The Constructibility Principle

Michael Aaron Cody

Bachelor of Science, Independent Theorist (Port St. Lucie, FL, the United States)
E-mail: Mac92contact@gmail.com
https://orcid.org/0009-0002-5218-4772

Cody, Michael Aaron (2026) The Constructibility Principle. *Philosophy of Cosmology,* Volume 36, 125-134. https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/36/3

The issue with current scientific models is that many models are speculative or paradoxical constructions central to philosophy of cosmology. The Constructibility Principle in this paper introduces a demarcation criterion. Essentially, what cannot be built cannot be claimed. Something that is to be built means realizable through logical or mathematical construction, symbolic or computational simulation, or operational and physical procedure. Unlike typical mere imaginability, Constructibility requires an explicit path by which typical models could in principle be tested. The principle is broadly applied to most philosophy paradoxes, to speculative cosmological works such as eternal inflation, many-worlds interpretations, and anthropic reasoning, and possibly to problems in artificial intelligence. Situated in the history of demarcation debates, from constructivist mathematics and operational definitions to falsifiability. The proposal does not close inquiry, but provides a systematic filter that could clarify boundaries, harden reasoning for imaginative narratives.

Keywords: Philosophy of Science, Demarcation Problem, Reality Filter, Constructibility

Received: 24 September 2025 / Accepted: 8 December 2025 / Published: 1 February 2026

Introduction

Modern contemporary philosophy of cosmology commonly has a persistent problem of demarcation. Most models of the early universe and also of large-scale structure generally extend from beyond the reach of observation. Generally, eternal inflation creates an interpretation of the universe that cannot be directly tested (Ellis, 2014:7). The vast ideas for world interpretation of quantum mechanics cause a logically coherent branching of thought structures, but offer little to no operational procedures by which other structures could be realized (Tegmark, 2014: 212). Anthropic reasoning typically treats our own cosmic observations as a selection effect, yet provides no constructive interpretation or method for determining when such reasoning yield explanatory power and when it reduces to tautology (Barrow, 1998:145) These kinds of examples usually show why philosophers and cosmologists still continue to ask the same thing, what really separates a scientific model from only a speculative story. The older tools of philosophy have not really fixed this problem. Popper's idea of falsifiability depends on a model being open to refutation, but that rule falls apart when the models place their claims into domains that no kind of observation can ever touch (Popper, 1959: 41). Lakatos made use of the idea of research programmes, often pointing to how they grow forward or else break down, but he never really gave an answer for what to do with models that might stay permanently outside of test (Lakatos, 1970: 95). Laudan later said that the whole search for a universal demarcation line was misguided, recommending instead that science should be judged more by its history of reliability, but in cosmology this kind of answer usually abandons the very boundary questions that make the field so distinctive (Laudan, 1983: 112). Because of this, there still seems to be a need for some kind of more modest filter. The Constructibility Principle is one way of putting forward such a filter. The claim itself is very direct, what cannot be built cannot be claimed. To build in this sense usually means one of three broad paths, either some kind of logical or mathematical construction, or a symbolic or computational simulation, or an operational and physical procedure that can be carried out. The aim here is not to legislate what reality is, but only to discipline how claims are made so they can count as admissible. A theory may of course be imagined, but unless it shows some real path where its parts could be built or simulated or carried out without incoherence, it still remains outside the area of what can be accepted as an existence claim. History gives the same kind of direction. Parmenides argued that thought and being must go together, cutting away appeals to what cannot even be meant (Kirk et al., 1983: 247). Kant said that objects of knowledge need the conditions of possible experience to even be framed (Kant, 1787/1998: Bxviii). Brouwer said mathematics is built in constructive intuition, and Bridgman said physics must be tied to the operations by which it is measured (Brouwer, 1912: 82; Bridgman, 1927: 5). Hilbert wanted to formalize mathematics fully, but Gödel came in to show that both consistency and completeness could not live together inside arithmetic (Hilbert, 1902: 443; Gödel, 1931: 175). These episodes all circle around the same point, imagination alone is never enough, procedure is always required. Placed in the setting of contemporary cosmology, the Constructibility Principle works as a kind of practical tool. It does not ban or reject speculative models, but it helps clarify their standing. A multiverse proposal only passes if it names surrogate paths that can be tested inside observable physics. A computational model only passes if it points to the procedure behind its results. A time loop fails whenever its steps cannot be closed. The purpose here is to show how the Constructibility Principle can function as a demarcation tool across philosophy, cosmology, and artificial intelligence, while keeping the style simple enough that editors, referees, and also students can make use of it.

