

Contents

Acknowledgements	ix
Preface	xi
Introduction	1
I. A Philosophical Problem	7
1. The set-theoretic independence problem	9
1.1. The set-theoretic independence phenomenon	9
1.2. From phenomenon to problem	17
1.3. Attempts to deal with the problem	18
1.4. Research questions on practitioners' philosophical views	26
1.5. An attempt via naturalness judgements	26
1.6. Research questions on naturalness judgements	29
1.7. Naturalness judgements in mathematics	30
2. A pragmatic approach	37
2.1. Pragmatism	37
2.2. Social epistemology	38
2.3. The philosophy of mathematical practice	38
2.4. Empirical philosophy of mathematics	40
2.5. Comparison to Maddy's approach	41
2.6. Disagreement and agreement in science	42
2.6.1. Deep disagreement	43
2.6.2. Disagreement and agreement in mathematics	46
2.7. My empirical research method	47
II. Sociological Study	49
3. Methodology	51
3.1. Qualitative content analysis	51
3.1.1. Sub-topics	53
3.1.2. Questionnaire	53
3.1.3. Invitation of interview partners	55

3.1.4.	Data collection	56
3.1.5.	The data	56
3.1.6.	Analysis procedure	58
3.2.	Coding scheme	61
3.2.1.	Main categories	61
3.2.2.	Forming of sub-categories	62
3.2.3.	Overview of the coding scheme	68
3.3.	Trustworthiness	69
3.4.	Ethical issues	70
3.4.1.	Avoidance of exploitation	70
3.4.2.	Informed consent	71
3.4.3.	Confidentiality	71
3.5.	Sample set	72
4.	Results	75
4.1.	Research areas	75
4.2.	Philosophical views on the independence phenomenon	76
4.2.1.	Reluctance to discuss philosophical issues	76
4.2.2.	Absolutist views	77
4.2.3.	Pluralist views	86
4.2.4.	Philosophical views in relation to research areas	93
4.2.5.	Reasons in favour of a specific new axiom	95
4.2.6.	Ideas on how ZFC could be extended – individual views	96
4.3.	Naturalness	97
4.3.1.	Examples of naturalness judgements	98
4.3.2.	The meaning of ‘e is natural’	100
4.3.3.	Difficulties in specifying naturalness	104
4.3.4.	Importance of naturalness	109
4.3.5.	Different uses of ‘natural’	110
4.3.6.	Naturalness judgements about forcing axioms	111
4.3.7.	Naturalness judgements about other new axioms	117
4.4.	Surprising theorems	119
III.	Discussion, Conclusions, and Hypotheses	123
5.	The philosophical views of set-theoretic practitioners	125
5.1.	Absolutist and pluralist practitioners	125
5.1.1.	Reluctance to discuss philosophical issues	126
5.1.2.	Absolutist practitioners	126
5.1.3.	Pluralist practitioners	128
5.2.	Disagreements	129
5.2.1.	Philosophical views in relation to research areas	130
5.2.2.	Disputed propositions	132
5.2.3.	Deep disagreement	136
5.3.	Conclusion	139

6. Assessing epistemic value by naturalness judgements	141
6.1. Initial findings on the role of naturalness judgements	141
6.1.1. Case distinction for naturalness judgements	142
6.1.2. Relevance of naturalness judgements	148
6.2. A general account of the role of naturalness judgements	153
6.2.1. Test instances	153
6.2.2. Overview: A way towards informed naturalness judgements	154
6.2.3. Progress dimension	155
6.2.4. Naturalness dimension	156
6.2.5. Value dimension	157
6.2.6. Different phases in the assessment process	160
6.3. Conclusion	163
7. Naturalness judgements about axioms	167
7.1. Naturalness judgements about forcing axioms	167
7.1.1. Natural and unnatural aspects	169
7.1.2. Disagreement and agreement	169
7.1.3. Naturalness and truth	171
7.1.4. Naturalness judgements and philosophical views	172
7.2. Naturalness judgements about other new axioms	172
7.3. Conclusion	172
7.3.1. Answering the research questions on naturalness	173
7.3.2. Overall evaluation of the naturalness attempt	173
IV. Thinking Further	177
8. Exploring generalisation to value judgements	179
8.1. Different layers of the set-theoretic discourse	181
8.2. A discourse layer for assessing epistemic value	182
8.2.1. Limits to agreement on value judgements	182
8.2.2. Arguments supporting agreement on value judgements . . .	183
8.3. Assessing epistemic value and extrinsic justification	186
9. Case study: The conciliationist challenge	189
9.1. Epistemic peers	189
9.2. The conciliationist challenge	193
9.2.1. The equal weight view and suspending judgement	193
9.2.2. The steadfast view	194
9.3. The case of absolutist and pluralist practitioners	195
9.3.1. Aiming at set-theoretic progress	196
9.3.2. Aiming to obtain true beliefs	199
9.4. Conclusion	200
Conclusion	201
Bibliography	209
Index	217

