

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

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2006-06/msg00162.html>

- *From:* "William of Ockham" <d3uckner@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 5 Jun 2006 10:36:47 -0700
-

david petry wrote:

William of Ockham wrote:

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 \mathbb{N} , which is not on the face of it meaningless).

As I understand it, you are claiming that it is obvious to you that the assertion that there exists a set containing every subset of \mathbb{N} is a meaningful assertion.

No. Do read what I say. I did not say it was obvious that the assertion was meaningful. I said "It is not on the face of it meaningless", i.e. that it's not obvious that it is not meaningful.

So let me ask you a question. Applying the same logic or intuition which forces you to believe that such an assertion is meaningful, would you not also be forced to the conclusion that the assertion that there exists a set containing every set is meaningful? I'd really appreciate it if you would go into some detail about why or why not that would be the case.

Again, while it is not obvious that it is meaningful, it is not obvious that it is not meaningful. It is not the case, of course, but once again I think you are getting confused being something not being the case.