

Re: Review of Mueckenheims book.

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-03/msg02482.html>

- *From:* Tony Orlow <tony@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 12 Mar 2007 16:11:34 -0500
-

mueckenh@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

On 8 Mrz., 22:46, Tony Orlow <t...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

mueck...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

WM, you don't disagree that there are infinite sets containing just finite values, such as the reals in $[0,1]$, are you? I certainly agree that an infinite set of naturals must contain infinite values, but that's only because they are spaced apart by a unit in value. Isn't that your thinking?

If you disregard physical restrictions, then there are infinitely many real numbers in the interval. Their cardinality, however, is not larger than "infinite" for any set. Therefore we need no alephs etc. The binary tree shows that different alephs are self contradictory.

If you take into account the physical restrictions, then there is no infinite set. And that is the only correct approach.

Regards, WM

Well, since numbers are not physical entities, they don't actually occupy space on the number line – they are true points. So, between any two finitely distant points are indeed some infinite number of points. You say that the only correct approach is to take into account "physical" restrictions, but where the subject is non-physical, those restrictions don't exist,