

Comparing the Theory of Empiricism and Rationalism Philosophy Essay

In this report, the theory of empiricism and rationalism will be discussed and compared. Empiricism is a set of theories philosophical (With applications logical, psychological or Language) that make the experience sensitive origin of any knowledge valid and all pleasure aesthetic. Empiricism objects in particular to the innate ideas and the idea of a knowledge a priori. It often goes hand in hand with a theory of associationist ideas that explains their formation by the combination of simple ideas.

Meanwhile, rationalism is the overall philosophical direction of accepting as the sole essence of reality driven and from the knowledge of logical thinking. From the period of Enlightenment rationalism is usually associated with the introduction of mathematical methods in philosophy, first with the work of Descartes, Leibniz and Spinoza.

Rationalism is often contrasted with empiricism. In fact, the views are not mutually exclusive, since for example the philosophy of science is rational and empirical. If, however, pulled the ends empiricism believes that all ideas come from experience, either through the five external senses or through the internal sensations such as pain and pleasure, and thus that knowledge is essentially based on experience. Similarly some versions of rationality argue that starting with basic principles such as the axioms of geometry, one could deductively derive all possible knowledge of the whole. Philosophers who argue over this point of view was Spinoza and Leibniz, whose efforts to address the epistemological and metaphysical problems raised by Descartes led to the development of a somewhat the melioristic approach to rationality. Both Spinoza and Leibniz argued that in principle at least all knowledge, including scientific knowledge can be gained by using the reasonableness alone. While both admit that this is not possible in practice to humans only in specific areas of science such as mathematics. Some people prefer to follow empiricism while others rationalism. I will present each one to the reader and inform them which I prefer for several reasons.

Empiricism comes from the Greek experience, The translation Latin is experientia, From whom it derives the word experience.

" empirical " in the Seniority classic , both for Greek as for Romans, refers to doctors , architects , artists and artisans in general get their skills directed toward the useful experience and technical , as opposed to theoretical knowledge conceived as "contemplation of the truth " regardless of any utility .

In philosophy the "empiricism" as such term is defined as a school or way of thinking that arises in the Modern Age, ripe fruit of a philosophical trend that develops especially in the UK since the late Middle Ages is usually seen as opposed to the call rationalism more characteristic of continental philosophy .

It is a theory of knowledge emphasizing the role of experience, Linked to sensory perception. In the formation of concepts:

The knowledge finds its validity only in its relation to the experience

The experience is the foundation of all knowledge not only in their origin but also as to the contents thereof

Be part of the sensible world to form concepts and how sensitive they are in their justification and limitation

Regarding universal concepts continue criticism nominalista already begun in the late middle Ages

With regard to scientific knowledge:

The method of science is induction and offers a true likely and contingent

And philosophy of science justifies the possibility of validity of theories through experiment, In relation to the experience possible

It is fundamental requirement of scientific method that the hypothesis and theories should provide the opportunity to be supported by experimental observation of a content security not merely analytical, but synthetic

Today the opposition "empiricism - rationalism " and "analytical-synthetic' is little understood in a clear-cut, as it was in earlier times, and rather one or another position due to issues methodological and heuristics or attitudes toward life rather than principles fundamental philosophical .

Science and experience

Old forms of empiricism include the work epistemological the Buddha in the East. Here we consider the evolution of Western philosophical attitudes.

Antiquity

In ancient times there was a clear separation:

The knowledge by experience and its result: technique and productive work. What has been understood historically as the "arts" and "offices " .

The ideal of knowledge theoretical which comprises two areas:

The Science: understood as a knowledge universal and necessary. Try the latest knowledge causes and early principles, what is now understood as the foundation of reality, metaphysics.

As an ideal of knowledge Practical action directed towards achieving the well and happiness, which in turn is developed in two areas:

Achieving well individual, happiness as Ethics

The achievement of the common good social, Policy.

In classical antiquity the theoretical and practical knowledge, like knowing universal and necessary ideal of "knowing" is independent of experience, and is the Wisdom. The ultimate expression of truth and knowledge as science's the Metaphysics and the ideal model of life as close as possible to happiness As Ethics Constitute the ideal of Wise.

This separation of knowledge and practical action on the production of tangible property meets a warrior aristocratic tradition and the nobility or ruling class. The arts and crafts were peculiar to slaves or traders, but the "wisdom "(philosophy) was the characteristic of the nobility and freemen.

