

margin note on **logic**

on page 23 in "Scared Stiff - ..., a Documentary";
page 2 in "Proposition Seven"

(Kant called a 'logically valid' structure one that has 'logical truth', the criteria of which he says are as follows:)

*⁹**Immanuel Kant** the physics-, math- and logic-professor's definition of logical validity (validity: 'strength'), in his lecture notes published 1800 and 1801, is this: **logical validity is an argument whose reasons are all possible to be true at the same time** ("*criterion of possibility: contradiction-rule, the requirement that reasons **not contradict one another***": consistency) **and are sufficient to necessitate one particular conclusion only** ("*criterion of sufficient reasons: **the hanging together** of the reasons with what follows", i.e. with the conclusion that follows, causing absurd conflict with the opposite conclusive claim). So logical validity is 1:**consistency** of all claims involved in the argument and 2:**cohesion** between reasons and conclusive claim. 1 is verified by a consistency-test, to demonstrate the **absence of contradiction**, and 2 by a reduction-to-absurdity-test in which we replace the conclusion by the opposite claim and demonstrate a **contradiction arising**. An argument with reasons (premises) that contradict one another is not logically valid by this standard. It is Immanuel **Kant's** standard and Ludwig **Wittgenstein's** standard. **Modern** statisticians have since invented 'self-contradiction-independent logical *validity*', but its purpose is self-serving: the purpose being, of course, the benefit: inconspicuous storage of self-contradicting statistical data. The problem with that is that **they too must lie to hide some underlying motive, the statistics-limited benefit of it**; and they had to create a validity-test that does not work, not quite, because the test (put in the opposite conclusion and verify a contradiction) is not really a 'reduction **to**' absurdity when the argument tested **already has** contradicting reasons/premises in it. Yet they still call it a 'reduction-**to**-absurdity-test'. An uglier problem is the fact that the prominent proponents for this validity-theory pretend that it is grounded in a naturally occurring phenomenon: {the observation that all **valid** arguments are self-contradicting after we switch to the opposite conclusive claim}¹ - to which "DA!" is all there is to say - and proceed to argue that {'**therefore**, if we come across an argument with contradicting premises, it is **valid**'}², where {¹⁺²} is an argument called 'affirming the consequent', which even they say is 'logically invalid', which it is. **So they use a***

verifiably invalid argument form to argue for the propriety of their theory of validity. It is **circular reasoning**, so that is why it is invalid. And they make billions in book-sales. The authors who do this are: Paul **Tidman**, Howard **Kahane** and Alan **Hausman**, professors of math and statistics etc., together with their publisher: **Wadsworth Cengage Learning**, Boston, MA. They have taken over all teaching of 'logic' in all universities on planet Earth. No wonder why de-ductive logic isn't a mandatory bachelor-level course in today's 'higher' education, and I only mention this because I think it ought to be. I hate to sound like some logic-nerd (*nerd: 'un-cool person'*), but I think it's pretty cool to prove these fraudsters the asses they are.

cf. Soerfjord 2013; PhD thesis HKU
ksoerfjord@gmail.com