

Re: Goedel – interesting problem?

Source: <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2004–06/0733.html>

From: Acid Pooh (poohonlsd_at_yahoo.com)

Date: 06/10/04

Date: 9 Jun 2004 17:50:52 -0700

"Acme Diagnostics" <LFinezapthis@partpostmark.net> wrote in message news:<40c3585d\$0\$83331\$45beb828@newscene.com>...

<snip>

- >
- > *Upshot: If you can't explain it and defend it in cooperative dialog,*
- > *stop with the professor bit. This is the real–world. No privileged*
- > *positions here. Put up or shut up, etc. You don't win or cooperatively*
- > *analyze a chess game by telling your opponent to go read a book.*
- >
- > *>Without it, you'll just be drawn to whatever happens to*
- > *>tickle your ears, with no basis for distinguishing truth from fiction.*
- >
- > *Ditto. More kook talk. Explain or refrain!*

We're not here to explain Godel's theorem to you. To borrow your phrase, this is the real world. Nobody owes you an explanation. If you're interested in the theorem, you should get a good text book and learn the theorem. If you need help with that, I'm sure somebody here would be helpful enough to explain that bit to you. If you're not interested in doing that, that's fine too. Just don't waste our time.

You can be sure that no one who actually understands Godel's theorem learned its details on usenet.

- >
- > *Explain the effect of Goedel's theorem to a music major, etc., who has*
- > *never heard the name "Goedel" before in no more words than Kent used.*

That would be pretty pointless. All one could possibly communicate is fluff, even with 10 more words than Dolan used. Look, this is a place where people talk about logic, not what music majors think about logic.

- > *Make is *useful* in a wide–variety of argumentation, some only touching*
- > *upon Goedel in passing, and with the reader never having heard of*
- > *Goedel before. And don't forget I lifted the piece out of two posts*

sci.logic: Re: Goedel – interesting problem?

- > *long after the fact. He composed his version in no more time than he*
- > *would take with any two short newsgroup posts. Piece of cake, eh? All*
- > *you need to do that is a clear theoretical understanding of the*
- > *Theorem, eh?*

Godel's theorem is a technical result with very specific hypotheses. It will obviously only apply in a very small class of circumstances. With a clear understanding of the theorem, it is relatively easy to identify those circumstances in which Godel's theorem or a generalization thereof may apply.

<snip>

- > *If I did that, all would be*
- > *lost. But theory isn't enough, and make no mistake, that is the major*
- > *rub here, less so the article in question. Theory is subject to paradox*
- > *and incompleteness. That's what we're arguing about. That's the threat*
- > *that I represent to your and Torkel and probably others in this group.*
- >

You say drivel like this and have the gall to accuse others of being a kook? Wow. I've got to admit, I like your style, if nothing else. To start with, the incompleteness you mention is of a very specific sort. And its very well understood. How you got from arguing for a description of Godel's theorem for people with no attention span to this, I do not know. But your claim of being a "threat" is completely unfounded.

- > *But at the end of the day, we have to seek the facts as they are, not*
- > *as they should be. If you refuse to accept that, you will lose in the*
- > *eyes of the great majority and in the eyes of the people who matter*
- > *most. You will lose credibility.*

You might want to actually know what the facts actually are before you make statements like these. If you understood the theorem (and you could, with a few hours effort: read *The Philosophies of Mathematics* by George and Velleman for an accurate introduction), you would see that facts as they are. Nobody is going to make the effort for you.

'cid 'ooh