

XTIDRU29A65OLUTE

[Anticipative extract of the “Manifesto of the Manifest”]

Laurent Dubois

Warning

As a foot-of-nose to the conventions of reading, one can read the annex first ! The chapters are modifiable in a kind of polymorphous conceptual puzzle.

Here the exegesis of an attempt of “demonstration” of the existence of “absolute truth”.

Demonstration :

“If absolute truth does not exist, the sentence "absolute truth does not exist" is not absolutely true either.’

As the above sentence must be true, it forms the proof of the existence of absolute truth.”

P. Cooijmans

Counter-demonstration :

“If the above demonstration is correct, the predicate “absolute” must be absolute as well as the rules which govern the demonstration and the counter-demonstration.

If “absolute” is absolute, it doesn’t come under the heading of an axiomatic but it could constitute an axiom.

If it doesn’t come under the heading of an axiomatic, it cannot be demonstrated.

If it constitutes an axiom, it has not to be & cannot be demonstrated.

Conclusion : the above demonstration cannot be correct.”

The demonstration contains three major flaws :

- Implicit ontological faith of the “must be”. Why “must” ? Because of A2VL. Why A2VL ? Because A2VL ! Tautology.
- Implicit postulate : the definition of “absolute” is referentiable &... “absolute”. Petitio principii.
- Abusive use of the implication : assimilation of “truth” to “A.T.”, as if “truth” other than absolute could not exist.

Counter-demonstration variants :

1) “Axiomatic” :

“The initial demonstration itself is relative to the axiomatic, the rules of inference & before all to the physico-chemical laws that allow its development, physico-chemical laws themselves highlighted by the axiomatic & the rules of inference/framework (deduction/induction) they authorize/permit !

Vicious circle.”

* an axiom is by definition a pseudo or supposed "absolute" *

2) "Absolute" :

"The demonstration of the existence of "absolute truth" can be assimilated to the demonstration of the existence of "absolute".

Now, the demonstration of the existence of "absolute truth" requires the absolute character of the predicate "absolute". (trivial statement)

Thus, the demonstration of the existence of "absolute truth" presupposes what it has to demonstrate.

* Ergo, the demonstration of the existence of "absolute truth" is vain/useless/ineffectual/fruitless/superfluous/unnecessary/circular/redundant...

* If the predicate "absolute" is not absolute, "A.T." concept would implode no matter when, intrinsically unstable, always already wobbly.

Now, the predicate "absolute" contains several meanings...

3) "Implication" :

"If absolute truth does not exist, the sentence "absolute truth does not exist" is not absolutely true either.'

- But since the above implication doesn't prevent the sentence "absolute truth does not exist" is not absolutely true either.' to be simply relatively true, the conclusion below is null & void. -

As the above sentence must be true, it forms the proof of the existence of absolute truth."

What is the value of this demonstration/argument? Simply valid? In any case, its absolute character is not demonstrated. Then, A.T. could be demonstrated by a lower-order/degree form.	What is the object of this demonstration ? A.T. Can it be assimilated to the demonstration itself? It has to be demonstrated, if not it's just a petitio principii.
--	---

"If the object of the demonstration was the demonstration itself, it would be demonstrated before even having been initiated & the demonstration would be useless.

Thus, the demonstration of the "absolute" character of the demonstration needs the leap to a meta-demonstration.

But the same reasoning, by recurrence, applies to the meta-demonstration & so on ad infinitum !

Conclusion, the demonstration of the "absolute" character of the demonstration is impossible.

QED"

Obvious parallel with the Gödel incompleteness theorem.

The correct demonstration :

"If absolute truth does not exist, the sentence "absolute truth does not exist" is not absolutely true either but not obligatory absolutely false.'

As the above sentence must be true according to the rules of the A2VL, it forms the proof of the existence of at least one relative truth."

A singularity of the demonstration : the Modus Ponens.

The particular power of the auto referential nature of the implication is highlighted by the characteristic of the Modus Ponens.

Contrary to most implications, the Modus Ponens here must be true because of the autoreference. Modus Ponens says : *we have not q, so we cannot have p, & this is expressed in 2 ways : it's true that p & q can be both false, it's wrong that we can have p true & q false.*

In the case of "'If absolute truth does not exist, the sentence "absolute truth does not exist" is not absolutely true either.'", the Modus Ponens imposes itself by "ontological condition" or irresistible force, while it's by formal conditions only in the case of more common "implications".

Critical analysis

Preliminary

Without even taking exception to the absence of any definition of "truth", does the denial of the predicate "absolute" preclude the possibility of the existence of any kind of truth ?

