On logical and semantic forms of conflict:
For a dialogical approach

Shahid Rahman

(Université Lille 3, UMR-CNRS: 8163)

Conflicts involving logic and semantics have been discussed since the very start of philosophy and provided the base for the development of an argumentative understanding of rationality. Aristotle dared even to provide an argument that should ground the main principle that on the same time defines and regulates logical conflicts in standard logic: namely the principle of non contradiction.

Nowadays, two main issues have come up with new perspectives on the notion of logical and semantic conflict

1   Different logics are being developed at a breath-taking pace and the logical conflicts acquired a more sophisticated version the trigger new questions such as:

1.1   How can we compare one logic with the other and what does it mean that one logic is in conflict with a different one if the principles are not shared? How do we compare to sentences involving logical constants the meaning of which changes from one logic to the other?

1.2   How do we decide which of the logics is the most appropriate one?

2   Modern argumentation theory conceives conflicts as a non logical (or non montonic) structure of arguments linked by a relation of defeat such that one argument might defeat another one because of some kind of contextual enrichment.

However, we also experience developments in logic that also deal with logical and semantic conflicts *inside* a logical system such as

3.1   Paraconsistent logic and dialetheism

3.2   Non normal logics or counterlogicals

3.3   Belief-revision

3.4   Global satsifiability-logic: A logic based on Jain theory of knowledge of the ancient

Indian tradition

Most of the strategies concerning such kinds of conflicts and their solution (when there is one) make use of the notion context and/or presupposition that is supposed to work either at a metalogical or at a pragmatical level. The point is that in the standard presentations logic is formal and contextual issues are involve content, so that there is a kind of tension that requires either a metalogical (called formal semantics) or a pragmatic (that separates meaning and use) exit.

The main aims of my presentation are

a) To offer an overall overview of these forms of conflict unified in a same frame: the dialogical one: disagreement about logics is disagreement about the specification of the way a play should be structured in relation to the same local meaning of a sentence .

b) To suggest ways to include the context in the object language level making use of Martin-Löf's Constructive Type Theory in order to make explicit how a piece of prove depends on a context in the frame of the Curry-Howard isomorphism between propositions and sets.