

## Candidate 5 evidence

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
section 1, part 2	
Q2)	+ Hume
<p>Hume, an 18th century Scottish philosopher, argued the case for empiricism; this is the idea that all knowledge seems to come from a place of prior experience. He argues against the idea of Descartes, for example, in his denial of the idea that people have inherent knowledge prior to experience.</p>	
<p><del>Hume mainly speaks of 'perceptions of the mind', of which he categorises two ways in which he may separate our knowledge - these are 'impressions' and 'ideas'. Impressions are our 'sense' and direct experiences, as Hume describes, for example, as the "pain of excessive heat" or the "pleasure of moderate warmth". Impressions are described as the more</del></p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
<p><del>"forceful" and "lively" of the two manners of experience. Hume then speaks of "ideas", which are described as "even the most lively of ideas is not as forceful as the most dull impression". They are copies of ideas; memories and imaginings based off things we have already experienced.</del></p> <p><del>Through this theory of impressions and ideas, Hume develops the "copy principle". This is used to disprove the counterargument of the Ideal of the imagination, where</del></p>	
<p>Hume separates all knowledge into <sup>two sections;</sup> "relations of ideas" and "matters of fact". Relations of ideas being our 'a priori' knowledge which we can know, by definition,</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
<p>to be correct, and denying them would be contradictory.</p>	
<p>He gives the example of a pythagorean triangles, as well as the equation "half of 30 is <math>5 \times 3</math>".</p>	
<p>The Relations of ideas are definitionally correct. One cannot deny a definition which proves itself.</p>	
<p>Matters of fact, however, are only known 'a posteriori', meaning that before the prediction takes place, its certainty cannot be definitively proven.</p>	
<p>Denying a matter of fact would not prove contradictory. This distinction was the example "the sun will rise tomorrow".</p>	
<p><small>Although the sun has, in the past, always risen, under strange circumstances it may not rise tomorrow. This can only be proven once the sun has, in fact, risen.</small></p>	
<p>This distinction between the two types of knowledge is known as "Hume's fork".</p>	
<p>stemming from this</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
<p>idea of "matters of fact", - Hume speaks of the "constant conjunction of objects", or "cause and effect". Hume questions <del>out</del> if we can ever really have a full, pure, and rational understand- ing of <u>why</u> things happen. He says that 'a priori' we really cannot know for cert- ain what <del>is</del> effect a particular cause may have. Hume uses the example of <del>hearing</del> "finding a watch on a desert island", which may cause one to believe that another human may, too, be on the same island. However, the watch could have many other reason- s for <del>being</del> its presence; if it had washed up on shore <sup>or</sup> if it had arrived on the island many years</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>prior. Hume therefore argues that before one has had direct experience of this other person being on the island, one cannot assume that a person was the cause of the watch. Similarly, Hume explains the curi- osities of "billiard balls", explaining that until one hits the balls, one cannot be certain which balls may move and which "stop dead". He therefore reinforces this theory that a priori knowledge does not correlate with cause and effect.</p> <p>Hume then brings up the idea of <sup>a</sup> knowledge of causes due to prior experience of this same cause creating one continuous effect throughout the past. How-</p> <p><small>He does similarly in his example of "believing a friend to be in France" but until we see the friend France and experience through our senses directly, we cannot know for certain that he is there.</small></p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN

Every time argues that simply because a single correlation between a particular cause and effect have always in the past existed, it does not mean that it will always in the future carry out similarly. Hume uses the example of the "experiment of breakfast". He says that although every day of our lives, we may have eaten bread for breakfast and had it now with us, it does not too mean that in the future it will always carry on in the same way. He says that the bread which holds "secret properties", which we cannot determine until after they have taken their toll<sup>onus</sup>, so although our bread this

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>morning may have looked, smelled, and tasted the same as yesterday's, today the bread may kill us. Hume begs us to consider that the future does not always correlate with the past, and that we would be foolish to believe that simply because something has happened, that it will again.</p> <p><del>Hume's theory of finally,</del></p> <p>Hume reinforces <del>our</del> this theory of there being no way of determining effects through viewing their causes, in his example of "Adam", the first man. Hume argues that Adam, upon seeing the clarity and movement of water, would be unable to predict that the same water had the <sup>properties necessary</sup> <del>stability</del> to drown him. This example again proves the importance and vitality of experience to shape one's knowledge. Hume also says that upon Adam's sight of fire, he would have no way of knowing that was he to enter into it, he would be burned.</p> <p>Hume's theory of cause</p>
	<p style="text-align: right;">* a (page 22) 22)</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	rationality	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>and effect, upon first inspection, appears acceptable. It would seem reasonable to state that <del>the</del> most of what we know for certain, we have ourselves experienced to be the case, or have been educated by another's experience. It also is acceptable for all knowledge to be categorised into <del>definitive</del> definitionally provable knowledge, and into experientially provable knowledge.</p> <p>Hume's theory, however, fails to explain how we might differentiate between causation and coincidence, as his theory can often be perceived in a somewhat 'post hoc' manner, in his inability to differentiate between causes</p>	
	<p>How do we determine if an event occurred before, simply, or if it was a cause?</p>	



ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>And finally, Hume explains how simplistic, more physical <sup>and 'sense'sud</sup> experience <del>can</del> may feed into our knowledge; however he does not explain how simple 'experience' may cause humanity to <del>have to</del> hold the concepts of justice, love, or freedom. <sup>He states that no knowledge is rational or inherent, yet people all over the globe in isolated communities agree that murder is wrong.</sup></p> <p>So in conclusion, although to a <del>at</del> basic degree Hume explains in an understandable manner <sup>itself</sup> the fact of experience causing understanding, Hume oversimplifies the complexities of the human mind, and disregards the importance of past correlations in the realms of science, for example.</p> <p>For if we are to discount the constancies of cause and effect from the past, then all scientific knowledge would be named baseless, and we would know nothing. * Page 23 (b)</p>	

