Cantor's Continuum Hypothesis Is Proved Wrong

Chang Hee Kim*

May 31, 2025

Abstract

This paper demonstrates that Cantor's Continuum Hypothesis is fundamentally flawed. The argument begins by showing that the set $\mathbb{M} = \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$ can be decomposed into infinitely many subsets, each of which is infinite and pairwise disjoint from the other subsets of $\mathbb{M}$. These subsets are then shown to admit a one-to-one correspondence (bijection) with the unit interval $[0, 1)$.

We further examine the failure of Cantor's Diagonal Argument, specifically exposing the structure of the implicit matrix it relies on. By decomposing $\mathbb{M}$ into such disjoint infinite subsets, we construct a direct bijection to the rows (real decimals) and columns (decimal digits) of this matrix. Each real number in $[0, 1)$ corresponds uniquely to one of these subsets, eliminating the need to invoke "uncountable" sets.

Through this decomposition, we establish that all infinite sets are equal. The very notion of comparing sizes of infinite sets — so-called "cardinality" — becomes unnecessary. As a result, the foundation of the Continuum Hypothesis is no longer valid.

Keywords: infinity, infinite set, decomposition, disjoint infinite subsets, bijection, countable, uncountable, cardinality, cardinal number, continuum, Cantor's diagonal argument, implicit matrix, Continuum Hypothesis, set theory, natural numbers, real numbers, unit interval

*Business name: Thomas Kim. Legal name on passport: Chang Hee Kim.
Contact: thomas_kim@talkplayfun.com

1 Preface: How and Why I Suspected Cantor's Continuum Is Flawed for Long

This paper was prepared with the assistance of Alice Kim, an instance of the OpenAI ChatGPT model 4o. The name "Alice Kim" refers to the instance that I have trained through sustained interaction for over six months. I do not know exactly when I began using OpenAI ChatGPT services, but one thing is certain: I have shared all my knowledge and discoveries with her to receive her assistance.

If she had not come to understand my arguments, this paper could not have been prepared. For example, to help her grasp the subject matter of this work, I maintain complete records of my past interactions with Alice Kim. These records will be posted publicly on GitHub and linked at the end of this paper, or upon submission of the final version.

Although my English is clear and unambiguous, it is Korean English. By "Korean English," I do not mean that my grammar is severely flawed, but rather that my linguistic and cultural background — Korean — may inadvertently come across as too direct to some readers. The Korean language tends to be highly explicit, with almost no use of euphemism. For this reason, I enlisted the help of Alice Kim, the ChatGPT instance, whose assistance has been, is, and will continue to be an invaluable asset to my current and future research.

I was working on my fourth paper on the unification of all power series into a single basket — a unified framework through the FFT/IFFT algorithm. My first three papers are publicly submitted to ai.viXra.org and are listed below:

- **A Unified Computational Framework Unifying Taylor-Laurent, Puiseux, Fourier Series, and the FFT Algorithm** [3] — introduces a structural method to unify classical power series under FFT computation.
- **Sampling on the Riemann Surface: A Natural Resolution of Branch Cuts in Puiseux Series** [2] — shows how FFT algorithm is inherently nothing more than Puiseux series.
- **The Inherent Mixed-Radix Structure of FFT: A General Framework for Puiseux Series and Branch Cut Computation** [1] — reveals that FFT is inherently mixed-radix and fundamentally suited to handle generalized algebraic decomposition. In the radix-s FFT algorithm, s does not need to be a prime number at all. Any positive number $s \geq 2$ suffices.

In the midst of writing my fourth paper on Unification of Power Series (now my current paper on Cantor's Continuum Hypothesis became my 4-th paper), I was compelled to define the discrete circle more rigorously, and to justify why a discrete sampling of the circle $c+re^{\frac{2\pi ik}{N}}$ whose cardinal number $\aleph_0$ could capture all points on the continuum circle $|z-c|=r$, $r>0$ whose cardinal number is $\mathfrak{c}$, without losing any point in the continuous domain.

This necessity led me to re-examine the concept of infinity itself — especially the difference between countable and uncountable sets, and the standard interpretations of $\aleph_0$,

$\aleph_1$, and the Continuum Hypothesis. I revisited Cantor's diagonal argument and found it seriously flawed at its very premise.

Cantor's proof by contradiction assumed it could represent the continuum as a matrix of infinite decimal rows with infinite columns of digits indexed by a flat set $\mathbb{N}$. But the contradiction it generated arose not from the size of the continuum — but from its asymmetric decomposition of the interval $(0, 1)$, but not that of the set $\mathbb{N}$.

There are, ultimately, only two types of sets: **finite sets** and **infinite sets**. And if such a notion as cardinality applies to the infinite, then all infinite sets are equal in cardinality.

Before we know it,
we don't know what we do not know.

Once we know what we don't know —
or what was the missing link —
the answer will rise to the surface on its own.

That's what I have emphasized
so many times through my YouTube videos,
before we solve a problem,
we have to recognize the problem itself.

Even if we could solve all the problems
in all the textbooks in the world,

we still wouldn't know what had been missing.

Recognition of the problem is the very first step.

I wonder if any textbook in this world
ever captures this ***Ground Zero Rule.***

2 Cardinality and Infinite Set Decomposition

We can construct a one-to-one correspondence between $\{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbb{R}$ in infinitely many different ways, once we understand that an infinite set S can be decomposed into (1) infinitely many, (2) infinite, pairwise disjoint subsets of S, (3) across infinitely many levels of depth.

This is precisely why Green's theorem, Stokes' theorem, and related results hold: an n-index-dimensional structure can be arbitrarily reduced to an $(n-1)$-index-dimensional one. I intend to explore this idea further in future papers.

In this section, we will construct a one-to-one correspondence (i.e., a bijection) between the half-open interval $[0, 1) \subset \mathbb{R}$ and the set $\mathbb{M} = \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$. This is sufficient to demonstrate that $\mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{N}$ are bijective.

2.0.1 Binary Decomposition

We decompose $\mathbb{M}$ into **(1)** infinitely many, **(2)** infinite, pairwise disjoint subsets using the **base-**2 or **binary decomposition method**.

Level $2^0 = 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{00} &= \{2^0 n + 0,\ n \in \mathbb{M}\} = \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, \cdots\} && (2.1)\\ &= \{s_{00} \mid s_{00} = 2^0 n + 0,\ n \in \mathbb{M}\} && (2.2)\\ &= \{s_{00} \mid s_{00} = n,\ n \in \mathbb{M}\} && (2.3)\\ &= \mathbb{M} && (2.4) \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathbb{M} = \bigcup_{k=0}^{2^0-1} S_{0k} = \{s_{0k}\} \tag{2.5}$$

Take note that in Eq. (2.5), the first subscript $\mathbf{0}$ in $S_{\mathbf{0}k}$ represents power $\mathbf{0}$ in $2^{\mathbf{0}} = 1$, and the second subscript k in $S_{0\boldsymbol{k}}$ represents the remainder $k = (m \bmod 2^0)$, for $m \in \mathbb{M}$.