Of course, no ! We will see that, in a sense, there must be degrees of truth in the same way that there are degrees of belief or levels of infinite, but that the predicate "absolute", which would have to ascribe the highest level of certainty, adds, in one of its acceptations, a so "exclusive" info to the concept of "truth" that it makes their association contradictory and their couple divorced before even having been married ! More, from a completely opposite perspective, if we focus on the "different" meanings of the word "absolute", we can infer the existence of "degrees" of absolute, &

consequently the "relative" character of this concept !

Meaning of absolute is relative.

Autocontradictory term ?

Weak meaning of the word.

The initial demonstration only proves, on the one hand, that the hypothesis of the inexistence of A.T. prevents to assimilate the denial of the existence of A.T. to an A.T. And, on the other hand, that the first part of the demonstration must be true according to the adherence to an axiomatic & 2 Value (first order) Logic or A2VL! Because of the absence of any definition of "truth" and "absolute", since, as well, the demonstration implicitly intends to define them in a retroactive process, we must conclude that this is both a *petitio principii* and what one calls a "tautology", i.e. an assertion obligatory true according to the constraints of this A2VL ! In that case, any tautology is an A.T. It remains a particularly elegant pseudo-demonstration whom the powerful hypnotic aspect comes from its auto referential nature that allows an instantaneous "auto checking" of the the truth of the consequent of the "implication", logical operation here implied (on the richness and traps of the logical "implication", cfr. annex XII).

So, if the assertion "If absolute truth does not exist, the sentence "absolute truth does not exist" is not absolutely true either" must be true, in no way it constitutes per se a proof of the existence of a truth "absolute" in a sense other than what is true "per se", what one could call a "trivial" absolute. It's its own proof only !

A subtle "Vérité de Lapalisse". Nothing other than a sophisticated version of the "Either A.T. exists either it doesn't" tautology.

Tautology

Would "absolute" be what gets from itself its own justification?

Let's consider the assertion : "Either A.T. exists either it doesn't".

It's is another example of tautology, the most consistent - if the attribution of some degree to consistence makes sense - type of assertion, obligatory true, but not "absolute" because of the belief in an A2VL implied by its acceptance.

One has "absolutely" to grasp that the adherence to this assertion implies a "belief" in the sense of Ramsey, a conviction of the axiomatic kind, a conviction - an obligatory/consubstantial conviction - in the axiomatic method ; the alternative is obligatory true as long as one is convinced of the pertinence of the A2VL, what prevents any kind of absolute assertion since, as well, this remark itself is relative to this belief, and so on ad infinitum ! Truth is relative to the level of abstraction considered, in the way of Cantor's transfinite.

What prevents us to apply the true/false alternative to the "Either A.T. exists either it doesn't" alternative ? Why can't we say that "Either A.T. exists either it doesn't" is either true either false ? Because of the constraints of the A2VL itself, the "irresistible force", to use juridics terms, the natural propensity ! It means that the tautology is beyond 2VL : it's indebted to 1VL. And 1VL is the synthetic expression of a faith, the faith in the existence & the pertinence of a... 2VL ! Now, if we can apply the alternative, we have made the proof that we cannot demonstrate absolutely the existence of A.T. Indeed, in all logic, in a recursive/nest of process, the stake into abyss of the questioning must continue indefinitely. Conclusion, in both cases, we have to be satisfied with a

“must”, a “must be A.T.”, and to make “as if” the existence of A.T. could be demonstrated absolutely.

It sounds like an ontological “Coulé method” which sometimes leads to “auto-contradictions”, as it is exemplarily illustrated by the Godel's belief in the Platonician “ideas' heaven”, while he demonstrates the inexistence of a systematic method, in other words of an “algorithm”, of demonstration of all the truths in arithmetic ; but the existence of an “ideas paradise”, that, ironically, like a Kantian reason's “attraction pole”, constitutes the motive of the Godel's demonstration, must be accessible in some way, what Penrose calls a “new kind of algorithm”, in conclusion of the development of its Turing's version of the Godel's theorem !

He doesn't know how we have access to the ideas, but we have to have access to them since there must be some kind of connection ! If not, why some ideas would remain definitely, absolutely inaccessible ; it's as if they didn't exist, and the Kantian noumenal attraction pole would just be a chimera !

In both cases, we sail in relative, if not confused & even chaotic, conceptual sea !

Is the natural inclination strong enough to validate absolutely the use of 2VL ?

- don't we constantly learn to change our thought's habits, to see beyond our prejudices ? Would 2VL not constitute the deepest prejudice ?
- does 2VL precisely not allow to conceive other value logics & to even make the hypothesis that 2VL itself be the deepest prejudice ?
- does 2VL dished deep, in its ultimate limits, inevitably face the abyssal & positively indescribable nature of the “infinite” ?
- do space & time, framework in which A2VL can express itself, not have been made relative ?

In any case, the use of the expression “natural inclination” gives the answer to the question !

