Re: Distinct linear orderings on Z

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005−03/8271.html

---

From: Albert Wagner (*albertwagner_at_cox.net*)
Date: 03/23/05

```
Date: Wed, 23 Mar 2005 13:23:41 −0600
```


stephen@nomail.com wrote:
<snip>
> I would like to see an example of a definition as
> defined by the philosophers. Of course one of their
> rules seems to be that you cannot define by example,
> which seems to be a handy excuse for never having
> to actually demonstrate what they mean by anything.

Whereas, mathematikers can only define by example because they erroneously assume that a single particular defines the general.

> They various definitions proposed for "circle" have
> been very weak and supposed all sorts of other definitions
> such as "motion", "line", "rate" and required myriad
> assumptions about how those words are defined.

Yes, interestingly, even the common definitions, of 'motion', 'line' and 'rate' work just fine for a precise definition. So it is curious why you would say that it is 'weak'. Especially, when definitions that rely on infinite sets require all sorts of undefined and multiply defined words.

```
−−
"I know that most men, including those at ease with
problems of the greatest complexity, can seldom
accept even the simplest and most obvious truth
if it be such as would oblige them to admit the falsity
of conclusions which they have delighted in explaining
to colleagues, which they have proudly taught to others,
and which they have woven, thread by thread,
into the fabric of their lives." −
        −− Tolstoy
```