

# Re: Ultimate debunking of Cantor's Theory

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-07/msg03052.html>

---

- *From:* Virgil <virgil@xxxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Thu, 19 Jul 2007 12:30:39 -0600
- 

In article <1184868790.872270.210900@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, WM <mueckenh@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On 17 Jul., 18:44, Randy Poe <poespan-t...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Jul 17, 8:07 am, WM <mueck...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On 16 Jul., 20:45, Virgil <vir...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

In article  
<1184602377.255290.254...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>,

WM <mueck...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>  
wrote:

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

In article  
<1184550638.931818.34...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>,  
IF one has a  
non-empty  
ordered set  
without a  
largest  
element,  
one  
can

Re: Ultimate debunking of Cantor's Theory

easily prove