Consequences of Ideas
Understanding the Concepts that Shaped our World
R.C. Sproul looking at philosophers whose ideas have had a major impact on Western Culture

The First Philosophers / Pre-Socratic Thinkers
- 3 Burdens of the Original Philosophers -
  - **Search for Metaphysical** *(that which transcends physical matter)* answer to physical world
    - Quest for Monarchy
      - Mono - One Chief / Beginning / Root - Search for one ruling substance
    - Quest for Unity in the Midst of Diversity
    - Quest for Cosmos over Chaos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The First Philosophers</th>
<th>Century (B.C.)</th>
<th>Birth-Death</th>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Major Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thales</td>
<td><strong>6th</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miletus, Asia Minor</td>
<td>All is Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pythagoras</td>
<td><strong>6th</strong></td>
<td>570-497</td>
<td>Samos</td>
<td>Croton, Italy</td>
<td>Pythagorean Thereom, Medicine, Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraclitus</td>
<td><strong>6th-5th</strong></td>
<td>540-480</td>
<td>Ephesus, Asia Minor</td>
<td>Flux - <em>On Nature</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parmenides</td>
<td><strong>5th</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elea, Italy</td>
<td>The Way of Truth and the Way of Seeming Whatever is, is.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeno</td>
<td><strong>5th</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elea, Italy</td>
<td>Sense Perception</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaxagoras</td>
<td><strong>5th</strong></td>
<td>500-428</td>
<td>Clazomenae, Asia Minor</td>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>“Seeds” - Corporeal Pluralism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sophism (Sophists)
- Cynicism and Skepticism sapped Greek Culture of its grandeur
  - Crass politicization of education, economics, law, & public works led to a decline in substantive thinking & civic virtue, both of which are enemies to any democratic enterprise that thrives on compromise & relativization of ethics.

  - Gorgias was famous Sophist known for radical skepticism - Turned back on philosophy and practiced rhetoric instead
    - Focused on the Art of Persuasion in public discourse - Achieve practical claims by persuasion
    - Functions as Madison Avenue does today
    - Believed there were no absolutes - “All statements are false”

  - Protagoras, probably the most influential Sophist in Athens, is frequently described as the “father of ancient humanism”
    - Knowledge begins and ends with man - All knowledge is limited to our perceptions
    - Absolute truth is neither possible or desirable
    - Laws are only preferences of a given society

Barbarianism
- Might is right - This is where people can turn when there is an impasse or disagreement among leading philosophers
- Sees law as nothing more than a reflection of the ruling class’s vested interests
Socrates: Savior of Western Civilization

- Virtue could be defined as right knowledge - Right thinking and right doing can be distinguished but never separated
- Method of discovering truth attributed to Socrates was that of dialogue - “Socratic Method”
  - Asking provocative questions - Assumptions are challenged as questions probe deeper into the matter at hand
  - Socrates once led an uneducated slave into articulating the Pythagorean theorem - By asking the slave the right questions, Socrates gets him to recollect the formal truth...
- Socrates was convinced that to gain knowledge, one must first admits one’s ignorance
  - This admission is the beginning of knowledge, but by no means the goal - Just a necessary condition for learning
- Socrates was persistent in his quest for **accurate definitions** which are essential to learning & precise communication
  - Anticipating the Enlightenment, Socrates used an analytical method by which he sought the logic of the facts
  - The Logic is what is left after the facts are exhausted
  - He sought the universals that are gleaned from an examination of the particulars
- Socrates was a martyr to the cause of philosophy - He drank the hemlock / poison willingly

Plato: Student of Socrates

- At the heart of Plato’s elaborate philosophical theory was his desire to “save the phenomena”
  - “Phenomena” refers to those things that are evident or manifest to our senses
- **Idealist and Realist**
  - Idealist - Because of the central significance he attached to ideas
  - Realist - Argued that ideas are not merely mental constructs but real entities
- For Plato, the realm of ideas is the realm of true knowledge
  - The realm of material objects is the realm of mere opinion
  - For Plato, knowledge that is restricted to the material world is at best mere opinion and at worst ignorance
  - Plato saw people living in two different worlds: the world of ideas and the world of physical objects
    - A material object participates in or imitates its ideal form - but, it is at best an imperfect copy of the ideal form
- **Ontology** - theory of nature of being
- **Epistemology** - theory of nature of knowing
- Plato’s ontology had a major impact on his epistemology
  - Check book (page 36-37) for the “Chair Concept”
- The mind or soul is tripartite according to Plato - Composed of Reason, Spirit and Appetite
  - Reason - includes awareness of a value or goal
  - Spirit - the drive toward action under reason’s impulse
  - Appetite - desire for physical things
Aristotle: The Philosopher

- Student of Plato
- Tutor of Alexander the Great - He passed on to him his passion for unity
  - Alexander the Great used this passion for unity to try & make the known world speak the same language
  - Wanted to create a unified culture in the ancient world
  - He would take armies of scientists to investigate the cultures that they conquered

- Aristotle found the Lyceum
  - Developed the “Peripatetic” method of teaching where his students walked behind him - Like Jesus’ disciples

- First thing to learn about Aristotle is his foundational work in Logic
  - Aristotelian Logic
  - Refined & modified systems of logic have been developed since his day, but he laid the foundation of formal logic
  - He simply defined Logic - He didn’t create it - It already existed, but had to be discovered
  - He saw Logic as the instrument of all science - Tool necessary for all other sciences
  - That which is illogical is unintelligible; incapable of being understood - Illogical represents chaos, not cosmos.
  - Logic measures or analyzes the relationships of statements or propositions
  - Aristotle wrote the fundamental laws of logic, including the law of “non-contradiction” - The chief principle of logic
    - “Something cannot be what it is and not be what it is at the same time and in the same relationship
  - Laws of logic apply to all sciences because they are valid for all reality
    - This is not to say that all that is rational is real. - We can conceive of ideas that are logical but do not correspond to reality - The illogical cannot exist in reality.
    - For example: Immovable Object and Irresistible Force - These can each exist, but both cannot exist at the same time - Something would have to give if they both supposedly existed - So one is not what it claims

- Science of taxonomy is crucial to all science because it is crucial to all knowledge - It is crucial to all knowledge because it is crucial to all language - Knowledge depends on language for its intelligibility.
  - A word that means everything, actually means nothing
  - To be meaningful a word must affirm something & deny something

The Four Causes - These produce changes in things

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Defined</th>
<th>Illustrated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal Cause</td>
<td>That which determines what a thing is.</td>
<td>The Sculptor's idea or plan for a sculpture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Cause</td>
<td>That out of which a thing is made.</td>
<td>The block or marble.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient Cause</td>
<td>That by which a thing is made.</td>
<td>The Sculptor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Cause</td>
<td>That for which a thing is made; its purpose.</td>
<td>The decoration of a house or garden is purpose of sculpture.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Notice: Romans 11:36, Colossians 1:15-20 - Christ is all of these

- The Dynamic of Change, for Aristotle, is bound up with the ideas of potentiality and actuality.
  - Actuality is primary, and it is a necessary condition for potentiality
  - There can be no such thing as pure, or absolute potentiality
    - This “thing” would be potentially anything, but actually nothing
  - However - According to Aristotle, there can be, indeed must be, something that is pure or absolute actuality
    - This is Aristotle’s “god”, or his notion of pure being. - This being has no unrealized potential
    - It is not open to change, growth, or maturation - Cannot have motion of any kind
    - This is Aristotle’s “Unmoved Mover”
• **The Unmoved Mover** in Aristotle’s mind is the ultimate cause of motion
  - Must be eternal, immaterial, and immutable
  - He understood that, in order to escape the illogical morass of infinite regress, the ultimate cause of motion must be an uncaused cause, or an unmoved mover.
  - This forms the classical root that God is a logically necessary being.
  - This unmoved mover, his god, remained an impersonal force to him
  - This mover, moves the world by attraction, not by force
  - This mover is then the final directing purpose of all things to their proper end

### Between Eras of Aristotle and Augustine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Birth-Death</th>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Philosophy</th>
<th>Major Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zeno</td>
<td>334-262 B.C.</td>
<td>Citium, Cyprus</td>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>Stoicism</td>
<td>Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epicurus</td>
<td>341-271 B.C.</td>
<td>Samos</td>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>Epicureanism</td>
<td><em>On Nature</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrrho</td>
<td>365-275 B.C.</td>
<td>Elis, Greece</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pyrrhonism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcesilaus</td>
<td>316-240 B.C.</td>
<td>Pitane, Asia Minor</td>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>Academic Skepticism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sextus Empericus</td>
<td>Late 3rd Cent - Early 2nd Cent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Skepticism</td>
<td><em>Outlines of Pyrrhonism</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plotinus</td>
<td>A.D. 204-270</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td></td>
<td>Neo-Platonism</td>
<td><em>Enneads</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Stoics**
- Developed a cosmology of materialism
  - Every person has within him a spark of the divine
  - Virtue is found in one’s response to materialistic determinism - “Man cannot determine his own fate”
    - He has no control over what happens to him
    - His freedom is restricted to his inner response or attitude to whatever befalls him
    - Goal is *ataraxia* - Peace of Mind
    - They sought peace of mind by imperturbability - the acceptance of one’s lot with serenity and courage

**The Epicureans**
- They were hostile to religion
- They sought *ataraxia* - Peace of Mind - through “refined hedonism”
  - This defines good as the attainment of pleasure and the avoidance of pain
  - Cyrenaics were crude hedonists who were gluttons, had orgies, maximum pleasure…
  - Unlike the Cyrenaics, the Epicureans sought a refined and sophisticated enjoyment of pleasure by indulging themselves in moderation
  - A preoccupation with intense and merely physical pleasure leads inevitably to two things one wants to avoid: unhappiness and pain.
  - Epicureans sought to escape the “hedonistic paradox”: The pursuit of pleasure alone ends in either frustration (if the pursuit fails) or boredom (if it succeeds)
Christianity, in an amazingly short span of time, supplanted Greek Philosophy as the dominant world-view

