

Re: Cantor Confusion

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-04/msg00217.html>

- *From:* "Dik T. Winter" <Dik.Winter@xxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 2 Apr 2007 12:34:04 GMT
-

In article <1175178657.434003.303550@xx>
mueckenh@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx writes:

On 29 Mrz., 04:23, "Dik T. Winter" <Dik.Win...@xxxxxx> wrote:

....

- > > It still says **nothing** about the number of single paths.
- >
- > An uncountable number of paths existing separated from each other
- > would form a level with uncountable man nodes.

Pray, for once, show a **proof** of this statement.

It is a result of set theory that uncountably many is greater than countably many. If you have a greater set, then there must be more elements than in a smaller set. If n elements exist in a set, then they must exist simultaneously. That means there must be some domain where this happens.

Yes. The domain is the set of paths. But you state there must be a **level** where it happens. Pray show a for once a **proof** of that statement.

- > But we know that there
- > cannot be such a level, including all infinity of the complete tree.

Indeed, there is not. Nevertheless there are uncountably many infinite paths.

That is obviously wrong. The necessity of as much separation points as separated paths is not restricted to the finite tree. It is required in any case. Otherwise there must be paths with no connection to the root node. But those constructs are not paths.

Re: Cantor Confusion

Show a *proof* of that necessity for infinite trees.

You do not believe it, but you fail to prove it. It is just your insistence that if all paths do separate from each other that there must be a level where all paths are separated from each other.

In particular, there must be all separation points in the tree.

You say: There are all uncountably many separated paths in the tree. But there are not all uncountably many points of separation in the tree.

Right. And that is provable.

Obviously bad logic. But you say, it is good logic. So let it be. Antilogic cannot be disproved by logic.

You are indeed not able to disprove it. Simply because you do not understand the logic.

—
dik t. winter, cwi, kruislaan 413, 1098 sj amsterdam, nederland, +31205924131
home: bovenover 215, 1025 jn amsterdam, nederland; <http://www.cwi.nl/~dik/>