

SLIDE	NOTES
1	<p>TITLE</p> <p>In this module we discuss attacks on truth with various "isms" or false philosophical systems.</p>
2	<p>PRAGMATISM</p> <p>Anim1: Quote Wikipedia</p> <p>Anim1: Quote Ayn Rand</p> <p>* Do not confuse pragmatism with the "pragmatic test of truth" we described in the previous chapter.</p> <p>* At the root of pragmatism is a belief in the primacy of consciousness in which there is no such thing as objective reality, whereas the "pragmatic test" assumes an objective reality for evaluating the test.</p> <p>What is the problem with "do what works" being your definition of truth?</p> <p>Doing what works is like measuring while denying the existence of the yardstick. It begs a deeper question:</p> <p>How do you define what works?</p> <p>You have to try everything out as if it were your first time, because how do you know what worked in this instance predicts whether something similar will work the next time? Since you keep no set of logical principles that are objectively true based on an external reality, everything you come across is a "one-of-a-kind" each time.</p>
3	<p>PRAGMATISM</p> <p>* For example: Russian Roulette, thinking you can control actions with your mind.</p> <p>* Here is an example of the danger in treating everything as "one-of-a-kind" and not building up any reusable structures of conceptual knowledge.</p>
4	<p>* The PRAGMATIC DEFINITION of TRUTH (truth is that which works) is a false definition which leads to subjective statements like: "What works for you is different than what works for me, but that's OK. We're both right."</p> <p>What if it works for you but not for me? Are we both right?</p> <p>How do you define what works? (You have to pull the trigger every time and see what happens)</p> <p>Anim1-5: Russian Roulette...1...2...3...4...Must be true!...5...Boom!</p> <p>This confuses a TEST of truth for the DEFINITION of truth ... which makes truth dependent upon SUBJECTIVE EXPERIENCE rather than OBJECTIVE REALITY. There is no standard, so you must pull the trigger every time. Tests of Truth are not definitions of truth:</p>
5	<p>Other flavors that have been around for a long time...4 Damning "isms"</p> <p>Anim1: Relativism</p> <p>Relativism claims that truth changes according to conditions such as time, and place. In other words, there is no universal, objective truth.</p> <p>Anim2: Quote Elder Christopherson</p> <p>Anim4: Skeptisicm</p> <p>Skepticism is the theory that certain knowledge is impossible. Skeptics claim that reality does not exist independent of the mind, or if perchance, such an independent reality does exist, we are completely cut off from it, trapped behind our own invalid senses and our limited perspective. For a skeptic, truth is unknowable because reality is unknowable.</p> <p>Anim5: Quote Ayn Rand</p> <p>Anim6: Subjectivism</p> <p>Subjectivism is the philosophy that our own consciousness is the only unquestionable fact of experience and that there is no external or objective truth.</p> <p>Anim7: Quote Ayn Rand</p> <p>Anim8: Dogmatism</p>

	<p>Dogmatism is a form of false certitude by holding onto a view 'no matter what' regardless of potential facts to the contrary.</p> <p>Anim9: Quote Boyd K. Packer</p> <p>* These false beliefs all similarly undercut mankind's reason by declaring truth to be either subjective (varying from person to person) or unknowable.</p>
6	<p>Such attacks on man's reason are not new...Cratylus (as far back as the late 5th Century B.C.) was such an attacker...(read the slide)</p> <p>Where does this put mankind on the intelligence scale?</p> <p>Anim1: There is a varying intelligence scale...Ranging in capability from "Dumb as a Rock" to capable of "Abstract Conceptual Thought" (reason)</p> <p>Anim2: Aristotle recognized early these foolish attacks on man's reason, and where to categorize those who advocated such foolishness..."Cabbage Heads"</p>
