

Meditations On Reality

A COLLECTION OF METAPHYSICAL
ESSAYS

STEPHEN K. DONNELLY

Copyright © 2004
Stephen K. Donnelly

© 2004 by Stephen K. Donnelly

In order to reprint any partial section of *Meditations On Reality*, you must contact sd_philosopher@yahoo.com and describe the usage you intend. In most cases you will be allowed to use sections of the text, but proper crediting will be required and the author must formally approve your usage.

In order to reprint the complete text of *Meditations On Reality* within a larger volume of work you must also contact sd_philosopher@yahoo.com to make arrangements. You cannot make any alterations to the text without acquiring express permission from the author.

You may redistribute this .PDF file freely to anyone, so long as it is not altered and you do not present it as though it were your own creation.

Of Dual-Realities; That They May Co-Exist:

What is reality other than a mere perception of both the past & the present? Reality exists as a solid, almost tangible, essence of "what-is". However, reality is quite subjective in many (often times, overlooked) ways. Reality is nothing more than what our mind perceives, to the best of its ability, to be the only knowable past & present. No one (save for God, the almighty Creator of Reality) can ever understand what reality really is. No one *needs* to ever know or comprehend reality's hidden corners and clefts. But reality remains. It always has remained. It always will remain. It is remaining.

True reality is not the same for me as it is for you. You may accuse me for claiming that reality is "relevant" (what is true for you is not true for me). But if one considers reality for even just a moment, he cannot successfully refute this claim of relevance. Reality is the collection of *everything* that we know about everything. From this seemingly un-comprehensible amount of knowledge, our brains form their "records" of the past (both of ourselves and humanity in general). Do you know *EVERYTHING* that I know, and [do you] know *nothing* more than that which I know, and visa-versa? Of course not! Surely there exists innumerable facts, events, information, etc. that while known to you, will never become known to me. Your reality then, by definition, cannot be the same as mine. Consider the following analogy:

50 victims of the German Holocaust and 50 common-class citizens who deny that the Holocaust ever took place. They are all placed together on an island that completely satisfies the means needed for survival, but at the same time is completely (and eternally) isolated from the rest of the known world. Now suppose that out of the 50 citizens, there rises up 25 [citizens] who come govern the remaining seventy-five. Let us call this governing-group, "governors". The 25 remaining citizens we shall refer to as "opponents". Finally, the 50 victims we shall call the "victims". As time progresses on this island, the victim's children will no doubt be told by their parents that the Holocaust occurred, and (at the same time are being told) that the Holocaust never occurred by the governors & the opponents. Let us

now advance 100 years in the future. The original members of the island (the victims, the opponents, & the governors) are all dead, leaving only their progeny as their successors to their "positions" (victims, opponents, & governors). This second generation is of utmost importance as it is the fulcrum on which the "balancing-bar of reality" rests. The only records of the Holocaust dwells within the children of the victims. As time continues on, you must agree that it is most likely that the opponent's/governor's views of the Holocaust (namely, that it never occurred) will successfully suppress the victim's views (namely, that they are the children of actual Holocaust survivors). This will not take place within the lifetime of one generation, but rather many generations. But, in the end, there will be no one on the island who truly believes in the depths of his soul that the Holocaust ever occurred. Yes, every member of that remote island will involuntarily, or voluntarily cause himself to *truly* believe (with all of his being) that the Holocaust could never have occurred. At the very least, no member will believe that the Holocaust of his ancestors ever occurred in history. The island's members therefore, now live their lives accordingly.

We now are left with two, equally credible Realities: 1) All of the members of the island who truly (within their own being) believe that the Holocaust never occurred, and 2) the rest of the world, who believes that the occurrence of the Holocaust is utterly undeniable.

I do not deny the existence that there seems to be a "Common-Reality". That is, a form of Reality which tends to be similar to most members of a given population. Several people can develop a Reality that is similar to that of his neighbor's. For instance, I believe that George Washington was America's first President. You may also believe that George Washington was America's First president. If you do, [then] we are sharing a portion of a Commonly-Held Reality. Rarely do you find a completely unique (in every way) Reality. If everyone held a completely unique Reality, the slow, but steady advancing of human history would cease. Unfortunately, it is all too common that one finds himself latching-on to the Reality of his parents (or any influential individual, for that matter) merely for its (Reality's) own sake. These are they whose span of learning-abilities are easily predicted. It is to my opinion that such "Parent-to-Child Realities" are to blame for the development of some of the absurd Common-Realities we have today.

Lastly, consider for yourself one final fact. Would you not agree that within in *all* of the records of all history, there are events (even major ones) that have occurred (i.e. wars that took place between Indians in America before Columbus ever discovered America), and yet [have] gone un-noticed to the pen of those who have written the records we have today? If this is the case (which it is), **WE ARE NOT LIVING IN TRUE REALITY AT ALL!** Ironically, this is the one form of reality that is still comprehensible to humanity and yet, it is just out of our reach! Yet, you (the reader of this essay) have probably accused me for being absurd in my suggestion that reality could be lost so easily!

