

Is reality real? (from Big Think)

Post by "Cassius" of January 11, 2022 at 2:10 PM

Yes exactly Kalosyni. That's the ultimate point and probably why that made it into the [principal doctrines](#). If you argue that perceptions are invalid then you have no frame of reference to conclude that anything is certain or even knowable at all.

This is one of those that makes sense to read together to try to figure out the ultimate points. Clearly one basic point is that the perceptions of the senses are the ultimate evidence that any knowledge has to be based on. As to 24 he seems then to be hammering home the point that we know that multiple perceptions can end up pointing in different directions, and so we always have to keep a bright line distinction in our mind that some things we have enough evidence to be certain about, but some we aren't, and we can't confuse the two together.

And that gets back to the references on how we distinguish something as true:

Quote

From Dlogenes Laertius: "for all reason is dependent upon sensations; nor can one sensation refute another, for we attend to them all alike. Again, the fact of apperception confirms the truth of the sensations.

That's Bailey and I see he uses the word "apperception" which might in fact might be a terrible word choice. We need [Don](#) here but it's my understanding from reading commentators is that "apperception" is a more modern word (see [here](#)) and that the better interpretation of this statement is simply that the senses guarantee themselves. In other words you guarantee the truth of the conclusion that the oar is not bent by removing it from the water and looking again, or the truth of the fact that the tower is square and not round by walking closer to the tower and looking at it up close, with the result that the truth of the senses is established by USING them, over and over, and then checking to see if the result is the same or different. For example, YONGE, which says that it is "the reality and evidence of sensation that confirms the certainty of the senses.":

us equally. Again, the reason cannot pronounce on the senses ; for we have already said that all reasoning has the senses for its foundation. Reality and the evidence of sensation establish the certainty of the senses ; for the impressions of sight and hearing are just as real, just as evident, as pain.

Mensch:

all reason is derived from sensation. Nor is any one of the senses superior to another, since we pay heed to them all. And the fact that our perceptions exist guarantees the truth of our sensations; for seeing and hearing are as real to us as feeling pain." Hence, it is from phenomena that we must draw inferences about nonevident realities. For all our thoughts are derived from sensation, either by

But I would argue it is clear that the bottom line is that the truth of the concepts we form is squarely dependent upon the observations of our senses, and that's why it is nonsensical and circular to argue that anticipations ARE concepts (as Bailey seems to do).