

# Infinite Exchanges

Davide Rizza, UEA

NHS, April 25th 2018

Numerical measures of sets

Infinite Exchanges

Where next?

- ▶ When we count we go through the progression:

$$1, 2, 3, \dots, n, \dots,$$

- ▶ However, often in mathematics we speak of the *entire* set  $\mathbb{N}$ .

- ▶ In set theory, we wish to determine and compare the sizes of sets like  $\mathbb{N}$ , which we call infinite.
- ▶ In order to do so we look for one-to-one correspondences as indicators of equal sizes.

- ▶ The progressions:

1	2	3	4	...
2	3	4	5	...
3	6	9	12	...

- ▶ are assigned the same size, symbolised by  $\aleph_0$ . They all diverge to  $\infty$ .

- ▶ From the standpoint proposed by Yaroslav Sergeyev  $\aleph_0$  is a relatively inaccurate esteem.
- ▶ Since we cannot see tails, we think of the indefinite progressions as equivalent.
- ▶ We see what we can denote by a number, so let us take ① to denote the number of elements in  $\mathbb{N}$ .

- ▶ We can now count the number of items in our sequences, knowing how that they must end after a specifiable number of infinitely many steps.

1      2      3      4      ...       $\textcircled{1} - 2$        $\textcircled{1} - 1$        $\textcircled{1}$

$2 - 1$     $3 - 1$     $4 - 1$     $5 - 1$    ...    $(\textcircled{1} - 1) - 1$     $\textcircled{1} - 1$

- ▶ Note that there is **no one-to-one correspondence** between the two sequences above. One has  $\textcircled{1} > \textcircled{1} - 1$  elements.

- ▶ If we take away one in every three elements along the first sequence below, we are left with  $\frac{1}{3}$  elements.

$$1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad \dots \quad \frac{1}{3} - 1 \quad \frac{1}{3} \quad \frac{1}{3} + 1 \quad \dots \quad 1 - 1 \quad 1$$

$$3 \quad 6 \quad 9 \quad 12 \quad \dots \quad 1 - 3 \quad 1 \quad 1 + 3 \quad \dots \quad 3 - 3 \quad 3$$

- ▶ There are only  $\frac{1}{3}$  multiples of 3 in  $\mathbb{N}$ , since anything greater than 1 is not in  $\mathbb{N}$ .



- ▶ Note that we are **NOT** replacing  $\infty$  (or  $\aleph_0$ ) with a new symbol  $\textcircled{1}$ . This would not change anything.
- ▶ Instead, we take  $\infty$  or  $\aleph_0$  to collapse infinitely many distinctions, which are visible by means of  $\textcircled{1}$ :

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \infty \\
 \dots \frac{\textcircled{1}}{3}, \frac{\textcircled{1}}{3} + 1 \dots \frac{\textcircled{1}}{2} - 1, \frac{\textcircled{1}}{2}, \dots, \textcircled{1} - 1, \textcircled{1}, \textcircled{1} + 1, \textcircled{1} + 2, \dots \\
 \aleph_0
 \end{array}$$

- ▶ To do this is helpful because it allows us to extend the class of mathematical problems that we can treat numerically.
- ▶ In general, we obtain an expansion of the purview of numerical analysis in applications.
- ▶ The simplest cases in which this happens are puzzles that derive from inaccurate discriminations of size at infinity.

- ▶ Suppose that we have labelled a collection of ping-pong balls with the symbols  $1, 2, 3, \dots$
- ▶ If there are as many ping-pong balls as there are numbers in  $\mathbb{N}$ , each available label of the form  $n$  is used, for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .
- ▶ Note: which labels we can work with depends on our *notation for numbers*, which may not include anything like ①.

- ▶ Suppose that all of our ping-pong balls are kept in a large urn.
- ▶ Stage 0: take out those with labels 1, 2, 3, and return the ball with label 1.
- ▶ Stage 1: take out the balls with labels 4, 5, 6 and return the one with label 2.
- ▶ Stage  $n$ : take out those with labels  $3n + 1, 3n + 2, 3n + 3$  ( $n \geq 0$ ) and return the one with label  $n + 1$ .

