A Small Philosophy on Infinity

A Kruger

Symbol shuffling? What is that?

Abstract

A preliminary view[1].

1 The Small Philosophy

A small thing that has bothered this writer is that if one tries to place an infinite number in a set, then the set can not be written down because there is not enough time to write such a set. Building a computer to write such a set is useless, since the computer is always finite by the time that it is completely built, and, if it is not completely built, then one needs a von Neumann machine. Bacteria are such machines, but they do not write anything except themselves. Trying to place bacteria in a set seems futile, since a practical container struggles to be big enough. From this then this experiment.

Suppose one writes a curly brace: {, and then repeats the action. This is then continued indefinitely. Suppose a second person does the same, and writes in the same spot at a higher speed. Then, the second person is infinite as far as the first person is concerned, and the third person is infinite for the second person. Continue this with a fourth person, and so on. The last person to write, is the furthest along and then 'the most infinite' of the writers. This last person's curly brace can then be re-defined as a right curly brace: }. This is a simple, practical way for defining an infinite set with notation. Invert the list of events, and one finds infinite regression, based on a potentially non-existent person defining infinity, and set theory. If this (last) person continues to write the right curly brace, then one finds him over-taking the left-most curly brace. Using the slowest writer to start writing right curly braces, then the next slowest to write right curly braces, and so on, and one finds the left curly brace in a similar way. Removing the persons writing yields that infinity, and thereby an infinite existence does not need a cause for infinity, nor for existence. Existence therefore caused the self of said existence, and is infinite. This then gives a motivation for writing $\{\infty\}$, even though the curly braces may not exist. This is another way of saying, that if one assumes the finite, that the infinite results, which again points to a not-so-necessary finite existence.

This is then a way of defining the curly braces as the absolute in containing, for the fastest writer is the absolute: $\infty\infty\infty$. Does *containing* exist? If one finds a right curly brace, then containing does exist, but the containment is done in terms of infinity, which means that containment is a consequence of infinity. One can then confirm that all symbols are infinite, since all symbols represent an infinite concept. Even the finite is an infinite concept, since one has to explore all of infinity to find all the finite sets, and therefore to confirm that *finite* exists. Should one then not explore only the infinite? Or is there something bigger?

At this point, one has a set: $\infty\infty\infty$ re-written as $\{\infty\}$. One has proven that infinity exists, but, not that one infinity is different from another infinity, since the underlying depends on a symbol written infinitely. This in turn means that $\{\infty\infty\} \equiv \{\infty\}$. This poses a problem, since we are told that $\pi \neq e$. Suppose one can write a finite symbol (such as a curly brace), and that one can stop writing after writing a finite number of these symbols. If one has uniqueness of an infinitely long number, then one can write one symbol to represent such a number (see any book that proves real numbers). This is in line with defining a set, which means one can simply define finite as finite, and hope for the best[2].

[1] This writing may not be used for: medical, nuclear or military purposes, medical research, nuclear research or research for military purposes.

[2] There are a number of assumptions in these words, words being one; one therefore assumes that the concept is clear enough to be understood.

2 Using the Philosophy

Suppose one has *the* set of all sets A, and one wishes to write this set down; then, one finds that $A = \{A\}$. Applying the well ordering principle: $n - 1$ to 0: for the number of curly brace pairs, one can remove one set of curly braces, and still have A left. That is, since $A = \{A\} = \{\{A\}\} = \cdots$, one has that the formula is proven for $n = k$ and $n = k - 1$, but, cannot be proven for $n = 0$ because $A \neq \{\}$, the empty set. This means that A cannot be written down in terms of containment (since containment is defined by pairs of curly braces). And this, I think, proves that the set of all sets does not exist in terms of symbols, which means that something else is needed to explore the concept.