

La posibilidad del conocimiento; un problema filosófico sin solución definitiva

The possibility of knowledge; a philosophical problem without definitive settlement

José Nava Bedolla

Instituto Superior de Ciencias de la Educación del Estado de México (ISCEEM) , México

nava5812@yahoo.com.mx

Resumen

La *posibilidad del conocimiento* es un problema filosófico sin solución definitiva que enfrentamos todos aquellos que tratamos de explorar, describir, explicar, interpretar o comprender cualquier realidad.

Dicho problema se puede resolver, con conocimiento o desconocimiento del hecho, utilizando distintos *supuestos filosóficos* (dogmatismo, escepticismo, subjetivismo, relativismo, pragmatismo y criticismo) que dependen de la facultad o facultades (la razón y/o los sentidos) que el sujeto cognoscente ponga en práctica cuando pretenda conocer determinado fenómeno.

La facultad o facultades (razón y/o sentidos) que el sujeto ponga en juego, cuando pretenda problematizar un objeto de estudio, dependerá o dependerán, a su vez, de los intereses ontológicos del investigador.

Dichos intereses se refieren, en el ámbito filosófico, a pretender que la realidad se mueva (subjetivismo, relativismo y pragmatismo), que esté inmóvil o en estados intermitentes entre el movimiento y la quietud (criticismo).

Palabras clave: filosofía, conocimiento, posibilidad, supuesto, problema, dogmatismo, escepticismo, subjetivismo, relativismo, pragmatismo, criticismo, razón, sentidos, etcétera.

Abstract

The possibility of knowledge is a philosophical problem without definitive solution we face all those who try to explore, describe, explain, interpret or understand any reality.

Such a problem can be solved with knowledge or ignorance of the fact, using different assumptions philosophical (dogmatism, skepticism, subjectivism, relativism, pragmatism and criticism) that depend on the faculty or faculties (the reason and/or senses) that the knower implement if it intends to meet certain phenomenon.

The power or authority (name and/or senses) that the subject put into play, if it intends to problematize an object of study, depends or depend, in turn, of the ontological interests of the researcher.

These interests relate in the philosophical field, to pretend that reality (subjectivism, relativism and pragmatism) move, which is stationary or intermittent states between movement and stillness (criticism).

Key words: philosophy, knowledge, possibility, of course, a problem, dogmatism, skepticism, subjectivism, relativism, pragmatism, criticism, reason, senses, etcetera.

Fecha Recepción: Julio 2015

Fecha Aceptación: Enero 2016

Introduction

Is it possible to know the reality ?, what is the source of human knowledge ?, What is science ?, how is classified ?, what criteria can accept that certain knowledge is true or false? These questions have not been resolved definitively. What should ?, have more than one solution? If so, these solutions will be compatible or contradictory and why? Any solution, is it better than the other ?, why?

Through this article some elements for exploration, description, explanation, interpretation and understanding of the issues mentioned are provided and the discussion is opened by an invitation to readers to reflect on the problems of human knowledge, the powers with which can be solved and, resulting therefrom, the assumptions used for this purpose.

Considering that the approach to the problem mentioned is very wide and exceeds the length of an article, we will have a general outline of the main problems of knowledge and assumptions that can be resolved to finally focus our attention on one of them: the possibility or probability of knowing reality. Therefore, we not associate the problem with the educational phenomenon, but will address the problem mentioned in general.

In the first part (I. The problems of knowledge), a mapping of the main difficulties of human knowledge is performed: definition, characteristics, elements, function, purpose, causes, consequences, classification and other aspects; in order to locate the problem of the phenomenon under study. It is clear, now, that the problems of human knowledge are so called because they are obstacles of knowledge of science, art, philosophy, or religion; are issues that relate to the knowledge of the four possibilities of realization of the human spirit mentioned.

In the second part (. II assumptions which can solve the problems of knowledge) other mapping on the concept of "philosophical assumptions" is made: definition, characteristics, elements, function, purpose, classification and other aspects; and the relationship between these and cognitive abilities of the knower is required.

