

## Re: "Friendly Premises"

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2005-08/msg00174.html>

---

- *From:* "George Dance" <[georgedance04@xxxxxxxx](mailto:georgedance04@xxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 6 Aug 2005 08:31:05 -0700
- 

Acme Diagnostics wrote:

> Torkel Franzen <[torkel@xxxxxxxx](mailto:torkel@xxxxxxxx)> wrote:  
>> "Acme Diagnostics" <[LFinezaphthis@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:LFinezaphthis@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> writes:  
>>  
>>> I told you that the two words are highly equivalent in context  
>>> of kookdom.  
>>  
>> Possibly you thought you did. However, applying the principle of  
>> charity, I preferred to take your comment literally, as pointing out  
>> that anything goes if we indulge in a bit of kookery.  
>  
> But one never needs to apply the principle of charity to oneself!  
> Ok ok. I see you are an exception.  
>  
>> Nevertheless, tedious old logic is the main topic of the group.  
>  
> Oh, you mean the thing that has no concept of "self-proving  
> procedure," as you asserted? Which I denied so you asserted  
> again? Which denial I then proved here:  
>  
> <http://tinyurl.com/8udal>  
>  
> (Not that that's my best nor shortest proof by a long shot.)  
>  
> and which refutation has now been reviewed by many logicians and  
> still stands?  
>  
> And which you nevertheless continue to assert? Over and over in  
> a number of posts?  
>  
> Yes, besides being well on record as the patron saint of that  
> canonical Article of Faith in this parish of the priesthood, I  
> do believe that it issues from your Holy See what is and what  
> isn't Logic Itself in this particular sect.

I'd advise you to go slow with the analogy. One can certainly interpret some of Torkel's posts (eg, his apparent reliance on the Context Principle while not explicitly discussing it) as examples of the priest's methodology.

Re: "Friendly Premises"

But bear in mind that that is an analogy, and merely one that I made up and shared with you: I suspect that most readers (if not Torkel himself) have not read it, and therefore have no idea what you mean when you talk about 'priesthoods' and 'Articles of Faith'; with the consequence that by using it too much you may come off looking like a kook yourself.

- > And of course nothing outside that system could possibly affect
- > an Article of Faith, just as in any conscientious system of
- > religious ... er... let's just say... self-proving procedures.
- > Larry

---

- *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ *Re: "Friendly Premises"*  
◇ *From: Acme Diagnostics*

- *References:*

- ◆ *Re: "Friendly Premises"*  
◇ *From: Torkel Franzen*
- ◆ *Re: "Friendly Premises"*  
◇ *From: Acme Diagnostics*

- 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*