

Re: The Axiomatization of Physics – Step 1

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-04/msg00117.html>

- *From:* "T.H. Ray" <thray123@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 01 Apr 2007 15:45:22 EDT
-

On Apr 1, 8:24 am, "T.H. Ray" <thray...@xxxxxxx> wrote:

Our knowledge in the philosophy of science and philosophy of mathematics has advanced considerably since Hilbert's 1915 paper. Science can be no more formalized a la Hilbert, than can Hilbert's (and Russell's and Frege's) plan to formalize arithmetic.

See, e.g., Popper's 1934 *Logik der Forschung* (published in English in 1959 as *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*) and of course, Godel's work of the same period. Hermann Weyl, as well, was a major contributor to our understanding of the boundaries between science and mathematics (Philosophy of

Re: The Axiomatization of Physics – Step 1

Mathematics and

the Natural Sciences, 1949). You neglect also that

relativity isn't the

only claimed "foundation of physics." Quantum

Theory and String

Theory both qualify.

Tom

It sounds to me like you're an apologist for occult science and that you are arguing against the possibility of clear thinking and the mathematization of the laws of physics.<<

Patently absurd. Do you know the difference between a mathematics axiom and a physical principle?

What is wrong

with Peano's axioms for arithmetic?

Shubee

Nothing. Do you have a point?

Tom

.