7	<p>OBJECTIVE STANDARD OF TRUTH</p> <p>With our definition of Truth as correspondence of thought with reality, we have an objective standard of TRUE and FALSE since reality is the same for everyone.</p> <p>* Truth is always direct line of sight between you and Reality.</p> <p>Anim1: In practice this means NOTHING comes between you and reality as the standard of truth.</p> <p>* Existence ALWAYS gets Tier1 Status...</p> <p>* Consciousness ALWAYS gets Tier2 Status.</p> <p>Anim2: This is the Lord's definition of truth (D&C 93:24)</p>
8	<p>What can screw this up?</p> <p>Anim1:</p> <p>* Anything that gets between you and reality.</p> <p>* Replacing the Standard of Truth (D&C 93:24) with a Source of Truth.</p> <p>* The following are numerous potentially valid or invalid SOURCES of truth, but all are invalid standards of truth.</p> <p>* In other words, giving Tier2 Status to Reality and Tier1 status to ANYTHING (either valid or invalid) between you and it. Such as:</p> <p>Anim2: Subjective Feelings...Presented by mystics as a mysterious higher way of determining truth.</p> <p>Anim3: Popular opinions...Internet mob</p> <p>Anim4: Expert opinions...expert scientists who say "because of my PhD I am the standard"</p> <p>Anim5: Scriptures (written by Persons...The Standard Works are not the standard of truth, but are valid sources of Truth)...</p> <p>* Elder Cannon Quote, I can play the Bible like a fiddle. Scriptures then become a quoting contest (wresting the scriptures) pitting one against each other.</p> <p>Anim6: Prophets are persons...If there are true prophets then there are also false prophets.</p> <p>* Prophets can potentially be a valid source of Truth, not a Standard of Truth...Otherwise it becomes General authority poker (pitting Peter against Paul)...Who said what? Who trumps the other when there is an appearance of contradiction?</p> <p>Anim7: God is a person...If there can be true Gods there can be false gods.</p> <p>True God is a valid source of Truth, not the Standard of Truth. Otherwise it then becomes "Which God? Who's God"...</p>

	<p>* You come to know reality before you come to know God. Babies first learn reality before they know any higher power.</p> <p>* Like Joseph Smith described in his time with everyone speaking authoritatively for their version of God...With much confusion. The Methodist crying "Lo Here! Other sects Crying Lo There!" (JS 1:5)...</p> <p>* Or worse in our time, "Allah Akbar" (kaboom or heads rolling)!</p> <p>* Even God didn't say "truth is what I say it is"... "I am the truth" means source of truth not standard of truth.</p> <p>Anim8: God, Faith, and Heart are all subjective STANDARDS of truth with every Consciousness becoming a Law unto themselves and competing.</p> <p>* With Primacy of consciousness, the question in all of these is "Which God", "Which Prophet", "Which Expert".</p> <p>Many of these sources are Valid...How do we fit them into our discovery of truth?</p>
9	<p>Don't let them replace the standard by having them get between you and reality, but use them to advise you in discovering the truth.</p> <p>* 3-Tier Primacy...Remember, Primacy is not either/or, but is ordering. This is all about your life (not anyone else's)</p>
10	<p>Many of the following fallacies have Latin names because they have been around for such a long time (even back to Aristotle)...It is kind of a fun thing to collect and categorize various fallacies (like baseball cards).</p> <p>FEELINGS (argumentum ad passiones)</p> <p>* D&C 93:24 does NOT say "Truth is what you feel it is".</p> <p>* Appeal to emotion is a logical fallacy characterized by manipulation of emotions such as fear, pity, or joy, in the absence of verifiable factual evidence. ...</p> <p>* Emotions are real, but subjective, telling YOU what YOU value. Other people <i>MAY</i> value the same things you value, but there is no guarantee.</p> <p>* You have your emotions, and they have their emotions, and neither person is duty bound to obey the emotions of the other as factual truth.</p> <p>Anim1: Giving Emotions improper primacy (willfulness) can cause trouble in any of the 5 branches of Philosophy.</p> <p>Anim2: Quote Obi Won Kanobi from the movie Star Wars Emotions are not a means of cognition for learning about the external world.</p> <p>Anim3: Quote Hymn 336...Latter-day Saints often sing the correct primacy together.</p>
