

# Realization of Truth: Addressing the Nothingness of Existentialism

Written by Andrew Brooks

Copyright© 2012Charitiesoflife

Philosophy troubles and engages itself in the various abstractions of the human condition, a field of study that seldom considers the simple motivations for such an existence and how such goals can determine the conclusions. Before Immanuel Kant's (1724-1804) Transcendental Idealism; before Søren Kierkegaard's (1831-1855) Subjective Truth; before Friedrich Nietzsche's (1844-1900) question of Objective Morality; before Martin Heidegger's (1889-1976) Dasein and Jean-Paul Sartre's (1905-1980) Nothingness there was just survival in its crudest form on earth. And, even though Existentialistic Writers have made the attempt to be more concrete in their analysis of the patterns of human thought by accepting our limitations, they have not related it to or tried to understand the meaning of the subsequent neurological simulation it produces. Therefore, these approaches are abstract and derived, which can result in any truths discovered by such inquires as being incomplete or vague.

One of the basic tenets of biology is that an organism is a by-product of how it interacts with its immediate environment. In the 2011 paper entitled, *Transfer of Energy within the Environment and the Affects of such Interactions on the Development of Humanity*, the importance of energy moving between an object/subject within an environment is discussed, an idea which can be extended to ask if there are different levels of input the object/subject, or more specifically, an biological organism (or organism) can receive? The question is three-fold: first, are there different levels of energy input an organism can receive and or react to in its environment; secondly, if there are different levels of energy, how may one define theses different levels for the organism in its present and thirdly, given the evolutionary and therefore, non-static nature of biological organisms that need to change in order to survive, what are the limits to its future energy states?

Before attempting to answer the first question, it will be necessary to discuss the relationship between energy and knowledge. As will be given in greater detail in the forthcoming overview of Existentialistic Thought, Existentialism is concerned with the indirect interaction of the subject and an object in the theatre of the environment. The specific query is how can the observer know what is occurring in the object if it is occurring at a distance to them? Is the truth based on the organism's senses (Idealism) or is there some supernatural state (Realism) that is beyond us where truth lies? And if so, are any of the truths that we think we know just empty and dangerous pretensions of what is actually out there?

In keeping with the requirements of biology, the central question may be reworded another way: how do the sensory organs of the subject (observer) at a distance (or even in contact) react to energy emitted by the environment (objects)? While it is possible that there are many states of reality that are beyond our unaided<sup>1</sup> sensory organs, it does not mean that our senses cannot be augmented. Furthermore, if the energy (cause of change) emitted by the environment is considered to be equal to knowledge (result of change), which it has to be if we accept that we are in a Monistic System, then it would be permissible to ask the questions in the previous paragraphs replacing energy with knowledge, thereby strengthening the connection between biology and philosophy which is so often overlooked.

#### 1.a. Sensory Input: Different Levels of Energy (Knowledge) Input

Because experience tells us that there is a limit to what our bodies can endure, there will be limits to what we can sense. Amongst the qualities of a biological organism is its ability to replicate and change during and after this replication. These characteristics are not equally shared by inorganic objects in the environment because their chemical composition is not as pliable as ours due to the inherent restrictions of inorganic materials. As such, there is a trade-off between the ability to endure environmental energy and being changed by it. For example, a rock is able to withstand a great deal more energy than the human body and its organs before its form is altered. However, because the amount of energy needed to affect change in the rock is substantial, it does not allow the rock to detect the more subtle changes in the environment, and as such, it cannot acquire the necessary knowledge to appreciate these less intense changes which can imbue the biological observer with more information about the environment they inhabit.