Neoplatonists
• Plotinus is father of it - Wanted to provide a philosophy that would provide an alternative to Christianity
• Needed to address the major issue of Christianity - Salvation
• His philosophy was eclectic and syncretistic - borrowed elements from various philosophies

Augustine: Doctor of Grace
• Born in A.D. 354 in present day Algeria - Died in 430 after establishing himself as the supreme doctor of grace
• He was the greatest Christian philosopher-theologian of the first millennium and arguably of entire Christian era.
• Dedicated his life to the pursuit of truth - He initially rejected Christianity
• In 386 he experienced conversion to Christianity & within 10 years was a bishop - A Role he maintained until his death
• Wrote *Confessions* and *City of God* - Championed Christian orthodoxy in fierce theological struggles w/ heretics
  • Donatist and Pelagian controversies
• He influenced the doctrine of the Trinity, church, grace and salvation
• Some thought he developed a synthesis between Christianity & Platonism, but his work doesn’t set this forth
• He combated all forms of skepticism, seeking to establish a foundation for the truth
  • He was aware of the basic reliability of sense perception, aware of the limitations of it & of its propensity to deceive us - He illustrated this with a boat oar looking bent in the water, but it not really being bent in reality
  • He also argued that the law of non-contradiction cannot be disputed, for it must be assumed and employed in every effort to deny it - Thus to deny it, is to affirm it

Truth and Revelation
• Concept of Divine Revelation was central to Augustine’s epistemology.
• Saw revelation as the necessary condition for all knowledge
  • Just as an external source of light is needed for seeing (even though we have all the necessary equipment needed for seeing in our eyes, if we are in a pitch dark room, we can’t see…) so an external revelation from God is needed for knowing
• Augustine argued that this is not only the case in biblical revelation alone, but that all truth must be revealed by God - Including scientific truth, is dependent on divine revelation
  • This is why he encouraged students to learn as much as possible about as many things as possible
• Even in the act of self-awareness or self-consciousness, one is immediately aware of God - When I become aware of myself, I am at the same time aware of my finitude and of the God who made me
  • For Augustine, the knowledge of self and the knowledge of God are the twin goals of philosophy
• Calvin later reflected that there is a mutually dependent, symbiotic relationship between the knowledge of God and the knowledge of self - I cannot know God, until I am first aware of myself in thought, yet I cannot truly know myself except in relationship to God
• Calvin and Augustine both go on to argue for the knowledge of God innate in each person’s soul

Knowledge and Faith
• Faith, says Augustine, is an essential ingredient of knowledge
  • Faith here is not restricted only to religious faith - Involves a provisional belief
  • There is a difference in faith and credulity
  • I cannot believe something that is manifestly irrational - Knowledge, to be believed, must be intelligible
  • Faith is not blind - For Augustine it is always reasonable
Creation
• He staunchly defended the biblical concept of creation
• According to Augustine, God created all things *ex nihilo* - “Out of nothing”
  • This is not the *ex nihilo*, *nihil fit* - “Out of nothing, nothing comes”
  • This is irrational and violates the law of non-contradiction
• Before creating the world, the eternal God existed, so creation *ex nihilo* does not mean creation *by* nothing
  • Using Aristotle’s “Four Causes” (listed above) we may say that the universe had a formal, final and efficient cause, but not a material one.

Problem of Evil
• Augustine sought to define evil in purely negative terms
  • Evil is a lack, privation, or negation of the good - It depends on good, for its existence
  • Only that which was first good, can become evil
  • Evil is defined against the backdrop of prior concept of good
  • Evil depends on the good, for its very definition
  • We speak of evil in terms like *un*righteousness, *in*justice and *law*lessness
  • Nothing can be purely, or totally evil - It is not a substance, or a thing - It is a lack or privation of good
• To avoid the ontological necessity of evil, Augustine turned to free will
  • God created man with free will in which he enjoyed perfect liberty
  • Man had the faculty of choosing what he wanted - He had the ability to sin and the ability *not* to sin
  • **He freely chose to sin out of his concupiscence (an inclination that leans to sin, but is not sin)**
  • As a result of the first sin, man lost his liberty, but not his will
    • Man lost the ability to incline himself to the things of God
    • This resulted in man’s absolute dependence on a work of divine grace in his soul if he were ever to move toward God - Fallen man is in bondage to sin
    • He still has the faculty of choosing, but he is now free only to sin, because his desires are inclined only toward sin and away from God - The “ability not to sin” is lost
  • With this view, Augustine battled the heretic Pelagius who denied original sin

### Humanity as Created and Fallen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Humanity as Created</th>
<th>Fallen Humanity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Free Will</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liberty</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Ability to Sin</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Ability <em>not</em> to Sin</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The <em>In</em>ability not to sin</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thomas Aquinas
- People refer to people typically by their last names in philosophy, but not this one - He goes simply by Thomas
- Catholic church canonized him - Named him “Doctor Angelicus”
- He stands as a giant in the intellectual world and his work continues to be studied in every university
- For sheer weight of intellect, he might not have any rival - Maybe only Johnathan Edwards
- Aquinas went on to become the supreme force of scholastic philosophy
  - This sought to create a coherent and comprehensive system of thought
  - Sought to codify traditional thought into a coherent system
  - Relyed heavily on rigorous logic, emphasizing the art of deductive reasoning
- Many people say he “separated nature and grace”
  - Nothing could be further from the truth
  - To charge him with this is to miss the primary thrust of his entire philosophy, particularly with respect to his defense of the Christian faith

*Side note:* One of the most important philosophical distinctions is the distinction between a distinction and a separation.
- This is what Aquinas did with nature and grace - He didn’t separate, but distinguished.

### The Source of Our Knowledge of Truth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kinds of Truth</th>
<th>Theological Truth</th>
<th>Philosophical, Scientific Truth</th>
<th>“Mixed Articles”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sphere</strong></td>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>Grace of Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Example</strong></td>
<td>God’s Plan of Salvation</td>
<td>The Body’s circulatory system</td>
<td>God’s Existence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immediate Source</strong></td>
<td>The Bible</td>
<td>The natural world</td>
<td>The Bible of the Natural World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ultimate Source</strong></td>
<td>God: His Special Revelation</td>
<td>God: His General Revelation</td>
<td>God: His Special or General Revelation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proofs of God’s Existence
- Departing from Anselm’s earlier *ontological* proof of the existence of God, which proceeds from the *idea* of God’s existence to His *actual* existence, Thomas works more from a *cosmological* framework, reasoning from the *cosmos* back to *God*.

### Traditional Proofs of the Existence of God

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beginning Point</th>
<th>Concise Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ontological Argument</strong></td>
<td>Our idea of God - Proceeds from idea of His existence, to His actual existence</td>
<td>God is that being than which no great being can be conceived. Such a being must exist in reality as well as in the mind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cosmological Argument</strong></td>
<td>Our sense experience of the cosmos then back to God</td>
<td>If anything exists, then an absolutely necessary being (God) must also exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teleological Argument</strong></td>
<td>Empirical evidence of order and design</td>
<td>The World is filled with things that show signs of order and purpose. If the world is designed, then there must be a Designer (God).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first proof Thomas offers is the proof of Motion
- He begins with the evidence for motion in the world
- Borrowing heavily from Aristotle, Thomas argues that whatever is moved is moved by another (based on what we call the law of inertia). - Thomas defines motion as the reduction of something to potentiality to actuality. - Object at rest may have potential to move, but it does not move until or unless this potential is actualized.
  - Thomas argues that nothing can make this move unless there is something else that is already actualized that then acts on the object that is still in its potential state. Whatever is moved must be moved by some prior actuality.
  - But this change cannot regress to infinity, because in that case the motion could never begin,
    - Therefore Thomas concludes, there must be a first mover, and everyone understands this to be God.

The second proof is the proof from efficient cause
- The law of causality asserts that every effect must have an antecedent cause. - This is not the same thing as saying that every thing must have a cause (as John Stuart Mill and Bertrand Russell claim) but that every effect must have one
- Law of causality is actually an extension of the law of non contradiction
- An effect cannot be an effect, unless it has a cause
- Without the sculptor, there would be no statue

The third proof of God’s existence is the proof from necessary being
- Although this is usually thought of as part of the cosmological argument, it is more properly called “ontological” because it is an argument from being.
- “No merely possible being is self-existent; it does not have the power of being in itself. If all things in reality were only possible, then at one time there would have been nothing in existence. If there was a time when nothing existed, then nothing could ever start to exist now. But if something does exist now, there must have always been something in existence; something must exist that possees necessary existence - it's existence is not merely possible but necessary. It cannot not be. It does not receive its existence from something else. There never was a time when it was not. In other words, if anything exists now, then something must have the power of being within itself, that is, something must have necessary being. This being, whose being is both logically and ontologically necessary, is God.”

The fourth proof is the proof from degrees of perfection
- He borrows heavily from Augustine - An argument from the comparative
- We are aware of degrees of good, true, noble...But something can be deemed good or true only against some maximum norm or standard
- Thomas argues that the maximum in any genus is the cause of everything in that genus

The fifth proof proceeds from the evidence of order in the universe
- This is a form of the so-called teleological argument
- In nature, we observe things that lack intelligence but function in an orderly and purposive way
- These things appear to act with a purpose - One cannot have purpose accidentally, nor can one have unintentional intentionality. In its simplest from the teleological argument rests on the evidence of design in the universe. Design demands a designer, an idea that deeply impressed both Immanuel Kant and David Hume despite their skepticism.

