

Chapter 1 : Truth Quotes (quotes)

I spent the past week working in Bhuj with Kutch Mahila Vikas Sangathan, a women's collective I mentioned briefly in my last entry. KMVS began in the late s as a small initiative, attempting to organize Kachchhi artisan women.

More so in the current digital age where we are often faced with a deluge of "information" from various sources most of which are dubious , it is imperative that we be able to separate the wheat from the chaff in order to make informed decisions. Macdonald provides many good examples of how various issues can be argued from numerous angles and depending on the perspective y The author makes the case that for almost any issue, there is not just the one "TRUTH" but in fact, many competing truths. Macdonald provides many good examples of how various issues can be argued from numerous angles and depending on the perspective you are coming from, all arguments can seem perfectly logical and convincing at the same time, even though they are diametrically opposed in effect and result. He covers various areas such as politics, economics and finance, corporate marketing, the environment, etc. The key takeaway is not to listen to just one side of a story, more so if it is just a sound bite or a catchy headline, which people seem to be doing more of nowadays as a result of diminishing attention spans. Nathasia rated it really liked it I am very excited about reading this book since we are in an epidemic of fake news and alternative facts, especially after the unexpected win by the PH government and also, other international issues that garners our interests such as Trump, Israel-Palestine conflict, China diplomacy and so much more. I always want to know about Truth itself. Well, truth is not as straightforward as some might think, or want to believe. Its not black and white, as there are different ways to speak about the Truth, I am very excited about reading this book since we are in an epidemic of fake news and alternative facts, especially after the unexpected win by the PH government and also, other international issues that garners our interests such as Trump, Israel-Palestine conflict, China diplomacy and so much more. Its not black and white, as there are different ways to speak about the Truth, and not all of them honest. On most issues, there are multiple truths we can choose to communicate, and our choice of conveying the truth will influence those around us perceive an issue and react to it. We can select truths that constructively engage people and inspire action, or we can opt for truths that deliberately mislead. Truth comes in many forms, and experiences communicators can exploit its variability to shape our impression of reality. In this book, the author explores how truth is used and conveyed in politics, business, the media and everyday life, and how readers can spot and call out misleading truths. The author hopes that the book can help readers have a clearer understanding of the many faces of Truths and to better able navigating the world. A fast, and concise read- with recaps at the end of reasonably broken up chapters, I am in awe of this book now and will be glad to share this bo The most important book you may ever read has arrived at a time when it is most sorely needed. A fast, and concise read- with recaps at the end of reasonably broken up chapters, I am in awe of this book now and will be glad to share this book with anyone I know. No matter your "leanings" politically, understanding what any one person, company or government is trying to spin, this book provides a great resource for looking at any item presented objectively. You will be better armed against politicians and advertisements after reading this book. I will share this with every person I know that has even a spark of independent thinking.

Chapter 2 : Truth (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

Truth is like a many sided diamond: every side belongs to the whole but it all depends where you are as to just how you view it. Every soul views Truth from different angles. There is a time along the pathway of every soul when it has to stand alone and find the I Am within without help or guidance or support from any one else.

