The background of the cover is a collage. The top portion features a parchment-like texture with various mathematical sketches in brown ink, including a wheel, a rectangular structure with internal lines, and several geometric diagrams. Handwritten text in a cursive script is interspersed among the drawings. The bottom portion of the cover is dominated by a large, glowing blue fractal pattern that resembles a complex, multi-layered sphere or a dense network of lines, set against a dark, textured background.

Mathematics and the *Real World*

*The
Remarkable Role of
Evolution
in the Making of
Mathematics*

ZVI ARTSTEIN

MATHEMATICS AND THE REAL WORLD

THE REMARKABLE ROLE OF EVOLUTION
IN THE MAKING OF MATHEMATICS

ZVI ARTSTEIN

TRANSLATED FROM HEBREW BY ALAN HERCBERG

 **Prometheus Books**
59 John Glenn Drive
Amherst, New York 14228

Mathematics and the Real World: The Remarkable Role of Evolution in the Making of Mathematics. Copyright © 2014 by Zvi Artstein. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, digital, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, or conveyed via the Internet or a website without prior written permission of the publisher, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical articles and reviews.

Hakesher Hamatemati: Hamatematika shell Hateva, Hateva shell Hamatematika, ve-Hazika La-evolutzia

(הקשר המתמטי: המתמטיקה של הטבע, הטבע של המתמטיקה, הויקה לאבולוציה)

© Zvi Artstein / Books in the Attic / Yediot Books, 2014

10 Kehilat Venezia St., Tel Aviv, Israel 6143401

Prometheus Books recognizes the following registered trademarks mentioned within the text: IBM®, NBA®; and Philadelphia 76ers®.

Cover images: spiral © Yang MingQi/Media Bakery; numbers © Chen Ping-Hung/Media Bakery; drawing in the upper left by Leonardo da Vinci, folio 518 recto, from the Biblioteca Ambrosiana in Milan, Italy

Jacket design by Jacqueline Nasso Cooke

Translated from the original Hebrew by Alan Hercberg

Unless otherwise specified, all images are by the author

Inquiries should be addressed to

Prometheus Books

59 John Glenn Drive

Amherst, New York 14228

VOICE: 716-691-0133 • FAX: 716-691-0137

WWW.PROMETHEUSBOOKS.COM

18 17 16 15 14 5 4 3 2 1

The Library of Congress has cataloged the printed edition as follows:

Artstein, Zvi, 1943– author.

[Hakesher hamatemati. English]

Mathematics and the real world : the remarkable role of evolution in the making of mathematics / by Zvi Artstein ; translated from Hebrew by Alan Hercberg.

pages cm

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-61614-091-5 (hardback) — ISBN 978-1-61614-546-0 (ebook)

1. Mathematics—Philosophy. I. Title.

QC6.A6913 2014

510.9—dc23

20140139

Printed in the United States of America

To Yael

CONTENTS

[Preface](#)

CHAPTER I. EVOLUTION, MATHEMATICS, AND THE EVOLUTION OF MATHEMATICS

- [1. Evolution](#)
- [2. Mathematical Ability in the Animal World](#)
- [3. Mathematical Ability in Humans](#)
- [4. Mathematics That Yields Evolutionary Advantage](#)
- [5. Mathematics with No Evolutionary Advantage](#)
- [6. Mathematics in Early Civilizations](#)
- [7. And Then Came the Greeks](#)
- [8. What Motivated the Greeks?](#)

CHAPTER II. MATHEMATICS AND THE GREEKS' VIEW OF THE WORLD

- [9. The Origin of Basic Science: Asking Questions](#)
- [10. The First Mathematical Models](#)
- [11. Platonism versus Formalism](#)
- [12. Models of the Heavenly Bodies](#)
- [13. On the Greek Perception of Science](#)
- [14. Models of the Heavenly Bodies \(Cont.\)](#)

CHAPTER III. MATHEMATICS AND THE VIEW OF THE WORLD IN EARLY MODERN TIMES

- [15. The Sun Reverts to the Center](#)
- [16. Giants' Shoulders](#)
- [17. Ellipses versus Circles](#)
- [18. And Then Came Newton](#)
- [19. Everything You Wanted to Know about Infinitesimal Calculus and Differential Equations](#)
- [20. Newton's Laws](#)
- [21. Purpose: The Principle of Least Action](#)
- [22. The Wave Equation](#)
- [23. On the Perception of Science in Modern Times](#)

CHAPTER IV. MATHEMATICS AND THE MODERN VIEW OF THE WORLD

- [24. Electricity and Magnetism](#)
- [25. And Then Came Maxwell](#)
- [26. Discrepancy between Maxwell's Theory and Newton's Theory](#)
- [27. The Geometry of the World](#)

- [28. And Then Came Einstein](#)
 - [29. The Discovery of the Quantum State of Nature](#)
 - [30. The Wonder Equation](#)
 - [31. Groups of Particles](#)
 - [32. The Strings Return](#)
 - [33. Another Look at Platonism](#)
 - [34. The Scientific Method: Is There an Alternative?](#)
-

CHAPTER V. THE MATHEMATICS OF RANDOMNESS

- [35. Evolution and Randomness in the Animal World](#)
- [36. Probability and Gambling in Ancient Times](#)
- [37. Pascal and Fermat](#)
- [38. Rapid Development](#)
- [39. The Mathematics of Predictions and Errors](#)
- [40. The Mathematics of Learning from Experience](#)
- [41. The Formalism of Probability](#)
- [42. Intuition versus the Mathematics of Randomness](#)
- [43. Intuition versus the Statistics of Randomness](#)

CHAPTER VI. THE MATHEMATICS OF HUMAN BEHAVIOR

- [44. Macro-considerations](#)
- [45. Stable Marriages](#)
- [46. The Aggregation of Preferences and Voting Systems](#)
- [47. The Mathematics of Confrontation](#)
- [48. Expected Utility](#)
- [49. Decisions in a State of Uncertainty](#)
- [50. Evolutionary Rationality](#)

CHAPTER VII. COMPUTATIONS AND COMPUTERS

- [51. Mathematics for Computations](#)
- [52. From Tables to Computers](#)
- [53. The Mathematics of Computations](#)
- [54. Proofs with High Probability](#)
- [55. Encoding](#)
- [56. What Next?](#)

CHAPTER VIII. IS THERE REALLY NO DOUBT?

- [57. Mathematics without Axioms](#)
- [58. Rigorous Development without Geometry](#)
- [59. Numbers as Sets, Logic as Sets](#)

[60. A Major Crisis](#)

[61. Another Major Crisis](#)

CHAPTER IX. THE NATURE OF RESEARCH IN MATHEMATICS

[62. How Does a Mathematician Think?](#)

[63. On Research in Mathematics](#)

[64. Pure Mathematics vis-à-vis Applied Mathematics](#)

[65. The Beauty, Efficiency, and Universality of Mathematics](#)

CHAPTER X. WHY IS TEACHING AND LEARNING MATHEMATICS SO HARD?

