From Formal Logic to Functional Symbolic Trajectories

Hilbert, Brouwer, Russell, and the Missing Machine of Representation

Kevin R. Haylett

Manchester,UK

June 2026
Selected Communications

Contents

Chapter 1

From Formal Logic to Functional Symbolic Trajectories

1.1 Opening: the problem before logic

At the beginning of the twentieth century, mathematics entered one of its most intense foundational crises. The older confidence that mathematics could proceed as a stable body of truths had been disturbed by paradoxes, by the rise of set theory, by the development of symbolic logic, and by competing accounts of what mathematical existence should mean. The question was not merely technical. It was deeper than the repair of a theorem or the correction of a definition. Mathematicians and philosophers were asking what mathematics itself was.

Was mathematics discovered? Was it invented? Was it a part of logic? Was it a construction of the mind? Was it a formal game played with symbols? Was it a language for describing the world? These questions shaped the work of Frege, Russell, Whitehead, Hilbert, Brouwer, Weyl, Gödel, Heyting, and many others. Yet beneath these debates lay a prior difficulty that was not yet visible in the language of the period.

They were trying to ground mathematics inside language, but they did not possess a formal model of language.

Every axiom, every proposition, every proof, every denial of a proof, every appeal to intuition, every statement about infinity, every statement about truth, and every statement about construction had to be expressed as marks, words, symbols, and rule-following sequences. The mathematicians were not outside language looking in. They were inside language attempting to stabilise language from within.

This matters. A mathematical proof is not encountered as a pure object. It appears as a sequence of symbols. It is written, read, copied, checked, remembered, translated, typeset, spoken, and taught. Even when one claims that the proof concerns ideal objects, the proof itself must become a finite symbolic trajectory in order to be communicated.

This chapter develops the claim that the foundational crisis of early twentieth-century mathematics can be reread as a crisis in the absence of a formal machine of symbolic representation. The great figures of the period were not merely disagreeing about truth. They were attempting to stabilise different symbolic trajectories without a prior model of how language itself stabilises meaning.

Hilbert sought to protect the working machinery of mathematics through formal systems and consistency. Brouwer resisted unrestricted formal assertion and insisted that mathematical truth required construction. Russell attempted to ground mathematics in logic while escaping paradox through type restrictions and symbolic hierarchy. Each saw a real part of the problem. Yet each worked before the modern availability of nonlinear dynamics, formal computation, information theory, semantic embedding, phase-space reconstruction, and symbolic trajectory models.

Finite Symbolic Mechanics, or FSM, begins from a different order of commitment.

It does not begin with logic.

It does not begin with truth.

It does not begin with completed mathematical objects.

It begins with finite representation.

Before logic, there must be symbol. Before symbol, there must be measurement or symbolic instantiation. Before proof, there must be a readable trajectory. Before the Principle of Excluded Middle can act, the proposition it acts upon must be formed, stabilised, and made admissible.

This chapter therefore proposes the following guiding reversal:

Classical foundations often ask: *what logic grounds mathematics?*

FSM asks: *what symbolic process makes logic possible?*

The answer developed here is that mathematical and logical expressions are functional symbolic trajectories. They are not static things. They are finite symbolic flows that carry representation, constraint, uncertainty, provenance, admissibility, and expectation through language.

This does not reject classical mathematics. It relocates it. Classical mathematics becomes a powerful and historically stabilised basin of symbolic practice. It works because its trajectories are extraordinarily stable under agreed rules. But that stability is not free. It is carried by finite marks, finite memory, finite language, finite computation, and finite acts of comparison.

The ink never disappeared. It was only forgotten.

1.2 The historical problem: from paradox to formal authority

The crisis of foundations did not appear suddenly. It grew from nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century attempts to make mathematics more exact.

The nineteenth century had already transformed mathematics. Analysis was made more rigorous. Set theory opened new ways of speaking about infinite collections. Boolean algebra and Frege's formal logic suggested that reasoning itself could be represented symbolically. Mathematics appeared to be moving toward a purified language in which ambiguity could be eliminated.

This movement was powerful because ordinary language is unstable. Words carry history, metaphor, local use, and inherited ambiguity. A term such as "set", "function", "number", "infinite", or "truth" may feel clear until it is pushed into an extreme case. Then the word begins to reveal hidden structure. It has a prior trajectory. It has commitments that were not previously made explicit.

Russell's paradox exposed this dramatically. If one allows unrestricted set formation, one may speak of the set of all sets that do not contain themselves. The question then arises: does this set contain itself? If it does, then by definition it should not. If it does not, then by definition it should. The symbolic construction folds back on itself and generates contradiction.

This was not a small technical inconvenience. It showed that ordinary symbolic freedom, when given mathematical authority, could produce an impossible object. The problem was not merely that someone had made an error. The problem was that language had been allowed to form a trajectory that looked meaningful but was not admissible.