1. The Constructibility Principle

The Constructibility Principle can be stated pretty directly like this: what counts as admissible claims about existence are generally bounded by constructibility. What cannot be built cannot be claimed. The scope of this principle is mostly epistemic, not really ontological. It does not try to legislate what ultimately exists in the universe. It instead works to discipline what human beings may responsibly assert in philosophy, science, and mathematics. To claim that only constructible things exist would definitely overreach the mark. The present suggestion is much more modest: when making assertions about reality, one should usually accompany them with a constructive path of some kind. A claim without such a path generally belongs to imagination, metaphor, or fiction, not to the domain of reasoned existence claims that we can actually work with. The principle generally functions as a demarcation tool that helps sort things out. It helps distinguish claims that can enter discourse as legitimate from those that remain speculative narratives without much grounding. The requirement of constructibility can usually be expressed as four gates, each working as a threshold that filters claims in a systematic way. *Awareness Gate:* A claim must be articulable in coherent terms that make some kind of sense. Statements that dissolve into contradiction at the level of meaning cannot advance further down the line. For example, "square circle" fails because it is conceptually incoherent from the start. This is not yet really a question of construction but of minimal intelligibility that any claim needs to have. *Expression Gate:* A claim must be expressible in symbolic, logical, or operational form rather than just vague language. Vague imagery or metaphor does not usually suffice here for scientific purposes. For instance, asserting that "there exists an essence beyond essence" may serve poetic ends but fails as a philosophical or scientific claim without symbolic articulation that can be worked with. *Reality Test:* A claim must generally be accompanied by a constructive path showing how it could in principle be realized, simulated, or measured in some concrete way. In mathematics, this typically means a constructive proof or algorithm that can be carried out. In physics, it usually means operational definitions, surrogate observations, or simulations tied to measurable invariants that connect to the real world. In computation it means reproducible algorithms or procedures that actually work. *Recursive Closure:* The constructive path itself must not rely on non-constructible or question-begging steps that lead nowhere. Procedures that collapse into infinite regress or contradiction disqualify themselves from consideration. A time loop in which causation relies entirely on its own effect fails here, because it cannot provide a closed and non-circular construction that actually resolves the problem. The gates generally form a hierarchy of failure points where different kinds of problems show up. Some claims collapse at the level of meaning, others at the level of expression, others at the level of realizability, others at the level of recursion. Together, they provide a systematic filter for admissibility that can be applied consistently. This kind of discipline has deep precedents in philosophy that go way back. Brouwer's intuitionism identified mathematical existence with constructive intuition, though it also rested on a rejection of the law of excluded middle that went beyond simple construction (Brouwer, 1912: 82). Bridgman's operationalism held that physical concepts gain meaning only through the operations that measure them, not as free abstractions floating around (Bridgman, 1927: 5). Hilbert's programme aimed to formalize all of mathematics completely, while Gödel's incompleteness theorems showed that no sufficiently strong system can be both complete and consistent at the same time (Hilbert, 1902: 443; Gödel, 1931: 175). These episodes do not directly endorse the present principle but they illustrate the recurring insight that coherence and construction are usually prerequisites for legitimate existence claims that can be taken seriously. Applied to cosmology, the principle generally separates models that can articulate constructive paths from those that cannot really do so. A multiverse theory that provides indirect observational surrogates, such as statistical signatures preserved in the cosmic microwave background, has admissible standing because it connects to something measurable. One that only multiplies universes without such links remains narrative rather than science. A computational model that specifies the procedures grounding its outputs is usually admissible because you can check the work. One that generates fluent sentences without constructive grounding is not really doing science. A perpetual motion machine is imaginable and sounds appealing but fails the Reality Test because no constructive path can be given within known physics that actually works. The justification for constructibility as a demarcation tool is usually straightforward once you think about it. Other standards, such as empirical adequacy or explanatory power, generally presuppose that a model has first cleared the threshold of constructibility. A claim without a constructive path cannot even be evaluated for adequacy or explanatory force because there is nothing concrete to evaluate. Constructibility therefore functions as a precondition rather than a competitor to other philosophical virtues that people care about. Constructibility does not foreclose speculation at all, which would be a mistake. It clarifies the status of speculation. Speculative models remain valuable for exploring possibilities, but they gain epistemic weight only when they supply constructive procedures that can be followed. The principle is modest in scope yet strong in effect when applied consistently. It disciplines the boundary between imagination and admissible assertion, and in doing so provides a filter that philosophers, cosmologists, and computational theorists can apply in practice without too much difficulty.

