

Chapter Three

Putnam on the Fact-Value Dichotomy

The outlook of Logical Positivism regarding fact-value dichotomy

We think that in the course of time everything has changed. Even philosophical doctrine cannot evade this trend. In every passing moment a new king appears and controls the key what may be called *Control Concept* in the current phase. The debate between 'is' and 'ought' is just like the outcome of concept control. Beginning in the eighteenth century, some of the enlightenment thinkers declared that values could not be derived from facts. Kendler says, "The naturalistic fallacy rejects the possibility of deducing ethical statements from non-ethical statements. This principle, more precisely described as the fact/value dichotomy, denies the possibility of logically deriving what *ought* to be from what *is*."²⁴ Here we particularly call upon the name of Moore who, in fact, inclined to say that values are non-natural term and as a matter of fact they cannot be defined in terms of natural terms or qualities. For Moore any attempt to define a non-natural term in terms of natural term would lead us to **naturalistic fallacy**. In the twentieth century a group of like minded philosophers having scientific background known as logical positivists extended the idea of fact-value dichotomy even further. In fact, they were bothered or distressed by the continued talk about God and religion and morality in the center of our scientific environment. In order to overcome the unscientific philosophical cordon, they at any rate, developed a kind of philosophy that not only emphasized on the dichotomy, but at the same time set

²⁴ Kendler, Howard H. "Psychology and Ethics: Interactions and Conflicts," *Philosophical Psychology* 15:4, 2002, p.490.

out a philosophical environment which would be factual in nature. As Earnest R. House notes, "The logical positivists thought that facts could be ascertained and that only facts were the fit subject of science, along with analytic statements like "1 plus 1 equals 2" that were true by definition. Facts were empirical and could be based on pristine observations, a position called foundational. On the other hand, values were something else. Value might be feelings, emotions or useless metaphysical entities. Whatever they were, they were not subject to scientific analysis. People simply held certain values or believed in certain values or did not. Values were chosen. Rational discussion had little to do with them."²⁵

The logical positivists seem to have believed that only facts could be called truth as they are derived from experiment and observation. At the same time they rejected all talk about values associated with ethics, morals, religions, aesthetics and philosophy not only as preferences without foundation, but as 'meaningless or non-cognitive babble'. As a matter of fact values were thus depreciated as mere matters of taste and as not subject to rational or objective discussion. According to logical positivists to ask whether it is wrong to lie or steal was equivalent to asking whether one prefers chocolate or vanilla ice cream. The answer was just a matter of person taste or choice ungrounded in any truth or reality because there was no experiment that could be performed to prove the truth of any answer. Narrating the scientific development, Nancy Pearcey remarks, "The direction in intellectual history since the Enlightenment has been to grant to science the authority to pronounce what is real, true, objective, and rational, while relegating ethics and

²⁵ House, Earnest R. , "Unfinished Business: Causes and Values", *American Journal of Evaluation* 22.3, p.313.

religion to the realm of subjective opinion and non-rational experience. Once the definition of knowledge is conceded, then any position that appears to be backed by science will ultimately triumph in the public square over any position that appears based on ethics or religion.”²⁶

There is no question of doubt that the ‘fact-value dichotomy’ has been created by logical positivists by conceiving or interpreting the term ‘meaningfulness’ in terms of truth and falsity on account of the principle of verification as fulfilling on the basis of the limited number of observational data or evidences. Here we can particularly mention the name of A. J. Ayer who in his celebrated book *Language, Truth and Logic* sets out the criterion of the principle of verification and thereby determined the meaningfulness of statement. It has been said that only factual statements can be determined as meaningful because such type of statements can only be verified on the basis of observational data. The question of verification of ethical statements or ought-statement in terms of observational data simply does not arise because the contents of ethical judgment are not factual or matter of empirical fact. As the nature of factual and evaluative statements is completely different from each other, there is no point of claiming that one can be logically deduced from the other. According to Ayer the fact-value problem arises because moral statements cannot pass a critical test of meaning called the verification principle. According to Ayer moral utterances are only expressions of feelings or emotions.

According to logical positivists’ all meaningful sentences must be either tautologies or empirically verifiable. A statement which is true by definition or which is unconditionally true by virtue of its form alone is

²⁶ Pearcey, Nancy., “ A New Foundation for Positive Culture Change: Science and God in the Public Square.” *Human Events*, Sept. 15, 2000.

said to be tautology and any statement would be empirically verifiable which is said to be a statement regarding observation about the world. The value statement, such as, 'charity is good' neither qualifies as a tautology nor is it an empirically verifiable statement. Ayer simplifies his argument in the following way:

A sentence is meaningful if and only if it can be verified.

Moral sentences cannot be verified.

Therefore, moral sentences cannot be meaningful.

Ayer's solution to the fact-value problem is to note that moral utterances function as a special non-factual way. According to Ayer moral utterances do not report our feelings, rather they express feelings. As the nature of moral statement is completely different from the nature of factual statement, there underlies a distinctive gulf between these two types of statement which is justified on the basis of the following accounts.

Arguments in favour of 'is-ought dichotomy'

1. No statement is both evaluative and factual. Since facts and values are separate, with facts being solid and provable and values being matters of personal taste, values play no role in the realm of facts, i.e. in science.
2. There is no logical connection between evaluative and factual statements. A factual statement states what is there externally in the world and the reference of a factual statement can be identified in spatio-temporal framework. Contrary to this, evaluative statements evaluate the goodness and rightness of moral actions which are by no means the object of the external

world. Evaluate statements state or involve essentially reference to human sentiments or feelings. Sentiments are the object of feelings, not of reason or the understanding. Accordingly, evaluative statements cannot be validly deduced from factual or descriptive statements.

3. Factual statements are true or false independently of any value judgments. There are different types of value parameters, such as, moral value, truth or logical value, external value, internal value, intrinsic value, instrumental value and non-instrumental value etc. Among these various kinds of values, there we find a broad classification, such as, truth value and other than truth value. This classification is justified by saying that logical or truth value is determined formally and all others values are determined informally. In the case of logical value there we have a decision procedure on account of which the value of a proposition is formally determine. This would not to be the case in the case of moral values. In determining the moral values we have to evaluate so many things. If we determined the value of a moral action in the line of Kantian ethics, we have to give due importance whether the action is done on the basis of categorical imperative or the principle of 'duty for duty sake'. If we evaluate an action in terms of virtue ethics, we have to evaluate it whether the action is performed by a moral agent possessing virtues etc. Thus, in Kantian ethics a moral action is said to be good or valuable if it is performed on the basis of categorical imperatives; in virtue ethics it would be valuable if it is performed on the basis

of some virtues; in consequential ethics it would be valuable if it is performed on the basis of the consequence of the action etc.

