

I, even I, would celebrate, in rhymes inept the great...

The Urth list — 18 messages, 8 voices, 15 Oct 2014

<https://urth.darkrealm.vip/thread/urth/6687>

Exported from an unofficial mirror of a public mailing list. Copyright in each message remains with the person who wrote it. Email addresses are obscured as `user at host`, the form the original archive published. This file was rebuilt from parsed fields rather than retained headers, so it is faithful in content but not byte-exact.

Norwood, Frederick Hudson — 15 Oct 2014, 18:28

I notice that none of the "we can never know anything absolutely" team on this thread has accepted my challenge to explain how A can be true, and A implies B can be true, and yet B can be false. I think maybe everything that can be said on this subject has been said. I think maybe I'll go home and read a story by Gene Wolfe.

Rick Norwood

Brendon Fuhs — 15 Oct 2014, 19:10 · in reply to Norwood, Frederick Hudson

Here is my attempt.

Suppose we are in a universe in which any statement implied by a true statement is considered false. Thus, if "A is True" and "A => B", then "B is False". But if we are in such a universe, and the fact that we are in such a universe implies the relationships we have described between A and B, then by the nature of implication in that universe, those relationships can't possibly be true. As it happens, we don't live in such a universe. Therefore the statement "if A is True and A => B, then B is False" is perfectly consistent! ;)

I declare this to be Gene Wolfe related because Wolfe likes to use apparent paradoxes and deliberately slippery logic in his worldbuilding.

On Wed, Oct 15, 2014 at 2:28 PM, Norwood, Frederick Hudson <NORWOODR at mail.etsu.edu> wrote:

I notice that none of the "we can never know anything absolutely" team on this thread has accepted my challenge to explain how A can be true, and A implies B can be true, and yet B can be false. I think maybe everything that can be said on this subject has been said. I think maybe I'll go home and read a story by Gene Wolfe.

Rick Norwood

Jeffery Wilson clueland.com — 16 Oct 2014, 04:39 · in reply to Norwood, Frederick Hudson

On 10/15/2014 1:28 PM, Norwood, Frederick Hudson wrote:

I notice that none of the "we can never know anything absolutely" team on this thread has accepted my challenge to explain how A can be true, and A implies B can be true, and yet B can be false.

That is known as modus ponens (the method that affirms), but that's short for modus ponendo ponens (the method that affirms by affirming), and as the longer Latin name implies, its truth is complicated by an infinite regress, as dramatized by another famed fantasy author:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/What_the_Tortoise_Said_to_Achilles

If you consider a true statement about abstracted symbols to be an absolute truth, why not save steps and just say "A is A"? That remains valid regardless of the values of A or B or the validity of modus ponens.

Jeff Wilson - < jwilson at clueland.com >
A&M Texarkana Computational Intelligence Lab
< http://www.tamut.edu/cil >

Norwood, Frederick Hudson — 16 Oct 2014, 12:07 · in reply to Jeffery Wilson
clueland.com

Jeffery Wilson: I do say A is A. That's called the reflexive property of equality. And, yes, I've read the Lewis Carroll bit. Even wrote a poem about it.

Said the mathematician Kurt Godel,
There are obstacles we'll never hurdle,
There's a theorem that's true
But no proof can you do,
'Till Achilles outraces the turtle.

Modern mathematics has dealt with the paradox. See, for example, Logic for Mathematicians by Hamilton.

Brendon Fuhs: Sure, you can say any consequence of a true statement is false, but I think you've just changed the meaning of the word "true", not invented a new logic.

Rick Norwood

-----Original Message-----

From: Urth [mailto:urth-bounces at lists.urth.net] On Behalf Of Jeffery Wilson clueland.com Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2014 12:40 AM To: The Urth Mailing List Subject: Re: (urth) I, even I, would celebrate, in rhymes inept the great...

On 10/15/2014 1:28 PM, Norwood, Frederick Hudson wrote:
I notice that none of the "we can never know anything absolutely"
team on this thread has accepted my challenge to explain how A can be
true, and A implies B can be true, and yet B can be false.

That is known as modus ponens (the method that affirms), but that's short for modus ponendo ponens (the method that affirms by affirming), and as the longer Latin name implies, its truth is complicated by an infinite regress, as dramatized by another famed fantasy author:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/What_the_Tortoise_Said_to_Achilles

If you consider a true statement about abstracted symbols to be an absolute truth, why not save steps and just say "A is A"? That remains valid regardless of the values of A or B or the validity of modus ponens.

