

HOW COMMON SENSE IS EXERCISED AND FLAWED: INSIGHTS OF PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE

Peggy Magdalena Jonathans¹, Thersia Magdalena Tamelan²

^{1,2}Universitas Kristen Artha Wacana

^{*})Corresponding author: jonathanspeggyofficial@gmail.com

Received date:31-05-2025; Accepted date: 31/12/2025

Abstract. Among the laypeople, public speakers are thought to represent the institution they are affiliated with or to characterize their identity. Laypeople might be amazed by the sound judgment of well-known figures, although they seem to be carried away from scientific justification. Studying the nature of language, its meaning, and its connection to reality (a.k.a philosophy of language) would be relevant to analyzing the depth of the speaking. The present study will disclose the logical fallacy made in the talk of an Indonesian public figure by meticulously observing his videotaped talk on the YouTube platform. The findings show the public figure contrasted the government's propositions with his wrong inferences, based on the analytical truth in his false common sense, made prudent suggestions and sound judgment without a scientifically tested conclusion, employed lots of metaphors throughout the talk, and tended to overgeneralize. Despite the flaws, his partially true proposition could be argued and served as a mind-blowing reflection and criticism of the Indonesian wall of democracy. The study is worthwhile in correcting the strong claims the speaker highlighted because common sense is prone to play a tricky pragmatic role in thinking about how things can be. As everyone has their innate common sense within the intuitive aspect of knowledge, the knowledge of absolute truth may lead everyone to distinguish right from wrong and decide wisely for a better life for all.

Keywords: *truth and false propositions, right and wrong inferences, logical fallacy*

INTRODUCTION

Open talk is a common practice in developing countries, as well as in Indonesia. Nevertheless, open talk may sound like a logical fallacy when it is not data-based, driven talk, mainly when the flow of talk mostly depends on the audience's common sense. Thomas Paine (1775-1776) popularized the phrase "common sense" through a pamphlet that was anonymously published on January 10, 1776, and his justification was released during the period of American independence from Britain (amidst the American Revolution) (Ladyman, 2002). Philosophy helps people comprehend their existence and determine what is true, good, and genuine (Ekpenyong & Ikegbu, 2018). Further, the study facilitates one to safely depend on science to help comprehend and take action till further notice. Green (2019) argues

that children learn by following a process comparable to how scientists generate hypotheses and revise theories in response to evidence evaluation. Thus, the present study is also worth conducting for lay people and scholars to have a bigger picture of the phenomenon and may start to maximize the logic (Hansson & Hendricks, 2018) behind all public arguments (Maxwell, 2007).

According to some philosophers (Falckenberg, 2020), the main objective of the modern philosophy of science is to challenge one's current common sense in light of scientific evidence (Rosenberg, 2012). Science creates a unique connection between perceptions of reality and imagination (Eco, 1984). As science results from methodical and careful examination, the evolution of the straightforward and evident idea enables people to think and choose freely. However, they are not free to act as they please.

According to Jon Ogborn, common sense and science serve different purposes (<http://iupap-icpe.org/publications/teach2/> Ogborn.pdf). While science is primarily interested in gaining some understanding that is, to some extent, independent of people and circumstance, the goal may forego the necessity of directing immediate action. Common sense is primarily concerned with immediate action in context. Science has created a vast toolkit of theoretical models that have been thoroughly studied (Eco, 1984), resulting in highly complex and structured creative tools. It has produced several novel (and not all that popular) ways of being logical. In this context, logic has a unique function in science (Eco, 1984), namely in the transactional realm where the results of imagination are carried out.

On the other hand, common sense is more based on the vast range of fundamental aspects of how things might be. Its rationality is limited to what is comprehensible or logical (Ladyman, 2002). It is considered a low-level, real-world, everyday problem-solving phenomenon.

The cruciality in determining what is proper and incorrect in real-world decision-making (Maxwell, 2007) is subject to common sense. That is what people would agree on; that is their natural understanding. It deals with ideas or claims that, in most people's experience, are sensible and well-judged, even though they have never undergone scientific testing (Beyerstein, 1996). In addition, our common sense tends to relate to things that happen in the human experience, making it observable with standard human capabilities and comparable to the proportion of humans.

It may consist of all of the unintentional impacts made during everyday living. Those feelings could be cherished in the memory and evoked by daily events. Conversely, Haselager (2020) views things differently by asserting that our experience's local character must be added to the many worlds' interpretation as a stand-alone premise because it cannot be derived from it. Therefore, one must revise common sense in light of experience and the idea that human behavior is an exercise of independent, causally unknown control.