[66. Why Learn Mathematics?](#)

[67. Mathematical Thinking: There Is No Such Thing](#)

[68. A Teacher-Parent Meeting](#)

[69. A Logical Structure vis-à-vis a Structure for Teaching](#)

[70. What Is Hard in Teaching Mathematics?](#)

[71. The Many Facets of Mathematics](#)

[Afterword](#)

[Sources](#)

[Index of Names](#)

[Index of Subjects](#)

PREFACE

There are many jokes about mathematicians. One of my favorites is about an engineer, an architect and a mathematician who have been sentenced to be hanged. In the evening before the day set for the execution, the warden asks them for their last requests. The engineer asks to be allowed to present a new machine he has designed that can perform all household chores without any human intervention. The warden promises that the next day, before the hanging, he will have one hour in which to show his machine to the prison staff and his two fellow death-row inmates. The architect asks to be allowed to explain his new concept of residential accommodation, a modern house that keeps cool in the summer and warm in the winter, without expenditure on fuel. Again the warden promises that the next day, before the hanging, he will have one hour in which to present his idea to the prison staff and his two fellow death-row prisoners. The mathematician says that he has recently proved a mathematical theorem that will shake the foundations of mathematics, and he would like to reveal it in a lecture to an intelligent audience. The warden starts agreeing...and the engineer and the architect start shouting, “We want our execution to be brought forward to this evening!”

This joke appeals to me because it reflects the widespread attitude of the public to what can be expected from books and lectures on mathematics. We will give the reasons for this attitude later, and here we will just note that even in school we are exposed to indoctrination that causes us to relate differently to texts and lectures on mathematics than we do to other subjects. In school students are expected to solve mathematical exercises to show that they have understood the material. Other subjects such as history, literature, or even biology do not require such exercises. The impression that this creates is that without solving exercises there is no point in listening to mathematics. The development of intuitive understanding of a subject, without practicing what has been learned, is not accepted as understanding in the case of mathematics. That is so despite the fact that an intuitive grasp of a subject, without needing to put it into practice, is an acceptable objective in other scientific and general disciplines. This is misguided and misleading indoctrination that does an injustice to mathematics. Furthermore, that approach is alien to professional mathematicians too. Of course they must have a deep understanding of the topics they are researching, but an intuitive understanding of other mathematical subjects is sufficient. I will put forward an analogy that I would ask you to keep in mind as you read this book.

I love classical music and regularly attend concerts of the Israel Philharmonic Orchestra, and I greatly enjoy both live performances and recordings. I cannot read music, and I do not know the detailed history of music or the life stories of the different composers. I am confident that those who can read music or are familiar with the history of music enjoy what they hear in a way that is different from my enjoyment. I am not sure if they enjoy it more than I do because, for example, they may be more conscious of any note played slightly inaccurately, whereas I would be totally oblivious of it. The experts understand the compositions on different levels from mine, but I enjoy the music immensely, perhaps not from the written notes, but from the tune. Not the trees, but the forest. There are hardly any “notes” in this book, nor trees, mainly a tune, mainly the forest. If one or a few notes appear here or there (at times using a different font, and preceded by a rule line), they can be skipped without breaking the thread of the text.

The different sections of the book are connected, but the ideas are presented in such a way that each section is self-contained and can be read independently of the others. The headings and titles of the sections and chapters indicate the central elements within them. It is advisable to start with [chapter 1](#) but then the reader can certainly go straight to the chapter on the mathematics of randomness or to the one on the mathematics of human behavior, or even jump to the [last chapter](#) on teaching mathematics.

Naturally, a book like this could not have been written without information, exchange of views, and help that I received from friends, colleagues, students, those who heard lectures on the topics covered in the book that I delivered in various forums, the translator and the editor, the publisher's team, and of course, my family. There are too many people for me to be able to enumerate each one of them here. To all of them, my sincere thanks.

So what is it all about: The book deals with *the mathematics of nature, the nature of mathematics*, and their interrelationship. We will describe, by means of a historical review as well as from the aspect of current research, the link between mathematics and the physical world and the social world around us. The discussion in the book also relates to areas of science and society to which mathematics is relevant. We will therefore also present scientific facts and social situations described by mathematics. That presentation is not exhaustive or detailed, as we focus on the mathematical aspects of the various fields. The discussion will be accompanied by the constant presence of the question regarding the extent of the effect of the *evolution of the human race* on the development of mathematics and its applications. We will examine the claim that the manner in which the human brain was fashioned by millions of years of evolution affected humans' mathematical capabilities and the type of mathematics that is easy for humans to develop and understand. We will also show that, to a large extent, evolution is responsible for the difficulty we have in understanding certain other areas of mathematics. We will try to do all that with a minimum of musical notes but with much pleasing music.

Zvi Artstein

The Weizmann Institute of Science

EVOLUTION, MATHEMATICS, AND THE EVOLUTION OF MATHEMATICS

Could evolution have affected mathematics? • Can horses perform calculations? • Can rats count? • Do infants solve problems of addition and subtraction? • Which rectangles please us? • Why are clowns scary? • What color are the sheep in Ireland? • What number comes next in the sequence 4, 14, 23, 34, 42, 50, 59,...? • Why square the circle? • How have optical illusions contributed to science?

1. EVOLUTION

The theory of evolution is attributed to Charles Darwin, but it was not Darwin who initiated the study of evolution. King Solomon stated, "There is nothing new under the sun," (Ecclesiastes 1:9), a philosophical statement alluding to the observation that the world is in a constant state of flux. At any given time we see the current situation around us, but we also follow changes that take place in our lifetime, and we are aware of changes occurring over periods of time that we are unable to observe directly. The evidence regarding changes that took place in the past often enables us to infer what caused those changes. That applies both to the physical world, such as rocks, flora, and fauna, and to human society, including modes of behavior, fashion, literature, medical practices, and technology. These changes take place according to their own mechanism. Sometimes it is clear to us what survives, what is modified, and what becomes extinct, but it is not always easy to identify the mechanism.

Let us take as an example the Earth's surface. Some rocks exist for many years, while others are quickly weathered and eroded by the wind almost as we watch. What causes the difference? Clearly it is the different rock textures that determine the differences in their ability to survive. Basalt will last, while limestone will crumble. There are no sand dunes on the tops of mountains because they would be blown away by the wind. We could say that the strong triumph, the fittest survive. We can deduce that being made of basalt is an advantage in the battle for survival on a mountain peak. That statement is trivial in the realm of rocks, and we do not usually examine rocks in terms of the competition for survival. But the conclusion that whatever is most suited to its environment survives is correct regarding rocks as well as human society. Historians, in discussing human history, try to understand why a particular society survived and another disappeared. Their conclusions generally refer to the advantages that the victors had over the vanquished. We can learn about the conditions under which a society or species developed from its specific characteristics. Likewise, from the conditions in which it developed, we can learn about the advantages that enabled it to win the battle for survival.

Darwin's great contribution to the theory of evolution was in identifying the mechanism by which different species of animals and plants changed and developed. Unlike Lamarck, who claimed that every species adapts to its environment and the characteristics it takes on are passed from each generation to the next, Darwin proposed a different mechanism responsible for the changes that every species undergoes. The mechanism consists of two main elements: mutation and selection. In the reproduction process, individuals undergo mutations that cause random and generally minor changes in their characteristics. The individuals with the best-suited characteristics reproduce at the fastest rate, and that constitutes the selection that results in successive generations of each species being better suited to the environmental conditions. The best-suited species among those competing for the

same food resources are the ones that survive.