Russell and Whitehead responded with *Principia Mathematica*, an immense attempt to derive mathematics from logic while avoiding paradox through a carefully stratified symbolic system. The theory of types can be read, in FSM terms, as an attempt to prevent symbolic trajectories from curling back into self-reference without constraint. A symbol could no longer range over everything, including the totality to which it itself belonged, without restriction. The symbolic universe had to be layered.

This was an important move. Russell saw that language required guardrails. But the project still treated logic as foundational. The aim was to repair the language of mathematics by installing a more disciplined logic beneath it.

Hilbert's programme took a different path. Hilbert sought to secure mathematics by formalising it. Mathematics could be treated as symbol manipulation according to explicit rules. If the system could be shown consistent by finitary means, then the larger body of mathematics could be protected. Hilbert's impulse was pragmatic and architectural. Mathematics worked. It was too powerful to abandon. The task was to secure the machinery.

In broad terms, Hilbert says:

> Without these formal rules, mathematics cannot operate. If we remove the Principle of Excluded Middle and related classical tools, the machinery loses its ability to move from A to B.

This is why Hilbert's defence of classical reasoning matters. For Hilbert, removing excluded middle was not merely a philosophical refinement. It threatened the working body of mathematics. It was like removing a central instrument from a discipline that depended on it.

Brouwer saw the danger differently. For Brouwer, mathematical truth could not be reduced to formal permission. A statement should not be admitted merely because a symbolic system allows it. Mathematical existence required construction. A proof of existence that did not produce or construct the object was suspect. The unrestricted use of the Principle of Excluded Middle over infinite domains was therefore unjustified.

In broad terms, Brouwer says:

> You cannot claim that P or not-P is settled over an infinite domain unless you have a construction that decides it. Otherwise you are allowing language to assert closure where no construction has been given.

Here the central issue becomes visible. Hilbert protects formal movement. Brouwer demands constructed movement. Russell restricts symbolic self-reference. All three are concerned with the admissibility of symbolic trajectories, though they do not use that language.

The early twentieth century therefore presents us with three powerful responses to the same deeper instability.

Russell asks: how do we stop symbolic language from generating paradox?

Hilbert asks: how do we preserve and secure the formal machinery of mathematics?

Brouwer asks: how do we prevent mathematical assertion from outrunning construction?

FSM asks a prior question:

What is the finite symbolic trajectory by which a mathematical statement becomes available for logic at all?

1.3 The missing model of language

The foundational debates unfolded in language, but language itself was not mathematically modelled as the container of the debate.

This is not a criticism of the mathematicians involved. They worked with the tools available to them. Formal logic existed. Set theory existed. Proof theory was being born. Linguistics existed in other forms, but not as a mathematical model of dynamic symbolic flow. There was no practical theory of semantic phase space. There was no computational theory of embeddings. There was no nonlinear dynamical model of language as an evolving trajectory. There was no Takens-style reconstruction of hidden state from observed symbolic sequence. There was no transformer architecture demonstrating that meaning may be held in relational geometry between symbols.

As a result, the foundational problem was attacked too late in the chain.

The usual chain was treated as:

$$\text{Logic} \to \text{mathematics} \to \text{proof} \to \text{truth.}$$

FSM suggests the order should be:

$$\text{measurement or instantiation} \to \text{finite symbol} \to \text{symbolic trajectory} \to \text{meaning stabilisation} \to \text{admissibility} \to \text{logic} \to \text{proof} \to \text{truth claims.}$$

This reversal matters because logic cannot operate on nothing. A proposition must be formed before it can be evaluated. The Principle of Excluded Middle requires a proposition P before it can assert P or not-P. But in FSM, P is not a static object. P is itself a finite symbolic trajectory.

A sentence is a movement.

A proof is a path.

A definition is a stabilised instruction for future symbolic movement.

A theorem is a compressed endpoint of a traversable symbolic route.

A mathematical object is not merely named by a symbol. It is carried by a symbolic history that tells us how it may be used, transformed, compared, and checked.

The missing model, then, is not simply a better logic. It is a formal machine of symbolic representation.

Such a machine must account for the finite mark, the finite symbol, the base or representation system, the historical path by which the symbol became meaningful, the uncertainty carried by representation, the admissibility conditions under which the symbol may enter reasoning, the consensus rules by which a community agrees that the trajectory can be followed, and the transformations by which one symbolic state may lead to another.

Hilbert had part of this machine in formal proof systems. Brouwer had part of it in construction. Russell had part of it in type restrictions. FSM attempts to place these partial machines inside a wider account of symbolic flow.

1.4 The prior commitment: words may form a model

Before any formal system begins, there is an implicit commitment that is rarely stated.

We accept that a sequence of words or symbols may form a model.

This is not trivial. A mathematical text is a chain of marks. It becomes meaningful only because a reader can traverse the chain and stabilise the intended symbolic movement. The text is not meaning by itself. The reader, the language, the rules, the history, and the community participate in making the trajectory admissible.

Prior Commitment: Meaning-bearing symbolic sequence

> A finite sequence of symbols may be admitted as a meaning-bearing trajectory when it remains sufficiently stable under reading, comparison, memory, and rule-governed transformation.