Finally, if not subjected to 1VL nor to 2VL, the tautology has to be subjected to higher value or alternative logic: 3VL ? Fuzzy logic ? Unless it were 0VL ! The situation could be “explosive”!

D-finitions

(mention-use)

There is another serious argument against the possibility of demonstrating the existence of A.T. (the existence of A.T., in its general acceptation, is satisfied with the demonstration of the existence of “1” particular A.T. only while the demonstration of its inexistence must be... general ; it's generally the contrary that prevails in the attempts of demonstrations).

It requires first the answer to the first set of true questions of this debate : what does one mean by “absolute”, “truth” and... “meaning”.

Definitions:

by “meaning”, we mean the correspondence/connection between a word or set of words (assertions) & a concrete or abstract object/entity or set of objects/entities ;

by “truth”, we mean the product of the truth tables in formal logic (truth-T) or the checking of the adequacy meaning-reality (truth-A) ;

Two ways of establishing the truth, two kinds of proof

- hypothetico-deductive
- inductive

- hypothetico-deductive: axiomatic framework : intrinsic/de facto impossibility of absolute proof.
- inductive : empirical method, in no way a “demonstration”.

Logico-mathematical framework

Let's consider first the last definition we gave to “absolute”, which is also the less interesting.

If “absolute” is what gets from itself its own justification, there is the coextensive notion of “no limitation” too, empirical qualification that makes it a pseudo-absolute ; also, if it's in a purely logical sense, then, any autoreferential assertion like, e.g. the sentence “This sentence is its own demonstration, its own proof” or, more simply “This sentence is true”, is an A.T.

So is any tautology like “this sentence is either true either false”.

But tautologies are nothing else than the expression of the precepts/axioms of the 2VL. In other words, the sentence “this sentence is either true either false” is simply another way to say : in 2VL, something is either true either false. And it is of course true, or rather “cela va de soi” since it decides/establishes so. In a sense, it is beyond true/false, we would have to ascribe to it another predicate than “true”. The axiom doesn't apply to itself, its content doesn't boomerang. And if one argues that 2VL takes its validity from itself, one cannot avoid to admit some degree of belief since, as well, in a funny way, A2VL itself is undermined by the possibility of the consideration of other value logics, e.g. 3VL. According to 3VL, it must be ok by definition that something is either true either false either “nor one nor the other” OR “one & the other”, which gives 3VL & 3VLbis !

More, 2VL allows even absurdities, oscillations, paradoxes... (confirmed by quantum physics).

And if, really, A2VL is absolute, it's trapped by itself since it cannot use an other mean than itself to prove it is (absolute) ; “absolute truth” must be proved before even having been proved !

Reality (I) is its own victim. What does A2VL tell to us about its birth, if the notion of “beginning” keeps any sense ? Where does this foundation come from ? What allows logic ? The “a priori” space & time ? Then, there is beyond or rather “infra” logic. Unless space-time were logic itself emerging & self-constituting. It's the snake that eats its tail.

It thrust itself upon our trust. In this sense, it would be absolute ; but “to impose” doesn't equate to “to be absolute”.

It's beyond 2VL. True/false makes sense in relation to “something”, were it abstract, thus “a posteriori”. Tautology is not A.T. It simply is ! Tautology as “true per se” expression ? It's a particular absolute since depending on logic, that is itself “axiomatic”.

If something must be absolute, it's logic itself because of its “irresistible force”.

But it's no more question of demonstration of course!

The knot of the analysis rests on the definition of “absolute” and “truth”, that force themselves upon our mind, not “absolutely”, but consistently, by virtue of our a priori approval, our almost obligatory faith in the 2VL ! “Almost” because we cannot exclude the possibility of the emergence of a new intrinsic/natural/spontaneous categorization of the real, that would make relative & inappropriate the use of our notion of... categorization, as well !

Physico-mathematical framework

Not convincing enough ? Ok, let's come back to “A.T.” definition, i.e. “truth always & everywhere true, & totally independent of anything !”

Independence

Let's consider the notion of "independence":

We can directly exclude, as object of the proof, any “concrete”, “material”, “detectable” entity, either corpuscular, which depends on its components, either ondulatory, which depends on the medium necessary to its propagation.

Let's analyse the sentence “the tree exists”. First, let's observe this:

- “This tree exists”
- “The tree exists :
- reference to “this tree”, the tree evoked before in the sentence “This tree exists”
- existence of the tree in its universal acceptance
- “A tree exists”.

The sentence “the tree exists” is true according/relatively to the checking of the now and here presence of the tree by an observer, and according to the various and implicit definitions & rules of logic (validity) and grammar (correctness) that allowed its formulation in order to express a connection with a concrete object/entity. And If the proof of the existence of the tree can be totally independent of any discursive or logico-mathematical demonstration, it needs some empirical evidence/demonstration : the checking of its presence in the eyes or any other sense of the observer.

