

Wisdom and Understanding through Information

By Jeffrey Noel Cook

Introduction

Philosophy, science, religion, politics, psychology, mathematics and all other fields of study are as of yet incomplete and will likely never be fully satisfied as humankind continues to evolve into the uncertain future. What may have worked in the past does not necessarily constitute what will work today. This statement is the basis of the wisdom and understanding that I hope to come to me. It is the only thing I assume at this time, which I cannot as of yet be certain of myself.

I have failed and failed to find satisfaction in any one philosophy and/or religion to date; they have all failed to give me wisdom and understanding of the problems I face in these times, in my existence. A synthesis is required: a synthesis of the aspects from one philosophy that has carried over to modern times with the aspects of another philosophy also carried over to modern times. I have read all of the most famous Western philosophers, prophets and teachers, as well as many from the East and Middle East. I feel the impulsive need to review the different perceptions from the past at this point in my life to check them against the implications they have given to the world today, many great, though some horrendous. I will check them against my observations and experiences to see if any or all contain what has long been sought after as Absolute Truth.

I will then take each aspect of the philosophies of old and of today and question them with logic, mathematics and history to critically analyze them in the search for truth. I will combine the efforts of the Socratic Method, the Scientific Method, Hume's Skepticism and all the other tools at my disposal that have been given to mankind in order to even perhaps challenge the very methods or philosophies themselves. I will do this for one and only one reason: I want to know who I am and why I am here. If it is my purpose to be happy from such an analysis, then I will be happy. If it is my purpose to be miserable, then I will make every effort to be so. And if it is something else altogether, I must discover it and I will strive with all my might to live that purpose. But I cannot see that purpose clearly today, as all philosophies I have read to date have logical flaws. All religious practices I see to date have mild to considerable flaws as well. All of mathematics and science and all other fields of study have these same visible flaws. I tend to not interpret why these flaws exist other than my primary basis: that they are in evolution. It is my goal to check if they truly are in evolution or if they really are abominable, as I believe humankind has yet found peace, happiness, wisdom, understanding or knowledge. I have seen many individuals have some qualities of these, but never the bulk of them. I do not have the bulk of them myself. I will try to synthesize what I will determine to be worthwhile for humankind today, much less for myself. If I cannot, in the end, discover what it is that will fulfill me with complete wisdom and understanding, then I will not share my analysis with anyone, as partial

wisdom and partial understanding is still ignorance and worthless to repeat. If I do, however, discover this wisdom and understanding that I search for, then I will stop at nothing to share it with others for the rest of my conscious existence.

The Four Critical Attributes of Information

I will start in terms of the concept of zero and the basis of numbers themselves. A number is a reference to the condition or value of some thing, anything from potential to money, from chickens to gods. Without numbers there is no reference to the condition or value of anything even if humankind discovered the condition or value in a particular concept or thing long before references in terms of numbers were ever given to them. Thus, to determine whether or not our life has any value, or a concept has any value, we can use numbers to reference their condition and thus their relationship with another thing, which gives it its value. How can one hold zero apples in his or her hand? While one could imagine the condition of the apple in his or her hand and reference any number to it, its value is zero and thus worthless. He or she cannot by the very definition of the words even imagine holding something of zero value, and if such were attempted, the result would likely be different for each person, a subjective response to a reference to something that has no value. Thus, the number *zero* in this case references to an apple having no value, while its condition still may be in tact. The number zero is not a value in and of itself, just as the number *one* cannot either carry the entire condition or value of an apple. It is a reference to one aspect of the entire existence of the apple.

Thus,

Number: a reference to the condition or value of one aspect of its entire existence.

Condition: answers the questions *what* (including *what is*, such as *what is the purpose*, and thus *why*, and many other derivatives of *what*), *how* (including *how many* or *how much* and many other derivatives of *how*) and *when* (including also many derivatives of *when*)?

Value: answers a question as to *where* (including also many derivatives of *where*) in reference to something other than itself, the priority by which to judge one thing to another?

