



The Different Theories of Truth Three Brothers

(Charles Sanders Peirce, William James And John Dewey)

Novia S. Silalahi¹, Avivah A. Putri², Indah K. Sianturi³, Aprillia Chasanah⁴

noviasariahta05@gmail.com

University of Lancang Kuning, Indonesia

Received : 2 Agustus 2019; Accepted: 20 Oktober 2019

Abstract

The theory of truth is that truth statements consist of practical consequences, especially in agreement with subsequent experience. The purpose of this study is to discuss the different theories of truth proposed by Charles Sanders Peirce, William James and John Dewey. This study uses a qualitative methodology that uses the analysis of this research article to reveal the basic theories and differences from each expert as they are known as pragmatic researchers with their theories of truth. This paper is intended to explore and provide different pragmatic theories of the three truths by Charles Sanders Peirce, William James and John Dewey. This reward research to see that results from differences in the theory of truth by Charles Sanders Peirce, William James and John Dewey which results in that Peirce is often associated with the idea that true beliefs are those who will stand the test in the future; James with the idea that true trust is reliable and also beneficial; while Dewey with that idea claims of ownership are verified (or "valuation"). Therefore, expecting further research is to find the effects of different theories of truth from the three experts in various contexts.

Keywords: theory; truth; different; expert

Introduction

The theory of truth must be related to the history of pragmatism in classical America. Charles Sanders Peirce was the first supporter of the theory of truth while William James was responsible for popularizing the theory of truth, while John Dewey had the role of reframes of the theory of truth. According to Levinson (1983: 5) says that pragmatism is about what is said with the assumed associated with the use of language and context. Meanwhile, according to Leech (1983: 36) said that pragmatic is the involvement between the point of view of the speaker and listener to solve

Novia S. Silalahi, Avivah A. Putri, Indah K. Sianturi, Aprillia Chasanah

The Different Theories of Truth Three Brothers

(Charles Sanders Peirce, William James and John Dewey)

the problem. According to Mey (1994: 3) states that Pragmatics is a science that has a relationship between language and its users. Last but not least, in short, pragmatics is the study of various aspects that depend on the context. To draw means we have to consider how speakers come to express what they want to say about whom they are talking to, where, when and under what circumstances. Pragmatic truth theories themselves often focus more on the practical implications of truth. Specifically, this theory aims as a practical function played by the concept of truth and its relation to actual activities and practices, such as statements and questions in general. The pragmatic theory of truth treats truth as an individual, integrated concept: pragmatic tends to provide an explanation of truth that does not distinguish between various topics on which our beliefs, statements or propositions may be about. For pragmatics, generally, this means that if the mathematical claim is true, it is true in the same way that ethical or scientific claims will come true. The theory of truth can be explained from several dimensions that influence the description of the character of the predicate "right". Informal logic, called arity predicate. The truth of the predicate is then divided according to the number of characters, namely: The predicate monadic is one that applies to the main subject - usually a representation of abstract content - an independent reference to something else. In this case, it can be stated that the truth is right in and from the truth itself. The second is the dyadic predicate. Is the one that applies to the main subject only refers to the second subject. In general, the subject is one additional object, translator, or language representation that gives birth to several relationships. The last one is the predicate triadic. One that applies to the main subject only refers to the second and third subjects. For example, in the pragmatic theory of truth, we must ascertain whether the object of the sign, before it can be said that the sign is true of the object whose agents interpret.

Research Method

This article uses the qualitative methodology of the Analyst chapter with many resources. Select some related articles as a reference to analyze and find a theory and then find out whether or not there are differences between the Three Theories of Charles Sanders Peirce, William James and John Dewey.

Results

Theory of Truth by Charles Sanders Peirce

Charles Sanders Peirce (1839-1914) was an American philosopher, logician and scientist who was generally recognized as the first person to propose a "pragmatic" theory of truth. The meaning of the concept of "truth" refers to the practical role which then uses terms that describe belief as true. Peirce states that true trust has finally received general acceptance to withhold future questions.

