

Human Ideas are All Guesswork: How Circumstantial Standards Undermine Our Reasoning and Empiricism

Publication Date:

2000 July

Abstract:

In this article, we delve into the idea of Circumstantial Standards, or the Belief System Conundrum, which questions the reliability and validity of human constructs and ideas. This theory posits that all human constructs, such as language, societal norms, mathematics, currency, calendars, etc., are merely circumstantial, assumptions, or guesswork. They are not rooted in objective reality, but rather in the Power of the Standard, a set of rules broadly accepted by the majority of the people. Thus, the Power of the Standard is not static; it is dynamic and changes over time, influenced by new discoveries, inventions, events, and trends. As a result, old standards fade away, new ones emerge, and the cycle continues. This suggests that human constructs and ideas are circumstantially relative, and hence, they are all essentially guesswork.

Keywords:

Belief Systems, Circumstantial Standards, Guesswork Predicament, Empiricism

We elucidate this concept with examples demonstrating how different ideas and systems vary based on culture, geography, and societal consensus.

1. The Guesswork Predicament: This example probes the randomness and variability of human symbols and representations, such as letters, numbers, units, and names. It questions why we use specific symbols and representations over others, and what the implications would be if we altered them. For example, why do we use 26 letters in the alphabet instead of 10 or 50? Why do we use 10 numbers instead of 2 or 100? What if we reduced the alphabet to 13 letters and eliminated all vowels; reduced the counting system to 8, 4, or 2, or expanded it to 16 numbers? Would the world be different today? Would the gravitational constant have a different value? Would the sum of all angles in a triangle still be 180? What if a standard ruler, which has 16 equally spaced line marks, was modified by removing a line or more? Would our measurement methods remain the same? What if vowels were removed and the alphabet only contained 10 letters? Would communication still be possible? If every culture in the world spoke different languages, then the fruit apple could have 101 different names. Why were the number systems of the Inca, Mayan, Egyptian, Greek, and Babylonian distinct from each other? These questions suggest that human symbols and representations are not inherent or fixed, but arbitrary and variable. They are based on conventions and agreements that can be modified, replaced, or

interchanged. They are not reflections of reality, but false constructions of reality. They are circumstantial, assumptions, and guesswork.

2. The Birthday Riddle: This example questions the relativity and subjectivity of human time and age, such as date, hour, and year. It asks how we measure and celebrate our time and age, and how they depend on the location, planet, and calendar we use. For instance, what if you were born in California and today is your birthday? How many times are you actually celebrating your birthday in a year? You might not have realized this, but if you are in Australia in spirit today, your birthday actually has already passed by last night. And if you are in Alaska today, your birthday has not come yet. More amazingly, if you are now physically present in Australia today, do you think your birthday is just coming or it has passed already? And another mind-boggling question: how old are you now, today? What would be your age if you lived in Australia or Alaska today? What about if you were on Mars, Jupiter, or Saturn today? There are many kinds of calendars, which one do you use as a basis for your birth date? These questions suggest that human time and age are not absolute or objective, but relative and subjective. They are based on measurements and calculations that can vary depending on the reference frame and system we use. They are not properties of reality, but perceptions of reality. They are again circumstantial, assumptions, and guesswork.

3. The Science Quandary: This example scrutinizes the dependability and validity of scientific evidence, typically based on data analysis, formula manipulation, and quasi-experiments. It posits that scientific evidence is not constant or objective, but variable and subjective. It hinges on the variables, parameters, and environment involved in the measurement or experiment. For instance, I can estimate a building's height by dropping a coin and using the formula, data, and experiments provided by science. However, this estimate will change if I and the building are on the moon, in Jupiter, or inside a black hole, due to differences in gravity, air resistance, and time dilation. Thus, scientific evidence is circumstantial and does not reflect the true or absolute height of the building.

4. The Belief System: This example questions the origin and diversity of human information. It posits that information is not inherent or fixed, but acquired and variable. It depends on how one interacts with one's surroundings and the kind of environment one lives in. For example, at the cellular level, the information acquired by an egg cell differs from that acquired by a sperm cell, as they inhabit different environments and perform different functions. Each carries different information. When they unite, they form a new individual with new information.

