

## Re: Platonism

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2004-12/2590.html>

---

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

**Date:** 11/29/04

Date: 28 Nov 2004 16:39:19 -0800

JXStern <JXSternChangeX2R@gte.net> wrote in message  
news:<8dchq0hkp2mikidl0d8nssil16gb3fb5t1@4ax.com>...  
> On 27 Nov 2004 06:16:09 -0800, examachine@gmail.com (Eray Ozkural  
> exa) wrote:  
> >> > *Otherwise, it is nonsense. If I am allowed to*  
> >> > *distort the meaning of "exists" every now and then, I will be able to*  
> >> > *talk of God and angels as if they existed, and that will be heresy for*  
> >> > *me: I am a physicalist.*  
> >>  
> >> *Well, me too, I think, but my physicalism relates only to the*  
> >> *sub-domains of philosophy that I care about, those of cognition and*  
> >> *language and computation. As far as cognitive agencies go, they may*  
> >> *assume that things exist and make the appropriate ontological*  
> >> *commitments, and then we can get on with the internal matters that we*  
> >> *need to deal with, about how agencies do what they do, in a material*  
> >> *world.*  
> >  
> > *I think I understood this when I first read it, but I'm not sure. Do*  
> > *you mean you don't care what somebody assumes to exist? :)*  
>  
> *Well, sure I \*care\*! My friend Fred, he assumes green dragons exist.*  
> *I have to take this into consideration when I parse any sentence that*  
> *I get from Fred, because I know that only blue dragons really exist.*  
> *Then again, perhaps (!) neither of us is much of an ontological*  
> *authority, no matter how handsome we may be otherwise.*

Yes, but in the end what matters is whether what you wanted to refer to by "dragons" exists at all. Or you are both talking nonsense (lying, deluded, etc.). That reminded me of some articles in pragmatics, naturally. You may have mistaken something else for a dragon, but you may still be referring to "that".

Still, your existential idea matters. Doesn't it?

Doesn't it bother you when somebody talks about the devil?

"I'm looking for the devil"

sci.math: Re: Platonism

Would not you like him to have a determinate reference? Wouldn't you like to know if what he talks of really exists? Wouldn't you like to \*know\* what he means? Maybe he is referring to his pet, affectionately called "the little devil". Or maybe he's just an ordinary religious person, looking for the sign of devil. Now, I think if he's looking for the sign of something that doesn't exist, you must tell him.

"Well, if the devil doesn't exist, how could you possibly find him?"

- > >Yes, I can see that my claim was much closer to Russell than Meinong,
- > >and for the most part I've found Russell to be a very reasonable
- > >philosopher. But I surely hope I am not becoming a logical positivist
- > >or anything like that. I should watch my steps. :)
- >
- > Indeed, for many faults are built in at the very beginning. But I am
- > not arguing for Meinong, either.

His solution was the worst. And Russell's solution might not be the best.

- > I'm arguing Turing, and Fodor, some
- > Dennett and Millikan, some Wittgenstein and a little revisionist Quine,
- > some axiomatics that may be more Hilbert than Tarski, a little
- > Berkeleyian abhorrence of abstraction, and a modern nominalism that is
- > all my own, mine and about three million practicing software
- > developers who don't know that they're doing it, too.

You know that I find some of that agreeable. But my bases could be quite different. I find a lot of inspiration in AI I think, more than philosophy.

- > >What do you mean by unsoundly combining several domains of philosophy?
- > >You mean combining metaphysics, language philosophy, method of
- > >philosophy (logic, etc.), philosophy of science like the logical
- > >positivists did? Do you think these should be taken as separate
- > >inquiries? (Your meta-philosophy? :)
- >
- > 42.

You mean logical positivism is as absurd as thinking 42 is the meaning of life?

Regards,

--

Eray Ozkural