the soul are akin to bodily qualities-even if not innate they can be implanted later by habit and exercise.
6. The virtue of wisdom contains a divine element which always remains,
7. By this its conversion is rendered useful and profitable or hurtful and useless.
8. The narrow intelligence flashing from the keen eye of a clever rogue: how clearly his paltry soul sees the way to his end.
  - a. He is the reverse of blind, but his keen sight serves evil, and he is mischievous in proportion to his cleverness.

## Introduction to Skepticism

Last Revised: 7/5/2005

### Skepticism

#### I Varieties of Skepticism

##### A. General Skepticism

1. The theory that we do not have any knowledge.
2. We cannot be completely certain that any of our beliefs are true.

##### B. Local/ Moderate Skepticism

1. We can have mathematical and empirical knowledge.
2. We cannot have metaphysical knowledge.

##### B. Global Skepticism

1. Global skeptics maintain universal doubt.
2. They deny that we know that there is an external world or that there are other minds.
3. They deny we can have knowledge of metaphysical truths regarding free will, God and souls.
4. They do not deny that we can have knowledge of simple mathematics and logic.

##### C. Superglobal/Extreme skepticism

1. They maintain universal doubt.
2. They go beyond global skeptics by denying that we can have knowledge of mathematics or logic.

##### D. Methodological Skepticism

1. Some form of skepticism is adopted as a means to another end.
2. The methodological skeptic is typically trying to refute skepticism.
3. Descartes is the best-known example

## History of Skepticism

Revised 6/21/2007

Based on the *Voyage of Discovery* by William F. Lawhead, Wadsworth, 2002.

#### I Introduction

##### A. Skeptikos

1. The skeptics claimed that it was an error to assume that human reason is capable of yielding knowledge about reality.
2. The name "skeptical" comes from the Greek "skeptikos", meaning "inquirers."
3. The skeptics inquired into the foundation of beliefs and claimed to have the honesty to accept that our beliefs in fact lack such foundations.

##### B. Pyrrho of Elis (320-270 B.C.)

1. While skepticism dates back to the Sophists, Pyrrho revitalized it.
2. By the 1<sup>st</sup> century B.C. Pyrrhonism became synonymous with Skepticism.
3. Pyrrho did not produce any writings, but other writers recorded his views.

##### C. Pyrrho's Sense Experience argument

1. Sense experience cannot provide knowledge.
2. To provide knowledge the sense experiences must match their objects.

3. But, if we can never get outside of our sensations, we can never know that the experiences match the alleged objects.

#### D. Pyrrho's Reason Argument

1. Argumentation cannot provide knowledge.
2. For each argument there is an equally good counter-argument.
3. Thus, there is no rational ground for accepting one argument over another.

#### E. Sceptics' Position

1. Given that both the senses and reason fail, we cannot have knowledge.
2. One can only speak in terms of appearances.
3. The prudent approach is to suspend judgment and not make any assumptions.
4. The skepticism also applies to morality.
5. A wise person adopts apathy and indifference-do not worry about what you do not know.
6. Since we cannot know what is really good or bad, people should simply follow the existing laws and traditions.

## II Academic Skepticism

### A. Arcesilaus

1. Approximately 316-242 B.C.
2. The head of Plato's Academy.
3. He turned the Academy towards skepticism

### B. Carneades

1. 214-129 B.C.
2. Took over the Academy after Arcesilaus.
3. Considered one of the most brilliant philosophers of his time.
4. Served as the Athenian ambassador to Rome I 156-155 B.C.
5. Along with a Stoic and Aristotelian, he gave public speeches on philosophy.
6. He utilized the "two face" method of skepticism: one day he gave an excellent argument in favor of justice and the next day he gave an equally good argument against justice.

### C. The Academy

1. The Sceptics thought the Academy had lost the Socratic spirit of inquiry and had settled into dogmatism.
2. This change was ironic, given Plato's view that the Forms were object of knowledge and his attacks on the Sophists.
3. The Sceptics focused on:
  - a. Socrates' claim that he knew nothing.
  - b. How the Socratic dialogues ended without reaching a definite conclusion.
4. The Sceptics also utilized Plato's attacks on the senses and his claim in the *Timaeus* that physics is merely a "likely story."

### B. Appearance

1. The Sceptics attacked the dogmatism of Stoics and Epicureans because they used the senses as a foundation of knowledge.
2. While the senses can only yield appearances, some sense impressions seemed so indubitable that one had to assent to them.
3. However, in dreams and hallucinations people experience seem convincing but are, of course, false.
4. Their main argument is there can be no criterion for truth:
  - a. Any standard of truth will also need justification.
  - b. Thus requiring another standard to establish the truth of the standard.
  - c. And so on into an infinite regress.
5. The Sceptics did not claim that nothing can be known-instead they claim that it we appear to lack knowledge.
6. They suspended judgment as to whether skepticism was true or not.

### C. Probability

1. The Stoics argued that consistency would entail that Skepticism would lead to the suspension of all activity and not just judgment.
2. Carneades responded by arguing that while certainty is not possible, probability is and it is sufficient to allow human action.
3. This compromise earned the scorn of both the Stoics and the later Pyrrhonic skeptics.

## III Revival of Pyrrhonian Skepticism

### A. Purists

1. It was believed that the Academics were simply not skeptical enough.
2. They rejected Carneades' view of probability- they argued that distinguishing probabilities required knowledge.
3. Pyrrhonian skeptics got the name from Pyrrho.
4. The purists formalized skepticism.

### B. Agrippa: the five pillars of Skepticism

1. Disagreement: Not everyone will agree on an issue.
2. Infinite regress: Resolving an issue requires reasons, but reasons need justification and these justifications will also need justifications and so on into infinity.
3. Relativity: Perceptions of things differ in different circumstances.

4. Hypothesis: If someone attempts to solve the regress problem by using a self evident starting point, another person can put forth a contradictory starting point and claim that it is self evident-this makes all starting points arbitrary.
5. Circular reasoning: Any argument that someone manages to avoid the first four problems will have to assume what it is trying to prove.

#### C. Latter Skeptics: Two Theses

1. Nothing is self evident.
2. Nothing can be proven.

#### D. Skeptics' Goal

1. The goal is to achieve personal peace.
2. If one cannot know, there is no reason to worry whether one has the truth or not.
3. There is no need to try to distinguish truth from falsehood or good from evil.
4. One should simply accept what appears to be and simply follow existing customs and laws.
5. Sextus Empiricus, 3<sup>rd</sup> century A.D. held this view.

### IV Importance of Skepticism

#### A. Problem

1. It makes no sense to create arguments unless there is some information that serves as their starting points (premises).
2. This implies there are reasons to believe that the starting points (premises) are true.

#### B. Contributions

1. Skepticism made philosophers more critical and helped reduce dogmatism.
2. Philosophers had to either accept or respond to the Skeptical arguments.
3. One early response was given by St. Augustine in his *Against the Academics*.
4. Skepticism was revived in the Modern period as a weapon and as a philosophic tool.
  - a. Descartes used methodological skepticism to develop his epistemology.
  - b. Berkeley chose to accept a world of appearances to avoid skeptical problems.
5. Some religious philosophers used skepticism to attack the pretenses of reason-thus showing that faith and revelation are the only possible sources of knowledge.
  - a. Erasmus, Pascal, Montaigne, and Bayle.
6. Skepticism might have contributed to the development of science: if the real essences of things cannot be known, then it is best to avoid metaphysics and stick to empirical examination of the world of appearances.

#### C. The Decline of Skepticism

1. Skepticism never seemed to succeed in providing peace, but it did create confusion.
2. While undermining dogmatism, Skepticism failed to provide any positive alternatives.
3. Simply following existing traditions and customs did not satisfy many people.
4. People turned to various religious philosophies and latter to Christianity.

## Rene Descartes

### Background

#### I Life & Works

##### A. Life

1. Born March 31, 1596 in La Haye France (now named "Descartes").
2. Received a scholastic education at the Jesuit college of La Fleche.
3. Earned a degree in law.
4. Joined armies to see the world.
5. On November 10, 1619, shut in for the winter, he had three vivid dreams.
  - a. The dreams lead to his mission-to solve the mysteries of nature via a philosophy based on mathematical reasoning.
  - b. In gratitude he vowed to make a pilgrimage to the Italian shrine of Our Lady of Loretto.
6. In 1649 he became the tutor of Queen Christina of Sweden.
7. The cold and his 5:00 am meetings with her eventually lead to his death by pneumonia on February 11, 1650.

##### B. Published Works

1. 1620-Wrote the *Rules for the Direction of the Mind*.
  - a. Published after his death.
2. 1633-Wrote *Le Monde (The World)*.
  - a. A work on physics-the world as matter in motion.
  - b. Galileo has been condemned by Rome for a similar view so it was not published until 1664.
3. 1637- *Discourse on the Method of Rightly Conducting One's Reason and Seeking the Truth in the Sciences*.
  - a. Written in French rather than Latin.
4. 1641-*Meditations on First Philosophy*.
5. 1644 *Principles of Philosophy*

- a. Intended to replace the textbooks based on Aristotle that were used in universities.
6. 1649-*Passions of the Soul*

## II Agenda

### A. Motivation

1. He was dissatisfied with the philosophy and science of his time.
2. He says that philosophy “has been cultivated for many centuries by the most excellent minds yet there is still no point in it which is not disputed and hence doubtful.”
3. He held that the sciences are on shaky foundations because they rest on philosophical assumptions.

### B. Travel

1. He was tired of the fact that the teachers repeated the old ideas of Aristotle and Scholastic dogma.
2. He set out on an intellectual journey.
3. His exposure to the vast diversity in opinion leading him to more confusion and doubt.

### C. Inward Focus

1. He decided to “undertake studies within myself too and one day to undertake studies within myself too and to use all the powers of my mind in choosing the paths I should follow.”
2. His goal was to locate a solid foundation for the sciences.
3. He is considered the father of modern philosophy because of his autobiographical and individualistic approach to philosophy.
4. Unlike Medieval philosophers, Descartes rarely used quotes and generally did not rely on arguments from authority.
5. Descartes operated as a solitary thinker working towards truth.
6. He was one of the first philosophers to make extensive use of personal pronouns.
7. He believed that individuals have the intellectual capabilities to discover truth on their own.
8. Descartes held that these individual journeys would lead to the same truths.

### D. Goals

1. To find certainty.
  - a. Doubts and conflicting opinions were disturbing and weakened the foundations of the science.
2. To create a universal science: this involved finding a unified set of principles from which can be deduced all answers to Scientific questions.
3. To reconcile the scientific, mechanistic conception of the universe with human freedom and religion.

## Method

### I Methodology

#### A. Mathematics

1. He used mathematics as a model in his quest for certainty and a universal science.
2. He found the certainty and self-evidence of mathematics to be very appealing and believed it could be applied to all questions.
3. He expressed this view in the *Discourse*.
4. He held that the method of mathematics consists in two mental operations: intuition and deduction.

#### B. Intuition

1. This is the recognition of self-evident truths.
  - a. Such as truths of math and the principles of logic.
2. If one is thinking with clarity when examining a self-evident truth, then one will simply see its truth.
3. Such truths are not derived from other truths.
4. He took such ideas to be innate-implanted by God.
5. We are not always aware of the ideas.
6. These ideas cannot be derived from sense experience.
7. These ideas are discovered by an intellectual “vision.”
  - a. This notion of nonsensory intellectual vision is found in Plato and Augustine.
  - b. It is a standard component of rationalism.

#### C. Deduction

1. This is a necessary inference from other propositions that are known with certainty.
2. He held that one could proceed, via deduction, from a self-evident truth to a conclusion that would thus be known with certainty.
3. He held that all truths could be reached by applying this method of deduction.
4. He was the first to publish the principles of analytical geometry in 1637.
  - a. Spatial figures could be analyzed in terms of numbers and variables.
5. The physical world can be translated, via geometry, into mathematical forms.
6. He contended that this method could be applied to bring order and measure to all knowledge.

#### D. The *Meditations on First Philosophy*

1. The six meditations is written as if he wrote them over the course of six days.
2. The meditations were actually the result of about a decade’s worth of effort.

3. It seems to be based on the fact that Jesuits would spend six days of Holy Week studying the spiritual meditations of Ignatius Loyola, the founder of the order.

## First Meditation: The Method of Doubt

### -Descartes

#### I First Part

##### A. Start and Goal

1. Many beliefs he took to be true were false.
2. Everything constructed on these beliefs was doubtful.
3. Goals:
  - a. Rid himself of all opinions he had accepted.
  - b. Build anew from the foundation to establish a firm and permanent structure in the sciences.

##### B. Method

1. It is not necessary to show all of his beliefs are false.
2. Assent will be withheld from:
  - a. Matters which are not entirely certain and indubitable.
  - b. Those appearing manifestly false.
3. Finding a reason to doubt in each justifies rejecting the whole.
4. No need to examine each in particular.
  - a. An endless undertaking.
  - b. The destruction of the foundations brings down the rest.

#### II Doubting the Senses

##### A. Senses

1. All that was accepted as most true and certain was learned from or through the senses.
2. But at times these senses are deceptive.
3. It is wiser not to entirely trust any thing which has deceived us once.

##### B. Dream Problem

1. Skeptical Pause: While the senses sometimes deceive us about barely perceptible or far away things, others cannot reasonably be doubted.
  - a. Example: "I am here, seated by the fire...and other similar matters. "
  - b. To deny these would be comparable to madness.
2. In dreams, things less probable than those claimed by the insane occur.
3. He has often thought he was awake when asleep.
4. Skeptical Pause: What happens in sleep does not appear as clear or distinct as current experience.
5. In sleep he has been deceived by illusions.
6. There are no certain indications to clearly distinguish being awake from dreaming
7. He assumes he is asleep and all these particulars are false delusions.
  - a. Possibly neither our hands nor body are as they appear to be.

##### C. Painter Analogy

1. Things represented in sleep are like painted representations which must have been formed as the counterparts of something real and true.
2. In this way those general things at least (eyes, head, hands, body), are not imaginary, but real.
3. Painters, even when representing sirens and satyrs, cannot give them entirely new natures, but combine the members of different animals.
  - a. If a painting represents a thing fictitious and false, the colors are necessarily real.
4. For the same reason, though general things (body, eyes, head, hands) may be imaginary, there are simpler and more universal objects which are real and true.
  - a. Just as certain real colors, these images of things, whether true and real or false and fantastic, are formed.
5. To this class of things pertains
  - a. Corporeal nature.
  - b. Extension.
  - c. Figure of extended things.
  - d. Quantity/magnitude and number.
  - e. Location.
  - f. Time
8. Physics, Astronomy, Medicine and sciences that consider composite things are very dubious and uncertain.

##### D. Math-Skeptical Pause

1. Arithmetic, Geometry and other such sciences.
  - a. Deal with very simple and very general things.
  - b. Do not determine whether they exist or not.
  - c. Might be taken contain some certainty and indubitability.

2. Whether one is awake or asleep,
  - a. Two and three together always form five,
  - b. The square can never have more than four sides.
3. It seems impossible that truths so clear and apparent can be suspected of any falsity or uncertainty.

### III God and the Demon

#### A. God

1. Descartes believed that an all-powerful God existed who created him.
2. How does he know that God has not made it so that there is
  - a. No earth.
  - b. No heaven.
  - c. No extended body.
  - d. No magnitude.
  - e. No place.
3. Yet he has perceptions of all these things and they seem to exist exactly as he sees them?
4. Others deceive themselves in what they think they know best, so how does he know he is not deceived when he
  - a. Adds two and three.
  - b. Counts the sides of a square.
  - c. Judges simpler things.
5. Possibly God has not desired that he should be deceived, for He is said to be supremely good.
6. If it is contrary to His goodness to have made Descartes so he constantly deceives himself
  - a. It would be contrary to His goodness to permit Descartes to be sometimes deceived
  - b. He cannot doubt that God permits this.
7. There is nothing in all he formerly believed which he cannot doubt for powerful and considered reasons.
  - a. So he ought to refrain from giving credence to these opinions as he would to the manifestly false.
  - b. If he desires to arrive at any certainty in the sciences.

#### C. The Demon

1. He supposes not that God, but some evil genius as powerful as deceitful has employed his whole energies in deceiving him.
2. All external things are illusions and dreams which this genius presents as traps for his credulity.
3. He considers himself as having no hands, eyes, flesh, blood, nor senses, yet falsely believing himself to possess them.
4. If it is not in his power to arrive at the knowledge of any truth, he will do what is in his power
  - a. Suspend judgment.
  - b. Avoid giving credence to any false thing.
  - c. Avoid being imposed upon by this arch deceiver, however powerful and deceptive he may be.

## Foundationalism and Coherentism

### Motivations

#### I Replying to the Skeptic

- A. Response to skepticism.
  1. Epistemic theories are typically constructed to respond to the skeptic.
  2. This is done by presenting an account of justification and belief that permits knowledge.

#### II The Justification Regress Problem

##### A. The Regress

1. It is generally accepted that a belief must be justified if it is to have the potential to be knowledge.
2. A belief is typically justified by another belief.
  1. Regress: belief A is justified by belief B, which is justified by C, etc.
2. The justification regress must be stopped to permit justified belief and hence the possibility of knowledge.

##### B. Option 1: Unjustified Foundation

1. A is inferred directly from B, which is unjustified.
2. Wittgenstein: "at the foundation of well-founded beliefs lies belief that is not founded."
3. Problem: Unjustified beliefs don't seem to be able to yield justified belief.

##### C. Option 2: "Biting the Bullet"- Infinite Regress Chain

1. A is justified by B, which is based on C and so on ad *infinitum*.
2. Problem: It seems unlikely that a person has an infinite set of beliefs.
3. Problem: Even assuming people have such an infinite set, it would be impossible to show that such a justified belief was justified.

##### D. Option 3: Coherentism

1. A is justified by B, which is based on C, which is based on A, going in a circle.
2. Problem: It seems to beg the question.

- a. A person claims to believe in the Bible "Because it's inspired by God."
  - b. When questioned, he says, "I believe in God because the Bible says God exists."
  - c. Arguing in a circle proves nothing.
- F. Option 4: Foundationalism
- 1. A is justified by B, which is based on a foundational belief that needs no further justification.
  - 2. There are justified beliefs at the base of every inferential chain.
  - 3. Every justified belief is either
    - a. A properly basic (justified) belief
    - b. Or ends in a chain of beliefs the last of which is self-justified.
  - 4. Foundationalism seems to stop the regress without begging the question.

## Foundationalism

### I Background

#### A. General Background

- 1. Until recently most epistemologists accepted that some self evident first principles exist and are
  - a. Immediately known to the understanding
  - b. Sufficient to build a complete system of knowledge.