Charles Robert Darwin (1809–1882) was born in the town of Shrewsbury, England, to a well-established family. His father, Robert, was a wealthy physician. His grandfather, Erasmus Darwin, who died before Charles was born but whose writings were available to Charles, was a philosopher and a naturalist who favored the theory of evolution of the leading French naturalist Jean-Baptiste Lamarck. Monet, Chevalier de Lamarck (1744–1829), known simply as Lamarck. Young Charles was exposed to scientific endeavors but was not a particularly industrious student. Instead of devoting his time to his studies, he preferred to observe nature and to collect various items, particularly beetles of different types. When he was twenty-three he was invited to join an expedition due to sail on a ship called the *Beagle* as its scientist; the main purpose of the expedition was to chart the shores of Australia and South America for the British Empire. His role was to collect and classify geological, zoological, and botanical specimens. In the course of the voyage Darwin noted that different but similar species could be found living in regions near each other, specifically on the Galapagos Islands. It was there that he conceived the model of evolution consisting of mutations and selection. It should be noted that Darwin, in developing his theory of the evolution of types of flora and fauna, was deeply influenced by the theory of the political philosopher Thomas Malthus (who lived half a century before him) on the demographic and economic development of human societies. Darwin's autobiography shows him to have been a modest and wise man; it is replete with statements indicating a deep understanding of evolution beyond the technique he developed. For example, in his reference to his elderly colleague Leonard Jenyns, with whom he had many discussions about nature, Darwin writes, "At first I disliked him from his somewhat grim and sarcastic expression, and it is not often that a first impression is lost but I was completely mistaken...." The connection between "it is not often that a first impression is lost" and evolution will be discussed further on in the book.

Although Darwin shared his thoughts on evolution and the ample evidence he had found supporting his theory with his scientific colleagues, among them some of the best-known English scientists of those days, he refused to publish his findings. He agreed to publish his theory only after Alfred Wallace, a young naturalist researcher who had undertaken many voyages to South America and the Far East, submitted a paper for publication containing ideas similar to those of Darwin but with only a flimsy basis. Darwin's friends became aware of this and urged him to publish his book, *The Origin of Species*. As a result, in the first official presentation of the theory, Wallace's article and Darwin's theory appeared at the same time.

There were several reasons for Darwin's long hesitation before publishing his conclusions. Some derived from the possible conflict with the religious belief that different species exist because of how they were created. Darwin's wife, Emma (née Wedgwood), was deeply religious, and Darwin did not wish to upset her. Another reason, however, no less important, for his hesitation to publish his mechanism of evolution was that despite the wealth of facts he had available supporting his theory of evolution, many aspects of the theory had not yet been demonstrated and lacked a scientific basis. In particular, Darwin could not offer a biological mechanism that would cause mutation. This mechanism was not discovered until the middle of the twentieth century, when the genes encoded in DNA molecules were revealed and were found to mutate randomly in the course of reproduction.

Mutation and selection of genes are the basis of the modern understanding of the process of evolution of plant and animal species. The genes carry the characteristics vital to the survival and development of each species. The ensemble of genes and the way they are expressed, at times as a reaction to the environment, define the characteristics of a species. Changes in the genes are responsible for changes in the species. Nevertheless, much can be learned about evolution without monitoring the changes

the genes themselves. By studying the conditions in which the species developed, survived, and was victorious in the evolutionary struggle, we can learn about the characteristics that are encoded in its genes and are passed on from generation to generation. The reverse of this claim is also correct: the characteristics observable at any given time enable us to learn about the conditions in which each species developed.

The following example shows how we can learn about the link between the conditions in which a species developed and their characteristics today. I came across this example in the course of a trip I made to the Galapagos Islands a few years ago. It relates to the mating habits of birds.



The rock cormorant in the picture on the left cannot fly. It lives on cliffs close to the seashore that are exposed to strong winds. Its abilities to find twigs and to build a proper nest are vital to the survival of the species in these tough conditions. In its courtship, the male cormorant demonstrates to his potential mate his ability to gather twigs to build the nest they would share. The courted female will respond to the male's advances only if he can prove he has that capability. The middle picture is of the frigatebird. In its courting display, the male inflates his gular pouch until it becomes an enormous red balloon. He does this to show his intended mate the strength of his lungs and his ability to fly long distances to scoop fish out of the water. The picture on the right, the blue-footed booby, demonstrates entirely different qualities in its courtship display. The male of this species incubates the eggs and protects them by covering them with his large blue feet. He therefore tries to woo his potential mate by flaunting the size and shape of its feet, thus proving his ability to protect the eggs they will produce together against enemies and unsettled or rough weather.

These examples illustrate that the characteristics and behavioral patterns we can discern today indicate the characteristics that were of evolutionary importance, and those show us how each species survived the evolutionary struggle.

The essential characteristics that helped any particular population to win the battle for survival during the formation of the species are etched into its genes, and we may identify them as innate attributes. Cheetahs' speed, eagles' "eagle eyes" and cats' tree-climbing ability are all innate traits. A cheetah cub is born with the ability and basic instinct to run fast. It will need help from its parents to learn what it needs to fear, how to hunt, and even how to run more effectively, but the basic features of speed and hunting are carried in its genes. Similarly, the genes of a cat enable it to learn how to catch mice, and the innate characteristics of an eagle include its keen vision and ability to identify potential prey from a great height. Learning merely refines and improves the innate attributes. The attributes of each species enable us to learn about the conditions in which the species developed; similarly, knowing the conditions in which the species developed enables us to learn about the characteristics that evolved.

It is reasonable to assume that just as physical attributes of animal species are innate features etched into their genes, the same will apply to at least some mental attributes. Mental and social skills also play a role in the battle for survival, so that in these too, the selection process strengthens the features that help the species to overcome its rivals. Specifically, in the reproduction process mental attributes can also be changed and improved by mutation. In the following sections we will examine

the mathematical capabilities of the human species from an evolutionary aspect. We will ask whether the abilities to understand and to use mathematics are the results of evolutionary development, whether they may be by-products of a brain that developed to cope with other needs.

2. MATHEMATICAL ABILITY IN THE ANIMAL WORLD

If mathematical ability made a contribution in the evolutionary struggle that brought the human race to the position it currently occupies among the species, it may be assumed that other living beings would possess a certain degree of mathematical ability. But what does mathematical ability mean? Mathematics encompasses a broad range of topics and conceptual methods. The question to ask, therefore, is which of those mathematical features provide an evolutionary advantage? And the follow-up question is how can we identify these mathematical abilities in animals?

The most basic mathematical ability is counting. It is followed by the understanding of the concept of a number as an abstract object and the ability to perform simple arithmetic operations, such as addition and subtraction. We will start by discussing the existence of these simple elements in adult animals. A mother cat moves her kittens from place to place and generally does not forget a kitten or two, and when she has finished moving them, she does not usually go back again to check whether she has moved all of them. She may remember them individually, but it seems reasonable to state that the mother cat has a sense of quantity. The instinct of quantitative estimation clearly provides an evolutionary advantage, so we should not be surprised that adult animals possess that ability. But does that ability extend to the ability to count and to the possibility of performing arithmetic manipulations?

