

Chapter 1 : John Locke > The Influence of John Locke's Works (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

His work is primarily focused in political philosophy, philosophy of social science, the history of philosophy, and in the later portion of his career, philosophy of religion. Taylor's philosophical style lies somewhere between analytical and continental traditions, and he adopts a somewhat hermeneutical approach.

Finding a new basis for common sensibilities and common values. The world is more economically interconnected than it has ever been. But it still seethes with divisions and social fragmentation. Can we find a new basis for shared values that will bring us together rather than tear us apart? Finding a new basis for social identification. Distant and powerful forces, not answerable to local communities, shape so much of our lives. How can we sustain local communities, communities with which we can identify? Or is the very idea of a local community an outmoded parochial idea suited only to centuries gone by? Neuroscience is revealing so much about the brain. Does this new knowledge solve age-old mysteries of the mind? Or does it reduce the mind to mere dumb matter and rob us of what we once thought was so special about us? Can freedom survive the onslaught of science? Science, especially neuroscience, is revealing more and more about the true workings of the mind, threatening to explode our ancient beliefs about things like the freedom of the will. Can traditional practices that presuppose human freedom survive this scientific onslaught? If we are not really free is it really permissible to punish people, and even put them to death, for their wrongful acts? Information and misinformation in the information age. The 21st century threatens to wreak havoc on the social organization of information and knowledge. We are awash in a glut of information coming at us from all sources – some reliable, some unreliable. But the old top-down authorities that once functioned to certify some information as true and other information as false, are quickly being dismantled. How can we distinguish the good from the bad, the wheat from the chaff? We philosophers for a new century thus face epistemological problems hardly imagined by our predecessors. Intellectual property, in the age of re-mix culture. Ideas now spread like wildfire – mixing and re-mixing in the blink of an eye. Can the very idea of intellectual property survive in the age of re-mix? Are outmoded ideas of property stifling the growth of a new culture? New models of collective decision making and collective rationality. Solving the problems of the 21st Century will require coordinated rational action on a massive scale. But we really have no models of collective rationality, no idea of the institutional, social, political and economic structures that will allow us to meet these challenges. Can philosophers help build them in time to guide us in meeting the challenges of this century? What is a person? What exactly is a human person, when every aspect of our biological and genetic and psychological make-up can be manipulated at will? What, if any, part of a person is fixed and unchanging? Humans and the environment. What relationship should humans have to the environment? Are we called to be stewards of the environment? Or is the environment just there for our exploitation and use? Never in the history of humankind have such questions been so pressing. But we have barely begun to think about them in a systematic philosophical way. And the number one philosophical problem for the 21st Century: What new principles of justice will help us manage distinctively 21st Century problems like preserving the environment while allowing the poorer nations of the world to improve their standards of living? The philosophy of the past has given no real models for answering such questions. It is urgent that philosopher of the 21st century do so. I got a strong view on number 10 and 7. I will write it up when i get the chance.

Chapter 2 : Why Biko's Black Consciousness philosophy resonates with youth today

The split between analytic philosophy and continental philosophy has left American philosophy departments stranded somewhere between the humanities, the natural sciences, and the social sciences. The split is not only a matter of academic politics, but of the struggles between two kinds of.

It should be noted, first and foremost, that philosophy in its traditional sense was science – philosophers like Aristotle used rationality to come to scientific knowledge of the world around us. It was not until relatively modern times that philosophy was considered to be separate from the physical sciences. It is said that liberalism proper, the belief in equal rights under the law, begins with Locke. Locke is the man responsible, through Jefferson primarily, for the absence of nobility in America. Although nobility and birthrights still exist in Europe, especially among the few kings and queens left, the practice has all but vanished. He was soundly criticized by a lot of Christian polemicists those who make war against all thought but Christian thought, especially during the Middle Ages, because he was thought to be an atheist, whose principles for a happy life were passed down to this famous set of statements: Such intangible things he considered preconceived notions, which can be manipulated. Stoicism is based on the idea that anything which causes us to suffer in life is actually an error in our judgment, and that we should always have absolute control over our emotions. Put another way, the world is what we make of it. Epicureanism is the usual school of thought considered the opposite of Stoicism, but today many people mistake one for the other or combine them. Epicureanism argues that displeasures do exist in life and must be avoided, in order to enter a state of perfect mental peace ataraxia, in Greek. Stoicism argues that mental peace must be acquired out of your own will not to let anything upset you. Death is a necessity, so why feel depressed when someone dies? Why get enraged over something? The rage will not result in anything good. Of importance is to shun desire: He lived in the Persian Empire from c. 340-270 BC. The Dark Ages were not so dark. His two most well known works today are The Book of Healing which has nothing to do with physical medicine and The Canon of Medicine, which was his compilation of all known medical knowledge at that time. Influenced primarily by Aristotle, his Book of Healing deals with everything from logic, to math, to music, to science. He proposed in it that Venus is closer than the Sun to Earth. Imagine not knowing that for a fact. The Sun looks a lot closer than Venus, but he got it right. He rejected astrology as a true science, since everything in it is based on conjecture, not evidence. As a matter of fact, the petrification of the bodies of plants and animals is not more extraordinary than the transformation of waters. Petrification can occur in any organic material, and involves the material, most notably wood, being impregnated by silica deposits, gradually changing from its original materials into stone. Avicenna is the first to describe the five classical senses: It would take too long to explain them in this list, but they are all forms of syllogisms, and every philosopher and student of philosophy is familiar with them from the beginning of education in the subject. Thomas founded everything he postulated firmly in Christianity, and for this reason, he is not universally popular, today. Even Christians consider that, since he derived all his ethical teachings from the Bible, Thomas is not independently authoritative of any of those teachings. But his job, in teaching the common people around him, was to get them to understand ethics without all the abstract philosophy. He was able to reach the masses with this simple, four-part instruction. He made five famous arguments for the existence of God, which are still discussed hotly on both sides: He has essence and existence, and these two qualities cannot be separated. He espoused significant principles of ethics and politics, in a time when the Greeks were espousing the same things. This may sound obvious to us today, but he wrote it in the early 4th to late 3rd BC. It is the same principle of democracy that the Greeks argued for and developed: The emperor must be honest and his subjects must respect him, but he must also deserve that respect. If he makes a mistake, his subjects must offer suggestions to correct him, and he must consider them. Any ruler who acted contrary to these principles was a tyrant, and thus a thief more than a ruler. Confucius also devised his own, independent version of the Golden Rule, which had existed for at least a century in Greece before him. His phrasing was almost identical, but then furthered the idea: The second statement is much more important, constituting an active desire to help others. The only other philosopher of antiquity to advocate the Golden Rule in the

