scientific reality is only the reality of a monkey (homo-sapien) by

Magister colin leslie dean the only modern Renaissance man with 9 degrees including 4 masters: B,Sc, BA, B.Litt(Hons), MA, B.Litt(Hons), MA, MA (Psychoanalytic studies), Master of Psychoanalytic studies, Grad Cert (Literary studies)

scientific reality is only the reality of a monkey (homo-sapien)

by

Magister colin leslie dean the only modern Renaissance man with 9 degrees including 4 masters: B,Sc, BA, B.Litt(Hons), MA, B.Litt(Hons), MA, MA (Psychoanalytic studies), Master of Psychoanalytic studies, Grad Cert (Literary studies)

List of **free** Erotic Poetry Books by Gamahucher Press by colin leslie dean Australia's leading erotic poet free for download

http://www.scribd.com/doc/35520015/List-of-Erotic-Poetry-Books-by-Gamahucher-Press Gamahucher press west geelong Victoria Australia 2023 to start take the term **homo**-

sapien A monkey made label

Homo is the Latin word for 'human' or 'man' and *sapiens* is derived from a Latin word that means 'wise'

So we have the arrogant monkey telling itself that it is WISE

There is the world which is independent and exist independent of representation and observation.

Reality is that world seen thru observation and representation

Reality is a social construction

Reality is seen/constructed thru our words/meaning

Our words/meaning allow us to make sense of the world

Our culture gives us our words/meaning

This is called our semantic field

Different cultures have different semantic fields –thus different social constructed realities

Our semantic fields are just maps which cultures/people over lay on the world [to gives us our reality] to allow people/cultures to navigate thru the world both psychologically and physically

All animals have their maps-semantic fields

And

Monkey (homo-sapiens) have their mapssemantic fields

But

All maps-semantic fields

end in nonsense-meaninglessness

Haha

So homo sapiens are not monkeys they say monkeys have tails and homo sapiens don't

haha if you say I am an idiot

then

you also have to say the very science/scientists I quote to support my position are idiots

Haha

monkey homo sapiens

go look at your tail

https://www.webmd.com/baby/what-isa-human-tail

Many believe that human ancestors had and used some form of a tail. Over time as a species, however, we evolved past the need for such an organ, which is why the majority of humans no longer grow them. Most humans grow a tail in the womb, which disappears by eight weeks... Sometimes, however, the embryonic tail doesn't disappear and the baby is born with it. This is a true human tail

haha

you dont get it do you monkey homo sapiens

the notion of species is nonsense

as your science is nonsense

go read the definitions

and laugh at your ridiculous science with its crap species

hahaha

by their own definitions

as shown

they are talking nonsense

that is a FACT based on their OWN definitions

you have two options

just

yes

or

no

are the scientists/science sites lying when they gives us the definitions of species below

either

yes

or no

If they are lying

Then you go take it up with them

If they are not lying but telling the truth

Then we have science/biology ends in contradiction

so what is a species

just a definition

https://www.nationalgeographic.org/enc yclopedia/species/

"A species is often defined as a group of organisms that can reproduce naturally with one another and create fertile offspring"

Or from your own biology site

https://www.biologyonline.com/diction ary/species "One can also define species as an individual belonging to a group of organisms (or the entire group itself) having common characteristics and (usually) are capable of mating with one another to produce fertile offspring."

but

but species hybridization contradicts

that

https://kids.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3 389/frym.2019.00113

"When organisms from two different species mix, or breed together, it is known as hybridization"

"Fertile hybrids create a very complex problem in science, because this breaks a rule from the Biological Species Concept"

so the definition of species is

nonsense

note

when Biologist cant tell us what a species is -without contradiction

thus evolution theory ie evolving species is nonsense

WE REACH NOW

the death of god -killed by the monkey (homo-sapiens)

so now with the death of god ast Nietzsche so elegantly described

the monkey (homo-sapiens) hast now taken gods place

the monkey (homo-sapiens) now is the supreme super-mind the supreme intelligence in the universe

it calls itself wise andst regards itself now ast having the mind intelligence reason that canst know the truth the total knowledge of the universe

the monkey (homo-sapiens) now believes it hast the ability to be omniscient

its arrogance

its hubris

its ego

are beyond belief boundless infinite its its opinion of itself its pride its hubris even goes beyond even the gods

yet for all this pride in its abilities

its semantic fields/maps

all end in meaningless nonsense rubbish

All products of human [the monkey (homo-sapiens)] thought end in meaninglessness-even Zen nihilism absurdism existentialism all philosophy post-modernism Post-Postmodernism critical theory etc mathematics science etc

so read on andst see the total dross rubbish that comes fromst this monkey (homo-sapiens) ridiculous mind which still is wallowing inst the cave darkness where it still lives- but unknown to itself- with its head up its ass

To see how this monkey (homosapiens) behaves

Read

Prolegomenon to the anthropology of monkey (homo-sapiens)

PENSES

http://gamahucherpress.yellowgum.com /wp-content/uploads/Prolegomenon-tothe-anthropology-of-monkey.pdf

or

https://www.scribd.com/document/6647 86006/Prolegomenon-to-the-Anthropology-of-Monkey-homosapiens So lets start

scientific reality is only the reality of a monkey (homo-sapien)

just as a bird has a bird reality

just as a worm has a worm reality

SO

scientific reality is only the reality of a monkey (homo-sapien)

but

the stupid monkey (homo-sapien) thinks arrogantly that its reality is the total "true reality"

just like the worm would thinks its reality is the total "true reality"

This stupid monkey says it is the superior life form

The monkey homo-sapien is limited by and cannot go beyond by its senses-of which its instruments are just extensions of- and the hard wirering of its monkey brain-which limits its processing power-Thus it can only ever understand "Reality" thru the limitations of its biologically/neurologically brain thus can never go beyond those limits in understanding "Reality" Thus for monkey homo-sapien scientific reality is/can only be the reality of a monkey (homosopien) - EVERYTHING WE THINK OR DO FROM WIPING OUR ASS TO DROPPING BOMBS FROM WAR TO POLITICS ETC IS JUST MONKEY HOMO-S&PIEN BEHA VIOUR

