



On the Signifier Independence of Truth in the Correspondence Theory of Truth

Yang I Pachankis*

Universal Life Church, Chongqing, China

*Corresponding author: Yang I Pachankis, Universal Life Church, Chongqing, China

Received Date: January 12, 2024

Published Date: January 30, 2024

Abstract

The research approaches the correspondence theory of truth with Ferdinand de Saussure's Sign Theory. By Kant's epistemological constructivism, the research analyses into both the subjective and objective facets of epistemology in the correspondence theory of truth. The medium, the signifier, and the signified are arranged teleological to the truth in scientific activities, and the correspondence thereof. It reflects on the human-centric and anthropocentric tendencies in modern and contemporary science contributed by the economy of correspondence. The epistemic relationship between anthropocentrism and technologies are discussed with the consciousness nature of the correspondence theory of truth.

Keywords: Medium; phenomenology of truth; objective epistemology; language; consciousness; pure I

Introduction

Kant's epistemological constructivism is the foundation of modern science and scientific communication. The phenomenological representation of the cognized to a conscious subject communicated through concepts shaped the correspondence theory of truth [1]. However, the objectively introspective notion of epistemology seems to deny there is any possible path to objective epistemology, and metaphysics remained with transcendental idealism [2]. An anthropological perspective persists with textual and literary criticism with the empirical and developmental path in knowledge and the theory of truth, for the dominant role of linguistics in scientific communication [3]. A detail is not usually taken into consideration in the trends in philosophy is the role of medium in the containment and delivery of signs, and the emphasis on "correspondence" in the theory of truth originates from the severance of individuality. I approach the research problem with Ferdinand de Saussure's Sign Theory. By signs and the media conveying them, I expand the concept to

encompass biological forms such as humans. In our constructs of consciousness, active use of language and signs are posteriori and the actions of communication have come too accustomed to touch on our awareness [4]. Therefore, the signifiers coming out of our linguistic acts can be understood as no more than the signified we perceive and conceive to present and represent our consciousness.

Methods

In the linguistic acts, unless and when we purpose to communicate our consciousness, such as through dialectics and conversation, the signifiers refer to the objects independent of our conscious phenomenon. There is an independent existence of truth that is objective and exterior to the consciousness in time and in space. Therefore, seeing the signified as a phenomenon to truth conveyed in the signifiers in the communication acts of consciousness between and among human species can be crucial to transcend the human-centric tendency of scientific activities [5,6].

The Medium

The connotation of the method implies that truth is medium independent. Modern society has come to a phase of mass production of knowledge, and an epistemic shift on knowledge is necessary to detach the physical carriers of signifiers from truth itself-even the signifiers from truth itself. In traditional paper medium, the signifiers come to our perception through the eyes to mental processing and consciousness with the reflections of light particles. The predominance of information science has not changed the signifiers, or at least from the front end and not the cryptographic backend of signifiers, but our perceptions on the signifiers [7]. The backlighting of the screens subtly changes the conveyance of signifiers to our consciousness receptors, and the actions of communication. Our conscious perceptions may alter according to the medium, and our processing of signifiers. Apart from the biochemical and biophysical differences briefly outlined above, the main changes in the actions of communication occur in the efficacy of signifier transmissions and the receptor's capacities of cognitive activities. The depth of time and space conveyed in the signifiers started to vary accordingly where information medium transmits in the speed of light compared to the restrictions 100 or 200 years ago, and even more for ancient texts. The signifier "the earth revolves around the sun" took Copernicus 11 years to observe and document, and only takes me less than a minute to type out and later less than a second to be transmitted to anywhere on the earth given the satellite is not too high [8]. What we now take as a concept of truth can also be proved with different technologies more efficient than human observation from the standpoint of earth, documented with circles and trigonometries.

It is not that scientific empiricism is unnecessary, but that the medium does not change the values of truth. When science itself is defined as human activity, where indeed any technologies are not without human interactions to query the truths, the differentiation between the self as medium and as an active person determines the correspondence of truth. Images and videos were not used to be taken as signifiers, and humans in images and videos are often objectified even when the person can be someone we have personal connections. Can a simulation or recording of the earth's trajectory around the sun be used as proof and evidence to the question? For skepticism, words can lie as well. When we take ourselves as medium, there is not much difference on the truth values between the concept of truth and the actions of truth. Human beings as medium always have lived in the truth, only that the consciousness may not have known the truth. In time, our sleep and wake cycles have always reflected the motion of the moon, and the consciousness used to behold that as the sun. Humans used to think the truth lies in the conscious actions, whereby the concept of truth in this particular case has been proven otherwise. The psychology of the a priori seems to lie in the actions, but the concepts don't merely exist in texts [3]. By the framework, the posteriori changes our consciousness from medium of receptors to an active state in cognition. The self, thence, gets to know to intermediate between the concept of truth and the actions of truth through the body as medium with a conscious state, without furthering on the actions of consciousness to consciousness [4].

