

Discussion about certainty with trick0171

This discussion with Youtuber, trick0171, is about certainty, or absolute knowledge. trick1071 takes a position that nothing can be known with certainty, one that is common in the scientific community, largely as a result from the false philosophical slant given to quantum indeterminism.

trick1071 is an intelligent fellow, but his intelligence has cursed him with the ability to create definite categories entirely from the scientific mindset of speculation. He will state things that he believes are true, but deny that these are true, because "truth" is something entirely other than what human minds can conceive. It is basically the same kind of mindset as priests, who state that only Christ can know the truth, and therefore, they priests can never lie.

I decided to publish the discussion, which unfolded as comments to variablast's video [A slice of reasonable certainty](#), partly to show trick0171 that the discussion would keep going in circles, because he would always state things that he believed to be absolutely true, and yet insist that nothing he was stating could ever be called absolutely true; partly to show others that science has indeed become a religion.

N.B. I have used my thinker's licence to insert comments occasionally. They're in small text, and indented. trick0171 raised many points along the way that I decided to ignore, owing to the need to focus on the basics, but I have taken the opportunity of this letter to address a few of them. Most of them are little jokes.

Kelly Jones

∞

Definitions: What is absolute knowledge?

MotionFur: You can be certain if there is a logical contradiction in the concept of gods. I hold there is, as theistic gods are by definition supernatural entities, and the assertion of gods interfacing with the natural realm destroys this idea. I explain that a bit in my video 'the supernatural.' Also KellyJones00 is making a 4-part series of logical disproofs for god, 2 done so far, that may be of interest.

variablast: MotionFur is right. When god is not being posited as a physical phenomenon, he still comes with logical baggage. Discovering contradictions in the definitions and assumptions is sufficient to put the belief to rest.

variablast: [watch?v=2jAjBwu4HUY&feature=channel_page](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2jAjBwu4HUY&feature=channel_page)

KellyJones00: I was just about to post some links, but you guys beat me to it. Great!

trick0171: Of course. I totally agree. Any god that self-contradicts itself such as the Christian god is entirely nonsensical in any way that is logical. Of course you know that most agnostics are agnostic to all god definitions. Some definitions are even more improbable than others due to how they are defined - and all are so improbable that it is not worth considering. Agnosticism is more of a philosophical stance on knowledge.

Entirely nonsensical.... is that absolutely nonsensical, or only probably nonsensical, there?

My problem is your disdain for the agnostic position, because if it is applied the way it was intended, it is a logically sound position.

variablast : It's a position that deserves disdain. It's lost the spirit of discovery, it seems, and lobotomized its proponents into men incapable of listing a single thing they really know, even that god doesn't exist! Awful!

trick0171: That is a bunch of BS. Not knowing something with "absolute certainty" does not mean that we do not have knowledge of anything. The scientific method does not apply absolute knowledge for example, but we can come to such high probabilities of knowledge that it does not matter.

variablast: You can know some things with absolute certainty. If you feel uncertain, don't quake in your boots, expand the standard deviation or give yourself some error bars. There you have it! It is a devotion to ignorance you promote, but maybe you just aren't coming across right. Let's talk later and see if you can fix all that or not.

trick0171: "It is a devotion to ignorance you promote" This is the insult I am talking about. I promote a devotion to truth and knowledge, not ignorance. If part of that is understanding uncertainty, then I will not make dogmatic illogical leaps to absolutisms. That is all there is to it. I am not "devoted to ignorance" but the exact opposite of that. What saddens me is that you cannot see that. It's a shame really.

KellyJones00: trick0171, you say that science can come so close to absolute knowledge that it doesn't matter that it can't have absolute knowledge. That's a very dangerous delusion. It doesn't matter how many "identical" repetitions of an experience one has, that seem to prove a theory, the next one may be non-identical, and open the way to all the rest being non-identical too. Finite things change. That's an absolute!

trick0171: I except certain axioms about the reality I live in. After that, science is our BEST method for obtaining probable knowledge within that system. We can predict the physics reliably enough to make your computer run. We can conclude that if I drop a rock in an area where there is gravity, that it is a very high probability that it will fall. Not sure what you are calling a "delusion" here.

