

# Re: Truth and facticity (Was: Re: Recursivity vs. Provability)

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2005-05/msg00067.html>

---

- *From:* "george" <[greeneg@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:greeneg@xxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 4 May 2005 13:47:04 -0700
- 

mitch wrote:

> "george" <[greeneg@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:greeneg@xxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
>> here in THIS weird room, there  
>> is NO SUCH THING as "true", just PLAIN true.  
>> You only get to be true (or false) UNDER AN  
>> INTERPRETATION, or IN A MODEL.

mitch retorted,

> Sadly, this is one of the failures  
> of the logical program.  
>  
> What I mean by this (before you blow your top)

Too late.

> is that everyday, common sense language usage  
> refers as if this has meaning.

Don't be silly. It does nothing of the kind.  
Everyday common sense language does NOT refer  
or interpret "as if" truth could mean something  
INdependent of a model or a context. Everyday  
common sense language KNOWS DAMN WELL that it has  
a context. The fact that the context is not explicitly  
verbalized doesn't mean it's not there. In fact,  
the WHOLE REASON FOR HAVING a \*context\* of interpretation  
is SO YOU DON'T have to verbalize some things.

In everyday common sense language, it is a tautology  
(unless it's being replayed as an answering-machine  
message) that "I am here now". Precisely BECAUSE  
it is tautologous, it would be meaningless without  
a context. But the context allows evaluation of this  
in LESS-contexted language (if you know who is speaking,  
if you know where he is, if you know what time it is).

The need for a model or an "interpretation" is NOT  
something that formal language just made up to distinguish

Re: Truth and facticity (Was: Re: Recursivity vs. Provability)

itself from natural language. It's very much built in to how we think, and all the Tarskian paradigm is doing is RECOGNIZING that so that it doesn't trip us up when we go to formal language.

- >
- > At one time I tried to talk about
- >
- >  $ZF + V=L(D)$  where  $D$  is a normal measure
- >
- > This axiom

Oh, shut up.

In the language you think you are talking in, namely the first-order language of ZF,

V DOESN'T EXIST.

If you are in NBG or someplace where this CAN be meaningfully translated into the first-order language you are using, then even STARTING with "ZF" is inappropriate.

- > admits precisely one two-valued measurable cardinal.

"Admits where?", to quote Enderton.

If this principle even has a first-order translation at all, then what you said either is a theorem of NBG or it isn't.

- > That is your formal representation
- > of "faith" George.

No, your conjecture either has a proof or it doesn't. If it does, then SINCE WE HAVE PROOF, faith is irrelevant. If it doesn't, then THERE IS A MODEL WHERE IT IS FALSE, so what little faith there may ever have been is completely misplaced. If you want to keep having faith in this anyway then you have to ascend to 2nd-order logic. Now THERE's glory for you.

- > It reflects the usual, everyday,
- > common-sense idea

Oh, SHUT UP. NOTHING IN ANY formal language inherently "reflects" ANY "usual, everyday, common-sense" ideas, NOR DOES ANYBODY BUT YOU \* G I V E A S H I T \* whether THAT even MIGHT be possible. It is just plain irrelevant.

- > that there is a reality

Re: Truth and facticity (Was: Re: Recursivity vs. Provability)

Oh, bullshit. That axiom is no more competent than any other to allege or deny the existence of "a reality". There is a STANDARD way of getting "a reality" around here and it IS NOT by asserting any particular axiom. It is by alleging that a theory is categorical at 2nd-order.

> and that truth and falsity have the expected  
> correspondence to facticity as it refers to reality.

Both of which are concepts with which you have amazingly little factual connection.

> In addition,  $V=L(D)$  is relatively constructed.

Which makes it all the more impossible for it to be saying anything about "reality". In "reality" V is all sets. REALLY ALL REAL sets. In reality, V only CAN have ONE value, namely the one it really has. Hypotheses about what else V might be are indicative of a faith in the ABSENCE of any reality, and of the relevance of relativism.

> It reflects what can be linguistically expressed  
> relative to this facticity assumption.

Possibly, but the mere fact that you are making a facticity ASSUMPTION as OPPOSED to RELYING on the FACTUAL TRUTH about what's factual IN REALITY makes everything you said by way of motivating this IRRELEVANT.