In FSM notation, let a word-string or symbol-string be

$$W = (w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_n).$$

In classical treatment, one may be tempted to write

$$W = M,$$

where M is the meaning or model expressed by the words.

FSM avoids this equality. The string is not identical to the model in a timeless sense. It carries the model through finite representation. We therefore write

$$W \sim M_W \mid (\alpha, \delta, H, C, B).$$

Here W is the finite string of words or symbols. M_W is the model, story, or meaning trajectory carried by the string. The symbol $\sim$ does not mean "approximately equal". It signals that the relation is held through finite representation, with measured inexactness, uncertainty, provenance, and admissibility. The parameter α denotes the Alphonic limit or minimum distinguishable symbolic region. The parameter δ denotes uncertainty. The parameter H denotes provenance or historical path. The parameter C denotes consensus or admissibility constraint. The parameter B denotes the base, notation, or representation architecture in which the symbols are expressed.

The use of $\sim$ is essential. It does not weaken the statement into approximation. Rather, it makes the statement honest. It says that meaning is carried by a finite symbolic relation, not by identity with an unreachable ideal object.

This is the missing precondition for formal logic.

Before we can say

$$P \vee \neg P,$$

we must first have

$$P \sim T_P \mid (\alpha, \delta, H, C, B),$$

where T_P is the functional symbolic trajectory that allows P to be read, held, compared, and used.

PEM does not act on a pre-existing eternal object. It acts on a proposition that must first be represented.

1.5 The Axiom of Finite Representation

The Axiom of Finite Representation may now be stated as a foundational axiom for FSM.

Axiom: Finite Representation

> Every mathematical symbol must be instantiated, physically or computationally realised, in a finite medium with measurable extent, bounded precision, and traceable history. No symbol floats free. The representation is the symbol.

Formally, for any admitted symbol s, there exists a finite representation r_s such that

$$s \sim r_s \mid (\alpha, \delta, H, C, B).$$

This is not saying that s is approximately represented by r_s. It says that the symbol exists for mathematics only through its finite representation.

A symbol may be written in ink, spoken as sound, stored as bits, held in neural memory, printed in a book, displayed as pixels, or encoded in a formal proof assistant. In each case, the symbol has a finite carrier. It has a history. It has boundaries. It has resolution limits. It has conditions under which it may be distinguished from neighbouring marks or states.

From this follows the Corollary of Inescapable Uncertainty.

Corollary: Inescapable Uncertainty

> Every act of symbolisation carries uncertainty because every representation requires distinction, and no distinction is infinitely sharp.

In FSM notation:

$$\mathrm{Rep}(s) \sim r_s,$$

with

$$\delta(s) > 0.$$

The value of δ may be negligible for many practical domains. Classical mathematics succeeds because many symbolic operations occur in regimes where uncertainty is irrelevant to the intended use. But negligible is not zero. Classical equality is therefore a limiting idealisation, not the ground state of representation.

This also changes how we read proof. A proof is not merely a timeless relation between propositions. It is a finite symbolic trajectory whose steps can be inspected.

Let a proof Π be represented as

$$\Pi = (l_0, l_1, \ldots, l_n),$$

where each l_i is a line, expression, or admissible symbolic state. In FSM:

$$\Pi \sim \langle l_0 \to l_1 \to \cdots \to l_n \rangle \mid (\alpha, \delta, H, C, B).$$

A proof is therefore a traversable path. Its validity is not observed as a mystical property. It is measured through comparison against admissible rules within a language community.

This returns mathematics to the mark.

A proof is a cairn. Each line is a stone. The reader walks the path.

1.6 Functional Symbolic Trajectories

The concept of the functional symbolic trajectory is the bridge between Alpha Logic and the more developed FSM account of language.

Definition: Functional Symbolic Trajectory

> A functional symbolic trajectory is a finite symbolic pathway that carries representation, constraint, and uncertainty through words, mathematics, measurement, memory, and social use. It is not a thing. It is a stabilised movement that can be followed, tested, compressed, extended, or allowed to fail.

Formally, we may write

$$T_S \sim \langle s_0 \xrightarrow{r_1} s_1 \xrightarrow{r_2} s_2 \cdots \xrightarrow{r_n} s_n \mid \alpha, \delta, H, C, B, K \rangle.$$

Here T_S is the symbolic trajectory. The s_i are finite symbolic states. The r_i are transition rules, operations, readings, or transformations. The parameter α gives the minimum distinguishable symbolic limit. The parameter δ gives the uncertainty carried by the trajectory. The parameter H gives provenance. The parameter C gives consensus or admissibility. The parameter B gives base or representation architecture. The parameter K gives cost of distinction, transformation, or maintenance.

A sentence is such a trajectory.

A proof is such a trajectory.

A theorem is such a trajectory compressed into a reusable symbolic form.

A logical rule is such a trajectory stabilised across repeated use.

A mathematical object is a trajectory whose use has become stable enough that it can be compressed into a noun.

This reframes the question "what is mathematics?"

The classical debate often asks whether mathematics is discovered or invented. FSM suggests another answer.

