

Re: how to list all of the real numbers

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-08/msg04093.html>

- *From:* Math1723 <anonym1723@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 24 Aug 2007 06:32:40 -0700
-

On Aug 24, 12:15 am, Jonathan Hoyle <jonho...@xxxxxxx> wrote:

On Aug 23, 7:04 pm, "Ross A. Finlayson" <r...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

It was nearly two years ago, and yes it was in that discussion where your outline was proven to be faulty. I could go over your logic flaw again, but it was detailed pretty well at the time, and you might just simply re-read that posted topic to refresh your memory.

Yes I should re-read it.

I think you would do well to. Despite the fact that it shows your proof to be in error, I think it was an example of your best work mathematically and logically. With a little effort, your construction could be used as a proof for the existence of limit ordinals.

I think what you mean here is: Given the existence of infinite ordinals, it could be a proof that not all of them will be successor ordinals (thus limit ordinals). One cannot simply "prove" the existence of any ordinals without accepting certain relevant axioms. Ross's errant modification of Cantor's Nested Interval Theorem cannot, in and of itself, substitute for such axioms.

As an aside, I am not sure Ross even believes in limit ordinals (despite his ironic "proof" of them). It is in these internal contradictions which causes him to spew the tangled garbage he does.