

Re: Review of Mueckenheims book.

Re: Review of Mueckenheims book.

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-03/msg01690.html>

- *From:* Tony Orlow <tony@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 08 Mar 2007 16:46:27 -0500
-

mueckenh@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

On 7 Mrz., 18:36, Tony Orlow <t...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Mike Kelly wrote:

Kumquats are not natural numbers.

--

mike.

WM used them as a metaphor. Natural numbers apply to kumquats, and all "objects", no?

I would never invent such a childish nonsense. William seems to like that stuff.

Regards, WM

Okay. I guess the first reference I saw to the kumquats in question was by you, but I must have missed the first mention. Sorry.

WM, you don't disagree that there are infinite sets containing just finite values, such as the reals in $[0,1]$, are you? I certainly agree that an infinite set of naturals must contain infinite values, but that's only because they are spaced apart by a unit in value. Isn't that your thinking?

Tony

.