

**Chapter 1 : Ignorance Quotes ( quotes)**

*Bright quotes and sayings on the subject of ignorance. Being ignorant means lacking knowledge with a quite vital line between ignorance and stupidity.*

While distinguishing rigorous knowledge scientia and lesser grades of conviction persuasio , Descartes writes: I distinguish the two as follows: But since I see that you are still stuck fast in the doubts which I put forward in the First Meditation, and which I thought I had very carefully removed in the succeeding Meditations, I shall now expound for a second time the basis on which it seems to me that all human certainty can be founded. First of all, as soon as we think that we correctly perceive something, we are spontaneously convinced that it is true. Now if this conviction is so firm that it is impossible for us ever to have any reason for doubting what we are convinced of, then there are no further questions for us to ask: Replies 2, AT 7: As my certainty increases, my doubt decreases; conversely, as my doubt increases, my certainty decreases. It has also a distinctively epistemic character, involving a kind of rational insight. Yet they raise questions about the extent to which his account is continuous with other analyses of knowledge. Prima facie, his characterizations imply a justified belief analysis of knowledge " or in language closer to his own and where justification is construed in terms of unshakability , an unshakable conviction analysis. Many will balk at the suggestion. It might therefore seem clear, whatever else is the case, that Descartes conceives of knowledge as advancing truth. Thus construed, to establish a proposition just is to perceive it with certainty; the result of having established it " i. Truth is a consequence of knowledge, rather than its precondition. What is it to us that someone may make out that the perception whose truth we are so firmly convinced of may appear false to God or an angel, so that it is, absolutely speaking, false? On a quite different reading of this passage, Descartes is clarifying that the analysis of knowledge is neutral not about truth, but about absolute truth: Harry Frankfurt defended such an interpretation in his influential work, Demons, Dreamers, and Madmen. Yet, in a follow-up paper he retracted the view: I now think, however, that it was a mistake on my part to suggest that Descartes entertained a coherence conception of truth. The fact is that there is no textual evidence to support that suggestion; on the contrary, whenever Descartes gives an explicit account of truth he explains it unequivocally as correspondence with reality. A definitive interpretation of these issues has yet to gain general acceptance in the literature. What is clear is that the brand of knowledge Descartes seeks requires, at least, unshakably certain conviction. Arguably, this preoccupation with having the right kind of certainty " including its being available to introspection " is linked with his commitment to an internalist conception of knowledge. For he holds that ideas are, strictly speaking, the only objects of immediate perception, or conscious awareness. More on the directness or immediacy of perception in Section 5. This assumption is tantamount to requiring that justification come in the form of ideas. An important consequence of this kind of interpretation " namely, a traditional representationalist reading of Descartes " is that rigorous philosophical inquiry must proceed via an inside-to-out strategy. This strategy is assiduously followed in the Meditations, and it endures as a hallmark of many early modern epistemologies. Philosophical inquiry is, properly understood, an investigation of ideas. The methodical strategy of the Meditations has the effect of forcing readers to adopt this mode of inquiry. He wants knowledge that is utterly indefeasible. Sceptical doubts count as defeaters. This indefeasibility requirement implies more than mere stability. A would-be knower could achieve stability simply by never reflecting on reasons for doubt. But this would result in mere undoubtedness, not indubitability. Before jumping to this conclusion, we should put the indefeasibility requirement into context. Descartes is a contextualist in the sense that he allows that different standards of justification are appropriate to different contexts. This is not merely to say the obvious: This example is potentially misleading, in that Descartes appears loath to count mere empirical evidence as knowledge-worthy justification. But upon ramping up the standard to what he finds minimally acceptable, the standard admits of context dependent variation. For Descartes, clarity contrasts with obscurity, and distinctness contrasts with confusion. But he regularly characterizes defeasible judgments at this level of certainty using terminology e. In the context of inquiry at play in the Meditations, Descartes insists on indefeasibility. Better to have a standard that excludes some

