

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

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

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2006-06/msg00038.html>

- *From:* "david petry" <david_lawrence_petry@xxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 1 Jun 2006 14:24:41 -0700
-

William of Ockham wrote:

david petry wrote:

david petry wrote:

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.

So by definition, only falsifiable predictions are meaningful. Is this a definition of the word 'meaningful'?

From a scientific point of view, yes, it's part of the definition.