#### 1.b. Sensory Input: Definition of the Levels in Energy (Knowledge) Input

At this stage of the discussion there is a schism between energy and knowledge caused by the limits of the first and the almost limitless nature of the second. As mentioned in the footnote, due to our ability to make tools, we are able to become aware of aspects of our environment that our sensory organs could not detect. This occurs because our tools, which are often inorganic, and more resilient, become extensions of our natural sense organs and augment our abilities. Therefore, although I cannot see what is occurring in another part of the universe, I can build a tool that

---

<sup>1</sup> The term 'unaided' is being used because, based on the tools that we use which extends our ability to observe our environment, such as microscopes and telescopes, it must be noted that while humans still have limited sensory organs, which confines our unaided observations, that by having this tool-acquired information, such information can be given to our sensory organs which will enhance our knowledge. Due to this the states of reality beyond our sensory organs will change, but will not reach zero.

allows me to experience it. Such information can then be put into a context which is meaningful to us.

Given this preface, it could be suggested that there are three (3) different levels of energy/knowledge that are bodies can possible sense: what we know, what we can know and what we might know. The first level entails the information we have acquired from experience either firsthand or from our tools. The second encompasses information which we may not have been given directly, but can be derived from our experience. For example, upon reading a journal I am competent in (LEVEL 1) I see a question which is not answered in the text, however, based on the logic of the paper and my own knowledge of how to use the logic, I am able to answer it (LEVEL 2). LEVEL 3 would be the information which is not related to what I have previously experienced or know, and cannot be derived from it, but once experienced it becomes obvious to the observer that it is related to my previous information. An example of this would be a discovery that no one else had thought of.

### 1.c. Sensory Input: Limits of Energy (Knowledge) Input

Even though we have a myriad of tools which has expanded our ability to experience the immediate environment, and those that are around us, such tools in-and-of-themselves have limits. The world and the universe of which it is part of, consists of a number of organic and inorganic fundamental elements (Periodic Table) which at present can be counted. However, the number of permutations that these elements can create is almost limitless implying that the energy states, and the information produced by them would be limitless as well. And even if one allows for the idea that given enough time the human mind can create any number of instruments to measure them, the human race's time is limited due to either the inevitable fate of our sun, or our inability to leave the planet before it does so. Nevertheless, it should be granted that the capacity to acquire knowledge through tools is very high.

### 2. Idealism and Realism

As mentioned, Idealism states that a person's perception and knowledge are a by-product of our senses, whereas, Realism affirms that reality exists independently of the perceiver. Set against each other the Idealist maintains that all we can know is from our senses and due to this, we create the reality we live in. The Realist would heartily agree, but add that because we are limited, and are not allowed to experience the fullness of the environment, our creation of reality is not the truth.

When this previous statement is taken to what appears to be its logical conclusion, it allows some Existential Philosophers to conclude that we base our lives on nothingness. The Realism's syllogism might go something like this: My View of the

world and my knowledge is from my senses; my senses are limited to what information they acquire from the world; limited information acquired from the world creates incomplete information about the world; incomplete information about the world leads to faulty information about the world. A sequence which concludes with: My view of the world is faulty. From there it could be suggested that if we accept that we do not have any intrinsic knowledge of the world at birth, and our only knowledge is acquired during life, and this knowledge is faulty, then there is no way to know what is correct, and life is absurd and meaningless<sup>2</sup>.

In section 1.c of this article it was concluded that while our tools have extended our understanding of the universe, they are ultimately limited. However, these limits are extremely high, and for all intensive purposes are, for limited beings like ourselves, such information will eventually be equal to truth<sup>3</sup>. Of course if we were absolute beings, we could obtain absolute truth, but we aren't. Therefore, by changing the premises of the previous syllogism, the outcome is no longer: My view of the world is faulty. It will eventually become: My view of the world can be the truth. Therefore, while it is not yet possible to state that we will be able to find out everything (Absolute Truth) there is about the universe before we cease to exist as a species, it is in theory possible, or, as religion defines as faith, that there is one.

Nevertheless, there is still a logically step which has been overlooked, the question of how are we able to interact with the environment? Even though it does not seem necessary to explore this specific step in the acquirement of knowledge because it appears to be a self-evident process, no step should be discounted. To begin, we can say that the human sensory apparatus is affected by energy in the environment, and that this energy is knowledge, and through our tools our understanding of the world can theoretically be truth, there still needs to be a way to define this process.