Jeff Wilson - < jwilson at clueland.com >
A&M Texarkana Computational Intelligence Lab < http://www.tamut.edu/cil >

Jeffery Wilson clueland.com — 17 Oct 2014, 05:55 · in reply to Norwood, Frederick Hudson

On 10/16/2014 7:07 AM, Norwood, Frederick Hudson wrote:

Jeffery Wilson: I do say A is A. That's called the reflexive property of equality. And, yes, I've read the Lewis Carroll bit. Even wrote a poem about it.

If you already know that the modus ponens is unprovable, and are familiar with reflexive equality which is axiomatic, why are you bothering to hold up modus ponens as an example of an absolute truth?

Jeff Wilson - <jwilson at clueland.com >

A&M Texarkana Computational Intelligence Lab

< <http://www.tamut.edu/cil> >

Norwood, Frederick Hudson — 17 Oct 2014, 13:23 · in reply to Jeffery Wilson
clueland.com

Modus ponens is unprovable. You have to start somewhere. Is it possible that modus ponens is false? Of course it is possible. I may be a madman, and modus ponens may not say what I think it says. I may be the only creature in the universe, and modus ponens may really mean, "Thou art God." But these objections can be raised in any discussion whatsoever, and after a while most people stop raising them. If I am sane, and if modus ponens says what I think it says, then it seems to me bedrock on which to build. Further, if there are cases where A implies B, A is true, and B is false, then that ends the discussion, because every statement is both true and false, and in that case there is no point in saying anything at all.

Rick Norwood

-----Original Message-----

From: Urth [mailto:urth-bounces at lists.urth.net] On Behalf Of Jeffery Wilson clueland.com Sent: Friday, October 17, 2014 1:56 AM To: The Urth Mailing List Subject: Re: (urth) I, even I, would celebrate, in rhymes inept the great...

On 10/16/2014 7:07 AM, Norwood, Frederick Hudson wrote:

Jeffery Wilson: I do say A is A. That's called the reflexive property of equality. And, yes, I've read the Lewis Carroll bit. Even wrote a poem about it.

If you already know that the modus ponens is unprovable, and are familiar with reflexive equality which is axiomatic, why are you bothering to hold up modus ponens as an example of an absolute truth?

Jeff Wilson - <jwilson at clueland.com >

A&M Texarkana Computational Intelligence Lab < <http://www.tamut.edu/cil> >

Marc Aramini — 17 Oct 2014, 13:40 · in reply to Norwood, Frederick Hudson

These are linguistic truths built into the definitions themselves ...

the statement if A then B is either true linguistically

or it isn't, in which case the premise was wrong. It doesn't mean much else. ie "If I have no head I will die." technology advances, and now I can live without a head - the original premise then becomes false. Doesn't mean anything.

On Fri, Oct 17, 2014 at 6:23 AM, Norwood, Frederick Hudson <

NORWOODR at mail.etsu.edu> wrote:

Modus ponens is unprovable. You have to start somewhere. Is it possible that modus ponens is false? Of course it is possible. I may be a madman, and modus ponens may not say what I think it says. I may be the only creature in the universe, and modus ponens may really mean, "Thou art God." But these objections can be raised in any discussion whatsoever, and after a while most people stop raising them. If I am sane, and if modus ponens says what I think it says, then it seems to me bedrock on which to

build. Further, if there are cases where A implies B, A is true, and B is false, then that ends the discussion, because every statement is both true and false, and in that case there is no point in saying anything at all.

Rick Norwood

-----Original Message-----

From: Urth [mailto:urth-bounces at lists.urth.net] On Behalf Of Jeffery Wilson clueland.com
Sent: Friday, October 17, 2014 1:56 AM

Ant3nio Pedro Marques — 17 Oct 2014, 13:46 · in reply to Norwood, Frederick Hudson
No dia 17/10/2014, ?s 14:23, "Norwood, Frederick Hudson" <NORWOODR at mail.etsu.edu> escreveu:

Further, if there are cases where A implies B, A is true, and B is false, then that ends the discussion, because every statement is both true and false, and in that case there is no point in saying anything at all.

Even merely human communication and language are not chained to what logic is able to dream of.

Norwood, Frederick Hudson — 17 Oct 2014, 14:03 · in reply to Marc Aramini

Ant3nio Pedro Marques is at least unabashedly post-modern, refusing to be chained by logic.

