

1: Truth (anti-tobacco campaign) - Wikipedia

This is a great question for digging deeper into history across all areas of life to observe when changes and advances were made over the last several thousand years, and ALSO, how changes were made to the way changes were being made.

It was set up in under the leadership of Archbishop Tutu and was a Background The unbanning of the liberation movements and opposition political parties in by Pres. A major obstacle to finalizing the interim constitution was the question of accountability for those guilty of gross human rights violations during the years of apartheid. It became clear during the negotiations that the political right and many in the security forces were not loyal to President de Klerk and posed a major threat to stability in the country. They demanded that President de Klerk issue them a blanket amnesty for past actions. Those negotiating for the apartheid regime insisted that a guarantee of general amnesty be written into the interim constitution. Without it, it is unlikely that the apartheid government would have given up power. The strength of the amnesty deal was that it was part of a package of initiatives contained in the interim constitution that set the country on the road to becoming a democratic, constitutional state. This included a strong and justiciable bill of rights.

Establishment and mandate of the commission The Truth and Reconciliation Commission TRC was born of a spirit of public participation, as the new government solicited the opinions of South Africans and the international community regarding the issue of granting amnesty as well as the issue of accountability in respect to past violations and reparations for victims. Civil society, including human rights lawyers, the religious community, and victims, formed a coalition of more than 50 organizations that participated in a public dialogue on the merits of a truth commission. This consultative process lasted a year and culminated in the legislation, the Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act 34 of the Act , that established the TRC. The Act provided for the establishment of a TRC made up of 17 commissioners. The commission was tasked with investigating human rights abuses committed from to , including the circumstances, factors, and context of such violations; allowing victims the opportunity to tell their story; granting amnesty; constructing an impartial historical record of the past; and drafting a reparations policy. Finally, the TRC would compile a final report, providing comprehensive accounts of the activities and findings of the commission together with recommendations of measures to prevent future violations of human rights. In order to achieve these objectives, the Act established three committees: The commissioners were selected through an open countrywide nomination process and publicly interviewed by an independent selection panel comprising representatives of all the political parties, civil society , and the religious bodies in the country. The primary focus of the commission was on victims. It received more than 22, statements from victims and held public hearings at which victims gave testimony about gross violations of human rights, defined in the Act as torture, killings, disappearances and abductions, and severe ill treatment suffered at the hands of the apartheid state. Those who had suffered violations at the hands of the liberation movementsâ€”by members and leaders of such groups as the African National Congress , the Inkatha Freedom Party , and the Pan-Africanist Congress â€”also appeared before the commission. The commission received more than 7, amnesty applications, held more than 2, amnesty hearings, and granted 1, amnesties for thousands of crimes committed during the apartheid years. An important feature of the TRC was its openness and transparency. The public hearings held by the TRC ensured that South Africans became aware of the atrocities that had been committed during the apartheid years. Challenges and limitations The TRC was confronted by a number of challenges, as it was not accepted by all parties to the conflict. The top echelons of the military did not cooperate with the commission. It was mainly the foot soldiers in the security forces and those who were already imprisoned or were facing charges who applied for amnesty. Senior politicians in the former government and senior leaders in the security forces did not apply. It took considerable effort to persuade them to participate in the amnesty process. A key weakness of the commission was that it did not focus sufficiently on the policies or political economy of apartheid. The link between racialized power and racialized privilege became obscured. Furthermore, a number of high-ranking officials from the security forces, including former minister of law and

order Adriaan Vlok, were given suspended sentences through a plea-bargain process under new prosecutorial guidelines ostensibly meant to facilitate prosecutions. The failure to prosecute disillusioned many victims and encouraged the view that the government had strengthened impunity and that the beneficiaries of apartheid had escaped accountability for their actions. Assessment Despite these challenges and limitations, the TRC was internationally regarded as successful and showed the importance of public participation in such processes, including the initial decision-making process leading up to the establishment of a truth commission. The hearings of the TRC attracted global attention, as it was the first commission to hold public hearings in which both victims and perpetrators were heard. While amnesties are generally considered inconsistent with international law, the South African TRC provided some basis for considering conditional amnesties as a useful compromise, particularly if they help to secure perpetrator confessions. It was hailed as an innovative model for building peace and justice and for holding accountable those guilty of human rights violations. At the same time, it laid the foundation for building reconciliation among all South Africans. Many other countries dealing with postconflict issues have instituted similar methodologies for such commissions, although not always with the same mandate. The South African TRC has provided the world with another tool in the struggle against impunity and the search for justice and peace.