"In 1901 Peirce stated in his writings that truth is a concordance of abstract statements with an ideal boundary in the direction where endless inquiry often leads to scientific beliefs. As a reference in explaining investigations, Peirce's concern is how we arrive at the stage of owning and holding opinions. Some beliefs may last a long time but won't last for investigation and investigation. For Peirce, true believers are people who have and will continue to maintain the ongoing investigation. In practical terms chosen by Peirce, this means that having true belief means having reliable belief in facing all challenges in the future."

"In particular, Peirce was sceptical that a coarse truth-theoretic correspondence theory, the idea that true belief in facts had much use to say about the concept of truth. The problem with the theory of correspondence of truth, according to him, is that it is only 'nominal' which is true and therefore 'useless'. Peirce said that "if truth and falsity mean you are something that is not defined in terms of doubt and belief in any way, then you are talking about the existence of an entity you can find out about anything, and that Ockham's razor will clean the shave off." "Your problem will be greatly simplified if instead of saying that you want to know the "truth", you only say that you want to reach a state of confidence that is unshakeable by doubt. (1905 [1998: 336])". For Peirce, true belief is one that is indefeasible and immovable — and indefeasible and immovable for all the right reasons: that is because it will stand up to all further investigation and inquiry. In other words, if we reach a stage where we are no longer able to increase our confidence, there is no point in holding that "right" title. (Misak 2000: 101).

Theory of Truth by William James

William James (1842-1910) was a psychologist and philosopher who was involved in popularizing pragmatic truth theories. James emphasizes that truth is a kind of satisfaction: satisfying true belief, in a certain sense. James points out that true beliefs can be satisfactorily impenetrable and immovable: in short, that is, how they will stand up to an investigation and survive an ongoing investigation.

At the beginning of writings around the twentieth century, Peirce was not yet widely available. As a result, pragmatic truth theories are often identified with

Novia S. Silalahi, Avivah A. Putri, Indah K. Sianturi, Aprillia Chasanah

The Different Theories of Truth Three Brothers

(Charles Sanders Peirce, William James and John Dewey)

James's account. James was in turn accused of criticizing deliberate misunderstanding: it was because he wrote in an easily accessible and attractive style that critics "had corrupted every word they could destroy, and refused to remove spirits from our discourse letters."

However, it also happens that James tends to neglect to say that the difference between (a) conveying a description of true ideas and (b) providing a translation of the concept of truth. This means that, while James's theory can provide a realistic psychological explanation for why we should care about the truth and the theory fails to explain many things about the actual concept of truth or what makes the idea true. In the preface to the *Meaning of Truth*, he multiplies himself by quoting many previous claims and notes that "when pragmatics speak the truth, they exclusively mean something about ideas, so they can be applied".

"James's points emerge as follows; from the blade From a practical point of view, we use the concept of truth to signal our belief in certain ideas or beliefs; True beliefs are beliefs that can be acted upon, can be relied upon, and lead to predictable results; further speculation about useless disorders. It often seems that James understands the concept of truth in terms of verification: thus, 'right is the name for whatever idea begins the verification process, what is useful is the name for the function completed inexperience'." And, more generally:

"The truth for us is merely a collective name for verification-processes, such as health, wealth, power, etc., names for other processes connected with life, and are also being pursued paying to pursue them (1907 [1975: 104]) "

James seems to be claiming that verification is what makes the right idea because having lots of money is something that can make someone rich. To be verified correctly:

"The truth occurs as the idea becomes reality, made true with the truth. Honesty event is an event, a process: the verification process itself, for which the validity of verification is valid (1907 [1975: 97], emphasis in original) "

As Peirce, James found that the pragmatic account of the theory of correspondence of truth is superior because it determines concretely what it means for ideas to correspond or "agree" with reality. "For the pragmatic, this agreement consists of causing "with reality and nothing else" in a way that results in "satisfaction as a result" (1909 [1975: 104])." With sometimes in determining the truth about verification and also to uncover the agreement of ideas and reality in pragmatic terms, James's story both criticizes and tries to co-opt the theory of truth correspondence.