In developing his natural theology, Thomas says our knowledge of God from nature, while true, is **mediate, analogous, and incomplete**
- Mediate because it comes through the medium of nature / creation.
- Analogous - He is speaking of a function of language
  - Univocal - A word means basically the same thing when applied to different beings
  - Equivocal - Meaning of a term changes dramatically when applied to two different beings
  - Analogical - Meaning of a term changes proportionally when two different beings are described.
    - When Thomas says are language about God is analogous, he means that it falls short of describing him exactly.
- Incompleteness - Does not make knowledge worthless, but is useful -
  - Yet, neither is the biblical revelation of God is neither exhaustive nor comprehensive
- He says although this is the case, it is still true as far as it goes
Quick Definitions of Some Major Philosophies

- **Rationalism** - a belief of theory that opinions and actions should be based on *reason and knowledge* rather than on religious belief or emotional response - Reason rather than experience is the foundation of certainty in knowledge
  - Dominated 17th century - Spinoza and Descartes

- **Empiricism** - John Locke, Francis Bacon
  - All knowledge is learned through experience - Post Experience - Knowledge begins with simple ideas
  - We use our senses to absorb knowledge - That which the 5 senses perceive is called “empirical” reality
  - The doctrine that all knowledge is derived from sense experience

- **Existentialism** - “Anti-System” - In its comprehensiveness and rapidity of its impact on western culture, it rivals Marxism
  - It has brought with it the conquest of the many over the one
  - It has eliminated the middle man - Meaning the middleman who typically translates the abstract, technical philosophy to the populace - This is typically the artist who creates music, art, & drama which follows the history of philosophy - Existential philosophers were artists as well
  - Nietzsche, Sartre and Kierkegaard
  - A philosophy that emphasizes the uniqueness and isolation of the individual experience in a hostile or indifferent universe, regards human existence as unexplainable, and stresses freedom of choice and responsibility for the consequences of one's acts - Emphasis on human autonomy - “Man is a subject, not an object.”

- **Enlightenment** - Swept Europe (particularly Germany, France and England) in the 18th century
  - It spawned what is called the “Analytical Method” - This forms the heart of the scientific method - Combines elements of induction and deduction. One gathers knowledge of facts inductively and empirically, then searches for the pattern of universal laws operating within the facts.
  - Characterized by belief in the power of human reason & by innovations in political, religious, & educational doctrine.
  - "The philosophy of the Enlightenment insisted on man's essential autonomy: man is responsible to himself, to his own rational interests, to his self-development, and, by an inescapable extension, to the welfare of his fellow man. For the philosophies, man was not a sinner, at least not by nature; human nature -- and this argument was subversive, in fact revolutionary, in their day -- is by origin good, or at least neutral. Despite the undeniable power of man's antisocial passions, therefore, the individual may hope for improvement through his own efforts -- through education, participation in politics, activity in behalf of reform, but not through prayer." [Peter Gay]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Philosopher</th>
<th>Birth - Death</th>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
<th>Primary place of Residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jean-Jacques Rousseau</td>
<td>1712-1778</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Wolff</td>
<td>1679-1754</td>
<td>Breslau, Polan</td>
<td>Halle and Marburg, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denis Diderot</td>
<td>1713-1784</td>
<td>Langres, France</td>
<td>Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul H.D. De Holbach</td>
<td>1723-1789</td>
<td>Edesheim, Germany</td>
<td>Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gotthold Ephraim Lessing</td>
<td>1729-1781</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wolfenbutel, Germany</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Nihilism** - total rejection of established laws and institutions - anarchy, terrorism, or other revolutionary activity.
  - total & absolute destructiveness, esp. toward the world at large & including oneself: the power-mad nihilism that marked Hitler's last years.
  - an extreme form of skepticism: the denial of all real existence or the possibility of an objective basis for truth.
  - nothingness or nonexistence.
  - The principles of a Russian revolutionary group, active in the latter half of the 19th century, holding that existing social & political institutions must be destroyed in order to clear the way for a new state of society & employing extreme measures, including terrorism & assassination.
Between Aquinas (13th Cent.) and Age of Reason (17th Cent.)

• Dramatic changes altered the landscape of Western Civilization - Religious, Political, Scientific, and Economic
• Revival of old philosophies, use of philosophy to replace theology
• New skepticism that replaced objective truth with logical principle of equipollence
  • Equipollence - A deliberate technique of balancing an particular proposition with its contradictory counterpart
  • Side Definition: *Phenomena* - refers to those things that are evident or manifest to our senses

• Copernican Revolution
  • Nicolaus Copernicus - First guy to place the sun at the center of the universe - Had been the earth in the middle
  • His theory was confirmed by the experiments of Galileo Galilei and perhaps most astonishingly by Ferdinand Magellan as he circumnavigated the globe. - Proving that the earth rotated on its axis

• Protestant Reformation
  • Also took place in 16th century

Rene Descartes: Father of Modern Rationalism

• A born Mathematician - Chief discipline was mathematics
• Math is really an extension of logic
• In *his Discourse* he set forth four rules to be followed in quest of truth:
  • 1) Never accept as true anything that is not known to be true without doubt
  • 2) Divide each difficulty under examination into as many parts as possible and necessary to solve it
  • 3) Conduct thinking by commencing with objects that are the simplest and easiest to know, then ascend little by little to the more complex
  • 4) In every case make enumerations so complete and reviews so general that you might be assured you have omitted or overlooked nothing
• To achieve foundational, clear, and distinct ideas, Descartes establishes a rigorous process of systematic doubt that would make a skeptic envious - He rejects as false anything about which he can imagine the slightest doubt
• *“I think, therefore I am”* - Most famous for this - He is certain that if he can think at all, he must exist

• The Existence of God
  • He begins by analyzing his doubt - He knows that he is doubting, because he cannot doubt that he is doubting without establishing doubt - To doubt doubt is to doubt
  • For Descartes, to know that he is doubting, he must know that he lacks certainty
  • This lack of certainty involves discerning the perfect from the imperfect - To discern this, he reasons, he first has to have a notion of perfection (at least with respect to certitude)
  • This clear and distinct idea of perfection has to have a cause - He also reasons that there cannot be more in an effect than there is in its cause
  • Only a perfect being can cause the idea of perfection - If the idea of perfection is real, its cause must also be real
  • Descartes concludes that God is the perfect cause of his idea of perfection
John Locke: Father of Modern Empiricism

- Locke set out to challenge rationalism - He wanted to challenge the rationalist ideal of clear and distinct innate ideas - He casts doubt on them by challenging their universality - Such as non-contradiction and causality
- He says that no person at birth has innate ideas - “Blank tablet” - All knowledge is learned through experience
- Use 5 senses to interpret and learn things - This is empirical reality
- Locke embraces the “correspondence” theory of truth, which eschews pure subjectivism or relativism
  - His problem with objective truth comes at the point of one’s getting in touch with reality
  - He faces the ancient subject-object problem: Objective truth must be subjectively appropriated
  - How can I know for sure that reality is as it appears to me?
  - The bridge between my mind and the world is my 5 senses - Explains this through Primary and Secondary Qualities
  - He basically finds it necessary to assume the basic reliability of sense perception; we must assume that sensations are caused by something other than the projections in our mind
- With respect to theism, Locke argues that the idea of God is not clear and distinct, nor is it innate.
  - He does not reject the idea of God, however, but argues for God’s existence empirically - His existence is a necessary inference gained from reflection - He is known by way of demonstration
  - He eventually says that there has to have been something from the eternity, or nothing would or could be now
  - He argues that knowledge of God’s existence is more certain than anything our senses have not immediately revealed to us

The chart below is a basic summary of his view on Political Philosophy
David Hume: Skeptic

- Often said that in the work of Hume, we enter the graveyard of British empiricism - He took the empirical approach to the depths of skepticism
- Many believe that he destroyed once and for all the law of causality, and that in so doing he opened the door to the idea that anything can produce anything
- He was friends with Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Adam Smith
- In analyzing epistemology, Hume argues that the total content of the mind can be reduced to the data provided by sensory experience, or perceptions
- Hume thinks the most central building block of knowledge is the notion of cause and effect - The foundation on which the validity of all knowledge depends - If the causal principle is flawed, there can be no knowledge

Law of Causality

- He begins by his own analysis by noting that the idea of cause and effect arises from reflection on certain relationships between objects
- Law of causality says that A causes B, but how do we know that A causes B?
  - There are usually 3 assumptions made about this
    1) A and B always occur close together spatially
    2) The cause always precedes the effect
    3) We always see A followed by B
  - Together these elements create a common sense assumption that there is some sort of necessary connection between A and B - Hume challenges this assumption.
  - This assumption rests on customary relationships - When I have wet grass in the morning...or after rain, I make certain assumptions...Hume does a good job of asking, how do we really know?
  - He gives a pocket billiards example...How do we really know what is the cause?
  - How can I be sure I am not committing the classic formal fallacy of logic called post hoc, ergo propter hoc (“after this, therefore because of this”)
  - Experts argue over whether Hume actually denies causality or is content to show that we cannot know that A causes B--that no object implies the existence of another when we consider objects individually
  - Hume rules out chance as a possible cause for anything, understanding that the word chance is a substitute for the word ignorance.

