

Re: Why Regularity?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2006-11/msg04997.html>

- *From:* "zuhair" <zaljohar@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 18 Nov 2006 09:18:10 -0800
-

Rupert wrote:

 zuhair wrote:

 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

Re: Why Regularity?

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 alternative 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 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.

Yes I am.

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 theorem of consistent lies.

Zuhair

I don't think you're doing philosophy, I think you're doing meaningless gibberish.

I don't know why you like using these meaningless words. If you read something you have to think about it, not just refuse it

Re: Why Regularity?

Re: Why Regularity?

straightforwards.

There is great similarity between Russells sets and the Lier paradox, you should be blind not to see this.

Regularity aims at avoiding this paradox. If we use unrestricted comprehension on ZF, and remove Regularity, then you will see ZF going to its true nature. Just putting a restriction like regularity, though avoids this paradox, but doesn't let you reveal the truth of this theory.

IF you are driving your car in the wrong direction, and you discovered that, and reduced your speed so that you will not reach the wrong aim, it doesn't mean that you are not driving in the wrong direction.

Regularity is only aviodance of what ZFC is heading at, i.e. Russells set.

Regularity is like putting your hands in front of your eyes as not to see the doom your are heading into, it doesn't change anything.

The direction should be changed.

If you remove regularity and make some directional modefication on the theory like axiom2),3)4) I have wrote, and the axiom of infinity that I need help with, you will find a theory that is as consistent as ZFC and do not have problems with having a universe.

Any set theory which has a paradoxial universe, is a set thoery of LIES. But it doesn't mean that it is not consistent, a theory that always lies is a consistent theory,as far as it avoids its universe, like ZFC, having Regularity as its braking power of avoidance of its universe.

Zuhair

.