2. Applications

The power of the Constructibility Principle shows up when you use it on cases where researchers or students genuinely do not know what counts as real science and what is just narrative. Its value is not about abstract ideals, but about how it cuts through confusion across different fields. The four gates of the principle apply to philosophy, logic, cosmology, artificial intelligence, and creative work. Examples show how the principle can root out wild claims while still allowing creative models with clear, logical paths. Paradoxes work well here because they push the boundaries of reasoning, and they make natural test cases for the framework. The liar paradox ("this sentence is false") shows how limits on self-reference and truth go beyond simple word games. Truth needs logical references, not constant defined languages that allow unrestricted self-reference, which is the heart of the real problem. The perspective of the principle is that paradoxes demonstrate that no constructive procedures can withstand its truth value across recursive testing, which exposes that something lies deeper. The reality is not that constructibility replaces semantic procedural analysis, but that it demonstrates why the paradox resists admissibility in the first place. The absence of a stable, constructive path can prevent it from being just an imaginative structure into something you can apply and work with. Infinite regress arguments struggle in a relation that shows the same pattern. A regress regarding causes with no structural anchor cannot be closed constructively; the thought chain creates an unresolvable procedure, failing the Recursive Closure gate every time. Regress that can be shown in a finite, recursive procedure could be admissible, but unbounded regressions can still collapse into non-constructability. These cases show how constructability complements traditional logical analysis by putting attention on procedural closure rather than just formal consistency. Cosmology is a focused field for constructibility because many theories go beyond empirical and logical reasoning, making it urgently needed in a field that is constantly expanding. The principle provides a systematic way to distinguish admissible models from speculative narratives that might sound overtly sophisticated but cannot logically back themselves. *Eternal Inflation:* Eternal inflation is mathematically consistent and produces a spread of bubble universes through clear mechanisms. The problem is that almost all of it sits beyond what we can ever observe. Under the principle, a model like this needs at least one constructive path before it can stand as a real claim. Those paths have to do more than check out mathematically. Surrogate observations must give measurable invariants. Simulations have to be tied to actual physics, not loose analogies, and the structure should offer potential falsifiers if those surrogates fail. Without some link to anything testable, eternal inflation stays an imaginative story, not an admissible claim (Ellis, 2014: 7). *The Measure Problem:* The measure problem hits eternal inflation as soon as you accept its basic setup. You have an infinite ensemble, and every outcome happens infinitely many times, so assigning probabilities becomes unclear. Under the principle, the standard is simple, if a measure cannot give finite, testable probabilities through a constructive procedure, the model fails the Reality Test no matter how strong the math looks. Calling on an undefined infinity is not building anything. It drops straight into non-constructibility. This makes the issue structural, not just technical. A theory without a constructible measure is not admissible because it cannot ground any real evaluation. *Many-Worlds Interpretation:* The many-worlds interpretation is logically consistent, but it has no constructive way to access or test any branch outside our own. Supporters usually point to decoherence as the path that might fix this. Decoherence is a real, constructible process you can model, but it only explains why branches separate. It doesn't give a way to check across them, which is the part that matters. Without some kind of constructive closure that lets the branches be tested or even simulated beyond a story level, the claim that "all branches exist" stays unconstructible (Tegmark, 2014: 212). *Anthropic Reasoning:* Anthropic arguments often sound convincing because they use observer selection to explain why the universe looks the way it does. But unless that selection process can be given a constructive form that leads to testable consequences, the reasoning drifts into a tautology. I see conditions that allow me to exist because otherwise I wouldn't be here to see them. Under the principle, an anthropic claim has to show the procedure that turns a selection effect into something observable. If it cannot do that, it becomes a placeholder that looks explanatory but does no real work (Barrow, 1998: 145). *Time Loops and Non-Constructible Infinities:* Time-loop models and proposals with unbounded infinities run into the Recursive Closure Gate. Even strong mathematics can fail here, general relativity allows closed timelike curves under certain conditions, and those loops are constructible in the math. The principle does not deny that, it asks whether the loop holds together once you add quantum rules and thermodynamic limits. If the full set of constraints cannot be closed in a constructive way, the model stays at risk of collapse no matter how elegant it looks. An infinite regress of universes has the same issue. Without a constructive anchor for the causal chain, the regress drops straight into non-constructibility. These cases are not filtered out by a particular selection. They fail because they cannot deliver constructive closure at the levels needed for physical realization. The strength of the principle in cosmology is that it is neutral. It does not ban speculation or push any interpretation, it just asks for constructive grounding. Eternal inflation with defined surrogates and measurable consequences can stand. Eternal inflation without them cannot. The principle gives editors, referees, and researchers a tool lighter than strict falsifiability but more disciplined than free imagination. That matters in fields where direct tests are out of reach but systematic evaluation is still required. It also helps structure discipline for LLM machine reasoning. Large language models can generate fluent text with strong surface structure. At the syntax level, the outputs are constructive because algorithms produce them through clear steps. Semantic constructibility is different. An output only becomes admissible when it maps to a reproducible, operational procedure a proof step, a verified algorithm, or an experiment that can actually be run. Without that mapping, the output stays surface fluency, not real reasoning. This lets researchers separate grounded computation from ungrounded machine claims as AI systems get better at mimicking human logic. The principle also applies to creative systems. Imagination is fine in its own world under its own terms, but fictional worlds can be internally consistent and compelling without being constructible, and there is nothing wrong with that. A fantasy universe with perpetual motion works in a story but fails the Reality Test in science. The principle keeps those domains separate. It lets creativity run while stopping conceptual confusion about what counts as an admissible existence claim. It also gives students a simple way to test ideas through the four gates and see how speculation gets grounded before it becomes part of structured inquiry.

