

Biosong Blog 17 (September 21, 2022) Truth

I am a human being, so I acquire knowledge and create My Story. Our stories are different, being subjective and co-created, but we put them together to construct 'our world.' What we call 'Truth' is what we agree will probably be the most useful and reliable knowledge (and Meaning) for our living together, because it fits best with our experience of reality and supports both our BEING and our BELONGING.

To know Truth we need to have Meaning, which comes from our Relationality – the way that people and situations are connected. An isolated incident or fragment of knowledge has no Meaning until it is connected up with something else. That's how we recognised a shape we'd seen before when we connected the dots in a picture book as children.

We use our conscious mind to test the Truth of what we think we know, but I suggest that the unconscious substrate of mind also contributes. If someone says human beings are machines, we test that against Process Biology and our personal experience and, in my case, we find it is not true. The untruths that we follow blindly and incorporate into our lives don't have to derail our natural Creative evolution, but they divert our attention away from more life-sustaining activities. The large investments in developing technologically enhanced, trans-human, beings are examples of that.

If we are not using all of our Intelligence, we think we know more than we actually do. Left-brain dominance has that effect, because everything seems to 'add up,' at least for the present situation. But it is humility, not hubris, that keeps us in touch with our agreed Truths. I suggest that, in our Real Life experience, there are no complete Truths – only half-Truths. What is true in a one situation may not be true in another.

The 'scientised mind' I mentioned earlier, and said I would explain, is an example of this hubris as it applies today. Scientism has misconstrued the great tool that is Science as if it is a Religion, and so our slavish devotion to using institutional, 'science-based evidence' as our Truth, for political power, has become a problem. Science is a wonderful tool for adding to knowledge, but it stands apart from any agreement about Truth. Its ethos is that a finding is always provisional and subject to further testing – never final, not even necessarily agreed, beyond a select group.

Science has contributed enormously to our understanding of the physical reality of our world, but its assumptions and its method have limitations. Its answers are determined by the frame of its questions, it disregards the unmeasurable (being not part of reality), and exaggerates the importance of repeatability as 'proof.' Its most fundamental assumptions – that nothing other than humans can have purpose or make Meaning, and that the world consists only of physical matter – are contrary to the special qualities of human experience I am writing about here.

Science has helped us to notice some important limitations of Aristotelian logic and language, too. Fuzzy logic, ironically, proves very useful in technology. Quantum physics has changed the way we try to understand probability, uncertainty and the 'coincidence of opposites' that I mentioned earlier.

Our physical reality is an important part of what we experience, but the deeper Truth pertains to the whole of our experience. Our non-physical reality is at least as important. Without it we can't **appreciate** the systemic Meaning or Value within which **human power** lies.