KellyJones00: trick0171, the delusion is saying that the higher the probability, the closer it comes to absolute knowledge. I explained the reason why. The stability of "laws of nature" are not signs of their absoluteness, because we have not investigated the entire Universe. We don't ultimately know what is big or small, what is short or long.

trick0171: I'm saying we can never have absolute knowledge. I'm saying we can only have probable knowledge. Does this help? I don't think we are disagreeing here. Or are you disagreeing that we can have probable knowledge as well?

Who is we? Is trick0171 referring to absolutely everyone, and saying it is absolutely certain that everyone everywhere can have only probable knowledge.....? If he is saying it is only probable that everyone is unable to know anything with absolute certainty, then he has left room for at least one person that may know something with absolute certainty sometime - by his own reasoning.

KellyJones00: trick0171, Just trying to work out what you mean by absolute knowledge. Some people think it must mean knowledge of all the details of the Universe. I agree such knowledge is impossible. But I also believe that's not exactly what you mean by "absolute knowledge". See below (A=A comment).

trick0171: No, that is a form of omniscience. Absolute knowledge means that we can know the truth value of something with absolute 100% certainty. I think the closest we can come to this is the notion that "thought exists". Everything else we need to assume some sort of axiom first (for example, we need to assume the axiom that the law of identity is accurate for $A=A$, and that our reality that gives us this logic is accurate).

Now I do assume those axioms, but I recognize what they are and therefore I don't believe we can have absolute knowledge (or absolute certainty if you would prefer that).

Example of an absolute truth: $A=A$

KellyJones00: What do you mean by absolute knowledge, trick0171? If you're referring to a kind of knowledge of all the details of all the things in the world, like a super scientist, then sure, that's logical. It can't exist, because the future hasn't happened yet, so there are some things no one can know. But absolute knowledge can also refer to truths like $A=A$, which are always true.

trick0171: $A=A$ assumes the reality we live in is correct and our logic is correct. It assumes the law of identity is correct. I think it is correct, but we cannot have absolute knowledge of this. We can show it to be entirely consistent in the context of reality we know about, but assuming it is absolute knowledge is dogmatic.

KellyJones00: Stating an alternative to the law of identity can only be this: "things are not what they are." But to state that, the law of identity is invoked. Do you see that? In other words, it is impossible to consider an alternative to the law of identity. Any alternative at all, any context at all, any reality, will always be what it is. Your argument is like the internally contradicting argument: "This is not happening."

trick0171: But I am not stating an alternative. I am stating that logic is based on language, a method, thought, and the reality we appear to live in. We cannot have absolute certain knowledge that those are accurate. My argument is against absolute knowledge of $A=A$, not against the logic of $A=A$. Also you are now assuming that the law of non-contradiction is accurate (in the absolute sense) as well. Keep in mind I am in no way suggesting that these are not accurate, or our best methods. I am only arguing against absolutes here.

KellyJones00: trick0171, the law of non-contradiction follows from $A=A$, so ignore it. Again, you really need to think your thoughts through carefully before you publish. No offence, but it is really easy to spot the issues if you try. Logic does not rely on any empirical data. Logic is basically "a thing is what it is". That's it. Do you see that this idea does not become false when there is no language, no method, no thought, nor experience? It simply is not, but it is not therefore false.

...

trick0171: for example, we need to assume the axiom that the law of identity is accurate for $A=A$, and that our reality that gives us this logic is accurate).

KellyJones00: trick0171, first, the law of identity *is the same as* $A=A$. The symbols are an expression of it in simple form. Second, you are spouting stuff speculatively. I would really like you to think about this before you comment. Promise? It will save me a lot of

time, and it will make things clear for you. Please investigate that $A=A$ must be assumed, *because* it cannot be proven. Think about why it cannot be proven. E.g. what's the proof going to state?

trick0171: I know the law of identity is the same as $A=A$. Trust me, I have given a lifetime of thought to this. You are the one speculating that A must equal A ABSOLUTELY. I am criticizing your speculation, not the other way around. You have not considered all of the other possibilities.

