

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/msg00070.html>

- *From:* "david petry" <david_lawrence_petry@xxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 2 Jun 2006 15:06:23 -0700
-

William of Ockham wrote:

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?

Then I would ask you to explain how you know that that is not what "meaningful" means. And I'd want to know what your motivation in this silly argument is. And just for kicks, could you try to answer those questions?