Mathematics is generated.

It is generated through finite symbolic trajectories, constrained by representation, rule-use, measurement, memory, and communal stabilisation. It is not arbitrary invention because the trajectories must hold together. They must remain repeatable, transmissible, checkable, and often useful in relation to measurement. But it is not simply discovery of completed objects floating outside representation. Mathematical objects must become symbols before they can be used.

Thus mathematics may be written:

$$\mathcal{M} \sim \{T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_n\} \mid (\alpha, \delta, H, C, B, K),$$

where $\mathcal{M}$ is not a timeless kingdom of objects, but a stabilised family of functional symbolic trajectories.

Classical mathematics appears when δ, α, H, B, and K are suppressed or treated as irrelevant. FSM remembers them.

1.7 Logic as constrained symbolic flow

Alpha Logic began from the claim that measurement precedes logic. This can now be restated in the language of functional symbolic trajectories.

Thesis: Logic as constrained symbolic flow

> Logic is not the foundation of language. Logic is a stabilised operation within finite symbolic language. In this framing, logic is the study of constrained symbolic flow.

The logical conditional is a useful example. Classically, one writes

$$P \to Q.$$

In FSM this becomes

$$P \longrightarrow Q \mid (C, \alpha, H, \delta).$$

This expression does not merely say that P implies Q in a timeless formal space. It says that the symbolic trajectory from P to Q is admissible under a consensus constraint C, an Alphonic limit α, a provenance layer H, and uncertainty δ.

The implication is therefore not primitive. It is a compressed record of a permitted transition.

This is close to what Alpha Logic was already attempting. It treated logic as a compression of measured flow. Repeated measurement stabilises patterns of transition. Once a transition becomes sufficiently stable, language compresses it into “if A, then B”.

In FST terms:

$$T_A \to T_B$$

is admissible only when the transition from T_A to T_B is stable under the relevant conditions.

Thus logic becomes the study of constrained symbolic flow.

Identity also changes. Classically:

$$A = A.$$

In FSM:

$$A \sim A \mid (\alpha, \delta, H, C, B).$$

This does not deny identity. It says that identity is maintained within a finite tolerance and representation history. A symbol remains itself because the conditions of distinction remain stable enough for the intended operation.

Non-contradiction also changes. Classically, one writes:

$$\neg(P \wedge \neg P).$$

In FSM, contradiction is not merely a formal impossibility. It is a collapse of admissibility when incompatible symbolic trajectories are assigned to the same region of representation under the same conditions.

We might write:

$$\neg(P \wedge \neg P) \mid \text{Stable}(T_P, \alpha, \delta, H, C, B).$$

The rule is powerful, but it depends on the stability of T_P. If P is not yet stabilised, contradiction may not be the right diagnosis. The symbolic trajectory may simply be under-formed, ambiguous, or crossing incompatible basins of meaning.

1.8 The Principle of Excluded Middle

The Principle of Excluded Middle is usually written:

$$P \vee \neg P.$$

In classical mathematics this is treated as a general law. A proposition is either true or false. There is no third possibility.

Hilbert defended the unrestricted use of such formal principles because they are central to the power and mobility of classical mathematics. They allow proof by contradiction, non-constructive existence proofs, and reasoning over completed mathematical domains. Without them, many familiar routes from A to B become unavailable.

Brouwer objected because the unrestricted use of PEM over infinite domains allows language to assert a completed decision where no construction has been given. For Brouwer, one cannot simply say "P or not-P" unless one has a construction of P or a construction that P cannot hold.

FSM reframes the dispute.

The question is not simply whether PEM is true or false. The prior question is whether P has become an admissible symbolic trajectory.

Let

$$P \sim T_P \mid (\alpha, \delta, H, C, B).$$

Then FSM may write the admissible form of PEM as:

$$\mathrm{PEM}(P) \sim (P \vee \neg P) \mid \mathrm{Adm}(T_P; \alpha, \delta, H, C, B).$$

This means:

> PEM may operate when P is sufficiently stabilised as a finite symbolic trajectory under the relevant conditions of representation, uncertainty, provenance, consensus, and base.

This is not a rejection of PEM. It is a relocation of PEM.

PEM is no longer treated as the first ground of logic. It becomes a late-stage rule that applies after symbolic formation.

For finite, well-formed, decidable cases, PEM may remain fully admissible. If one has a finite set and a well-defined property, then each member may be tested within the accepted symbolic architecture. In such a domain, Hilbert's pragmatism is justified.

But for uncompleted infinite domains, or for symbolic trajectories whose meaning has not stabilised, PEM may outrun admissibility. In such cases, Brouwer's caution is justified.

FSM therefore holds Hilbert and Brouwer together.

Hilbert saw that mathematics requires formal mobility.

Brouwer saw that formal mobility without constructed route may become unjustified.

FSM adds that both positions depend on a prior representational machine.

