From: LE CORRE Vincent B[redacted]
Subject: set theory, element vs set
Date: February 6, 2023 at 15:59
To: Adam Rogalski <RogalskiA@state.gov>, Edward Lehman [redacted]

I started writing this email 2 days ago. I want the FBI and the Justice Department to clearly understand the sophisticated mechanics behind the crimes committed by the transnational criminal entity McDonald's Corporation.

ONE OF THE KEY POINTS TO UNDERSTAND FOR THE INVESTIGATORS IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN AN ELEMENT AND A SET

Mr. Rogalski, I am still waiting to know who is the special agent leading the racketeering enterprise criminal investigation. If I don't get any reply, sooner or later, I have to notify the Office of the Inspector General of the State Department and/or the Justice Department. I don't want to do that but you keep silent. What other choices are you giving me? Meanwhile, please make sure my communications are transferred to the lead investigator. Thank you.

Dear Messrs. Lehman and Rogalski,

I guess none of you ever studied set theory. Neither did I. But back in high school, [redacted], who is one of the most brilliant French mathematicians, at least he once claimed if I recall correctly one of the most polyvalent, once suggested me to read a book called *Naive Set Theory* by Paul R. Halmos.

By the way, yes, there is a link Between [redacted] and Cédric Villani and from what [redacted] told me back then by email, I can make an educated guess that probably, when Philippe Mouricou (Villani's then director of communication) was committing the crimes of blackmail and witness tampering against me, most likely Villani was right next to him. Anyway, my guess is that Villani must have reported to the public prosecutor the fact McDonald's committed fraud.

But let's move on.

Naive Set Theory by Paul R. Halmos

"Section 1

THE AXIOM OF EXTENSION

A pack of wolves, a bunch of grapes, or a flock of pigeons are all examples of sets of things. The mathematical concept of a set can be used as the foundation for all known mathematics. […] Incidentally, to avoid terminological monotony, we shall sometimes say *collection* instead of *set*.

[…]

Sets, as they are usually conceived, have *elements* or *members*. An element of a set may be a wolf, a grape, or a pigeon. It is important to know that a set itself may also be an element of some other set. Mathematics is full of examples of sets of sets. A line, for instance, is a set of points; the set of all lines in the plane is a natural example of a set of sets (of points).

[…]

The principal concept of set theory, the one that in completely axiomatic studies is the principal primitive (undefined) concept, is that of *belonging*. If x belongs to A (x is an element of A, x is *contained* in A), we shall write

$x \in A$.

This version of the Greek letter epsilon is so often used to denote belong tin that its use to denote anything else is almost prohibited.

[…]

A possible relation between sets, more elementary than belonging, is *equality*. The equality of two sets A and B is universally denoted by the familiar symbol

$A = B$;

the fact that A and B are not equal if expressed by writing

$A \neq B$.

The most basic property of belonging is its relation to equality, which can be formulated as follows.

Axiom of extension. *Two sets are equal if and only if they have the same elements.*"

PLEASE MAKE SURE YOU UNDERSTAND THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN AN ELEMENT AND A SET.