

Existentialism in philosophy

[Philosophy](#)



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

These values may not be set in stone or codified in some law books, but these values exist regardless of the meaning/meaninglessness we find in the world. I would agree though with Sartre that we must take full responsibility for the freedom we enjoy. The search for our own essence should be guided by a firm set of values.

One implication I see in this kind of philosophy is the attainment of power for an individual. If we believe that there is no one above us (eg. God) and that we make our own destiny, then we are empowered to explore for ourselves the world, its meaning, and our existence. A negative implication I see in this philosophy is the lack of something to hold on to when all else fails. The lack of a higher order, a God perhaps, takes away the meaning of life.

I don't think philosophy can provide 'final answers' to the 'final questions'. I think what philosophy offers is a way of looking at things, a way of explaining those things, a way of achieving the meaning of those things. Philosophy guides us in asking the right questions and leads us to find a probable explanation for our questions, not a final, ultimate answer.

Knowledge, belief, and faith serve to help us find meaning in life. Knowledge gives us the basic facts of the realities of the world. Belief is the set of knowledge that we choose to appropriate for ourselves. It is the manner in which we look at the truth in life. Faith, meanwhile, gives us the power to sustain that belief. It keeps us hoping and believing despite the difficulties we face in figuring out the meaning of life.

The value of philosophy, then, lies in its ability to provide an explanation for our existence. It provides probable answers to the questions of life. With philosophy, we can achieve a reasoned explanation of, say, sadness, happiness, hate, or death. It helps us to reach an approximation of the

meaning of our lives.

2. I think the certainty of the things we see, hear, think, or believe lies in our perception of things. An apple, for example, maybe crunchy for someone while it maybe not for another person. The certainty is a matter of interpretation which means that every object, feeling, thought in this world has several interpretations and, therefore, possess a kind of multiple certainties.

I believe, therefore, that despite the multiple certainties found in this world, knowledge can still be gathered from them. The human tendency to describe, classify or make labels all result in the creation of knowledge. A knowledge, for instance, about an apple's texture, color, the taste will be developed from the multiple certainties that are attached to the apple as an object.

While the " I" exists as the only absolute truth for Descartes, I would argue that there is also truth in the world we inhabit. We exist as much as an apple, a tree, or a monkey does. We wouldn't actually be aware of our existence if there is no world that reflects our existence. For the " I", therefore, to exist, a world must also exist to accommodate the existence of " I". There is truth in the world we inhabit.

In the ' dream' and ' evil deceiver' arguments, I believe that everything can be doubted because of the biases of our own perception of the world. This renders things to always be subjective in nature. The multiple interpretations that we impose on things make them subjective. I would extend, in addition, the argument to doubt also human existence. We exist, we know about that, but that knowledge also stems from our biased perceptions.

What we can know, therefore, is the immediate realities that we see, hear,

<https://assignbuster.com/existentialism-in-philosophy/>

touch, and think about in our daily lives. The human brain can absorb only as much that's why our knowledge of the world is also limited. We will get to know the truths and realities of this world as long as we are existing, perceiving, and believing.