

Re: Cantor's diagonal proof wrong?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2004-11/2775.html>

From: Virgil (*ITSnetNOTcom#virgil_at_COMCAST.com*)

Date: 11/14/04

Date: Sun, 14 Nov 2004 14:12:27 -0700

In article <20041114133319.308\$pd@newsreader.com>, curt@kcwc.com (Curt Welch) wrote:

> *Torkel Franzen <torkel@sm.luth.se> wrote:*
> > *curt@kcwc.com (Curt Welch) writes:*
> >
> > > *Why is it ok to write 0.111... but not ...11111 ?*
> >
> > > *You can indeed write "...11111", and also "fnoggle fnoggle" and*
> > *"froufy forbandle ignotoot!".*
>
> *Ok, that's valid. We do not have a common foundation to argue from.*
>
> *But lets just ignore these side issues and look at the*
> *strongest part of my argument where I use Cantor's logic to prove that a*
> *table of integers does not contain all the integers. How can you show my*
> *argument is invalid and at the same time, keep Cantor's logic about the*
> *relationship between the integers and reals as valid?*

The "contradiction" is that you cannot prove that *every* table of integers is missing some integers whereas Cantor has proved that *every* table of reals is missing some reals (in fact missing more than are actually tabulated).