However, during the past COVID-19 pandemic, some events were against common sense, such as allowing mass gatherings, discouraging the use of face masks, spending time in public areas (Wimalawansa, et al., 2020), commonsense approaches are to minimize risks from COVID-19. <https://doi.org/10.36811/ojprm.2020.110010>, permitting unprotected usage of packed public transportation systems and failing to wash hands.

Imagined things and experiences are abstracted from the real world— these two make the materials of common sense concrete. However, Peels, de Ridder, and van Woudenberg (2020) find the problematic issue where people tend to create a new example of material coincidence based on ideas from physics rather than

common sense, which the usual solutions cannot explain. Since it usually aims to achieve short-term pragmatic objectives (Eco, 1984), the overall goal of common sense is to comprehend the present moment so one can behave effectively in the situation (Maxwell, 2007). The meaning of commonsense language and thought comes from action, from our physical presence in the world. An entity or event's significance is a package of its capabilities, its composition, and what can be done to it. In short, that implies that complexity is something to consider.

Commonsense reasoning frequently employs metonymy and metaphor. Green (2019) points out that the effectiveness of metaphors and analogies in scientific thinking should be assessed based on how well they serve as a guide rather than as empirical claims about the universe. Commonsense reasoning is creative by nature, just like language. It can always try recombining or changing them differently to create new entities and events that could help us grasp anything because it works with imagined entities and events. In order to create new methods of imagining previously unimaginable things, it attempts to view one thing as another.

In commonsense reasoning, metonymy and metaphor are frequently employed. In doing so, it tries to see one thing as another, generating new ways of conceiving previously impossible things (Green, 2019). Just as language is creative by nature, so is the common sense of reasoning. It works with imagined entities and events, so it can always try recombining or altering them differently to generate new entities and events that could help us understand anything.

With the prominence of common sense, the present study aims to reveal whole insights into the philosophy of science on how common sense is exercised (Rosenberg, 2012) through open talk, which was flawed by a public figure in Indonesia. The focus is on finding the truth (Ladyman, 2002), false propositions, and right and wrong inferences (Ladyman, 2002) of Rocky Gerung's open talk.

METHOD

The present qualitative study research employs discourse analysis on Rocky Gerung's YouTube talk from the November 2010 edition. The procedures of the study comprise several steps, namely (1) watch Rocky Gerung's videos; (2) use common sense to find the truth and  the false propositions; right and wrong inferences, if any, in Rocky Gerung's talk; give the examples and evidence (Beyerstein, 1996). The truth can be analytic (Losee, 2001) (conceptual or logical or by definition) or synthetic (empirical or coming from one's or others' experience); (3) write the argumentative paper; (4) decide the theme and the title.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This philosophical study examines a speech by Rocky Gerung on November 6, 2010, in a YouTube video titled "Merawat Indonesia dengan Akal Sehat" (which translates to "Nourishing Indonesia with Common Sense"). This argumentative essay on the discussion is divided into at least three sections: (a) correct and incorrect propositions; (b) correct and incorrect inferences; and (c) examples and proof of analytical truth (conceptual, logical, by definition) (Ekpenyong, & Ikegbu, 2018) and synthetic truth (empirical, derived from one's own or another's experience) (Losee, 2001).

The discussion will be argued and supported by examples and evidence under the following theme:

Standing and Practicing Governing Based on The 1945 Constitution

Rocky Gerung is one of Indonesia's intellectual scholars and political critics with a philosophy and political science background. His talk was addressed to the era under the previous President, Mr. Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono and it covers three main sub-themes, as follows:

Sub-Theme (1): The Mentality of Indonesian Politicians

Rocky attacked the Indonesian minister of religious affairs, a top official, for using the word "register" carelessly, which sounded disrespectful rather than sensitively representing his statement. Rocky advised the minister to exercise caution when addressing the public because the public may interpret the senior official's statements as the government's attitude. According to Rocky's observations, he correctly deduced that other authorities had made similar reckless remarks in other public spaces. One of his examples of analytical truth (Losee, 2001) is "All high officials are the government."

His common sense provided the analytical truth (Losee, 2001), but psychology can explain why Indonesian officials often present themselves poorly to the public. Speaking in front of an audience requires much skill. The speaker, message, channel, listener, feedback, interference, and scenario make such complexity difficult to master without training. The American government created the Dos and Don'ts guidelines for public speaking because it understands how serious public statements by its leaders may be. Nonetheless, the public knows that US officials have received public speaking instruction. Indonesia might, therefore, consider doing the same. The purpose is for the speech to be well said and mannerly behaved.