The Possibility of Miracles

- Hume understands that the concept of miracles is crucial to the Judaeo-Christian faith.
- Take away miracles and you take away Christianity
  - Locke says that miracles certify the “credit of the proposer” - That is, miracles do not prove the existence of God (His existence must be established before a work can be credited to Him), but they demonstrate God’s certification of an agent of revelation.
  - Hume defines a miracle as a violation of natural law which is established by repetitive, uniform experience. For an event to be deemed a miracle, it must go against or depart from the uniformity of experience.
  - In fact, the probability quotient against a miracle will always be higher than the probability for it. In addition, a claim to a unique event has no credibility when placed against the uniformity of experience.
    - For example, a popular Christian argument for the resurrection is that Jesus’ disciples must have been telling the truth concerning his resurrection because they were willing to die for this conviction.
    - From one perspective the disciples’ willingness to die for their belief certainly adds a degree of credibility to their claim. But is it decisive? - “Which is more likely,” Hume would ask, “that deluded fanatics would die for their delusion or that a man would come back to life from the dead?” The answer is obvious - It is more likely that men would die for a delusion than that one of them would come out of the grave alive.
  - If Hume were to apply his criticism of miracle consistently, he would rule out not only miracle but all empirical evidence - It would never be possible to have anything begin, because the first time anything happened, it would be considered a miracle.
Immanuel Kant: Revolutionary Philosopher

- The thought of Immanuel Kant represents the watershed of modern philosophy. The Philosophical revolution created by Kant may have had a greater impact than the Copernican revolution in science and more far-reaching consequences than the American Revolution. Ironically, the Kantian Revolution was taking place at the same time in history at the American Revolution.

- The Impasse between rationalism and empiricism had created a crisis of skepticism (See Below). His new synthesis was no less significant than Plato’s much earlier synthesis of Heraclitus and Parmenides.

- Kant is also famous for destroying the classical synthesis Thomas Aquinas had achieved in his natural theology.
  - Many assume that Kant destroyed the traditional arguments for God’s existence once and for all, saying the Kant eliminated reason and made room for faith.
  - Kant was the product of a strange mixture: He received early training in Pietism, and was influenced by the Enlightenment, especially Jean-Jacques Rousseau.
  - Kant insisted that nothing could destroy his personal belief in God, but also that a knowledge of God cannot be demonstrated by “pure reason” or science.
  - He was consumed by two problems: 1) The starry heavens above 2) The Moral law within
The Possibility of Knowledge

- Kant's epistemology is a synthesis that incorporates elements from rationalism and empiricism.
  - He agrees with empiricists that knowledge begins with experience, but he asserts that not all knowledge rises out of experience. He agrees with Hume that we do not directly experience causality, yet he rejects the notion that causality is merely a psychological habit of connection. Our notion of causality, says Kant, comes from rational judgement, an operation of the faculty of the mind.
- Kant says knowledge begins with the “sense manifold”, which receives sensations and impression. These sensations are sorted out by categories built into the mind.
  - Knowledge is a synergistic process between the senses and the mind.
  - We have what Kant calls, “pure intuitions of space and time” - No one can perceive either space or time. We cannot experience them in themselves, yet everyone of my perceptions I perceive in space and time.
  - Without the pure intuitions of space and time, I could not individuate the data of experience or the words used to express them. I would have and indiscriminate, chaotic blurb of sensation that is unintelligible and meaningless.
- It is the mind that provides unity to the diversity of my sensory experience. But it is not simply the mind, it is my mind.
  - The subject that orders knowledge is the self.

The Limits of Knowledge

- One of the most well-known elements of Kant’s philosophy is his distinction between the phenomenal and noumenal worlds (or realms).
  - Knowledge, according to Kant, is limited to the realm of empirical experience. - The sense manifold is the building block of knowledge. - The only realm we experience by sense perception is the phenomenal world.
    - Phenomena = Things that are evident or manifest to the senses - Perceivable appearances
    - Thus the Phenomenal World is the world of appearances as we experience it with the senses.
  - Kant says that our knowledge is limited to the Phenomenal World.
  - The Noumenal Realm is beyond the reach of our senses - We cannot therefore know anything about the noumenal.
    - The self also belongs to the noumenal realm, because we cannot perceive it directly, unaided by the mind.
  - Most important for Kant’s role in history of philosophy, he includes God in the noumenal realm.
    - God, according to Kant, can never be perceived - He is not part of the sense manifold
    - The classic debate between natural theology and Kantian skepticism relates to the question of whether God can be known mediateley through the phenomenal world - Aquinas, for example, insists that God is known by and through the phenomenal. - He uses Romans 1:19-20 to argue his point
    - Essentially, only Paul or Kant can be right here and the other must be wrong.

The Ontological Argument

- Kant attacks this argument on the grounds that existence is not a predicate - it is too elusive to receive formal definition.
  - Existence is posited of a thing differently from its predicates (those things than can be affirmed or denied about it)
    - Side definition: Predicate = Something that is affirmed or denied concerning an argument of a proposition
    - One may know the fully determined essence of a thing, along with all its predicates, and still not know if it exists.
  - Reason allows that such a God can or may exist in reality, but reason cannot know that God does exist.
- Kant's rejection of the ontological argument fundamentally rests on his denial of existence as a predicate.

The Cosmological Argument

- Kant argues against the cosmological argument on the unusual grounds that, in the final analysis, it rests on the ontological argument. - If ontological is flawed, then so is cosmological.
  - Historically the cosmological has been the most popular and persistent argument for the existence of God.
    - Called cosmological because it reasons from the cosmos back to God as the cause of the cosmos.
    - In short, it says that if anything exists, then an absolutely necessary being must also exist. - It appeals to the law of causality: Since nothing can be its own cause, something must be uncaused or self-existent to account for the existence of anything.
  - Ontological moves from idea of God to the reality of God whereas the Cosmological begins with sense experience.
**Brief summary of cosmological.** - If we perceive that something exists, we are left with four options:

1. The perceived “reality” is an illusion
2. The reality is self-created.
3. The reality is self-existent.
4. The reality is ultimately cause or “created” by something that is self-existent.

Of these four option, two (3 & 4) include something that is self-existent.

Option 2 is formally or logically impossible, for the notion of self-creation is analytically false - For something to create itself, it must be before it is.

If option 2 is eliminated, the only rational alternative to something being self-existent (necessary being) is option 1.

- If everything is an illusion, then nothing exists and we need not worry about knowing anything.
- But if all is an illusion, then the illusion itself is an illusion, which is self-defeating. If a perception or idea is illusory, then something or someone must be having the illusion. That is, there must be a cause for the illusion. The cause must be self-created, self-existent, or caused by something (ultimately created by something self-existent). So, option 1 is resolved to options 3 or 4. We can see the the only two rationally possible options are 3 and 4, both of which have a self-existent something or necessary being.

All of this rests on the laws of non-contradiction and causality - Kant understands this and is unwilling to dispense with either reason or causality altogether. Instead he limits the application of the law of causality. - He argues that the law of causality has no meaning of application except in the sensible world (that is the world that can be perceived by the senses). This law applies to the phenomenal realm, not to the noumenal. Physics, not metaphysics.

**Sproul has been puzzled by Kant here on his insistence of the limitation of causality.** If everything in the phenomenal world requires a cause, why does not the phenomenal world itself require a cause?

This is where Kant links the ontological with the cosmological - He basically says, just because my reason tells me that logic demands a self-existent being, this does not mean that there is a self-existent being.

In defense of Aquinas and others who have argued cosmologically, they were simply trying only to prove that the idea of God was reasonable, or that reason demands the existence of God.

**The Teleological Argument**

This argument impressed both Kant and Hume the most. Kant grants that the world is filled with things that display clear signs of orderliness or purpose. It is difficult to conceive of design without a designer.

Some modern evolutionists have attempted to explain design in terms of chance or accidents. It is troublesome to speak of “accidental purpose.” This is similar to unintentional intentionality. One cannot have cosmos chaotically.

Kant agrees that the pursuance of order suggests an Orderer, but this brings one back to a dependance on the law of causality as in the cosmological, and therefore results in the problems inherent in the ontological.

It is important to note that Kant does not deny the existence of God, but he does deny that God’s existence can be rationally demonstrated, and denies that the idea of God can be disproven rationally.

**Kant’s Moral Argument for God**

Kant holds that the idea of God is a useful regulative idea - This is one that is useful but not demonstrable.

If in his criticism of the limits of theoretical thought Kant banishes God out the front door, he rushes to the back door to let God back in. In his moral and practical philosophy Kant seeks a basis for ethics.

He argues for the presence of the “categorical imperative,” a universal sense of oughtness that is integral to human experience and that provides a moral obligation or imperative to duty.

Kant’s version of the golden rule is this: Act as if the maxim of thy action were to become a universal law of nature.

Kant asks the basic question, “What would be necessary for ethics or the moral imperative to be meaningful? He concludes that for ethics to be meaningful there must be justice. Since justice does not work itself out perfectly in this world, there must be a future state in which justice will prevail. - Which means there must be a perfect judge who is morally blameless, since a corrupt judge would not render perfect justice. This judge must be omniscient, never erring in his judgement, and he must be omnipotent, ensuring that his justice is enacted.

In short, Kant argues for the Christian God on the basis that He must exist for ethics to be meaningful. He says even if we can’t know that He exists, we must live “as if” he did for ethics and society to be possible.
Karl Marx: Utopian

- In the 19th century, due in large measure to Kant’s metaphysical skepticism or agnosticism, philosophers turned their attention to constructing a philosophy of history. Prior to Kant = Metaphysics and epistemology. After Kant = History and anthropology. Emphasis since Kant has been this world / the phenomenal.

- Before Marx, after Kant, was G.W.F. Hegel - One of the most complex and difficult philosophers
  - Hegel, challenged by Kant, sought to reconstruct metaphysics so that it encompassed history - His working axiom was this: What is rational is real, and what is real is rational.