In the third part (III. How to solve the problem of the possibility of knowledge?) Analyzes the different ways that you can solve the problem of the possibility or probability of human knowledge, using different philosophical assumptions derived of different capacities that the knower can put into play when establishing a relationship of knowledge with any object of study: his reason and / or your senses. This part is where the relationship between the problem of the possibility of knowledge and philosophical assumptions with which it is and / or can be resolved, depending on the ontological interests of the subject is set knower (Nava, 2014).

If this article does arouse the curiosity of the readers to explore, describe, explain, interpret and understand the philosophical problems of human knowledge, the assumptions that can be resolved and the different cognitive faculties that can lay hands, with their respective epistemological and ontological consequences, then it will have achieved its purpose.

I. The problems of knowledge

Human knowledge can be understood as a process in which a knower and an object relate to know. This means that the essential elements of any process of knowledge is the knower, the object of knowledge and the relationship to be established between them so that knowledge is given.

Before the relationship of knowledge established, both, both the subject and the object, are single entities, ie beings that exist independently of each other. Both are in the ontological sphere, in reality, which can be concrete or abstract.

The object of knowledge arises while an entity (in this case it is assumed that the human being is capable of knowing only) pays attention to another entity either (tangible or intangible) in order to meet because "... objectivity becomes with the intent precisely because the known object does not of itself ... "(Polo, 2006, p. 41) and, in turn, the man who turned his attention to another entity in order to know, single entity that was before relate to the object to know becomes knower to fix his attention on an object to know; "... Knowledge is an act,

spontaneous as to its origin, immanent in their term, by which a man intentionally present any region be done ..." (Verneaux, 2011, pp. 103-104).

The problem arises when the subject seeks to establish the relationship of knowledge to the object, because both (knower and the object of knowledge) are in different, different and even contrary worlds: the subject is knowing the human soul, his psyche, his thought, his reason, his mind, etc.; and, therefore, it lies in the psychological sphere. Instead, the object of knowledge is the reality (which may be material or immaterial), belongs to the ontological sphere. Hesse (2011, p. 15) states that "... the knowledge is presented as a relationship between these two members -Refers the subject and object-, who remain in it eternally separated from each other ...".

The fact of being in different spheres makes the relationship of knowledge between the knower and the object of knowledge is not essential, ie, which literally fuse together for a true relationship of knowledge is given. Therefore the relationship, in essence, is impossible. When the knower (the human soul) aims to cross the barrier of object known (concrete or abstract reality) to literally grasp the object of knowledge, clashes also literally against a barrier imposed reality. They are worlds, different planes or areas where there are the subject and object, and therefore can not be merged; It is like trying to mix oil and water.

As knowledge is essentially impossible, the problem of knowledge arises: "... the spirit can not leave itself to match things ... one thing can not enter into the spirit ..." (Verneaux, 2011, p. 77). Neither consciousness can leave knowing itself to penetrate the area of the object, or it can enter the mind. The knowledge of reality, in essence, is impossible; it seems that human beings are not born to know the reality, perhaps only we came to this world with the powers necessary to survive in it and not know it in essence.

Hessen says (2009, p. 16): "... seen from the subject, this apprehension is presented as a way out of the subject outside their own sphere, an invasion in the field of object and a snapshot of the properties of this. The object is not dragged, however, within the sphere of the subject, but transcendent remains to him ... "The knower (the human soul) it is impossible to penetrate the

area of the object to be known (concrete or abstract reality). That is why the relationship of knowledge can only be given in the logical world, in the logic area. All a subject can say about certain object will not be the reality of the object, what this is, but only a discourse on it will be a language on the object, a speech made by a person who does not necessarily coincide with the speech made by another subject. "... The human language is not meant to speak of knowledge: linguistic formality is not cognitive; There infra-linguistic and supra-linguistic cognitive levels ... "(Polo, 2006, p. 14). All human beings feel and think differently. It is one of the reasons why knowing subjects will have to agree on what is meant by particular object of knowledge.

