

Re: An argument against modus ponens

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2008-09/msg00289.html>

- *From:* george <greeneg@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 10 Sep 2008 10:21:41 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Sep 9, 2:41 pm, John Jones <jonescard...@xxxxxxx> wrote:

For example, red is found in the context of colour and not sound; physical objects are found in the framework/context of space which allows differences to be manifested. So without the framework of colour no particular colour can be represented. Without the framework for P, neither P nor not-P can be represented.

WE KNOW the framework for P.

P is a boolean variable.

Or a propositional variable.

It can be true or false.

Or, if you decide to make it an axiom,

then it can be a propositional constant, and be true.

But P is NOT "represented". It's not even the KIND of thing that can be

"represented". The context may also have P standing for a longer proposition made out of sub-propositions with other names or representations.

THAT IS the framework.

The fact that you didn't ALREADY know that is one of many things that has made you unfit to participate in the discussion.

If you follow that

Of COURSE WE follow it! You are the one who does not follow it!

then what I was saying was that 'not-P' can only mean R or the absence of the framework for the possibility of P.

It means nothing of the kind. It simply means the other truth-value, the one that P DOESN'T have.

P can have either but it can't have BOTH.

.