**Hegel’s Dialectic**

- The term dialectic refers to tension between ideas. Some have used it as a synonym for contradiction, which is tension with a vengeance.
- Hegel’s dialectic process starts with a plausible starting point, which becomes a *thesis*. When analyzed, the thesis may imply a contradictory notion - an *antithesis*. This seeming contradiction tends to create an impasse, as did the philosophies of Heraclitus & Parmenides, & as did rationalism & empiricism.
- The impasse can be resolved only by a *synthesis*, which in effect rescues what is true in both the thesis and the antithesis. Hegel sees this resolution through synthesis as an elevating or lifting up of thought to a new level.

```
Thesis  Antithesis

Synthesis

Thesis  Antithesis

Synthesis = Thesis

Synthesis = Thesis

Synthesis = Thesis
```

- A synthesis is achieved, then it becomes a new thesis. This is turn engenders a new antithesis, which demands resolution in a new synthesis. History moves in this upward, progressive fashion.
Moving on to Marx

- He ranks as one of the most remarkable thinkers in history - remarkable for the degree to which and the rapidity with which his ideas had an impact on world culture.
- Philosophy of Marx, known popularly as dialectical materialism, represents a sharp contrast with Hegel's philosophy of history. Marx agrees with Hegel that movement of history is dialectic in nature, but Marx insists that the force moving history is not ideals or reason but economics. The clash of economic views is the source of conflict and change.
- Marx was a man of action - He didn't just think this stuff, but put it into action.

Marx's Disillusionment

- Marx's father converted to Lutheranism when Karl was young, mainly for business reasons. This affected his disillusionment with religion in life. By 23, Marx had his Ph.D in philosophy.
- Classicists defined man as Homo sapiens, “man the wise,” believing that what separates man from beast is the human intellect - Marx redefines man as Home faber, “man the maker.”
- He sees man's identity as bound up in his labor - Labor = primary catalyst for self-realization. By labor man survives.
- Marx keenly understands the critical role played by tools in the production of goods. "Means of production" are different for an American on a tractor, than for a man in a third world nation - Equal intelligence, age, size, etc, but different tools.
- The industrial revolution created tools that increased the production of goods exponentially. Marx saw the industrial revolution as a serious threat to the well-being of humanity because he saw human community as created by labor, more specifically, by the division of labor. Labor is a collective enterprise, making coexistence essential to survival.
- Society change rapidly as people left agrarian societies to industrial ones as people left the farms and went into factories. - This resulted in worker dehumanization. The farmer who labored for himself, now must sell his labor to the capitalist who owned the “means of production,” the tools. Whoever owns the tools, rules the game.
- Marx says the economic system “forces” the worker to abandon self-employment and to hire himself out to the capitalist as a wage-earner. In reality becoming a wage-earning slave. Worker’s labor is a means to someone else’s end. Worker now no longer owns the tools or the fruits of his labor.

Worker’s Alienation

- Four distinct aspect of alienation: He is alienated from
  - 1) Nature
  - 2) Himself
  - 3) His “species being”
  - 4) Other beings
- Man's original relationship to nature is disrupted by his “unnatural separation” from the fruit of his labor. His labor becomes a commodity, something to be bought and sold. His labor is no longer his own.
- The essence of capitalism is to have your money work for you. Owning things that make money for you.
  - With ownership comes risk. Must invest your capital.
- Marx sees the worker being alienated from himself because his work is not voluntary. It is imposed on him, creating a feeling of dread. The worker is “blue” on Monday and cannot wait for Friday. The worker feels “human” only during his leisure hours. Man as Home faber is no longer fulfilled in his work.
- Man is alienated from his “species being” in the sense that human beings must express their character in free, conscious activity. Animals produce only to meet their most natural needs. The beaver builds a dam and the bird her nest, but man labors to produce far beyond his basic needs. He creates artistically, intellectually, and with a host of other productions. As a wage-earner, says Marx, man loses his creative freedom or it is stifled and, in a sense, he is reduced to an animal who labors simply to put bread on the table.
- Under communism, as Marx envisioned it, everyone labors together for the common good and everyone owns everything. The problem, of course, is that when everyone owns everything, no one owns anything.
Society’s Substructure

- According to Marx, every society has both a substructure and a superstructure. A substructure is like the foundation for a building, while the superstructure is like the building itself. The substructure determines the kinds of superstructure that can be erected on it.
- A society’s substructure is its economic basis or material order, including factors of production and relations of production. The ways tools are developed determines the way men relate to each other. The more sophisticated the tools, the greater the division of labor. This increased division of labor escalates class struggle.
- Capitalism, according to Marx, reduces the classes to two: the owners and the workers. (He did not anticipate the rise of the strong middle class)
- The subjective nature of value drives exchanges in the marketplace, either by bartering or by using currency. In economic theory value is subjective, involving personal preferences. No other person can declare what a good or service is worth to me.
  - In the barter system a man who has an excess of shoes and a shortage of lamps may trade with a man who has an excess of lamps and a shortage of shoes.
  - When goods are purchased with currency, this is essentially a complex form of a barter.
  - In capitalism the price of goods and services, as well as the cost of labor, is determined by the market forces of supply and demand. The larger the labor force, the cheaper the cost of labor. This allows the products to be sold at a price higher than the cost of labor (and materials), which results in a profit. This profit is then gained by the owner. This creates what Marx calls, *surplus value*. The fact that the owner gains more value from his produce than the value of labor that produced it Marx sees as an exploitation of the laboring class. This exploitation is a necessary ingredient of capitalism and fuels what Marx calls the “iron law of wages.”
  - In contrast to capitalism’s market value of labor, Marx argues for the *labor theory of value*: The value of a product is based on the amount of labor put into it. - This principle led to abysmal failure - To seek such an objective theory of value is to oppose the very nature of humanity with its individual tastes, wants and needs. In the capitalist system prices are driven by what people value, what they want to have - Good example would be an experienced painter versus myself painting a painting - It would take me far longer, so should I get paid more?
- Marx thought that the condition of workers in the capitalist system would become steadily worse - Poor become poorer and rich, richer - This was Marx’s greatest error
- With the increase of production by better tools, the cost per unit of goods declines (through the law of supply and demand.) This makes it easier for people to receive the goods and service, and it raises the poor person’s standard of living. - No economic system has been as effective as capitalism in raising the human standard of living.

Society’s Superstructure

- This superstructure includes society’s ideology in such areas as religion, morality, and law. A society’s thinking flows out of its “materialistic base.” Neither reason nor theology shapes society; rather, society’s economic platform shapes its reason or theology.
- In the realm of law, for example, Marx argues that law is established on the vested interests of the ruling class.
- Within Marxism, equality is more important than equity. - Indeed Marxism assumes that equity is served only by equality
  - This means that the sluggard or indolent “deserves” or is “entitled” to an equal share of the pie with the diligent & laborious.
- Likewise, according to Marx, Religion, the “opiate of the masses” is a narcotic used by the ruling class to keep the proletariat in line - The slave is promised a reward in heaven if he behaves now and keeps his fingers out of the bourgeoisie’s pie.
- Marx’s ultimate goal was to end private ownership through the state’s ownership of the means of production. This would yield the utopian order of a classless society, a dream shattered in the Soviet Union and in Maoist China.
Soren Kierkegaard: Danish Gadfly

- We have seen the dramatic impact Marxist philosophy has had on the world. In comprehensiveness and rapidity of its impact on Western culture, existentialism rivals Marxism. (See above note under “Quick definitions of Major Philosophies”)
- Similar to Socrates, the gadfly of Athens, Kierkegaard was the Danish gadfly - He is also popularly known as the father of modern existentialism - He is credited with having coined the term existentialism.
- First work was “Either/Or” - He expresses the crossroads he faced: to regress to a life of sensual debauchery or to pursue spiritual integrity with a passion.
- He was given to severe melancholy, and his brilliant insights and beautiful literary style grew out of his personal pain.

The Three Stages (Illustrated Below)

- These represent optional lifestyles people can choose.
- 1) Aesthetic Stage
  - Lives life as a spectator - Engages in social life and can discuss arts with brilliance, but he is incapable of openness in human relationship and lacks self-direction. Chiefly an observer rather than a doer or actor. A condition of spiritual impotence that leads to sin and personal despair - Leaves meaning of life itself to the mercy of external events. Looks for fulfillment and escape from boredom and amusements. - Form of hedonism in a sense.
- 2) Ethical Stage
  - Moves from personal preference and taste to recognizing and embracing universal rules of conduct. Acquires sense of moral responsibility and submits himself to laws - Experiences conflict with guilt and becomes aware of finitude
  - Reality of guilt places the person in a new situation of either/or: He either remains at the ethical stage or makes a transition out of it to the third stage - religious stage.
- 3) Religious Stage
  - Not reached merely by thought, but the person must make a decisive act of commitment, what Kierkegaard calls a leap: leap of faith - Requires person to exercise passion
  - Reflecting on the culture in 19th century Europe Kierkegaard says they lack passion. - Looks at OT where there is tons of passion
  - This “Leap” lands the person right in the lap, not of a God who can be known philosophically or rationally, but of one who himself is the supreme subject.
Fear and Trembling
- His most pressing question is how to live as a Christian. Clearest example of true faith he can find is Abraham. In “Fear and Trembling” he considers Abraham's struggle to obey God’s unthinkable command to kill his son Isaac.
- As Kierkegaard muses over the story of Abraham and Isaac, he asks, “Is there such a thing as a teleological suspension of the ethical?” That is, can the ethical ever be temporarily suspended for the sake of a higher power?
- Abraham obeyed God in a passionate act of faith. He went beyond the ethical stage to the religious stage by acting out of trust in his personal relationship with God. A life marked by risk includes fear and trembling, dread and anxiety.
- His portrayal of the religious stage is no brief for antinomianism or ethical relativism. Obedience to God is required (John 14:15). Obedience is motivated, not by a zeal for conformity to abstract precepts but by a passionate love for the lawgiver who says, “Thou Shalt.”
- His point was that the Christian life flows out of the deepest passions of a person amid risk and anxiety.