4. Facts can, and values cannot, be established beyond controversy. What is a fact is fact. In Wittgensteinian model it can be said that a proposition pictures a fact and a fact makes a proposition as either true or false. This means that to be a fact is to be fact of something and to be a fact of something is to a fact of something interpreted as either true or false. Thus, anything lacks of truth value would not be a fact. Thus, while determining fact; there are rational and scientific grounds for knowing it to be a fact. What is a fact to me is equally be a fact to other as well provided that he has to have the same scientific knowledge. As a fact is determined on the basis of some rational systematic scientific method, there remains nothing hidden and as a matter of fact a fact is determined as a fact uncontroversially. Contrary to this as there are different value parameters, there remains possibility of controversy regarding moral values. Even though some moral philosophers, such as Kant, Hare etc., would like to say that moral principles are universalizable, but this would not be acceptable without question begging. Because there are many other moral philosophers and moral theories according to which moral rules and principles are subjective in nature. According to them what would be good in a particular person or a particular society may not be good to other person or other society. That means moral action is determined as good or bad in terms of the situation or moral luck. Thus, besides moral principles there may

have some extraneous factors which would play crucial role in determining the value of a moral action.

5. Evaluative statements can neither be true or false. They do not possess any propositional value. Therefore, the question of their truth and falsity simply does not arise. Evaluative statements do possess value, but such kind of value is not truth-functional or factual or cognitive. Unlike truth-functional or factual value, the value of evaluative statement is determined on the basis of moral grounds associated with feelings, love, compassion, care and virtues. Thus, the value of an evaluative statement is determined on the basis of situation and circumstance. A fact is a matter of *impersonal taste*, whereas a value is a matter of *personal taste*. Therefore, unlike a fact, values play no role in the realm of facts.
6. Values are not involved in the determination of what is a fact. As the realm of value and the realm fact are completely different in nature, value can not determine fact. That means no factual statement is logically deduced from an evaluative statement and vice-versa. We cannot say that 'everyone ought to do it' entails 'it would be a fact'; nor we can say that 'as it would be a fact, so everyone should do it'. In the case of logical deduction the conclusion must be at par with the premise or premises or the conclusion must be contained by the premise or premises. Either of these alternatives can only be fulfilled if they belong to the same realm. But it has been already stated that the nature of value and fact are different. Therefore, the question of deducing of one from the other simply does not arise.

7. Values are not involved in scientific descriptions of fact. We have already stated that what is a fact is a fact. This is mainly for the reason that in the case of something as determining a fact there underlies scientific background for claiming it to be a fact. How do we determine moral or aesthetic value scientifically? As they are not part of the empirical world, neither they can be verified by observational data nor they can be falsified by observational data. Values can neither be experienced nor be rationalized. The so-called intrinsic or non-instrumental value has to be understood not a mere means to the end, but as an end in itself. Value is something inheres in the object; it is something to be realized. In this regard values are transcendental in nature. Values are not part of the empirical world, they are not the furniture of the world, and values are something associated with feeling, sentiment. In this regard, values are psychological in nature. Accordingly, it can be said that values are not intermixed in the statement of scientific theories or facts. Values being matters of personal taste cannot be reasoned about.

8. Values are completely subjective and have no objective qualities. As values are matters of personal taste, values can be differentiated from person to person. In this regard values are said to be subjective in nature. How can we objectify values which are predominantly associated with personal feeling, sentiment? Anything which falls short of reason cannot be objectified. When a person being a speaker says that 'this is a red pen', the hearer has two options. Either the hearers would be agreed with the speaker or would be disagreed with the speaker.

Whatever the option the hearer would like to adopt, he or she has to adopt it on the basis of the objective qualities possessed by the red pen. If we say that this pen is really red, we mean to say that it is a fact that this pen is red. How do we come to know that it is really a fact that this pen is red? We come to know on the basis of the objective qualities possessed by the red pen and also on the basis of the knowledge of the concerned person under what condition a pen is said to a red pen. As this pen is red is a factual statement, it can be verified on the basis of the observational data which again are factual in nature. However, this would not be the case when we are evaluating a value judgment. How do we know that the wall- hanging picture of Rabindranath Togore is good? How do we value such picture? Does this picture possess any objective quality? Is this valuing scientific? Valuing a picture requires some aesthetic sense or vision which is not objective, factual quality of the picture under consideration. Rather it depends on the subjective or individualistic quality of the person who values the picture.

On the basis of the above observation, it has been concluded by logical positivists and their followers that there underlies a big gulf between 'is' and 'ought' statement. Consequently, the question of deducing one from the other simply does not arise.

Putnam's position regarding Fact-Value Dichotomy:

Although positivism as a philosophical movement did not last long because of its **self-referential absurdity**, but the positivistic ideas of fact-value dichotomy are still quite prevalent among many scientists.

Even these ideas have become pervasive in our culture in part because they allow an easy and thoughtless rejection of value claims. In his book *The Collapse of the Fact/Value Dichotomy*, Putnam says, " There are a variety of reasons why we are tempted to draw a line between 'facts' and 'values' – and to draw in such a way that 'values' are put outside the realm of rational argument altogether. For one thing, it is much easier to say "that's a value judgment ", meaning, "that's just a matter of subjective preference," than to do what Socrates tried to teach us: to examine who we are and what our deepest convictions are and hold those convictions up to the searching test of reflective examination."²⁷ Those who insist on the fact/value dichotomy would like to cease the relevance of values in scientific discourse and other activity. However, philosophers over the years equally realize that the relevance of values cannot be avoided even in the scientific discourse. Reflecting on this view, Putnam says, "The worst thing about the fact/value dichotomy is that in practice it functions as a discussion –stopper, and not just a discussion-stopper, but a thought stopper." ²⁸

Putnam in his many writings was highly critical about the doctrine that 'no statement is both evaluative and factual'. In one place, Putnam goes on to say that one particular answer to the question of fact and value has assumed the status of a **cultural institution** , namely, the answer 'that facts and value are totally disjoined realms, 'that the dichotomy 'statement of fact or value judgment' is an absolute one." In fact this is the view Putnam wants to attack. Because in one place, Putnam says that he has defended the idea that something can be both a fact and a

²⁷ Putnam, H., *The Collapse of the Fact/Value Dichotomy and Other Essays*, Cambridge M.A: Harvard University Press, 2002, pp. 43-44.

