

Re: Epistemology 201: The Science of Science

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.cognitive/2005-02/2267.html>

From: aeo6 (aeo6_at_cornell.edu)

Date: 02/21/05

Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 10:15:49 -0500

Allan C Cybulskie said:

>

> "robert j. kolker" <nowhere@nowhere.net> wrote in message

> news:37ebq0F5bcpooU1@individual.net...

>>

>>

>> Allan C Cybulskie wrote:

>>> I've already dealt clearly with that. It's merely a word game, since

>>> infinity is the largest number that we can talk about. But that does

> not

>>> allow us to go beyond that and draw any inferences beyond "we can't talk

>>> about the extra elements because we don't have a terminology for it).

>>

>> Not a word game. $A < B$ (in the sense of cardinality)

>

> In short, the cardinality is less in this case. What does this have to do

> with number of elements, or any of the analysis I provided?

>

>> According to you anything you cannot comprehend is a word game.

>

> Stephen asked me what infinity + infinity was. Since I expect that he would

> not have approved of an answer of "2 * infinity", I saw the question as only

> possible leading to the answer "infinity", and then to the reply that

> therefore the set (0,1) has a number of elements equalling infinity and the

> set (0,2) has a number of elements equalling infinity, and so there was no

> reason to claim that the set (0,2) had to have more elements. But that's a

> word game based on the fact that we won't say "2 * infinity", not an actual

> argument.

>

> Surely

>> the sign of a less than first rate intellect. I suggest you give up on

>> mathematics and take up floor polishing, dish washing or even computer

>> programming.

>

> This is probably more ironic than you know.

>

> Besides, who said I was all that interested in mathematics? I merely

> exercise my right to not allow people playing word games to pull the wool

> *over my eyes.*

>

>

>

Thank you Allan. You are obviously no less than a first rate intellect as far as I can tell. Probably the only way to see beyond Cantor is to NOT be a mathematician by trade. I guess my problem here is that I HAVE been trying to say $\text{infinity} + \text{infinity} = 2 * \text{infinity}$, as long as you're talking about the same infinity consistently. I'm not sure why people have such a hard time conceiving ratios between infinite sets that are less than a power-set ratio. Even when there are an infinite number of rationals for each natural number, they are assigned the same cardinality, because of this counting method. It's nice to hear that someone else detects double-speak when it comes to mathematicians interpreting Cantor's cardinalities, vis a vis number/size/cardinality. Either I'm not crazy, or at least I'm not alone.

Thanks!

--

Smiles,
Tony