An Attack on Christendom
- He reacted strongly against the state church and nominal Christianity.
- Hegel’s synthesis of church and state, according to Kierkegaard, had produced the arid Christianity of “citizen Christians.” In Denmark people were considered to be Christians simply because they were Danes, obscuring the call to individual faith and conversion. For writing “Attack on Christendom” he was fully expecting to be arrested and prosecuted. He argued that the state church had reduced Christianity to and empty formalism and externalism, which in effect produces mere spectators to true Christianity.
- His view of truth is the root of much controversy
  - He believes in the axiom that God is truth. But he argues that the believer finds truth only when he experiences the tension between himself and God. Is he saying that truth itself is merely a matter of subjective belief? Or is he saying that truth is known only when grasped in the inward experience of the believing subject? If he means the former, then he would be the father of modern relativism.
  - He does declare that truth is subjectivity. This implies more than that truth has a subjective element. It suggests a wholesale rejection of objective truth.
  - But that Kierkegaard probably did not intend a wholesale rejection of objective truth may be seen in his declaration that “What is out there is an objective uncertainty.” It is one thing to say that we do not achieve objective certainty about external reality; it is another thing to say that there is no objective reality out there.
  - His subjective method stresses the importance of personal experience over factual information. He is concerned not with abstract essences but with concrete, particular existence. This is why he was called an existentialist.
  - What is at stake with his view of truth as subjectivity is nothing less than the classical Christian view of objective historicity. Biblical Christianity is tied to real history. It affirms crucial events that actually happened, objectively, in the fullness of time. If dehistoricized, it is destroyed.
  - Modern existential theology has taken this to a new extreme now saying that it doesn’t matter whether or not there was a real historical Jesus or not - but only the individual experience…

An Unscientific Postscript
- In his “Concluding Unscientific Postscript” he tells of two men in prayer. One a church member who professes an orthodox view of God but prays to God with a false spirit. In truth, he says, he is praying to an idol. The other man is a heather who prays to idols with true passion. Therefore he says, he is praying to God. Why? Because truth is found in the inward how, not the external what. This passionate inwardness becomes the highest truth for the individual.
- He says in “Concluding Unscientific Postscript” that, “An objective uncertainty, held fast through appropriation with the most passionate inwardness is the truth, the highest truth there is for an existing individual.
  - It gets interesting when you apply this to worshipping Satan, or saying that someone accepts Hegel’s philosophy rather than Kierkegaard’s.
- An inherent weakness of the subjective method is that it remains dependent on constantly renewed experiences. The anchor for the soul has no rope. While stressing the paradoxes of Christianity that one must embrace by faith, he goes too far by excluding reason too completely.
Friedrich Nietzsche: Atheistic Existentialist

- Graffiti seen on a subway wall in New York City makes this announcement:
  - “God is dead.” - Nietzsche
  - “Nietzsche is dead.” - God
- The movement of theothanatology (the science of the death of God) finds its roots in Nietzsche.
- His brief life (dying at the age of 56) was marked by repeated, serious health problems. At 34 he left the university post due to illness and roamed Europe looking for a cure. He spent his last 11 years in an asylum, undergoing treatment for hopelessly incurable insanity, apparently cause by a severe infection of the brain.
  - During this period he suffered such delusions that he identified himself with Christ, signing his letters, “The Crucified One.” It is said that his sister, who was partly responsible for his continued care, sold tickets to people who wanted a firsthand glimpse of her famous, but now-demented brother.
- Some have dubbed him as the “Philosopher of Evolution.” - He rejected much of Darwin’s thought, but was nevertheless influenced greatly by him. He extended the evolutionary hypothesis beyond the physical development of animals, making religion, philosophy, and logic the products of evolution. He, however, more so saw things as declining, not so much advancing… He complained that his age was “decadent” - A process of decay
  - He blames much of this decay on Christianity’s negative influence. With is emphasis on meekness and submission to deity, he says, Judaeo - Christian tradition squashes the fundamental spirit of humanity. - Weakness replaces strength and pity replaces boldness and courage.

The Will to Power

- He thought Darwin attached too much significance to the natural law of self-preservation. Simple self-preservation or the survival of the species cannot “save the phenomena” of nature. Frequently in nature, the power to create new forms brings death rather than life. The most fundamental force in life is not self-preservation, according to Nietzsche, but what he calls the will to power.
  - The will to power may be linked to modern paradigms such as people’s attempts to rise to the top of the pyramid, an adult version of “King of the Hill.” It is like the aspiration to significance, the search for “meaning” in one’s life.
  - Darwin’s view it too passive - Nietzsche insists that life is active; it exerts power and moves toward growth and expansion. Life is not about mere survival or preserving the status quo.
  - The difference may be seen in the business world - Corporations are successful only when they continue to grow and expand. When a company enters a “maintenance mode,” attempting to protect its current position, is has in effect decided to liquidate. The will to power, on the other hand, struggles to produce more, at a faster rate, and more often. One life is lived at the expense of another. For someone to win the power struggle, someone must lose. There can be no conquerer without the conquered or the vanquished. Nature is not neat and clean, but wasteful and dirty. - Will to power is really the will to overpower.
  - Absolute moral rules imposed by Christianity are inhuman and dehumanizing; their ideal of peace denies man’s most fundamental drive. These religions declare sinful that which is most natural to mankind (Probably because man is naturally sinful!!!)

The Herd Morality

- He distinguishes between “Herd Morality” and “Master Morality” - Herd is also called “Slave Morality” - It is the morality of those who seek security. It originates in the meanest and lowest elements of society - the weak, oppressed, and those lacking in confidence. I elevates the virtues that alleviate pain and affliction.
  - This Herd Morality to him is one of utility (Utilitarianism is the social ethic that seeks the greatest good for the greatest number, sacrificing the desires of the few, or the superior for the desires of the many)
  - It benefits the weak. Those who embrace it are mindless like cattle or sheep, seeking comfort and security in the herd or the flock. This morality is rooted in and driven by fear.
  - Master morality stands in strong contrast to slave. - Morality of the nobility. To the noble, evil is that which is vulgar, pedestrian and plebeian. The authentic patrician, unlike plebe, believes that he creates his own values and morality. He is the master of his fate; he controls his destiny. He is his own judge. He seeks his own glory as he works out his will to power. Demands the most of himself, tackling rigorous tasks that only increase his strength.
Historically, he says, the noble caste was found among the barbarians. Before exhibiting their physical dominance, the developed the psychic strength to exercise their will to power. They were complete or authentic men. The barbarians finally lost out, however, because the masses succeeded in elevating ideals like peace and equality to the level of societal norms. With the advent of herd morality, man’s most basic nature was denied, which in his view is a denial of life itself. He says this triumph of the herd was based in the final analysis on dishonesty.

- He says, “I regard Christianity as the most fatal and seductive lie that has ever yet existed - as the greatest and most impious lie.”
- For example, Christianity advocates the love of one’s enemies, while nature requires that we hate our enemies since they are obstacles to our individual will to power. Thus it dilutes the vital energy of strong men by subverting their natural biological instincts.

The Superman
- Not the comic book hero, but a conqueror. Nature is vindicated, not by the masses who are merely able to survive, but by the few gifted persons who are geniuses and supermen. They are simply superior individuals. Throughout history they would be, Julius Caesar, Alexander the Great, Napoleon Bonaparte.
- He describes the superman as one of extreme courage - dialectical courage - that exists and is exerted amid contradictory tension.
- He is often regarded the father of nihilism, which asserts that there is on ultimate meaning to human existence, no transcendent purpose, value, or virtue. - the nothingness of human existence. No virtues. Even courage itself is meaningless - this is why he calls his own meaning or courage “dialectical” for it operates in the realm of contradiction.

Spectrum of Philosophical Views

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theism</th>
<th>Nihilism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Positions</td>
<td>(e.g., Hybrid Humanism)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- His superman would be one who, knowing there are no values, creates his own.
- He argues that if evolution had a goal, surely it would have been recycled by now. Tim is infinite, causing the constant recurrence of world state. The French Revolution will happen again and again, always producing another Napoleon. The real world is an endless sea of becoming. The only apparent trend is the will to power.
- Part of this eternal recurrence he says, is the necessity of the death of God. God is merely an illusion about the absolute, an illusion created by human mind. It must be shattered for the new age of the superman to dawn. Must deliberately eliminate God from our thinking. Then the world system of morality and standards that relies on this idea for its existence will be destroyed.

The Logic of Nietzsche
- Any evaluation of him must inquire into his epistemology. How does one refute a philosopher who declares absurdity at the outset? When dealing with these people, Sproul normally just asks them why the even bother to talk? The most consistent act of such a philosopher would be just to shut up.

  - When Sproul challenges such psuedo-philosophers in this manner, they reply that they have no need to be consistent or rational because reality and truth are neither consistent nor rational. Indeed, this would be a “rational” defense of irrationality. But to seek to justify irrationality by rational means begs the question in piercing screams. It is self-defeating, because it employs the very norms it is attacking. To claim irrationality allows a thinker to be sloppy as he wishes without making himself vulnerable to a sober critique.
  - When Sproul debates someone who claims irrationality at the outset, I see no need to refute him; he has already done that for me. I hand back the microphone and ask him to politely state his position again, but more loudly. If he declares that his alternative to theism is absurdity, then he has done all I can hope to achieve in my arguments for theism. The irony is that most proponents of absurdity take umbrage at being deemed absurd proponents of absurdity. They want to be regarded as cogent defenders of absurdity, which is a fool’s errand. For if Nietzsche’s (or anyone else’s) argument for irrationality is true, then it must be false!
Jean-Paul Sartre: Litterateur and Philosopher

During the 2nd half of the 20th century, philosophy was dominated by existential (or phenomenological) on the one hand and by analytical philosophy on the other. On the phenomenological side the two dominant thinkers were Martin Heidegger and Jean Paul Sartre.

Pre - Sartre was Husserl - He is called the “Father of modern Phenomenology” - He said, “For me the world is nothing other than what I am aware of and what appears valid in my acts of thought.” This bracketing is a kind of detachment from any objective point of view. He limits the scope of philosophy to the phenomenal experience. He would say our understanding of things determines the essence of things; the essence of things does not determine our understanding. Here we see the root of the existential credo, “Existence precedes essence.”