positive form is Jesus of Nazareth. Smart is the new sexy! Analytical geometry is the study of geometry using algebra and the Cartesian coordinate system. He discovered the laws of refraction and reflection. He also invented the superscript notation still used today to indicate the powers of exponents. He advocated dualism, which is very basically defined as the power of the mind over the body: He rejected perception as unreliable, and considered deduction the only reliable method for examining, proving and disproving anything. He also adhered to the Ontological Argument for the Existence of a Christian God, stating that, because God is benevolent, Descartes can have some faith in the account of reality his senses provide him, for God has provided him with a working mind and sensory system and does not desire to deceive him. From this supposition, however, Descartes finally establishes the possibility of acquiring knowledge about the world based on deduction and perception. In terms of the study of knowledge therefore, he can be said to have contributed such ideas as a rigorous conception of foundationalism basic beliefs and the possibility that reason is the only reliable method of attaining knowledge. Paul accomplished more with the few letters we have of his, to various churches in Asia Minor, Israel and Rome, than any other mortal person in the Bible, except Jesus himself. But without Paul, the religion would have died in a few hundred years at best, or remained too insular to invite the entire world into its faith, as Jesus wanted. Paul had more than one falling out with Peter, primarily among the other Disciples. Peter insisted that at least one or two of the Jewish traditions remain as requirements, along with faith in Jesus, for one to be counted as Christian. Paul insisted that faith in Jesus is all that is required, and neither circumcision, refusal of certain foods or any other Jewish custom was necessary, because the world was now, and forevermore, under a state of Grace in Jesus, not a state of Law according to Moses. He is especially impressive to have systematized these principles flawlessly, having never met Jesus in person, and in direct opposition to Peter and several other Disciples. Many theologians and experts on Christianity and its history even call Paul, and not Jesus, the founder of Christianity. That may be going a bit too far, but keep in mind that the Disciples intended to keep Christianity for themselves, as the proper form of Judaism, to which only Jews could convert. Anyone could symbolically become a Jew by circumcision and obedience of the Mosaic Laws every one of them, not just the Big Ten. Paul argued against this, stating that as Christ was the absolute greatest good that the world would ever see, and Almighty because he and the Father are one, then the grace of Christ is sufficiently powerful to save anyone from his or her sin, whether Jewish, Gentile or anything else. If Socrates wrote anything down, it has not survived directly. Plato and Xenophon, another of his students, recounted a lot of his teachings, as did the playwright Aristophanes. It is only through philosophy that the world can be free of evils. He argued against democracy proper, rule by the people themselves, since in his view, a democracy had murdered his teacher, Socrates. All things of the material world can change, and our perception of them also, which means that the reality of the material world is weaker, less defined than that of the immaterial abstractions. Plato argued that something must have created the Universe. Whatever it is, the Universe is its offspring, and we, living on Earth, our bodies and everything that we see and hear and touch around us, are less real than the creator of the Universe, and the Universe itself. This is a foundation on which 4 based his understanding of existentialism. But consider that Aristotle is the first to have written systems by which to understand and criticize everything from pure logic to ethics, politics, literature, even science. Aristotle is also the first person in Western history to argue that there is a hierarchy to all life in the Universe; that because Nature never did anything unnecessary as he observed, then in the same way, this animal is in charge of that animal, and likewise with plants and animals together. The Medieval Christian theorists ran with this idea, extrapolating it to the hierarchy of God with Man, including angels. Thus, the angelic hierarchy of Catholicism, usually thought as a purely Catholic notion, stems from Aristotle, who lived and died before Jesus was born. Aristotle was, in fact, at the very heart of the classical education system used through the Medieval western world. His principles of ethics were founded on the concept of doing good, rather than merely being good. A person may be kind, merciful, charitable, etc. We could go on about Aristotle, of course, but this list has gone on long enough. Honorable mentions are very many, so list them as you like.

Chapter 3 : Racial discrimination in america today essays

The split between analytic philosophy and continental philosophy has left American philosophy departments stranded somewhere between the humanities, the natural sciences, and the social sciences.

Locke may well have influenced such diverse eighteenth century figures as Swift, Johnson, Sterne, Voltaire, Priestly and Jefferson. Beginning with the publication of the 92 page summary of the Essay in the *Bibliothèque universelle et historique* for January through March of along with the publication of the first edition in December , the Essay was both popular and controversial on both the continent and in England for the next fifty years. The sustained argument in *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* for rejecting the old scholastic model of knowledge and science in favor of empirically disciplined modes of inquiry was enormously successful. This was an early and striking success of the Essay. Locke denied this, but given that we have good reason to hold that Locke was an anti-trinitarian, we have some reason to doubt that this denial is sincere. The age of rational religion was coming to a close by the middle of the eighteenth century. Berkeley argued that the causal or representative account of perception leads to skepticism about the existence of the external world as there is no good solution to the problem of the veil of perception and the associated distinction between primary and secondary qualities is untenable. These attacks gave rise to several misapprehensions about the doctrines of the Essay and their connection with the history of philosophy. Locke certainly thought he had the resources to solve the problems posed by the veil of perception doctrine and his account of the distinction between primary and secondary qualities is not the same as the one that Berkeley gives. This, along with his agnosticism about whether the soul was material or immaterial were debated hotly through much of the eighteenth century and at least the debates about personal identity were largely recapitulated in the twentieth century. Noam Chomsky in *Cartesian Linguistics* traces the important ideas in linguistics back to Descartes and the school at Port Royal rather than Locke. There were numerous translations into European languages during the eighteenth century as well. As a consequence the *Two Treatises* had very little influence on the debates over how to justify the legitimacy of replacing King James II with William and Mary. John Dunn claims that in the eighteenth century in England the work had little influence. Dunn Certainly conservatives such as Josiah Tucker read it and rejected its doctrines. In France, Locke was influential through the first half of the eighteenth century and then rapidly lost influence as the French came to regard the English as conservative. He was regarded as one of the prophets of the American and French revolutions. The doctrines of natural rights and human rights were rejected in favor of utilitarianism. In the twentieth century with the sale of the Lovelace papers and their donation to Oxford University, interest in Locke among philosophers has considerably revived. These papers included letters, several drafts of the Essay and other works.

Chapter 4 : Latin American Philosophy (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

West is a heavy hitter in social philosophy, having pioneered the school of "neopragmatism" with a focus on the condition of race and class in America. West was the first African-American to receive a Ph.D. in philosophy from Princeton University in

History The history of Latin American philosophy is usefully divided into five periods: Pre-Columbian, Colonial, Independentist, Nationalist, and Contemporary that is, the twentieth century to the present. Most periods are characterized by the dominance of a particular tradition: However, the contemporary situation is more complex and varied. For that reason, it is discussed in a separate and subsequent section, apart from the other historical periods that are the focus of this section. There is good evidence that in at least the major pre-Columbian civilizations there were attempts to explore questions about the nature of reality, the limits of knowledge, and the basis of right action. Moreover, such work persisted in various forms for some time after the Conquest Restrepo ; Maffie Whether this body of work is rightly characterized as philosophy or something else is a disputed matter, with scholars disagreeing about how best to characterize it see Nuccetelli, , ch. It is clear that the reflective and speculative work of pre-Columbian Amerindian peoples was undertaken without any familiarity with the Western philosophical tradition. Those inquiries were also generally undertaken within the religious frameworks of their places and times and the literary or presentational modes in which such questions were entertained were typically removed from traditional forms of European philosophical production. Despite these differences with European philosophy, and despite the often fragmentary and frequently second-hand information that survives concerning pre-Columbian thought, extant works have nevertheless supported a variety of intriguing and subtle accounts of those philosophical or proto-philosophical reflections. Scholasticism, introduced by the Spanish and Portuguese clergy that arrived with the conquistadores, was the dominant philosophical perspective. Most of the work produced during the first two centuries in the colonies was cast in the framework used in the Iberian peninsula. It was particularly indebted to the thought of both sixteenth-century Iberians and their medieval predecessors. Most of these authors were born in the Iberian peninsula, but many of them had settled in the colonies. Sor Juana has the distinction of being the first Latin American thinker to raise questions concerning the status of women in Latin American society. She is also retrospectively regarded as the first Latin American feminist writer and philosopher see also the section on feminist philosophy, below. The eighteenth century, under the influence of modern philosophy and the Enlightenment, helped prepare the way for the revolutionary wars of independence. Philosophical discussions of the time were dominated by political thought. Even so, scholasticism continued to influence the intellectual class and stoked an ongoing interest in traditional metaphysical questions. However, the wave of independentist thought found its greatest inspiration in Enlightenment political philosophy. In particular, liberal political ideals based on the thought of the French philosophes helped to consolidate independentist views throughout Latin America. In the early 19th century, many Latin American countries secured independence from European colonial powers. In the wake of independence, the newly liberated peoples faced the challenge of forming stable, enduring nations out of the remnants of the Spanish and Portuguese empires. The predominant political concerns of that era included the organization and consolidation of the new nations, along with aspirations for social stability, national integration of largely diverse peoples. The overarching ambition in many nations was to achieve the same economic and social progress enjoyed by other nations in Europe and North America. In this context, the ideology of choice was a version of positivism. Indeed, positivism became so influential and widely accepted by intellectuals that it became the official state philosophy of several nations. It was even used to justify dictatorial regimes, as in the case of Mexico. Positivism of the Latin American variety was derived from a peculiar mix of European ideas primarily originating in the thought of Auguste Comte " , Herbert Spencer " , and Ernst Haeckel " The period of positivist hegemony, in which it was the dominant philosophical perspective in Latin America, extended roughly from the middle of the nineteenth century to the first decade of the twentieth. The Contemporary Period Contemporary Latin American philosophy begins in the twentieth

