

Re: Epistemology 201: The Science of Science

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.cognitive/2005-03/0657.html>

From: Wolf Kirchmeir (wwolfkir_at_sympatico.ca)

Date: 03/06/05

Date: Sun, 06 Mar 2005 08:42:36 -0500

Albert Wagner wrote:

> *Wolf Kirchmeir wrote:*

>

>> *Albert Wagner wrote:*

>>

>>> *Wolf Kirchmeir wrote:*

>>

>>

>> [...]

>>

>>>> *Well, Albert, it wasn't intended as a smart arse remark but as an explanation of why I didn't comment on the rest of that post. I thought that it was enough to show there was a question-begging assumption -- that you would see the problem, and so accept that there was no point in commenting on the rest of the post, since it didn't recognise the question-begging. You had in some other post complained about snipping. (I can't recall the context of that complaint, though.)*

>>>>

>>>> *And you still haven't shown in what way the quoted definition does not beg the question. If you think I've mnisread it in some way, I'd like to know how.*

>>>>

>>>>

>>> *It is so tedious to attempt to argue with someone who will never admit to any wrong, even when it is documented on usenet. Your solution is to simply snip whatever seems incriminating under the simple-minded illusion that no one will read previous posts.*

>>>>

>>> *The phrase "begging the question" is a logical fallacy also called circular argument or circular reasoning. It is applied to a logical argument not to a definition given in reply to jmfahciv@aol.com.*

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>