

Re: Cantor Confusion

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-03/msg03832.html>

- *From:* Virgil <virgil@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 17 Mar 2007 15:51:57 -0600
-

In article <1174140129.542070.30270@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, mueckenh@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

On 16 Mrz., 21:31, Virgil <vir...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

In article <1174055000.972069.261...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>,

The function of all cross sections, $f: n \mapsto 2^n$, is "continuous" in the sense that never a jump by more than a factor 2 can occur because the nodes of the tree are connected by an untearable network. The domain is the same as the range, namely \mathbb{N} . That is fact, not by claim but by construction of the tree. That's why I constructed it.

You constructed the tree to show that $2^{n+1} \leq 2 \cdot 2^n$? Well, that really must have been fun. Ok, I agree on this. Now we know a property of the function

$$f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$$

$$n \mapsto 2^n.$$

Re: Cantor Confusion

This does not tell us anything about 2^{\aleph_0} .

\aleph_0 is not a natural number.

Are you just discovering that?

Every index of a digit of a real number or of a node, however, is a natural number. Therefore it is of no interest at all to speculate about what happens "at \aleph_0 ". That should you try to discover.

As WM has speculated on exactly that issue frequently, one wonders what has now made him change his mind.

.