

Re: Another stab at Cantor

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2006-09/msg03937.html>

- *From:* magidin@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx (Arturo Magidin)
 - *Date:* Tue, 19 Sep 2006 21:58:15 +0000 (UTC)
-

In article <1158699227.198536.286480@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, georgie <geo_cant@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

What a joke. Suppose he was thinking of your step when he said "all possible steps".

The complete phrase he used was:

"all possible steps OF THIS PROCEDURE"

[emphasis added]

The procedure described was : take a GIVEN list, create the diagonal string, prepend it to the list to create a new one.

There is no need to suppose anything.

It really isn't much of a stretch to think "all possible steps" means all of them. Did he really need to anticipate your argument and say "all possible steps and Arturo Magidin's steps that wouldn't be included in the set of all steps because Arturo Magidin's steps are special"?

He said "all possible steps of this process." The only honest interpretation is that he means all possible steps OF THAT PROCESS, not of "any" process. The steps I described are not part of "th[at] process", so they were not included.

I didn't realize you were special and your steps don't get included in the set of all steps.

Re: Another stab at Cantor

There was no "set of all steps." There was only "all possible steps OF THIS PROCEDURE."

Are there other people who feel this way too?
Every
time I say "all of..." do I have to mention other peoples names besides
yours?

Every time you say "all of the X that are in Y", do you mean all of
the X, whether or not they are in Y?

=====
"It's not denial. I'm just very selective about
what I accept as reality."
--- Calvin ("Calvin and Hobbes" by Bill Watterson)

=====
Arturo Magidin
magidin-at-member-ams-org

.