If I fixed my attention on the following questions: Who am I ?, Where I come from ?, where I ?, where am I ?, What am I doing here ?, automatically in order to solve them, as told here , I become single entity that I am in reality (ontological sphere) in knower (psychological sphere) and, by the same act done, the questions mentioned simple entities that were before I will fix my attention on them on the occasion of knowing (ontological sphere), are transformed into objects turn to know (but they continue in the ontological sphere). When this happens, a splitting of my being the case, stay out of the ontological sphere and, therefore, passage to another reality: the psychological sphere, because who knows is my soul, psyche, reason, thinking, brain, spirit. Unable to penetrate the reality of the above issues, I can not penetrate its essence and never be able to know them, because I find, as knower (psychological sphere), in another world, in a different reality than the object of knowledge (ontological) sphere. It can be concluded that reality is unknowable, that knowledge of phenomena is a problem that has no definitive solution; because, otherwise, it would have already solved the great minds who have occupied it throughout the history of science.

To Verneaux (2011, p. 72) "... the object and the subject are only definable by their mutual relationship is knowledge. What is an object, a thing, a being? What it appears to a subject. What is a subject, a consciousness, a spirit? That whom or who appears an object ... "The reality (concrete or abstract) transcends the knower, ie, is outside it, in another world.

If knowledge of reality (science) is impossible, so is the knowledge of that knowledge (meta-science). We refer to the problems mentioned in the presentation of this work: Is it possible to know the reality ?, what is the source of human knowledge ?, What is science ?, how is classified ?, what criteria you can accept that certain knowledge is true or false? (Hessen 2009). These questions have more than one solution. What will obey each and every one of the above questions can be answered in many different ways, even contradictory? We are faced with the philosophical problems of knowledge.

In the table below you can see the main philosophical problems of human knowledge:

TABLE NUMBER 01: Philosophical problems of human knowledge

NO. P.	PREGUNTA	TEMA
1	¿Es posible conocer la realidad?	EL PROBLEMA DE LA POSIBILIDAD DEL CONOCIMIENTO
2	¿Cuál es la fuente del conocimiento?	EL PROBLEMA DEL ORIGEN DEL CONOCIMIENTO
3	¿Cuál es la esencia del conocimiento?	EL PROBLEMA DE LA ESENCIA DEL CONOCIMIENTO
3.1	EL PROBLEMA DE LA RELACIÓN DE CONOCIMIENTO : ¿Quién determina a quién en una relación de conocimiento : el sujeto al objeto, el objeto al sujeto o ambos se determinan recíprocamente?	
3.2	EL PROBLEMA DE LA EXISTENCIA DE LA REALIDAD : ¿Puede existir el objeto por conocer con independencia del sujeto cognoscente?	
3.3	EL PROBLEMA DE LA COMPOSICIÓN DE LA REALIDAD : ¿La realidad es única, dual o múltiple ?	
4	¿Cómo se tipifica el conocimiento?	EL PROBLEMA DE LA CLASIFICACIÓN DEL CONOCIMIENTO
5	¿Cuáles son los criterios y conceptos de verdad que nos permiten aceptar un conocimiento como verdadero o rechazarlo por falso?	EL PROBLEMA DE LA VERDAD DEL CONOCIMIENTO

Fuente: elaboración propia.

II. The assumptions with which can solve the problems of knowledge

You can set that philosophical problems of knowledge mentioned can be resolved and indeed this happens from different assumptions.

When a knower establishes a relationship of knowledge with an object of knowledge, use, consciously or unconsciously, certain philosophical assumptions, by which solves the problems of knowledge, and thus establishes a logical connection with it, but not essential. How is that relationship out?

For now we say that human beings came into this world with two great powers which, though not help us much to know in essence, they do allow us to relate to him the reason and the senses: "... knowledge, as such, is act and, at least, that act is operation: operation corresponds to an "object" ... the operation is a faculty ... "(Polo, 2006, p. 15). It is understood that all knowledge is a process in which a knower (faculty) is related in logical terms with an object to be known.

If humans can not know the essence of reality, at least we can assume, estimate, assume, surmise, assign, grant, presuppose what they are, what their characteristics, function, purpose, classification, problematic; ie a mapping of all that we can say about any phenomenon, fact, event, event, object. Herein is the logical relationship between the knower and the object of knowledge, to make a speech on it using the unique capabilities that we have to relate to any reality, be it concrete or abstract: the reason and the senses.

