

Re: Eternal Verities

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2004-10/1019.html>

From: Lester Zick (*lesterDELzick_at_worldnet.att.net*)

Date: 10/23/04

Date: Sat, 23 Oct 2004 17:49:07 GMT

On Sat, 23 Oct 2004 16:30:46 GMT, patty <pattyNO@SPAMicyberspace.net> in comp.ai.philosophy wrote:

>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?*

What is gained and what is lost when someone misstates her own position? Same answer I expect.

>*To set the record straight: Lester's assertion is not wrong because it*

>*is a tautology; rather it is just inconsequential.*

patty restates another position. patty would have been better off taking the less than one sentence option for this little mystery exposition.

>*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.*

Or you could just try to code your own position as a logical predicate to see what you mean and why no one comprehends what you mean.

Regards – Lester