

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/msg00043.html>

---

- *From:* "William of Ockham" <d3uckner@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* 1 Jun 2006 23:00:45 -0700
- 

david petry wrote:

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.

Then of course you win the argument, if you are allowed to define the terms of the conclusion in any way you wish. What if I object that this is not what 'meaningful' means?

.