John Dewey's Theory of Truth

John Dewey (1859-1952) is the third figure of the golden age of classical American pragmatism, Dewey is an expert who says little about the concept of truth, at first glance, Dewey's truth looks like a combination of Peirce and James' stories. As Peirce, Dewey emphasized the relationship between truth and close scientific inquiry; like James, Dewey's view of the truth as a result of past investigations is not verified as the result of anticipated investigations that continue into an unlimited future. For example, in 1911 he wrote that:

"From the standpoint of scientific inquiry, the truth of trust shows is not only accepted but belief is accepted in the virtue of certain methods. ... For science, the truth of faith is verified, propositions that arise from certain procedures of investigation and testing. I mean that if a scientific man is asked to point to an example of what is meant by truth, he will choose ... the belief that the results of the investigation of the best techniques available in a particular field, and he will do so no matter what his conception of the nature of truth (1911 [2008: 28]). "

Dewey's point is that a true proposition is when the preposition is acted upon, and the acted preposition leads to the type of outcome that is predictable and reliable. And these results are the advantages of scientific verification, which are broadly interpreted. From a pragmatic point of view, the process of scientific verification leads to matching expectations and results, a process that gives us all the "correspondence" we can ask for. Dewey eventually came to believe that conventional philosophical terms such as "truth" and "knowledge" were burdened with so many things, and had become so petrified, it was difficult to understand the practical role these terms were originally presented. As a result, in subsequent writings, Dewey largely avoided talking about "truth" or "knowledge" while not focusing on the function played by this concept. "With its 1938 *Logic: Dewey's Theory of Talking about "assessability guarantees"* as an objective of inquiry, uses this term in place of both "truth" and "knowledge" (1938 [2008: 15-16])."

Dewey reserves in terms of "rights" only for claims that the product has to control the investigation. This means that claims are not true before being verified, but it is a verification process that makes them true:

"Truth and falsehood are the only property that subject-matter ultimately, closure, inquiry in the manner achieved (1941: 176)."

"Second, Dewey insisted that only "judgment" - not "proposition" - can really be seen as a bearer of truth. For Dewey, "propositions" are proposals and working hypotheses used, through an investigation process for verifiable conclusions and judgments. Thus, propositions may be more or less relevant to the existing investigation but they are, expressly, true or false (1941: 176)." "Instead, truth and falsehood are provided for "judgment" or "the results of the completion of

the investigation" (1941: 175; 1938 [2008: 124];" "Burke 1994): claims, in other words, are guaranteed to be accountable. Third, Dewey continues to argue that this pragmatic approach to truth is "the only thing worth mentioning the theory of correspondence of truth". In response, we see it turning to "justified judgments", drawing a distinction between "propositions" and "judgments", and the basis of the concept of truth (or justified judgments) in scientific inquiry (Thayer 1947; Burke 1994)." "This adjustment is designed to expand, clarify and improve Peirce and James accounts. Do they do it is an open question? Of course many, like Quine, conclude that Dewey only avoids important questions about truth: that Dewey's strategy is "to avoid the truth of the predicate and limp along with guarantees of trust" (Quine 2008: 165)."

Conclusion and Limitations

According to the history in the pragmatic Peirce, James, and Dewey are the people who have the greatest influence in determining the size for what constitutes a pragmatic truth theory - even though their differences are also quite significant, and then they slowly modify and clarify them. Their situation is too enthusiastic in responding to both criticism and praise. although this can make it difficult to decipher a single definition, historically, it is counted as a pragmatic truth theory, although several common themes are interrupted in each of their accounts.

First, in each note begins with a pragmatic analysis of the meaning of the predicate truth. Assuming that describing trust as "right" must be able to make a kind of practical difference, which can contribute to explaining this difference.

Second, on each account and then linking the truth between specifics and investigations: describing the component to claim to be true is to say that he has or will stand for scrutiny.

Third, each account rejects the theory of correspondence which is considered too abstract. Or, more precisely, any attempt to redefine correspondence in pragmatic terms, as an agreement between claims and prediction results.

