

Re: Question: Given $|X|>0$ and $|Y|>0$, can $X \times Y$ be empty?

Re: Question: Given $|X|>0$ and $|Y|>0$, can $X \times Y$ be empty?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2007-08/msg00131.html>

- *From:* Scott <ToaTerra@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 08 Aug 2007 23:54:28 -0000
-

On Aug 8, 2:47 pm, george <gree...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

Oh, BULL.

Practically every respondent ALWAYS TELLS YOU EXACTLY where your gaps are! I know I do. In a message you are not replying to, I told you that the gap was that you had not defined A or f_A and that

THAT was EXACTLY where your gap was. But I don't see you bothering to try to fill it.

And so I changed the proof to fill in the gaps. Unfortunately, I haven't been able to post it because of everyones frustration.

Why are you even trying to disagree with Cantor's theorem in the first place??

Because I do not understand something about the proof itself.

Does it not occur to you that since there are proofs of it in books, IT OBVIOUSLY MUST be right?? Why don't you instead point to some SINGLE SIMPLE

I've never had a problem with the deduction, its the implicit assumptions. I read on a site somewhere (I think www.crank.com, but can't be sure) where an editor of a journal posted information about why so many people continue to challenge Cantor's Theorem and all the mistakes they made. But far the largest was in deduction; ie, flaws in creating proofs. He said the least area people tried to refute it is the assumptions. I've already recognized and acknowledged long ago that the proof itself is solid. The problem is I've never come across a book that addresses the assumptions.

Re: Question: Given $|X|>0$ and $|Y|>0$, can $X \times Y$ be empty?

Re: Question: Given $|X|>0$ and $|Y|>0$, can $X \times Y$ be empty?

INDIVIDUAL

piece of the proof that you don't understand, and offer a simple counter-argument TO THAT? IF you "aced propositional logic" then that shouldn't be hard.

No problem. See my simple example in previous post.

Here is one: READ A BOOK.

Do you really need someone to recommend you a book?!?

Read a book: I have "Set Theory and its Philosophy" and "The Joy of Sets".

I tried asking for a "logic buddy",

That will also work. I am qualified.

But you have to be able to admit that you are messing up.

Most people have too much undeserved ego to use me.

Then I will take you up on your offer. Would you like to do it through email or posting to the newsgroup. I have no problem admitting when I am wrong.

someone who can
convert ideas into mathematical notation,

idiot: THAT is NOT a logic buddy!

Mistake in that statement. I would like a logic buddy as someone who I can present proofs and they can point out flaws and areas to further study. For example, in a previous thread I put forth the idea that the infinite set of denumerable strings can be mapped to the set of natural numbers. People pointed out that natural numbers are finite length. I acknowledged my lack of understanding led to a faulty proof and moved on to start studying the finiteness of natural numbers.

Re: Question: Given $|X|>0$ and $|Y|>0$, can $X \times Y$ be empty?

Re: Question: Given $|X|>0$ and $|Y|>0$, can $X \times Y$ be empty?

Propose, find flaw, learn, repeat.

Logic does not give a HOOT about "mathematical notation"!

So why do you?

Neither do you, as long as you are going to keep writing (Ex)
(whatever).

THAT IS STUPID notation! As Arturo OUGHT to have figured out by now,
from
the trouble it has put you into.

This is the notation of my book "Set Theory...". Others have said it
is a good book so I stick with the notation. Its simple, concise, and
easy to understand. And the notation doesn't seem to the problem with
the proof.

but no one is interested.

That is NOT at all true.

EVERYbody wants SOMEbody to feel superior to.

So true. And frankly, that is the feeling I get from you. You're not
really interested in helping me as opposed to just yelling and trying
to bolster yourself up.

I have tried going through some of the problems in the books I have (for
those which have solutions) and I am getting them right.

Nobody here believes that, ESPECIALLY if you are stupid enough to be
asking questions like "how do you prove a subset does not exist" and
denying the axiom of separation and expecting to find some flaw in
a proof of Cantor's theorem. THIS IS NOT NORMAL behavior,
ESPECIALLY
not normal for people who are actually SHOULD be "doing" logic.

Really. Then I ask for enlightenment. How does one "do" logic? I

Re: Question: Given $|X|>0$ and $|Y|>0$, can $X \times Y$ be empty?

Re: Question: Given $|X|>0$ and $|Y|>0$, can $X \times Y$ be empty?

always thought it was find a problem or propose a theory and back it up with proofs.

EVERY time you post something stupid, people TELL YOU TO STOP doing it that way and TELL YOU TO START doing it this way:
JUST OBEY THEM.
It Really Is Just That Simple.

I do, except for those individuals who prefer to yell and call names.

I told you 5 times already to STOP writing $(\exists x)(\text{whatever})$ and START writing $\exists[\text{cond}(x)]$. THAT'S One alternative, one you have THUS far been NOT all for.
IF you would start doing that then it would become possible to explain to you
WHAT A WFF IS.

But $(\exists x)(\text{whatever})$ *is* correct notation. See "Set Theory and its Philosophy". My problem with your posts is you focus on notation (being different from your favorite) and claim that as ignorance for understanding set theory. People have used $x \in s$, $x \in S$, and $x \in S$ to mean the same thing. Who really cares which one a person uses. Not interested in starting a religious war over which one is "correct". As long as it is clear when is meant, let people use their favorite notation.

Something that you somehow managed to miss in all your books is that 0) propositional logic is also called 0th-order logic;

How does this relate to the proof?

1) if you pretend that conjunctions and disjunctions can be infinitely long, and

Where in the proof was that occurring?

Re: Question: Given $|X|>0$ and $|Y|>0$, can $X \times Y$ be empty?