

# Re: Ultimate debunking of Cantor's Theory

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-07/msg02532.html>

---

- *From:* Virgil <virgil@xxxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Mon, 16 Jul 2007 12:45:59 -0600
- 

In article <1184602377.255290.254310@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, WM <mueckenh@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On 16 Jul., 07:20, Virgil <vir...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

In article <1184550638.931818.34...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>,

IF one has a non-empty ordered set without a largest element, one can easily prove

But IF one has an empty non-ordered set with a largest element, what can one prove then?

How can there be a "largest" if there is no ordering by which to compare sizes?

Can Wm explain how to identify a largest without being able to compare relative sizes?

.