

Re: An uncountable countable set

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2006-09/msg01044.html>

- *From:* Virgil <virgil@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 05 Sep 2006 16:41:05 -0600
-

In article <44fdc460@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, Tony Orlow <tony@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

MoeBlee wrote:

Better would be $a=b \leftrightarrow AP(P(a) \leftrightarrow P(b))$.

The difference between = and \leftrightarrow disappears when logical truth values are quantities from 0 through 1, so I don't see that as any better, but equivalent.

"0 through 1"?

Does TO expect to find any truth values strictly between 0 and 1?

I am aware that there are difficulties defining what constitutes a valid property in this sense, as Russell's Paradox demonstrates, but I think the kind of statement that produce such issues can be identified. That would be an interesting discussion....

In ZF, predicate definition of sets is limited to defining subsets of sets which are otherwise known to exist, so that Russell's paradox is vanquished.

Absent some mechanism of similar effectiveness, TO's system will crash.

Ummm.... Isn't each isolated theory "subjective" in terms of the properties that it explores? If there is no universal system of cohesive mathematics, then this is surely the case. In the examp