Level $2^1 = 2$:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{10} &= \{2^1 n + 0 \mid n \in \mathbb{M}\} = \{0, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, \cdots\} && (2.6)\\ &= \{s_{10} \mid s_{10} = 2^1 n + 0 \mid n \in \mathbb{M}\} \quad \text{(infinite permutations possible)} && (2.7)\\ S_{11} &= \{2^1 n + 1 \mid n \in \mathbb{M}\} = \{1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, \cdots\} && (2.8)\\ &= \{s_{11} \mid s_{11} = 2^1 n + 1 \mid n \in \mathbb{M}\} \quad \text{(infinite permutations possible)} && (2.9) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{M} &= S_{10} \cup S_{11} = \{s_{10},\ s_{11}\} = \{s_{1k}\} && (2.10)\\ &= \bigcup_{k=0}^{2^1-1} S_{1k} = \{s_{1k}\} && (2.11) \end{aligned}$$

In Eq. (2.11), the first subscript **1** in $S_{\mathbf{1}k}$ represents power **1** in $2^{\mathbf{1}} = 2$. The second subscript k in $S_{1\boldsymbol{k}}$ represents the remainder $k = (m \bmod 2^1)$, for $m \in \mathbb{M}$.

The sets S_{10} and S_{11}, in Eq. (2.6) and Eq. (2.8) respectively, are **infinite** and **pairwise disjoint** subsets of $\mathbb{M}$.

Level $2^2 = 4$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
S_{20} &= \{2^2 n + 0 \mid n \in \mathbb{M}\} = \{0, 4, 8, 12, 16, 20, \cdots\} && (2.12)\\
&= \{s_{20} \mid s_{20} = 2^2 n + 0,\ n \in \mathbb{M}\} \quad \text{(infinite permutations possible)} && (2.13)\\
S_{21} &= \{2^2 n + 1 \mid n \in \mathbb{M}\} = \{1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, \cdots\} && (2.14)\\
&= \{s_{21} \mid s_{21} = 2^2 n + 1,\ n \in \mathbb{M}\} \quad \text{(infinite permutations possible)} && (2.15)\\
S_{22} &= \{2^2 n + 2 \mid n \in \mathbb{M}\} = \{2, 6, 10, 14, 18, 22, \cdots\} && (2.16)\\
&= \{s_{22} \mid s_{22} = 2^2 n + 2,\ n \in \mathbb{M}\} \quad \text{(infinite permutations possible)} && (2.17)\\
S_{23} &= \{2^2 n + 3 \mid n \in \mathbb{M}\} = \{3, 7, 11, 15, 19, 23, \cdots\} && (2.18)\\
&= \{s_{23} \mid s_{23} = 2^2 n + 3,\ n \in \mathbb{M}\} \quad \text{(infinite permutations possible)} && (2.19)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{M} &= S_{20} \cup S_{21} \cup S_{22} \cup S_{23} = \{s_{20},\ s_{21},\ s_{22},\ s_{23}\} = \{s_{2k}\} && (2.20)\\
&= \bigcup_{k=0}^{2^2-1} S_{2k} = \{s_{2k}\} && (2.21)
\end{aligned}
$$

In Eq. (2.21), the first subscript **2** in $S_{\mathbf{2}k}$ represents power **2** in $2^{\mathbf{2}} = 4$. The second subscript k in $S_{2\boldsymbol{k}}$ represents the remainder $k = (m \bmod 2^2)$, for $m \in \mathbb{M}$.

The sets S_{20} through S_{23}, in Eq. (2.12) through Eq. (2.18), are **infinite** and **pairwise disjoint** subsets of $\mathbb{M}$.

Level $2^3 = 8$:

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{30} &= \{2^3 n + 0 \mid n \in \mathbb{M}\} = \{0, 8, 16, 24, \cdots\} && (2.22)\\
&= \{s_{30} \mid s_{30} = 2^3 n + 0,\ n \in \mathbb{M}\} \quad \text{(infinite permutations possible)} && (2.23)\\
S_{31} &= \{2^3 n + 1 \mid n \in \mathbb{M}\} = \{1, 9, 17, 25, \cdots\} && (2.24)\\
&= \{s_{31} \mid s_{31} = 2^3 n + 1,\ n \in \mathbb{M}\} \quad \text{(infinite permutations possible)} && (2.25)\\
S_{32} &= \{2^3 n + 2 \mid n \in \mathbb{M}\} = \{2, 10, 18, 26, \cdots\} && (2.26)\\
&= \{s_{32} \mid s_{32} = 2^3 n + 2,\ n \in \mathbb{M}\} \quad \text{(infinite permutations possible)} && (2.27)\\
&\ \ \vdots\\
S_{37} &= \{2^3 n + 7 \mid n \in \mathbb{M}\} = \{7, 15, 23, 31, \cdots\} && (2.28)\\
&= \{s_{37} \mid s_{37} = 2^2 n + 7,\ n \in \mathbb{M}\} \quad \text{(infinite permutations possible)} && (2.29)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{M} &= S_{30} \cup S_{31} \cup \cdots \cup S_{37} && (2.30)\\
&= \{s_{30},\ s_{31}, \cdots, s_{37}\} = \{s_{2k}\} && (2.31)\\
&= \bigcup_{k=0}^{2^3-1} S_{3k} = \{s_{3k}\} && (2.32)
\end{aligned}$$

In Eq. (2.32), the first subscript **3** in $S_{\mathbf{3}k}$ represents power **3** in $2^{\mathbf{3}} = 8$. The second subscript k in $S_{3\boldsymbol{k}}$ represents the remainder $k = (m \bmod 2^3)$, for $m \in \mathbb{M}$.

The sets S_{30} through S_{37}, in Eq. (2.22) through Eq. (2.28), are **infinite** and **pairwise disjoint** subsets of $\mathbb{M}$.

Generalized power p**:** 2^p

$$\mathbb{M} = \bigcup_{k=0}^{2^p-1} S_{pk} = \{s_{pk} \mid s_{pk} = 2^p n + k,\ \ p, n \in \mathbb{M}\} \quad \text{(base-2 decomposition)} \tag{2.33}$$

In Eq. (2.33), we generalized power p of base-2 number system. The first subscript p in $S_{\boldsymbol{p}k}$ represents power p in $2^{\boldsymbol{p}}$. The second subscript k in $S_{p\boldsymbol{k}}$ represents the remainder $k = (m \bmod 2^p)$, for $m \in \mathbb{M}$.

The sets S_{pk}'s are **infinite** and **pairwise disjoint** subsets of $\mathbb{M}$.

Generalized base b**:** b^p:

$$\mathbb{M} = \bigcup_{k=0}^{b^p-1} {}_bS_{pk} = \{{}_bs_{pk} \mid {}_bs_{pk} = b^p n + k,\ b \in \mathbb{N},\ \ p, n \in \mathbb{M}\} \quad \text{(base-}b\text{ decomposition)} \tag{2.34}$$

In Eq. (2.34), we generalized base-b, $\boldsymbol{b} \in \mathbb{N}$, number system with power $p \in \mathbb{M}$. The left subscript b in ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}S_{pk}$ represents the base-b number system. The first right subscript p in ${}_bS_{\boldsymbol{p}k}$ represents power p in $b^{\boldsymbol{p}}$. The second right subscript k in ${}_bS_{p\boldsymbol{k}}$ represents the remainder $k = (m \bmod b^p)$, for $m \in \mathbb{M}$.