Before presenting several convincing examples showing that some animal species do have mathematical ability, a warning is in order. The results of experiments in general, and of animal experiments in particular, should be interpreted with great caution. A well-known illustration of this is the case of "Clever Hans." (More details and references concerning this story, and concerning the research mentioned later in this section, can be found in the monographs by Dehaene and by Devlin [2000] listed in the sources.) Toward the end of the nineteenth century a horse known as Clever Hans was exhibited on tour in Germany with its trainer, Wilhelm von Osten. The horse showed remarkable ability in adding, subtracting, finding the squares of numbers, simple division, and so on, all with a very high degree of success. The horse was wrong occasionally, but such errors occurred infrequently. The method by which the horse showed its abilities was that when an exercise was read out or written on a board, it would tap its hoof the number of times corresponding with the right answer. It was suspected that the act was simply a clever deception by which the trainer somehow or other managed to give the right answer to the horse. An official committee was appointed, headed by a psychologist named Carl Stumpf and whose members included the director of the Berlin Zoo. The committee checked, among other things, whether the horse could solve the problems if the trainer was not present, and it found that even then the horse could still give the correct answers. The conclusion was that some animals have a fairly advanced mathematical ability. Subsequently, more detailed examinations in 1907 by another psychologist, named Oscar Pfungst, showed that the horse did not know mathematics. The trainer was indeed reliable and honest, but the horse had learned to distinguish involuntary changes in his facial expressions and in the facial expressions of the audience when the trainer was not present. The horse understood from those facial expressions when it had reached the correct number of taps of its hoof. The presence of the trainer or an audience was essential. Pfungst found that if the trainer looked tense at a wrong answer, the horse answered according to the expression and not the correct answer. The research methods developed by Pfungst

a result of this case are now recognized as a breakthrough in psychological research.

Scientific experiments that were more soundly based have proven that some animals do indeed possess mathematical ability. The German zoologist Otto Koehler (1889–1974) proved as early as the 1930s that some species of birds can identify a collection with a given number of elements. It is apparently not difficult to train a pigeon to choose every third seed when faced with a row of seeds. A squirrel can be trained so that when faced with boxes containing different quantities of nuts, it will choose the box with exactly five nuts. There is a limit to the numerical-identification ability of these animals. Koehler himself found that even the most capable animals could not identify collections with more than seven elements. The number appears in the literature also as a bound to the number of information units that a human brain can process. We will meet the number seven again later on in similar contexts. Still, these experiments demonstrate the mathematical ability to estimate quantities but do not yet prove an ability to count or to grasp the abstract concept of a number.

Adult crows are known to be able to count, within certain limitations. Food is placed near a building. The crow learns very quickly that it is dangerous to attempt to approach the food when someone is in the building. It cannot see into the building to check if anyone is inside or not, but it can see when someone enters or leaves it. The popular literature (without scientific checks, it must be said) reports situations in which several people enter the building one after the other. As long as they remain in the building, the crow keeps away. The people in the building then leave, one by one. With surprising accuracy the crow knows when all those it saw enter the building have left, and only then does it approach the food. Clearly there is a limit to crows' ability to be exact, just as there is a limit to humans' ability to keep track on exact large numbers. Crows managed to count up to five or six in this manner, with a high degree of accuracy. The ability to identify a collection with a given number of elements demonstrated by crows in this example and by other species is consistent with an evolutionary advantage.

The ability to count is clearly an advantage in the battle for survival, but its origin in the avian world is unclear. After all, how often in the evolution of crows did they encounter a situation in which they had to count the number of dangerous animals entering and leaving a building? Specifically, it is unclear whether this apparent counting is in fact counting in the mathematical sense. In other words, does the crow have the ability, whether conscious or not, to comprehend the number of the people entering the building, or does it simply remember who went in and who came out?

Monkeys were found to have a greater mathematical ability to count and compare. The following experiments were carried out by Guy Woodruff and David Premack of the University of Pennsylvania (their paper was published in 1981). A chimpanzee was shown a full glass and a half-full glass, and was taught to choose the half-full glass every time. The same chimpanzee was then offered the choice of a whole apple or half an apple, and it chose the half apple. In other words, it generalized the mathematical principle from the glass to the apple. In a similar fashion, the chimpanzee was taught to demonstrate simple mathematical abilities, such as recognizing that the combination of half an apple and a quarter of an apple is three-quarters of an apple. In another experiment, two trays were placed before a chimpanzee. The first tray had two piles of pieces of chocolate, one pile with three pieces and the other with four. The second tray had a pile of five pieces of chocolate and then a separate single piece. In most cases, the chimpanzee chose the tray with the larger total number of pieces. This does not yet constitute proof that the chimpanzee understood the abstract concept of numbers or the addition of numbers, but it is evidence of mathematical abilities. This is not surprising, as such abilities constitute an evolutionary advantage.

Another experiment with animals proves that the concept of numbers in the abstract does exist to some degree among some, even among less-developed animals. The experiments were conducted by Russell Church and Warren Meck of Brown University (the research was published in 1984). It is not

difficult to train rats so that when they hear two beeps, one after the other, they are given enough food to satisfy them. Similarly, when they see two flashes of light, they can also safely eat the food. They were taught, however, that when they hear four beeps or see four light flashes, it is dangerous to eat the food, as they get an electric shock. The aural or visual signals, that is, the beeps or flashes, are received and processed in the brain via two different senses, hearing and sight. The rats reached a high level of reacting correctly, approaching the food if they heard two beeps or saw two flashes, and avoided doing so if they heard four beeps or saw four flashes. When the rats had been trained sufficiently, they heard two beeps that were immediately followed by two light flashes. How do you think they reacted? Did the rats consider the signals as a double invitation to eat the food, or did they interpret them as a four-signal warning to refrain? If they reacted according to the latter, it may be assumed that they recognized the number four as an independent concept, even though the signals received were of two different types. The answer: the rats clearly identified the number four and did not approach the food when they received four signals, even when they were received via different senses.

This experiment with rats still does not indicate arithmetic ability in these animals, nor does it give definite proof that such abstract counting is an innate attribute, that is, a characteristic carried in the genes, as it may be the result of training made possible by the development of the brain for other purposes. It seems reasonable, however, that this ability is innate, mainly because of the evolutionary advantage given by the abilities to count and to recognize the concept of numbers. To be convinced beyond all doubt that a particular ability is innate, it should be identified in the animal when it is still very young. Such experiments with cubs and other animal young are obviously very difficult to perform. With human cubs, that is, babies, such experiments can be performed.

3. MATHEMATICAL ABILITY IN HUMANS

Before we present the evidence that mathematical ability is inborn in human beings, that is, embedded in their genes, we need to make two comments about the nature of the discussion. First, our use of the term *genes* from here on is a conceptual one and does not relate to any specific gene or set of genes. We will leave the identification of the genes responsible for mathematical ability to our biological colleagues. For us, establishing the fact that it is innate is sufficient. Second, in the examples of animals and in the discussion in this section, we do not relate to the ability of any individuals. We do not ask whether the success in mathematics of a specific student is determined by his genes alone or whether it is due to environmental conditions or to his having good or less-good mathematical teachers. The discussion is concerned with the mathematical capabilities of the human race and the connection between that capability and the process of evolution, a process that has continued for millions of years, in the course of which the abilities under discussion were formed.

