

The Struggle For Reality

*Every truth is complicated
but every lie is simple.
So our best hope to find the truth
is to get rid of our lies.*

Introduction

It's been months since I came to the conclusion that a single form of hidden essence determines all human conditions. As always the case, something new is merely a new connection of old already known facts. But also, there are always many different levels of such connections. In this case, the simplest new connection can be recognized between Science and Life. Normally, one would think that Science enters Life through technology that surrounds us and thus, changes our thoughts and our possible actions. Of course, an obvious exception could be the lives of scientists for whom science is directly their life itself. But what turned out is that all human lives have an identity with science in general. This identity could not be recognized earlier than today because the new face of science as a "struggle for reality", only became clear after Relativity and Quantum Mechanics. These "big" words might scare someone, but actually the point is very simple and can be made clear at once:

If we use a stick to pull something out of the water, the stick becomes a natural extension of our arm, we almost feel the end of it touching the object that we want to get. Using "big" words again, we could say that our brain "integrates" the sense of the stick into our normal sensory inputs. In fact, if we think a little bit, we realize that even feeling an object at our fingertip is already an integration, because actually we should sense it in our brain. So, this integration is a helpful lie to omit the details of routes and tools and rather get the results of proper actions.

Even in mathematics, the tools that were used to get the absolute truth, were taken for granted. "Two apples and three apples giving five apples" is a good way to tell it to a child, so that his imagination could help to verify the truth. Amazingly, we never have to worry about explaining the same thing with pears and cherries so that he could get the general truth. Once he understood it with apples, he can automatically use it with any objects. Numbers and coordinate systems to identify points with numbers also have the seemingly obvious meanings. Everybody knows that a point in one coordinate system will have different coordinates than in a different one. If I measure everything in one system and then I move my system five metres away, then all measurements should be modified with the five metres. But, the distance between two points like the edges of a table, should not depend on the chosen coordinate system. This silent and obvious distinction between the "acts" of description and the "facts" of description was based on the assumption that it will never lead to confusion. The new science showed this to be wrong. The acts and facts of description melted into one and the very questions of their separation lead to contradictions. This is fairly well known for Relativity and Quantum Mechanics, but less known for the new mathematics, Set Theory and Logic.

And yet, these new scientific results of the twentieth century only brought to light the old problem in general, how description relates to reality. Philosophers of course, were onto this problem from the very beginning. When Zenon pondered on how the flying arrow could be moving and yet being at a place at a time, then obviously he was not questioning reality, rather how our description of space and time as points could correspond to reality. In his time, the axioms for the points were not established, so in a sense he was just preparing these axioms. Those who never understood the problem that Zenon provoked, can't really understand the Cantor

axioms for points either. But now we shouldn't go into this problem, rather recognize the amazing fact that Cantor only stated his axiom at the end of the nineteenth century. So then all the big mathematicians before him, including Gauss the "prince" of them, didn't really understand how the points are lying on a line. We might try to wash away this sharp judgment by saying that they did understand, only they didn't express it in an abstract form as an axiom. But this is a lie! It's not the axiom, it's the knowledge what lies behind the axiom that enabled Cantor to give a new proof for the non sequencability of the points of a line. This proof could have been comprehended and appreciated perfectly by Gauss too. Of course, his ego would have stopped him to appreciate it fully. To prove this, it's enough if we recall how he reacted to the repeated questions about the unsolved Fermat problem, by saying that one can always find new and true relations about numbers. He knew perfectly well that the Fermat problem was a deep one, not just an other relation that happens to be true. Not only Gauss lied, but his greatest idol Newton too. These lies though must be recognized, shouldn't be regarded as signs of immorality. Gauss for example, was denied his income by Napoleon and he didn't want to accept the handout approved by the recommendations of French mathematicians. In contrast, Hegel admired the conquering Napoleon. I mention these on purpose to prepare the reader's mind to a new kind of objectivity.

We tend to make our judgments by pre-existing conditions. Usually, we don't even care what actually one said, rather who he was. Everybody knows that if a person acted today as Jesus did, then society would reject him and everybody would take part in his rejection. He would be simply locked up in an asylum or a jail. Those who don't believe in Jesus can easily justify this fact, but those who believe in him, either deny this or had the excuse that Jesus was already the "real" one. The important question is why don't we judge everybody by what they say? In this sense, Pontius Pilatus was an okay guy, because he asked Jesus: "What's your point?" and when Jesus tried to get out of a straight answer, he got "pissed off". But, judging someone by what he says is not that easy. If we don't understand what we hear, why should we waste our time? On the other hand, if we hear what we already know, why should we waste our time even more? This dilemma is one of the deepest and how actually a commitment of truthful listening comes about is a mystery. Usually, a little thread of already known truths resonate in us and makes us "spend" the time to get deeper in someone else's thoughts. For example, when I first learnt the few facts about Set Theory, I became addicted to it and instantly recognized it's importance. But aside from the mystical factors, we can classify two obvious motivations for enquiring.