#### B. Example: Plato

- 1. The principles-Forms.
- 2. We have latent knowledge of the forms as innate Ideas.

#### C. Example: Aristotle and Aquinas

- 1. Both: The basic truths, such as axioms of math and logic, are grasped immediately by the understanding.
- 2. Aquinas (*Summa Theologica*)-Truth can come into the mind in two ways.
  - a. As known in itself.
  - b. A truth known through another is understood by the intellect, not immediately, but through an inquiry of reason of which it is the terminus.

### II Classical ("Cartesian") Foundationalism

#### A. Classical Foundationalism

- 1. We may have infallible non-inferential knowledge that serves as the foundation for all other knowledge.
- 2. There are two kinds of belief: basic and inferred.
- 3. A basic belief is "properly basic" if it justified non-inferentially.
- 4. A non-basic justified belief is inferentially based on one or more properly basic beliefs.
- 5. The relationship is asymmetrical: the basic beliefs justify the inferred beliefs, but the reverse is not true.

#### B. Descartes Goals in the *Meditations*:

- 1. To tear down the superstructure and destroy the foundations of our epistemically unjustified beliefs.
- 2. To create a new, infallible foundation with indubitable propositions,
- 3. To erect a solid and certain superstructure, a house of knowledge. .

#### C. Descartes Refutation of Skepticism

- 1. From indubitable basic principles, Descartes deduced the existence of God.
- 2. He deduced that God is benevolent and not a deceiver.
- 2. Since God gave us our perceptual mechanisms, we can know we are not being deceived when we believe things about objects in the world.
- 3. Normally, what we see is real.
- 4. Only under abnormal circumstances will one be deceived.
- 5. Because we can be deceived, knowledge cannot be attributed to such empirical judgments.
- 6. So, induction can never be a means of knowledge-only of belief.
- 7. Aside from the indubitable basic principles, the only path to knowledge is deduction.

#### D. Criticism of Classic Foundationalism

- 1. It limits us to very little knowledge- Doesn't seem able to provide enough inferred knowledge or justified beliefs.
- 2. It can allow only infallible or incorrigible beliefs in the foundation.
- 3. While there might be self-evident truths, there do not seem enough of them to serve as an adequate foundation.
- 4. Empirical beliefs cannot be knowledge.
- 5. Tends toward skepticism about the external world, other minds, induction, etc.
- 6. Most contemporary foundationalists have rejected classical foundationalism in favor of moderate foundationalism.

### III Moderate Foundationalism

#### A. General idea

- 1. Uses the foundational model of distinguishing basic from non-basic beliefs.
- 2. Attempts to address the criticisms of classic foundationalism.

3. Rejects the possibility of an infallible belief system.
  4. Accepts fallibilism: the theory that many of our most cherished beliefs could be false.
- B. Features of modest foundationalism:
1. An asymmetrical relationship exists between the foundations and the superstructure.
  2. Doubts about any psychological beliefs being indubitable are allowed.
  3. Almost any belief can be basic for a person under certain circumstances.
    - a. No particular type of content is required.
  4. The foundational relationship is justification rather than knowledge, though knowledge is the goal of believing.
  5. Superstructure beliefs can be inductively based on basic beliefs.
  6. Coherence is allowed some role in justification.
    - a. If a belief set is incoherent, it cannot be justified.
  7. One must distinguish between *having* a justification for a belief and being able to show that one has such a justification.
    - a. It is not necessary for a person to be able to show that he or she is justified.
- C. Problem
1. Moderate foundationalism doesn't provide a strong enough justification for knowledge.
  2. It seems incapable of responding to skepticism.
  3. As it compromises and accepts coherence constraints, it seems to become another form of coherentism.

## VII Coherentist Theories of justification

- A. Background
1. Coherence theories claim that the truth resides in the absolute system of knowledge.
- B. Classic Coherentism.
1. Truth is not defined as correspondence of propositions with facts
  2. Truth is defined as integrated and absolute wholes in which individual propositions receive justification and relative truth credentials.
  3. Every true belief is entailed by every other proposition in the coherent system.
- C. 20<sup>th</sup>-21<sup>st</sup> Century coherentists
1. W. V. Quine, Wilfrid Sellars, Gilbert Harman, Keith Lehrer, and Laurence Bonjour.
  2. Reject the coherence theory of truth as an implausible metaphysical doctrine.
  3. Accept a coherentist theory of justification.
  4. Individual beliefs are justified by the entire system of beliefs in which they cohere.
  5. All justification is inferential, so the notion of being properly basic is a contradiction.
- B. The isolation objection.
1. The coherence of a theory or set of beliefs seems an inadequate justification of the theory/set of beliefs.
  2. It fails to provide the necessary criteria to discern illusory but consistent theories/sets of belief.
    - a. Fairytales, dreams and hallucinations may be coherent.
    - b. Astrology may be as coherent as astronomy,
    - c. Real world example: British counter intelligence in WWII.
  3. We want to connect our theories and beliefs with empirical data.
  4. Consistency may be a necessary condition for justification but it is not a sufficient condition.
    - a. A is necessary for B: A is required for B, but A need not be sufficient for B.
    - b. A is sufficient for B: If A is the case, then so is B-but A need not be necessary for B.

## Introduction to Metaphysics

Last Revised: 7/5/2005

### I Introduction

- A. Defined
1. The study of the nature and structure of reality.
  2. Ontology: the study of the constituents of reality.
- B. Some Questions in Metaphysics
1. Does God exist?
  2. What is the nature of God?
  3. What is space?
  4. What is time?
  5. What is a person?
  6. Do minds exist?
  7. In virtue of what are things of the same type?
  8. Is time travel possible?
  9. What is the basis for chance/possibility?
  10. Are there other universes?

## II Some Metaphysical Problems

### A. Problem of Universals.

1. Determining what it is for two tokens (instances) to be of the same type.
2. Determining what individuates entities-what makes one thing *one* thing.
3. Determining what makes a thing what it is.

### B. The nature of mind-determining whether the mind is

1. Physical or non-physical in nature.
2. A substance or a collection of properties or something else.
3. Capable of surviving the death of the body.

### C. The Problem of Personal Identity

1. Determining what it is to be a person.
2. Determining what it is to be the same person across time.
3. Determining whether a person can continue to exist after the death of the body.

## III Some Concepts

### A. Some concepts

1. Ontological Kind: A fundamental type of entity.
2. Property: A quality, such as *being square* or *being red*.
3. Substance:
  - a. An entity capable of independent existence.
  - b. That which bears properties (substrata).
  - c. Material (body)-Three dimensional (extended), located in space, physical.
  - d. Immaterial (mind, spirit, soul)-Non-physical, non-extended, not in space.
4. Dualism: The view that there are two basic ontological kinds.
  - a. Material substance/properties.
  - b. Mental substance/properties.
5. Idealism/Immaterialism: The view that all that exists is mind/immaterial substances or properties.
6. Materialism/Physicalism-The view that all that exists is physical/material.
7. Particular: An entity that can exist wholly only at one point in space at a given time.
8. Universal: An entity capable of multiple location-Capable of existing wholly at multiple points in space at the same time.

## IV Methodology

### A. Doing Metaphysics

1. Selecting a problem.
2. Presenting a clarification of or solution to the problem.
3. This is often done by creating a theory or working within a theory.

### B. Assessing Metaphysical Theories

1. Metaphysical theories/accounts are assessed in terms of their costs and benefits.
2. The less cost the better.
3. The greater the benefits, the better.
4. This is a rough estimate, not a numerical calculation.

### C. Ockam's Razor

1. Do not multiply entities beyond necessity.
2. The greater the number of ontological kinds accepted by a theory, the greater its cost.

### D. Simplicity

1. The simpler, the better.
2. All other things being equal, a simpler theory is preferable to a more complex theory.

### E. Mystery/Weirdness

1. The less mystery or "weirdness" associated with a theory, the better.
2. Entities, concepts, mechanisms and such can be mysterious or "weird."

### F. Plausibility

1. The more plausible a theory is, the better.
2. This is determined by matching the theory against intuitions, background knowledge and accepted theories.

### G. Primitives

1. Primitive: something, such as an entity, concept or relation, that is not analyzed or explained by the theory.
2. These are or are comparable to assumptions.
3. All theories require primitives, but the fewer the better.

### H. Explanatory Power/Problem Solving

1. The more the theory explains, the better.
2. The better the solution the theory offers to the problem(s) it addresses, the better.

3. This is a benefit.
- I. Fruitfulness
  1. Other benefits of the theory, including its usefulness in areas beyond its original purpose.
  2. The more, the better.
- J. Coherence.
  1. A theory needs to be coherent.
  2. To the degree a theory is incoherent it is a bad theory.
- K. Consistency.
  1. A theory needs to be internally consistent.
  2. A theory is inconsistent when claims within the theory are contradictory (one must be false) or are contrary (both cannot be true).
  3. An inconsistent theory is seriously flawed to the degree that it contains inconsistencies.
- L. Non-Circularity/Non Question Begging.
  1. A theory is circular if it simply restates what it is trying to explain.
  2. A theory is circular if it assumes what it needs to prove.
  3. A theory is flawed to the degree that it contains circularity.

## John Locke (1632-1704)

### Background

#### I Background

- A. Early years & Education
  1. Born in 1632 into a Puritan family.
  2. Educated at Oxford in theology, natural science, philosophy and medicine.
  3. Described as “a man of turbulent spirit, clamorous and never contented.”
  3. He Found Oxford’s Scholasticism to be “perplexed with obscure terms and useless questions.”
  4. He read the works of Descartes on his own.
  5. He was a lecturer at Oxford in Greek and rhetoric for a short while.
- B. Public Life
  1. 1667-1683 he served as the doctor and adviser to Lord Ashley (who became the Earl of Shaftsbury).
  2. Held a variety of political offices.
  3. 1669 He helped draft a constitution for the Carolinas.
- C. Revolution
  1. The Parliament of England and the throne had been struggling with each other for decades.
  2. Locke supported parliamentary rights.
  3. Locke fled England for Holland in 1683 when James II took the throne.
  4. In 1689, after the Glorious Revolution of 1688 which replaced James II with William of Orange, he returned to England.
  5. He held various political offices.
- D. Works
  1. 1690: *Two Treatises on Government* and *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*.
  2. 1689-1692: *Letters Concerning Toleration*.
  3. 1693: *Some Thoughts Concerning Education*.
  4. 1695: *The Reasonableness of Christianity*.
- E. The End
  1. In 1691 he entered into partial retirement and moved 20 miles outside of London.
  2. He spent his remaining years studying the scriptures and enjoying the company of friends.
  3. He died in 1704.

## Locke’s Theory of Substance and Personal Identity

From: *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690,1694)

#### I Substance

- A. Idea of Substance
  1. Qualities cannot subsist, sine re substante (without something to support them).
  2. The supporter of the qualities is called “Substantia”: “standing under” or “upholding.”
- B. Locke’s Elephant Story
  1. If asked what supports the qualities, he would be like the Indian:
    - a. Saying the world was supported by a great elephant, was asked what the elephant rested on.
    - b. His answer: a great tortoise.
    - c. Asked what supported the tortoise, he replied: something he knew not what.
  2. We have no distinct idea of substance and are perfectly ignorant of it.

3. It is something we know not what.

#### C. Ideas of Material Substance and Spiritual Substance

1. The physical is supposed to be (without knowing what it is) substratum of simple ideas from outside.

2. The mental is supposed (with like ignorance) to be substratum to the operations experienced within.

3. Given that we lack clear and distinct ideas of either, it is as ration to claim there is no body as to claim there is no spirit.

## II The Identity Of Living Things

### A. Living Creatures

1. The identity of a living being does not depend on the sameness of matter.

2. Changes in matter or parts do not result in a change of identity.

3. An oak is not a mass of matter but a disposition of them as constitutes its parts.

a. It remains one plant through changes of matter if it has an organization of parts in a coherent body with a common life.

4. Same animal: a continued life communicated to different particles of matter successively united to the organized living body.

## III Man

### A. Identity of Man

1. The identity of man is in an organized continued body under one organization of life in the particles of matter united to it.

2. If identity of soul makes the same man, and a soul could occupy different bodies, men in distant ages might be the same man.

3. If the soul makes the man, "man" would apply to an idea excluding body and shape.

4. The soul of a man could be in a hog, but we would not say the hog is a man .

5. It is one thing to be the same substance, another to be the same man, and a third to be the same person.

### B. What is a Man?

1. Man: an animal of a certain form.

2. A creature without reason but having the shape of a man would be called a man.

3. A cat or parrot that reasoned would be called a cat or parrot.

4. For most, a man is not just a thinking/rational being, but a particularly shaped body joined to thinking.

a. The same body and the same spirit go into making the same man.

## IV Consciousness and Personal Identity

### A. Person

1. A thinking intelligent being.

2. That has reason and reflection.

3. Can consider itself as itself, the same thinking thing, in different times and places.

4. Which it does only by that consciousness which is inseparable from thinking.

### B. Consciousness

1. Consciousness always accompanies thinking.

2. Consciousness: what makes each to be what he calls self, and distinguishes him from other thinking things.

3. Consciousness is the sole basis of personal identity, the sameness of a rational being.

4. The identity of a person reaches as far as this consciousness can be extended backwards to any past action or thought.

## V Consciousness Makes Personal Identity

### A. Forgetting

1. If people did not forget, few would doubt the same thinking thing was always present.

2. We do forget and this raises doubts about whether we are the same thinking substance or not.

3. This does not concern personal identity, which is about sameness of person, not sameness of substance.

### B. Consciousness

1. The same consciousness makes a man himself to himself.

2. So personal identity depends on that alone, regardless of substance or substances.

### C. Changes of Time & Substance: Clothing analogy and Hand argument

1. The self extends as far as the same consciousness can extend to actions past or to come.

2. Time or change of substance no more makes two persons, than changing clothes after a night's sleep makes two men.

3. The limbs of one's body are a part of him- he sympathizes and is concerned for them.

4. Cut off a hand and separate it from the consciousness, it is no more a part of him than the remotest part of matter.

## VI Personal Identity & Immaterial Substance

### A. First Question

1. Is it the same person through change of substance?

2. This can only be resolved by those who know:

a. What kind of thinking substances they are.

b. If consciousness of past actions can be transferred from one thinking substance to another.

3. If the same consciousness is not the same individual, we must know

a. Why one intellectual substance may think it did something it did not.

- b. Why such a thought may be without reality, like in a dream.
- 4. That this never happens is best explained by God's goodness.
  - a. He will not, by their error, transfer the consciousness bringing reward or punishment with it.
  - b. This must do until we have a clearer understanding.
- 5. If the same consciousness is transferable from one thinking substance to another, two thinking substances might be one person.

#### B. Second Question

- 1. Can there be two distinct persons though the immaterial substance is the same?
- 2. Can the same immaterial being lose its consciousness of past actions and be unable to regain them?
- 3. Those accepting preexistence claim the soul has no consciousness of what it did while separate from body, or in another body.
- 4. If personal identity reaches no further than consciousness, a preexistent spirit must make different persons.

#### C. Example: Nestor

- 1. Suppose a person now has the soul that was in Nestor at Troy but not his consciousness.
- 2. Having no consciousness of actions of Nestor he cannot conceive himself as Nestor.
- 3. This would no more make him the same person as Nestor, than if some particles of Nestor body were a part of him.
- 4. The same immaterial substance, without the same consciousness, no more makes the same person, than the same particle of matter, without consciousness, makes the same person.
- 5. If he is conscious of any actions of Nestor, he is the same person with Nestor.

### VII Memory and Personal Identity

#### A. Resurrection

- 1. The same person can be at the resurrection, though not in his original body.
- 2. If the same consciousness is present in the body along with the soul that inhabits it.

#### B. The Prince and the Cobbler

- 1. If the soul of a prince, carrying along his consciousness enters the soulless body of a cobbler:
  - a. He would be the same person with the prince.
  - b. Accountable only for the prince's actions.
- 2. The body goes to the making the man, and would to everyone determine the man.
- 3. The soul would not make another man: he would be the same cobbler to all but himself.

#### C. Language

- 1. In the ordinary way of speaking, "same person" and "same man", stand for the same thing.
- 2. People can apply sounds to what ideas they think fit, and change them as they please.
- 3. When inquiring what makes the same spirit, man, or person, we must determine what we mean and thus determine when it is and is not the same.

### VIII SELF DEPENDS ON CONSCIOUSNESS

#### A. Consciousness

- 1. Self: that conscious thinking thing, whatever the substance, which is:
  - a. Sensible or conscious of pleasure and pain.
  - b. Capable of happiness or misery.
  - c. So is concerned for itself, as far as that consciousness extends.
  - d. It matters not whether it is spiritual or material, simple or compounded.

#### B. The Little Finger

- 1. Understood under that consciousness, a little finger is as much a part of him as what is most so.
- 2. If the little finger is removed and the consciousness went it, the finger would be the same person, and self would have nothing to do with the rest of the body.
- 3. It is the consciousness that goes along with the substance, when a part is separate from another, which makes the same person.
  - a. This also applies to substances remote in time.
- 4. Whatever the consciousness of the present thinking thing can join itself, makes the same person.
  - a. And so attributes to itself and owns the actions of that thing, as far as consciousness reaches, and no further.

### IX. REWARD AND PUNISHMENT

#### A. PI and Justice

- 1. On personal identity is founded all the right and justice of reward and punishment.
- 2. Happiness and misery are what each is concerned for himself regardless of what happens to any substance not joined to that consciousness.

#### B. The Little Finger

- 1. If consciousness went with a severed little finger, it would be the same self which was concerned with the whole body before, whose actions must be its own now.
- 2. If the body had its own consciousness, unknown to the finger, it wouldn't be concerned for it as a part of itself or own its actions.

#### C. Personal Identity

1. Personal identity consists not in the identity of substance, but in the identity of consciousness.
2. If Socrates and the mayor of Queenborough have the same consciousness they are the same person.
3. If the same Socrates waking and sleeping do not have the same consciousness, then Socrates waking and Socrates sleeping are not the same person.
4. To punish Socrates waking for what sleeping Socrates thought, and waking Socrates was not conscious of, would not be any more right, than to punish one twin for what the other did that he was unaware of, because they could not be distinguished..