century, around , coinciding with the decline of positivism. By , the remaining positivists in Latin America were usually regarded as museum pieces rather than proponents of a viable philosophy meriting serious attention. The contemporary, post-positivist period can be divided into three distinct sub-periods. The first "rebellion" is characterized by the backlash against positivism and the subsequent development of foundations for future philosophical movements ca. The second "normalcy" is characterized by the achievement of a degree of institutionalization and normalization in the philosophical profession " The third period "maturity" ca. It was brought about by a generation of philosophers born around , all of whom were trained as positivists, before breaking with it. The adoption of ideas from France, and later from Germany, was instrumental in formulating the basis for rejecting positivism. It began with the influence of Emile Boutroux " , Henri Bergson " , and French vitalism and intuitionism. They completed the process initiated by the founders and laid the foundations of future developments. One of the main preoccupations of the founders and the generation that followed them was the absorption of European ideas; they wanted to be philosophically up to date. In contrast with the objectives of the philosophers that preceded them, which were for the most part religious during the colonial period , political during the period of independence , or economic during the nationalist period , the concern of these thinkers was more systematically philosophical in motivation. This was a significant change in Latin American philosophy, insofar as scholasticism, Enlightenment liberalism, and positivism were typically undertaken at least in Latin America for purposes frequently disconnected from a conception of philosophy in which the discipline was pursued for its own sake. For scholastics, the primary objective was the apologetic defense of the faith; for liberals, the end was political emancipation; and for positivists, the goal was national integration and economic and social progress. In all three cases, European ideas were typically adopted with pre-established ends in mind. As a consequence, philosophical movements were not obviously the products of philosophical concerns as such. In contrast to prior generations, the founders and those who followed them did not tend to adopt European ideas with a view to the defense of a body of doctrine, or in order to achieve certain practical ends of political liberation or of national unity and economic and social progress. Their ideas arose from philosophical dissatisfactions with positivism. They were concerned, for example, with freedom and the fact that determinism, which they considered undesirable, was a necessary corollary of positivism. Still, their attitude toward the ideas they adopted was seldom critical. They saw the defects of positivism, but too often they still accepted uncritically the solutions they borrowed from non-positivist European philosophers to fight it. Although the founders and some of their immediate successors had attained some emancipation in the philosophical enterprise, full maturity remained elusive. Still, the sophistication of some thinkers, such as Korn, was considerable and planted the critical seeds that germinated in the following period. A state of normalcy became established in most countries of Latin America, and what might be called Latin-Americanism grew significantly. The limitations on originality characteristic of previous generations were in part the result of the lack of self-criticism and the practical difficulties involved in pursuing a philosophical career in Latin America. The contribution of those generations was largely restricted to the importation of foreign thought; originality in substantive doctrine was rarely achieved, or even an ambition. There were exceptions, of course. Romero, for example, in his *Theory of Man* , developed an original philosophical anthropology. This group was the first generation of Latin American philosophers to benefit from formal education in philosophy. Previous philosophers had been mostly self-taught, typically trained in another profession, but taking up philosophy out of personal interest. The structural changes in the academy introduced by the Founders and the generation that followed made it possible for an entire generation to be trained by philosophers at the university. Another important general feature of this period of Latin American philosophy was that the incipient Latin-Americanism of the previous generation developed and flourished. This change became evident with the philosophers born around and those who followed them. Several philosophers of this generation readily traveled throughout Latin America and establishing dialogue with other Latin Americans. This is not to say that Latin-Americanism in philosophy was very robust. Even today, lack of region-wide philosophical dialogue remains more common than not, and communities of discourse tend to be more local or national than international. Still, philosophical communication within Latin America markedly increased during this period. One of the factors that helped the

development of philosophy was the increasing consciousness of a distinctly Latin American philosophical identity, of a sense that there was something different or distinctive about Latin American philosophy. This debate was one in which practically all important philosophers of the period participated. In turn, this debate provided impetus to the study and dissemination of the philosophical work of Latin American thinkers throughout the region. In addition, anthologies, specialized works, and critical editions of Latin American philosophical classics have been published. The very controversy concerning the existence and possibility of an autochthonous Latin American philosophy that drew so much attention in the second quarter of the twentieth century and, for that matter, still continues, has helped to promote and spread the knowledge of Latin American thought and the philosophical dialogue among Latin American philosophers. This was not a phenomenon limited to any one period of Latin American philosophy. The colonial regime was without a doubt paradigmatic of intellectual oppression and control, but the fact of oppression and intellectual constraints became more profound after independence. In the nineteenth century, positivists used philosophy as an instrument for specific political and social agendas, and it was used as a basis for suppressing dissent. In the twentieth century this oppressive pattern was not limited to a specific intellectual orientation; philosophical suppression became institutionalized in regimes of the right and the left. The result has always been the same: Latin American intellectuals subject to these pressures have regularly been forced to go into exile, a state of affairs that has become almost customary and is prevalent to this day in some countries. An indirect but unexpectedly beneficial result of this recurring situation was that the philosophical peripatetism of Latin American philosophers contributed to inter-American philosophical dialogue. Among the most influential were: There were diverse effects of the arrival of this group. First, their migrations throughout Latin America helped break down some of the national barriers between philosophical communities in Latin America. The conception of hispanidad that they inherited from Miguel de Unamuno and from Ortega, and the need to establish themselves in Latin America, helped the process; they went from country to country, spreading ideas and contributing to the increase in philosophical dialogue. Second, many of them helped implement changes in university curricula across Latin America, frequently establishing lasting programs in philosophy. The effects of their work became evident when the generation born around reached maturity. It was at that point that Latin American philosophers began to think and act philosophically in pan-Latin American terms, traveling, exchanging ideas, and cooperating in projects of common interest. The period that goes from to does not reveal drastic changes in philosophical orientation. Simultaneously, scholasticism experienced renewed impetus. The number of sympathizers of philosophical analysis and Marxism continued to grow, but Thomism, phenomenology, existentialism, and various versions of nationalist and culturalist philosophy were the dominant approaches throughout Latin America. Those working outside the dominant currents had little institutional power. The work had markedly increased in originality and depth, and some of it achieved international visibility. This period of maturity continues to the present. To appreciate the distinctiveness of this new situation, it helps to recall that the period of normalcy was characterized by 1 critical interaction with the philosophical ideas coming from outside Latin America, 2 an increase in dialogue within Latin America, and 3 the institutionalization of philosophy. In the period of maturity, these features became stable and the general caliber of philosophical work continued to improve accordingly. If one measures philosophical activity by the number of new journals founded, or by the number of important congresses that occur, one might mistakenly conclude that philosophical activity actually diminished after the s. However, many of the journals founded in the preceding twenty years continued publication, so there was actually a net increase in fora for philosophical work. Moreover, more than a dozen important congresses and philosophical meetings took place between and In short, the activity related to publications and professional meetings had reached a healthy level of stability.

