

# Re: Another stab at Cantor

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2006-09/msg03957.html>

---

- *From:* "georgie" <[geo\\_cant@xxxxxxxx](mailto:geo_cant@xxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 19 Sep 2006 16:31:09 -0700
- 

Arturo Magidin wrote:

In article <1158699227.198536.286480@xx>, georgie <[geo\\_cant@xxxxxxxx](mailto:geo_cant@xxxxxxxx)> wrote:

Arturo Magidin wrote:

Do you know what a red herring is?

Its something you would probably try, to avoid the real issue.

Very droll, Georgie. You're still being an ignoramus, though.

There's that glaring character flaw that you use to divert attention.

...  
He then asserted that after doing this an infinitely countable number of times, he would obtain a list. ->That<- assertion is false. What he "ends up" with in the limiting case is a "pseudo-list" (I'm making up the term right now, only for the purposes of this paragraph)

I noticed that about you. You "make things up" as we go.

Oh, doubly droll. No wonder you are such an ignoramus.

Character flaw putting you in denial again, I see.

Re: Another stab at Cantor

You can't seem to accept that and have resorted to personal attacks.

Oh, I can accept perfectly well that you have failed to understand the rebuttals. I have chosen to express my contempt for you in the form of personal attacks. This has nothing to do with denial, but merely with contempt.

That seems to be a character flaw that you have.

Perhaps. It is nonetheless a reflection of just how absurdly ignorant you are.

Wow, three times in one post that all you could reason with was your character flaw.

The original poster describes a process whereby, if you have a list, you produce a new string, pre-append it, and obtain a new list. Lather, Rinse, Repeat.

The original poster then talks about continuing this process via the "totality of all possible steps of this procedure." The procedure can only be applied so long as you have a list. This can certainly be done at each natural-numbered step. If you take the union of these steps,

Taking the union was never discussed or implied.

"Jane, you ignorant twit."

That is what, in this situation, "the limiting case" is.

Four times. After all, I didn't say what the union was, I just pointed out it wasn't discussed.

Re: Another stab at Cantor

You have a nested collection of ordered sets; the limiting case is obtained by taking the union of the sets. If you didn't know that, well, that would hardly be a surprise.

Five responses that only consist of your character flaw.

what you end up with is an ORDERED set which, AS GIVEN, is not a list; among other reasons because each term has an infinite number of predecessors. At this stage, the "procedure" cannot be applied, so the process STOPS.

So we are done with  $\rightarrow$ that $\leftarrow$  process.

If we aren't done with all possible steps, we better go back, because that's what the OP said.

We are done will ALL steps that are possible FOLLOWING THE OP'S INSTRUCTIONS. If you are trying to Re-write those instructions to change his procedures, then stop being coy about it and come right out and say so. But the OP gave a very specific procedure that does not exhaust everything Georgie can think of; it merely exhausts a particular process, which results in exactly the set that I have been describing.

Denial.

At this stage, it was asserted the resulting (ordered) set contains all possible strings. That is false. While the set, ordered as given, is not a list, it can nonetheless be REORDERED

That reordering step is a possible step.

Only if you purposely misinterpret and/or rewrite what the OP stated. The original poster gave a VERY SPECIFIC procedure, and that procedure DOES NOT include the ability to reorder what is given. That procedure can only take a GIVEN list,  $\rightarrow$ AS GIVEN $\leftarrow$ , produce its diagonal string with respect to the GIVEN order, and return the ordered set you obtain by taking the list AS GIVEN with the diagonal

Re: Another stab at Cantor

string preappended as first term.

More denial on your part. After all, your first statement about the OP was "There is no such thing," when referring to L\_Omega. Now you're saying there is. \*YOU\* are the one changing things.

The process does not allow you to reorder the given list before applying the diagonal process. As such, what I described (taking a set which is not given as an ordered list, reordering it to make it into a list, and then applying the diagonal process), while "possible" in the sense of "it can be done", it is not "possible within the confines of the procedure described by the original poster." As such, this is NOT included in the OPs discussion.

It \*MUST\* be in the set of all possible steps.

It is the set of all possible STEPS FOLLOWING THE GIVEN INSTRUCTIONS. You are trying to change the given instructions. As such, you are guilty of at best equivocation, and quite probably willful confusion.