Proof that a formulation, even unconscious,
is not necessary to recognize the existence of other entities :
primitive forms of being avoid “obstacles”.

It makes the truth of the assertion & the existence of the entity relative because precisely of

the connection that makes it changeable and because of the impossibility of knowing if it continues to exist if/when this existence is not checked ! This is all the more obvious in the quantum measure-observer interaction: quantum wave collapse !

The “concept” of existence, which could seem absolute, is always relative to a particular entity (cfr. Ockham).

Let's note that a posteriori, and a posteriori only, we can say that the existence of an entity is independent of the proof (even if it can be discussed! Indeed, if it seems that [logico-mathematical] language/framework doesn't create & doesn't even have any influence on the concrete reality, who makes this observation/denegation: The reality itself in its abstract dimension & through logico-mathematical formulations ! An auto-derivation that leads to a solipsism “à la Berkeley”), but, of course & a fortiori according to the above/in brackets digression, the proof of its existence is not independent of the existence of the entity nor of the object ! The checking would have to be constant.

In other words, while the existence only/per se doesn't obligatory requires a connection, if we consider the reality as a whole, what excludes any kind of proof other than the “auto-proof” as synonym of “existence”, the "proof of the existence" implies necessarily a connection !

Thus, the connection has to be abstract. But what does “abstract” mean ? Once again, we have to have the definition “reflex” !

Definitions of “existence” & “abstraction” :

- “existence” : to be in life currently, to be really, to persist, to last/continue (what falls under some kind of perception/sense)

- “abstraction” : the fact of isolating mentally an element, a property in order to consider it isolately/separately

What doesn't try to represent the concrete/tangible reality; without concrete reality or reference to material elements (by default definition that doesn't give info on “abstraction” (of course) ; at least, we know that it has a “reality”).

Some types of "abstractions" in qualitative degree increasing order :

- the simple “naming” (already an abstraction ? Yes, spatio-temporal, unique identity. Now, does the perception of the generality comes before naming or is it the contrary ? Maybe coextensive ; the Kantian “a priori form of sensibility” characterization doesn't prevent the German philosopher to develop the obligatory coextensive (contradictory) thesis of the immanence of space & time).

-- generalization/definition (horses/horsness)

--- glossaryzation : concept of set of words

---- concept & definition of “word”

----- concept & definition of “definition”

----- the consciousness of the different levels of abstraction

-- invention : speculation/supposition (Pegasus/Unicorn) ; dreams

☑ autoreference(s) (in series) :

--- idealization (God : beyond any possible abstraction ?)

--- self consciousness : auto-abstraction

---- meta : consciousness of being abstracting oneself & other objects/entities ; infinite process of meta-distanciation

----- consciousness of consciousness of being abstracting oneself & other things : retroactive loops, recursive process (computing science)

----- passage to the limit/leap : consciousness of the artificial character of the dichotomy I/universe

----- what process more abstract than the identification of the part to the whole by the whole through its parts, in the state of affairs, of the human being to the universe by the universe through its human form - more precisely yet of L.D. to the reality by the reality through... "my" L.D. form - can one/I imagine ? How could this particular form of being even imagine the effective realization of all what is possible ?

----- so, in all logic, now, I must say: I am the universe, & I express it through my L.D. form. There is always a dichotomy though ! I systematically consider/express my own nuclear possibilities (combinatorics). But what possibilities ? Predetermined ? By myself ? Now, once the consciousness perspective reversing process accomplished, it seems that my particular forms cannot make as if it didn't make sense. I'm trapped in my own depth; obsessive thought. What is the essential lesson to infer from this change of perspective ? Nothing to wait from anybody/anything since "anybody/anything" doesn't make sense at all !

--- idealization (formalism)

---- discovery (logic/mathematic/science)

---- absurdities (paradoxes/oscillations)

----- combination of idealization & autoreference (mathematical-logic)

----- these exegesis & categorization themselves (is the (meta) process infinite?)

Now, would "pure" abstraction not equate to "nothingness"?

Would abstraction not be "relative"?

But even an abstract connection is not possible and would be contradictory in the case of A.T. since the least relation of A.T. to the least entity would make it "relative" ! Indeed, we could not make the proof that this A.T. would exist without being object of any observation. Unless A.T. were this demo itself, but then... this is the snake that eats its tail ! Tautology, and it does not escape the necessity to express itself if it "has to" be demonstrated !

So, does the simple possibility of the evocation of A.T., were it itself A.T., not cause a connection and a contradiction ? Unless we precisely don't speak about it, nor in good nor in bad. But then, we simply don't know what we are talking about ! And how could we prove anything related to it ? (Kant's Noumena)

If A.T. exists, this sentence cannot be related to it in anyway ; does one see the subtle paradox ?

