

Reflexive paper essay sample

[Religion](#)



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Philosophy is the study that entails the issues related to reality, value, reasons, language and mind (Kleiner, 1). Thus, philosophy seeks to make clear issues that regard beliefs, attitudes and concepts of individuals or groups. Literature contributed by Philosophers like Aristotle, Plato, Aquinas, Jean and Descartes have shaped philosophy to a great extent. Their views concerning matters of the world have formed a basis upon which several decisions have been made. This article compares and contrasts their perspectives in the field of philosophy.

Aristotle existed between the periods 322 to 384 BC. Plato, on the other hand, existed between the years 348- 424 BC (Kleiner, 3). There are several reasons that can make Descartes to be compared to Aristotle. Unlike Plato, my realization is that both Descartes and Aristotle hold the idea that souls exist singly. Secondly, that the operation of the soul is based singly on it as a body organ. My own comprehension is that Descartes agree with the notion Aristotle puts across that souls have no essential nature. I agree with the idea that souls exist in as one of the most important body parts. This makes souls be in apposition to control the entire mechanism behind the operations of a human body. According to Aristotle, the organ tasked to have control of the entire body is called the heart (Kleiner, 5). Aristotle further intricate that all animals and mankind have hearts that is the source or origin and the controller of the entire system. Hence, I highly support that impression that nutritive and sensitive souls are present in the heart. I agree with the arguments of Aristotle as it is the heart where the soul exists. Usually when one is annoyed it is the soul that is affected and this in turn controls the actions or response that one takes.

Aquinas and David Hume have one thing in common; their intellectual

<https://assignbuster.com/reflexive-paper-essay-sample/>

prowess is highly gifted. However, they have divergent views also (Kleiner, 6). Their views concerning religion differ to a greater extent. Thomas Aquinas was a strong believer of Christianity and the teachings of God. Hume on the other hand was an atheist. This is evident in his writings where he is seen as agnostic. Despite these, Hume had some interests in the issues of religion. Thomas Aquinas strived to prove that religion existed. He presented persuasive arguments to make non-believers recognize that God is the cause of all that happens in the world. I agree or confer with Thomas Aquinas ability to demonstrate the power of God is motivating. To me Thomas Aquinas views enhanced my perception not only to believe, but also to go an extra mile through actions to demonstrate the teachings of God the creator. Aquinas suggests that there is a link between cause and effect based on preexistent cause. My understanding makes me believe that Thomas chain of cause is not infinite but hierarchical. Thus, subordinate cause depends on higher causes. This is the thing refuted by Hume as no observation concerning the links between cause and effect can be made. Hume impressions have change my perceptions about persons who relate two or more issues but fail to demonstrate a way that can make the audience to observe the link.

We also observe that the philosophies of Aquinas are in line with the traditions of Aristotle (Kleiner, 102). Both of them were for the idea that sensation is different from ideas and knowledge and therefore, both cannot be perceived. Hume comes to dismiss these claims as he confers to the teachings of John Locke that mankind is conscious of the ideas they come up with. I agree to the fact that our thoughts reveals that we resolve issues based on precedent feelings and sentiments. This perception of ideas by <https://assignbuster.com/reflexive-paper-essay-sample/>

Hume differs from other philosophers such as Aquinas, Socrates, Aristotle and Plato. This has made me perceive people who believe that both sensation and ideas are different to be adhering to the olden philosophers like Aquinas and Aristotle.

Jean-Paul Sartre believed that freedom is essential for meaning life to occur (Kleiner, 67). According to Sartre and his opinion regarding existentialism, no approach is needed to understand the world. I refute Sartre's approach regarding existentialsim. This is because the situation at hand would make an individual decide on the approach to use. Descartes main focus was to reveal certainty, a method referred to as methodological skepticism.

Descartes described a journey that can be taken by an individual from a doubtful state with absolute certainty. Descartes followed the principles of Plato of existence because things exist. They believed in the fact that God's word makes things infinite, independent and supremely powerful (Kleiner, 123). Thus, Descartes believed that the Aquinas notion of cause and effect exists and brings outcome. Skepticism that was advocated by Descartes was put forward by Plato. Plato also went an extra mile to put in place empiricism, relativism and rationalism, which went a notch higher to differentiate his work from Sartre and Descartes. Plato put forth that the reality existed in the physical world. However, the reality has to be transcended and comprehended in the form of non-physical world. He differed with the notion of John-Paul Sartre that no approach was needed to comprehend the world. The reasons as to why I disagree with Sarter is that if no approach is required how it is possible that physical and no physical world can be differentiated. This make perceives Sartre's work to be full of loopholes. Plato's work the cave revealed that there are instances when the

<https://assignbuster.com/reflexive-paper-essay-sample/>

opinions of humans can differ from the true knowledge in practice (Kleiner, 89). One weakness in Descartes work was his inability to alienate himself from doubt. His attempt to subject everything to doubtful moments was a strategy he was using so as to come up with something that was immune to it.

Socrates demonstrates high levels of corruption and impiety. This is against the norms of an ideal society. We observe that the Socrates is taken to a court of law where he is needed to defend himself (Kleiner, 178). Corruption is against Aquinas who greatly believed in the teachings of Christianity.

Socrates acts like a subject when he is accused of making the young to be corrupt. Socrates behavior of not giving subjects a chance to defend themselves is unacceptable. This is a typical scenario of what happens when subjects are undergoing the judgment procedure. The subjects are never given an opportunity to defend themselves. My perception is that leaders who practice Socrates doctrines cultivate inequality virtues among members of a society. But I agree with the society where Socrates lived as they practiced the rule of law when Socrates was brought to face the law.

A summary of these philosophers reveals a lot of issues and themes. Among the themes that are evident include Religion, corruption, Existentialism just to mention a few. Religion is highlighted as the most important of all. This has been evident from the history of early mankind to the present generations. However, we also note that there some themes that have been in place for quite a long time which contradict the principles of Christianity. A typical example is the one put across by Socrates. It is worth noting that there are some philosophies that need to be integrated together to enable better understanding of the world. The philosophies of mind, soul and

functioning of all body parts. Further, Christianity should be integrated into such fundamentals to enable better understanding of human beings and the physical and non-physical world.

Work Cited

Kleiner, Harrison. *The Perennial Conversation: An Introduction to Philosophy*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt Publishing Company, 2012.