Re: An uncountable countable set

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2006−08/msg02931.html

---

- *From*: Tony Orlow <aeo6@xxxxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Wed, 23 Aug 2006 18:04:07 −0400

MoeBlee wrote:

> Albrecht wrote:
>
>> There is no relevance in which system the axiom is found.
>> E.g. the Axiom A: "Axiom A is wrong", is self contradicting, regardless
>> of which other axioms are used, I think. The same holds for the axiom
>> of infinity.
>
> You miss the point. Since you've not shown any contradiction in set
> theory, whatever contradiction you claim to have found must be a
> contradiction between set theory and something else outside of set
> theory. But if you can't articulate that something else as a
> mathematical formula, then no one much cares that set theory conflicts
> with your not mathematically articulated principles.

Hi MoeBlee − How are you?

Set theory contradicts with:

(1) E y e N, A x>y, x< 2*x < x^2 < 2^x (y=2)

because:

(2) A y e N, aleph_0>y

and

(3) aleph_0/2 = aleph_0 = aleph_0^2 < 2^aleph_0

(1) is trivially inductively provable.
(2)and (3) are from transfinitology.

> So I take it from your response that you don't have a set of axioms for
> your mathematics. So I wonder how you expect people to evaluate whether

something is or is not a theorem of your mathematics.

Can you evaluate the relationship between the above three statements?

MoeBlee

Thanx,

Tony
.