

## Re: A quiet query from a visitor

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-08/msg03350.html>

---

- *From:* Han de Bruijn <[Han.deBruijn@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:Han.deBruijn@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Tue, 21 Aug 2007 09:44:17 +0200
- 

S.W.Christensen wrote:

I have recently been peeking into sci.math and have been wondering how its occupants stand on the foundations of mathematics. My field being machine learning (with a background in physics), it's unsurprising that I'm an intuitionist, but is that commonplace around here, or is indeed any of the schools particularly prevalent? Does anyone care?

There are two "schools" of mathematicians prevalent here. The first one consists of those who adhere to mainstream mathematics, essentially the David Hilbert program. The second "school" is a bunch of dissidents who have only in common that they are against the traditional set theoretic foundations of mathematics, for various reasons. Their main argument is that common mathematics doesn't conform very well to "the real world".

Mainstream school names: Tonic, G. Frege, William Hughes, Virgil, David C Ullrich, Jesse F Hughes, David R Tribble, William Elliot, Moeblee, Dik T Winter, Mike Kelly, Bob Kolker.

Some mathematicians seldom get involved with foundational issues: Robert Israel is a good example.

Dissident "school" names: tommy1729, JSH (James Harris), Tony Orlow, WM (Wolfgang Mueckenheim), Han de Bruijn (HdB), David Petry, Angus Rodgers.

If you are looking for intuitionists: Aatu Koskensisilta (I think so).

Disclaimer. The above lists are only an approximation of the reality in 'sci.math' and highly reflect the author's opinion and experience.

Furthermore, the mainstream as well as the dissident "mathematicians" all have a QUITE different background and some of them are FAR more serious than others.

For what it's worth.

Han de Bruijn

Re: A quiet query from a visitor