In classical Athens and appeared ambivalent attitude of thinking that is going to keep throughout the history of philosophy in the West and is now characterized primarily as rationalism and empiricism. Actually respond to two attitudes and ways of understanding the function of thought and sense of life.

The first to maintain an attitude were clearly empiricist Sophists rationalists who denied the speculation about the natural world common to its predecessors, Pre-Socratic and, above all, Plato on the contrary were concerned "in such related entities as man and society. " The value of truth is restricted to the concrete value of experience and the exercise of power, either individually (moral) or social (policy).

Empiricism is interested in it rhetoric in the domain of language as an essential instrument for political life in Athens and the exercise of power.

Aristotle proclaimed the importance of induction based on experience.

Perhaps Aristotle who best expressed the value of knowledge from experience, however he deemed submitted to the supreme value of the theoretical. In Metaphysics, 982, b.11 -32, Aristotle conceives of knowledge as a process:

Be part of the ordinary with the animals endowed with sense and memory and therefore experience, is the accumulation of experience that men do "experts."

More perfect knowledge of that experience coupled with reflection, making men into "artists" that now call technical (Doctors, architects, strategists, etc.).

The perfection of human rational function is manifest in the supreme power of rising to the foundations of this knowledge through the causes to the first principles is in this that the man resembles the gods, knowledge of a Science first, until the eighteenth century understood as metaphysics. This is possible only to the extent that a company has insured the property, and therefore can devote to "free men" to "futility" of thought in pursuit of truth of science.¹²

So that, if philosophized to escape ignorance, it is clear that seeking knowledge seeking knowledge, not useless. And they witnessed what happened. For this discipline began to look for when there were almost all things necessary and related to rest and adornment of life. It is therefore evident that we look for any purpose but just as we call it free man for himself and not for another, so we consider this as the only free science, because this one is for herself. Hence also his possession could justly be considered improper man. For human nature is a slave in many respects so that as Simonides, "only God can have such a privilege, but is unworthy of a man's search for science to provide."

Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, 982, B.11 -32

Aristotle is actually a rationalist philosopher as one would expect in an outstanding disciple of Plato that supports knowledge metaphysical the body as such.

As such is the founder of a formal logic, deductive, which ranges from necessary to what is necessary through the necessary, as defined by the form of argument par excellence, syllogism, Based on the ability of understanding to the knowledge intuitive of the principles and intuition of essences as forms substantial of things.

However is the first to reflect on the value of knowledge and experience inductive method referred to a scientific knowledge as "observation of Nature: Biology, Medicine, etc. . .

Hellenism and Rome

But the influence of artisans in developing theories, or rather general rules, more or less scientific for the practice of the construction, agriculture, navigation, medicine, etc. . . , was always present, especially in Hellenism, Alexandria and during Roman empire where the "arts" had enormous significance in civil construction, not only in cities but in the construction of roads, bridges and hydraulic works.

Hippocrates of Cos, V century BC is considered the father of medicine, by the shift which until then had mostly Egyptian tradition, linked to magic and to sacred. It is the

first by a general theory about what is health and disease in relation to a definite concept of man.

They are important names of classical culture, in addition to the above: Archimedes, century BC, A true theory and practice of empirical line, Vitruvius, century BC. The first to make a treatise on architecture and urbanism and medicine Galen, century AD

The concepts and experience

The Greeks spread the knowledge of reason who knows by concepts applicable to many objects as universal knowledge, the mere knowledge of the experience apprehended by the senses that only the individual and concrete.

Samos Epicurus (Fourth century BC) was the Greek philosopher, founder of Epicureísmo.

How to understand what are the concepts and their relation to the sensible and both in their relationship with reality is the foundation of these two attitudes to consider the history of rationalism and empiricism.

On the extent to which these concepts represent "essence" immutable things, form the substance, Knowledge acquires a universal and necessary, and so is knowledge goal and makes possible scientific knowledge. This is the basis of the rationalist attitude. Language, then, to the extent that it is capable of representing the concepts as true in a language " apophatic "as Aristotle says in his reality as faithfully content truth.

To the extent that the concept is closer and more dependent on sensory experience, knowledge provides only a knowledge whose truth lies in the particular and concrete and is subject to the subjectivity of the individual who has the experience. The concepts and its referent in the language, words, are somewhat conventional generalizations of individual experience shared with members of a cultural society that makes communication possible through language.