It is my primary understanding that everything in existence can be referenced with numbers relating to the sequence of the condition and value of any given thing. In essence, there are four attributes that are required to understand any one thing, to know any one thing, to be certain of any one thing. I base the sequence of the four attributes on two strong sciences of today: physics and molecular biology. It is said in physics that all of the universe's parameters can be defined for an object by simply knowing its mass, charge and volume. Of course that gives us no reference between that object and an outside observer. Thus, mass, charge and volume are the conditions of the object and its value is how the parameters of that object interact with the observer, which stretches into the realm of Einstein's Relativity. In physics, if an object is quite small and billions of

light years away from the observer, the value is quite small to the observer, and often considered to have no practical value. However, physicists feel certain that these parameters stretch across the vastness of space and are interconnected if perhaps even to the smallest extent. The only case where this would not be true, in the event that an object has absolutely zero value on the observer, is when the object exists outside of the universe; in other words, it exists in a place where light cannot travel to and from, such as from within a black hole or in an alternate universe if one accepts such concepts/discoveries. In Molecular biology it is said that all the information stored in DNA or RNA are the various sequences of just four different “bases” and the many derivatives of each in the strain. DNA and RNA differ only by *one* base if that means anything great or small, while the other three are the same exact chemical. It is with these two discoveries that I base my analysis, on the strong stability of the sequence of four attributes, three conditions and one value.

Just to add one additional aspect of this, binary computer code today uses the various sequences of *on* or *off* for all its information. For the value of *on*, the number 1 is referenced and for *off* it is 0. I believe this form of computer language was a strong start for last century, but I do not believe conscious computers or artificial intelligence will ever come to fruition until Quaternary Computer Language is fully developed and implemented, the sequencing of not only two numbers, but also another two, totaling four of course, as this is what is seen in the natural sciences regarding information.

So, if I were to analyze the attributes of an apple, I would first look at its value to see if it has any. Do I have an apple in front of me? No. So its value is 0 or virtually 0. However, I will go now to the kitchen to get an apple and bring it back to this room to analyze. Okay, now I have an apple before me and will use only my eyes and thoughts to analyze its condition and I will first analyze it before really attempting to define its full value.

1) What?

- What is it? An apple.
- What kind? A McIntosh.
- What color? Patches of red, yellow and yellow-green.
- What is its shape? Non-uniformly round.
- What is its purpose for me? To analyze in order to gain wisdom and understanding of this very apple and perhaps to eat later.
- And so on depending how deep I want to analyze it according to the What Condition.

2) How?

- How fresh is it? Some bruising, discoloration, does not appear fresh enough to eat the entire thing, but if I were to cut it up I could salvage much of it.
- How tasty does it appear? Not terribly good, but I might try it anyway after I analyze it.

- How did I acquire it? I went to the kitchen to get it from the refrigerator. But before that, I purchased it at the grocery store by traveling there in my truck. I acquired the money to purchase it through suffering and struggle, work.
- How many apples are there and how many are left in the refrigerator? I have only one left and it is this one sitting before me
- How big is it? Roughly 2 ½ inches in diameter, maybe 3 in the widest part.
- And so on depending how deep I want to analyze it according to the How Condition.

3) When?

- When did you first acquire this apple? About two weeks ago.
- When did you just first touch it? About 30 minutes ago when I took it from the bag.
- When will you eat it? In about 10 minutes or so.
- When did you learn it was a McIntosh? About 31 minutes ago when I read the package.
- When did you first eat a McIntosh? In my early childhood.
- When did you last eat a McIntosh? About a month ago, my wife ate the rest from this bag.
- And so on depending how deep I want to analyze it according to the When Condition.

4) Where?

- Where is the apple now in relation to me physically? About 5 inches away from my left little finger.
- Where is the apple in my thoughts? In the forefront of my mind, I am thinking almost about nothing else.
- Where is the apple in my future? It will be eaten for my greater satisfaction and dietary needs.
- And so on depending how deep I want to analyze its value to me.

And that concludes my analysis of the apple. I will now go eat it, which will lead to my experience.

Experience

I have now eaten the apple and can relate my experiences in words based on my senses and thoughts.

- 1) It was not very amusing to the touch of my fingers; it was spongy in parts.
- 2) Its texture was not very pleasant at first in my mouth, as I bit into a bruise that I had not seen in my earlier analysis.
- 3) Its taste in the bruised area was slightly bitter and unpleasant.
- 4) I used my eyes and fingers to detect a solid section of the apple to bite into and it was juicy and quite good.

- 5) I was only able to manage three small quality bites before I threw the rest away.
- 6) I am not craving an apple at the moment.
- 7) I still have the pleasant aftertaste in my mouth from the three quality bites.
- 8) I feel relatively and surprisingly satisfied in terms of hunger from the apple and expect it to give me energy for some time even from the very small amount I ate.
- 9) I do believe I will eat a McIntosh apple in the future sometime.
- 10) I consider the entire experience of eating a bruised apple average at best.