We will first address the simplest mathematical operations, that is, counting, addition, and subtraction. One of the basic principles of classical psychology is that babies are born with a brain that evolution has prepared for learning but that is initially void of all information. Babies learn about the world initially via observation and then via a combination of observation and experience. More abstract learning appears later, with language development. This view was held and taught by no less than Sigmund Freud (1856–1939), the father of modern psychology. What he said related to general knowledge in general and to mathematical ability. At first glance it does appear that regarding mathematical elements that description is correct. Only when they are three or four years old do children acquire the ability to count, and later on to add and subtract. At first they only recite what

they have heard, one, two, three, and so on, without realizing that they can count. To illustrate, if given three balls, they may count one, two, three, four, five, counting the same ball more than once. Only at a later age do children begin to understand what counting is, and even later do they start performing simple arithmetic operations. A leading researcher and advocate of this approach was the famous psychologist Jean Piaget (1896–1980), who formulated a complete theory of cognitive development regarding the gradual acquisition of mathematical abilities from childhood to adulthood. (The reader can find elaborations on this issue and other research referred to later in this section in the monographs by Dehaene and Devlin [2000] listed in our sources.) In one of his experiments, Piaget showed children eight flowers, six roses and two chrysanthemums, and asked, “Are there more flowers or more roses?” A significant number of children answered roses. Piaget concluded that children have no intuition of set inclusion; in other words, the children had no understanding that with two sets, one of which includes the other—in our case the set of flowers includes the set of roses—the former is larger. In Piaget's time, it was believed that the relation between sets was the right basis for mathematics (a view that is currently becoming less and less accepted; more on this in the [last chapter](#) of the book). Accordingly, Piaget concluded that small children have no understanding of the connection between sizes of sets and of one set including another, let alone any ability to count or knowledge of simple arithmetic.

Nevertheless, the fact that the ability to count is not acquired until a child is several years old does not necessarily prove that the characteristic is not innate. In the observations mentioned above, including Piaget's experiments, counting and arithmetic were acquired together with the ability to communicate and to use a given language, generally the mother tongue. It is not surprising that communicating in a given language is not an innate attribute but a learned one. The ability to learn a language is an inborn characteristic, but acquiring the language itself takes several years. Before the child learns a language, his arithmetic abilities do not come into play, as seen in the above experiments. The obstacle is not the child's lack of ability to count but the fact that he has to answer questions that he does not comprehend, or he does not realize what the expected answer is, until he has had some more years of practice. It is easy to devise tests showing that understanding the question plays an important role in interpreting the results.

Children aged three to four years are shown four marbles and, nearby, four buttons; they are asked whether there are more marbles or more buttons. Most of them will answer that the number of marbles and buttons is the same. The buttons are then spread more widely, that is, spaced farther apart from each other, and again the question is asked, “Now, are there more marbles or more buttons?” Most of the young children will give the same answer, the number is the same. When this exercise is repeated with older children, aged five and six years, many of them answer that there are more buttons.



This does not indicate a drop in their mathematical aptitude. The correct explanation is that older children are not used to being asked the same trivial question more than once. They therefore conclude that the questioner must expect a different answer and assume that the question is about the distance between the items and not their number, and they answer accordingly.

There is clear evidence that very young infants relate to numbers and can even perform simple addition and subtraction. How can such cognitive capabilities be examined in babies only a few months old? Several parameters enable us to see whether a baby is excited or surprised. One is the length of time it looks at something. A baby can look at an object or a situation for a few seconds and

then it will divert its gaze to something else. When it looks at something new or surprising—and for babies a few months old, new is also surprising—it holds its gaze on it for a longer period, for a few seconds more. A second parameter is the rate at which the baby sucks, say its pacifier. When it is excited or surprised, it sucks harder and more frequently.

An experiment undertaken by Ranka Bijeljic-Babic and colleagues in Paris (the results of which were published in 1991) showed that even newborn babies have a sense of numbers. They measured the intensity with which babies sucked while hearing meaningless words of three syllables, such as “defantok,” “alovo,” “kamkeman.” At first, when the babies heard the words, they sucked harder until they became accustomed to the sounds, and then they reverted to normal sucking. Then two-syllable words were spoken, and this led to harder sucking again. This pattern repeated itself. Whenever the number of syllables in a series of words changed, the reaction of the babies changed too. In other words, even at such an early age, babies can recognize that word sounds consist of syllables and react to a change in the number of syllables between one series and another. The syllables in the “words” were chosen randomly to avoid their having any meaning or significance, so that the only explanation for the babies’ reaction was the number of syllables.

A more complex experiment performed in the laboratory of Prentice Starkey of the University of Pennsylvania (the results of which were published in 1980) showed that distinguishing between different numbers is not restricted to one communication channel. Six-month-old babies were shown pairs of pictures with either two or three elements, say two in the picture on the left and three in the picture on the right. Different objects were shown each time, sometimes just geometric shapes, sometimes dots, and so on, and each time the colors were different; this was done to neutralize any possible effect of the content of the pictures. While the pictures were being shown the babies also heard notes or sounds, sometimes two and sometimes three, in random order, in order to cancel any possible effect of any structure in the order in which the notes were heard. When three notes were heard, the babies clearly preferred to look at the picture with the three images, and when they heard two notes, they turned their attention to the picture with two elements. They were exhibiting a counting operation or were at least comparing quantities perceived via two different senses, sight and hearing.

Another sophisticated experiment conducted by Karen Wynn of Yale University (results published in 1992) showed that babies have a natural sense of addition and subtraction. A screen was placed before babies of a few months, and they saw a figure going behind it. The screen was removed, and they saw the figure. Next, one figure went behind the screen, and then another figure followed. The screen was removed, and the babies saw the two figures. This was repeated several times until the babies became accustomed to what was happening. Then an arithmetically incorrect exercise was performed. One figure went behind the screen, and then a second figure. When the screen was removed, only one figure could be seen. To a highly significant degree, the several-months-old babies showed surprise. They expected two figures, and lo and behold, there was only one! The experiment was repeated with a number of variations to remove the possibility that the infants were simply used to the result of a particular exercise. It was highly significant that results that were arithmetically incorrect gained more of the babies’ attention. Later, a similar experiment was conducted with adult rhesus monkeys. They showed signs of surprise when, for example, a banana was put inside a box followed by a second one, and when the box was opened, there was only one banana inside.

These experiments were scrupulously and rigorously controlled, and it may be concluded from them that human beings’ arithmetic abilities are genetic. Clearly these operations are performed by undeveloped brains and in no particular language, and there is thus no possibility for the baby to discuss the results with its parents or friends. When the child grows, it will have to learn how to express this mathematical ability in the everyday language it uses to talk to its parents. This learning

is a process in itself. But simple arithmetic is innate in babies and is not a by-product of a brain that had been developed for completely different purposes. From this it may be deduced that simple arithmetic afforded an advantage in the evolutionary competition. This is not surprising. For those competing for food, the mathematical ability to distinguish large from small, the many from the few, and even addition and subtraction gives an evolutionary advantage. An individual with this ability will be better suited to a competitive environment than would other members of the same species with lower mathematical abilities.

