Re: Galileo's Paradox

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2006−12/msg02773.html

- *From*: Virgil <virgil@xxxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Fri, 08 Dec 2006 16:57:19 −0700

In article <4579d1c7@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>,
Tony Orlow <tony@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

> When there is a balance between one assumption and another, we are in a position to justify one or the other. That's logic....

The same way assumption of Santa Claus balances assumption of a tooth fairy? That's TO's logic!

> > There are some VERY simple definitions in set theory (either naive or ZF, AC or not), and some of them are REALLY as simple as one can expect: a set is called "infinite" if there exists a bijection (which already has been completely and fully WELL defined) between that set and at least one of its proper subsets. Period. That is all there is to it.
>
> Cardinality, yes, is simplistic − no argument. Very simplistic...

Math is simple (not always easy, but definitely simple).
TO is simplistic.

> > You don't wanna accept this definition? Good, propose yours..."potencial infinity", "actual infinity", shminfinity: give us DEFINITIONS, axioms to work with...and let's hope that upon checking and re−checking, those axioms and definitions aren't shown to be inconsistent, which has NOT been proved for ZF, AC or not AC....and that they are sufficiently interesting to deal with, of course.
>
> Okay, a "potential" infinite set is one where each element, like the naturals, has a specific string associated with it, which has a

> left−hand end.

If those strings do not have two ends, you have either an uncountably potentiality or a ppotential uncountability.

> > After some time interchanging posts, some of these trolls/crankis begin to REALLY believe that they have proved inconsistencies, contradictions, etc. Just read some of Eckie's posts to see what a diet low in potassium can do to human brain.
>
> No one here claims any such thing.

Eckie does! WM does!

> One can only claim that certain
> logical constructions involved are invalid.

In matters mathematical, claims without proofs usually do not count for much. They are called conjectures.

> There is nothing wrong with expecting science to satisfy intuition.

In the way that general relativity and quantum field theory do?

> > And one last question from me to you: what do you think of my remark, some 5−6 days ago, that as far as I know, NONE of the megacranks is a mathematician? Don't you wonder about this? I don't doubt there are mathematicians that don't like this ir that part in math, but I bet they won't troll about it as you people do, and that's a huge difference.
> > Tonio
>
> I chose to work within computer science, after having planned to become a mathematician, for the obvious reasons....

Couldn't cut it as a mathematician?
.