2: The Infallible Word of God.: Truth Established

Finally, the Inter-American Court stresses that, while the establishment of truth commissions is an important means of seeking and establishing the truth, the "historical truth" which commissions establish "does not substitute the State's obligation to also establish the truth through judicial proceedings".

Not a single witness corroborated Kavanaugh classmate Debbie Ramirez, who claimed Kavanaugh waved his penis in her face at a party when the two were classmates at Yale. Mayer Fesses Up Assuming the truth of the evidence-free, uncorroborated, and ultimately unproven charges against Kavanaugh, Elle posed this daunting question: Did you learn anything in your reporting of Thomas that you applied to your reporting of Kavanaugh? Having helped spread the smears against Thomas, Mayer knew what to do: So having watched this before, I knew that key issues would be whether the judge had a pattern of similar behavior, since that helps establish who is telling the truth when there is a standoff, and whether there were credible corroborators on either side. Knowing this is why Ronan Farrow and I were so alert to the significance of other accusers, such as Deborah Ramirez. Her allegation showed that, if true, yes, there was a pattern of misconduct, and likely another side of the judge. The Times had interviewed several dozen people over the past week in an attempt to corroborate her story, and could find no one with firsthand knowledge. Ramirez herself contacted former Yale classmates asking if they recalled the incident and told some of them that she could not be certain Mr. Kavanaugh was the one who exposed himself. Again, Mayer did not claim Kavanaugh is guilty. Why publish unproven allegations? As a reporter, my heart goes out to the powerless and vulnerable who try to tell the truth in the face of great risks, no matter who they are. As a woman, I do feel empathetic toward other women, if they are telling what appears to be the truth. I admire their guts, and their belief that speaking up can right wrongs, and even sometimes change history. We value our readers and encourage their participation, but in order to ensure a positive experience for our readership, we have a few guidelines for commenting on articles. If your post does not follow our policy, it will be deleted. No profanity, racial slurs, direct threats, or threatening language. Please post comments in English. Please keep your comments on topic with the article. If you wish to comment on another subject, you may search for a relevant article and join or start a discussion there.

3: established truth - definition - English

Truth (stylized as truth) is a national campaign aimed at eliminating teen smoking in the United States. "truth" produces television and digital content to encourage teens to reject tobacco and to unite against the tobacco industry.

Rather than think of a proposition as either absolutely true or absolutely false, a pragmatist will consider the consequences of designating the proposition true or false, and decide whether or not to consider it true based on what follows. I think that this is an invaluable method for the formation of scientific theories, but is just not solid enough for a theory of truth in general. Like correspondence theorists, pragmatists think of truth in terms of an agreement between our ideas and reality. What then does it mean to say that truth is an agreement with reality, if our true ideas of objects do not completely agree with their objects? But pragmatism thinks of truth in terms of consequences. If we grant a belief to be true, the pragmatist asks, what experiences would we expect to follow, and do they match up with our actual experiences? This is the essence of the scientific method. Thus truth is not a static relation but a process, or an event that happens to an idea. Verification is what happens to an idea when we determine that it is true based on the available evidence. James points out that in itself, the possession of truth is merely the means to other satisfactions. As an example, he imagines himself lost and starving in the woods and stumbling along a cow-path. His true idea that a house lies at the other end of the path may save his life. For the pragmatist, utility and truth are essentially tied together. All true ideas are potentially beneficial, even if only for the purpose of leading us to other true ideas, and therefore the pragmatists think of the concept of truth itself in terms of the practical advantages it brings. One of the most important aspects of any truth is that it always leads to other truths, and for this reason James believes we do not need complete verification to accept all truths. Things exist in kinds, so for instance we may accept the belief that the object on the wall is a clock without opening it up to verify this because we have held true beliefs previously about other clocks. The belief that the object is a clock worksâ€”it fits into our conceptions of what is true and makes the world more coherentâ€”and therefore we need not examine the clock to verify that it is a clock. In the same vain, we need not go to Japan to verify that Japan actually exists. It makes sense to believe so, and if we were to assume that Japan does not exist, it would call countless other beliefs into question. In this respect, pragmatism is nearly identical to coherence. Because things exist in kinds, James says, indirect verification processes are usually sufficient. In generalising about objects from what we know about only a few of those objects, we will be right ninety-nine out of a hundred times. And so James believes that these processes of verification are just as acceptable when dealing with truth as full-verification processes, with the advantage of being more expedient. In the next section, James defends pragmatism against the obvious objection of rationalism. For the rationalist, that the object on the wall is a clock was true long before any mind even formed the proposition. This is indeed the strongest objection against pragmatism, so James needs an equally forceful counter-argument. James analogises truth to health, wealth, and strength, all of which exist in things before the name given to designate them. It is a fallacy to say that a person has a lot of money because he is wealthy when it is in fact quite the other way around. A person is wealthy because he has a lot of money. He is made wealthy by the accumulation of wealth. The fallacy is most apparent when it comes to strength. We may say a person can lift a lot of weight because he is strong, when in actuality he is only strong because he can lift a lot of weight. James asserts that the same applies to truth. The object on the wall is a clockâ€”this statement is true because it is a clock; it is not a clock because the statement is true. The truth of the statement exists in actuality only when it is verified. The most important aspect of pragmatism, and where it differs absolutely from correspondence, is that we must accept that what is true today may not be true tomorrow. Ptolemaic astronomy, Euclidean geometry, and Aristotelian logic are examples James gives of sciences that were once regarded as true. They worked in their own time to explain the regularity of motion in the heavens, the proportional relations of figures, and the truth value of syllogisms, and so they were regarded as true, which the pragmatist sees no problem with. Now that we have advanced beyond the point where these systems work to incorporate all our knowledge, some of the propositions within them are regarded as false. The sciences we currently go by are thought to be true because thus far they work well to explain the