To many the answer appears to be obvious, that our senses take external information and bring it to the central nervous system and that connects us with the world around us. To wit: having the outcome, we suppose the cause is unnecessary to determine and is simply a deterministic process. The next section will consider this by looking at what is actually necessary to interact with the environment.

---

<sup>2</sup> This is a brief overview of Jean Paul-Satire's work. His work will be discussed later in this paper.

<sup>3</sup> The definition of Subjective, Objective and Absolute Truths will be discussed in Section 8.b.

### 3. Immanuel Kant: Transcendental Idealism

I would submit that the first casual link between biological perception and physiological postulations was given by Immanuel Kant's theory of Transcendental Idealism. By the time Kant wrote *Critique of Pure Reason* (1787), the basics of human anatomy, including gross elements of the nervous system were understood. It would take until the start of the 20<sup>th</sup> century for Santiago Ramón y Cajal and his colleagues to formulate the Neuron Doctrine however the level of resolution Kant had in his time was enough for him to understand that there were tracts consisting of fibers leading from the various sensory organs into the brain. With this in mind, and understanding that external information from the senses accumulates in the brain, he formulated the idea of Transcendental Idealism, a theory that asked what were the basic conditions or processes that had to exist in a person in order for that person to be aware and ask and answer questions about their environment.

Kant began answering the question of experiential necessity by determining that the person had to have an intrinsic understanding of Time and Space. In Kant's system, he theorizes that knowledge can be acquired either through experience or not. Those aspects (sub-process) of the experience gathering aspects of the person, or Central Nervous System (CNS), existing within the person at the time of the experience that are not due to experience are referred to as *a priori*, while those that are a result of experience are *a posteriori*. Kant believes that the person's ability to appreciate Time is an *a priori* internal intuition, or in other words, an inherent ability of the CNS to experience Time. In contrast, Space is a *a priori* external intuition. The key difference is that the phenomenon of Time is a by-product of the CNS and Space is a result of external phenomena. Therefore, what Kant is proposing is not that pre-existing experiences are already inside the person prior to experience, but that the ability to acquire the experience has to be there before it can be experienced.

It might be easy to consider these conclusions rhetorical however the concept of Time being a product of the central nervous system is a pivotal point to be aware of in the understanding of how knowledge can be acquired. Logically, the type of energy that is experienced by a person should determine the characteristics of the sensory organs. Evolution of the biological substrate in a specific environment will determine *a priori* what the person can experience, whereas, Time, and its perception is a result of the characteristics of the individual. What this infers is that, using Kant's term, the manifold of experience, or experiencing different parts of that experience at the instant, can occur because of the CNS and is not determined by the environment. If there was no standard of Time, our complex sensations would be impossible to understand. It is only because people share the same basic neuroanatomy that a commonly share view of Time is accepted.

The Theory of Non-Linear Existentialism (NLE) comes to a similar conclusion, and also agrees with Kant concerning Analytical and Synthetic Judgments. As with Transcendental Idealism, Non-Linear Existentialism views Time as a subjective phenomenon which is set by the central nervous system in order for the person to experience the complexities of the energy entering and experienced by the person. NLE goes further in attempting to define the specific elements of the Telencephalon involved in this, and refers to it as frequency modulation of the neuronal impulse. Moreover, Analytical Judgments, or those that can be inferred from present information (Section 1.b. LEVEL 2) and Synthetical, or those that can't (Section 1.b. LEVEL 3) are also inherent in NLE.