Just as the worm is limited by and cannot go beyond by its senses and the hard wirering of its brain-which limits its processing power Thus it can only ever understand "Reality" thru the limitations of its biologically/neurologically brain thus can never go beyond those limits in understanding "Reality" Thus for a worm scientific reality could only be the reality of a worm

Hither to monkey man has been arrogant about its reason It believed reason was a tool to understand to create knowledge it created vast systems deep ideologies profound "truths"

Monkey man believed its reason could unlock "truths" but now it has come to the end of its arrogance its all pervading belief in the abilities its reason There is nowhere to go now it is the end point reason is bankrupt it is all over it is the end of history-for everything that comes from the mind of monkey man any system any ideology

any science any mathematics etc from the past now and into the future will be seen to end in nonsense rubbish meaninglessness

Since

all observation is theory laden

reality is just what A theory says it isie what the monkey says it is

truth is what A theory says it is ie what the monkey says it is

http://gamahucherpress.yellowgum.com /wp-content/uploads/Scientific-realityis-textual.pdf

or

https://www.scribd.com/document/5726 39157/Scientific-Reality-is-Textual

TRUTH

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Truth

- 2 Major theories
- 2.1 Substantive
- o 2.1.1 Correspondence
- o 2.1.2 Coherence
- o 2.1.3 Pragmatic
- o 2.1.4 Constructivist
- o 2.1.5 Consensus
- 2.2 Minimalist
- o 2.2.1 Deflationary
- o 2.2.2 Performative
- o 2.2.3 Redundancy and related

o 2.2.4 Philosophical skepticism

- 2.3 Pluralist
- 3 Formal theories
- 3.1 Logic
- 3.2 Mathematics
- 3.3 Tarski's semantics
- 3.4 Kripke's semantics

All products of human thought end in meaninglessness-even Zen nihilism absurdism existentialism all philosophy post-modernism Post-Postmodernism critical theory etc mathematics science etc

The-Anthropology-of-science

(science is a mythology) ie the scientific method is a myth

http://gamahucherpress.yellowgum.com/w p-content/uploads/The-Anthropology-ofscience.pdf https://www.scribd.com/document/512683 685/Prolegomenon-to-The-Anthropologyof-Science

What is science -no more than monkey homo sapiens big noting itself

what is science?

you might say that which uses the scientific method

https://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Science

Science in the broadest sense refers to any system of objective knowledge. In a more restricted sense, science refers to a system of acquiring knowledge based on the scientific method,

but

hahaha the scientific method is a myth

haha if you say I am an idiot

then

you also have to say the very science/scientists I quote to support my position are idiots

take this

THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD IS A MYTH

<u>https://www.google.com/search?client=</u> <u>firefox-b-</u> <u>d&q=scientific+method+a+myth</u>

AND

take this

THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD IS A MYTH

https://www.wtamu.edu/~cbaird/sq/201 2/11/20/who-invented-the-scientificmethod/

There is not one scientific method. The existence of one, golden-standard scientific method is a myth perpetuated by ELEMENTARY school textbooks in an effort to make science accessible to YOUNG students. This myth is chronicled in the book "Scientific Literacy and the Myth of the Scientific Method" by Henry H. Bauer.

So who says there is a scientific method

well scientist tell us that

why

to give them social PRESTIGE

how

well

well because it then demarcates science from pseudo-science those who dont have the scientific method

thus enhancing the PRESTIGE of scientists

why do scientists want social PRESTIGE

well they are a monkey homo-sapiens

and monkey homo-sapiens want to be better than all the other monkey homosapiens-just monkey behavior

that is why

monkey homo-sapiens compete with other monkey homo-sapiens trying to be better generally by acquiring social status thru objects or things other monkey homo-sapiens envy ie biggg car bigggg house expensive underwear etc Andst why doeth these monkey homo sapiens compete with each to each perhaps no more than to at the end to attract some she monkey homo sapien maiden sexy just like certain birds ie Bower birds Peacocks

For ast Lord Byron –the great romantic poet -didst sagely say in that glorious Childe Harold's Pilgrimage (canto 1 1x)

"Maidens, like moths, are ever caught by glare"

Andst what may that glare be that attracts the she monkey homo sapien

Well wealth power strength aristocracy titles etc anything to which the culture she be in doth value

Andst why

Because ast a she monkey homo sapien here task ist to breed with the best alpha monkey homo sapiens she can catch andst to have her bubbers in the best monkey homo sapien nest she cants get —love being the mechanism to create bonding that enable the male monkey homo sapien to hang around long enough to bring u the bubbers

But I do digress ast

Let us progress

Andst further on we go to

Determinism ends in contradiction

Thus linear causality is undermined/destroyed

Thus science is undermined /destroyed proof Magister colin leslie dean has shown

Determinism shown to end in Meaninglessness nonsense

Causal determinism

en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Determinism "Causal determinism, sometimes synonymous with historical determinism (a sort of path dependence), is "the idea that every event is necessitated by antecedent events and conditions together with the laws of nature." "Causal determinism has also been considered more generally as the idea that everything that happens or exists is caused by antecedent conditions" take the 3 body problem –as a simplification of all things in the universe

But note all the universe is made up of things in interrelationships with everything else

if we take Newton's law of gravitation

F = G(m1m2)/R2.

