

## Re: Eternal Verities

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2004-10/1017.html>

---

**From:** patty (*pattyNO\_at\_SPAMicyberspace.net*)

**Date:** 10/23/04

Date: Sat, 23 Oct 2004 16:30:46 GMT

Lester Zick wrote:

> *Eternal Verities*

> -----

>

> *Lester's opinion –*

>

> *Everything is differences because alternatives are self contradictory*

> *since anything different from differences is an oxymoron.*

>

> *patty's opinion –*

>

> *Lester's opinion is wrong because philosophers don't like tautologies*

> *and patty isn't nearly as stupid as this argument suggests.*

>

What is gained and what is lost why someone misstates another's position?

To set the record straight: Lester's assertion is not wrong because it is a tautology; rather it is just inconsequential.

Let's code Lester's statement as a logical predicate to see what i am talking about:

(forevery X) (X isa difference)

or perhaps we could try another word:

(forevery X) (X isa Thing)

or maybe the one used in RDF:

(forevery X) (X isa Resource)

In fact what we put at the top of any ontology tree is just a token that fits into that axiom of class theory. Now does Lester see why his statement is of no consequence ? Nope, he will not comprehend this.

patty

Re: Eternal Verities