#### D. Objection and Reply

1. Suppose I lose the memory of some parts of my life, beyond possible retrieval.
2. Aren't I the same person that did the actions and had the thoughts I was once conscious of, though I forgot them?
3. Reply: we must notice what the word "I" is applied to-here to the man only.
4. Assuming the same man is the same person, "I" is easily supposed to stand for the same person.
5. If it is possible for the same man to have distinct incommunicable consciousness at different times, the same man would at different times make different persons.
6. This is the sense of mankind in the solemnest declaration of their opinions.
  - a. Human laws do not punish the mad man for the sober man's actions,
  - b. Nor the sober man for what the mad man did.
  - c. Thus making them two persons.
7. We say such a one is not himself or beside himself as if it is thought the self was changed and the same person was no longer in that man.

### X A PROBLEM ABOUT PUNISHMENT

#### A. Drunk, Asleep, & Judgment Day

1. Is not a man drunk and sober the same person?
2. Why else is he punished for the act committed when drunk, though he is never afterwards conscious of it?
3. Just as much the same person as a man who walks in his sleep is the same person, and is answerable for any mischief he does while asleep.
4. Human laws punish both with a justice suitable to their way of knowledge because, in these cases, they cannot distinguish with certainty what is real and what counterfeit.
5. So ignorance in drunkenness or sleep is not admitted as a plea.
6. Though punishment is annexed to personality, and personality to consciousness, and the drunkard was perhaps not conscious of what he did human law justly punishes him.
  - a. Because the fact is proved against him, but want of consciousness cannot be proved for him.
7. When all secrets of all hearts shall be laid open no one shall be made to answer for what he knows nothing of; but shall receive his doom, his conscience accusing or excusing him.

### XI Odd Cases

#### A. Two and One

1. Suppose two distinct incommunicable consciousnesses act in the same body, one by day, the other by night.
2. Suppose the same consciousness, acting by intervals, has two distinct bodies.
3. Personal identity is determined by the consciousness.
4. Granting the thinking substance must be immaterial; it may part with its past consciousness and be restored, as when men forget their past actions.
5. Make remembering and forgetting take turns by day and night, and there are two persons with the same spirit and two persons with the same body.
6. Self is not determined by identity or diversity or substance, which it cannot be sure of, but only by identity of consciousness.

## Personal Identity

### -David Hume

Revised 4/6/2005

#### I Preliminaries

##### A. Other Philosophers imagine

1. We are always conscious of what we call our Self.
2. We feel its existence and its continuance.
3. We are certain, beyond evidence of a demonstration, of its perfect identity and simplicity.

##### B. Hume

1. When he enters into what he calls himself he encounters a particular perception or other.
  - a. Perceptions of heat or cold, light or shade, love or hatred, pain or pleasure.
2. He is never without a perception and never observes anything but the perception.
3. If his perceptions are removed for any time, as by sound sleep, as long as he is insensible of himself he does not exist.
4. If all his perceptions were removed by death and he could not think, feel, see, love, nor hate after the dissolution of his body he would be annihilated.

### C. Disagreement

1. If after serious and unprejudiced reflection another has a different notion of himself, Hume cannot reason with him.
2. He may perceive something simple and continued he calls himself, though Hume is certain there is no such thing in his case.

## II Bundles & Persons

### A. Bundles & Change

1. A person is only a bundle or collection of different perceptions.
2. These perceptions succeed each other and are in perpetual flux and movement.
3. There is no power of the soul remaining unalterably the same even for a moment.

### B. The mind is a kind of theatre.

1. Numerous perceptions successively make their appearance.
2. There is no simplicity at one time, nor identity in different times, despite our natural propensity to imagine otherwise.
3. The comparison of the theatre must not mislead us:
  - a. Only the successive perceptions constitute the mind.
  - b. We have no notion of the place where these scenes are represented or the materials composing it.

## III Identity & Relations

### A. Identity

1. What leads us to ascribe identity to successive perceptions and suppose we have an invariable and uninterrupted existence?
2. Every distinct perception adding to the mind is a distinct existence.
3. We suppose the train of perceptions is united by identity.
4. The understanding never observes any real connection among objects.
  - a. Even cause and effect is a customary association of ideas.
5. Thus, identity is nothing belonging to nor uniting different perceptions.
6. Identity is a quality attributed to them because of the union of their ideas in the imagination, when we reflect upon them.

### B. Relations

1. The only qualities that can yield ideas of a union in the imagination are: Resemblance, contiguity, and causation.
2. These three are the uniting principles in the ideal world.
3. Without them every distinct object is separable by the mind and appears to have no connection with any other object.
4. Identity depends on resemblance and causation, and not contiguity, this has little or no influence here.
5. They produce an easy transition of ideas, so notions of personal identity come from the smooth, uninterrupted progress of thoughts along a train of connected ideas.

### C. Resemblance & Memory

1. Memory is a faculty by which we raise up images of past perceptions.
2. An image necessarily resembles its object.
3. Frequent placing of resembling perceptions in a chain of thought conveys the imagination more easily from one link to another.
4. This makes the whole seem like one continuing object.
5. So, memory both discovers the identity and contributes to its production-it produces the resemblance among perceptions.

### D. Causation & Analogy to a Commonwealth

1. The mind is a system of different perceptions linked by cause and effect that mutually produce, destroy, influence, and modify each other.
  - a. Impressions give rise to correspondent ideas and these ideas produce other impressions.
2. The soul is like a republic or commonwealth.
3. The members are united by ties of government and give rise to other persons, who propagate the same republic in the incessant changes of its parts.
4. As the same republic may change members, laws and constitutions the same person may vary character, disposition, impressions and ideas, without losing identity.
  - a. Whatever changes he endures his parts are still connected by the relation of causation.

## IV Concern, Memory and Conclusion

### A. Concern

1. Our identity, in regard to passions, corroborates that of the imagination.
2. This is by making our distant perceptions influence each other.
3. And by giving us a present concern for our past or future pains or pleasures.

### B. Memory

1. Memory alone acquaints us with the continuance and extent of the succession of perceptions, so it is the source of personal identity.
2. If we had no memory, we would lack a notion of causation and hence of the chain of causes & effects constituting our self.
3. Once we have a notion of causation from memory, we can extend the chain of causes and our identity beyond our memory.
4. Thus comprehending times, circumstances, and actions we forgot but suppose existed.

### C. Criticism of Memory as the basis of Identity

1. We remember few of our past actions.
2. To claim that if one forgets, then the present self is not the same as the past self overturns the established notions of personal identity.

3. Memory discovers, more than it produces personal identity, by showing cause and effect among different perceptions.
4. Those who claim memory entirely produces our identity must give a reason why we can extend it beyond our memory.

#### E. Conclusion

1. All questions concerning personal identity can never possibly be decided and are to be regarded as grammatical rather than philosophical difficulties.
2. Identity depends on the relations of ideas that produce identity via the easy transition they occasion.
3. Since the relations and easiness of the transition may insensibly diminish, we have no just standard to settle disputes concerning when they acquire or lose title to identity.
4. All disputes concerning identity of connected objects are merely verbal, except as far as the relation of parts yields a fiction or imaginary principle of union.

## Buddha's No Self Doctrine

### I No Self

#### A. Names

1. He asks to be addressed as Nagasena.
2. Regardless of the name it is but a way of counting, a term, an appellation, a convenient designation, a mere name- for there is no Self.

#### B. The King's Questions

1. If there is no self, then who
  - a. Furnishes priests with robes, food, bedding, and medicine, and the reliance of the sick?
  - b. Makes use of them?
  - c. Keeps the precepts?
  - d. Meditates?
  - e. Commits immorality?
  - f. Tells lies?
2. Implications-If there is no self, then
  - a. There is no merit nor demerit.
  - b. There is no one who does or causes to be done meritorious or demeritorious deeds.
  - c. Neither good nor evil deeds can have any fruit or result.
  - d. One who kills a priest is not a murder.
  - e. The priests cannot have any teacher, preceptor, or ordination.

#### C. Who/what is Nagasena?

1. He is not the hair of the head or body.
2. He is not the nails, teeth, skin, flesh, sinew, bones, marrow, kidneys, heart, liver, blood, sweat, fat, tears, saliva, snot, urine, or brain.
3. He is not form.
4. He is not sensation, consciousness, sensation, perception or predispositions and consciousness united
5. He is not something besides form, sensation, perception, the predispositions, and consciousness.
6. The king says he fails to discover any Nagasena.
7. Nagasena is a mere empty sound-there is no Nagasena.

### II Rebirth

#### A. Rebirth

1. How does rebirth take place without anything transmigrating?

#### B. Illustration 1: Light

1. If one were to light a light from another light, the one light would not have passed over [transmigrated] to the other light.
2. In exactly the same way does rebirth take place without anything transmigrating.

#### C. Illustration 2: Poetry

1. Learning poetry from a teacher.
2. The verse did not pass over [transmigrate] to you from your teacher?"
3. In exactly the same way does rebirth take place without anything transmigrating.

## Ghosts and Minds

By Michael C. LaBossiere

### I Introduction

#### A. Philosophical Examination

1. Little on the subject of ghosts.
2. Plato's *Phaedo*.

## B. Purpose

1. To consider the issue of the existence of ghosts within the context of modern philosophy of mind.

## C. Defining Ghosts

1. Before it can be decided whether ghosts can exist or not, one must be clear on what it is to be a ghost.
2. A ghost is a mind which
  - a. Has become disembodied through the death of its original body.
  - b. Still has the capacity to interact with the physical world in some manner.
3. Possible types of Interaction:
  - a. The ghost can be sensed by others.
  - b. The ghost can actually manipulate its physical environment.
  - c. Some other capacity for interaction.
4. It has not been assumed that a ghost must be an immaterial entity.
  - a. This would beg the question at hand.
  - b. The possibility that ghosts could be material entities (of a special sort) must be kept open.

## II Theories of Mind

## A. Identity Theory

1. A materialist theory of mind-the mind is composed of matter.
2. Each mental state is identical to a state of the central nervous system.
3. The mind is equivalent to the central nervous system and its states.
4. So, there are no ghosts.
  - a. The death of the central nervous system is the end of the mind, because they are identical.

## B. Substance Dualism

1. Reality contains at least two fundamental types of entities:
  - a. Material entities.
  - b. Immaterial entities.
2. The mind is an immaterial substance with a special causal relation with its body which
  - a. Enables the mind to control and receive information from the body.
  - b. Allows the body to affect the mind in some respects.
3. Ghosts are a real possibility.
  - a. The mind is a separate substance, so the death of the body need not result in the death of the mind.
  - b. The mind is a distinct substance and substances are entities capable of independent existence, so the mind could continue to exist.
4. Interaction after death.
  - a. The mind could interact with its original body, so it could interact with the physical world even when bodiless.
  - b. The lack of a body could limit the mind's capabilities, which might explain the limits attributed to ghosts.
  - c. Ghosts are said to be limited to making faint noises or moving small objects.

## C. Property dualism.

1. The mind and body are not distinct substances.
2. The mind is composed (at least in part) of mental properties that are not identical with physical properties.
3. Example: the property of *being a painful feeling* could not be reduced to a particular physical property of the brain, such as the states of certain neurons.
4. Thus, the mind and body are distinct, but are not different substances.

## D. Property dualism: Epiphenomenalism

1. There is a one way relation between the mental and physical properties.
2. The non-physical mental properties are caused by, but do not in turn cause, the physical properties of the body.
3. The mind is causally inert and is a "by-product" of the physical processes of the body.
4. Because mental properties are causally dependent on physical properties, the death of the body ends the mental properties.
5. Hence, there are no ghosts.

## E. Property Dualism Interactionism

1. The mental properties of the mind and physical properties of the body interact.
2. Mental properties can bring about changes in the physical properties of the body and vice versa.
3. The mental properties need not be entirely causally dependent on the physical properties of the body.
4. Hence, the mental properties composing the mind could survive the death of the body.
5. The mental properties might be able to exist as a bundle of properties.
  - a. A ghost is a bundle of mental properties that form a mind without a physical body.
6. The mental properties might require some substance or body to support them.
  - a. A ghost is a mind consisting of mental properties supported by something other than its original body.
  - b. The mental properties might inhere in an object or place.
  - c. This might explain why ghosts are said to haunt particular places and rarely, if ever travel about the world.
7. The mental properties might take control of a new body.

- a. This might explain possession.
- 8. Since the mental properties are capable of interacting with physical properties, the mind could interact with the physical world, even after bodily death.
- F. Functionalism.
  - 1. Mental states are defined in functional terms.
  - 2. A functional definition of a mental state defines that mental state in terms of its role or function in a mental system of inputs and outputs.
    - a. A mental state is defined in terms of the causal relations it holds to external influences on the body, other mental states, and the behavior of the body.
  - 3. Typically regarded as a materialist view of the mind.
    - a. The systems in which the mental states take place are taken to be physical systems.
  - 4. Difference between identity theory and functionalism.
    - a. Identity theory: a specific mental state is identical to a specific physical state.
    - b. Identity Theory: for two mental states to be the same, the physical states must be identical.
    - c. Identity Theory: If mental states are particular states of neurons in a certain part of the human nervous system then anything that does not have that sort of nervous cannot have a mind.
    - d. Functionalism: a specific mental state is not defined in terms of a particular physical state.
    - e. Functionalism: Every mental state is a physical state of some kind.
    - f. Functionalism: For two mental states to be the same they need only be functionally identical, not physically identical.
    - g. Functionalism: As mental states are defined functionally, anything that can exhibit these functions, can have a mind.
  - 5. It is possible for ghosts to exist.
  - 6. Any system that performs the proper functions is a mind, regardless of how that system is constituted.
  - 7. It seems possible that a mind could suffer the loss of its original physical system, but retain the same or adequately similar functions afterwards.
  - 8. Since the mind is a physical system, there is no special problem with it interacting with the physical world, even after it has a new physical system.
  - 9. The new physical system might be a structure, place or a new body.
    - a. Example, a person might die in a house and, consistent with ghost stories, the mind might survive in the house.
    - b. The mind that was once a set of functions instantiated in a human body would now be a set of functions instantiated in a house or parts of a house.
    - c. As long as the functions are preserved, the mind would continue to exist as a ghost.

### III Conclusion

- A. Conclusion
  - 1. The issue of the existence or non-existence of ghosts has not been settled.
  - 2. If dualism, property dualism or functionalism is correct, then ghosts can exist.
  - 3. If identity theory is correct, then there can be no ghosts.

## The Problem of Universals

Based on the *Voyage of Discovery* by William F. Lawhead, Wadsworth, 2002.

### I The Problem of Universals

- A. Introduction
  - 1. The problem originated with Plato and Aristotle.
  - 2. A universal is something that can be common to many particulars and is typically taken to be a property.
  - 3. Universals seem to be elements of speech and thought.
  - 4. The main problem is in determining the metaphysical nature of universals.
- B. Thales-the Problem of The One and the Many
  - 1. Approximately 624-545 B.C.
  - 2. Thales sought to find the unity underlying the diversity of the world.
  - 3. The problem of the one and the many involves determining the basic principle or thing that accounts for everything.
- C. Scholasticism
  - 1. Students and teachers in Charlemagne's schools were called Scholastics.
  - 2. Later the term applied to the philosophical attempt to integrate faith and reason.
    - a. Those involved were known as Scholastics or Schoolmen.
  - 3. Scholasticism was the dominant philosophical approach of the time.
- D. Scholastic Formulation of the problem.
  - 1. The scholastics based their approach to the problem on Boethius' translation of Porphyry's introduction to Aristotle's *Categories*.
  - 2. Question 1: Do universals exist as metaphysical entities or do they exist only in the understanding?
  - 3. Question 2: If universals exist as metaphysical entities are they material or immaterial?
  - 4. Question 3: If universals exist as metaphysical entities are they separate from sensible objects or not?

5. Porphyry refused to take a position on these issues because he regarded the problem as extremely difficult.

#### E. Tokens and Types

1. Type: a general kind, such as blue, human, or computer.
2. Token: a specific individual of a type, such as Sally's blue shirt, George Bush, Steve's iBook.
3. The problem: in virtue of what does a specific token fall under a type?
  - a. Example: In virtue of what is George Bush a human?
4. More formally: in virtue of what is token *a* of the type *F*.

## II Realism

### A. Defined

1. Universals are real and exist in the world.
2. Universals are immaterial.
3. Realists differed on their view as to whether universals existed separate from sensible objects or not.
  - a. John Scotus Erigena accepted the Neoplatonic view that forms exist between God and the sensible world.
  - b. St. Anselm accepted a Platonic view.
  - c. Most, like William of Champeux (1070-1121), held that universals do not exist apart from individuals; naturally the same universal exists in different individuals-these are known as immanent universals.

### B. Epistemic Motivation

1. Basing their logic on Aristotle's, they assumed reasoning progressed by presenting the logical relations between universals.
2. If universals do not correspond to real entities, then reasoning is about mere fictions.
3. Hence we would have no knowledge.
4. They concluded that there is a correspondence between reality and logic.

### C. Scholastic Theological Motivation: Original Sin

1. Universals helped account for the concept of original sin.
2. Odo of Tournai (died 1113) claimed that humanity is a universal that all humans share.
3. When the first humans sin, the universal was corrupted.
4. Since all humans share this universal essence, all humans inherited the sin.

### D. Scholastic Theological Motivation: Trinity

1. The Trinity requires that three persons be one God.
2. Taking the divine essence to be a single universal substance solves this problem.

### E. Problem

1. If individual humans are humans because they participate in the universal Humanness, it follows that the universal of Humanness is within the universal Mammal.
2. Logically, all universals are subsumed within the most comprehensive universal-Being.
3. If Being is identical to God, then all things are components of God and the creator-creature distinction collapses, yielding Pantheism.
4. John Scotus Erigena accepted this pantheism, but most thinkers seemed to be ignorant of this implication.
5. Because the early thinkers only had access to Plato's *Timaeus* and did not have access to Aristotle's commentaries on Plato until the 13<sup>th</sup> century, they were unaware of the existing criticisms of transcendent universals.

## III Nominalism

### A. Defined

1. From "nomina", Latin for "names."
2. Universals are merely names.
3. Only individuals have metaphysical reality.

### B. Roscelin (approximately 1050-1120)

1. A teacher of logic in France.
2. Condemned as a heretic by the council of Soissons in 1092.
3. Nothing exists outside of the mind that is not a particular.
4. Universals do not have any metaphysical existence.
5. Universals are *flatus vocis* (vocal winds) used to designate groups.
6. He concluded that without universals, "Trinity" is a mere name that refers to three distinct Gods.
  - a. In the face of excommunication he abandoned this view.

### C. Problems

1. Commonsense seems to indicate that things in the world are ordered in natural kinds that don't depend on our names.
2. Christian theology seems to entail an objective order in reality.
3. Nominalism seems to undercut the metaphysical foundations for the doctrine of original sin.
4. Leads to a denial of the Church's position on the Trinity.

