

Re: Implementable Set Theory and Consistency of ZFC

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-10/msg05377.html>

- *From:* Han de Bruijn <Han.deBruijn@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 29 Oct 2007 09:50:18 +0100
-

Jesse F. Hughes wrote:

Han de Bruijn <Han.deBruijn@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> writes:

Jesse F. Hughes wrote:

Even assuming that there are four models rather than one, so what?

The point is that you have **not** given a proof of (5)–(8) using only

axioms (1)–(4). Thus, you have not done what you said.

Even if you show that there are seven models for (1)–(4) in which

(5)–(8) are also true, you haven't done what you said. Even if you

show there are **infinitely** many models satisfying this condition, you

haven't done what you said. So, perhaps you should either do what

you said or change your claim.

No. Because *_nothing_* sensible ever counts as a proof in your conception of mathematics.

Quite wrong. I've told you what counts as a proof of the claim that (5)–(8) are theorems of (1)–(4). Namely, a proof of each of (5)–(8) using only (1)–(4) as axioms.

What is so controversial about that?

Nothing. I've done just *_that_* in my article.

Re: Implementable Set Theory and Consistency of ZFC

Let those who can not keep up do not halt the parade ..

Uh huh.

Han de Bruijn

.