

**To What Extent Do You Agree with The Claim That "There's a World of Difference
Between Truth and Facts"**

Student's Name

Institutional Affiliation

Course

Professor

Date

To What Extent Do You Agree with The Claim That "There's a World of Difference Between Truth and Facts"

Marcus Aurelius said, "everything we hear is an opinion, not a fact, and everything we see is a perspective, not the truth." When looking at knowledge, we are sometimes confused trying to differentiate between facts and the truth. Truth involves something which is completely the case. Facts are mostly something that occurs or exists in reality. Truths differ from facts in that it is far more subjective and contextualized. Facts are independent matters rather than subjective ones (Devine, 2018). It means that they are mostly tied with proof as it defends the assertion of knowledge. Unlike truth which has profound moral implications, facts have a more utilitarian suggestion. Since facts are reality being measured by individuals, I believe that the truth of the facts relies on the technique or approach they concede to create proof and validation to back their assertions about the facts (Devine, 2018). However, the assertion about the facts might be impacted by the changed views and understandings, distressing the consistency of the understanding achieved by the public. The phrase "To what extend" is an expression that shows how true the claim is. "World of difference" emphasizes how the two words (truth and facts) might differ. This paper will explore the extent to which information acquired through different areas of knowledge shows a world of difference between truth and facts. As a result, I will utilize two areas of knowledge: Natural science and history, to determine the difference between truth and facts.

Natural Science

In natural science, there is "a world of difference between truth and facts. The knowledge contexts make us reflect on the purpose of investigation in our areas of knowledge. Natural science acquires its knowledge through experiments, which shows that facts are founded

on the outcome of the experimentation, while truth can be postulation. For any scientist to develop a knowledge claim, they must proceed with an experiment to prove the scientific theory. However, no single experiment can provide evidence of the truth of a scientific theory, and all that is issued is a demonstration that its validity extends or fails. Therefore, for truth, scientists make assumptions to conclude the test outcomes. For instance, earlier in my biology class, we learned about the Davson-Danielli model suggested by Davson and Danielli in 1935, describing the structure of plasma membranes in cells (Njiruh, 2018). This idea suggested that plasma membranes contain a phospholipid layer between two protein layers. Such context explains how the methodical facts were founded on the reflection on the outcome of the experimentation. At the same time, assumptions were made by the scientist after the observation. However, it is hard to tell whether the model was true since it was just a model, and only a postulation was prepared on its structure. After Singer-Nicolson made an analysis, the Davson-Danielli model was falsified. The results showed that the protein layers are surrounded by the phospholipid bilayer rather than on the outside, as suggested by Davson and Danielli model (Njiruh, 2016). Such facts prove that natural science has no absolute truth since it only depends on assumptions. The rationality of the experimentation must supplement the approximate test. In this case, the pragmatic theory of truth can be utilized to be reflected as true. However, paradigm changes in terms of the transformations in scientific evidence might influence this pragmatic theory of truth. Such facts conclude that scientific facts are meant to change over time; hence no absolute truth. Therefore, I agree that truth and fact in natural science have “a world of difference” when scientists investigate an occurrence, especially one that no longer exists in our natural world.

On the other hand, scientific facts founded on the result of the experiment can be deceptive due to misconstruction by the scientist. For instance, the scientist revealed that sperms

do not swim for them to fuse with the ovary, but they spin. Such a new finding has fabricated Antonie Van Leeuwenhoek's assertion made in the 17th century using a microscope.

Leeuwenhoek defined sperms as a "living animalcule" with a "tail" and was believed to swim like eels (Fransen, 2019). Since then, people's viewpoint that sperms swim like eels has not altered, and this insight even worked when experts utilized a contemporary microscope to observe sperm movement. Therefore, it is believed that sperm swimming utilizes the pragmatic concept of truth as it is convenient. However, the correspondence theory of reality is overruled since it is not consistent with the new finding that sperms spin rather than swim (Devine, 2018). You might expect a new finding about sperm movement since it utilizes paradigm modification, and a scientist constantly performs their investigation to improve our knowledge. However, authority balance might occur since we logically try to follow a lead that can be reliable. For example, in natural science, we believe experts since they are consistent specialists for us to trust. Hence, we try to put unreasonable trust in the knowledge assertion on them deprived of faith.

