

Re: Well Ordering the Reals

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-11/msg00168.html>

- *From:* Tony Orlow <aeo6@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 1 Nov 2005 16:28:54 -0500
-

Virgil said:

> In article <MPG.1dd15ad9caf3df8a98a5ca@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>,
> Tony Orlow <aeo6@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
>
>> Russell said:
>>> Daryl McCullough wrote:
>>>
>>> [snip]
>>>
>>>> Hilbert wondered whether the reals could be well-ordered.
>>>
>>> Wouldn't such a well-ordering have to be complicated enough
>>> that it couldn't be used to decide CH? (Since CH is undecidable,
>>> right?) It's hard for me to imagine how a well-ordering of the
>>> reals could be specified in any book of finite length while still
>>> leaving CH undecided.
>>>
>>>
>> Did you look at my web page?
>
> Since TO starts with a whole raft of conditions contrary to fact, there
> is no need to punish oneself perusing such garbage.
>
So, you choose to participate in a conversation in total ignorance of the
subject matter, deliberately? Screw you, loser. I'll waste no more time on you
then.

—
Smiles,

Tony
<http://www.people.cornell.edu/pages/aeo6/WellOrder/>

-
- *Follow-Ups:*
 - ◆ ***Re: Well Ordering the Reals***
 - ◇ *From:* MoeBlee
 - ◆ ***Re: Well Ordering the Reals***

Re: Well Ordering the Reals

◇ *From:* Virgil

• ***References:***

◆ ***Re: Well Ordering the Reals***

◇ *From:* Daryl McCullough

◆ ***Re: Well Ordering the Reals***

◇ *From:* Russell