Are Facts Alone Enough to Prove a Claim?

Word Count: 1599

1 Introduction

Many believe that facts provide impartial evidence that can be relied upon to support the truthfulness of a claim (Farrell, 2023). From this perspective, the essence of knowledge lies in elucidating facts and articulating them coherently, thereby allowing others to form informed judgments. Conversely, others argue that interpreting and analyzing data is crucial in examining a claim (Farrell, 2023). From this viewpoint, the truthfulness of a claim is not just based on providing a set of confirmable facts but also on how they are contextualized, positioned, and related. This debate raises critical issues regarding the nature of knowledge, the role of facts in proving or disproving claims, and the importance of critical thinking and analytical reasoning in evaluating arguments. To address this topic, this essay will focus on two areas of knowledge: natural and human sciences.

2 Natural Science

In natural sciences, it is often asserted that presenting verifiable facts is sufficient to prove a claim (Molnar and Gair, 2015). This approach seeks to establish an objective truth by relying on supporting evidence.

Empirical evidence, gathered directly or indirectly through observation or experimentation, is the cornerstone of scientific knowledge (Costa, 2023). This evidence is presented as data that can be analyzed to support or refute a claim. For example, Newton's law of gravitation in physics is based on observable and repeatable phenomena that can be described and measured mathematically (Schreiber et al., 2023). Likewise, the theory of evolution in biology is supported by the extensive array of data, including evidence from the fossil record, comparative anatomy, biogeography, and molecular biology (Ayala, 2023). Sometimes, having the facts alone is enough to prove a claim true. Nevertheless, it is essential to recognize that scientific knowledge constantly evolves and can be refined with discoveries. Political, societal, and cultural norms sometimes make interpreting and debating scientific claims difficult.

The discovery of evidence for "*omnis cellula e cellula*," one of the three concepts in the

classical cell theory stating that "all cells come from pre-existing cells," demonstrates how scientific claims can be proven solely through factual evidence in natural science (Alberts, 2023). The French chemist and microbiologist Louis Pasteur used the swan neck flask to disprove the idea of spontaneous generation. Using swan neck flasks filled with broth, he demonstrated that after heating the broth to eliminate any present microorganisms, none grew when the flask remained sealed. However, when exposed to the open air, microorganisms appeared in the broth (Ullmann, 2023).

By conducting a straightforward comparative experiment, a significant breakthrough in biology was achieved only by analyzing the experimental data. The assertion *omnis cellula e cellula* was thoroughly examined using objective scientific analysis and actual data rather than subjective interpretation or opinion. This significant finding highlights how the scientific method can enhance our comprehension of the natural world and is the culmination of years of scientific research. However, natural science also has an opposing view that mere facts may not suffice to prove a claim. Instead, it is essential to meticulously assess and evaluate the facts to support or refute a claim. Thus, interpreting and analyzing these facts are equally crucial in demonstrating the validity or invalidity of a scientific claim.

The peer review process is fundamental to scientific research. Before any findings are published, specialists in the relevant field scrutinize the work of the researchers (Constantine, 2018). This thorough examination assesses the methods, data analysis, and conclusions to validate the study's authenticity and credibility. One of the reasons for such rigorous scrutiny is that researchers' initial hypotheses and guiding theories can influence their data interpretation (Baldwin et al., 2022). Consequently, data might be swayed by individual prejudices or preconceptions, potentially resulting in skewed conclusions. A notable lapse in this process was the 1998 paper by Andrew Wakefield, which wrongly linked the MMR vaccine to autism (Rao and Andrade, 2011). Published without thorough peer review, it caused a decline in vaccination rates.

The relationship between smoking and lung cancer exemplifies how interpretation and examination are essential in natural science. It is widely accepted that smokers have higher

lung cancer incidence and mortality rates than nonsmokers ("What Are the Risk Factors for Lung Cancer?" 2023). It is also observed that those who quit smoking have lower incidence and mortality rates than smokers ("Tobacco-Related Mortality" 2022). Yet, despite these clear patterns, medical scholars have varying opinions regarding analyzing and interpreting these facts.

Various theoretical frameworks and assumptions about the underlying causes and potential remedies have impacted the interpretation of scientific evidence. While many researchers point to compelling evidence linking smoking as a primary cause of lung cancer, others, like Dr. Takeshi Yoro, MD, Ph.D., offer a different perspective:

> The mechanism of carcinogenesis is multifaceted, with causes spanning from diet to air pollution to stress. We call it "lung cancer" when cancer coincidentally forms in the lungs. Otherwise, we could not explain the mountain of nonsmokers who develop lung cancer. (Yoro, 2011)

This is despite the International Agency for Research on Cancer having accumulated over 130 volumes of monographs on environmental factors in cancer ("Monographs Available" 2023). In the natural sciences, facts are essential, but so is their interpretation, significantly when influenced by biases and theoretical frameworks.

3 Human Science

In human sciences, it is often argued that facts hold more weight than opinions or personal beliefs (Healy, 1987). This is because facts furnish solid proof that can be corroborated independently, forming a logical foundation for decision-making. Like in other fields, substantiating statements with evidence is vital in human science. Areas such as psychology, sociology, and political science underscore the significance of objective evidence in validating their claims.