Thus when we move object A it effects the other two objects B and C But when objects B and C move that effects object A

So

we can say that A in effect caused its own motion thus we can say the antecedent cause of A is infact just the antecedent A itself in other words the cause of the cause is the cause

just nonsense meaninglessness

note

because all things in the universe are interrelationships with everything else

then

from the above all things are their own antecedent cause

just nonsense meaninglessness

thus causation is both logically nonsense and science itself must then be meaningless nonsense

http://gamahucherpress.yellowgum.com/w p-content/uploads/Determinism-shown-toend-in-meaninglessness.pdf

or

www.scribd.com/document/716760568/De terminism-Shown-to-End-in-Meaninglessness-causation-science-Humeepistemology-logic-ontology-metaphysics-Kant-physics

further

Scientific reality is textual

http://gamahucherpress.yellowgum.com/w p-content/uploads/Scientific-reality-istextual.pdf

or

https://www.scribd.com/document/572639 157/Scientific-Reality-is-Textual

Haha

So homo sapiens are not monkeys they say monkeys have tails and homo sapiens don't

haha if you say I am an idiot

then

you also have to say the very science/scientists I quote to support my position are idiots

Haha

monkey homo sapiens

go look at your tail

https://www.webmd.com/baby/what-isa-human-tail Many believe that human ancestors had and used some form of a tail. Over time as a species, however, we evolved past the need for such an organ, which is why the majority of humans no longer grow them. Most humans grow a tail in the womb, which disappears by eight weeks... Sometimes, however, the embryonic tail doesn't disappear and the baby is born with it. This is a true human tail

haha

you dont get it do you monkey homo sapiens

the notion of species is nonsense

as your science is nonsense

go read the definitions

and laugh at your ridiculous science with its crap species hahaha

by their own definitions

as shown

they are talking nonsense

that is a FACT based on their OWN definitions

you have two options

just

yes

or

no

are the scientists/science sites lying when they gives us the definitions of species below

either

yes

or

no

If they are lying

Then you go take it up with them

If they are not lying but telling the truth

Then we have science/biology ends in contradiction

so what is a species

just a definition

https://www.nationalgeographic.org/enc yclopedia/species/

"A species is often defined as a group of organisms that can reproduce naturally with one another and create fertile offspring"

Or from your own biology site

https://www.biologyonline.com/diction ary/species

"One can also define species as an individual belonging to a group of organisms (or the entire group itself) having common characteristics and (usually) are capable of mating with one another to produce fertile offspring."

but

but species hybridization contradicts

that

https://kids.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3 389/frym.2019.00113

"When organisms from two different species mix, or breed together, it is known as hybridization"

"Fertile hybrids create a very complex problem in science, because this breaks a rule from the Biological Species Concept"

so the definition of species is

nonsense

note

when Biologist cant tell us what a species is -without contradiction

thus evolution theory ie evolving species is nonsense

THE END OF HISTORY Magister colin leslie dean

https://www.scribd.com/document/605875 005/THE-END-OF-HISTORY

or

http://gamahucherpress.yellowgum.com/w p-content/uploads/THE-END-OF-HISTORY-Magister-colin-leslie-dean.pdf

The end of history because-EVERYTHING ends in nonsense rubbish

All products of human thought end in meaninglessness-even Zen nihilism absurdism existentialism all philosophy post-modernism Post-Postmodernism critical theory etc mathematics science etc

a theory of everything

http://gamahucherpress.yellowgum.com/w p-content/uploads/A-Theory-of-Everything.pdf

or

https://www.scribd.com/document/455372 682/A-Theory-of-Everything

All products of human thought end in meaninglessness-even Zen nihilism absurdism existentialism all philosophy post-modernism Post-Postmodernism critical theory etc mathematics science etc

All things are possible

With maths being inconsistent you can prove anything in maths ie you can prove Fermat's last theorem and you can disprove Fermat's last theorem

http://gamahucherpress.yellowgum.com/w p-content/uploads/All-things-arepossible.pdf

or

https://www.scribd.com/document/324037 705/All-Things-Are-Possible-philosophy

Mathematicians are not an intelligent lot

http://gamahucherpress.yellowgum.com /wp-content/uploads/Mathematiciansare-not-an-intelligent-lot.pdf

or

https://www.scribd.com/document/6409 86761/Mathematicians-Are-Not-an-Intelligent-Lot-epistemology-logicmathematics-philosophy-foundations Mathematics ends in contradiction:6 proofs <u>http://gamahucherpress.yellowgum.com/w</u> <u>p-content/uploads/MATHEMATICS.pdf</u>

or

https://www.scribd.com/document/406976 21/Mathematics-Ends-in-Meaninglessnessie-self-contradiction

Prolegomenon to undermining the foundations/fundamentals of science (the foundations of science are a myth:gravity,matter,charge,force)

http://gamahucherpress.yellowgum.com/w p-content/uploads/undermining-thefoundations-of-science.pdf

or

https://www.scribd.com/document/591616 840/Prolegomenon-to-Undermining-the-Foundations-of-Science EVEN your hallowed NASA agrees with Magister

https://starchild.gsfc.nasa.gov/docs/Star Child/questions/question30.html

what is gravity

"We don't really know. However, if we are to be honest, we do not know what gravity "is" in any fundamental way - we only know how it behaves."

The age of the enlightenment is at an end: reason is bankrupt

http://gamahucherpress.yellowgum.com/w p-content/uploads/The-age-of-theenlightenment-is-at-an-end.pdf

or

https://www.scribd.com/document/552377 365/The-Age-of-the-Enlightenment-is-atan-end-reason-is-bankrupt

A SOLUTION

Prolegomenon to beyond the boundary of the monkey reality

http://gamahucherpress.yellowgum.com /wp-content/uploads/Prolegomenon-tobeyond-the-boundary-of-reality.pdf

or

https://www.scribd.com/document/5851 40550/Prolegomenon-to-Beyond-the-Boundary-of-Reality

Our

instruments which we

investigate our reality are

only extensions of our

senses and we use our

bounded logic and language

to make sense of the data

BUT

Perfume is invisible to the

ear

Sound is invisible to the eye

Colour is invisible to the

taste

Sweet is invisible to the

touch

A Prolegomenon to a Grand Unified Theory

http://gamahucherpress.yellowgum.com /wp-content/uploads/Prolegomenon.pdf

or

https://www.scribd.com/document/5087 21702/Prolegomenon-to-a-Grand-Unified-Theory To

go beyond its limits monkeyman must decenter itself- due to its arrogance- and go beyond those conditions that have made the dog and monkey-man what they are to escape its limits and see the bigger picture –perhaps a picture already seen by the mystic: can a fish comprehend what is beyond water ie air can a bird comprehend what is beyond air ie space can monkey-man comprehend

what is beyond space ie ???

