

Re: Godel proved maths inconsistent not incompleteness theorem

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2008-04/msg00090.html>

- *From:* Charlie-Boo <shymathguy@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 2 Apr 2008 06:04:23 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Mar 29, 10:35 am, Aatu Koskensisilta <aatu.koskensi...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

On 2008-03-29, in sci.logic, Charlie-Boo wrote:

What are these usual proofs (other than the original)?

The proofs of the second incompleteness theorem that come to mind are all variants of the original as set out in detail in Hilbert & Bernays.

I just reduced the second incompleteness theorem to the always Halting Problem. Is that a variant of the original as set out in detail in Hilbert & Bernays?

C-B

How do we know they are of no use?

Robinson arithmetic is too weak to prove the derivability conditions.

--

Aatu Koskensisilta (aatu.koskensi...@xxxxxxxx)

"Wovon man nicht sprechen kann, darüber muss man schweigen"
– Ludwig Wittgenstein, Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus