

# Stakeholders of (the) Truth

---

In a world where globalisation is the movement, for most of us it is a priority to know what's up with the world, even before knowing what's up with our neighbour next door. However, nobody is virtually accountable to anybody in this social world. Zeroes and ones have made enormous quantities of information available these days, that people are encumbered under the homogeneity of facts and lies. Being surrounded by fallacies of all kinds, how do we know the truth?

Truth – what does it even mean? In the words of a commoner, truth is the righteous. What is righteous: Thesaurus says it's "good". That reminds of Shakespeare, when he wrote "There is nothing either good or bad, but thinking makes it so." So does mere thinking make truth? Well, maybe. What is true for me, may not be true for you, just like what may be right for me, may not be for you. We are taught as a part of Theory of Knowledge at school, that knowledge comes from different stakeholders. For Instance, newspapers published different stories of the episode of Kashmir this year, with no one clear big idea. The views of the Kashmiris, the Pakistanis, the political authorities of both countries, the views of the population of India were not identical. It is palpable that views, and even eye-witnesses, differed amongst individuals. Taking the 2008 Noida double murder case as another example, it can be concluded that each one has his/her own stake of knowledge.

There are many stakeholders of knowledge, who have many media to reach us. Each's gen is fairly important for us to know, until we know the facts and opinions differentiated. A big information provider is the media. Given the fact there are many stakeholders and it is next to impossible to state that a certain is the truth, perhaps we are all wrong in insisting for media accountability. No, that is not where it leads. Media's deed is to let its audience know all relevant facts and important opinions without exaggerating or undermining. Facts are inarguable and can be proven. The media can therefore be rightly accused for rendering any facts or statistical figures if it does so. Also, it has to neutrally bring in both claims and counterclaims, of all kinds of stakeholders: pertinent intellectual personalities, targeted victims, profession critics and the common man. Opinions are not inarguable; media may display debates and discussions of conflicting opinions, but it shall pursue no self-interested and not prohibit any opinion unless it is abusive.

But do we ever stop to question the knowledge the newspapers, the news channels provide us? Do we reason how we know what we believe we know as told by them? There doesn't prevail even a single form of journalism that can be trusted upon to know what is happening at some orientation in space and time. More than censoring the mass media for its unaccountability, it is essential to understand how much to keep and how much let go off the other ear after hearing.

Any fact that someone provides you, should be critically reflected upon by you. Look at all perspectives, understand the influence, know the extent of credibility and be a stakeholder of well-thought knowledge, instead of passing by with one perspective, as if it is the truth. Look for owners or sponsors of newspapers, surveys etc. to know the extent to which they may be biased to trap you.

Be media-literate, in terms of knowing you are choosing the right foundation to draw information to share with others. When people are trying to prove their argument, they can commit various

blunders. Challenge assumptions and identify hasty generalisations. Respect all perspectives, and have your outlook. In the up-to-the-minute research-led ecosphere, the intellectual is the one who possesses an opinion, which is as unique as fingerprints, and the rest are merely parrots.

In early days there were men whose vocational job was to copy documents. It was evident, that even though those men professionally copied each word, after many copies by various pantographs: it is an intuitive fact that there are found to be variations. Similarly, the information we know reaches us after so many filtration layers, thus being variant of the gen of the original stakeholder. This might be due to Chinese-whisper-like alterations, or an entrenched wilful conspiracy. Apart from being vigilant, what is the solution to this play-of-trick... should all knowledge be exposed and subject to candid criticism?

Ms. Gariyasi Garg

Freelancer