It really ought to have a name. Some writers call it special pleading, but most writers use that term for a slightly different fallacy. Some call it confirmation bias, which is an accurate but little-used term. The fallacy consists of giving reasons for your thesis without considering reasons against it, or giving reasons against an opposing view without considering reasons for it. This hand-out is about reaching two-sidedness. Note that there may be far more than two sides to a complex issue. So the true alternative to one-sidedness is many-sidedness. But I will refer to the alternative as "two-sidedness" for convenience. The one-sidedness fallacy does not make an argument invalid. It may not even make the argument unsound. The fallacy consists in persuading readers, and perhaps ourselves, that we have said enough to tilt the scale of evidence and therefore enough to justify a judgment. The arguments on the other side may be stronger than our own. Some logicians say that an argument is cogent if it is valid and sound and takes all relevant considerations into account. On this usage, one-sidedness does not undermine validity or soundness, but cogency. To become two-sided, you must first make the arguments against your own thesis explicit. Write them out as carefully as you write out the positive arguments for your thesis. But if that were all, your final case would be indecisive or inconsistent. You must take the counter-arguments into account. Demonstrate their weaknesses, admit their strengths, and revise your own argument accordingly. In practice this takes many forms. It might mean answering the counter-arguments and showing their inadequacy. It might mean retracting part of your thesis or one of your arguments for it. It might mean qualifying an unqualified or oversimplified thesis. It might mean acknowledging an exception. It might mean making a concession. It will almost always mean making a simple argument complex. The remedy for one-sidedness is either experience or imagination, or both, and a willingness to use them. Just as an exercise, imagine that you deny the thesis that you believe. What arguments can be mustered for that denial? It opens your mind. Your imagination will give you some of the arguments against your thesis, but perhaps not the best ones. So expect to strengthen the two-sidedness of your arguments with a lifetime of sensitive listening and observation. Our courts avoid one-sidedness by giving trained professionals on each side of a case a serious interest in making the strongest arguments they can for their side. Each lawyer might make a one-sided argument but the judge and jury get a two-sided body of evidence and reasoning. Even here, however, the lawyer is not only more likely to understand the facts, but to win, if she makes a two-sided argument. An argument for one side that disregarded the strong arguments on the other side leaves the jury to wonder whether you can answer them. This leads to an important point. You might think that one-sidedness is actually desirable when your goal is winning rather than discovering a complex and nuanced truth. If winning is persuading a decision-maker, then any kind of manipulation or deception that actually works is desirable. But in fact, while winning may sometimes be served by one-sidedness, it is usually better served by two-sidedness. If your argument say in court is one-sided, then you are likely to be surprised by a strong counter-argument for which you are unprepared. The lesson is to cultivate two-sidedness in your thinking about any issue. Beware of any job that requires you to truncate your own understanding. This file is an electronic hand-out for the course, Real-World Reasoning.

Chapter 3 : many-sided | Definition of many-sided in English by Oxford Dictionaries

Hector Macdonald's recent book, Truth: How the Many Sides to Every Story Shape Our Reality, is ruthless in its timeliness. Over the past several years, a blend of technology, political events, and social change has attenuated the gatekeepers of knowledge and subjected us to a deluge of information.

Tarski goes on to demonstrate some key applications of such a theory of truth. This was especially important to Tarski, who was concerned the Liar paradox would make theories in languages containing a truth predicate inconsistent. Correspondence revisited The correspondence theory of truth expresses the very natural idea that truth is a content-to-world or word-to-world relation: We suggested that, against a background like the metaphysics of facts, it does so in a straightforward way. But the idea of correspondence is certainly not specific to this framework. Indeed, it is controversial whether a correspondence theory should rely on any particular metaphysics at all. Yet without the metaphysics of facts, the notion of correspondence as discussed in section 1. This has led to two distinct strands in contemporary thinking about the correspondence theory. One strand seeks to recast the correspondence theory in a way that does not rely on any particular ontology. Another seeks to find an appropriate ontology for correspondence, either in terms of facts or other entities. We will consider each in turn. Whether his own theory is a correspondence theory, and even whether it provides any substantial philosophical account of truth at all, is a matter of controversy. One rather drastic negative assessment from Putnam 1986, p. As it is normally understood, reference is the preeminent word-to-world relation. Satisfaction is naturally understood as a word-to-world relation as well, which relates a predicate to the things in the world that bear it. The Tarskian recursive definition shows how truth is determined by reference and satisfaction, and so is in effect determined by the things in the world we refer to and the properties they bear. This, one might propose, is all the correspondence we need. It is not correspondence of sentences or propositions to facts; rather, it is correspondence of our expressions to objects and the properties they bear, and then ways of working out the truth of claims in terms of this. This is certainly not the neo-classical idea of correspondence. In not positing facts, it does not posit any single object to which a true proposition or sentence might correspond. Rather, it shows how truth might be worked out from basic word-to-world relations. As we will discuss more fully in section 4. Rather, it offers a number of disquotation clauses, such as: These clauses have an air of triviality though whether they are to be understood as trivial principles or statements of non-trivial semantic facts has been a matter of some debate. With Field, we might propose to supplement clauses like these with an account of reference and satisfaction. In , Field was envisaging a physicalist account, along the lines of the causal theory of reference. This should inter alia guarantee that truth is really determined by word-to-world relations, so in conjunction with the Tarskian recursive definition, it could provide a correspondence theory of truth. Such a theory clearly does not rely on a metaphysics of facts. Indeed, it is in many ways metaphysically neutral, as it does not take a stand on the nature of particulars, or of the properties or universals that underwrite facts about satisfaction. However, it may not be entirely devoid of metaphysical implications, as we will discuss further in section 4. These are instances of representation relations. According to representational views, meaningful items, like perhaps thoughts or sentences or their constituents, have their contents in virtue of standing in the right relation to the things they represent. The project of developing a naturalist account of the representation relation has been an important one in the philosophy of mind and language. See the entry on mental representation. But, it has implications for the theory of truth. Representational views of content lead naturally to correspondence theories of truth. To make this vivid, suppose you hold that sentences or beliefs stand in a representation relation to some objects. It is natural to suppose that for true beliefs or sentences, those objects would be facts. We then have a correspondence theory, with the correspondence relation explicated as a representation relation: As we have discussed, many contemporary views reject facts, but one can hold a representational view of content without them. The relations of reference and satisfaction are representation relations, and truth for sentences is determined compositionally in terms of those representation relations, and the nature of the objects they represent. If we have such relations, we have the building blocks for a correspondence theory

