

<http://anatheistviewpoint.blogspot.com/2011/11/why-ill-not-be-bothering-with-bahnsen.html>

March 22, 2012

Friday, 4 November 2011

Why I'll Not Be Bothering With Bahnsen

'You should read Greg Bahnsen!' - a regular cry from the presubullshitters, trying to explain their argument. What the hell, why not? I'll have a look!

Ok, here's a piece by him entitled "[The Crucial Concept of Self-Deception in Presuppositional Apologetics](#)" (snappy!), let's see how it starts.....hmmm, not well, not well at all. *First sentence* - That self-deception which is practiced by all unregenerate men according to the Apostle Paul's incisive description in Romans 1:18ff. is at once religiously momentous and yet philosophically enigmatic.

Brilliant! An attack on 'unregenerate men', and an appeal to scripture within the first 20 words! I'll save you from wading through the rest, it's just a mass of circular reasoning and appeals to authority, a bit of a chore to read all told.

I did like this towards the end though, where Bahnsen describes the self deceit of the non-believer -

1. S believes that p,
2. S is motivated to ignore, hide, deny (etc.) his belief that p, and
3. By misconstruing or rationalizing the evidence, S brings himself to believe falsely that "S does not believe that p."

- see that? He's claiming that the non-believer is MOTIVATED to 'ignore, hide, deny'! It's that same old trick of claiming to know what others think, without actually having any knowledge AT ALL of the thoughts of others.

Really Bahnsen comes across as a bit of a self important cunt, no wonder his fans are bellends to a man! One does wonder though, did they become bellends through exposure to this 'argument', or were they attracted to the argument because they recognised it's inherent bellendism....

If only I had a special revelation that could tell me....

Posted by [Alex B](#) at 00:58

[Email This](#)[BlogThis!](#)[Share to Twitter](#)[Share to Facebook](#)

141 comments:

C.L. Bolt Nov 3, 2011 06:14 PM

This comment has been removed by the author.

[Reply](#)

Alex B Nov 3, 2011 06:16 PM

"I do wish, for your sake, you would calm down and read these things more thoughtfully. Christians are not the meanies and morons you make them out to be."

That may be true, but they are all, without fail, deeply deluded. As I've said elsewhere, I feel sorry for you wasting your only life on this stuff.

[Reply](#)

C.L. Bolt Nov 3, 2011 06:25 PM

This comment has been removed by the author.

Reply

Alex B Nov 3, 2011 06:34 PM

Only I'm not, as I accept things as real based on actual evidence - you do not.

Other people had spoken quite highly of you, so I'm a bit disappointed to see you indulging in Sye-isms in place of reason.

Reply

C.L. Bolt Nov 3, 2011 07:19 PM

This comment has been removed by the author.

Reply

Anonymous Nov 3, 2011 09:36 PM

Two? In your first comment above? So, which two of the four question marks did you want him to answer?

I'm curious now! This should get interesting...

JoE

Reply

Alex B Nov 4, 2011 01:04 AM

"I accept things as real based on actual evidence - you do not."

Fair enough, let's have that evidence then.

On those two questions - 1. one doesn't need to be a farmer in order to smell bullshit 2. ask Sam Harris

Reply

Anonymous Nov 4, 2011 02:54 PM

"And let's not talk about engaging in other things than reason. I asked you two simple questions that you refused to answer."

Typical christian liar. Can't even tell the simple truth about how many questions he has asked.

Why anyone believes a word that comes out of christians' lying mouths, I'll never understand. Fear of eternal punishment won't do it for me. Promises of eternal heavenly reward won't do it for me. What would it take for me to believe those scummy liars ?

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 5, 2011 06:47 PM

Hello Alex,

I'm back from my excursion to Burma and see that Sye has apparently abandoned the conversation over on [your other blog entry](#). Apparently he could not answer the few questions I posed to him. Really, that wasn't even a warm-up!

