

Extension of Induction to Well Founded Sets¹

Prof. Philip Penance² -Version: January 16, 2017

1. A ordered set X is called *well-founded* (abbreviated WF) if every non empty subset of X has a minimal element.
2. A set is *well ordered* if it is:
 - (a) Well founded and
 - (b) Totally ordered
3. Zermelo's theorem (equivalent to the axiom of choice).
Every set can be well-ordered.
4. Special Case: Well-ordering principle:
Every non-empty set of the natural numbers contains a least element.
5. (X, \leq) be an order. The following are equivalent:
 - (a) X is well founded.
 - (b) There is no strictly decreasing sequence $x_0 > x_1 > x_2 > \dots$ of elements of X with an infinite number of terms.
6. (X, \leq) be an order. The following are equivalent:
 - (a) X is well founded.
 - (b) Strong Induction (SI):
Let $p : X \rightarrow \{T, F\}$ be a predicate. Suppose that for all elements $x \in X$ the statement
$$[\forall y < x, p(y)] \rightarrow p(x) \quad (1)$$
is true. Then the property p is true for all $x \in X$.

Proof. (\Rightarrow) Let X be well founded. Suppose to the contrary that induction does not hold. Then there exists a property $p : X \rightarrow \{T, F\}$ and an element $x^* \in X$ such that $p(x^*)$ is false yet for all x , (1) is true. By WF we may assume x^* is minimal such that $p(x^*)$ is false. Then $[y < x^*, p(y)]$ is true and it follows by (1) that $p(x^*)$ is also true – a contradiction.

(\Leftarrow) Suppose that strong induction holds. We show that any set $A \subseteq X$ which has no minimal element must be empty. Consider the property $y \notin A$. If A has no minimal element the statement

$$[\forall y < x, y \notin A] \rightarrow x \notin A$$

must be true for all x . (If there existed $x \in A$ such that $[\forall y < x, y \notin A]$ then x would be minimal in A . It follows by induction that A is empty as advertised.

7. Remark: If x^* is minimal in X , then the left hand side of (1) is vacuously true. Hence the basis of induction is vacuously included in the statement of SI.

Proof. Let X be well founded. A strictly decreasing sequence with infinite image can have no minimal element. It follows that no such sequence can exist in X . Suppose now that there is no strictly decreasing sequence

$$x_0 > x_1 > x_2 > \dots$$

of elements of X with an infinite number of terms and to the contrary, there exists a non empty subset B with no minimal element. Let $b_0 \in B$. Since b_0 is not minimal there exists $b_1 \in B$ such that $b_1 > b_0$. Continuing in like manner we construct a strictly decreasing sequence with an infinite image - contradiction.

¹Reference: Wikipedia article [Well-founded relation](#)

² <http://penance.us>