3. Discussion

The Constructibility Principle needs to be set against the older attempts to solve the demarcation problem. It does not claim to replace those earlier criteria, it tries to show where they work, where they don't, and to give a lighter filter that actually does something. Three comparisons matter the most. Falsifiability. Research programmes. And non-empirical theory assessment. Popper argued that scientific theories must be falsifiable. A theory has to make predictions that could actually be shot down by observation (Popper, 1959: 41). The strength there is obvious, it is simple, and it forces a theory to take real risks. The weakness shows up fast in cosmology. Many models push into places where no observation can reach at all through indirect data versus direct empirical data. Multiverse proposals, anthropic claims, and many-worlds interpretations all have trouble finding any decisive way they could be proven wrong. So, there is now a growing literature of "untestable" science that sounds sophisticated but goes nowhere. The Constructibility Principle approaches the same general convention, but from another angle. It does not ask first if a model can be falsified. The principle asks if it supplies any constructive path that can be used or followed. That difference matters a lot. A claim can be falsifiable in theory but not constructible in practice. A statement like "there exists a sibling universe whose signals will never reach us" is falsifiable only in theory if such signals could exist, but it is not constructible because no procedure can be offered for realization or simulation. Constructibility becomes the precondition. If a model cannot be constructively articulated, then there is nothing to falsify, at the same time, constructibility alone does not make a theory legitimate. A constructible model can still be unfalsifiable in practice. The two criteria work together, with constructibility setting admissibility and falsifiability adding strength when available. Lakatos tried to fix the problems of falsifiability by looking instead at the history of research programmes (Lakatos, 1970: 95). A programme is progressive when it generates new predictions and degenerating when it leans on ad hoc moves that sound good but do not actually work. The strength of that approach is that it mirrors what scientists do in the real world. The difficulty in cosmology is that many programmes stay permanently non-testable. Eternal inflation may be progressive in theory, but it cannot show progress empirically if no constructive procedures ever appear. The Constructibility Principle cuts through this confusion. A programme without a constructive path cannot demonstrate progress in the same sense as one that does. Theoretical expansion may continue, and Lakatos was right that such expansion is part of scientific growth. Constructibility does not reject that but simply clarifies the limits. It distinguishes formal elaboration from admissible progress by requiring that constructive procedures eventually show up. In that way, the principle does not reject Lakatos's framework. It supplements it with a baseline that separates provisional expansion from grounded advance. More recently, Dawid argued that fields like string theory may need non-empirical theory assessment (Dawid, 2013: 11). He identified three main criteria. The *No Alternatives Argument (NAA)* says that when a research programme has no genuine competitors, its viability gains indirect support. The