11	<p>POPULAR OPINION (argumentum ad populum)</p> <p>D&C 93:24 does NOT say "Truth is what the majority of people believe".</p> <p>Anim1: Read the explanation</p> <p>Anim2: Read the explanation ... Willfulness of many people. Teenagers fall particular prey to this one. Sales to the teen market make a lot of money off from it.</p> <p>* Abdicating your reason to someone else.</p>
12	<p>APPEAL TO AUTHORITY (argumentum ad verecundiam)</p> <p>D&C 93:24 does NOT say "Truth is what the expert, or authority says it is".</p> <p>* Appeal to authority is a logical fallacy which appeals to some form of expert or authority figure.</p> <p>Anim1: Read the explanation</p> <p>Anim2: Read the explanation ... Teenagers also fall particular prey to this one. Sales to the teen market make a lot of money off from it.</p> <p>* Abdicating your reason to someone else</p>
13	<p>SCRIPTURES</p> <p>D&C 93:24 does NOT say "The Bible says It, I believe it, that settles it."</p> <p>Anim1: Quote Elder George Q. Cannon</p>

	<p>While it is certainly true that the Bible is like the fiddle, in that every kind of tune can be played upon it, what must always be remembered is that there are:</p> <p>(1) tunes that will save you, and</p> <p>(2) tunes that will damn you;</p> <p>So you must be very careful as to which tunes you dance to.</p>
14	<p>PROPHETS</p> <p>D&C 93:24 does NOT say "Truth is what the prophet says it is."</p> <p>* For those of us who are religiously inclined, prophets are valuable <i>sources</i> of truth, but it is false to have any person in authority be the <i>standard</i> of truth. This then turns into BLIND OBEDIENCE.</p> <p>What do you think modern prophets themselves would say about doing what they say "no matter what"?</p> <p>If you can play the scriptures like a fiddle... You can also do it with modern Church leaders.</p> <p>Anim1: Quote Elder Dallin H. Oaks</p> <p>Anim2: Quote President Brigham Young</p>
15	<p>Blind obedience and blind faith are destructive.</p> <p>Anim: Quote Joseph Smith</p> <p>We are taught to listen to what is being taught and get our own confirmation.</p>
16	<p>GOD</p> <p>God Himself did NOT say "Truth is what I say it is."</p> <p>* It then becomes "Who's God? And what is he saying?"... The Sept. 11 attacks were done in the name of Duty to God.</p> <p>* Those who believe in the absolutism of God have a very different perspective from Latter-day Saints.</p> <p>Anim1: Quote Mother Teresa</p> <p>Anim2: Quote Mother Teresa</p> <p>Anim3: Quote Mother Teresa</p> <p>Blind absolute confidence? Unthinking pencils? Praying for slavery? Is the purpose of mortality really to become unthinking pencils, or puppets in slavery to the will of God?</p> <p>Whose plan from the pre-mortal life does slavery and mindless-tools sound like?</p>
17	<p>GOD'S FREE MAN</p> <p>Quote LDS.org: agency</p> <p>Anim1: Quote President John Taylor</p> <p>Anim2: Quote President Joseph F. Smith</p> <p>The restored gospel of Jesus Christ proclaims mankind has agency, but don't we Latter-day Saints also believe in being obedient to God's will?</p> <p>Anim3: Quote Luke 22:42 and Helaman 14:30</p> <p>Is there an apparent contradiction between Luke 22:42 and Helaman 14:30?</p> <p>Often, people misquote Christ's words in Gethsemane as evidence of a requirement of blind obedience to God.</p> <p>* We can't BOTH have the will of God being enforced absolutely AND preserve the moral agency of man.</p> <p>* Giving tier-1 status to "Thy Will" and tier-2 status to "My Will" makes God a cosmic dictator with mankind his slave.</p> <p>Anim4: Three-Tier Resolution</p> <p>* Moral agency comes from tier-1 "My Will" and tier-2 "Thy Will".</p> <p>* Obedience comes from tier-2 "Thy Will" and tier-3 "My Will".</p> <p>* The law of obedience is not, nor ever will be a law of blind obedience. A clarifying phrase that BOTH preserves agency AND obedience would be:</p> <p>"It is my will that thy will becomes my will."</p>
18	<p>Questions? Rating?</p>