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***Philosophy***

**Question 1: Part D**

**William James distinguishes between dogmatic and philosophic education. Define both kinds of education and give an example of each one. Which one about G.W. Foote argue against? In answering this question, explain G.W Foote’s arguments for questioning our beliefs.**

**Answer:** William James quotes about dogmatic education as when one thinks about the ideas. He rejects the claims of others whether based upon the scientific connotations or the observable facts. In such an education, the ideas are sorted after being assertive. Such a search leads towards the new findings and disconnects the links between the human mindfulness and its relation with the expectations. William James writes about the philosophic education as the search about the belief on the basis of What, Who, How, etc. these What, Who and How’s are present in the facts about certain things which one study throughout his life. His mind predicts about the certainty of anything first at the basis of its knowledge present in his mind, and then on the basis of what he has seen additional to its existing knowledge. In such cases most often its observation is also based on the existing knowledge.

In order to more precisely guess about William James definitions of dogmatic and philosophic education, one needs to consider the following facts. For example, by the lenses of dogmatism, one needs to portray things as they have ever or in the present exists. Like one’s portrayal of the facts about any religious beliefs just on the basis of his facial expressions or the basis of how staunchly he or she is talking about any phenomena in order to convince others on his words. This is dogmatism. Whereas the philosophic education is when one urges others to his own point of views based on the existing knowledge in his or her mind. In such cases, the knowledge of scientific facts and literature guides the purpose, which is normally the part of the textbooks. According to the G. W Foote’s arguments presented in “It doesn’t pay to be religious”, it appears that he is against the dogmatism about the knowledge, which he thinks leads towards skepticism. G.W Foote argues that religious authorities appeals of their followers in an “*ad Bellum”* manner which is fraudulent(Foote). He is of the opinion that such beliefs are just fraudulent and nothing else.

**Question 2: Part F**

**What are the parts of an argument and how does one critique an argument? What are two ways in which rationalism attacks the arguments of empiricism? Explain.**

**Answer:** The arguments must always be taken as a part and as a continuation of any previous arguments. This division enables anyone to think about the argument more clearly. He divides the argument into sections and thinks about them more thoroughly and clearly. It also enables the one to think about it rationally and open up his mind about whether it is effective or ineffective. The argument analysis also follows a chronological approach, in which there is a relation of one aspect, with the previous aspect or with the aspect that is coming by. Following are three parts of an argument.

*The Claim*: it is the very first part of the argument, in which the speaker presents in front of the other person something new, which might not be in his mind before or he has not listened about it in the manner he is presenting. The claim is like an umbrella statement or a general statement, which still lacks interpretation.

*The Reason*: Reason is the part of an argument, where it has started the journey towards precision. It is now on part of the recipient to interpret it in the way he or she wants. This precision now does not require the consent of the one who has given the previous general statement or has made a claim. The reason is the part where it will be authenticated that why the particular aspect has been talked about.

*The Evidence*: This part involves Evidence. Normally the readers or the listeners believe in the speeches or the texts of others, but there are some which require some proofs. This proof might involve scientific reasoning or the evidence-based facts for the listeners.

The two ways in which rationalism attacks the arguments of empiricism are first the extent by which we are dependent on the experiences of ours just to have the knowledge of our surroundings and the second by our reach to the reality. These are two ways the dispute between the rationalism and empiricism is evident.

**Question 3: Part H**

**What is Pragmatism? Give a definition and example of how it works? How do Ohiyesa critique William James’s Pragmatism? Explain.**

**Answer:** In the philosophical connotations, the pragmatism is that movement where one claims that the ideology at hand is only true if it satisfies the situations. For example, at part of ideology, it is just not enough that it has the support of the individuals, but for this, it is also important that it goes through the situation calmly(James). It sets as perfectly with the circumstances at hand. The philosophical connotations of pragmatism originated in the United States. Pragmatism is basically based on the presumption that ideology if it is true, will work accordingly and satisfactorily. It states that the meaning of the prepositions must be found in the practical connotations of accepting it. William Jones was the first person to use this term. He used this term when addressing the audience about Philosophical Conceptions. C. S Peirce and John Dewey have also worked on the pragmatism as a philosophy.

