

Re: Arthur O'Dwyer on the feasibility of simulating a Turing Machine

Source: <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/General/comp.programming/2004-02/2656.html>

From: Malcolm (malcolm_at_55bank.freeserve.co.uk)

Date: 02/29/04

Date: Sun, 29 Feb 2004 18:37:34 -0000

"Edward G. Nilges" <spinoza1111@yahoo.com> wrote in message

>

> *The assertion is that given enough time and memory space, a*

> *desktop PC can compute anything. This assertion is true and*

> *equivalent to Church's thesis re the Turing machine.*

>

This is true. In practise an infinite machine cannot be built in a finite universe. However the memory and backing store can be arbitrarily large, and frequently is in real desktop systems.

>

> *This is true so far as it goes. But the description of the TM needs to*

> *be rephrased depending on your philosophy of mathematics.*

>

> *The TM is an "entity" only to the Platonist who ground the truth of*

> *mathematics in the existence of Forms. To an Intuitionist or Marxist*

> *the TM is a text and a set of construction instructions.*

>

This is the heart of it. Just say a TM is an "abstraction". It's amazing that Marxists would attempt to get involved in mathematical philosophy.

>

> > *And as for "how long the computation will take", does the phrase*

> > *"Halting Problem" have any meaning to you?*

>

> *Yes, and it doesn't apply, since this NG is collectively dazzled by*

> *HALTING Turing Machines that take up all the matter in the*

> *universe for the deconstructive reasons I've explained in the*

> *following paper:*

>

That's because you've tried to claim that one can implement an infinite tape in a finite and discrete universe. Obviously most people will home in on that and ignore anything else you might have to say.

>

> *".writing is not only an auxiliary means in the service of science—and*

> *possibly its object—but as Husserl in particular pointed out in The*

> *Origin of Geome*