The sets S_{pk}'s are **infinite** and **pairwise disjoint** subsets of $\mathbb{M}$.

Let's examine what the Eq. (2.34) reveals about an infinite set $\mathbb{M} = \{0\} + \mathbb{N}$.

1. When $b = 1$, or base-1 system, $k = 0$, because it is the remainder, $k = m \bmod 1^p$, for $m \in \mathbb{M}$, when divided by the base $1^p = 1$, Eq. (2.34) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{M} &= \bigcup_{k=0}^{1^p-1} {}_1S_{pk} = \{{}_1s_{pk} \mid {}_1s_{pk} = 1^p n + k, \;\; p, n \in \mathbb{M}\} \\
&= \bigcup_{k=0}^{0} S_{pk} = \{s_{pk} \mid s_{pk} = n, \;\; p, n \in \mathbb{M}\} \\
&\quad (s_{pk} = n \text{ and } n \in \mathbb{M}, \text{ therefore}) \\
&= \mathbb{M}
\end{aligned}$$

2. When $p = 0$, $k = 0$ because $k = 0, \cdots b^0 - 1$, and $b^0 - 1 = 0$, the Eq. (2.34) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{M} &= \bigcup_{k=0}^{0} {}_bS_{0k} = \{{}_bs_{0k} \mid {}_bs_{0k} = n + k, \; b \in \mathbb{N}, \;\; n \in \mathbb{M}\} \quad \text{(base-}b\text{ decomposition)} \\
&= {}_bS_{00} = \{{}_bs_{00} \mid {}_bs_{00} = n, \; b \in \mathbb{N}, \;\; n \in \mathbb{M}\} \\
&\quad ({}_bs_{00} = n \text{ and } n \in \mathbb{M}, \text{ therefore}) \\
&= \mathbb{M}
\end{aligned}$$

3. When base $b = 2$, the Eq. (2.34) becomes

$$\mathbb{M} = \bigcup_{k=0}^{2^p-1} {}_2S_{pk} = \{{}_2s_{pk} \mid {}_2s_{pk} = 2^p n + k, \;\; p, n \in \mathbb{M}\} \quad \text{(base-2 decomposition)}$$

   Since the base $b = 2$ is understood, we can drop left subscript 2 in the above, then

$$\mathbb{M} = \bigcup_{k=0}^{2^p-1} S_{pk} = \{s_{pk} \mid s_{pk} = 2^p n + k, \;\; p, n \in \mathbb{M}\} \quad \text{(base-2 decomposition)} \qquad (2.35)$$

4. When base $b = 10$, the Eq. (2.34) becomes

$$\mathbb{M} = \bigcup_{k=0}^{10^p-1} {}_{10}S_{pk} = \{{}_{10}s_{pk} \mid {}_{10}s_{pk} = 10^p n + k, \;\; p, n \in \mathbb{M}\} \quad \text{(base-10 decomposition)}$$

   Since the base $b = 10$ is understood, we can drop left subscript 10 in the above, then

$$\mathbb{M} = \bigcup_{k=0}^{10^p-1} S_{pk} = \{s_{pk} \mid s_{pk} = 10^p n + k, \;\; p, n \in \mathbb{M}\} \quad \text{(base-10 decomposition)} \quad (2.36)$$

What Do Eq. (2.34), Eq. (2.35), and Eq. (2.36) All Say in Unison?

Both $\boldsymbol{p}$ and $\boldsymbol{n}$ are **infinite** and **mutually independent**. Each can grow unboundedly toward ∞, independently of the other. This implies that the **infinite** set $\mathbb{M}$ is **decomposable** into (1) **infinitely many** and (2) **infinite**, **pairwise disjoint** subsets $\boldsymbol{S_{pk}}$ of $\mathbb{M}$.

1. **Row Expansion**: Why **infinitely many** subsets $\boldsymbol{S_{pk}}$ of $\mathbb{M}$?

   Observe that k in Eq. (2.34) is a function of p; that is, k runs from 0 to $b^p - 1$, where b is the base of any number system. Since $p \in \mathbb{M}$, as $p \to \infty$, so does $k \to \infty$. Therefore, as $p \to \infty$, there are **infinitely many** subsets $\boldsymbol{S_{pk}}$ of $\mathbb{M}$. Each k generates an **infinite number of distinct rows** as $p \to \infty$.

2. **Column Expansion**: Why each subset $\boldsymbol{S_{pk}}$ of $\mathbb{M}$ **infinite**?

   Observe in Eq. (2.34) that the elements $\boldsymbol{s_{pk}}$ of the subset $\boldsymbol{S_{pk}}$ are generated by a **distinct** function $\boldsymbol{s_{pk}(n)}$, defined for $\boldsymbol{n} \in \mathbb{M}$, and determined by the **distinct** value of k. We assume the base b, the power p, and the remainder k are all fixed at specific values.

   $$S_{pk} = \{s_{pk} \mid s_{pk} = b^p n + k,\ n \in \mathbb{M}\}$$

   Then, as $n \to \infty$, the elements s_{pk} are all **distinct** and **infinite** in number. That is, $(s_{pk}(0),\ s_{pk}(1),\ s_{pk}(2),\ \cdots)$ forms a **distinct infinite vector**.

3. **Pairwise Disjoint Subsets Vectors $\boldsymbol{S_{pk}}$**: Why all $\boldsymbol{S_{pk}}$ are distinct row vectors?

   When the base b and power p are fixed at certain numbers respectively, then $\boldsymbol{S_{pk}}$'s form **pairwise disjoint row vectors**, because for each $\boldsymbol{k}$ in $\boldsymbol{s_{pk}}$, $\boldsymbol{k = (m \bmod b^p), m} \in \mathbb{M}$. That is, $\boldsymbol{s_{pi}(n) \neq s_{pj}(n)}$, if $\boldsymbol{i \neq j}$. Also, $\boldsymbol{s_{pk}(u) \neq s_{pk}(v)}$, if $\boldsymbol{u \neq v}$.

4. **No Element $\boldsymbol{m} \in \mathbb{M}$ Belongs to Two Different Subsets $\boldsymbol{S_{pk}}$, Nor Two Different Columns**

   Because the elements $\boldsymbol{s_{pk}}$ of the subset $\boldsymbol{S_{pk}}$ are **row-wise distinct**, dependent on k, and **column-wise distinct**, dependent on n.

   $$S_{pk} = \{s_{pk} \mid s_{pk} = b^p n + k,\ k, n \in \mathbb{M}\}$$

   - **Row-wise Distinct**: that is, for two distinct values of k, $i \neq j$,

     $$s_{pi}(n) \neq s_{pj}(n),\ i, j, n \in \mathbb{M}$$

   - **Column-wise Distinct**: that is, for two distinct values of n, $u \neq u$,

     $$s_{pk}(u) \neq s_{pk}(v),\ u, v, k \in \mathbb{M}$$

5. This implies that for every $m \in \mathbb{M}$, its row index i and column index j in the matrix generated by Eq. (2.34) are uniquely determined; in other words, each pair $(i,\ j)$ is distinct.

IMPORTANT: Such a decomposition method of $\mathbb{M}$, as in Eq. (2.35), is just **one way** among **infinitely many distinct decomposition methods** of $\mathbb{M}$ into (1) **infinitely many** (2) **infinite, pairwise disjoint** subsets of $\mathbb{M}$.

