

# Re: Cardinality question

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-04/msg01852.html>

---

- *From:* Will Twentyman <[wtwentyman@xxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:wtwentyman@xxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Wed, 13 Apr 2005 10:50:34 -0400
- 

Eckard Blumschein wrote:

On 4/12/2005 6:27 PM, Torkel Franzen wrote:

Eckard Blumschein <[blumschein@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:blumschein@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> writes:

What about "my findings" the situation is opposite. In contrast to the Cantorians I am open for any objection.

Splendid! We must simply wait for posterity to find that there are no objections to your profound arguments, and to adjust their mathematics accordingly.

I am not sure what profound arguments you are referring to. What about Cantor's basic mistakes, I got aware of telling very well known secrets to those who are able to judge. However, there seems to be a variety of personal arrangements with these mistakes ranging from Ebbinghaus who indirectly admitted the "obvious fallacy" but nonetheless alluded a "big useful mathematical truth" to those physicists who revealed to be unhappy with set theory but having not yet a better substitute.

So far I was unable to grasp the putative big truth. I see it rather an pretended excuse for lacking courage and/or understandable adaptation. It would not be wise writing books on nothing more than nonsense. Moreover, the existing set theory is welcome in order to suppress questions concerning some peculiarities of real "numbers". Axioms are not to be questioned, basta.

## Re: Cardinality question

Do you understand what an axiom represents? It is an \*assumed\* rule for the system being worked in. You are free to use different axioms if you wish, but that will merely give you a different system. If you want different axioms, use different axioms. ZF is used by some people because it is consistent and because it corresponds closely to what those people have in mind for set theory.

> Caveats by Eberhard Illigens did not have

any effect against Cantor's authority. David Hilbert fortified his "power of state" when he feared Weyl could be the revolution. Students of mathematics have to learn so much arbitrarily sophisticated stuff that their ability for developing independent criticism and creativity is perhaps more damaged than by permanent consume of natriumglutamate. In so far it would be illusory to wait for future generations.

This statement seems odd. How much mathematics have you taken?

Even if I do not expect any applause, I would like to doubt whether the ubiquitously assumed idea that numbers are god-given numbers in every respect is really best. When I missed humbleness, I meant that it is perhaps suboptimal to "attack" infinity and continuum like a conqueror commanding an army of uniformed numbers.

Numbers are invented by us, just like the rest of mathematics. Even something as simple as 1, 2 or 3 is an abstraction from reality.

--

Will Twentyman  
email: wtwentyman at copper dot net

.