truths, than one that justifies some falsehoods. Descartes maintains that though atheists are quite capable of impressive knowledge, including in mathematics, they are incapable of the indefeasible brand of knowledge he seeks: But I maintain that this awareness [cognitionem] of his is not true knowledge [scientiam], since no act of awareness [cognitio] that can be rendered doubtful seems fit to be called knowledge [scientia]. Now since we are supposing that this individual is an atheist, he cannot be certain that he is not being deceived on matters which seem to him to be very evident as I fully explained. Distinguish particularist and methodist responses to the question. The particularist is apt to trust our prima facie intuitions regarding particular knowledge claims. These intuitions may then be used to help identify more general epistemic principles. The methodist, in contrast, is apt to distrust our prima facie intuitions. The preference is instead to begin with general principles about proper method. The methodical principles may then be used to arrive at settled, reflective judgments concerning particular knowledge claims. Famously, Descartes is in the methodist camp. Were we to rely on our prima facie intuitions, we might suppose it obvious that the earth is unmoved, or that ordinary objects as tables and chairs are just as just as they seem. Yet, newly emerging mechanist doctrines of the 17th century imply that these suppositions are false. Such cases underscore the unreliability of our prima facie intuitions and the need for a method by which to distinguish truth and falsity. But such pre-reflective judgments may be ill-grounded, even when true. The dialectic of the First Meditation features a confrontation between particularism and methodism, with methodism emerging the victor. In response and at each level of the dialectic, Descartes invokes his own methodical principles to show that the prima facie obviousness of such particular claims is insufficient to meet the burden of proof. Knowledge of the nature of reality derives from ideas of the intellect, not the senses. An important part of metaphysical inquiry therefore involves learning to think with the intellect. The Fifth Meditation meditator remarks "having applied Cartesian methodology, thereby discovering innate truths within: Elsewhere Descartes adds, of innate truths: All geometrical truths are of this sort" not just the most obvious ones, but all the others, however abstruse they may appear. Hence, according to Plato, Socrates asks a slave boy about the elements of geometry and thereby makes the boy able to dig out certain truths from his own mind which he had not previously recognized were there, thus attempting to establish the doctrine of reminiscence. Our knowledge of God is of this sort. This storehouse includes ideas in mathematics, logic, and metaphysics. Interestingly, Descartes holds that even our sensory ideas involve innate content. On his understanding of the new mechanical physics, bodies have no real properties resembling our sensory ideas of colors, sounds, tastes, and the like, thus implying that the content of such ideas draws from the mind itself. But if even these sensory ideas count as innate, how then are we to characterize the doctrine of innateness? Importantly, the formation of these sensory ideas "unlike purely intellectual concepts" depends on sensory stimulation. This characterization allows that both intellectual and sensory concepts draw on native resources, though not to the same extent. Relatively little attention is given to his doctrines of innateness, or, more generally, his ontology of thought. On the internalism-externalism distinction, see Alston and Plantinga For a partly externalist interpretation of Descartes, see Della Rocca For a stability interpretation of Descartes, see Bennett On the indefeasibility of Knowledge, see Newman and Nelson On contextualism in Descartes, see Newman On the methodism-particularism distinction, see Chisholm and Sosa On analysis and synthesis, see Smith Foundationalism and Doubt Of his own methodology, Descartes writes: Throughout my writings I have made it clear that my method imitates that of the architect. When an architect wants to build a house which is stable on ground where there is a sandy topsoil over underlying rock, or clay, or some other firm base, he begins by digging out a set of trenches from which he removes the sand, and anything resting on or mixed in with the sand, so that he can lay his foundations on firm soil. In the same way, I began by taking everything that was doubtful and throwing it out, like sand Replies 7, AT 7: His method of doubt is intended to complement foundationalism. The two methods are supposed to work in cooperation, as conveyed in the above quotation. Such an edifice owes its structural integrity to two kinds of features: A system of justified beliefs might be organized by two analogous features: Euclid begins with a foundation of first principles "definitions, postulates, and axioms or common notions" on which he then bases a superstructure of further propositions. Those long chains composed of very simple and easy reasoning, which geometers customarily use to arrive at

their most difficult demonstrations, had given me occasion to suppose that all the things which can fall under human knowledge are interconnected in the same way. Discourse 2, AT 6: It would be misleading to characterize the arguments of the Meditations as unfolding straightforwardly according to geometric method. Though the component finds no analogue in the method of the geometers, Descartes appears to hold that this component is needed in metaphysical inquiry. In contrast, metaphysical inquiry might have first principles that conflict with the senses: The difference is that the primary notions which are presupposed for the demonstration of geometrical truths are readily accepted by anyone, since they accord with the use of our senses. Hence there is no difficulty there, except in the proper deduction of the consequences, which can be done even by the less attentive, provided they remember what has gone before. Admittedly, they are by their nature as evident as, or even more evident than, the primary notions which the geometers study; but they conflict with many preconceived opinions derived from the senses which we have got into the habit of holding from our earliest years, and so only those who really concentrate and meditate and withdraw their minds from corporeal things, so far as possible, will achieve perfect knowledge of them. Such mistakes in the laying of the foundations weaken the entire edifice.