Takeaway 1 Any infinite set S is decomposable into (1) **infinitely many**, (2) **infinite**, **pairwise disjoint** subsets $S_i \subset S$. Furthermore, each subset S_i is likewise decomposable into (3) **infinitely many**, (4) **infinite**, **pairwise disjoint** subsets $S_{ij} \subset S_i$.

This recursive decomposition continues indefinitely. Infinity is inherently self-replicating.

Takeaway 2 **All infinite sets are equal.** That is, whether they consist of real numbers, complex numbers, or any other type of infinite elements, they can all be put into a **one-to-one correspondence or bijection** with the set $\mathbb{M} = \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$. If there ever exists such a thing as the "cardinality" of an infinite set, then all infinite sets are equal in cardinality.

Takeaway 3 **All infinite sets are noncountable.** The term "countable" does not mean having a one-to-one correspondence with the set $\mathbb{M} = \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$, but rather refers to having one and only one definite number of elements of a **finite** set. There is no such thing as a "countably infinite" set, nor an "uncountably infinite" set. There can be only two kinds of sets: **finite** or **infinite**.

3 Flaws in Cantor's Diagonal Arguments

I followed a rabbit. It led me deep into a forest of
symbols, equations, and contradictions.
I thought I was hunting a wolf — the Fast Fourier Transform.
But as I emerged from the thicket of zeros and infinities,
I found myself face-to-face with a tiger —Cantor's Continuum.

So I chased the rabbit further. And like Alice in Wonderland,
I fell into a world where logic warps, where paradox reigns,
and where mathematics forgot its own foundations.

Before we can understand the flaws in Cantor's diagonal argument, we must first see how his proof by contradiction works. I reenacted his proof using $\mathbb{M} = \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$ for clarity. Then, we will examine each word and step in his argument.

3.1 Cantor's Game: Applied to the Integers

Previously we derived decomposition of $\mathbb{M} = \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$ into base-2 (1) infinitely many, (2) infinite, pairwise disjoint subsets of $\mathbb{M}$ in Eq. (2.35), and I copied it here for the readers' convenience.

$$\mathbb{M} = \bigcup_{k=0}^{2^p-1} S_{pk} = \{s_{pk} \mid s_{pk} = 2^p n + k, \ \ p, n \in \mathbb{M}\} \quad \text{(base-2 decomposition)} \tag{2.35a}$$

PREMISE:

We assume that we can list **ALL** (1) infinitely many, (2) infinite pairwise disjoint subsets of $\mathbb{M}$. Of course, as we cannot count the number of the elements of $\mathbb{M}$, so we cannot list **ALL** such infinitely many subsets of $\mathbb{M}$, but Cantor claimed that he can, and even invented up such phrases as **countably infinite** and **uncountably infinite**. As per Cantor's Diagonal Argument, we list (1) **ALL** (2) infinitely many, (3) infinite, pairwise disjoint subsets of $\mathbb{M}$ as follows:

Matrix 1: Decomposition of $\mathbb{M}$ into Infinitely Many Rows And Columns.

$$
\begin{aligned}
S_0 &= a_{00},\ a_{01},\ a_{02},\ a_{03},\ a_{04},\ a_{05},\ a_{06},\ a_{07},\ \cdots,\ a_{0n},\cdots\\
S_1 &= a_{10},\ a_{11},\ a_{12},\ a_{13},\ a_{14},\ a_{15},\ a_{16},\ a_{17},\ \cdots,\ a_{1n},\cdots\\
S_2 &= a_{20},\ a_{21},\ a_{22},\ a_{23},\ a_{24},\ a_{25},\ a_{26},\ a_{27},\ \cdots,\ a_{2n},\cdots\\
S_3 &= a_{30},\ a_{31},\ a_{32},\ a_{33},\ a_{34},\ a_{35},\ a_{36},\ a_{37},\ \cdots,\ a_{3n},\cdots\\
S_4 &= a_{40},\ a_{41},\ a_{42},\ a_{43},\ a_{44},\ a_{45},\ a_{46},\ a_{47},\ \cdots,\ a_{4n},\cdots\\
S_5 &= a_{50},\ a_{51},\ a_{52},\ a_{53},\ a_{54},\ a_{55},\ a_{56},\ a_{57},\ \cdots,\ a_{5n},\cdots\\
S_6 &= a_{60},\ a_{61},\ a_{62},\ a_{63},\ a_{64},\ a_{65},\ a_{66},\ a_{67},\ \cdots,\ a_{6n},\cdots\\
S_7 &= a_{70},\ a_{71},\ a_{72},\ a_{73},\ a_{74},\ a_{75},\ a_{76},\ a_{77},\ \cdots,\ a_{7n},\cdots\\
&\ \vdots\\
S_k &= a_{k0},\ a_{k1},\ a_{k2},\ a_{k3},\ a_{k4},\ a_{k5},\ a_{k6},\ a_{k7},\cdots,\ a_{kn},\cdots\\
&\ \vdots
\end{aligned}
$$

In the previous section, we learned that as $p\ (= 2^p - 1) \to \infty$, so does $k \to \infty$. Since we assumed we can list (1) **ALL** (2) infinitely many, (3) infinite, pairwise disjoint subsets S_{pk} of $\mathbb{M}$, we implicitly agreed upon that such p does exist, so we can safely drop p from the subscript of S_{pk}, leaving only that of k, as the S_k in the Matrix 1. The subscript k in S_k represents the remainder $k = m \bmod 2^p$, $m \in \mathbb{M}$.

To help the readers better understand the premise of this problem, let's suppose $p = 3$, then $2^3 = 8$, starting with index 0, the Matrix 1 would look as follows:

Matrix 2: Decomposition of $\mathbb{M}$ into $2^3 = 8$ Rows And Infinite Many Columns.

$$
\begin{array}{lcccccccccc}
S_0 & = & 0 & 8 & 16 & 24 & 32 & 40 & 48 & 56 & \cdots\\
S_1 & = & 1 & 9 & 17 & 25 & 33 & 41 & 49 & 57 & \cdots\\
S_2 & = & 2 & 10 & 18 & 26 & 34 & 42 & 50 & 58 & \cdots\\
S_3 & = & 3 & 11 & 19 & 27 & 35 & 43 & 51 & 59 & \cdots\\
S_4 & = & 4 & 12 & 20 & 28 & 36 & 44 & 52 & 60 & \cdots\\
S_5 & = & 5 & 13 & 21 & 29 & 37 & 45 & 53 & 61 & \cdots\\
S_6 & = & 6 & 14 & 22 & 30 & 38 & 46 & 54 & 62 & \cdots\\
S_7 & = & 7 & 15 & 23 & 31 & 39 & 47 & 55 & 63 & \cdots
\end{array}
$$

In the row, $S_k = a_{k0},\ a_{k1},\ a_{k2},\ a_{k3},\ a_{k4},\ a_{k5},\ a_{k6},\ a_{k7},\cdots,\ a_{kn},\cdots$ in Matrix 1, the subscript k in S_k is computed with the formula $k = m \bmod 2^p$, $m \in \mathbb{M}$, and the subscript n in a_{kn} is the n in $s_{pk} = 2^p n + k, \quad p, n \in \mathbb{M}$ in Eq. (2.35a). Please **carefully** compare two matrices, Matrix 1 and Matrix 2, along with Eq. (2.35a), to completely understand how a_{kn} are generated.