phenomena we are aware of. But as our awareness expands and our stock of true ideas grows ever larger, we must be prepared to alter the truth value of many of our theories and accept that what is true is not necessarily true forever. The obvious objection to this claim is that if we only believed what it is better for us to believe, the truth would not always fit the bill. For instance, it might be better for a dying child to believe that he is not really dying in order to spare him unnecessary anxiety from the fear of his imminent death. And since what is better to believe is not always the truth, the truth and the good must be separate. Yet this is clearly an inadequate response to the objection. James goes on to say that what is better for us to believe is true unless it clashes with another benefit, which is most usually another truth. The greatest enemy of truth is other truths. So perhaps James would say that if it is better for us to believe some unfounded fancy, we may grant that belief to be true unless it contradicts a belief that we know to be true. Perhaps then we may grant that there is a life after death, because we have no specific truths to defeat that belief. Yet I do not believe that James would want to grant this, as for such a belief there is no verifiability whatsoever and pragmatism as a theory would crumble if it had to admit all beliefs of which verification of truth or falsehood is impossible. The objection is left without an adequate response. In spite of its many problems, pragmatism has two major strengths. The first is its agreement with correspondence theory that our concept of truth has to do with a relation between beliefs and facts in the external world. The second is its inherent fallibilism: Thus the pragmatic theory of truth has the major advantages of both correspondence and coherence while avoiding many of their disadvantages. However, pragmatism suffers from many weaknesses of its own. By discussing truth as a function of propositions rather than a property, it ignores what we mean by truth. When we think of something that is true, we think that it has a certain propertyâ€”that it corresponds to reality. We are not thinking that it is merely useful because it coheres with our existing explanation of reality. It may be the case that something is useful because it is true, but this does not entail as James asserts that if something is useful it is true. If I have a fear of heights and am trapped on the top floor of a burning building, it may be useful to believe I can flyâ€”this will get me out of the window where I will fall to the air mattress below rather than burn to death out of my fear of the fall. My belief was useful but false. I may find it useful to believe in an after-life while I am lying on my death-bed, but this does not make the belief true. The belief is already either true or false, depending on whether I really have an immortal soul, a fact which can not be proven either true or false. Another major weakness is the idea that indirect verification can be just as good a process for making truth as direct examination. Because things exist in kinds, James says, we may make generalisations about all specimens of a certain type from what we know to be true of only a few. He asserts that if we do so we will be right in ninety-nine out of one hundred cases. But what of that hundredth case? Pragmatism will have us grant the property of truth to all cases in spite of the certainty that in some cases this property will be falsely assigned. How can we accept a theory of truth that we already know will be wrong in some cases? In addition, allowing broad generalisations to pass for truth without direct verification, and thus assigning certain properties to all members of a particular class based on properties that we have only verified in a few such members is the essence of prejudice and stereotyping, and ought to be avoided. Finally, the objections that James leaves open are enough to seriously hinder the pragmatic theory, most obviously the objection that truth and the good are separate because it will often be better for us to believe something false or unverifiable than to believe what is true. A man is strong because he can lift heavy weights; it is not the case that he can lift heavy weights because he is strong. James wants to say that the same applies for truth. A proposition is true because it works in reality; it is not the case that it works in reality because it is true. But this analogy does not hold: Ptolemaic astronomy contains many claims that work to explain the motion of heavenly bodies but we now know them to be completely false. This is the fatal flaw of pragmatism as a theory of truth. People used to believe that the world was flat, and this belief worked and was coherent with all other beliefs people encountered in their daily lives. The actual world, however, was still quite round. When new information came to light and people began to realise that the world was round, it did not suddenly change shape. The proposition that the world is flat was false when everyone believed it and it worked within the framework of their knowledge, and it is still false now. The proposition that the world is round was true when nobody believed it and it was unnecessary to know, and it is still true now. Truth is not made, as pragmatism asserts.