I checked out the present entry, given that it pertained to Bahnsen, and saw Chris Bolt's comments. Naturally a presuppositionalist of the Vantillian sort (V'illains) are going to want to defend Bahnsen's reputation. I would have to concede that Bahnsen was in a way an expert in self-deception – look at what he wanted to believe and how he tried to get others to spread the same belief.

In Bolt's comments, the following statement stuck out:

Bolt: *"It is not, 'just a mass of circular reasoning and appeals to authority' either, and merely asserting that does not*

make it so."

Notice how Bolt is presupposing the primacy of existence in this statement. He's clearly saying that something is not the case "merely" by asserting that it is not the case. He's saying that something is the case essentially regardless of what anyone says, wishes, thinks, feels, desires, commands, etc. In terms of the subject-object relationship, this reduces to the view that the objects of consciousness are what they are and exist independent of conscious activity. That's the primacy of existence. It's the principle which underwrites our recognition that "wishing doesn't make it so."

And yet, presuppositionalist Dustin Segers just got through announcing to the world that the primacy of existence is false, that it's self-refuting, that its defenses beg the question, and that it makes the same error as logical positivism. (See [here](#) and [here](#).) And here presuppositionalist Chris Bolt is invoking the principle to defend his position!

How can this be?

I propose that it's because the primacy of existence really is true, despite presuppositionalist gyrations against it, that in fact it's inescapable, and that attempts to deny or refute the primacy of existence are self-defeating because they assume precisely what they're trying to deny or refute.

I have already shown (see for instance [here](#)) precisely how the primacy of existence is incompatible with theism, since theism explicitly presupposes the primacy of consciousness. I've pointed this out to Chris Bolt before, but he puts it safely out of his mind while making use of the very principle which his worldview cannot consistently integrate.

There's plenty to say about Bahnsen, self-deception, Ph.Ds, appeals to Sam Harris, and other matters which crop up in Bolt's comment, but this is the biggie, and in fact it's the one which is most important in exposing the irrationality of god-belief.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 5, 2011 07:05 PM

"Sye has apparently abandoned the conversation over on your other blog entry."

Alex is deleting my comments. If you'd like to debate these issues, I trust Eric would be happy to host it. I haven't heard you debate yet, and would be happy to engage the infamous "Bahnsen Burner" in a live debate! Just contact me through my website.

Cheers.

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 5, 2011 07:20 PM

Sye wrote: "Alex is deleting my comments. If you'd like to debate these issues, I trust Eric would be happy to host it. I haven't heard you debate yet, and would be happy to engage the infamous "Bahnsen Burner" in a live debate! Just contact me through my website."

But you've already told me that you won't be able to meet my terms, Sye. Particularly the part about being an honest opponent. (See the comments of [this blog](#) if you don't remember.) I don't understand why you continue to try to move the conversation to some verbal format when it seems apparent that you're not even able to interact with my points in writing.

Regardless, my situation is far too unpredictable at this time to commit to any kind of schedule as I am currently in evacuation from a flooded Bangkok.

Meanwhile, perhaps you can explain why Chris Bolt performatively relies on a principle which your friend Dustin

Segers says is false, self-refuting, and indefensible. What do you say?

After that, there are numerous other open questions I've posed to you that I'd like to see answered. If you're afraid that your comments are being deleted here, feel free to come over to my blog. I won't delete your comments. Promise! I want the world to see.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 5, 2011 07:35 PM

"But you've already told me that you won't be able to meet my terms, Sye. Particularly the part about being an honest opponent."

Erm, then why are you engaging me here? Methinks your cowardice is showing. No wonder you seem to get along with Alex! :-)

Cheers!

P.S. Delete away Alex!

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 5, 2011 07:38 PM

"After that, there are numerous other open questions I've posed to you that I'd like to see answered."

I wasn't thrilled with your "answers" either. Surely you could carve an hour or so out of your busy schedule for a debate? C'mon, how is it that you have NEVER had time to do one? You aren't doing a Dawkins are you?

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 5, 2011 07:44 PM

Sye: "Erm, then why are you engaging me here?"

