

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/msg00147.html>

---

- *From:* george <[greeneg@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:greeneg@xxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Thu, 09 Aug 2007 08:21:23 -0700
- 

On Aug 8, 7:54 pm, Scott <[ToaTe...@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:ToaTe...@xxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

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

YOU DID post at least one thing "trying to fill in gaps". But that is not the point. The original proof you posted was, well, mistaken. Clue: THIS IS THE INTERNET: DO NOT give yourself carpal tunnel by posting something out of a book after typing it yourself: POST A LINK. After you posted the proof from Potter, the IMMEDIATE next response was:

You realize that there are glaring mistakes and some things that don't even make sense among all of that, right?

Even more amazing was your reply, "I'm here to learn from my mistakes; please point them out." Idiot: YOU WERE POSTING A PROOF FROM A BOOK. \*YOUR\* mistakes could be NOWHERE in evidence in that unless you had MISquoted the book!

But we often have to tell people to stop reading books they don't understand. Throw that book away.

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.

That is not really true. What you don't understand is first-order logic.

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?

You really need to start reading THAT book.

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.

THERE ARE \*NO\* implicit assumptions going on here!  
The assumptions are ALL EXPLICIT in the AXIOMS! There are some more assumptions involving FOL as a paradigm generally, but IF YOU HAVE STUDIED FOL then you already know and agree with those assumptions! You certainly cannot STATE an implicit assumption that anybody ever MADE anywhere.  
Idiot.

I've already recognized and acknowledged long ago that the proof itself is solid.

No, you haven't, especially not if you were trying to go by the proof you posted, WHICH YOU DON'T UNDERSTAND, and which we strongly suspect is not even correctly quoted (since, as MoeBlee and Artruro both said, "there are glaring mistakes and some things that don't even make sense among all of that"). If we didn't understand it then it's a very safe bet that you didn't either.

The problem is I've never come across a book that addresses the assumptions.

You have no idea how pathetic and idiotic you sound.  
YOU CANNOT STATE any alleged "implicit assumptions".  
There is nothing going on here beyond string comparison.

No problem. See my simple example in previous post.

Wrong. If the example is in fact simple then just reproduce it

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?

here&now.

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".

Too advanced. What you didn't know was that 1) the philosophy is NOT important, and 2) set theory is going to be presented IN FIRST-ORDER LOGIC, SO FIRST, YOU HAVE TO LEARN FIRST-ORDER LOGIC. You DON'T get to START with set theory!

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.

....

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.

You are not likely to get that.

The main reason why is that "I can present proofs" is just a lie: you canNOT present proofs. You don't understand them. Even when you were trying to quote a proof directly out of the Potter book, you messed THAT up.

For example, in a previous thread I put forth the idea

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?

An idea is NOT (usually) a proof.

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

No, it led to something ridiculous. It was not ANY kind of proof, faulty or otherwise.

and moved on to start studying the finiteness of natural numbers.

That does not BEAR study! PLEASE! Everybody KNOWS a finite string when they see one (if they have in fact seen the whole string). That actually IS the relevant implicit assumption! It is implicit FOR A REASON! Do NOT study it!

.

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