

Re: Is continuum completely filled up?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-01/msg05184.html>

- *From:* David Marcus <DavidMarcus@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 24 Jan 2007 13:27:29 -0500
-

Andy Smith wrote:

Randy Poe <poespan-trap@xxxxxxxx> writes

Andy Smith wrote:

Speaking intuitively, I would have said that the line in $[0,1]$ is a 1-dimensional space and it is up to somebody to demonstrate that you can cover it with (an uncountable infinity of) points of zero dimension.

The point of my post was that you can't even ask the question "do the reals cover it" until "it" is defined. Any attempt I might make to define the line (for instance in terms of distance from 0) depends on the real numbers.

So I don't know what "it" is. If I think of it as a representation of $[0,1]$, then of course $[0,1]$ covers it because $[0,1]$ and "it" are essentially the same thing. "It" has no existence (in my scheme) outside of $[0,1]$.

Let me be even more specific. I will define "the line segment from P_1 to P_2 " as the set of points P

$$\{P : P = a \cdot P_1 + (1-a) \cdot P_2, 0 \leq a \leq 1\}$$

So everything in this set is defined by a real number a between 0 and 1. There's no such thing as a point which is not associated with such an a , since that's my membership test. Do you see that it's obvious there is no member of my set not corresponding to some a ?

No, but in the context of all of this, how do you adjust a such that successive points in P (there can be no such thing) are continuous ?

Re: Is continuum completely filled up?

Is this a serious question? Or, are you trolling? How can you ask a question about "successive points" and then add "(there can be no such thing)"? And, what does "continuous" mean in this context?

—
David Marcus