Re: Ultimate debunking of Cantor's Theory

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007−07/msg02734.html

- *From*: Virgil <virgil@xxxxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Tue, 17 Jul 2007 13:49:40 −0600

In article <1184674028.768881.143490@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>,
WM <mueckenh@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

> On 16 Jul., 20:45, Virgil <vir...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
>
> > In article <1184602377.255290.254...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>,
> >
> > WM <mueck...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
> >
> > > On 16 Jul., 07:20, Virgil <vir...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
> > >
> > > > In article
> > > > <1184550638.931818.34...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>,
> > > > 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
> behind every checked line there remain infinitely unchecked lines?

At least for WM's example, there is a rule for constructing lines and a rule for the diagonal, and by comparing rules it becomes obvious to everyone but WM that the diagonal differs in at least one digit position

from each and every line.

More generally, any rule by which a diagonal is defined is such that it guarantees it to differ from each 'line' at at least one digit position and to differ in many positions from any line which has a dual representation.
.