

# Issues In The Meaning And Definition of Logic

Post by “Mathitis Kipouros” of August 25, 2021 at 9:02 AM

I find this link, that explains the different types of reasoning:

[Deductive Reasoning vs. Inductive Reasoning](#)

I think is short enough to be worth reading when you see this.

This is sort of a very summarized version of what the podcast explains.

[Quote from Godfrey](#)

This is what has always struck me about logic (not that I'm close to being an expert!). You can have an internally consistent argument that has no basis in reality, so what's the point?

I'm not sure what internally consistent means, but I gather that you may be talking about an argument being valid (that is, well formed) and it being true. This article addresses that: if the premises are false, the conclusion is going to be false. But this doesn't discard the whole framework of logic, as a useful means for communicating an argument, it just emphasizes that if you use it wrong you'll get wrong results.

[Quote from Cassius](#)

I do think that math and geometry are useful and when not considered to be magical is valuable to know.

From what I read the only type of reasoning that would allow magic, is abductive reasoning, because it allows for the less certainty. As a understand them, deductive logic gives general premises to confirm that a particular case is an instance of them (less margin of error), the inductive takes particular observations to infer a general rule about things (more margin of error), and abductive takes whatever particular observations and jumps to "the most likely particular conclusion" (thus, the greatest margin of error).