

Re: .999... ?= 1

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2004-06/1173.html>

From: Herman Jurjus (h.jurjus_at_hetnet.nl)

Date: 06/07/04

Date: Mon, 7 Jun 2004 13:08:15 +0200

"Eckard Blumschein" <blumschein@et.uni-magdeburg.de> wrote in message
news:40C439B6.90002@et.uni-magdeburg.de...

[snip]

> >> *I see zero having three aspects of equal value but different sign:*

> >> *minus 0.0 over bar*

> >> *just zero*

> >> *plus 0.0 over bar.*

> >

[snip]

> >> *Both the negative and the positive description, from the left and from*

> >> *the right, respectively are identical with just zero.*

[snip]

> *While I do not expect people like Chapman who are specialized in theory*

> *of numbers fighting for what they were thought by all means. I hope you*

> *will be more independent, in principle. Do not consider it an attack on*

> *numbers like 0 and 1 if I try to add some subtleties. Since language of*

> *mathematics has failed for centuries to satisfactorily resolve the*

> *issue, it might be worth pondering about alternatives. What does +0*

> *mean? How does it differ from -0? We agree about the identity of their*

> *value zero, no matter whether it is seen from the left or from the right.*

Do you happen to know the book "Inconsistent Mathematics", by Chris Mortensen?

Unfortunately, i couldn't get my hands on it, yet, but from reviews:

The function such that $f(x) = 0$ for $x < 0$ and $f(x) = 1$ for $x > 0$ can be turned (according to the book) into a continuous function, by defining both $f(0) = 0$ and $f(0) = 1$. The rather flagrant contradiction ($0 = f(0) = 1$) is made harmless, by using a non-standard logic (a 'paraconsistent' logic = logic in which the ex-falso-quodlibet rule fails).

They claim this leads to very handy calculus rules in applied situations.

sci.math: Re: .999... ?= 1

Is this close to what you have in mind?

Cheers,
Herman Jurjus