Unexpected Explanatory Coherence (UEA) criterion focuses on cases where a theory built for one purpose unexpectedly removes the curtain of another field, giving it illumination. The *Meta-Inductive Argument (MIA)* points to historical success in similar strategies to justify confidence in present untested work (Dawid, 2013: 17–23). These criteria try to deal with the gap that appears when direct empirical test is absent. Their limitation is that they move justification into sociological or historical territory instead of concrete procedures. NAA risks circular reasoning by treating the absence of alternatives as confirmation even when no constructive procedures exist. UEA and MIA depend on retrospective judgments of coherence and past success, but neither ensures that current claims admit constructive realization. As Ellis and Silk (2014: 322) warned, these approaches can blur the line between science and speculation if they allow consensus or explanatory fit to replace admissible procedures. Constructibility does not deny Dawid's criteria. It reframes them. NAA, UEA, and MIA may all offer secondary support, but they only gain real epistemic force after a constructive path has been supplied. Constructibility is the more basic filter and comes first, it doesn't weigh sociological judgment. It requires that any claim provides a constructive path, whether logical, computational, or operational, before coherence, consensus, or historical analogy can add weight. Theories that clear the constructibility threshold can then be evaluated further using Dawid's criteria. Theories that fail remain outside admissible discourse. *Too Restrictive:* One objection is that constructibility sets the bar too high and cuts out speculative work that might still be valuable. The principle doesn't seek to dimmish thought. Speculation is still welcome, but a claim does not gain any real ontological weight until some kind of constructive procedure is actually given. The principle disciplines the way people talk about these ideas without shutting down imaginative exploration that might eventually lead somewhere useful. *Limits Creativity:* Another objection might say that the principle might squeeze creativity in ways that people don't want. But creativity usually grows better under some structure than under total freedom. Artists and scientists generally tend to produce their best work inside constraints that give their ideas form. Constructibility does not narrow invention, it just clarifies what counts as an existence claim. It applies to admissibility in philosophy and science, not to the full range of human thought. *Gödel's Theorems:* Another objection can say that some truths might exist that cannot be constructed or proved within a system, as Gödel showed (Gödel, 1931: 175). Would the principle end up excluding those kinds of truths? The reply is that constructibility is epistemic, not metaphysical. The principle doesn't legislate reality or the thought of it. It only governs what counts as an admissible claim in discourse. If a truth exists but cannot yet be given any constructive procedure, then it stays outside admissible claim until further articulation appears. That is a limit of human reasoning, not a limit of reality itself. *String Theory Landscape: S*tring theory has generated an enormous "landscape" of possible vacuum states, with estimates reaching something like 10^500 solutions (Susskind, 2007: 247; Polchinski, 2004: 6). The sheer size of that landscape creates a real methodological problem. If every set of low-energy parameters can appear somewhere, then the predictive power of the theory starts collapsing into almost nothing. Supporters often fall back on anthropic reasoning, saying that only vacua compatible with life will ever be observed, or on meta-inductive arguments that past success in related research traditions should count for something. But from the standpoint of the Constructibility Principle, the challenge is sharper and more direct. Unless procedures can be given for actually constructing or simulating which vacua count as admissible and which do not, the whole framework risks collapsing into straight non-constructibility. Just listing a huge space of possibilities does not cross the Reality Test if there is no constructive closure that actually works. A good contrast is Steven