In psychology, scientific methods can be utilized to analyze human behavior and yield essential data that either corroborates or challenges specific hypotheses. Researchers can

identify and interpret behavioral trends through various techniques, such as experiments and surveys, to substantiate assertions regarding human behavior (Stangor and Walinga, 2014). Political scientists can use statistical analysis and other methods to support their claims about political behavior and trends. For example, examining political institutions can provide profound insights into the workings of governments and international relations. Election exit polls and public opinion surveys can also shed light on the prevailing political sentiments and beliefs within a population (Rom et al., 2022).

Censuses are indispensable in human sciences as a foundational tool for gathering comprehensive demographic, economic, and sociological data about a nation's inhabitants (Gaur et al., 2023). By systematically collecting information on variables such as age, gender, race, residence, and employment, censuses provide invaluable insights into the composition and dynamics of a population. For instance, the Japanese Census establishes the legal population, which influences the distribution of government revenue and representation in the House of Representatives ("Overview of 2020 Census" 2023). Moreover, data from censuses informs various policies, from urban development and welfare initiatives to disaster mitigation strategies ("Questions and Answers regarding 2020 Census" 2023). Thus, censuses offer a robust framework for understanding societal needs and ensuring that administrative strategies are grounded in rigorously collected and analyzed objective data, emphasizing the significance of facts in human sciences.

Similarly, factual data has enriched our understanding of the clinical field. Dialectical Behavior Therapy (DBT) is recognized as effective in treating individuals with borderline personality disorder (Chapman, 2014). The American Psychological Association explicitly recommends DBT for this disorder, noting its status as one of the few psychotherapies with confirmed evidence (Warlick et al., 2022). Its efficacy has been reported based on rigorous evidence and data, further solidifying DBT's reputation as a trustworthy therapeutic method.

While the weight of factual evidence is undeniable, a counterclaim expresses that facts may not be sufficient to alter someone's beliefs or opinions. People may possess long-held convictions that resist even the most compelling evidence or rational arguments.

Emotional resonance and personal experiences may exert a more substantial influence on one's views than mere facts (Giorgi, 2017). Many factors, including cultural, social, and personal biases, shape our perceptions and interpretations (Moussaïd et al., 2013). For example, despite the overwhelming scientific consensus on the safety and efficacy of COVID-19 vaccines, some individuals, influenced by personal experiences, anecdotal stories, or misinformation, remain hesitant or refuse vaccination. This hesitancy persists even when they are presented with extensive data on vaccine benefits and the risks of preventable diseases (Gorman et al., 2022). Such scenarios underscore that while facts are foundational in human science, the intricacies of human cognition and emotion can sometimes overshadow objective evidence, making it challenging to change deeply held beliefs.

This counterclaim is evident in the approaches to tackling mental illness. Although evidence-based treatments such as psychotherapies and medications have been proven effective through scientific studies, some individuals may prefer alternative treatments based on personal beliefs (Harvey and Gumport, 2015; Schulz and Hede, 2022). For instance, in many indigenous communities worldwide, traditional healers or shamans are often consulted for mental health concerns (Dein, 2020). These healers may use rituals, ceremonies, or herbal remedies to treat individuals, believing that spiritual imbalances or malevolent spirits cause mental disorders. While Western medicine might view these practices skeptically due to a lack of empirical evidence supporting their efficacy, many in these communities deeply trust and value the wisdom of their traditional healers. This emphasizes the influence of cultural beliefs and values on mental health treatment approaches. Facts are fundamental in human sciences, yet thoughts may prevail.

4 Conclusion

In both natural and human sciences, the role of facts in proving claims is a topic of ongoing debate. While natural science often leans on empirical evidence to establish objective truths open for independent verification, the multifaceted nature of human cognition means that interpretation is pivotal, especially when biases and theoretical frameworks

come into play. On the other hand, human sciences emphasize the weight of facts but recognize that personal beliefs and cultural nuances can sometimes overshadow objective evidence. The intricate nature of human cognition and emotion, combined with societal and cultural influences, can challenge the dominance of facts in shaping perceptions and beliefs.

While facts serve as the bedrock in both areas, their interpretation and the influence of subjective experiences are equally crucial in determining their impact. Critical analysis, reasoning, and the broader context are paramount in proving or disproving claims from these facts.

Works Cited

Alberts, Bruce. "Cell theory". *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 28 June 2023. www.britannica.com/science/cell-theory. Accessed 28/6/2023.

Ayala, Francisco. "Eevolution". *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 28 June 2023. www.britannica.com/science/evolution-scientific-theory.. Accessed 28/7/2023.

Baldwin, Jessie, et al. "Protecting against researcher bias in secondary data analysis: challenges and potential solutions". *European Journal of Epidemiology*, 13 Jan. 2022. link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10654-021-00839-0#citeas. Accessed 1/8/2023.

Chapman, Alexander. "Dialectical Behavior Therapy". 2014. www.apa.org/pubs/videos/4310914. Accessed 20/8/2023.

