

## Re: True = [ proven | provable ]

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2005-01/1448.html>

---

**From:** |-/erc (h\_at\_r.c)

**Date:** 01/18/05

Date: Tue, 18 Jan 2005 11:21:13 +1000

"George Cox" <george\_coxanti@spambtinternet.com.invalid> wrote in

> |-/erc wrote:

>>

>> *Mathematicians don't need the word true.*

>>

>> *For "I think its true" say "I think its provable".*

>

> *Mathematicians don't need "I think".*

try it some time!

>

>>

>> *For "G is true" say "G is proven"*

>

> *In systems that contain a modest amount of number theory, "true" and*

> *"provable" are not co-extensive.*

You see, I proved my assertion that True = [ proven | provable ]

You all just stated yours and said.. believe this!

Hence True = [ proven | provable ] is TRUE, your claims to knowledge of the underpinnings of universal mathematics is complete waste of bandwidth. The fact none of you can agree on what incompleteness is and we get 1,000 different explanations suggests maybe you should examine your axioms and get it straight? Nobody can argue with spaghetti!

AGAIN: TRUE is not an existential, its only part of this predicate KNOW\_IT'S\_TRUE which means PROOF. They are synonyms par future / past tense, provable / proven.

TRUTH is just timeless provability. NOW THINK THIS TIME.... WHO SAYS ITS TRUE??.

HOW DO THEY KNOW ITS TRUE? there's no central platonic plane stating....

"this is true, this is true, this is true", its a collective hologam of the sentient life forms that read it. YOU CANNOT STATE SOMETHING IS ABSOLUTELY TRUE without proof. HOW COULD YOU KNOW?

Herc

Re: True = [ proven | provable ]