The concepts for empiricism are not a guarantee of objective knowledge and as science has only a relative value and justified in the generalization of common experiences, conventionally represented in the concepts and language.

"Man is the measure of all things "is the phrase that comes to sum up this trend. It is attributed to Protagoras one of the notable sophists with whom Socrates (Plato), said dispute. Name that is historically embodied in the title for one of the best known "Dialogues of Plato.16more rationalist tradition is represented by the Greek metaphysical thought and tradition more closely linked to the Christian tradition in the West: The Pre-Socratic, Pythagoras, Plato and Aristotle and especially Platonism and Neoplatonism because ultimately this idea refers to an ultimate principles, which Christians refer to God.

The most empiricist tradition is represented by Sophists and Skeptics, But each school Stoicism, Epicureism, Pirronismo and each historical moment have their representatives with different shades closer to one extreme or another rationalist empiricist.

The Middle Ages

In the West the fall of the Roman Empire makes all knowledge refuge in monasteries and is restricted almost to the control and power of the Church. Adopted Christian thought in antiquity and throughout the High Middle Ages Platonism and Neoplatonism thought to be the best suited to their belief in One God the Creator of the world according to ideas (Divine Providence), and gave a transcendent meaning to human life, another life must be judged by God.

From the eleventh century, through the Arab Aristotelianism is recovered in the West. Thinkers are important in this process Alkindi, Avicenna, 17 18 Averroes, 19 20 Alhazen, Avempace and the special cultural significance Toledo School of Translators.

The controversy raised in the University of Paris by Roscelino and Abelardo about the reality of universal concepts was a new interest in issues logical and what will be the nominalism One of the issues that will have greater influence in the "assessment of the experience."

This revaluation of the experience and the 'importance of individual knowledge 'is produced from the thirteenth century , especially the Franciscan order and Oxford University As opposed to the order of the Dominicans (University of Paris). Thomas Aquinas Dominican promotes Christian Aristotelianism has had much influence in the history of the Church.

The Franciscans stress the importance of the individual, and appreciate the experience of the world as the value of knowledge as such, does not prevent it lights up and about the meaning of life to God by recognizing the value of knowledge of nature as God's work . The most significant thinkers of this trend are Roger Bacon, Duns Scotus And especially William of Ockham.

Nominalism and "Ockham's razor. " Criticism of the Aristotelian theory of motion

The call nominalism is a critically on the value of the concepts, and the sense of language.

Faced with the classic Aristotelian arguments "qualitative" or essential, and the world of "entities" as concepts are introduced in these arguments, Ockham establishes a principle that has passed into history as " Ockham's razor "or simplicity principle" Non sunt entia sine necessitate multiplicands " (No need to multiply entities without

necessity), or equivalent to assess the explanations simple and close to the experience, rather than resorting to arbitrary and fanciful speculation.

On the other hand in Paris Nicolas Oresme criticizes the Aristotelian theory of motion by means of quantities tables, movement is studied by relating the spaces and the time it takes to travel that area , sensing the concept of speed and acceleration so important to establish the experimental conditions of the movement, classified them as " uniform " , " deformed "and "uniformly deformed . " And it is the closest antecedent to the study of movement through "mathematically related quantities " , the foundation of scientific progress XVI and XVII century and the concept of analysis mathematician.

Jean Buridan and its "impetus theory "analyzes the "momentum "or permanence of the movement after having sat the cause that produces it, as in the case of projectiles. It is the most important antecedent of what in modern science will be the beginning of inertia.

The Renaissance: The incorporation of experience in scientific research

The heliocentrismo and movements of the earth were to move definitively determining physical "qualitative" Aristotelian and move toward a physical science "quantitative" refers to measures and calculations mathematicians.

The great discoveries, (compass,gunpowder,printing, the West Indies) have greatly expanded the known world until then and modes of social organization and transmission of culture through books.

This renewal process forward dramatically in the Renaissance being particularly important replacement abacus by algoritmo essential operations for the calculation. This is made possible after the Arab contribution numbering system decimal, introducing zero 0, already known in India and the current numerical graphs, which made it possible to make tables of arithmetic operations and expand all fields' calculation essential for trade at this time grown bourgeoisie of cities.