Chapter 5 : Ethics and Political Philosophy in Latin America Today

Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.

Our foundation essays are longer than usual and take a wider look at key issues affecting society. Once the flames begin to catch the wind will blow it higher. Is this a coincidence of history or a confluence of historical verities? Each generation must, out of relative obscurity, discover its mission, fulfil it or betray it. This is the generation of those who turned 16 between and It experienced the wrath of apartheid. As Mattes further explains , the born-frees refer to those who, starting in Some characterise born-frees as who were born in and voted for the first time in the general elections. This discussion subscribes to the latter characterisation. The born-frees are not a homogenous generation. There are who that are at the universities. Others, because of their socioeconomic circumstances, loiter in the streets. The philosophy spawned radicalism characterised by confrontation with the apartheid machinery. The epochal June 16, students uprisings are a case in point. Crowds pay tribute to anti-Apartheid hero Steve Biko as former President Nelson Mandela unveils a statue of him in Why are they being radicalised when they should be enjoying the fruits of democracy brought by the struggles of the previous generations? The born frees increasingly think not “ especially those in the lowest strata of society, unable to afford a tertiary education, facing a bleak future and feeling alienated. They question the very concept of freedom and being born free as an oxymoron. These concepts have failed to instil a sense of pride in their blackness. In many ways this trivialises the complexity of the post-apartheid society, following many years of apartheid colonialism. Theologian Ndikho Mtshiselwa argues that the fundamentals of the apartheid colonial social order are still in place, with the democratic regime unwittingly administering them, instead of changing or providing leadership in their destruction. It seeks to infuse the black community with a new-found pride in themselves, their efforts, their value systems, their culture, their religion and their outlook to life. This is what students at the universities of Cape Town and Stellenbosch are fighting against. The same spirit exists at the University of the Witwatersrand, where Western epistemology is increasingly being challenged in the debate on curricula transformation. The born-frees are grappling with the question of the meaning of freedom in post-apartheid South Africa. They seek an antidote to their reality wherein blackness continues to be mocked and marginalised. Their reality is one in which language policy is overtly used to limit the number of black students at historically white universities. They also have to contend with situations whereby white students enjoy privileged status under the guise of dual language instruction to perpetuate the falsehood of separate but equal. This much is evident in the accounts of 32 students at the University of Stellenbosch in the online documentary Luister. The struggles of the born-frees beg the questions: Did it err when it focused more on political transformation to the detriment of social and economic dimensions? Its transcendence continues to connect generations.

Chapter 6 : The Influence of the Renaissance on Modern American Society, Culture and Art

Ethics and Political Philosophy in Latin America Today. Professor Enrique Dussel is a professor of ethics in the department of philosophy of the Autonomous Metropolitan University, Iztapalapa, in Mexico City (UAM).

This is evident by the early colonial documents such as the Fundamental Orders of Connecticut and the Massachusetts Body of Liberties. Two native-born Americans, Samuel Johnson and Jonathan Edwards, were first influenced by these philosophers; they then adapted and extended their Enlightenment ideas to develop their own American theology and philosophy. Both were originally ordained Puritan Congregationalist ministers who embraced much of the new learning of the Enlightenment. Both were Yale educated and Berkeley influenced idealists who became influential college presidents. Both were influential in the development of American political philosophy and the works of the Founding Fathers. Late in the century, Scottish Innate or Common Sense Realism replaced the native schools of these two rivals in the college philosophy curricula of American colleges; it would remain the dominant philosophy in American academia up to the Civil War. Johnson wrote in his Autobiography, "All this was like a flood of day to his low state of mind" and that "he found himself like one at once emerging out of the glimmer of twilight into the full sunshine of open day. He began to teach the Enlightenment curriculum there, and thus began the American Enlightenment. One of his students for a brief time was a fifteen-year-old Jonathan Edwards. Whatever features an object may have, it has these properties because the object resists. Though Edwards reformed Puritan theology using Enlightenment ideas from natural philosophy, and Locke, Newton, and Berkeley, he remained a Calvinist and hard determinist. Jonathan Edwards also rejected the freedom of the will, saying that "we can do as we please, but we cannot please as we please. Enlightenment[edit] While the 17th- and early 18th-century American philosophical tradition was decidedly marked by religious themes and the Reformation reason of Ramus, the 18th century saw more reliance on science and the new learning of the Age of Enlightenment, along with an idealist belief in the perfectibility of human beings through teaching ethics and moral philosophy, laissez-faire economics, and a new focus on political matters. So he crafted one. His fusion philosophy of Natural Religion and Idealism, which has been called "American Practical Idealism", [19] was developed as a series of college textbooks in seven editions between and. These works, and his dialogue Raphael, or The Genius of the English America, written at the time of the Stamp Act crisis, go beyond his Wollaston and Berkeley influences; [20] Raphael includes sections on economics, psychology, the teaching of children, and political philosophy. His moral philosophy is defined in his college textbook Elementa Philosophica as "the Art of pursuing our highest Happiness by the practice of virtue". It was influential in its day: Three members of the Committee of Five who edited the Declaration of Independence were closely connected to Johnson: In continuing with the chief concerns of the Puritans in the 17th century, the Founding Fathers debated the interrelationship between God, the state, and the individual. Resulting from this were the United States Declaration of Independence, passed in, and the United States Constitution, ratified in. The Constitution sets forth a federated republican form of government that is marked by a balance of powers accompanied by a checks and balances system between the three branches of government: Even Franklin professed the need for a "public religion" [28] and would attend various churches from time to time. Jefferson was vestryman at the evangelical Calvinistical Reformed Church of Charlottesville, Virginia, a church he himself founded and named in, [29] suggesting that at this time of life he was rather strongly affiliated with a denomination and that the influence of Whitefield and Edwards reached even into Virginia. He was a Presbyterian minister and a delegate who joined the Continental Congress just days before the Declaration was debated. His moral philosophy was based on the work of the Scottish philosopher Francis Hutcheson, who also influenced John Adams. Common Sense, which has been described as "the most incendiary and popular pamphlet of the entire revolutionary era", [45] provides justification for the American revolution and independence from the British Crown. The American incarnation of Romanticism was transcendentalism and it stands as a major American innovation. The 19th century also saw the rise of the school of pragmatism, along with a smaller, Hegelian philosophical movement led by George Holmes

Howison that was focused in St. Louis , though the influence of American pragmatism far outstripped that of the small Hegelian movement.

Chapter 7 : American Philosophy | Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy

American Philosophy. Pragmatism is seen by most philosophers today as the classic American philosophical tradition. Not easily definable, Pragmatism is a.