1.9 Brouwer's construction as serial symbolic measurement

Brouwer did not provide a single modern formal definition of "construction" in the way later logicians or computer scientists might expect. His construction was rooted in the activity of the mind and in the intuition of temporal succession. Mathematics was something made, not merely discovered in a completed external realm. Logic did not come first. Mathematics came first, and logic was a reflection of mathematical activity.

From a modern FSM perspective, Brouwer can be reread as speaking about serial symbolic measurement.

A construction is not merely an object. It is a temporally ordered process. One step follows another. The route matters. The proof is not just a final statement but a lived sequence of symbolic acts.

We may write a Brouwerian construction as:

$$K_P \sim \langle k_0, k_1, \ldots, k_n \rangle \mid (t, H, \delta, C),$$

where K_P is the construction of P, the k_i are construction stages, t denotes temporal ordering, H denotes provenance, δ denotes uncertainty, and C denotes admissibility.

This allows FSM to translate Brouwer's insight into modern language:

Brouwerian construction in FSM language

> A construction is a finite symbolic trajectory with serial provenance.

This is close to the language of time series. Each step is not merely a static mark but a measured symbolic state in a sequence. The construction has memory. It has path-dependence. It has an order. It may be inspected, reconstructed, and compared.

In this sense, Brouwer was reaching toward dynamics without the formal language of dynamics. He knew that completed infinity could not simply be held as a finished object. He knew that unrestricted formal assertion could outrun construction. He knew that mathematical meaning was not exhausted by symbol manipulation.

But he did not possess a public formal model of language as a symbolic phase space.

FSM supplies one possible modern continuation.

Let a mathematical text be treated as an observed one-dimensional symbolic signal:

$$S = (s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n).$$

The hidden semantic state is not directly visible. It must be reconstructed from the sequence. In modern terms, one may think of the symbolic sequence as a time series from a larger semantic system. The task of reading, proving, and understanding is then a form of phase-space reconstruction:

$$\mathcal{E}(S) \sim \{(s_i, s_{i+\tau}, s_{i+2\tau}, \dots, s_{i+(m-1)\tau})\}.$$

Here $\mathcal{E}(S)$ denotes an embedding or reconstruction of the symbolic trajectory from delayed or relational coordinates. The parameters τ and m represent delay and embedding dimension in the analogy. In language, these are not merely numerical choices but represent the depth of contextual reconstruction needed to stabilise meaning.

This formulation allows us to see Brouwer differently. His "construction" is not vague if we place it inside a theory of serial symbolic generation. It becomes a requirement that the route through semantic phase space be traversable.

Brouwer objected to logical closure where the trajectory had not been constructed.

FSM agrees, but moves the issue from private mental intuition into public finite symbolic representation.

1.10 Hilbert's formalism as stabilised symbolic machinery

Hilbert's position remains powerful. Mathematics did not become successful by waiting for every object to be constructed in Brouwer's sense. It became successful because formal systems allow stable operations across vast symbolic territories.

Hilbert's programme may be written as the attempt to define a formal system $\mathcal{F}$ such that mathematical statements can be represented as strings, proofs can be represented as finite derivations, and consistency can be shown using restricted methods.

In simple notation:

$$\mathcal{F} = (\Sigma, R, A),$$

where Σ is a symbol alphabet, R is a set of rules, and A is a set of axioms.

A proof in $\mathcal{F}$ becomes:

$$\Pi_{\mathcal{F}}(P) = (l_0, l_1, \dots, l_n),$$

where each line follows from previous lines by rules in R, and the final line is P.

FSM translates this as:

$$\Pi_{\mathcal{F}}(P) \sim T_{\Pi} \mid (\alpha, \delta, H, C, B, K).$$

Hilbert's great achievement was to make the syntactic pathway visible. He brought proof down into inspectable symbolic form. This was already a move toward finite symbolic trajectories, although Hilbert did not frame it that way.

Where FSM diverges is in refusing to let the formal string become disembodied. Even the formal system has representation conditions. Its alphabet must be instantiated. Its rules must be read. Its proof must be checked. Its consistency proof must itself be expressed as a symbolic trajectory.

Hilbert wanted mathematics to be secured by finitary means. In FSM, that impulse is deeply sympathetic. But the finitary must include the finite nature of symbolisation itself. Finitary reasoning cannot merely be a trusted meta-level while the representational ground is ignored. The formal machine must also be measured as a finite symbolic machine. Hilbert was right that mathematics needs formal mobility. FSM adds that formal mobility has cost, provenance, base, and uncertainty.

1.11 Russell and the lesson of self-reference

Russell's paradox remains one of the clearest demonstrations that symbolic language can generate false stability.

The expression "the set of all sets that do not contain themselves" feels meaningful. It follows ordinary grammatical patterns. It appears to identify an object. Yet when used without restriction, it generates contradiction. From an FSM viewpoint, Russell's paradox is not merely a problem in set theory. It is a symbolic trajectory that has been admitted too early. The phrase has the surface form of a valid mathematical object, but its trajectory is not admissible under unrestricted self-application.

