

Re: Why Regularity?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2006-11/msg04990.html>

- *From:* "zuhair" <zaljohar@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 18 Nov 2006 09:01:39 -0800
-

Rupert wrote:

zuhair wrote:

Rupert wrote:

The reason why we have the axiom of regularity isn't really anything to do with the liar paradox. It's just an indication of the fact that we only want to study well-founded sets. In ZF-regularity we can prove that the class of well-founded sets is a model for ZF with regularity anyway.

I am speaking in a more philosophical manner, I see ZF as a theory of finding consistency of statements of the that who always lies. All sets in ZFC are lies. Yet , I said such M that all of its statements are lies do have consistency, it is the consistency of the total liar, though I call the later (the opposite truth teller) anyhow. This is philosophical. Putting the axioms of regularity confines us to the lies that are fairly consistent, it makes us avoid the liar paradox, which reveal the philosophical truth to ZF. ZFC with Regularity is consistent logically, but philosophically speaking, it is a system of consistent lies, see the ulternative that I have proposed, I think this is the HONEST set theory . But It seems not so practical. The Lieying ZF (the standard one) is easier to deal with. And since all what we require from a set theory is consistency, then it doesn't really matter if ZF is philosophically a consistent lie. Since it easier to deal with, then let it.

Zuhair

There is a mathematical analysis of the liar paradox. Tarski proved that no language can define its own truth predicate. That's how the

Re: Why Regularity?

liar paradox is avoided in mathematics.

As I say, I don't see what the liar paradox has to do with the axiom of regularity.

You are not discriminating between , philosophy and mathematics. Read what I wrote in another sense. in a philosophical sense. It is not about regularity only, it is about the whole of ZFC, the theory of consistent lies.

Zuhair

.