## IV Conceptualism

### A. Peter Abelard (1079-1142)

1. A student of Roscelin and William of Champeaux
  2. Argued against realism and nominalism in support of conceptualism.
- B. Abelard's Attacks on Realism
1. He argued that universals could have inconsistent qualities.
    - a. Socrates and a donkey both instantiate the universal Animal.
    - b. Socrates is rational, the donkey is irrational.
    - c. So, Animal is both rational and irrational.
  2. Raised the problem of the multiple location of universals.
    - a. How can two beings instantiate identical universals in different places at the same time.
  3. Raised the problem of pantheism.
- C. Abelard's Attack on Nominalism
1. He accepted Aristotle's definition that a universal is what can be predicated of many things.
  2. He contended that universals cannot just be words because words are physical sounds and one physical thing cannot be predicated of another.
- D. Abelard's View of Universal Words
1. A universal word is just a sound, but points to a universal concept.
  2. The concept is the word's logical content or meaning.
  3. By means of these universal ideas the mind "conceives a common and confused image of many things."
    - a. Example: "When I hear 'man' a certain figure arises in my mind which is so related to individual men that it is common to all and proper to none."
- E. Abelard's Moderate Nominalism
1. Some interpret Abelard as taking universals to be only general concepts in the mind.
  2. In this case, they are mental constructs that do not exist outside the mind.
- F. Abelard's Steps Towards Moderate Realism
1. Similar to Aristotle, he claims that a universal concept is acquired by abstracting what is common to individuals.
  2. Thus, universals have an objective basis in the things but do not exist apart from the individuals who possess them.
  3. Universals can be considered separately from individuals, using a distinction in reason.
  4. This view posed an alternative to realism-it denies immanent universals but accepts objective similarities.

## V Moderate Realism

### A. Early Moderate Realism

1. Originated by Abelard and developed by Aquinas and other thinkers who had access to Aristotle's works.
2. Universal ideas are in the mind, but have a foundation in external reality.
3. Universals exist *ante rem* (before things) in the mind of God.
4. Universals exist *in rem* (in things) as properties that group individuals by resemblance.
5. Universals are *post rem* (after things) as mental concepts formed by abstraction.
6. The particular/individual is the basic ontological entity.
7. This view was later developed in a variety of ways, such as trope theory.

## Meeting Yourself

-Michael C. LaBossiere

### I Introduction

#### A. Travel

1. Travel involves journeying from one point to another.
2. Spatial travel: journeying from one location in space to another location.
  - a. This happens all the time.
3. Time travel: a journey from one point in time to another.
  - a. Time travel is happening all the time.
  - b. You are traveling towards the future at the rate of sixty minutes per hour.
4. Interesting types of time travel.
  - a. Moving from the present time to the past.
  - b. Going into some future time, without all that time consuming mucking about in all the time between now and then.

#### B. Meeting Yourself

1. It has been claimed that if a person travels far enough, she will end up back where she started.
  - a. No one claims that if you travel far enough you will meet yourself.
2. If time travel is possible, a person should be able to travel back in time and meet herself in the past.
  - a. If a person takes care not to travel too far ahead in time, he should be able to meet himself in the future.

#### C. Problems & Paradoxes

1. Suppose 34 year old Bill, decides to go and kill himself at age twenty.
2. If Bill kills himself, he would not exist at 34.

3. Hence, he could not go back to kill himself.
4. Yet, if Bill is able to travel through time, he should be able to go back and kill himself.
5. Focus is not on paradoxes, but the problem of simply going back in time and meeting yourself.

## II Metaphysical Problems & Universals

### A. Problem of Multiple Location

1. If you can travel backwards in time, then you should be able to meet yourself.
2. Problem: explaining how the very same thing, you, can be in two places at exactly the same time.
3. For the same person to be in two different places at the same time, the components that make up the person must be capable of existing in more than one place at the same time
  - a. The components must be capable of multiple location.

### B. The problem of universals.

1. Involves the issue of the same thing existing in different places at the same time.
2. One part of the problem-determining what it is for two tokens to be of the same type.
  - a. Example: determining what it is for six different green objects to all be the same in respect to their color.

### C. Universals

1. David Armstrong argues that there are instantiated universals.
2. An instantiated universal is a property that can exist in multiple locations at the same time.
3. Example: for six different objects to all be green would be for each object to instantiate the universal green.
  - a. The very same, identical universal green would be wholly located at each green object.
  - b. The green of each is one and the same entity which is multiply located.

### D. Universals and Time Travel

1. If whatever makes a person the person he happens to be is composed of instantiated universals, going back in time to meet yourself would be possible.
2. First-what makes a person who he is, say Bill, is made up of universals.
3. Second-a universal is capable of existing in distinct locations at the same time.
5. Hence, the universals that make up Bill can exist in different places at the same time.
6. So, it would be possible to have a person identical to Bill standing five feet from Bill.
7. This identical person could be the Bill from the future.
8. Since Bill and Bill from the future would be identical, they would be the same person.
9. Hence, if a person is composed of universals, then he could travel back in time to meet himself.
10. It would be a case of the same person existing in different locations at the same time.

## III Tropes

### A. Tropes

1. Keith Campbell rejects instantiated universals in favor of tropes.
2. A trope is a property (such as *being green*) that can only exist in one location at one time.
3. What it is for two tokens to be of the same type is explained in terms of resemblance.
  - a. Example: for six different objects to all be green would be for each object to have its own distinct green trope.
  - b. Each green trope would be a different entity from the others, but they would resemble each.
  - c. They would all be green because of their resemblance.

### B. No time travel with tropes?

1. If what makes a person the person he happens to be is composed of tropes, going back in time to meet yourself would seem to be impossible.
2. First- what makes a person who he is, say Sally, is made up of tropes.
3. Second-a trope is incapable of existing in distinct locations at the same time.
4. Hence, the tropes that make up Sally cannot exist in different places at the same time.
5. So, it would not be possible to have a person identical to Sally, say the Sally from the future, standing five feet from her.
6. A person could not travel back in time and meet herself because time travel is not possible.

### C. Relativity

1. According to modern physics, based on Einstein's special theory of relativity, there is no absolute and universal time.
  - a. Time is relative to each thing.
  - b. Time is relative in that each thing carries around its own personal time scale which does not, in general, agree with the time scale of other entities.
2. The relativity of time has been proven.
  - a. If one atomic clock is orbiting in the shuttle and another is left on earth, the orbiting clock will lag behind the earth clock.
  - b. The difference in time is due to the speed of the shuttle and its location in earth's gravity well.
3. Once relativity is established, the notion of same time goes out the window.
4. Each thing has its own time scale which varies with its location and speed, so there is no objective basis for sameness of time.
5. So, nothing can be in two different locations at the same time.
  - a. Being in a different location would put it in a different time.

### D. The End of Instantiated Universals

1. An instantiated universal has to exist in different places at the same time.
  2. Since there is no sameness of time, instantiated universals cannot exist as defined.
- E. Reconciling Tropes & Universals
1. People can be made of tropes, yet still be able to travel back in time to meet themselves.
  2. Example- Bill has traveled back in time to ask himself where he left his keys.
    - a. Bill tells future Bill where they are in return for a bit of advice on how to play the ponies later on.
  3. Both Bill and future Bill can be composed of identical tropes, yet still meet.
  4. This is possible because Bill and future Bill will actually exist at different times.
  5. Hence, there is no need for Bill and future Bill to exist at the same time.
  6. They simply have to have their times "close enough" to allow them to interact.
  7. Thus, I can have my tropes and time travel, too.

## Taoist Metaphysics

Taoist Metaphysics:

From *THE TAO TEH KING, OR THE TAO AND ITS CHARACTERISTICS* by Lao-Tse

Last Revised: 7/5/2005

### I The Tao

#### A. Origin of the Tao

1. It is not known whose son it is-it might have been before God.
2. There was something undefined and complete before Heaven and Earth.

#### B. Naming the Tao

1. The Tao that can be trodden is not the enduring and unchanging Tao.
2. The name that can be named is not the enduring and unchanging name.
3. (Conceived of as) having no name, it is the Originator of heaven and earth.
4. (conceived of as) having a name, it is the Mother of all things.
5. The Tao is the same under both aspects-it receives different names.

#### C. Names of the Tao

1. We look but do not see it and name it 'the Equable.'
2. We listen and do not hear it, and name it 'the Inaudible.'
3. We fail to grasp it and name it 'the Subtle.'
4. With these qualities, it cannot be described; and hence we blend them together and obtain The One.
5. Its name is not known.
6. It is designated as the Tao (the Way or Course).
7. It is called The Great.
8. It may be named in the smallest things.
9. It may be named in the greatest things.

#### D. The Tao and Water

1. The highest excellence is like (that of) water.
2. Its excellence is its benefiting all things and its occupying, without striving (to the contrary), the low place which all dislike.
3. Its way is near that of the Tao.

#### E. The Tao and Emptiness

1. The Tao is like the emptiness of a vessel.-It is deep and unfathomable.
2. The use of the wheel depends on the empty space for the axle.
3. The use of clay vessels depends on their empty hollowness.
4. The use of an apartment depends on the empty space.
5. What has a (positive) existence serves for profitable adaptation, and what has not that for (actual) usefulness.

#### F. Qualities of the Tao

1. Its upper part is not bright and its lower part is not obscure.
3. It cannot be named.
4. It again returns and becomes nothing.
5. This is called the Form of the Formless, the Semblance of the Invisible; and the Fleeting and Indeterminable.
6. Still and formless.
7. Standing alone, undergoing no change.
8. Reaching everywhere and in no danger of exhaustion.
9. The Great Tao is all pervading-it is on the left hand and on the right.

#### G. Passing On

1. The Tao passes on (in constant flow).
2. Passing on, it becomes remote.
3. Becoming remote, it returns.

#### H. Interacting with the Tao

1. We meet it and do not see its Front.
2. We follow it, and do not see its Back.
3. When we get hold of the Tao of old to direct things of today, and know it as it was of old, this is unwinding the clue of Tao.

## I. Law

1. Man takes his law from the Earth.
2. The Earth takes its law from Heaven.
3. Heaven takes its law from the Tao.
4. The law of the Tao is its being what it is.

## J. Action of the Tao

1. It is ceaseless in its action.
2. All things depend on it for their production and they obey it.
3. When its work is accomplished, it does not claim to have done it.
4. It clothes all things and does not assume to be their lord.

## K. Movement of the Tao

1. The Tao in its regular course does nothing (for the sake of doing it), and so there is nothing it does not do.
2. If princes and kings were could maintain it, all things would of themselves be transformed by them.
3. Simplicity without a name is free from all external aim.
4. With no desire, at rest and still, All things go right as of their will.
5. The movement of the Tao proceeds by contraries.
6. Weakness marks the course of Tao's mighty deeds.

## L. Production

1. The Tao is the Mother of all things.
2. The Tao produced One; One produced Two; Two produced Three; Three produced All things.
3. All things leave behind them the Obscurity (out of which they have come).
4. All things embrace the Brightness (into which they have emerged), while they are harmonized by the Breath of Vacancy.
5. Some things are increased by being diminished, and others are diminished by being increased.
6. All things under heaven sprang from It as existing (and named);
7. That existence sprang from It as non-existent (and not named).

## II The Sage

## A. The Sage does without doing

1. The sage manages affairs without doing anything, and conveys his instructions without speech.
2. The work is done, but no one can see how.

## B. Possessing the Tao

1. The report of fulfillment is the regular, unchanging rule.
2. To know that unchanging rule is to be intelligent.
3. Not to know it leads to wild movements and evil issues.
4. The knowledge of that unchanging rule produces capacity and forbearance.
5. Capacity and forbearance lead to a community (of feeling with all things).
6. From this community comes a kingliness of character.
7. He who is king-like goes on to be heaven-like.
8. In that likeness to heaven he possesses the Tao.
9. Possessed of the Tao, he endures long; and, until death, is exempt from decay.

## C. Desires

1. He whose desires are few gets them; he whose desires are many goes astray.

## D. The Sage

1. The sage embraces humility and manifests it to all.
2. Free of self-display, he shines.
3. Free from self-assertion, he is distinguished,
4. Free from self-boasting, his merit is acknowledged.
5. Free from self-complacency, he acquires superiority.
6. Free from striving, no one in the world is able to strive with him.

## E. Great

1. The Tao is great; Heaven is great; Earth is great; and the (sage) king is also great.
2. In the universe there are four that are great, and the (sage) king is one of them.
3. The sage is able, by not making himself great, to accomplish his great achievements.

## III Knowledge

## A. Opposites

1. Knowledge of beauty gives knowledge of ugliness.
2. Knowledge of skill gives knowledge of the lack of skill.

3. Knowledge of Existence gives knowledge of non-existence.
4. Knowledge of difficulty gives knowledge of ease.
5. Knowledge of length gives knowledge of shortness.
6. Knowledge of height give knowledge of lowness.
7. Musical notes and tones become harmonious through the relation of one with another.
8. Knowledge of being before gives knowledge of being behind.

## Part IV: Value

### Introduction to Ethics

Last Revised 7/13/2005

#### I What is Ethics?

##### A. Morality and Ethics

1. Morality: the customs, precepts and practices that deal with matters of good/bad and wrong/right.
2. Descriptive morality: A description of an actual morality.
  - a. This simply states the characteristics of the morality in question.
  - b. This is done in the social sciences
3. Ethics: the entire realm of morality and moral philosophy.
4. Meta Ethics: The investigation of the creation and assessment of moral theories.
5. Normative Ethics: The creation and application of moral standards.
6. Applied Ethics: The application of moral standards to specific cases/situations.

##### B. Moral Philosophy/Ethics (as a branch of philosophy)

1. A rational and systematic attempt to understand moral terms, statements, principles, and theories.
2. Analysis of moral terms, concepts, principles and theories.
3. Creating and assessing moral principles and theories,
4. Applying principles and theories to moral problems.

##### C. Some classic moral problems

1. Objective/subjective dispute: the problem of determining whether ethics is objective or subjective.
2. The problem of the basis of morality: the problem of determining the foundation of morality.
3. The Euthyphro problem: Is something good because God says it is good, or does God say it is good because it is good?
  - a. First presented by Plato in a dialogue of the same name.
  - b. Originally a question about the nature of piety, but now presented as a problem for divine command theory.
  - c. This raises problems about the relationship between morality and religion.
4. The scope of morality: the problem of determining who and what counts morally.
5. Specific enduring moral problems: euthanasia, capital punishment, suicide, abortion, lying, stealing.

##### D. Some Moral Questions

1. What is good?
2. What is evil?
3. What is the correct life to live?
4. Is stem cell research morally acceptable?
5. What is the basis, if anything is, of morality?
6. Is morality objective or subjective?
7. Is it morally acceptable to use torture as a means of combating terrorism?
8. Is euthanasia morally acceptable?
9. Are there moral rights?
10. Is it morally acceptable to cheat in a serious relationship?
11. Is cloning morally acceptable?
12. Is there a moral obligation to test oneself for STDs?

#### II Ethical Assessment and Value

##### A. Focus of Ethical Assessment

1. Moral theories are often defined in terms of the main focus for moral assessment.
2. Actions: right/wrong, obligatory, optional, neutral, superogatory (not obligatory, but going beyond duty).
3. Consequences: good, bad, indifferent.
4. Character: virtuous, vicious, neutral.
5. Motives: good, evil, neutral.

##### B. Value

1. Value is a key part of moral theory.
2. Value: A measure of worth; includes both moral and non-moral worth.
3. Positive Value/Negative Value
4. Extrinsic value: Derives its value from something else.
  - a. A means to an end.
  - b. Something useful.
  - c. Examples: money, medicine, education, work, etc.

5. Intrinsic value: Valuable in and of itself.
  - a. An end in itself.
  - b. Example: persons.

### III Spectrum of Morality

#### A. Introduction

1. Moral views can be placed on a spectrum ranging from absolutism to nihilism.

#### B. Absolutism

1. There is one correct solution to every moral problem.
2. Morality is objective-moral statements are true or false independently of what people think or believe.
3. No moral principle can be overridden by another.
4. No exceptions are permitted.
5. Example: Assuming lying is wrong, it would be wrong to lie, even to save a life.

#### C. Objectivism

1. Morality is objective.
2. Moral principles can override each other.
3. Exceptions are permitted.
4. Example: Assuming that lying is generally wrong, lying to save a life could be permissible.

#### D. Relativism

1. Morality is relative to or depends on the culture.
2. The truth of a moral statement depends on the culture in which it is made.

#### E. Subjectivism

1. Morality depends on the individual.
2. Morality is subjective and the truth of a moral statement depends on who makes the statement.

#### F. Moral nihilism.

1. There is no morality.
2. Morality is a deception or illusion.
3. All moral statements are false.
4. Moral nihilists do not deny that people talk about morality etc.
5. Moral nihilists view morality as the atheist views religion.

#### G. Moral skepticism.

1. The truth of moral claims cannot be known.

### IV Ethics and Other Normative Areas

#### A. Introduction

1. Ethics is a normative area-it deals with matters of norms (values).
2. There are other normative areas and these overlap with ethics.

#### B. Ethics

1. Assessment: Right/wrong, good/bad, virtue/vice
2. Basis: Varies-conscience, reason, self-interest, social agreement, nature, etc.
3. Punishments: Guilt, blame, bad reputation, non-legal punishment, suffering etc.
4. Rewards: Peace of mind, praise, good reputation, well-being etc.

#### C. Religion

1. Assessment: Righteous/sinful, holy/unholy, blasphemy.
2. Basis: religious authorities (such as priests) or divine being.
3. Punishment: Guilt, social punishment, punishment by divine agents (such as hell).
4. Rewards: Social rewards, divine reward (such as heaven).
5. Religion and ethics
  - a. Religion has often been used as the basis of morality.
  - b. Religion has often been assessed by moral standards.
  - c. Religion typical includes a moral aspect.
  - d. There is extensive overlap: religion raises many moral issues and morality raises many religious issues.

#### D. Law/Rules

1. Assessment: Legal/illegal
2. Basis: The authority of the lawmakers.
3. Punishment: Fines, prison terms, exile, death, torture, etc. inflicted by the enforcers of the law.
4. Rewards: Typically none.
5. Law and ethics
  - a. Laws can be immoral.
  - b. Something that is moral can be illegal.
  - c. There is a tradition of basing many laws on morality.

