

Re: Meyer's Argument against Gödel's Theorem

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2008-08/msg00567.html>

- *From:* herbzet <herbzet@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 19 Aug 2008 03:13:16 -0400
-

jeffreykegler@xxxxxxxx wrote:

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) 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

Re: Meyer's Argument against Gödel's Theorem

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