

# Re: Godel Contradiction

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2009-06/msg00409.html>

---

- *From:* slartibartfast <tomokane2003@xxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Fri, 12 Jun 2009 11:47:38 -0700 (PDT)
- 

(so "reply to author " means actually email it, ok I won't do that, thought it might have meant private message.)

$1+1=2$ . if you invent a very long and complicated "proof" that  $1+1=3$ , you cannot appeal to the "complexity" of the proof, to dismiss "simplistic" objections from the "layman" when he says " $1+1=3$  looks wrong to me".

Its up to you, to avoid insults and show him where he is wrong.

by your own admission you don't know whether Godel's result is correct or not since as you say

"I don't, to a mathematical certainty as verified by my own witness of the proof steps, assert that it is true. On the other hand, given that I know of no challenge in the literature to the quite common statement that such a proof does exist, I think it is reasonable to surmise that it does"

argument ad hominem used to make the "flat earth theory" seem reasonable.

within those exact details (that you are personally missing) of the proof , you cannot rule out the possibility that there may be a flaw.

I HAVE seen challenges to it, but anyone who submits a paper challenging it, is regarded as a crackpot and their paper is not even read! One professor of logic emailed me regarding his experience regarding this prejudice.

Since not all logicians agree about the correctness of Godel's incompleteness theorem and Since I personally do not have the formal training in, or knowledge of, logic, I am therefore between a rock and a hard place in this regard,

## Re: Godel Contradiction

Since my ONLY reason for undertaking the arduous task of learning formal logic, PA and ZFC etc would be to be able to follow every detail of Godel's proof for myself, I would consider it an awful waste of my time if I were to discover that Godel was in fact wrong, particularly in view of the fact that "believers" would not bother to look at such an argument. of course I might find Godel's proof to be correct and I would find that gratifying. (but I'd first have to know what the hell is \*MEANT\* by the godel 'statement')

As it is Neither you nor I have any right to rule out the possibility of Godel's proof being incorrect despite the fact that many (or even most –it doesn't matter) logicians claim it to be correct.

such parroting and argument ad hominem is just a waste of time.

I AM sure however, that I regard the sentences:  
(in ANY system you care to choose)

"~decidable(G)"  
and "~decidable(~decidable(G))"  
and "~decidable(~decidable(~decidable(~decidable(G))))"  
etc as being utter gibberish that doesn't get around to stating anything at all.

I'm NOT just being argumentative here, I REALLY think they are meaningless, I'm willing to concede the possibility that I may be wrong about that BUT if you honestly perceive those statements as meaningful then PLEASE show me how that is the case.

I do not believe you can do this. which is why I suspect that you will fudge and dodge this particular question with disparaging insults perhaps but I predict you will avoid addressing this one particular issue.

and I'm not sure the statement ~decidable( ~decidable(G) )  
is any different from the statement ~decidable("~decidable(G)")

and I don't see how coding the "meaning" of the statement into numbers (big ones or otherwise) can have any bearing on that fact.

in the meantime you can take a look at THIS guy, he seems to know what he's talking about regarding this (though you are probably in a better position than me to understand what he is saying)

.