

# Re: Torkel Franzén is dead

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2006-06/msg00675.html>

---

- *From:* "MoeBlee" <[jazzmobe@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:jazzmobe@xxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 23 Jun 2006 15:27:29 -0700
- 

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?

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

Re: Torkel Franzén is dead

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

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

that he discriminated on the basis of PhDs,

Call it a "correlation" not a discrimination. 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? 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").

Re: Torkel Franzén is dead

Re: Torkel Franzén is dead

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 Koskensisilta. Nevertheless, I  
find your characterization of Koskensisilta's view to be clearly  
unreasonable.

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.

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. That makes communication with you  
laborious at best.

MoeBlee

.