

Georg Ernst Streibig alias Chyron  
Pintschallee 1  
12347 Berlin  
[www.streibig-chyron.de](http://www.streibig-chyron.de)  
[www.chyron-streibig.de](http://www.chyron-streibig.de)  
[info@streibig-chyron.de](mailto:info@streibig-chyron.de)

BERLIN , August 24 , 2022

Mr. Peter van Inwagen  
Philosopher  
UNIVERSITY of NOTRE DAME  
College of Arts and Letters  
[peter.van.inwagen@duke.edu](mailto:peter.van.inwagen@duke.edu)

Dear Mr. van Inwagen,

„It would be better not to believe in abstract [platonic] objects if we could get away with it.“ (P.v. Inwagen, „A Theory of Properties“, Oxford 2004, p. 107)

What ,rashness! What naive nonsense! The only things that exists are **abstract objects** („Ideas“) – nothing else! Even matter (material ,substances“) consists of abstract objects (Platonic Ideas). See CALCULUS MATERIAE, p. 1-400.

Therefore, you should rather stay away from such idiotic things as „elementary particles“, „black holes“ or „big bangs“ (P.v.Inwagen, „Metaphysics“, New York 2015, p. 197, a.o.)! Only for someone who believes in this nonsense – that is, only for a philosophical dilettante – is it „rationally possible“ without any problems „not to be a Platonist“. And only such a philosopher will want („wish“) this.

And that’s why your book „Material Beings“ (New York 1990/1995) is wrong.

Material things (beings) consist of parts. OK. „The number of the fathom and the fathom are the same...The number of the army is the same as the army.“ (Theaitetos 204d).

summand plus summand = sum

$$y = xs$$

And this is true in the material realm for each all(ness) as well as for each whole(ness): „I think now that there is no difference between all and whole.“ (Theaitetos 205).

But what’s really the difference? – The difference is in the number itself: A (material) all(ness) consists of a finite number of parts; the sum of its parts is finite. A (material) whole(ness), on the other hand, consists of an infinite number of parts; the sum of its parts is infinite. – An all(ness) is made by adding further parts, e.g. by reduplication, to another all(ness).

$$13 + 13 = 26$$

A whole(ness), on the other hand, always remains the same whole(ness) even if further parts are added or if its parts are doubled:

$$\aleph (\text{Aleph}) + \aleph (\text{Aleph}) = \aleph (\text{Aleph})$$

The matter (material substance) **Al** is not an all(ness), but a whole(ness). It consists of an infinite ( $\aleph$ (Aleph)) number of parts. No addition of additional parts can change this whole(ness) into another whole(ness), into another material substance. A physics that does not take this into account, that does not treat matter (material substances) as wholes but as (mere) alls – that means that it believes that it can (theoretical) put these substances together from parts and in this way (practically) even create new ones –, is nonsense. It does not lead to a convincing, self-contained system – since the real infinities contained in it cannot be eliminated. See, for example, the unmanageable  $\aleph$ 's (Alephs) in Feynman's quantum electrodynamics. The „atomic hypothesis“ of Democritus (and Bohr etc.) does **not** „contain the most information in the fewest words“. It is wrong. With **ideas** – that is, with „abstract objects“ from which matter itself consists – things are different. Here a finite number of elements already leads to the whole (to the product) – but these are not parts of the whole, but factors, - according to the mathematical law:

factor x factor = product

$$2 \times 3 = 6$$

$$3 \times 2 = 6$$

Theaitetos 204c: „Is there any difference between all in the plural and all in the singular? For instance, if we say one, two, three, four, five, six, or twice three, or three times two, or four and two, or three and two and one, are we in all these forms speaking of the same or of different numbers?“

As an example, the music. A fugue by Bach is, in its mental, ideal structure, not a sum of parts (tones, notes), but – ‚horizontal‘ (temporal) and ‚vertical‘ (spatial) – a (mathematical) **product** of (harmonic) intervals (proportions, number ratios).

As I said: Your book „Material Beings“ – ‚philosophical‘ nonsense. Read Plato more often!

Good luck and every good wish

Sincerely

G. E. Streibig alias Chyron