## Chapter 2 : Albert Einstein Quotes (Author of Relativity)

*The line 'ignorance is your new best friend' is about how I felt I was losing people, and I think the band did too. But it's okay, we're growing up. I love that song.*

Ignorance can be thought of in two broad categories. The first is primary ignorance which is when we are ignorant but do not recognize that we are ignorant. Secondary ignorance is when we are ignorant but we know that we do not know. Of the two types of ignorance, primary ignorance is the more insidious. Decisions made where we think we know, but we do not, are often bad decisions. With respect to knowledge an interesting paradox exists. If we know nothing about a subject, we typically recognize we do not know, but if we know a bit about a subject it is human nature to overestimate our knowledge and slip into primary ignorance. In many areas of our lives we are secondarily ignorant and have no issues recognizing that we do not know. On the other hand, after a bit of research on the world wide web I might think I can diagnose myself, understand whether trade deficits are harmful to our economy, or have an opinion on whether a recent court case was well decided – all things probably too complex for me to have enough knowledge without a great deal of research as well as reliance on expert opinion such as seeing a doctor. Many people were very critical of what the Fed was doing. Yet, often these people who thought the Fed had no idea what they were doing themselves knew almost nothing about monetary policy and inflation – they almost never knew about monetary velocity, the Taylor Rule, and the intricacies of demand-pull vs. Failure to recognize the expertise of the Federal Reserve as compared to our own ignorance led to many very poor investment decisions due to misguided fears of high inflation. This clutter is an unfortunate by-product of one of our greatest strengths as a species. We are unbridled pattern recognizers and profligate theorizers. Often, our theories are good enough to get us through the day, or at least to an age when we can procreate. But our genius for creative storytelling, combined with our inability to detect our own ignorance, can sometimes lead to situations that are embarrassing, unfortunate, or downright dangerous. How to avoid The Dunning-Kruger Effect: Before having an opinion ask yourself whether you are an expert in the area. If not, have you done extensive reading and research? Ask yourself – what do the experts say? Should you rely on expert opinion? If not, why not? Are my opinions formed by information from an expert or from a non-expert pundit? We are all swayed by stories and direct life experiences. Ask yourself whether these small samples are representative of the the larger experience. Seek out the other side before having an opinion. The internet can provide a great deal of information about health issues, but it does not make one instantly an expert. Finally – it is a painful thing to admit, but none of us are immune to this phenomenon. Interesting question I am asking myself right now:

## Chapter 3 : Quotes about Knowledge and ignorance ( quotes)

*Ignorance: no Bigotry: no Illiteracy: no Count It's the knowledge What you really want Knowledge That you really want One, two. More on Genius "The Knowledge" Track Info. Written By Jimmy Jam.*

## Chapter 4 : Education And Ignorance Quotes. QuotesGram

*Knowledge is power, and ignorance is bliss. Does this mean that the powerful can't be happy? It just very well may. Let's face the facts: The world isn't all rainbows and unicorns.*

## Chapter 5 : Ignorance and the Dunning-Kruger Effect – IFOD – Interesting Facts of the Day

*The worst kind of ignorance is not knowing just how ignorant we are. That leads to the devastating pretense of knowledge that's part and parcel of the vision of intellectual elites and politicians.*

## Chapter 6 : On Stupidity and Genius | Knowledge Guild

*Ignorance vs. knowledge is a very apparent theme in the Book "Fahrenheit ". It is show more content Montag feels at the begining of the novel that the communication is greatly lacking in society.*

### Chapter 7 : Stupidity Quotes - BrainyQuote

*The most marked difference "between stupidity and genius" is that -usually- the stuff coming from a genius makes sense -if you can understand it.*

### Chapter 8 : The Knowledge Illusion by Steven Sloman, Philip Fernbach | [www.nxgvision.com](http://www.nxgvision.com)

*Oedipus the King Demarah and Han Thesis: Self-knowledge and ignorance are the pivotal themes in Oedipus the King, and evident through Tiresias' wisdom of the truth, Creon's resourcefulness and Oedipus' disregard of his fate.*

### Chapter 9 : Deciding between knowledge and ignorance – Genius Now

*Ignorance, People, Help, Me, You, Choose Anyway, no drug, not even alcohol, causes the fundamental ills of society. If we're looking for the source of our troubles, we shouldn't test people for drugs, we should test them for stupidity, ignorance, greed and love of power.*