

# Re: Why? [was Re: Cantor's powerset theorem is false?]

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2006-06/msg00121.html>

---

- *From:* "William of Ockham" <d3uckner@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* 4 Jun 2006 04:12:48 -0700
- 

Patricia Shanahan wrote:

Cantor's power set theorem is clearly falsifiable. All it takes is a pair of sets  $S$  and  $P$ , with a function  $f:S \rightarrow P$ , such that  $P$  is the power set of  $S$  and  $f$  is a bijection.

Indeed, but it is not this aspect of Cantor's proof that David is saying is not falsifiable (if I understand him, which I'm not sure I do). He seems to be claiming that the assumption of a power set of  $N$  exists is not falsifiable, therefore it is meaningless.

My objection is that his claim is so wide-reaching that it rules out many things as meaningless which many people would count as meaningful (including the assertion that there exists a set containing every subset of  $N$ , which is not on the face of it meaningless).

.