- d. Some immoral things are not illegal.
  - e. There is extensive overlap: law raises many moral issues and morality raise many legal issues.
- E. Etiquette
- 1. Assessment: Polite/impolite, proper/improper, rude.
  - 2. Basis: Social agreement, custom, etiquette authorities.
  - 3. Punishment: Social disapproval.
  - 4. Rewards: Social approval.
  - 5. Etiquette & Ethics
    - a. It can be immoral to ignore etiquette.
    - b. Things required by etiquette might be immoral.
    - c. There is a slight overlap.
- F. Aesthetics
- 1. Assessment: art/non-art, good/bad, beautiful/ugly
  - 2. Basis: Varies-reason, emotions, social agreement, etc.
  - 3. Punishment: Rejection, being ignored
  - 4. Reward: Acceptance, attention, possibly lucrative contracts and sales.
  - 5. Aesthetics & ethics
    - a. Things of beauty can be immoral.
    - b. There is some overlap: aesthetics raises some moral issues and morality sometimes involves aesthetic issues.
- G. Distinct
- 1. While these areas do overlap and interact, it is important to keep them distinct.
  - 2. Example: Law
    - a. Being illegal does not entail that something is automatically immoral.
    - b. Being immoral does not entail that something is automatically illegal.
    - c. Being moral does not entail that something is automatically legal.
    - d. Being legal does not entail that something is automatically moral.
  - 3. There are theories that do argue for such entailments.
    - a. Example: One form of divine command theory takes the will of God to define what is good.
    - b. Example: Legal positivism is the view that the law determines what is moral.

## V Some Moral Theories

- A. Aretaic/Virtue Theory
- 1. The basis of moral assessment is character.
  - 2. The focus is on the moral agent rather than the actions.
- B. Cognitivism
- 1. Moral statements are true or false.
  - 2. Moral statements do not just express feelings/emotions.
  - 3. The truth or falsity of such statements is based on the presence or absence of properties.
- C. Cultural Relativism
- 1. Different cultures have different moral principles.
  - 2. An anthropological rather than ethical thesis.
  - 3. Is used to argue for ethical relativism.
- D. Divine Command Theory
- 1. What the divine commands is good.
  - 2. What the divine forbids is evil.
  - 3. Morality is based on religion.
- E. Deontology
- 1. Derived from "deon", which is Greek for "duty."
  - 2. The position that certain features of an action are wrong or right.
  - 3. It is a rule following position:
    - a. An action is wrong if it violates the moral rules.
    - b. An action is right if it confirms to the moral rules.
    - c. An action is neutral if it is neither prohibited nor endorsed.
  - 4. One this view, actions possess intrinsic value.
- F. Ethical Egoism
- 1. Psychological egoism-people always act in what they see as their own best interest.
  - 2. Ethical egoism-people should act in accord with what they see as their own best interests.
  - 3. Hobbes
- G. Ethical Relativism
- 1. Morality is not objective.
  - 2. The validity of moral statements is based on the society/culture.

3. Moral statements are true or false, but their truth value is relative to the culture.

4. Herodotus, Harmon

#### H. Emotivism

1. Noncognitivism-ethical statements are neither true nor false.

2. Moral statements express attitudes and feelings.

3. Example: "Stealing is wrong" = "stealing-yuck."

4. A.J. Ayer

#### I. Error Theory

1. Argument

a. If moral principles are objectively valid, there must be moral facts/properties.

b. There are no moral facts/properties.

c. There are no moral truths.

2. It is an error to believe there are moral truths.

3. J.L. Mackie.

#### J. Hedonism

1. Psychological hedonism: Motivation is explained by desire for pleasure and aversion to pain.

2. Ethical Hedonism:

a. Only pleasure has intrinsic positive value.

b. Only pain has intrinsic negative value.

#### K. Intuitionism

1. The right or good can be known by direct intuition.

2. G.E. Moore-good.

3. W.D. Ross-right.

#### L. Moral Anti-Realism and Realism

1. Moral Realism: Moral facts or properties have an objective existence.

a. Plato and the Good.

2. Moral Anti-Realism: Moral facts or properties do not have an objective existence.

#### M. Moral Skepticism

1. We cannot know whether moral claims are true or not.

#### N. Natural Law

1. An eternal, absolute moral law is discoverable by reason.

2. Stoics

3. Thomas Aquinas

#### O. Naturalism

1. Ethical terms are defined via factual terms.

2. Ethical terms refer to natural properties.

3. Example: Ethical Hedonism-defines good and bad in terms of the natural properties of pleasure and pain.

#### P. Prescriptivism

1. Noncognitive theory.

2. Moral statements are neither true nor false.

3. Moral statements go beyond mere expressions of attitudes/emotions.

4. Moral statements are universal prescriptions

a. Judging that a particular person Y should do X implies that anyone in Y's circumstances should do X.

5. R.M. Hare

#### Q. Subjectivism

1. Morality is relative to the individual.

2. Morality is not objective.

3. The validity of moral statements depends on the individual.

#### R. Teleology

1. Derived from "telos", which is Greek for "end" or "goal."

2. The view that the ultimate criterion for morality lies in a nonmoral value that results from actions.

3. It is a consequentialist position:

a. An action is right to the degree that it maximizes positive value for the morally relevant beings.

b. An action is wrong to the degree that it produces negative value for the morally relevant beings.

5. Example: Mill's Theory

## Utilitarianism

### I. Introduction

#### A. Defined

1. An action is morally right when it maximizes utility for the morally relevant beings.

2. An action is morally wrong when it fails to maximize utility for the morally relevant beings.
3. This is a teleological and consequentialist approach to ethics because it is focused on the outcomes of actions.

#### B. Utility

1. Utility must be defined.
2. Utility, in general, is what is accepted as valuable or the end of action by the theory.
3. Examples of what has been considered to be of utility include: Pleasure, happiness, desires, and interests

#### C. Relevant Beings

1. The morally relevant beings must be determined.
2. Morally Relevant Beings: The beings to be taken into account when calculating utility.
  - a. Mill: All mankind and, as far as the nature of things permits, all of sentient creation.

#### D. Act and Rule Utilitarianism

1. Act Utilitarianism: The theory that an action is right if and only if it generates as much utility for the morally relevant beings as any alternative.
2. Rule Utilitarianism: The theory that an action is right if and only if the action is required by a rule that is within a set of rules that, if accepted, would maximize utility for the morally relevant beings.

#### E. Proponents

1. Jeremy Bentham
2. J.S. Mill
3. Henry Sidgwick

## II Appeal

#### A. Costs and Benefits

1. Outside of morality, people seem naturally inclined to make decisions based on weighing utility.
2. In business, companies aim at maximizing profit and make decisions based on calculating costs and benefits.
3. In democratic governments, policies are supposed to weigh costs and benefits so as to maximize utility for the citizens.
4. The appeal of this approach extends to utilitarianism.

#### B. Democracy

1. The notion of aiming for the greatest good for the greatest number matches the democratic ideal.
2. The notion of majority rule is part of the democratic ideal.
2. Thus, democracy lends its appeal to utilitarianism.

#### C. Moral Intuitions

1. In many cases the notion that we should act to create the greatest utility has great intuitive appeal.
2. Doctor example
  - a. A plane crash in a remote location injures six people.
  - b. The only doctor available knows she can either save five people and let the most injured die or save the most injured person and let 3-4 of the others die.
  - c. Most peoples' moral intuitions lead them to believe the doctor should save the five over the one.
3. Collision Example
  - a. A truck driver rounds a corner and sees a motorcycle coming towards him.
  - b. He can swerve to avoid the motorcycle but in doing so, he will run over a group of children crossing the road.
  - c. Most peoples' moral intuitions lead them to believe that the truck driver should avoid the children and risk hitting the motorcycle.

## John Stuart Mill (1806-1873)

### I Background

#### A. Background

1. Born May 20, 1806 in Pentonville, London, England
2. Died May 8, 1873 in Avignon, France

#### B. Education

1. Educated by his father, Jeremy Bentham and Francis Place.
2. Had an extremely rigorous upbringing and was not allowed to associate with boys his own age.
3. His father, a follower of Bentham intended to create a genius to further the cause of utilitarianism.
4. At three he learned the Greek alphabet and Greek words.
5. By eight he had read Aesop's Fables, Xenophon's Anabasis, Herodotus, Lucian, Diogenes Laërtius, Isocrates, six Platonic dialogues, history in English and had learned arithmetic.
6. At twelve he studied scholastic logic and Aristotle's logical treatises in Greek.
7. At thirteen he studied Adam Smith and David Ricardo.
8. At 21 he had a nervous breakdown.

#### C. Life

1. Worked for the British East India Company.
2. A Liberal member of Parliament.

3. In 1851 he married Harriet Taylor.

#### D. Works

1. (1843) *A System of Logic*
2. (1844) *Essays on Some Unsettled Questions of Political Economy*
3. (1848) *Principles of Political Economy*
4. (1859) *On Liberty*
5. (1861) *Utilitarianism*
6. (1861) *Considerations on Representative Government*
7. (1869) *The Subjection of Women*
8. (1873) *Autobiography*

## Utilitarianism

-John Stuart Mill

Revised: 7/26/2005

### I What Utilitarianism Is

A. Foundation of morals: "utility" or "the greatest happiness principle."

1. Actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness; wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness.
2. Happiness: pleasure and the absence of pain.
3. Unhappiness: pain and the privation of pleasure.

B. Ends

1. Pleasure and freedom from pain are the only things desirable as ends.
2. All desirable things are desirable for their inherent pleasure or as means to promoting pleasure and preventing pain.

### II The "Pig" Objection

A. The Objection

1. Supposing life has no higher end than pleasure is mean, groveling and a doctrine worthy only of swine.
2. This charge was originally made against the Epicureans.
3. Epicurean Reply: The accusers show human nature in a degrading light since the accusation supposes humans capable of only swinish pleasures.

B. Mill's Reply

1. If humans and pigs had the same pleasures the same rule of life would be good for both.
2. The comparison is degrading because a beast's pleasures don't satisfy a human's conceptions of happiness.
3. Humans have faculties above animal appetites and, if aware of them, don't see as happiness anything leaving out their gratification.

C. Differences of Quality in Pleasures

1. Mental pleasures are superior to the bodily due to circumstantial advantages and not intrinsically.
2. The principle of utility is compatible with some pleasures being more valuable.
3. In other cases quality and quantity are considered, so it would be absurd for pleasure's assessment to depend only on quantity.

D. Basis of the difference of quality in pleasures.

1. The more desirable pleasure is one which all/almost all who experience both prefer regardless of any moral obligation.
2. One pleasure has superior quality if those competently acquainted with both, prefer it to any quantity of the other even if accompanied by greater discontent.

E. Preference

1. Those acquainted with and capable of appreciating both prefer a life using higher faculties.
2. Few humans would consent to be changed to a lower animal for its fullest pleasures.
3. They wouldn't give up their greater qualities for the complete satisfaction of all desires they have in common.
4. If they thought they would, it would only be because of such unhappiness they would accept any escape.

F. Higher Faculties

1. A being of higher faculties requires more to make him happy and is capable of more acute suffering.
2. Despite these liabilities, he can't wish to sink into a lower existence.
3. Why: pride, love of liberty and personal independence, love of power or excitement, dignity.

G. Happiness & Contentment

1. Supposing the superior, in equal circumstances, is less happy than the inferior confuses happiness and contentment.
2. It is better to be a human being dissatisfied than a pig satisfied;
3. Better to be Socrates dissatisfied than a fool satisfied.
4. If the fool or pig thinks otherwise it is because they only know their side while the other party knows both.

H. Objection

1. Many capable of higher pleasures are tempted to postpone them to the lower.

2. This is compatible with the intrinsic superiority of the higher.
3. Men, from weakness, often chose the nearer though lesser good.
4. They pursue pleasures injurious to health, though aware health is the greater good.
5. People addict themselves to inferior pleasures, not from deliberate preference, but because they are the only ones they have access to or the only ones they can now enjoy.

#### I. Competent Judges

1. The better of two pleasures is determined by the judgment of the majority of those who have knowledge of both.
2. This is the sole tribunal on quality and quantity.
3. When judgment declares the pleasures of the higher faculties preferable to the animal they are entitled to the same regard.

#### III Stand, End and Scope

##### A. Standard

1. That standard is not the agent's own greatest happiness, but the greatest amount of happiness altogether.

##### B. End and Scope

1. Ultimate end: an existence exempt as exempt from pain and as rich in enjoyments as possible, both in quantity and quality.
2. Being the end of human action, it is necessarily the standard of morality.
3. Scope: To the greatest extent possible, secure to all mankind and so far as the nature of things admits, to the whole sentient creation.

#### IV Of What Sort of Proof the Principle of Utility Is Susceptible

##### A. Questions of ultimate ends cannot be proven in the ordinary sense.

1. No first principles of knowledge or conduct can be proven by reasoning.
2. Principles of knowledge, as matters of fact, are subject to a direct appeal to faculties judging fact- senses and consciousness.
3. Questions about ends are questions about what is desirable.
4. Utilitarian doctrine: happiness is the only thing desirable as an end; all others are desirable as means to that end.

##### B. The Analogy

1. The only possible proof that an object is visible is that people see it.
2. The only proof that a sound is audible is that people hear it; and so of the other sources of experience.
3. By analogy, the sole evidence that anything is desirable is that people desire it.
4. No reason can be given why the general happiness is desirable, except that each person desires his own happiness.

##### C. All possible proof and all that is required:

1. Happiness is a good.
2. Each person's happiness is a good to that person,
3. The general happiness, therefore, is a good to the aggregate of all persons.
4. Happiness is thus one of the ends of conduct and, consequently, one of the criteria of morality.

#### V Objection & Reply

##### A. Objection-People desire things other than happiness.

1. Happiness has not been shown to be the sole criterion.
2. It must be shown that people desire happiness and nothing else.
3. People do desire things which are distinguished from happiness, such as virtue and the absence of vice.
4. So opponents infer there are other ends besides happiness, and happiness is not the standard of morality.

##### B. Virtue & Happiness

1. People desire virtue and it is to be desired disinterestedly, for itself.
2. The ingredients of happiness are various, and each is desirable in itself, and not just as adding to an aggregate.
3. The principle of utility does not mean any pleasure or exemption from pain is a means to happiness and thus to be desired.
4. They are desirable in and of themselves-besides being means they are part of the end.
5. Virtue is not naturally and originally part of the end, but can become so.
6. In the virtuous virtue is desired not as a means but as a part of their happiness.

##### C. Love of Money

1. There is nothing originally more desirable about money than about glittering pebbles.
2. Its worth lies solely in the desires for other things
3. From being a means it can become a principle ingredient of a person's conception of happiness.

##### D. Love of Power and Fame

1. What is true of the love of money is true of the great objects of human life such as power or fame.
2. The strongest attraction of power and fame is the immense aid they give to attaining our other wishes.
3. The means can become part of the end, and a more important part than what they are means to.
4. Happiness is not an abstract idea but a concrete whole; and these are some of its parts.
5. The utilitarian standard sanctions and approves their being so.

##### F. Virtue contrasted with the Love of Money, Power or Fame

1. Virtues differs from the love of money, power, or fame.
2. These loves might render an individual noxious to others.
3. Love of virtue makes a person a blessing.
4. Utilitarians accept other desires unless they become more injurious to the general happiness than promoting.
5. Utilitarianism holds the cultivation of the love of virtue as most important to the general happiness.

#### G. Happiness

1. Nothing is desired except happiness.
2. Whatever is desired as a means to happiness, is desired as a part of happiness, and not desired for itself until it has become so.
3. Those who desire virtue for its own sake desire it because it is a pleasure or being without it is a pain.

#### H. Proof of the principle of utility.

1. If human nature is such it desires only what is part of or a means to happiness there is no other proof or any other needed that these are the only things desirable.
2. If so, happiness is the sole end of human action, and its promotion the test to judge all human conduct.
3. It necessarily follows that it must be the criterion of morality, since a part is included in the whole.

## Problems with Utilitarianism

### I Internal Problems

#### A. Formulation

1. Utilitarianism aims at maximizing value for the morally relevant beings.
2. Does this mean that the most value should be created for the existing relevant beings or that more of them should be created?
3. Should value be maximized in terms of the total, an average or per individual?
4. How is value to be measured and compared between individuals?
5. Utilitarian theorists need to address these formulation problems and can reply to these problems by doing just that.

#### B. Consequences

1. The consequences of an action can extend indefinitely making moral assessment seemingly impossible except for someone who is omniscient.
2. This makes moral assessment problematic because an action that initial seems right (or wrong) could have terrible (or great) consequences.
  - a. Example: American medics save Ho Chi Min's life, but he goes on to lead Vietnam into communism.
  - b. Example: During a mugging, a criminal kills unknowingly kills a terrorist mastermind thus averting an event that would have killed and injured dozens or even hundreds of innocent people.

#### C. Response

1. C.I. Lewis argues that consequences can be divided into three types.
2. The actual consequences of an action: an action is absolutely right if it produces the best maximization of value.
  - a. Example: If Hitler had been killed as a child by a kidnapper.
3. Reasonably foreseeable consequences of an action: an action is objectively right if it is reasonable to belief that it would normally maximize what is of value.
  - a. Example: The medics treating Ho Chi Min who was an ally at the time.
4. Intended Consequences: an action is subjectively right if the agent sincerely intended to maximize what is of value.
  - a. Example: A doctor gives a patient a shot that has been mislabeled thus injuring her, though he intended to cure her.

### II External Problems

#### A. Problem: Unreasonable Expectations

1. Moral theories need to place reasonable expectations on moral agents.
2. For the utilitarian, the action that is right is the one that maximizes utility.
3. Most of the time a person could be taking an action that would create more utility than what they are doing at that moment.
  - a. Example: instead of playing a computer game, a person could be helping the poor.
4. Most of the resources expended by most people could be better expended to maximize utility.
  - a. Example: instead of buying fancy rims for his car, a person could donate the money to a homeless shelter.
5. However, these expectations would place an unreasonable burden on moral agents.
6. Given that the theory requires too much, it is an unreasonable moral theory.

#### B. Reply: Rules

1. The rule utilitarian can reply that these act utilitarian requirements would lead to overall disutility.
2. Thus, on rule utilitarian grounds people should be held to realistic expectations because this set of rules would maximize utility.

#### C. Problem: The rights of minorities

1. Utilitarianism seems to justify the violation of the rights of minorities provided that such violations create more utility than disutility.
2. Example: Turning an innocent person over to a crowd to prevent a riot that could kills many people.
3. Example: Permitting the economic exploitation of the minority to benefit the majority.
4. Example: "Those who walk away from Omelas"

5. Example: Framing an innocent person to allay public fears about a dangerous criminal.

6. Example: Killing an innocent person to use his/her organs to save other people.

#### D. Reply: Rules

1. Rule utilitarians claim that what should be assessed is the consequences if the rule of the action were adopted as a general rule.

