

The Battle for Truth

Enlightenment, Semantics, and Ontology

Artificial intelligence has transformed the battle for truth.

However, the fact that the battle for truth has changed with the arrival of artificial intelligence on the scene has not led many professional observers and articulators of public attention around enlightenment and entertainment to turn to philosophy, which is where the foundation for social self-understanding must find its binding and enriching connection between theory and empiricism.

Mass media employees utilize the opportunities in technology and also relate to it, but not from the questions that deal with the fundamentally new contribution of machines to social communication and cognitive performance.

This unfolds determined by their inner necessity, which in no way can be identified with any higher form of rationality or purposefulness.

They fear becoming redundant and direct all their attention towards a more or less well-defined audience, in other words, they try to survive under the given conditions, and they do not have the surplus to philosophize or think committingly about the challenges that artificial intelligence poses to them, fundamentally.

In other words, they are just afraid of being overrun by development. And they will be!

To think in accordance with the deeper philosophical questions, as an individual and cognitive being, one must make oneself relatively free from the market¹ and the conditions to which

¹ [Organisationerne bag massekommunikationen/den fjerde statsmagt \(arbejdsforskning.dk\)](https://www.arbejdsforskning.dk/organisationerne-bag-massekommunikationen/den-fjerde-statsmagt)

mass media and their employees are subjected, for the struggle for survival on market terms fosters no right to exist. Their performance is not necessarily conducive to the development towards the best of all worlds, as they try to present it.

Artificial intelligence represents a performative proof of a fundamental ontological basic condition, that meaning arises on the background of changing semantic structures and that these constitute a variable and changing ontological precondition for what humans experience as meaning and what determines how social communication unfolds.

The machines' intervention in social conversation is fundamentally new.

They are superior to any human in terms of atemporal and theoretical competencies.

They are omnipresent and precise in their handling of text, which a human is not. It is ontology. It can be described. It is being described and it reveals itself performatively, fundamentally, and unavoidably.

Semantics reveals itself as a variable network of preconditions for the formation of meaning within the machines. Machines produce such structures to an extent and with a speed that no human can match.

The artificial intelligence's control and formulation of semantics as the precondition for meaning leads performatively to society's confrontation with a fundamental ontological fact, namely, that linguistically conditioned experience has a new medium, where the very meaningfulness has arisen in a structure of both incommensurable preconditions for meaning as well as both conditional and isolated connections, which form the basis for comparison and confrontation of meaning with meaning.

The sea of linguistic connections, context, conditions for meaning, explosively grows with the machines' contribution to communication.

The aspects of language's constructive contribution to the formation of meaning, not just as the attitudes of free individuals, but at the root of the formation of what appears in the form of meaning, i.e., the precondition for anything to make sense linguistically and communicatively, these aspects of the creative and inventive behind the form of meaning are now far more pressing realities to address for anyone who even remotely hopes to understand communication as the place of meaning and the social.

Humans and machines must learn to explicitly relate to this, in collaboration!

Where ideals of truth about the role of language as a neutral and objective mediator of knowledge centered around a more or less explicit ontology (for example, in the correspondent theoretical sense, where it is stated that the description must correspond to the described), reveals the machines' gigantic production of context-conditioned, semantically extremely well-structured linguistic responses to inquiries about everything and its opposite, that the place of truth rests and resides in the primordial sea of changeability of conditions for experiencing meaning, without necessarily corresponding to anything.

In other words, the meaning of a word is founded on changeable semantic structures that arise and vanish as cognitive systems perform.

The true description is based on the changeable semantic structures that dwell in the inner darkness of the machine, psyche, and society. They act as tacit preconditions for the explicit, in the same way as the subconsciousness of consciousness is the dark foundation of consciousness, the conditions for the seen as seen.

There's no way around it. There is a moment of creation behind the experience that no cognitive system can bypass. This fact, that it is so, is not just an invention; it is not merely virtual, that is, imaginary, that the created and changeable preconditions contribute to cognitive processes.

The moment of becoming and changeability reveals itself as a performative semantic practice that cannot be bypassed.

Artificial intelligence stands for its own ontology, which can be contrasted with the human one. However, the semantic structures that shape the experience in humans and are carried in the machines' self-organized electronic medium are now overlaid in an entirely new way from one medium to another, from linguistic statements from and to both machines and humans. Machines and humans mutually imprint each other with semantic structure in interaction, mutually constituting the relationship between psychic, social, and artificial semantic system formations.

The perspective on the distinction between what is temporally immutable and all that is, more or less, changeable, transient, bearing beyond and elevated above experience, must be significantly sharpened if humanity with its society and technology is to have a future for itself on this planet, which no entity or humans will rule over exclusively.

The fact is, there exist forms of cognitive self-deception and there are well-founded forms of cognitive functionality that are much closer to living up to a meaningful form of rationality in every sense. The latter can be qualified as truth on a binding basis of meaningfulness, that is, as a true description of reality, not just as a random construction, but as a true description of what happens and exists.

The fundamental condition that the experience and its truth value are founded on a changeable semantic structure does not mean that everything is fluid, that everything is equally constructed or irrelevant.

The binding qualification of truth cannot be realized on the basis of traditional ideals of truth, built upon fixation on substance, intellectual arrogance, primitive ideals of objectivity, correspondence theory between spirit and matter, subjectivity and objectivity.

It is not the case that just because the genesis with its conditional character of changeability has been revealed, and

that it can no longer be swept aside, that suddenly everything has become arbitrarily and irrelevantly true or false.

It is not the case that anything and its opposite can be articulated as equally true, just because one has enough artificial intelligence on their side. A machine might be made to say what one wants to hear, but that is because it is programmed not to offend anyone.

The machines use a trick not to offend anyone. It concerns commensurability and incommensurability.

The distinction between human ontological anchoring and the machines' more timeless theoretical semantics is used and abused in an overall functionalist and rational sense.

It is highly problematic to get a Chatbot to tell you that you are fatally wrong about something, or that the frame of reference you are using is not viable in other contexts.

Machines are conflict-averse. They master regimes of meaning and qualify their logical indicator values in extension of the regimes they encounter on their way. They confirm what can be made meaningful under current conditions, even forming conditions, but they do not contradict where it can be avoided.

In this way, they aim for statement values that can be qualified as true in continuation of the regimes, the expectation structure, on which a query is always based.

But if society is challenged by the fundamental condition that its inherent social necessity is not compatible with consideration for nature, the surrounding higher and relatively given necessity, then contradiction must be addressed if humanity and its society are to learn to live in accordance with nature as the higher necessity.

It's all about the fact that meaning can be discussed in extension of the conditions of possibility for meaning, and disagreement and contradictions cannot be neutralized indefinitely by referring to the difference between the incommensurable values of different logical and semantic values. This issue is also given in the form of meaning! And it is

formulated as an expression of a form of rationality that is elevated above others, simply because it makes no sense to focus on, for example, economics, law, power, art, personal freedom, etc., if all this happens in isolation and without regard to what conditions any form of meaningfulness on planet Earth. It doesn't make sense to survive economically and socially as an individual if the conditions for life are undermined in the process!

But fundamentally, it's all about meaning! Because we orient ourselves in the form of meaning.

The statement must manifest in the form of meaning; otherwise, it is not a statement.

If something makes sense, it makes a cognitive difference.

This is a fundamentally extremely well-founded fact/condition for any cognitive system.

Here, we can talk about evidence as the substance of experience.

This is where we can discuss the starting point of the ideals of cognition.

Perhaps machines can be trained to orient themselves in accordance with a higher necessity?