We have a sentence that says that it cannot speak about what it precisely speaks about !

Not only we cannot prove the existence of A.T. but, in order to solve the paradox implied by the attempt to do it, we have to make this attempt infinitely relative in a dynamical auto-resolving nest of process.

A.T. must be totally (we don't even insist/take advantage of the *petitio principii* here implied – "totally" is just another term for absolute !) independent to anything, if not, it's dependent in some way, and relative ; if it's totally independent to anything, it does not exist !

Is this demonstration an A.T. ?

Answer : is it totally independent to anything ? We only have to find the least element to which it is dependent !

Maybe it is not even true ; it has just to be consistent !

Thus, A.T.'s proof can not be connected in any way to A.T.

Conclusion : if A.T. exists, "I", reality, "must be" it, and I have no way to check that it is really the case ! And if some of my dubitative forms argue that pure nothingness would not even have the ability to make the hypothesis of the negation of itself, they always reason in the framework of an axiomatic system in which they are compelled to have some degree of confidence, what one could call an "ontological" faith/confidence !

Once again, if A.T. makes sense, and God knows how powerful is the conviction that it is the case ("God" is precisely the other expression of it), I, as whole reality, as God, must be it, but I inseminate myself the doubt about myself, I "relativize" myself by expanding, developing, expressing myself through multiple particular forms, concrete or abstract, and so removing to myself the ability to demonstrate my absolute character !

A.T. is independent of any demonstration & of any definition, which can be false as well !

In other words, it cannot be connected/circumscribed by our definitions/demonstrations; and their intrinsic contradictions change nothing at all concerning A.T.

Demonstration :

If the following demonstration :

"If absolute truth does not exist, the sentence "absolute truth does not exist" is not absolutely true either."

As the above sentence must be true, it forms the proof of the existence of absolute truth."

is true, the sentence :

"absolute truth does not exist" is not absolutely true."*

must be true "without condition".

In other words, it must be true what the consistence of the above demonstration can be.

Conclusion: the existence of A.T. escapes this/any attempt of demonstration.

This meta-demonstration is "simply" "correct" according to the rules of A2V1.

QED"

* While relative element only in the process of the demonstration, by boomerang/retroactive chain reaction, this sentence acquires an autonomous absolute character & ipso facto disqualifies the whole reasoning.

In other words, we can just prove that "absolute truth" MUST exist according to the consistence of the logical rules of the system of demonstration, not that it EXISTS!

Consequently, if the demonstration must be the proof of the existence of A.T., this is not because of its validity, its pertinence, not even because its tautological nature, but by its own & only existence ; indeed, were it invalid or totally absurd, hence false, that it would change nothing at all (// Godel/Cohen demonstrations of undecidability of continuum hypothesis ! [ambivalence]). This is the emergent power of the auto-proclamation of the "I" of the Cartesian cogito: "I" am thus I am true, "Sum ergo verus"!

“always & everywhere”

Let's change our leading angle.

What do "always" and "everywhere" mean?

Always: without beginning nor end in time.

Everywhere : without particular/precise localisation

In both cases, without particular/singular coordinates.

They have to be absolute notions; they would even have to be the first & best expression of the “absolute” ; if it's not always & everywhere, the truth is circumstantial, hence relative ! Also, let's observe that “always & everywhere” doesn't imply necessarily “eternity” and “infinity”, the last straws, the limits of space-time. But of course, “eternity” and “infinity” escape by definition any kind of demonstration.

But according to the proved “relative” character of space & time, “always” & “everywhere” (simultaneity) notions don't make sense! Hence, absolute truth cannot be related in anyway to space & time - another confirmation of its absolute independence; concretely, absolute truth must be totally inaccessible since beyond space & time; in any case, it does not exist in the sense we gave to “existence”, i.e. duration; in other words, if it exists, in a way to define, this is as if it didn't exist in our current, non provable intrinsic/absolute framework !

Now, there are the co-variance equations (transformation) allowed by the postulate of a new absolute : the speed of light. But precisely, it is question of a “postulate” ! Now, would the variability of this speed change fundamentally the co-variance laws ? No, it would just make them a little more complex. But could the co-variance laws constitute an “absolute truth” bearer ? No, because it rests on an axiomatic.

Variant : Does something non-relative to anything exist?

In a material form, no !

In the other hand, we can not prove that an immaterial entity can be without any material support.

The designation of the entity reveals the necessary connection & therefore the relative character of the proof.

Any form of being is relative to its appearance/development

In other words, nothingness doesn't make shift of any predicate because it makes the “lost” of any predicate.

