BILL, RECORD LECTURE!!!!

BILL RECORD LECTURE!!!

Ramsey Theory implies Bolzano Weierstrass

Exposition by William Gasarch-U of MD

Bolzano-Weierstrass Theorem: Ramsey Part

BW Thm Let $X = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots\}$ is a set of distinct reals in $[0, 1]$.
Then X has a limit point.

Bolzano-Weierstrass Theorem: Ramsey Part

BW Thm Let $X = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots\}$ is a set of distinct reals in $[0, 1]$. Then X has a limit point.

Let $\mathrm{COL}\colon \binom{\mathbb{N}}{2} \to [2]$ be defined by

Bolzano-Weierstrass Theorem: Ramsey Part

BW Thm Let $X = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots\}$ is a set of distinct reals in $[0, 1]$. Then X has a limit point.

Let $\mathrm{COL}\colon \binom{\mathbb{N}}{2} \to [2]$ be defined by
Below we assume $i < j$.

Bolzano-Weierstrass Theorem: Ramsey Part

BW Thm Let $X = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots\}$ is a set of distinct reals in $[0, 1]$. Then X has a limit point.

Let $\mathrm{COL}\colon \binom{\mathbb{N}}{2} \rightarrow [2]$ be defined by
Below we assume $i < j$.

$$\mathrm{COL}(i,j) = \begin{cases} 1 & x_i < x_j; \\ 2 & x_i > x_j. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Bolzano-Weierstrass Theorem: Ramsey Part

BW Thm Let $X = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots\}$ is a set of distinct reals in $[0, 1]$. Then X has a limit point.

Let $\mathrm{COL}\colon \binom{\mathbb{N}}{2} \to [2]$ be defined by
Below we assume $i < j$.

$$\mathrm{COL}(i, j) = \begin{cases} 1 & x_i < x_j; \\ 2 & x_i > x_j. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

There exists a homog set $i_1 < i_2 < \cdots$.

Bolzano-Weierstrass Theorem: Ramsey Part

BW Thm Let $X = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots\}$ is a set of distinct reals in $[0, 1]$. Then X has a limit point.

Let $\mathrm{COL}\colon \binom{\mathbb{N}}{2} \rightarrow [2]$ be defined by
Below we assume $i < j$.

$$\mathrm{COL}(i,j) = \begin{cases} 1 & x_i < x_j; \\ 2 & x_i > x_j. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

There exists a homog set $i_1 < i_2 < \cdots$.
1) If the homog set is colored 1 then then $x_{i_1} < x_{i_2} < \cdots$.

Bolzano-Weierstrass Theorem: Ramsey Part

BW Thm Let $X = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots\}$ is a set of distinct reals in $[0,1]$.
Then X has a limit point.

Let $\mathrm{COL}\colon \binom{\mathbb{N}}{2} \rightarrow [2]$ be defined by
Below we assume $i < j$.

$$\mathrm{COL}(i,j) = \begin{cases} 1 & x_i < x_j; \\ 2 & x_i > x_j. \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

There exists a homog set $i_1 < i_2 < \cdots$.
1) If the homog set is colored 1 then then $x_{i_1} < x_{i_2} < \cdots$.
2) If the homog set is colored 2 then then $x_{i_1} > x_{i_2} > \cdots$.

Bolzano-Weierstrass Theorem: Ramsey Part

BW Thm Let $X = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots\}$ is a set of distinct reals in $[0,1]$. Then X has a limit point.

Let $\mathrm{COL}\colon \binom{\mathbb{N}}{2} \rightarrow [2]$ be defined by
Below we assume $i < j$.

$$\mathrm{COL}(i,j) = \begin{cases} 1 & x_i < x_j; \\ 2 & x_i > x_j. \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

There exists a homog set $i_1 < i_2 < \cdots$.
1) If the homog set is colored 1 then then $x_{i_1} < x_{i_2} < \cdots$.
2) If the homog set is colored 2 then then $x_{i_1} > x_{i_2} > \cdots$.
We assume (1). The case of (2) is similar.

The Bolzano-Weierstrass Theorem: Reals Part

The Bolzano-Weierstrass Theorem: Reals Part

Lemma Every increasing bounded set of reals has a limit point.

The Bolzano-Weierstrass Theorem: Reals Part

Lemma Every increasing bounded set of reals has a limit point.

I won't prove this; however, it follows from the definition of **reals** which is itself somewhat complicated.

The Bolzano-Weierstrass Theorem: Reals Part

Lemma Every increasing bounded set of reals has a limit point.

I won't prove this; however, it follows from the definition of **reals** which is itself somewhat complicated.

If you put together the Ramsey Part and the Reals Part you get BW which I restate:

The Bolzano-Weierstrass Theorem: Reals Part

Lemma Every increasing bounded set of reals has a limit point.

I won't prove this; however, it follows from the definition of **reals** which is itself somewhat complicated.

If you put together the Ramsey Part and the Reals Part you get BW which I restate:

BW Let $X = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots\}$ is a set of distinct reals in $[0, 1]$. Then X has a limit point.

Application or "Application"?

Application or “Application”?

PRO This is a real thm that people Analysis care about.

Application or "Application"?

PRO This is a real thm that people Analysis care about.

PRO Generalizes to R^n.

Application or “Application”?

PRO This is a real thm that people Analysis care about.

PRO Generalizes to R^n.

PRO This is clearly not a theorem in combinatorics.

Application or "Application"?

PRO This is a real thm that people Analysis care about.

PRO Generalizes to R^n.

PRO This is clearly not a theorem in combinatorics.

CON The worst math song ever was written about the BW theorem:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=df018klwKHg

Application or "Application"?

PRO This is a real thm that people Analysis care about.

PRO Generalizes to R^n.

PRO This is clearly not a theorem in combinatorics.

CON The worst math song ever was written about the BW theorem:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=df018klwKHg

CON Already known.

Application or "Application"?

PRO This is a real thm that people Analysis care about.

PRO Generalizes to R^n.

PRO This is clearly not a theorem in combinatorics.

CON The worst math song ever was written about the BW theorem:
`https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=df018klwKHg`

CON Already known.

CAVEAT This is smoother way of saying the usual proof.

Application or "Application"?

PRO This is a real thm that people Analysis care about.

PRO Generalizes to R^n.

PRO This is clearly not a theorem in combinatorics.

CON The worst math song ever was written about the BW theorem:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=df018klwKHg

CON Already known.

CAVEAT This is smoother way of saying the usual proof.

Credit Who first made this observation?

Application or "Application"?

PRO This is a real thm that people Analysis care about.

PRO Generalizes to R^n.

PRO This is clearly not a theorem in combinatorics.

CON The worst math song ever was written about the BW theorem:
`https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=df018klwKHg`

CON Already known.

CAVEAT This is smoother way of saying the usual proof.

Credit Who first made this observation?Me

Application or "Application"?

PRO This is a real thm that people Analysis care about.

PRO Generalizes to R^n.

PRO This is clearly not a theorem in combinatorics.

CON The worst math song ever was written about the BW theorem:
`https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=df018klwKHg`

CON Already known.

CAVEAT This is smoother way of saying the usual proof.

Credit Who first made this observation?MeReally!

Vote

Rather than go through Application of “Application” or “Thats bullshit man” I’ll ask a better question

Vote

Rather than go through Application of "Application" or "Thats bullshit man" I'll ask a better question

VOTE

Vote

Rather than go through Application of “Application” or “Thats bullshit man” I’ll ask a better question

VOTE

Like the application

Vote

Rather than go through Application of “Application” or “Thats bullshit man” I’ll ask a better question

VOTE

Like the application

Do not like the application