2. They claim that the violation of the rights of minorities and permitting terrible things would create more disutility than utility when considered as general practices.

3. Example: If people knew it was a rule that innocent people could be sacrificed to appease mobs or framed, then people would be afraid and would distrust the authority.

4. We should adopt the set of rules that are most likely to bring about the most utility most of the time.

5. In cases of conflicts between the rules, then the acts are to be assessed using act utilitarianism.

a. Example: lying is usually wrong, but if there is a choice between saving a life and telling a lie, one should lie.

6. Opponents argue that rule utilitarianism collapses back to act utilitarianism, because the basis of assessment is still the principle of utility.

#### E. Problem: Nothing is Forbidden

1. The theory seems to permit terrible things provided the utility outweighs the disutility.

2. Aside from disutility, there is nothing that is intrinsically wrong.

a. Murder, rape, genocide, torture, etc. could all be good under the right circumstances.

#### F. Reply: Happiness and human nature

1. Utilitarians like Mill claim that human happiness requires acting and being a certain way, including being virtuous.

2. Human beings cannot be happier when they are committing rape, murder, genocide and so forth.

3. Opponents argue that these terrible things do seem to make some people happy and that even if they do not make everyone happy now, it is easy to imagine a vicious species or a change in humanity.

4. This makes morality arbitrarily dependent on what the majority happens to be.

#### G. Problem: Absurd Implications

1. Developed by William D. Ross

2. If two actions create the same utility, then they are of equal value.

3. Yet, telling a lie could have the same utility as telling the truth.

4. But this seems absurd since the truth seems to be intrinsically good.

#### H. Reply

1. It can be argued that the consequences only seem absurd because of a cultural bias towards truth.

2. If lying promoted utility as well as truth, then their equal value would need to be accepted.

3. It can also be argued that our moral intuitions already incline us towards accepting lies in some cases.

#### I. Problem: Integrity

1. Developed by Bernard Williams.

2. A tourist is given a choice:

a. If he kills one native, the army will let the others live.

b. If he refuses, the soldiers will kill all the natives.

3. On utilitarian ground, he should kill the one native.

4. Williams argues that utilitarianism would lead to alienation, so it is flawed.

#### J. Reply

1. It can be contended that some alienation is a necessary and unavoidable aspect of morality.

2. The utilitarian can take this into account when calculating utility.

3. Moral decisions often require choosing among evils.

## Deontology

### I Introduction

#### A. Defined

1. Derived from "deon", which is Greek for "duty."

2. The position that certain features of an action are wrong or right.

3. This contrasts with the consequentialist position.

### II Rule-Deontological Theories

#### A. Defined

1. A rule following position.

2. An action is wrong if it violates the correct moral rules.

3. An action is right if it conforms to the correct moral rules.

4. An action is neutral if it is neither prohibited nor endorsed.

5. Actions have intrinsic value.

#### B. Rules

1. The deontologist needs to provide the correct rules.
  2. A list, as in the Ten Commandments.
  3. Or a rule for generating rules, as in Kant's theory.
  4. Ross held that the rules would be found via intuitions-those of the "thoughtful and well-educated people."
  5. Kant held that the rules are to be found via reason.
  4. Ross held that the rules are objective, but can be overridden.
  5. Kant argues that the rules are objective but are absolute-there are no exceptions to a correct rule.
- C. Proponents
1. Kant
  2. Ross
  3. Rawls
- D. Appeal
1. The theory provides clear and definite answers without gray areas.
  2. The theory provides guides for action in the form of rules.
  3. People are accustomed to following rules.
  4. There is a correspondence with law.
  5. The theory matches our moral intuition that some actions are right and others are wrong, regardless of the consequences.
    - a. Example: Scrapping a person for organs in order to save other people.
    - b. Example: Exterminating people with incurable and transmittable diseases.

## Kantian Ethics: Introduction

### I Introduction

- A. Theoretical Reason
1. Theoretical reason is reason that yields knowledge of the world of experience.
  2. This deals with "the starry heavens" and the physical nature.
  3. Physical bodies are governed by scientific laws.
  4. Kant claims that we encounter both physical objects and persons.
  5. We experience bodies from the outside, but experience personhood from outside and inside (our own personhood).
- B. Practical Reason
1. Kant claims that people feel the draw of "the moral law within."
  2. This law is a governing principle but differs from the laws governing natural objects.
  3. While he divides reason, he claims that "in the final analysis there can be but one and the same reason which must be different only in application."
- C. Ethical Works
1. 1785: *The Foundation of the Metaphysics of Morals*.
  2. 1787: *The Critique of Practical Reason*.
- D. Emphasis
1. He places an emphasis on duties, motives, the dignity and moral worth of persons, plus an unchanging and absolute moral law.
  2. He does not use God as the basis for his ethics.
  3. He claims that our ability to identify God with the greatest good and to regard historical religious figures as good requires a pre-existing a priori concept of moral perfection.
- E. Rationalism
1. Morality cannot be derived from empirical facts about humans.
  2. Like Hume, he agrees that we cannot go from an "is" to an "ought."
  3. He solves this problem by his "Copernican revolution."
  4. If moral principles cannot be derived from what is experienced, then the mind must apply its own rational principles of morality to said experience.
  5. So, for Kant acting morally is acting rationally and immorality is a form of irrationality.

## Kantian Ethics: Good Will, Duty and the Categorical Imperative

### Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysics of Morals

#### I The Good Will

- A. The Good Will and Qualities
1. Only the good will is good without qualification.
  2. Intelligence, wit, judgment, courage, resolution, and perseverance are good but may become bad without a good will.
  3. Power, riches, honor, health, and happiness, inspire pride and presumption without a good will to correct their influence.
- B. Worthiness of Happiness
1. Seeing one without a good will enjoying prosperity cannot please an impartial rational spectator.

2. So, a good will is necessary to being worthy of happiness.

### C. Virtues

1. Some qualities serve the good will but lack intrinsic unconditional value—they presuppose a good will.
2. Moderation, self-control, and calm deliberation are good and seem to be part of the intrinsic worth of a person.
3. They are not good without qualification, though the ancients thought so.
4. Without the principles of a good will, they may become bad.
  - a. The coolness of a villain makes him more dangerous and abominable.

### D. The Goodness of the Good Will

1. A good will is good in itself—not because of what it does or its ability to obtain an end.
2. It is to be esteemed much higher than all it can bring about.
3. If it couldn't achieve its purpose and only it remained—not a wish, but a summoning of all one's power, like a jewel, it would shine by its own light, having its whole value in itself.
4. Its usefulness or fruitlessness cannot add nor take away from this value.

## III Moral Worth, Maxim & Universal Law

### A. Moral Worth

1. The moral worth of an action is not in its expected effect nor a principle of action motivated by its expected effect.
2. All positive effects and promotion of the happiness of others could have been caused other ways.
3. So there would have been no need of the will of a rational being.

### B. The Good

1. The supreme and unconditional good is only in the good will.
2. The pre-eminent good consists only in the conception of law—as far as it, and not the expected effect, determines the will.
3. This is possible only in a rational being.
4. This good is already present in the person and there is no need to wait for it to appear in the result.

### C. Law

1. The universal conformity of the will's actions to law in general alone serves the will as a principle.
2. I am never to act otherwise than so that I could also will that my maxim should become a universal law.
3. Proof: The common reason of men perfectly coincides with this.

### D. Example

1. May I when in distress make a promise with the intention not to keep it?
2. Two questions:
  - a. Is it prudent?
  - b. Is it right?
3. It is different to be truthful from duty and to be truthful from fear of injurious consequences.
  - a. To deviate from the principle of duty is wicked.
  - b. Ignoring my maxim of prudence may be advantageous, although abiding by it is safer.
4. The shortest and unerring way to determine if a lying promise is consistent with duty is to ask:
  - a. Should I accept that my maxim be a universal law for myself and others?
  - b. Should I be able to say: "Everyone may make a deceitful promise when he finds himself in a difficulty from which he cannot otherwise extricate himself"?
5. I cannot will that lying be a universal law—there would be no promises since none would believe promises.
6. Hence my maxim as a universal law would necessarily destroy itself.

### E. Determining the Good

1. To determine what must be done to have a good will ask "Canst thou also will that thy maxim should be a universal law?"
3. If not, it must be rejected, not because of a disadvantage, but because it cannot be a principle of possible universal legislation.

### F. Duty

1. Duty is the necessity of acting from pure respect for the practical law.
2. Every other motive must yield to this because it is the condition of a good will and its worth is above everything.

## IV The Categorical Imperative

### A. Law & Will

1. Everything in nature works according to laws.
2. Only rational beings have a will—the faculty of acting according to the conception of laws or principles.

### B. Imperatives

1. All imperatives command either hypothetically or categorically.
2. Hypothetical: If the action is good only as a means to something else.
3. Categorical: it is conceived as good in itself and is necessarily the principle of a will which conforms to reason.
4. The categorical imperative: Act only on that maxim whereby thou canst at the same time will that it should become a universal law.
5. The imperative of duty: Act as if the maxim of thy action were to become by thy will a universal law of nature.

## IV Examples

## A. Case #1: Suicide

1. The situation: A man reduced to despair by a series of misfortunes is weary of life.
  - a. He asks if it would be against his duty to himself to commit suicide.
2. Maxim: From self-love, I will end my life when its continuation is likely to bring more evil than satisfaction.
3. Test: Can this principle become a universal law of nature?
  - a. A system of nature including a law to destroy life by means of what is to impel its improvement contradicts itself.
  - b. Thus, it could not exist as a system of nature.
  - c. Hence the maxim cannot exist as a universal law of nature and is inconsistent with the supreme principle of all duty.

## B. Case #2: Lying Promises

1. The situation: A person is forced to borrow money.
  - a. He knows he cannot repay it, but knows he will not get it unless he promises to repay it.
  - b. He wants to promise, but asks: Is it not unlawful and inconsistent with duty to get out of a difficulty in this way?
2. Maxim: when I need money, I will borrow it and promise to repay it, though I know I cannot.
3. Test: The maxim may be consistent with one's future welfare, but is it right?
  - a. It could never be a universal law of nature, but would necessarily contradict itself.
  - b. If it were a universal law that everyone could lie to get out of difficulty:
    1. The promise and intended end would be impossible.
    2. Promises would not be believed and ridiculed as vain pretences.

## C. Case #3.

1. Situation: A person has a talent that, if developed, might make him useful in many respects.
  - a. Being in comfortable circumstances, he prefers to indulge in pleasure rather than take pains to improve his natural capacities.
2. Test: Can his maxim of neglect, agreeing with his inclination to indulgence, agree with duty?
  - a. Such a system of nature could subsist though men allow their talents to rest, and devote themselves to enjoyment.
  - b. He cannot will this to be a universal law of nature.
  - d. As a rational being, he necessarily wills his faculties be developed, since they serve him, and were given for many purposes.

## D. Case #4.

1. The situation: One in prosperity sees others in wretchedness and though he could help, he sees it as no concern of his.
  - a. Everyone can be as happy as Heaven pleases, or as he can make himself.
  - b. He will take nothing from or envy him, but does not wish to assist him.
2. Test:
  - a. If this were a universal law, the human race might be better than when
    1. Everyone talks of sympathy and goodwill, or occasionally practices it.
    2. But cheats and betrays or violates the rights of men.
  - b. But, it is impossible to will that such a principle have the universal validity of a law of nature.
  - c. Such a will would contradict itself:
    1. He might need the love and sympathy of others.
    2. But by such a law of nature he would deprive himself of all hope of aid.

## V Ends

## A. Rational Beings

1. Man and all rational being exist as an end in himself, not merely as a means to be arbitrarily used.
2. In all his actions, whether concerning himself or other rational beings, they must be regarded as an end.

## B. Objects of the inclination

1. Objects of the inclinations have only a conditional worth.
2. If the inclinations founded on them did not exist, they would be without value.
3. The worth of any object to be acquired by our action is always conditional.
4. Beings whose existence depends on nature's will have only a relative value as means, and are hence things.

## C. Rational Beings

1. Rational beings are persons, because their nature shows them as ends in themselves, which must not be used only as means.
2. These are not merely subjective ends whose existence has a worth for us as an effect of our action.
3. They are objective ends, whose existence is an end in itself.
4. If all worth were contingent, there would be no supreme practical principle of reason whatever.

## D. Supreme practical principle (Second Formulation of the CI)

1. If there is a Supreme practical principle it must be drawn from what is necessarily an end for everyone.
2. The foundation of this principle is: rational nature exists as an end in itself
3. A man necessarily conceives his own existence as such, making it a subjective principle of human action.
4. Every other rational being sees its existence similarly, on the same rational principle
5. So it is an objective principle, from which as a supreme practical law and all laws can be deduced.

6. The practical imperative: So act as to treat humanity, whether in thine own person or in that of any other, in every case as an end withal, never as means only.

#### E. Kingdom of Ends

1. Kingdom: the union of different rational beings in a system by common laws.
2. It is by laws that the universal validity of ends is determined.
3. If we abstract from the personal differences of rational beings and from their private ends, we can conceive all ends combined in a systematic whole.
4. This includes rational beings as ends in themselves, and the special ends each may propose to himself.
5. Thus, we can conceive a kingdom of ends.

#### F. Rational Beings as Legislators (Third formulation of the Categorical Imperative).

1. Kant focuses on “the idea of the will of every rational being as making universal law.”
2. Known as the principle of autonomy.
3. For Kant, the autonomy of the will is based on freedom.
4. When one’s moral principles are based on external authority or one’s own inclinations, the will is not free.
5. The moral law is not something that is imposed from outside-it is an expression of one’s own rational nature.
6. As moral agents, rational beings are bound by moral law.
7. Rational beings are autonomous legislators of moral law.
8. In the kingdom of Ends everyone is autonomous, yet follows the same moral laws.

## **Kantian Ethics: Three Postulates of Morality**

### I Three Postulates

#### A. Introduction

1. There are three ideas that are unprovable and cannot be the objects of knowledge, but are irresistible because they are the foundation of all morality.
2. They are: freedom, immortality and God.

#### B. Freedom

1. Human freedom must be accepted for morality to make sense.
2. Freedom cannot be observed scientifically-for Kant, the scientific view is that all events are determined by natural causes and human behavior is analyzable in psychological and physiological terms.
3. In inner moral experience it is found that the moral law command unconditional obedience.
4. If X is what I ought to do, this implies that X is something that I can do.
5. Hence, only free agents can meet the requirements of morality.
6. Thus, there is a noumenal self beyond the empirical self which is the basis of moral actions.
7. This freedom is unprovable, but is a practical necessity for morality.
8. Human life would be meaningless without morality, hence humans must regard themselves as free.

#### C. Immortality

1. For Kant, the moral law is strict-we are obligated to make our will conform perfectly with duty.
2. No one can meet this requirement during life.
3. Thus, immortality is a practical necessity-endless time is required to achieve the perfect conformity.
4. “This infinite progress is possible, however only the presupposition of an infinitely enduring existence and personality of the same rational being; this is called the immortality of the soul.”

#### D. God

1. The hope for eternal life cannot be the motive for doing right.
2. If one is motivated by this, then one is not doing good out of duty but based on a calculation of interest.
3. According to Kant, we intuitively want moral goodness to be linked with happiness.
4. In experience, no necessary connection is found between virtue and happiness.
5. For this intuition to make sense there must be a transcendent cause bringing about a just future distribution of happiness.
6. Thus, “it is morally necessary to assume the existence of God.”
7. Morality is rational and independent of God’s will, yet morality naturally leads to religion.

## **Problem with Deontology & Kant’s Theory**

### I Problems

#### A. Problem: Duty

1. Duty is regarded by some as inadequate as a basis for morality.
2. One is inclined to ask “a duty to do what and why?”
3. Determining the answer to “why” often seems to result in an abstract answer that is not well connected to normal life.

#### B. Reply

1. Deontologists attempt to answer these questions within their theories.

2. Also, it seems to beg the question to assume that morality must be grounded in normal life.

C. Problem: Inflexibility

1. The absolutist's moral rules permit neither exception nor allow us to take into account the consequences of an action.
2. Our moral intuitions seem to favor allowing exceptions in certain circumstances.
  - a. Example: Lying is generally wrong, except to save a life, etc.
3. Our moral intuitions also seem to favor the view that we should sometimes take the consequences of actions into account.
  - a. Example: A doctor at an accident scene.

D. Reply

1. Suitable construction of the rules can allow for the apparent exceptions and concern about consequences to be adequately handled.
2. One can simply "bite the bullet" and argue that there are no exceptions and the consequences are irrelevant.

E. Problem: Rationality (Kant)

1. Critics of Kant are quick to point out that his theory gives non-rational beings no intrinsic moral weight while giving rational beings absolute worth.
2. Those who think non-rational beings have value see this as a flaw.
3. Why should rationality alone have intrinsic value?

F. Reply

1. Why think that non-rational beings have worth?

G. Problem: Terrible Maxims seem to pass Kant's test.

1. Suppose George hates the French and wants them all dead.
2. His maxim: "I give myself permission to kill the French."
2. The universal "Everyone has permission to kill the French."
3. There is no contradiction, so killing the French would be acceptable.
4. The same can be done with other cases.

H. Reply

1. Such maxims seem to involve defects in a being's rationality.
2. Such maxims also seem to violate the other formulations of Kant's categorical imperative.

I. Problem: Kingdom of Ends

1. Kant's view that rational beings must be treated as ends has limited use.
2. It does tell us we should not enslave or exploit others, but does not tell us how to resolve many moral conflicts or what it means, in the concrete, to treat beings as ends.

J. Reply

1. It can be argued that careful reflection on this will provide concrete applications.

## Introduction to Aesthetics

A. Aesthetics

1. General Definition: A branch of philosophy concerned with theories of art and beauty.
2. Descriptive aesthetics: A description of a culture's, group's or person's aesthetic views.
  - a. This simply states the characteristics of the aesthetics in question.
  - b. This is done in the social sciences, art history, etc.
3. Meta Aesthetics: The investigation of the creation and assessment of aesthetic theories.
4. Normative Aesthetics: The creation and application of aesthetic standards.
5. Applied Aesthetics: The application of aesthetic standards to specific cases/situations.

B. Aesthetics

1. A rational and systematic attempt to understand aesthetic statements, principles and theories.
2. Analysis of aesthetic concepts and terms.
3. Creating and assessing principles relating to the arts.
4. Defining and assessing artistic value.
5. Creating and assessing aesthetic theories.