Over the past half century, conservatism has become the dominant political philosophy in the United States. Newspaper and television political news stories more often than not will mention the word conservative. Almost every Republican running for office—whether for school board or U. Even Democrats sometimes distinguish among members of their own party in terms of conservatism. Although conservatism as we know it today is a relatively new movement—it emerged after World War II and only became a political force in the 1960s—it is based on ideas that are as old as Western civilization itself. The intellectual foundations on which this movement has been built stretch back to antiquity, were further developed during the Middle Ages and in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century England, and were ultimately formulated into a coherent political philosophy at the time of the founding of the United States. In a real sense, conservatism is Western civilization. The basic foundations of American conservatism can be boiled down to four fundamental concepts. We might call them the four pillars of modern conservatism: The first pillar of conservatism is liberty, or freedom. Conservatives believe that individuals possess the right to life, liberty, and property, and freedom from the restrictions of arbitrary force. They exercise these rights through the use of their natural free will. Above all, it means freedom from oppression by government—and the protection of government against oppression. It means political liberty, the freedom to speak your mind on matters of public policy. It means religious liberty—to worship as you please, or not to worship at all. It also means economic liberty, the freedom to own property and to allocate your own resources in a free market. Conservatism is based on the idea that the pursuit of virtue is the purpose of our existence and that liberty is an essential component of the pursuit of virtue. Adherence to virtue is also a necessary condition of the pursuit of freedom. In other words, freedom must be pursued for the common good, and when it is abused for the benefit of one group at the expense of others, such abuse must be checked. Still, confronted with a choice of more security or more liberty, conservatives will usually opt for more liberty. The second pillar of conservative philosophy is tradition and order. Conservatism is also about conserving the values that have been established over centuries and that have led to an orderly society. Conservatives believe in human nature; they believe in the ability of man to build a society that respects rights and that has the capacity to repel the forces of evil. It signifies the performance of certain duties and the enjoyment of certain rights within a community. Order is perhaps more easily understood by looking at its opposite: A disordered existence is a confused and miserable existence. If a society falls into general disorder, many of its members will cease to exist at all. And if the members of a society are disordered in spirit, the outward order of society cannot long endure. Disorder describes well everything that conservatism is not. The third pillar is the rule of law. Conservatism is based on the belief that it is crucial to have a legal system that is predictable, that allows people to know what the rules are and enforce those rules equally for all. This means that both governors and the governed are subject to the law. The rule of law promotes prosperity and protects liberty. Put simply, a government of laws and not of men is the only way to secure justice. The fourth pillar is belief in God. Belief in God means adherence to the broad concepts of religious faith—such things as justice, virtue, fairness, charity, community, and duty. These are the concepts on which conservatives base their philosophy. Conservative belief is tethered to the idea that there is an allegiance to God that transcends politics and that sets a standard for politics. For conservatives, there must be an authority greater than man, greater than any ruler, king, or government: There must be a moral order, conservatives believe, that undergirds political order. This pillar of conservatism does not mean mixing up faith and politics, and it certainly does not mean settling religious disputes politically. It also does not mean that conservatives have a monopoly on faith, or even that all conservatives are necessarily believers. Each of the four pillars is closely related to all the others. Liberty, for example, is considered a gift of God and must be protected by the rule of law. The rule of law itself is dependent on the natural law—a transcendent law reflected in every orderly and civilized society, demarcating good and evil. Tradition and order are best

reflected by our common law—a law developed over centuries by reasonable people in their everyday lives, which sets the rules for social order consistent with the past. And tradition is an important dimension of belief in God. What could demonstrate tradition and order more fully, for example, than the Old Testament and the history of the Jewish people, or the doctrines of the Christian Church? The Four Cities Another way of understanding these four pillars is to see them in terms of the historical origins of the conservative tradition. Russell Kirk, who is probably the preeminent conservative scholar of the twentieth century, often spoke of the four cities in which the foundations of Western civilization—and so, of conservatism—were laid: Jerusalem, Athens, Rome, and London. Our own Philadelphia in the late eighteenth century can then be seen to represent the culmination of a great tradition. The first city is Jerusalem, where the concept of a transcendent order originated—the understanding that true law comes from God and that God is the source of order and justice. From Jerusalem came one of the most essential ideas of conservatism—that man does not have all the answers, that there is a power greater than man to which we owe our lives and everything that is good. The Hebrews in the Old Testament taught that God made a covenant or compact with His people; He decreed laws by which they should live, and from that revelation we eventually developed modern ethics and modern law. The idea of a compact forms the very basis of our modern political order. The second city is Athens, where the ancient Greek philosophers, particularly Plato and Aristotle, described the basis of the social order—what was required for people to live together and to thrive in society. Aristotle, whose writings have had a profound influence on conservative thought, understood the needs of the individual and his relationship to community. Man is a political animal, he taught, and only recognizes his talents and how to use them for the common good if he is part of a community. The Greek philosophers, however, added nothing to the argument for liberty; in fact, Greek philosophy tended to advocate total subjugation of the individual by the state. The third city in this progression is Rome, where we learn of the highest form of government, the republic, and the use of the separation of powers and checks and balances for the control of political power. Rome also provided the very idea of the rule of law—how law was necessary to preserve order and liberty, and how it needed to be reliable and consistent. Until the Roman republic collapsed, Roman statesmen such as Cato and Cicero also taught us about virtue as a necessary restraint on the passions of men, vital for the preservation of liberty. The Roman Empire, which followed the republic, taught little about individual liberty, of course, but a great deal about the use, and abuse, of power. Finally there is London, where the teachings that helped to establish the foundations of modern conservatism stretched from the Middle Ages to the end of the eighteenth century and beyond. The foundation was laid by the Magna Carta in 1215 and evolved into the concept of the common law and the idea that the law applies equally to all, whether the king or the lowliest commoner. The Magna Carta and the common law also taught the concept of the permanence of the law—the principle of the supremacy of law, meaning that an enduring law exists and must be obeyed by all men. William Blackstone, a professor at Oxford and later a judge, published his *Commentaries on the Laws of England* in 1765; he argued in that massive work that natural law was the basis of all law and was rooted in Christian ethics, and he declared that man had innate rights to personal security, to personal liberty, and to private property. But Blackstone also argued that these rights were not absolute. In society, you had to give up certain rights as the price for the mutual commerce that you enjoyed. Call it a social contract; it is a fundamental doctrine of American politics and central to conservative philosophy. The influence that British political thinkers had on conservative philosophy could fill many books. Burke was Irish, a member of the House of Commons, and is probably the closest thing we have to the intellectual father of modern American conservatism. Among his most important contributions to conservative philosophy are his views about the wisdom of tradition and order. He believed that the wisdom of any one individual is minuscule compared with the collective wisdom accumulated by our ancestors over the centuries. To Burke, habit, instinct, custom, faith, reverence, prejudice—the accumulated practical knowledge acquired through experience—is more important than abstract speculation. Tradition, in other words, is vital for a good society. It is not law and tradition as such that are to be feared, but arbitrary laws and arbitrary government. Burke also taught that the most important political virtue is prudence—the art of calculating the eventual results of policies, of avoiding extremes, of shunning haste. The Philadelphia Experiment The ideas that came from Jerusalem, Athens, Rome, and London were all alive in the minds of the

men who gathered in a fifth city, Philadelphia, in and again in , in order to draft, debate, and eventually adopt the Declaration of Independence and the U. Our Founders had studied the Bible; they had read the classics and the British political writers; they knew the history of Western civilization. Weaving together the best elements of that tradition, they formed what would endure as the greatest experiment in the history of a political community founded on the concepts of liberty, morality, and justice. In this way, our American Founders were also the founders of the American conservative cause. The Declaration of Independence dissolved the relationship between the American people and Great Britain and established a new, sovereign nation—the United States of America. The Declaration set out the moral vision of the new nation and articulated a theory of what a legitimate government should be. It then spoke in quite specific terms about how Britain had violated those principles. Many of the early Americans had left Europe because they had been oppressed and wanted the freedom promised in the New World. They wanted to worship as they saw fit, to speak their minds, and to earn a living freely. But over the years, British rule began to undermine American liberty. The Declaration lists twenty-eight abuses by the king—taxation without consent, denial of trial by jury, denial of religious liberty, freedom of speech, and more. The social contract had been broken—by the king—so the colonists declared that they owed no further allegiance to him. We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Here the Founders are affirming that natural law is a higher law than that made by men, one that establishes the difference between right and wrong. It then says that the only legitimate governments are those that operate by the consent of the governed, and that the governed have a right—again, God-given—to change the government or abolish it. Put another way, the Declaration says there is no divine right of kings, no absolute power of government. Instead, all rightful power in government derives only from the people. The Declaration makes it clear that we are born with these rights, which means that every person has equal rights. The only legitimate function of a government is to secure these rights, and, again, only with the consent of the people. So the Declaration limits the power of the government not once but twice:

Chapter 8 : How ancient philosophy effects us today by darienne spradling on Prezi

Global justice, UN today is a mere puppet of US and its allies, its lost its trust and effectiveness in managing human conflict and a dumb spectator to powerful forces weilding power over nations people and teritories.