Let R be the Russell set:

$$R = \{x : x \notin x\}.$$

The paradox arises when asking:

$$R \in R?$$

In FSM notation, the problem is that the trajectory

$$T_R \sim \langle \text{set formation} \to \text{self-application} \to \text{membership decision} \rangle$$

does not remain admissible under the same symbolic conditions that generated it. The path loops into an unstable region.

Russell's type theory can therefore be viewed as a constraint on symbolic trajectories. It prevents certain transitions between levels of representation. A symbol cannot freely operate over a totality that includes itself unless the system has explicit rules for such recursion.

This makes Russell a crucial predecessor to FSM. He saw that language could not be allowed to generate mathematical objects without layered constraint. But he still sought salvation through logic. FSM treats the issue more generally as a problem of symbolic trajectory admissibility.

1.12 The Dirichlet stress test: classification before measurement

The Dirichlet function provides a useful later example of the same issue in analysis.

Classically, the Dirichlet function is defined by:

$$D(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & x \in \mathbb{Q}, \\ 0, & x \notin \mathbb{Q}. \end{cases}$$

This is a perfectly valid classical function. It is precise within the completed real-number framework. Every real number is either rational or irrational. The Principle of Excluded Middle is built into the classification.

But FSM asks a different question:

What must already be assumed before $x \in \mathbb{Q}$ or $x \notin \mathbb{Q}$ is admissible?

A measured number does not arrive as a completed real number. It arrives as a finite symbol in a base, with finite resolution and provenance. A decimal string, binary string, hexadecimal string, or base-12 string is not a neutral window onto the same object. It is a representation architecture. The base matters. The symbolic trajectory changes.

Let a measured symbol be written:

$$x_B^{(n)} \sim \text{finite representation of } x \text{ in base } B \text{ to } n \text{ places.}$$

Classically, one may imagine that this symbol points toward a completed real number x, and then ask whether x is rational or irrational. But FSM does not begin with the completed object. It begins with the finite representation:

$$x_B^{(n)} \sim T_x \mid (\alpha, \delta, H, C, B).$$

The rational or irrational classification may be admissible if the generating process is known. For example, $x = 1/3$ has a rational construction even if its decimal representation does not terminate. But a finite measured string alone does not decide rationality or irrationality. The classification depends on provenance.

This exposes the hidden role of PEM in classical analysis:

$$x \in \mathbb{Q} \vee x \notin \mathbb{Q}.$$

FSM rewrites this as:

$$(x \in \mathbb{Q} \vee x \notin \mathbb{Q}) \mid \mathrm{Adm}(T_x; \alpha, \delta, H, C, B).$$

Again, the issue is not that classical mathematics is wrong. Within its basin, the Dirichlet function is valid and useful. It teaches us something important about continuity, density, and measure. But from the FSM side, it also teaches something else. It shows how easily mathematics can classify imagined completed points that no measurement could deliver as completed objects.

Classical mathematics begins with classification.

FSM begins with instantiation.

1.13 Base and trajectory

The role of base is not cosmetic in FSM. A base is not merely a different costume for the same underlying number. It changes the symbolic route by which the number is represented, transformed, compared, and stabilised.

Classically, one may write:

$$10_{10} = A_{16}.$$

FSM writes:

$$10_{10} \sim A_{16} \mid (\alpha, \delta, H, C, B_{10}, B_{16}).$$

The two symbols may be admitted as representing the same intended numerical value under a translation rule. But they are not the same symbolic trajectory. Their marks differ. Their compression differs. Their digit geometry differs. Their operational affordances differ. Their relation must be maintained by a conversion pathway.

Let s_B denote a symbol in base B. Then

$$T(s_B) \not\equiv T(s_{B'})$$

even where

$$s_B \sim s_{B'}.$$

This is important for the larger argument. If bases create different trajectories, then mathematical meaning is not separable from representation. The old assumption that notation is merely a transparent carrier must be weakened. Notation participates in the construction of the symbolic path. This does not mean that mathematics collapses into arbitrary notation. It means that representation has geometry. A symbolic system has shape, cost, compression, and directionality.

In Geofinitism and FSM, this becomes central. A base is a coordinate system for finite symbolic movement. Hilbert's formalism depends on such coordinate systems. Brouwer's constructions also depend on them when communicated. Russell's type restrictions are coordinate restrictions on symbolic self-reference. All formal systems are representational architectures.

1.14 Measuring proof: the clay analogy

Even classical mathematics must be measured exogenously. This may sound strange at first because proofs are usually treated as internal mathematical objects. But in practice a proof must be inspected. We read it. We compare one line to another. We check whether the rule has been followed. We verify that a symbol has not changed role midway. We ensure that a definition is being used consistently. We notice whether a quantifier has shifted scope. We detect whether a variable is bound or free.

What we have to remember, is that both "endogenous and exogenous" measurements are still symbolic trajectories. Text within text. A story within a story, a game within a game. And importantly, this is inescapable. Exogenous does not mean outside of text is simply means it is connected to what a dynamical process where a transducer takes something from the non symbolic world and converts it into a word asa a "transfictor" via a finite process that in Geofinitism is given the handle of "Generon" and dynamically is "generonic".