²⁸ Ibid. p.44.

value. If this is taken into account, then the view as engrossed by the logical positivists that 'no statement is both evaluative and factual' can not be retained as valid. In this regard, Putnam says, " My purpose was to **break the grip** that a certain picture has on our thinking ; the picture of a dualism, a dichotomous division of our thought into two realms, a realm of 'facts' which can be established beyond controversy, and a realm of 'values' where we are always in hopeless disagreement."²⁹

Are facts and values totally disjointed? If we answer affirmatively, then the view that 'no statement is both evaluative and factual' holds good. On the other hand, if we answer negatively then the said view does not hold good. Putnam, however, does not agree with the view that 'no statement is both evaluative and factual'. Perhaps he wants to reject it. In fact, many statements seem to have both factual and evaluative content. In such a case, the view that 'no statement is both evaluative and factual' has to be rejected. Let us explain this point with an example. The statement 'Bill Clinton was a good president' seems to have a factual content, namely, Bill Clinton was a president, but it also seems to express an evaluation. Accordingly, this statement must be regarded as both factual as well as evaluative as it has both factual and evaluative content. In such a case the view that 'no statement is both evaluative and factual' does not hold good. Again consider another example. John knows that promises ought to be kept. On the standard interpretation this entails that John believes that promises ought to be kept (a factual content) and also that promises ought to be kept(an evaluative statement). Again this example goes against the above mentioned view. Even in the case of conjunctive statements, there we

²⁹ Ibid. p.44.

find both factual and evaluative content. For example, out of two separate statements, such as, Ram is a boy, Ram is good, we can formulate the statement 'Ram is a good boy' whose have both factual and evaluative content.

Some commentators would like to say that a statement having both factual and evaluative content would be regarded as an evaluative statement. It should not be regarded as the mixture of both factual and evaluative statement. Accordingly, the view that 'no statement is both evaluative and factual' remains intact. The problem with this proposal is that even though it enables to retain the above view intact, but at the same time it renders the positivists' claim that 'there is no logical connection between evaluative and factual statements' false. If both the factual and the evaluative contents are very much there in an evaluative statement, then how we can say that there is no logical connection between factual and evaluative statements? We cannot say this. Accordingly, there requires further modification of the view that 'there is no logical connection between evaluative and factual statements'. Owing to overcome this problem the fact-value dichotomist would like to say that 'there is no logical connection between a *pure evaluative* statement and a *pure factual* statement'. Accordingly, it can be said that no pure factual statement entails a pure evaluative statement. This, in fact, is a version of **Hume's Law** as Hume has said that 'no ought-statement can be validly deduced from any set of is-statements' where the logical deduction is determined in terms of *entailment*.

However, Putnam gives a **counter-example of Hume's Law** or against the dichotomist view that 'there is no logical connection between a pure evaluative statement and a pure descriptive statement'. In one place ,

Putnam writes as follows: 'Even though each of the statements 'John is a very inconsiderate man', 'John thinks about nobody but himself', 'John would do practically anything for money'' may be simply a true description in the most positivistic sense (and notice 'John would do practically anything for money' does not contain any value term), if one has asserted the conjunction of these three statements, it is hardly necessary to add 'John is not a very good person'. What Putnam insists here is that any one who understands the meaning of the above three sentences perfectly, he or she would easily draw the conclusion that the person under consideration is not a good person because here he or she accepts certain moral principles to the effect that inconsiderate and selfish persons are by no means good. In this sense the view that 'no statement is both evaluative and factual' has to be violated. On the other hand, if it would be claimed that the three descriptive statements under consideration are also evaluative, at least in conjunction or that they entail an evaluative statement, then it would definitely violates the positivistic view that 'there is no logical connection between evaluative and factual statements'.

Putnam also rules out the proposal of **two-component theory** as given by some commentator. For Putnam if factual statements are classified as evaluative, then they have two meaning components, such as, factual and emotive, which for him is not possible, because in such a case the factual component can be separated from the statement as a whole and as a matter of fact the statement would no longer be treated as factual in true sense. So long a statement would be regarded as factual; its factual content cannot be detached from it. In this regard, Putnam considers an example from our ordinary moral descriptive vocabulary, namely the

statement 'John is considerate'. Here Putnam's position is that if there are two components to the meaning of 'x is considerate', then the only description we can give of the 'factual meaning' of the statement is that it is true if and only if x is *considerate*. And that trivializes the notion of a 'factual component'. Putnam, however, tells us that even though **two-component theory** is not tenable, but from this it does not follow that 'x is considerate' does not have a certain emotive force. Putnam admits that in normal situation 'x is considerate' has a certain emotive force. However, it does not always have. In such a case the 'two-component' theory does not hold good. In fact, we can use the statement 'x is considerate' for many purposes, namely, to evaluate, to describe, to explain, to predict, and so on. Among all such uses, it does not require to deny the existence of such a statement as 'X is considerate'. Here perhaps Putnam wants to distinguish between *statements* on the one hand and *uses* to which these statements can be put on the other. By 'statement', he probably means the same as 'sentence' in the generic sense, i.e. a linguistic form which can be used on many different occasions. However, a proponent of the fact-value dichotomy would certainly not want to classify sentences as factual or evaluative. It is natural to say that a sentence like 'John is considerate' may be used for different purposes on different occasions, but it is equally natural to say that it may be used to make different statements on different occasions and accordingly it may have different meanings. In fact P.F. Strawson has shown this in his celebrated article 'On Referring'. Here he makes a distinction between a sentence, a use of a sentence and an utterance of a sentence. According to Strawson a sentence can neither be true or false, only *the use of a sentence* what Strawson calls *statement* can be regarded

as either true or false and hence meaningful. However, the fact/value dichotomist would differ from Putnam in the context that such a sentence would express purely factual statements on some occasions and purely evaluative statements on other occasions. When 'John is considerate' expresses an evaluative statement, it has also a factual content. Putnam may be right in saying that this factual content cannot be expressed in 'the language of physical theory'. However, some commentator suggests that such proposal of Putnam does not give rise to a threat to the fact/value dichotomy.

Values are deeply involved in the arena of facts:

Those who adhere to the view that no value statement can logically be deduced from factual statement would like to say that values are not deeply involved in the arena of facts. Contrary to this, those who adhere to the view that at least in some **non-logical sense** value statement can be obtained from factual statement would like to admit that values are deeply involved in the domain of facts. Logical positivists would like to say that values are not involved in the domain of facts as their nature is completely different with each other. Putnam, however, would like to say that values are deeply involved in the domain of facts. Even though science deals with brute facts, but at the same time the practice of science involves much more than the assemblage or grouping of self-evident facts. Careful observation shows that definitions of 'true', 'fact', 'observation' and the like are derived from philosophical considerations, from the epistemology of science and these consideration involves values. According to Putnam even in the bare level of observation, "epistemic values guide us in pursuing right

descriptions of the world.”³⁰ In fact, careful analysis would reflect that the entire operational structure of science involves the use of standards or values. Here Allen makes an interesting comment. According to Allen “every intellectual inquiry has to be guided by standards for sorting the true from the false, established facts from uncertain ones, interesting facts and problems from those which will tell us nothing new or significant, promising lines of enquiry from probable dead-ends, well-conducted from ill-conducted inquiry. They are what R. G. Collingwood called *categorical activities*, ones which are not rightly or wrongly performed, but ones of which the performers as they go along necessarily judge the successes or failure of their own performances. Being trained in them included coming to appreciate and observe the standards employed.”³¹ From this passage, Allen then concludes, “This, then, is the first breach of the fact/value dichotomy: that knowing itself involves the personal employment of standards, most implicitly, for judging what we know and whether we have succeeded or failed in knowing it.”³²

According to Putnam values are deeply involved in the domain of facts. Here he understands or interprets the truth of the factual statements in the same sense as *acceptability or justifiability under ideal conditions*. Even though Putnam in one stage does not defend the theory of truth, but when he attacked the fact/value dichotomy in his *Reason, Truth and History*, he then says that truth is an *idealization of rational acceptability*. According to Putnam we call a statement ‘true’ if it would be justified some epistemically ideal conditions. For him ‘epistemically ideal

³⁰ Ibid. p.32.