Sorry, do you not know the difference between a friendly exchange in the form of written comments in a blog post, and debate hosted on a podcast?

By the way, what is it that you want to debate anyway?

Sye: "Methinks your cowardice is showing."

Sye, I've interacted thoroughly with your website. I don't see how that counts as "cowardice." Meanwhile, you're the one who has not responded to my refutation of your website, so I think you're putting the shoe on the wrong foot.

But meanwhile, again, I wonder how you can reconcile the conflict between the presuppositional context of Chris Bolt's statement above, and Dustin Segers' unresearched attempts to refute the primacy of existence. Can you account for this? If not, then just ignore it.

Also, I was wondering how you can account for anything epistemological when your worldview has no theory of concepts. Where do you get the idea that this is possible when you have no understanding of concepts?

Sye: "No wonder you seem to get along with Alex! :-)"

I've never met Alex, but so far as I can tell he seems like a fine chap. What's wrong with getting along with your neighbor?

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 5, 2011 07:52 PM

Sye; "I wasn't thrilled with your 'answers' either."

The issue is not whether or not you're "thrilled" with my answers, but whether or not you can cogently respond to them and successfully defend your god-belief in the process. I'm of the measured opinion that you can't. But you have the opportunity – if not in the comments of Alex's blog, certainly on mine – to show that you can.

Sye: "Surely you could carve an hour or so out of your busy schedule for a debate?"

Believe me, I wish I could count on an hour to devote to anything here, but things are quite chaotic and out of my control. That's something I have to live with, even if you find it inconvenient for your self-promotional activities.

Sye: "C'mon, how is it that you have NEVER had time to do one?"

I don't believe I've ever stated that I've never had the time to do one. It's never been my thing frankly. My expertise lies in my writing – it's far more valuable. Besides, you never did answer my initial question to you when you first floated the suggestion: what would be the point?

Sye: "You aren't doing a Dawkins are you?"

Dawkins has a history of live performances in a debate context, I do not. In your haste to associate me with someone you'd like to discredit in your mind, you've ignored some crucial distinctions. Besides, unlike Dawkins, you can engage me any time on my blog. I'm available, but only according to a haphazardly shifting schedule.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 5, 2011 07:55 PM

"Sorry, do you not know the difference between a friendly exchange in the form of written comments in a blog post, and debate hosted on a podcast?"

Perhaps I have been listening to Alex too much :-D

"By the way, what is it that you want to debate anyway?"

The existence of God, and whatever questions you feel I have not adequately answered.

"Meanwhile, you're the one who has not responded to my refutation of your website"

I am not interested in your argumentum ad verbosium. Bring your 'refutation' to the debate.

"Can you account for this?"

I sure ain't takin' your word for any supposed conflict and what it has nothing to do with you and me.

"Also, I was wondering how you can account for anything epistemological when your worldview has no theory of concepts."

Great question for the debate!

"I've never met Alex, but so far as I can tell he seems like a fine chap. What's wrong with getting along with your neighbor?"

Nothing. I'm sure pig farmers don't mind each others stink either.

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 5, 2011 08:04 PM

"The issue is not whether or not you're "thrilled" with my answers, but whether or not you can cogently respond to them and successfully defend your god-belief in the process."

Um, check out my website. Debating people is what I do. I am tired of your dodging though.

"Believe me, I wish I could count on an hour to devote to anything here, but things are quite chaotic and out of my control. That's something I have to live with, even if you find it inconvenient for your self-promotional activities."

Riiiiight. You've been posting here for over an hour. Quit with the lame excuses please.

"It's never been my thing frankly."

So which excuse do you want to stick with?

"what would be the point?"

Same point that you have in engaging me anywhere.

"In your haste to associate me with someone you'd like to discredit in your mind, you've ignored some crucial distinctions."

Indeed there is a distinction in that he grew some, but lost them, you've never had them ;-)

Cheers

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 5, 2011 09:34 PM

I asked: "By the way, what is it that you want to debate anyway?"

