

Re: hagman has the balls to admit it ; the thing is ...

Re: hagman has the balls to admit it ; the thing is

...

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-10/msg01361.html>

- *From:* tommy1729 <tommy1729@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 07 Oct 2007 12:35:19 EDT
-

hagman wrote:

On 6 Okt., 23:39, tommy1729 <tommy1...@xxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

hagman wrote:

On 6 Okt., 08:07, JSH <jst...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

I think talking about a simple failure in what
is
usually taught as
logic can give you a sure-fire way to
understand
how simple thinking
failures can underpin disagreements with my
research.

Like consider $1 = 1$, a simple tautological
statement which is called
an identity in mathematics, and notice, the
equal
sign means you have

Re: hagman has the balls to admit it ; the thing is ...

the same thing on the left of the equals as on

the

right.

Even if you have $x=y$, it must be true that,

what?

$x=y$

That is, it must be true that x and y are

equal, as

consider

$1 = 0$

as in mathematics that is invalid, but modern

logicians do not have an

invalid type in standard logic.

So they might just say that $1=0$ is false, not

invalid.

But the expression is not so much
false—though

it

is false—as it

fails because it contradicts the use of the

Re: hagman has the balls to admit it ; the thing is ...

equals

sign.

If you figure that out, you can work your way

through supposed

paradoxes in logic and figuring that out is

what I

did years ago, and

I even posted about it years ago as consider:

Logical Formedness Axioms

1. Identical sets are identical.

2. Different sets are different.

3. Statements contradicting axioms 1 or 2 are

false

or malformed.

4. A malformed statement is one for which a conclusion does not follow given its structure.

5. A false statement is one that while

Re: hagman has the balls to admit it ; the thing is ...

structurally

correct is not

true.

See:

<http://mymath.blogspot.com/2005/05/logical-formedness>

-axioms.html

It turns out that if you accept those axioms

then

necessarily you are

accepting the equals means equal.

I think maybe part of the problem with
people

in

the US is that equal

can mean just about anything, like note that

the

Founding Fathers said

"all men are created equal" and had slaves!

Sardonic humor aside I think that for most

people

the failure in

Re: hagman has the balls to admit it ; the thing is ...

understanding such trivial logic is what I call

a

two-step failure

which has to do with how their brains
process

information, as it LOSES

pieces of information in trying to move from

noting

that equals means

equal, and realizing that as a necessity.

As consider the suppose paradoxical
statement:

Consider a set of all sets that exclude

themselves.

That is a malformed statement as it violates
1.

and

2. above. But to

know that you have to hold a certain amount
of

information in your

mind, sort of in the working space you might

say of

your brain.

Re: hagman has the balls to admit it ; the thing is ...

If you lack the mental capacity to do that
then

your mental wiring

prevents you from comprehending that
reality.

Let me explain in detail and see if you can

hold in

all the info:

A set of all sets that exclude themselves

cannot

exist as it needs to

include itself, but if it includes itself it

excludes itself, so the

statement is malformed, as a set cannot
include

and

exclude itself.

Such a set X (if it existed) would have the

property

that YeX if and only if $\sim YeY$.

We might give this property a name and say that X

is

Russel-ish.

You seem to have grasped the proof that

Russel-ish

Re: hagman has the balls to admit it ; the thing is ...

sets do not exist.

ahh hagman is a nobel man who has the balls to

admit JSH grasped something.

(and hagman snipped to much ...)

1) Others have admitted previously that the "prime counting function" can, well, count primes, at least as long as one disregards all the ODE stuff attached; or that his factoring method had might under lucky circumstances be able to actually factor a r a not too big number.

yes and some people proved riemann hypothese under the assumption of the correctness of a few lemma's ;--)

2) Note the word "seem" ;)

lol
perhaps by accident
the law of large posts euh large numbers (of posts) applies to JSH ;--)

but now seriously ; (as you snipped away , by the way)
i feel JSH has got a point.

the liars paradox is indeed just a badly defined sentence.

and i support his 5 axioms.

and indeed equal = equals.

(from the correct perspective)

and his ideas are consistant in my set theory (TST)

see the previous post of me for more details
(since hagman snipped it)

Re: hagman has the balls to admit it ; the thing is ...

Re: hagman has the balls to admit it ; the thing is ...

regards
tommy1729

.