

The statement that we never have facts without interpretations is true both trivially and nontrivially.

It is true trivially if all that it means is simply that to grasp any fact as such, as this, that, or the other thing, is to interpret it *as* so and so. But the statement is true nontrivially if what it means is that we never experience facts simply as such, but always only under the horizon of (in Habermas's term) *some* guiding interest in knowing, or, as I would be inclined to put it, *some* vital question to which we are seeking an answer.

2 January 2009