Now, I have finally completed the process of analysis and experience and would like to look now at this from the empiricist perspective in order to better gain wisdom and understanding of this apple in terms of sensory stimuli. Locke raised the question, “how do you know?” Hume suggested that the left hand can never “know” what the right hand is doing. In other words, we cannot link the sight of the apple with the taste of the apple, nor the touch. We cannot “know” with any amount of certainty that one sense is not lying to the other. Also, to the empiricists you must be able to show that you know based on sensory experience, observation of data or experimentation with data. Without this, you know nothing, you have no wisdom, no understanding.

Well, I listed ten details of my experience, but only gained a couple of understandings that existed after the experience. These understandings were in details 6-10. However, there are only two out of five of those lasting impressions that had anything to do with sensory experience: 7 & 8. The other three are non-sensory impressions that I gained from the experience: 6, 9 & 10. Now, consider that we removed all the sensory data that we used in the analysis, as well as the actual experience in eating the fruit. Suppose we slipped into a coma without the ability to receive any outside stimuli. Yet, consider we were still able to rationalize and relate our experience to ourselves with full logic and could rightfully remember our past. Would not those three non-sensory impressions still be relatable for us if someone else fed us the apple in our hospital bed even without our knowledge? Consider them again now from the perspective of a comatose patient.

- I am not craving an apple at the moment.
- I do believe I will eat a McIntosh apple in the future sometime.
- I consider the entire experience of eating a bruised apple average at best.

These are all reasonable impressions for anyone, comatose or not, in fact even for someone who has never eaten a McIntosh apple or any apple at all. Is there any need for sensory experience to come to these three impressions? What are the three crucial elements in those details that are shared between sensory experience and rational thought?

Lack of craving – elective & superfluous
 Belief / prediction – faith, conviction and prophecy
 Consideration – thought and contemplation

I consider these three remaining details to be but a few of the many aspects of wisdom and understanding that should stand up to the empiricist test of *how do I know?* But the

empiricist Hume would suggest that these are the three associations of ideas. As of yet, I *believe* these were my impressions that I gained through experience; I just do not yet know that these impressions are 100% certain. I do not know if I had enough to eat. I do not know if I will again ever eat a McIntosh. And I certainly do not know if my considerations of the experience are accurate, especially if I have never before eaten one. But what I do believe is that these are my impressions and not ideas; I believe this more than I believe I even had the experience. Consider the comatose patient who did not experience the apple through his senses; yet, he still gained the same *understanding* from it.

At this point, I am leaning toward the conclusion that understanding is completely separate from sensory experience. Even if you never have eaten an apple before, could you not have an understanding the same as the three details above? For instance, I have a “moklechol” that I would like to give you to eat but it has no taste, smell or texture and you must close your eyes when you eat it. Can you answer any or all of the following?

- I am/am not craving a moklechol at the moment.
- I do/do not believe I will eat a moklechol in the future sometime.
- I consider the entire experience of eating a [insert adjective] moklechol [insert adjective].

Hume may ask, regarding even the first statement, “how can I know if I am craving a moklechol if I do not know what it is? The question is meaningless.”

I might answer Hume, are you denying that your mouth waters when some unknown dish is cooking in the kitchen that strikes your fancy? Why do you need to know what something is in order to crave it according to an empiricist?

Hume may say, “I have in the past had a sensory experience of certain foods; that was my impression. I crave the specific food that I had in the past, which is my idea, exactly corresponding to the impression, not necessarily what is on the stove cooking, as the food could be poisoned without any change in smell or other sensory perception.”

I say then, what does it matter if you know what a moklechol is, when you really never *know* what you are eating anyway, in accordance with this line of thinking?”

Hume might then answer, “It doesn’t matter. *Cravings* (ideas) cannot alone lead to knowledge, as they are only ideas relating to one particular impression. You need to understand that the idea relates to the impression and this needs to be confirmed first through sensory experience before you have the knowledge.”

“These are very good answers, Hume,” I might admit. “But I am still a little hazy on something. How then can you ever trust your sensory experience? Did you have the knowledge and/or resources in your time to check if you craving-ideas directly related to your impression? I mean, if you cannot even know if your food is poisoned or contains some infectious bacteria, how do you know even that *any* idea is true? I guess what I am

asking is, since you have stated that you never know for sure that the sun is going to rise or set tomorrow, that your food will be as healthy as the last time you ate it, that you will even speak another word, can any idea be meaningful at all in this line of thinking?"

