

# Re: Relative Cardinality

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-07/msg00937.html>

---

- *From:* Virgil <ITSnetNOTcom#virgil@xxxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Thu, 07 Jul 2005 11:38:18 -0600
- 

In article <1120742497.832998.137320@xx>, mueckenh@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

> Proginoskes wrote:  
>> mueckenh@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:  
>>> Randy Poe wrote:  
>>>> mueck...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:  
>>>>> As this would lead to strange results like  $\text{Card}(N) =$   
>>>>>  $\text{Card}(\{\text{Primes}\})$ ,  
>>>>  
>>>> Of course,  $\text{Card}(N)$  does equal  $\text{Card}(\text{Primes})$ .  
>>>>  
>>>> Does WM think there is a natural number  $n$  such that the  
>>>>  $n$ -th prime does not exist?  
>>>>  
>>> Yes, it is so. I am not sure, whether sequences like 111...111 with  $n$   
>>> 1's or like  $10^{2n} - 10^n + 1$  do ever cease to supply primes now and  
>>> then.  
>>  
>> That is an irrelevant comment, because there are prime numbers which  
>> are not of that form (like 2).  
>  
> It is no irrelevant but you have not yet understood my arguing.

No one but WM can understand WM's arguing.

>  
>> Er ... Euclid proved that there are an \_infinite\_ number of primes.  
>  
> Euclid did not talk of infinity. There are more than any given number,  
> he said.  
>  
>> What do you find wrong with that proof?  
>  
> Do you really think it necessary to demonstrate such things here?

## Re: Relative Cardinality

Does WM really think it necessary to avoid everything that does not allow him to obscure the real issues?

- > Recently we had a proof that  $\sqrt{2}$  is not rational. We should
- > concentrate on more general problems: It is impossible to label more
- > than  $10^{100}$  entities by all particles the universe supplies. Therefore
- > there cannot exist a set with more than  $10^{100}$  elements and we cannot
- > count up to  $10^{10^{100}}$ .

What happens in the physical world does not govern what happens in an axiom system. Such systems are not subject to any physical limitations but only the limitations of what the axioms themselves state and the imaginations of those who investigate them.

- >
- > Regards, WM
- >
- > Regards, WM
- .

---

### • *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ **Re: Relative Cardinality**  
◇ From: mueckenh

### • *References:*

- ◆ **Re: Relative Cardinality**  
◇ From: mueckenh
- ◆ **Re: Relative Cardinality**  
◇ From: Virgil
- ◆ **Re: Relative Cardinality**  
◇ From: mueckenh
- ◆ **Re: Relative Cardinality**  
◇ From: Dik T. Winter
- ◆ **Re: Relative Cardinality**  
◇ From: mueckenh
- ◆ **Re: Relative Cardinality**  
◇ From: Randy Poe
- ◆ **Re: Relative Cardinality**  
◇ From: mueckenh
- ◆ **Re: Relative Cardinality**  
◇ From: Proginoskes
- ◆ **Re: Relative Cardinality**  
◇ From: mueckenh

- Prev by Date: **Re: On the tangent function over  $C$**
- Next by Date: **Re: I'm puzzled ( $Q$  on norms of matrices)**
- Previous by thread: **Re: Relative Cardinality**
- Next by thread: **Re: Relative Cardinality**
- Index(es):

Re: Relative Cardinality

- ◆ Date
- ◆ Thread