

---

Subject: Re: Looking for a new gamer

Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 13 Nov 2009 16:10:42 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

SSADMVR wrote on Fri, 13 November 2009 08:07Dover wrote on Fri, 13 November 2009 16:56If the threshold for truth was so low, then all I would have to do is say "JohnDoe is a real faggot. He's also German, according to the little flag next to his name. All Germans must be faggots". In fact, I'd have extra support for my claim since I could also point to Madrackz. Regardless, that wouldn't make my claim any more true. I'm sure there is a German out there who isn't a huge throbbing faggot.

That theory would be academically correct. Premises are correct, so the outcome is too. You are sure there are Germans that are not faggots, but you do not KNOW.

Well, not entirely true because the example is retarded. Weither or not someone is a faggot is not a fact. Therefore can never be a premise.

No. It isn't academically correct. The premise goes from the specific to the general, and ignores the possibility of any kind exception (In fact, it ignores the possibility that the observation may be the exception, and the greater majority wouldn't follow the "rule").

SSADMVR wrote on Fri, 13 November 2009 08:08Dover wrote on Fri, 13 November 2009 10:04SSADMVR wrote on Fri, 13 November 2009 08:02lol, idiot. You can not know wether information is correct or incorrect before you learn the actual information. Therefore, learning anything > learning nothing. Following your theory, you advise to never learn anything, now that isn't ignorant at all...

Someone hasn't been following the thread...

SSADMVR wrote on Fri, 13 November 2009 08:02Oh and, theory is correct when deduction and induction are used correctly untill someone proves it is not. That's how it works.

No, that isn't how it works, because induction can never prove anything. Ever. Combined with deduction it can, notice the "and". And no, I didn't read all the thread. But what you wrote was wrong, so I corrected you.

You're wrong. It's not "and". It's just deductive reasoning. Inductive reasoning alone can't prove anything. Deductive reasoning alone can. By adding induction, you haven't added anything to your evidence. Deduction is still doing all the logical heavy lifting.

---