The only things that are made when we designate something as true are the reasons we have for making the designation. Still, as a tool for scientific discovery, pragmatism does have much to offer. When constructing theories it is undoubtedly helpful to think of truth as a plastic, changeable thing. If we regarded all previously held truths to be true absolutely, we would never have advanced beyond Ptolemaic astronomy or Aristotelian logic. The essence of the scientific method is to grant truth to whatever explanation works for a given phenomenon, and this idea is at the very core of pragmatism. But as an actual theory for what is completely and absolutely true, pragmatism fails utterly. Therefore, whether you accept or reject the theory depends entirely on what you are interested in accomplishing. If your goal is to expand scientific knowledge, pragmatism is what its name advertises: But if you are interested in actually defining truth and what it really means for something to be true, pragmatism must be rejected in favour of other theories which treat the concept of truth as a concrete, rather than a provisional, phenomenon.

4: Bible Devotion: Truth Established

Truth Established. The lip of truth shall be established for ever; but a lying tongue is but for a moment. (Proverbs) Truth wears well. Time tests it, but it right well endures the trial.

The coherence theory of truth is far stronger, I believe, than Bertrand Russell depicts it, and it is well-defended in this text by Francis Bradley. Bradley himself does not even address the correspondence theory in this text, but merely argues against foundationalism as though this were a complete theory of truth in itself, and the only serious opponent of coherence. I believe that Bradley shows that coherence within a system is a test for truth but not the only test. I would give my complete assent to the third claim only. That infallible truths exist, Bradley begins by showing, is virtually beside the point when we are trying to construct a system of knowledge. As a test of how strong an ultimate fact is, we must ask what we are able to contradict on the basis of the fact. For example, Bradley takes the case of simple sensations a, b, and c, from which you can deny only the denial that a, b, and c exist in any manner or sense. If we take a complex feeling containing both a and b, we can only deny the denial that a and b can ever co-exist in feeling. But these truths do not get us very far. Yet we have now introduced several fallible elements into our judgment. Not only that, but in the case of the sensations themselves there is always a chance of sense-hallucination or a morbid fixed idea, special psychological cases that could arguably render even the fact that one is experiencing such and such a sensation false. Foundationalists might declare that in spite of the weakness of fallible truths, we have no choice but to contend that they exist, otherwise we would have no certain knowledge upon which to build and everything would be subject to scepticism. Bradley agrees that we cannot suppose that it is possible that all judgments of perception and memory are false, but he rejects the notion that that knowledge is a construction that rests on a foundation of certainties. The foundation of truth, according to Bradley, is merely provisional: For Bradley, experience is not a superstructure but a system, and the object of knowledge is to have as comprehensive and coherent a system as possible. To attain this, we must both reflect and continually have recourse to the materials of sense. Some facts must of course be relegated to the world of error, as it would be impossible to maintain a coherent system if all facts presented to us were accepted. But we need not assume that any facts are absolutely certain, but quite the contrary—that all facts are subject to error. We may regard a fact as being true in so far as it coheres within our system, and as a result we will certainly find some facts that will never need to be discarded. But even these strong facts without which the rest of our knowledge would be incoherent are not in principle infallible, and they need not be. The criterion for truth is not certainty, but something much simpler and less demanding. One objection to thinking of all facts as fallible is that truth can never be more than a matter of probability. Bradley recognises this, but believes that it is something we must accept. Coherence theory would not suffer from this problem if we were omniscient beings, because if we knew all facts there would be no room for new facts to call into question the old, and our all-encompassing system of knowledge would be coherent, complete and certain. One might ask Bradley how we are to trust facts of memory within such a system, as if all our memories are called into question it may seem that our structure of knowledge collapses. But for Bradley there is really no difference between facts of memory and facts of perception, as both are justified according to the same criterion. He is justified in believing that Louis XVI was executed because if it were not the case that this well-known historical event took place, such an error would bring too much disturbance into his world. We can assume the truth of facts of memory just as we can assume the truth of widely accepted scientific theories. We can not verify either, but unless there is a reason to doubt we need not do so. Finally, it may be objected that according to this system one can invent an imaginary world even more orderly than the known world, and that this world can be so well-constructed that the facts of the actual world might justifiably be considered to be erroneous while the facts of the fancied world are considered true. Bradley does not take this objection seriously, as it fails to properly understand his criterion for justification, which demands the inclusion of all possible material. One cannot confine oneself within an imaginary world and determine what is true or false from within that framework alone, but all of the materials of the sense must be given due consideration. I believe that Bradley makes an excellent case for

