

Re: Godel's proof, truth, reality, self-awareness, and all that jazz

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-09/msg06055.html>

- *From:* "cbrown@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx" <cbrown@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 26 Sep 2007 13:54:53 -0700
-

On Sep 25, 1:44 pm, "Jesse F. Hughes" <je...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

"cbr...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx" <cbr...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> writes:

On Sep 25, 11:50 am, "Jesse F. Hughes" <je...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

But this doesn't seem too difficult to add (does it?). Why not something like this?

- (a) $\{ \} = \{ \}$.
(b) If A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n and B_1, B_2, \dots, B_m are sets, then $\{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n\} = \{B_1, B_2, \dots, B_m\}$ iff the following hold:

- (i) $m = n$
(ii) for each $i \leq n$, there is a $j \leq n$ such that $A_i = B_j$
(iii) for each $i \leq n$, there is a $j \leq n$ such that $B_i = A_j$

Equivalently (?), we could say that two sets A and B are equal iff $f(A) = f(B)$, where f is his encoding mapping sets to natural numbers.

Again, it only maps sets /as strings/ to naturals; and since multiple strings represent the same set, $f(A)$ is a /set/ of naturals, not a single natural.

No, I don't see that. His description of the mapping seems to presume principles (a) and (b), I suppose, since he builds the mapping

Re: Godel's proof, truth, reality, self-awareness, and all that jazz

inductively (and without concern for order of elements). He says that he maps, e.g., $\{\{\{\{\}\}\}\}$ to the minimal bit string representing the elements of the set. Since $\{\} \mapsto 0$ and $\{\{\}\} \mapsto 1$, this set maps to $2^0 + 2^1$. Similarly, the set $\{\{\{\}\}\{\}\}$ would map to $2^1 + 2^0$.

Anyway, what *is* lacking is a clear definition of the encoding that would settle this question. What I wrote above is what I think he means, but his definition is by example, which is not very useful to settle disagreements like this. So, I will let Han defend his own mathematics and hopefully present it more clearly.

Sigh. Another day, another mea culpa. You are correct; see my response to Han.

The short version of his encoding, in recursive form, appears to be:

$$\begin{aligned} f(\{\}) &= 0 \\ f(A) &= \sum_{x \in A} 2^{f(x)}. \end{aligned}$$

Cheers – Chas

.