KellyJones00: I have given you the other possibility, which is that a thing is not what it is. I'll explain again. For a thing to be not what it is, the law of identity is still invoked, ie. "a thing is not what it is"
= (is identical with)
"a thing is not what it is"
That structure is the law of identity ($A=A$).

trick0171: We are running in circles here. You can explain to me the logic of why $A=A$ all you want, but again, THAT logic is based on the assumption that reality exists in which that logic follows. $A=A$ is perfectly logical - and I agree with this; however, we cannot have absolute knowledge that that logic is not in some way flawed, or even entirely flawed.

KellyJones00: But can you think of any reality at all that is not itself?

trick0171: Do you mean can I logically think of any reality? And can I assume my thought is correct if I cannot come up with something logically consistent? I think this is where you are having a hard time. You are making absolute assumptions based on limitations of what you perceive as logically impossible or inconsistent.

KellyJones00: trick0171, can you think of any reality at all that is not itself, even an alternative dimension with allogical sentient beings that are not themselves? I think you will find this is all laughably silly.

trick0171: I DO find it laughably silly. Hence the reason I would not promote the idea of a universe that A does not = A . That does not mean I can have absolute certain knowledge of that. Again, I am not arguing that something cannot be completely illogical or absurd or "laughably silly" based on the reality our mind seems to be structured in and allow for logically. I am ONLY arguing against this idea of absolute knowledge, because that idea is equally as absurd. If I am a brain in a jar being probed by scientists, ANYTHING I am thinking could be the absurd thing in actual reality (for example). Again, we can only go by our own perceptions, thinking, language, and logic - that we THINK exists. In other words, what seems to be the only thing that makes sense to us - could really not make any sense what so ever. Unlikely - yes. But I am only arguing against absolutes. In our day to day existence, it is pointless. We are talking strictly philosophical grounds here.

KellyJones00: trick0171, you mention above the idea "ANYTHING I am thinking could be the absurd thing in actual reality (for example)." I'm glad you posed the idea of "actual reality". Clearly, you can logically conceive of there being something that is actually true, rather than something that is perceived with limited information.

Logic is not a system, but the essence of consciousness, which *identifies*

KellyJones00: Logic does not rely on any empirical data. Logic is basically "a thing is what it is". That's it. Do you see that this idea does not become false when there is no language, no method, no thought, nor experience? It simply is not, but it is not therefore false.

trick0171: Sorry, but you are incorrect on what logic is. Logic is a method derived through language to interpret what we consider "constants" within what we perceive as reality. Having no language, no method, etc - is only one alternative. The other is that these exist but that our version of them is incorrect, etc. For example, it could be that paraconsistent logic is abundant - and what we see as consistent really is not. So when you say "it simply is not, but it is not therefore false" - you cannot have absolute knowledge of this. I would agree with the statement, but I need to accept the axiom of my perceived reality first. Since I am forced to recognize this is axiomatic - I cannot have absolute knowledge. All logic begins with initial axioms.

KellyJones00: trick0171, no that's rules of logic you're explaining. They're things that stem from logic itself, which, as explained, is the simple basic truth that "a thing is a thing". That's the essence of truth. Also, trick0171, it's not logically possible to say that "a thing is what it is" is based on perceived reality. That's arse-about.

trick0171: I never said that "a thing is what it is" is based on perceived reality. I said our KNOWLEDGE that a thing is what it is is based on our perceived reality. A very important distinction. In other words "a thing is what it is" may very well be a truth, and I have no doubt it PROBABLY is a universal truth. If reality is what it seems to us, it most certainly is a truth. We cannot know that reality is what it seems to us, and therefore we cannot say we have absolute knowledge that it is a truth.

Check again.

KellyJones00: trick0171, sure, we can only theorise about the actual identity of things, but science never offer absolutes in theories. We can know for certain that something is happening. But precise identities for that something remain theories and speculations, and always will. Anyway, to say something is probable requires absolute knowledge also. Even if you say it is probably probable!

trick0171: "to say something is probable requires absolute knowledge"
No it does not.