You, Marc Aramini, keep confusing logic with science. Mathematics is built on logic. If the premise becomes false, then you no longer apply modus ponens. You don't need to lose your head. Every even number is divisible by two. What if the original premise is "This number is odd. Then the theorem doesn't apply. It doesn't disprove modus ponens.

Rick Norwood

From: Urth [mailto:urth-bounces at lists.urth.net] On Behalf Of Marc Aramini Sent: Friday, October 17, 2014 9:40 AM To: The Urth Mailing List Subject: Re: (urth) I, even I, would celebrate, in rhymes inept the great...

These are linguistic truths built into the definitions themselves ...
the statement if A then B is either true linguistically
or it isn't, in which case the premise was wrong. It doesn't mean much else.
ie "If I have no head I will die." technology advances, and now I can live without a head - the original premise then becomes false. Doesn't mean anything.

On Fri, Oct 17, 2014 at 6:23 AM, Norwood, Frederick Hudson <NORWOODR at mail.etsu.edu<mailto:NORWOODR at mail.etsu.edu>> wrote:

Modus ponens is unprovable. You have to start somewhere. Is it possible that modus ponens is false? Of course it is possible. I may be a madman, and modus ponens may not say what I think it says. I may be the only creature in the universe, and modus ponens may really mean, "Thou art God." But these objections can be raised in any discussion whatsoever, and after a while most people stop raising them. If I am sane, and if modus ponens says what I think it says, then it seems to me bedrock on which to build. Further, if there are cases where A implies B, A is true, and B is false, then that ends the discussion, because every statement is both true and false, and in that case there is no point in saying anything at all.

Rick Norwood

-----Original Message-----

From: Urth [mailto:urth-bounces at lists.urth.net<mailto:urth-bounces at lists.urth.net>] On Behalf Of Jeffery Wilson clueland.com<http://clueland.com/>

Sent: Friday, October 17, 2014 1:56 AM

To: The Urth Mailing List

Subject: Re: (urth) I, even I, would celebrate, in rhymes inept the great...

On 10/16/2014 7:07 AM, Norwood, Frederick Hudson wrote:

Jeffery Wilson: I do say A is A. That's called the reflexive property of equality. And, yes, I've read the Lewis Carroll bit. Even wrote a poem about it.

If you already know that the modus ponens is unprovable, and are familiar with reflexive equality which is axiomatic, why are you bothering to hold up modus ponens as an example of an absolute truth?

Jeff Wilson - <jwilson at clueland.com<mailto:jwilson at clueland.com> >
A&M Texarkana Computational Intelligence Lab <http://www.tamut.edu/cil >

Urth Mailing List

To post, write urth at urth.net<mailto:urth at urth.net>

Subscription/information: <http://www.urth.net><<http://www.urth.net>>

Marc Aramini — 17 Oct 2014, 14:19 · in reply to Norwood, Frederick Hudson

yes, if it becomes false, you don't apply it. Thus, there is no case where modus ponens can ever be misapplied, and your original challenge one which cannot be met. If A, then B ... I'm going to stick to talking about Wolfe.

On Fri, Oct 17, 2014 at 7:03 AM, Norwood, Frederick Hudson <

NORWOODR at mail.etsu.edu> wrote:

Ant?nio Pedro Marques is at least unabashedly post-modern, refusing to be chained by logic.

You, Marc Aramini, keep confusing logic with science. Mathematics is built on logic. If the premise becomes false, then you no longer apply modus ponens. You don't need to lose your head. Every even number is divisible by two. What if the original premise is ?This number is odd. Then the theorem doesn't apply. It doesn't disprove modus ponens.

Rick Norwood

From: Urth [mailto:urth-bounces at lists.urth.net] *On Behalf Of *Marc Aramini

Sent: Friday, October 17, 2014 9:40 AM

To: The Urth Mailing List

Subject: Re: (urth) I, even I, would celebrate, in rhymes inept the great...

These are linguistic truths built into the definitions themselves ...

the statement if A then B is either true linguistically

or it isn't, in which case the premise was wrong. It doesn't mean much else.

ie "If I have no head I will die." technology advances, and now I can live without a head - the original premise then becomes false. Doesn't mean anything.