>> Statements that are "just plain" true are being  
>> talked about in the context of 1 particular STANDARD  
>> model, and what is actually being alleged is that they  
>> are true in THAT model.

>  
> To some extent, this presupposition

This is NOT a presupposition, DIPSHIT.  
This is a FACT ABOUT the paradigm.

> is an artifact of your training.

Well, yes, I am well-enough trained in the paradigm to know that it says this ABOUT that. But neither I NOR the paradigm pretends or presumes that any of this has ANYthing to do with factual reality! This is OUR linguistic game! OURS! Other people's opinions as to its inadequacy to "factual reality" are of NO relevance to US!

Re: Truth and facticity (Was: Re: Recursivity vs. Provability)

> It is a correct presupposition

It is NOT a presupposition; it is part of a framework of DEFINITIONS, so the question of its "correctness" CANNOT ARISE, UNLESS it is inconsistent with its neighbors in the framework.

> from the perspective of logical training.  
> But, it completely removes the ability  
> of a human being to express themselves

The purpose of this language IS NOT for "human beings to express themselves". What is being expressed with languages of this type is fundamentally something combinatorial that is QUITE completely independent of ANY human thought. A 4-element set has 16 subsets IRrespective of how any human FEELS about that or what HE may want to EXPRESS about it.

> using the mathematical  
> elements of natural language.

That's just utter bullshit. You can still use the mathematical elements of natural language NON-mathematically and naturally, IF YOU WANT TO. You are certainly not going to get any objections to any such behavior FROM mathematicians, let alone logicians. Logicians are only caring about the behavior of people who ARE agreeing to play the game. If you want to go talk natural language, we are not going to be distracted.

> In one fell swoop you have negated most generally  
> accepted human knowledge.

What a complete and utter crock of shit. Not even the discovery of Russell's paradox or what you call "Frege's identity puzzles" was sufficient to do THAT. At most, these correctly highlighted some inconsistencies in what PASSED for the RECEIVED WISDOM as a general framework for knowledge. NOW, WE HAVE BETTER FRAMEWORKS. The discovery of relativity didn't "negate" the generally accepted Newtonian mechanics; it made the SAME predictions about what would happen at low speeds.

What YOU are negating with THIS bullshit is the possibility of scientific revolution, something for which YOU ought to be FAR more ashamed than any of US ever were for studying logic.

Re: Truth and facticity (Was: Re: Recursivity vs. Provability)

- > That is what I infer from most of your
- > objections along these lines.

So? Everybody already knew YOU were a nut-case anyhow!

- > Perhaps you can clarify this if
- > I have misunderstood.

Not bloody likely.

"Misunderstanding" doesn't BEGIN to cover it. You have been trying to rail against "logicism" since the day you got here. What YOU FUNDAMENTALLY misunderstand is that you do NOT have standing to attack ANYthing until AFTER you have agreed just WHAT IT IS that is being attacked.

- >> They are likely to be false
- >> in another one (because if they were true in all models,
- >> we would be saying that they were provable, AS OPPOSED to
- >> saying that they were true).
- >
- > Which is why I began by searching for axioms.

To quote Enderton again, "searching where?"

You CAN'T "search for axioms".  
You can PICK whatever axioms you want!  
ANYthing can be an axiom!  
If we ask three umpires, "How do you call them?",  
we can get 3 answers:  
Ump1: "I call 'em as I see 'em."  
Ump2: "I call 'em as they are."  
Ump3: " They's balls & they's strikes, but  
they ain't NOTHIN' 'TIL I call 'em."

Ump1 and Ump2 are WRONG.  
Ump3 is RIGHT -- EVEN when he's wrong -- BECAUSE  
HE'S THE UMPIRE. And if you (wrongly) PRESUME you  
CAN disagree, you JUST GET THROWN OUT OF THE GAME.

You CANNOT "search" for axioms.  
How could you KNOW when you had FOUND one??  
Any criteria you may be using for blessing  
one sentence's axiomaticity over that of another  
ARE IN FACT YOUR PRIOR, ACTUAL, FACTUAL, OPERATIVE  
\*AXIOMS\* \*THEM\*selves!

- > If you had ever shut up long enough to use the brain
- > God gave you

Re: Truth and facticity (Was: Re: Recursivity vs. Provability)

Re: Truth and facticity (Was: Re: Recursivity vs. Provability)

If you personally would just eat shit and die,  
I would consider that evidence that maybe there  
is a God after all.