Sye responded: "The existence of God,"

I figured as much. Fortunately I've already settled this question. What is there to debate?

Sye: "and whatever questions you feel I have not adequately answered."

To say that your answers are not adequate would imply that you've presented answers in the first place. But you haven't. You continually try to shift to another topic, just as you have in this exchange. Don't you see that? Step back and take a look at how you've tried to steer the conversation into a direction different from the real topic at hand.

I wrote: "Meanwhile, you're the one who has not responded to my refutation of your website"

Sye: "I am not interested in your argumentum ad verbosium. Bring your 'refutation' to the debate."

Why? If you can't deal with it in writing, why should anyone think you have anything of value to say on it verbally? Why not simply explain why the category "immaterial" is appropriate for the laws of logic while "conceptual" isn't? It's clear that you don't think they're conceptual, since you've stressed so emphatically and repeatedly that you think they're "immaterial." And you do this because you have no *conceptual* understanding of logic. And that's because your worldview provides you with no account for the conceptual level of cognition.

I asked: "Can you account for this?"

Sye: "I sure ain't takin' your word for any supposed conflict and what it has nothing to do with you and me."

I don't expect you to simply take my word for it. I presented my analysis above in my comments in response to Chris Bolt. Did you read them? Do you see how Chris Bolt's statements are in fundamental conflict with Dustin Segers'? If you don't, let me know what's unclear to you. I'm happy to explain, as there may be readers here who don't understand, and I'm always happy to help them understand.

I wrote: "Also, I was wondering how you can account for anything epistemological when your worldview has no theory of concepts."

Sye: "Great question for the debate!"

If you can't even muster an answer in a comments section, why suppose you'd have anything of value to offer on the topic in a live debate? See, you just don't seem to get it: there's nothing of value to be gained here. I accomplish what I want accomplish in my writings. And I stand unrefuted.

Tell you what: I've raised this point (namely that your worldview has no account for concepts) several times in dialogue with you, and you've never tried to challenge it. Can you at least make your concession to this point clear? Can you openly state for the record, here and now, your acknowledgement of the fact that biblical Christianity has no theory of concepts? If you are unwilling to acknowledge this, and maybe claim that Christianity does in fact have its own distinctively Christian theory of concepts, can you show me where I can find it? Feel free to give book, chapter and verse of the passages in the bible which maybe you think spell out a theory of concepts. If you can't, then I will accept your concession on the matter.

[Continued...]

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 5, 2011 09:41 PM

I wrote: "I've never met Alex, but so far as I can tell he seems like a fine chap. What's wrong with getting along with your neighbor?"

Sye: "Nothing."

Indeed, nothing. So I guess I'm unclear on the intent of your innuendo. It's stuff like this that makes you so detestable. It's unnecessary and deliberately anti-social. It's as though you wanted people to dislike you. Do you?

I wrote: "The issue is not whether or not you're 'thrilled' with my answers, but whether or not you can cogently respond to them and successfully defend your god-belief in the process."

Sye: "Um, check out my website."

I have. I've refuted it. You haven't defended the argument showcased on your website from my refutation of it. Why not?

Sye: "Debating people is what I do."

That's debating? Really?

Sye: "I am tired of your dodging though."

I'm sorry, I really don't get this. It's so out of the blue. What do you think I'm "dodging"? I've spent the last several years engaging presuppositional apologetics expressly and directly, and I've posted my writings on the topic on the worldwide web for free public access. How on earth do you think I'm "dodging" anything?

Sye: "You've been posting here for over an hour."

Well over an hour. But with countless interruptions. Because of interruptions, it's taken over an hour to do what should take only 10 minutes.

Sye: "Quit with the lame excuses please."

First of all, Sye, what I've conveyed to you are not "excuses" – that's all *you* have for not addressing my refutation of your website - evasions and excuses ("It's too long! Wah wah wah!"), and now you're projecting. Second of all, I don't *need* an excuse not to talk to you verbally. I can do what the hell I please, even if you disapprove. Third, you've still not been able to explain what value there would be in such a spectacle – I'm a compassionate person, and I don't see the need to humiliate you publicly any more than you humiliate yourself. Fourth, since you've now made it clear that you want to debate the existence of your god, then I'm quite satisfied that there's nothing of value to be gained from such an exercise.

