

# Re: The Lord's Natural Philosopher

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2007-10/msg01001.html>

---

- *From:* tadchem <tadchem@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Sun, 14 Oct 2007 17:51:31 -0700
- 

On Oct 14, 4:50 am, "Jong Kim" <rh...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

<snip>

Excepting any Pavlovian Dog, there can be no difference between "philosophically true" and "factually true":

<snip>

Borgemoi!

How many lies are published in the American media \*daily\* because they are "politically correct"?

Empistemology!

People who consider themselves philosophers (and are also so considered by many others) have spent millennia debating the nature of "truth" and what we really "know" and how we know anything.

Last time I looked, they were still at it.

Each seems to be discussing what are prima facie distinct concepts, yet all are given the same names. It is a morass of equivocations.

A semanticist would be forced to point out that if there were only one such concept, it would need only one name, so none of the epistemologists has a handle on what "truth" is in a way acceptable to his/her peers.

In short, the term "true" has not yet been clearly, unambiguously, and acceptably defined.

By extension, all words which are defined in terms of the word "true" are equally vague.

The truth is that we don't know what "the truth" is. The vast

## Re: The Lord's Natural Philosopher

majority of human endeavor that is not directly involved in survival and reproduction is to some extent a search for "the truth" – from science to religion to New Age 'metaphysics' and Medieval astrology.

(So far, 'science' has been producing rapid, repeatable, and cumulative gains.)

As a practicing pragmatist, I have found it is necessary and sufficient to accept as an \*operational\* definition of "true" the equivalent phrase "empirically, independently, and reproducibly demonstrated."

To even make a workable claim to being 'true' a statement must be Falsifiable (it must be conceivable to perform an empirical test of its truth), Logical (it does not violate basic logic), Comprehensive (it must account for all relevant data), Honest (it must not rely on disproven or false data), Replicable (it must be independently demonstrable by even skeptics), and Sufficient (it must not rely upon other unknown, unproven or unprovable elements).

The following link may be helpful:

<http://www.csicop.org/si/9012/critical-thinking.html>

Tom Davidson  
Richmond, VA

.