

Re: Cantor and the binary tree

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-05/msg05670.html>

- *From:* Tony Orlow (aeo6) <aeo6@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 31 May 2005 12:24:53 -0400
-

mueckenh@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx said:

>
>
> Dik T. Winter wrote:
>
>>> I don't know how many bits the number $1/3$ has.
>>
>> Infinitely many, and that is not a natural number.
>
> But each level is enumerated by a natural number. Or do you think that
> $1/3$ has any bit, 0 or 1, at a position which cannot be enumerated by a
> natural number? Hence every node can be enumerated. Therefore your
> answer does not hit the point.
>>
>>> But if it is a number
>>> then it has a path in my tree. And if it has a path in my tree then it
>>> has a node to be mapped on.
>>
>> Right for the first, wrong for the second.
>
> The nodes are the path. As long as the path stretches we do never run
> out of nodes. Therefore the argument, that there is no last node, is
> meaningless. There are always nodes enough.
>
>
>>
>>> You must know, there are infinitely many
>>> nodes in my tree.
>>
>> That does not matter, an infinite (i.e. unending path) as that which
>> $1/3$ corresponds to does not have a node on it that corresponds to $1/3$.
>
> If there is a path (= set of nodes) which $1/3$ corresponds to, then
> there is always the node required.
>
> But I see, the advocates of set theory must insist on the idea that the
> paths run into a domain without nodes. It is strange, because the paths
> are the nodes. So you must insist that there are strings of bits
> without bits. It is a mystery because the strings cannot exist without

Re: Cantor and the binary tree

> bits.

>

> But it is impossible to argue against strings of bits without bits.

>

> Regards, WM

>

>

It's true, WM. Arguing with people that see paths without nodes and branches, or strings without bits, ends up being pointless. They make no sense, and probably never will be able to understand actual logic. It's a shell game with them.

—

Smiles,

Tony

.

• **References:**

◆ ***Re: Cantor and the binary tree***

◇ *From:* mueckenh

◆ ***Re: Cantor and the binary tree***

◇ *From:* Dik T. Winter

◆ ***Re: Cantor and the binary tree***

◇ *From:* mueckenh

◆ ***Re: Cantor and the binary tree***

◇ *From:* Dik T. Winter

◆ ***Re: Cantor and the binary tree***

◇ *From:* mueckenh

• Prev by Date: ***Re: What Went Wrong with New Math?***

• Next by Date: ***Self Study problem help***

• Previous by thread: ***Re: Cantor and the binary tree***

• Next by thread: ***Re: Cantor and the binary tree***

• Index(es):

◆ ***Date***

◆ ***Thread***