Knowing herself in the cities of the control of the Church and through the influence of artists and artisans, especially the architecture for the building of new cities and essential metal for the new "arts of war" by the application of gunpowder. The knowledge acquired experience as a social value which until then had not.

The fact of the discovery of the West Indies 'raises the issue of the roundness of the earth while the heliocentrismo making body of scientific hypotheses book Copernicus. The heliocentrismo called into question and deepens the crisis of the medieval conception of the world and Aristotelian physics.

The social power of the nobility will be moving into a new social class, the bourgeoisieAnd to find a new basis in money. Money that they have to resort kings by

lending the bankers to maintain an army based on gunpowder and not "weapons of the knights."

The change of mentality that led to the Renaissance, Humanism. Not accept the "argument from authority" and both artists and researchers and thinkers are demanding freedom, which greatly facilitated by the fact value the experience and experimentation as a source of knowledge.

The knowledge acquired with this new value: 'to know to master nature'.

Leonardo da Vinci could not go to college to be illegitimate, as was sometimes tried to "rough" for not knowing Latin, for some:

I am fully aware that there are arrogant people who believe to be right discredit me for not being an educated man do crazy! [...] not know that my materials have more value because they are derived from experience rather than the words of others, and experience is the teacher of those who have written correctly

Leonardo da Vinci's Atlantic Codex, folio 327v .

Talk of the Renaissance is to speak of Leonardo da Vinci Miguel Angel, Etc. that if scientists were not specifically meant the opening of minds to new concepts. Luis Vives, Erasmo, Etc. meant overcoming the criterion of authority that both limited the horizon of knowledge in its dependence on faith and the Church as an authority to monitor any deviation from the 'established'.

The Modern Age: Rationalism and Empiricism

René Descartes, the father modern rationalism.

The traditional Aristotelian philosophy goes deeper into crisis after the heliocentric theory of the universe and the progress that science is getting to apply new research methods. Of particular relevance is the method of "resolving" composition "of Galileo.

Science tries to "discover the laws governing nature to dominate." How is it possible to know from experience the general laws of behavior of nature?

Models of research method: Francis Bacon and Descartes

Two models of philosophical thinking and assessment of knowledge: Rationalism Empiricism and proper.

It is in this field opposing philosophical rationalism -empiricism in which empiricism is often situated as such. Is restricted even entitled "English empiricism "(Francis Bacon,

Hobbes, Locke, Berkeley, Hume) In contrast to the "continental rationalism "(Descartes, Malebranche, Spinoza, Leibniz, Wolff).

In this opposition the problem has been to reduce the admission of the existence or nonexistence of innate ideas.

According to Descartes has some understanding intuitions evident made by God in human nature as innate ideas or principles of thought from which it is possible to establish logical relationships between ideas received from the experience.

This way of thinking by relating ideas analysis fruit has brought huge progress in recent years been in calculation mathematical discovery and description of the laws of nature and its application to empirical science.

After the development of calculation been already in the RenaissanceAnd the development of algebra by 1"Stevin, Place, Cardan and others, it becomes possible to calculate the projectile motion by Tartaglia; drop movement of ' serious' Galileo, The study of the variation of pressure by the height Torricelli, The study of the pressures and the discovery of the hydraulic press and the balance of probabilities Pascal, The prediction of planetary motion Kepler. And the culmination of this process occurs within the rationalism with its own Descartes, Pascal, Leibniz and Newton. These last two, with the discovery of infinitesimal calculusOpened up tremendous prospects in the mathematization and calculation of continuous functions applicable to many processes of continuous change of nature, finally being the work of Newton a compendium of what came to mean the physical science for centuries to come.

On the model of this process of reflection mathematics Descartes proposes his method scientific research, a science that guarantees truth by the succession of evidence with certainty down following the rules of the method.

These truths thus established correspond to the reality of the world as a major innate ideas is the idea of God as being perfect and good, who cannot deceive nor be deceived .

They are the main rationalist: Descartes, Spinoza, Malebranche, Leibniz, 34 Wolff, Pascal and the group of Port Royal in France.

John Locke (1632-1704) the most influential English empiricist.

English empiricist thought

John Locke responds to rationalism Continental, championed by Descartes, Writing in the late seventeenth Essay Concerning Human Understanding (1689).