Heidegger, a student of Husserl, is often lumped with existential philosophies, although he contends he is not one. His chief concern was to construct a new ontology or theory of being. This ontology’s starting point was man. Man begins by finding himself in a state of what he calls “thrown-ness.” Man finds himself passively hurled into his peculiar existence. He is thrown into the midst of life, and he is responsible to take the initiative in discovering the meaning of his existence. He can either interpret himself as a thing -- one thing among others -- or he can make his possibilities the reason for his existence. - Difference is inauthentic and authentic men.

Inauthentic men have thoughts focused on everyday concerns - His joy is always at the mercy of what happens externally - Newspaper and television does thinking for him. - Mere passing of time.

He also seeks safety in normality. Similar to Nietzsche’s herd.

The authentic man says no to all forms of escapism. He becomes authentic by making the right decisions. He comes to grips with the threat of nothingness and know he cannot escape his limitations, chiefly his temporality and finitude.

Sartre became active in the French Resistance, for which Germans made him a prisoner of war - While in prison he continued to study and expound on Heidegger’s philosophy. - Also heavily influenced by Marxism, but never joined the communist party.

He is known for his dictum, “Existence precedes essence.” - This concept is directly linked to his atheism. He believes there is no God, so he believes there is no prior idea for humans, no design or purpose for them.

In the case of man, existence precedes essence. Man simply is. He exists and later defines himself. He creates his own values.

He basically believes things are radically absurd. All things are superfluous. Everything is contingent and there is no reason for anything. All things share equally in meaningless.

Freedom and Responsibility

For him it is not so much that man has freedom, but is freedom. Autonomous.

At one point he describes man as “useless passion”

First it identifies that man is a being who feels and cares

Second it shows that this passion is useless - futile and meaningless

The anxiety of freedom he says is exacerbated by the fact that a person must move forward with no assurance that he is on the right track, because in the final analysis there is no right track.

Freedom and God

He says that he is not happy with his conclusion that God does not exist. He criticizes sharply those who, while denying God’s existence, argue for essential norms of truth, honesty, justice, goodness, and so forth…

Like those before him, he maintains that God is the product of man’s creative consciousness. Religious belief is not rooted in communion with God or communication from God. Rather, it is merely a wish projection. It flows from one’s fearful reluctance to face threats from insecurity, frustration, etc… Every fiber of man’s life screams in protest against the thought of nihilism. Those who cannot take it create a god to help them cope.

He says that man’s freedom and God’s existence are mutually exclusive categories - If God exists, man cannot be free. He says that anything less than autonomy is not true freedom.
Darwin and Freud: Influential Thinkers

- Though neither Darwin or Freud are usually classified as philosophers, both men published theories that had a profound impact on Western theoretical thought.
- Darwin’s name has become synonymous with evolution. Though theories of evolution predated his work and though there is no single, monolithic “theory” of evolution, but multiple with various nuances.
  - It is natural to expect a link to emerge between natural science and history. History not only deals with activities of human beings over time but also with the setting for these activities in the realm of nature. One’s understanding of the universe’s origin (cosmogony), nature (cosmology), and age has a profound impact on one’s anthropology and theology. In these two fields Darwin’s work provoked the greatest crisis.

Darwin and Theology

- If, as some contend, humans emerged no due to divine intelligence and action but due to impersonal forces of nature, the question of human dignity becomes acute. Man’s present dignity is bound up with his past and future, with his origin and destiny.
  - If we are indeed a grown up germ destined for annihilation, what value, worth, or dignity do we have? If origin and destiny are meaningless, how can our lives have any meaning?
  - Darwin’s word, “The Origin of Species” was published in 1859. He started it in 1839, and completed it by 1844, but didn’t get it published because he was probably fearful of the upheaval. Darwin’s work was heavily influence by another (Principles of Geology) which requires an earth millions of years old. - In “Origin…” he theorizes that all living organisms on earth have descended from a single primordial form. This is the essence of macro-evolution.
- Darwin’s word, “The Origin of Species” was published in 1859. He started it in 1839, and completed it by 1844, but didn’t get it published because he was probably fearful of the upheaval. Darwin’s work was heavily influence by another (Principles of Geology) which requires an earth millions of years old. - In “Origin…” he theorizes that all living organisms on earth have descended from a single primordial form. This is the essence of macro-evolution. This differs from micro-evolution, which restricts evolution to changes and adaptations within a group.

Darwin’s Major Premises

- Premise 1: Each individual member of a given species is different.
  - This uniqueness is affirmed in variety of people.
- Premise 2: All living creatures tend to produce more offspring than the environment can support.
- Premise 3: Differences among individuals, combined with environmental pressures, affect the probability that a given individual will survive long enough to pass along its genetic traits.
- From these basic premises he concludes that natural selection not only prompts changes within species but leads to the origination of new species. Macro-evolution requires that new species evolve from different species. - This is what has raised so much controversy.

- Much remains, however, for evolutionary theory to establish. The origin of biological species, in the final analysis, is not so much a biological as a historical question.
  - We frequently hear that our modern understanding of the nature of living organisms proves macro-evolution. As the argument goes, the fact that all living things are composed of the same basic substance, such as amino acids, proteins and so on, proves that all life came from the same source. - But to conclude common source from the premise of common substance is fallacious reasoning. Common substance no more requires common source that the occurrence of one thing after another proves that the first caused the second.
  - Evolutionary theories usually assume that all changes involved in mutations, natural selection, and so forth are a part of an upward spiral of progress. Such “progress” suggests a goal or a purpose. But this involves an assumption of teleology or design. Design without a designer, like aim without an aimer, begs the question of intelligence. Evolution is much a question of philosophy and not just biology.

Freud on Culture and Religion

- He is generally considered the “Founder of Psychoanalysis”
- Thought noted in psychology, he was also keenly interested in anthropology. - After 1923 he turned more and more to the study of culture. - In his analysis, his chief hypothesis is that every individual person is an enemy of civilization.
• Civilization, says Freud, is imposed on the majority by a controlling or coercive minority - Coercion is necessary because of two basic human characteristics: 1) Men are not spontaneously fond of work and 2) Human passions often overrule reason.

• Basically, at this point, he turned to attempt to recount for religion’s origin - In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, atheists turned to this question, “If God does not exist, why do human beings appear to be religious beings?”
  
  • Most common explanation is that it is rooted in a deep wish-projection or psychological need.

  • Freud concludes that the chief task of civilization is to protect and defend us from nature. Nature manifests itself in ways that seem to mock human control. Earthquakes tear apart and bury human life and structures. Floods destroy everything in their path and drown people. Dreadful diseases inflict suffering and pain. Then there is the big enemy, what Freud calls the “painful riddle of death,” for which no medicine has been discovered.

  • First humanize / personalize nature
  • Then Sacralize nature - religious devotion.

Other Major World Philosophies and Philosophers
What is below is not in Sproul's book, but is off the internet

Abelard, Peter
(1079 - 1142). French philosopher. One of the most influential medieval logicians and theologians. Around 1113, while teaching theology in Paris, Abelard fell in love with his student Heloise, whom he secretly married; he was condemned for heresy a few years later because of his nominalist views about universals.

Anaxagoras
(c. 500 - 428 B.C.). Greek Presocratic philosopher who is said to have made Athens the center of philosophy and to have been Socrates' teacher; he rejected the four elements theory of Empedocles and posited instead an infinite number of unique particles of which all objects are composed.

Anselm, St.
(1033 - 1109). Italian monk and Scholastic theologian who became archbishop of Canterbury. St. Anselm founded Scholasticism, integrated Aristotelian logic into theology, and believed that reason and revelation are compatible. He is most famous for his influential ontological argument for God's existence.

Aquinas, St. Thomas
(1225 - 74). The greatest thinker of the Scholastic School. His ideas were, in 1879, made the official Catholic philosophy. He incorporated Greek ideas into Christianity by showing Aristotle's thought to be compatible with church doctrine. In his system, reason and faith (revelation) form two separate but harmonious realms whose truths complement rather than oppose one another. He presented influential philosophical proofs for the existence of God.

Aristotle
(384 - 322 B.C.). Greek philosopher, scientist, logician, and student of many disciplines. Aristotle studied under Plato and became the tutor of Alexander the Great. In 335 he opened the Lyceum, a major philosophical and scientific school in Athens. Aristotle emphasized the observation of nature and analyzed all things in terms of "the four causes." In ethics, he stressed that virtue is a mean between extremes and that man's highest goal should be the use of his intellect. Most of Aristotle's works were lost to Christian civilization from the fifth through the twelfth centuries.

Augustine of Hippo, St.
(354 - 430). The greatest of the Latin church fathers and possibly the most influential Christian thinker after St. Paul. St. Augustine emphasized man's need for grace. His Confessions and The City of God were highly influential.

Averroes
(1126 - 98). Spanish-born Arabian philosopher, lawyer, and physician whose detailed commentaries on Aristotle were influential for over 300 years. He emphasized the compatibility of faith and reason but believed philosophical knowledge to be derived from reason. The Church condemned his views.

Avicenna
(980 - 1037). Islamic medieval philosopher born in Persia. His Neoplatonist interpretation of Aristotle greatly influenced medieval philosophers, including St. Thomas Aquinas. Avicenna was also a physician; his writings on medicine were important for nearly 500 years.

Bacon, Sir Francis
(1561 - 1626). English statesman, essayist, and philosopher, one of the great precursors of the tradition of British empiricism and of belief in the importance of scientific method. He emphasized the use of inductive reasoning in the pursuit of knowledge.

Boethius
(c. 475 - 535). Roman statesman, philosopher, and translator of Aristotle, whose Consolation of Philosophy (written in prison) was widely read throughout the Middle Ages; it showed reason's role in the face of misfortune and was the link between the ancient philosophers and the Scholastics.

