1. Here is a page on deontic logic: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/logic-deontic/> and the relationship between expected utility maximization and description length minimization: <https://www.lesswrong.com/posts/voLHQgNncnjjgAPH7/utility-maximization-description-length-minimization> based on the relationship between the semantics and model theory of deontic logic (especially considering the equivalent definitions of deontic logic and alethic logic, such as DS4 = S4, when we replace obligation ⬄ necessity and permission ⬄ possibility, and by considering the modified equivalents of other deontic formulas, such as the DBr axioms vs the Br axioms, can you construct a formal relationship for model conversions between deontic logic and alethic logic, by treating alethic logic as the deontic logic of an ideal world, and by treating deontic logic as what one ought to believe, for example, by considering the relationship between the factive formula in alethic logic Necessary(X) -> X and the deontic formula Obligated(Obligated(X) -> X)?
2. By the way, did I ask for the right thing when I said that alethic logic and deontic logic are like the relationship between classical logic and constructive logic, such that there is a double-negation-style translation from alethic logic to deontic logic?
3. Can you please complete the Godel-Gentzen style translation from alethic logic to deontic logic this way, starting with the base system?
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