AND

Godels theorems 1 & 2 to be invalid:end in meaninglessness

http://gamahucherpress.yellowgum.com/w p-content/uploads/A-Theory-of-Everything.pdf

http://gamahucherpress.yellowgum.com/w p-content/uploads/GODEL5.pdf

or

https://www.scribd.com/document/329703 23/Godels-incompleteness-theoreminvalid-illegitimate

from

http://pricegems.com/articles/Dean-Godel.html

"Mr. Dean complains that Gödel "cannot tell us what makes a mathematical

statement true", but Gödel's Incompleteness theorems make no attempt to do this"

Godels 1st theorem

"...., there is an arithmetical statement that is true,[1] but not provable in the theory (Kleene 1967, p. 250

Godel cant tell us what makes a mathematical statement true,

thus his theorem is meaningless

in the statement

"there is an arithmetical statement that is true,[1] but not provable in the theory"

godel cant tell us what the word "true" means

thus

the word "true" is meaningless

thus

the statement

"there is an arithmetical statement that is true,[1] but not provable in the theory"

is meaningless

thus

thus godels 1st theorem is meaningless

checkmate game over

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Truth#Mathe matics

Gödel thought that the ability to perceive the truth of a mathematical or logical proposition is a matter of intuition, an ability he admitted could be ultimately beyond the scope of a formal theory of logic or mathematics[63][64] and perhaps best considered in the realm of human comprehension and communication, but commented: Ravitch, Harold (1998). "On Gödel's Philosophy of Mathematics".,Solomon, Martin (1998). "On Kurt Gödel's Philosophy of Mathematics"

thus by not telling us what makes a maths statement true Godels 1st theorem is meaningless

mathematics is rubbish as you can prove any crap you want in mathematics

here is a 5 proof from the Magister colin leslie dean

before you start reading have a look at this great critique- by a mathematician- of the Magisters poetry

https://www.reddit.com/r/mathmemes/com ments/14yf49q/because_i_feel_like_it/

now for the proof

http://gamahucherpress.yellowgum.com/w p-content/uploads/All-things-arepossible.pdf https://www.scribd.com/document/324037 705/All-Things-Are-Possible-philosophy

or

http://gamahucherpress.yellowgum.com/w p-content/uploads/MATHEMATICS.pdf

or

https://www.scribd.com/document/406976 21/Mathematics-Ends-in-Meaninglessnessie-self-contradiction

let x=0.999...(the 9s dont stop thus is an infinite decimal thus non-integer)

10x =9.999...

10x-x = 9.999... - 0.999...

9x=9

x = 1(an integer)

maths prove an interger=/is a non-integer maths ends in contradiction

thus mathematics is rubbish as you can prove any crap you want in mathematics

an integer= non-integer (1=0.999...) thus maths ends in contradiction: thus it is proven you can prove anything in maths

now before you all start rabbiting on take note

you have two options

just

yes

or

no

are the mathematician/maths site lying when they say

either

yes

or

no

mathematician/mathematic sites are lying when they say

An integer is a number with NO DECIMAL or fractional part

If they are lying

Then you go take it up with them

If they are not lying but telling the truth

Then you are stuck with mathematics ending in contradiction

Because

By the definitions

a number with NO DECIMAL is/= a number with A DECIMAL

thus a contradiction

by definition

0.999.. is an infinite DECIMAL no last digit

https://encyclopediaofmath.org/wiki/Inf inite_decimal_expansion

and

An integer is a number with NO DECIMAL or fractional part

https://www.cuemath.com/numbers/wh ole-numbers/

Whole number definitions

https://www.cuemath.com/numbers/wh ole-numbers/

A whole number means a number that does not include any fractions, negative numbers or [no] DECIMAL. It includes complete or whole numbers like 4, 67, 12, and so on

Natural number is

defined to be

https://www.cuemath.com/numbers/nat ural-numbers/

They are a part of real numbers including only the positive INTEGERS, but not zero, fractions, [no] DECIMALS, and negative numbers Natural numbers are the numbers that are used for counting and are a part of real numbers. The set of natural numbers includes only the positive integers, i.e., 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, ∞ .

thus

when

a number with NO DECIMAL is/= a number with A DECIMAL

is a contradiction

Take definitions of INTEGER

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Integer

An integer may be regarded as a real number that can be written without a

fractional component. For example, 21, 4, 0, and -2048 are integers, while 9.75, 5+1/2, and $\sqrt{2}$ are not.

and for those interested in In modern settheoretic mathematics

we also get

This notation recovers the familiar representation of the integers as $\{..., -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, ...\}$.

https://www.cuemath.com/numbers/integer s/

Integers Definition

An integer is a number with no decimal or fractional part

A few examples of integers are: -5, 0, 1, 5, 8, 97,

https://www.mathsisfun.com/definitions/in teger.html A number with no fractional part (no decimals)

the counting numbers $\{1, 2, 3, ...\}$

https://tutors.com/lesson/integersdefinition-examples

To be an integer, a number cannot be a decimal or a fraction

http://www.amathsdictionaryforkids.com/q r/i/integer.html

integer

• a positive number, a negative number or zero but not a fraction or a decimal fraction. To be an integer, a number cannot be a decimal or a fraction.