"If we believe in the causal principle that food leads to health, it is only through habit or custom that we do so; there is no rational basis for it. We are limited to our atomistic impressions and their corresponding ideas."

I would then get quite frustrated I think. "But then we could have *no* knowledge at all! Our limit of knowledge would begin and end at zero. You have criticized that metaphysics attempts to transcend what we *can* understand with that which we *cannot*. But if we cannot even trust a single idea to relate accurately to a sensory impression, then even by attempting *any* analysis or observation with our senses would also be the attempt to transcend that which we cannot understand. Your reasoning leads directly and logically to an appalling contradiction in my interpretation: if the metaphysical cannot exist because it has no impression, then how could the physical exist without an accurate idea?"

"There is no contradiction," he would likely spit out quickly. "You are simply not understanding this simple concept. Ideas may not always be accurate, even though they do exactly correspond to an impression. But plain and simple, if you do *not* have a valid sensory experience, then you certainly cannot have a meaningful idea."

"So, the impression needs to be accurate for the idea to be accurate and then you must re-verify the idea with accurate enquiry?"

"Our ideas reach no farther than our experience. We have no experience of divine attributes. I need not conclude my syllogism. You can draw the inference yourself. When a miracle occurs, the subject may be sincere but under a delusion; or the witness may be deliberately lying. But no human testimony can have enough force against the bulk of human experience of the laws of nature to prove that a violation of these laws has occurred, that is, to prove a metaphysical miracle occurred. Reason is, and ought only to be, the slave of the passions, and can never pretend to any other office than to serve and obey them."

"So the disciples who saw Jesus raised from the dead?"

"Delusional or lying," he would say.

"And the single man, Galileo, who first saw the planets in his telescope."

"An accurate observation."

"And the saints throughout history who later claimed to have been visited by God and/or angels?"

“Delusional or lying.”

“And the individual who first observed single-celled microscopic organisms in a microscope?”

“An accurate observation.”

“And the experiences that I myself have had with breaks from the ‘laws’ of nature?”

“After my time, but delusional or lying nevertheless.”

“And the fact that Einstein was able to build and make accurate predictions based on ideas that did not come from sensory experience, such as space being curved?”

“A lucky, but meaningless idea nevertheless—and after my time.”

“And the notion that people have claimed to see UFOs maneuver in ways that would break the laws of nature?”

“Delusional or lying,” he would likely say. “You cannot break the laws of nature, else that would constitute the metaphysical, a meaningless idea.”

Tired and disillusioned, I would need to sadly turn away from Hume at last, thanking him for his insight and time. I would be sad mainly because I would have tried every possibility to learn from his philosophy the means by which one can determine if he or she is delusional or accurate in his or her sensory experiences. He explained that the majority opinion rules over individual experience. I can see how he would consider my examples of new scientific discoveries to be accurate observations, as later people would confirm their analysis. But this often happens so long after that individual dies, so saddening that he or she will never *know*, in accordance with the empiricist definition, with absolute certainty if he or she was delusional or accurate in depicting their senses. He gives no insight at all on how one can determine what to do if you have an experience that no one else confirms; is it real or a delusion? Galileo was not confirmed of his sensory experience by anyone else, but he was accurate. And the disciples of Jesus were delusional or lying, even though many hundreds of people over the years have also claimed confirmation of such experiences, who also must be also delusional or lying. Hume’s answer is that the majority opinion is the only true and valid, but he then discounts miracles even when the majority opinion confirms that which is metaphysical. In the end, I gained nothing, no knowledge, understanding or wisdom. In the end, I have more questions than I did before. In this case, due to the numerous contradictions, I cannot give any credence to any part of the empiricist philosophy. It answers no questions without contradiction; the contradiction being that *metaphysical* as opposed to *physical* is a meaningful idea when the metaphysical cannot exist in the first place. And it gives no insight into how to be able to discover if someone else is lying about his or her experiences. He states that one cannot know this unless he or she experiences them his or herself. But then how can anyone ever state that they did not experience what they

claim? I see no way by any means with this philosophy to gain any worldly wisdom or understanding. I will need to continue a basis of understanding by gathering other forms of information. The empiricist deals merely with *on* or *off*, *true* or *false*, and nothing in between. No wisdom, understanding or consciousness can be complete with these two conditions alone. I need to discover what these other conditions are.