³¹ Allen, Richard T., “Polanyi’s Overcoming of the Dichotomy of Fact and Value”, Retrieved September 21, 2004.

³² Ibid.

conditions' are like 'frictionless planes' as we cannot really attain epistemically ideal conditions or even be absolutely certain that we have come sufficiently close to them. In every theory there involves values. In fact, Putnam himself claims that "theory selection always presupposes values". When we select one theory instead of others, what actually counts in our selection process? When we attribute a theory in terms of 'coherent', 'reasonableness', 'simplicity', 'plausibility', what actually helps us to do so? When we say that 'the beauty of the theory is such as such', on what count do we comment it? All these are normative requirements and in some sense or other, directly or indirectly, are associated with values. Putnam inclines to say that even though 'coherence, simplicity and so on are presupposed by physical science, yet coherence, simplicity and the like are values'.³³ Putnam further contends that in the case of a selection of a particular theory value also counts the most. That means even though science is factual in nature, a scientific theory is factual, but the true reality is that facts do not compel the scientists to choose a given theory. Bare scientific facts do not make a scientific theory sound. In fact science without normative values would be hollow science. A science or a scientific theory would be sound and beneficial to the mankind in general if it would be associated with or coherent with some normative values. This view has been well supported by environmental ethicists in recent times. In fact when a scientist goes on to select a particular theory as reasonable out of hundred theories, he does not do so on the basis of facts, because at that time sufficient facts may not be available to him. Instead of this, he applies value-based criteria that will permit him to determine whether

³³ Putnam, H., *The Collapse of the Fact/Value Dichotomy and Other Essays*, Op. cit.. P.142.

or not a particular theory is *reasonable*. Moreover, when we witness a conflict between a theory and a fact or between two theories, we ipso-facto observe that values are intimately associated in the working out of conflicts. Putnam says, " When a theory conflicts with what has previously been supposed to be a fact, we sometimes give up the theory and we sometimes give up the supposed fact, and...the decision isa matter of informal judgments of coherence, plausibility, simplicity, and the like. Nor is it the case that when two theories conflict, scientists wait until the observational data decide between them..."³⁴ This leads us to say after Putnam that when scientists face a difficulty of selecting a theory instead of other and the sufficient data are not at hand , then they take the help of value-laden criteria. This was also happening when Einstein's theory was accepted and Whitehead's theory was rejected. Putnam says, "Yet Einstein's theory of gravitation was accepted and Whitehead's theory was rejected fifty years before anyone thought of an observation that would decide between the two. Indeed, a great number of theories must be rejected on non-observational grounds, for the rule: "Test every theory that occurs to anyone" is impossible to follow."³⁵

What has been noted so far is that values are inherently embedded as well as implanted in facts. This actually leads us to say that anyone who deals with facts equally deals with value-ridden in this process because values are automatically and persistently associated with facts. Even in advance it can be said that values are involved in the ordering and structuring of facts to give understanding and meaning to data. How do we interpret or evaluate facts? We do so in terms of values. Without

³⁴ Ibid. p.142.

³⁵ Ibid. p. 142.

values, researchers will find endless unexplained data. Thus, values are necessary for the construction and operation of theory, process, methodology, interpretation, observation, description, and evaluation. Putnam inclines to say that even 'the level of evidence that is required to prove a hypothesis' is a value choice in science. The problem, however, is not the presence of value in science, but the problem with the error which runs with the view that facts has nothing to do with the arena of values. It is the irony of modern science that even though it involves values or alternatively, even though scientists involve values in their work, but by denying that they do so, they are likely not to recognize the presence of values. In other words, we gather facts to support assumed rather than argued value commitments, all concealed by the veil of science. According to Harries, 'only by admitting to the role of values in the identification and processing of facts will scientists and others be able to debate openly their value commandments.'

What has been established from the above is that values are deeply embedded in the factual or scientific statements. Does it then lead us to say that values statements like factual statements would be regarded as true? We have already shown after Putnam that truth is the same as 'convergent' rational acceptability or justifiability under ideal conditions. Accordingly, following Putnam we can say: "A statement S is true if and only if, for any person P at any time t, if P's condition at t were ideal (with respect to S), S would be rationally acceptable (completely justified) for P at t, and the negation of S would not be rationally acceptable for P at t." Here Putnam understands *acceptability* or *justifiability* in terms of epistemic values such as coherence and simplicity. For Putnam to say that a theory is coherence is equally

meant to say that it is justified and to say that the acceptance of a statement is justified is to say one ought to accept the statement. Accordingly, Putnam's position again be restated like this: "A statement S is true if and only if, for any person P at any time t, if P's conditions were ideal (with respect to S) at t, P ought to accept S at t, and P ought not to accept the negation of S at t." This clearly suggests that for Putnam, a statement to the effect that a given statement is true is equivalent to an evaluative statement. Further, it is also important to observe here that Putnam accepts the 'equivalence principle' that any statement is equivalent to the statement that it is true. For Putnam an equivalence principle is philosophically dispassionate as on any theory of truth 'Snow is white' is equivalent to 'Snow is white'. That is why early Wittgenstein justifiably claims that such statements actually say nothing. Synthesizing all the points as mentioned above, it can be said after Putnam that ascriptions of truth are equivalent to evaluative statements and that every statement is equivalent to evaluative statement. If this stands as delivered, then it would definitely go rather well with a rejection of the fact-value dichotomy. The pertinent question is: if every factual statement is said to be evaluative, then why there remains a debate? Are all evaluative statements true or false in Putnam's sense? If it does then at least in the truth value there remains no distinction between a factual and an evaluative statement. It may happen that some statements are rationally acceptable for some people under ideal conditions, but may not be rationally acceptable for some other people under ideal conditions. Such statements are neither true nor false in Putnam's sense. Thus, to retain the fact-value dichotomy as a matter of philosophical discussion, we have to say that there are some

evaluative statements in which the question of truth or falsity simply does not arise. Instead of this if it would be held that truth and falsity are sue-generic concept of the evaluative statement then the dichotomy between fact and fact collapses again.

Are values involved in the identification or determination of a fact?