when

when mathematics proves

1 (NOOOOO decimal or fractional partthus an INTEGER)= 0.999...(the 9s dont stop no last digit thus is an infinite decimal with a decimal part thus CANOT be an integer but a non-integer)

maths prove an interger=/is a non-integer thus

maths ends in contradiction

AGAIN

If they are lying ABOUT the definitions

Then you go take it up with them

If they are not lying but telling the truth

Then you are stuck with mathematics ending in contradiction

a number with NO DECIMAL is/= a number with A DECIMAL

is a contradiction

Now

When

an integer= non-integer (1=0.999...) thus maths ends in contradiction: thus it is proven you can prove anything in maths

proof

you only need to find 1 contradiction in a system ie mathematics

to show that for the whole system

you can prove anything

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Principle_of_ explosion

In classical logic, intuitionistic logic and similar logical systems, the principle of explosion (Latin: ex falso [sequitur] quodlibet, 'from falsehood, anything [follows]'; or ex contradictione [sequitur] quodlibet, 'from contradiction, anything [follows]'), or the principle of Pseudo-Scotus (falsely attributed to Duns Scotus), is the law according to which any statement can be proven from a contradiction.[1] That is, once a contradiction has been asserted, any proposition (including their negations) can be inferred from it; this is known as deductive explosion

2nd proof

A 1 unit by 1 unit $\sqrt{2}$ triangle cannot be constructed-mathematics ends in contradiction

Mathematics ends in contradiction:6 proofs

before you start reading have a look at this great critique- by a mathematician- of the Magisters poetry

https://www.reddit.com/r/mathmemes/com ments/14yf49q/because_i_feel_like_it/

now

http://gamahucherpress.yellowgum.com/w p-content/uploads/MATHEMATICS.pdf or

https://www.scribd.com/document/406976 21/Mathematics-Ends-in-Meaninglessnessie-self-contradiction

A 1 unit by 1 unit $\sqrt{2}$ triangle cannot be constructed-mathematics ends in contradiction

but

it is simple

before you all start going on

have a read and have LAUGH at someones ridiculous arguments to refute the Magister colin leslie dean

https://www.reddit.com/r/AnarchyMath/co mments/14rt7hi/a_1_unit_by_1_unit_trian gle_cannot_be/

mathematician will tell you

 $\sqrt{2}$ does not terminate

yet in the same breath

tell you

A 1 unit by 1 unit $\sqrt{2}$ triangle can be constructed

even though they admit $\sqrt{2}$ does not terminate

thus you cant construct a $\sqrt{2}$ hypotenuse

thus

you cannot construct 1 unit by 1 unit $\sqrt{2}$ triangle

thus maths ends in contradiction

AGAIN

3 proof

most say the most certain of things is 1+1=2

but

1 heap + 1 heap = 1 heap

1 + 1 = 1

get a salt shaker

pour out one heap of salt on the left

pour out one heap of salt on the right

NOTE WE ARE TALKING ABOUT HEAPS

now push the 2 heaps together ie we add them together

now what have we

we have one heap of salt in the middle

thus

1 heap + 1 heap = 1 heap

1 + 1 = 1

thus a contradiction in maths thus maths ends in contradiction ie meaninglessness-

But

to stop the a priori/analytic clap trap

just tell us

when you + the 2 heaps together

what do you see in front of you again

you say but heaps can be of different sizes you will say

1 apple + 1 apple = 2 apples

yet we can have a large apple + a small apple

yet you will say

1 large apple +1 small apple = 2 apples

You will say

1 number +1 number =2 numbers

but mathematician dont even know what a numbers is

http://gamahucherpress.yellowgum.com/w p-content/uploads/MATHEMATICS.pdf

or

https://www.scribd.com/document/406976 21/Mathematics-Ends-in-Meaninglessnessie-self-contradiction

yet you will say

1 number+ 1 number = 2 numbers

but mathematician dont even know what a numbers is

A consequence of Kurt Gödel's work on incompleteness is that in any effectively generated axiomatization of number theory (ie. one containing minimal arithmetic), there will be true statements of number theory which cannot be proven in that system. So trivially it follows that ZFC or any other effectively generated formal system CANNOT capture entirely what a number is

Again

most say the most certain of things is 1+1=2

but

- 1 number + 1 number = 1 number
- 1 number (10) + 1 number (20) = 1 number (30)
- 1 chemical (na sodium) = 1 chemical (cl chloride) = 1 chemical (nacl salt)
- 1 DNA (female) + 1 DNA (male) =1 DNA (child)

1 + 1 = 1

or

1 DNA (female) + 1 DNA (male) = 2 DNA (twins)

1 + 1 = 2

or

1 DNA (female) + 1 DNA (male) = 3 DNA (triplets)

1 + 1 = 3

or

1 DNA (female) + 1 DNA (male) = 4 DNA (Quds)

1 + 1 = 4

thus maths ends in contradiction ie meaninglessness-

With maths being inconsistent you can prove anything in maths ie you can prove Fermat's last theorem and you can disprove Fermat's last theorem

http://gamahucherpress.yellowgum.com/w p-content/uploads/All-things-arepossible.pdf

or

https://www.scribd.com/document/324037 705/All-Things-Are-Possible-philosophy

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Principle_of_ explosion

In classical logic, intuitionistic logic and similar logical systems, the principle of explosion (Latin: ex falso [sequitur] quodlibet, 'from falsehood, anything [follows]'; or ex contradictione [sequitur] quodlibet, 'from contradiction, anything [follows]'), or the principle of Pseudo-Scotus (falsely attributed to Duns Scotus), is the law according to which any statement can be proven from a contradiction.[1] That is, once a contradiction has been asserted, any proposition (including their negations) can be inferred from it; this is known as deductive explosion

4th proof

Magister colin leslie dean proves

Godel's 1 & 2 theorems end in meaninglessness

before you start reading have a look at this great critique- by a mathematician- of the Magisters poetry

https://www.reddit.com/r/mathmemes/com ments/14yf49q/because_i_feel_like_it/

Godel's 1 & 2 theorems end in meaninglessness

theorem 1

Godel's theorems 1 & 2 to be invalid:end in meaninglessness

http://gamahucherpress.yellowgum.com/w p-content/uploads/A-Theory-of-Everything.pdf

http://gamahucherpress.yellowgum.com/w p-content/uploads/GODEL5.pdf

or

https://www.scribd.com/document/329703 23/Godels-incompleteness-theoreminvalid-illegitimate

from

http://pricegems.com/articles/Dean-Godel.html

"Mr. Dean complains that Gödel "cannot tell us what makes a mathematical statement true", but Gödel's Incompleteness theorems make no attempt to do this" Godels 1st theorem