At best, you have no insight. You are trying to get out of your original statements via a technicality that you are trying to manufacture.

so that the result  
->IS<- a list, and we can easily produce strings not on THAT list, and therefore not in the original (ordered) set.

Except for the fact that it can't be.

Except for the fact that you are willfully equivocating on "possible steps". What I described is not "possible within the confines of the algorithm provided" and therefore is not contemplated in the original construction.

O.K. I understand that you won't even admit you said "There is no such thing." as your first statement, which is 100% wrong. Why should I ever expect any admission at all? I shouldn't, of course.

Re: Another stab at Cantor

Re: Another stab at Cantor

I think that what is sticking in your craw is that you somehow decided that the original poster meant to CONTINUE applying the process anytime he could take the collection of everything he had produced thus far and somehow turn it into a list.

I think you ignored that all possible steps means all of them,

And here is your confusion/idiocy/lie.

You won't even admit you said "There is no such thing." as your first statement, which is 100% wrong. We have to agree on that first.

The procedure was explicitly described. The instructions where to continue applying THAT PROCEDURE when possible. The instructions where not "continue obtaining diagonal numbers any which way as long as possible", which is what you attempt to cast it as.

You won't even admit you said "There is no such thing." as your first statement, which is 100% wrong. We have to agree on that first.

not all  
of them except the ones Arturo Magidin might want to describe.

You are confused. The "possible steps" described in the OP MUST follow the given instructions, not "all the ones that Georgie Boy attempts to pull out of his anal orifice."

You won't even admit you said "There is no such thing." as your first statement, which is 100% wrong. We have to agree on that first.

How many times did that character flaw show its ugly head instead of reason? I sure hope you aren't a teacher. That's a terrible trait for a teacher.

But that is NOT what he said.

Even if what he said or meant was that the sky is blue, the set of all possible steps includes steps you describe in all your posts you will

Re: Another stab at Cantor

ever write or even think about.

He did not ask for "all possible ways to add diagonal terms", moron. He asked that HIS PROCEDURE be repeated for as long as possible. HIS PROCEDURE, not "any old procedure you can think of, write of, or that Georgie Boy thinks are meant".

You won't even admit you said "There is no such thing." as your first statement, which is 100% wrong. We have to agree on that first.

How many times did that character flaw show its ugly head instead of reason? I sure hope you aren't a teacher. That's a terrible trait for a teacher.

Even if he didn't have the insight to mean to include those, we can assume he did

No, we cannot. My argument addresses WHAT HE WROTE, not what Georgie boy decides was what he should have written.

You won't even admit you said "There is no such thing." as your first statement, which is 100% wrong. We have to agree on that first.

How many times did that character flaw show its ugly head instead of reason? I sure hope you aren't a teacher. That's a terrible trait for a teacher.

and your argument about reordering and such is meaningless.

My argument addresses what he wrote, not what you imagine that he should have written. Duh.

How many times did that character flaw show its ugly head instead of reason? I sure hope you aren't a teacher. That's a terrible trait for a teacher.

What he gave was a specific deterministic algorithm that does not allow you to reorder the sets you obtain.

## Re: Another stab at Cantor

For the sake of argument, we could be adults and understand that your restrictions are just avoiding the real issue.

You could be honest and recognize that your entire cogitations rely on a dishonest equivocation, and that you are quite simply wrong. That you are criticizing an argument I gave on the grounds that it addresses exactly what it was written to address (to wit, what the other poster actually wrote), and not something else. In short, that you are being an idiot.

You won't even admit you said "There is no such thing." as your first statement, which is 100% wrong. We have to agree on that first.

How many times did that character flaw show its ugly head instead of reason? I sure hope you aren't a teacher. That's a terrible trait for a teacher.

The OP didn't  
explicitly say one way or the other

Yes, he did. You just didn't get it. He said to repeat HIS process, and HIS process does not allow reordering.

He **\*NEVER\*** said it didn't **\*ALLOW\*** anything.

→Of course←, if you change the process, then there is no reason to think that the argument given will also apply to the different process.

You won't even admit you said "There is no such thing." as your first statement, which is 100% wrong. We have to agree on that first.

so lets forget about the trivial  
cases. His set of "all possible steps" includes all steps.

No, it did not. If you want to change it to mean that, then write it out exactly and precisely, just like he did. He gave a precise description, which you are misrepresenting by equivocation.

