

Re: Epistemology 201: The Science of Science

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-02/5106.html>

From: aeo6 (aeo6_at_cornell.edu)

Date: 02/14/05

Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 10:07:09 -0500

Lester Zick said:

> *On Fri, 11 Feb 2005 10:25:06 -0500, Tony Orlow (aeo6)*

> *<aeo6@cornell.edu> in comp.ai.philosophy wrote:*

>

> *> Lester Zick said:*

> *>> On 10 Feb 2005 18:29:10 GMT, stephen@nomail.com in comp.ai.philosophy*

> *>> wrote:*

> *>>>*

> *>>> In sci.math Albert <albertwagner@cox.net> wrote:*

> *>>> : stephen@nomail.com wrote:*

> *>>> :> In sci.math Albert <albertwagner@cox.net> wrote:*

> *>>> :> : stephen@nomail.com wrote:*

> *>>> :> : <snip>*

> *>>> :> :> Not according to the definition of cardinality. Cardinality is well*

> *>>> :> :> defined, and it logically follows that $|A + B|$ can equal $|A|$ even*

> *>>> :> :> when $|B| \neq 0$. You are not appealing to logic, but to intuition.*

> *>>> :> :> What does your intuition think infinity+1 equals?*

> *>>> :> :*

> *>>> :> : Appealing to illogic is not more correct than an appeal to intuition.*

> *>>> :> :*

> *>>> :> : <snip>*

> *>>> :> :*

> *>>> :> :> What appeal to illogic? Cardinality is well defined. It*

> *>>> :> :> logically follows from that definition that $|A+B|$ can equal $|A|$*

> *>>> :> :> even when $|B| \neq 0$. Point to an error in the logic.*

> *>>> >*

> *>>> :> : Show me the logic from which the definition follows.*

> *>>> >*

> *>>> > Two sets have the same cardinality if there exists a bijection*

> *>>> > between them. That is the definition. Like most definitions,*

> *>>> > it is just assigning a name to a longer concept. Can you*

> *>>> > give me an example of a definition that logically follows*

> *>>> > from something? I cannot think of any examples in math or logic.*

> *>>>*

> *>>> The universal truth of contradiction is defined by the self*

> *>>> contradictory nature of alternatives to contradiction.*

> *>>>*

> *>>> Regards – Lester*

> >>

> > *Does consistency, as an alternative to contradiction, contradict itself?*

> > *How is consistency self-contradictory?*

>

> *Well, consistency is defined by the absence of contradiction, Tony.*

> *It's the result of contradiction and not an alternative.*

Cosistency is the absence of contradiction.

> *It can't*

> *contradict itself because the absence of something can't contradict*

> *anything any more than the addition of zero can change magnitude.*

The absence of something contradicts the presence of it.

>

> *Regards – Lester*

>

--

Smiles,
Tony