

NIHILISM'S EPISTEMOLOGY: THE NATURE OF THE PROBLEM AND THE POWER OF LANGUAGE

Dr. Rupal S. Patel,

PhD Guide, Gujarat University.
Associate Professor, Umiya Arts
& Commerce College for
Girls (Detrojwala), Sola,
Ahmedabad, Gujarat
rupalashok@gmail.com

Ms. Foram A. Patel,

PhD Scholar, Gujarat University. Assistant Professor, S.G.M. English Medium College of Commerce & Management (SEMCOM),
Vallabh Vidyanagar, Gujarat
forampatel48.fp92@gmail.com

Abstract

The Present paper joins the investigation of the hypothesis of Nihilism with certain different speculations and idea. Agnosticism the term and later got advanced as a hypothesis, also a demeanour among Russian occupants play significant, yet a critical job in working up the convictions of individuals and the impact can be found in their activity. The intensity of new school existentialism is in the intensity of language to produce smoke to conceal their will to control in the word round of morals with its essential quality of brutality decreasing the individual soul to a social develop. Scepticism gives the word game to battle against these new divine beings. In spite of the fact that scepticism precludes the presence from claiming any target truth in profound quality and morals and in any standardizing evaluative or prescriptive sense in the significance of words, it doesn't prevent the presence from securing all goal truth. To any agnostic who has made a jump to scepticism as a profound quality, such disavowal is an unsuitable logical inconsistency to the pragmatics vital for authorizing that ethical quality in battle with the universe. For the person who rejects suicide, scepticism can go about as an ethical quality to battle against the divine beings and even a theodicy for the foolishness of life and specifically for the ludicrousness of Technological Society constrained by social architects and their divine beings. To state it is equitably evident that there is no target truth is weakness conflicting with the sceptic's jump to profound quality. Hence, scepticism must arrangement with epistemology, philosophy and its God.

INTRODUCTION

Existentialism has become a cult for those who would rather rule as gods in hell by convincing the 'Other' it is heaven instead of dealing with the worth of the individual soul dealing and trying to leap beyond the absurdity of both hell and heaven. The power of new school existentialism is in the power of language to generate smoke to hide their will to power in the word game of ethics with its necessary attribute of violence reducing the individual soul to a social construct. Nihilism provides the word game to struggle against these new gods. Though nihilism denies the existence of any objective truth in morality and ethics and in any normative evaluative or prescriptive sense in the meaning of words, it does not deny the existence of all objective truth. To any nihilist who has made a leap to nihilism as a morality, such denial is an unacceptable contradiction to the pragmatics necessary for enforcing that morality in struggle with the universe.

For the individual who rejects suicide, nihilism can act as a morality to struggle against the gods and even a theodicy for the absurdity of life and in particular for the absurdity of Technological Society controlled by social engineers and their gods. To say it is objectively true that there is no objective truth is cowardice inconsistent with the nihilist's leap to morality. Thus, nihilism must deal with epistemology. What is truth? What is knowledge? What is?

Also, once the question of suicide is decided, nihilism must deal with the absurd individual's relationship to God and the gods of Technological Society as the next remaining philosophical conceptual question. The Powers of social engineering seek to create a world in whatever image they happen to be pursuing on any given day and exist as gods seeking power as an end-in-itself as is true of God. A nihilist is entitled to want more than simply survival in life as a free but impoverished absurd individual, which is what the gods of both new schools secular religious existentialism and old school existentialism preach the individual ought to be so as to maintain their power. To do more than just be a free absurd individual which the nihilist could just as easily do while impoverished in a prison cell as in the freedom of material prosperity, the nihilist must have an understanding

of what “truth” and “knowledge” mean in Technological Society and of the nihilist God: we must have an epistemology and an ontology for truth and knowledge.
(as it is)

OBJECTIVE

The paper includes a contemplation of the arbitrary and random nature of reality, truth, and knowledge and therefore of the concepts of luck, fate, gods, and God for the absurd nihilist individual who has made a leap to morality in Technological Society. The essay will be divided as follows:

- 1) A further description of an existential philosophy of language as necessary to contemplate truth and knowledge in language as an expression of the individual person as god along with the gods and the God available for worship by the individual;
- 2) An existential epistemology by which existential truth leads to pragmatic truth and by which epistemology is gained through holistic reasoning based on acceptance of its arbitrariness and randomness;
- 3) The nature and comparison of nihilism’s God and the other many gods available.

