

**Pete L. Clark** 2 days ago edited

@WM: So you're saying that the part of your answer which you claim makes it on topic was something you had to intentionally omit because of its known unpopularity to mathematicians? Wow.

I am not sure that you understand the technical items of set theory. Your arxiv papers contain no arguments which are written in the language of modern set theory, i.e., formalized via ideas and techniques from mathematical logic. Rather, you confine yourself to a sort of literary analysis of very old papers, mostly from the 19th or early 20th centuries. You use terms like completed versus potential infinity, which are not part of the modern vernacular.