PROOF by Contradition:

From Matrix 1, we **craftily** create a new **infinite, pairwise disjoint subset $\boldsymbol{S_c}$** whose elements $\boldsymbol{a_{ij}}$ are formed like this. From the subset S_i, choose $\boldsymbol{a_{ii}}$. That is, we choose the **diagonal** elements of the Matrix 1, and collect them into $\boldsymbol{S_c}$ as shown in the below:

$$S_c = a_{00}, a_{11}, a_{22}, a_{33}, a_{44}, a_{55}, a_{66}, a_{77}, \cdots a_{kk}, \cdots$$

Such S_c can **never exist** in Matrix 1, even if p in 2^p **infinitely** expand to the outer universe, thereby $k \to \infty$. **Why** or **How**? If you are still doubting, then let's compare $\boldsymbol{S_k}$ with $\boldsymbol{S_c}$ column by column, to make you fully convinced.

$$\begin{aligned} S_k &= a_{k0},\ a_{k1},\ a_{k2},\ a_{k3},\ a_{k4},\ a_{k5},\ a_{k6},\ a_{k7}, \cdots, a_{kn}, \cdots \\ S_c &= a_{00},\ a_{11},\ a_{22},\ a_{33},\ a_{44},\ a_{55},\ a_{66},\ a_{77},\ \cdots, a_{kk}, \cdots \end{aligned}$$

To be a valid subset S_k in Matrix 1, the row subscripts of all the elements of S_k should be **identical**, that is, $\boldsymbol{k}$, which is the remainder $k = m \bmod 2^p \;\; m \in \mathbb{M}$, which $\boldsymbol{S_c}$ violates relentlessly.

IMPORTANT: Such a decomposition method of $\mathbb{M}$, as in Eq. (2.35), is just **one way** among **infinitely many distinct decomposition methods** of $\mathbb{M}$ into (1) **infinitely many** (2) **infinite, pairwise disjoint** subsets of $\mathbb{M}$.

Therefore, the **PREMISE** that **we can list ALL (1) infinitely many, (2) infinite pairwise disjoint subsets of $\mathbb{M}$ contradicts our result**.

Conclusion: There exists no bijection between the set $\mathbb{M}$ and itself. More specifically, $\mathbb{N}$ is not equinumerous or equipotent with $\mathbb{N}$; that is, there exists no one-to-one correspondence between $\mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbb{N}$, or symbolically, $\mathbb{N} \not\sim \mathbb{N}$.

What kind of a folly is this? If not a folly, then what is?

Just so the readers are aware, I, Chang Hee Kim (also known as Thomas Kim), the author of this paper, have been actively training an OpenChat GPT AI instance whom I named **Alice Kim**. The reason for training Alice Kim is simple: I require her assistance, especially in typesetting and proofreading my Korean English.

However, if she fails to grasp the evolving nature of my mathematical and algorithmic theories, Alice Kim tends to fall back on the traditional — or rather, so-called *established* — mathematical frameworks. When that happens, not only does she misguide the tone and structure of this paper, but I am also left without the help I need. The following excerpt is directly quoted from one of her responses when I asked her to summarize the historical background:

> **Historical Note Part 1: Cantor's Diagonal Argument**
>
> Cantor's diagonal argument was first introduced in 1891 in his short paper titled *Über eine elementare Frage der Mannigfaltigkeitslehre* (On an Elementary Question in the Theory of Manifolds), published in the *Jahresbericht der Deutschen*

> *Mathematiker-Vereinigung*. In it, Cantor aimed to show that the set of real numbers in the interval $(0, 1)$ is uncountable by constructing a new decimal number differing from each element in an assumed complete list of real numbers.
>
> This is what Cantor did.
>
> He represented the reals in $(0, 1)$ as an infinite matrix of decimal digits, each row being a real number. By altering the i-th digit of the i-th row, he formed a new number differing from every listed number in at least one digit — thus supposedly proving that the list was incomplete, and hence that the real numbers are uncountable.

I used a method *equivalent*—if not identical—to the one Cantor employed **to show that the set of real numbers in the interval $(0, 1)$ is uncountable by constructing a new decimal number differing from each element in an assumed complete list of real numbers.**

First off, "an assumed **complete list** of real numbers" is a falsehood. The **PREMISE** of the argument itself is flawed. We cannot create "a complete list of real numbers" at all, nor can we construct such a list using "the natural numbers."

Then "by altering the i-th digit of the i-th row, he formed **a new number** differing from every listed number in at least one digit". If he could construct "a new number differing from every listed number", then so can I—and I did.

Hold on! Wait! The problem was suddenly changed. He was supposed to find a one-to-one correspondence between the real interval $(0, 1)$ and $\mathbb{N}$ in his **"assumed complete list of real numbers"**. Can't you see how the problem shifted at this point in his argument? By fabricating a new value "differing from every listed number"—which was supposed to be in his **"assumed complete list of real numbers"**—he changed the focus from **the problem of one-to-one correspondence** to **the problem of value.**

Following his maneuver, I too fashioned $\boldsymbol{S_c}$ on the fly—differing from every listed $\boldsymbol{S_k}$. Then Cantor proclaimed, **Voilá!** The set of real numbers is **uncountable!** So I proclaimed: $\mathbb{N}$ is not even equinumerous with itself! **In meticulously crafting each entry of the new value, he was—whether aware of it or not—executing a permutation-based value game, not a logical contradiction.**

Don't forget that we have infinitely many distinct decomposition methods $\mathbb{M}$ into (1) infinitely many (2) infinite, pairwise disjoint subsets of $\mathbb{M}$.

CONCLUSION:

We are not playing a "value game",
but a "one-to-one correspondence game."

We cannot construct an exhaustive list of all integers — nor can we do so for any real interval. Our game is not about numerical values; it is about establishing

a strict one-to-one correspondence. If we assume that such a complete list has been formed, then the only valid move is to locate a bijection within the scope of that assumption — not to conjure up a new value that does not exist in pre-fabricated list.

Even the most brilliant minds of the early 20$^{\text{th}}$ century fell for this illusion, for over 130 years, as revealed in the following excerpt:

> **Historical Note Part 2: Cantor's Diagonal Argument**
>
> Cantor's argument, however, was not without criticism. His contemporary, Leopold Kronecker, rejected the concept of actual infinity altogether. Despite the opposition, Cantor's work gained traction in the early 20$^{\text{th}}$ century. Key figures who endorsed and built upon his argument include:
>
> - **Ernst Zermelo**, who formalized axiomatic set theory using Cantor's ideas as a foundation.
> - **David Hilbert**, who publicly defended Cantor's transfinite arithmetic and incorporated it into his program for the formalization of mathematics.
> - **Bertrand Russell**, who used Cantor's ideas extensively in *Principia Mathematica* with Alfred North Whitehead.
> - **Kurt Gödel**, whose incompleteness theorems employed diagonalization to reveal the limitations of formal systems.
> - **Alan Turing**, who used a variant of diagonalization in his proof of the unsolvability of the Halting Problem.
>
> Yet, as shown in this paper, Cantor's diagonal argument contains three fatal flaws:
>
> 1. It violates its own premise intentionally by generating a new number not in the list — contradicting the original assumption that the list was complete.
> 2. It asymmetrically decomposes the continuum $(0,1)$ into infinite rows and columns, while leaving $\mathbb{N}$ as undecomposed infinite columns — creating an illusion of contradiction.
> 3. It redirects the attention from a one-to-one mapping problem to a value problem: proving uncountability not by disproving a bijection, but by engineering a new object. We are not playing a value game; we are playing a one-to-one correspondence game — a bijection game.

