

Truth & the Infinite

The paradoxical reality of wisdom as utility

There seems to be an un-spoken reality that is never explored and which underlies the search for Truth; we fear coming close to the idea that a line must be defined to separate utility from freedom. What I mean here is that “Truth”, which is regarded by mankind as the highest possible virtue, is some kind of foundational absolute from which we can believe whatever we wish without repercussion. I see flaws there.

1. *The foundational truths we set are always arbitrary; from the narrow definition of an anthropomorphic God, to the scientific method, to the much more obtuse idea of the pantheistic abstraction, no one comes to define the concept of “foundation”, for their chosen foundation, and instead press on towards building moral and purposeful structures by which to live by while being satisfied that their foundation is “Truth”.*
2. *The chosen foundations are necessarily taken as absolute truth simply by definition, precisely because the concept of a foundation assumes that it must be concrete/real and therefore without the possibility to be doubted.*
3. *Finally, by extension of the pre-suppositions thus far, no one defines “truth” either, because 1: the problem of consciousness and 2: value hierarchy itself is very rarely doubted- if one doubts the idea of value, they must doubt truth as being the highest form of value and so in turn must surrender themselves to nihilism as they have no orientation by which to continue living.*

This however, does not mean there is only danger in questioning and observing value hierarchy, foundation and truth. I now return to the beginning in which I mention *utility and freedom*, which may in fact be a better way to achieve a foundational truth.

Both are necessarily paradoxically linked, as they define and create each other: no utility can exist without a degree of freedom, and freedom becomes meaningless without utility.

Take utility as defined to be the relationship between cause and effect, and such a relationship being “purposeful”. As for freedom, let us define it as being the full range of possibility within a given set of parameters.

To be free as a limited human being is to be free to manifest any action we wish within the limits of our ability, and such a limitation is what creates utility as a necessary part of our lives. Note how limitation seems to connect both ideas paradoxically: If you were not limited in any sense, you would have no need for utility, and if you had no need for utility, freedom would lose its meaning because freedom requires a certain limitation. Therefore, both utility and freedom would become meaningless in the search for a truth we need to establish as a foundation to living our limited lives.

Now we could talk about absolute freedom as an omnipotent God, but then what utility and meaning would there be in our lives as limited human beings if we did? That is another matter entirely.

If we propose the equation that “truth” equals both utility and freedom, it becomes apparent that we need to balance the two but simultaneously find a definition for God’s truth:

- 1. We must come to understand our limitations so as to maximize utility, which in turn maximizes a kind of freedom (this is the kind which, at the height of our ability to harness utility, we achieve the freedom to operate that utility). The other kind of freedom is the one we attribute to an absolute power, completely without limitation and so naturally, beyond our human limitations.*
- 2. If utilitarian freedom is all we can achieve within human limitation, there is no possibility for any meaningful purpose beyond absurdity, and so we have no choice but to explore limitless freedom in order to render utilitarian purpose meaningful.*

This is where the definition of “truth” breaks down, as no one adequately describes what limitless freedom really is beyond the words “*God*”, “*The Infinite*” or the more teleological definition “*truth*” itself.

Must we understand the infinite in any other way in order to define truth therefore create meaning? Not if we remain within the boundaries of utilitarian meaning, and simultaneously accept or ignore the overall absurdity which exists outside of it. Of course, very few have ever been up to the task of defining the infinite, and those who tried either gave up (Galileo) or drove themselves to insanity (Cantor).

We could end the impossible feat with an absurd solution: *To retain our utilitarian meaning by choosing to give God meaning for it to serve the utility of us retaining our meaning.*

And of course, we can reverse it because it is part of one of the two parts of a paradox:

To retain our meaning in utility by choosing to give God utility for it to serve the meaning of us retaining our utility.

As far as we know, or don’t know, this is what we are constantly doing to maintain a truth we have no idea about, to serve a purpose we know deep down we will never understand and achieve in order to rid ourselves of the need to satiate, which in large part if not entirely, is what we suffer from.

I propose that as long as we are using such an absurd paradox to perpetuate our need for truth, purpose and meaning, that we first acknowledge that *it is what we are doing* in order to avoid the most possible conflicts which exist between ideologies, as these differences may in fact be created by our ignorance of this paradox.

Second, we would have to come to understand our relationship to all the paradoxes which arise in our experiences of reality; namely the *veridical, falsidical and antinomical paradoxes*.

We could attribute utilitarian meaning to them with the intention of maintaining a constant balance in all things, provided humanity can collectively adopt faith in “balance”, being the highest virtue, or more transitionally, define “truth”, which is currently the highest virtue, as being *balance* itself.

I believe Dostoevsky, Nietzsche and Camus have all paved the way towards establishing that all the ideologies which place “Truth” as the highest virtue undermine themselves and necessarily collapse- equally, I believe many existing philosophies which come to describe dualities (the componential mechanism of paradoxes) could be and already are used to establish rituals to maintain balance.

This is not to say that western & Judeo-Christian religions don't have their own important value by implementing monistic ideas which create practical frameworks for morality and purpose, they do this very well but must oppress truth in order to do it, hence why they undermine themselves, whereas the eastern philosophies like Taoism and Buddhism, which focus more on balance for the individual well-being must politically oppress their societies in order to maintain morality and purpose.

The necessity is to combine the virtue of the Eastern “Balance” with the virtue of the Western “Truth”, *successfully* and in a manner which accommodates most of the existing ideologies, rituals, practices and scientific consensus.

The way to do this is to create a physical framework (the scientific consensus) upon which we can map on an understanding of paradox, (reality) to finally derive or attribute purpose and meaning to it (ideology and ritual).

Being as we all share the same existence, the purpose and meaning we create is also shared by all- the values have always remained the same across humanity, it is the definitions which evolved in contradiction to each other due to environmental, economic and political reasons.

Such a framework could possibly be what I call “Paradoxism”, which I introduce separately in another thesis but resumed here below one can understand how comprehensive it is:

-It proves the infinite to be outside the realm of need for belief and establishes a foundation for an absolute truth we can attribute to “God’s limitless freedom”.

-It uses the 3-dimensional reality we all inevitably experience and maps it on to the 3 different paradoxes that exist and attributes them to all 3 existing systems of morality.

-It makes sense of the relationship between all the paradoxes out of which arises a meaning and purpose that satisfies the human beyond absurdism.

This philosophical structure, which places truth at the center of paradox, in combination with the understanding that its balance is the highest virtue, virtually makes it possible for all people to understand meaning, morality and purpose from a greater perspective which can serve to build compatibility, unification and peace.

Would it be so hard to accept that paradoxes are the source of all wisdom?

Socrates was paradoxical in that he knew all he knew was he knew nothing.

Buddha was paradoxical in that he believed balance was the pathway to truth.

Lao Tzu was paradoxical in that he knew existence co-existed with non-existence.

Christ was paradoxical in that he claimed sacrifice to be how you gain everything.

James Sirois