

Re: Torkel Franzén is dead

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2006-06/msg00611.html>

- *From:* "George Dance" <georgedance04@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 23 Jun 2006 16:26:09 -0700
-

MoeBlee wrote:

George Dance wrote:

Then I can
only
conclude
that you
believe that
(1) some
people
never
need to use
principles
of good
reasoning,
or (2)
everyone
needs to use
principles
of fluid
mechanics.

What?! He didn't say there
are people who don't need to
use good
reasoning. He said that there
are people who don't need to
learn FORMAL
logic.

Which leaves him one way to escape the
dilemma,

What dilemma?

Re: Torkel Franzén is dead

Of asserting either (1) or (2) above).

the one he took: to deny that the principles of formal logic have any connection with principles of good reasoning.

Please provide a quote in which Franzen said that there is NO connection between formal logic and principles of good reasoning.

Yet another apparent straw man – even more apparent, since it's clear that 'he' refers to Aatu Koskensisilta.

My mistake. Yes, it was Koskensisilta to whom you referred.

What Aatu eventually said, in response to the dilemma, was: "Teaching someone to "use" some formal calculi or other in no way constitutes teaching correct reasoning." Do you think I'm misinterpreting the meaning of 'in no way'?

Yes, since what Koskensisilta said does not entail that Koskensisilta believes there is no connection between formal logic and principles of good reasoning. All Koskensisilta argued was that teaching formal logic is not itself to teach correct reasoning;

No; he did not say it "is not in itself to teach correct reasoning"; he said it "in no way constitutes teaching correct reasoning" – which clearly sounds to me like mutual exclusivity.

and I take that in a REASONABLE sense (as opposed to your MOST unreasonable misconstrual) that teaching formal logic does not ensure that the student will exercise good reasoning in informal contexts.

What's unreasonable about it? Some mathematicians believe that logical relations like implication are purely mathematical relations which correspond to reality no more than, say, the implications of geometry. I don't see anything unreasonable in inferring that Aatu; if he thinks

Re: Torkel Franzén is dead

Re: Torkel Franzén is dead

it's unreasonable, he can tell me that and clarify what he does mean.

He doesn't need you to speak for him.

It is NOT reasonable to think that Koskensisilta thereby claims that there is no connection between formal logic and principles of good reasoning.

And just why not? Spell out your own reasoning, so we can see the reasonableness.

You're starting to rack up a list of claims as to what Franzen said, but in too many instances those claims are without an actual quote of Franzen provided by you.

Three of those claims – that Frankel raised the issue of PhDs,

See my previous post. YOU mentioned something like. "Not unless he raised the issue." So, NATURALLY, I asked you say where he raised the issue. If he did NOT raise the issue, then your remark is utterly irrelevant

As I've explained, he raised the issue of some people being Subxxxxx, er, Some People: IOW, people with no aptitude for formal logic, whom he said are caused to uttering absurdities by exposure to it. I explained to you how that distinction correlated with holding a PhD: Franzen did not classify math PhD's as Some People. (Your response to that, IIRC, being roughly 'whatever'). Is any of that still unclear to you?

and leaves your charge of a "correlation" with PhDs unsubstantiated.

As I've told you, my evidence is purely anecdotal: I have yet to see one post in which he treated a math PhD in the way he treated the targets of the posts I've submitted so far. That is fully consistent with my hypothesis. Do you have one – yes, even one – counterexample to that claim?

Re: Torkel Franzén is dead

that he
discriminated on the basis of PhDs,

Call it a "correlation" not a discrimination.

Call it both; on the completely reasonable hypothesis that Franzen saw a connection between holding a math PhD and the grounds – perceived 'aptitude' in formal logic – by which he did discriminate.

Fine. You just need to
say EXACTLY what is your claim about a "correlation" (that is, a correlation that does not manifest as Franzen discriminating along the lines of that correlation?

I've explained that: Franzen discriminated between SPs (who, he believed lacked the aptitude for math) and non-SPs. Since it is reasonable to think he saw a connection between having 'aptitude' and being a math PhD, it's reasonable to think that he did not treat those the way he treated PhDs. The evidence so far supports that; in all the posts and testimony we've looked at, there is no evidence of his treating a math PhD like an SP.

Is that right? If not, then I don't know
what you're claiming. I just don't know what it is exactly that you claim about a "correlation" let alone that you haven't shown a "correlation").

Well, now I've claimed a correlation based on the evidence so far: no evidence for any math PhDs that Franzen treated like Ist Semester Logic Student (in thread A), or me (in thread B), or any of the other people I'll be introducing later.

and now that he made the above
statement – look like claims that you added to the list yourself.

It was my mistake regarding Franzen and Koskensilta. Nevertheless, I find your characterization of Koskensilta's view to be clearly unreasonable.

If he thinks they're unreasonable, he can qualify them. I can't see anything unreasonable about believing that he holds them (or that Franzen held the same views, I FTM).

Re: Torkel Franzén is dead

Re: Torkel Franzén is dead

Meanwhile, there's also that little matter of your claim that Franzen "completely ignored" (or whatever exact wording you used) the subject of the the thread on logic in schools.

Oh? What exactly did he say about logic in schools? You have the thread: Give us a post in which he said one word about teaching logic in schools. AFAICS, he completely ignored that topic, and merely used the thread as a sounding board for his views (which he made clear in both word and action) about SP's like me.

And you have a really bad habit of too often taking certain things that people say in the most ridiculous sense you can extract from the actual reasonable statement being made.

I know you have a different opinion about what Torkel meant when describec my kind as having no mathematical aptitude. My opinion is borne out by what else he said to me, and to others who seemed to have no 'aptitude', like 1st Semester Logic Student (and some other characters who'll come along later). What is your opinion based on, except your further opinion that yours are reasonable opinions?

That makes communication with you laborious at best.

Perhaps. If you just accepted that everything I claimed was 'reasonable', that would make it easier for me, too. But i don't think that's going to happen any time soon, nor do I see why you would think it.

MoeBlee