On Fri, Oct 17, 2014 at 6:23 AM, Norwood, Frederick Hudson <NORWOODR at mail.etsu.edu> wrote:

Modus ponens is unprovable. You have to start somewhere. Is it possible that modus ponens is false? Of course it is possible. I may be a madman, and modus ponens may not say what I think it says. I may be the only creature in the universe, and modus ponens may really mean, "Thou art God." But these objections can be raised in any discussion whatsoever, and after a while most people stop raising them. If I am sane, and if modus ponens says what I think it says, then it seems to me bedrock on which to build. Further, if there are cases where A implies B, A is true, and B is false, then that ends the discussion, because every statement is both true and false, and in that case there is no point in saying anything at all.

Rick Norwood

-----Original Message-----

From: Urth [mailto:urth-bounces at lists.urth.net] On Behalf Of Jeffery Wilson
clueland.com
Sent: Friday, October 17, 2014 1:56 AM

Ant3nio Pedro Marques — 17 Oct 2014, 14:34 · in reply to Norwood, Frederick Hudson

I'm not anything of the sort. Just because the inadequacies of tools you thought all powerful are pointed out to you, it doesn't follow that you can go around calling others names.

Do you have formal higher training in Math?

No dia 17/10/2014, 15:03, "Norwood, Frederick Hudson" <NORWOODR at mail.etsu.edu> escreveu:

Ant3nio Pedro Marques is at least unabashedly post-modern, refusing to be chained by logic.

You, Marc Aramini, keep confusing logic with science. Mathematics is built on logic. If the premise becomes false, then you no longer apply modus ponens. You don't need to lose your head. Every even number is divisible by two. What if the original premise is "This number is odd. Then the theorem doesn't apply. It doesn't disprove modus ponens.

Rick Norwood

From: Urth [mailto:urth-bounces at lists.urth.net] On Behalf Of Marc Aramini
Sent: Friday, October 17, 2014 9:40 AM
To: The Urth Mailing List
Subject: Re: (urth) I, even I, would celebrate, in rhymes inept the great...

These are linguistic truths built into the definitions themselves ...
the statement if A then B is either true linguistically
or it isn't, in which case the premise was wrong. It doesn't mean much else.
ie "If I have no head I will die." technology advances, and now I can live without a head - the original
premise then becomes false. Doesn't mean anything.

On Fri, Oct 17, 2014 at 6:23 AM, Norwood, Frederick Hudson <NORWOODR at mail.etsu.edu> wrote:
Modus ponens is unprovable. You have to start somewhere. Is it possible that modus ponens is false?
Of course it is possible. I may be a madman, and modus ponens may not say what I think it says. I
may be the only creature in the universe, and modus ponens may really mean, "Thou art God." But
these objections can be raised in any discussion whatsoever, and after a while most people stop
raising them. If I am sane, and if modus ponens says what I think it says, then it seems to me
bedrock on which to build. Further, if there are cases where A implies B, A is true, and B is false, then
that ends the discussion, because every statement is both true and false, and in that case there is no
point in saying anything at all.

Rick Norwood

-----Original Message-----

From: Urth [mailto:urth-bounces at lists.urth.net] On Behalf Of Jeffery Wilson clueland.com
Sent: Friday, October 17, 2014 1:56 AM

Norwood, Frederick Hudson — 17 Oct 2014, 14:38 · in reply to António Pedro Marques

I did not mean to be calling you names. You said you did not want to be chained to logic; that
sounds like post-modernism to me. I apologize if you think of post-modernism differently.

Yes, I have formal training in mathematics.

Rick Norwood

From: Urth [mailto:urth-bounces at lists.urth.net] On Behalf Of António Pedro Marques Sent:
Friday, October 17, 2014 10:34 AM To: The Urth Mailing List Subject: Re: (urth) I, even I, would
celebrate, in rhymes inept the great...

I'm not anything of the sort. Just because the inadequacies of tools you thought all powerful are
pointed out to you, it doesn't follow that you can go around calling others names.

Do you have formal higher training in Math?

No dia 17/10/2014, às 15:03, "Norwood, Frederick Hudson" <NORWOODR at
mail.etsu.edu<mailto:NORWOODR at mail.etsu.edu>> escreveu:
António Pedro Marques is at least unabashedly post-modern, refusing to be chained by logic.

You, Marc Aramini, keep confusing logic with science. Mathematics is built on logic. If the
premise becomes false, then you no longer apply modus ponens. You don't need to lose your
head. Every even number is divisible by two. What if the original premise is "This number is
odd. Then the theorem doesn't apply. It doesn't disprove modus ponens.