This is measurement.

The analogy with marks in clay is useful because it removes the illusion of disembodied certainty. Ancient marks in clay could be counted, compared, preserved, misread, copied, or broken. Modern mathematics uses finer marks, but it still uses marks. Ink, chalk, pixels, sound, silicon, and memory are all finite media. A proof is therefore not a pure object floating above the world. It is a finite symbolic artefact whose stability is measured through repeated comparison.

Formally, proof-checking may be written:

$\mathrm{F}(\Pi, P) \sim \mathrm{Adm} \mid (\alpha, \delta, H, C, B, K)$.

The output is not classical equality with Truth itself. It is an admissibility relation within a formal and representational system. When the uncertainty is negligible, the proof is simply accepted as valid. This is how mathematics works in practice. FSM does not deny this. It makes the hidden conditions explicit. The "proof" remains powerful. It becomes more honest.

1.15 Bridging Alpha Logic and Functional Symbolic Trajectories

Alpha Logic was an earlier attempt to formulate logic within FSM. It began from observable interaction, finite measurement, uncertainty, cost of distinction, and the claim that measurement precedes logic. It already contained the essential reversal. What was missing was the mature phrase **functional symbolic trajectory**.

Alpha Logic saw that logic compresses measured flow. Functional symbolic trajectory now gives the language for how that compression moves through words, symbols, proofs, and models. The relationship may be stated as follows:

Relation between Alpha Logic and FST

> Alpha Logic is the first operational attempt to construct a finite logic. Functional Symbolic Trajectory is the broader dynamical account of what logical and mathematical statements are.

In Alpha Logic, the conditional “if A, then B” emerges from repeated measurement of transition. In FST language, this means that the trajectory from A to B has become stable enough to be compressed into a rule.

Thus:

$$A \to B$$

becomes:

$$T_A \to T_B \mid (C, \alpha, H, \delta).$$

Here the logical arrow is not primitive. It is a compressed transition.

This formulation also clarifies how logic pluralism enters FSM. If language supports multiple stable symbolic basins, then multiple logics may exist as different admissibility structures over symbolic trajectories. Classical logic, intuitionistic logic, modal logic, paraconsistent logic, fuzzy logic, and other systems become local rule architectures. They are not meaningless. They are not all equivalent. They are stabilised symbolic machines with different commitments and different domains of use.

FSM does not need to choose between Hilbert and Brouwer as if only one can be right. Hilbert's logic is a high-mobility formal trajectory. Brouwer's logic is a construction-constrained trajectory. And as we have developed here, FSM is the representational frame in which both can be examined.

1.16 The modern language they did not have

It is important to be fair to the historical figures. Hilbert and Brouwer did not fail because they lacked intelligence or seriousness. Quite the opposite. They pushed the available symbolic tools to their limits. However the twentieth century had not yet developed the language now available to us. They did not have practical computation as a universal cultural object.

- They did not have proof assistants.

- They did not have digital representation theory in the everyday sense.

- They did not have information theory.

- They did not have nonlinear dynamics as a general language of trajectories and attractors.

- They did not have semantic embedding spaces.

- They did not have transformer models showing how token sequences can support high-dimensional relational reconstruction.

- They did not have a working analogy between language and phase-space reconstruction.

- They did not have a theory of functional symbolic trajectories.

Had they possessed such language, the debate might have taken a different path. Hilbert might still have defended formal systems, but he may have described them as finite symbolic machines whose power depends on stable trajectories and controlled uncertainty. Brouwer might still have resisted completed infinity, but he may have described construction as serial symbolic measurement with provenance rather than as a private act of mental intuition. And Russell might still have restricted self-reference, but he may have described type theory as a constraint on symbolic trajectory recursion rather than only as a logical hierarchy. The foundational question might then have become:

> What representational conditions make a mathematical trajectory admissible?

rather than:

> Which logic is ultimate?

This does not mean FSM would have replaced the historical programmes. It means the available coordinate system would have changed. Different words allow different paths. Different symbolic bases generate different trajectories. The history of mathematics might have flowed through a different channel.

1.17 Hilbert and Brouwer reconciled through FSM

We can now return directly to Hilbert and Brouwer.

Hilbert's commitment:

> Mathematics needs formal rules. Without them, its machinery loses power. The formal system allows movement from A to B even when direct construction is unavailable. The Principle of Excluded Middle is one such tool. To remove it is to cripple classical mathematics.

Brouwer's commitment:

> Mathematics must not assert more than has been constructed. A formal route that crosses an unconstructed infinite domain may be linguistically permitted but mathematically unjustified. The Principle of Excluded Middle is valid only where a decision procedure or construction is available.

FSM's commitment:

> Both positions depend on finite symbolic representation. A proposition, proof, construction, or formal rule must first become a functional symbolic trajectory. Only then can logic act upon it.

