

Re: Contradiction or paradox

Re: Contradiction or paradox

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2007-05/msg00424.html>

- *From:* David C. Ullrich <ullrich@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 20 May 2007 06:07:58 -0500
-

On 19 May 2007 15:27:59 -0700, Charlie-Boo <shymathguy@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

On May 19, 4:55 am, David C. Ullrich <ullr...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On 18 May 2007 15:28:12 -0700, MoeBlee <jazzm...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On May 18, 2:39 pm, Charlie-Boo <shymath...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

On May 18, 5:29 pm, MoeBlee <jazzm...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On May 18, 12:43 pm,
Charlie-Boo
<shymath...@xxxxxxxx>
wrote:

On May 18,
1:13 pm,
MoeBlee
<jazzm...@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

On
May

Re: Contradiction or paradox

18,
4:12
am,
Charlie-Boo
<shymath...@xxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

On
May
17,
11:19
pm,
MoeBlee
<jazzm...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

Your
mindless
and
irresponsible
claims
about
Norm
Megill's
system
is
another
example.

If
you
want
to
debate
that
system,
it
would
help
to
start
a
new
thread.
He
uses
an

Re: Contradiction or paradox

expression
like
 $xRy(Rz)=(xRy)Rz$
and
substitutes
+
for
R
but
there
is
nothing
at
that
point
about
+
or
-
so
-
could
equally
well
be
substituted
for
R.

Silly
boy,
there
is
an
hypothesis
of
that
theorem
that
you
have
not
shown
is
satisfied
by
subtraction.
That
has

Re: Contradiction or paradox

been
pointed
out
to
you
already
by
a
few
other
posters.

See, I repeat, you have not
shown that subtraction
satisfies the
hypotheses.

I repeat, you have not shown that subtraction satisfies the
hypothesis.

Of course he hasn't. And of course he's going to ignore this point
regardless of how many times you repeat it – that's the standard
in CB-speak regarding simple refutations of things he says: If
he simply ignores the refutation then he's free to come back a
few months later and state that no such refutation exists.

What was that word? Right, "irresponsible". Yes, his claims
about Megill's thingie have certainly been irresponsible,
since he's _repeating_ false claims, in particular that
there's no difference between + and – above, in spite of
the fact that the difference _was_ very clearly explained
to him _last_ time.

You provide nothing. You prove nothing. You substantiate nothing.

Giggle. The "substantiation" for everything I said is right
here in this thread (ok, a web browser is also required to
verify that what Moeblee says about the Megill site is
actually correct.)

There
is

Re: Contradiction or paradox

Re: Contradiction or paradox

also
the
general
question
of
what
ZFC
alone
can
prove
and
what
he
says
regarding
that
question
and
what
his
site
shows.

You
don't
know
what
ZFC
is.

Published
papers don't
even agree
as to what
ZFC is. But
I know
exactly
what it is.
What is it?
Then I'll
say. It has
to do with
Computationally
Based
Logics.

There are various
formulations of formal ZFC,
but they are not so

Re: Contradiction or paradox

dissimilar that a general definition can't be given. And what you know exactly is what you BELIEVE ZFC to be. From your postings in the thread that discussed ZFC proving general results in mathematics, it's clear that you don't know what ZFC is.

Then what is it? Formally.

The set of sentences entailed by classical first order logic with identity (with the language whose only non-logical symbols are the 2-place predicate symbols '=' and 'e') and the non-logical axioms: extensionality, union, power set, infinity, regularity, schema of replacement (as formulated*), and choice.

*

If P is a formula and v does not occur free in P and w does not occur free in P and v is free for y in P and w is free for y in P and b does not occur free in P, then all closures of the following are axioms

$\forall x \forall y \forall z ((P[x/y] \ \& \ P[z/y]) \rightarrow x=z) \rightarrow \exists b \forall y (y \in b \leftrightarrow \exists x P(x))$.

MoeBlee

Re: Contradiction or paradox

David C. Ullrich– Hide quoted text –

– Show quoted text — Hide quoted text –

– Show quoted text –

David C. Ullrich

.