- ▶ If we reason with **actual infinity**, we have taken out two ping-pong balls infinitely many times.
- ▶ We expect  $2 \cdot \aleph_0 = \aleph_0$  ping-pong balls out of the urn.
- ▶ If we reason with **potential infinity**, we see that, at stage  $n - 1$  in our procedure, we return the ball with label  $n$ .
- ▶ We do it for each finite  $n$ . We expect **0** balls out of the urn.

- ▶ Suppose that a supply of ① labels is available and that each ping-pong ball is labelled, using this supply.
- ▶ At each stage we take three distinct balls. We cannot go through ① stages, which would require  $3① > ①$  distinct balls.



- ▶ In the last stage, we have  $3n + 3 = \textcircled{1}$ , whence  $n = \textcircled{1}/3 - 1$ . There are  $\textcircled{1}/3$  stages  $0, 1, 2, 3, \dots, \textcircled{1}/3 - 1$ .



- ▶ In the last stage, we have  $3n + 3 = \textcircled{1}$ , whence  $n = \textcircled{1}/3 - 1$ . There are  $\textcircled{1}/3$  stages  $0, 1, 2, 3, \dots, \textcircled{1}/3 - 1$ .
- ▶ The last three balls we consider are:  
$$3(\textcircled{1}/3 - 1) + 1, 3(\textcircled{1}/3 - 1) + 2, 3(\textcircled{1}/3 - 1) + 3 = \textcircled{1}.$$

- ▶ In the last stage, we have  $3n + 3 = \textcircled{1}$ , whence  $n = \textcircled{1}/3 - 1$ . There are  $\textcircled{1}/3$  stages  $0, 1, 2, 3, \dots, \textcircled{1}/3 - 1$ .
- ▶ The last three balls we consider are:  
$$3(\textcircled{1}/3 - 1) + 1, 3(\textcircled{1}/3 - 1) + 2, 3(\textcircled{1}/3 - 1) + 3 = \textcircled{1}.$$
- ▶ The last ball we return has label  $n + 1$ , with  $n = \textcircled{1}/3 - 1$ .

- ▶ In the last stage, we have  $3n + 3 = \textcircled{1}$ , whence  $n = \textcircled{1}/3 - 1$ . There are  $\textcircled{1}/3$  stages  $0, 1, 2, 3, \dots, \textcircled{1}/3 - 1$ .
- ▶ The last three balls we consider are:  
$$3(\textcircled{1}/3 - 1) + 1, 3(\textcircled{1}/3 - 1) + 2, 3(\textcircled{1}/3 - 1) + 3 = \textcircled{1}.$$
- ▶ The last ball we return has label  $n + 1$ , with  $n = \textcircled{1}/3 - 1$ .
- ▶ At each stage, we keep two ping-pong balls. Altogether, we have taken  $2(\textcircled{1}/3)$  out of the urn.

- ▶ In the last stage, we have  $3n + 3 = \textcircled{1}$ , whence  $n = \textcircled{1}/3 - 1$ . There are  $\textcircled{1}/3$  stages  $0, 1, 2, 3, \dots, \textcircled{1}/3 - 1$ .
- ▶ The last three balls we consider are:
 
$$3(\textcircled{1}/3 - 1) + 1, 3(\textcircled{1}/3 - 1) + 2, 3(\textcircled{1}/3 - 1) + 3 = \textcircled{1}.$$
- ▶ The last ball we return has label  $n + 1$ , with  $n = \textcircled{1}/3 - 1$ .
- ▶ At each stage, we keep two ping-pong balls. Altogether, we have taken  $2(\textcircled{1}/3)$  out of the urn.
- ▶ Clearly,  $\textcircled{1}/3$  ping-pong balls remain in the urn.

- ▶ If we had been taking and returning dollar bills, we would have faced an infinite decision problem with payoffs.
- ▶ Infinite decisions can be handled numerically if one can effect computations in base ①.
- ▶ How far can one develop the theory of utility and probability using ①? Work in progress ...

THANK YOU !