The essence of nihilist truth and knowledge is in seeing the importance of language and its descriptive “rule-following” that I will call Rule Following to meta-ethics and to the power of ethics to create an aesthetic world more real than reality because language binds even the gods and God.

DISCUSSION

I. THE NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

One of the many available gods in Technological Society and its pretend dominant one upon which much of the dogma of Technological Society derives is science and its knowledge and truth to which supposedly everything must be naturalized or, more accurately, pretend to be naturalized. However, modern science was built on the Western Civilization foundation of Christianity and its belief that God can be known and understood through reason through the intelligent design exhibited by reality. Unfortunately, though this faith and belief in the power of reason to show and find God has been confirmed and justified, the scientifically revealed God is not what Christianity expected. Science has not shown us the intelligent design of a Creator limited by reason but the existence of an omnipotent and omniscient reason for their being something instead of nothing that acts by necessity as arbitrary and random Power. In turns out, God can do whatever He, She, or It wants as exhibited by the random and arbitrary nature of reality. Not only does God play with dice with the universe, it is loaded dice — as one would expect but for many reasons is denied.

Acceptance of this reality in which explanation is no longer an attribute of knowledge or truth is the foundation of existential nihilist truth and knowledge of gods and God. Whether science can survive the cracking of its foundation is a big question. Once the hope of explanation is gone, can the will to power be a sufficient replacement? For social engineers and for those who worship science as a religion, power is enough; they only need truth and knowledge including scientific truth and knowledge to serve as aesthetics for their power. For them, actual knowledge and truth about what reality are unnecessary; ethics is concerned only with what ought to be.

Descriptive concepts of knowledge and truth were once a necessary part of scientific reasoning. As science loses its foundation in reality as a source of intelligent design knowledge and truth and ethics becomes the foundation of science as is already happening in much of Western Intelligentsia, normative belief will try to take it over as a means to create the necessary knowledge and truth to support the beliefs of the dominant ethics. Can science fight off and survive such hijacking by ethics?

The ethical demands of Technological Society including those enforceable by the monopoly on violence that is the secular religion we call law are unavoidable including its assumption or hijacking of the Christian beliefs that there must be intelligent explanation for the universe. Social justice engineers pretend to be nihilists but in the end are just as willing to kill me or anyone to create a world in their image in the same way God is willing to do kill us; this is why they are his Powers-that-be in this reality. So, in this contemplation, we must not to let ourselves be taken or fooled by secular religious propaganda and its delusional ethical reality. Making the Orwellian Winston choice of loving Big Bother and his God of Power is always an option for happiness, but for the nihilist, who makes a leap to morality, acceptance of reality as it is and not how it ought to be is the defining attribute of existence. So, keep in mind the reality that led us to nihilism.

Assuming a fair coin, it is true in all possible worlds that the odds of it coming out heads or tails are 50/50. This mathematical knowledge is as certain and absolute as any concept of knowledge can be but what good is it as an explanation for the coin coming up head or tails? None. The meaning of “fair” in coin tosses requires there be no explanation unless everyone knows it and it works: the result must be arbitrary and random for everyone. If there was a way to predict the coin toss so that it is not arbitrary and random but known only by one player but not the other, that knowledge would negate its fairness. However, if this knowledge were known by both

players, there would be no choice to make or any reason to toss the coin— unless one player wanted intentionally to lose.

