Logical Apathy

An Enquiry into a Lack of Consideration

Justin Edward Oxford
Boston College
23 February 2018

In the noble pursuit of truth table analysis and development, some logicians have proposed that there are statements which one cannot know to be bivalent. Thus, a third truth value was introduced – the indeterminate (or 'I.'). However, it is the opinion of this (amateur) logician that there exists a fourth truth value. To see this fact, one must merely observe the natural nature of natural conversation – consider the following dialogue:

> "Alice is the fastest runner in her grade," says Bob.
> "I don't care," says Cathy.

Or perhaps,

> "Some students cannot afford $70,000 per year in tuition," says Donald.
> "I don't care," says Emily.

Further,

> "You can't walk here!" shouts the construction worker.
> "I don't care," says the business man.

These statements cannot be deemed true, false, or indeterminate since only one person cares about the claim. For something to have a determinable truth value – of the three proposed in traditional logic – people must actually care. As in the case of the business man and construction worker, what is the truth value of, "You can't walk here!"? For the construction worker, this is true, since those are the rules in his domain of reality. But it is also certainly false in physical analysis, for the business man *can* and is walking there – he is able to do so. The question of indeterminacy rests on how much the observer knows of the rules for walking there, and thus breaks down as one develops an opinion. But there is a fourth perspective – that of the business man. He doesn't care what the rules are; he is walking there! Thus, it is due time to construct a new, additional truth value to symbolize apathy. It shall be hereby notated as, D. Let us now endeavor to discover the properties of D when constructing complex claims through logical operations.

In the cases of conjunction, negation, and bi-condition while using simple statements for argument construction, D wins out. For if Peter is tall, and I don't care what Sandra does for the living, then I really don't care about the result or significance of these two statements being put together. Thus, I do not care about this statement in terms of the argument. Further, if I don't care that Peter is tall (negation) – that is, I don't care whether he is actually tall, whether he is actually not tall, or whether anyone can know if he is tall – I don't care about Peter's height. And lastly, consider if two things depend upon one another, say, if we have, "I can go to the party, if and only if, my mom says I can." If one doesn't care if I can go to the party, then they certainly don't care for my mother's opinion – although, they should as a matter of principle, but that is the subject of another paper – no matter whether she is in favor or opposed. Further, if one knows that my allowance for passage into the party depends necessarily upon my mother's command, and one does not care what my mother's command is, then one must not care whether I go to the party – since if one did care about my attendance they would be invested in my mother's decision. Thus, where there is at least one simple statement, having the value of D, in a bi-conditional, the bi-conditional statement returns an overall value of D.

In the cases of disjunction and condition, our inquiry becomes more complicated. Assuming disjunctions to be inclusive, we have the following: if at least one simple statement is true, then it doesn't matter whether you care or not – it's true, suck it up. Consider our example of the business man, again. If the worker were to shout, "You cannot walk here, or you will get cement on your shoes!" then despite the business man's apathy for the rules, he will surely have his shoes covered in cement. Moreover, if one of the simple statements is false, then the entire claim is D – since if it is false that his shoes will be covered

Copyright 2018 Justin Edward Oxford

in cement, then he probably cares even less. Finally, if one of the simple statements is indeterminate, then the entire claim is indeterminate – since it could be either T or D.

Finally, we arrive to the conditional operation. Here, order matters. And if the consequent holds a value of D, then so does the entire claim. "If you walk here, you will break the rules," means nothing to the business man if he does not hold regard to the rules. It does not matter what the rules say if he rejects rules out of principle. Now, if it so happens that, "If you break the rules, then you will walk here," is uttered, then we have a different circumstance. The order has been changed. Notice here that the definition of rules depends upon the person uttering the warning, and the business man merely does not care about their definition. Thus, if the only rule in their definition of rules is that one cannot walk 'here', then the business man will still be in violation of the rules – he will walk 'here'. But he does not care. Thus, this claim holds true. Moving on, much in the same way as disjunction, when the consequent is false and the antecedent is D, the value is D, and it is likely that this would result is even less care than was held previously. (I find proof of this claim to be trivial, and it is left to the reader as an exercise.) Moreover, if the consequent is indeterminate, then the value of the claim is indeterminate – since it could be either T or D. And finally, if both simple statements hold the value of D, then this is the ultimate act of rebellion, for one does not care what they are doing, nor do they care of its consequences.

Here, I present the table of basic forms for reference:

P	Q	P • Q	P ∨ Q	P ⊃ Q	P ≡ Q	~P
T	T	T	T	T	T	F
T	F	F	T	F	F	F
T	I	I	T	I	I	F
T	D	D	T	D	D	F
F	T	F	T	T	F	T
F	F	F	F	T	T	T
F	I	F	I	T	I	T
F	D	D	D	D	D	T
I	T	I	T	T	I	I
I	F	I	I	I	I	I
I	I	I	I	I	I	I
I	D	D	I	D	D	I
D	T	D	T	T	D	D
D	F	D	D	D	D	D
D	I	D	I	I	D	D
D	D	D	D	D	D	D

Upon my receipt of research funding, I shall endeavor to inquire of the nature of an argument's validity given this new value. But until then, I rest hoping that what I have done has been well received food for thought – although ultimately, I do not care.

■■■

Copyright 2018 Justin Edward Oxford