Perhaps what you're unclear on is that I do things for the sake of achieving and/or preserving values, and so far you've not persuaded me that there's any value to be gained and/or achieved in a live verbal exchange with someone who's as dishonest as you. At least in writing, there is some value – I don't have to make a transcript of your words to interact with them in my essays.

I asked: "what would be the point?"

Sye: "Same point that you have in engaging me anywhere."

That's impossible – for in a comments discussion I already have your words in writing and a site to point to where you've stated what you've stated. Also (and this is important), in writing, one has the ability to consider his words carefully, research his points, and review his work before publishing it. But I realize this is anathema to your purposes given the gimmickry of your apologetic devices. They won't work on me.

I wrote: "In your haste to associate me with someone you'd like to discredit in your mind, you've ignored some crucial distinctions."

Sye: "Indeed there is a distinction in that he grew some, but lost them, you've never had them ;-)"

Sye, you always seem to have a desire to bring an exchange down to a puerile, juvenile level. Why can't you interact with other adults *as an adult*? Believe me, Sye, you do not carry a reputation on the net as someone who's achieved maximum machismo. Belief in fantasies is certainly not macho.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 5, 2011 10:19 PM

Look Dawson, surely you realize that you are known for your verbal diarrhea, whether you agree with that assessment or not. When I first heard of you, I found an article online which echoed my sentiments exactly. I would be happy to engage you if you (or anyone) put your position into short points, as the amount that one has to sift through to determine if there is even a point in the diaper, is too laborious to bother.

Even your friend Alex here recently posted a TL:DR on a response to one of his arguments which was far shorter than just about everything I have seen you write.

If you could condense your thoughts such that you could debate them in a 1 to 2 hour time-frame, I'm sure that it would benefit many on both sides. I have looked online for any debate or talk that you have given and have found exactly nothing. If something like that exists, please let me know.

I skimmed some of your primacy of existence posts, and although I am not a philosopher, saw holes that one could drive a truck through. Surely, if nothing else you could set me straight on those in a debate.

What do you do if people meet you on the street who want to discuss this? Do you tell them to get out their laptop so you can talk? It all seems so very odd to me that you have never, to my knowledge, done anything other than write about your view. If I have missed something, please tell me where I can listen to one of your talks or debates?

Sorry, but your writing bores me out of my gourd. We could get this over with really quickly. Just pick out any 2 hour time slot, and I will do my best to meet it. I suggest having the exchange on Eric Hovind's show as my first encounter with Jim and Alex. I trust that Eric would also be accommodating to whatever time you were available.

Aside from all the bluster, I'd really like to have this exchange. I'm sure that even your 'fans' would love to hear it. Really, that's all I'm interested in. If you are not, then that's simply too bad.

Cheers.

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 5, 2011 11:39 PM

[Continued from above...]

I wrote: "I've never met Alex, but so far as I can tell he seems like a fine chap. What's wrong with getting along with your neighbor?"

Sye: "Nothing."

Indeed, nothing. So I guess I'm unclear on the intent of your innuendo. It's stuff like this that makes you so detestable. It's unnecessary and deliberately anti-social. It's as though you wanted people to dislike you. Do you?

I wrote: "The issue is not whether or not you're 'thrilled' with my answers, but whether or not you can cogently respond to them and successfully defend your god-belief in the process."

Sye: "Um, check out my website."

I have. I've refuted it. You haven't defended the argument showcased on your website from my refutation of it. Why not?

Sye: "Debating people is what I do."

That's debating? Really?

Sye: "I am tired of your dodging though."

I'm sorry, I really don't get this. It's so out of the blue. What do you think I'm "dodging"? I've spent the last several years engaging presuppositional apologetics expressly and directly, and I've posted my writings on the topic on the worldwide web for free public access. How on earth do you think I'm "dodging" anything?