C. Classic problems in Aesthetics

1. The nature of art: aesthetics focuses on defining art.
2. The nature of beauty: since Plato, philosophers have attempted to define beauty and its role in art.
3. The problem of censorship: first addressed by Plato, the question of whether art should be censored.
4. The problem of objectivity: whether aesthetic value is objective or merely in the eye of the beholder.
5. The paradox of taste: presented by Hume who raises the following problem-
  - a. On one hand, tastes cannot be disputed-if a person likes or dislikes a work they cannot be wrong about this.
  - b. On the other hand, some aesthetic judgments seem not only wrong but also obviously absurd.

D. Some Questions in Aesthetics

1. What is art?
2. What is beauty?
3. Is beauty subjective or objective?

4. Should art be censored by the government?
5. Should artists censor their own work?
6. What makes one work of art better than another?
7. How are genres defined?
8. Do genres matter?
9. Is art important to society?
10. Is art education important?
11. What, if anything, makes art valuable?
12. Can a forgery have the same value as "real" art?
13. What distinguishes "real" art from a forgery?
14. Should art serve political or social purposes?
15. What is the distinction between pornography and art?
16. Should historical films be historically accurate?

#### E. Aestheticians, Art Critics and Artists

1. Analogy to Law
  - a. Aestheticians are like lawmakers-they create aesthetic theories.
  - b. Art critics are like judges, applying the theories created by aestheticians.
  - c. The artist is like the one on trial-they create the works of art.
2. Aesthetics involves, in part, developing theories or principles for assessing works of art.
3. The art critic applies a specific theory or principle when assessing a specific work of art.
4. The artist uses a specific theory or principle when creating her work.
5. One person might occupy all three roles.

## Oscar Wilde(October 16, 1854 – November 30, 1900)

12/1/2005

### I Background

#### A. Life

1. Oscar Fingal O'Flahertie Wills Wilde.
2. Anglo-Irish playwright, novelist, poet, and short story writer.
3. Lived in late Victorian London.
4. A major celebrity of his time who possessed a quick and sharp wit.
5. Was convicted and imprisoned on the ground of "gross indecency" for a homosexual act.

#### B. Poetry

1. Poems (1881)
2. The Ballad of Reading Gaol (1898)

#### C. Plays

1. Vera, or The Nihilists (1880)
2. The Duchess of Padua (1883)
3. Salomé (1893)
4. Lady Windermere's Fan (1892)
5. A Woman of No Importance (1893)
6. An Ideal Husband (1895)
7. The Importance of Being Earnest (1895) [3]

#### D. Prose

1. The Canterville Ghost (1887)
2. The Happy Prince and Other Stories (1888) [4]
3. The Portrait of Mr. W. H. (1889)
4. Lord Arthur Saville's Crime and other Stories (1891)
5. Intentions (1891)
6. The Picture of Dorian Gray (1891)
7. House of Pomegranates (1891)
8. The Soul of Man Under Socialism (Pall Mall Gazette, 1891, book 1904)
9. De Profundis (1905)

## The New Aesthetics

### -Oscar Wilde

Revised: 2/7/2005

### I First Part of the Dialogue

## A. VIVIAN.

1. Position: Life imitates Art far more than Art imitates Life.
2. Life holds a mirror to Art and reproduces a strange imagined type or realizes in fact what was dreamed in fiction.
3. The basis of life is the desire for expression.
4. Art presents various forms through which this expression can be attained.
5. Life uses them even to detrimental effects: young men have committed suicide because Rolla and Werther did so.

## B. Cyril's Challenge to Vivian

1. Vivian must show that Nature, no less than Life, is an imitation of Art.
2. Vivian must show that Nature follows the landscape painter and takes her effects from him.

## II Vivian's Case

## A. Nature and Art

1. Claim: The change in London's climate is entirely due to a particular school of Art.
  - a. The fogs that blur gas lamps and change houses into monstrous shadows come from the Impressionists.
  - b. Impressionists are also responsible for the silver mists that turn bridges and barges to faint forms of fading grace.
2. Nature is our creation and not a mother who has borne us.

## B. Looking and Seeing

1. Things are because we see them.
2. What we see, and how we see it, depends on the Arts that have influenced us.
3. To look at a thing is very different from seeing a thing.
4. One does not see anything until one sees its beauty-only then does it come into existence.
5. Example: Fog
  - a. People see fogs, not because there are fogs, but because artists taught them the loveliness of such effects.
  - b. There may have been fogs for centuries in London, but no one saw them, so we know nothing about them.
  - c. Fogs did not exist till Art had invented them.

## C. Nature's Imitation of Art

1. Art creates an incomparable and unique effect and then passes on to other things.
2. Nature, forgetting imitation can be the sincerest form of insult, keeps repeating until we become tired of it.
3. Example: Nobody of culture now talks about the beauty of a sunset.
  - a. Sunsets belong to when Turner was the last note in art.
  - b. Vivian describes a sunset as a second-rate Turner.
5. Life very often commits the same error.
  - a. Life produces false Rene's and sham Vautrins, as Nature gives a doubtful Cuyp and a questionable Rousseau.
  - b. Nature irritates one more when she does such things.
  - c. It seems so stupid, so obvious, so unnecessary.
  - d. A false Vautrin might be delightful, but a doubtful Cuyp is unbearable.
6. When Art is more varied, Nature will be too.
7. No one would deny that nature imitates art and it is the one thing that keeps her in touch with civilized man.

## III What Art Expresses

## A. C Y R I L.

1. Admits the strange imitative instinct in Life and Nature.
2. Claims Art expresses:
  - a. The temper of its age.
  - b. The spirit of its time.
  - c. The moral and social conditions that surround it, and under whose influence it is produced.

## B. V I V I A N

1. Claims Art never expresses anything but itself.
  - a. This is the principle of the new aesthetics.
  - b. This, more than the vital connection between form and substance, makes music the type of all the arts.
2. Nations and individuals from vanity
  - a. Think the Muses are speaking of them.
  - b. Try to find in the calm dignity of art a mirror of their own turbid passions.
  - c. Forget the singer of life is not Apollo but Marsyas.
  - d. Note: Marsyas found a flute discarded by a goddess and challenged Apollo to a contest of music-he lost and was flayed alive.
3. Art reveals her own perfection and the crowd fancies
  - a. It is being told its own history.
  - b. Its own spirit is expressed in a new form.
4. This is not so: The highest art rejects the burden of the spirit, and gains more from a new medium or fresh material than from:
  - a. Any enthusiasm for art.

- b. Any lofty passion.
  - c. Any great awakening of the human consciousness.
5. Art Develops purely on its own lines-she is not symbolic of any age.
  6. The ages are the symbols of art.

#### IV Imitative Art

##### A. VIVIAN

1. The more imitative an art is, the less it represents the spirit of its age.
2. Example: The evil faces of the Roman emperors are realistically represented.
  - a. We mistakenly think the secret of the Empire's ruin is in the portrayed faces.
  - b. It could not be destroyed by the vices of Tiberius nor saved by the virtues of the Antonines.
  - c. It fell for other reasons.
3. Example: The drunken boors and brawling peasants of Dutch art tell us nothing about the great soul of Holland.
4. The more abstract and ideal an art is, the more it reveals the temper of its age.
5. To understand a nation by means of its art, look at its architecture or music.

##### B. CYRIL.

1. The spirit of an age may be best expressed in the abstract ideal arts, for the spirit is abstract and ideal.
2. The arts of imitation reveal the visible aspect of an age.

##### C. VIVIAN: Disagreement and the example of the Middle Ages

1. Disagrees with Cyril.
2. The imitative arts provide various styles of artists or schools of artists.
3. The people of the Middle Ages did not resemble the figures in medieval art
4. The Middle Ages, in art, are a definite form of style.
5. An artist with this style could be produced now.
5. No great artist ever sees things as they really are or he would cease to be an artist.

##### D. VIVIAN: Example of Japan

1. Japanese people, as presented in art, do not exist-they are the deliberate creation of certain artists.
2. There is no resemblance between the real Japanese and their representation in art.
  - a. The people who live in Japan are like the general run of English people.
  - b. They have nothing curious or extraordinary about them.
3. The whole of Japan is a pure invention-there is no such country or people.
4. A painter went to Japan to see the Japanese.
  - a. He saw only a few lanterns and some fans.
  - b. He could not discover the inhabitants.
  - c. He did not know the Japanese people are simply a mode of style, an exquisite fancy of art.
5. To see a Japanese effect stay at home and steep yourself in the work of Japanese artists.
6. If you cannot see a Japanese effect at home you will not see it anywhere.

##### E. Example: Ancient Greeks

1. Greek art does not tell us what the Greek people were like.
2. Were the Athenian women like the stately figures and goddesses of the Parthenon?
3. If you judge from the art, they certainly were so.
4. But according to authorities like Aristophanes they were not.
5. We look back on the ages entirely through the medium of art, and art, very fortunately, has never once told us the truth.

#### IV VIVIAN: Doctrines of the New Aesthetics

##### A. First Doctrine: Art never expresses anything but itself.

1. It has an independent life, just like Thought, and develops purely on its own lines.
2. It is not necessarily realistic in an age of realism, nor spiritual in an age of faith.
3. Far from being the creation of its time, it usually directly opposes it.
4. The only history it preserves is the history of its own progress.
5. Sometimes it returns on its footsteps and revives an antique form.
6. At other times it anticipates its age, and produces work that takes another century to understand, appreciate and enjoy.
7. In no case does it reproduce its age.
8. To pass from the art of a time to the time itself is the great mistake all historians commit.

##### B. Second Doctrine: All bad art comes from returning to Life and Nature, and elevating them into ideals.

1. Life and Nature may be part of Art's rough material, but before they must be translated into artistic conventions.
2. The moment Art surrenders its imaginative medium it surrenders everything.
3. As a method Realism is a complete failure.
4. Every artist should avoid modernity of form and subject matter-any century but our own is suitable.
5. The only beautiful things are things that do not concern us.
7. It is because Hecuba is nothing to us that her sorrows are so suitable a motive for a tragedy.

- a. Note: Hecuba was the wife of King Priam of Troy and mother of Hector, Cassandra and Paris.
- b. Note: The tales vary, but in all cases she comes to an unpleasant end (suicide, death or transformation into a dog).
- 8. It is only the modern that ever becomes old-fashioned.
- 9. Life goes faster than Realism, but Romanticism is always in front of Life.
- C. Third Doctrine: Life imitates Art far more than Art imitates Life.
  - 1. This results from Life's imitative instinct and because the self-conscious aim of Life is to find expression.
  - 2. Art offers life beautiful forms by which it may realize that energy.
  - 3. External Nature also imitates Art.
  - 4. The only effects that nature shows are those already seen through poetry, or in paintings.
  - 5. This is the secret of Nature's charm, as well as the explanation of Nature's weakness.
- D. Fourth Doctrine: Lying, the telling of beautiful untrue things is the proper aim of Art.

## Political & Social Philosophy

Revised 7/14/2005

### Introduction

#### I Introduction

- A. Social and Political Philosophy
  - 1. The philosophy of society and social sciences: economics, history, sociology, anthropology, political science, and the others.
  - 2. Political Philosophy: The study of the nature and justification of coercive institutions.
  - 3. Philosophy of Law: the study of the nature and justification of law.
- B. Classic Problems in Social Philosophy
  - 1. The problem of the state: what is the basis, if any, of the authority of the state?
  - 2. The problem of rights: If there are rights, then what are they based on?
  - 3. The problem of law: what should human laws be based on?
  - 4. The problem of the individual and the state: to what extent should the state control individuals?
  - 5. The problem of liberty and security: to what extent should liberties be restricted in order to provide security?
- C. Some questions in social philosophy
  - 1. What are rights?
  - 2. What is justice?
  - 3. What is the ideal society?
  - 4. What justifies laws?
  - 5. What is the basis of political authority?
  - 6. Should limits be placed on the power of the state?

## Liberty

11/9/2005

#### I Introduction

- A. Questions
  - 1. What is the nature and extent of liberty?
  - 2. Who/what should determine the extent of liberty?
  - 3. When liberty and security are in conflict, which should be given precedence?
  - 4. On what grounds, if any, should liberty be limited?
- B. Liberty
  - 1. The main debate focuses on the nature and extent of liberty.
    - a. What are people free to do and why do they have such freedom?
  - 2. Liberty is most commonly considered in the context of the state-in terms of what the state permits or must accept.
  - 3. Liberties are often discussed in terms of rights.
  - 4. Liberties are often classified in terms of legal, political and moral liberties.
- C. Positive & Negative Liberty
  - 1. A concept developed by Isaiah Berlin (1909-1997).
  - 2. Negative liberty: an absence or lack of impediments, obstacles or coercion.
  - 3. Positive liberty: a capacity for behavior and the presence of the conditions of freedom.
- D. Who/What Determines Liberty?
  - 1. One point of debate is the matter of what/who is to determine the extent of liberty.
  - 2. Some thinkers argue that the state should determine the extent of liberty permitted.
    - a. Example: Mussolini
  - 3. Some thinkers argue that the extent of liberty is to be determined on moral grounds.
    - a. Example: Mill

### E. The Conflict between Liberty & Security.

1. One main debate is over the conflict between liberty and security.
2. Some thinkers argue that people should give up liberties in exchange for increased security.
  - a. Example: Some contend that people should give up certain civil liberties to help fight terrorism.
3. Other thinkers argue that people should not give up certain or perhaps even any liberties for increased security.
  - a. Example: Some contend that people should not yield their right of privacy even if doing so would make it easier to find terrorists.

### F. Other Grounds for Limiting Liberty

1. In addition to security, some argue that there are other grounds for limiting liberty.
2. Some argue that people should not have the liberty to do immoral deeds.
  - a. Example: Some contend that people should be denied the liberty of same sex marriage because it is immoral.
3. Some argue that people should not have the liberty to do things that are harmful to others or to themselves.
  - a. Example: Some contend that people should not have the liberty to use drugs because drugs are harmful.

## Benito Amilcare Andrea Mussolini

(July 29, 1883 -April 28, 1945)

### I Background

#### A. Life

1. Born in Predappio, Italy in 1883.
2. Was the leader of Italy from 1922 until his overthrow in 1943.
3. He transformed Italy into a fascist state.
4. He joined Nazi Germany in making war on Europe.
5. He was killed by the Italians in 1945.

### What is Fascism

Benito Mussolini & Giovanni Gentile, 1932

Revised 11/9/2005

### I Fascism

#### A. Peace

1. Fascism rejects the possibility and utility of perpetual peace.
2. It repudiates Pacifism.
  - a. A renunciation of struggle.
  - b. Cowardice in the face of sacrifice.

#### B. Only War

1. Brings all human energy to its highest tension.
2. Puts the stamp of nobility on those who have courage to meet it.
3. All other trials are substitutes-they never force men to make the great decision- the alternative of life or death.

#### C. Life

1. The Fascist accepts life, loves it and despises suicide.
2. The Fascist conceives of life as duty, struggle, conquest, and above all for others.

### II Fascism and Other Views

#### A. Marxism and Fascism

1. Fascism is the opposite of Marxian Socialism.
2. Marxism is materialist conception of history that holds human civilization can be explained
  - a. Through the conflict of interests among social groups.
  - b. By the change and development in the means and instruments of production.
3. Fascism believes in holiness and heroism and denies that actions are influenced by economic motives, directly or indirectly.

#### B. Fascism denies:

1. The economic conception of history.
2. That men are puppets carried by the waves of chance.
3. The real directing forces are out of their control.
4. The existence of an unchangeable and unchanging class-war.
5. That class-war can be the preponderant force in the transformation of society.

#### C. Democracy and Fascism

1. Fascism combats and repudiates democratic ideology in its theoretical premises or practical application.
2. It denies that the majority, by the simple fact that it is a majority, can direct human society.
3. It denies that numbers alone can govern by means of a periodical consultation.
4. It affirms the immutable, beneficial, and fruitful inequality of mankind.

5. Inequality can never be permanently leveled through a mechanical process such as universal suffrage.
6. It denies political equality in the garb of collective irresponsibility, the myth of "happiness" and indefinite progress.

#### D. Predictions

1. The 19<sup>th</sup> century was one of Socialism, Liberalism, and Democracy, but it does not follow that the 20<sup>th</sup> must also.
2. Political doctrines pass, but humanity remains.
3. It may be expected this will be a century of authority...a century of Fascism.
4. If the 19<sup>th</sup> century was a century of individualism, this will be the century of collectivism and hence the century of the State.

## II Foundation of Fascism

### A. Fascism

1. The foundation of Fascism is the conception of the State, its character, its duty, and its aim.
2. The State is an absolute, in comparison with which individuals or groups are relative- only to be conceived in their relation to the State.
3. The Liberal State is not a directing force, guiding the material and spiritual development of a collective body.
4. The Liberal state is merely a force limited to recording results.

### B. The Fascist State

1. The State is conscious and has a will and a personality- it is the "ethic" State.
2. The State organizes the nation.
3. The State leaves a sufficient margin of liberty to the individual.
4. The individual is deprived of all useless and possibly harmful freedom, but retains what is essential.
5. The deciding power in this question cannot be the individual, but the State.

### C. Empire

1. The growth of empire is an essential manifestation of vitality, and its opposite a sign of decadence.
2. A people rising, or rising again after decadence, are always imperialist.
3. Renunciation is a sign of decay and of death.
4. Fascism is the doctrine best adapted to represent the tendencies and the aspirations of a people.
5. Empire demands discipline, the coordination of all forces and a deeply felt sense of duty and sacrifice.
6. This explains
  - a. Many aspects of the practical working of the regime.
  - b. The character of many forces in the State.
  - c. The necessarily severe measures that must be taken against those who would oppose it.

## Liberty

### J.S. Mill

## I Goal and History of Liberty

### A. Mill's Goal

1. Goal: to determine the nature and limits of power legitimately exercisable by society over the individual.
2. The struggle between Liberty and Authority was between subjects and government.

### B. Liberty & Rulers

1. Liberty was protection against the tyranny of political rulers.
2. The rulers were seen as necessarily antagonistic to the ruled.

### C. Liberty as Limiting Power

1. To prevent the weaker from being preyed on a stronger predator was commissioned.
2. As the king was as likely to prey on the weak a constant attitude of defense was indispensable.
3. The aim of patriots was to limit the power of the ruler over the community-This was liberty.

### D. History of Limiting Power of Rulers.

1. Obtaining recognition of certain immunities- political liberties or rights.
2. The establishment of constitutional checks.
3. Governors were not seen necessarily as an independent power opposed to the ruled
4. The rulers should be their delegates, revocable at their pleasure.
5. The rulers should be identified with the people.