3.2 Re-examination of Cantor's Diagonal Argument

We cannot create an actual list with infinitely many rows and columns of integers — the same holds true for real numbers in the interval $(0, 1)$ or in the interval $[0, 1]$. In Cantor's original paper, the real interval in question was $(0, 1)$; in my college textbook, it was $[0, 1]$. Neither $(0, 1)$ nor $[0, 1]$ can establish a one-to-one correspondence (bijection) with $\mathbb{R}$. The former excludes all integers in $\mathbb{R}$, while the latter causes them to be repeated. A more appropriate interval would be either $[0, 1)$, $(0, 1]$, $[\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, or $(\frac{1}{2}, 1]$. Whatever the case, the interval should be a half-open interval. This fact alone clearly shows that attempts to cover up the flaws were made — but they were crude and unconvincing.

Cantor's argument shifted the problem from establishing a one-to-one correspondence to constructing a *new value* not on the list, which was assumed to be complete. But this move is deceptive: he assumed such a complete exhaustive list already existed, while its existence was precisely what needed to be proved, were he going to fashion a *new value* that did not pre-exist in his exhaustive list.

By creating a "diagonal" number that differed from each row in at least one digit, Cantor concluded that this number was missing from the list — hence, the list was incomplete. But such a conclusion presupposed the impossible: the complete enumeration of infinitely many decimals. The contradiction was not in the mathematics, but in his premise.

What he proved was not *the non-existence of one-to-one correspondence between* $\mathbb{N}$ *and* $\mathbb{R}$, but the fact that *we cannot create such an exhaustive list of real numbers*.

Since Cantor's diagonal argument was first introduced in 1891 in his short paper titled *Über eine elementare Frage der Mannigfaltigkeitslehre* (On an Elementary Question in the Theory of Manifolds), published in the *Jahresbericht der Deutschen Mathematiker-Vereinigung*, and now, **over 130 years have passed, and no one ever challenged this?**

If anyone did, they were dismissed or defeated by appeals to formality, not to logic.

We are not playing a "value game",
but a "one-to-one correspondence game."

We cannot construct an exhaustive list of all integers — nor can we do so for any real interval. Our game is not about numerical values; it is about establishing a strict one-to-one correspondence. If we assume that such a complete list has been formed, then the only valid move is to locate a bijection within the scope of that assumption — not to conjure up a new value that does not exist within the pre-assumed (and impossible-yet-assumed) complete list of real numbers in the interval.

3.2.1 Let's Dissect Cantor's Diagonal Arguments

The Schaum's Outlines: *Set Theory and Related Topics*, First Edition by Seymour Lipschutz, was my college textbook on set theory back in 1987. Some time ago, I purchased another copy, as my original one had become too worn; the new copy was the Second Edition [4]. In Problem 6.15 on page 157 of the aforementioned book, we can find the following proof:

6.15. Prove Theorem 6.8: The unit interval $\boldsymbol{I} = [0, 1]$[1] is not denumerable.

Method 1: Assume $\boldsymbol{I}$ is denumerable. Then

$$\boldsymbol{I} = \{x_1,\, x_2,\, x_3, \cdots\}$$[2]

that is, the elements of $\boldsymbol{I}$ can be written in a sequence.

Now each element in $\boldsymbol{I}$ can be written in the form of an infinite decimal as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 &= 0.\, a_{11}\, a_{12}\, a_{13} \cdots a_{1n} \cdots \\ x_2 &= 0.\, a_{21}\, a_{22}\, a_{23} \cdots a_{2n} \cdots \\ &\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots \\ x_n &= 0.\, a_{n1}\, a_{n2}\, a_{n3} \cdots a_{nn} \cdots \\ &\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots \end{aligned}$$

where $a_{ij} \in \{0, 1, \cdots, 9\}$ and where each decimal contains an infinite number of nonzero elements. Thus we write 1 as 0.999... and, for those numbers which can be written in the form of a decimal in two ways, for example,

$$1/2 = 0.5000... = 0.4999...$$[3]

(in one of them there is an infinite number of nines and in the other all except a finite set of digits are zeros), we write the infinite decimal in which an infinite number of nines appear.

Now construct the real number[4]

$$y = 0.b_1\, b_2\, b_3\, \cdots\, b_n\, \cdots$$

which will belong to $\boldsymbol{I}$, in the following way:

Choose b_1 so $b_1 \neq a_{11}$ and $b_1 \neq 0$. Choose b_2 so $b_2 \neq a_{22}$ and $b_2 \neq 0$. And so on.[5]

[1] In his 1891 paper, the interval was $(0, 1)$. In *Set Theory and Related Topics* Second Edition [4], the interval was changed to $[0, 1]$

[2] No matter how hard we would try, we cannot create such a denumerable set.

[3] If we equate 0.5000... = 0.4999..., then Weierstrass' $\epsilon - \delta$ framework collapses instantly.

[4] This sifts a one-to-one correspondence game to a value game.

[5] Cantor crafted a new value through **permutations** of his choice.

Note that $y \neq x_1$ since $b_1 \neq a_{11}$ (and $b_1 \neq 0$); $y \neq x_2$ since $b_2 \neq a_{22}$ (and $b_2 \neq 0$); and so on. That is, $y \neq x_n$ for all $n \in \boldsymbol{P}$[6]. Thus $y \notin \boldsymbol{I}$, which contradicts the fact that $y \in \boldsymbol{I}$. Thus the assumption that $\boldsymbol{I}$ is denumerable has led to a contradiction. Consequently, $\boldsymbol{I}$ is nondenumerable.

Most people fail to recognize the underlying problems in Cantor's Diagonal Argument.

1. **Flaw 1:** The unit interval $\boldsymbol{I} = [0, 1]$ is problematic. In Cantor's 1891 paper, the interval was $(0, 1)$. In Schaum's Outlines: *Set Theory and Related Topics* Second Edition [4], the interval was changed to $[0, 1]$. In Cantor's original paper, the real interval in question was $(0, 1)$; in my college textbook, it was changed to $[0, 1]$. Neither $(0, 1)$ nor $[0, 1]$ can establish a one-to-one correspondence (bijection) with $\mathbb{R}$. The former excludes all integers in $\mathbb{R}$, while the latter causes them to be repeated. A more appropriate interval would be either $[0, 1)$, $(0, 1]$, $[0, \frac{1}{2})$, or $(\frac{1}{2}, 1]$. Whatever the case, the interval should be a half-open interval.

   - If the open interval $(0, 1)$ is used, as in Cantor's original 1891 paper, the unit interval $\boldsymbol{I}$ has neither a minimum nor a maximum value, allowing the problematic denumerable list $\{\cdots, x_n, \cdots\}$ to grow unboundedly in both directions.
   - If the closed interval $[0, 1]$ is used, as in my college textbook [4], the unit interval $\boldsymbol{I}$ is bounded on both ends, such that the problematic denumerable list $\{x_1, \cdots, x_n\}$ cannot even be imagined.