Religion is akin to cells. It emerges depending on the environment where you live or the country where you were born. If you are born in India, you are likely to be a Hindu. If you are from China, you are likely to be a Buddhist. If you are from Indonesia, you are likely to be a Muslim. If you are from Rome, you are likely to be a Catholic. And if you are from another part of the

world, you could be a Christian, a Protestant, or even an Agnostic. Whatever it is, your religion is circumstantial. The question then is, how do we decide which religion is the correct, true, or acceptable one? Is there a universal truth or authority that we can follow? Or do we have to rely on circumstantial standards, another guesswork predicament?

5. The Identity Crisis: This example questions the reliability and validity of human names and labels, such as words, numbers, symbols, and units. It asks why we use certain names and labels, and what would happen if we changed them. For instance, why do we call a round fruit with white flesh and red, yellow, or green skin an apple? Why don't we call it a banana or an orange or any other word like peanut or zero? What if we defined the word orange as a round fruit with white flesh and red, yellow, or green skin? Could we then call an apple an orange? What if we used the same definition for a banana? Could we then call an apple a banana? What if we swapped all the definitions of every fruit and every word in the dictionary, will the world of vocabulary change? These questions suggest that human names and labels are not inherent or fixed, but arbitrary and variable. They are based on conventions and agreements that can be modified, replaced, or interchanged. They are propositions that are circumstantial, assumptions, and guesswork.

6. The Codexation Dilemma: This example questions the reality and validity of human ideas transforming to physical realities. For example, the idea of an apple is an abstract concept. When the idea is associated with a physical apple, the idea becomes real. Does this mean that ideas only become real if and only if they are physically associated with a solid object? Does this mean that the presence of a material apple validates concrete proof that the apple is real? Why do we use the word apple instead of the word orange or the letter A or the number 2 as the name for the fruit? Why do we use the Yen as the mode of payment in China rather than the Peso? Why does the alphabet start with the letter A and not with the letter K or the letter B? Why do we have odd and even numbers in our counting system? Why not just even numbers and forget the odds? Why do we use money? Why is your name your name and not my name? The phrase "I Love You" is spoken differently by various races around the world. Among the hundreds of translations, which one is the correct one? The answers to these questions depend on your race, your culture, your education, your belief, and your personality. Human ideas are all circumstantial. They are assumptions! They are all guesswork!

7. The Red Herring Paradox*: This example questions the accuracy and dependability of mathematical principles and practices. It asks how do we resolve multiple answers that are contradictory but well founded mathematically. Take note in the following examples that there are so many solutions and answers for this single equation: $1+2+3+4(1+2+3+4) = x$

$$(a) \ 1+2+3+4(1+2+3+4) = x$$

$$(10)(10) = x$$

$$x = 100$$

$$(b) 1+2+3+4(1+2+3+4) = x$$

$$(4!)(4!) = x$$

$$(4!)^2 = x$$

$$(24)^2 = x$$

$$x = 576$$

$$© 1+2+3+4(1+2+3+4) = x$$

$$1+2+3+4(10) = x$$

$$(1*10)+(2*10)+(3*10)+(4*10) = x$$

$$10+20+30+40 = x$$

$$x = 100$$

$$(d) 1+2+3+4(1+2+3+4) = x$$

$$1+2+3+4(10) = x$$

$$1+2+3+40 = x$$

$$x = 46$$

$$(e) 1+2+3+4(1+2+3+4) = x$$

$$[1*(1+2+3+4)] + [2*(1+2+3+4)] + [3*(1+2+3+4)] + [4*(1+2+3+4)] = x$$

$$10 + 20 + 30 + 40 = x$$

$$x = 100$$

* The Lawsian Red Herring Paradox, technically named the Diversion Paradox, is a mathematical interjection used to formulate an equation or solution with multiple contradictory unique valid answers or conclusions (the paradox) using diversion. It is an inscriptional technique or strategy used to find alternatives or new ways of solving problems and correcting "undefined" concepts in the world of numbers, orders, and dimensions. On the other hand, it also misleads or diverts the equation or solution by giving an intended or unintentional answer or conclusion (the red herring) on the basis of fancy logic, false information, or incorrect operation.

In essence, these examples demonstrate the concept of Circumstantial Standards, which challenges the reliability and validity of human ideas and systems. Since human constructs and ideas are uncertain and variable, which translate to assumptions and circumstances, hence the knowledge we live in basically revolves on guesswork.

A complete version of this article can be found in the book [Originemology](#) by Joey Lawsian.