It seems clear at least from Putnam's observation that values are deeply involved in the facts. If this so happens, then does it leads us to, after Putnam, that values are involved in the identification or determination of a fact? The answer perhaps would be affirmative. Values inform the process and methodology of fact discovery. Even at the preliminary level values influence which experiments will be performed and which will not in determining fact. However, there we find different types of facts. For example, some facts are self-evident whereas others are not. Self-evident facts are not the result of interpretation and observation. However, in case of other than self-evident facts, there we need interpretation and observation. We think that in the case of self-evident fact there is no role of values. However, in case of other than self-evident facts values are deeply involved, because where there is a process of interpretation as well as evaluation, it must pass through a process of evaluation. In fact, Michael Polanyi makes it clear that in order to claim something to be a fact by a scientific community; it must pass through a process of evaluation which in turn involves value judgments. For Polanyi there are no mere facts in science. A scientific fact is a scientific opinion based on the ground of evidence favoring it. Science is not a mere collection of facts, but a system of facts based on

their scientific interpretation. Polanyi says, "In accepting the authority of science we accept the totality of all these value-judgments."³⁶

Even scientific endeavor operates through a set of traditional values and part of these values include the standard of scientific merit which in turn help to determine whether something to be or not to be a fact. Just artistic, moral or legal traditions are transmitted; standards of scientific merit are also to be transmitted from generation to generation by the affiliation of individuals at a great variety of widely disparate points. These leads us to say that just like moral and artistic traditions, the appreciation of scientific merit is also based on tradition and in every passing year the succeeding generation accept and develop the previous scientific tradition on the basis of their own scientific opinion. This leads us to say that just like artistic, moral and legal traditions, the authority of science is equally traditional and whatever is based on tradition includes or incorporates a set of value judgments. Thus, like all other normative disciplines, factual science does require historical experiences which eventually help to determine what is valuable and what is not.

When philosopher like Putnam has claimed that values are embedded in fact, he understands it in terms of epistemology. More succinctly it can be said that values determine facts on the basis of epistemology. He says, "Indeed, once we stop thinking of 'value' as synonymous with 'ethics', it is quite clear that it (science) does presuppose values – it presupposes *epistemic* values."³⁷ That means in order to determine or identify something as factual or not factual, one has to have a

³⁶ Polanyi, Michael., " The Republic of Science: Its Political and Economical Theory." Retrieved September 21, 2004.

³⁷ Putnam, H. *The Collapse of the Fact/Value Dichotomy and Other Essays*, Op. cit.. P.30.

commitment to certain values. In this regard, it can be said following Putnam that value-judgments and value-commitments must go before scientific and other fact-discovering. Putnam says, "Knowledge of facts presupposes knowledge of values. This is the position I defend. This might be broken into two separate claims: (i) that the activity of justifying factual claims presupposes value judgments, and (ii) that we must regard those value judgment as capable of being right...." ³⁸

Putnam being an anti-realist rejects the externalist and transcendent point of view regarding the concept of truth. For Putnam truth is internal to the *conceptual scheme* and it would be determined on the basis of epistemic justified conditions. Truth is, after all, an ideal and a norm for guiding our epistemic activities. Accordingly, the theory of truth must be justified and also be logically coherent and consistent. Putnam says, "...truth is an idealization of rational activity. We speak as if there were such things as epistemically ideal conditions and we call a statement 'true' if it would be justified under such conditions."³⁹ Unlike the logical positivists and the externalists, Putnam redefines truth as an ideal possibility to be discovered in language. For Putnam truth is not something that would be understood or determined in just two alternative ways, rather 'truth is plural, pragmatic and rooted in the domain of human language'⁴⁰

According to Putnam fact and value interpenetrate through the influence of value judgments on both theory and epistemology. Epistemology is interpenetrated by axiological (value) considerations and choices and facts are developed within that epistemological

³⁸ Ibid. p.137.

³⁹ Putnam, H. *Reason, Truth and History*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1981, p.55.

⁴⁰ Pradhan, R. C. *Recent Developments in analytic Philosophy*, Indian Council of Philosophical Research, New Delhi, 2001, p.427.

framework. This, however, does not lead us to say that facts and values are one and the same thing. What can at best be said here is that values can play role in the determination of facts on the basis of epistemology. One thing should be kept in mind that when Putnam initiates to narrow down the fact-value dichotomy by showing that values are embedded in factual statements, he thereby understands values in an epistemic sense. That means his understanding of values is different from the so-called moral or ethical values in the true sense of the term. To say that what is a fact is influenced by values is not to say that facts are necessarily subjective. When Putnam claims that values are implanted in factual judgment, he thereby does not rule out the objectivity of values like the postmodernists. For Putnam value judgment can possess objectivity.

The role of values in the determination of facts can also be justified by making a distinction between 'what really exists' and 'what we think or believe to exist'. In fact knowledge of *what really exists* is the goal of all truth lovers. However, belief about *what exists* is the result of our endeavors to know and such endeavors are predisposed by our values and theories. Our approach towards truth is a constant effort to improve our epistemic theories of *knowing* to get closer and closer towards truth. Observation does not guarantee what actually does or does not exist and it has been, according to Dickson, conceived by Einstein too. Rather it is our best theoretical attempts that would help us to make sense of the world. Thus, instead of giving only importance on observation as has been done by the logical positivists, it would be paramount importance, Putnam opines, to improve or develop our theories which in turn develops our knowledge, i.e. epistemic

knowledge, which helps us to get closer and closer towards truth. In supporting Putnam, Dickson says, "To put the point succinctly, as Heisenberg did (attributing these words to Einstein), "the theory determines what you can observe.""⁴¹ Let us make this point clear with the help of an example. Suppose there are two persons of which one is ordinary educated person and the other is a trained specialist in medical science. When a biopsy slide is given to them and ask: "What they observe?", both of them looking at the same thing. However, even though they observe the same thing, but each of them will see something very differently because each of them has a different theory of interpretation they learned. And what is most important here is that the trained person has a better theory of interpretation in the case of successful diagnostic as he comes to know 'what really exists' better than the normal educated person. This suggests that there are truths or facts that exist, but which are not yet known to us through mere observation. This would again throw a challenge to the logical positivists which upheld the fact-value dichotomy on the idea of verificationism based on observation. Putnam's understanding of verification theory suggests 'it is metaphysically impossible for there to be any truths that are not verifiable by human beings.' Alternatively, it can be said that only such truth would be recognizable which would come through the principle of verification. That is why it has been said that verificationists' are the firm believers of fact-value dichotomy. According to Putnam the glory of verificationism did not last long as philosophy in general and science in particular has rejected this theory for its some immanent loopholes. According to Putnam, verificationism

27. Dickson, P.S50

is nothing but a variety of 'anti-realism' in the eyes of current philosophers of language. However, problem of verificationism is that it limits the boundary of world on humans' verification capacities. However, it has been a proven case that there may remain facts which do not or perhaps ever cannot know. Even science at times has moved beyond the boundary of verifiability and it would equally be true to say that there are many truths that are beyond the power or capacity of our assertion. The development of science suggests that we are unlikely ever to know the exact number of stars in the universe before the Big Bank. This does not however mean to say the fact-value dichotomy loses its relevance at par or vis-à-vis with the rejection of the principle of verification theory. Verification theory just a pointer through which the fact-value dichotomy is well defended. Thus, there is no point of saying that fact-value dichotomy loses its relevance just like as the principle of verification loses its glory.

