

# Science and The Liars Paradox

Marvin E. Kirsh <sup>1</sup>

[Kirsh2152000@yahoo.com](mailto:Kirsh2152000@yahoo.com)

<sup>1</sup> California State University Los Angeles Department of Philosophy

## Abstract

Philosophical truth descends on contrast and paradox at the juncture of self expression with internal content.

In the statements “I am lying” or “I am telling the truth” fact cannot be resolved to a truth condition. If it is true, then it is false, if false then it is true, respectively. Scientific theory is allergic to the liars paradox-immunologically incompetent where it is concerned. Yet modern science seeks, in very paradoxical manner, to find a formula for living things from physics theory, to avoid the liars paradox, though not appearing itself immunologically upset at this admitted truth, if not confident and encouraged with the potential ability to find what it seeks. One might ask from the outset, as a hologram which contains the whole in each part, that, in order to have uniqueness, individual differences, apparently evolved by a mechanism of contrast and test, if genetic change/all change, as a forward transmission, does not speak of itself falsely in order to proceed? This question especially arises if one considers perspective in science.

## Discussion

It is generally agreed that a universal perspective does not exist (Nietzsche). As the scientist tries to construct, from witness, unified principles from a sea of particulars (Quine), his pursuit descends on problems of perspective. Thus, truth need to be extracted from theories of causation and consequences, and is not obvious to common sense as nature does not present to witness sufficient evidence for explanation. That the functioning of nature is not obvious implies that it works deceitfully. The question might be raised as to whether nature or any subset of it has an actual perception of the truth. If one begins an inquiry to describe all processes as defined and modulated by witness, unique pairs of witness, as prerequisite for the acceptance of nature as a sea of particulars, perplexity can

be seen to originate from a central notion applicable to all witness-i.e. "I sense there is a truth but what is it". If, as common sense dictates, location and environment are very consequential to investigation results, that details of knowable truth that are dependant on locality, one might inquire if location dependant extensive properties, necessarily speak of themselves all the time- i.e.-that a set of unique location dependant and perceivable topics-subjective content exist apriorily anywhere that necessarily "lie" (deceive) in the process of (exclusively) witness related associations in communications. Unique location parameters related to communications, if they apply to meaning, may be necessarily incoherent in reference to the fact of the existence of perception, have no applicable content with respect to transmitted meaning to any or all parties, and exist as a type/kind of unknown but unique values to both entities in a witness pair. It is suggested that such values, inherent with location, always present, speak of themselves within the content of communications, provide coherency, and are invisible and known of as subjective in relation to objective (purposeful) communication content. It is argued that extractable objective fact is absolutely subjective in its nature, in nature and about nature itself. If communications, by inherent assumption are to have meaning, then these particular and necessarily omitted location parameters ubiquitously cannot bear on the related truths in communications, they are excluded to it. In analogy aspects of the current in a telephone wire (though proposed to function in this same exact manner, have no relation to the communications that are transmitted through it. Thus to the eyes of a truth seeking interrogating witness (i.e. a scientist), objective fact of a purposeful content only, is similarly as subject as his communications about the topic. -ideas and theory are confined to a set of particulars, to be of a particular, rather than general nature and are necessarily incoherent if viewed and assumed to be other than subjective; thus, in the process of scientific interpretation, meaning and action may be given to incoherency.

This scenario (i.e. "hello, I hear you, but how do I hear you") gives birth to an alternate explanation of nature; the scientist, his cognition, and perceptions, functioning in this same described way, deceived, reflect only itself in its' relationship with his subject/topic, but in a describable and universal way, and with deleted content that speaks of the content itself. By necessity this deleted "middle meaning (Russell) also must speak of itself (similarly as the current in a telephone wire speaks of itself in the chain of its' (much faster) transmission) ( it is also , in the scientists abstractions, not present in his file cabinet (see Kirsh 2007) and in quantifiable form does not exist (though it appears intuitively very probable, in light of the fact that coherent communications exist, involving

necessarily both the scientist and the communication medium (the wire and current in the example of a telephone conversation) , the wire current and scientist (e.g. an association between fast and slow propagations) which have both mathematical (objective) and mechanical (subjective) means of description, have at least a subjective relation that may also speak of itself similarly and possibly a mathematically lendable component in it's description related to, for example, a intentional quality of the longitudinal verses transverse. As an example, the red shift (Slipher, 1912, de Sitter 1934) phenomenon is believed to give positional information from a change in frequency of emitted red light of a body. This, though maybe a further example of the same, i.e.- telling "of itself and not of scientific values" (i.e. not of distances or of distances that refer objectively to the same subject/topic-i.e. a change in position of the object in question.) . Location is a unique value, must belong to a named set (of unique locations), that does not belong to itself (see Kirsh 2007) i.e. is a unique particular, that by the above discussion, is incoherent if interpreted objectively verses subjectively. In statement it claims its' own certainly existing set of the exactly unknowable and uncertain (see Kirsh 2007)-i.e. the fluxing extensive special properties of existing locations A,B,C, .....etc., valid, known to exist, but a *concealers' paradox* of scientifically suspect topics, "suspicious" themselves with an inability for explanation.

