

## Re: Zenkin's paper on Cantor (reply of Dr. Zenkin)

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2004-11/4025.html>

---

**From:** Eray Ozkural exa (*examachine\_at\_gmail.com*)

**Date:** 11/19/04

Date: 19 Nov 2004 08:52:37 -0800

Excuse me, but I want to make it really clear that compared to Longley, Mr. Dolan is a reasonable person. As a matter of fact, I find Mr. Dolan quite knowledgeable in a number of subjects, but he does not seem to appreciate the importance of civil discussion on public forums. Even when agreeing with somebody, he will assert irrelevant personal statements. He seems to be on an excess amount of caffeine constantly.

When criticized properly, I will honor it. I have taken much of Mr. Dolan's criticism seriously. However, he seems to know very little about the debate about actual/potential infinity which is a significant *\*philosophical\** matter going back to the ancient Greece. Such matters are not to be left to those who accept the validity of whatever philosophy is implicitly assumed in their particular school of mathematics, *\*without\** ever questioning. There is no need to state that it will be pointless to discuss foundational subjects with persons who cannot question them.

Incidentally, many people who call themselves "constructivists" come around saying that constructivism has no trouble saying that a Turing Machine has *\*actually\** an infinite tape, which makes the discussions all the more fuzzy! There are many versions of constructivism and intuitionism, and it seems that we fail to acknowledge the *\*exact\** metaphysical assumptions in these versions when we use the suitcase words.

I have had such a discussion with an extremely intelligent and experienced mathematician. He told me that PCs are not Turing Machines, because they have "an infinite tape". I think he did not know anything about descriptive complexity. This infinite portion of the tape consists entirely of blank symbols, and therefore has descriptive complexity  $O(1)$ , which is easily realized by a physical system. When I told him about Ullman's indefinite growing argument, he objected "But when the universe is filled up, it cannot grow any more! Then, it is not infinite", to which I responded "Yes, but there is *\*nothing\** that is larger than the universe." To assume the contrary would be theology, which I despise.

Regards,

"JPL Verhey" <matterDELMinds@hotmail.com> wrote in message  
news:<419cd7d4\$0\$44068\$5fc3050@dreader2.news.tiscali.nl>...  
> "David Longley" <David@longley.demon.co.uk> wrote in message  
> news:Jpfd7EJk2LnBFw1T@longley.demon.co.uk...  
>> In article <419c4735\$0\$44080\$5fc3050@dreader2.news.tiscali.nl>, JPL  
>> Verhey <matterDELMinds@hotmail.com> writes  
>>>  
>>>"David Longley" <David@longley.demon.co.uk> wrote in message  
>>>news:ogGFp6BAYAnBFwB6@longley.demon.co.uk...  
>>>> In article <320e992a.0411171745.ba123df@posting.google.com>, Eray  
>>>> Ozkural exa <examachine@gmail.com> writes  
>>>>  
>>>> This is false.  
>>>  
>>>Haha..  
>>>Well DL, there is no one understanding you better than Dolan.  
>>>  
>>>> --  
>>>> David Longley  
>>>  
>>>  
>> And there's an illustrative example of why it's false. Most people, at  
>> any age, don't take criticism well (if at all), and very very few  
>> actively seek it out even when it's in their own best interests to do  
>> so. It's an essential skill of the professional to court criticism.  
>> It's the sine qua non for learning.  
>  
> I just loath you, DL. You are on the same list with people who would say  
> I'm an heretic and sinner, and am instructed that in order to understand  
> that I should read the Koran.  
>  
> Longley Uh Ackbar!!