Rick Norwood

From: Urth [mailto:urth-bounces at lists.urth.net] On Behalf Of Marc Aramini Sent: Friday,
October 17, 2014 9:40 AM To: The Urth Mailing List Subject: Re: (urth) I, even I, would celebrate,

in rhymes inept the great...

These are linguistic truths built into the definitions themselves ...
the statement if A then B is either true linguistically
or it isn't, in which case the premise was wrong. It doesn't mean much else.
ie "If I have no head I will die." technology advances, and now I can live without a head - the
original premise then becomes false. Doesn't mean anything.

On Fri, Oct 17, 2014 at 6:23 AM, Norwood, Frederick Hudson <NORWOODR at mail.etsu.edu<mailto:NORWOODR at mail.etsu.edu>> wrote:
Modus ponens is unprovable. You have to start somewhere. Is it possible that modus ponens is false? Of course it is possible. I may be a madman, and modus ponens may not say what I think it says. I may be the only creature in the universe, and modus ponens may really mean, "Thou art God." But these objections can be raised in any discussion whatsoever, and after a while most people stop raising them. If I am sane, and if modus ponens says what I think it says, then it seems to me bedrock on which to build. Further, if there are cases where A implies B, A is true, and B is false, then that ends the discussion, because every statement is both true and false, and in that case there is no point in saying anything at all.

Rick Norwood

-----Original Message-----

From: Urth [mailto:urth-bounces at lists.urth.net<mailto:urth-bounces at lists.urth.net>] On Behalf Of Jeffery Wilson clueland.com<http://clueland.com/>
Sent: Friday, October 17, 2014 1:56 AM
To: The Urth Mailing List
Subject: Re: (urth) I, even I, would celebrate, in rhymes inept the great...

On 10/16/2014 7:07 AM, Norwood, Frederick Hudson wrote:
Jeffery Wilson: I do say A is A. That's called the reflexive property of equality. And, yes, I've read the Lewis Carroll bit. Even wrote a poem about it.

If you already know that the modus ponens is unprovable, and are familiar with reflexive equality which is axiomatic, why are you bothering to hold up modus ponens as an example of an absolute truth?

Jeff Wilson - <jwilson at clueland.com<mailto:jwilson at clueland.com> >
A&M Texarkana Computational Intelligence Lab <http://www.tamut.edu/cil >

Urth Mailing List

To post, write urth at urth.net<mailto:urth at urth.net>
Subscription/information: <http://www.urth.net><<http://www.urth.net>>

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes — 17 Oct 2014, 15:24 · in reply to Norwood, Frederick Hudson

All Greeks are men.
Socrates is a Greek.
Therefore, I like pizza.

On Fri, Oct 17, 2014 at 7:38 AM, Norwood, Frederick Hudson <NORWOODR at mail.etsu.edu> wrote:
I did not mean to be calling you names. You said you did not want to be chained to logic; that sounds like post-modernism to me. I apologize if you think of post-modernism differently.

Yes, I have formal training in mathematics.

Rick Norwood

From: Urth [mailto:urth-bounces at lists.urth.net] *On Behalf Of *Ant?nio Pedro Marques
Sent: Friday, October 17, 2014 10:34 AM
To: The Urth Mailing List
Subject: Re: (urth) I, even I, would celebrate, in rhymes inept the great...

I'm not anything of the sort. Just because the inadequacies of tools you thought all powerful are pointed out to you, it doesn't follow that you can go around calling others names.

Do you have formal higher training in Math?

No dia 17/10/2014, ?s 15:03, "Norwood, Frederick Hudson" <NORWOODR at mail.etsu.edu> escreveu:

Ant?nio Pedro Marques is at least unabashedly post-modern, refusing to be chained by logic.

You, Marc Aramini, keep confusing logic with science. Mathematics is built on logic. If the premise becomes false, then you no longer apply modus ponens. You don't need to lose your head. Every even number is divisible by two. What if the original premise is ?This number is odd. Then the theorem doesn't apply. It doesn't disprove modus ponens.

Rick Norwood

From: Urth [mailto:urth-bounces at lists.urth.net <urth-bounces at lists.urth.net>] *On Behalf Of *Marc Aramini
Sent: Friday, October 17, 2014 9:40 AM
To: The Urth Mailing List
Subject: Re: (urth) I, even I, would celebrate, in rhymes inept the great...