without facts. Field anticipated a naturalist reduction of the representation via a causal theory, but any view that accepts representation relations for truth bearers or their constituents can provide a similar theory of truth. See Jackson and Lynch for further discussion. Representational views of content provide a natural way to approach the correspondence theory of truth, and likewise, anti-representational views provide a natural way to avoid the correspondence theory of truth. This is most clear in the work of Davidson, as we will discuss more in section 6. Some are notably different from the neo-classical theory sketched in section 1. For instance, Austin proposes a view in which each statement understood roughly as an utterance event corresponds to both a fact or situation, and a type of situation. It is true if the former is of the latter type. This theory, which has been developed by situation theory e. Rather, correspondence relations to Austin are entirely conventional. See Vision for an extended defense of an Austinian correspondence theory. As an ordinary language philosopher, Austin grounds his notion of fact more in linguistic usage than in an articulated metaphysics, but he defends his use of fact-talk in Austin b. In a somewhat more Tarskian spirit, formal theories of facts or states of affairs have also been developed. There are more metaphysically robust notions of fact in the current literature. The view has much in common with the neo-classical one. Like the neo-classical view, Armstrong endorses a version of the correspondence theory. States of affairs are truthmakers for propositions, though Armstrong argues that there may be many such truthmakers for a given proposition, and vice versa. Armstrong also envisages a naturalistic account of propositions as classes of equivalent belief-tokens. It is then argued that facts are the appropriate truthmakers. In contrast to the approach to correspondence discussed in section 3. For more on facts, see the entry on facts. The truthmaker principle is often put as the schema: Fox proposed putting the principle this way, rather than explicitly in terms of truth. The truthmaker principle expresses the ontological aspect of the neo-classical correspondence theory. Not merely must truth obtain in virtue of word-to-world relations, but there must be a thing that makes each truth true. For one view on this, see Merricks The neo-classical correspondence theory, and Armstrong, cast facts as the appropriate truthmakers. However, it is a non-trivial step from the truthmaker principle to the existence of facts. Parsons argues that the truthmaker principle presented in a somewhat different form is compatible with there being only concrete particulars. As we saw in discussing the neo-classical correspondence theory, truthmaker theories, and fact theories in particular, raise a number of issues. One which has been discussed at length, for instance, is whether there are negative facts. Negative facts would be the truthmakers for negated sentences. Russell notoriously expresses ambivalence about whether there are negative facts. Armstrong rejects them, while Beall defends them. For more discussion of truthmakers, see Cameron and the papers in Beebe and Dodd Realism and anti-realism The neo-classical theories we surveyed in section 1 made the theory of truth an application of their background metaphysics and in some cases epistemology. In section 2 and especially in section 3, we returned to the issue of what sorts of ontological commitments might go with the theory of truth. There we saw a range of options, from relatively ontologically non-committal theories, to theories requiring highly specific ontologies. There is another way in which truth relates to metaphysics. Many ideas about realism and anti-realism are closely related to ideas about truth. Indeed, many approaches to questions about realism and anti-realism simply make them questions about truth. It relies on there being objects of reference, and something about the world which makes for determinate satisfaction relations; but beyond that, it is ontologically neutral. But as we mentioned there, this is not to say that it has no metaphysical implications. A correspondence theory of truth, of any kind, is often taken to embody a form of realism. The key features of realism, as we will take it, are that: The world exists objectively, independently of the ways we think about it or describe it. Our thoughts and claims are about that world. Wright offers a nice statement of this way of thinking about realism. These theses imply that our claims are objectively true or false, depending on how the world they are about is. The world that we represent in our thoughts or language is an objective world. Realism may be restricted to some subject-matter, or range of discourse, but for simplicity, we will talk about only its global form. It is often argued that these theses require some form of the correspondence theory of truth. Such a theory will provide an account of objective relations of reference and satisfaction, and show how these determine the truth or falsehood of what we say about the world. But realism is a more general idea than physicalism. Any theory that provides objective relations of reference and satisfaction, and builds up a theory

of truth from them, would give a form of realism. Making the objectivity of reference the key to realism is characteristic of work of Putnam, e. Another important mark of realism expressed in terms of truth is the property of bivalence. As Dummett has stressed e.

