

# Re: Meyer's Argument against Gödel's Theorem

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2008-08/msg00560.html>

---

- *From:* [jeffreykegler@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:jeffreykegler@xxxxxxxxxx)
  - *Date:* Mon, 18 Aug 2008 20:50:04 -0700 (PDT)
- 

I'm pleased that my novel about Gödel's ontological proof got mentioned on this list. I was not very surprised that LauLuna had reservations about my approach to Gödel. *\_God Proof\_* is a venture into hard SF at the boundary of math, religion & philosophy.

Combining math & philosophy is dicey. Throw in religion and things get really treacherous. Add to that a writer who has decided to deal with the whole business in the form of a novel, and even a generous person might wonder if he's not dealing with a crank or madman.

I took it from LauLuna's remarks that he'd not actually read *\_The God Proof\_*, but that he had done me the favor of looking it over to see if, despite everything, there might be something there. I hope I don't presume on sci.logic's patience if I explain a bit why I dealt with this material in the way I did.

Let me say that my research into modal logic and Gödel was quite serious. I became proficient enough in the math to assist two of the professionals then studying Gödel's ontological proof. Melvin Fitting ([http://comet.lehman.cuny.edu/fitting/errata/book\\_errors/godelbookerrors/godelerrata.pdf](http://comet.lehman.cuny.edu/fitting/errata/book_errors/godelbookerrors/godelerrata.pdf)) and Jordan Howard Sobel (by letter) were kind enough to acknowledge my minor assistance. Assistance to another researcher at the boundaries of philosophy and mathematics landed me a mention in *\_Mind\_* (V115, N459, p. 692). An acknowledgment does not compare with a publication, but just the same seeing my name in the same pages which have carried articles by Turing, Freud and James gives me a shiver. On my own, I'm a published mathematician of minor note. (*Communications of the ACM*, V29 #6, June 1986, pp. 556-558).

Far more serious qualifications than mine would be no guarantee against error. LauLuna presents some paraphrases as evidence that I've got Gödel wrong on the Incompleteness Theorems. For example, LauLuna says,

[ a proof that the world cannot be proved consistent ], Kegler writes, is not that bad, for if the world cannot be proven

Re: Meyer's Argument against Gödel's Theorem

consistent, well, that's a proof that it is indeed consistent.

While my original language was carefully chosen an