Synthetical Judgments occur in Non-Linear Existentialism when sufficient non-linearity allows a previous input to be temporarily associated with a new output. If the linkage is consistent with the other patterns in the Telencephalon, which in terms of NLE implies that there is an increase in neuronal energy, then a new pattern is developed. The result is that the patterns which are being developed in the cerebral hemispheres which link representations of external events to those within the person. Moreover, the determination of whether these patterns are formed is based on the amount of stimulation such patterns create, with the ultimate goal, as theorized by NLE, of reducing the difference between the current level of neuronal excitation (Non-Optimal Wants Baseline Activity Level) and the highest level that can be maintained by the system (Primary Needs Baseline Activity Level). This is important to emphasize as we approach the nothingness of existentialism.

### 3.1. Immanuel Kant: Phenomena and Noumena

An interesting extension of these ideas is what is offered in the way of the mending of the dichotomous concepts of Phenomena and Noumena. Kant started his theories by stating that we can only experience what we sense however, he still believed it was possible to know the things-in-themselves (Noumena). The problem with this assertion is that by definition the Noumena cannot be known through the senses. Nevertheless, in keeping with Kant's belief that our senses allow us to infer the Noumena, and from what has been offered in this paper concerning the Levels of Input, it is possible for Synthetical Judgments to go beyond the known and the sensed (with the aid of tools and time) so that there is a connection between the absolutism of the Noumena and the immediacy of Phenomena, or the idea of Subjective and Objective Truth<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>4</sup> Details will be given in Section 8.a and b on the relationship between Truth and Thought, as well as, Subjective, Objective and Absolute Truth.

#### 4.a. Søren Kierkegaard: Subjective Truth

To Søren Kierkegaard, truth is a result of the subjective thinker and is uncertain because it is in a state of growth. In the *Concluding Unscientific Postscript to the Philosophical Fragments* (Posthumously, 1946) it is stated that since the thinker is limited in how they view the world, that any truth they have it not complete, however, because the subjective thinker continues to improve and develop their understanding of the world, they and their truth is in a state of becoming. Therefore, while Kierkegaard does not directly comment on the biological underpinnings of truth, his conclusion that truth is uncertain because it is a result of a person, it could be asked if he was implying that this uncertainty is a result of an uncertain or unstable system that produces it?

If the implication is correct, then it should be asked what are the uncertain elements of the subjective thinker which causes them to produce uncertain truths? As offered previously, Non-Linear Existentialism answers this question by positing that external input enters the nervous system and causes three (3) physical events to occur: 1) the input that reaches the individual is translated from external energy to internal energy patterns, these are the building blocks of information; 2) this representation of the outside world is then linked to internal patterns within the nervous system with the primary goal of reducing the energy incongruencies between the patterns (all of which are either related to Needs or Wants), a process which is guided by the reduction of incongruities, but in-itself, is accomplished by a process of trial and error; 3) and finally, the person's reactions to these incongruities which would be defined as their Emotions. Therefore, it is possible that uncertainty can be created by anyone of these steps, and can be better understood as different forms of subjectiveness due to the phenomena of Quantity or Quality.

#### 4.b. Søren Kierkegaard: Quantity and Quality

In the 2011 paper discussing the use of the Phenomenological Method, the theoretical difference between Quantity and Quality is offered. Quantity is an External Standard which is used to measure and or define the object being examined and Quality is an Internal Standard which is based on the amount of neural energy associated with the patterns inside the nervous system. Consequently, if there is a question on which external standard to use to measure an event, or if there is no such standard, this causes a question of in the Standards of the Society such as Law. Variance in internal standards occurs when the same event, viewed by the same person at different times, but leads to different levels of excitation to be associated with that event, is the person's Value System. For those which experience an increase in energy, it will be deemed a good event and for those with a decrease the event will be bad. As such,

either phenomenon can lead to uncertainty in the groups they affect because each can cause a change in the standard that is used to judge truth, or that which does not contradict.