A mansion of mirth?

trick1071 starts to play intellectual games. He can know stuff, but can never know truths, he state emphatically, and yet - miraculously - he can define truths!

trick0171: To clarify, probability makes no assertions of absolute knowledge. They are required to assume an axiom first, then conclude a likeliness if (and only if) that axiom is true. That likeliness (probability) is not absolute, because of the axiom needed to assume it. We cannot derive a probability of the axiom itself (that is why it is axiomatic and that is why we cannot have absolute knowledge of it). We presume the axiom because our perceived reality/limitations force us to.

KellyJones00: trick0171, are you sure? How come you're so emphatic about that no? If you really wanted to say everything was probable, and really understand that deep in your mind, you'd not even be able to say, "I don't know", because even this would require certainty of lack of knowledge.

trick0171: I said possible - NOT probable. I know I am repeating myself a lot here, but we can only accept the axiom of our perceived reality - which I indeed do. From that point on is where I derive my "knowledge" from - but due to this, it can never be absolute.

trick0171: I know it seems hard for you to fathom, but even me thinking "I do not know", does not mean that "I do not know" with absolute certainty, even though it sounds absurd logically. It assumes I am understanding the word "I" the word "don't" and the word "know". It assumes I have an idea of what "know" is and that the idea about "knowing" is correct. It assumes I have language, and that language is meaningful. It assumes I exist. It assumes a certain construct of reality. Etc, etc, etc...

The only argument trick0171 can make is to present an alternative to truth, that is not based on $A=A$. But he can't, because presenting an alternative will *always* rely on $A=A$. This isn't a limitation of a perceived reality, or of reality, or of perception; it is literally impossible everywhere for there to be something that is not.

KellyJones00: trick0171, are you absolutely certain that such knowledge relies on those things? Or are you speculating?

trick0171: Based on what I can understand assuming my reality exists, it appears that way to me. So no - I am not absolutely certain due to this. My argument is based on logic, a construct of language, and what seems like an "I".

KellyJones00: trick0171, this heads back to the mistake that "a thing is what it is" is identical in meaning to "reality is how it appears", so I'll head back down to that section.

trick0171: I never stated nor implied that "a thing is what it is" is identical in meaning to "reality is how it appears". I am implying that for our KNOWLEDGE of "a thing is what it is", we have to rely on how we perceive reality. We need to categorize the difference between knowledge and truth here - because I think you may? be confusing the two.

trick1071 decisively defines absolute knowledge and absolute truth as things that can never be attained by consciousness, apparently a definition that applies absolutely...

trick0171: I am implying that for our KNOWLEDGE of "a thing is what it is", we have to rely on how we perceive reality.

KellyJones00: trick0171, if you're claiming that everyone has knowledge, but no one's knowledge can be ultimately true, then you're making a truth claim that once again - in your opinion - has to be derived from how reality appears. So let's be more systematic, and just focus on resolving what you meant by "how reality appears".

trick0171: I never said no one's knowledge can be ultimately true, just that we cannot know if our knowledge is ultimately true. I think this is an important part. But you are right - lets focus on one thing at a time here.

So, is it true definitively that no one can ever know, anywhere in the Universe, that they can know that they know anything that is ultimately true?

....

KellyJones00: trick0171, if you are saying a person has to be conscious before they can think and know that $A=A$, sure. That's reasonable. But $A=A$ doesn't become relative knowledge when it's not think. It's always true, in whatever brains it appears in.

trick0171: This is a leap you are making. You cannot know (absolutely) that it is always true in whatever "brain" it appears in, nor can you know that it is "true" without a brain to

think it - absolutely. Nor can you be absolutely certain that $A=A$ makes any sense in reality what-so-ever.

KellyJones00: trick0171, I didn't mean everyone understands it to be true. Just that it's not possible to be sane while deny the meaning of $A=A$. It would be like saying constantly to oneself, "Is-not-is-not-is-not".

trick0171: Agreed, but we are talking about absolute knowledge. Sanity has nothing to do with it.