However, there is not "a world of difference between truth and fact in natural science. Even though the two terms are different, truth and fact seem alike. Facts in natural science are empirical and result from the scientific method after the observation is completed (Njiruh, 2018). Truth is the outcome of several scientific interpretations made by a methodical specialist. Therefore, even though we can suppose that truth is absolute due to the forceful nature of the (AoK), we can conclude that it is near to facts than in another area of knowledge.

History

There is a substantial extent in the "world of difference" between truth and facts in history. The two terms are distinct, where facts display a straightforward and restricted

perception of historical occasions (Baggini, 2017). In history, facts are the different pieces of proof or resources that are accessible by historians. Truth is the outcome of the assessment of accessible resources and their understanding by historians (Baggini, 2017). Truth delivers the interpretation and points that mark history more individual and significant to society. During the history classes, we try to address historic truths as things that are supple and very reliant on beliefs and perceptions (Baggini, 2017). We would write essays and frequently respond to "To what extent" inquiries, and we are responsible for finding clarification and providing purpose for how far we reach an agreement with a specified historic truth. The point that we finish such inquiries when assessing historical occurrences shows that truth is in historical interpretations for perceptions and is not constantly unbiased. Hence, it is a world of difference away from facts.

Different battles throughout history can prove the difference between truth and fact. For instance, in 1511, Malacca Empire was occupied by the Portuguese army led by Alfonso de Albuquerque. One of the causes of its conquest was the old-fashioned weapons used by its soldiers (Desai, 2018). These facts were detailed in several texts, and objects were identified to show the occurrence of the incident. In the perspective of truth, such ancient facts are incorporated into the history subject in Malaysian schools, making the individual believe in the truth that Malacca individuals had outdated technology by correspondence theory of truth. This truth corresponds with the weapons of the Malaccans during the conquest, including the spear, Keris, arrow, and bow. This shows that facts can prove truth since Malaysian students believe that they have developed traditional weapons for ages based on the facts.

However, it can be reasoned that there is no "world of difference between truth and facts" when we conclude that the truths of authorities are respected over those of mere people in this AoK. Irrespective of whether an individual's truth is that the Malaccans were defeated, the truth

of many historians who are specialists in Malaysian believe that they lost the war due to their traditional weapons (Desai, 2018). Since historians' truth corresponds to the facts, it could be concluded that there is no "world of difference" between truth and facts.

Conclusion

While there is a variance between truth and fact, I agree that they have a "world of difference." Natural science and history contrast in that while natural science investigates the physical world as we exist, history assesses past events. However, in the two AOK, truth and fact can be complexly connected since truth can be realized over examining facts, and the rationality of a fact can be measured by how fit it relates to the truth. I believe that neither fact nor truth should be considered complete and unbiased knowledge since they can all be manipulated. However, through evidence, I think we must recognize that what we see is what the general public is giving us as facts when examining truth and contemplating whose truth it may be.

References

- Baggini, J. (2017). *A short history of truth: Consolations for a post-truth world*. Quercus.
- Desai, D. S. (2018). The Portuguese Administration in Malacca, 1511–1641. In *Local Government in European Overseas Empires, 1450–1800* (pp. 517–528). Routledge.
- Devine, N. (2018). Beyond truth and non-truth. In *Post-truth, fake news* (pp. 161–168). Springer, Singapore.
- Fransen, S. (2019). Antoni van Leeuwenhoek, his images and draughtsmen. *Perspectives on Science*, 27(3), 485–544.
- Njiruh, N. P. (2016). The cell membrane Structure.