

Re: Relative Cardinality

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-07/msg01433.html>

- *From:* Virgil <ITSnetNOTcom#virgil@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 10 Jul 2005 12:56:13 -0600
-

In article <1120994946.238614.40010@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, mueckenh@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

> Virgil wrote:
>
>>> 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.
>
> Two elements of a set must differ by at least one property.

"Properties" are ideas, and non-physical.
.

- *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**

Re: Relative Cardinality

◇ *From:* Randy Poe

◆ ***Re: Relative Cardinality***

◇ *From:* mueckenh

◆ ***Re: Relative Cardinality***

◇ *From:* Proginoskes

◆ ***Re: Relative Cardinality***

◇ *From:* mueckenh

◆ ***Re: Relative Cardinality***

◇ *From:* Virgil

◆ ***Re: Relative Cardinality***

◇ *From:* mueckenh

- Prev by Date: ***Re: Relative Cardinality***
- Next by Date: ***Re: Best Maths Computer Programming Language***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: Relative Cardinality***
- Next by thread: ***Re: Relative Cardinality***
- Index(es):
 - ◆ ***Date***
 - ◆ ***Thread***