William James’s concept of Pragmatism is critiqued on in many ways. It is believed that William James doesn't have the concept of Meta-Physics, and to have the concept of pragmatism, an idea about the Metaphysics should have. Ohiyesa believes that pragmatism is opposed in each and any form by the Metaphysics. Many philosophers think that William James concept of Pragmatism is flawed for various reasons. For example, James had a narrow knowledge of Meta-Physics. His scholarly work revolved against the philosophy as a general form and he has always viewed pragmatism on the qualitative basis rather o the quantitative basis. He has also tried much time to include the scholarly findings of philosophy by not testing them on the quantitative scales of the Metaphysics, which is flawed. Although the pragmatism is some kind of support in a specific way to the Meta-Physics, their relation of idealism and pragmatism ought to involve convergence and not the contestation.

**Question 4: Part L**

**Explaining the philosophy behind the story and the philosophical role of the characters?**

**Answer:** The father has arrived in a situation when his children’s were not having a good time, rather, they were in conflict with each other. The father strictly took notice of the situation strictly and asked for them the reason for their conflict. Her daughter complained that his younger brother remains too disturbing towards her, whereas her brother complained that throughout their way towards home from school, she has remained strict with her and also had not shared the chocolate bar with him. The story if categorized on the philosophical understanding then it suggests that the cognitive philosophy of their father suggested him to offer them an exciting and a kind of rewarding activity. Which he does and offer them both that once they are done with their daily tasks he will take them out so they can have a good time together. His father is worried as he knows that these minimal continuance distortions are becoming a routine affair and that will to result good in any way for both of them. Finally, he takes them out.

What the philosophy in this story suggests us is that until anyone does not take hold of the situation by applying his or her cognitive philosophical attributes- it will keep on becoming a hurdle for him. He does so this practice with his children’s this time and him witnesses a kind of improvement in their attitudes. William James work on philosophy suggests that the cognitive abilities of any individual guide them properly about the situations that might result in the worse scenario in the future(James). To come up with these, he states that just analyzing the physical behavior when can make up his mind how to come up with the solutions to this problem. Such cognitive attributes then, makes one able to come up with the solutions of the difficult problems which arises in one’s individual or collective life.

**Question 5: Part O**

**In the film *Examined Life*, we watched a segment about the philosophers and activists, Judith Butler and Sunaura Taylor. Butler and Taylor are presented as modern-day Pragmatist. Explain how they are Pragmatists and how they present pragmatism as an alternative to rationalism and empiricism.**

**Answer**: The quoted line for Astor Taylor part in the examined life is “Philosophy is in the streets”. Once one has completely gone through this part of Taylor, he opines that according to Taylor, the philosophy is walking somewhere in the streets, in the attitudes and in the way of communication of the people. She believes that philosophy has many dimensions that are all visible. Once anyone is in the street. Their modern pragmatism is based on the notion that people have now seemed to put aside the philosophy and all its related definitions and are now in the pursuit of real happiness that comes after imagination about things. As the film is based on the primary views as to how the people behave with one another, how they look towards each other and what they perceive about each other, it suggests that, that everything is pragmatism unless when applies his or her cognitive philosophical abilities to judge the attitudes of others.

Pragmatism is totally different from rationalism and empiricism in many ways. Pragmatism involves one's thinking about things in a more qualitative manner and not in a more quantitative way. This suggests that being pragmatic is related to one’s own self, it has less to do with the cost-benefit analysis and more with their views about the external situation. Whereas the empiricism and the rationalism involve some heft understandings of the things based on reasoning. They are all quantitatively judged and has many things related to the cost-benefit analysis. In such situations, one goes towards believing in the internal instincts that are supposed to be true in such cases. Since pragmatism, empiricism and rationalism are all branches of philosophy but all these three has a totally different understanding of the things in hand. Thus this debate suggests that, due to the Philosophy’s internet connection with the metaphysics, it includes some cost-benefit analysis also, which are apparent in the cases of empiricism and rationalism.
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