"...., there is an arithmetical statement that is true,[1] but not provable in the theory (Kleene 1967, p. 250)

but

Godel did not know what makes a maths statement true

checkmate

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Truth#Mathe matics

Gödel thought that the ability to perceive the truth of a mathematical or logical proposition is a matter of intuition, an ability he admitted could be ultimately beyond the scope of a formal theory of logic or mathematics[63][64] and perhaps best considered in the realm of human comprehension and communication, but commented: Ravitch, Harold (1998). "On Gödel's Philosophy of Mathematics".,Solomon, Martin (1998). "On Kurt Gödel's Philosophy of Mathematics"

thus his theorem is meaningless

ALSO NOTE

Godels 1st theorem is logically flawed: His G statement is banned by axiom of reducibility

in the system Godel uses to prove his theorem ie Principia Mathematica there is an axiom called the axiom of reducibility

Godel constructs his G statement to prove his 1 st theorem "the corresponding Gödel sentence G asserts: "G cannot be proved to be true within the theory T""

BUT that statement is impredicative

BUT

Godels sentence G is outlawed by the very axiom of the system he uses to prove his theorem ie the axiom of reducibility -thus his proof is invalid,

http://www.enotes.com/topic/Axiom_of_re ducibility

russells axiom of reducibility was formed such that impredicative statements where banned

thus

godel commits a logical flaw to prove his theorem-thus his theorem is invalid

theorem 2

Godels 2nd theorem

Godels second theorem ends in paradox– impredicative

The theorem in a rephrasing reads

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/G%C3%B6de 1%27s_incompleteness_theorems#Proof_s ketch_for_the_second_theorem

"The following rephrasing of the second theorem is even more unsettling to the foundations of mathematics: If an axiomatic system can be proven to be consistent and complete from within itself, then it is inconsistent."

or again

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/G%C3%B6d el%27s_incompleteness_theorems

"The second incompleteness theorem, an extension of the first, shows that the system cannot demonstrate its own consistency." But here is a contradiction Godel must prove that a system c a n n o t b e proven to be consistent based upon the premise that the logic he uses must be consistent . If the logic he uses is not consistent then he cannot make a proof that is consistent. So he must assume that his logic is consistent so he can make a proof of the impossibility of proving a system to beconsistent. But if his proof is true then he has proved that the logic he uses to make the proof must be consistent, but his proof proves that this cannot be done

note if Godels system is inconsistent then it can demonstrate its consistency and inconsistency but Godels theorem does not say that

it says"...the system cannot demonstrate its own consistency"

thus as said above

"But here is a contradiction Godel must prove that a system c a n n o t b e proven to be consistent based upon the premise that the logic he uses must be consistent"

But if his proof is true then he has proved that the logic he uses to make the proof must be consistent, but his proof proves that this cannot be done

Now

Some argue that Tarskis semantic theory of truth can fit Godels theorems

BUT

Tarski theory of truth ends in meaningless rubbish as does godel

to see godels meaningless rubbish-Godel's 1 & 2 theorems end in meaninglessness https://old.reddit.com/r/maths/comment s/18j265d/godels_1_2_theorems_end_i n_meaninglessness/

5 th proof

Now to Tarski theory of truth

https://philpapers.org/rec/MILTOT

BUT Tarski theory of truth ends in meaningless rubbish as does godel

But Tarskis theory of truth is logically flawed where in fact truth is never really defined . The problem with Tarskis theory is it requires a metalangauge and we get an ad infinitum If a grammar of a language must be in its metalanguage, as Tarski seems to require, than the grammar of this metalanguage must be in its metalanguage. Thus we have a notion of truth in the object language dependent on the notion of truth in the metalanguage. But the notion of truth in the metalangague is itself dependent on the notion of truth in its meta-metalanguage

As is stated inPhilosophy of logic By Dale Jacquette, Dov M. Gabbay, John Hayden

http://books.google.com.au/books?id=1 xEVkzuX5e0C&pg=PA142&lpg=PA1 42&d...

"the indefinitely ascending stratification of metalanguages in which the truth or falsehood of sentences is permitted for only the lower tiers of the hierarchy never reaches an end point at which the theorist can say that truth has finally been defined"

also

Interesting there is a theorem that says truth is undefinable ie Traski undefinability theorem This theorem means no one not even godel can tell us what truth is

Tarskis theorem- means no mathematician including godel can tell us what truth is-thus godels theorem is meaningless

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tarski%27 s_undefinability_theorem

Tarski's undefinability theorem, stated and proved by Alfred Tarski in 1936, is an important limitative result in mathematical logic, the foundations of mathematics, and in formal semantics. Informally, the theorem states that arithmetical truth cannot be defined in arithmetic

. Can you see how stupid Tarski is with his undefinability theorem

If his theorem is true then from his theorem we thus cant know if his theorem is true –classic lair paradox

Or

We cant know if his undefinability theorem is true as we cant define what true is

Or again

And we cant know if his "undefinability theorem" is true as from his "theory of truth" truth is never finally defined as we have seen So why bother with it But then mathematicians NEED such theorems for they all NEED to believe in mathematical "truth" without it again their mathematics is just meaningless rubbish which makes their brains burst and to flow out the ears in smelly ooooze - as the Magister has show

Haha what a dickhead

NOW

The with the collapse of science/mathematics into contradictionmeaninglessness- we can arrive at the raising of consciousness

It has been shown

everything is unintelligible and paradoxical.