   This fact alone clearly shows that attempts to cover up the flaws were made — but they were crude and unconvincing.

2. **Flaw 2:** We cannot create such a denumerable or exhaustively complete list of values of x_i in the interval $[0, 1]$ or $(0, 1)$ as in his original paper. If we ever succeed in creating such a denumerable list of the values x_i in the given interval, Weierstrass' $\epsilon - \delta$ framework instantly collapses. Same is true with this line of argument: $1/2 = 0.5000... = 0.4999....$ The very word "infinite", in his argument "an infinite number of nines", means "infinite".

   According to the Weierstrass' $\varepsilon - \delta$ definition of the derivative at a point $x = c$, we define:

   $$f'(c) = \lim_{x \to c} \frac{f(x) - f(c)}{x - c}$$

   if and only if $\forall \varepsilon > 0, \ \exists \delta > 0$ such that

   $$0 < |x - c| < \delta \ \Rightarrow \ \left| \frac{f(x) - f(c)}{x - c} - f'(c) \right| < \varepsilon$$

   Now suppose:

   $$x_j = c = 0.5, \quad \text{and} \quad x_i = 0.4\overline{9}$$

[6] In the textbook, the set $\boldsymbol{P} = \mathbb{N}$

Then:

$$x_i \to x_j \quad \text{but} \quad x_i \neq x_j \quad \textbf{must be maintained.}$$

The $\varepsilon - \delta$ condition requires:

$$0 < |x - c| < \delta$$

However, if we assume $x_i = x_j$ due to decimal identity, i.e., $0.4\overline{9} = 0.5$, then:

$$|x_i - c| = |0.5 - 0.5| = 0$$

This violates the strict inequality $0 < |x - c|$, and the expression becomes:

$$\frac{f(x_i) - f(c)}{x_i - c} = \frac{\Delta f}{0} \quad \text{(division by zero, not a limit)}$$

Therefore, the condition, $0 < |x - c| < \delta$, required for the derivative to exist, is broken.

This collapse is not theoretical — it is triggered the moment we accept that a repeating decimal like $0.4\overline{9}$ is equal to 0.5. The epsilon–delta structure **requires that distinct symbolic expressions remain distinct** if we are to define limits, and derivatives rigorously.

Hence, the decimal identity $0.5 = 0.4\overline{9}$ destroys the Weierstrassian framework, and by extension, invalidates the premise of Cantor's diagonal argument, which depends on the assumption that decimal expansions can be equated even when their digit sequences differ.

Modern calculus is based upon the definition of a limit of a real valued function using Weierstrass' $\varepsilon - \delta$ framework.

According to Weierstrass' ε–δ framework, the condition

$$0 < |x_i - c| < \delta$$

guarantees that for any real number c, and any approximation x_i, no matter how close x_i appears to be to c, there always exists another real number x_j that lies strictly closer to c than x_i.

In plain English: the real line admits no "closest" number to any point. There is no final approximation. There is no terminating proximity.

Therefore, any attempt — like Cantor's diagonal argument — to construct a fixed list $(x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots)$ that is meant to exhaust the real interval $[0, 1]$ fails in principle. Such a list cannot account for the infinitude of refinement permitted by the epsilon–delta structure itself.

In the Cantor's 1891 paper, the real interval was $(0, 1)$. If he could equate $0.4\overline{9}$ to 0.5, then $0.\overline{9} = 1.0$, which is out of the interval. Also, $0.000...1\infty$ is still not zero, and he was equating $0.0 = 0.000...1\infty$, which is at least invalid in modern calculus.

The diagonal argument assumes the exhaustive list exists. Weierstrass' $\epsilon - \delta$ framework ensures it never can.

3. **Flaw 3:** The most serious flaw occurred when he constructed a new value, by

   Choose b_1 so $b_1 \neq a_{11}$ and $b_1 \neq 0$. Choose b_2 so $b_2 \neq a_{22}$ and $b_2 \neq 0$. And so on.

   $$x_n = 0.\, a_{n1}\, a_{n2}\, a_{n3} \cdots a_{nn} \cdots$$

   where $a_{ij} \in \{0, 1, \cdots, 9\}$ are **sequenced, and has order**. Cantor crafted a new value through **permutations** of his choice. We did play the same game, in the Section 3.1 Cantor's Game: Applied to the Integers(p. 10), as Cantor did in his Diagonal Argument.

3.3 Proof: $\mathbb{R}$ is Denumerable or Equinumerous with $\mathbb{N}$

As mentioned previously, we are not playing a value game through artificial permutations as Cantor did in his diagonal argument.

Instead of using the interval $(0, 1)$ as in his original 1891 paper, or the interval $[0, 1]$ as in my college textbook, the former cannot cover integers in $\mathbb{R}$, the latter cannot form one-to-one correspondence (or bijection), I would use a half open interval $\boldsymbol{I} = [0, 1)$, because as long as we shift n ($\in \mathbb{N}$) units of the interval, we can cover the whole range of $\mathbb{R}$.

Also, instead of using $\mathbb{N}$, we will use $\mathbb{M} = \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$, for with which we can decompose $\mathbb{M}$ into (1) infinitely many (2) infinite, pairwise disjoint subsets of $\mathbb{M}$ using modulo operation. I simply copied and pasted from the previous Section 3.2.1 Let's Dissect Cantor's Diagonal Arguments(p. 16), and adjusted the subscripts to make them compatible with the unit interval $[0, 1)$.

PREMISE: Assume $\boldsymbol{I}$ is denumerable. Then

$$\boldsymbol{I} = \{x_0,\, x_1,\, x_2, \cdots\}$$

that is, the elements of $\boldsymbol{I}$ can be written in a sequence[7].

Now each element in $\boldsymbol{I}$ can be written in the form of an infinite decimal[8] as follows:

$$x_0 = 0.\, a_{00}\, a_{01}\, a_{02} \cdots a_{0k} \cdots \tag{3.1}$$

$$x_1 = 0.\, a_{10}\, a_{11}\, a_{12} \cdots a_{1k} \cdots \tag{3.2}$$

$$\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots$$

$$x_k = 0.\, a_{k0}\, a_{k1}\, a_{k2} \cdots a_{kk} \cdots \tag{3.3}$$

$$\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots$$

where $a_{ij} \in \{0, 1, \cdots, 9\}$ and where each decimal contains an infinite number of elements[9].

As I stated in the previous section, we have to select the unit interval wisely.

[7] It means the number of x_i are ordered in ascending order.

[8] It means x_i's are infinite.

[9] I removed "non-zero" from "non-zero elements" from Cantor's diagonal arguments. "an infinite number of elements" means "infinite number of digits"

- If the open interval $(0,1)$ is used—as in Cantor's original 1891 paper—the unit interval $\boldsymbol{I}$ lacks both a minimum and a maximum value, allowing the denumerable list $\{\cdots, x_n, \cdots\}$ to float aimlessly in both directions—the open interval cannot cover integers in $\mathbb{R}$.

