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Descartes vs Locke

**Introduction**

The personal identity issue and the detriments have been of concern to most philosophers. There are questions which have been raised including what does it entail being a person every day. The theory of physical identity is the philosophical conflict with the crucial issues of our existence like who we are and whether there is life after the demise of a person (Allison, 41-58). This kind of analysis of the personal identity gives the set of sufficient and necessary conditions for the person’s character in the duration of time. In philosophy, if the mind, the concept of personal identity other times is called the diachronic problem of the individual personality. There are various theories of their own identity or consciousness. In this paper, the review of René Descartes and John Locke on personal identity and consciousness shall be presented.

John Locke

John Locke is one of the philosophers who debated the Cartesian theory which stated that the soul accounts for the personal identity. John (217) questioned that personal identity is the matter of the continuity of the psychological. By arguing both the Augustinian viewpoint of the man as being firstly sinful, which maintains that a man naturally knows the basic logical prepositions? John suggested that the empty mind that is shaped by the experience, reflections, and sensations are the primary source of our entire ideas.

John (217) created the third terms between the body and the soul, and his though might surely be meditated by the people who following the scientist ideology identified the consciousness and brain quickly. The brain while consciousness maintains the same while the body or other substances might change. Thus, personal identity is in knowledge but not in mind. Nevertheless, the theory by Locke reveals the debt he has on theology and Apocalyptic which advanced the excuses any failings of human justice and hence the miserable state of humanity. The issue with personal identity is at the center of the discussions concerning life after immortality and death. For one o exists after death, there is a need to be the person after death who is supposed to be the same individual as to the individual who died. I did not agree with John Locker when he said that the brain while consciousness maintains the same while the body or other substances might change. Thus, personal identity is in consciousness but not in the brain

John (217) kept that consciousness could be transferred from one person’s soul to another’s and that the personal character should be together with awareness. Locke raised the question that is the similar substance that thinks it can be altered, it could be the same individual or maintaining to be the same or it could be a dissimilar person. John answered the questioned in affirmative. The consciousness can be transmitted from a substance to the other and hence, whereas the soul is altered, consciousness maintains to be the same, therefore preserving the individual identity during the change. Contrary, consciousness could be lost in the utter forgetfulness whereas the thinking substance or the body maintains the same. In these conditions, there could be the same soul however two different people. The affirmation concludes the claim that the same thinking substance or soul is neither sufficient nor necessary for the individual identity in over time.

The distinction between the person and man is dubious, John’s (217) distinction between the thing or the soul that thinks is us plus the consciousness is even more essential. The answer is that the difference solves the issues of the dead resurrection. In the case of the cobbler and prince Locke shows the effect of resurrection resolution. In this case, the prince soul plus the thoughts of the prince is transmitted to the cobbler’s body. The outcome of this is that the prince still sees himself as the prince even with the fact that he is in a different shape. John’s distinction between the person and the man makes it possible for a person to be in a diverse body during resurrection while still be the same individual. John concludes that consciousness is essential to the punishment and reward that is meted during Judgment day.

The prince and cobbler case leases to the problem though because the personal identity is founded on the consciousness plus a person could be just aware of his knowledge, the human judges will never know when they are punishing or judging the similar person or the same body. It means, Locke (217) argued that one might be sentenced just for the bodies’ acts; however, one I only responsible for the actions when one is conscious. It forms the basis of the defense of insanity that one is not held accountable for the deeds done when an individual is unconscious.

**René Descartes**

Descartes (1991) argued that consciousness is axiomatic since one cannot logically be able to deny the mid existence while at the sometimes utilizing the mind doing the denying. Nevertheless, the derivation and formulation of the action are wrong whereby he assumed that one could be aware of the absence of something to cause awareness. Consciousness is the ability which perceives things that are in existence. I support René Descartes that consciousness is the ability which sees things that are in reality. Indirectly and directly each phenomenon of the consciousness is generated from the awareness of the world in external. Some content or some objects are involved in each stage of knowledge. Introspection is the cognition process which is directed outward being the process of the apprehension some of the existents in the external world. Meditation is the cognition process which is directed inward that is the process of the perception of an individual’s physiological actions concerning some existent in the external world the activities like reminiscing, feeling, thinking among others. The contents state of consciousness is the contradiction in the terms.

Descartes (1991) stated that because being conscious is to perceive something, the consciousness needs something that is outside itself for it to function. Consciousness is dependent on existence. Additionally, the consciousness cannot just be the conscious itself as implied by Descartes. To be the consciousness, it needs to be aware of eternal something to itself. Only like after the consciousness of something that is external could identify itself. Just like the car motor which generates the electricity for its usage, it requires to be started by something which is outside it. It involves existence. Descartes provided the physiological usage of the consciousness concept, but he did not offer the concept analysis. Instead, he employed the idea in a manner that is suggestive for the study. The conscious thought is the mental state which is self-intimating.

 Descartes (1991) defined consciousness as the thought that makes a clear mind. As people, we are aware of every idea we possess, and we are fully aware of having them though, and we are not in the position to doubt that we have thought. He also stated that consciousness involves reflection. There are the questions on how strong or in which form that Descartes was committed to this. Is the consciousness significantly constituted by the clear perception from the real perception?

Descartes (1991) stated that conscious thought is also intentional which means we can distinguish the thinking as the mind mode from the content. The thoughts represent the things which appear to be on the outside of the mind. In the Sixth and Third meditation, Descartes utilized the structure of representation to infer the Gods existence and the presence of the mind-independent material. Most Cartesians used Descartes philosophy in defining the terms consciousness. One of the Cartesians stated that inner knowledge, awareness and the perception which every one of us goes thought directly in ourselves during when we are aware, of what happens and what we are doing. Another one is the thought nature compromise of the inner sensation, testimony, and consciousness whereby the mind is aware of the things that it suffers and does in general of everything that happens immediately when it is acted on or when it acts.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, Descartes argued that consciousness is axiomatic since one cannot logically be able to deny the mid existence while at the sometimes utilizing the mind doing the denying. Additionally, the consciousness cannot just be the conscious itself as implied by Descartes John (217) stated that the brain while consciousness maintains the same while the body or other substances might change. Thus, personal identity is in knowledge but not in mind. I support René Descartes that consciousness is the ability which perceives things that are in existence. I did not agree with John Locker when he said that the brain while consciousness maintains the same while the body or other substances might change. Thus, personal identity is in consciousness but not in mind. Indirectly and directly each phenomenon of the consciousness is generated from the awareness of the world in external. Some content or some objects are involved in each stage of the awareness
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