KellyJones00: well, knowledge doesn't arise in an insane person.

trick0171: Even if that statement was true (which I doubt)...so??

Manifestations of Reality / How Ultimate Reality appears / how reality appears is not the proof/basis for $A=A$

trick0171: "is the simple basic truth that "a thing is a thing"." Sorry, but you need to justify the claim that it is a simple basic truth when talking about absolute certainty. It is a simple basic truth given (and I will repeat this again) the assumption that reality is how it appears to us.

" $A=A$ is the essence of truth."

No, that is not the essence of truth.

How can he state anything about truth with such direct conviction, given his views? Perhaps he is still formulating his views, and this entire conversation is a burbling of bubbles from an uncooked meal? If so, trick0171 lacks integrity, for someone who has a relationship to truth would admit as much.

KellyJones00: trick0171, I think I can see the problem now. You think "a thing is what it is" *is* the same as "reality is how it appears", do you not?

trick0171: I think "a thing is what it is" probably relies on reality being a certain way, including the thoughts I appear to be having about "things".

KellyJones00: trick0171, I think what you're saying is that a person needs to be conscious in order to experience identity. But we can comprehend the logical concept "beyond consciousness". It is what it is, even though we cannot give any contents to that concept. This means, $A=A$ is still true without consciousness, and in a reality we cannot imagine. The identity "beyond consciousness" or "beyond what I experience" is perfect for all consciousnesses.

trick0171: Any comprehension of logical concepts "beyond consciousness" are speculation at best, not absolute. Even the speculation that something exists (at all) beyond thought. This is the reason I stated in the beginning that the closest we can come to an absolute is that "thought" exists - but even that has some problems as "thought" and "existing" rely on what the thought is thinking rather than the thought itself and that we cannot be absolutely certain of. How that thought exists, or if that thought makes up an "I", or what we qualify as "consciousness" is all up for debate when talking absolutes. Even if that thought is consistent (for example, equaling itself) we cannot know absolutely - as bizarre as that seems to us. Basically - if we can use words to think of something, any of those words could be meaningless, delusional, non-existent, or something that we cannot fathom given our limitedness. Having "absolute knowledge" kind of becomes nonsensical and only pertains to an idea that has strict limitations we cannot know absolutely exist or

exist in the way we think.

Going off topic on our discussion of whether we can have absolute knowledge, I would also like to state the importance of this in regards to the theism problem, as I see it. Many theists do not apply any epistemological standard at all, and this allows them to contrive "absolute certainty" about their belief - which makes it impossible to counter as they do not need to use logic. We need to move people away from this idea that they can just be absolutely certain about something. We need to invoke evidence based and logic based probabilities, and the flexibility to change a belief if the evidence takes the idea to change. The idea that they can have absolute knowledge makes a belief literally unchangeable and inflexible. They just "know it" and "know it absolutely" - and for them no other justification is needed. This is a big problem as I see it.

variablast: I get what you're saying there as well, trick. You need to be able to respond to new evidence as it comes up. For certain events though, you can become irrational by claiming not to understand the situation or know that they occurred! It is more irrational to claim that there is any doubt about the easy stuff than it is to claim you have just a tiny bit of reservation. Some things are true, if you contest that, then what use are you in confronting those that believe in falsehoods?

KellyJones00: trick0171, yes, theists do refer to their beliefs as absolutely true without providing any reasoning, but only on faith in what they're told. This is clearly not what I'm doing, so let's get back on topic. Above, you say the law of identity probably relies on reality being a certain way. Let's tease this idea out. The law of identity is "a thing is how it is". So, by "reality appears in a certain way", do you mean: the law of identity would be revoked if

1. reality doesn't appear at all (i.e. there is no observer)?
2. reality appears to be not itself (i.e. the observer is insane)?

trick0171: For the record, I believe what I stated was "I think 'a thing is what it is' probably relies on reality? being a certain way". For short hand lets call "a thing is what it is" LOI (law of identity).