Descartes, Rene
(1596 - 1650). French philosopher and scientist, considered the father of modern philosophical inquiry. Descartes tried to extend mathematical method to all knowledge in his search for certainty. Discarding the medieval appeal to authority, he began with "universal
doubt," finding that the only thing that could not be doubted was his own thinking. The result was his famous "Cogito, ergo sum," or "I think, therefore I am."

**Dewey, John**  
(1859 - 1952). Leading American philosopher, psychologist, and educational theorist. Dewey developed the views of Charles S. Peirce (1839 - 1914) and William James into his own version of pragmatism. He emphasized the importance of inquiry in gaining knowledge and attacked the view that knowledge is passive.  

**Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich**  
(1770 - 1831). German philosopher whose idealistic system of metaphysics was highly influential; it was based on a concept of the world as a single organism developing by its own inner logic through trios of stages called "thesis, antithesis, and synthesis" and gradually coming to embody reason. Hegel held the monarchy to be the highest development of the state.  

**Heidegger, Martin**  
(1889 - 1976). German philosopher who studied with Husserl. Heidegger's own philosophy, which was influenced by Kierkegaard, emphasized the need to understand "being," especially the unique ways that humans act in and relate to the world.  

**Hobbes, Thomas**  
(1588 - 1679). English materialist and empiricist, one of the founders of modern political philosophy. In the Leviathan, Hobbes argued that because men are selfish by nature, a powerful absolute ruler is necessary. In a "social contract," men agree to give up many personal liberties and accept such rule.  

**Hume, David**  
(1711 - 76). British empiricist whose arguments against the proofs for God's existence are still influential. Hume held that moral beliefs have no basis in reason, but are based solely on custom.  

**James, William**  
(1842 - 1910). American philosopher and psychologist, one of the founders of Pragmatism, and one of the most influential thinkers of his era. James viewed consciousness as actively shaping reality, defined truth as "the expedient" way of thinking, and held that ideas are tools for guiding our future actions rather than reproductions of our past experiences.  

**Kant, Immanuel**  
(1724 - 1804). German philosopher, possibly the most influential of modern times. He synthesized Leibniz's rationalism and Hume's skepticism into his "critical philosophy": that ideas do not conform to the external world, but rather the world can be known only insofar as it conforms to the mind's own structure. Kant claimed that morality requires a belief in God, freedom, and immortality, although these can be proved neither scientifically nor by metaphysics.  

**Kierkegaard, Soren**  
(1813 - 55). Danish philosopher, religious thinker, and extraordinarily influential founder of existentialism. Kierkegaard held that "truth is subjectivity," that religion is an individual matter, and that man's relationship to God requires suffering.  

**Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm**  
(1646 - 1716). German philosopher, diplomat, and mathematician, one of the great minds of all time. Leibniz was an inventor (with Sir Isaac Newton) of the calculus and a forefather of modern mathematical logic. He held that the entire universe is one large system expressing God's plan.  

**Locke, John**  
(1632 - 1704). Highly influential founder of British empiricism. Locke believed that all ideas come to mind from experience and that none are innate. He also held that authority derives solely from the consent of the governed, a view that deeply influenced the American Revolution and the writing of the U.S. Constitution.  

**Machiavelli, Niccolo**  
(1469 - 1527). Italian Renaissance statesman and political writer. In The Prince, one of the most influential political books of modern times, Machiavelli argues that any act of a ruler designed to gain and hold power is permissible. The term Machiavellian is used to refer to any political tactics that are cunning and power-oriented.  

**Maimonides**  
(1135 - 1204). Spanish-born medieval Jewish philosopher and thinker. Maimonides tried to synthesize Aristotelian and Judaic thought. His works had enormous influence on Jewish and Christian thought.  

**Marx, Karl**  
(1818 - 83). German revolutionary thinker, social philosopher, and economist. His ideas, formulated with Engels, laid the foundation for nineteenth-century socialism and twentieth-century communism. Although Marx was initially influenced by Hegel, he soon rejected Hegel's idealism in favor of materialism. His Communist Manifesto and Das Kapital are among the most important writings of the last 200 years.  

**Mill, John Stuart**  
(1806 - 73). English empiricist philosopher, logician, economist, and social reformer. His System of Logic described the basic rules for all scientific reasoning. As a student of Jeremy Bentham, he elaborated on utilitarian ethics; in On Liberty, he presented a plea for the sanctity of individual rights against the power of any government.  

**Moore, G. E. (George Edward)**  
(1873 - 1958). British philosopher who emphasized the "common sense" view of the reality of material objects. In ethics, Moore held that goodness is a quality known directly by moral intuition and that it is a fallacy to try to define it in terms of anything else.  

**More, Sir Thomas**  
(1478 - 1535). A leading Renaissance humanist and statesman, Lord Chancellor of England. More was beheaded for refusing to accept the king as head of the Church. Influenced by Greek thinking, he believed in social reform and drew a picture of an ideal peaceful state in his Utopia.
Nietzsche, Friedrich Wilhelm  
(1844 - 1900). German philosopher, philologist, and poet. As a moralist, he rejected Christian values and championed a "Superman" who would create a new, life-affirming, heroic ethic by his "will to power."

Pascal, Blaise  
(1623 - 62). French philosopher, mathematician, scientist, and theologian. His posthumous Pensees ("Thoughts") argues that reason is by itself inadequate for man's spiritual needs and cannot bring man to God, who can be known only through mystic understanding.

Plato  
(c. 428 - c. 348 B.C.). Athenian father of Western philosophy and student of Socrates, after whose death he traveled widely. On returning to Athens, he founded an Academy, where he taught until he died. His writings are in the form of dialogues between Socrates and other Athenians. Many of Plato's views are set forth in The Republic, where an ideal state postulates philosopher kings, specially trained at the highest levels of moral and mathematical knowledge. Plato's other works analyzed moral virtues, the nature of knowledge, and the immortality of the soul. His views on cosmology strongly influenced the next two thousand years of scientific thinking.

Plotinus  
(205 - 270). Egyptian-born founder of Neoplatonism, who synthesized the ideas of Plato and other Greek philosophers. Plotinus believed all reality is caused by a series of outpourings (called emanations) from the divine source. Although not himself a Christian, he was a major influence on Christianity.

Rousseau, Jean Jacques  
(1712 - 78). Swiss-French thinker, born in Geneva. Rousseau has been enormously influential in political philosophy, educational theory, and the Romantic movement. In The Social Contract (1762), he viewed governments as being expressions of the people's "general will," or rational men's choice for the common good. Rousseau emphasized man's natural goodness.

Russell, Bertrand  
(1872 - 1970). English philosopher and logician influential as an agnostic and a pacifist. Early work with Alfred North Whitehead gave birth to modern logic. Russell changed his views numerous times but always sought to establish philosophy, especially epistemology, as a science.

Santayana, George  
(1863 - 1952). Spanish-born American philosopher and poet; a student of William James. Santayana attempted to reconcile Platonism and materialism, studied how reason works, and found "animal faith," or impulse, to be the basis of reason and belief.

Sartre, Jean-Paul  
(1905 - 80). French philosopher, novelist, and dramatist; one of the founders of existentialism. Sartre was a Marxist through much of his life. He held that man is "condemned to be free" and to bear the responsibility of making free choices.

Schopenhauer, Arthur  
(1788 - 1860). German post-Kantian philosopher who held that although irrational will is the driving force in human affairs, it is doomed not to be satisfied. He believed that only art and contemplation could offer escape from determinism and pessimism. Schopenhauer strongly influenced Nietzsche, Freud, Tolstoy, Proust, and Thomas Mann.

Scotus, John Duns  
(c. 1266 - 1308). Scottish-born Scholastic philosopher who tried to integrate Aristotelian ideas into Christian theology. Scotus emphasized that all things depend not just on God's intellect but on divine will as well.

Smith, Adam  
(1723 - 1790). Scottish philosopher & economist. He believed that if government left the marketplace to its own devices, an "invisible hand" would guarantee that the results would benefit the populace. Smith has had enormous influence on economists into the present.

Socrates  
(464 - 399 B.C.). Athenian philosopher who allegedly wrote down none of his views, supposedly from his belief that writing distorts ideas. His chief student, Plato, is the major source of knowledge of what is known of his life. Socrates questioned Athenians about their moral, political, and religious beliefs, as depicted in Plato's dialogues; his questioning technique, called dialectic, has greatly influenced western philosophy. Socrates is alleged to have said that "the unexamined life is not worth living." In 399 B.C., he was brought to trial on charges of corrupting the youth and religious heresy. Sentenced to die, he drank poison.

Spinoza, Benedict (Baruch)  
(1623 - 77). Dutch-born philosopher expelled from the Amsterdam Jewish community for heresy in 1656; he was attacked by Christian theologians 14 years later. In Ethics, Spinoza presents his views in a mathematical system of deductive reasoning. A proponent of monism, he held-in contrast to Descartes-that mind and body are aspects of a single substance, which he called God or nature.

Voltaire (Francois Marie Arouet)  
(1694 - 1778). French philosopher, essayist, and historian; one of the major thinkers of the Enlightenment. A Deist who was anti-Christian, Voltaire widely advocated tolerance of liberal ideas and called for positive social action. His novel Candide is a parody of the optimism of Leibniz.

Whitehead, Alfred North  
(1861 - 1947). British philosopher and mathematician who worked with Bertrand Russell. Whitehead tried to integrate twentieth-century physics into a metaphysics of nature.

William of Ockham (Occam)  
(c. 1285 - c. 1349). Franciscan monk and important English theologian and philosopher. In his nominalism, he opposed much of the thought of St. Thomas Aquinas and of medieval Aristotelianism; he also rejected the Pope's power in the secular realm.