European Summer Meeting of the Association for Symbolic Logic, Berlin, 1989 The Journal of Symbolic Logic, Vol. 57, No. 1, March, 1992, pp.326-327 <a href="http://www.jstor.org/stable/2275203">http://www.jstor.org/stable/2275203</a>

K. M. PODNIEKS, Methodological consequences of Gödel's incompleteness theorem. Computing Center, Latvian State University, 226250 Riga, USSR.

The usual definition of "true" formulas in first-order arithmetic (inductively, by structure of formulas) provokes Platonist illusions (see [1]) that any closed formula must be either "true" or "false". But it is impossible to verify a formula like (Ax)C(x) empirically. This can be done only theoretically, i.e., using some fixed system of axioms.

Similar illusions are connected with the categoricity theorem for second-order arithmetic. This theorem can be proved within ZF; however, it does not yield that any closed formula of arithmetic can be proved or disproved in ZF.

The latter illusion is connected with some features of Gödel's proof (see [2]) of his incompleteness theorem: Gödel's formula G(T), constructed for some theory T, "is true, but not provable". But the truth of G(T) can be established only by postulating the consistency of T, and since  $Con(T) \rightarrow G(T)$  can be proved (for any T) in first-order arithmetic, we should not speak about the "informal truth" of G(T).

The real meaning of the incompleteness theorem is the following: any serious theory based on a fixed system of principles cannot be made perfect—it inevitably contains either contradictions or undecidable problems. The mere postulating of the excluded middle  $(F \land \neg F)$  in some theory T does not yield the decidability of all closed formulas F in T.

Any theory (in mathematics, science, or other branches of intellectual life) is essentially a construction involving inevitably many elements of fantasy (even the arithmetic of natural numbers contains such elements; see [3]). The incompleteness theorem says that no fantastic construction can be designed "logically" enough to ensure the decidability of all definite statements of it.

## REFERENCES

 K. M. Podnieks, Platonism, intuition and the nature of mathematics, Latviiskii Gosudarstvennyi Universitet, Riga, 1988. (Russian)

ABSTRACTS OF PAPERS: BERLIN, 1989

327

<sup>[2] — ,</sup> Around Gödel's theorem, Latvišskii Gosudarstvennyi Universitet, Riga, 1981. (Russian)
[3] P. K. RASHEVSKII, On the dogma of the natural numbers, Uspekhi Matematicheskikh Nauk, vol. 28 (1973), no. 4 (172), pp. 243-246; English translation, Russian Mathematical Surveys, vol. 28 (1983), no. 4, pp. 143-148.