

ON DESCARTES' MEDITATIONS

My day job is in the legal field and in that industry we must read and interpret rules for the rules and statutes, as well as case law of precedential value, and other judicial opinions which have analyzed a set of facts on specific issues arising between two or more parties that use inductive and deductive reasoning and/or make reasonable inferences, that which a “reasonable person” would make—never mind defining what “reasonable person” really means—about those particular sets of facts presented.

From that experience I have come to the judgment (perhaps jaded or cynical at this point, depending on one’s perspective) that there are consistencies in most relevant facts and in those most consistent you get a constant. And, that constant is more likely to be closer to the truth than not. If I were to rely on Descartes’ meanderings, which state that a “formal falsehood can only be found in judgments,” (Melchert, 2007) and the fact that in experience, especially in a work environment, humans have the disposition to form judgments (of which I can only assume is meant to be opinions and sets of values regardless of whether those judgments were formed inside the work place or carried in from their social upbringing), I would have to ultimately conclude that my thoughts about what is more likely to be closer to the truth is, in fact, false.

Fortunately, or unfortunately, as the case may be, I am a hard one to convince of anything other than those constants because I discovered many things I was taught in secondary school to believe as *truth* turned out to be misleading or incorrect. Some constants have been realized either through personal experience or through our experts (the supposed esteemed leaders of science, politics and/or research, etc.) if they have managed to agree and what they have agreed as true becomes that constant, i.e. does not change hours, days or months later. For example, we know how a fetus is conceived, that a female carries it inside her womb and gives birth to it. These things have been for generations before me and have never faltered, at least to my

knowledge as of yet. But, even if these things can or could change, because we (the masses) do not know this, in the sense of really knowing, how would I ever even consider that I might be missing out on some mystical or unprecedented change in evolutionary theory? Perhaps at some point in our future our minds will have another “big bang.”

I am most intrigued by anyone’s attempts at deciphering whether or not God exists because I have to wonder if, when contemplating the existence or non-existence, they are only considering the God of their particular religion and if so, are they denying the existence of any omnipotent being other than that religion’s God? And if they deny the existence of any other religion’s God, would those same arguments that supposedly prove the non-existence also disprove the existence of their God?

Descartes seems to believe that because we humans err, we can be deceived (quite frequently) and that because our lives are not as perfect as we could possibly imagine them to be that we are imperfect beings and that because God is, or should be, without flaw or imperfection, does not or should not err and cannot be deceived that he is perfect; thus we imperfect humans could not be Gods. But do we really know what “perfect” really means? What if those things he considered to be flaws were perfect flaws? If God does not err and God created us, then how he created us (flaws and all) would be no mistake. Our “imperfections” wouldn’t be imperfections at all, but would be perfect flaws; then despite those perfect flaws we would still be perfect and therefore Gods. Wouldn’t we?