An assumption is something that should be assumed in advance if you want to reach a desired result, is a postulate. This is something that is logically necessary, which is involved, of course. It is causally necessary, condition or result. Latin *suppositicius*, put in place; It is an epistemological expression of any object that is of course by the spirit without actually given in experience (Runes, 1998, pp. 304 and 357).

The main feature of a philosophical course from its etymological definition is that it is a term, an idea that is placed instead of another idea, another term only. The course replaces the certainty of knowledge.

The important question is about: what is the need to satisfy an assumption that is used to solve a philosophical problem of knowledge? Answer: replace the certainty that would, if the philosophical problems of knowledge and had been settled definitively, for an opinion, conjecture, assumption, estimate, presumption, how they could solve them.

Philosophize is to solve, in a certain way, the philosophical problems of knowledge, when we try to explore, describe, explain, interpret, understand, some concrete or abstract reality.

It can be stated that no philosophical course is better or higher than another or others, all depend on the epistemological and ontological interests of the knower. It should also settle the cognitive subjects not always start from the same philosophical course to solve any problem of knowledge, the philosophical course you choose may depend on the space in which the researcher, the time in which you live, the circumstances are found to They surround him, and their interests, both epistemological and ontological.

In the table below you can see the main philosophical problems of human knowledge and philosophical assumptions that can be solved:

TABLE NUMBER 2: THE MAIN PROBLEMS OF PHILOSOPHICAL KNOWLEDGE AND HUMAN WITH THE ASSUMPTIONS THAT MAY BE SOLVED:

P R O B L E M A S D E L C O N O C I M I E N T O	P O S I B I L I D A D E S	S	DOGMATISMO. El sujeto sí aprehende realmente al objeto.			
			ESCEPTICISMO. El sujeto no puede aprehender realmente al objeto.			
			RELATIVISMO. Solo hay verdades en relación a una humanidad determinada.			
			SUBJETIVISMO. La verdad se limita al sujeto que conoce y juzga.			
			PRAGMATISMO. Verdadero significa útil, valioso, fundamentador de la vida.			
			CRITICISMO. Es posible conocer, pero no en esencia, porque cada sujeto siente y piensa diferente a los demás sujetos; porque la verdad cambia en tiempo, espacio y circunstancias; y porque todo conocimiento debe ser útil a quien lo formula y al grupo al que pertenece quien lo formuló.			
O R I G E S	S	P	RACIONALISMO. La fuente principal del conocimiento humano está en la razón, en el pensamiento.			
			EMPIRISMO. La única fuente del conocimiento humano está en la experiencia.			
			INTELCTUALISMO. La fuente y base del conocimiento lo son tanto la experiencia (primero), como la razón (después).			
			APRIORISMO. La experiencia (después) y el pensamiento (primero) son las fuentes del conocimiento.			
E S E N C I A	LA RELACIÓN SUJETO-OBJETO	SUPUESTOS	OBJETIVISMO. El objeto determina al sujeto.			
			SUBJETIVISMO. El sujeto determina al objeto.			
			DIALÉCTICA. El sujeto y el objeto se determinan recíprocamente.			
			EL PROBLEMA DE LA EXISTENCIA DE LA REALIDAD	SUPUESTOS	REALISMO. Además de los objetos ideales hay objetos reales, independientes del pensamiento.	
					IDEALISMO. Todos los objetos poseen un ser ideal, mental.	
					FENOMENALISMO. No conocemos las cosas como son en sí, sino como se nos aparecen.	
			EL PROBLEMA DE LA COMPOSICIÓN DE LA REALIDAD	SUPUESTOS	DUALISMO. El pensamiento y el ser, el sujeto y el objeto están separados y en una eterna lucha de contrarios.	
					MONISMO. El ser es materia y forma, pero es único y es un todo indivisible.	
PLURALISMO. El número de sustancias es infinito.						
TIPOS DE CONOCIMIENTO	SUPUESTOS	CONOCIMIENTO RACIONAL. Mediato, discursivo.				
		CONOCIMIENTO INTUITIVO. Inmediato. Conocer viendo.				
		CONOCIMIENTO MIXTO. Racional-intuitivo o intuitivo-racional.				
CRITERIOS DE VERDAD DEL CONOCIMIENTO	SUPUESTOS	TRASCENDENTE. Concordancia del pensamiento con el objeto.				
		INMANENTE. Concordancia del pensamiento consigo mismo.				
		MIXTO. Trascendente-inmanente o inmanente-trascendente.				

