# A Counterexample to the Universality of Cantor's Diagonal Argument within Actual Infinity

Kesan Yi
kesan.yi@hotmail.com

April 23, 2026

**Abstract**

This paper re-examines the logical foundations of Cantor's diagonal argument. By constructing a countable set $S$ that includes a transfinite limit element under the framework of actual infinity, we demonstrate a paradox: a strictly defined sequential ordering leads the diagonal argument to classify a countable set as uncountable. This paper argues that Cantor's proof relies on two critical implicit assumptions: the completed totality of natural numbers and the presumed invariance of the result across all possible permutations. We conclude that the diagonal argument may reflect the limitations of finite indexing rather than the intrinsic cardinality of the set.

## 1 Introduction

Georg Cantor's proof of the uncountability of real numbers fundamentally altered the landscape of set theory. However, the validity of his diagonal argument depends on the interplay between the indexing system (natural numbers) and the elements being indexed. This paper constructs a specific countable set to test whether the diagonal argument maintains its consistency when applied to sets containing "limit" elements under the perspective of actual infinity.

## 2 Review of Cantor's Proof and Its Implicit Assumptions

### 2.1 The Procedure of Cantor's Diagonal Argument

Cantor's proof that the interval $[0,1]$ is uncountable typically proceeds by contradiction:

1. **Assumption**: Suppose the set of real numbers in $[0,1]$ is countable. Thus, they can be listed in a sequence $L = \{r_1, r_2, r_3, \ldots, r_n, \ldots\}$.

2. **Construction**: Each $r_n$ is expressed as an infinite decimal $0.d_{n1}d_{n2}d_{n3}\ldots$.

3. **Diagonalization**: A new number $X = 0.x_1x_2x_3\ldots$ is constructed such that $x_n \neq d_{nn}$ for every $n$.

4. **Conclusion**: Since $X$ differs from every $r_n$ in the list at the $n$-th decimal place, $X$ is not in the list. This contradicts the assumption that the list was exhaustive.

### 2.2 Implicit Assumptions in Cantor's Framework

The efficacy of this procedure rests on two profound implicit assumptions:

- **Assumption A: The Completed Totality of Natural Numbers**: Cantor adopts the perspective of *Actual Infinity*, treating the set of all natural numbers $\mathbb{N}$ as a completed totality. Only if the "process" of natural numbering is viewed as finished can one claim to have "scanned" the entire list and successfully identified a number $X$ that lies "outside" it. Without this assumption, the construction of $X$ would be an endless potential process, never reaching a state of definitive exclusion.
- **Assumption B: Invariance Under Permutation**: Cantor does not specify a particular mapping between $\mathbb{N}$ and the reals. The implicit claim is that *any* possible list or correspondence will inevitably fail. In other words, the conclusion of uncountability is treated as an inherent property of the set, independent of the method or order in which the elements are arranged.

## 3 The Counterexample: The Set of Sequential Binary Strings

To challenge these assumptions, we define a set $S$ under the framework of actual infinity: Let $s_n$ represent a binary string consisting of $n-1$ ones followed by zeros. We define the set $S$ as follows:

- $s_1 = 0.000\ldots$
- $s_2 = 0.100\ldots$
- $s_3 = 0.110\ldots$
- $s_n = 0.\underbrace{11\ldots1}_{n-1}00\ldots$

Consistent with the view of actual infinity, we include the completed limit of this progression:

- $s_\infty = 0.111\ldots$ (An infinite sequence of 1s).

The set $S = \{s_1, s_2, s_3, \ldots, s_\infty\}$ is clearly countable, as it is the union of a countably infinite set and a single element ($|S| = \aleph_0 + 1 = \aleph_0$).

## 4 Applying the Diagonal Argument to Set $S$

If we arrange $S$ in the natural order of its construction $(s_1, s_2, s_3, \ldots)$, the diagonal entries $(d_{nn})$ are all 0. Following Cantor's construction rule (changing 0 to 1), we generate:

$$X = 0.111\ldots \tag{1}$$

The result $X$ is exactly $s_\infty$. Because $s_\infty$ is defined as the limit of the sequence, it does not occupy any finite position $n$ in the natural number list. Therefore, the diagonal argument concludes that $X$ is "not in the list" and erroneously labels this countable set $S$ as **uncountable**.

This demonstrates that the "exclusion" of $X$ is not due to the size of the set $S$, but rather the inability of finite natural number indexing to pinpoint the position of a transfinite element.

## 5 Conclusion

This analysis suggests that Cantor's diagonal argument proves the incompleteness of finite indexing systems rather than the absolute cardinality of infinite sets. When a set contains elements that represent the completion of an infinite process, any list indexed by natural numbers will "appear" incomplete, even if the set is fundamentally countable. Thus, the uncountability of the continuum warrants a re-evaluation that accounts for the limitations of the indexing process itself.

## Acknowledgments

The author would like to express gratitude for the productive discussions with the AI collaborator, Gemini, which assisted in clarifying the logical structure of this argument and the formalization of the LaTeX manuscript.

## References

[1] M. Hazewinkel (Ed.), *Encyclopaedia of Mathematics*, Springer-Verlag / Kluwer Academic Publishers. (Section on Set Theory and Cantor's Diagonal Method).

[2] G. Cantor, *Über eine elementare Frage der Mannigfaltigkeitslehre*, Jahresbericht der Deutschen Mathematiker-Vereinigung, 1891.