

10.11.2019 (10/11/19)

Triangle diagram of the number of vertices, edges, and number of faces of a polyhedron, about the sum of all numbers of the vertices, the sum of all numbers of the edges, the sum of all numbers of the faces, and the volume of the polyhedron.

- 1) The sum of all numbers of the vertices, edges, and faces of a polyhedron is equal to $2V + E + F$ (10/11/19)
- 2) The sum of all numbers of the vertices, edges, and faces of a polyhedron is equal to $2V + E + F$ (10/11/19)
- 3) The sum of all numbers of the vertices, edges, and faces of a polyhedron is equal to $2V + E + F$ (10/11/19)

Therefore, the sum of all numbers of the vertices, edges, and faces of a polyhedron is equal to $2V + E + F$.

5) The sum of all numbers of the vertices, edges, and faces of a polyhedron is equal to $2V + E + F$ (10/11/19)

4) The sum of all numbers of the vertices, edges, and faces of a polyhedron is equal to $2V + E + F$ (10/11/19)

Therefore, the sum of all numbers of the vertices, edges, and faces of a polyhedron is equal to $2V + E + F$.

~~It seems that the appropriate framework for this problem is~~

~~It seems that the appropriate framework for this problem is~~

It seems ~~for~~ desirable to examine these characterizations of the ~~testable~~ content of observation sentences, as regards the role of the observation sentences in testing conflicting theories. The three types of content are:

- 1) stimulus content
- 2) stimulus content and ^{the} content determined by ~~a~~ portion of all the laws and rules of the theory. (core content)
- 3) stimulus content and content determined by all the laws and rules of the theory. (total content)

Suppose O_1 and O_2 hold theories T_1 and T_2 respectively. It is impossible that ~~if~~ ~~both~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~theories~~ ~~are~~ ~~such~~ ~~that~~ ~~any~~ ~~observation~~ ~~statement~~ ~~will~~ ~~have~~ ~~the~~ ~~same~~ ~~total~~ ~~content~~ ~~for~~ ~~O_1~~ ~~and~~ ~~O_2~~ ~~as~~ ~~long~~ ~~as~~ ~~T_1~~ ~~and~~ ~~T_2~~ ~~differ~~. So that if agreement on the total content of observation statements is required to ~~test~~ test the theories, then a test is impossible.

~~Suppose O_1 and O_2~~

Suppose some set S of observation statements have the same stimulus content for O_1 and O_2 , but that O_1 and O_2 hold no laws or rules in common. Is it possible that T_1 and T_2 can be tested? It is possible that O_1 and O_2 could make ~~a~~ ^{set} ~~series~~ of observations ^{statements}.

$\{p, q, r, \dots\}$ ~~all~~ all in the set S ~~of observation statements~~
~~of a set S is such that~~ they occur in two theories T_1 and T_2 and there
is a set of consistent observation statements A ,
~~such that~~ such that on the basis of A , T_1 predicts
an observation statement in S and T_2 predicts
 $\neg p$. Then the ordered triple $\langle S, T_1, T_2 \rangle$ will
be said to be observationally critical. A set

~~of observation statements~~ of observation ^{statements} such as A will
be said to be a critical set of observation ^{statements}.

Suppose O_1 and O_2 make a set of observation
statements. O_1 predicts p and O_2 predicts $\neg p$
on the basis of the observation statements and
the theories T_1 and T_2 respectively. Later
both make the observation $\neg p$. Clearly O_1 will
be lead to suppose his own theory needs some
sort of revision. However, is there any reason
to believe he will adopt T_2 ? I think not.

Even though, in fact, the observation statements
in S have the same stimulus ~~meaning~~ for
 O_1 and O_2 , O_1 may on the basis of his uncorrected
theory conclude that they have different
stimulus content. (What stimulus content is
for the theory T_1 ?) ~~It is possible to come~~
~~to a point where the stimulus content of T_1~~
~~is more important than the stimulus content of~~
 ~~T_2 and O_1 will not adopt T_2 .~~
~~Though the stimulus content of~~
~~observation statements is the same, the stimulus~~
~~content is different and $\langle T_1, T_2 \rangle$ is~~
observationally critical. ~~Neither theory~~
need be lead to adopt the other theory
in case the other is false.

But the above attempt shows
that it is possible to construct a set (T_1, T_2)
is comparable iff T_1 and T_2 are such that T_1
both T_1 and T_2 , the set (T_1, T_2) has the
same structure as (T_1, T_2) for some T_1, T_2 .
Thus there will be a total ordering of elements
in T_1 and T_2 , ~~which is~~ T_1 and T_2 are
isomorphic but not equal.

Suppose now that T_1 and T_2 are such that T_1 and T_2
with some structure (T_1, T_2) is not a total ordering
and T_1 and T_2 are not comparable. Then if T_1 and T_2
with a certain set of elements A
and on this base product with T_1 and T_2
the result is a product of T_1 and T_2 and
the result is a product of T_1 and T_2 and
will be T_1 and T_2 . We want to show that
this is not the case in a certain sense and
that some delay T_2 causes in the
area (as the will be shown by the structure
of the units, and the delay will be that
as the case) if the theory T_2 is not
succeeded that T_1 is an extension of
would have a certain delay T_2 and
as a result of the delay T_2 is
possible to construct a theory T_2
of this theory T_1 then adopting T_2
would permit us to reconstruct the
theory if the current is held on the same
by T_1 and T_2 . But if we do not have the
theory and we have a theory T_2
structure, ~~then~~ we would have the
theory T_1 and T_2 the same.