now this is an opportunity to raise your consciousness

as now

"... the student's world begins to collapse and dissolve and static consciousness begins to be dislodged ... [With] the collapse of predictive structure, the world becomes an unintelligible flux: without categorical structure or form ...rationality and judgment becomes silenced and paralyzed. This is the level of unintelligibility and meaninglessness."

thus this then

"... can bring about the radical transformation to sunya consciousness only by seeing through the formal structures which condition any view of the world or experience." thus showing

that the "... prerelational, prelinguistic, preontological consciousness which can never be objectified, never constituted in any way, never referred to or described is called sunya"

https://www.scribd.com/document/5692 5572/Altering-consciousness-fromwestern-psychology-and-prasangikamadhyamika-buddhist-theories-ofinsight-generation-Cognitivedissonance-Double-bind

or

http://gamahucherpress.yellowgum.com /wpcontent/uploads/2012/09/insightgelukba 21.pdf

NOW

What can this raising of consciousness achieve or lead to

Lets take mathematics

Thus

Even though mathematics is nonsense it nevertheless seems to work in the monkey constructed reality

The Question becomes

"the real question is why does mathematics work when mathematics is irrational inconsistent and ends in meaninglessness —that is the real mystery to be solved When it is solved perhaps a new revolution of thought perhaps new and more wonderful things to discocer"

Magister colin leslie dean the only modern Renaissance man with 9 degrees including 4 masters: B,Sc, BA, B.Litt(Hons), MA, B.Litt(Hons), MA, MA (Psychoanalytic studies), Master of Psychoanalytic studies, Grad Cert (Literary studies)

He is Australia's leading erotic poet: poetry is for free in pdf

http://gamahucherpress.yellowgum.com/bo ok-genre/poetry/

or

https://www.scribd.com/document/355200 15/List-of-FREE-Erotic-Poetry-Books-by-Gamahucher-Press

"[Deans] philosophy is the sickest, most paralyzing and most destructive thing that has ever originated from the brain of man." "[Dean] lay waste to everything in its path...

[It is] a systematic work of destruction and demoralization... In the end it became nothing but an act of sacrilege





colin leslie dean Australia's leading erotic poet free for download

http://www.scribd.com/doc/35520015/List-of-Erotic-Poetry-Books-by-

Gamahucher-Press Gamahucher press west geelong

Victoria P.I Brothel Scene 1903 • Edvard Munch P.2 The Brothel, c.1879 Edgar Degas P.3 Maisons Closes (In the Salon at the Rue des Moulins) by Henri de Toulouse-Lautrec, 1894 P.4 <u>Waiting for a Client by Edgar Degas</u>, 1879 P.6 French Brothel in 18th Century, 19th Century French Painting Wall Art



or François Rabelais be it perhaps a play upon the 7 deadly sins or again perhaps the 5 hindrances or those



But play as that Sage didst

But say All the world's a stage, And all the men and women merely Players; They have their exits and their entrances, And one man in his time plays many parts" so dearest reciter dearest actor upon the stage howeth const a short a sense this fu be Rut life that be the question for those that seek a life within the world to be not Rut destroyed dissolved andst still too Rut live their life so dearest actor of lifes game there be Rut many

5

paths for thee to gain religions philosophies spiritualities isms ideologies all Rut products of the human brain some doth say be it matter if Ahh what. gointinst the de hermit cove or temple ashram e'en inst the or monnetery furnace itself what be J7

matter at if all be \mathcal{R} ut rubbish fromst human brain if thee \mathcal{VES} if thee peace doth gain

PREFACE Ahh What be

7

this world Gods work some may say or perhaps ast doth say just science naught Rut , Natures art andst way so take which thee may Rut listen to what J may say upon my part of this riddle mystery that doth all us waylay fromst which life we cannot fly until we die so howeth doth we live inst this world of gain andst pain of dazzle andst blight of dark andst light where with delight Rut next we doth Rut bleed with might Ahh sadly it be so that with all the poets wit andst all that is writ upon such perfumed script Ahh sadly so it be not J to tell thee how or so But Oh thee must thy May to see

Alchemists Wizards Conjurers Sorcerers Doth they offer thee what they didst what didst want Marlows Dr Faustus" A world of profit and delight of power honour omnipotence"

Thru the magic that didst give with "lines circles schemes letters and characters" thee also what didst Dr Faustus desire to But control the winds andst clouds all things that move betwixt the poles to gain the gods power Ahh doth that sound like science to thee to give all to thee for thy utility thy sensuality that thee canst burn ast a gemlike flame But be that gain But servitude andst for all the world thy soul to be But slain

10000 fireflies light chandeliers' bright the garden of Thalaba sorcerers delight with sciences might captivate entice its tentacles round thee tight with thy desires it doth inflame thee trap thee inst thy soul it doth bite inst its webs thee cant flee the opulence see voluptuous excess light flickers inst curtains translucent gold flecked electric sparks scatter o'er velours scented silk pink ast sunrise to thy eyes doth fly ast pale moonbeams thy dreams will-'o-the-wisps be reality our phantasies like we be ast didst Gamiani Rut Rut didst Rut see

9

Gold incandescent of Cashin grapes Shahoni light flash sparks ast rockets streak o'er face sprays thru emerald light sparks pearly mist floss coat apricot ripened that thy flesh kiss odorous fruit aloes andst apples uponst their bed of snow ripened pistachios that tingles thy tongue ast sweet watermelon rind free of dust | become that void that be concealed within all things that thy lips doest lick thy lips to ecstasy doest find more delight thanst *feramore* didst with those melting pomegranates fromst Casbin hills or still those melting pears inst the 1000 gardens of Cabul

See that sea of flickering light that doth filter fromst those ripples fromst those liquids sweet inst goblets of vermilion-gilt that be Rut filled fromst that cistern onst carpets of rich silk that doth fill those bottles of red andst white of 20 quarts of wine of rosy gleam that doth those waves of light doest Rut tinge to cast Ohh a mist of pink round those lips that sip those eyes that beam to burn with gemlike flame upon that sip of wine fromst every clime of every subtle tasting hue of Amber Rosolli bright like dew of Shiraz ast Selim didst quaff of

