

Re: Ultimate debunking of Cantor's Theory

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-07/msg02329.html>

- *From:* Calvin <crice5@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 15 Jul 2007 10:12:01 -0700
-

On Jul 15, 9:42 am, WM <mueck...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On 15 Jul., 15:05, Don Stockbauer wrote:

There are just two flavors of infinity:

1. The potential

which is not infinite.

2. The actual

Which is not there.

The problem I have with all this, not knowing much about the various theories of sets, is that some people will make declarations, such as that there are no infinite sets, or there are only potentially infinite sets, as if they are speaking absolute truths.

They don't say, along with those declarations, that they mean 'according to this or that set theory'. They say it as if it is revealed truth. Then, when someone challenges the declarations, they start talking about sets of axioms in various theories, and so demonstrate their knowledge, which is undeniable.

But, in spite of high IQs, and vast and subtle accumulated knowledge about the deepest aspects of all known theories of sets, the fact remains that with only limited knowledge, and only average IQ, anyone who thinks about it at all, knows that the totality of natural numbers is an infinite totality.

Re: Ultimate debunking of Cantor's Theory

(The word 'totality' here is not used in the sense of a sum, but in the sense of 'all'.)

If I'm forbidden from using the word 'set', so be it, but there is an 'all' of natural numbers, and it is infinite.

.