

Re: Godel proved maths inconsistent not incompleteness theorem

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2008-03/msg01802.html>

- *From:* Charlie-Boo <shymathguy@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 25 Mar 2008 05:36:46 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Mar 24, 2:24 pm, Peter_Smith <ps...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

Peter Smith claims his book has my proofs, but see my reply – his statements are not so. His proofs are an order of magnitude longer and more complex than mine.

Hardly. What I said was that some of the proof ideas you very vaguely wave your arms at (e.g. about the unsolvability of the halting problem entailing that the set of true sentences is not r.e.) are widely available in the literature in properly worked out versions.

There is so much nonsense in just these 4 lines, where do I begin? (Besides the fact that this is not what you said.)

1. What part of my proofs is vague and armwaving?
2. "some of (my) proof ideas are available in the literature"? That's bad? Let's consider the negation of this statement: None of my proof ideas are available in the literature. That would be preferable? But then none of the proof ideas available in the literature would be used in my proofs and CBL wouldn't be doing the job of capturing their proofs!

You are literally saying that it is wrong if CBL formalizes proofs that have been published! Don't you see something wrong with your assertion?

Of course some of my proof ideas are available in the literature. In other words, some of the proof ideas in the literature are available in CBL! In fact, a ton of them are. Isn't that a good thing??

3. Furthermore, if only some of my proof ideas are available in the literature, then some are not. In other words, CBL provides some proofs that have never been published before! And you try to make like that's a bad thing?? You have just agreed that CBL creates brand new proofs. Thanks.

Re: Godel proved maths inconsistent not incompleteness theorem

As far as your book goes, honestly, the proof that the true sentences are not enumerable is WAY more complex than necessary. I can prove this theorem in numerous ways (see my postings – will post them again if you'd like to discuss this) and they are ALL much shorter and simpler than all of the gyrations (7 or 8 steps) that you go through.

Where did you get that proof from? It would be very helpful to study the origin of this proof.

And this is just the first of the proofs that you say are mine. No, it isn't my proof. It's way the heck longer and more complicated than the CBL proof of this theorem – all of the CBL proofs I have given, in fact.

The CBL proofs are formal, simpler and numerous in number. You provide one long messy proof and you say that is better than CBL's numerous simpler proofs????????

Did you really think you could get away with that?

Can you (anyone) prove me wrong? So do you now see the value in the proofs I have provided? You like to brag about your book (no problem – I thanked you for the interesting reference) but are you honest enough to admit something is shown to be superior?

How about if you either prove me wrong or admit that what I have provided is better? Why not?

Because I'm not a fucking professor and you will lie, cheat and steal to the end of time to deny credit to anyone outside of your peers.

(Look through journals and see how academia dominates publishing. Where are the mathematical geniuses who don't have a job working for a college or university?)

One of my fans once posted a description of how psychologists recognize this characteristic of some groups in society. Maybe we should study that to fix the problem.

C-B

.