

Re: Epistemology 201: The Science of Science

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-03/2023.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 misread 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.*

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>> *I beg to differ. A definition that states that X has certain properties is a type of logical argument: it's a short form for "If X has {properties}, then it is a Y."*

>

>

> *Bullshit. A dictionary is *not* a list of logical arguments full of
> logical fallacies.*

[...]

I didn't say so. I said the definition under discussion begged a question. OK, so you don't like that. Would it make you happier to say that "when used in an argument, this definition begs a question"? If so, I'll say it that way, though I see no difference myself.

As to not being able to read my mind, I thought you prided yourself on your "reading comprehension." I took you at your word, and stopped being tediously explicit. And stupid ad hominem attacks is what I get for my pains.

As for claiming a "private definition", I did no such thing. I analysed the definition offered as best I could. You will note that I did not say whether or not I believed intuition requires non-rational processes – I left the question open. I repeatedly said "we don't know [that]". In fact, I have nowhere stated what I think intuition is. I referred to a definition I gleaned from psychology texts at one point, and you jumped to the conclusion that it represented my view, and made a smart arse remark about that, too. Why? because it disagreed with you apparently believe. You're kind of tetchy with disagreements – does your ego really depend on whether or not some concept is true? Do you think I think you're stupid just because I detect what I think is an error? For the record, I don't. But when you respond with LOL and stronger insults, I wonder whether you are in fact capable of recognising what might look an error to someone else, or actual error for that matter.

For the record, I don't know what intuition is – I only know what people think it is, and AFAICT those concepts are flawed.

BTW, dictionaries tell you what people mean by a word, which may or may not be true about the thing referred to. Progress is made when people ask not, "Is this actually what people mean?", but "Is this actually the case?" That's how I see it anyhow. And don't come back with some variation of "I don't need to be lectured on that."

You seem to be more concerned with winning an argument than with discussing issues. Pity, since when you do stick to issues, you usually make good sense.

Presumably you offered the dictionary definition because you agreed with it. If so, you must have grounds for agreeing with it. What are they?