

Re: An uncountable countable set

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2006-10/msg05895.html>

- *From:* Lester Zick <dontbother@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 21 Oct 2006 11:06:41 -0700
-

On 20 Oct 2006 13:39:32 -0700, "MoeBlee" <jazzmobe@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

MoeBlee wrote:

Tony Orlow wrote:

I'm reading Non-Standard Analysis instead.

What book?

You really would be better served by having your basics in set theory and mathematical logic in order first and then taking on non-standard analysis.

Robinson agrees there's no smallest infinity,

Then that is not the same as the ordering of the ordinals we're talking about. I very much doubt that Robinson claims that there is not a least infinite ordinal.

Please tell me exactly what passages or theorems you are referring to in Robinson's work so that I can see exactly what it is you are talking about.

And this reminds me that you never did come to understand the difference between cardinality and ordering. I and others have pointed out to you that you conflate these. One doesn't even need non-standard analysis to provide an ordering in which there is a set S with no least member yet with every member of S greater than some set with no greatest member. But that ordering is not an ordering by cardinality. Yes, PA has models in which there are different orderings so that objects are called 'infinite' per these orderings, but this is NOT the same sense of 'infinite' as that of the cardinality sense. And we can

Re: An uncountable countable set

define a division operation on these "infinite" objects to get infinitesimals, but again, this is not the same as cardinality.

Moreover, you must be very careful to distinguish between the proof of the existence of certain models and a RECURSIVE axiomatization for a theory of which the model is a model of.

Ah another lecture in neomathspeak. See the problem is that Tony just doesn't agree with you. And there is nothing in what you say which can bridge that gap because nothing in the orthodox catechism of standard set methodology (I'm assuming it's standard) can be demonstrated true. You and he just have different perspectives on the problem and nothing in what you have to say has any relevance to what Tony believes any more than what Tony believes has any relevance to what you believe. Which is undoubtedly why he has begun to study non standard analysis before satisfying your criteria for the standard set methodologies you believe in. And though your beliefs are pervasive, to the extent they aren't demonstrably true your arguments are irrelevant because they're unable to effect a suspension of disbelief in Tony. In general terms it's called a crisis of faith.

~v~~

.