#### 5.Friedrich Nietzsche: Question concerning Objective Morality

Based on the previous offerings it is likely that Nietzsche's famous saying concerning God's death is a result of uncertainty in standards. In Section 125 of the Gay Science (1882) the Madman is overwhelmed with the idea that God has been killed, and the murder is none other than everybody. It is possible that Nietzsche made this statement in the shadow of what had already been stated about Existentialism (Section 2. Idealism and Realism). It can be concluded, based on what appears to be logical premises, that if there are currently no absolute standards because we are unable to learn them, and our current inability to act in a moral way is proof of this, then the entity, or God, that is said to be part of the world that is the standard which is responsible for morality in an immoral world, produces a contradiction which can only be solved by the removal of this entity.

Nevertheless, seen in the light of External and Internal Standards/Truth<sup>5</sup>, the death of God may not be an absolute necessity. First, being that there are many different religions, supported by various dogmas in our various societies, it is fair to claim that each of these religions/dogmas acts as a type of External Truth. Therefore, unless two (2) or more individuals from two (2) or more religions have absolute faith about their own standards, discussion between them might cause either standard to be eroded.

Second, once the dogma is internalized, it should produce a system that coordinates and strengthens neuronal patterns in the person so that they feel excitation when information in agreement with the dogma occurs. The difficulty of course occurs either when people in a particular faith are viewing others in the same faith who claim to be practicing this dogma are not consistent in their actions, or elements of the world which the religious person encounters causes the person to question this internal standard. In either case, even though there appears to be no absolute standard or truth, due to either logic, or our own limitations as a species, or any other number of impediments, this does not mean that one does not exist or cannot be experienced by not turning to measurable experience. If a person has the faith that there is one, and is willing to live in harmony with it, then it does exist.

---

<sup>5</sup> The specific relationship between Standards and Truth will be given in Section 8.9 where it will be shown that there is a strong positively correlation between the two.

## 6.Martin Heidegger: Dasein

While some Existentialists claim that the lack of truth is a nothingness that inherently cannot be resolved, Heidegger concluded that it can be achieved in theory through an actual something. As with Kierkegaard, Heidegger states in his work *Being and Time* (1927) people are in a continual state of Becoming, and that the current instantaneous state of the person, or Being (ontological or significance), continual changes as it interacts with the world (ontic). Being, or the present state of the organism, is incomplete because the significance given to events is not correct. By implication, the present Being is in a state of incompleteness, which Heidegger argues can be made less incomplete by the process he refers to as Dasein. Dasein is an inborn characteristic of the thinking person, whose undifferentiated character is not nothing, but an ability that is only measurable through the Becoming. And as stated in the paper on the subject, modulation in frequency / amplitude modulation, as created layer VIb of the cortex, is Dasein.

## 7.a.Jean-Paul Sartre: Nothingness

One of the preeminent Philosopher's of the 20<sup>th</sup> century was Jean Paul Sartre, a result, in part due to his claim that at the heart of our Being is Nothingness. At times Sartre's thesis *Being and Nothingness* (1943) appears contradictory and is often unpredictable in its claims, however, when the basics of his system in this work is exposed and defined there are many correlations between it and Non-Linear Existentialism. His claims, as do other Existentialists, that our knowledge is solely obtained through our interaction with phenomena that we encounter in the environment. He then postulates that we stay incomplete Beings because we continue to pass through a state of non-Being. The reason for this situation is that the original concrete input, or the in-itself, from the environment (including the individual's awareness of themselves in the guise of reflection) is being destroyed and turned into the unstable for-itself by Nothingness, a continuous process that is claimed to be at the center of our persons.

Based on his work, Sartre appears to be formulating a system that is similar to that given by Sigmund Freud. Even though details of the connection between Sartre and Freud will not be given until the following paper on the subject, *Implications of Non-Linear Existentialism on Freud's Psychoanalytical Models*, it is theorized in this work that Freud's system involves neuronal energy which on one level fluctuates around a baseline level of neuronal excitation via a negative feedback system, which in turn, and on a larger scale, is part of another feedback system<sup>6</sup> attempts to reinstate

---

<sup>6</sup> This system has a positive feedback system which operates up to the point of sustainable neuronal excitation.

the initial, and relatively unfettered level of stimulation in the cortex. By looking for context in this work, Sartre's continuous cycle between Being and non-Being, or completeness and incompleteness, as caused by Nothingness, appears to have the same neurological motivations as Freud's.