Fuente: elaboración propia.

III. How to solve the problem of the possibility of knowledge?

The knower can solve the problem of the possibility of knowledge using their cognitive faculties: reason and / or senses.

Is it possible to know reality? Many philosophers have asked this question and solved in different ways: for some it is possible to explain the phenomena, facts, events, happenings (Socrates, Plato), others say no (Pyrrho of Elis) and more, they say if you can not explain, at least you can explore, describe, interpret, understand how (Protagoras, Heraclitus, James, Kant). Those who have claimed that it is possible to explain the reality in essence, is that, without knowing it, have resolved the issue from their reason; those who claim otherwise have used their senses and who are located in the middle departed their two qualities: the reason and the senses.

At first we call dogmatic; the latter, skeptical, subjectivist, relativist and pragmatic; and third, critical. The truth is that this question has no definitive answer because we can not know whether it is possible or not human knowledge of reality and we can only assume the answer.

3.1 Solving the problem of the possibility of knowledge with reason, assuming that it is possible to find:

If the knower solves the problem of the possibility of knowledge of phenomena, using his reason, you can or want to assume that it is possible to know the reality. This is because he wants the thing will not move, stay static, motionless, quiet, peaceful, docile, forever and ever. A esteem that it is possible to know the facts has been called dogmatism.

Dogma implies a fixed doctrine. Dogmatism is a philosophical conceit with which you can solve the problem of the possibility of knowledge of reality affirming, using reason, the subject, the knowing consciousness really apprehends the object, that knowledge of the

phenomena is not a problem, contact between the knower and the object of knowledge is possible and real (Hessen (2011, pp. 21-22).

The function of the dogmatic philosophical conjecture, the need that can meet the knower assuming that it is possible to know, is to indoctrinate other subjects to conform to established knowledge. It works very well in the four possibilities of realization of the human spirit, philosophy, science, religion and art.

The last of whom end or who, consciously or unconsciously, solve the philosophical problem of the possibility of knowledge of the phenomena with reason, is the stillness of reality. Maintaining the status quo, ie the established order.

For example: in education we indoctrinate our children with the "truths" concerning traditions, beliefs and customs of our culture. The "rights" and "obligations", as citizens must accept and promote, are already "given", "positions"; you just have to "introduce" in the souls of our pupils; then then it is possible to know our rights and obligations because they are part of positive law and in the constitutional and legal order; They are the rules that promote teachers through "civic" and "ethics" education of our students.

This is an order established by reason (origin of knowledge) that promotes indoctrinating our students (possibility of knowledge), trying to avoid clutter (empiricism) to maintain the status quo (dogmatism). Order or disorder, stillness or movement; Therein lies the philosophical aspect of the assumptions.

3.2 Solving the problem of the possibility of knowledge through the senses, estimating that it is not possible to know, presuming that there is no universally valid truth, surmising that truth is relative and attributing that, ultimately, truth is useful.

If the knower solves the problem of the possibility of knowledge by using their senses, it will assume that it is not possible to know; because their sensitive faculties will take you estimate

that each individual feels and thinks differently, that truth changes in time, space and circumstances and that all knowledge should be useful.

These philosophical estimates we've called skepticism, subjectivism, relativism and pragmatism, respectively.

From these assumptions, the subject may grant knower denial of the possibility of real contact between the knower and the object of knowledge, suspect that is impossible to know. It can be assumed that the subject can not really grasp the object. It is possible to surmise that knowledge is a problem because it is not possible real contact between subject and object.