coherence, which stands up well to most criticism. Yet Bradley is also guilty of presenting the alternative to coherence as a far weaker position than it actually is. He certainly shows the flaw in believing that all of our knowledge is built on a foundation of certain, infallible truths, but this is not a critique of correspondence but foundationalism, which is not a complete epistemological theory in itself but merely a feature of many such systems. Coherence is superior to foundationalism, but I do not believe it superior to correspondence for one reason only: Coherence does have two major strengths which are much to its credit. The first is its compatibility with fallibilism, which is a feature that I believe is essential to any valid epistemological theory. I believe that it is utterly impossible for any fact of any kind to be considered absolutely certain. The second major strength of coherence is that it eliminates our need for direct knowledge of the external world, which is the fatal flaw in correspondence theory. We can never know anything beyond our own thoughts, so under the correspondence theory we can never know if anything is true. With coherence we can designate a proposition is true if it makes sense within our existing framework of knowledge without taking that leap of faith and stipulating that it corresponds to some external reality. The belief that an external reality exists can be justified under coherence theory, but its truth is merely provisional and if it turns out to be false it would not undermine coherence theory as it would correspondence. To use the belief in an external world as an example, it can clearly be imagined how one could have a complete and coherent system of knowledge that includes the belief that the real world is merely illusion and that corporeal objects do not actually exist. Another person might have a nearly identical system of knowledge but believe in the existence of the material world. From the principles of coherence alone we would not be able to tell which system is closer to the way things really are. If both systems are coherent they are both equally valid, though they will undoubtedly contain many beliefs which conflict with one another. Of course the coherence theory would collapse if we assume the law of contradiction to be false, but so would every other piece of knowledge we thought we knew. If a proposition and its contradiction could both be true, we might as well give up on all of philosophy and science because knowledge of any kind would be impossible. We must assume the truth of the laws of logic in any system, and to say that the system is flawed because it depends on the truth of these laws is completely unfair. In any case, Bradley would surely respond just as he has in the case of memory: Since we have no reason to doubt the truth of the law of contradiction, we may accept it and continue from there. So while coherence does have its weaknesses, and it is not what most people have in mind when they think of the concept of truth, I believe it is a far stronger position than it is usually given credit for.

5: Truth Established – Rational and Logical Refutations

A word to the wise: do not prank call my parents today to ask if their refrigerator is running. That is, of course, unless you'd like to trigger their post-traumatic stress involving a certain recent refrigerator leak turned flood turned home renovation.

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 –86, 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

HOW IS TRUTH ESTABLISHED? pdf

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.

6: New Yorker Scribe: Kavanaugh Smear Established "Pattern," Not Truth

In proof of this we have signed this paper to establish the truth of the facts, lest the moment should arrive when either of the actors in this terrible scene should be accused of premeditated murder or of infringement of the laws of honor.

First of all, for something to be true it must first be in the Scriptures. On the other hand, if it is not in the scriptures we have even a bigger problem. So, rule number one is: Remember, most false teachings are simply not in the Bible. If we intend to lay a good foundation of truth where should we start? A lot of teachings go astray when the foundation is laid first in prophets. The second one of these principles is that of a multiple witness. Therefore, we shall seek a second and third witness on all points of scripture, in scripture. The third rule is that the "Word of God" is not in conflict with itself. Jesus Christ is the Word of God and is consistent. He does not change. And if a house be divided against itself, that house cannot stand. The last three scriptures are perfect examples of the last two rules of proof. First, they are the examples of the rule that the Word of God does not conflict with itself thus to cause "a kingdom divided", and they are examples that the second and third witness establishes the truth. Scripture does prove itself and the truth is always in harmony. When in our studies we come across a verse of scripture that appears to be in contradiction with other scriptures, we must acknowledge that the one unsupported must fall under the weight of the others which are in agreement. It should also hint to us that there may be a translational error in that verse. This brings me to the last rule of establishing truth we will cover. This is that we must "study" the Word of God, not just read it. It is not sufficient to just listen to someone else teach. Therefore many of them believed;.. It is absolutely imperative that we pierce the veil of modern English translations and go directly to the original languages, just as they did in biblical times. We surely should do the same.

7: Established In Love - She Reads Truth : She Reads Truth

Truth Established C.H. Spurgeon The lip of truth shall be established for ever; but a lying tongue is but for a moment. (Proverbs) Truth wears well.

