

Re: Godel proved maths inconsistent not incompleteness theorem

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2008-05/msg00172.html>

- *From:* David C. Ullrich <dullrich@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 04 May 2008 09:10:57 -0500
-

On Sat, 3 May 2008 08:22:41 -0700 (PDT), Charlie-Boo <shymathguy@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

On May 1, 7:56 am, David C. Ullrich <dullr...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Wed, 30 Apr 2008 01:54:34 -0700 (PDT), Charlie-Boo

<shymath...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Apr 28, 12:39 pm, Chris Menzel <cmen...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

[...]

Yeah. For each line of the purported proof you have to run the theorem prover for one step and see if any of the theorems proven equals that line.

1. For each line in the purported proof
 - a. Run one step of the theorem prover
2. For each theorem generated, compare it to the theorem at that line.
3. If equal, then go to the next line (1)
 - a. If no more lines, the proof is valid.
4. If no more theorems to generate, the proof is not valid.

My god this is simply incredible. After people have posted trivial proof-of-concept examples and pointed you to industrial strength examples elsewhere you still think

Re: Godel proved maths inconsistent not incompleteness theorem
that this is how a proof checker works?

No. I never said that's how a proof checker works.

Huh? This was in the middle of a discussion of proof checkers. You said "For each line of the purported proof you have to...". Not even "you could...", but "you have to".

Nice try. Unfortunately for your cre