

=

-

In my opinion it does not matter if a belief to be justified is true or false. In fact we tend to believe something that is untrue if it can be proven valid enough to us by either a credible source or ourselves. There are; however, two essential questions that must be answered before we proceed any further with this idea. When do beliefs need justification? And Why do we need such prove of their validity?

Mostly human beings do not question their principles, unless they are challenged and there is a need to defend them. Indeed, more than anything else, a justification in this respect is a battle between two or more personal belief sets that are unique. For the most part we are able to group those personal sets under four general categories of beliefs and we shall discuss two of them later in this essay.

In the world as we know it, some sort of balance between generalisations and individual interpretations is required. If we were to doubt every single statement, source or even ourselves, our persona would develop into an extreme outlier of this seemingly equilibriumatic society. Thus we need a justification in order to distinguish beliefs that are vital for interpretation of our reality and coexistence with the reality of others.

"Dependence on reason seems to be central to the very concept of rationality. It is no surprise, then, that the rational view of existence is just the only one that creates reasons to believe."
-Gordon M. Macg

Certainly one of the ways in which we can substantiate our beliefs is **reasoning**. This method is a derivative of **reasoning** is a power or capacity that human beings have, and which no other animal has, at least no to the same extent. Such power usually connotes the ability to recognise, understand and respond using logical fundamental statements and sciences that imitate them.

For example, if we know that A bigger then B and C is smaller then B, we deduce that A is bigger then C. In this situation there is no need for us to actually observe the process we simply work out the outcome. **reasoning** employs reasoning as its prime tool for justifying a reliable process, outcomes of which can be trusted.

reasoning is a good technique for supporting the **conviction** of beliefs and **effective** type of argument. However, it may be unsuccessful when something we are trying to recognise, understand or respond to, is new to us and cannot be rationalized by logic or otherwise.

"Wise men... do not rely on the evidence,"

David Hume

To deal with the whole range of beliefs that cannot be justified within our mind, we rely on empirical evidence. "Picture is worth a thousand words..." this kind of proverb, which is shared by humanity, could imply that sensory experiences are as ~~fundamental~~ as ~~chronological~~ reasoning. Without a doubt there are some things we would rather see, hear or otherwise sense in order to be able to validate them as opposed to puzzling them out. This technique could be generalised under a term of ~~reception~~.

Majority of the non-religious people claim that there is no "higher power" due to the fact that they cannot see or touch it. When we hear an alarm clock going off we presume the morning is outside and it is time to leave the bed. We taste something unpleasant and automatically conclude that it could be harmful to us. Examples of this observation-based conclusion are truly numerous and could be grouped under the ~~empirical~~ ~~case~~ ~~of~~ ~~them~~. Foundationalists claim that perceived experiences form the foundation from which further ideas can be drawn.

Although, this way of justification is exceptionally convincing it is not without flaws. Our senses no matter how good they are or how well they are trained can mislead us at times or be completely wrong.