

# Moore

(1)

## Moore: Refutation of Idealism

Moore was a realist & Common sense phil.  
Existence of object is real & what our Common-sense says is true. The external world does not depend on human perception. Moore defended realism by refuting idealism & by use of Common sense as ordinary language.

Art:- Refutation of Idealism in which he criticises the fundamental thesis of Idealism that its esse est percipi. If it is shown fallacious then the whole superstructure of Idealism would automatically collapse.

### ⇒ Reduction of Idealism

refuted this in two ways -

#### Analytical/Logical method

↓  
Analysis of different alternative meanings of esse est percipi

#### Metaphysical arguments

↓  
Difference between esse & percipi

#### Analytical/Logical method:

✓ He analyses different alternative meanings of esse est percipi & shows that it does not hold true in any of the meaning.

✓ In this proposition, crucial word is percipi which normally means sensations but more takes it in wider meaning - thought to refute whole of Idealist phil.

✓ The conjoining word est has three meanings - identity, partial identity & inference

① first case, esse & percipi are synonymous & identical in meaning - 'Bachelors are unmarried adult human males' Existence = perception

② 2nd case, esse & percipi, though not identical, are so related that percipi is essentially a part of meaning of esse - 'Bachelors are males'

in both the cases, esse & percipi are Co-existent; & thus merely tautologies. In that way the proposition become sterile & non-productive from knowledge point of view.

✓ 3rd alternative where existence is inferred from the percipi, distinction between them can be maintained as smoke & fire, though related but not identical. But such propositions are Synthetic (acc. to Berkeley) & never necessary & hence contingent. If it is necessary relation, then it becomes analytic - necessary. But it can't be both analytic & Synthetic.



### metaphysical arguments :-

- ✓ existence of X is different from awareness of X - awareness & Content of awareness are different, as distinction is not due to awareness or sensations, as visual mechanism of seeing is same.
- ✓ The distinction can only be due to difference between different objects; but idealists are confused between awareness & Content of awareness, & have taken them identical. pure consciousness has two elements -
  - ① a consciousness which is responsible for all awareness
  - ② Content of awareness due to which one awareness is different from the other.
- ✓ Idealists say ~~that~~ even if awareness and its content are somewhat distinguishable, they are not separable, but, more says that as we know from our experience that when we see red or blue things our vision does not become red or blue which means red or blue object does not belong to awareness. Thus it is philosophically justifiable to say that rope is red than to say 'our consciousness is red.'

✓ To know, there should be thg to know but if all knowledge is mental then it means mind knows mind, which is impossible.

✓ There are significant differences between mental images & objective facts, yet the perception of both remains same.

⇒ Criticism of Moore :-

✓ Moore without any ground considered Esse est percipi as central knot of all idealist system, but Idealist philosophers like Plato, Descartes do not accept this. not idealism is whole

✓ Moore did not refute - 'God is the cause & ultimate ground of Ideas'.

✓ in 3rd meaning of 'is' Moore's argument does not hold true against Kant's Synthetic a priori judgement. acc. to Quine there is no absolute difference between Synthetic & analytic judgement.