The only knowledge that human can possess is knowledge a posteriori (Knowledge based on experience). He famously proposition that the human mind is a Tabula rasa you blank, Which are written from the experiences derived from sense impressions as a person's life continues.

There are two sources of our ideas: feeling (from the senses) and reflection (From the mental operations:thoughts, memories ...), both make a distinction between simple and complex ideas. Simple ideas are created in a passive mode in mind, after getting through the sensation. On the contrary, complex ideas are created after the combination, comparison and abstraction of simple ideas. For example the idea of a horn like that of a horse are two simple ideas, but by coming together to represent a unicorn become a complex idea.

According to Locke, our knowledge of things is a collection of ideas , which are in agreement or disagreement with each other as a laws of association of ideas.

But consider the idea of "substance'Or the idea of "cause"As a" complex idea " completely changes the foundation of all traditional philosophy based on the "substance "as"subject"and" causality "and" explanation of the change or movement»

A generation later, bishop Irish George Berkeley (1685-1753) determined that the point of view of Locke opens the door for a possible atheism. He devised an extreme empiricism and metaphysical , in which objects exist if they are perceived "This percipi est " (To be is to be perceived) So that whenever an object is perceived , because if he perceived any human God entity would perceive it. The perception in any case is the ground of being . Such ideas rather than empirical respond to a sense idealist.

Moreover, David Hume reduces all knowledge , as such , to " impressions "and" ideas. " Supports two kinds of truths : truths of fact" relation of ideas " Every idea has to be reduced to a corresponding print. When an idea arises from the relationship between ideas , the content of reality has to rely on the impressions that motivate . If you do not find these views should be rejected as a product of mere imagination without any true content . This is the case with the idea substance and the idea of cause.

David Hume (1711-1776) created an empiricism with a point of view skeptic.

A set of impressions generate an association of ideas about a fact and an opinion thereon.

A murder , for example, is not and can be reduced to an impression It is a list of ideas: The idea for the killing of a man (I remember an impression) with the idea of " displeasure that produces " in consciousness as internal printing is associated with a new idea: "murder" as an idea that express moral judgments concerning the refusal of

the association of the two impressions: Murder is something "bad" as subjective assessment moral but has no knowledge content true or false.

Similarly, the notion of cause can not be reduced to an impression, arises from the relationship between ideas. What is the relationship that unites two ideas as the cause? . For Hume it is clear that causal relationship is established under the terms of "a constant succession of impressions" generated in man a "habit" or "custom".

To print to a pileup of water on the fire provided that the water is still warm. It is consciousness that combines these two successive impressions and ideas (the fact of putting the water on the fire, and its successor the fact that hot). This partnership is a new idea, the idea cause whose foundation is the expectation that "the fact that so far has happened to me that whenever I put a pileup of water on the fire heats it" allows me to say: "The fire heats the water", ie the fire causes the water to heat.

But we can not find any impression that is directly related to the idea of cause. The content of an idea really makes sense only in reference to printing the resulting. The idea of cause, then, is something merely subjective, the result of the association of the minds of two successive impressions whose connection is not listed as evidence.

The problem of science and experience: the analytic and synthetic - The a priori and a posteriori

The consequences of the concept of cause, as conceived Hume concerning a claim to be scientific knowledge can not be more destructive. It leads to a skepticism since we can never know the basis of our impressions and understanding of the experiences will never leave us one subjectivism incompatible with science.

On the other hand, the seventeenth-century science is showing some clear successes in the knowledge of the laws of nature, and in the domain of the same techniques in their applications.

This critique of the notion of cause according to empirically postulated, resulted in Side rationalist until then, his awakening of the "dogmatic slumber." All his critical work trying to overcome this course was absolutely unworkable scientific knowledge.

Locke's empiricism as both Hume, drift to what has been called associationism next to reduce knowledge to an psychologism As was understood later. Traditional science from the Greeks to the modern age, proceeds by concepts. It is independent of experience, (which in the modern age is conceptualized as a priori).

Knowledge true is possible because the object experience is considered given as reality objective origin and cause of the condition leading to significant understanding of the experiences. The experience guarantees the existence of the perceived. The concepts, while validly derived from experience, they connect universal knowledge and reality.

This is how knowledge is usually assessed in non-critical consciousness that identifies with the real knowledge .

