

## Re: Cantor and the binary tree

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-05/msg04498.html>

---

- *From:* Robert Kolker <[nowhere@xxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:nowhere@xxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Tue, 24 May 2005 16:01:11 -0400
- 

Tony Orlow (aeo6) wrote:

The subsequent conclusion that the reals are not "countable" rests on the notion that all countably infinite sets are the same size, which is an assumption that I reject for many reasons, and which has no justification besides "oo=oo=oo".

Will you stop this sloppy nonsense and listen. Let two sets A, B be in one to one correspondence with the integers N by the mappings f and g respective then  $f : N \rightarrow A$ ,  $g : N \rightarrow B$ . since f and b are bijections  $f_{\text{inverse}}$  maps A to N and the composition  $(g(f_{\text{inverse}}))$  maps A onto B in a 1-1 fashion which means A is equivalent to B. QED.

Now go away and learn some mathematics.

Bob Kolker

.