

Formal contradiction arising from a universal form of Gödel's Theorem

One-step Gödel theorem

Let K be *any* a consistent, sufficiently strong logic. Then

$$G_0 \quad (\exists X)(\Sigma \not\vdash_K X \text{ and } \Sigma \vDash_K X)$$

In words, "There exists at a statement X , such that there is no proof of X in K from the axioms Σ , but X is a consequence in K of Σ ." There may be many such statements X , but Gödel's theorem explicitly constructs one such statement, $Q = \Sigma \not\vdash_K Q$. Q is an instance of G_0 . Allowing the universalization of this statement, we obtain:

Universal Gödel theorem

Let K be *any* a consistent, sufficiently strong logic. Then

$$G \quad (\forall \Sigma)(\exists X)(\Sigma \not\vdash_K X \text{ and } \Sigma \vDash_K X)$$

In words, "Given a sufficiently strong logic K , then for **all** extensions of K formed by adjoining new axioms to K to form a set of axioms Σ there exists at a statement X , such that there is no proof of X in K from the axioms Σ , but X is a consequence in K of Σ ."

Formal contradiction

$$\Sigma^* \vdash_K G$$

$$\Sigma^* \vdash_K (\forall \Sigma)(\exists X)(\Sigma \not\vdash_K X \text{ and } \Sigma \vDash_K X)$$

Substituting for G

$$\Sigma^* \vdash_K (\exists X)(\Sigma^* \not\vdash_K X \text{ and } \Sigma^* \vDash_K X)$$

Universal instantiation, $\Sigma = \Sigma^*$

$$\Sigma^* \vdash_K (\Sigma^* \not\vdash_K Q \text{ and } \Sigma^* \vDash_K Q)$$

Where Q is the specific Gödel proposition

$$\Sigma^* \vdash_K \Sigma^* \not\vdash_K Q \text{ and } \Sigma^* \vdash_K \Sigma^* \vDash_K Q$$

$$\Sigma^* \vdash_K \not\vdash_K Q \text{ and } \Sigma^* \vdash_K \vDash_K Q$$

$$\Sigma^* \not\vdash_K Q \text{ and } \Sigma^* \vdash_K Q$$

The assumption that the **universal** Gödel's theorem is one of the first-order logics leads to a formal contradiction, albeit that the assumption that the **one-step** Gödel's theorem is first-order does not entail such a contradiction.