Chapter 4 : Peter Suber, "One-Sidedness Fallacy"

In Truth: How the Many Sides to Every Story Shape Our Reality, Hector Macdonald explores how truth is used and abused in politics, business, the media and everyday life. He shows how a clearer understanding of truth's many faces renders us better able to navigate our world and more influential within it.

Over the past several years, a blend of technology, political events, and social change has attenuated the gatekeepers of knowledge and subjected us to a deluge of information. Macdonald has stepped forward to address our unease with a book not about lies, but about truth—how factual or unfalsifiable statements can be dressed up, reshaped, or displayed to lead us to almost infinite conclusions. The people who use such competing truths are Advocates the people who tell selective truths ethically to accomplish good goals , Misinformers people who have only gotten part of the story and are inadvertently giving false impressions and Misleaders people who deliberately employ selective truths in an unethical fashion. Through a series of anecdotes and definitions he catalogues the methods such people can use to make the truth serve their goals and influence others. He makes it clear from the start that this is to be a practical book for the busy 21st-century world-citizen. Indeed, the structure of the entire book seems tailor-made for the executives that Macdonald serves in his profession of strategic communications consultant. Each chapter is stuffed with punchy anecdotes that would go over equally well at a party or board meeting and concludes with a helpfully highlighted box of takeaways, in case the reader is too busy to actually read. The rest of the book is surprisingly light on specific advice for the wary and overwhelmed consumer of contemporary media. Macdonald seems better at describing how the truth can be used to manipulate or motivate than at recommending tactics for navigating a world of would-be influencers. Each of his chapters deals with topics that have enjoyed considerable theoretical attention, whether in philosophy, history, sociology, or another discipline. However, Macdonald rarely gives more than a nod to how others have addressed these issues. The relationship of words and their various meanings has been studied by philosophers, linguists, and others, and even a cursory investigation should have netted Macdonald several ideas with which to dialogue. The only work with which Macdonald engages here is Kathleen Taylor on brainwashing techniques. To say that this fails to do justice to the centuries of work amongst theologians and philosophers regarding the nature of religious truth claims is a vast understatement. However, the categories he uses are rife with philosophical implications—naming and definitions, truth claims, belief, determinations of value, moral judgments, and social constructs are all at least partly matters of philosophy. The upshot is that instead of avoiding philosophy he simply imports it unexamined. Macdonald himself seems aware of this, pausing to address concerns that he is advocating relativism. He insists that he is not; there are such things as facts, and there are moral realities. He simply does not explain how to recognize a fact or a moral truth, or on what basis such things exist, as he considers it beyond the purview of his book. This raises the question: Macdonald declines to answer, but the problem remains. This kind of soft relativism is nothing new. It derives from attempts to be pragmatic and inoffensive, which of their nature preclude strong truth commitments or rigorous argumentation that could provoke objections. Safety from provoking objections, however, also means safety from provoking reflection, understanding, or meaningful change. Occasional passages provoke reflection in the attentive reader. On the whole, however, they cannot persuade or provide any deep understanding of why these manipulation tactics work, what they mean for discourse, and most importantly how to discover truth in anything beyond the most superficial sense. I have mentioned the anecdotes in passing, but in fact, they make up the majority of the book. Macdonald is a witty storyteller, and each anecdote is meant to illustrate some tactic of manipulation or critical misunderstanding. Some are more apt than others; many simply seem like good stories with a distant connection to the topic. Telling stories to prove arguments is effective in part because the drama of narrative can serve to cover up logical inconsistency. We are used to filling in gaps in stories by inference, and as a result we tend to overlook holes in the logic of a compelling anecdote. By relying so heavily on anecdote, Macdonald spares himself the difficulty of articulating himself clearly and rigorously. Despite his claims, Macdonald does not seem interested in helping us avoid manipulation at the hands of competing truths. What

he has actually provided is his own taxonomy of the genre which he argues is enough to inoculate against misleaders , as well as instructions for manipulating others. His hope is apparently that if his readers learn how to manipulate others for virtuous ends, things will somehow work out. Without any clear sense of what those virtuous ends are or how we might discover them, this seems like a faint hope indeed. None of this is to say that Truth is a bad read. It is not, however, a book that promotes real understanding or one that succeeds at its own stated goals. You may come away with a few new insights on how our age of misinformation operates, but you will not be much better equipped to adjudicate competing truths or oppose manipulation. She and her husband currently live in Virginia. Share this with your friends:

Chapter 5 : Truth: How the Many Sides to Every Story Shape Our Reality by Hector Macdonald

The idea of a monotheistic god is understandably tempting. Henry Kissinger is reputed to have asked who to call when he wanted to speak to Europe.