Are values involved in the examination and description of facts?

So far on the basis of above observation, it can be said that after Putnam that values are intimately associated with description. That means descriptive statements are no longer different from evaluative statement in some sense or other. Accordingly, it can be said after Putnam that values involve in the examination and description of facts. We have already pointed out that when Putnam was talking of values, his own sense of value is epistemic in nature rather than moral. Consequently, when we are approaching the view that values are involved in the examination and description of facts after Putnam, we are talking of epistemic values. It has already been shown in the foregoing discussion

that a fact is often been influenced by theoretical or other value-laden concerns and more notably an appropriate word to describe a fact is often inextricably associated to value concerns. When you look at an object, what are you actually looking at? How do you justify and explain your looking at on that object? To look at an object and subsequently saying it in terms of such and such is the justification of looking at on that object. However, 'saying it in terms of such and such' is actually making an evaluative statement and thereby imposing value terms upon factual statement. That is why Putnam aptly says, "'Valuation' and 'description' are interdependent – a possibility that is constantly overlooked by positivists and their ilk."⁴² Putnam regrets that it was not only the default of logical positivists, it was a mistake committed by many others as well. Putnam says, ".....from Hume on , empiricists – and not only empiricists but many others as well, in and outside of philosophy – failed to appreciate the ways in which factual description and valuation can and must be *entangled*."⁴³ There are many terms as used in language inherently possessing twin concepts such as, descriptive as well as evaluative, e.g. 'well nourished', 'self respect', 'premature morality' etc. Facts and values are entangled as descriptive terms often involve evaluative connotations or meanings. When we are pointing an object as 'calculator', it equally means to say that the object named as calculator possessing a machine for which it is denoted as calculator. According to Putnam when we describe something based on its function or principles of operation, the description implies that the object function properly and this represents an evaluation. Accordingly, to describe an object as a calculator it to *evaluate* it correctly and the

⁴² Putnam, H. *The Collapse of the Fact/Value Dichotomy and Other Essays*, op. cit. p. 27.

⁴³ Ibid. p. 27

assessment of judgment, i.e. evaluation is based on empirical fact. In this sense a fact is entangled with value. This has not been something as applied in a particular case or domain, rather it would equally be true in everywhere even in unknown artifacts, biological world etc. Even Allen puts it by saying that even 'with reference to living things and their operations and actions, description is necessarily evaluation.'" In this regard, it can be said that values are involved in the examination and description of facts.

The affirmation of what has been stated so far actually leads us to say that values are intermixed in many statements of facts. If this so happens after Putnam that values are entangled with facts then it can ipso - facto lead us to say that values may be intermixed in statements of facts. There is nothing wrong to suggest that in scientific and everyday use many statements of facts include both an empirical component and an evaluative component without rendering the statement non-factual or subjective. For example, there we find many linguistic phrase, where there intermixes the twin concept, such as, descriptive and evaluative. For example, the phrases, such as, 'a good result', 'a promising finding', 'a worthwhile experiment', 'an anomalous result', etc., are cases in point.

Those who have actually favoured the fact -value dichotomy would like to say that since some value-judgments are subjective matters, they cannot be treated at par with factual statements. For them factual statements are objective, whereas not all value judgments are objective in the true sense of the term. Therefore, in order to establish that values are entangled with facts as claimed by Putnam, he has to show that value statements like factual statements are objective in nature. For

example, when a researcher says that one blood pressure machine is *better* than the other because of the colour of the pill, we simply recognize the subjective nature of the claim of 'better'; but instead of this if the same researcher says that one blood pressure machine is *better* than the other because one controls blood pressure without side effect than the other, we can say that here the statement of value 'better' is based on value-laden. Therefore, to say that the second statement is not factual, because it is only a value-judgment is clearly an error. Let us consider one more example to make this point clearer. The statement 'Concrete is a good material to use for sidewalks' is declared a fact by anyone having experience with concrete sidewalks even though it entangles with values such as 'durability is better than non-durability'. This again leads us to say that a fact claims can include value claims without rendering them solipsistic or subjective. Putnam's own observation is that intermixing of fact and value in many factual statements is inevitable and necessary. He says, "...the picture of our language in which nothing can be *both a fact and value-laden* is wholly inadequate and that an enormous amount of our descriptive vocabulary is and has to be entangled." ⁴⁴ Putnam's view has been well supported by Smith as he says that 'knowledge must in some sense reflect value-judgments.' For Smith relying on knowledge and reflecting upon knowledge definitely includes evaluative aspects.

Fact-value dichotomists, however, would like to say that since values are mere personal preferences, they are no longer the outcome of reason. In fact it would be simply pointless to suggest that one ethical code of conduct is better than other, because it would not be the

⁴⁴ Ibid. p61

outcome of rational decision. In this regard, it has been claimed that values are irrational and what is irrational would be subjective in nature. However, Putnam thinks the other way round. According to Putnam 'value disputes' are rational disagreements as such disagreements very often help us to find out where the *better reasons* lie. It has been suggested by saying that value disagreements often pointing to higher values and in this process it is directed towards objective facts. In this regard we can mention the remark of Leo Strauss who has beautifully narrated the objective criterion of value judgments by citing an example. For Leo Strauss 'if the historian shows, by objectively measuring the action of a statement against the model of 'rational action in the circumstances' that the statement made one blunder after another, he makes an objective value judgment to the effect that the statement was singularly inept.' It would be quite ridiculous to claim that value judgments are mere personal taste. A normal human being always takes rational decision, whether it is in the case of factual judgment or in the case of evaluative or value judgment. Therefore, it would be wrong to suggest that a rational decision would be a decision of pure reason just as it would be wrong to suggest that a science is a pure factual science. The decision of a normal human being is a mixture of both factual and evaluative contents. Even Nobel Laureate economist Amartya Sen argues that not only reason and arguments but scientific evidence can be brought to bear profitably in value discussion. A science without values would be worthless science. Sen says, "Someone disputing a value judgment put forward by someone else can have a scientific discussion on the validity of the value judgment by

examining the scientific truth of the underlying factual premises.”⁴⁵ There is no question of doubt that most of our judgments are factual in nature because they are the outcome of science. However, the accurateness or precision of such factual statement actually hinges on the value judgments. It has been already stated that any form or kind of investigation, analysis and examination of factual statements actually enmesh with value ridden terms or elements. Precisely, it can be said that factual judgment gets its precision through the booster of value ridden elements. Putnam elsewhere goes on to say that no logical reason can be given for the logical irrelevance of fact to value judgments even if we stand by the logical positivists’ standpoint. It is in fact true to say that brute fact is a fact that would be worthless in human life. However, a fact would be worthy of human consideration either in the form of acceptance or in the form of rejection if it would be encoded by value ridden elements. Alternatively, it can be said that just as we present arguments and evidence to support a claim that a given statement is a fact likewise we can present arguments and evidence to support a claim that a given practice is good or bad. Moreover values come into play in the description of reality. For example, ‘This is a pen’ – is a factual statement, but its’ acceptance or rejection is determined by valuing it. It would be acceptable if it is good and it would not be acceptable if it is not good. That is why Putnam rightly remarks that ‘evaluation and description are interwoven and interdependent.’⁴⁶ Putnam’s view has been supported by Smit by saying that an evaluative description can have a factual component. Smit says, “If value-judgments are descriptive, i.e. there is a matter of fact that determines

⁴⁵ Sen, Amartya.

