

Re: Opinions on mathematics.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2006-12/msg03491.html>

- *From:* Michael Press <jack@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 11 Dec 2006 04:59:57 GMT
-

In article

<BLOCKSPAMfishfry-934B15.19505210122006@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
om>,
fishfry <BLOCKSPAMfishfry@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

In article <jack-9BB5C5.19391010122006@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>,
Michael Press <jack@xxxxxxx> wrote:

In article

<BLOCKSPAMfishfry-1B105C.19230410122006@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
om>,
fishfry <BLOCKSPAMfishfry@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

In article

<jack-0A4BC5.16490010122006@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>,
Michael Press <jack@xxxxxxx> wrote:

Folks have talked about the how
mathematics is
practiced and the nature of mathematical
objects. It is
difficult to address these matters without
saying
'mathematical objects' and expecting to be
understood.
It looks like we are stuck with the notion of
mathematical objects.

From time to time someone tells me that
mathematics is
not science. I disagree with this assertion.
The reason
is that a mathematical object is a structure
that we
construct in our mind with the aid of

Re: Opinions on mathematics.

writings and
diagrams. When doing mathematics we are
mapping our
minds, and changing our minds. This is my
outlook in a
nutshell. Mathematics is a science. Our
minds are real.

Unicorns are a construction of our minds. By your logic, are
unicorns
real?

Somebody writes a story about a unicorn. At the end the
unicorn dies. Some people who read the story will feel
sad.

So in your opinion, a unicorn has the same reality as the Golden Gate
Bridge or any other physical object?

No. Observe that I did not bring in unicorns.

I answered to illustrate my drift, that we take
seriously our mental constructions.

--

Michael Press

.