

Candidate 2

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	Section one	
1.	David Hume starts out section two by describing the differences between impressions ^{and} is ideas.	
	Impressions are lively, first-hand perceptions whereas ideas are less vivid, second-hand	
	perceptions based off impressions	
	He says that impressions are the most vivid ^{and} is occur when	
	we experience something, like	
	seeing a tree or hearing a	
	song. Ideas are memories of	
	impressions. This is when you	
	imagine a tree in your mind	
	or remember a song you heard	
	earlier. They will never be as	
	vivid or as real as impressions	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
An idea can't give you the same	
sensations, sounds or flavour as	
an impression can. The most it	
can do is give you a	
strong memory about what	
it was like.	
The imagination is very	
important. Your imagination can	
make ideas seem almost as	
real as an impression. If	
you can imagine the flavour,	
sound or sensation of an	
impression so vividly it could	
almost seem like you are	
back in that moment.	
However there will always	
be something missing to	
an idea that separates	
it from an impression.	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
<p>Hume then moves on to consider Descartes' view point about innate ideas. As Hume believes all ideas are based off impressions, he doesn't agree that innate ideas exist. Innate ideas are ideas, not born through experience, but are in us from birth. Hume says that no idea could be in us from birth. Where did it come from? We would have no experience of it so Hume believes it can't exist. Everything we know is based on the world around us and ^{and} our experiences of it. He uses the example of leopanders.</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	He says people from Lapland
	could never know the taste
	of wine because they have
	never had it. You cannot
	create the idea of a taste
	or emotion without first
	experiencing it and having the
	impression of it.
	So know would Hume be
	able to tell us how we
	know things we have never
	experienced? I have never
	experienced something ^{something} perfect and
	infinite, yet I still know
	& understand what it means.
	Hume says ^{says} that we can
	create ^{these} 'new ideas' because we
	don't always have to look/
	remember all of the impression.

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	He says there are three four
	things you can do to an
	impression to create a 'new
	idea.' they are augmenting,
	diminishing, transposing and
	compounding. This means you
	can combine two impressions,
	Separate the impression, exaggerate
	or make ^{Put} the impression on
	a smaller scale. For example;
	We have the impression of
	gold and ^{and} the impression of
	a mountain. By compounding
	them together we can
	create a gold mountain.
	This ^{is} an idea we don't
	have an exact idea ^{impression} of
	but it comes from more
	than one impression combined.

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
Shade ^{is}	
without any impression	
of it. This example could	
cast his entire philosophy	
into doubt. This would show	
that you didn't always need	
an impression first to have	
an idea.	
However Hume decides this	
example wouldn't cause any	
harm to his philosophy.	
He says that this is	
a singular example that	
won't damage or change	
his ideas. He brushes it	
off the and says it doesn't	
matter.	
There are many criticisms	
of Hume's section two,	
especially the counter	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	example he proposes. Many
	believe he doesn't actually
	create an example where
	someone is creating an
	idea without an impression.
	Some say that whoever who
	ever was looking at the
	shades would use the
	ones around the missing
	one to find out what
	shade it would be. This
	is just using first-hand
	impressions to create an
	idea, using the four methods
	I have put forward earlier.
	Another criticism is; that
	how would we know if the
	person was right? We
	can't see inside their

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	mind to establish whether
	they are telling the truth
	the last. big criticism
	of the Missing shade of
	blue is about his dismissal
	of it. Why does it matter
	if it's just one example?
	Just one example could easily
	topple his ideas. One
	rotten brick can send an
	entire house to the ground.
	And even if it couldn't, it's
	not a singular example.
	The idea can be changed to
	any different colour, levels
	of spice, musical notes etc.
	The premise of the counter
	example can be reworked
	to create loads of other

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN

examples. And that many counter examples could surely topple the argument?
I do believe that Hume is correct. Ideas can only come from impressions. We may stretch and change the impression but the idea is ~~always~~ always based on something.