These are linguistic truths built into the definitions themselves ...

the statement if A then B is either true linguistically

or it isn't, in which case the premise was wrong. It doesn't mean much else.

ie "If I have no head I will die." technology advances, and now I can live without a head - the original premise then becomes false. Doesn't mean anything.

On Fri, Oct 17, 2014 at 6:23 AM, Norwood, Frederick Hudson <NORWOODR at mail.etsu.edu> wrote:

Modus ponens is unprovable. You have to start somewhere. Is it possible that modus ponens is false? Of course it is possible. I may be a madman, and modus ponens may not say what I think it says. I may be the only creature in the universe, and modus ponens may really mean, "Thou art God." But these objections can be raised in any discussion whatsoever, and after a while most people stop raising them. If I am sane, and if modus ponens says what I think it says, then it seems to me bedrock on which to build. Further, if there are cases where A implies B, A is true, and B is false, then that ends the discussion, because every statement is both true and false, and in that case there is no point in saying anything at all.

Rick Norwood

-----Original Message-----

From: Urth [mailto:urth-bounces at lists.urth.net] On Behalf Of Jeffery Wilson clueland.com
Sent: Friday, October 17, 2014 1:56 AM

Lee — 17 Oct 2014, 15:26 · follows Dan'l Danehy-Oakes

Marc Aramini: These are linguistic truths built into the definitions themselves ...

Antonio Marques: Even merely human communication and language are not chained to what logic is able to dream of.

I am thinking of the Biblical passage in which "a cherubim" is set to guard the Garden of Eden. An illogical linguistic construction, where a singular article is paired with a plural noun, is used to describe an angelic being which does not fit into a logical framework of human comprehension yet still, apparently, is assumed to exist.

Norwood, Frederick Hudson — 17 Oct 2014, 16:04 · in reply to Lee

Good one, Lee.

Rick Norwood

-----Original Message-----

From: Urth [mailto:urth-bounces at lists.urth.net] On Behalf Of Lee

Sent: Friday, October 17, 2014 11:26 AM

To: urth at urth.net

Subject: (urth) I, even I, would celebrate, in rhymes inept the great...

Marc Aramini: These are linguistic truths built into the definitions themselves ...

Antonio Marques: Even merely human communication and language are not chained to what logic is able to dream of.

I am thinking of the Biblical passage in which "a cherubim" is set to guard the Garden of Eden. An illogical linguistic construction, where a singular article is paired with a plural noun, is used to describe an angelic being which does not fit into a logical framework of human comprehension yet still, apparently, is assumed to exist.

Marc Aramini — 17 Oct 2014, 16:07 · in reply to Dan'l Danehy-Oakes

If you liked pizza after Socrates was Greek , which seemed to be the case, then it might be post hoc ergo propter hoc rather than a standard non sequitur.

On a wolfe related topic, I did use logic to think of my changeling reading: either the boy was 15 or 18 in Korea, and the changeless doppelgänger appeared at the same time as his three years older sister. So I knew his birthday was either 1934, creating military problems and one family split in twain in 1945, or 1931, solving two problems and positing two families. External references verified the 1931 date. Logic applies to Wolfe, as does Chekov's gun.

On Friday, October 17, 2014, Dan'l Danehy-Oakes <danlido at gmail.com> wrote:
All Greeks are men.
Socrates is a Greek.
Therefore, I like pizza.

On Fri, Oct 17, 2014 at 7:38 AM, Norwood, Frederick Hudson <NORWOODR at mail.etsu.edu
<javascript:_e(%7B%7D,'cvml','NORWOODR at mail.etsu.edu');>> wrote:

I did not mean to be calling you names. You said you did not want to be chained to logic; that sounds like post-modernism to me. I apologize if you think of post-modernism differently.

Yes, I have formal training in mathematics.

Rick Norwood

From: Urth [mailto:urth-bounces at lists.urth.net
<javascript:_e(%7B%7D,'cvml','urth-bounces at lists.urth.net');>] *On
Behalf Of *Antonio Pedro Marques
Sent: Friday, October 17, 2014 10:34 AM
To: The Urth Mailing List
Subject: Re: (urth) I, even I, would celebrate, in rhymes inept the
great...

I'm not anything of the sort. Just because the inadequacies of tools you thought all powerful are pointed out to you, it doesn't follow that you can go around calling others names.

Do you have formal higher training in Math?

No dia 17/10/2014, às 15:03, "Norwood, Frederick Hudson" <
NORWOODR at mail.etsu.edu
<javascript:_e(%7B%7D,'cvml','NORWOODR at mail.etsu.edu');>> escreveu:

Antônio Pedro Marques is at least unabashedly post-modern, refusing to be chained by logic.