We expect the sun to rise tomorrow because it has done so millions of times before and the odds are with us. But, it may not and it will not for those who die during the night. The problem with the usual epistemic goals of explanation is that it seeks to explain away the nihilist nature of reality that is its true nature. Looking at reality holistically and not from the perspective of the myopic view of a worker bee in Technological Society concerned and knowledgeable only about the specific narrow task assigned us as worker bees, reality is neither rational nor intelligent. Specific problems have specific pragmatic solutions. However, reality as a holistic whole is an arbitrary and random mess with no purpose other than existence. Unless you believe in a deterministic god who follows set rules: who will live to see the sun tomorrow, who will not, and whether you will see the sun rise tomorrow is a matter of random and arbitrary luck.
(to keep as it is)

Neither physics nor any explanation will give meaning to why some die while others do not live nor why we are here today instead of nothing being here. As it is said- "Things do not happen for a reason, they simply happen". All language is vague and indeterminate, thus even assuming reality is not vague and indeterminate which is a big assumption, any explanation using language will be vague and indeterminate including that of mathematics that can at best reflect reality as a sheet of music reflects music but is not music or as a booking sheet reflects a horse race but is not a horse race. Talking about a unified theory of everything is nonsense talk. All explanation regardless of whether it is scientific or not scientific is full of contradiction and inconsistencies. No science or non-science is anywhere near providing us neither with a smooth and simple world explanation nor even with a rough and complicated world explanation of anything.

Similarly as with fixing a coin hurl in order to realize which side will come up, any clarification of reality utilizing the words "truth" and "information" in the feeling of logical facts that go behind the pragmatics of the specific second will serve to refute decision. In existential terms, it negates the will to power of the individual soul struggling with the universe to give it meaning except for the will of rejecting truth and knowledge. The only explanations that preserve the will to power of the individual soul and its struggle with the universe are pragmatic truth involving probability and thus ignorance of truth. Unfortunately, the truth and knowledge preferred by those who reject nihilism in order to create explanations for reality as social engineers creating a world in their image — hiding their arbitrary and random creation of power behind aesthetics — is a powerful language word game that often seems more real than reality. Reason stops being a tool to solve a particular problem but instead a tool to solve the problem of reality by giving it an explanation — ignoring that reality is not a problem nor does it need any explanation. It exists as God exists: by necessity. It is we who are contingent. Choice only exists in betting on the arbitrary and random contingencies that make up our contingent life. But, does gambling on reality constitute knowledge and do any winnings constitute truth? Can a reality of arbitrary and random luck and fate be a sound epistemology and ontology? I argue yes. Language is a word game. Reality is a mind game of probabilities. Playing it is an end in itself as a reflection of the reason there is something instead of nothing: God. As stated in *Meta-Ethics*, after suicide, the next real philosophical question — and perhaps the last — is not whether you believe in God but whether He believes in you. Regardless of the answer, reason only allows for probabilities for solving the problems of physical existence not explanation. It may be better to rule in hell than to serve in heaven but only if you are a coward who needs the Other to rule over instead of playing your own hand and betting on yourself in the game of life.

II. THE POWER OF LANGUAGE

It is the difference between a genuine despair and a despair that is partly pretence. And with this there goes another consideration which is perhaps less obvious: there are occasions when an "untrue" belief is more likely to be sincerely held than "true" on

— George Orwell

The power of language to create reality is well contemplated these days, to the point that some post-modern "social construct" theorists maintain that we know no reality beyond language. Though in my contemplations I have not gone that far conceptually except in the ability of ethics to create facts to justify what ethicists want and need to be real to justify their ethics of what ought to be real, I have also argued that the vagueness and indeterminacy of language are practical problems in any use of descriptive language in Technological Society because so much of our language is removed from reality. The Pareto Principle of economics applies to language much more than it does to economics especially when aesthetics is factored into a word game; often close to 100% of words spoken in any given word game are created solely for aesthetic purposes — in areas such as modern philosophy of language and mathematical logic. Many such word games are truly just games existing like chess solely to occupy the brilliant minds of those who play the games.

Even ignoring the effects of aesthetics in the language of descriptions, we depend so much on instrumental language and associated instruments, techniques, and algorithms to describe the world and now even to describe our actions upon the world that the connection between language and reality is often and easily lost even at the simplest of levels.