How is this finding consistent with the finding that some primitive tribes, including some discovered recently in isolated locations, use only the numbers one, two, and three to describe the environment, and any larger quantities are referred to as “many”? If living beings such as birds or rats can differentiate between numbers greater than three, one would expect humans to be able to count better. The answer is simple: language developed much later among human beings in the process of evolution and placed greater emphasis on more important things than the less important. Those primitive tribes apparently are well aware of the difference between sets consisting of five or six objects, but their language is not rich enough to describe them because they had no need to devote terms to numbers greater than three. This does not contradict the fact that at the intuitive level the arithmetic capability is much higher. As a language develops, so does the ability to express and perform more-extensive arithmetic operations. Language developed relatively late in the general evolutionary process but is itself part of that process. The human brain is distinctive among living beings in its verbal communication abilities. Indirect evidence that arithmetic, counting, and the facility to perform addition and subtraction, for example, are the direct results of evolution and not just by-products of language can be found in recorded cases of people born with a malfunction of the brain that meant they could not count or perform addition or subtraction but whose other verbal capabilities were perfectly normal. Conversely, there are people with defective verbal capabilities who can perform arithmetic operations easily.


It should be noted that similar techniques of research into the evolutionary roots of mathematics can be used to discover abilities and features whose roots are evolutionary and that are unrelated to mathematics. Recently (in 2010) research by Karen Wynn of Yale, mentioned above, and her partner Paul Blum was published, showing that altruism and the aspiration for justice exist in babies a few months old, at an age when it is reasonable to assume they could not have absorbed the characteristics from the environment. This too is not surprising. The preference for a just distribution of resources is an attribute that helps a society survive the evolutionary struggle, and it is reasonable therefore, that it is inherent at the genetic level.

4. MATHEMATICS THAT YIELDS AN EVOLUTIONARY ADVANTAGE

Mathematics has many aspects. The previous section showed that the ability to perform arithmetic calculations is the result of evolution. In this section we will indicate other branches of mathematical operations that, it may reasonably be assumed, provided an advantage in the evolutionary struggle. We will present evidence that those parts of mathematics were also incorporated in the genetic heritage. We may refer to this aspect of mathematics as *natural mathematics*. In the next section we will describe mathematical operations that are not natural, as they did not afford any evolutionary advantage in the hundreds of thousands of years during which the human genome was formed.

It is reasonable to assume that the ability to recognize geometrical elements gave an evolutionary advantage. As sources of food and water have typical geometric shapes, being able to recognize those

shapes correctly constituted an advantage in the competition for sources of sustenance. But is there any evidence that, as a result of evolution, the recognition of geometric shapes is carried by the genes? We will soon turn our attention to such evidence but will first introduce what is known as the golden cut, or the golden-ratio rectangle.



The golden-ratio rectangle is one in which the ratio between the longer side and the shorter side is such that if a square with sides the length of the shorter side of the rectangle is removed, the sides of the rectangle that remains will have the same ratio as the original one. We note, although this is not relevant to our tale, that it is not difficult to calculate the numerical value of the golden ratio (and skipping the calculation below will not impair the reader's understanding of what follows).

Denote the length of the rectangle by a , and the width by b . The relation required between the ratios is expressed by $\frac{a}{b} = \frac{b}{a-b}$. If we denote by x the desired ratio $\frac{a}{b}$, the unknown x satisfies the quadratic equation $x^2 - x = 1$, the solution of which is (recalling secondary-school mathematics) $\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$. This is the golden ratio, approximately 1.6180 in decimal numbers.

The golden ratio appears in many instances and processes in nature, and several of its attributes were known in ancient times. It has been identified in ancient architecture. For example, the dimensions of the Parthenon in Athens are amazingly close to those defined by the golden ratio. The ratio can also be discerned in Leonardo da Vinci's paintings; he also referred to it in his mathematical writings although he did not state that he used it in his art.

The discovery of the golden ratio in various and sometimes-unexpected forms in nature resulted in the ancients attributing mystical properties to it, and they even referred to it as the *divine proportion*. For many years, a lively debate continued and is still continuing today among historians and artists on the question of whether builders and artists in ancient times made conscious use of the golden ratio in their architecture and art, or whether its frequent appearance is due to the fact that it is aesthetically pleasing. We will not join this open debate at this point but will just note that the ratio is indeed very pleasing to the eye. This has been proved in dozens of empirical studies, including studies showing that infants react with greater pleasure and calm to golden-ratio rectangles than they do to rectangles with other proportions, including those with greatly different proportions.

This needs to be explained. We are used to the fact that the pleasantness of a drawing or a painting or a shape to the adult eye is highly dependent on familiarity and education. For example, the attitude toward modern art initially was almost hostile, and it moderated over the years as the general public became more and more familiar with it. Babies have not had time to become familiar with any particular shape or form. What, then, is the origin of their preference for the golden ratio? The answer is simple: Evolution. An examination of the dimensions of the human head reveals that they are close to the golden ratio. Likewise, the proportions of sections of the human face, such as the ratio of the width and height of the eyes, the height and the width of the ears, and so on, are also close to the golden ratio. The evolutionary advantage to an infant who can recognize and is happy to discover a figure with those proportions is clear. Babies who are calm when they see their mother approaching,

contrast to exhibiting discomfort or even crying for help when they see a bird of prey nearby, have greater chance of surviving. Hence the feeling of greater comfort when confronted with rectangular forms that have proportions similar to those of the human face rather than other forms is etched in the human genes. This has nothing to do with the golden ratio itself. In fact, research shows that babies also feel at ease with the shape of a hand, and the evolutionary reason for that is self-evident. Evolution rewards a baby who reacts with discomfort if held by a predator compared to its reaction when held by a human being. I would hazard a guess that if it were possible to perform similar experiments with birds, we would find that of all geometric forms, the most pleasing to a young chick would be an acute-angled triangle.

At this stage we may still wonder whether babies may have learned to feel comfortable with ratios similar to the golden ratio in the first weeks after their birth. The answer lies in the signs of discomfort and fear when they are faced with certain forms. Psychologists claim that about one-tenth of all children experience a primeval fear of clowns. Recently an occupation known as medical clowning has become widespread. It involves clowning activities meant to relax and help children requiring hospitalization. But cases have also been reported in which the activities of the medical clown only harmed the child, and the condition of the terrified children deteriorated when they saw the clown. This too is related to geometry and its evolutionary roots. The sight of a clown, with all his bright colors and the nonhuman proportion of his limbs and head, calls into play the same genes that make infants cry for their parents' help when they see a multicolored bird of prey or a tiger approaching. It is unreasonable to think that in the modern world children would "learn" to be afraid of clowns. These innate features are the inception of geometric recognition. (We will often refer below to the simple but illustrative metaphor of confrontation with a tiger.)

