

What is Truth?

Some will say that Truth is *something you feel in your gut (in your heart)*, even when you cannot explain or rationalize it to someone else. However, there is plenty of evidence that what we feel in our gut or heart may subsequently prove incorrect or misleading.

So how else can one answer this question?

Without ruling out the notion that Truth is something that one feels in the gut, we shall try a logical approach to answering this question. To do this, we must first understand the difference between *Facts, Conclusions and Truth*.

Facts are the observed events. From facts, one may then attempt to draw **conclusions** i.e. the implications of the observed facts, and then use these conclusions as the basis for predicting future outcomes. Before we can use these facts to draw conclusions, we have to see or infer **correlations** between the observed facts and outcomes.

A **Truth** becomes established when the inferred correlation is proven, consistently and over time, to lead to the same conclusion, i.e. that a given set of observed facts always and invariably produce the same result. From this we can then say that *it is True that xyz set of observations will invariably give a specific result*, based on the established correlation.

This is the scientific process followed to arrive at scientific laws. Therefore, in science, a Law is the same as the **Truth** that applies to a specific set of facts and conditions.

We also know in science that the environment can affect the outcome for the same set of facts. For example, the temperature at which a liquid will start to

evaporate (i.e. its boiling point) will differ depending on the pressure of the environment. For example, at close to sea level (i.e. 1 bar of atmospheric pressure) water will start to boil when heated to 100C.

Now, this is where the *Truth* drawn from this observation becomes critical. Is the *Truth*: (1) *Water boils at 100C*, or is it (2) *When you apply heat to water, it will eventually come to a boiling point*. The first conclusion is a summary of an observed set of facts. The second conclusion is a predictive model, and therefore closer to a statement of Truth! Unlike the first, the second statement is the Truth because the model will always predict when the liquid will boil, for the given set of facts, once the proper correlation has been established.

As the graph below shows, the boiling point (temperature) for water changes with pressure. Yet, this added fact does not change the Truth (the conclusion) that *"when temperature is applied to water, it will boil"* (start to evaporate). All that the graph demonstrates is that another dimension of fact has been added that influences the outcome.

When we apply the same logic to the human experience, we can accurately say that the dimensions of facts needed to make the necessary correlations are a lot more than that needed in the scientific process. For example, we know that unseen factors like attitudes, motives, influences, etc. have a bearing on how two people will respond to the same situation. This makes it more difficult to develop a predictive model of the outcome for observed human behaviors. More so when humans are involved in determining the outcome. But, even where humans are not involved in determining the outcome, we tend to forget that time is a dimension to be taken into account, if we are to draw the necessary conclusion for our prediction model. In the human experience, the requisite time span may exceed a person's life span on earth.

This is where looking back into history could help, to see if correlations exist. But even here, people's attitudes may have changed in the interval, making it

difficult to establish correlations. Luckily, there are situations where historical facts have a bearing to today's experiences, especially where human beings have not changed much from the past in their motivation, although the outward manifestation of behavior and outcome may be different.

Therefore, it is important to appreciate that the method or manifestation of results is not part of the facts used to establish correlations. Rather, it is the essence of the activities (facts/outcomes) that are important for drawing correlations or conclusions from observed historical events. After all, killing is killing regardless of the method.

It is only through such deeper insight that one can come to grasp such Truths in human affairs as *"What you sow is what you reap"*, because this insight requires one to take into consideration only the essence of the events, as well as the factor of time. The essence would include seeing the actors in the events as Spirits, whose life span extends far beyond the earthly incarnation, and not just the human being. This is yet another dimension in the equation, when trying to see Truth as it applies to Human affairs.

Indeed, focus on the limited time span on earth and the manifestation of behavior or outcomes is what confuses many when we try to see correlations in the human experience. It is therefore not surprising that many who readily accept scientific Truths (Laws) dispute or reject the idea of Truth as they apply to the human experience. On that basis, one frequently hears statements like *"What then is 'truth' in our human affairs?"* Others say *"Your truth is yours and mine is mine"*.

Hopefully the foregoing will help those who ask the first question to see how Truth can be ascertained in human affairs. What the second statement indicates is that people do hold onto different conclusions, but not Truths. The inconsistency in that position is clear because *Truth is that which obtains for*

ALL situations given a set of facts and conditions. Therefore, we cannot have different Truths for the same set of facts.