The universal object of scientific research in traditional Aristotelian science

Whenever you perceive in the experience a " cat " that object will experience all the notes themselves the essence of cat, as essential qualities of "cats " in a universal sense , because " this cat "of experience participate the essential quality of " gaticidad "and also some of the possible accidental notes that identify with that cat, if it is white cat , will have all the characteristics of the essence of " white " because it participates in the universal quality of " whiteness "if the cat runs or stops running, it is because accidentally the cat may acquire and lose (participate and opt out of) the form the universal quality of being " corridor " , etc. .

It is assumed that the mind is capable of intuit the essence universal as form of things perceived in experience. Where this happens the object in question will notes categoriales specific to that concept.

The reason this way of thinking about science, analyzes the concepts of isolation from the experience, classifies and relates the concepts to each other through the "notes" or " qualities " that characterize them , and reason , applying the laws of thinking, LogicThrough the syllogisms, obtained Opinion that are applicable to real objects with a guarantee of scientific truth. The result is a science of qualities " 'as was the Aristotelian science .

Science so conceived is universal universal concepts for trying to cover an entire universe of objects, and necessary it is based on real insights on the qualities of objects. science is therefore a "qualitative "and "a priori "where the experience clearly plays a secondary role .

But the starting point of philosophical thought from Descartes , for both the rationalists and empiricists to , changes dramatically :

It given is not the object of experience , but consciousness of self - thinking as a subject of experience.

The object is a "print "or "idea" of consciousness. The understanding operates with ideas.

In the absence of intuition sensible reality as perceived there is no guarantee that the relationship between idea - Based on the object is truly objective . This relationship becomes problematic.

Rationalism presents a justification of science , by innate ideas, from the idea of God , but the argument is unconvincing.

The empirical value science as an inexplicable fact, with an occasional basis and likely only as a subjective and common induction.

What we can guarantee that the connections between ideas correlated to the connections of reality?

But the science in the modern age is a fact. It has acquired, from the applications of mathematical calculation, a method and an undoubted success in the realm of nature and its practical applications. A science based on "quantity" and "measure" and the mathematical relationships that allow for "explanatory hypotheses" that are confirmed in the experience through the experiences.

Neither rationalists nor empiricists find a sufficient reason properties of such knowledge:

As analytical and a priori is independent of experience. So can deduce consequences from certain concepts obtained a priori by reason as hypothesis and analysis mainly mathematicians. Consequences that are subsequently verified on experience through experiences.

But synthetic the other, in that it cannot be reduced to a truths of reason that purely analytical predicates are contained in the notion of the subject. Experiments show that the consequences deduced are an extension of knowledge as explain the basis of experience.

How can a mere concept or an understanding of mathematical calculation, both products of speculation of human reason to determine or predict the facts of experience?

Such is the problem of the relationship between science and experience that neither empiricism nor rationalism respond convincingly.

The laws of science cannot be analytic or a priori

There is no doubt that scientific laws are not analytic and expand knowledge. It is clear that the concept of "body" as a material and perceptible by the senses is not followed by analysis of the concept, without further consideration, the law: "All bodies attract each other in direct proportion to their masses and inversely to the square of their distance"

The laws of science cannot be synthetic or a posteriori

But experience or experiment, to be always individual and subject to conditions, cannot serve as a basis to enable us to ensure that such an experience, or outcome of the experiment, results from a law the Nature.

The Kantian solution

Philosopher of the Enlightenment, Kant's thought is central to the whole philosophy of the nineteenth century.

Kant attempts a synthesis that would make possible scientific knowledge but whose universal and necessary truths are not merely formal and analytical but could be material. This attempts to prove the possibility and existence of synthetic judgments a priori, that would own judgments of science: universal and necessary, being a priori, but synthetics because they enlarge the knowledge in their material content to extend whatever possible predicates the notion of the subject, overcoming the limitations of truths of reason.

To justify such judgments that the mind rejects it as a "clean slate" that is limited to passively receiving information that comes to sensitive data in the same way that rejects the ability of intuition understanding.