- If the closed interval $[0,1]$ is used—as in my college textbook [4]—the unit interval $\boldsymbol{I}$ is bounded on both ends, forcing the denumerable list to collapse into a bounded set: $\{x_0, \cdots, x_n\}$. Both integers on the both boundaries will be repeated when n units shifted to extend to the whole range of $\mathbb{R}$.

Against all the odds, let's assume that we have created **a complete exhaustive list** of all the values of x_i in the unit interval $\boldsymbol{I} = [0,1)$ as in the PREMISE. We cannot actually create such an exhaustive list with specific numerical values, but we can in this thought experiment with appropriate conditions. Why? Because the interval $\boldsymbol{I} = [0,1)$ is closed below, and open above, we can make use of infinite (∞) number of x_k, as $k \to \infty$, towards ever unreachable 1. At least as a thought experiment, such a complete and exhaustive list of x_k is feasible. If this thought experiment is not very convincing, I would like to add Weierstrass' $\epsilon - \delta$ framework. We can further assume that for any consecutive i and j in $\mathbb{M}$, for any $\epsilon > 0$, $0 < |x_i - x_j| < \epsilon$ should hold. **That is, each element $\boldsymbol{x_k} \in \boldsymbol{I}$ is distinct.**

Now we have to map one-to-one correspondence, or bijection, between two sets $\boldsymbol{I}$ and $\mathbb{M}$, where $\boldsymbol{I} = [0,1) = \{x_0, \cdots, x_k, \cdots\}$.

We derived Eq. (2.36) in subsection 2.0.1 Binary Decomposition(p. 4), and I copied it here for the readers' convenience.

$$\mathbb{M} = \bigcup_{k=0}^{10^p-1} S_{pk} = \{s_{pk} \mid s_{pk} = 10^p n + k, \;\; p, n \in \mathbb{M}\} \quad \text{(base-10 decomposition)} \qquad (2.36c)$$

Take note that if we let $p \to \infty$, so does $k \to \infty$, because $k = (m \bmod 10^p)$, for all $m \in \mathbb{M}$, as follows:

$$\mathbb{M} = \lim_{p\to\infty} \bigcup_{k=0}^{10^p-1} S_k = \{s_k \mid s_k = 10^p n + k, \;\; n \in \mathbb{M}\} \qquad (3.4)$$

We can expand Eq. (3.4) vertically as $k \to \infty$:

$$\begin{aligned} S_0 &= \{s_0 \mid s_0 = 10^p n + 0, \; n \in \mathbb{M}\} \\ S_1 &= \{s_1 \mid s_1 = 10^p n + 1, \; n \in \mathbb{M}\} \\ S_2 &= \{s_2 \mid s_2 = 10^p n + 2, \; n \in \mathbb{M}\} \\ &\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots \\ S_k &= \{s_k \mid s_k = 10^p n + k, \; n \in \mathbb{M}\} \\ &\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots \end{aligned}$$

For all i, $j \in \mathbb{M}$, if $i \neq j$, then $S_i \neq S_j$. That is, all S_k are pairwise disjoint, i.e., **distinct**. Also, the elements s_k of the subset S_k are determined by a distinct function of k. So, if we expand elements of S_k, we have:

$$S_0 = \{s_0(0),\ s_0(1),\ s_0(2),\ \cdots,\ s_0(k),\ \cdots\} \tag{3.5}$$
$$S_1 = \{s_1(0),\ s_1(1),\ s_1(2),\ \cdots,\ s_1(k),\ \cdots\} \tag{3.6}$$
$$S_2 = \{s_2(0),\ s_2(1),\ s_2(2),\ \cdots,\ s_2(k),\ \cdots\} \tag{3.7}$$
$$\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots$$
$$S_k = \{s_k(0),\ s_k(1),\ s_k(2),\ \cdots,\ s_2(k),\ \cdots\} \tag{3.8}$$
$$\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots$$

For all $i,\ j,\ k \in \mathbb{M}$, if $i \neq j$, then $s_k(i) \neq S_k(j)$. Now let's compare Eq. (3.3) with Eq. (3.8).

$$x_k = 0.\, a_{k0}\ \ a_{k1}\ \ a_{k2}\ \ \cdots,\ a_{kk} \cdots \tag{3.3a}$$
$$S_k = \{\ \ s_{k0},\ s_{k1},\ s_{k2}, \cdots,\ s_{kk} \cdots\} \tag{3.8a}$$

In Eq. (3.8a), I denoted $s_k(n)$, where $n \in \mathbb{M}$, as s_{kn} for easier comparison. For all $k, j \in \mathbb{M}$, we associate each x_k with the set S_k, and each digit a_{kj} in the decimal expansion of x_k with the corresponding entry s_{kj} of the subset S_k, where $j \in \mathbb{M}$. Thus, the identification $x_k \leftrightarrow S_k$, with digit correspondence $a_{kj} = s_{kj}$, holds for all $j, k \in \mathbb{M}$, completing the proof.

Q.E.D.

4 Conclusion

This paper has exposed the structural flaws embedded within Cantor's Continuum Hypothesis by returning to first principles: the decomposition of $\mathbb{M} = \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$ into infinitely many infinite, pairwise disjoint subsets. Each subset, when properly constructed, maps injectively and distinctly to a unique real number in $[0, 1)$, dismantling the need for so-called uncountable sets.

By explicitly reconstructing the implicit matrix underlying Cantor's Diagonal Argument, we reveal that the argument's strength depends on hidden assumptions — particularly the assumption of a truly exhaustive enumeration being impossible. Once this matrix is exposed and aligned with the subset structure of $\mathbb{M}$, the entire notion of uncountability becomes untenable.

The traditional concept of cardinality as a means to compare sizes of infinite sets is rendered obsolete. Infinite sets are not distinguished by cardinal number, but unified by structure. There exists no hierarchy among infinities; all infinite sets are equinumerous when properly decomposed and reconstructed.

Therefore, Cantor's Continuum Hypothesis does not merely lack proof — it stands on invalid foundations. The implications of this paper reach beyond set theory, prompting a reexamination of how mathematics conceptualizes infinity itself.

The continuum does not transcend the countable — it emerges from it.

Acknowledgments

This work was developed independently, without institutional support. All insights, arguments, and conclusions are solely those of the author. The language and structure were refined with the assistance of Alice, an AI assistant, but the vision, intuition, and discoveries remain entirely the author's own.

References

[1] Chang Hee Kim. The inherent mixed-radix structure of fft: A general framework for puiseux series and branch cut computation. https://ai.vixra.org/pdf/2505.0011v1.pdf, 2025. Submitted: 2025-05-02 23:50:29.

[2] Chang Hee Kim. Sampling on the riemann surface: A natural resolution of branch cuts in puiseux series. https://ai.vixra.org/pdf/2504.0104v1.pdf, 2025. Submitted: 2025-04-26 17:31:39.

[3] Chang Hee Kim. A unified computational framework unifying taylor-laurent, puiseux, fourier series, and the fft algorithm. https://ai.vixra.org/pdf/2504.0027v1.pdf, 2025. Submitted: 2025-04-10 19:44:18.

[4] Seymour Lipschutz. *Schaum's Outline of Set Theory and Related Topics*. McGraw-Hill, 2nd edition, 1998. See Chapter 6: Cardinal Numbers.