

Re: An argument against modus ponens

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2008-09/msg00471.html>

- *From:* John Jones <jonescardiff@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 20 Sep 2008 04:01:13 +0100
-

george wrote:

george wrote:

I said *IN LOGIC*, DUMBASS.

On Sep 17, 5:36 pm, John Jones <jonescardiff@xxxxxxx> wrote:

No, it makes no difference whether objects are in or out of logic,

No, obviously, it DOES make a difference.

If we were talking about knights, rooks, and pawns, it would make A VERY

big difference whether our framework was chess OR SOMETHING ELSE, the point being that all of these words MEAN SOMETHING DIFFERENT OUTside

of the chess context FROM what they mean inside it.

Doesn't work George. The problem is an old one, but not often talked about. It's this. What do you identify by the term 'word' in 'these words'. Put another way, what exactly is this thing that can be different things?

X, or

banana-matuzi-wallop land. They don't have properties.

In logic, they do.

THAT IMPLIES that THESE objects ARE being presented
IN A FRAMEWORK
OF LOGIC,

No it doesn't imply anything.

Re: An argument against modus ponens

IT DOES SO TOO.

IF *I* SAY THAT *I* AM presenting these objects in a logical
framework, then that's

how *I'M* presenting them and there isn't SHIT THAT YOU OR ANYBODY
ELSE CAN
do about it.

You may of course choose to reject the framework, but then, there is
simply

nothing to talk about, ESPECIALLY if the framework IS LOGIC and the
SIGN ON

THE DOOR TO THE ROOM *SAYS* sci.LOGIC.