

The Illusion of Absolute Answers

Humans are wired to seek answers. We like to believe that every question has an answer. But what if some answers aren't absolute—just convenient guesses we accept as truth? What about personal dilemmas that cannot be answered through mere words? Or an ethical philosophical debate, where every conclusion gives rise to a new question to be answered?

Everything has an Answer: Absolutism

This argument could agree with the following:

1. **Mathematical truths-** Some answers seem undeniably absolute—take mathematics, for instance. No matter where you are, $2+2$ will always equal 4. Numbers exist independently of belief, making them immune to interpretation. Such facts cannot be questioned because of its logical state.
2. **Scientific Determinism-** The universe operates on fixed laws, meaning every question has an objective answer, even if we haven't discovered it yet.
3. **Logical Positivism-** Truth is verifiable through logic, reason, and empirical evidence. If something appears uncertain, it's only because we lack the tools to find the answer.

This perspective assumes that even subjective experiences have an underlying objective explanation—we just don't always have access to it.

Some Things are Unanswerable: Relativism

This argument could agree with the following:

1. **Epistemic Relativism** – Knowledge is shaped by the observer's perspective. What is "true" for one person or culture may not be true for another. Morality varies across societies—what one culture sees as ethical, another might not.
2. **Conceptual Relativism** – The way we understand reality is shaped by our language, background, and mental frameworks. Color is not a fixed truth—our brains interpret wavelengths and assign meaning based on perception. What we see is perception, not objective reality.
3. **Moral Relativism** – Right and wrong aren't universal but depend on personal or societal values.

This contrasts with absolutism (which says truth exists independently of perspective) by arguing that all answers are shaped by the lens through which they're viewed.

This thesis aims to answer the question 'Does Everything have an Answer?'

Where, objectivity and subjectivity can coexist on the same plane, without clashing. This means that the thesis is not rejecting objective truths like math or physics, but rather showing that in human experiences—where variables are infinite—answers are rarely one-size-fits-all. It is a nuanced middle ground between absolutism and relativism.

Thesis

Everything has an answer—but not always a universal one. Context changes truth.

No single solution fits everyone because every situation is built on unique variables. Just like how different factors shape problems and situations, different factors also shape solutions.

For instance, two separate individuals may experience the same problem but will need two unlike answers.

This phenomenon occurs because the variables, factors and the circumstances that those problems were 'constructed' upon, are distinct.

Therefore, although experiencing identical problems, their answers will be distinguishable because of the unlike factors that came together to create this problem.

- Two people commit the same crime, but their circumstances (self-defense vs. premeditated murder) make their punishments different.
- Two patients have the same illness, but their treatments differ because of genetics, lifestyle, diet, or allergies. The answer to their treatment isn't universal—it depends on their unique conditions.
- Two people are depressed. One finds meaning in relationships, the other in personal achievement. Their answers are different because they have different needs.

Implication

People will never find a single right answer to philosophical or moral questions. They are looking for a single, absolute truth when, in reality, multiple truths can coexist based on perspective and circumstance.

If everything does have an answer but different ones, then truth itself isn't fixed. It's fluid, shaped by perspective, context, and interpretation. That changes how we approach knowledge, decision-making, and even morality:

- If there's no universal answer, then what we call "truth" is just the most *widely accepted* perspective.
- If answers change based on context, then certainty is an illusion—the best we can do is find what works *for now*.
- It also means that dismissing other perspectives outright is flawed—because someone else's answer might be just as valid as ours within their reality.
- If everyone has different truths, how do you navigate through conflicts and disagreements? Is compromise required?
- How do we satisfy our need for certainty if the only certain fact is the uncertainty of reality?
- If truth is fluid, should we treat scientific "facts" as temporary? We can marginalize this, since science is considered objective.
- Retaliation to previous point: Everything that is considered objective is indirectly subjective because these 'objective' truths are known through human perception, which is inherently subjective.

This idea challenges the way we think about everything—from science to ethics to personal struggles.

Conclusion and Final Thoughts

Everything may have an answer, but not all answers are universal. Some are absolute, while others are shaped by perspective and situation.

The search for answers is more important than finding a singular truth—because the process of questioning leads to growth, understanding, and deeper insight.

If the world isn't built on singular truths but on adaptable answers, then the real skill isn't knowing the right answer but learning how to find the right answer for a given situation. And perhaps the real answer isn't a single truth—it is the courage to embrace uncertainty.