You, Marc Aramini, keep confusing logic with science. Mathematics is built on logic. If the premise becomes false, then you no longer apply modus ponens. You don't need to lose your head. Every even number is divisible by two. What if the original premise is "This number is odd." Then the theorem doesn't apply. It doesn't disprove modus ponens.

Rick Norwood

From: Urth [mailto:urth-bounces at lists.urth.net
<javascript:_e(%7B%7D,'cvml','urth-bounces at lists.urth.net');>] *On
Behalf Of *Marc Aramini
Sent: Friday, October 17, 2014 9:40 AM
To: The Urth Mailing List
Subject: Re: (urth) I, even I, would celebrate, in rhymes inept the
great...

These are linguistic truths built into the definitions themselves ...

the statement if A then B is either true linguistically

or it isn't, in which case the premise was wrong. It doesn't mean much else.

ie "If I have no head I will die." technology advances, and now I can live without a head - the original premise then becomes false. Doesn't mean anything.

On Fri, Oct 17, 2014 at 6:23 AM, Norwood, Frederick Hudson <
NORWOODR at mail.etsu.edu
<javascript:_e(%7B%7D,'cvml','NORWOODR at mail.etsu.edu');>> wrote:

Modus ponens is unprovable. You have to start somewhere. Is it possible that modus ponens is false? Of course it is possible. I may be a madman,

and modus ponens may not say what I think it says. I may be the only creature in the universe, and modus ponens may really mean, "Thou art God." But these objections can be raised in any discussion whatsoever, and after a while most people stop raising them. If I am sane, and if modus ponens says what I think it says, then it seems to me bedrock on which to build. Further, if there are cases where A implies B, A is true, and B is false, then that ends the discussion, because every statement is both true and false, and in that case there is no point in saying anything at all.

Rick Norwood

-----Original Message-----

From: Urth [mailto:urth-bounces at lists.urth.net
<javascript:_e(%7B%7D,'cvml','urth-bounces at lists.urth.net');>] On Behalf
Of Jeffery Wilson clueland.com
Sent: Friday, October 17, 2014 1:56 AM

Ant3nio Pedro Marques — 17 Oct 2014, 16:11 · in reply to Norwood, Frederick Hudson

I asked that because one has to know what one is dealing with. I do not enjoy having my position be misunderstood. Math-oriented folks usually like to be rigorous in their exchanges. I said absolutely nothing about wanting or not wanting to be chained to logic; this discussion is not about personal wishes.

No dia 17/10/2014, 3s 15:38, "Norwood, Frederick Hudson" <NORWOODR at mail.etsu.edu> escreveu:

I did not mean to be calling you names. You said you did not want to be chained to logic; that sounds like post-modernism to me. I apologize if you think of post-modernism differently.

Yes, I have formal training in mathematics.

Rick Norwood

From: Urth [mailto:urth-bounces at lists.urth.net] On Behalf Of Ant3nio Pedro Marques
Sent: Friday, October 17, 2014 10:34 AM
To: The Urth Mailing List
Subject: Re: (urth) I, even I, would celebrate, in rhymes inept the great...

I'm not anything of the sort. Just because the inadequacies of tools you thought all powerful are pointed out to you, it doesn't follow that you can go around calling others names.

Do you have formal higher training in Math?

No dia 17/10/2014, 3s 15:03, "Norwood, Frederick Hudson" <NORWOODR at mail.etsu.edu> escreveu:

Ant3nio Pedro Marques is at least unabashedly post-modern, refusing to be chained by logic.

You, Marc Aramini, keep confusing logic with science. Mathematics is built on logic. If the premise becomes false, then you no longer apply modus ponens. You don't need to lose your head. Every even number is divisible by two. What if the original premise is ?This number is odd. Then the theorem doesn't apply. It doesn't disprove modus ponens.

Rick Norwood

From: Urth [mailto:urth-bounces at lists.urth.net] On Behalf Of Marc Aramini
Sent: Friday, October 17, 2014 9:40 AM
To: The Urth Mailing List
Subject: Re: (urth) I, even I, would celebrate, in rhymes inept the great...

These are linguistic truths built into the definitions themselves ...
the statement if A then B is either true linguistically
or it isn't, in which case the premise was wrong. It doesn't mean much else.
ie "If I have no head I will die." technology advances, and now I can live without a head - the original
premise then becomes false. Doesn't mean anything.