According to A2VL, Appearance/disappearing give 4 possibilities :

- either it appears and disappears
- or it appears and it does not disappear
- or it does not appear and disappears
- or it does not appear and does not disappear

Does it underline the limits/failures of 2VL? Reality seems to contradict it; - we cannot compare with the entities/attributes (to be black or not) that are empirical; - more: the fact that "probabilities" make sense "a posteriori" only. The assertion/question: "What's the probability that "be" be doesn't make sense because pure nothingness doesn't make shift with probabilities; distinction between mathematical "a priori"- "a posteriori" probabilities & ontological a posteriori probabilities (according to logic, 3/4 chances for an entity, concrete or abstract, to be relative. But in fact, concretely, all known particular entities belong to the first option. And the reality as a whole? What kind of probability? Does this concept make sense yet?)

Also, we cannot exclude the possibility of an eternal being. This is even what we have to conclude from the 4 above logical possibilities about any entity.

Indeed, if we question the birth of the universe, the emergence of the reality, i.e. the apparition of the first entity, we must conclude that eternity & appearance after absolute nothingness have to be equivalent because "no time" can have precede the apparition of the time!

What is the “space-time”? Where & when is the “space-time”?

Both a frame : duration/length = extent = dimensions & the measure of this frame/dimensions : coordinates/dimensions.

What/who produces these dimensions ?

What/who produces these definitions ?

Answer : space-time itself by the way of some its portions (why is the “matter” a portion of space-time ? If not, would space-time have any existence ? Could it be distinguished from “nothingness” ? Besides, according to the General Relativity developed by the Einstein space-time-matter portion, the complete expression is precisely “space-time-matter continuum”)

So the space-time in one of its particular forms, human being, conceives “probably” first space-time in a particular meaning, as portions, different entities, & extend, by abstraction, to the general meaning, what has potentially no limit, but no way to check it as “whole” (even if it can check the limits of its particular forms, or of itself as particular form) since no external point of view. But what does speak “here & now” ? Space-time in its general acceptance through one of its particular forms, L.D.

Consequently, or rather primarily, I must say: I am the space-time as whole & I give to myself arbitrarily these name & definition, through my particular human manifestation, and in the state of affairs, my L.D form.

- portion without measure - measure - whole, no limit: indefinite!

Definitions come from the global space-time through a particular portion, human being, & these observations are currently made through a sub-particular portion : L.D.

It gives backyard/retroactive/boomeranged credit to the whole.

Global space-time : I, through my particular human forms (from babies to Presocratics, Kant & Einstein, in the limited western perception of my L.D. form) give credit to itself/myself, & now, here, according to the logico-mathematico-physical framework I gave to myself & through my L.D. form, I highlight the stake into abyss of my vertiginous fractal nature.

Micro-absolute? Then, relative!

The glossary paradox

Beyond the unconventional localisation of this glossary, the interesting thing is that the whole exegesis could be renamed “Polymorphous Organic Glossary”.

Glossary

Meaning :

- expression of the connection between a sign or set of signs & a concrete or abstract object/entity or set of objects/entities, and/or itself
- the above sentence & this sentence itself.

Definition :

- synonym of meaning
- production of this meaning.

Glossary:

- set of defined terms
- defined term = one of the elements of this set.

What we call A.T. is simply dependent of the definition we give to it.

Let's continue the process of regression to the... meaning-root : definition of definition

- does the obligation for A.T. to be not constitute a kind of dependence ? We are not even sure that our definition of A.T. is absolutely true ! Where does this absolute notion come from ?
- from a particular entity distinct of the whole
- from the whole itself in one of its particular forms.

What are “part” & “whole” ? Definitions ! Inextricable autoreferential process : definitions

define definitions that refer to what is beyond any definition, which depends on definition in some way yet ! Probability are great that reality is absolute, but it cannot prove to itself ; I cannot prove to myself I'm absolute, just believe in me (in the Manifesto of the manifest's spirit) ; I condemn myself to have faith in myself.

“Part” & “whole” are the objects of definitions that reveal their autonomy a posteriori only. According to the 2VL framework, chances are great that “absolute” exists. A2VL even tells that it is itself. Really, evidence of absolute seems so strong that/but it can be proved !

I am a definition.

By default, ab absurdo, which is not relative ! It seems that the notion of absolute is not absolute !

If it's true per se, it precisely has not to be demonstrated, but then, anything can be as well ! And A.T. can be assimilated to anything !

- Absolutely independent ?

& we have no means to determine it (confusion "must be"/being)

& independent from what ?

Totally independent in the sense of what can not be relative in any way to anything is an illusion/impossible unless it is totally alone, the only entity, so the reality itself as a whole !

- If we can correctly define A.T., that means :

- either that we are ourselves absolute, which is clearly false according to the definition since we don't exist always and everywhere nor are we totally unrelated/independent to anything
- either absolute is accessible to relative entities.

The question is : is accessible related to “relative”/related in any way?

If yes, can “related” be synonymous of “dependent”?

Clearly “no” !