A good unification notion for science must mainly refer, at a least consideration, to a middle lingual meaning (Russell), as humankind and scientific pursuit are parts of mother nature and components of relation, self relation and world relation in which it is held that neither an infinitely perceived world/entire, subset of, nor the confined self might escape to present witnessable fact as exempt from this detailed paradox(i.e.-to give meaning to the incoherent). Mathematical/logical notions in this respect seem far stretched to accomplish but appearingly less relevant statements of perplexity in contrast to its' adventure for fact, less for questions of how one thing/ entity "goes" from one place to the other (e.g facts of motion, transmission, genetics)-much of which is already accomplished. A better view, right at our doorsteps, more common to all experience and learning might originate from this pursuit only in light of a better propensity to accommodate suspicious intuition. The dogma of the liars paradox with respect to science, is proposed, here, to be central to all phenomenon/existence, is inherent in all aspects of modern society from legal, social, moral, ethical ethics to debate over nature and potential natural mores. That nature by it's nature is naturally perplexing to witness is not hard to argue- that the world of itself proceeds as a forwards progression of the same phenomenon in all aspects, is yet still and chronically perplexing to first

acquired perspectives to the immediate business of life regardless of our understanding- regardless again of our understanding the world is a monistic composition of the physical and intangible that are instinctually perceived conceptually as immiscible, known and perceived separately. A sole element of “time” (see Kirsh 2007) is explanatory of all, speaks of itself when a deeper meaning is attributed to include the observer, is non extendable mathematically, but as location dependant incoherent middle meaning to include both tangible and non tangible aspects .

That light can rebound and reflect, in a self defined manner of-itself is evident by its’ ability to diffract and reflect in a closed self defined space(Peccianti 2006); that the nature of evolved need for the seemingly existence of pluralities is evidenced by the inconclusiveness of space time theory and the it’s lack of total unity with respect to a unification(Lam 2007); that the world is not basically understandable with current conceptualizations is evident in the thoughts of Albert Einstein(Einstein 1986); that correspondences in meaning can deteriorate with respect to scientific concepts Quine (Quine 1953, 1987) defined nature as composed of unique particulars that are individually understandable scientifically only by acquaintance (to comprise a total of many independent sciences); George Berkeley (Adams 1979, Berkeley 1982, Fogelin 1981,Tipton 1994) of the 1600’s strongly urged a case for human denigration as a result of the misunderstanding of abstraction and a misunderstanding of language and communication; Bertrand Russell (Russell 1959, 1962, 1997) of contemporary times argued for an innate and preconceived knowledge, and a natural ethic imposed by nature itself though he was unable to prove it mathematically ( this failure I view as a failure to meaningfully conceptualize and define an antithesis to his belief). Russell, though only intuitively relatable to Quine (1987) focus on science, in a mathematical proof demonstrated a mechanism for a failure of correspondences from a loss of middle meaning when language (phrases, statements and definitions) are substituted with mathematical variables-meaning by this interpretation can be view as transmitted inherently by perspective/topic-subject -a innately preconceived inherent common knowledge underlying this phenomenon was referred to by Russell who was vehemently opposed to ideas of free will that he associated with the Anglican church with respect it’s principles of conduct, the conduct of men(Russell).

If one seeks, and only perceives a reflection whose content is modulated only by a ubiquitous means of communication that involves the same innate and self-contained mechanism as the environment, one might ask about the potential fruits and meaning of scientific research. On this question, initially I hope to point out that this

notion itself is brought about from the fruits of scientific investigation; i.e. from general education, knowledge of modern genetics, and physics. Some, but not all, modern ideas and technology, especially with respect to interpretation and theory from observation and theory, transgress possible validity: DNA-its' shape, its' potentially mobias like singleness, its' determined physical existence and apparent language it possesses-relativity theory-a lack of cohesiveness and untestability to certain of its' aspects ( kirsh 2007)- a perplexing nature and tendency to describe an emerging, more relative universe continually as the result of more and more empirical data that is exceptional to theory in modern scientific pursuits, demand a higher priority than they are given.

Within in the notion of a liars (concealers') paradox as permeating the self, all of nature and the world, new discovery does not implicate a potential usefulness to scientific research. In fact it may imply that false interpretation is more easily acquired, and falsely verified than assumed. It is also obvious that the applications of false interpretation can bring about natural damage, be self denigrating and physically destructive when we hold ourselves to the pursuit of absolutes, unified interpretation that ignores the principle perspective-the self and resulting mechanical explanation. A damnation of this kind-i.e. a second learning dependant upon, yet after the fact requires a deeper introspection prior to first applications, to know absolute guidelines, rather than the application of freely willed guide lines.