### 7.b. Jean-Paul Sartre: Feedback System of Nothingness

If these terms are translated into the language of Non-Linear Existentialism (NLE), thereby grafted onto the nervous system, then the basic structure of a Feedback system starts to appear. Sartre's system is driven by need to complete the incomplete being through the for-itself, which he states cannot be done<sup>7</sup>. In contrast, but with a similar theme, for NLE, the goal is to change a set of patterns within the cortex that produce sub-optimal excitation, to a set of patterns that produce optimal excitation. And since the fluctuations created by VIb is continuous, this force will continually adjust the Internal Standard of the person so as to optimize stimulation in the cortex, only the outcomes (past) of this process will appear set. This statement is very similar to what Sartre states in his system, which is, that the past state of the for-itself can become the in-itself.

In addition, nothingness and the magnetic field share many similar attributes, and some primary differences. In most feedback systems, there is a Set Point that the system attempts to maintain. For example, the ventilation system attached to a thermostat is designed to keep the room the thermostat is in at a specific temperature. The force which brings this about is heat. For NLE, and Sartre's, there is an internal force that is being used to reinstate a Set Point (NLE=Optimal Energy) or for Sartre, to create it (truth). Sartre refers to it as the variance brought about by nothingness, while NLE refers to it as the magnetic energy from layer VIb of the cortex. Furthermore, along with each energy source being in fluctuation so neither can be defined (indeterminate), they are continuous and do not diminish. Moreover, Sartre states: this nothingness which separates human reality from itself is the origin of time (pg. 154, *Being and Nothingness*), an idea perfectly in line with NLE. Nevertheless, Sartre has truth (a pattern) as the goal (set point) and not the optimization of neuronal energy.

---

<sup>7</sup> Sartre states this clearly in the following quote on pages 277 – 278 of *Being and Nothingness*: If I may use a down-to-earth image for the sake of making my thought clearer, picture an ass drawing behind him a cart. He attempts to get hold of a carrot which has been fastened at the end of a stick which in turn has been tied to the shaft of the cart. Every effort on the part of the ass to seize the carrot results in advancing the whole apparatus and the cart itself, which always remains at the same distance from the ass.

### 7.c. Jean-Paul Sartre: Objective Time

Having stated that Sartre links nothingness to time, this statement is incomplete without qualifying it. As opposed to Non-Existentialism which, like Kant, has Time as a result of internal processes, Sartre hypothesizes in *Being and Nothingness*, “the for-itself discovers temporality on being – that is outside. Universal temporality is objective.” (pg. 280) He outlines his theory in the following quotations:

“This nothing which measures and signifies exteriority-to-self is the trajectory, as the constitution of exteriority in the unity of a single being.” (pg. 290);

“The trajectory never is, since it is nothing; it vanishes immediately into purely external relations between different places.” (pg. 290);

“Thus the temporal identification of the moving body with itself across the constant positing of its own exteriority causes the trajectory to reveal itself . . . (pg.290-91); and

“The present dimension of universal time would therefore be inapprehensible if there were no motion. It is motion which in the pure present determines universal time. (pg. 291).

For Sartre, trajectory, or constant motion of an external activity through external space permits the for-itself to experience time.

By taking this position, Sartre is able to reaffirm his idea of questioning internal causality however the theory is not consistent with external reality. As revealed in these selections, Sartre believes that constant external motion results in external universal time, and that it is a nothing because (and by inference is the same phenomena as the nothingness which creates for-itself) trajectory is a nothing. However, it is incorrect to state that external events are constant, let alone consistent, both of which are basic properties of time. To the contrary, external events are very much the opposite because they are either inconsistent in themselves or through interacting with others, become inconsistent. Therefore, although the theory of NLE agrees that constant interaction with an event can lead to time, the events have to be internal where is can be regulated. And, although internal causality can still be indeterminate, and appears to be a nothing, the regulation of time is internal.

