

the necessity of inf in current standard curriculum
 options for non believer, let down by intuitionists, finitists, so .. understand the 'way of
 thinking' instead of accepting
 usefulness + computers
 applying finitist to infinite, one definite step, meta task, exhaustion,
 russell proof about \aleph_0 not inductive, what about one to one, why is it justified, grounded
 again in selective extrapolation of human experience
 exchange versus count (history) why is count predominant
 goal ... to establish foundations, doubt, is it a foundation, or extension in reverse
 direction? (wittgenstein, cantor, interest sources) (accept next most obvious faced by the
 infinity problem: extrapolate the next possibility: one to one) one cannot build without
 foundation, is infinitesimal call the foundation for the foundation? (mention kline's book).
 crucial step to continue with 'standard' and promises of 'will be explained
 later' (zeilberger's friend), note about 'cranks' later
 do we need cantor's set theory (paper)
 axiomatisation as a experience belief extractor, arbiter (dan's website)
 psychology of infinity (papers) versus the artificial necessity (time, space) and the actual
 usefulness of degenerate ideal transf (inacceptable 'as good as' source?)
 crank: easy to attack, hard to defend, need help from sbdynam majority, but .. majority ... a
 sign of uncritical thinking or having been there and resolved it ... the ppl who do not call
 names. so majority should be very careful in calling names but contradicts majority.
 (wittgenstein convince quote) when there is need and no need of discussion
 unavoidable turn to philosophy (early! russell's into paper and set theory exercises) but need
 to want to try to understand (e.g critiques hands vs humans of no value)
 (source: http://philoonline.org/library/guminski_5_2.htm)

give analogy examples for some points
 talk a bit about each paper (footnote?)
 quote [http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/3481965?](http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/3481965?uid=3737864&uid=2460338415&uid=2129&uid=2&uid=70&uid=4&uid=83&uid=63&sid=21101515942501)
[uid=3737864&uid=2460338415&uid=2129&uid=2&uid=70&uid=4&uid=83&uid=63&sid=21101515942501](http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/3481965?uid=3737864&uid=2460338415&uid=2129&uid=2&uid=70&uid=4&uid=83&uid=63&sid=21101515942501)

quote: mental model (find paper)
 quote 'symbol game', which turns to forced 'educational intervention' belief, turns to
 creative handicap, accept but cannot use.
 quote doubts of cantor, changes of russell, embracement of symbol game -> useful to
 cantor/russell, handicapping now for 'students' after the transformation to 'foundation'

next one: logical necessity resolution by invariance of experience, any exp leads to that,
 chemical necessity (flies to bulb) to genetic hard coding? (some humans follow bulb) but still
 essential for any organism's survival..