A simple example, imagine showing someone with fishing experience a pole with a string tied to one end and a hook tied to the string, they see a fishing pole. To someone with no fishing experience, they see in these items a useless pole with a string and a hook. The two views of reality would be joined by joint experience: have them try to catch a fish. Regardless of whether they speak the same language, it would be action and the sharing of action that would result in the sharing of a world view.

(as it is)

However, as facts and states of affairs get more and more convoluted, even joint experience no longer leads to the same description of reality. As modern astronomers look at the night sky through their instruments, they no longer see the North Star, Scorpius, Ursa Major, or Ursa Minor as the astronomers of the Ancients did; now they see red shifts and blue shifts on their computer images of Doppler effects along with instrument readings of electromagnetic radiation and cosmic particle interactions. No need to actually look at the night sky anymore to describe it; it is described by graphic representations on computer screens created by computer logic programmed algorithms. Which are more real, the night sky or the computer simulations of the night sky? Ultimately, both and neither. Even if brought together to jointly act, the Ancients who describe Ursa Major as the Big Dipper and Ursa Minor as the Little Dipper are describing a different word game from those who describe them in terms of light-years and red shifts. Even without ethics clouding up the waters, descriptions of reality are without doubt theory laden, always vague, and indeterminate of what is.

This power of language is not my concern here; neither is the Wittgenstein Private Language Argument nor the related concept of social construct. For a nihilist sense of truth and knowledge, the concern is with the power of language as a means not for description or for interpretation but simply as a means for power through the creation of ontological “Rule Following” as distinct from the pragmatic “rule following” of nihilism.

Regardless of whether you believe that numbers are invented by the mind or discovered by it in a platonic reality outside of time and space or whether they exist in a Platonic reality in the mind of God, to know δ is to know how to calculate δ — even for God to know δ . As with all numbers, its semantics and syntax are one — to know the meaning of a number is to know the invented or discovered rule for calculating it. Ask God what the 7,777,777th place number is in δ and He would have to calculate it. The calculation may not occur in space or time because our space-time concepts do not apply to an omniscient and omnipotent being such as God that by definition is outside of space and time — as perhaps are numbers — but there would have to be a calculation.

The same would be true for God to know the meaning of δ in terms of the words: “measured numeric circumference of a circle divided by its measured numeric diameter”. In order to do so, He would have to know our semantics and syntax for these words. He would have to know English. Again, perhaps not know it at any particular time or space, but she would have to speak English.

This is not the same as asking whether God can create an immovable rock including immovable by Him; however it is the same as asking whether He knows the meaning of the word “rock” without being able to speak English or whether God can make a square circle. The first question is nonsense. Regardless of how much post-modernists what it to be true, the word “rock” is not the same as a rock. Rocks exist and only exist in space and time; by any definition of God, She does not exist in space and time. Thus the first question is as much nonsense as asking whether God can make a square circle. However, the question as to whether God knows the meaning of “rock” is just as meaningful as asking whether God can understand our asking Her to make a square circle. She could understand the question only if She understood the rules of English grammar and then She would know the meaning of “rock” and that asking for a square circle is nonsense — as simply bad grammar.

This Rule-Following that can control even God and thus most definitely has power over us does not gain its power from being about a real something distinct from language. If circles and diameters were still defined ostensibly wherein we had to actually draw and point to a circle and its diameter every time we wanted to say something about them to someone, there would be no rule following by others nor by God; there would be simply copying of what we were doing and the acts of copying would pass on the information of copying. The information provided by copying would no more be knowledge than a parrot that mimics or repeats English words has knowledge of English. In a non-word game of only ostensive definitions pointing to reality, an omniscient omnipotent being would be the only one making perfect definitions such as drawing a perfect circle with a perfect line as its diameter so our communications would still be vague and ambiguous but there would be no rule following just copying. Understanding a sentence means understanding a language; and understanding a language means to get master technique of a language, in a language.

