**87) Claim: Any piece of information referred to as a fact should be mistrusted, since it may well be proven false in the future. Reason: Much of the information that people assume is factual actually turns out to be inaccurate.**

Write a response in which you discuss the extent to which you agree or disagree with the claim and the reason on which that claim is based.

1. 正:a、受时代限制认识局限，马克思(Marx)资本论(Das Capital)说社会主义(socialism) 出现在发达国家;b、科学水平限制;c、信息复杂，不准确反:推论( inferenc e)漏洞很多:a 、确实有，但作为原因不充分;b、认识在不断改变， 现在错不一定将来错;c、怀疑一切无法进步

3. 交汇:十分复杂，但完全不信不可行:a、追求真理是本性;b、人的认知能力发展;c、 事实还需研究

4. 结论:尽管人对事实的态度仍需讨论，简单说因有真实被推翻就不信任一切是草率的。 如果掌握方法，则一定的信任会使人更大收益并抵消(compensate，offset)部分弊端。

…some judgment of contemporaries is biased and might be proved to be inaccurate?... we should be inspired to double all contemporary definition?... ‘descendant’ ‘contemporary’… descendant is more disinterested when consider the accuracy of a fact… the judgment of contemporaries might not be wrong and if deficient in fundamental knowledge, over-skepticism over-skepticism lead to total simplicity and naivety…

…there are some limits when contemporaries assess a fact. A good case in hand is Van Gogh, a famous painter whose work was not acknowledged by people during his lifetime, and was considered a madman and a failure. He sold only one of his paintings at a low price all over his career, but he never gave up his painting style and followed his own heart. Even a majority of people don’t understand the art work, it still doesn’t mean it is valueless. Decades later, he attained widespread critical, commercial and popular success, and is remembered as an important but tragic painter, whose troubled personality typifies the romantic ideal of the tortured artist. In sum, even some individuals are not comprehensible for most people, it might be meaningful to the world and descendant would reassess their greatness impersonally.

…no doubt that some so-called fact might become inaccurate, we still can’t be convinced that all fact need to be doubt. Before van Gogh, people cared about the subject and the painting had to look like the object it was supposed to represent. With the development of fast technology innovation, painters were not basically cameras anymore. After van Gogh, they start to focus on the intent of the artist and the painting no longer had to represent a specific object. Van Gogh was ahead of his time, hence, his paintings were considered by most people to be ugly. However, it doesn’t mean those people’s judgment are wrong owing to the fact that they just have different aesthetic standard. To sum up, human knowledge is on constant change and no one can guarantee which norm is absolutely right.

… All skeptics believe some body of knowledge is accurate (or as accurate as it can be) — they have to in order to have a reference by which they can judge whether a particular opinion or belief measures up. Whereas religious people can be skeptical — the Creationists for example reject Darwinian evolution — this is not true skepticism as it is merely the rejection of a particular set of opinions because it happens to contradict another set of opinions. A true skeptic constantly questions his or her own basic premises, something that a religious adherent is not supposed to do for it is likely to lead to a crisis of faith. So any system of knowledge which doubts itself is a candidate for a skeptic's foundation beliefs. This short article will focus on scientific skepticism.

Many doubt has scarce evidence and be used by people with ulterior motives. A good case in hand is during the SARS period, China government didn’t inform the mass and someone began to rumors. The public couldn’t find out the truth and gradually question the government and even cause the social unrest. In sum, compliance with an order or submission to authority would be effective in the well-being of society.