

Re: reductio ad falsum versus reductio ad absurdum

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2005-09/msg00311.html>

- *From:* William Elliot <marsh@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 8 Sep 2005 01:37:52 -0700
-

From: adamgolding@xxxxxxxxxx
Newsgroups: sci.logic
Subject: Re: reductio ad falsum versus reductio ad absurdum

William Elliot wrote:

- > On Tue, 6 Sep 2005, futurist wrote:
- >
- >> sorry about that—that was the first time i've used Google Groups'
- >> quick-reply feature, which i assumed would just quote the entire
- >> previous message. anyway, this was a reply to Torkel Franzen's
- >> distinction between constructive reductio and indirect proof. there is
- >> another post which is in response to you which has all the appropriate
- >> quotations in place.
- >>
- >> Google quick-reply feature for math, science and serious
- >> discussion sucks big time.

- > so i've discovered—believe me i'm as big a fan of proper quotation
- > as you are (although i'm suprised that your newsreader doesn't let
- > you switch between threaded/new-arrivals on the fly by means of a
- > convenient keyboard shortcut—even when messages are properly quoted
- > i like to see the tree structure)

It does and it isn't convenient when there are scores of posts in several math groups and forums. The quick-reply feature works both ways. Those who use it frequently get a quick no-reply from me. It cuts down the number of posts to read and adequately consider to a manageable few. Even so, with the up take of school, I've dropped two newsgroups.

- >> Don't use it except for the frivolous of yack yack
- >> newgoupies for which it's designed. Upon hearing Google was
- >> getting greedy with public stock offering, I knew it was going to
- >> deteriorate. Indeed and alas, my foreknowledge wasn't
- >> disappointed.

- > while google groups' (beta) interface leaves much to be desired, one
- > can hardly complain that the massive archive that was dejanews
- > returned and was expanded, (and at no cost to the user)

Re: reductio ad falsum versus reductio ad absurdum

Ya, they fucked it up and it's no longer the great tool it was before they went to stock market offerings and corporate greed.

> > I hadn't noticed any replies addressed to me.
> > Note, I read by new arrivals and not by thread.

> sorry, the quotes were there but the "____ wrote:" header was
> missing--this is the post here:

> <http://groups.google.com/group/sci.logic/msg/17b42846e1d3247f>

Oh spare me. Only if it's a slow night, which is won't be until xmas vacation, I'm little inclined to spend extra time to open an outside link and then go scrolling thru the site until I find the referenced material.

As I'm now composing off line from replies I've down loaded, it's additional bother to reconnect, pull up the post and download it with the next batch of downloaded email, clean it of all google stuff and hope that there's no "press here for complete post" button. Well if I get around to it after all the other stuff I've downloaded and if I remember to look for it after a quick scan of new arrivals, and if none of them are more

> > BTW the way, using capital "I" would polish your posts
> > toward appearing studious and scholarly.

> there are new and developing standards of language online.

There are new and developing online standards of linguistic crap.
There are new and developing capitalist standards of corruption.

.

• **References:**

- ◆ **Re: reductio ad falsum versus reductio ad absurdum**
◇ From: adamgolding
- ◆ **Re: reductio ad falsum versus reductio ad absurdum**
◇ From: Torkel Franzen
- ◆ **Re: reductio ad falsum versus reductio ad absurdum**
◇ From: futurist
- ◆ **Re: reductio ad falsum versus reductio ad absurdum**
◇ From: Torkel Franzen
- ◆ **Re: reductio ad falsum versus reductio ad absurdum**
◇ From: futurist
- ◆ **Re: reductio ad falsum versus reductio ad absurdum**
◇ From: Torkel Franzen
- ◆ **Re: reductio ad falsum versus reductio ad absurdum**
◇ From: futurist

Re: reductio ad falsum versus reductio ad absurdum

- ◆ **Re: reductio ad falsum versus reductio ad absurdum**
◇ From: Torkel Franzen
- ◆ **Re: reductio ad falsum versus reductio ad absurdum**
◇ From: futurist
- ◆ **Re: reductio ad falsum versus reductio ad absurdum**
◇ From: Torkel Franzen
- ◆ **Re: reductio ad falsum versus reductio ad absurdum**
◇ From: futurist
- ◆ **Re: reductio ad falsum versus reductio ad absurdum**
◇ From: William Elliot
- ◆ **Re: reductio ad falsum versus reductio ad absurdum**
◇ From: futurist
- ◆ **Re: reductio ad falsum versus reductio ad absurdum**
◇ From: William Elliot
- ◆ **Re: reductio ad falsum versus reductio ad absurdum**
◇ From: adamgolding

- Prev by Date: **Re: A Brief Note on Notation**
- Next by Date: **Re: Axiomatic Proof Help**
- Previous by thread: **Re: reductio ad falsum versus reductio ad absurdum**
- Next by thread: **Re: reductio ad falsum versus reductio ad absurdum**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**