Another basic mathematical ability that almost certainly played a role in the evolutionary struggle is the ability to identify patterns. I am not familiar with controlled experiments that show that the tendency and ability to recognize patterns is ingrained in the genes, but imagine early man with a tiger stealthily creeping up on him in the grass, leaving a trail of flattened grass. The ability to identify the trail as a source of danger could be life-saving. Ability to recognize patterns is not restricted to visual patterns. Consider for instance patterns of sound. For most of us, hearing very few notes is enough to recognize a pattern and sometimes to identify an entire tune or melody. As recognizing patterns is an attribute that is helpful in the evolutionary struggle, those who had this ability had more offspring than those that lacked it. It is thus almost certain that the tendency to recognize patterns is passed on genetically. Less harm is caused by seeing a pattern where none exists than by failure to identify an existing pattern. Thus, the evolutionary tendency to identify patterns also results in identifying ostensible patterns, including patterns that do not exist. We can take the Bible code as an instance of incorrect identification. By constructing sentences consisting of only every n th word of the text in the Bible, it can apparently be shown that many of the events in modern life were allegedly foreseen in the Old Testament. Careful statistical tests proved that these patterns have no scientific reality. From the outset, however, the tendency to find patterns overcame scientific caution. In later sections we will come across other mental errors deriving from discovering patterns where they do not exist.

Much of mathematics, both in research and in the various stages of learning mathematics, focuses on the identification of patterns in sequences. Here are a few simple exercises. Continue the sequence

2, 4, 6, 8, 10,...

At a relatively early age, children will recognize the sequence of even numbers and will correctly give the next numbers in the sequence, 12 and 14. More knowledge is required to recognize the following

sequence:

1, 4, 9, 16, 25, 36,...

but it is not difficult to see that the numbers in the sequence are the squares of the numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, so that the following numbers will be 49 and 64. We should point out and emphasize that these sequences do not necessarily continue as we have suggested. In other words, these extensions of the sequences do not derive from a logical necessity. Moreover, the answers are culture dependent. Here is an exercise attributed to the mathematician and historian Morris Kline. Continue the sequence:

4, 14, 23, 34, 42, 50, 59,...

The answer? 72. The numbers in the sequence are the numbers of the streets at which the Manhattan Subway C stops, and the next station is at 72nd Street. I would guess that if regular travelers on the New York subway were given this exercise, many would have given the answer 72. I have deliberately avoided saying that they would have given the right answer, because this is not a matter of right and wrong. The answer is right if that is what the questioner intended. It is easy to see, however, that the human race has the inborn intuition to continue series such as the above in a reasonable manner, and to understand what the questioner wants. (We will discuss again this exercise in the [last chapter](#) of the book.)

Clearly one must not exaggerate, and the story of the four-engine airplane flying from New York to London comes to mind. About an hour after takeoff, the pilot announces that one of the four engines has failed, but there is nothing to worry about. The other three are working as they should, and the flight would just take nine hours instead of the originally scheduled six. A short while later the pilot announces that a second engine had ceased functioning, but not to worry, the only effect was that the flight would now take twelve hours. A while later comes the third announcement, that the third engine is now out of action, so the flight time is now fifteen hours. At this point a passenger jumps up and asks, "Is there enough food and drink on board in case the fourth engine fails and the flight takes eighteen hours?" (It would be interesting to ask mathematics students to complete the sequence in the event that the fourth engine stopped working.)

Some continuations of sequences, even if there is no logical necessity, are directly connected with natural phenomena. Let us take, for example, the following sequence:

1, 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 13, 21,...

Each number (from the third) in the sequence is the sum of the previous two numbers, so that the next two in the sequence would be 34 and 55, and so on. This is the Fibonacci sequence, named after the Italian mathematician Leonardo Fibonacci, or Leonardo of Pisa (1170–1250), whose book *Liber Abaci* (1202) included extensive development of the properties of this sequence. It reflects many aspects of development and growth in nature, as well as mathematical properties that are interesting in themselves. We describe one use of the sequence here.

Certain trees, including some types of mangrove, increase in number by a branch taking root in the ground and growing into a new trunk. A year has to pass, however, until a branch of a young mangrove can send out one of its branches from which a new tree will grow. Assume that a young mangrove is planted in the ground. After one year there will still be one mangrove tree, but after two years a branch of the first tree will also be growing, so there will be two mangroves. This is the beginning of the sequence 1, 1, 2. The next year, only the first tree can send out a branch to take root, so in the fourth year there will be three trees. The year after that, the two oldest mangroves will send out a branch

each, so there will be a total of $2 + 3 = 5$ trees growing, and we already have the sequence 1, 1, 2, 3, and so on. Each year the number of new trunks is equal to the number of older trees (more than a year old), and the sequence describing their number of trees is the Fibonacci sequence. We will not expand the scope of this matter beyond the example quoted, but I will just add that if a number in the sequence is divided by the preceding number, the further along the sequence we go, the closer is the result to the golden proportion discussed above. This is another fact that convinced the ancients that they were observing a divine proportion or ratio. The fact that series whose extensions can be discovered intuitively are reflected in natural phenomena boosted the tendency to develop the ability to identify patterns throughout the generations.

We will summarize the observations in this and the previous section by stating that we can point to and to some extent corroborate by means of experiments, mathematical abilities that throughout hundreds of thousands of years of evolution afforded an advantage in the evolutionary struggle for survival. The processes of mutation and selection by which evolution shaped the human race resulted in those abilities being etched into human genes.

5. MATHEMATICS WITH NO EVOLUTIONARY ADVANTAGE

In this section we will examine a number of aspects of mathematics that, apparently, are not carried by our genes because they did not provide an evolutionary advantage during the formation of the human species (other nonnatural aspects of mathematics will be discussed later on). The current discussion is speculative, but further on we will present evidence corroborating the observations made here. We emphasize once again that the lack of an evolutionary advantage we are referring to relates to a period in which the genes determining the human species were developing. That is why mathematics of the type we will discuss here is not natural to intuitive thinking. This does not mean that this aspect of mathematics is not important or useful. Just the opposite. This type of mathematical ability provides a great advantage in the later evolution of human societies, but the time that has elapsed since human societies developed is not long enough for these abilities to have been etched into their genes.

The language of mathematics makes much use of quantifiers, expressions such as “for every,” “there exists” that appear in mathematical propositions. For example, Pythagoras's famous theorem which was proved as early as two thousand five hundred years ago, states that *for every* right-angled triangle, the sum of the squares on the two sides equals the square of the hypotenuse. The emphasis is on the quantifier “for every.” Another useful claim states that every positive integer is the product of prime numbers. A recent famous example is Fermat's last theorem. The hypothesis that it was correct was formulated as early as the seventeenth century but was unproven until the proof by mathematician Andrew Wiles of Princeton University, which was not published until 1995. The theorem states that for every four natural numbers (i.e., positive integers) X , Y , Z and n , if n is greater than or equal to the sum $X^n + Y^n$ cannot equal Z^n . Throughout the thousands of years of development of modern mathematics, the proof that a particular property *always* holds was considered an achievement.

However, is it natural to examine whether a particular property *always* holds? When something occurs repeatedly under certain conditions, does it naturally give rise to the question whether it occurs *every* time those conditions hold? Not so. If experience shows that a tiger is a dangerous predator, the conclusion drawn is that if one meets a tiger one should flee or hide. Losing energy or time in abstract thought about whether that particular tiger always devours its prey, or whether every tiger is a dangerous predator, would not afford an evolutionary advantage.

