

## Re: Why does Cantor a target for cranks?

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2006-12/msg05257.html>

---

- *From:* "T.H. Ray" <[thray123@xxxxxxx](mailto:thray123@xxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Sun, 17 Dec 2006 11:24:12 EST
- 

Keith Ramsay wrote:

More simply, Wildberger is correct in saying that one doesn't need infinite sets to state the completeness and uncountability of the computable reals, in his context, because if one is assuming that all functions are computable, which one can do, then all of the objects being discussed are computable functions of some kind, and representable in finite terms as algorithms. If one uses the usual definition of function, then of course these functions are all infinite sets already.

Isn't it simpler just to distinguish between computable functions and functions generally, rather than trying to tell other people what they

Re: Why does Cantor a target for cranks?

should  
or should not be doing?  
If you don't want to repeat yourself,  
why not just say at the beginning,  
"The word function will always mean 'computable  
function'  
in this work", or something like that.

And if you don't like the law of the excluded middle,  
why not just say, "I won't be using the law of the  
excluded middle  
in this work"?

I don't see why people get so worked up  
about a personal choice like this.

--

Timothy Murphy  
e-mail (<80k only>): tim /at/ birdsnest.maths.tcd.ie  
tel: +353-86-2336090, +353-1-2842366  
s-mail: School of Mathematics, Trinity College,  
Dublin 2, Ireland

It's only important when one considers what constitutes  
a convincing proof. If a proof of A relies on double  
negation, such that  $A = \sim\sim A$  (which in turn relies on  
the principle of excluded middle), has one proven A?

Tom

.