

Re: Goedel – interesting problem?

Source: <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2004–06/0439.html>

From: Acme Diagnostics (*LFinezapthis_at_partpostmark.net*)

Date: 06/07/04

Date: 6 Jun 2004 19:43:07 -0500

Chris Menzel <cmenzel@remove–this.tamu.edu> wrote:

>On 6 Jun 2004 13:09:18 -0500, Acme Diagnostics

><LFinezapthis@partpostmark.net> said:

>> [Lots of stuff...]

I made a major error in my last reply. I criticized your technical explanation in terms of the intended reader's comprehension. In fact, I should have cast it in terms of my own ignorance and invoked the judgement of credentials to cure that. Probably a meaningless distinction to you, but important to me.

>*I think productive interchange is at an end. Aside from the fact that you can't refrain from insults*

There are subtly implied and direct insults. I greatly despise the former, usually enjoy the latter. Right, I was thinking I had gone overboard and should have edited the post for that instead of just adding the blurb at the bottom. I apologize. I belong to humor groups where insults are only funny. I'll take a look at that.

>*when sincere responses get too technical
>for your tastes,*

See, you can be funny too. That **is** funny. I can stand outside and laugh at myself. But my Usenet housekeeping job is flaming pretentious dorks. Now that wouldn't work too well if I became one myself, would it?

What have you posted here that hasn't been posted 100 times before? OTOH, I post a lot of original material and keep a tally of it, and anyone on Usenet with half a brain can understand all of my posts, as in marketing. Nobody is left out. Nobody is made to feel inferior. Nobody is made to think their opinions are less worthy for lack of a phd. Good thing most people don't do that, but still we are underrepresented. I post it in hopes of critical review prior to publishing review. Most of it stands without serious rebuttal, disagreement, flaming, etc. (as with kookdom). It's the main

sci.logic: Re: Goedel – interesting problem?

reason most people put up with my antics.

*>you are clearly not going to be persuaded away from a
>view I find patently absurd: that obscure, amateurish, and demonstrably
>incorrect statements*

I have no problem with that, especially the incorrect statements. I've posted too much about that to repeat. But you seem to think you are immune. Your opinion carries exactly as much weight as mine. You haven't figured that out yet, evidently by your one-liners and characterizations.

One more time on "rely." By relying on judgement of credentials for technical validity (appropriately approximate for editing requirements) there is a probability of being wrong. You could be right, the author could be wrong. But only an evaluation of your credentials could change that probability very much in my POV. Judging those is a great deal of work and you haven't helped (there are ways to do it unpretentiously). Nobody here has given me a reason to even google their nic. OTOH the very first post I read of the article author's blew me out of my chair, and more-or-less consistently since then.

I've taken plenty of hits for claiming my ignorance, but you still have not acknowledged either the obvious editing component of "Masterpiece of explanatory text" or intended reader after several rounds and constant reminders. You are in denial about that. Until you do, little you say could persuade me, and in that sense you are correct. You cannot make that move for the reason I gave in the last post. That often happens in chess. The opponent resigns because the only move left loses. And here you are disengaging, but maybe for the reason you give.

*>that purport to be expressions of clear
>mathematical theorems somehow nonetheless manage accurately to convey
>the essential content of those theorems to their readers.*

You still have a naive view of logic, like I had in my teens. Logic is hard. The few books are important in the beginning, but become trivial in the greater scheme of things. The hardest academic logic subject is applied statistics. That's at the other end of logic.

*> So it really
>seems to me that both of us have better things to do.*

Not me. Talking to people who think differently is most rewarding. Publishing your ideas for criticism is crucial. As opposed to you, evidently, I read and thought about every word you said. I learned from talking to you, I just don't know exactly what yet. I don't think very fast on that level, and it wasn't easy.

>Best of luck,

Re: Goedel – interesting problem?

sci.logic: Re: Goedel – interesting problem?

Same here. Perhaps someday we will meet again under more pleasant circumstances. No doubt we have interests in common and share many opinions as well.

I'm sure you are a very good programmer. Nothing I said about that means anything. You have a good handle on theoretical logic from what I can tell. But these are skills. I used to be a concert organist, and that has a pretty hard skill component too. Skills are great, but they're intellectually easy, especially math and symbolic logic. The knowledge is spoon fed in a textbook. X hours of practice, Y learned. With the right books, X minutes, Y learned. But there's creative reasoning too (hopefully not too creative) and you can't find it in a book, by definition. Probably the biggest part of that is editing, aka sitting in the dark room, but which has an artistic component (which I lack) that you can't learn in a book, again by definition. The skills are part of the meta-logic foundation, but only a part of that, even.

Larry