On the contrary claims that understanding is active. Considers that intuition is given by the sensitivity and that concepts are developing the self-understanding⁶⁰ and serve as a justification of scientific knowledge. At the same time from these conditions are not empirical, a priori, can determine the general conditions of experience allowing forecast and scientific cooperation in the domain of nature.⁶¹

The knowledge expressed in statements (or judgments), as Kant thought:

TRUTH

CONDITIONS

ORIGIN

TRIAL

EXAMPLE

Truth in fact

Contingent and particular

A posteriori, dependent on experience

Synthetics enhances the knowledge. The predicate is not contained in the notion of the subject

I have a book in hand

Reason Truth

Necessary and Universal

A priori, does not depend on the experience

Analytical: The predicate is in the notion of the subject

All mammals are animals

Scientific truth

Universal and necessary

A priori, does not depend on the experience, but only applies to the experience

Synthetic a priori: knowledge expands. Only applicable to phenomena

The bodies are drawn in direct proportion to their masses and inversely as the square of their distance

But the question of such trials is less relevant than the problem about the limits of knowledge.

Synthetic judgments a priori, i.e. science, are only possible in reference to phenomenal, i.e. the field of experience possible. The reality as noumenon can only be thought, not known.

The evidence is a product of consciousness about their perception or idea or concept and disconnected real:

If we cannot transcend one's own conscience, what is the relationship between reality and our perception? Is it a causal relationship?

Yes cause is a relation of ideas, as Hume said, or a priori concept, a category of understanding, as Kant says, we cannot know the real. What then is the real thing to be understood as a cause?

If, as empiricists, we cannot distinguish the world perceived from the outside world. Why, however, will inevitably arise the question of an outside world thought?

This is the essential problem for the status of scientific knowledge.

Rationalism

The rationalism is doctrine raises the reason discourse as the only possible source of any knowledge real.

Precise Terminology:

Are common and identical expressions of " modern rationalism " or " classical rationalism "to describe the rationalism as it is formulated in Descartes to Leibniz, corresponding roughly to what one may call from Kant "rationalism dogmatic"

Rationalism dogmatic

When reason, considered single source decisive knowledge, and its principles only a priori, claims to reach truth particularly in the field metaphysics.

The term " rationalism modern aims to situate it in the history of thought in accordance with the terms of use and distinguishing the status of reason in ancient philosophy, as found in Plato and Aristotle example.

The term "rationalism classical aims to distinguish it from a rationalism expanded and renewed , "modernized " by the Kantian critique and the contribution of Experimental Science" critical rationality "to Kant and Karl Popper" applied rationalism "in Bachelard...

There is also the term "rationalismcontinental "To distinguish and oppose the empiricism Anglo - Saxon (Hobbes, Locke, Hume, Etc.)

We follow terminology in distinguishing a modern rationalism (from Descartes to Leibniz) , a critical rationalism to describe generally the Kantian rationalism and post-Kantian , regardless of modification , sometimes sensitive, which it is composed.

The word rationalism was also used before Renaissance, and for the Middle Ages he was then rationalism theology.

Modern rationalism

The intellectual attitude to put reason and rational procedures as sources of knowledge back to Ancient Greece when under the name Logos (Which originally meant speech), it detaches from the mythical thought, and from science, gives rise to philosophy.

Plato sees in a pseudo sensitivity knowledge only giving access to sensible reality, and changing the material world. Rely on sense experience is to be locked up like prisoners in a cave who take marching shadows on the wall dimly lighted, for reality itself. "Let no one enter here is not a geometer " , does it burn on the pediment of his school year in math we learn to detach ourselves from our senses and exercise our reason alone, prerequisite to dialectic philosophical. Knowledge of real knowledge of Ideas or species,

intelligible and immutable realities, and this knowledge is rational. There is in this sense a Platonist rationalism.

Aristotle on the other hand, bases its philosophy on the concrete observation of nature (physics), and lays the groundwork the logic formal in Organon (we call today general logic) of what was called later the metaphysics (beyond the physics, that is to say beyond nature), of ethics (Nicomachean Ethics).

But this is not the use of reason, nor his claim, which is sufficient to define rationality as doctrine. It is constituted and systematized at the end of the Renaissance in the specific conditions of the rediscovery of the ancient heritage, and the mathematization of physics.

Modern rationalism is based on the assumption metaphysics that the principles underlying reality are identical to the laws of reason itself. So is it the principle of decisive reason (or reason) that Leibniz, in Tests theodicy (1710) formula as follows:

"Is that nothing ever happens, without cause or at least a decisive reason, that is to say something that can be used to make a priori reason why it is existent rather than nonexistent, and why it is so rather than otherwise."

