

Re: Penrose vs the Robot

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2005-11/msg00622.html>

- *From:* "Rupert" <rupertmccallum@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 24 Nov 2005 18:16:22 -0800
-

Daryl McCullough wrote:

> Rupert says...

>

>>Daryl McCullough wrote:

>>> Rupert says...

>>>

>>>> If you consider the "Godel sentence for Penrose"

>>>>

>>>> G \leftrightarrow Penrose does not unassailably believe G

>>>>

>>>> then Penrose cannot consistently maintain his soundness

>>>> with respect to sentences such as G.

>>>

>>>>This sentence leads to paradox.

>>>

>>> No, it doesn't.

>

>>The reason Penrose "can't make sense" of the sentence is that he argues

>>about it to himself and gets into contradictions, same as with the liar

>>paradox.

>

> Yes, it certainly has similarities with the liar paradox, but in

> contrast with the liar paradox, it isn't a paradox. It doesn't

> lead to a contradiction. For Penrose to *believe* it leads to

> a contradiction, but for the sentence to be *true* doesn't lead

> to a contradiction.

>

> So, yes, it is like the liar paradox, except that it isn't a paradox.

>

The contradiction only appears at the level of Penrose's belief system,

so it's not as startling. However, when Penrose reasons about this

sentence, he almost certainly will get himself into contradictions. I

think that's a good enough reason to call the sentence paradoxical.

> --

> Daryl McCullough

> Ithaca, NY

- *Follow-Ups:*
 - ◆ **Re: Penrose vs the Robot**
 - ◇ *From:* Stephen Harris
 - ◆ **Re: Penrose vs the Robot**
 - ◇ *From:* Daryl McCullough

- *References:*
 - ◆ **Penrose vs the Robot**
 - ◇ *From:* Daryl McCullough
 - ◆ **Re: Penrose vs the Robot**
 - ◇ *From:* Rupert
 - ◆ **Re: Penrose vs the Robot**
 - ◇ *From:* Daryl McCullough

- Prev by Date: **Re: Help with a problem**
- Next by Date: **Re: Help with a problem**
- Previous by thread: **Re: Penrose vs the Robot**
- Next by thread: **Re: Penrose vs the Robot**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**