

# Re: Implementable Set Theory and Consistency of ZFC

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-10/msg05982.html>

---

- *From:* "Jesse F. Hughes" <jesse@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Wed, 31 Oct 2007 07:35:39 -0400
- 

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

From my response to Ullrich:

So, even if I don't make use of (5-8), a proof of A from (1-4) is a proof from (1-8) ? So, even if I say "there exists a Foo", then such a statement is a valid premise for proving that the integral of  $1/t$  from 1 to x is  $\ln(x)$  ? Weird ..

Talking about "a very simple observation" ..

The theorem "There is only one empty set" uses no axiom of ZFC aside from extensionality. Do you think it's \*not\* a theorem of ZFC? Instead, it is only a theorem of the theory (Extensionality)?

Talk about weird.

---

"At some point in the future history of humanity, AP will eclipse even Jesus." -- Archimedes Plutonium, 10/21/07

"I wrote those lines because I am not a megalomania [sic] but rather very humble and down to earth." -- Archimedes Plutonium, 10/22/07

.