⁴⁶ Putnam, H. p.3

the truth or falsity of value-judgments, then an assertion of value refers to a fact about a given object. Facts about values are then... a perfectly delineable subspecies of facts in general...." ⁴⁷

What has been suggested above is that there may have some factual statements where we do not find any affection of values. Such statements are called *brute-factual* statements. For example, the statement such as, 'There are two pens on the desk' is a purely factual statement where there is no relevance of values. Contrary to this, there we again find some values that are not strictly factual. For example, the matter of taste or preference is a case in point. When one says that he likes pens better than pencils, his liking is based on values. Finally, there are some facts intermixing with practical values. For example, concrete makes a good material for sidewalls. Here the phrase 'good material for sidewalls' is an assertion of value and the word 'concrete' refers to a fact about the concrete. Owing to establish that value judgments are objective, Putnam goes beyond the presence of facts. He inclines to say that the rational quality of such judgments can call upon an external, objective standards even present in scientific research. In any scientific research certain processes and methods are used that value the compatibility, correlation and correspondence of results what may be over simplified as *judgment of reasonableness*. According to Putnam judgment of reasonableness can be objective not because of the fact that it is part of scientific research but because of the fact that 'they have all typical properties of value judgments'.⁴⁸ Putnam further contends that ethical or even moral values can be objective if they are transcendent of the

⁴⁷ Smit. J. P. "The Supposed 'Inseparability' of Fact and Value", *South African Journal of Philosophy*, 22:1, 2003, p.52.

⁴⁸ Putnam. Hillary. P.145

individual or the local society. For example, the values of justice, fairness, truth and respect for the dead are objective because they are universalizable or so to speak nearly universal.

Objections against the objectivity of value-judgments

First Objection

As value judgments often differ from person to person, it would be hard to come by the objectivity of value judgments. There we find two problems in this regard, one comes from **application** and the other comes from **degree**. How to apply the given standard in a given case and where do we draw the line? In responding to the challenge of postmodernism's attack on the institution of law, it can still be said that objective laws are applied judiciously with an attempt at fairness. There is no question of doubt that judges always strives for objective judgments with the idea of applying the law fairly. Likewise, in spite of the fact that our moral judgments may differ, we ought to strive to apply the same principles objectively as possible. At times we may of course fail, but this does not lesson us that what we are striving for loses its objectivity. If it does then we have to ignore the well established theory of moral universalizability as echoed by Kant and Hare. In this regard, the position of Strauss is particularly relevant as he elsewhere has said even though we may frequently differ in exact application of moral judgment but 'it would be absurd to deny that there is an objective difference between a blundering general and a strategic genius.'⁴⁹ Even though the drawing line between right and wrong, between bad and worse is not something concrete and based on

⁴⁹ Strauss, Leo. *Natural Right and History*, Chicago University of Chicago Press, 1953, p.63

degree but we still discriminate something as right from wrong, something as bad from worse. Putnam says, "...the condemnation of unspeakable acts ...requires a strong distinction between conduct that is merely 'not nice' and conduct that is unconditionally *wrong* - and that is what any 'norm', any universal deontological statement, aims to give us."⁵⁰ My own sense is that even though there we do not find any concrete and definite boarder- line between right and wrong, bad and worse in ethics and morality like the logico-mathematical disciplines, but still there remains some moral laws and moral sanctions by means of which one can assume in degree what is right and what is wrong; what is good and what is bad.

Second Objection

The second objection states that not every person or every society meets the standard. As there we do not have any objective guideline of moral standard, then how can every person determine moral objectivity.

In responding to this challenge, it can be said that failing to live up to the moral standard certainly would not be the default of standard itself. There is no point of departure from moral standard. In fact we have all values we strive for but cannot live up to. The very nature of objective standard is that they represent ideals we can strive for even though we cannot fully attain them. The subjectivity of moral values would actually reflect the failure of moral agents to live up to the moral standards. Anti-objectivists would like to say that very often one may raise question regarding the ethical standard upholding by our society. Such question is relevant because different people of the same

⁵⁰ Putnam, Hillary. P.144.

community or society express different opinions regarding particular ethical standard. However, philosopher like Putnam would like to say that such argument is not against the objectively or moral standards rather an argument in favour of them. A question regarding ethical standard has been relevant only if we can see a higher standard of our own society. Strauss says, "But the mere fact is that we can raise the question of the worth of the ideal of our society shows that there is something in man that is not altogether in slavery to his society, and therefore that we are able, and hence obliged, to look for a standard with reference to which we can judge of the ideals of our own as well as of any other society."⁵¹ The objectivity of values cannot be measured in terms of the finite moral agents through their actions, nor through the actions of our society, but the very values our society upholds and such values are *transcendental* in nature.

Third Objection

The third objection states that not all cultural values are standard. There may be many sick societies where cultural values may not be standard. Some cultures clearly have maladaptive characteristics where standard of social consensus are not necessarily objective. Even sick societies permit cruel and unjust practices. Moreover, not every culture practices the value in the same way. This variance is to be expected because different cultures may be at different places toward a true understanding and application of a given value. In responding to this criticism, it has been said that like sick societies there we find some truth in science which at any given time is subject to both disagreement.

⁵¹ Strauss, Leo, op. cit. p. 3

and change. Even historian Jacob Barzun observes in his essay "The Search for Truths", even in the disciplines such as cosmology, astrophysics, etc., where exactness and agreement appear at their highest. Having said this, science still remains an objective enterprise envisaging what is true. Whatever the variance we notice in different cultures and different societies the underlying value is still there. This is the genesis of ethical and moral values and that is why it has been claimed by many that moral statements are universalizable in nature.

Can postmodernist interpretation be a way out of fact-value dichotomy?

There is a point of view which suggests that postmodernist interpretation of fact and value is a way out the fact-value dichotomy. Putnam does not agree with this proposal. According to Putnam the postmodernist interpretation actually leads to a wrong direction and it cannot give a solution of the fact-value dichotomy. Postmodernism which is notoriously difficult to define⁵² does not give due attention to the distinction between facts and values, nor it asserts that values as well as facts can depend on objective support. Instead of this, postmodernists believe that there is really no difference between facts and values because both ultimately reflect **subjective preferences**, rhetorical instances or ideological commitments. In fact postmodernists have asserted that all 'facts' are really only values – values as defined by the positivists as merely subjective expressions of personal taste. Postmodernists further contend that scientific explanation of fact is

⁵² Oelschlaeger, Max. (ed) *Postmodern Environmental Ethics*, State University of New York Press, 2007, p.1.

merely political and rhetorical game designed to gain, hold and exert power over others.