1) LOI would not necessarily be revoked if reality doesn't appear at all. LOI would not necessarily exist if reality does not appear at all either. Appearing would have nothing to do with it, so I would say no to #1.

2) "Reality appears to not be itself". I would say this option could possibly revoke the idea of LOI (depending on the reality), but I need some clarification on it. Do you mean to say- reality exists but our perception of it is entirely inaccurate? Or do you really mean to say- reality exists but what we perceive has nothing to do with that reality (there is no connection)? Or do you literally mean? that- reality exists but the appearance of that reality is not itself (even though it is the literal appearance of that reality)?

KellyJones00: trick0171,

1) Yes, that sounds reasonable. But you and I have applied the LOI to judge that identity requires appearances, including the appearance of the concept "no appearances".

2) "Reality appears to not be itself" is an internally contradictory statement. But let's break down your interpretations.

(i) Whatever is perceived is perceived, and is a reality. So we can't be in error by stating that something is happening, or being perceived. But we cannot be ever sure of our interpretation of what is happening, namely, the precise identities.

(ii) Since to appear is to exist, perception is not disconnected from reality. The question is, what is Ultimate Reality, when omniscience is logically impossible?

(iii) "Reality is not how it appears" is internally contradictory.

trick0171: (i) We will need to define "reality" then, because the way I define it means "truth". In other words, what is out there - regardless if a thinker can perceive it or not.

(ii) Not sure what you mean by "Ultimate Reality" here. Omniscience has to do with knowing everything - but we are not talking about that. We are talking about knowing one thing with absolute certainty.

(iii) I agree with you that it is internally contradictory.

Lets go back to (ii) for a second. Lets say I picture a "unicorn on mars" in my mind. Does this mean that the unicorn exists in reality? Or does it just mean that the neuro-structure (possibly) exists in reality, and that gives me that perception? We need to clarify what we mean by "reality".

KellyJones00: trick0171,

(i) are you saying you don't accept as true that something is happening right now?

(ii) Ultimate Reality is what is ultimately real. What is true for all realities.

(iii) Right, the idea that reality is not what it is is proven internally contradictory based on logic. But, logic isn't based on empirical data or a certain presentation of reality. Reality can only ever appear as it is (however it appears). Disproof 3 in the kids' animation series is about this.

trick0171: (i) Accepting something as true is "knowledge". I do accept that something is happening right now. I just do not have absolute certainty (knowledge) of it. Something I believe may be absolutely true, but I can never have absolute knowledge that it is.

(ii) ok - I would just call that "reality". :)

At this late point in the discussion, going back and defining Knowledge, Belief, Truth, and Logic

KellyJones00: trick0171, Let's get back to basics. You say, "(i) Accepting something as true is "knowledge""

An impressionable or gullible person may accept everything they're told, including lies, as true. This doesn't make them knowledgeable. Knowledge really means, understanding that comes from rational thoughts. It is not hard to have absolute certainty that something is happening. Every attempt to disprove it is foolish..... Can you not see that?

trick0171: Yes, we should start at the basics with definitions really. I would define knowledge (at it's basic level) as truth plus justified belief in that truth. This is why I do not think knowledge cannot be absolute. I was just trying to discern the distinction between knowledge and truth. If you want to consider rational thought the justification part, I am fine with that, but your definition does not state anything about truth, so how about "understanding of truth that comes about from rational thought"? Is that acceptable for the basic definition? (otherwise knowledge would not have to coincide with truth at all as long as something is understood rationally - which I don't think you want to imply?)

KellyJones00: trick0171, Truth is so much a part of my values, that I forget to explicitly say as much. Yes, knowledge is definitely of what is true, and arises from rational thought.

Beliefs are what are held owing to an absence of empirical data; once there is data, there is no need for belief.

Rational thought creates theories about empirical data (induction/science) or truths about reality (deduction/philosophy).

Truths are not beliefs, and truth itself is that which is. The basis of all truth is $A=A$, that a thing is what it is.

A specific presentation of Reality (a manifestation, a certain appearance) is not the determinant of truth.

Rather, logic is just the reflexive act of mirroring to oneself an appearance. It just says, "what is happening is happening."

