

Wiles has not proven the Fermat's Last Theorem

Dmitri Martila

Tartu University

eestidima@gmail.com

18.05.2020

Demonstrated in alternative way, that the Theorems of Gödel are true, and hold not only for some special mathematical problems, but in general (for any kind of statement in any kind of system/situation). As applications: Hilbert's Second Problem Solved. Agnosticism is solved. Burden of Disproof is given to atheists. Andrew Wiles'es proof of Fermat's Last Theorem (which is hypothesis) uses unproven hypotheses of set theory (not the axioms of set theory), thus, the proof is debunked.

Introduction

Good video of introduction is in Ref.[1], I am adding following to it.

In our Scientific experience, we often see, that some theorems or conjectures/hypotheses have more ways of proving than others. Hereby theorems with unlimited number of non-equivalent proofs are not seen yet.

As example, there are several ways to prove the Pythagorean Theorem, but only one way to prove the Fermat's Last theorem.

Therefore, there must be a chance, that for some hypothesis there has and will have only zero proofs. Yes, the Riemann Hypothesis in 2020AD has zero proofs, and there is a chance, that during unlimited time, in will still have zero proofs. That is believed in 2020AD as being trivially true, because there is no automatic way of finding proofs. But prior to Dr. Gödel's contribution it was in fact believed that given infinite research time any true statement will be proven. But came Gödel and made a revolution in our understanding of mathematics. I am spreading this revolution to any methodology, to any paradigm, to any field.

My Proof of the First Incompleteness theorem

Suppose Dr. Gödel is wrong. In such case there is certainty to find [given unlimited research time and resources] the first way to prove a true hypothesis. After that somebody will look for the second way to prove the hypothesis, like there are some people today, who look for "simpler proof" of the Fermat's Last Theorem: Ref.[2]. But because the number of ways to prove something is limited (footnote [3]), then the chances to find the second proof of the true hypothesis is less than certain. But because the second way of proving the true hypothesis could have been found first instead of the second (it means, the order of finding the proofs is not crucial for my proof), then it is wrong to assign to every first proof the perfect certainty. Therefore, the Dr. Gödel must be right.

Topic of Axioms

An axiom is defined in its historic origin as undecidable thing, but which is obvious and natural and, thus, comes even to skeptic's mind with no doubt, e.g., „I think, therefore I am“ (Descartes).

There is at least one historic case [4], that a hypothesis, which was long time being tested to be true (tested in numerical way), became one day wrong.

From this one can conclude, what even if the Riemann Hypothesis is undecidable (can neither be proven nor disproven), it can not be called a new axiom. However, the idea to add Riemann Hypothesis as axiom is considered in Ref.[5]. Thus, the number of axioms in any theory stays limited: the undecidable things are not added as axioms [in my personal vision of Science], but rather they remain hypothesis-es, which can serve us as assumptions.

Proof of the Second Incompleteness Theorem

The set of axioms produces statements. Some are decidable, some are undecidable. To prove in full range the consistency of mathematics is to prove validity of all statements, including undecidable ones. Latter to do is impossible by definition. Thus, it is not possible to prove, that mathematics is consistent.

Another way to prove the Gödel's Second Theorem:

1. Axioms are defined as undecidable things.
2. Such things are true.
3. Thus, axioms are true, and, thus, the set of axioms are without self-contradiction, i.e. consistent.

Thus, consistent set of axioms can not be proven.

The axioms are defined not as assumptions, but as undecidable but obvious things. Indeed, some axioms can in fact be logically demonstrated [thus, gaining status of theorems or facts].

Proof of the Euclid's fifth postulate

From proper definition of parallel lines follows, that at least one parallel line can cross a point near some other line. Moreover, from the definition follows, that such line is one.

Proof of $A+B=B+A$ axiom follows from definition of sum. Proof of $A=B, B=A$ axiom follows from definition of equality (=).

