

# Re: A new definition of natural numbers

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2006-11/msg04218.html>

---

- *From:* Eckard Blumschein <[blumschein@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:blumschein@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Wed, 15 Nov 2006 15:01:52 +0100
- 

On 11/13/2006 9:10 PM, Tonico wrote:

Eckard Blumschein ha escrito:

On 11/6/2006 9:31 AM, Virgil wrote:

In article <454EE10F.7070506@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, Eckard Blumschein <[blumschein@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:blumschein@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

Perhaps Archimedes was the first one who gave a still unrivalled compelling description of natural numbers.

Not by modern standards.

Concerning the basics of mathematics: Do we need questionable modern standards or a comprehensively correct and as plausible as possible logic foundation?

Judge yourself: Methods by Euclid, Newton, Leibniz, Euler, Gauss etc. were overly successful and will continue to do so. Is there any need to use Cantor's transfinite set theory, any example of useful application of  $\aleph_2$  or even more nonsensical phantasmagoria?

Eckard Blumschein

\*\*\*\*\*

Transfinite theory is beautiful,

One of the first reasons for me to ask for clarification was that I felt beauty of mathematics hurt.

Re: A new definition of natural numbers

Is that ALL  
your argument against Dedekind–Cantor–Set theory?

Elsewhere I listed more in detail several reasons, e.g.:

- 1) not a single proven fundamental,  
in particular obvious misinterpretation of DA2
- 2) ongoing use of the invalid definition of a set
- 3) obviously naive and populist arguments, exaggerating rhetoric
- 4) students are urged to believe rather than understand
- 5) lacking readiness of mathematicians to agree on some logical  
conclusions is notoriously based on obedience to set theory
- 6) impossibility of looking at the natural numbers one by one and  
simultaneously as an entity
- 7) apparently nobody here is in position to defend transfinite set theory  
by tangible factual arguments without insult and hoity–toity phrases

Seems uncountably  
weak to me...\*sigh\*...specially if you're trying to convince  
mathematicians. You may try though in your city's bazaar, or perhaps in  
Mueck's college.

I would like to appeal to sufficiently intelligent open–minded people.  
Most likely, individuals like Virgil will not accept any deviating  
opinion. What about M., I disagree with him in part. He claims that  
there are physical limitations to numbers. I see numbers as an independent  
ideal concept. Also, I do not share his view on "intercession". He seems  
not to follow yet my admittedly uncommon insight that the point of view  
matters if one decides between countable and uncountable.

Regards,  
Eckard

.