

## ***Interactive comment on “Agnotology: learning from mistakes” by R. E. Benestad et al.***

**J. C. Hanekamp**

hjaap@xs4all.nl

Received and published: 4 July 2013

It seems indeed a dead end when Benesatd et al. refuse to tackle the issue of circularity, which I in the last comment clearly and logically explicated and found lacking. Not a word is spilt on that central issue, and that is telling. And of course, the reality of non-epistemic drivers in theory choices (no need for internet pages; the scientific literature I referred to will do just fine) are explicated using analogous examples, not as an insinuation in the direction of the climate change debate. Reading is perhaps not easy, but surely not that hard.

In the final analysis, merely disagreeing, as Benestad et al. do, is not enough. That, as I teach my students, is not an argument, but merely an assertion in need of evidence. But that seems wholly lost on Benestad et al., or perhaps, and I am guessing now, standards in climate science are simply that fast and loose.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

