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For this second synthesis essay, our two main topic we’ve been talking about are: consistency and truth. Along the essay I’ll be posing the connections, which I have had along the courses we’ve been taking, and the discussions we’ve been having with my classmates this couple of weeks. It just keeps amazing me the whole structure of connectivity we are making and taking out of every dialogue.

The importance of the concept, interpretation, is in all our dialogues especially when we are in the quest of the interpretation of language, we have talked about it in the Philosopher’s looks at Science, Fire in the Equations and in Godel, Escher, Bach. It can be very dangerous to try to interpret language in science because its quest is to have a precise language.

Language serve us as an important tool for communication; in the broadest sense is to make something common; according to David Bohm, On Dialogue. Thanks to language we can move from one system to the other one to convey our emotions and our interpretations. Even in the Hebrew and Spanish Bible, the complications of the interpretation of language is demonstrated. In the Hebrew Bible, God answers Moses, “Yo sere quien sere”, while in Spanish is translated as “Yo soy quien soy”, and it completely changes the meaning conveyed in God’s words. The most exact language discovered up to these days is mathematics and we have been trying for years to make or discover an universal language in order to have a communication with another intelligent being where they could easily understand our context.

When we discussed Crito, many things came up to my mind. The importance of Socrates own values and being consistent towards them is something to be amazed by. What I like about the dialogue between Socrates and Crito, is the fact that Socrates tries his best to make his point clear and make Crito understand why he is choosing not to escape. In order for Crito to understand he has to have his own reasonable doubts about the context in which they are both in. Socrates explain his point well systematically and there’s no leap of mal interpretation between him and Crito. Socrates is being consistent with his decision he once took of being under the Athenian laws, due to this, he has to follow the law and not become a problem to the town with his escape. He wants his values to persist and not corrupt the town. He will not do any harm to those who commit harm unto him.

In Design Thinking, our purpose was to get to know the user, and learn what are the aspects they want to see in a website. So, when we had our interviews it was very amazing to notice, how one has it’s own prejudices about the topic or the person that it can become an obstacle to try to understand their point of view in the subject. This is the blocking in which David Bohm talks about in his first chapter. This also relates with interpretation, where we have to interpret the users words and transform them into actions and into ideas or concepts. We have to left behind what we think about it in order to not suffer alterations in the outcome. There has to be empathy towards the user to get the most out of it, and have an outcome of success.

12 angry men, was the movie we watched on Wednesday and it was very related with interpretations and empathy. The whole ideas is before giving a verdict, or support something in which you are not completely certain, there’s a time for it to reflect and it’s completely fine to have reasonable doubts about the subject. By asking questions and giving it a time and space to think about a topic many things can come out from. One has to be very specific in which things you are disagreeing or agreeing things, because many times we are being blind by the truth because of our own prejudices.

This brings up to mind the importance of dialogues, where there is no central authority telling you the exact system in which you will follow the dialogue, but instead have a cooperative conversation with the people involved trying to get a meaning out of it. Consensus in dialogues are often not allowed, people state their assumptions systematically and with good arguments in order not to confuse other participants in the dialogue. There has to be trust and openness when one is participating in a dialogue. Like in the movie there was no trust at the beginning but at the end at least everybody came to a consensus thanks to the openness of every participant, even the grumpy old one.

In order to find precision in language and to find objective truth we have to have a combination of all the previous topics I mentioned before. We have to constantly be open to new ideas and new interpretations and to doubt everything we have been told to be proven right. When one has the space to come to talk freely without any guidance, spontaneous conversations come to live and many meaning is taken out of it along with questions and interpretations. The key to find the truth is to shut down what we think we already know and to question everything. This will help us to be consistent with what we are looking for and keep away the blockings which are keeping us away from finding the truth and understand others opinions and their interpretations.