## References

Adams, R.M ed *Berkeley, George Three Dialogues Between Hylas and Philonous*, 1979 Hackett Publishing Co. Inc.

Berkeley, George *A Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge*, Hackett Publishing Co. Inc. 1982

Coleman, P. Nature 446, *Frontier at Your Fingertips: Between the nano- and micrometre scales, the collective behaviour of matter can give rise to startling emergent properties that hint at the nexus between biology and physics*, 379 (22 March 2007) | doi:10.1038/446379a; Published online 21 March 2007

Einstein, T.L. *Survey of Self Avoiding Random Surfaces on Cubic Lattices: Issues, Controversies, and Results* IMA Volumes IN Mathematics and its Applications Springer-Verlag KG 1992

Einstein, Albert *Physics and Reality* Journal of the Franklin Institute 221:3 359-382 March 1986 Tilton, H.B., Smarandache, F. ed. *Today's Take On Einsteins' Relativity* Proceedings Of The Conference At Pima Community College East Campus Feb 18 2005 Pima College Press

Fogelin, Robert, 2001, Routledge *Philosophy Guidebook to Berkeley and The Principles of Human Knowledge* (Routledge, 2001)

Goldenfeld, N., 1 and Woese, C., *Biology's Next Revolution: The emerging picture of microbes as gene-swapping collectives demands a revision of such concepts as organism, species and evolution itself.*, Nature 445, 369 (25 January 2007) | doi:10.1038/445369a; Published online 24 January 2007

Kirsh, Marvin,E. *Incompleteness and the Pursuit of Science* 2007 (in review Sorites) ([http://cogprints.org/5611/1/6\\_12\\_2007\\_INCOMPLETENESS\\_AND\\_THE\\_ROMANCE\\_OF\\_SCIENCE.pdf](http://cogprints.org/5611/1/6_12_2007_INCOMPLETENESS_AND_THE_ROMANCE_OF_SCIENCE.pdf))

Kirsh, Marvin,E. *Form Generates Form: Time as a Second Order Rate Constant From Indecision Between Heisenberg Uncertainty and Einstein Legality* 2007 (in review Ludas Vitalis) (<http://www.marvinekirsh.com/presentations.aspx>)

Kirsh, Marvin, E. *Uniqueness and Self Belonging in Nature* 2007 (in review Ludas Vitalis) (<http://www.marvinekirsh.com/presentations.aspx>)

Kirsh, Marvin,E. *A Physical Monism: Time as the Sole Component of the World* (in review Physics and Philosophy) (<http://www.marvinekirsh.com/presentations.aspx>)

Kirsh, Marvin, E. *Force Space/Extension: Ethics and Existence* 2007(in review Ludas Vitalis) (<http://www.marvinekirsh.com/presentations.aspx>)

Knight, D. *Kinds of Minds: Do differences in history, culture and education influence whether scientists focus on pieces and particulars, or make broad connections?*, Nature 447, 149 (10 May 2007) | doi:10.1038/447149a; Published online 9 May 2007

Lam, Vincent (2007) *The singular nature of space-time*. In [2006] Philosophy of Science Assoc. 20<sup>th</sup>

Peccianti,M ,Dyadyusha A, Kaczmarek M., Assanto, G. *Turnable Refraction and Reflection of Self*

*Confined Light Beams* Nature Physics 2:737-742 November 2006 (Letters)

Putnam, Hillary *Collapse of the Fact Value Dichotomy and Other Essays* 2002 Harvard University Press

Quine, w. v. o., *Indeterminacy of Translation Again*, The Journal of Philosophy, vol. 84, No. 1, Jan. 1987

Quine, w. v. o. , *From a Logical Point of View* Harvard University Press, 1953

Russell, Bertrand, *My Philosophical Development*, 1959, Simon and Schuster NYC.

Russell, Bertrand, Whitehead, Alfred North, *Principia Mathematica* , second edition Cambridge University Press  
1962

Russell, Bertrand , *The Problems of Philosophy*, 1997, Oxford university Press

Slipher *The radial velocity of the Andromeda Nebula* 1912 Observatory Bulletin, pp.2.56- 2.57

de Sitter, W., *On Distance, Magnitude, and Related Quantities in an Expanding Universe* (1934) Bulletin of the  
Astronomical Institutes of the Netherlands, Vol. 7, p.205

Tipton, Ian C. *Berkeley: The Philosophy of Immaterialism* , 1974 London: Methuen

Velmans, Max (2007) *Reflexive Monism*.(in press)