

Evaluate coherence theory of justification essay



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Coherentism is an alternative to foundationalism, coherentism is the idea that new information is well justified and accepted as knowledge if it coheres (agrees) with our existing knowledge in a mutually supporting network. Coherentism offers answers to some of the problems that arise with foundationalism, and therefore it offers an alternative or additional means of justify our belief systems.

And in these systems we hold hundreds of beliefs that support each other coherently. However some beliefs that we hold do not necessary fit with our coherent set of beliefs, for example I hold that ghosts exist as dead people, however I also belief that when people die they are just dead, so I keep the belief that when people die they are just dead, and keep that in the system with hundreds of other beliefs about most things in my life and I put the belief about ghosts in a new set of beliefs, along with evidence and justification which I also believe in, for example I saw a program about a women who had seen ghosts, and that people have believed in them for hundreds of years, and that sometimes in certain places I feel cold and like someone is in the room with me. But because my first set of beliefs the (more justified set), is more justified it seems more plausible which makes me more confident in trusting that set, whereas the second one has little evidence and justification so I cannot believe that over my more coherent knowledge. But how do my beliefs cohere with one another, for how can you build beliefs based on another, I believe $2+2=4$ but how can that relate to the greenness of grass, and if you are using beliefs to justify others couldn't it just be one big circular argument that self-prophises a whole set of beliefs based a pon itself.

And is it really sensible to reject one set of beliefs simply because of the amount of beliefs I have in another, as the smaller one could still be true and the evidence more valid than the first. But on the plus side it does seem that most people in everyday life seem to go with what's most coherent and reject ideas that don't fit, so it seems sensible to suggest that this is how we acquire knowledge and the system that we keep it in. It also serves as a good alternative to foundationism as foundationism can seem too simplistic and doesn't explain how beliefs at the top of the pile can justify the bottom.

Evaluate the claim that perceptions are caused by material objects. Been the logical person that I am, I must first state that the correlation of opening your eyes to see material objects cannot be turned around to say that the material objects cause your eyes to see them because they exist, just as it cannot be said that people are inside my television because I can see them, there is no causation, just correlation.

The world been seen through my eyes doesn't justify directly the world existence, there is no difference between this and being deceived by an evil demon to see such objects to be made to think they exist (Descartes) this distinction cannot be made. There are some philosophers who at this point in my argument would be turning in their graves, one such philosopher is G. E. Moore, " he famously said, here is my hand, it exists", " now here is another" in my opinion he hasn't really thought this through, he cannot really know his hand exists, only that he has an experience that he thinks looks, feels, smells, etc like he has two hands. But this does not mean that have to exist they are not indubitable (immune to doubt) for certain truths (a priori) cannot be false $2+2=4$ but the statement I have two hands is A posteriori

and its truth value in my opinion has not yet been determined, there seems too many problems between saying I sense something that seems like the world, and saying I know the world exists, because seeing it alone does not justify its existence it could be many other things, a cunning hologram, the matrix, a evil demon, it just seems that anyone who claims such a statement isn't really a philosopher.