

# Re: Ultimate debunking of Cantor's Theory

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-07/msg02335.html>

---

- *From:* Rotwang <[sg552@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:sg552@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Sun, 15 Jul 2007 10:31:17 -0700
- 

Calvin wrote:

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.

Those people are cranks, or in the case of the OP, pretending to be cranks. Of course there's no reason why you should believe me and not them when I say this, if you don't think my posts stand up on their own (which you evidently don't). I suggest if you are serious about wanting to understand what's going on that you read a book on axiomatic set theory – I can personally recommend Goldrei's "Classic Set Theory" which I quoted earlier in this thread.

Then, when someone challenges the declarations, they start talking about sets of axioms in various theories, and so demonstrate their knowledge, which is undeniable.

I haven't noticed that coming from the same people who make the kind of declaration you talk about above.

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,

## Re: Ultimate debunking of Cantor's Theory

anyone who thinks about it at all, knows that the totality of natural numbers is an infinite totality.

(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.

No argument from me here.

.