

Re: Uncountable sets in CZF?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2004-08/5503.html>

From: Jesse F. Hughes (jesse_at_phiwumbda.org)

Date: 08/30/04

Date: Mon, 30 Aug 2004 20:59:04 +0200

raf@tiki-lounge.com (Ross A. Finlayson) writes:

- > *Cantor-Schroeder-Bernstein: it works both ways.*
- >
- > *What that means is that one of the reasons that people call the reals*
- > *uncountable is because they've figured out a bijection between the*
- > *reals and the powerset of the naturals, thus they reason that there*
- > *are no bijections between the reals and the naturals, because*
- > *Cantor-Schroeder-Bernstein says the existence of a surjection either*
- > *way between two sets is proof of the existence of a bijection between*
- > *those two sets.*
- >
- > *That is to say, the existence of a surjection from A to B and from B*
- > *to A implies that A and B are equivalent, and as well from A to B to C*
- > *and C to B to A through composition.*
- >
- > *That implies it is not a mathematical fact and to promote the other*
- > *view as gospel, immutable, written in stone, etcetera, would thus be*
- > *deceitful.*

What implies ***what*** is not a mathematical fact?

--

Jesse F. Hughes

"My baby don't allow me in the kitchen
and I've come to love her decision."

-- Bad Livers