References and Further Reading 1. From the "Mayflower Compact," penned in as the early English settlers arrived in the New World, basic socio-political positions were made explicit and fundamental to newly established communities. Speaking of forming a covenant to "combine ourselves into a civil Body Politic," those arriving on the Mayflower immediately identified a close and ineliminable connection between individuals and their community. This sentiment was echoed in founding documents of other colonies, such as the Fundamental Orders of Connecticut and the Massachusetts Body of Liberties. Likewise, the writings of prominent early colonial leaders, such as John Winthrop emphasized "the care of the public must oversway all private respects" for it is a true rule that particular estates cannot subsist in the ruin of the public. From the earliest concerns, then, even prior to the establishment of the United States, the social and political issues of the relation of individuals to their communities as well as the nature of the communities themselves that is, as secular or religious were paramount. Far and away the most significant thinker of the first half of the 18th century for American Philosophy was Jonathan Edwards. Frequently characterized as trying to synthesize a Christian Platonism, with an emphasis on the reality of a spiritual world, with an empiricist epistemology, an emphasis on Lockean sensation and Newtonian corpuscular physics, Edwards drew directly from the thought of Bishop George Berkeley, who stressed the necessity of mind or non-material reality to make sense of human experience. This non-material mind, for Edwards, consists of understanding and will, both of which are passive at root. It is understanding that, along lines of the successes of Newtonian physics, leads to the fundamental metaphysical category of Resistance, which Edwards characterizes as "the primary quality of objects. Understanding, though, is different than will. Edwards is perhaps best known for his rejection of free will. As he remarked, "we can do as we please, but we cannot please as we please. Every act of will is connected to understanding, and thus determined. Echoing the views of John Calvin, Edwards saw not good works, but the grace of God as the determiner of human fortune. While couched primarily in a religious context for Edwards but less so for others, the acceptance and adaptation of a Newtonian worldview was something shared by most American philosophers in the latter half of the 18th century. These later thinkers, however, abandoned to a great extent the religious context and focused rather on social-political issues. Sharing many commitments of European philosophers of the Age of Enlightenment such as a reliance on reason and science, a broad faith in scientific and social progress along with a belief in the perfectibility of humans, a strong advocacy of political democracy and laissez-faire economics, many of the famous names of American history identified themselves with this enlightenment thought. While they attended very little to basic issues of metaphysics or epistemology, the Founding Fathers, such as Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, and James Madison, wrote voluminously on social and political philosophy. The American Declaration of Independence as well as the United States Constitution, with its initial amendments, better known as the Bill of Rights, was drafted at this time, with their emphasis on religious toleration. Though including explicit references to God, these thinkers tended to commit themselves in their writings less to Christianity per se and more to deism, the view of God as creator of a world governed by natural laws which they believed were explicated for the most part by Newton but not directly involved with human action. For example, as early as and as late as Franklin spoke of God as world-creator and Jesus as providing a system of morality but with no direct commitment to the divinity of Jesus or to any organized church. Instead, a major focus of concern was the appropriate nature of the State and its relation to individuals. While the thought of Thomas Jefferson, exemplified in the language of the Declaration of Independence, emphasized natural, inalienable rights of individuals against the tyranny of the State - with the legitimacy of the State only in securing the rights of individuals - federalists such as James Madison highlighted dangers of factional democracy, with his view of protecting both individual rights and the public good. A Hegelian movement, centered in St. Louis and identified largely with its chief proponent, George Holmes Howison, occurred in the

second half of the nineteenth century, but was overshadowed by the rise of Pragmatism. Even the journal founded in by the St. Louis Hegelians, *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, became best known later on because of its publication of essays by the pragmatist Charles Peirce. Where the thinkers of the American enlightenment stressed social and political concerns, based on a Newtonian mechanistic view of the world, the thinkers of American Transcendentalism took the emphasis on individuals and their relation to the community in a different direction. This direction was based not on a mechanistic view of the world, but on an organic metaphor that stressed the subjective nature of human experience and existence. Highlighting personal experience and often even a fairly mystical holism, writers such as Ralph Waldo Emerson, Henry David Thoreau, and Walt Whitman argued for the priority of personal non-cognitive, emotional connections to nature and to the world as a whole. Human are agents in the world more fundamentally than they are knowers of the world. Because of this, those things that constrain or restrict free personal thought, such as conventional morality and political institutions, need to be transcended as well. Unscrew the doors themselves from their jambs! I speak the past-word primeval, I give the sign of democracy. In his paper, "Nature," Emerson states, "In the woods, we return to reason and faith. I am nothing; I see all; the currents of the Universal Being circulate through me; I am part or parcel of God. In the wilderness I find something more dear and connate than in streets and villages. As thinkers, mankind have ever been divided into two sects, Materialists and Idealists; the first class founding on experience, the second on consciousness; the first class beginning to think from the data of the senses, the second class perceive that the senses are not final, and say, The senses give us representations of things, but what are the things themselves, they cannot tell. Society is good when it does not violate me, but best when it is likest to solitude. Everything real is self-existent. Everything divine shares the self-existence of Deity. [Kant showed] there was a very important class of ideas or imperative forms, which did not come by way of experience, but through which experience was acquired; that these were intuitions of the mind itself; and he denominated them Transcendental forms. Though not known widely outside of academic circles, two thinkers in particular wrote passionately for re-conceiving philosophical concerns and positions along Darwinian lines, John Fiske and Chauncey Wright. Both stressed the need to understand consciousness and morality in terms of their evolutionary development. Such a naturalistic, evolutionary approach became even more pronounced at the end of the twentieth century. It was outside of academia, however, often under the label of "Social Darwinism" that this view had even greater impact and influence, especially via the writings of Herbert Spencer and William Graham Sumner. Both Spencer and Sumner likened societies to organisms, in a struggle for survival. Indeed, it was Spencer, not Darwin, who coined the term "survival of the fittest" to capture what he and many others took to be the significance of evolutionary theory. If groups within a society, and even societies themselves, are - like biological organisms - in a constant competition for survival, then a sign of their fitness is the fact that they do in fact survive, for Spencer. Such competition, indeed, is useful and good, for in the long run those that survive will have competed and won, a clear statement of their superiority. That is, to take care of his or her own self. Society, therefore, does not need any care or supervision. One prominent advocate of Darwin, who nevertheless argued that cooperation rather than competition was the message of evolutionary thought, was Lester Ward. After Transcendentalism and evolutionary philosophy, the third and by far most renowned philosophical movement in nineteenth century America was Pragmatism. Informally christened as "pragmatism" in the s by one of its most famous proponents, Charles Sanders Peirce, Pragmatism is seen by most philosophers today as the classic American philosophical tradition. Not easily definable, Pragmatism is a constellation of principles, stances, and philosophical commitments, some of which are more or less salient for particular pragmatism philosophers as will be noted below. Nevertheless, there are threads that run across and through most pragmatists. There is a strong naturalistic bent, meaning that they look for an understanding of phenomena and concepts in terms of how they arose and how they play a part in our engagement with the world. Then, our conception of these effects is the whole of our conception of the object. All knowledge claims are fallible and revisable. The flip side of such fallibility and revisability is that no inquiry is disinterested. Beliefs are fundamentally instruments for us to cope with the contingencies of the world. In addition, there is an enunciated commitment to intersubjectivity and community. So, while rejecting the notion of any pure

