

Re: Distinct linear orderings on Z

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-03/8336.html>

From: Albert Wagner (*albertwagner_at_cox.net*)

Date: 03/23/05

Date: Wed, 23 Mar 2005 15:52:21 -0600

Giuseppe Bilotta wrote:

> *Albert Wagner wrote:*

>

>>> *Wrong. The original definition makes no statement whatsoever
>>> about the finiteness or not of the subset.*

>>

>> *Of course it doesn't explicitly. But the implication is obvious.*

>

>

> *This is true for a large part of Euclid's theorems as well.*

> *Does this make Euclid's geometry circular?*

>

>

>> *Is a pickpocket who works in gloves innocent of theft?*

>

>

> *Non-sequitur straw-man argument.*

LOL. Just throw out some philosophy sounding word, huh?

>>> **You* are deducing that the subset is itself infinite*

>>> *(something which, BTW, you can only deduce if you accept that a*

>>> *set which is in bijective correspondance with another set has*

>>> *the same finiteness property; where do you get this from?), and*

>>> *putting it back in the definition.*

>>

>> *Finiteness property? LOL. The old 'dormitive principle' again,*

>> *huh? And yes, I used your own definition against you.*

>

>

> *Finiteness property: a set being finite or not.*

'Dormitive principle': Used by the logically illiterate.

--

"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

sci.math: Re: Distinct linear orderings on \mathbb{Z}

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