Rocky said other prominent officials tend to propagate state hegemony among the population. Perhaps, to put it more clearly, the hegemony stemmed from these people's "false" common sense, which they subsequently spread among themselves without backing a scientific study. Rocky continued by saying that Indonesia has many intelligent individuals who can replace its current population by applying common sense. Although Rocky had a good idea and good judgment, scientific evidence did not support his conclusion (Beyerstein, 1996).

.It should be recognized that a nation with a clean bureaucracy and good management results from many intricate variables. Hundreds of years, such as America, may pass before a developed nation is established. Rocky kept this aspect of himself hidden from his speech.

He then brought up one of Indonesia's most prominent figures, former President Mr. Soekarno, who was overthrown politically by his opponent. He claimed that Mr. Soekarno's use of metaphors in the line, "I was bent like a rattan, but not broken," is an excellent example of the high official mentality in Indonesia. He went on to juxtapose that to the more practical way that Mr. Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono, the President who succeeded him, expressed himself in a similar circumstance while in office: "I was bombarded and assaulted." In his opinion, the President overstated something that never occurred. Rocky subconsciously expected every Indonesian President to show optimism through the deft use of metaphorical language to imbue his people with a dynamic environment. His inadequate criticism of the Indonesian

leaders' purported public self-representation may have led to his incorrect conclusion.

When discussing the behaviors of most Indonesian lawmakers during the House meetings, which were broadcast live by many national television networks, Rocky utilized analogies to convey his disgust. He called them "people without heads" and accused them of failing to advance the country in any way. Likewise, an independent survey found that although many of the House's measures have benefited justice and the general welfare of the Indonesian people, the public was not very pleased with the legislature's performance. Rocky's false assertion, however, might be a potent reminder of the parliament's steadfast commitment to its national responsibility.

Sub-Theme (2): Democracy, Diversity, and the Constitution of the Nation

Rocky provided a rational explanation (Ladyman, 2002). of Indonesian ideology (Pancasila). The first stanza of Pancasila, "Ketuhanan yang Maha Esa," which I can interpret as "The essential existence of God or Deity" or "The essential nature of God, the Almighty," was historically taken from the concepts of "Tauhid" and "Pantheism," according to Rocky.

However, his subsequent claim that "it was totally not of Indonesian cultural heritage" was untrue. Meanwhile, pantheism refers to a theology that identifies God with the universe or the universe as a manifestation of God. Tauhid is a doctrine that identifies God in oneness. He neglected to note, though, that pantheism, Hinduism, Buddhism, and other religions all incorporate animism, the actual indigenous belief of Indonesia. He frequently generalizes too much about the topic of the discussion. It may be claimed that his proposition is somewhat true.

Furthermore, he cautioned that "Esa" should be interpreted according to its original meaning, "The Almighty." However, "One religion for the country and one way of worshiping the same God" is not an accurate translation. The declaration is consistent with the founding fathers' (of the Constitution) goals.

Rocky failed to support his claims with facts or logic as the conversation continued. Rocky neglected to mention that native Indonesians already have a custom known as "Rembuk Desa (the villagers are in one accord for something) to reach an agreement on a topic under discussion. Villagers gather in Rembuk Desa to debate issues and reach a consensus based on majority choice. Conversely, he asserted that "Musyawarah" (meeting to reach an agreement) and "Mufakat" (consensus) are customs of other nations. He based his conclusions on the Arabic loanwords 'mufakat' and 'musyawarah'. Anthropology and linguistics, two pertinent disciplines, documented the number and reasons for Arabic loanwords in the Indonesian corpus.

In Indonesia, Arabic loanwords have experienced a process of re-Arabization, whereby they were initially given a form different from classical Arabic and then later given a new form that was more in keeping with the original classical Arabic. Due to their classical forms, most Arabic loanwords lack any colloquial traces that would indicate their place of origin. It is incredibly naive to assume that Indonesia lacks numerous important and substantial cultural traditions based on its heavy reliance on borrowed terms.

