Re: Review of Mueckenheims book.

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007−03/msg03155.html

- *From*: mueckenh@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
- *Date*: 15 Mar 2007 04:16:11 −0700

On 12 Mrz., 22:11, Tony Orlow <t...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

> mueck...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:
>
>> On 8 Mrz., 22:46, Tony Orlow <t...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
>>
>>> mueck...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx 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 tat
>>> your thinking?
>>
>> If you disregad 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 contradictive.
>>
>> 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, though relations do, even if between infinite
> nonphysical concepts called numbers.

The subject may be non−physical (it is not). But in order to make it reasonable (in order to reason about it), you have to attach physical stuff like written or at least thought symbols. Their number is finite.

Regards, WM

.