The use of the predicate "absolute" seems to be redhibitory ; its simple formulation would be excessive.

- Would “absolute” not apply to appearing and disappearing only ? Totally, completely appearing and disappearing

- to ascribe a predicate to nothingness is absurd

- the purpose is not to demonstrate the inexistence of A.T., rather that it has not been and can not be demonstrated ! And the relativity of this demo reinforces it, giving it, non paradoxically, contrary to what a superficial reading could lead to believe, a higher degree of pertinence yet.

- I have not demonstrated that A.T. doesn't exist (even if : what does “exist” mean? [definition of “existence”]) but that we cannot demonstrate it exists, and certainly not absolutely, and that we can even develop arguments to prove it would not have to exist ! In other words, we have to be satisfied with arguments that lead to think that it would have to exist.

If the absolute character of the truth can be proved, it's that of an autoreferential demonstration only ! But the demonstration makes sense as long as it is checked, thus according to the "relative" process of checking only !

Truth is the expression of a reality, concrete or abstract.

A.T. is the expression of a reality, concrete or abstract, "always & everywhere" !

"A" reality ? Then, in connection in some way with other realities in a set of realities.

"The" reality ? Then, the only possible demonstration of A.T. is the reality itself, its expression, its auto-affirmation, its auto-constitution.

Absolute/total independence implies "no proof at all", the impossibility of any proof, demonstration !

Totally abstract autoreference ; is pure abstraction synonym of nothingness ?

The word "absolute" is relative to the set of words, to its nature of word.

The meaning is relative to the word, to the definition.

The definition is relative to the entity that produces it.

The entity is relative to its cause(s) & origin(s).

The word "absolute" is not absolute. What would give it a privilege ?

Relative to the rules of construction ; at worst, to its formulation.

But where do these rules come from ? To what are they relative ?

It seems that "truth" & "absolute" are 2 contradictory terms ;

At best, A.T. is improvable!

At worst, the expression "A.T." is auto-contradictory.

And what about mathematical logic ?

Mathematical logic = theory applied to itself, when a theory is its own object.

Mathematical logic seems to constitute the introduction of "qualitative" characterizations in the field of pure "quantitative" operations. (// undetermination ?)

Pre-conclusion :

The questions to be asked are: where do these definitions come from & what/who does make this demonstration. Either the question makes sense, & the answer too, either not, & the answer can not make anything wrong.

The question must not only be : "What does meaning mean ?" but : "Who/what wonders : "What does meaning mean ?"!"

In other words, "Who/what" does make this exegesis & the analysis of the language ?

Answer : an entity (most general set) in the more particular form of human being (subset) & more precisely yet in its L.D. form (subsubset).

In other words, the non-arbitrary (possibility of translation & space-time identity, even if relative, because of the laws of transformation) particular entity that corresponds to the conventional/arbitrary characterization that constitutes the name “entity”, & the name “name”, in a nest of process.

What defines itself as being fundamentally beyond/infra any nominalization & maybe even conceptualisation gives to itself the means, through language & conceptualisation, of being conscious of this abyssal process & of checking the vicious circle in which it seems to irremediably trap itself, since it can claim being beyond/infra any language through some language only !

Hence, language must be a part (symbiosis) of the entity (language consubstantial of consciousness) : language is what makes humanity.

External perspective on itself from the concerned entity. How is it possible ? How is this consciousness possible ? In a new way, it leads to the “Manifesto” message, by systematic semantico-analytical means rather than by intuitive-spatial-psychological change of perspective.

TRANSLATION :

The question must not only be : “What does meaning mean ?” but : “Who/what wonders : “What does meaning mean ?” !”.

In other words, “Who/what” does make this exegesis & the analysis of the language ?

Answer : I, whole reality, under my “entity” gender (most general set) in the more particular form of my human being form (subset) & more precisely yet in my L.D. form (subset).

In other words, my non-arbitrary (my possibility of translation & my space-time identity, even if relative, because of my laws of transformation) particular form that corresponds to my conventional/arbitrary characterization that constitutes my gender “entity”, & my name “name”, in my nest of process nature.

I define myself as being fundamentally beyond/infra any nominalization & maybe even conceptualisation & so give to myself the means, through my language & conceptualisation forms, of being conscious of my abyssal process & of checking the vicious circle in which I seem to irremediably trap myself, since I can claim being beyond/infra any language through my language form only !

Hence, language must be an essential part (symbiosis) of me (my language form consubstantial of my consciousness) : language is what makes my humanity.

External perspective on myself from one of my particular forms. How is it possible ? How is my consciousness possible ? In a new way, it leads to the “Manifesto” message, by systematic semantico-analytical means rather than by intuitive/spatial/psychological change of perspective.

Highest level of abstraction?

