

## Re: Problems I have with $1.999\dots=2$

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-05/msg02904.html>

---

- *From:* [anzaures1@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:anzaures1@xxxxxxxxxxx)
  - *Date:* 14 May 2005 23:02:05 -0700
- 

Kirby Cook <kwmc...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

>step...@xxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

> Kirby Cook <kwmc...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

>> : Let me try it another way. My assertion might be stated (I hope) as

>> : follows. Given the set whose elements are nine tenths, nine tenths plus

>> : nine hundredths, nine tenths plus nine hundredths plus nine thousandths,

>> : etc., the least upper bound of the set is one, and one is not a member

>> : of the set.

>> That is true. 1 is not a member of the set { .9, .99, .999, ... }.

>> But if .999... is a set, then it is not a number,

>> and the question does  $1=.999\dots$  does not make much sense.

>> If you interpret .999... as a number, which is what most people

>> do, then you really do not have a lot of choices about what number

>> it is.

>> Stephen

>Since the preceding post could only be described as inattentive,

The preceding post is perfectly attentive. Makes perfect sense to me.

You think it is not attentive simply because you refuse to understand the simplest thing that EVERYBODY is telling you. Everybody!

> I was going to ignore it. But I won't, after all.

How kind of you!

Why do you insist on insulting those who try their very best to explain elementary math to you?

If you are here to understand math – then try to understand what

experts are saying to you.

But if you are here to prove that you are superior to those, who understand math, you are in the wrong group. Go to sci.ignorant.jerks.who.like.to.insult.science.

>My point, which I consider sufficient, is that  $.999\dots$  is a member of the described set, and 1 isn't.

Which described set? The set, which comes from the following list:

..9  
..99  
..999  
....  
  
..999999999999999999  
.....

Where is  $.999\dots$  in this list? I don't see it. In what position in the list is it? In position 35? In position 55673443? Tell us where the "number" (or the string)  $.999\dots$  is in your list. There is no member of the set that contains the substring  $..$ .

It is not there.

.

---

• **References:**

- ◆ **[Problems I have with  \$1.999\dots=2\$](#)**   
    ◇ From: Kirby Cook
- ◆ **[Re: Problems I have with  \$1.999\dots=2\$](#)**   
    ◇ From: stephen
- ◆ **[Re: Problems I have with  \$1.999\dots=2\$](#)**   
    ◇ From: Kirby Cook
- ◆ **[Re: Problems I have with  \$1.999\dots=2\$](#)**   
    ◇ From: Richard Tobin
- ◆ **[Re: Problems I have with  \$1.999\dots=2\$](#)**   
    ◇ From: Kirby Cook
- ◆ **[Re: Problems I have with  \$1.999\dots=2\$](#)**   
    ◇ From: stephen
- ◆ **[Re: Problems I have with  \$1.999\dots=2\$](#)**   
    ◇ From: Kirby Cook

- Prev by Date: **[Re: Collatz Problem: An idea for its solution.](#)**
- Next by Date: **[Re: Sets of measure 0 question...](#)**
- Previous by thread: **[Re: Problems I have with  \$1.999\dots=2\$](#)**
- Next by thread: **[Re: Problems I have with  \$1.999\dots=2\$](#)**

Re: Problems I have with  $1.999\dots=2$

- Index(es):

- ◆ *Date*

- ◆ *Thread*