Of Proof; That it Does not Exist:

"What", I ask, "is Proof?" Proof is (at least in *my* Reality) not a sensible essence. Meaning, Proof's existence cannot be *proved* by any of our senses (taste, hearing, touch, seeing, smell, etc.). It is nothing more than that which we create it to be. Proof has; however, managed to permeate into Common-Reality, and thus, is generally accepted. Excluding God, Proof is arguably the only thing that has no essence at all, and yet, is still believed by the populace to exist. **PROOF DOES NOT EXSIST!** You may be outraged at such a bold claim, but consider this: can you prove that the last person you saw was really a true, living/breathing/rational human-being, and not a hallucination of your own mind? The carefully thought-out answer to my question would always be the same: NO. The only way to answer, "Yes" to my question would be to deny the existence of any and all forms of hallucinations (let alone supernatural-phenomena caused by God). True, the existence of proof is "relative" to each individual's own Reality. But if this is the case, then I argue that Proof has lost its esteemed purpose. For what good is it to try to "prove" that paper comes from trees when your Reality states that all paper is a synthetic substance?

Proof; however, may exist in two senses: 1) the ability to prove one's own existence, and 2) the dilemma of mathematics. Such a concept as self-existence was contemplated as far back (in history) as the 1700s' by [the] French philosopher, Rene Descartes. Descartes' Philosophy was (at its core) quite simple: "Cogito Ergo Sum". "I Think; Therefore, I Am". In order to even contemplate the question, "Do I Exist?", one must first exist to begin

with. Furthermore, does anyone or anything really exist at all? Let us doubt all that we may in order to ascertain whether or not we exist. I hereby doubt the existence of *everything*. Nothing exists. But what is “nothing”? If I can understand to some degree of what “nothingness” is, then *something* must exist (or at least, have existed). For I would not have known what “nothing” is unless I first had known what “something” is. Therefore, I must exist. But what am I? I am something that thinks, to be sure. This, to me, is the only logical form of proof. Everything else may be *probable*, but never *provable*. As soon as we arrive at this conclusion; however, we are immediately confronted with the dilemma of mathematics. I refer to mathematics as being a “dilemma” because I find that, despite all my efforts, I am able to neither affirm, nor deny its existence as a substance of proof. If I affirm its existence, I betray my own reasoning. Yet, on the other hand, I discover I have no grounds on which to deny its validity as a substance of proof. Therefore, I am unresolved as to whether or not mathematics is a valid form of proof.

Having said all this, I propose to you a simple question: “Does anything at all really *need* to be proved?” I’d answer such a question with an emphatic, “NO!”. I can live my life in light of the fact that I will never be able to prove that anyone (or anything) exists. Most things *do* exist. But their existence is not contingent on whether or not it (it’s existence) is provable.

Of Superiority and Inferiority:

Oh Man, what a stranger creature you are! Fascinated by an ever-increasing list of absurdities which plague all life—human beings, that is, who contribute nothing but idleness to society. Who is truly a Superior being or Inferior being, and why? Is superiority a mere measure of “positive” contribution to one’s own society? I’d argue not.

Consider the [former] dictator of Iraq, Mr. Hussein. Is he not a Superior to one degree or another? Perhaps not when measured only against his human-rights standard for which he is so vehemently despised for. But, was not Mr. Hussein a “successful” dictator? He, unlike many other dictators, has managed to remain in full-authority for a span of over thirty years. You see, Saddam was very good at doing what he intended to do;











namely, be the dictator of Iraq. He was a Superior sovereign when compared to other such dictators. Hence, I label Mr. Hussein as not an Inferior being, but rather, as a Superior [being].

Let not this scale of Superiority/Inferiority become inaccurate, however. I shall add that I classify Saddam not merely as a Superior, but as a *Negative-Superior*. Successful though he was as a dictator, he left a negative effect upon humanity that will never be forgotten. Along with Saddam, I'd classify Hitler and Stalin as *Negative-Superiors*, as well. This rating (*Negative-Superior*) is NOT applied to *only* political leaders—it can (and does) include any imaginable genre of people. My scale of rating now consists of: 1) *Positive-Superior*, 2) *Negative-Superior*, 3) *Positive-Inferior*, and 4) *Negative-Inferior*.

Let us now consider Inferiority. Examples of persons who I consider to be Inferior (and in these specific examples, *Negative-Inferiors*) include Heavy-Metal artist, Ozzy Osborne; the majority of those publicized for their role as actors/actresses; “ghetto-dwellers”; etc. Such persons contribute nothing of value to society. *Negative-Inferiors* are often denoted by their socially-inacceptable lifestyle, careless wasting of any personal talents, and/or lack of respect and respectability. Beware of the *Negative-Inferior* beings; for they contribute nothing to humanity in return for their consuming of our ever-precious supply of oxygen! *Positive-Inferiors* are far less common than the *Negative-Inferior* are. To be rightly classified as a *Positive-Inferior*, one must have little or no effect on the lives of others; and all-the-while contribute just as little society at large—a very difficult task, indeed.

“...*Knowledge: The Weary Locomotive of Time...*”

Suggested Bibliography:

-  Meditations on the First Philosophy by Rene Descartes
-  Discourse on the Method by Rene Descartes
-  Being and Nothingness by Jean Paul Sartre
-  Thus Spoke Zarathustra by Friedrich Nietzsche
-  Beyond Good and Evil: Prelude to a Philosophy of the Future by Friedrich Nietzsche
-  Birth of Tragedy by Friedrich Nietzsche
-  The Genealogy of Morals by Friedrich Nietzsche
-  Ecce Homo by Friedrich Nietzsche
-  Will to Power by Friedrich Nietzsche
-  The Republic by Plato