### 8.a.Truth: Production of a Standard

Having referred to the concept of truth numerous times, and having made inferences, it is necessary to try to define it without falling into any number of tautologies. When asked what is true, the answers may vary from: truth is self-evident, or truth is what agrees with the facts or truth is what you believe it to be. In many ways, truth is all of these examples. Non-Linear Existentialism is built on the concept of incongruities between neuronal patterns and how a biological system can reduce them to obtain the

optimal level of sustainable excitation. As such, in this system, truth would consist of ensuring, and in keeping with Section 4.9 which outlines the three (3) physical steps involved in the modification of the neuronal connections, that the Pattern-Stimulation-Associations (PSAs) stored within the cerebral cortex are consistent with the standards which they are based on, and if they are, this is Truth.

To understand the scope of the previous statement, I will outline the theoretical development of truth in a person as a standard. At first, although the infant is having all of its needs met, and creates a maximum state of sustainable excitation (PNBAL) in the cerebral cortex the child's nervous system is devoid of the necessary patterns to acquire these needs. As the basic patterns, and incongruities created by the creation of time, begin to reduce the overall level of cerebral excitation (Instantaneous Incongruities), the child increases its interactions with the environment in an inherent effort to mitigate this reduction. While in the immediate (Small) environment of their early development, the child begins to interact with systems of patterns (rules and regulations) which, based on their efficacy may or may not return the system to PNBAL. Moreover, when these initial Small PSAs of the early environment are compared to those in later larger environments, this again will determine if a true standard exists.

Another way to view this is by using sets and showing how they interact. To begin, the infant has an initial System A of PSAs and, in an ideal situation, each of these PSAs agrees with the each other, therefore there is no incongruities between them. This we will define as Small Set A = (1, 1, 1 ... 1)<sup>8</sup>. And if there is disagreement in some of the PSAs in the set, it would look like this: Set B = (1,2,1 ...2). With these two basic sets defined, we can then show that if Small Set A is equal to the Large Set, then Set A = Set A and the Subjective Standard/Truth of the children equals the Objective Standard/Truth of the society. However, it is more likely the child will have either a set like Set B and it will either have incongruities within this set, or in comparison to the Larger Sets ( Set C = 2,2,2 . . .2 ). There are many other iterations of this interaction, including a very damaging circumstance where the infant who is initially in Small Set D = (1,3,4. . . 5), which has many incongruities, enters the Larger Set E = (2,7,9. . . 0) when they are older. Since there is no standard either within the Small Set or Large Set or even between them, the child will be in a chaotic situation.

#### 8.b.Truth: Subjective, Objective and Absolute Standard/Truth

If truth is being consistent with the standard it is compared to, then it is possible for there to be different truths based on different standards. Subjective Standard/Truth

---

<sup>8</sup> The same numbers does not imply they are the same PSA, but that they are consistent with each other

would consist of a person with Set A = (1,1,1... 1). What this implies is that even if the Larger Set outside of it completely internally consistent, but written as Set B = (2,2,2....2) then Set A is not equal to Set B. Therefore, as the Realist would report, and to make their point by defining Set B as the Objective Standard/Truth, a person may have a consistent view of the world, but because it is faulty, it is not the real view. Nevertheless, as I have argued, the better our tools, and the better the standards we develop, the more likely our Subjective Standards or Truths will become the Objective Standards. But is it important to remember that this Objective Standard/Truth cannot become though measured experience an Absolute Standard/Truth because of the limitations of our tools and of our ourselves.