Another concept often referred to in mathematics is the concept of infinity. The Greeks proved that there is an infinite number of prime numbers. Is the urge to prove this statement a natural one? Considering many elements, is it reasonable to ask whether there is an infinite number of them? Again, I think it is not. Imagine ancient man discovering that a certain region is teeming with tigers. Is it worthwhile for him to consider whether there is an infinite number of them, or would it be preferable for him to get as far away as possible from that area as quickly as possible? The question "Is there an infinite number of tigers?" and even the question "Are there many more tigers than the large and dangerous number that I have already seen?" are academic questions, which will only harm those who devote time and energy to them and hence will impair their chances of surviving in the evolutionary struggle.

Another type of claim developed by mathematics is expressed in the reference to facts that *cannot* exist. A statement such as "If A does not occur, then B will occur" is commonplace among teachers, students, and researchers of mathematics. We will come across many such examples further on. This way of thinking is also not natural. Activity of the human brain is based on association, on the recollection of things that happened. To base oneself on an event that did not take place may be possible and useful, but does not come easily or intuitively. When you enter a room, you look at what is in it and devote less thought to what is not there. We should repeat that we are not claiming that searching for an infinite number of mathematical elements, or proving that a certain property always holds, or relating to the negation of a possibility is an unworthy, unimportant, or uninteresting activity. What we are claiming is that those activities are not natural and that without a mathematical framework that suggests these possibilities, a reasonable person or an untrained student would not intuitively ask those questions.

Another attribute that is not innate in human nature is the need for rigor and precision. Mathematics is proud that a mathematical proof, provided it does not contain an error, is like an absolute truth. Mathematics therefore developed techniques of rigorous tests intended to lead to that absolute truth. Such an approach cannot have been derived from evolution. Genes do not direct humans to act rigorously to remove any possible doubt. The following anecdote illustrates this convincingly.

A mathematician, a physicist, and a biologist were sitting on a hill in Ireland and looking at the view. Two black sheep wander past them. The biologist says: "Look, the sheep in Ireland are black." The physicist corrects him: "There are black sheep in Ireland." "Absolutely not," says the mathematician, "In Ireland there are sheep that are black at least on one side."

Is the mathematician's claim, however rigorous and correct it may be, reasonable and useful in daily life? Of course not. In that sense, life is not mathematics. In life, even in ancient times, it is and was worthwhile and desirable to allow a lack of rigor, and even to allow errors, in order to achieve effectiveness. If a tiger's head can be seen above a bush, a man should not insist on being precise and saying that it has not been proven that the specific tiger has legs, but instead he had best distance himself from there as fast as he can.

We have claimed that the use of quantifiers and the interest in negatives or the reference to facts that cannot exist were not absorbed into the human brain during the evolutionary process and are not intuitive. Indirect evidence supporting this claim may be derived from studies that examined how many mathematical operations the human brain can perform consecutively. Calculations such as addition and subtraction can be performed one after the other almost without limit. A person can be asked to perform a long series of multiplications, additions, division, and so on, and if he manages to remember the order, for instance by discovering a pattern in it, he can internalize the instructions and develop intuition regarding the next operation. This does not apply to quantifiers and negation.

"Every dog has a collar that is not green." That statement uses three concepts of logic: *every*; *has*; and

is not. Studies have shown that even if someone can remember the order of the operations, the large number of quantifiers that the brain can absorb is seven. Beyond that, even the most capable person cannot assess the outcome of the operation. It is interesting that the limit to the number of logical operations the human brain can absorb is seven, the same number as the maximum number of elements that animals can identify (see section 2 above). Other indirect evidence is provided by the existence of certain individuals, some of them autistic and some with Asperger's syndrome, who can perform complex arithmetic calculations with amazing speed and accuracy. However no individuals have been found who can similarly perform complex logical operations. The reason is apparently that the ability to perform arithmetic calculations exists in the brain naturally and is strengthened disproportionately in people whose limitations do not allow them to develop other abilities. Logic is not one of those extreme abilities.

Why is it important to identify mathematical abilities that are innate by virtue of evolution and to identify other attributes that are not innate? Humans think intuitively, associatively, and it is possible and easy to develop intuition based on natural abilities. Abilities contained in the genes are easier to develop, nurture, and use. It is harder to do that with abilities that are not natural to the human species. The recognition that there is a distinction between those two types of mathematical operations and an understanding of the source of that distinction are important to the understanding and utilization of human thought. In the sections that follow, we will see how these differences are significant to the development of mathematics, and in the [last chapter](#) of the book, we will discuss the implications of recognizing these differences for teaching mathematics.

6. MATHEMATICS IN EARLY CIVILIZATIONS

In this section we will review the mathematics that developed in the Babylonian, Assyrian, and Egyptian kingdoms. We will also look at the mathematics that developed independently and somewhat later in the Chinese dynasties. Although this survey does not cover the mathematics created in those realms exhaustively, it does correctly reflect the type of mathematics that developed. In particular, we will see that its development clearly traces what we have called the evolutionary advantage. The advantages of mathematics not only afforded humans an advantage over other living beings, but they also gave advantages to societies that developed mathematics over others that did not. The societies that ruled were those that developed the most up-to-date mathematics and that used it to establish and expand their power.

Reference to numbers and arithmetic existed prior to the Babylonian and Egyptian civilizations, but there is no direct evidence about where this mathematics existed or its level of development. Based on those remote tribes discovered in the last few centuries whose languages included only the numbers 1, 2, 3, many, we may assume that the mathematics these remote tribes used was minimal. In contrast, in 1960 human bones were discovered in the Belgian Congo that were dated to 20,000 BCE, and on them were signs that archaeologists and anthropologists believe express counting up to and beyond the number twenty. Thus we may conclude that when man lived and developed in small groups, was nomadic, and subsisted mainly by hunting, he used and even developed simple mathematics, which we referred to in previous sections as giving an evolutionary advantage.

The Babylonian kingdom was a mighty one, certainly for its time. Its origins date back to 4700 BCE. Its culture was based on Sumerian culture. Later, the Akkadian civilization became predominant, leading to cultural, economic, and social progress. The Akkadian contribution is attributed mainly to King Hammurabi, who ruled around 1750 BCE and who is famous mainly through the Code

- [**Vanishing Girls book**](#)
- [**click Island of the Lost: Shipwrecked at the Edge of the World here**](#)
- [Erotic Drawings for free](#)
- [read To Have and Have Not](#)
- [**read online Analog Science Fiction and Fact \(July-August 2014\) here**](#)

- <http://dadhoc.com/lib/Vanishing-Girls.pdf>
- <http://berttrotman.com/library/Shooting-Movies-Without-Shooting-Yourself-in-the-Foot--Becoming-a-Cinematographer.pdf>
- <http://www.celebritychat.in/?ebooks/The-Inner-Reaches-of-Outer-Space--Metaphor-as-Myth-and-as-Religion.pdf>
- <http://growingsomeroots.com/ebooks/To-Have-and-Have-Not.pdf>
- <http://bestarthritiscare.com/library/Analog-Science-Fiction-and-Fact--July-August-2014-.pdf>