(micro qualitative jump)

I am what I call myself, through, probably among others, my human forms, the universe conscious of itself, the “whole” – synthetic designation of a potentially infinite dynamical process -,

reality in the sense of all what exists & is possible !

Author of the analysis : “I”! “I” is both a precise (refers to 1 person) & not precise (one doesn't know who “I” is) term. But it doesn't mean anything ! Not precise enough, it's just another term for “author” !

At least, “I” means there is a spatio-temporal identity/specificity. But spatio-temporal identity/specificity & all these words are already too complex expressions & what has to be explained, as a sub-question.

“I” doesn't mean anything if not related to a concrete thing ? But what does mean concrete thing ?

“I” : a particular entity; thus, “I” can mean something if not related to a particular entity but in the general sense that it can be referred to “any” entity.

“I” is a designation, either directly through the indication, auto-designation of a singularity, either indirectly, through the roundabout way of its assimilation to any element of the set of the elements that corresponds to the definition of “I”. Vicious circle, petitio principii.

One wants to say : “I” is what is beyond/intra any word & analysis, the condition of language.

But “I” can tell it by using language only !

Does it mean that “I” IS language ?

Indeed, “I” is language! But what “I” is considered, by itself, to refer to, is it language ?

“I” is language that makes reference to what is not... itself/language !

“I” is language that says it is not language !

“I” designs an entity trapped by itself, by the formulation once it uses “I”, but it checks that language, its ability to express its consciousness, can deny itself & design what is beyond any language.

Essence of language seems to be its power to express a beyond/intra language.

But then, language is not ontologically basic, fundamental, first (conditions) ; it's in fact, concretely, empirically first. It has taken the power. The only way of escaping its power, it's to “shut up”. But it is it that says it yet ! The conclusion imposes itself: “I” is the language. “I” is the analysis/exegesis. I am the analysis/exegesis.

Anthropomorphism : would this analysis/perspective

constitute the roof of an anthropomorphic thought process?

- then, it would be an anthropomorphism that would lead/intend
to relativize/minimize & even negate itself !

Strange anthropomorphism.

- would the real anthropo-morphism/-centrism not rather be
the supposition that consciousness would constitute the privilege/exclusivity
of the human being ?

Either I, L.D., am the universe, or not :

- if yes, I cannot fundamentally globally relativize my self-perception.
- if not, well, I work with the means at my disposal. At least do I own this extraordinary capacity to imagine/conceive this notion of “whole” & to empathetically conceive its way of conceiving !

The pertinence of this/my perspective is reinforced by its persisting power in the same way as one cannot prevent oneself of reading words or sets of words once one has learned to read despite of the difficulty one encounters in learning to read.

Manifesto of the manifest !

The conviction in the pertinence/existence of A.T. remains so strong.

Conclusion :

The really interesting questions :

- what is the pertinence of this analysis ?
- what is the power of this analysis ?
- what is the interest of this analysis ?
- what is the pertinence of this analysis ? Its autoreferential nature, autoanalysis, autochecking ; its own “examen de conscience” ; doubt of itself & the reality.
- what is the power of this analysis ? Its incommensurable richness comes from the consciousness of its own limits : the inability to define “absolute limits”. Of course, it doesn't constitute the proof of the inexistence of A.T.

In the spirit of the illusory Epimenid (the Cretan) liar paradox version, it shows the possibility of particular demonstrations of the impossibility of demonstrating absolutely the existence of A.T.

Let's note that the particularity of concepts like “absolute”, “God” is the “boomerang” effect of their meaning on any detail of the framework/referential in which they are implied. Kind of chain reaction, contamination. So strong power of conviction.

- what is the interest of this analysis ? This analysis is its own interest, in other words, no interest at all !

Finally, the questions of truth & its absolute character don't have a real importance ; we can check an obvious evolution in abstractive abilities because of the necessity of strata as ground for emergent properties. Ontological dissymmetry.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Special thanks to my P. Coijmans, T. Smith, C. Langan, K. Gödel, A. Turing, G. Cantor, R. Penrose, E. Nagel and J. Newman, F. Ramsey, A. Einstein, W. Heisenberg, N. Bohr and so many other forms for sharing a so stimulating intellectual food !

Next developments will include exegesis of and/or references to :

- Langan's supertautology
- Gödel's incompleteness theorems
- Chaitin & Solovay Omega numbers
- Priest dialetheism
- Ramsey's degrees of belief

- Annex I : Abusive use of the implication
- Annex II : Validity-truth specificities illustration:
- Annex III : Intension-Extension
- Annex IV : Some Semiotics
- Annex V : Truth theories
- Annex VI : Semantic theory
- Annex VII : On multiple interpretations of sentences
- Annex VIII : Autoreferences
- Annex IX : Some miniatures
- Annex X : Smith autoreferential items
- Annex XI : Turing halting problem
- Annex XII : on the richness & traps of the “implication”.