Scent didst drip down curtains peach-

blossomed hued embroidering patterns of lips puffy red flecked inst gold like scales of fish swirling tints flicker onst all charms of opulence that dazzle inst this room of Comte Jules-Amédée -Hector de Ravila de Ravilès Ahhh those femmes luscious of Rubenesque delight of those that Byron didst But not like that sigh that sight Ohh that sight of scarlet andst mellow grape that flesh of summer andst autumn nights that doth burn thy breath ast their eyes Ohh their eyes of gemlike flame lights of desires fires drip along bosoms well curved ast balloons of pink light down crease doth slip pearly ribbons that lick flesh to thy breath to ooze to mist of pink clouds of lust to float thru room down dazzling

breasts down corsages kissing tips of shoulders like tongues that along them slips Ahh Ahh around crystal light flickers ast scented flowers thru the airs perfumed that deck biceps of Sabine-like with emerald streaks of sapphire sparks andst pinkish sprays of scented sighs glistening bubbles froth o'er lips ast frozen moonbeams onst summer heated flesh alabaster white glides o'er these femmes Red dust layers deep not a speck upon my mind doth keep flecked inst foam-froth ast their eyes gemlike flames doth light with glints of green tints reflect inst pupils dilated large orbs of ebony like turquoise melted fromst those lusts that burn those juices that churn along their lips that sip champagne fromst Ohh those so Ohh so slender champagne-glass *flutes* that

look Oh look they across those rims of glass look at thee with Ohh those eyes of gemlike flames that wash thy Nebuchadezza flesh with fires to ignite thy mind that be some salad of savoury delights that be these femmes But fruit upon the vine that fruit pulp with odours thee doth find that float fromst 'neath corset pinched waistlines embellished gowns with frills andst lace full-skirts bustling bodice bulge Ahh those fumes untold that seep fromst drawers to soak this place with emanations of such heated sensations that burst ast flowers fromst those blooms of all those femmes hid inst Oh that so delightful hidden place twixt thighs of chiseled flesh where doth But throb that bud that stem with thy sighs

That light that didst that coat that opulence of some Indian Maharaja or some Mohammedan Caliph like some sum bursting o'er rose damask curtains scarlet bright like flowing blood red along silk sheets that float like pink to meet upon plump feather waters mattress white ast virgin snow 'meath canopy of mahograny bright brilliant luculent show of Ohh such delight that flicker to glint onst gilded things thru out that room that light Ohh that light that makes thee swoon to But see like 'meath a silver moon that Ohh that midnight silk of blue peignoir sash that doth lay upon that floor of brocaded carpets ast a bright snake of coiling burning flame But look thee Ohh looketh thee andst see ast painted 'gainst that scene Ohh Ohh

those beauties eyes gemlike flame painted figures ast carved fromst alabaster white splash upon the light to tint the airs that doth seem to float ast mist ast thee stares At that she with blush upon her cheeks red hued that doth flow along that throat of she so soft those breasts those slopes of white cloud flesh that doth inst the airs pink doest float Relieved of dust no 10000 cares free to roam above the clouds all so fair like fromst a tale of Boccaccio or some lay of Aretino ast Count Alcide de Mxxx might But say ast that gown of silk pink flash of light didst But slip to those feet to around to surround like fairy floss or fallen cloud of pinkish light to see thee Ohh that she that stature dude only with stockings black as night gartered with a rose red

ast virgin blood that shine upon her feet inst orange shoes ast that other she lets drip her peignoir to ripple about her feet to both to flash inst that verré cheval inst that room of mahogramy framed reflections splashing Ahh thoses forms But seem painted by Madam Vigée Le Brun upon that light upon that scene fromst perhaps Mrs Radcliff or Walpole of OOH such delight those nipples so tight so tuart turgid spikes of flesh sweaty bursting strawberries ripe to bite swollen upon yes thy lips But Ohh looketh thee to see those lips of she discreet folds small shell with fur so sparse next to that of moist pourting mound inst that net of black hair curling where both doth drip lust juice upon the floor pearls of alight

bubbles slip Aloadin doth within the fragrant airs waves his hands like winnOWing wings above his head conducting inst his garden of paradise minuets andst quadrilles sings the rhythms enticing all the senses fills with spinning curling curtsying the women spin glittering jewels their eyes gemlike flames agleam dazzling all painted inst

à la Peau d'Espagne glinting light blues andst pinks upon the airs scented perfumed fumes that waft fromst those clefts of moisty puffy swollen flesh that thy breath of thee Ahh of thee thy breath engraves thy lust inst the script of thy sighs upon that scene that painting of that

sea of flesh inst mirrors myriad thru along the room Indras net each andst each inst each upon each each doth swoon ast doth Mlle Célestine R- doth But see those pictures of the bourgeoisie oer the floors a heated nest of sex andst lust that each limb to limb doth creep coupling clusters wow free of dust the world rolls by "the clouds should know me by now" of heated flesh inst the twilight gleams 10000 eyes a fire gemlike flames burning each andst each inst lust games each andst each sucking fucking sucking desires fromst each legs thighs knotted bellies andst breasts their breaths bur the airs to scorch the flesh to the painting tint with excess daisy chains conga lines sucking fucking sucking limbs arms

entwined each to each animals that prev onst each andst each linked arched cries sighs ast they curl andst furl along the floor their groans andst Ahhhs doth thru the glittering gold light doth soar dripping ast fire that their lust doth burn with more desires ast Aloadin his hands doest faster dance the limb the music inst frenzied crave faster faster doth he wave his hands that seem to claws and st eagle talons form ast the hords doth scream "Mighty art thou the Bestower of joy "The Lord of Paradise" " ast doth inst unison with Gamiani say they "laid waste by deceptions disappointments always to desire

never to be satisfied"

