

Re: Cantor Confusion

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2006-12/msg01591.html>

- *From:* Eckard Blumschein <blumschein@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 05 Dec 2006 15:19:23 +0100
-

On 12/5/2006 12:39 AM, Virgil wrote:

If irrational numbers are thought to complete the rationals which sounds quite logical, then the constituted entity of the reals has to be as fictitious as the irrationals.

And the rationals and the naturals and all other mathematical constructions.

No. No. No. I do not have a more apt word than fictitious in the sense it was used by Leibniz in order to stress the conceptual difference between addressable discrete numbers and merely attributed without such address positions. If you deny this conceptual difference, then you are denying the difference between generally countable rationals on one side and generally uncountable just fictitious reals on the other side.

In other words: Genuine numbers are countable, fictitious numbers are uncountable. The latter do not have an available numerical address.

They are all equally fictitious, creations of the mind having no existence outside of the mind.

This is an attempt to hide that Dedekind and Cantor built an Utopia.