Skepticism means ruminates, examines doubt. From this assumption philosophy you are denying the possibility of knowledge. You can dismiss the possibility of real contact between subject and object. It is assumed that the subject can not grasp the object. We can say that knowledge, in the sense of a real apprehension of the object by the subject, is impossible.

The need to satisfy this philosophical course, its function is to cast doubt on the knowledge of reality.

On the purpose to pursue anyone who uses a skeptic to solve the problem about the possibility of knowing philosophical course, it is possible to state that thinks, or wants to think, because it may well suit the interests of the person who made the skeptic speech, that reality is in constant motion, movement understood as change.

The problem of the possibility of knowledge can also be solved, like the skeptic course, from the senses, using philosophical assumptions subjectivist, relativist and pragmatic. In a sense, these assumptions are also skeptical, because the need is satisfying to sow doubt in or the subjects or groups of subjects, with the aim of moving reality.

From a philosophical subjectivist course, we can say, solving the problem of the possibility of knowledge through the senses, there is a truth, but has a limited validity to each subject. Protagoras said that man is the measure of all things (Hessen, 2011, pp. 25-27). This claim has

an individualistic sense, it can be justified that every human being can solve the problem differently about the possibility of knowledge.

To say Schopenhauer (1997, p. 19), "There is no other, more independent truer truth and need less evidence of that everything that can be known, that is, the entire universe, is not object to for a subject, perception of the perceiver; in a word representation ... "Every human being the world is represented differently, depending on their senses; their material and spiritual evolution; the time and place in which he lives; culture in which it is recreated; their emotions, prejudices, feelings, ambitions, fears; myths, traditions, customs, beliefs of the society in which he lives.

It can be stated that the need to comply the function of the subjectivist philosophical estimation, is precisely the liberation of the human being as an individual. Nietzsche (. 1976, p 41) raises the more or less as follows: "Independence is the privilege of the strong, the small minority who have the courage to assert themselves ...".

The last of whom end or who, consciously or unconsciously, solve the problem of the possibility of knowledge of reality to the senses, assuming that each individual feels and thinks differently and, therefore, everyone can build their own truth about phenomena investigated, it consists, like in the skeptical course set in motion in the thing, reality phenomena.

Following Hesse (2011, pp. 25-27), from a philosophical relativist presumption we can say that there are only truths in relation to a particular humanity. The truth depends on circumstances of time, place and way of life of human beings.

It can be seen that the problem of the possibility of knowledge, as in the skeptical philosophical course, is solved by the senses; because only with the senses you can see the movement of reality, change.

In Kuhn (. 1999, p 319) "... scientific knowledge, like language, is intrinsically the common property of a group, or it is nothing at all ..."; science is relative, both in its development and in its criteria of truth.

Again, as in subjectivism, it is promoting doubt about the truth of the explanation of reality, in order to set it in motion; perhaps because it suits the interests of the periods and / or cultures derived from the circumstances being experienced.

From a pragmatic philosophical conjecture, to say Hessen (2011, pp. 27-29), the subject may abandon the idea of knowing the truth, in the sense of concordance between thought and being, and grant that truth is the useful, valuable, which serves the subject to survive. It can be attributed that intelligence was given to man individually, to orient themselves in reality and not to know it.

James (. 1975, pp 156-158), really means "... adaptation to reality ... true ideas are those that we can assimilate, make valid, confirm and verify; Misconceptions are not ... "Possessing true thoughts means, for James, have instruments of action that tell us what realities can be helpful or harmful. The truth is provisional, group, and speech must adapt to the reality to be useful, true.

According to Nietzsche (1976, p. 88), "of the senses comes every manifestation of certainty, all good conscience, all evidence of truth." Then the truth is changeable, relative; because the senses do not provide stable knowledge.

As in the skeptical, subjectivist and relativist philosophical assumptions, in pragmatism the problem of the possibility of knowledge through the senses is solved because there is the need to promote doubt subjects, subject groups, times, with the intention to move reality, cause changes that may be political, economic, social, cultural, and so on.