"givens," of experience, pragmatists also reject any pure subjectivism or abandonment of standards or criteria of adjudication beyond the individual. Unlike the American philosophical movements that preceded Pragmatism, pragmatists wrestled with issues and concerns across the philosophical spectrum, from basic metaphysics to epistemology to all forms of axiology ethical, political, and even aesthetic. Peirce, a polymath by all accounts, not only coined the term "pragmatism" in the s, but did ground-breaking work in semiotics the study of signs as well as in logic, particularly in the logic of relations. In addition, while a scientist and mathematician by trade, he wrote a considerable amount on the philosophy of science for example, on the nature of explanation , value theory, and metaphysics, including seminal work on categories. From his early writings in the s, in which he criticized Cartesian doubt and foundationalist search for indubitability, to his later works on cognition and what he termed "evolutionary cosmology," Peirce continuously and consistently argued against forms of nominalism and in favor of realism, both in the sense that non-particulars are real though perhaps not existent and in the sense that our conceptions are of things independent of us. This comes through in his insistence that, as inquirers do not exist in isolation, beliefs are not fulfilled as he put it, the irritation of doubt is not overcome in isolation. Rather, it is the development of successful habit that matters and it is the verdict of the community of inquirers in the long run that matters in the determination of what settles inquiry. Just as this is not a subjectivist view of what is real or true, it is also not a "social constructivist" view, in which what is real or true is determined by what society decides. Instead, as in the model of good science, there is a community of inquirers who form a system of checks and balances for any belief, but this community of inquirers operates within a world of objects, qualities, relations, and laws. In establishing his notion of pragmatism as a means of clarifying and determining the meaning of signs, Peirce coined his "Pragmatic Maxim," noted above. This maxim not only points to pragmatism as a criterion of meaningfulness but also to pragmatism as a standard of truth. For Peirce, belief is not merely a cognitive state of an isolated agent, rather it encompasses an awareness of a state of affairs along with the appeasement of the irritation of doubt or surprise and - as genuine belief and not simply verbiage - the establishment of a habit, or rule of action. This requirement of a rule of action carries over for Peirce beyond epistemological concerns to metaphysical ones as well, particularly in his work on categories, or fundamental modes of being. Using varied terminology at different times, Peirce identified three fundamental categories of being. One category was that of Quality or Firstness. This is the conception of being independent of anything else, such as the example of a pure tone or color. A second category was that of Brute Fact or Secondness , that is being relative to or connected with something else. This might be a particular instance of a tone or a color sample. This is what he sometimes called the "demonstrative application" of a sign. Finally, there is Law, or Habit or Thirdness , or mediation whereby a First and Second are brought into relation. This is the notion of regularity and representation, and as such involves a regulative as well as descriptive aspect. An example is a red light indicating the need to stop or perhaps indicating danger. Law, habit, regularity are neither reducible to the particular instances that are true of it that is, Secondness nor to the pure material quality of what is instantiated in those particulars that is, Firstness. For Peirce, these three categories are all real, are all irreducible to the others, and are all involved in any form or act of inquiry. William James William James, known during his lifetime as much for his work in psychology as for his work in philosophy, did much more than Peirce to popularize the label and notion of pragmatism, both as a philosophical method for resolving disputes and as a theory of meaning and truth. Though James himself also argued against subjectivism and for the importance of "older truths" that is, established facts , his writings led many others including Peirce to see his position as much more relativist and nominalist-leaning. James stressed the practical effects of belief and assertion, claiming that truth is a species of good what it is ultimately good for us to believe. For example, the traditional metaphysical concern of the nature of substance, as a category of things underlying and separable from attributes, has led to philosophers since the time of Plato to argue back and forth without any apparent solution. For James, the only significance of such an issue is what effect on our subsequent experience is likely to occur given the adoption of some position with respect to this issue. Likewise, any stance on, say, the existence of God, will matter only if adopting a belief for or against such existence will shape our future experience for the better. Since beliefs are instruments for coping with the world, those beliefs that are good

for us, those that indeed help us cope, are the ones that are true. Of course, the goodness and coping-value of some beliefs might be negligible as in my beliefs that Romans wore socks while in Britain. The point for James is not the level or strength of goodness, but the appropriate criterion of truth and significance. While James, then, often focused on trying to dissolve long-standing philosophical puzzles, he also offered substantive positions on many issues. He argued for what is now called a compatibilist view of free will that human freedom is compatible with some forms of determinism as well as against a dualist view of mind. With respect to some traditional philosophical issues, e. With respect to determinism, for example, he argued that a belief in determinism leads to a feeling of fatalism and a capitulation to the status quo; hence, it is not better for us. In metaphysics, he is still known for his view of "radical empiricism," in which he argued that relations between objects are as real as the properties of objects. This view, he claimed, consisted in outline of a postulate, a statement of fact, and a generalized conclusion. The postulate is that the only things that shall be debatable among philosophers shall be things definable in terms drawn from experience.

Chapter 9 : The Uses of Philosophy in Today's World

Along the way, the conservative movement built a coherent philosophy that still exists today. And it is no exaggeration to say that most of today's prominent conservatives—whether politicians, academics, activists, donors, or writers—got their start, in one way or another, working for Ronald Reagan.

This work is available here free, so that those who cannot afford it can still have access to it, and so that no one has to pay before they read something that might not be what they really are seeking. But if you find it meaningful and helpful and would like to contribute whatever easily affordable amount you feel it is worth, please do so. I will appreciate it. The button to the right will take you to PayPal where you can make any size donation of 25 cents or more you wish, using either your PayPal account or a credit card without a PayPal account. It differs from science in that it includes the study of more than what is empirical. Examples of philosophical writing that examine concepts and beliefs about various topics are many of my essays at www. In normal usage, the terms "philosophy" and "philosophical" have a number of trivial meanings which have nothing to do with the academic subject of philosophy or the slightly broader sense in which I use it here, that includes thinking more deeply and systematically about topics which may not be found in typical college philosophy department courses, so people tend to misunderstand what philosophy is, and see no point in studying it. It is not related to philosophy in the sense of sustained, systematic, reflective analysis of any topic. Loosely associated with this view of philosophy is the one that thinks philosophers are at best merely "book-smart" people who have no common sense because they come up with crackpot beliefs and ideas. While in some cases this may be true, more often it is believed because it is not the reasoning but only the conclusion that is looked at, and it is true that many conclusions philosophers reach are counter-intuitive or odd, or contrary to conventional belief. It is important, however, not to look just at conclusions that people reach, but the evidence and reasons they give for them. That is where insights lie if there are to be any. Thus, in a time of great economic, scientific, and technological advancement, one might mistakenly believe that there is no particular use for philosophy, because it deals with intangible ideas, some seemingly crazy, which cannot be proved scientifically or verified objectively, and which have nothing to do with providing greater creature comforts or material progress. So what is the use of philosophy? In the first, and narrowest, place, for some people philosophy simply satisfies a personal need or interest. Philosophy is, as it has always been, interesting in its own right for that minority of people who simply like to think about, or who are by nature driven to think about, and who appreciate and find great pleasure in discovering insights into, what seem to be intangible or complex issues, great or small. But the tools of philosophy can be important to everyone because it potentially helps one think better, more clearly, and with greater perspective about almost everything. There are numerous specific topic areas in academic philosophy, many of interest only to a few, even among philosophers, but there are features and techniques common to all of them, and it is those features and techniques which also can apply to almost anything in life. These features have to do with reasoning and with understanding concepts, and, to some small extent, with creativity. Normally, all other things being equal, the better one understands anything and can think clearly and logically about it, the better off one will be, and the better one will be able to act on that understanding and reasoning. It is my view, for example, that better conceptual understanding by NCAA and NFL administrators would lead to a far more workable and acceptable "instant replay review" policy. Furthermore, philosophy in many cases is about deciding which goals and values are worthy to pursue -- what ends are important. Philosophy is a way of scrutinizing ideas about which goals are the most worthy one. A healthy philosophical debate about what is ideal or which ideals ought to be sought and pursued, is important. Efficiency in the pursuit of the wrong values or ends is not a virtue. Kennedy, in speaking at Amherst College on a day honoring poet Robert Frost, said: It is also important that beliefs and goals be examined, even if they are idealistic; that is, even if society is nowhere near ready to proceed from where they are to some idealistic state. For it is important to know what is most reasonably ideal, and to understand the reasons for thinking it is the ideal, in order to try to make step-wise progress as society is ready to discover and accept any step in the right direction and in order to reassess what