Mathematics can be defined as "Common sense used in the most uncommon sense". This reveals that anybody can understand mathematics, but it hides what the "uncommon sense" means. In a first approach it simply means a totally detailed and precise usage of the common sense. But it also means the boring field in which the common sense is used, namely points, numbers, and so on. We mathematicians of course, claim that if someone is willing to endeavor into this boring field then it becomes the most exciting, exactly because of the achieved exact truth. The real beauty of mathematics though is that the convincing about a truth requires only the mind. In contrast, physics is about the matter that we see outside, so its truth can only be verified by actual observations or experiments. This distinction is false though, because true physical understanding is using the same "seeing" as mathematics. What really happens is that we make assumptions and then we derive or explain the facts. If for example, we assume that the air contains little particles that move around and bounce randomly, but are attracted towards the earth by gravitation then, we can clearly understand why a hot air balloon or an airplane will have a force moving it upwards in spite of the gravitation of each particle directing downwards. Only seeing this mathematically, can be called an understanding of flying. Saying "big" words like buoyancy or Bernoulli's Law are just bull shitting or explaining what we already

accept. This fully visual understanding of physics is not required today. In fact, the whole relationship of mathematics to physics is abused. The reason for this (like all truths) is very complicated. It starts with, why Newton didn't explain his physics and leads to why Einstein's Relativity was only accepted by its predictions and not by its mathematical description of matter. But all this is again not the point in this introduction, rather the motivation that makes someone to learn about physics. We all know that physics is true! The machines are working, the rockets are flying, and so on. Some people react to this by "thinking" that's all very nice, but I don't have to understand all that, some people do that for me. Others want to learn about physics, but they don't start from math, rather from this conviction that physics must be true. In either case, almost all people believe that they can understand the world without math and/or physics. Here "understand" usually means a self admittedly limited understanding of the world, so what really is dangerous, is that people believe that they can understand the world by learning from people who don't know mathematics. Plato wrote above the academy that no one should enter without the knowledge of Geometry. Today, those who read Plato don't learn Geometry! Yes, today we ignore whatever we want. All this emphasis on math was to come to a single and unavoidable conclusion, namely that the new philosophy could not be achieved by someone who isn't a mathematician as well. There are two other requirements which I will describe in the followings.

Before I get to the other two requirements, we have to realize the depth behind this pin pointing of the three conditions. Just imagine honestly what is your first thought if someone tries to convince you about something new? It is the obvious, "Why you?". In fact, this lies behind our prejudices, dropping names and so on. Pontius Pilatus didn't ask Jesus, "Why you?" but it was in his tone. Jesus should have preempted this provocation and explain why him. Today it's convenient, he was the son of God. In spite of this emphasis on revealing my conditions to be the one with the new philosophy, I have to also emphasize that these conditions are not causes of the philosophy, rather unavoidable symptoms.

As I said, not only Science became revealed as a struggle for reality, but Life too. This sentence in itself can drop in someone's mind like Set Theory dropped in mine forty years ago, and start to make sense by itself. To initiate this deep meaning, we can simply start from the most obvious capacity of the human brain. Indeed, we have to avoid the always reoccurring deep questions of human consciousness, human intelligence. These are actually traps to avoid to realize the more fundamental problems. The simple fact is that we not only reflect the world in our direct actions, but that we live in the reflections too. Calling something a reflection is merely a choice of words. The animals react so they reflect too. In fact, animals react quite smartly so that could stray us again towards how intelligent they are or how much more intelligent we are. Less emphasized is how the smart animal reactions could be merely produced by natural selection. This is an other mystery, but still would lead us away from the simple point I want to make. All we know for sure, is that in our brain we have a reflection of the world and we continually live in that world too. The advantages of a complete secondary mirror world are simply "appearing" as our intelligence opposed to the animalistic reflections. A simple example shows the difference: A cat buries his poo, but will try to do so in a kitchen floor, if not let outside. This reveals that he was simply purposefully reacting, but not considering the full reality. Humans must have similar instinctive purposeful elements of behaviours, but at the end, the reflected world is compared with the actual real world, so the actions are not only purposeful, but "intelligent". It's a simple fact that no animal can obtain this reflected, secondary world what we all learn with an ease. Dolphin and Chimpanzee trainers will always remain trainers. Our metaphysical tendencies, naturally lead to the wide varieties of hypothesizes, what the single crucial element is in our abilities to acquire reflection. In my life, I read about a dozen such hypothesis,

for a while I even believed in some of them, but now I know they are all hollow speculations. It's interesting for example, that animal tool usage was not well documented before this century, so Marxism claimed that using tools and work in general was the basis of developing language and human intelligence. This of course, fitted perfectly their philosophy about work, classes, and so on. Today, we see everyday on the TV, chimpanzees using sticks to get ants, eagles using rocks to break eggs and so on. These are totally blind usages of tools. In Arthur C. Clarke's 2001, the outer influence, the monolith, induces the instant usage of the tool, without evolution. This is not only ridiculous but stupid too. It would be much more likely that humans had similar blind tool usages as animals and then the outer influence (I can even deal with a monolith) would cause the instant "realization" of the already working ability. The Russian psychologist Pavlov was much more cautious and avoided explaining the causes for what he called "secondary" signaling system. The truth is that the human reflection is very complicated. We haven't got a single clue how it developed in our race and how it is initiated in us as individuals.

One very important fact is always ignored about our individual learning of this reflection and this ignorance reveals a lot! We learn language very early and acquire a fairly perfect intelligence at the same time. This lead to the false belief that our system of reflection is also finished at the same time. Indeed, small children can be geniuses and know more about the world than some adults. Yet, no one really asked the question that then why the long period up until puberty is required to become an adult. Some even thought that the hormones, sexuality, the general change of body brings about the final transformation. The truth is that a silent hidden learning of many years is required because we learn such a complicated system to become an adult. Puberty is merely a biological confirmation in the system of learnt lies and double lies. Most importantly this second learning, unlike the early childhood, is governed by a completely new hierarchy of realities versus reflections.