If nothing happens that is neither unjust, since there is nothing that is not, in law, intelligible and explicable by reason. Under the ontotheology, the identity of thinking and being finds its ultimate justification in God, Creator of the universe and its laws on the one hand, human reason and its principles on the other. That in which rationalism and understood fully accomplished in the idealism philosophy, which Hegel give its most systematic form in the formula: "What is rational is real, and what is actual is rational" (Preface the Philosophy of Law).

It follows that reason, containing the universal principles and ideas a priori expressing eternal truth is immutable and identical in every man. It is in this sense that Descartes, in the Discourse on Method Writes : "Common sense is the best thing in the world shared "Stating that "The power of judging well and distinguishing truth from falsehood , which is properly what is called good sense or reason, is naturally equal in all men . "

From the perspective of the origin of our knowledge, rationalism is traditionally opposed to empiricism, irrationalism, and the revelation:

Rationalism vs Empiricism

According to empiricism, the experience is the source of all knowledge. As John Locke in the Essay Concerning Human Understanding 1690:

"Suppose that the mind is, as we say, white paper (tabularasa), devoid of any character, no idea. How does it have to be filled? Where he takes this huge fund that busy and

limited imagination of man emerging in him with an almost infinite variety? Hence he draws the material of reason and knowledge? I answer with one word: experience in it and all our knowledge is founded and ultimately found its source. "

This experience is one of our external senses, allowing us for example to form the idea of color, but also that of our thought in action, by which we can form the idea of thinking or reasoning.

The rationality postulates , in fact , the existence of universal logical principles of reason (the principle of excluded middle , principle of sufficient reason) and ideas a priori, ie independent of any prior experience and experience . Thus Descartes he admits the existence of a priori and innate ideas such as the idea of infinity, time, number, or the idea of God is " as the mark of the workman on his book ", simple ideas and materials, without which we would experience significant unintelligible: " I think it is in us certain primitive notions which are like the originals, the pattern which we form all our other knowledge " (Letter to Elizabeth May 21, 1643).

In the eyes of rationalism, in fact, the sensory experience cannot give true knowledge. Plato already denounced the volatility and relative, which shows a play of shadows inconsistent, and Descartes in the first Meditation *Metaphysics*, is misleading:

"Everything that I have received so far for the most true and certain I 've learned the meaning or meanings: gold I sometimes felt that these senses are deceptive, and it is prudent to not to trust entirely those who have once been deceived . "

Rationalism, however we will see below in its criticism does not repudiate the sensory experience but to submit forms a priori that make it possible and organize the given .

Rationalism and Irrationalism

It is meant here by irrationalism Reference to any experience or any faculty other than reason and not obeying its laws , supposed to give a deeper and more genuine phenomena and people, and leaving room for a strip of ineffable mystery, or inexplicable. Rationalism is opposed to that effect mysticism, the magic. At the occultism, At sentimentalism, At paranormal or to superstition. Only authoritative rational processes: intellectual evidence, proof, reasoning.

It sentimentalism romantic that attacks Hegel in the preface to the *Phenomenology of Spirit*, when he mentions the alleged philosophy " the lack of concept is given a poetic and intuitive thinking , the market throws combinations fantasy , a fantasy only by disorganized thinking - fantast queries that are neither fish nor fowl , neither poetry nor philosophy ". Whoever claims to touch the truth in the ineffable experience of feeling intimate condemned to silence and solitude of the inability; "In other words, he tramples the roots of humanity ".

Conclusion

If I had to choose between rationalism and empiricism I would choose rationalism. There are many reasons why I trust my mind over my body. First of all I believe that my senses are tricked all the time, I see things that aren't true. When I watch a movie I can feel it's real, my senses get me into another world I don't belong and it's my mind the one that recognizes that it's only a movie, that it's not true. Besides there are limitations in the senses, for example I know that atoms exist even if I'm not able to recognize one, I can't feel them. My senses can be tricked all the time, they make me believe in things that are not true, My mind is able to question the thing I think, if I see a house I am sure that the house is there, if I think in a theory I can test it so I can be sure if the theory is right or wrong. Magic is an example of how weak senses really are, magicians can make us believe that a rabbit can appear inside an empty hat, our mind is the one who tells us that is impossible that a rabbit is inside something empty so we recognize our senses had fail. This is the reasons why I choose rationalism, because I believe is stronger.