Reflexivity Statement

In terms of positionality, I try to disassociate from any form of categorization (class, race, gender etc.) that might inflict certain bias in my research. While on one hand I understand the influence and importance of personal beliefs and positioning, but my preference is to strive for objectivity within the constraints of the given/available information.

While getting closer to 'truth' is of utmost importance to me, but I am often perplexed by the definition of truth itself which seems rather tautological if not circular. While truth is defined as "that which is true or in accordance with *fact* or reality", however the simple definition of fact is defined as "a thing that is known or proved to be *true*".

If I were to *concede* 'truth do exist', I have a preference toward , Inflationary (Substantive) Theories of truth and within that more specifically towards the *'correspondence theory of truth'* which defines truth as something point to facts, or reality, rather than truth being defined under the coherence theory of truth as something that coheres to the rest of our knowledge or pragmatic theory of truth that defines truth is what works or serves our purpose.

While I have no formal training in philosophy, I am deeply interested in the epistemic roots of belief and more broadly the epistemic justification or rationality of beliefs. From a broader worldview, Nihilism (more specifically Absurdism) makes the most sense *to me*, but it creates further problem where I cannot bring myself to close the gap in David Hume's is-ought problem. This is because the reality I perceive, only has the 'is' or 'description of how things are' and no information about how we can reach to the 'ought' or what 'should be. By extension, what is 'good' or what is 'bad' do not hold much meaning to me, likely since my meta ethical stance of being a 'moral skeptic' or having a strong preference towards 'moral error theory'. -This creates a significant issue when I have undertaken or might do research in social science of required to come up with normative or prescriptive recommendations.

Relating this back to how I approach or likely would-be conducting data science work I have struggled to find the answer on how effective I can be with core underlying belief in the absence of objective truth, morality, values etc.

While as silly as it may sound, as Blaise Pascal had addressed the difficulty 'reason' and 'rationality' pose to genuine belief can be cured by "acting as if [one] believed", might be the only way out. Therefore, the best I can do, is to play 'pretend' and 'act' in a way that existence have some meaning, or more narrowly the work I do will have some 'value' and play my part in moving the needle of science as an incremental process improved through employing falsifiability, as Karl Popper had articulated, which may help me to get a bit closer to truth (*assuming/conceding truth does exist*).