

Re: when laypersons look smarter than math professors Re: a question for the anti-Cantorian

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2005-05/msg00291.html>

- *From:* The Ghost In The Machine <ewill@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 23 May 2005 14:00:02 GMT
-

In sci.logic, george
<greeneg@xxxxxxxxxx>
wrote
on 23 May 2005 01:08:27 -0700
<1116835707.783956.148660@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>:
>
> HERC777 wrote:
>>
>> OK, I choose the axioms of the programming language Haskell.
>
> NO, YOU DON'T, DUMBASS.
> Haskell DOESN'T HAVE axioms.
> Haskell IS A PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE.
> IT HAS *SYNTAX*. PERIOD.
> BECAUSE it is a language.

Haskell, if it's like C, C++, Pascal, FORTRAN, COBOL, etc. does in fact have de facto axioms — or perhaps limitations. To wit:

[1] All numbers are finitely represented, and therefore there is a finite cardinality of numbers. (Even if there's an indefinitely large integer capability in the language, e.g. LISP, there's only so much RAM anyway.) In this context, infinity is a token (well, it is also in mathematics; we can talk about it but never reach it) and there's only one infinity.

[2] All algorithms must terminate.

[3] All sets are finite, for reasons similar to [1].

This is of course one of HERC's differences; he looks at everything through a complexity filter. (Many mathematics professionals are perfectly comfortable with a proof that a number exists, and don't bother to compute it. :-))

>
> Jeezus.

Re: when laypersons look smarter than math professors Re: a question for the anti-Cantorians

>
>> If you can't inspect the set in Haskell its a load of crap,
>
> SEZ WHO? You certainly can NOT find ANY "axiom of Haskell"
> that says THAT! Haskell DOES NOT even HAVE sets ANYway!
>

That shouldn't be too hard to rectify; Haskell has polymorphism.
Unfortunately a quick cursory search didn't pull up an equivalent
to Java's class library API, so I can't say for sure whether
they bothered to define one.

It's an interesting language, in some respects, though I don't
expect to have to learn it in my place of employment at this time.
But then, who knows? :-)

—
#191, ewill3@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx
It's still legal to go .sigless.

• **Follow-Ups:**

- ◆ ***Re: when laypersons look smarter than math professors Re: a question for the anti-Cantorians***
 ◇ From: george
- ◆ ***Re: when laypersons look smarter than math professors Re: a question for the anti-Cantorians***
 ◇ From: ken quirici

• **References:**

- ◆ ***Re: when laypersons look smarter than math professors Re: a question for the anti-Cantorians***
 ◇ From: george
- ◆ ***Re: when laypersons look smarter than math professors Re: a question for the anti-Cantorians***
 ◇ From: HERC777
- ◆ ***Re: when laypersons look smarter than math professors Re: a question for the anti-Cantorians***
 ◇ From: george
- ◆ ***Re: when laypersons look smarter than math professors Re: a question for the anti-Cantorians***
 ◇ From: HERC777
- ◆ ***Re: when laypersons look smarter than math professors Re: a question for the anti-Cantorians***
 ◇ From: george

- Prev by Date: ***Re: Homework Help***
- Next by Date: ***Re: when laypersons look smarter than math professors Re: a question for the anti-Cantorians***

Re: when laypersons look smarter than math professors Re: a question for the anti-Cantorians

- Previous by thread: *Re: when laypersons look smarter than math professors Re: a question for the anti-Cantorians*
- Next by thread: *Re: when laypersons look smarter than math professors Re: a question for the anti-Cantorians*
- Index(es):
 - ◆ *Date*
 - ◆ *Thread*