Phenomenon of the Signifier

Signifiers do not exist in a singularistic form. When the medium of our ears cannot perceive the vibration of sound waves for various reasons, sign language is also a choice of signifier to communicate the truths and facts. With all the different languages in the world, signifiers as conventions for communication do not change the truth values in science, but only the spheres of communication and commutable fellow humans. We can try to teach astronomy to a bird, but our medium of the body seems to convey less actions of truth than the birds do. However, the birds do not seem to convey more concepts of truth in astronomy than human beings. And with the extensions of technology as medium, we can also convey more actions of truths than the birds in astronomy with or without biophysical presence. And herein, birds, or the concept of birds, can also serve as signifiers, just as how the airplanes were conceived for invention [9]. Between the concept of truth and the action of truth, the signified can actually be a mere signifier. This resumes the consciousnesses of consciousness that the consciousness is a medium [4]. There is a loophole in the correspondence theory of truth that one can convert a set of signifiers to another set to claim the epistemological values of truth. The verification principle originated from pragmatism becomes the basis on the truth values in the correspondence of truth [10]. The priorities between the concept of truth and the action of truth, analogically, become the question of "should I lift my left foot or right foot first when walking?" This is especially a conundrum in peer-review activities and with the falsification principle [11].

Besides, there is a risk of violating the autonomy in intersubjectivity when texts, or signifiers, convey actions. In this regard, the signified only refer to the evidence in forms of matter or conscious product, and the evidence becomes the signifier for the logic of truth in the consciousness contents [3,4]. The acceptance, or refusal thereof, of evidence then becomes the primary phenomenon in the correspondence theory of truth. The phenomenon of the signified only acts on consciousness and not on the truth. The conscious actions of deciphering and re-encoding the signifiers only act on another's conscious mind, and make the signified irrelevant to the objectivity of truth. It falls into the matter of conception with each set of persons' anthropological traits with the signified, and the existence of objective truth becomes the falsifiability of the correspondence theory of truth. The consciousness can only achieve the epistemological objectivity on the pure I [2]. However, "this is a bird" can still be both a fact and truth. Even though the signifier does not convey the contents of the signified, the signified cannot present any objective values without the signifier. The signifier works like vectors in mathematics, only that the signifier follows restrictive terms while vectors follow directional representation. "This is a bird" is a fact when I am referring to the concept of a bird, and it becomes a truth when you look at a bird and know THIS is THE bird I signified. And your actions of the consciousness and of the activities become the correspondence to my truth through the signified, i.e., the BIRD.

The Signified Truth through Correspondence

The signified is an influence to the mind. There is no objectivity

between and among more than one subject who are equal, unless there is an omniscient being. The signified only correspond to the truth with the definitions of the signifiers agreed upon according to individualistic phenomenological subjectivities. The transcendence is not the transcendence of the I but the objectivity of the truths through the I. The consciousness and the self become one, as it always is, when the signified corresponded with the truth. Facts and truths differ in that facts always change while truths are constant; truths are dynamic while facts are static. Validities of the truths are conveyed through the signified. Signifiers are moot without the subjective and active involvement of the intersubjective consciousness. The emphasis on correspondence in the correspondence theory of truth is not on the objectivity of epistemology, but the subjective nature of epistemology IS objective on epistemological activities. We don't say "the earth revolves around the sun" is true nowadays because every one of us has actually and empirically done experiments and obtained proofs in various ways, but only because it is now universally accepted as truth and everyone else takes it as a fact. The signified becomes meaningless when the truth is imprinted in the consciousness, whereas the signified used to represent the validities of the truth.

The signified are epistemically objective and the mind epistemically subjective. The signified exist out of the medium, and out of the mind-only that our consciousness tells that they objectively exist. Two persons can reach the same conclusion and truth without correspondence, but they cannot corroborate with each other without it. They cannot correspond without the signified and they cannot understand each other without a shared understanding of the signifiers each uses. Just as when it comes to scientific methodology, different interpretations of the same phenomenon do not necessarily preclude the interpretations from belonging to the same truth, and the same method does not prevent different persons from obtaining different results and / or reaching at different conclusions. The epistemic objectivity only corresponds to individual minds and the mind's epistemic subjectivity attempts to reach an objective state, expressed through the signified.

