

Re: Epistemology 201: The Science of Science

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-02/2762.html>

From: Albert (*albertwagner_at_cox.net*)

Date: 02/09/05

Date: Tue, 08 Feb 2005 19:47:01 -0600

Tony Orlow (aeo6) wrote:

<snip>

> *I don't see abstract truths as being any less "real", even though they
> aren't physical, than the "real" world. When we abstract them from the
> environment, those representations are in our heads. Yet, the truth that
> we abstract from the environment is there without us. We discover it,
> rather than invent it. I was offering as concrete an example as I can
> think of to demonstrate that prime numbers, an example of integers, are
> indeed apparent in nature. I simply take the opposite view from the one
> that says we invented the math that governs nature. That idea is absurd
> to me, since nature has apparently always behaved according to the rules
> we are discovering, long before we came along. I suppose now we're going
> to talk about how each one of us is god and creates our own reality?*
>
> *Okay, maybe the pervasive pissiness I keep seeing is starting to seep
> into me. But, mathematical truth is a priori and prima causa, gagnaggit!*

I personally have no problem with saying that there is a mathematics that is a priori and prima causa in Nature. My problem is with those who claim that **all** of modern mathematics is so, when so much of what is claimed by some mathematicians is patently an invention and is totally unrelated to the world.

--

"Don't you see that the whole aim of Newspeak is to narrow the range of thought? In the end we shall make thoughtcrime literally impossible, because there will be no words in which to express it."

-- George Orwell as Syme in "1984"