

# Re: "Friendly Premises"

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2005-08/msg00081.html>

---

- *From:* "George Dance" <[georgedance04@xxxxxxxx](mailto:georgedance04@xxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 3 Aug 2005 06:36:20 -0700
- 

Torkel Franzen wrote:

> "George Dance" <[georgedance04@xxxxxxxx](mailto:georgedance04@xxxxxxxx)> writes:  
>  
>> Sorry for your misunderstanding; I should have made it clear that >>I was  
>> referring to someone else's assertion.  
>  
> Surely you are eagerly affirming the proposition that there is no  
> such thing as proof in logic?

Surely not. I am pointing out that, if Mr. Shobe is correct that the concepts of 'self-proving procedure' and 'proof' refer to the same things, then asserting (as you did) "There is no concept of 'self-proving procedure' in logic" is equivalent to asserting "There is no concept of 'proof' in logic."

.

---

- *Follow-Ups:*
  - ◆ **[Re: "Friendly Premises"](#)**  
◇ *From:* H. J. Sander Bruggink
  - ◆ **[Re: "Friendly Premises"](#)**  
◇ *From:* Torkel Franzen
- *References:*
  - ◆ **[Re: "Friendly Premises"](#)**  
◇ *From:* Jesse Alama
  - ◆ **[Re: "Friendly Premises"](#)**  
◇ *From:* Acme Diagnostics
  - ◆ **[Re: "Friendly Premises"](#)**  
◇ *From:* Martin Shobe
  - ◆ **[Re: "Friendly Premises"](#)**  
◇ *From:* George Dance
  - ◆ **[Re: "Friendly Premises"](#)**  
◇ *From:* Torkel Franzen
  - ◆ **[Re: "Friendly Premises"](#)**  
◇ *From:* George Dance
  - ◆ **[Re: "Friendly Premises"](#)**

Re: "Friendly Premises"

◇ *From:* Torkel Franzen

- Prev by Date: [\*\*Re: "Friendly Premises"\*\*](#)
- Next by Date: [\*\*Re: "Friendly Premises"\*\*](#)
- Previous by thread: [\*\*Re: "Friendly Premises"\*\*](#)
- Next by thread: [\*\*Re: "Friendly Premises"\*\*](#)
- Index(es):
  - ◆ [\*\*Date\*\*](#)
  - ◆ [\*\*Thread\*\*](#)