3.3 Solving the problem of the possibility of knowledge with reason and the senses, conceding that it is possible to know, but not in essence

Following Hesse (2011, pp. 29-30), schools of thought that philosophical assumptions are based on criticistas believe that it is possible to know (dogmatism) but not in essence, so one must analyze the statements of others and not accept anything without thinking, pondering, analyzing the judgments of others (skepticism); because humans feel and think differently to other human beings (subjectivism) way; because judgments change in time, space and circumstances (relativism); and because knowledge that we pass as true, should be useful in achieving our goals in achieving our goals, both individually and in our relationships with other human beings (pragmatism).

Critical philosophical assumptions allow to solve the problem of the possibility of knowing using for this reason and the senses and / or senses and reason; so Hesse reach those conclusions.

Kant (1996, p. 6) called "critical" to his conjecture teach philosophy with philosophical assumptions that establish a mediation between the dogmatic and skeptical. His commitment was to teach philosophize, to think for himself; not to transmit the principles of a philosophy made. "Review" means fair assessment, we can say the Aristotelian golden mean. Above all, appreciation of the possibilities of man as creator and sustainer of culture. The task of criticism is both negative and positive. Concerning human reason, it makes its limitations; but at the same time or within these guarantees and creative work possible.

Kant (1994, p. 25) illustration understood as the possibility of "... freeing man from his guilty disability ..." This failure is defined as "... the inability to use his intelligence without the guidance of another ..." (Kant 1994, p. 25). It is a culpable failure because "... its cause lies not in lack of intelligence but of determination and courage to avail itself of it without the guidance of another ...". (. Kant, 1994, p 25) Therefore Kant (. 1994, p 25) said: "... Sapere aude! Have the courage to use your own reason! ..." Kant concludes this because is solving the problem on the possibility of meeting with his reason and his senses, only reason first and then uses the senses.

CONCLUSION

Which of all philosophical assumptions that can solve the problem of the possibility of knowledge is the best? Answer: none. In epistemological terms are only conjectures, opinions; derived from reason, senses or both and, ontologically, the choice will depend on the interests of the person or group of people who use them.

The following table is possible to observe, in summary, the different and contradictory philosophical assumptions from which you can solve the problem of the possibility of knowledge; because different cognitive abilities to address them, depending on the ontological and epistemological interests of the knower are used:

TABLE NUMBER 3: THE PHILOSOPHICAL ASSUMPTIONS WITH THAT CAN SOLVE THE PROBLEM OF THE POSSIBILITY OF KNOWLEDGE:

PROBLEMA DEL CONOCIMIENTO	CAPACIDAD QUE SE PUEDE UTILIZAR	SUPUESTO FILOSÓFICO	DISCURSO
¿ES POSIBLE CONOCER LA REALIDAD?	LA RAZÓN	DOGMATISMO	El sujeto sí aprehende al objeto.
	LOS SENTIDOS	ESCEPTICISMO	El sujeto no aprehende al objeto,
		SUBJETIVISMO	Cada sujeto construye su propia verdad,
		RELATIVISMO	La verdad cambia en tiempo, espacio y circunstancias,
		PRAGMATISMO	Lo verdadero es lo útil, lo que le sirve al sujeto,
SENTIDOS Y RAZÓN O RAZÓN Y SENTIDOS	CRITICISMO	Sí es posible conocer, pero no en esencia, porque cada sujeto siente y piensa diferente, porque la verdad cambia en tiempo, espacio y circunstancias y porque, además, todo conocimiento debe tener cierta utilidad.	

Fuente: elaboración propia.

All this boils down to movement or stillness. If you want reality remains as it is, they will argue reasons for this; if a change is wanted, the senses provide the necessary arguments, and if desired reconcile opposites may be used both qualities.

It can be assumed that human beings did not come into this world with the tools necessary to understand the essence of reality powers and that, therefore, all we can do in cognitive terms is to develop a mapping of the same (definition, characteristics, function, purpose, classification, elements, etc.); using for this our faculties (right and / or directions), with which we make

certain assumptions to solve the problems of ontological knowledge depending on our interests.

There is a relationship between the assumptions used to solve the problem of the possibility of knowledge, cognitive faculties of all knower and the ontological interest thereon.