His wrong inferences continued by describing further that, culturally speaking, the Indonesian way of solving problems was only by physical battle using weapons. Indonesia is an archipelago, and the culture varies from place to place, as does their tradition of conflict resolution. Regarding diversity, Rocky highlighted the Indonesian

Youth Pledge ('Sumpah Pemuda') as the central pillar for national unity. Interestingly, on October 10, 1928, he emphasized that the Pledge aimed to nourish the country's diversity and democracy. Rocky is a nationalist to the core. He happened to oversee some people in the country who irresponsibly attempted to deviate from the Pledge of the Original Noble Concept. Explicitly, the Indonesian heroic youth in 1928 declared 'One motherland, One nation, One Language' for Indonesia. However, he said the 'major community' invested in a plot to replace the Pledge with 'one major' religion or one primary ethnicity' for the country. Rocky personally was displeased by the use of the words, 'the majority' versus 'the minority,' because the words themselves discriminate against people and violate democracy. To this point, Rocky has served well with his intriguing thoughts.

Nevertheless, Rocky sharply analyzed that some people, including high officials, have intentionally ruled out the ideology and the basic Constitution from the nation's daily pragmatic concept and the state policy and implementation. One of the correct inferences to support Rocky's strong claim was when the Constitutional Court of Indonesia permitted and accepted a general proposition (theorem) other than the basic Constitution's propositions. Eventually, the court chairman let a man of the 'majority religion' elaborate his 'religion' propositions on a state issue, which was out of context (Hansson & Hendricks, 2018). Thus, he said, there is hideous power behind the country's wall of democracy trying to sneak around, but people are oblivious to the coming attack against Indonesia's democracy. This is the area where the philosophy of science should take place. Green (2019) highlights "the eagle eyes" on how a more in-depth examination of conceptual formation may yield insight into systematicity theory. The reliability of collective data and systematic analysis components are necessary to support the hypothesis he addressed.

Rocky amazed his audience with his quick-witted and entertaining mind, covering his area of talk merely by exercising his common sense, which is extraordinarily valid to some extent. He also cleverly uses a correct extension of meaning (metaphors) from the words power, wall, and sneak around.

Sub-Theme (3): Communal versus Public Interests and the Milestone of the Republic of Indonesia

To a layman, Rocky's talk is perhaps provocative. Nevertheless, for educated scholars, science's critical test is needed to confront their talk to understand the issue (Eco, 1984) securely. In this area of interest, contemporary philosophers should assist the civil people with the proper inferences (without taking any side: government versus opposition) because common sense tends to play tricky pragmatic thinking of how things can be (Eco, 1984; Losee, 2001). In the following part of the talk, he engaged the audience with communal versus public interest (Hansson & Hendricks, 2018). He specified 'communal' as 'the majority or special groups,' whereas 'public' as 'the civil people or the Indonesian citizens.' He perceived that the government tended to exercise its discourse of power, led by the 'communal' desires.

According to him, the 'communal' had such a steering power over the government, even when the government knew the steering was heavily laden and faulty. He has pursued this matter as everyone must agree when we find his creative metaphors right. If it is not, everyone with an open-minded attitude should consider his talk a severe reflection of misconduct in the country. Though this sounds convincing, we can rely heavily on science to explain different things because he extensively used metaphors and metonymy. Communalism is, in fact, a political

philosophy and economic system that integrates communal ownership and confederations of highly localized independent communities (<https://www.studypage.in/indian-polity/communalism-caste-and-reservations>; Hansson & Hendricks, 2018). The movement emerged during the late 20th century. This is different from the current situation in Indonesia, and Rocky did not deliver the correct proposition. We understand his discipline background, and he attempted to incorrectly extend the meaning of 'Communal' to justify his reasoning and persuade his audience (Hansson & Hendricks, 2018).

Education is another of his concerns. He further reminded the nation's aims (explicitly stated in the 1945 Indonesian Constitution) to 'provide equal access to education for all.' However, later, at the grassroots level, the communal power intentionally (Hansson & Hendricks, 2018) interpreted it as 'making the school children have high morality according to the religious values.' He was upset with the government's reluctant response to a change of what is not right, such as regulating the clothes, body, and specific moral values. In this specific case, it might be concluded tentatively that what happened was the government officials' misconduct.

Nevertheless, his broad-scope examination of how interrelated aspects come into one focused analysis is admirable, though a few are false. From time to time, he preferred using hyperbole to pose his provocative picture of Indonesia's political picture and the current government in service, as discussed next. Synthetic truth (Losee, 2001) is absent from all his talks. Sometimes, audiences are carried off by his common sense. However, one should be aware that the arguments made by science are to thoroughly consider and rule out other possibilities, sample more methodically, produce more extensive recordings, and examine the facts. They strengthen the relationship between scientific knowledge and other knowledge assertions (Green, 2019).