Constantine, Norman. "Peer Review". *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 22 Nov. 2018. www.britannica.com/topic/peer-review. Accessed 28/7/2023.

Costa, Daniel. "Emperical Evidence". *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 3 Feb. 2023. www.britannica.com/topic/empirical-evidence. Accessed 29/7/2023.

Dein, Simon. "Traditional Healers and Global Mental Health". *Innovations in Global Mental Health*, 8 Oct. 2020. link.springer.com/referenceworkentry/10.1007/978-3-319-70134-9_132-1. Accessed 20/8/2023.

Farrell, Marcy. "Data and Intuition: Good Decisions Need Both". *Harvard Business Publishing*, 6 Jan. 2023. www.harvardbusiness.org/data-and-intuition-good-decisions-need-both/. Accessed 29/7/2023.

Gaur, Aakanksha, et al. "Census". *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 15 Aug. 2023. www.britannica.com/science/census. Accessed 21/8/2023.

Giorgi, Simona. "The Mind and Heart of Resonance: The Role of Cognition and Emotions in Frame Effectiveness". *Journal of Management Studies*, 20 Apr. 2017. onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/joms.12278#pane-pcw-references. Accessed 20/8/2023.

Gorman, Jack, et al. “Implications of COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy: Results of Online Bulletin Board Interviews”. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 10 Jan. 2022. www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1068554/full. Accessed 20/8/2023.

Harvey, Allison, and Nicole Gumport. “Evidence-based psychological treatments for mental disorders: Modifiable barriers to access and possible solutions”. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, vol. 68, May 2015, pp. 1–12. www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0005796715000285. Accessed 27/6/2023.

Healy, Paul. “Facts, Values, and Objectivity in the Human Sciences”. *Auslegung: a Journal of Philosophy*, 1987. api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:55200358. Accessed 1/8/2023.

Molnar, Charles, and Jane Gair. *Concepts of Biology – 1st Canadian Edition*. BCcampus, 14 May 2015, opentextbc.ca/biology/. Accessed 29/7/2023.

“Monographs Available”. *International Agency for Research on Cancer*, 2023. monographs.iarc.who.int/monographs-available/. Accessed 25/6/2023.

Moussaïd, Mehdi, et al. “Social Influence and the Collective Dynamics of Opinion Formation”. *PloS One*, 5 Nov. 2013. www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3818331/. Accessed 20/8/2023.

“Overview of 2020 Census”. *Japanese Statistics Bureau*, 14 Aug. 2023. www.stat.go.jp/data/kokusei/2020/gaiyou.html. Accessed 21/8/2023.

“Questions and Answers regarding 2020 Census”. *Japanese Statistics Bureau*, 14 Aug. 2023. www.stat.go.jp/data/kokusei/2020/qa-1.html. Accessed 21/8/2023.

Rao, Sathyanarayana, and Chittaranjan Andrade. “The MMR vaccine and autism: Sensation, refutation, retraction, and fraud”. *Indian Journal of Psychiatry*, 2011. www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3136032/. Accessed 20/8/2023.

Rom, Mark, et al. *Introduction to Political Science*. OpenStax, 18 May 2022, openstax.org/details/books/introduction-political-science. Accessed 25/7/2023.

Schreiber, Barbara, et al. “Newton’s law of gravitation”. 24 July 2023. www.britannica.com/science/Newtons-law-of-gravitation. Accessed 28/7/2023.

Schulz, Pierre, and Vincent Hede. "Alternative and complementary approaches in psychiatry: beliefs versus evidence". *Dialogues in Clinical Neuroscience*, 1 Apr. 2022. www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6296392/. Accessed 20/8/2023.

Stangor, Charles, and Jennifer Walinga. *Introduction to Psychology – 1st Canadian Edition*. BCcampus, 17 Oct. 2014, opentextbc.ca/introductiontopsychology/. Accessed 25/6/2023.

"Tobacco-Related Mortality". *Centers for Disease Control and Prevention*, 22 Aug. 2022. www.cdc.gov/tobacco/data_statistics/fact_sheets/health_effects/tobacco_related_mortality/index.htm. Accessed 11/8/2023.

Ullmann, Agnes. "Louis Pasteur". *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 18 June 2023. www.britannica.com/biography/Louis-Pasteur. Accessed 20/6/2023.

Warlick, Craig, et al. "Effectiveness of a brief dialectical behavior therapy intensive-outpatient community health program". 2022. psycnet.apa.org/record/2022-13890-001. Accessed 20/8/2023.

"What Are the Risk Factors for Lung Cancer?" *Centers for Disease Control and Prevention*, 31 July 2023. www.cdc.gov/cancer/lung/basic_info/risk_factors.htm#:~:text=People%20who%20smoke%20cigarettes%20are,the%20risk%20of%20lung%20cancer. Accessed 1/8/2023.

Yoro, Takeshi. "Anti-smoking movement fosters an atmosphere of intolerance towards dissenting opinions". *SAPIO*, Shogakukan, 14 Sept. 2011.