brain as a computer? as silly as artificial intellig=nce.,   The simple example I teach re quantum is when i tr= to decide should i order fish or meat. for the moment before I orde= (as you an I agree ms before i even am concious of ordering.) both choi=es like schroedingers cat exist as a superpostioned wave function th=t collapses and a choice is made. . yes i am takin= liberties. . the students you referred to you suggest are working o= computers, not very odd that they might see you I language conformi=g to their pre perceptions

On Mon, Jun 8, 2015 at 9:41 PM, Noam Chomsky ██████████████████████████████ wrote:

I have a VERY thick skin, and love to=hear criticism. One of the best ways to learn. And I'v= often given up closely held beliefs on the basis of persuasive argumentation. But in this case, I just don't see the argume=ts.

It's true that the mathematic= lacks rigor, but that's for the same reason that publications in =rofessional math journals lack rigor. The steps that are not spelled out are straightforward enough so that they can be easily filled i=. I don't know of any problems about set theory, apart from =he classic ones. Some version of set theory is presupposed in every =ranch of math, including category theory. As for the brain as a computer, I'm not sure what you see as the problem.=C2 The papers I sent you do assume that I-language is a computational s=stem, with the properties mentioned, easily formalized. I don =99t know of any coherent alternative. Actually, very good professional mathematicians and physicists, one working primarily on quant=m computers, have attended my regular seminars for years, but I've=never heard a suggestion as to how mathematical ideas used in quantum theo=y would be relevant to systems of the kind we're considering. The "displacement conjecture =80 is, in fact, an immediate consequence of what would be the best poss=ble theory if it's true: SMT, in particular, the assumption that t=e basic combinatorial operation is the simplest one possible. Merge =s simply set-formation, presupposed in all of mathematics. I agree tha= it's naïve, if by that you mean very simple, arguably optima=ly so. But hasn't that been the pretty explicit goal of scie=ce, at least since Galileo, quantum theory included? I'd lik= to hear the objections, and hope to learn from them.<=p>

Noam

From: jeffrey E. [mailto:jeevacation@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, June 08, 2015 3:07 PM
To: Noam Chomsky
Subject:

I will take your word that you share my thick skin f=r criticism and share a strange pleasure in learning, even if it mea=s having to accept that some formerly closely held beliefs might nee= strong correction.   I have no particular

knowledge re politics or history, so I will never offer an opinion.=C2 however re mathematics and or money , I feel on strong ground.=C2 That being said,   thought puzzles in the paper are brilli=nt and insightful.   the mathematical descriptions lack rigor , and the metaphors suffer from the common science limitation of try=ng to describe things using the engineering metaphors or the tools of =A0 the moment.ex.   The human or its brain as a computer ., set=theory . It was popular in the early 20th as you know to describe the body as an electric machine..   the mathem=tics used today in quantum show more promise , as it attempts to describe =hings that appear counter intuitive. or difficult to comprehend , (your d=splacement conjecture)   your simple X and Y , Merge , is quite naive and unfortunately incorrect.

.

　　2. from the paper you sent. ; a much more elegant way of conveying =A0 what i had failed to do re sentences and money

　　European structuralism commonly adopted the Saussurean conception of langua=e (MONEY) (in the relevant sense) =s a social entity; as Saussure put it, a storehouse of word images (values) in the brains of a collectivity o= individuals founded on a "sort of contract."

--

　　please no=e

--

　　please =ote