- > you might have figured out just
- > how close our positions really are.

Dipshit: when you think your positions are close  
to somebody else's, you DON'T accuse him of not using  
the brain god gave him or of not shutting up — an  
accusation that you personally ENTIRELY LACK standing  
to make GIVEN THE LENGTH of the turds you routinely  
excrete HERE. Allies are too valuable and too rare  
for that.

- > If you had any balanced perspective of the issues here,

Shut UP, moron.

You wouldn't know a balanced perspective if it walked  
up to you and spit in your face, which it in fact  
often DOES around here.

- > you would have directed me long ago to
- > Russell's observation

WHat UTTER bullshit.

APPEAL TO AUTHORITY \* IS A FALLACY \*,  
\*DIPSHIT\*. If the observation has any relevance  
at all then that certainly is DESPITE and NOT  
BECAUSE of the fact that it came from Russell.

- > that mathematicians confused the containment relation
- > and the membership relation

I would NEVER refer ANYbody to THAT observation  
SINCE IT IS MANIFESTLY BULLSHIT.

- > since this is evident in the
- > axioms I wrote.

There is NO POSSIBLE way that ANYthing YOU wrote  
COULD be evidence about the behavior OF MATHEMATICIANS  
IN GENERAL! Neither Russell nor anyone else is at liberty  
to "observe" that "mathematicians" have "confused" these  
two relations! In the first place, THAT would imply  
some PRIOR REALITY as to what these relations "really"  
were! In case you hadn't heard, THAT is NOT available!

- > On the other hand, the issue with identity

Re: Truth and facticity (Was: Re: Recursivity vs. Provability)

Re: Truth and facticity (Was: Re: Recursivity vs. Provability)

There IS NO issue with identity, let ALONE one (among the MANY issues that people have TRIED to raise about identity) that qualifies as "the" issue. I continue to insist that the first sign of the apocalypse will be when mitch figures out how to EXPLAIN something.

> reduces to the non-categoricity of classical logic

Classical logic IS NOT "non-categorical". CERTAIN FIRST-ORDER AXIOM-SETS in classical logic are non-categorical. From the viewpoint of the logic, that is a property of the axiom-sets AND NOT of the logic.

>> Sometimes it is well-known in advance that you have  
>> one intended model in mind, and that the theory's value  
>> is only in helping you prove things about that model.  
>> Other times, the theory itself is important and all its  
>> various models are more or less created equal.  
>  
> Is this a FACT?

Of course it is.

All I have to do to make it a fact is DECIDE to think about 1st-order axioms for true arithmetic ONE day, and DECIDE to think about every old thing that might be an abelian group, the next.

> If you comprehend anything I have written above, then you  
> will realize that FACTICITY collapses Russell's distinction  
> between extension and intension.

Fuck Russell. And fuck you too:  
NOTHING collapses that distinction.

> The utility of an assertion rests with its facticity.

That's just idiotic.  
You don't know what "facticity" means.  
Things that are KNOWN not to be factual can still be useful.

> Most people speaking of a truth

People DON'T "speak truths". People utter utterances; they perform speech acts. What is or isn't "true" is NOT the thing that's uttered/spoken. It's the thing

Re: Truth and facticity (Was: Re: Recursivity vs. Provability)

Asserted/MEANT by what is uttered/spoken.  
Which depends on CONTEXT.

- > do so in the context of an
- > assertion as a reliable statement of fact.

Yes, there are social norms about what goals people have when they make utterances and what hearers should normally be expected to infer. Absolutely none of that has anything whatsoever to do with logic. Formal language NORMALLY BRAGS about its DIVORCE from space and time.

---

• **References:**

- ◆ ***Truth and facticity (Was: Re: Recursivity vs. Provability)***  
    ◇ *From: mitch*

- Prev by Date: ***Re: arithmetic in ZF***
- Next by Date: ***Re: On Programs That Output Themselves***
- Previous by thread: ***Truth and facticity (Was: Re: Recursivity vs. Provability)***
- Next by thread: ***[FAQ, 99/07/28] Mathematical logic on the web***
- Index(es):
  - ◆ ***Date***
  - ◆ ***Thread***