Weinberg's anthropic argument for the cosmological constant. In 1987, he argued that if the constant were much larger, galaxies would not form at all, and observers would never appear. This created a bounded range that ended up being close to what was later found when dark energy was detected (Weinberg, 1987: 2607). From the standpoint of constructibility, this shows that anthropic reasoning can sometimes be admissible when it lays out procedures that give testable ranges. But these cases are rare exceptions. In most situations, anthropic appeals function as placeholders with no constructive closure. It is worth pointing out that some theorists have tried statistical weighting of vacua or algorithmic rules for vacuum selection. These attempts are meant to supply constructive procedures, but they are still incomplete and do not yet give finite, testable outcomes. From the standpoint of constructibility, these efforts are promising but still provisional. Until they produce closed procedures, the landscape stays unconstructible. The principle makes this distinction clear. Anthropic selection can only act as a constructive procedure when it closes into testable consequences. Otherwise, the whole idea of "life-permitting vacua" stays an imaginative narrative. Constructibility disciplines this domain by pushing theorists beyond simple enumeration or sociological justification and toward procedures that actually show how string vacua map onto admissible physical states. The strength of the Constructibility Principle is its modesty. It does not overload science with universal rules, it also does not abandon demarcation altogether. It gives a criterion that is practical, teachable, and ready to use. In real practice, scientists, referees, and editors already treat unconstructive theories as weaker, but those judgments are uneven and subjective. The novelty of the Constructibility Principle is that it makes that implicit norm systematic and transparent. It gives a clear framework that works across philosophy, cosmology, and computation. Teachers can use the principle to show students why some elegant stories stay outside admissible discourse. Referees can apply it in a consistent way when facing speculative models. Constructibility becomes a lighter but stronger filter. It channels inquiry toward articulation that can actually be realized. And by doing that, it gives philosophy of cosmology a practical tool for handling the unique methodological problems of the field.