He now termed the country 'the Republic of Fear' if all the above conditions persist. He knew his talk well and was talented, playing with highly selected words and the logic for every justification. The ability aligns with the characteristics of commonsense reasoning, which is inherently creative. He argued that there is a discourse of practicing power from the outside, such as feudalism and neoliberalism. Evidence could not fully support the inferences (Beyerstein, 1996). He should differentiate between the misconduct of certain people and the country's transition effort to progress and improve all aspects of state administration and management. Even though he made an inconclusive judgment, Rocky is admired for his effort to criticize all misconduct and evil plots of certain people. He is appreciated for his watchful eye for guarding the country. Rocky was also brilliant in finding something in all virtuous actions. Safety and harmony are two important expectations everybody will look for in the country where they reside. He came to the broad brush of the people's primary dimension by visualizing the country as 'the Republic of Fear.' He suspected the government's ignorance contributed to that and predicted 'the Republic of Hope' would collapse. By touching on the essential dimension of country security, he probably called the educated citizens to question the government's commitment based on the Constitution.

To this stage, Rocky's agenda from his talk can not be concluded because he seemed to oppose anyone in the presidential position for the previous decade before the talk. However, one thing is sure: his talk may open people's minds to the need for self-reflection and evaluation in any dimension of a 'progressing' nation. Having listened to his talk, people could be like 'eagle eyes': watching, controlling, and lending a hand to the government.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we still use common sense to find the best way to build Indonesia as a tolerable country with intelligent officials, and we are fully committed to serving its people based on the virtues agreed upon by the founding fathers. Similarly, Rocky called for collecting the 'common sense' of the Indonesian people to maintain 'the Republic of Hope' well, only for the well-being of the people and the nation.

Scientific investigation is prominent, along with common sense and logic, balanced by wisdom to create a harmonious life for the Republic of Indonesia. Common sense is generally directed towards immediate pragmatic (goals, especially for public policy at the grassroots levels, and exercising common sense is ethically better than exercising the discourse of power (Eco, 1984). That would always be complementary to having people (critics) help us all see one thing as another, form new ways of imagining things that could not have been experienced before, and prevent the destructive impact from appearing. Nevertheless, the critic's presence reminds us of what has been forgotten in the nation's practices. As everyone has innate common sense within the intuitive aspect of knowledge, the knowledge of absolute truth (Losee, 2001; Maxwell, 1984), everyone should learn to distinguish right from wrong and decide wisely for a better life for all.

REFERENCES

Artz, J. M. (2013). Towards a Philosophy of Information Systems. <https://core.ac.uk/download/301359384.pdf>

Beyerstein, B. L. (1996). *Distinguishing science from pseudoscience*. The Centre for Curriculum and Professional Development.

Eco, U. (1984). *Semiotics and the philosophy of language*. Indiana University Press.

Ekpenyong, B., & Ikegbu, E. A. (2018). The language of philosophy and the philosophy of language: A symbiotic paradigm. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI) Journal*, 1(3), 296–305.

Falckenberg, R. (2020). *History of modern philosophy*. Google Books. <https://books.google.com/>

Green, S. (2019). Science and common sense: perspectives from philosophy and science education. *Synthese* 196, 795–818. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-016-1276-9>

Hansson, S. O., & Hendricks, V. F. (Eds.). (2018). *Introduction to formal philosophy*. Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-77434-3>

Haselager, P. (2020). Conceptual revisions: Intentions and free will in the light of cognitive neuroscience. In R. Peels, J. de Ridder, & R. van Woudenberg (Eds.), *Scientific challenges to common sense philosophy* (pp. 104–120). Routledge.

Kempson, R., Fernando, T., & Asher, N. (Eds.). (2012). *Philosophy of linguistics* (Vol. 14). North Holland/Elsevier.

Ladyman, J. (2002). *Understanding philosophy of science*. Routledge.

Losee, J. (2001). *A historical introduction to the philosophy of science* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Maxwell, N. (2007). *From knowledge to wisdom: A revolution for science and the humanities* (2nd ed.). Pentire Press.

Paine, T. (1776). *Common sense*. [PDF]. Internet Archive. <https://archive.org/details/commonsense00pain>

LedTure

Journal of Language, Education, Literature and Culture Vol.3, No.2: December 2025

<https://bing.ukaw.ac.id/ejournal/index.php/ledture>. e-ISSN Online: 3026-0302 DOI: 10.33323/l.v3i2.71

Peels, R., de Ridder, J., & van Woudenberg, R. (Eds.). (2020). *Scientific challenges to common sense philosophy*. Routledge. <https://lccn.loc.gov/2020015625>

Rosenberg, A. (2012). *Philosophy of social science* (4th ed.). Westview Press.