All critics of nihilism get along in life by axioms, recursive definitions, tautologies, and similar circular reasoning and use the technique of assumption of any contradictions to create their explanations of life. This process is a holistic way of reasoning distinct from induction and deduction; it is what the philosopher C.S. Pierce called abduction. There is no reason to exclude our existential nihilist axioms from this abduction process especially given that we admit our axioms to be creations of language and limited by language: we admit we are trying to speak about that of which we should be silent. This honesty is not present in the opponents of nihilism.

(as it is)

God does play dice with the universe but we are the only gamblers betting on the roll. He even uses loaded dice as He is entitled to do because He is God. Ante up and play the game. Even with loaded dice, you can figure out

the probabilities and play accordingly. Losing or winning does not matter; it is playing the game that counts. At least by playing with God at his random and arbitrary games, you are at least playing with God not with a bunch of posers playing made up Rule Following games whose language He has learned by coming to earth as Christ and thus could beat us any time He wanted. Play Him at His game. Open yourself up to the benign indifference of the universe as Camus wrote before going coward on us. Open yourself up to the clarity of hate as well as the opiate of love. Will to empower your individual soul to beat those who will to power to be a god over you. Truth and knowledge are in the deal and probabilities of playing with God at His card game not in the word games of ethics or of the descriptive language fabricated to support ethics.

Do not lose your soul in the delusion of aesthetics as did Camus and as the Powers of new school existentialism advocate so that you can lose your soul to their power. Remember, ultimately, to all who seek justice and truth, you are nothing but an inauthentic waiter who they need to act upon through violence to form in their image. Aesthetics will always be controlled by the gods of Rule Following. Know the beauty of the random and arbitrary universe and its benign indifference to all equally.

CONCLUSION

Before the intensity of irregular and self-assertive activity and its numbers language of karma, destiny, and likelihood, both slave and ace are equivalent which isn't valid for some other word game. Morals need brutality. The energy of adoration needs the lucidity of hate to exist. The divine beings need to make a world in their picture. The Good needs the Bad. Social development of social equity needs pioneers, supporters, champs, washouts, the generous, the excused, and the unforgiving. Prior to agnosticism, we are on the whole equivalent as the Ugly.

We needn't bother with clarification or a discerning objective to find, investigate, and vanquish the universe. Such disclosure, investigation, and vanquishing as a self-assertive and irregular objective are closes in-themselves similarly as God's presence and his essential nature are an end-in-itself for God. Fearful maintaining a strategic distance from the bet such is reality to lose oneself in the precise and controlled demise of Rule Following and its will-to-control clarifications will make one's very own leader damnation; at that point, through savagery upon the Other, morals will give you the hirelings you need for your standard. On the off chance that it is smarter to control in hellfire as a quitter than to serve in paradise, Rule Following and morals are the essential apparatuses for your will to control. Be that as it may, on the off chance that one wouldn't like to take the's out by blaming the trivial of life so as to savagely act through morals upon the Other, skepticism gives another alternative. On the off chance that one has the mental fortitude to bet in the round of life by wagering on one's existential soul and get together with the Other in the "considerate apathy of the universe" similarly as God does and should, it is smarter to be alive as a hireling in paradise than as a dead ruler in damnation.

REFERENCES

- 1944, MS 124 (1941, 1944), in Wittgenstein, Ludwig. Nachlass: The Bergen Electronic Edition. (1941, 1944) at MS 124(1944) available at <http://wab.uib.no/transform/wab.php?modus=opsjoner>
Ibid. At MS 124, pp. 175–176 (March 23–24, 1944).
Orwell, George. "Inside the Whale". All Art is Propaganda: Critical Essays". Compiled by George Packer. First Mariner Books: NY, NY (2009) at p. 135.
Wittgenstein, Ludwig. Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus. Dover Publications: Mineola, NY (1999) at ¶4.1212
Godfrey-Smith, Peter. Philosophy of Biology. Princeton University Press: Princeton, NJ (2014) p. 11.
See generally, Gray, Jim. "Jim Grey on eScience: A Transformed Scientific Method". The Fourth Paradigm. Ed. Tony Hey, Stewart Tansley, Kristin Tolle. Microsoft Research: Remond, Wash. (2009). pp. XX - XXI.