Constructivist epistemology Social constructivism holds that truth is constructed by social processes, is historically and culturally specific, and that it is in part shaped through the power struggles within a community. Constructivism views all of our knowledge as "constructed," because it does not reflect any external "transcendent" realities as a pure correspondence theory might hold. Rather, perceptions of truth are viewed as contingent on convention, human perception, and social experience. It is believed by constructivists that representations of physical and biological reality, including race , sexuality , and gender , are socially constructed. Giambattista Vico was among the first to claim that history and culture were man-made. Hegel and Marx were among the other early proponents of the premise that truth is, or can be, socially constructed. Marx, like many critical theorists who followed, did not reject the existence of objective truth but rather distinguished between true knowledge and knowledge that has been distorted through power or ideology. For Marx, scientific and true knowledge is "in accordance with the dialectical understanding of history" and ideological knowledge is "an epiphenomenal expression of the relation of material forces in a given economic arrangement". Consensus theory of truth Consensus theory holds that truth is whatever is agreed upon, or in some versions, might come to be agreed upon, by some specified group. Such a group might include all human beings, or a subset thereof consisting of more than one person. Pragmatic theory of truth The three most influential forms of the pragmatic theory of truth were introduced around the turn of the 20th century by Charles Sanders Peirce , William James , and John Dewey. Although Peirce uses words like concordance and correspondence to describe one aspect of the pragmatic sign relation , he is also quite explicit in saying that definitions of truth based on mere correspondence are no more than nominal definitions, which he accords a lower status than real definitions. Defined and named by William Ernest Hocking , this variation is known as "negative pragmatism". Essentially, what works may or may not be true, but what fails cannot be true because the truth always works. For Peirce, the idea of " As Feynman noted, an idea or theory " Pragmatism and negative pragmatism are also closely aligned with the coherence theory of truth in that any testing should not be isolated but rather incorporate knowledge from all human endeavors and experience. The universe is a whole and integrated system, and testing should acknowledge and account for its diversity. As Feynman said, " Deflationary theory of truth Modern developments in the field of philosophy, starting with the relatively modern notion that a theory being old does not necessarily imply that it is completely flawless, have resulted in the rise of a new thesis: This thesis is in part a response to the common use of truth predicates e. In common parlance, truth predicates are not commonly heard, and it would be interpreted as an unusual occurrence were someone to utilise a truth predicate in an everyday conversation when asserting that something is true. Newer perspectives that take this discrepancy into account and work with sentence structures that are actually employed in common discourse can be broadly described: Among the theoretical concerns of these views is to explain away those special cases where it does appear that the concept of truth has peculiar and interesting properties. In addition to highlighting such formal aspects of the predicate "is true", some deflationists point out that the concept enables us to express things that might otherwise require infinitely long sentences. This assertion can also be succinctly expressed by saying: What Michael says is true. The idea that some statements are more actions than communicative statements is not as odd as it may seem. Consider, for example, that when the bride says "I do" at the appropriate time in a wedding, she is performing the act of taking this man to be her lawful wedded husband. She is not describing herself as taking this man, but actually doing so perhaps the most thorough analysis of such "illocutionary acts" is J. Strawson holds that a similar analysis is applicable to all speech acts, not just illocutionary ones: Redundancy theory of truth According to the redundancy theory of truth , asserting that a statement is true is completely equivalent to asserting the statement itself. Redundancy theorists infer from this premise that truth is a redundant concept; that is, it is merely a word that is traditionally used in conversation or writing, generally for emphasis, but not a word that actually equates to

anything in reality. This theory is commonly attributed to Frank P. Ramsey , who held that the use of words like fact and truth was nothing but a roundabout way of asserting a proposition, and that treating these words as separate problems in isolation from judgment was merely a "linguistic muddle". A version of this theory was defended by C. Williams in his book *What is Truth?*. Consider the analogy between the sentence "Snow is white" and the character named Snow White, both of which can be true in some sense. To a minimalist, saying "Snow is white is true" is the same as saying "Snow is white," but to say "Snow White is true" is not the same as saying "Snow White. Philosophical skepticism and Certainty Philosophical skepticism is generally any questioning attitude or doubt towards one or more items of knowledge or belief which ascribe truth to their assertions and propositions. Philosophical skepticism comes in various forms. Radical forms of skepticism deny that knowledge or rational belief is possible and urge us to suspend judgment regarding ascription of truth on many or all controversial matters. More moderate forms of skepticism claim only that nothing can be known with certainty, or that we can know little or nothing about the "big questions" in life, such as whether God exists or whether there is an afterlife. Religious skepticism is "doubt concerning basic religious principles such as immortality, providence, and revelation ". Pluralist theories of truth Several of the major theories of truth hold that there is a particular property the having of which makes a belief or proposition true. Pluralist theories of truth assert that there may be more than one property that makes propositions true: Propositions about the physical world might be true by corresponding to the objects and properties they are about. Some of the pragmatic theories, such as those by Charles Peirce and William James , included aspects of correspondence, coherence and constructivist theories. In some discourses, Wright argued, the role of the truth predicate might be played by the notion of superassertibility.

