

The theory of determinism and its supporters philosophy essay



A concept of various events within a given paradigm bound by any state of an object or event on a mass magnitude by prior states is defined as Determinism. The philosophical understanding of this theory is related to the understanding of chain of various events. Every event that occurs happens as a result of pervious passed event or set of various events that happened in a historic concept before the current event. Some common people would define this as a repeat of the past or the word “ Déjà vu” determinism is the actual past that has already occurred and only the future is possible at any point of occurrence in time.

There are mainly to types of Determinism theories the Hard and Soft determinists. The Hard determinist’s theory consisting of believing ones actions control the outcome of events set before them. This is usually conceived by a person’s actions in the sense of behavior or decision that can alter an events status, therefore viewing actions in the same category as events. Therefore the chain of events can’t be altered if every event is caused by a pervious action before it, therefore clearly suggestion the past can never be changed or the action could not have been able to be different.

Soft determinists reject the understanding theory of hard determinists give to words such as free will and moral responsibility. They believe when some makes a choice they have already conceived the idea of alternative options of actions. The final decision was chosen to prior knowledge or research.

They went through the process of knowing why they chose to do it this way or that way. They had already considered all the options of approach which left no other option present and that no one can corrupt their decision by any means available this becomes clarified as a free will of choice.

<https://assignbuster.com/the-theory-of-determinism-and-its-supporters-philosophy-essay/>

One of the most remarkable supports of this ideology was none other than a great philosopher Aristotle. He believed nothing could have ever been planned to be caused or self-caused. He believed every chain of events happened as a result of free will and freedom of them happening, our actions planned or uncontrolled still could not change the path of the future happening what is destined to happen shall happen. He was not alone in believing in determinism. Other great Greek philosophers agreed to this understanding including Leucippus and Democritus.

2-2) What do Plato and Socrates believe is the reason for humans to do the right thing?

They strongly believed humans decide to do the right thing based on a concept of reward in the form of succession in a job or election. The truth and loyalty of a human to do the right thing motivate a human's achievement.

In addition the act of religion had a very strong and influence on humans in Greece at the time. The main teaching involved that none of the Greek gods accepted a human to do a bad thing as the wrath of the gods was beyond imaginable. It did not matter which human did wrong everyone would be punished by the Gods for allowing one human to do wrong this way no human wanted to suffer a punishment for this level due to one human ignorance.

Socrates was a rationalist when it came to his teachings rather than lecturing about philosophy, he would hold open discussion letting people decide and choose their own answers to improve one's own knowledge. His motivation

for believing in people will do the right thing was based on their self-conscience. No human could possibly be happy by performing an act of guilty conscience permanently as the punishment for doing so was far less great than the reward for doing well. Therefore we humans would be obliged to do the right things.

His student at the time Plato, went on to write his own theories and understandings of Socrates work of why humans would do the right thing? He was more of a realist and believed in the society of the world and how virtue made everything possible. He strongly believes every human wanted to do the right thing. But the problem of being human is we are too weak in his own moral. Due to society controlling our actions and acts we seem to move where ever anyone else is due to pressure from people around us to do the bad deeds.

3-3) describe the empirical and rationalistic arguments for the existence of God.

The topic of Gods existence has always been the center of attention for humanity of all times from philosophers to great innovators and mathematicians. Humanity challenges what is not obviously visible, the main challenging question till this day and age even in today's society is ' How does one believe in the non-existence?' the question is how can humanity be lead to believe in something they have never seen for them self? There must be some logical evidence in either science or books containing the answer.

Empirical arguments are based on designs that argue the case for Gods existence, by using laws of science, by various empirical features of the

world today that generates evidence of intelligent design. It is based on gathering real life evidence, rather than a theory or ideology of God's existence. These arguments are there to justify ones conclusions to gain credibility for one's own theories of philosophy.

One of the greatest empirical arguments till this day came from the painter and innovator Leonardo Di Vinci. He strongly believed for every work that he created must have a higher and more superior creator in this understand he was challenging the existence of god. Some creating a master piece is the creator but who created us? This lead many people to believe it was theory and that science held the answer to challenge the existence of God in design of arguments.

Rationalistic arguments are based on more theoretical evidence of Gods existence. By challenging what a writers claim is and their use of logical reasoning to support the claim. The use of the writer's acknowledgement of counter positions, it was more of an argument based of the interpretation of various studies using policy, values, religion, culture and judgment.

Rationalistic arguments prove gods existence by written evidence for examples using religion and the bible, therefore suggestion a logical explanation.

4-1) Describe Newton's Law of Motion.

Newton formulated three laws of motion by the understanding of principles of physics using realistic experiments and observational reports to make sure that they were true. This theory tells us about how the relationship between force and motion cause an object to move. A lot of newton's

theories and formulas were evolved around the existence of gravity being the stronger of lesser forces acting on an object's motion.

His first law of motion stated an object will remain in a straight line motion and an object at rest will stay and rest unless some action of an unbalanced force was upon it for example wind, natural earth quake etc. This law was often called the law of inertia by scientific means. This basically meant that an object will remain to do what they are doing unless interrupted by an unbalanced force; the object will remain in its current state of motion.

The second law evolved around the principles of speed of an object's motion. An object's acceleration only increased when a force acts on mass of an object. The greater the size of the object being accelerated the greater amount of force will be required to keep the acceleration of that object. In simple terms heavier objects require a greater force to move the same distance as a lighter object. Newton created a mathematical formula to explain this theory with evidence, $F = M A$ or defined as FORCE = MASS times ACCELERATION.

The final law of motion which is one of the greatest and well-remembered due to him discovering this formula while taking a bath. He was so intent with this theory he challenged anyone to prove him wrong that he ended up writing it on his tombstone. "For every action there is an equal and opposite re-action". This basically meant that for every force there is a reaction force in equal size but opposite in direction. Whenever an object is being pushed against and another object of the same force in the opposite direction equally as hard the balance of both objects becomes neutral.