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In Crito, Plato says that one betrays ones values for the common good of the law and the city. If the city gave us nurture, gave us education and then treated us badly, we should still obey it. Plato believes that we should obey and put the city before anything else, even oneself. By staying in a city, we agree to the laws it has, like having a contract with the city.

Something like this happened several times in the movie Agora. For example, when the library is destroyed some people suffered and were against it, but it was something commanded by the ruler and they had to obey. Another example is when Hypatia´s father decides with a struggle that the Greeks should attack the Christians. We also see it when all of the people that still believed in the Greek gods had to give them up and take up the Christian god, because Greek gods were prohibited. And my last example is when Orestes doesn’t betray his values by standing up for Hypatia, but since he is the one in charge of the city he has to follow the law and then betrays his values and gives Hypatia up.

These are difficult situations because we can never know who has the absolute truth. We don’t know, in the case of Agora, if the ones who were right were the Christians, the Jews or the Greeks. I can relate this with something that Armando de la Torre said in class, that everything is an approximation to reality and nothing can be proved. We will only try to infinitely reach that truth without actually ever reaching it. We can also see this in Fire in the Equations. Which one is the real cause for the origin of the universe? Could it be the Big Bang? Could it be that the universe just is? Or could it be that some supreme being like God created it? If we ever come to reach a conclusion about the creation and of the universe, at the end it will still be only an approximation to the real truth.

Is there any way that we can prove something? I believe we can’t. We always need that first leap of faith. We can never prove that something is absolutely right, especially in the case of science, natural law and religion. Usually, we are taught that this leap of faith can’t be questioned and this is something that makes religions and different branches of science clash. To question something can sometimes be uncomfortable, that is why it is so hard most of the time to talk about religion. In science it might be difficult to question because it might require entering into an unknown area y people might not have the answers if they don’t know.

Since almost nothing can be proved, in science and religion, it ends up forming a risk to our own identity. We reach the point in which we can’t prove anything, and that we are based on leaps of faith and we end up believing in what we like the most and in what we believe to be the most beautiful, like Kitty Ferguson mentions in Fire in the Equations. If we could prove everything with certainty, there wouldn’t be any space for faith.

Now to think about approximations in a different way, in our second meta-dialogue we discussed how we are always trying to reach and be more like the ideal we have of the MPC. We are constantly trying to be this idea we have of MPC, trying to work harder. The truth is that it might be that we won’t actually reach that ideal because we might take another route, and then we will have another ideal to which we will try to approximate. Heinz said something in class that I also think relates to this. He said that there is always going to be a margin of error, in physics, in life, in the MPC, in everything. So at the end we are just approximating something. But it is okay to have this margin of error, because we can’t expect to reach everything perfectly and we can also learn from our mistakes.

We use our knowledge from learning to make things better in the future and we can apply everything we have learned to our daily lives. Tacit knowledge is acquired by experiences and it is an attitude most of all. We should try to look for solutions and answers, as well as questions. Mistakes also become very important and our struggle to continue to search after them. We should also try to expose ourselves to new situations, environments and things, to get out of our comfort zone. We should also be proprioceptive, in the sense that we should be conscious of what is going around us and what is going on with us.

But how can we ever get to know what is going on with us? How can we get to know ourselves? I have come to think that this is mostly impossible, because in order to really get to know ourselves we would need to pop-out to an outer level. We wont be able to understand ourselves if we are ourselves. Sometimes I have noticed that people seem to know me much better than I know myself, and coming to think of it, it doesn’t sound so crazy. They are not in our same level, they are in another level, a higher one.

We need people that know us very well in order to get to know ourselves. Sometimes we have assumptions of ourselves and we believe things that might not be reflected to someone else. In order to really remove these assumptions and be aware of them, we need proprioception of ourselves. To be conscious of what we see as assumptions and what is the true self that we portray to everyone else. Always considering that it is mostly impossible to get to know one self totally.

“As dearly as we may hold those assumptions and as well as they’ve served us in the past, when it comes to arguing for the validity of a proposal for the origin of the universe, these are self-serving arguments—good arguments maybe for hoping a theory is correct, but no arguments for deciding it is. Such a decision would be an act of faith.” – The Fire in the Equations, chapter 4.