

Re: Godel's comments about the "true reason" for incompleteness

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2008-03/msg01282.html>

- *From:* MoeBlee <jazzmobe@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 18 Mar 2008 10:24:08 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Mar 17, 4:40 pm, "R. Srinivasan" <sradh...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Mar 17, 10:34 pm, MoeBlee <jazzm...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:> On Mar 15, 10:18 am, "R. Srinivasan" <sradh...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

After all,
there is no way for a powerless individual like me to change
human
nature. But sooner or later, the farcical nature of this state of
affairs will become clear to everybody and hopefully some
one of a
suitable stature and integrity will break away from the status
quo and
seriously consider my contribution.

Yes, you are a great revolutionary thinker, and not until some other
great revolutionary thinker who also happens to have a research grant
comes along will mankind ever be free from the cave of ignorance.

Why don't you just answer the point I have made?

Because whatever point you think you made there does not interest me,
especially as your argument for it is so confused. But what did
interest me is the passage I quoted.

Earlier your
objection was that you don't know what NAFL means.

You keep talking about "NAFL theories" and I keep asking for a
definition of 'T is an NAFL theory'.

Re: Godel's comments about the "true reason" for incompleteness

I will attempt to
address that soon.

Good. In the meantime, when you go off describing yourself as poor
widdle misunderstood leader of mankind from ignorance if only for an
official pat on the back from a real live heavyweight mathematician,
then I'll feel free to ridicule that.

But this post makes a point that does not invoke
NAFL.

It invokes confusion.

Why can't I find a straightforward individual from amongst your
peers, someone who will engage me in a honest debate?

Debate what? One cannot debate nonsense.

What is the
point in denying credit to an individual for legitimate work that he
has done,

Who said you should be denied any credit for any work you're done?

even if one ignores the unethical and petty nature of such
an enterprise?

What unethical and petty enterprise are you referring to?

I can understand and rationalize the existence of a few
individuals (e.g. closer to home) who are of this nature, but the
academic world seems to have mass-produced clones of this breed.

Right. Because people are not impressed with your work, it must be
that they are mass-produced clones. God forbid you countenance that
each individual is not impressed with your work based on that
individual having come to that conclusion himself.

Re: Godel's comments about the "true reason" for incompleteness

The "true reason" for incompleteness is that Godel overreached beyond the boundaries of first-order logic.

What are you talking about? Do you contend that the proof is not formalizable in PRA or Robinson arithmetic or PA or even Z set theory – all first order theories.

You might ask, what is the objection to second-order logic, why not formally admit propositions which quantify over "all" propositions?

Who objected to second order logic?

Take the assertion that "From a contradiction, an arbitrary proposition follows", or, say,

$P \& \sim P \longrightarrow Q$, (*)

Let us take P to be fixed in (*), and consider this proposition for arbitrary Q. Obviously there is an implied quantification over Q,

If 'Q' is a sentence letter, then it is not quantified over in the language. (Of course, the meta-language may quantify over sentence letters of the object language).

If 'Q' is a meta-variable in the meta-language, then it is not quantified over in the meta-language (if the meta-language is first order).

if
we want to convey that "all" propositions follow from a contradiction. If we admit (*) as a formal proposition in the same language which we are considering the notion of "all" propositions (e.g. PA), then clearly (*) is an impredicative construction, for the quantification must include (*) as well in its domain.

IF we admit it thus then it's a problem. But we DON'T. The assertion that all sentences follow from a contradiction is not made in the object language but rather in the meta-language.

This is not permitted in NAFL, which requires propositions like (*) to be metamathematical

Re: Godel's comments about the "true reason" for incompleteness

constructions, outside the formal language. Then you can see that there is no impredicativity.

(1) You told us before that the syntax of NAFL is that of classical first order logic. (2) There's not even the problem you seem to think in classical first order logic, since we DON'T conflate the meta-language and the object language.

In fact there is no such thing as a tautology in NAFL, and (*) is not a meta-theorem of NAFL theories. I will elaborate this week-end, if I manage to find some time (I am on leave Thursday-Sunday, so hopefully I will be able to get started on the long-pending NAFL thread).

Only you can say what goes on in NAFL. Since you've not defined what an "NAFL theory" is, no one can by himself sit down to reason what is or is not the case about NAFL theories. Our only hope is to wait each time for you to make a pronouncement as to what is or is not the case about NAFL theories and as we may not question your pronouncements since they are not subject to independent evaluation upon any exact definition of what an NAFL theory is.

MoeBlee

.