## II The Tyranny of the People

### A. The Will of the People

1. That the people have no need to limit their power over themselves might seem axiomatic.
2. Phrases like "self-government" don't express the truth- it is not the government of each by himself but of each by the rest.
3. The will of the people means the will of:
  - a. The most numerous or most active.
  - b. The majority.
  - c. Those who make themselves accepted as the majority.

4. The people may desire to oppress a part of their number and precautions are needed against this.

#### B. The tyranny of the majority

1. Protection against the tyranny of the magistrate is not enough.
2. Protection is needed against the tyranny of prevailing opinion and feeling.
3. Protection is needed against society's tendency to
  - a. Impose its own ideas and practices as rules of conduct.
  - b. Fetter the development or prevent the formation of individuality not in harmony with its ways.
  - c. Compel all to fashion themselves upon its model.

### III Limits, Rules and Principle

#### A. The Limit of Legitimate Interference

1. There is a limit to the legitimate interference of collective opinion with individual independence.
2. What makes existence valuable depends on the enforcement of restraints on others' actions.
3. Some rules of conduct must be imposed by law and by opinion on things not fit for law.
4. What these rules should be is the principal question in human affairs.

#### B. The Basis of Rules

1. People regard their own rules as self-evident and self-justifying.
2. The practical principle guiding opinions on conduct is each person's feeling that all should be required to act as he would like.
3. A country's morality mostly comes from
  - a. Class interests and feelings of superiority of any ascendant class.
  - b. Servility towards the preferences or aversions of their masters or gods.
4. The likings and dislikings of society, or a powerful portion, mainly determine the rules of law or opinion.

#### C. No Principle

1. There is no principle by which the propriety or impropriety of government interference is tested.
2. Men side in a case according to
  - a. Their sentiments.
  - b. The interest they feel about what the government should do.
  - c. Their belief that the government would, or would not, do it in a manner they prefer.
3. Men very rarely chose a side because of a consistently held opinion about what is fit to be done by government.

#### D. Mill's Principle

1. Principle: the sole end for which mankind are warranted, individually or collectively in interfering with the liberty of action of any of their number, is self-protection.

#### E. Rightful Exercise of Power

1. The only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilized community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others.
2. His own good, physical or moral, is not sufficient warrant.
3. He cannot rightfully be compelled to do or forbear because
  - a. It will be better for him.
  - b. It will make him happier.
  - c. Others think it would be wise or right.
4. These are good reasons for remonstrating or persuading him, but not for compelling or doing evil if he does otherwise.
5. The only part of the conduct for which one is amenable to society, is what concerns others.
6. What merely concerns himself, his independence is, of right, absolute.
  - a. Over himself, his body and mind, the individual is sovereign.

#### F. Limits in Application of the Principle: Children & those in need of care.

1. This doctrine applies only to humans with mature faculties.
2. Children and those below the legal age of adulthood are excluded.
3. Those requiring the care of others must be protected against their own actions and external injury.

#### E. Limit in Application of the Principle: Barbarians

1. Backward states of society where the race may be considered as immature are excluded.
2. A ruler full of the spirit of improvement is warranted to use any expedients that will attain the end.
3. Liberty, as principle, has no application to a state before people can be improved by free and equal discussion.
4. Once mankind can be guided to improvement by conviction or persuasion, compulsion is not admissible as a means to their good, and justified only for the security of others.

### IV Utility as the Foundation of Liberty

#### A. Utility

1. Mill rejects the idea of abstract right independent of utility.
2. Utility is the ultimate appeal on all ethical questions.
3. It must be utility in the largest sense, grounded on the permanent interests of man as a progressive being.
4. These interests authorize the subjecting individuals to external control only for actions concerning the interest of others.

## B. Punishment

1. If one hurts others, there is a prima facie case for punishing him.

## C. Compelling

1. There are positive acts benefiting others that he may rightfully be compelled to do.
  - a. Giving evidence in a court of justice.
  - b. Bearing a fair share of common defense or work necessary to the interest of society.
  - c. Performing certain acts of individual beneficence, such as saving another's life, or protecting the defenseless.
2. Things obviously a man's duty to do, he may rightfully be made responsible to society for not doing.

## D. Accountability

1. A person may cause others evil by actions or inaction and he is accountable.
2. To make one answerable for doing evil to others is the rule.
3. To make one answerable for not preventing evil is the exception.
4. There are many cases clear and grave enough to justify the exception.
5. Reason for not holding him responsible must arise from special expediency: either because
  - a. He is likely to act better if left alone than if controlled by society.
  - b. The attempt to exercise control would produce greater evils than it would prevent.
6. When such reasons preclude enforcement of responsibility, the conscience of the agent should judge.

## V Sphere of Action and Regions of Liberty

## A. Sphere of Action

1. The sphere of action in which society has at most indirect interest is the parts of a person's life and conduct which affects only him or others with free, voluntary, and undeceived consent and participation.
2. Objection: Whatever affects him may affect others through himself-he replies to this later in his work.

## B. First region of human liberty: The inward domain of consciousness.

1. Liberty of conscience.
2. Liberty of thought and feeling.
3. Freedom of opinion and sentiment on all subjects, practical or speculative, scientific, moral, or theological.
4. The liberty of expressing and publishing opinions.
  - a. May seem to be another principle since it concerns other people.
  - b. Almost as important as liberty of thought.
  - c. Based on the same reasons, is practically inseparable from it.

## C. Second region of human liberty: Tastes and pursuits:

1. Framing the plan of our life to suit our character.
2. Doing as we like, subject to possible consequences
3. Doing so without impediment if we do not harm others even if they think our conduct foolish, perverse, or wrong.

## D. Third region of human liberty: From the liberty of each follows the liberty of combination among individuals.

1. Freedom to unite, for any purpose not involving harm to others.
2. If they are adults and not forced or deceived.

## E. Freedom

1. A society that does not respect these freedoms is not free, regardless of the type of government.
2. None is completely free in which they do not exist absolute and unqualified.
3. True freedom is pursuing our own good our own way, provided we do not deprive others or impede their efforts to obtain it.
4. Each is the proper guardian of his own health- bodily, or mental or spiritual.
5. We gain more by allowing each to live as seems good to them, than by compelling each to live as seems good to the rest.

## VI Opposition

## A. Opposes

1. This doctrine opposes the general tendency of existing opinion and practice.

## B. Ancient commonwealths

1. The ancient commonwealths thought they had the right to regulate all private conduct
2. They had an interest in the bodily and mental discipline of every citizen.
3. This might have been admissible given the conditions.

## C. Modern Commonwealths

1. Larger communities and separation of spiritual and secular authority prevent as much interference by law in private life.
2. Engines of moral repression are used more against divergence from reigning opinion in private rather than social matters.
3. Religion was almost always run by the ambition of a hierarchy, seeking control over all conduct or by the spirit of Puritanism.

## D. Tendencies Against Liberty

1. There is an increasing inclination to expand the powers of society over the individual by force of opinion and legislation.
2. The tendency is to strengthen society and diminish the power of the individual.
3. This encroachment is not an evil that spontaneously disappears-it tends to grow more formidable.

4. The disposition of mankind to impose their opinions and inclinations as a rule of conduct on others, is so energetically supported by the best and worst feelings that it is generally only restrained by lack of power.
5. Since power is growing, without a strong barrier of moral conviction against mischief, it will increase.

## Emma Goldman

### I Background

#### A. Life

1. June 27, 1869 – May 14, 1940.
2. Born in Lithuania.
3. Immigrated to the United States in 1886.
4. Deported to Russia and was there during the Russian Revolution.
5. Lived in France.

#### B. Activities

1. Imprisoned in 1893 for urging unemployed workers to "Ask for work. If they do not give you work, ask for bread. If they do not give you work or bread, take bread."
2. September 10, 1901- Arrested on charges of conspiracy to assassinate President McKinley.
3. Involved in the Spanish Civil War in 1936 as the English language representative in London for the CNT-FAI.
4. February 11, 1916- arrested and imprisoned distributing birth control literature.
5. 1917-Arrested for conspiring to obstruct the draft:

#### C. Works

1. *Living my Life*-autobiography.
2. *My Disillusionment in Russia* 1923, 1924, 1925.
3. *Anarchism and Other Essays*

## ANARCHISM: WHAT IT REALLY STANDS FOR

-Emma Goldman

From *Anarchism and Other Essays* (3rd revised edition, New York: Mother Earth Publishing Association, 1917)

### I Anarchism's Opposition

#### A. Objections to anarchism

1. First: it is impractical.
2. Second: it stands for violence and destruction, hence must be repudiated as vile and dangerous.

#### B. Reply to the First Objection

1. Oscar Wilde: A practical scheme is one already existing, or could be carried out under existing conditions.
2. The existing conditions are objected to, and any scheme that could accept them is wrong and foolish.
3. True criterion: If the scheme has vitality enough to build and sustain new life.
4. Anarchism is practical-more than any other idea it is
  - a. Helping to do away with the wrong and foolish.
  - b. Building and sustaining new life.

#### F. Reply to the Second Objection.

1. The ordinary man does not know the most violent element in society is ignorance.
2. Its power of destruction is what Anarchism is combating.
3. Anarchism destroys only parasitic growths feeding on the life of society.
4. It clears soil from weeds and sagebrush, that it may bear healthy fruit.
5. Anarchism urges man to think as well as investigate and analyze every proposition.

### II Nature of Anarchism

#### A. ANARCHISM.

1. The philosophy of a new social order based on liberty unrestricted by man-made law.
2. The theory that all government rests on violence, and hence are wrong, harmful, and unnecessary.

#### B. Two Elements: Individual and social instincts

1. The two are not foreign to each other, but closely related and truly harmonious, if in a proper environment.
2. The individual and society battled for supremacy, because each was blind to the value and importance of the other.

#### C. Anarchism

1. The only philosophy which
  - a. Brings to man the consciousness of himself.
  - b. Claims God, State, and society are non-existent and their promises void, since they are fulfilled only by man's subordination.
3. Anarchism teaches there is no more conflict between individual and social instincts than between heart and lungs.

### III Pernicious Influences-Religion

#### A. Liberator

1. Anarchism liberates man from phantoms that have held him captive.
2. To achieve unity, Anarchism declares war on pernicious influences preventing harmonious blending of individual and society.

#### B. Strongholds of Enslavement

1. Religion-the dominion of the human mind.
2. Property-the dominion of human needs.
3. Government-the dominion of human conduct.

#### C. Religion.

1. Dominates man's mind, humiliates and degrades his soul.
2. God is everything, man is nothing.
3. From that nothing God created a kingdom so despotic only gloom, tears and blood have ruled the world since.
4. Anarchism rouses man to rebel against this.
5. When you think and judge for yourself you will be rid of the dominion of darkness, the greatest obstacle to progress.

### IV Pernicious Influences -Property

#### A. Property

1. Property: The dominion of man's needs, the denial of the right to satisfy his needs.
2. Anarchism shows the insatiable, devouring, devastating nature of property, and is preparing to strike it dead.

#### B. Property is Robbery

1. French Anarchist Proudhon: "Property is robbery"
2. Monopolizing the efforts of man property has made him a pauper and outcast.
3. Property lacks the excuse man does not create enough to satisfy all needs-the productivity of labor far exceeds normal demand.
4. The only demand property recognizes is its appetite for greater wealth, because wealth means power.
  - a. The power to subdue, crush, exploit, enslave, outrage, and degrade.

#### C. Real wealth

1. Real wealth consists in things of utility and beauty that help create strong, beautiful bodies and inspiring surroundings.
2. Man now gives the world only gray and hideous things, reflecting a dull and hideous existence.

#### D. Machine & Centralization

1. If we continue in machine subservience, our slavery is more complete than bondage to the King.
2. Centralization is the death of liberty, health, beauty, art and science-all impossible in a clock-like, mechanical atmosphere.

#### E. Anarchism & Property

1. Anarchism repudiates this method of production: its goal is the freest possible expression of all latent powers of the individual.
2. Oscar Wilde- a perfect personality: "one who develops under perfect conditions, who is not wounded, maimed, or in danger."
3. A perfect personality is only possible when man is free to choose the mode, conditions, and freedom to work.
4. Anarchism's Ideal: One to whom work is the result of inspiration, intense longing, and deep interest in work as a creative force.
5. Anarchism's economic arrangements: voluntary productive and distributive associations, gradually developing into free communism.
  - a. Anarchism recognizes the right to arrange for other forms of work in harmony with tastes and desires.

### IV Pernicious Influence: The State

#### A. The Three

1. Religion has fettered the human mind.
2. Property, the monopoly of things, has subdued and stifled man's needs.
3. The State has enslaved his spirit, dictating every phase of conduct.

#### B. Government

1. Emerson: "All government in essence is tyranny."
2. All governments aim at the absolute subordination of the individual.
3. Thoreau: Law never made man more just and respect for it makes even the well disposed agents of injustice.
4. The keynote of government is injustice.
5. Governments punish insignificant offenses, but maintain themselves by the greatest offense-annihilation of individual liberty.

#### C. Ouida on the State.

1. The State aims only to instill qualities in its public by which its demands are obeyed and its treasury filled.
2. Its highest attainment is the reduction of mankind to clockwork.
3. It destroys all finer and delicate liberties.
4. The State requires
  - a. A taxpaying machine without a hitch.
  - b. An exchequer without deficit.
  - c. A public, monotonous, obedient, colorless, spiritless, moving like sheep between two walls.

#### D. Bakunin on the State.

1. Bakunin repudiates the State as synonymous with
  - a. The surrender of the liberty of the individual or small minorities.
  - b. The destruction of social relationship, the curtailment, or complete denial of life for its own aggrandizement.
2. Most modern thinkers agree that government is necessary only to maintain or protect property and monopoly.

## V Law & Order

### A. Some hold the fatal belief that government

1. Rests on natural laws.
2. Maintains social order and harmony.
3. Diminishes crime.
4. Prevents the lazy from fleecing his fellows.

### B. Natural Law

1. Natural law—a factor in man asserted freely, spontaneously and without external force, in harmony with nature's requirements.
2. Its expression does not need the machinery of government: the club, gun, handcuff, or prison.
3. To obey such laws requires only spontaneity and free opportunity.
4. Governments show they do not maintain themselves by such harmonious factors by the violence, force, and coercion they use.
5. Blackstone: "Human laws are invalid, because they are contrary to the laws of nature."

### C. Order

1. It is difficult to ascribe to governments any capacity for order or social harmony.
2. Order derived from submission and maintained by terror, the "order" of governments, is not much of a guaranty.
3. True social harmony grows naturally out of solidarity of interests.
4. In a society where workers have nothing while those who never work enjoy everything, solidarity of interests is non-existent.
  - a. Hence social harmony is a myth.
5. Authority responds by giving greater privileges to those monopolizing the earth and further enslaving the disinherited masses.
6. The arsenal of government—law, police, soldiers, courts, legislatures, prisons—"harmonizes" the antagonistic elements in society.

### D. Diminishing Crime

1. The most absurd apology for authority and law is that they diminish crime.
2. The State is the greatest criminal, breaking written and natural law, stealing via taxes, killing in war and capital punishment.
3. It has failed to destroy or even minimize the horrible scourge of its own creation.
4. Crime is misdirected energy.
5. While institutions misdirect human energy into wrong channels; while most do what they hate and live a life they loathe, crime will be inevitable, and laws will only increase it.

### E. Laziness

1. If society were free of the cost of keeping and protecting a lazy class, there would be abundance for all.
2. Laziness results from special privileges, or physical and mental abnormalities.
3. The present system fosters both— it is amazing that people want to work at all.

### F. Anarchism

1. Aims to strip labor of its deadening, dulling aspect, its gloom and compulsion.
2. Aims to make work an instrument of joy, strength, color, and harmony, so all will find recreation and hope in work.
3. To achieve this, government, with its unjust, arbitrary, repressive measures, must be done away with.
4. In destroying government and laws, Anarchism plans to rescue the self-respect and independence of the individual from restraint and invasion by authority.
6. Only in freedom can man
  - a. Grow to full stature.
  - b. Learn to think.
  - c. Give his best.
  - d. Realize the true force of the social bonds knitting men together—the true foundation of a normal social life.

### G. Human Nature

1. Horrible crimes have been committed in the name of human nature.
2. The greater the charlatan, the more definite his insistence on the wickedness and weaknesses of human nature.
3. With every soul in a prison, with every heart fettered, wounded, and maimed we can't speak of human nature.
4. John Burroughs— Experimental study of animals in captivity is absolutely useless.
  - a. Their character, habits, appetites undergo a complete transformation.
  - b. With human nature caged in a narrow space, whipped into submission, we cannot speak of its potentialities.
5. Freedom, expansion, opportunity, peace and repose, alone can reveal the real human nature and its possibilities.

### H. Anarchism stands for

1. Liberation of the mind from the dominion of religion.
2. Liberation of the human body from the dominion of property.
3. Liberation from the shackles and restraint of government.
4. A social order based on the free grouping of individuals for the purpose of producing real social wealth.

5. An order that will guarantee to all free access to the earth and enjoyment of the necessities of life, according to individual desires, tastes, and inclinations.

## VI Methods

### A. Political Machinery

1. Anarchism opposes the use political machinery as a means of bringing about the great social change.
2. Thoreau on voting
  - a. All voting is gaming- a playing with right and wrong.
  - b. Even voting for the right thing is doing nothing for it.
  - c. A wise man will not leave the right to chance, nor wish it to prevail through the power of the majority.
3. The history of voting shows only failure and defeat, not even one reform to reduce economic and social stress of the people.
4. Laws have been passed and enactments made for the improvement and protection of labor.
  - a. Where child labor laws prevail, child exploitation is at its highest.
  - b. In the US workers enjoy full political opportunities, but capitalism has reached its zenith.

### C. Representatives

1. Even if workers had their own representatives, the chance of their honesty and good faith are slight.
2. It may be claimed that men of integrity would not become corrupt, but they could then not exert the slightest influence

### D. Direct Action

1. Stirner: man has as much liberty as he is willing to take.
2. Anarchism: direct action and Open defiance of, and resistance to laws and restrictions, economic, social, and moral.
3. Defiance and resistance are illegal and there lies the salvation of man.
4. Everything illegal necessitates integrity, self-reliance, and courage.
5. It calls for free, independent spirits, for "men who are men, and who have a bone in their backs."

### E. More on Direct Action

1. Universal suffrage owes its existence to direct action.
2. American independence owes its existence to the spirit of rebellion and defiance.
3. The direct action of a John Brown and his comrades ended slavery.
4. Trade unions succeeded by direct action.
5. Direct action will lead to revolution and no real social change has ever come about without it.