

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

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2006-06/msg00203.html>

---

- *From:* "george" <[greeneg@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:greeneg@xxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 8 Jun 2006 11:35:27 -0700
- 

georgie wrote:

The context of my statement was a response to a discussion about the how meaningful things are.

Well, the falsifiability criterion was more from science than math. As has already been pointed out, existentials are hard to falsify and universals hard to verify. As should be obvious, as a general rule, if "x" is meaningful then "not x" is equally meaningful, since the meaning of "not" is well-known. But one of them will be falsifiable and the other will not, in a logical context, so that guideline doesn't work as well here.

In science, however, it still works; it sort of admonishes you that you should ALWAYS be looking FOR general laws (universals) and AVOIDING even hypothesizing the existence of particular individual things that aren't "proven" from what you already have. It's sort of like Occam's razor. In other words, the scientific position (as opposed to the religious one) is that nothing that we have thus far observed qualifies as a supreme being. You can take that as a tenet of a scientific theory on the grounds that if such a being exists, it is perfectly capable of falsifying it in a way that we can understand.

Meaning in the logical context arguably comes from proofs. Theorems have meaning. Everything else arguably doesn't, simply because it could have the opposite truth-value in a different model.

.