Like a mirror is not created by the reflection it reflects.

trick0171: OK, now we need to define belief. I define belief as "any cognitive content held as true". In other words, there can be justified or rational belief such as belief based on empirical data ("I believe in evolution"), or there can be belief based on blind faith ("I believe in fairies"), etc...

You are correct, truths are not beliefs (I didn't say they were). Can we agree on this definition of belief?

Also, can we say there is a distinction between "truth that is" and "truths we come to through deduction or through empirical evidence"? I would say there is a huge categorical difference here and you are applying the word "truth" differently in each case. We need to determine which definition we are going to apply to the word. I use the first one, but let me know which you prefer. Also, I disagree on what logic is, but let's start with the definitions of "belief", "truth", and "knowledge", because without them we will get nowhere. I should have said this two comments ago, but I just want to make clear that the way you are using "truths" in the second sense of 'truths we come to through deduction or through empirical evidence' I would consider "beliefs" - not? "truths" per the way I am defining.

KellyJones00: trick0171, knowledge is cognitive content that *is* true or *is* a well-tested theory. Anything "held" to be true without knowing it to be true is technically not cognitive. Beliefs are what are held in an absence of evidence and therefore also of cognition. The way I see it, people tend to believe something to the degree that they have to combat doubts. The more doubt, the more they have to muster belief, to convince themselves.

Science is about finding enough evidence to weaken doubt. So, when the doubt is weakened by evidence, there is little need to convince oneself, and therefore reduction of belief.

...

trick0171: Also, can we say there is a distinction between "truth that is" and "truths we come to through deduction or through empirical evidence"?

KellyJones00: trick0171, you missed the subtle distinction I made.

Truths are deduced. Philosophy. Realm of certainties.

Theories are induced. Science. Realm of uncertainties. Probabilities.

trick0171: Can we say there is a distinction between "truth that is" and "truths we come to through deduction", because I would say there is just as much categorical difference here as I suggested earlier when I had empirical evidence added in.

KellyJones00: trick0171, yes, there is a distinction between the truths arrived at by deduction (since there are many), and truth itself. Truths arrived at by deduction all rest on truth itself. Without truth, there are no truths. Without the LOI, there is no "reality is how it appears".

trick0171: Good, because we should only use the word "truth" for the "truth that is" and call the value we obtain through deduction reasoning something else - at least for this debate. It is important we do not confuse words.

Lets talk about the assumption of "without truth, there is no truths", because, though I agree with this, I would say I only agree because it is intuitive and what we consider axiomatic. My claim is not that the statement "Without the LOI, there is no "reality is how it appears" is untrue; my claim is that we cannot know it to be true with absolute certainty.

Damn, I almost got him to drop that silly attitude.

I would also like you to look up the basics of paraconsistent logic and address the point (if possible) as that is deductive. It will give you an idea of the intuition that deductive reasoning must rely on to conclude the axiom of our perceived reality.

KellyJones00: trick0171, paraconsistent logic was invented to resolve a problem that didn't exist, namely, that contradictory ideas can both be true. The latter arises from mistaking science identities as deductive premises, which I explain in my vid "Logic 101".

trick0171: Paraconsistent logic means some contradictions are not explosive (they do not reduce to triviality). This means that we cannot deduce that these contradictions are not true (though they might not be - we cannot know).

KellyJones00: trick0171, did you mean to write "we cannot deduce that a proposition is true"? The vid "Logic 101" shows the difference between scientific identities and true propositions, I recommend watching it.

trick0171: Watched logic 101. I disagree with your definition. You gave the definition of the law of identity. This is NOT a complete definition of logic but an important part of it. But I will discuss what $A=A$ (LOI) is in a moment.

I meant to write "we cannot deduce that these contradictions are True or not True" for paraconsistent logic. I had to retype that comment like 5 times because for some reason YouTube would not post.

Lets clarify things about LOI. In logic, $A=A$ is a tautology. A tautology is true under any possible valuation (interpretation/assignment of truth values) of its variables. This is because its negation is a contradiction. What is axiomatic are those truth values we assign, because it is an interpretation we accept (and rightfully so). We also need to recognize it for what it is.