KMVS began in the late s as a small initiative, attempting to organize Kachchhi artisan women. Over the years, the expressed needs of Kachchhi women have led KMVS to expand into more and more arenas, ranging from microlending to vocational training to literacy to reproductive rights to governmental representation of women. In most countries of the world, the paradox of domestic violence is that it is both ubiquitous and invisible. Domestic violence often happens under a blanket of social silence, and it is very hard to get accurate figures on its incidence. But the survey laments that, in rural areas, surveillance of and protection from domestic violence is inadequate. This may not come as a surprise. Under these conditions, many are unable to justify leaving the homes of their husbands or marital families, even under severe abuse. Though this is hardly unique to India, age-old customary norms create an ecology that, tacitly or explicitly, condones spousal abuse and rape. Many would be forced to return to their abusive homes. Others would be evicted, with no shelter and no source of income. Rarely would the courts take cases of cruelty or abuse seriously. Indeed, one study found that in Mumbai, a majority of cases of cruelty of husband upon wife are registered only after the woman has been found dead, often either by dowry death or by suicide. However, one must prove that money or articles exchanged were connected to dowry demands, and it is easy to make such demands subtle enough to be imperceptible to judicial rules of evidence. Divorce was rarely allowed except on grounds of chronic brutality, which, again, is almost impossible to prove. Rape is criminalized, but according to the code, can only be committed by a man upon a woman, and does not apply if a husband forces non-consensual intercourse upon his wife. There were no laws to protect a woman from harassment or sexual assault. The PWDVA is a civil law which aims to give protection and resources to any woman who has suffered from physical, sexual, verbal, emotional, or economic abuse by any man with whom she is in a domestic relationship. For those of you folks who geek out on legal mumbo jumbo like I do, the text is fascinating. Because it is handled very differently. In common law jurisprudence, civil law tends to be about restitution, and criminal law, about retribution. Instead, working within a culture where the institution of the joint family is paramount, the laws tasks service providers with facilitating mediated reconciliation or compromise first, leaving legal actions such as divorce or protective orders as a last resort. PWDVA describes itself as endeavoring to protect the right of women to a violence free life, to charge the state with facilitating that right, and to expand the legal understanding of domestic violence, so to allow women to act upon a much wider range of abuses. It does this in a variety of ways. First, it creates access to medical, legal, counseling, childcare, shelter, and protection services. If called upon, these service providers are required to provide the survivor with the requested services, free of charge, and to whatever degree of confidentiality she desires. Second, the survivor is able to choose her services. If she wants, she can bypass the police altogether, only seeking counseling or legal services. These are not police officers in fact, they can belong to NGOs. Fifth, because this is a civil law, the burden of proof is much lower. Though orders can be appealed by the accused, a survivor only needs to submit a report of domestic violence for a magistrate to begin issuing orders. And third-parties can issue reports, as well, with the liability protection of a Good Samaritan clause. It also means that everything from minor verbal abuse to rampant physical abuse has the potential to be viewed on the same spectrum of domestic violence, if it is interpreted as a gender-based abuse of power and control, allowing the possibility of an early intervention. This is in line with the emerging spectral view of sexual violence in the states, beginning with sexual harassment and ending in sexual assault or rape. It also inherently includes sexual violence, such as sexual harassment, sexual assault, and rape. Finally, it transcends boundaries of class, gender, and sexuality, to some extent, by not presuming that domesticity is inherent to intimacy. Part of this is because PWDVA takes an interpretation of domestic violence that lies somewhere in between intimate partner violence and family violence. In the context of PWDVA, abuse of a woman by any man in the marital household equally constitutes domestic violence. That is, a husband, brother, father, brother-in-law,

or any year.

Chapter 9 : Many sided truths about Truth and Reconciliation â€™ Sri Lanka Guardian

In Truth: How the Many Sides to Every Story Shape Our Reality, Hector Macdonald explores how truth is used and abused in politics, business, the media and everyday life. He shows how a clearer.