Re: An uncountable countable set

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2006−09/msg00934.html

- *From*: Tony Orlow <tony@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Tue, 05 Sep 2006 12:29:51 −0400

MoeBlee wrote:

> Tony Orlow wrote:
>
> > MoeBlee wrote:
> >
> > > Tony Orlow wrote:
> > >
> > > > No, it all rests on the notions of identity and
> > > > equality. As Leibniz
> > > > pointed out, when the properties of two
> > > > objects are all exactly the
> > > > same, then they are the same object. So,
> > > > when we say two numbers are
> > > > equal, that means all properties of the two
> > > > are equal.
> > >
> > > Ha! The fallacy of reversing implication right there! An
> > > example of
> > > just about the most basic fallacy.
> >
> > When you say "a=b", you say "A a A b P(a)=P(b)". The two are equivlent
> > statements, and therefore imply each other.
>
> I explained to you a long time ago that in general, in first order
> logic we cannot state the identity of indiscernibles, even as a schema,
> let alone have it implied from something else in first order logic.
> However, as exception to the generalization just mentioned, in a
> language with only finitely many non−logical primitive symbols, we can
> state the identity of indiscernibles as a schema. And in very general
> terms not tied to any specific kind of system, we may say that the
> indiscernibility of identicals implies the identity of indiscernibles
> only in the sense that the identity of indiscernibles is a logical
> priniciple (or at least taken by many people to be a logical
> principle), thus a given.
>
> But what was incorrect in your original statement was the word 'so' in
> the sense that you were RELYING on one principle to infer the other. In

that sense, you committed the f