Results

The research transcends the correspondence theory of truth with the objectification of the self. When the truth, as an abstract concept, is seen as the purpose of science, the medium and signifiers only act on the consciousness and guide the consciousness to the truth with the signified. The phenomenon of the signified is an intersubjective construct of correspondence to the truths by the severance of individuality and the phenomenon of consciousness in perception and cognition of the truths. The correspondence theory of truth acknowledges the subjective nature of epistemic activities, and focuses on the intersubjectivity of truths. With Ferdinand de Saussure's Sign Theory, the research reaches an objective understanding on the phenomenon of truth through the correspondence theory of truth. The consciousness as a medium conveys the signifiers of truth through perception and the actions of communication serve as signified to the phenomenon of truths. The posteriori use of language and technologies increase the efficacy of epistemic activities, and the correspondence of truths thereof. The

act of the I is always subjective conscious construction as to the objectivity of truths. In turn, the objectivity of truths changes the materials of the consciousness. The correspondence theory of truth does not reject objective epistemology, but accepts subjectivity as a path to objectivity. The transcendence happens with the consciousness of the I, independent of the truth. The capacity of the medium limits the volumes of truths and the imprints of the signified to the truths, and the preservations thereof. The correspondence thus becomes the economy of truth. The human-centric and anthropocentric development of science replaces the truth with correspondence, and is teleologically flawed. The utility of science ought not to be confused with the economy of truth.

Discussion

The consciousness is the source of epistemology, while epistemic activities do not represent truths. The notions from the correspondence theory of truth seem to favor the actions of truths over the concept of truths teleologically, while the concept of correspondence is always human-centric if not anthropocentric. Objectivity tends to deny the subjective nature of epistemology, while differentiation between objective and subjective epistemology is still a key philosophical problem [12]. Scientific activities are about truths and the truth of truth is the consciousness from epistemological constructivism. The objectivity of science, therefore, has trended to the materialistic fevers of technologies. Technologies may last longer than human physiology, but still insignificant compared to the objects of truths. Human technologies can never surpass the apparatus rationale of the human subjects, and it has always been the discoveries of science driving the innovation of technologies. The economy on science suggests the anthropology of science is still important to guide the apparatus rationale of the consciousness and technologies. Therefore, the developmental psychological paths of human beings may have not evolved as much as the technologies seem to assure us. The self and the ego in the consciousness of correspondence may differentiate the anthropocentric and human-centric tendencies in science. The earth-centric notion of the universe is no more than an egoistic mass psychology in collective and corresponded activities [13]. The utilities of science may boost the egocentric tendencies with technology, and it derives from the unmastered consciousness. Humanitarianism caters to such egoistic tendencies and generousities in the truths foster prudence in utilities.

Funding

The research is not funded.

Conflict of Interest

The author has no known conflict of interest.

References

1. Rastovic M (2011) Kant's Copernican Revolution. *Philosophy Study* 2(1): 19-26.
2. DeBord CE (2012) Kant, Fichte, and the Act of the I. *Philosophy Study* 2(1): 9-18.
3. Shillingsburg PL (1991) Text as Matter, Concept, and Action. *Studies in Bibliography* 44: 31-82.

4. Joseph ED (2016) The Consciousness of Being Conscious. *J Am Psychoanal Assoc* 35(1): 5-22.
5. Kopnina H, Washington H, Taylor B, Piccolo J (2021) Anthropocentrism: More than Just a Misunderstood Problem. *The International Journal of Ecopsychology* 3(1): 4.
6. Mellamphy NB (2021) Re-thinking "Human-centric" AI: An Introduction to Posthumanist Critique. *EuropeNow*.
7. Kaldor M (2011) War and Economic Crisis. C Calhoun, G Derlugian (Eds.), *The Deepening Crisis*. New York University Press Social Science Research Council pp: 109-134.
8. Doc, T. Nicolaus Copernicus. *Famous Scientists*.
9. Parker A (1984) *Birdy*.
10. James W (1909) *The Meaning of Truth*.
11. Thompson WC, Scurich N (2018) When does absence of evidence constitute evidence of absence? *Forensic Sci Int* 291: e18-e19.
12. Kee Mun W (2011) A review of philosophical assumptions in management research. *Afr J Bus Manag* 5(29): 11546-11550.
13. Doc, T (2023) Nicolaus Copernicus. *Famous Scientists*.