While in the actual story offered by Peirce, James, and Dewey found several defenders with pragmatic theories from the mid-twentieth century with the most active truth themes that set the path for future versions of pragmatic theories of truth. Which in each of these stories rejects the theory of correspondence of truth because it is considered too abstract. Or, more precisely, each of them tries to redefine correspondence into pragmatic terms, as an agreement between claims and prediction results.

Based on the description above it can be concluded that the difference theorist of the three truths is that Peirce said that truth theory is based on the practical role played by the concept of truth, James also stressed that truth is a kind of satisfaction: satisfying true beliefs, in a certain sense. Meanwhile,

Dewey stressed the relationship between truth and good scientific inquiry; Dewey's view of truth is a result of the past investigations was not verified as the result of anticipated investigations that continued into the unlimited future.

References

- Almeder, R. (1986). A definition of pragmatism. *History of Philosophy Quarterly*, 3(1), 79-87.
- Armstrong, A. C. (1909, July). The Evolution of Pragmatism. In *Bericht über den III. Internationalen Kongress für Philosophie* (pp. 720-726).
- Capps, J. (2017). A Pragmatic Argument for a Pragmatic Theory of Truth. *contemporary pragmatism*, 14(2), 135-156.
- Capps, J. (2019). Pragmatic theory of truth.
- da Costa, N. C. (1989). Logic and pragmatic truth. In *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics* (Vol. 126, pp. 247-261). Elsevier.
- Dewey, J. (1916). The pragmatism of Peirce. *The Journal of Philosophy, Psychology and Scientific Methods*, 13(26), 709-715.
- Ezorsky, G. (1967). Pragmatic theory of truth.
- Feng, C. H. E. N. (2005). On the Development of Pragmatic Theory of Truth. *Journal of Hanzhong Teachers College*, (1), 9.
- Hamuddin, B. (2012). A comparative study of politeness strategies in economic journals (Doctoral dissertation, University of Malaya).
- Herdi, H. (2014). The Abilities in Applying Verb Tenses in Writing Sentence Using Mixed Model. *ELT-Lectura*, 1(1).
- Hollinger, D. A. (1980). The problem of pragmatism in American history. *The Journal of American History*, 67(1), 88-107.
- <http://dyrahadi.blogspot.com/2015/03/fundamentals-of-pragmatics.html>
- <http://eprints.uny.ac.id/9086/3/bab%202-07211144028.pdf>
- James, W., Burkhardt, F., & Thayer, H. S. (1975). *Pragmatism* (Vol. 1). Harvard University Press.
- Kirkham, RL (1992). *Theory of truth: A critical introduction*.
- Menand, L. (1997). *Pragmatism: A reader*.
- Misak, C. (2002). *Truth, politics, morality: Pragmatism and deliberation*. Routledge.
- Ormerod, R. (2006). The history and ideas of pragmatism. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 57(8), 892-909.
- Quan-hua, W. U. (2003). The Educational Inspiration of the Pragmatic Theory of Truth. *Journal of South China Normal University (Social Science Edition)*, (1), 14.
- Rorty, R. (2000). Pragmatism. *International Journal of psycho-analysis*, 81(4), 819-823.
- Snarey, J., & Olson, P. (2003). Article review of the pragmatism of the Founding

Novia S. Silalahi, Avivah A. Putri, Indah K. Sianturi, Aprillia Chasanah

The Different Theories of Truth Three Brothers

(Charles Sanders Peirce, William James and John Dewey)

Brothers. *Journal of Moral Education*, 32 (1), 91-95.

Soames, S. (1984). What is a Theory of Truth?. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 81(8), 411-429.

Soames, S. (1984). What is Truth Theory? *The Journal of Philosophy*, 81 (8), 411-429.

Suckiel, E. K. (1982). The pragmatic philosophy of William James.

Suckiel, EK (1982). William James's pragmatic philosophy.

Van Fraassen, B. (1988). The pragmatic theory of explanation. *Theories of Explanation*, 135-155.

White, H. (2010). William James's Pragmatism. Ethics and The Individualism of Others. *European Journal of Pragmatism and American Philosophy*, 2(II-1).

Williams, M. (2010). Pragmatism, minimalism, expressivism. *International Journal of Philosophical Studies*, 18(3), 317-330.