I found this vid I just watched interesting given our debate. A? tad off topic but a little related: [/watch?v=9gMiFl5nMfo](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9gMiFl5nMfo)

This is TBS's response to Matt Slick who uses "TAG" to conclude "god exists", and part of it is this idea of "logical absolutes" - which he cannot prove. It appears to me that this stance is similar to your own.

....

KellyJones00: When you have some free time, interest, and bandwidth, check out the two vids on my channel, "Deceitful Definitions". They deal with the idea of axioms.

trick0171: Just watched your "Deceitful Definitions" videos. They relate to the poor

axioms used in the bible, but not really sure how they relate to our discussion. The axiom of $A=A$ is shown consistent and therefore a wonderful axiom to use, but you must understand that the axiom " $A=A$ " is not the same as an axiom such as "We can know $A=A$ with absolute knowledge". It is this second statement that you seem to think we can apply, which I disagree with.

KellyJones00: trick0171, your entire argument rests on $A=A$. You are proposing that $A=A$ is not absolutely true by suggesting an alternative is possible (the which suggestion relies on $A=A$). This is the only way to make sense of the idea of not having absolute knowledge. In other words, you're trying to disprove logic by using logic. There is no logic outside of perception, there is no absolute knowledge "out there" which is apart from consciousness.

trick0171: But again, I am accepting the axiom that $A=A$ and not the axiom that $A=A$ is absolutely true. I think you have this reversed. You are proposing $A=A$ is absolutely true by relying on $A=A$ (the axiom). I am not "disproving logic by using logic", I am saying the burden of proof is on the person who suggests that "logic is absolute", because it is that person who is using circular reasoning.

....

KellyJones00: trick0171, Truth itself is present in? all deduced truths, so it is silly to use a different word. Just capitalise it.

trick0171: This is where our disagreement is. The correct statement is "Truth itself is probably present in all deduced truths", because we cannot know that absolutely. We can except it as an axiom, and we can have good reason to except it as an axiom, but we cannot know it absolutely. From this point on I will capitalise the "T" in Truth. This will mean "Truth that is". It is this Truth that we cannot have absolute knowledge of, which funnels down to everything else.

KellyJones00: "We cannot know that absolutely". Can you know that you cannot know it absolutely, absolutely? Since your response is usually no (unfortunately), therefore, it is possible to know absolutely that it is possible to know some things absolutely.

trick0171: We already went over this. My response is "no". In other words, I cannot know with absolute certainty that I cannot know absolute certainty, and I also cannot know with absolute certainty that it is possible to know some things absolutely. The reason for this is that I need to apply my axiom of reality before I can even have the notion of "know". I am just recognizing that axiom, and in the context of that reality, explaining why I do not think we can have absolute knowledge.

On Ultimate Reality

KellyJones00: The "unicorn on Mars" concept seems to be asking, what is ultimately real. Clearly, we can't *ultimately* know if we're hallucinating or dreaming or in a Matrix. We can't know for certain that a unicorn on Mars doesn't exist. We can't be certain that our brain constructions of reality are indeed generated by neurons. We only perceive a construction of reality, and have to live with that. However, what we perceive *is* perceived.

No deceiving demons can interfere with that truth. It doesn't matter if our experiences are or aren't ultimately beams from aliens into our consciousness. What is happening *is* happening. Something is. This is what logic is: identity. It doesn't rely on precise details. So,

what is true for all realities is that they are what they are.

trick0171: "However, what we perceive *is* perceived." This is at the heart of our debate, because you cannot fathom the idea that you might not be perceiving at all, or that what you are perceiving is not really what you are perceiving, or that you are both perceiving and not perceiving at the same time, Or that perception is something entirely different than how our language defines the word "perception", or some other equation outside of something understandable in the context of how you percieve reality. Do I believe any of that - no. But these makes the idea of "absolute knowledge" kind of nonsensical.

∞

∞ [Back to Top](#) ∞

Return to Index