One can prove the **postulates of the Theory of Relativity**. The central postulate of the Theory of Relativity is the equivalence principle. It can be proven following way: take one ball of 1 gramm and drop it down. Obviously it reaches the ground the same time as falling group of two such balls (or more identical balls). Varying the size of the balls, their number and distance between the balls, one comes to conclusion, that falling (along the line of different spacetime curvature) is independent of mass, size, shape, and density of the object. Thus, it proves the equivalence principle in logical way: „physics in small falling laboratory is independent of the spacetime curvature.“ But others are looking for experimental debunkment of Theory of Relativity: Ref.[6].

Solution to Hilbert's Second Problem

1. If arbitrary statement is undecidable, then it is true. Indeed, if a statement is false then sooner or later a counter-example will be found (at least in numerical search).
2. The statement "mathematics is consistent" is either undecidable (thus, true) or false (due to the second theorem).

3. If set of axioms is inconsistent, then any statement (which uses axioms) is false, because one or more of used axioms is false. Any false statement is decidable. Thus, the undecidable statements are possible only for consistent set of axioms. I remember, that something in mathematics was proven to be undecidable: Ref.[7]. Any undecidable statement is true. Thus, the mathematics is consistent.

Application to Agnosticism

If one can neither prove nor disprove God, then God exists.

Application to Gnostic Atheism

Fact to accept: if one can neither prove nor disprove God, then God exists. Hereby because Gnostic Atheists hope for absence God, then God could be disproven. Because God could be disproven, then it is wrong to assign Burden of Disproof exclusively to theists. In such case the atheists must accept, that God satisfies Popper's Falsifiability criterion, thus the God is scientific.

Application to Fermat's Last Theorem Proof

Quote: „This paper explores the set theoretic assumptions used in the current published proof of Fermat's Last Theorem, how these assumptions figure in the methods Wiles uses, and the currently known prospects for a proof using weaker assumptions.“ [2]. Such assumptions are not axioms, because they are not obvious things. Secondly, the Proof of Fermat's Theorem is outside the axioms of the algebra, because it supposed to use axioms of the set theory. Therefore, within the algebra the Fermat's theorem is still neither proven, nor disproven. It is strong candidate then for undecidable statement of algebra [therefore the Hilbert's Second Problem, which is talking about algebra axioms, is becoming solved through my arguments above]. Conclusion: Fermat's Hypothesis was proven by another hypothesis („assumptions“), thus there is no proof of Fermat's statement even in the set theory.

References

[1] Gödel's Incompleteness Theorem – Numberphile, 2017.

<https://youtu.be/O4ndIDcDSGc>

[2] Colin McLarty, What Does it Take to Prove Fermat's Last Theorem? Grothendieck and the Logic of Number Theory, Bulletin of Symbolic Logic 16 (3), 359-377 (2010) <https://doi.org/10.2178/bsl/1286284558>

[3] Surely, one can imagine infinite non-equivalent ways to prove the Pythagorean theorem during the infinite long development of science; but, there is possibility, that there are or will be some theorems or hypotheses, which will never have infinite many proofs.

[4] L. J. Lander, T. R. Parkin: Counterexample to Eulers's conjecture on sums of like powers. Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 72, 1079 (1966); the sign of $\pi(x) - \text{Li}(x)$ conjecture.

[5] Chaitin G.J., Thoughts on the Riemann hypothesis, 2003, arXiv:math/0306042

[6] Pierre Touboul et al., MICROSCOPE Mission: First Results of a Space Test of the Equivalence Principle, Phys. Rev. Lett. 119, 231101 (2017) <https://physics.aps.org/articles/v10/s133>; James Overduin et al., STEP and fundamental physics, Class. Quantum Grav. 29, 184012 (2012) arXiv:1401.4784

[7] Rado T., On Non-Computable Functions, Bell System Technical J. 41, 877-884 (1962), e.g. Busy beaver function; Kurtz, Stuart A.; Simon, Janos, The Undecidability of the Generalized Collatz Problem, Proc. 4th Intern. Conf. on Theory and Appl. of Models of Computation, TAMC 2007, Shanghai, May 2007; Wikipedia: Undecidable problem; there are several problems in ZFC known to be undecidable, the continuum hypothesis and the axiom of choice, for example. Hilbert's tenth problem is an example of very concrete principle limits of mathematics.