

Controversy of Descartes' View on Innate Ideas in the Context of Rationalism

Regress Argument and Descartes' Objections to It

Philosophical views on the determination and structuring of beliefs have been continuously improving in response to contemporary challenges. In the perspective of Descartes' philosophy, skepticism is an integral concept in the scopes of this essay, for it can be measured in the following dimensions: 1) within the global perspective; 2) within the local dimension (some questions to be studied); 3) in the frameworks of academic discussion; 4) in political discussions, etc.

This essay is aimed to trace the escapism from the regress argument, for some implications of skepticism can be justified only in the frameworks of the multiple doubting that opens up the road to fundamentalism. In the context of this essay, formal skepticism can be an integral part of academic knowledge discussion, however, Descartes' objection to the Regress Argument is based on the justification of skeptical perspective.

Formal skepticism is a term that can be defined in the following way: the method that can be used in discussions that regulates the degree of negation in seek of the proof for some argument. This method goes well along with the Regression argument. For example, if there is some argument is on the way in discussion, there should be the Regression argument that negates the initial argument. Of course, this negation originates from the skeptical perspective; the point of view that can be extrapolates on the rationality of knowledge that should be justified in terms of the practical doubt. If it so, the negation can proceed with the endless manner, therefore, there should some fundamental beliefs come on the way to mark up the way that can originally be meant to proceed with the justification method of some true belief.

In overall, the method of Descartes' objection is the one to be explained only in the way of special logical chain of argumentation that originates from the initial type of settings.

In such cases, the rationalism by Descartes is an opened way to the logical dualism of thinking and sensitivity (emotional and moral excellence). This dualism should be justified by the ordinary argumentation in separation between body and mind. According to Descartes, if a human can think, he or she exists, for the ability of thinking can be treated as the ability to exist. However, the justification for this argument comes up from some fundamental beliefs for thinking value as existential in the ontological perspective. In such cases, Descartes takes this position of thinking ability as paradigmatic to explain the normative values of human existence in terms of development.

In terms of valuability, Regress Argument can be used multiple times in development of the discussion. However, it is known that fundamentalism overcomes the Regress argument in terms of the following dimensions:

1. It is explicated to the implicit values and notions, concepts that are present a priori, such as they exist and are accepted without any need of justification.
2. Fundamentalism suggests the point of begin or the point to end up with the discussion when the argument is set up for the benefit of one or other side of discussion.
3. Fundamentalism has been arisen from the need to suppress the Regress argument in terms of development the basic explanation tools in the discussion.

Despite of the rationalism proposed by Descartes as the system of argumentation (Regress Argument) based on the skeptical orientation and dualism between mind and body, the philosopher proposed the controversial conception of innate ideas. Descartes believed that there are some innate ideas that can arise in a human by the divine substance, and not by experience or senses. This point of view by Descartes goes into controversy with the conception of “nativism”. In controversy, nativists believed that some ideas and ways of

thinking may arise in a human pre-natively, being transferred by genes code. In this relation, innate ideas, according to Descartes, is an alternative solution to skeptical orientation and setting up the ideas in array to be justified.

In the frameworks of this essay, analytical skills for the local skepticism can be driven within a regular academic discussion to reach the effect of double negation of each argument in a case. If even any of the regress arguments can be valid through a multiple way of negation, it can be effective in terms of good care about the quality of discussion. Each premise can be explained via multiple negations. However, even if negation is possible in many ways, there should be some fundamental solution that can exist a priori from some point of the discussion.

In the academic discussion, in the context of this essay, it would be possible to find out that analytic mind can develop alternative solutions, such as the few to each argument. In comparison to global skepticism in dimension of the all-overwhelming principles of political discussion, it can be well-measured by the terms of the world-wide perspective. In this relation, skepticism can be treated as rational paradigmatic method of “doubting” that can be used in different fields of providing the set up discussion.

By Descartes, this method is universal, in relevance to a priori concepts and proofs. In this way, the philosopher argued Locke’s point of view about the innate ideas in contradiction to the “nativist” explanation of the reality. Innate ideas, according to Descartes, can exist only by divine existential parameters. In terms of academic discussion, this point of view can be contradicted by the followers of the Locke’s point of view. Philosophy of the doubt can be treated rationally in the context of sense and knowledge.

Descartes’ objection to the Regress Argument is based on his conception of the innate ideas that can be treated as fundamental. Therefore, his objection is rational, but the

background is in fundamental knowledge about things and objects that may find its reflections in each idea that is needed to have proofs.