You won't even admit you said "There is no such thing." as your

Re: Another stab at Cantor

Re: Another stab at Cantor

first statement, which is 100% wrong. We have to agree on that first.

Then again, your character flaw may not let you be an adult. I'm not sure.

I see you are still a wife-beater.

Do you expect me to tattle on you because you are being childish?

[...]

"If Arturo Magidin's step is a step then it is one of all possible steps." is true.

No, it is false. You are putting far more into the procedure than the original poster provided. And then you are claiming that the proof presented is insufficient because it fails to address something which was not put into the original procedure. Well, DUH.

You aren't thoroughly considering the OP.

I am thoroughly considering what the original poster wrote. I did not, nor did I intend to, consider everything that anybody could possibly decide to make by modifying what the original poster provided.

He, at least, was quite specific and explicit. I addressed the explicit, and specific, procedure he provided. You want to invent a new one, or pull one out of your ass? Be my guest.

You won't even admit you said "There is no such thing." as your first statement, which is 100% wrong. We have to agree on that first.

How many times did that character flaw show its ugly head instead of reason? I sure hope you aren't a teacher. That's a terrible trait for a teacher.

Re: Another stab at Cantor

What I described is not a "possible step" in the original poster's algorithm; it takes place AFTER the original poster is done with his algorithm, which can only be applied omega times. What I described "takes place" at step " $\omega + 1$ ", which is incompatible with the original poster's description.

What a joke.

No. It's a fact. If you cannot wrap your brain around it, well, that's your problem.

You won't even admit you said "There is no such thing." as your first statement, which is 100% wrong. We have to agree on that first.

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

I don't have to suppose anything. His words spoke for themselves, and his works only allow to consider a very specific operation which does NOT include the process I described.

You won't even admit you said "There is no such thing." as your first statement, which is 100% wrong. We have to agree on that first.

It really isn't much of a stretch to think "all possible steps" means all of them.

He said to apply HIS process, as described.

His process description ended at L3. Then he said

"Let  $L_\omega$  be the list defined by the totality of all possible steps of this procedure."

Which can certainly be interpreted as meaning all possible steps since he didn't specify explicitly anything after L3.

In any case, you won't even admit you said "There is no such thing."

Re: Another stab at Cantor

Re: Another stab at Cantor

as your first statement, which is 100% wrong. We have to agree on that first.

ANY stretch at all, no matter how minor, departs from his instructions. As such, an argument designed to address HIS instructions need not apply to anything other than HIS PRECISE, EXACT, instructions.

Weasle out of then. That's fine.

You want to change the instructions because you think you can do better? Fine. Change them, and provide your own explicit instructions, we will deal with them then.

You won't even admit you said "There is no such thing." as your first statement, which is 100% wrong. We have to agree on that first.

If you mean "start with a list, and then take all possible diagonal strings that you can produce from any list that you can produce from any set that includes the original list and any previously produced strings, via any method whatsoever", then say so. The result will not be the set the original poster produced by  $\rightarrow$ his $\leftarrow$  instructions, and my argument will not apply. But then, my argument was not  $\rightarrow$ meant $\leftarrow$  to apply to that set. That set is uncountable.

You won't even admit you said "There is no such thing." as your first statement, which is 100% wrong. We have to agree on that first.

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 did not need to anticipate ANYTHING. He specified EXACTLY what steps were allowed; his "step" takes a LIST of binary strings, and returns a LIST of binary strings. Namely, given a LIST of binary strings, produce the diagonal string, preappend it to the given list, and return the result. That is what he SAID.

No it isn't.

Re: Another stab at Cantor

When he said repeat,

He never said the word "repeat" in his OP. I've been quoting. You've been making crap up.

it  
must be understood to mean repeat ->THAT PROCESS<-. Not some other process. Not "any" process that georgie boy decides to try. Not any process ->I<- decide to try. ->THAT PROCESS<-, and that process alone. If he meant something else, he should have written something else. If YOU want to mean something else, then write something else.

If your entire problem is that the argument designed to handle EXACTLY WHAT WAS WRITTEN does not handle your own pet process, that's just because you are trying to use a hammer to unscrew a phillips head.

[...]

You won't even admit you said "There is no such thing." as your first statement, which is 100% wrong. We have to agree on that first.

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

You seem to be in denial.