Re: Implementable Set Theory and Consistency of ZFC

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007−11/msg00086.html

- *From*: Han de Bruijn <Han.deBruijn@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

- *Date*: Thu, 01 Nov 2007 10:03:34 +0100

MoeBlee wrote:

> On Oct 31, 1:59 am, Han de Bruijn <Han.deBru...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
>
> > Jesse F. Hughes wrote:
> >
> > > I will say it once more. I am typing this slowly, since I don't
> > > want
> > > you to miss anything I say. If you have a proof in a theory
> > > consisting of axioms (1)−(4), it is also a proof in the theory
> > > consisting of axioms (1)−(4)+(X).
> >
> > How do you "know" that? Has the Pope told you, by dogma, that it is so?
>
> No, you royal ignoramus, it's PROVEN as a basic property of the
> deductive system. It's the property of monotonicity of deduction. And
> we PROVE it.

Yeah, yeah. Then why are (5−9) required in ZFC, once Infinity has become an axiom of it? Why is e.g. Choice provable in (ZFC−Infinity) and not in common ZFC?

Han de Bruijn

.