

Re: Ultimate debunking of Cantor's Theory

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-07/msg02713.html>

- *From:* Randy Poe <poespam-trap@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 17 Jul 2007 09:44:58 -0700
-

On Jul 17, 8:07 am, WM <mueck...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On 16 Jul., 20:45, Virgil <vir...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

In article <1184602377.255290.254...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>,

WM <mueck...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On 16 Jul., 07:20, Virgil <vir...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

In article
<1184550638.931818.34...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>,
IF one has a non-empty ordered set without
a largest element, one can
easily prove

But IF one has an empty non-ordered set with a largest
element, what
can one prove then?

How can there be a "largest" if there is no ordering by which to compare
sizes?

Can WM explain how to identify a largest without being able to compare
relative sizes?

Can you explain how you check all lines of an infinite list while

Re: Ultimate debunking of Cantor's Theory

behind every checked line there remain infinitely unchecked lines?

Every line is associated with a natural number n .

If you prove something is true about any line numbered n , then you have proved it for all lines without having explicitly checked. Why? Because "any line numbered n " covers every line. There are no exceptions.

I can declare without checking that all even numbers end in 0, 2, 4, 6 or 8. In particular, I can declare with checking that all even numbers of 1000 digits have that property.

Do you have to check all of the $10^{1000/2}$ 1000-digit numbers to convince yourself of the truth of that statement?

– Randy

.