one thinks is ideal when unexpected social responses show flaws or undesirable side-effect in the concept. For example, welfare and housing for the poor have often run into unexpected difficulties and in some cases have been counterproductive to the desire to help people improve their lives. While the basic goals of helping people escape poverty and substandard housing in order to become productive, secure, and hopeful about their lives may remain ideal, supplying homes or money in certain ways may not be the effective means to that, or may not be the equivalent to it as an end. While science tests hypotheses by empirical means, philosophical pursuit of values and ideals tests concepts of the ideal in two ways: Social progress toward an ideal often takes place in small stages, and sometimes flaws in the ideal become visible as the stages are implemented. It takes understanding of the stated values, ends, and means in order to recognize missteps. However, it must be pointed out that there are people trained in philosophy who do not think very well, at least not on all, if any, topics. And there are people who have never had any sort of philosophy or logic course who are quite astute in their thinking in general. The study of philosophy is something like the intellectual equivalent of training in sports. Those with natural talent and no training will often be better than those with training but little natural talent, but proper training should develop and enhance whatever talent most people have to begin with. And it also must be pointed out that not all philosophical writing or thinking is very good, and, perhaps more importantly, not all philosophy courses are very well taught or very good. In some cases, however, where teachers are entertaining and articulate, students come out favorably impressed, but still with little or no understanding. So when I talk about the uses of philosophy or about "philosophy" itself, I really mean to be referring to the best of what philosophy has to offer, not necessarily what one might learn in some particular philosophy , or even upperclass or graduate level, course, and not necessarily what one might find in a book chosen randomly from the philosophy section of a university library or bookstore. The tools of philosophy are important to individuals and to society because as long as we are not omniscient, factual knowledge by itself is no substitute for philosophy, just as philosophy is no substitute for factual knowledge. Philosophy is about the intelligent and rational uses of knowledge, and it is about the scrutiny of beliefs to see how clear and how reasonable they are in the light of knowledge we have. Knowledge is the substance of philosophy, not its opposite. As I explain in " Words, Pictures, Logic, Ethics, and Not Being God " because there is much we cannot know directly or even by observation, much of our knowledge comes from our use of reason. And philosophy, when done properly, perhaps more than any other field, gives training and practice in the most general and basic elements of reasoning. The essay " Reasoning " explains what reasoning is, how it works, and why it is important. It also explains that it does not always yield the truth or knowledge, but that in certain circumstances, it is the best we can do to try to attain knowledge. In many cases, reasoning will show us what we need to find out in order to have knowledge about a particular phenomena, by showing us what the gaps are in the knowledge we have. What underlies most philosophy -- particularly perhaps British and American philosophy -- is training and practice in 1 analyzing and understanding concepts, 2 recognizing and showing the significance of hidden, unconscious, or unrealized assumptions, 3 recognizing and remedying various forms of unclear conceptualization and communication, such as vagueness and ambiguity, which are often unintended and at first unrealized 4 drawing reasonable conclusions from whatever evidence is at hand, and 5 recognizing evidence in the first place -- seeing, that is, that some knowledge can serve as evidence for more knowledge and is not just some sort of inert fact or end in itself. These things are, or can be, very important for science, social science, economics, business, and other practical and empirical pursuits, but they are crucial for knowledge about matters of value, interpretation, perspective, and that which is intangible. It turns out that much of science, social science, economics, and business contains elements of the intangible, and questions about values, which can only be dealt with philosophically. Moreover, even the most empirical matters have conceptual components that require careful analysis and understanding. Nobel physicist Richard Feynman had the view that if he could not explain a concept or principle in physics in a way that a college freshman who was interested in physics could understand it, he probably did not understand it himself as well as he thought he did. I think such understanding is often important or even necessary for teaching well, but I am not sure it is sufficient, because one might be able to understand a concept without seeing why or how it might be difficult for other people to understand it. Philosophers, or anyone who has analyzed concepts, ought to have some

advantage in teaching them, but that advantage may not be sufficient to teach those concepts to others very well. I have seen philosophers and others who were quite good at doing philosophy, not be able to teach it to beginners, simply because they left out too much in their explanations, did not start at a basic enough beginning place, did not wait to see whether there was comprehension before they continued from point to point, did not appreciate how strange or difficult or complex an idea was to the student, did not know how to get points across not only logically but psychologically, and, in short, did not know what groundwork needed to be done in order to help the student understand and see the significance or meaning of the explanation being given. My long essay " The Concept and Teaching of Place Value " gives an explanation and an example of how understanding a concept, and understanding and appreciating the psychological difficulties of comprehending it, are necessary for teaching it well.

Pervasive Philosophical Subject Matter While the application of systematic thought to any avowedly practical enterprise such as science or business can be productive, it is also unnecessary in the sense that much is often accomplished without it, and what cannot be accomplished without it is often not missed. It only seems important in cases where practical matters come to an impasse or where an idea bears such great and obvious practical fruit that it cannot be ignored. But there are pervasive philosophical areas of life that nearly everyone recognizes as important, though perhaps not recognizing them as primarily philosophical in nature, and perhaps not recognizing that they require deeper and more sustained thought than is typically given to them, even by supposed experts. While everyone has "opinions" or beliefs about many of these intangible things, there are better and worse opinions, beliefs that are more reasonable or less reasonable than others. Not all opinions or beliefs are equal in quality or in value. One opinion is not necessarily as good or as reasonable as another; is not likely to withstand scrutiny or to be compatible with all the evidence available. Unfortunately in many cases, politicians, bureaucrats, news commentators. So a natural hunger for philosophical wisdom is only partially addressed, and not always in the most satisfying, nutritious, or practically useful and advantageous manner. Shallowness in these area is often sufficient as long as it sounds good or seems deep to those who think less or who do not think much for themselves at all. Still the issues are philosophical ones, and they are often recognized as such, even if most do not realize that there are better answers and better ways of thinking about them than they are aware. So although these are areas where people could benefit from philosophy, they usually do not, and do not care to. In that sense philosophy is just of potential benefit. But it is not unlike other, practical, areas of potential benefit that are ignored. When the inventor of the Xerox photocopy machine was looking for financial backing, almost all the large business concerns of the day turned him down. The primary reason given was that there was no need for copy machines; we already had carbon paper to make copies of documents. Not only have prominent inventions and scientific ideas been rejected, but so have business ideas and management plans. Many a successful enterprise has resulted from employees going into competition with their former bosses who would not listen to, or could not understand or appreciate, their ideas for innovation. Philosophy is about careful, sustained, and systematic thinking. It is about a willingness to pursue the possible truth and value of ideas and the evidence for them, no matter what conclusions might result or how strange they might initially seem. Philosophy does not always lead to truth or to ideas of great value, but it can. And the potential always exists. There is much yet to be learned by the application of thought to what is already known or believed to be known.