4. Conclusions

The Constructibility Principle as described can be viewed simply as what cannot be built cannot be claimed. When engaging with the principle it becomes clear that it's not a metaphysical law, but an epistemic filter. It disciplines what generally may be admitted into discourse, without presuming to legislate what ultimately exists. The core strength of the principle lies in its modesty, setting a threshold that claims must include constructive paths. Letting paths take different perspectives of forms for different domains. In mathematics they can mean proofs or algorithms. It can be applied to physics that correlate to different operational definitions, surrogate observations or simulations tied to measurable invariants. In computations they mean reproducible and grounded procedures. Constructibility therefore takes many domain specific forms, but all share a common requirement of explicit constructive procedures. This shared logic gives the principle its coherence across different fields without wiping out their differences. Universality here doesn't mean identical standards everywhere. It means that all domains share a demand for constructive procedures that fit their practice. A mathematical proof and a physical experiment look different, but both satisfy the same basic requirement: they supply clear paths by which claims can be admitted into discourse. This shared logic gives the principle its coherence across disciplines. Cosmology shows why such a criterion is needed. Eternal inflation, many-worlds interpretations, and anthropic reasoning all extend beyond ordinary testability. The Constructibility Principle doesn't solve their technical challenges, but it clarifies their standing. A model may be coherent or mathematically consistent, but unless it supplies constructive procedures it lacks admissible status. This diagnostic role is precisely what philosophy of cosmology requires: a systematic way to separate open problems from speculative narrative. The principle also travels beyond cosmology. It helps clarify paradoxes in logic, distinguishes grounded from ungrounded outputs in artificial intelligence, and provides education with a practical tool for teaching the boundaries of admissible claims. The cross-domain reach demonstrates robustness, while cosmology remains the anchor where the need is most acute. The novelty of the Constructibility Principle is not that it invents a completely new practice. Scientists, referees, and editors already sense when models lack constructive grounding, but judgments are often uneven. Nowhere is this more visible than in cosmology, where referees divide on whether speculative models count as science. The value of constructibility is that it makes the filter systematic, explicit, and consistent. It enables shared evaluation across cases where intuition diverges most sharply. In this sense the principle is not a terminus but a threshold. By requiring constructive paths, it strengthens reasoning while leaving space for future articulation. It clarifies boundaries without foreclosing inquiry. What cannot be built cannot yet be claimed, but what may be built tomorrow remains open. This principle provides a contribution to ongoing debates in the philosophy of cosmology by clarifying admissibility standards for speculative models such as eternal inflation and many-worlds interpretations.

🕮 References

Barrow, J. D. (1998) *Impossibility: The Limits of Science and the Science of Limits*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Bridgman, P. W. (1927) *The Logic of Modern Physics.* Macmillan: New York.

Brouwer, L. E. J. (1912) Intuitionism and formalism. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 20(2), 81–96.

Dawid, R. (2013) *String Theory and the Scientific Method.* Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Ellis, G. F. R. and Silk, J. (2014) Defend the integrity of physics. *Nature*, 516(7531), 321–323.

Ellis, G. F. R. (2014) On the philosophy of cosmology. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics*, 46, 5–23.

Gödel, K. (1931) Über formal unentscheidbare Sätze der Principia Mathematica und verwandter Systeme I. *Monatshefte für Mathematik und Physik,* 38, 173–198.

Hilbert, D. (1902) Mathematical problems. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 8(10), 437–479.

Kant, I. (1787/1998) *Critique of Pure Reason.* Trans. P. Guyer and A. W. Wood. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Kirk, G. S., Raven, J. E. and Schofield, M. (1983) *The Presocratic Philosophers* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Lakatos, I. (1970) Falsification and the methodology of scientific research programmes. In: *Lakatos, I. and Musgrave, A. (eds.), Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge* (pp. 91–196). Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Laudan, L. (1983) The demise of the demarcation problem. *Proceedings of the Biennial Meeting of the Philosophy of Science Association*, 1983(2), 111–127.

Polchinski, J. (2004) *The cosmological constant and the string landscape.* arXiv:hep-th/0404271.

Popper, K. (1959) *The Logic of Scientific Discovery.* Hutchinson: London.

Susskind, L. (2007) The anthropic landscape of string theory. In: *Carr, B. (ed.), Universe or Multiverse?* Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Tegmark, M. (2014) *Our Mathematical Universe.* Knopf: New York.

Weinberg, S. (1987) Anthropic bound on the cosmological constant. *Physical Review Letters*, 59(22), 2607–2610.