

# Is Scientific Skepticism Enough?

As a tribe, we skeptics take seriously the *scientific* ideas of objective rationality founded on empirically observable evidence. The world is never going to run out of problems anytime soon that would benefit from skeptical, critical-thinking using such tools. And as a skeptic I'm happy to identify with such a group. However, when facing the wider world, can identifying amongst ourselves with this kind of Skepticism really represent – define – our whole view of reality, truths about it, and our place in it?

Identity Politics and Good Fences: - Defining something, even simply identifying it, giving it a name, is *always* a political act, a preferential matter of policy (for some human purpose). We're seeing a lot of evidence for this in woke / anti-woke polarisation, but in fact it's much more fundamental than we might imagine to any world model we hold. We can't just deny the woke and replace it with anti-woke, whatever that is. It's just another kind of woke. We need to recognise that ***there is something more than scientific skepticism.***

# The Natural World

## Scientific

## Un-Scientific

**Science**  
Knowledge meeting scientific criteria.  
With varying levels of agreement about certainty. (How much certainty and agreement matters, depends on the scope of intended use.)

**Future Science**  
Mysterious stuff we don't appear to know with any certainty, but should meet scientific criteria when we do work it out.

**Other Stuff**  
Stuff which *is excluded from* being scientific by definition of scientific criteria, but nevertheless appears to be part of the world.

(At this point I delivered the presentation as paper I'd written in response to Diana's question to the group on "what does it mean to us to be a scientific Skeptic?")