Re: Approaching the infinite binary tree

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2008−09/msg03516.html

- *From*: "Salviati" <eckard.blumschein@xxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Mon, 29 Sep 2008 06:04:25 +0200

"LudovicoVan" <julio@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
news:85a88c3e−0e26−4b34−9c7c−5f5b7645ec71@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

> I am thinking along the following lines, and I'd greatly appreciate
> some feedback.
>
> Given the set of the extended naturals: N* := N u {w}, where
> 'w' (omega) is the limit ordinal.

....

> The number of points on a diagonal at step k is 2^k, and they delimit
> (2^k)−1 equal intervals, each of (normalized) length equal to 1/
> [(2^k)−1]. In the limit case we can −informally− say that we have 2^w
> limit points delimiting (2^w)−1 equal intervals, each of length 1/
> [(2^w)−1]. With the theory of IFS we can prove (I won't try) that a
> distance function expressed in these geometrical terms provides a
> *complete* metric space.

The last one I recall who dealt with the infinite binary tree was W.M.
Did you read his (second) booklet?

I doubt that one can clarify what is wrong with set theory if one takes
its terminology for granted.

Salviati:
... in ultima conclusione, gli attributi di eguale
maggiore e minore non aver luogo ne gl'infiniti,
ma solo nelle quantità terminate.
IR >|> IR+ =|= IR

.