Every researcher, know it or ignore it, provided that aims to build an object of study, you will need to resolve the philosophical problems of knowledge using their reason, their senses or both faculties.

The fact that the problem of the possibility of knowledge can be solved in many different ways, even contradictory, is that, knowingly or lack of it, the knower that aims to fix it does from certain philosophical assumptions that depend the use or the powers to do so: his reason, his senses or both.

To reflect on the problem of the possibility of human knowledge, it is necessary to take the conceptual tools needed. In these instruments we call, in this study, philosophical assumptions. Knowing them, the investigator can use to resolve, knowingly, the questions referred and thus more safely walk the hard road of building knowledge.

The relationship of knowledge between knower and known object can be set from reason and / or senses; using different philosophical assumptions, which are derived from one or two faculties mentioned, depending on the epistemological and ontological interests of the investigator.

Knowledge problems have not been solved definitively, have more than one solution and have been solved in many different ways, even contradictory.

Bibliography

- Aristóteles (A) (1992). *Metafísica*. Porrúa, Col. "Sepan Cuántos...", núm. 120, México.
- Beauchot, Mauricio (2000). *Tratado de hermenéutica analógica*. Ítaca. México.
- Descartes (1981). *Meditaciones metafísicas*. Porrúa, Col. "Sepan Cuántos...", núm. 177, México.
- Gaarder, Jostein (2001). *El Mundo de Sofía. Novela sobre la Historia de la Filosofía*. Patria/Siruela, México.
- Hessen, Juan (1999). *Teoría del Conocimiento*. Porrúa, Col. "Sepan Cuántos...", núm. 351, México.
- Hume, David (1992). *Tratado de la Naturaleza Humana*. Porrúa, Col. "Sepan Cuántos...", núm. 326, México.
- Kant (1996). *Crítica de la Razón Pura*. Porrúa, Col. "Sepan Cuántos...", núm. 203, México.
- Kant (1994). *Filosofía de la historia*. FCE, México.
- Kuhn T., S (1999). *La Estructura de las Revoluciones Científicas*. FCE, Breviarios, México.
- Leibniz (A) (1991). *Nuevo Tratado Sobre el Entendimiento Humano*. Porrúa, Col. "Sepan Cuántos...", núm. 321, México.
- Leibniz (B) (1991). *Monadología*. Porrúa, Col. "Sepan Cuántos...", núm. 321, México.
- Locke, John (1994). *Ensayo Sobre el Entendimiento Humano*. Tomo I, Gernika, México.
- Nava Bedolla, José (2014). *La Orientación Epistemológica de la Investigación Educativa. La filosofía, teoría, metodología, técnicas e instrumentos para realizar investigación en las ciencias de la educación*. Editorial Académica Española (EAE), Saarbrucken, Alemania.

- Nietzsche, Federico (1976). Más allá del bien y del mal. Editores Unidos Mexicanos, S. A., Col. Obras de Federico Nietzsche, México.
- Platón (A) (1998). Diálogos. Porrúa, Col. “Sepan Cuantos...”, núm. 13, México.
- Platón (B) (1991). Las Leyes. Porrúa, Col. “Sepan Cuantos...”, núm. 139, México.
- Polo, Leonardo (2006). Curso de teoría del conocimiento. Tomo I, Ediciones Universidad de Navarra, S. A., Pamplona, España.
- Runes, Dagoberto D. (1998). Diccionario de filosofía. Grijalbo, México.
- Schopenhauer, Arturo (1997). El Mundo como Voluntad y Representación. Porrúa, Col. “Sepan Cuantos...”, núm. 419, México.
- Séneca (1999). Tratados Filosóficos. Porrúa, Col. “Sepan Cuantos...”, núm. 281, México.
- Spinoza (1990). Ética. Porrúa, Col. “Sepan Cuantos...”, núm. 319, México.
- Tomás de Aquino (1991). Suma Contra los Gentiles. Porrúa, Col. “Sepan Cuantos...”, núm. 317, México.
- Verneaux, Roger (2011). Curso de filosofía tomista. Epistemología general o crítica del conocimiento. Herder, España.
- William, James (1975). Pragmatismo. Colofón, México.