Thus FSM may write:

$$\text{Hilbert} \sim \text{FormalMobility}(\mathcal{F}),$$

$$\text{Brouwer} \sim \text{ConstructedProvenance}(K),$$

$$\text{FSM} \sim \text{AdmissibleSymbolicTrajectory}(T).$$

More explicitly:

$$\text{FormalProof}_{\mathcal{F}}(P) \sim T_{\Pi},$$

$$\text{Construction}(P) \sim K_P,$$

$$P \sim T_P \mid (\alpha, \delta, H, C, B, K).$$

Hilbert emphasises T_{Π}, the formal proof trajectory and Brouwer emphasises K_P, the construction trajectory. Where as FSM emphasises the prior representational conditions under which either trajectory can be admitted.

This gives a bridge rather than a battlefield. Hilbert is not simply wrong and Brouwer is not simply right. Hilbert preserves a vast and effective symbolic machine. Brouwer correctly identifies that symbolic permission can outrun constructed meaning. FSM says that the deeper issue is the admissibility of the symbolic trajectory itself.

1.18 Conclusion: the missing axiom and the next foundation

The early twentieth-century foundations debate was often framed as a conflict between logicism, formalism, and intuitionism. Russell tried to ground mathematics in logic while avoiding paradox. Hilbert tried to secure mathematics through formal systems and consistency proofs. Brouwer tried to restore mathematics to construction and resisted unrestricted classical logic, especially over infinity. Each project saw part of the same difficulty.

- Russell saw that language could generate contradiction.

- Hilbert saw that mathematics required formal stabilisation.

- Brouwer saw that formal assertion could outrun construction.

FSM adds that all three were working inside symbolic language without a formal model of symbolic language itself.

The Missing Axiom

The missing axiom is the Axiom of Finite Representation. Every mathematical symbol must be instantiated in a finite medium. Every proof is a finite symbolic trajectory. Every proposition must be formed before it can be evaluated. Every logical rule acts on represented symbols. Every use of infinity is carried by finite marks. Every base, notation, and language shapes the trajectory it carries.

The sign $\sim$ is therefore not a minor notation. It is a reminder that mathematics, when measured or instantiated, is carried through finite symbolic relation. It is not approximate in the casual sense. It is finitely held.

This changes the placement of logic. Logic does not disappear. Logic becomes downstream of symbolic trajectory. The Principle of Excluded Middle is not abolished. It is made conditional upon the admissibility of P as a stabilised finite symbolic trajectory.

Construction is not dismissed. It is reframed as serial symbolic measurement with provenance. Formal proof is not weakened. It is recognised as a finite symbolic path whose stability can be checked.

Mathematics is not merely discovered or invented. It is generated through finite symbolic trajectories that become stable enough to be reused, transmitted, and trusted.

Had Hilbert, Brouwer, and Russell possessed this language, they may have drawn different lines. Hilbert may have seen formalism as one powerful symbolic machine rather than the final security of mathematics. Brouwer may have formalised construction as temporal symbolic provenance rather than grounding it in private intuition. Russell may have understood paradox as trajectory failure in self-referential symbolic flow. The twentieth century might then have developed not only formal logic, but a wider science of admissible symbolic trajectories. FSM begins from that possibility. It does not retire the old cathedral. Rather, it remembers the ink, measures the stones, and asks how the path was built.

Notes and references

This chapter is intended as a working synthesis. It draws on the current FSM and Geofinitism vocabulary, especially the Axiom of Finite Representation, Alpha or Alphonic Logic, functional symbolic trajectories, the Alphonic limit, admissibility, provenance, base-dependence, and the use of $\sim$ as a marker of finite symbolic relation rather than approximation.

Bibliography

[1] Irvine, A. D. and Deutsch, H. "Russell's Paradox". *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Available at: https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/russell-paradox/.

[2] Irvine, A. D. "Principia Mathematica". *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Available at: https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/principia-mathematica/.

[3] Zach, R. "Hilbert's Program". *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Available at: https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/hilbert-program/.

[4] Moschovakis, J. "Intuitionistic Logic". *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Available at: https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/logic-intuitionistic/.

[5] Iemhoff, R. "Intuitionism in the Philosophy of Mathematics". *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Available at: https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/intuitionism/.

[6] Brouwer, L. E. J. "Intuitionism and Formalism". *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 1913.

[7] Hilbert, D. "On the Infinite". 1925. English translations appear in collections of Hilbert's foundational writings.

[8] Haylett, K. R. "The Axiom of Finite Representation". Medium. Available at: https://medium.com/@kevin.haylett/the-axiom-of-finite-representation-bdd33ca5626f.

[9] Haylett, K. R. "Alphonic Logic". Available at: https://www.finitemechanics.com/essays/ATT_27_alphonic_logic.pdf.

[10] Takens, F. "Detecting strange attractors in turbulence". In D. A. Rand and L.-S. Young, editors, *Dynamical Systems and Turbulence*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 898, Springer, 1981.

[11] Plevris, V. "The Function That Is Broken Everywhere: How Dirichlet Changed What Mathematicians Thought a Function Could Be". Medium, 2026. Cited here as a contemporary exposition of the Dirichlet function and its role as a stress-test for function, continuity, and classification.