

# Re: Why? [was Re: Cantor`s powerset theorem is false?]

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2006-06/msg00036.html>

---

- *From:* "david petry" <[david\\_lawrence\\_petry@xxxxxxxxx](mailto:david_lawrence_petry@xxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 1 Jun 2006 13:10:04 -0700
- 

William of Ockham wrote:

david petry wrote:

What I have been suggesting is that mathematics can be viewed as a science which makes falsifiable predictions. You are certainly free to speculate about the existence of things lying beyond the world we observe, but, importantly, you really have no right to demand that I or anyone else accept your insights about such things.

I am not demanding that anyone accept any insight. The question is, why we should accept your speculation that only falsifiable predictions are meaningful. How do you know this is true? What evidence is it based on? How would I falsify it?

If we are going to communicate, we have to agree on the ground rules. What I have been arguing for are things that I consider to be part of the ground rules essential for communication. The idea that only falsifiable predictions are meaningful is definitional. As I see it, if you argue against that, you are merely playing word games.

.