

Re: Another stab at Cantor

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2006-09/msg03935.html>

- *From:* "William Hughes" <wpihughes@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 19 Sep 2006 14:47:42 -0700
-

georgie wrote:

William Hughes wrote:

Either the limiting case is not countable, and we don't care whether or not it contains all the reals,

From the very first response to the OP:

"...There is no justification for this assertion. What makes you think that all binary strings are included in the process?

In fact, it is demonstrably false."

So it appears that someone cared.

But not about an uncountable limiting case.

The limiting case was not uncountable and this was shown in the very first post. (Hint to the hard of thinking, If you can index a set by the integers it is countable).

Even if one grants your idiotic belief that Arturo Magidin's description of the limiting case was wrong, it remains true that the limiting case he cared about was countable.

-William Hughes

.