

Re: This Month's Thought on Fermat's Last Theorem: 1

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2004-10/1416.html>

From: Will Twentyman (wtwentyman_at_read.my.sig)

Date: 10/05/04

Date: Tue, 05 Oct 2004 07:50:21 -0400

Keckman wrote:

> On 4 Oct 2004 07:42:01 -0700, Randy Poe <poespam-trap@yahoo.com> wrote:

>

>>

>> Anyway, this statement:

>>

>>> If that's queue's length is supposed to be oo then there is item oo.

>>

>>

>> is simply wrong. You keep saying it, but it's not true.

>> That's what you're trying to PROVE, and you "prove" it

>> by saying it over and over.

>>

>

>

> Lets put those queues to queue. Where we count as well as biggest item

> _and_ amount of natural numbers.

>

> 1 = 1

> 1+1 = 2

> 1+1+1 = 3

> .

> .

> .

> Math today says that we get(if amount is supposed to be something that
> is not finite)

>

> 1+1+1+1+...

This is not a defined construction in the Peano Axioms.

> Which if is infinite.

... but not a number.

sci.math: Re: This Month's Thought on Fermat's Last Theorem: 1

- > *But math today says that there is oo amount of 1 in that queue*
- > *although the sum is finite.*

No, the branches of math you are probably referring to say that queue is not made of finitely many operations, so not allowed.

--

Will Twentyman
email: wtwentyman at copper dot net