

Re: Relative Cardinality

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-07/msg00734.html>

- *From:* mueckenh@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* 6 Jul 2005 12:05:45 -0700
-

Virgil wrote:

>> Unjustified conclusion. If there is a bijection possible between two
>> well-ordered sets A and B, then we find that $\text{Card}(A) = < \text{Card}(B)$ and
>> $\text{Card}(B) = < \text{Card}(A)$. For infinite sets $\text{Card}(A) = \text{Card}(B)$ cannot be
>> concluded, because they do not actually exist.

>

> Then WMCards does not measure set sizes.

>

> Set sizes must satisfy: If $a \leq b$ and $b \leq a$ then $a = b$

>

That is a fairly primitive rule extrapolated from finite sets.

Potentially infinite sets are never complete and, therefore, have no sizes which could obey that rule.

My tool can only show that a set is not surpassing another by magnitude. Equality is nonsense with infinite sets.

>

>> Something not

>>> completely existing can be less than but cannot be equal to some other

>>> existing or not existing object.

>

> The only something not completely existing here is WM's sanity.

Do you really need that kind of arguing? – already at this stage?

>>

>>> However, equal WMCards does not mean that a bijection

>>> exists.

>>

>>> For finite sets equal Cards (+/- 1) means that a bijection (+/- 1) can

>>> be established.

>

> If equal WMCards do not imply bijectability even for finite sets, they

> are no bloody use for finite sets. We already knew that they are of no

> bloody use for infinite ones.

They are of excellent use to determine the truth! I notice your

reaction!

Regards, WM

.

- *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ **Re: Relative Cardinality**

- ◆ *From:* Virgil

- *References:*

- ◆ **Re: Relative Cardinality**

- ◆ *From:* Virgil

- ◆ **Re: Relative Cardinality**

- ◆ *From:* mueckenh