

Re: Epistemology 101

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.cognitive/2004-12/0448.html>

From: Albert (*albertwagner_at_cox.net*)

Date: 12/28/04

Date: Mon, 27 Dec 2004 19:39:05 -0600

Neil W Rickert wrote:

> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----

> Hash: SHA1

>

> Albert <*albertwagner@cox.net*> writes:

>

>

>>Neil W Rickert wrote:

>><snip>

>>

>>>But what is the basis for "truth"?

>

>

>>I don't understand this question.

>

>

> You have stated the problem quite succinctly. I look forward to
> your solution.

Unfortunately, my solution is for you to clarify your statement.

>>What could possibly be a

>>'basis' for truth? A higher truth? A truism? The context was

>>Science.

>

> Some philosophers seem to write as if truth is determined by the god

> of their atheism, and piped directly into the immaterial substance

> of their non-existent spiritual soul.

>

> The theologians at least have somewhere to point when asked for a

> basis for truth. But where does the secular philosopher point?

As was pointed out in my previous post, the context was science
and neither theology nor philosophy.

--

"Don't you see that the whole aim of Newspeak is to narrow the
range of thought? In the end we shall make thoughtcrime literally
impossible, because there will be no words in which to express it."

sci.cognitive: Re: Epistemology 101

-- George Orwell as Syme in "1984"