On Fri, Oct 17, 2014 at 6:23 AM, Norwood, Frederick Hudson <NORWOODR at mail.etsu.edu> wrote:
Modus ponens is unprovable. You have to start somewhere. Is it possible that modus ponens is false?
Of course it is possible. I may be a madman, and modus ponens may not say what I think it says. I
may be the only creature in the universe, and modus ponens may really mean, "Thou art God." But
these objections can be raised in any discussion whatsoever, and after a while most people stop
raising them. If I am sane, and if modus ponens says what I think it says, then it seems to me
bedrock on which to build. Further, if there are cases where A implies B, A is true, and B is false, then
that ends the discussion, because every statement is both true and false, and in that case there is no
point in saying anything at all.

Rick Norwood

-----Original Message-----

From: Urth [mailto:urth-bounces at lists.urth.net] On Behalf Of Jeffery Wilson clueland.com
Sent: Friday, October 17, 2014 1:56 AM

DAVID STOCKHOFF — 17 Oct 2014, 16:12 · in reply to António Pedro Marques

And if she doesn't like pizza . . . Python fans know the rest.

On Friday, October 17, 2014 12:09 PM, Ant?nio Pedro Marques <antonio at gmail.com> wrote:

I asked that because one has to know what one is dealing with. I do not enjoy having my position be
misunderstood. Math-oriented folks usually like to be rigorous in their exchanges. I said absolutely
nothing about wanting or not wanting to be chained to logic; this discussion is not about personal
wishes.

No dia 17/10/2014, ?s 15:38, "Norwood, Frederick Hudson" <NORWOODR at mail.etsu.edu>
escreveu:

I did not mean to be calling you names. You said you did not want to be chained to logic; that sounds
like post-modernism to me. I apologize if you think of post-modernism differently.

Yes, I have formal training in mathematics.

Rick Norwood

From:Urth [mailto:urth-bounces at lists.urth.net] On Behalf Of Ant?nio Pedro Marques
Sent: Friday, October 17, 2014 10:34 AM
To: The Urth Mailing List
Subject: Re: (urth) I, even I, would celebrate, in rhymes inept the great...

I'm not anything of the sort. Just because the inadequacies of tools you thought all powerful are
pointed out to you, it doesn't follow that you can go around calling others names.

Do you have formal higher training in Math?

No dia 17/10/2014, às 15:03, "Norwood, Frederick Hudson" <NORWOODR at mail.etsu.edu> escreveu:

Antônio Pedro Marques is at least unabashedly post-modern, refusing to be chained by logic.

You, Marc Aramini, keep confusing logic with science. Mathematics is built on logic. If the premise becomes false, then you no longer apply modus ponens. You don't need to lose your head. Every even number is divisible by two. What if the original premise is "This number is odd. Then the theorem doesn't apply. It doesn't disprove modus ponens.

Rick Norwood

From: Urth [mailto:urth-bounces at lists.urth.net] On Behalf Of Marc Aramini

Sent: Friday, October 17, 2014 9:40 AM

To: The Urth Mailing List

Subject: Re: (urth) I, even I, would celebrate, in rhymes inept the great...

These are linguistic truths built into the definitions themselves ...

the statement if A then B is either true linguistically

or it isn't, in which case the premise was wrong. It doesn't mean much else.

ie "If I have no head I will die." technology advances, and now I can live without a head - the original premise then becomes false. Doesn't mean anything.

On Fri, Oct 17, 2014 at 6:23 AM, Norwood, Frederick Hudson <NORWOODR at mail.etsu.edu> wrote: Modus ponens is unprovable. You have to start somewhere. Is it possible that modus ponens is false? Of course it is possible. I may be a madman, and modus ponens may not say what I think it says. I may be the only creature in the universe, and modus ponens may really mean, "Thou art God." But these objections can be raised in any discussion whatsoever, and after a while most people stop raising them. If I am sane, and if modus ponens says what I think it says, then it seems to me bedrock on which to build. Further, if there are cases where A implies B, A is true, and B is false, then that ends the discussion, because every statement is both true and false, and in that case there is no point in saying anything at all.

Rick Norwood

-----Original Message-----

From: Urth [mailto:urth-bounces at lists.urth.net] On Behalf Of Jeffery Wilson clueland.com

Sent: Friday, October 17, 2014 1:56 AM