

Re: Well Ordering the Reals

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-11/msg01271.html>

- *From:* Tony Orlow <aeo6@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 9 Nov 2005 12:22:31 -0500
-

Daryl McCullough said:

> Virgil says...

>

>> Since TO's alleged "apparent bijection" is merely an artifact of TO's
>> delusions, and has no existence in real mathematics, it is certainly no
>> big thing in mathematics.

>

> Actually, I think Tony is thinking (in his web page) of an enumeration
> of a dense subset of the reals. That is, for any two distinct reals r_1
> and r_2 there is a real r in his set such that r is between r_1 and r_2 .
> He seems to think that this well-orders the reals, when it actually just
> well-orders a countable subset.

Well, that is what I am asking. How does one prove that such an ordered subset
actually includes ALL the reals, rather than just the rationals or some other
type of real? I don't think this enumeration misses one point on the line, but
how do I prove this?

>

> ---

> Daryl McCullough

> Ithaca, NY

>

>

Smiles,

Tony

<http://www.people.cornell.edu/pages/aeo6/WellOrder/>

.

- *Follow-Ups:*
 - ◆ ***Re: Well Ordering the Reals***
◇ *From:* Virgil
 - ◆ ***Re: Well Ordering the Reals***
◇ *From:* Daryl McCullough
 - ◆ ***Re: Well Ordering the Reals***
◇ *From:* Randy Poe

Re: Well Ordering the Reals

- **References:**

- ◆ **Re: Well Ordering the Reals**

- ◇ *From:* Robert Low

- Prev by Date: **Re: Zermelo–Fraenkel Theory Of Sets**
- Next by Date: **Re: Dirichlet's nowhere differentiable function**
- Previous by thread: **Re: Well Ordering the Reals**
- Next by thread: **Re: Well Ordering the Reals**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**