

# Truth is Not Absolute

Have you ever seen a group of people, hating and fighting another group just like theirs over a difference in thought related to a social, cultural or religious topic? If yes, you have all the prerequisites to follow along, else I recommend finding such content online as it is obvious to have such an incident on the trending topics' list.

So with all the work done, let's start.

It is not surprising for many, that many wars and conflicts are going on in the world right now and equally lethal disputes have taken place in the past. We will study only three domains here, namely, religious, cultural, social, as all others are tied to be one of these, how? we will see this later on.

## 1. **Religious**

To be more precise, it is seen to be the most followed and frequent among all the disputes. Occurs when one religion tries to prevail activities seen as forbidden in others, it is natural to have subject of disagreement among the people, and even a little spark to those disagreements can cause huge uprising.

## 2. **Cultural**

It is mainly seen in the form where economic development challenges old beliefs and customs to be illogical and practically liable. Main problem is seen to be the age groups, which divide into two groups, with and against cultural acts.

## 3. **Social**

The most difficult to understand and even harder to resolve is this one. Usually seen as a political escalation where irrespective of religion and age, some people benefit from a norm of any institute/government/society, while others get harmed or have a fear of being harmed.

Now, what we need to understand is that, there is case where any disputes happen among those with no social influence. Rather the ones who have it, try to misuse their fame to increase the same.

Let us consider an example, three boys were friends, one travels by a car and calls himself 'sitting and not moving', for him, it's the car which moves, while second boy calls that he saw him moving from the footpath, he claims that he was in the same motion as the car was, and a disagreement followed by arguments take place.

Now, the fact is, both of them were correct in their own frames of references, which is exactly what the third boy tries explaining to both of them, but for no benefit, the boys keep on arguing on two different aspects comparing the uncomparables and counting the uncountables.

The fact is not that they think, the one standing opposite to them is wrong, but the sense of being challenged, it may be a case where only one side of dispute falls in either of two stated above, but, in general, both sides fall under the categories. The same applies to anyone, correcting someone on an error is not done in order to correct only, but to gain fame and show disrespect of some form or the other.

The case may arise when third person is ready to take various advantages of the situation, that will worsen the conditions, as in case of Indian Democratic practices, the terms like religion, secularism, equality, caste and creed are not used to measure the development of their respective interests but to gain support.

We need to understand that none of us are wrong if, our motive is correct. The result may be against our notion, this doesn't mean it can serve as a proof of steps' correctness that one has taken, it just shows that we were not correct, and there is a lot of difference in being wrong and not being correct.

The observations of both 1st and 2nd boy were not correct for each of their rivals, but none of them were wrong on any aspect, to gain wisdom, we just need to shift our frame of reference from 'me' to 'we' because, indeed, truth is not absolute in any sense, it's more dynamic than how much we think it is.