

Brent Ethan Carr

On the Stone Outside My Window

Outside of my window is a stone. It is small and grey and smooth. I imagine the stone looking back at me and likewise pondering my appearance. "He is blond and is wearing black-rimmed glasses." The stone and I are existing in relation to each other, whether or not I ascribe a point of view to it. The stone's personhood is lesser than my own since it is not real. Likewise, it is lesser in its depth since I do not imagine more than what the stone thinks, and even if I were to imagine more, I would only be able to hold one thought, that of sensation or of the mental, in my mind at a time, which the stone is wholly dependent upon. Even when I imagine the stone to be personal, it is less so than myself.

Now, my point of view is not contingent in the same way as the stone's is, yet my existence is dependent upon realness, which is trueness. Truth, however, is dependent upon nothing, for if Truth were dependent upon something then, Truth would not be self-verifying. If I say, "There is no Truth," then, that is either true or not! Since something cannot be true and not true concurrently, the statement is false. Moreover, if nothing were to exist, Truth would exist because it would be true that nothing existed.

This line of inquiry, however, leads me to consider the personhood of Truth. For surely, something cannot exist dependently upon something that is lesser than it. How can Truth be lesser than me? Is not existence greater than nonexistence? And surely, personhood is greater than non-personhood!

Imagine the number ten. From ten, since it is made up of ten ones, we can get one. Now, imagine the number one. From one, can we get ten? No! Ten is larger than one and consists of ten ones while one contains only itself. Surely then, it is always true that an effect must be as powerful as or less powerful than its cause.

Consider a square. From a square which has area internally, I can imagine removing a triangle. The triangle has three sides, the square four; the triangle's angles add up to one-hundred and eighty degrees, the square's add up to three-hundred and sixty degrees; as well, the total area within the triangle is less than the area of the square. From this square, we have gotten a shape that is lesser in every respect.

What if now I imagine removing a circle from the square. Surely the circle has more sides and more angular degrees! However, the circle is still lesser than the square for the square contains the totality of all the dimensions of the circle as the circle is dependent upon the area of the square.

Now, let us consider logic. A conclusion is only as strong as its premises. This is to say that a conclusion is dependent upon the reality of its premises. Premises must then, contain in seed form the conclusion for if they do not then, the conclusion is false. All of these examples so contained are succinct proof of the causal principle. So, let us turn and consider the point of this inquiry: Truth's personhood.

When I say, "I exist in relation to that stone," I am ascribing a point of view to the stone, but this is a projection from my own point of view to make one so for the stone. This is to say that the

point of view of stone is dependent upon my imagining of it, and so it is dependent upon my having of a point of view. However, upon Truth is my point of view dependent. "I exist," is a statement that is either true or false, of reality or not. My existence is Truth-dependent. Therefore, Truth must be like I am to the stone given the causal principle and thus, Truth is personal and possessing of personhood.

One might object, "Truth is something that a being or nonbeing possesses. Truth is a thing possessed!" Is it so that Truth is the possessor of itself or is a being or nonbeing required to possess it? Surely, if no being or nonbeing were about to possess it, such would be true. Still though, it seems we are not escaping the necessity of something in relation to Truth for there to be a truth. What then is that which possesses Truth? I would say it would be Reality that so possesses Truth for it is Reality that possesses the truth, "One is a number." But what then is Reality? Is not that which is reality, that which is true? In other words, are they not the same thing? To say a thing is true is to say it has reality!

Consider again the statement, "One is a number." The reality is what we ask about and what is true is that which corresponds to it. What is true, however, is reality and what is reality is what's true. The two are the same. I can say, "One is a number," is a real statement or a true statement. Some statements such as "Unicorns aren't real" seem to make Reality in relation to Truth while "It is true that Unicorns don't exist" make Truth in relation to Reality.

One might further object, "Sure, Truth is something that things are in relation to, and Truth is prior to them, but in what sense has Truth caused anything?" First, we must ask, "Why am I reading this?" It piqued your interest, surely. Why did it pique your interest? Perhaps it is because you are a curious person, a man hungering to know of all the diverse perspectives held the world over – perhaps not. Whatever the reason, surely, you can inquire into the why of that reason and then, the why of that reason. Where does this inquiry end? All of our actions, in fact all happenings, all motion are part of a causal chain, the causal chain we have just laid bare.

Nothing is prior to Truth. If everything is part of a causal chain, Truth must be, due to His priorness, the first cause. For if a thing were prior to Truth, we could inquire, "Why is it so?" The only terminus of inquiry is that something is so, that it just is. The only thing which we are capable of lavishing this distinction upon is Truth; for if a thing is so, it is called true. If there is nothing, it would be so that there is nothing, there would be a truth about there being nothing, and thus there is no such thing as nothing for there will always be Truth; may it further be said then, Truth is Being and that Truth is inescapable, the spectator haunting the post-moderns. The nature of Truth is that He is always ultimately and immediately prior to all things; therefore, Truth is the cause of all things.

Furthermore, existence and the causal chain refute the notion there could have been nothing. It could not be so that there is a causal chain and at its helm nothing! What was prior to that which is? Surely something! Even more surely, Someone. For is cannot come from is not - like begets like.

Let us thus summarize what the stone has shown us: Truth is the first cause of all things and Truth is personal as we are; in fact, He has more personhood than us, being the type - by way of creating and sustaining - of all personness. Reality is likewise so, for Reality is Truth, and Truth, Reality.