8: Proverbs Truthful lips endure forever, but a lying tongue lasts only a moment.

Truth and Reconciliation Commission, South Africa (TRC), courtlike body established by the new South African government in to help heal the country and bring about a reconciliation of its people by uncovering the truth about human rights violations that had occurred during the period of apartheid.

History[edit] Florida Tobacco Pilot Program[edit] The "truth" campaign was modeled after a campaign developed by the Florida Tobacco Pilot Program, which ran from to In stark contrast to the heavy "life or death" tone adopted by many anti-tobacco campaigns, the strategy behind "truth" is to emphasize the facts about tobacco products and industry marketing practices, without preaching or talking down to its target audience. Above all, the campaign avoids making directive statements telling youth not to smoke, and instead encourages them to make up their own minds about smoking and the tobacco industry. The Truth Tobacco Documents Library , created in and managed by the University of California San Francisco , houses millions of formerly secret tobacco industry internal corporate documents. This research revealed that although youth were aware of the deadly nature of cigarettes, they were attracted to smoking as a tool for rebellion and empowerment. The "truth" campaign designers wanted to counter the appeal of cigarettes by encouraging teens to rebel against the duplicity and manipulation exhibited by tobacco companies. For example, the iconic "truth" advertisement "" portrays a mass of youth walking up to a major tobacco company building, then suddenly collapsing as if dead while a single youth remains standing with a sign that reads, "Tobacco kills 1, people a day. Ever think about taking a day off? One youth steps forward with a megaphone to shout up at the workers in the building, "do you know how many people tobacco kills every day? This is what people actually looks like. We have the creativity. We will be the generation that ends smoking. This online activism tactic is similar to that used by the Human Rights Campaign when they asked individuals to change their profile pictures in support of marriage equality. In another effort to connect smoking to a teen passion point, "CATmageddon" showed teens that smoking is bad for pets and set up the scenario that if there were no cats due to smoking-related illness and disease there would be no cat videos and therefore there would be a "CATmageddon," a "world devoid of furry kittens and the adorable, hilarious videos that come with them. In , the "truth" campaign showed how the tobacco industry has targeted African-Americans, low-income communities, LGBTQ individuals, members of the military as well as those with mental health conditions. Initial documentary style videos created for this campaign featured comedian and actress Amanda Seales and premiered at the 59th Annual Grammy Awards. Grassroots marketing is done via a team of "truth tour riders" who are sent to popular music and sporting events across the country every summer, including Warped Tour , Mayhem Festival and High School Nation. Each piece of merchandise features a design that corresponds with a fact about smoking. Items are often created in partnership with artists, such as a pair of custom sneakers made in collaboration with Kevin Lyons and Vans shoes. Between and , Truth Initiative known at the time as the American Legacy Foundation conducted a nationally-representative Media Tracking Survey of youth aged 12â€”17 to inform its "truth" campaign evaluation. The Legacy Media Tracking Survey LMTS measured tobacco-related attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors, exposure to smoking influences including "truth", sensation seeking, and openness to smoking. Another study of "truth" from to examined whether campaign awareness and receptivity differed for youth across socioeconomic backgrounds. A similar study published in the American Journal of Preventive Medicine in found a direct association between youth exposure to "truth" messaging and a decreased risk of taking up smoking. In this way, the authors argue "truth" is a cost-effective public health intervention. Awards and praise[edit] The "truth" campaign has been praised by a number of leading federal and state public health officials, [30] as well as the U. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention , [31] and the U. Department of Health and Human Services. The dispute ran from July until its resolution in July In the ad, an actor who identified himself as a dog walker placed a phone call to Lorillard, offering to sell Lorillard the urine from his dogs. Lorillard stated that it would not sue if the foundation agreed to a series of demands. Accordingly, Truth Initiative entered into discussions with Lorillard to attempt an out-of-court resolution. The matter was resolved by the Delaware Supreme Court on July 17, They ruled

unanimously that the "truth" campaign did not violate the Master Settlement Agreement.

