

## Re: Godel's comments about the "true reason" for incompleteness

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2008-03/msg01539.html>

---

- *From:* MoeBlee <jazzmobe@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Fri, 21 Mar 2008 10:52:56 -0700 (PDT)
- 

On Mar 21, 1:45 am, "R. Srinivasan" <sradh...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

GC&~GC&~TPC

Note: you have apparently misread what I have written above.

Yes, I did. My "mind" saw a '->' where you wrote a '&'.

My apologies for my remarks regarding your sentential skills. It was my lapse in reading.

But there's still no point to your argument. PA doesn't prove a contradiction, so PA does not refute any instance of a schema of tautologies.

I said IF PA proves a contradiction (see (\*\*\*) above THEN PA would have refuted the schema  $P \& \sim P \rightarrow Q$

But PA does NOT prove a contradiction. So what is the point?

Sure, if  $P \& \sim P \rightarrow Q$  is not in the language of PA, its formal negation is also not in the language of PA. But all I am saying here is that PA can prove itself inconsistent by proving a contradiction.