

Reasoning Against Reason

Dr. Steve Kumar

We live in a time when common sense is no longer common anymore. What used to be right is wrong, what we call good is bad. We have lost our sense of judgment and are drowning in the sea of subjectivism. Blinded by unbelief and fueled by emotion we are marching mindlessly to a land without hope. To celebrate insanity one must first reject rationality. The pillar of reason which guided the truth is abandoned. With the rejection of objective truth and absolute morals, we are powerless to alter our destiny.

The following provides answers to five common objections against reason.

Reason is Irrelevant

To make sense of this statement you must use reason to express it, in which case reason is relevant. Only in the light of reason is the statement meaningful. If it's meaningless then nothing meaningful is expressed in the statement.

How do we know reason is irrelevant without using reason? You have to use reason in order to reject reason in which case reason is actually useful. To argue that reason is irrelevant is to rely on reason, therefore, making reason a relevant tool. To say "reason is irrelevant" is equivalent to cutting off the branch on which you are sitting.

Reason is our mental capacity to distinguish between A and B. Aristotle, the Greek thinker who defined the laws of Logic, stated that two contradictory statements cannot both be true. If a given statement is true, its contradictory statement cannot also be true. For example, if it is true that my car is parked in my garage it cannot also be true that my car is not parked in my garage. It cannot be both light and dark, true and false, right and wrong, wet and dry, day and night at the same time.

Reason is Relative.

If reason is Relative then the argument against reason is also relative. As the saying goes, "What is good for the goose is good for the gander." Why

should we trust the reasoning of a post modernists when they provide no ground for trusting them. One could argue that without reason you cannot argue for any position, therefore, by rejecting reason you have nothing to say or argue. This objection is self-refuting, contradictory, and meaningless. It's as meaningful as the statement that says, "All statements are meaningless." Everything is absurd. Nothing is true. Life has no creeds. There are no rules. Question all authorities. Trust nobody. There are no absolutes. Everything is relative.

Reason is Impersonal

There are many things in life that are impersonal. Driving a car, painting your house, digging your garden, collecting your mail, etc. Many things in life are not personal but should we abandon mathematics, philosophy and science because they not romantic? We dare not reject reason for not being something its not. Life offers the personal as well as the impersonal. We accept both realities.

To reject reason because it is impersonal is a Red herring. It is arbitrary and subjective. To argue because something is not personal it has no value in human life is intellectual insanity. It is as meaningful as the person who says, "I don't like bicycles because they have only two wheels." To argue "A is not B, therefore, I will not accept A" is meaningless since it wasn't designed for it. It's equivalent to thinking, "Why is two plus two not three?" This assumption is not logical, or practical and livable.

Reason is Inadequate

To argue that reason is inadequate is not self-evident. It is an unsupported statement. It is not a justified assumption but a dogmatic notion. It begs the question. It is an unproven assumption. Reason is basic to thinking and communication. Reason is a vital tool in constructing an argument. It is a necessary backbone in proving one's evidence.

Reason may compel you but reason may not convince you. Reason may not force you to believe but reason will provide evidence for beliefs. Reason is a friend of truth not the master of truth. As the old saying goes, "You may lead a horse to the water but you can't make him drink." Reason may guide you

to the truth but reason is not the truth. It's like insisting, "I believe in language." But language without concepts is useless. In the same sense, it would be pointless to argue by saying I believe in reason since reason is an abstract entity. Reason has no content to believe. The role of reason is to lead you to the light. As Samuel Johnson once replied to a skeptic who spoke in a puzzling manner, "I don't understand you, sir." Johnson responded by saying, "Sir, I have found you an argument but I am not obligated to find you an understanding." Remember the man who said during the election, "I have made up my mind. Please don't confuse me with the evidence."

Reason is too Western

Truth is not a matter of location. Whether one comes from North or South, East or West, $2 + 2$ is always 4. Westerners have no monopoly on Logic. Logic is not a matter of race but a matter of truth. The laws of Logic are universal and are relevant to all groups. It's amazing how people who reject Western logic will readily accept Western technology, Western democracy, Western science, and even Western cash. Truth is not a matter of space.

To argue that this is the case is to go beyond common sense and reason. It is possible to deny Logic and common sense verbally but to practice it existentially is impossible. The laws of Logic, like the law of noncontradiction, are necessary for communication, understanding and existence. Logic enables humans to function in a normal way. Reason is not a matter of culture but a matter of truth. Reason is not something the West has invented but something the West has discovered. Plotinus was on the right track when he said, "He who seeks to destroy Logic will by Logic be destroyed." A healthy view of reason is vital for surviving in our universe.