9: Truth (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

*The English word truth is derived from Old English $tr\ddot{a}$ - $ew\ddot{a}$ %, $tr\ddot{a}$ - $ow\ddot{a}$ %, $tr\ddot{a}$ - $w\ddot{a}$ %, Middle English $trew\ddot{a}$ %e, cognate to Old High German *triuwida*, Old Norse *troth*, it is a -th nominalisation of the adjective true (Old English $tr\ddot{a}$ - owe).*

Posted by agapegeek Ver 1. Our court system, while not perfect is based upon some significant established Biblical principles. In the Old Testament law God said that if anyone was guilty of breaking the law they were to be tried in a legal court. It is a concept that can be found in our modern courts today. For example, in Numbers In those cases it is practically impossible to determine who is telling the truth and who is not. This law is repeated by God in Deuteronomy God built in a self-protection system that is very important for every Bible student to follow. If you have ever listened to a variety of preachers and teachers of the Bible, you probably noticed that very few of them actually agree on anything. In fact it is actually very easy to make the Bible say whatever you want it to say. Ignorant people, churches, denominations and even intellectual theologians have all proved this reality. But here is what God says about that, in the mouth of two or three witnesses let every word be established 2 Cor You are required to provide the collaborating, cooperating and corresponding testimony of at the least a second witness. There has been a group of individuals that call themselves Christians, that have read a Bible verse from Mark that they say instructs them to handle snakes in their church services. As a result many have been bitten and some have even died. That is a prime example of taking one verse out of context and attempting to make it a crazy doctrine. Snakes are widely spoken of in the Bible and many times they are a symbolic reference to a spiritual evil force that we cannot see. So people have taken a single verse literally and as a result have fallen into error. So the goal to correct Bible interpretation is to find at least two scriptures that say the same thing, even though they might say it using different words. Sometimes you can find a scripture from the Old Testament that is quoted in the New Testament. That certainly qualifies as two witnesses. That is the easiest way to confirm a truth in the mouth of 2 or 3 witnesses. In the book of Revelation chapter 12 there is a symbolic woman clothed with a symbolic sun. In order to figure out who the woman is you have to first figure out who or what the sun is. You see the identity of one is totally dependent on the identity of the other. Does that make sense? Logically the Bible is organized into subjects that can be easily identified because they use the exact same Hebrew or Greek word to convey the subject. It is still the same object, just called something totally different. Let me briefly enlighten you on the identity of the sun in Revelation I would have to write a huge book to go into this in as much depth as it really needs to be explored, but I will not attempt to include everything I know right here. The sun is representative of Jesus Christ. How do I now that? If as I discussed in earlier blogs that the Bible interprets itself, then we should be able to find the identity of the sun in other scriptures in the Bible. Well in Malachi 4: Who do you think that is? This would be the first and most direct witness to this truth. But we still need at least one more witness. So now it become more challenging. There is a verse in Revelation Some think that it is a nearby planet reference, but of course it is the Sun, our closest star to our planet that seems to rise every morning. A totally different way to name the exact same thing, yet they both refer directly to the same physical object. For a third witness of the identity of the Sun we can find it in 2 Peter 1: The sun is our closest star and usually the only one we are able to see during the daylight hours. This one thing will help you more than anything else that I know to correctly divide the Word of God. If you want to understand the Bible correctly, then you must follow the rules that God has given to us or you will remain lost in your ignorance. Learn that there are rules to correct Bible interpretation, learn what these rules are and then live by them and you will benefit tremendously in learning about God and the truth. God Bless you and thanks of reading my Bible lesson on correct Bible Interpretation.

Report of an Independent Task Force End of semester research report x-ray tomosynthesis Synopsis: A Partly Conjectural Outline of Human Evolution World city syndrome The Kenya pioneers Impact of science and technology on human life Maltese anthology Willow And Wattle Cism review manual .zip Fasting : our response to Gods purposes Peter stiling ecology theories and applications New restaurant business plan Developing the emotionally literate school Introduction to the teaching profession Richard wolfson essential university physics 3rd edition The stars in shroud Glencoe life science 2005 national geographic worksheets The story of Gisli the outlaw Stamp with editable fields Christianity, Cults and Religions Pamphlet 10 pack (Compare 18 World Religions and Cults at a Glance!) What great teachers know about the work of great teaching An Englishwoman in a Turkish Harem (Cultures in Dialogue, Series One) Mourning and Modernity On the edge of reason The end of the regime of Mary Tudor Hazardous materials chemistry for emergency responders Wiley Mass Spectral Library 2005 The Computer-Based Patient Record Marsha Is Only a Flower (Step-Into-Reading, Step 3) Concern for the social order Mathematics Today, red [grade 2] 12 Paying Tribute Four Decades Later 491. Organizational Collaboration, Culture, and Performance F.A. Mann (1907-1991 Lawrence Collins Plate section: The Section 8 project-based assistance program Feeding your child North American Mythology Of The Forest Tribes Catholic writers and spontaneous generation. Independence Day celebration Picturepedia an encyclopedia on every page