

B) 'Aristotle's theory of the four causes is convincing'. Discuss

Aristotle's theory of the four causes is convincing because in everything he says we can relate to it. We can relate to it because he used his senses to come up with his theory.

Aristotle spent a lot of time observing the world of natural living. He wanted to discover what the purpose of everything was. This is how he came up with his theory of the four causes. For example; what does the heart do? Why does the muscle contract? Scientifically we know now but why do we have to live like this anyway? Other living things such as reptiles survive in a completely different way.

He came to a conclusion that nature in itself did not have a conscious mind. The purpose that the object is trying to achieve is somehow inside the object already without knowing. For example; a cow's purpose of living is to be a fully-grown cow but if it dies young, it doesn't achieve it's potential. He believe everything had an order, nothing came randomly. The reason of why a living thing may not achieve its purpose would be it's final cause from the Unmoved Mover, God.

Everything that Aristotle did was based on observation. He was meticulous in his interpretation in what he had seen and observed by using all his senses to come up with a definite conclusion that everyone would believe.

Many people have problems believing his theory as you had to believe quite strongly in God as Aristotle believed he was the creator of everything. Aristotle did not question, where creation was created because he already thought he knew. It wasn't a question of weather he believed or not because to him God is pure knowledge. Aristotle's idea of God was one of an unchanging, ultimate designer, who was static and eternal, but impassive. 'Only God, who exists as form without matter is perfect'.

However, Aristotle's theory is seen to be a lot more to do with common sense compared to Plato's, which is a lot more to do with interpretation. Aristotle considered Plato's theory as completely wrong. This was because Aristotle saw no reality in Plato's theory at all.

Aristotle saw many things wrong with Plato's theory such as; he thought it had no static, it seemed powerless. This was mainly because Aristotle looked at change in situations. To him there must be some sort of change to the theory of the Forms.

Also, Aristotle couldn't see how the existence of the forms explained how we gained knowledge in the first place. He didn't understand how not knowing what we already know brings us knowledge because we didn't know it before.

Aristotle also disagreed with Plato's theory because the theory of the forms did not explain how individual objects of nature existed. Plato stated things as a whole as he didn't look into depth of different individuality.

Another disagreement that Aristotle made was that he could never just 'draw the line' somewhere with what was the ideal. There was always something better than what was thought to be the best. For example; beauty and truth were ideal according to Plato but, how ideal can you get?

The reason why Aristotle and Plato had so many disagreements was because they were really talking about completely separate ideas. Plato's theory was based upon situations such as; how justice is known throughout the world? No-one decided upon particular rules to follow. Whereas Aristotle was trying to understand what reality really is.

Aristotle's theory was much more convincing as many people can understand more clearly where he got his ideas from but Plato's ideas are quite different to what people would expect to hear.

