

# Re: Implementable Set Theory and Consistency of ZFC

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-10/msg05408.html>

---

- *From:* "Jesse F. Hughes" <jesse@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Mon, 29 Oct 2007 07:21:29 -0400
- 

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

Jesse F. Hughes wrote:

Han de Bruijn <Han.deBruijn@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> 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?

## Re: Implementable Set Theory and Consistency of ZFC

Nothing. I've done just that in my article.

Weird. How come no one else can recognize that you've done that?

Also, if you *\*had\** done that, then axioms (1)–(4) + (9) would be sufficient for ZFC. Don't you find it a touch odd that no one else has noticed this fascinating fact?

You *\*do\** know that if (1)–(4) prove (5)–(8), then so do (1)–(4) + (9), right?

--

"Is that possible? Could it be that easy? No way. [...] There must be a mistake. Right?"

"But I am the top mathematician in the world." -- James S. Harris

.