

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

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2006-06/msg00077.html>

- *From:* "William of Ockham" <d3uckner@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 3 Jun 2006 00:04:40 -0700
-

david petry wrote:

And I'd want to know what your motivation in this silly argument is.

It's not a silly argument. You have made a very sweeping claim (namely that only verifiable statements are meaningful). Your whole argument depends on this, so the onus is on you to show it is correct (and not on me to show it is not correct). Moreover, if your claim is true, it rules out as sorts of statements that theologians, logicians, mathematicians, philosophers, metaphysicians believe are meaningful.

So the onus really is on you to give some evidence or proof of your claim (i.e. that only verifiable statements are meaningful).

Perhaps you have heard of something called "verificationism"? That was a similar idea to yours, made in the 1920's. The idea soon collapsed, at least in its crude form. The most obvious objection is it that it involves an initial falsehood: before I can think of possible ways of verifying a given statement, I must know first what it means. Some other problems with the theory are

- * Explaining statements about the past.
- * Explaining statements about the future. (Please don't confuse the issue of whether a statement is true or false, with the issue of whether it is meaningful).
- * All general propositions (i.e. of the form all A's are B's).
- * Statements about infinity

.