According to Putnam the postmodernists' interpretation of fact-value controversy is no longer tenable as it fails both practically and philosophically. It fails practically because we do believe that there hinges a considerable distinction between fact and value even though there remains a complex relationship between them. Secondly, it fails philosophically as it is now a truism that the fate or ultimate destiny of postmodernism is nihilism by ruling out any distinctive feature between facts and values. We think that Postmodernists' interpretation of fact-value dichotomy has a close proximity to Hume in a *very specific* sense. We call it very specific sense because unlike the postmodernist, Hume accepts the distinction between fact and value. But what seems to be alike to us is that like Hume, Postmodernists use the phrase *personal emotions and subjective preferences* while explaining the concepts of facts and values.

Conclusion

According to Putnam the insistence that facts and values have nothing to do with each other is "**the last dogma of empiricism**". Philosophy in the past was burdened with many dogmas. Even W. V. Quine was very much critical about **dogma-oriented philosophy**. Philosophy has to be presuppositionless. The broad bank philosophy is the latest enterprise to make philosophy a **dogma-free philosophy**. Putnam inclines to say that the flight from values was an exaltation of empiricism which ultimate objective is to gain personal moral freedom. Such empiricism is linked with directly or indirectly with positivism, modernism,

naturalism and philosophical materialism which fall under the same umbrella in broad sense. In this regard, Putnam makes interesting remarks. He says, "Apparently any fantasy - the fantasy of doing science using only deductive logic (Proper), the fantasy of vindicating induction deductively (Reichenbach), the fantasy of reducing science to a simple sampling algorithm (Carnap), the fantasy of selecting theories given a metaphysical available set of "true observation conditionals", or, alternatively, "setting for psychology" (both Quine) - is regarded a preferable to rethinking the whole dogma (the last dogma of empiricism?) that facts are objective and values are subjective and "never the twin shall meet"⁵³ According to Putnam the postmodernists are main culprits to deny the objectivity of moral values. In this regard, they are very much influenced by the Romantic rebellion against authority, the denial of absolutes and the affirmation of relativism and above all the Nietzschean thrust into nihilism. As a matter of fact even though there we witness a considerable philosophical debate between modernists and postmodernists but they share the common view of values and values judgments. Putnam does not agree with this view. We can explicate the insights of Putnam in the following ways:

- (a). According to Putnam facts and values are often entwined and joined at the hip even though they have separate philosophical position.
- (b) Values are essential to the realm of facts, because values are integral to the process of knowing. In this regard Putnam quotes Michael Polanyi. Polanyi says, "Science itself can be pursued and transmitted to succeeding generations only within the elaborate system of traditional

⁵³ Putnam, Hillary. P.145.

beliefs and values, just as traditional beliefs have proved indispensable throughout the life of society.”⁵⁴ A science without value is a mere barren science; a fact without values is a brute-fact. As everything is measured in the context of the society, nothing remained apart from values. Every factual statement is a statement of hidden value. When someone says that he likes to swim every morning and if we ask him why he likes to swim every morning he replies that it is good for health. Thus we have the statement, such as; swimming is good for health which is a value statement.

© Evaluation is an essential part of description. When an examiner evaluates an answer script of a student, he evaluates it on the basis of the description of an answer of the question under consideration. Even if we say that marking is again a factual content, but still we can say that the basis or criterion of marking is evaluative in nature. In this regard, it can be said that values are a necessary part of an accurate description of reality.

(d) Both facts and values can be discussed and handled rationally. It would be wrong to suggest that facts are rational assessment unlike values. Those who adhere to the view that there remains a gulf between fact and value would equally believe that facts are rational outcome and values are emotional outcome. But this is not tenable as like factual statements evaluative statements do require rational assessment.

(e) Value judgments or value statements can be objective like factual statements. Those who adhere to the view that values statements are not objective would like to say that values judgments are not empirical and the process of evaluation in the case of value judgments hinges on

⁵⁴ Polanyi, Michael. 'The Republic of Science: Its Political and Economic Theory' *Minerva* I, 1962, P. 57.s

in most cases moral convention and moral taste of the society as well as the moral agent. However, Putnam does not agree with this proposal. According to Putnam value judgments may be objective and it would be wrong to suggest that value judgments are purely subjective in nature. If value judgments are held to be subjective then we cannot say that value judgments are universalizable. But we can say that value or moral judgments are universalizable.

(f) Logical positivists on the basis of the **Principle of Verification** have given a criterion of evaluating factual or empirical statement. For them a statement (factual statement) would be literally meaningful if and only if it could be completely verifiable or completely falsifiable by some or limited number of **observational data**. Thus, observational data are the criterion of verifiability of factual statements. There we do not have any observational content in evaluative statement. In fact evaluative statement is not something based on observation. However, Putnam claims that there is no point of claiming that the standpoint of logical positivism is uncritically accepted. In fact the principle of verification or falsification have either been abandoned or modified in the arena of fact in order to allow scientific claims that cannot be verified or falsified. Thus, to claim the objectivity of factual statement on the basis of the principle of verification is not tenable and it is not reasonable to claim that evaluative statements are not objective because such statements are not tested by the **Principle of Verification**.

(g) Putnam finally claims that it is not reasonable to suggest that all non-empirical truth belong to the realm of values. Values are very much entangled with facts in the process of *Speech Acts* as conceived by Austin. Even though Austin in the earlier stages of his theory of *Speech*

Acts makes a subtle distinction between *performative* and *constative*, but he eventually rules out such division. We think that Putnam in this context would stand by the concept of Austin's Speech Act theory. We strongly believe that in the Speech Act it would be really hard to maintain a clear cut division between factual statements and evaluative statements.

The pertinent question then is: why are values so despised by the modernists? One reason of course is the colossal or massive development of science and technology. Science by its very nature relishes epistemological status based on truth or knowledge resulted from its processes and determinations. All other claims to knowledge from other sources, such as, revelation, natural law, tradition, philosophy, etc. are rejected by positivist-influenced modernists as the idle imaginings of subjective nature, i.e. values. Thus, there we find an environment where moral or ethical values are rejected as 'unintelligible claptrap or hogwash'. However, Putnam thinks the other way round. He thinks that such positivist tendency needs to be revised and it has been realized by many that values play a role even in the scientific enterprise and that the fact-value dichotomy is false and impossible to maintain. Narrating Putnam position, Harries says, "Value-judgments can be objective and rational. They are subject to rational analysis like empirical facts. They can draw upon empirical and non-empirical facts for their basis. They may often be more important than facts because they give meaning to facts."⁵⁵

-----x-----

⁵⁵ Harries, Robert A. "A Summary Critique of The Fact/Value Dichotomy", December 21, 2005, p.20.