

Forensic Science, Psychology and Philosophy

'Golden Oldies' radio stations have a format to attract listeners who can recognize songs from the past, depending on what era and songs are considered 'oldies'. They attempt to entertain those people who are able to analyze the melodies and lyrics, compare these melodies and lyrics to what they have previously heard, and anticipate or reliably predict the melody and lyrics of the song that is currently playing. Once this reliable prediction takes place, the listener can comfortably sing along and enjoy. What will I recognize? Will it be notes, instruments, melody, words or lyrics? Will it be a combination of these? When will I recognize the song? How well did I know this song beforehand? I can not predict beforehand because I do not know the significance of this performance as related to the significance of previous performances. Who are the artists involved and what are their styles? What are the qualities of the renditions? When will I be able to silently sing along? I can start to silently sing along only after I listen and then reliably predict the melody and lyrics. If I can not reliably predict the melody and lyrics, I will not be in sync with the music and will have to wait for the next song before I silently sing along.

Now the big questions come up. What do we recognize? How do we recognize something? When do we actually recognize something? Why do we recognize something? This can be recognizing music, people, houses, roads, fingerprints, fired bullets, or shoeprints. We must try to understand more of what, how, when, and why we recognize. We must try to understand to what level we need to know something so that we can recognize it later.

We can ask ourselves many questions and seek answers to try to understand recognition. Some of these questions follow: What are cognition and recognition? What are perception and discernment? What are knowledge, belief, and faith? What is doubt? What are proof and support? What are reasoning and logic? How, when, and why can we predict what we are going to hear or see based on what we are currently hearing or seeing? These questions, and many more of these types of questions, have been asked before

and are still being asked today. They have not been completely answered.

How do I explain my ability to recognize? I believe in my ability to cognize detail in an image and then recognize detail in a second image. I have to try to understand cognition before I try to understand recognition. When I actually recognize the detail in the second image as having been in the first image, I know I have agreement. But what is agreement? This second image is not exactly like the first image. There are variations between the images. So how do I recognize agreement if agreement always has levels of variations? So when is there agreement if there are variations? What do I do if I have doubt about agreement? I have to deal with doubt, but how? I can not ignore doubt. I have to try to understand doubt.

How do I prove what I recognize? Can I prove what is happening inside my mind? If I can not prove my recognition to someone else, what can I do? Some others can recognize detail like I can. They can verify my recognition by reaching their own recognition of the same detail. Do I need to prove my recognition if they agree with my recognition? Is their recognition proof or is it a supporting belief? About all I can do is to express my belief in what I recognize.

Many of these questions are being asked to forensic scientists. However, the questions being asked are basically revolving around the themes of 'why can we do what we do,' and 'why can we say what we say?' How do we answer those questions? Forensic scientists need to try to gain more understanding of why we can do what we do and why we can say what we say. The theme of this writing is to encourage the forensic identification (individualization [recognition]) sciences to examine whether psychology and/or philosophy provide support for what we do. When we examine evidence, we perform critical thinking to determine whether detail agrees. Psychology and philosophy are studies of knowledge and thinking. Knowing and thinking have been discussed and studied for centuries. Let us not ignore what has already been done. Let their studies contribute to our forensic sciences. Let our forensic sciences contribute to their studies of psychology and philosophy. Let us study the studies of knowledge and thinking. Let us blend these spheres of knowledge and thinking. We need additional understanding of why we can recognize 'Golden Oldies' and why we can recognize fingerprints. Let us share our knowledge.

John Vanderkolk
Indiana State Police Laboratory