The concept of standards as truths can also imply an interesting dynamic for the concepts for Quantity and Quality. Previously, it was noted that the phenomena of Quantity is an ability to measure based on an External Standard and Quality, an Internal Standard. Moreover, if the Standards/Truths are consistent with themselves and with the external ones, there would be no incongruities between what is considered to be right or wrong, therefore, complete objectivity. Given this, in a scenario where the Smaller and Larger Sets, as previous discussed become the same, producing no incongruities, then the concept of Quality would vanish. The reason is that since Quality is a term that is assigned to the internal variances of the CNS's ability to assign importance to input, and in the situation offered in which there would be no Residual Incongruities between their various pattern-stimulation-associations, the concept of uncertainty, except for that created by Instantaneous Incongruities, would vanish.

#### 8.c.Truth: Necessity of Thought

Based on this definition of truth, it can be shown that Thought is the process of obtaining it based on the amount of modulation created by it. Overall, the previous discussion attempted to show that truth occurs when all standards agree. If the child is fortunate enough to grow up in an environment with consistent PSAs, and these PSAs are consistent with the rest of society, then they are closer to understanding and accepting the truth. For most others, there will be incongruities either between the individual members of their sets or between their sets and the Larger Sets of the environment (Analytical Judgments). In either case, this will have created Residual Incongruities. And, as NLE suggests, since the PSAs of the Smaller Sets cannot change unless there is an inherent means of modulating them, Thought is considered to be this process, testing, by way of a hybrid state of uncertainty and previous attempts, and sometimes producing entirely new pattern-stimulation-associations (Synthetic Judgments) to reduce the cerebral pattern incongruities between the representatives of external input and internal needs.

### Conclusion: Limitations of Abstractions

Truth and Thought are both based on, but are not limited to experience, nor the tools by which they are often expressed. From this analyze, it appears that Sartre's nothingness and Existentialism in general can lead to nihilism because the feedback aspects of a biological system are overlooked. While internal neuronal modulation or that which inadvertently produces the inherent appreciation of what is referred to as time, does lead to the production of Instantaneous and Residual Incongruities as it encounters external signals, these processes of modulation, which also resulted in Thought, can reduce Residual Incongruities as it optimizes the energy created by the patterns. Or, perhaps Sartre did not consider that while Thought can be discontinuous with prior inputs, producing instability that gives the impression of Nothingness, the optimization of cerebral energy between the patterns can lead to Subjective and even Objective Truth. It is also possible that since Sartre put the obtainment of truth (a pattern) and not the optimization of cerebral energy as the goal of life, he created a problem that an abstract system, such as philosophy could not possibly solve.

## References

Brooks, A. (2011). *Implications of Non-Linear Existentialism on Freud's Psychoanalytical Models*. Unpublished manuscript.

Brooks, A. (2011). *Phenomenological Method Applied to Quantity and Quality as Framed by Heidegger's Existentialism and the Neuro-Physiological Necessity of Non-Linear Existentialism*. Unpublished manuscript.

Brooks, A. (2011). *Transfer of Energy within the Environment and the Affects of such Interactions on the Development of Humanity*. Unpublished manuscript.

Kant, I. (1993) *Critique of Pure Reason*, V. Politis (Ed.)(Meiklejohn Trans). Rutland, Vermont:Everyman. (Original work published 1787).

Heidegger, M. (2008). *Being and Time*. (J. Macquarrie and E. Robinson Trans.) New York, NY:HarperCollins. (Original work published 1927).

Kierkegaard, Soren (1992). *Concluding Unscientific Postscript to the Philosophical Fragments*, Volume 1. (H. V. Hong and E. H. Hong, Eds and Trans.) .Princeton University Press, New Jersey. (Original work published 1941).

Nietzsche, F. (1974). *The Gay Science, with a Prelude in Rhymes and an Appendix in Songs*.(W. Kaufmann Trans.). New York, NY:Random House. (Original work published 1882).

Sartre, J. P. (1992). *John-Paul Sartre, Being and Nothingness: The Principle Text of Modern Existentialism*. (H. E. Barnes, Trans.) New York, NY: Washington Square Press (Original work published 1943)