Sye: "You've been posting here for over an hour."

Well over an hour. But with countless interruptions. Because of interruptions, it's taken over an hour to do what should take only 10 minutes.

Sye: "Quit with the lame excuses please."

First of all, Sye, what I've conveyed to you are not "excuses" – that's what you have for not addressing my refutation of your website, and you're projecting. Second of all, I don't *need* an excuse not to talk to you verbally. I can do what the hell I please, even if you disapprove. Third, you've still not been able to explain what value there would be in such a spectacle – I'm a compassionate person, and I don't see the need to humiliate you publicly any more than you humiliate yourself. Fourth, since you've now made it clear that you want to debate the existence of your god, then I'm quite satisfied that there's nothing of value to be gained from such an exercise.

Perhaps what you're unclear on is that I do things for the sake of achieving and/or preserving values, and so far you've not persuaded me that there's any value to be gained and/or achieved in a live verbal exchange with someone who's as dishonest as you. At least in writing, there is some value – I don't have to make a transcript of your words

to interact with them in my essays.

I asked: "what would be the point?"

Sye: "Same point that you have in engaging me anywhere."

That's impossible – for in a comments discussion I already have your words in writing and a site to point to where you've stated what you've stated. Also (and this is important), in writing, one has the ability to consider his words carefully, research his topic, check relevant facts, review related literature, and review his work before publishing it. But I realize this is anathema to your purposes given the gimmickry of your apologetic devices. They won't work on me.

I wrote: "In your haste to associate me with someone you'd like to discredit in your mind, you've ignored some crucial distinctions."

Sye: "Indeed there is a distinction in that he grew some, but lost them, you've never had them ;-)"

Sye, you always seem to have a desire to bring an exchange down to a puerile, juvenile level. Why can't you interact with other adults *as an adult*? Believe me, Sye, you do not carry a reputation on the net as someone who's achieved maximum machismo. Belief in fantasies is certainly not macho.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 5, 2011 11:58 PM

Instead of addressing the points that have been raised so far in this discussion, Sye continues to focus on whether or not there will be a verbal debate between us. I've already addressed this concern of his for self-promotion numerous times, and yet he still wants to make it an issue, and still resists addressing the worldview questions that I have raised. For instance, he's apparently reluctant for some reason to clarify whether or not he's willing to acknowledge the fact that his worldview has no distinctively Christian account for concepts. That to me is a huge issue and I'm not surprised to see him try to squirm away from it. He goes on about condensing my points to the level of soundbites, but when I've attempted to simulate this by asking a simple, direct question as to whether or not his worldview supplies its own account of concepts – something that surely cannot be charged with "verbal diarrhea" – he's utterly silent on the matter, and instead seeks to deflect the issue back to debating a topic that has already been settled in a podcast format. Amazing!

Sye wrote: "Look Dawson, surely you realize that you are known for your verbal diarrhea, whether you agree with that assessment or not."

I don't realize that because I don't know that. Also, I don't know what you mean by "verbal diarrhea" as neither you nor your old-earth creationist counterpart has provided any standard by which such an assessment can be secured. If my little blog entries qualify as "verbal diarrhea," then surely Greg Bahnsen, Cornelius Van Til, Robert Turkel, Steve Hays, and a whole host of other writers fit the rubric as well, otherwise it would appear that you're simply special-pleading your pejoratives.

Sye: "When I first heard of you, I found an article online which echoed my sentiments exactly."

Actually, what you were after was something to do your heavy lifting for you in discrediting me somehow. But even that source had been answered by the time you got to it, so it's unclear what value you think it really has other than meeting your penchant for the impression of having numbers on your side.

Sye: "I would be happy to engage you if you (or anyone) put your position into short points,"

I would be happy to engage you if

(a) you could persuade me that you can be honest;

- (b) you “repent” from your incessant habit of continually trying to drag the discussion down to a childish level (e.g., “grow some”);
- (c) you agree to settle on a topic that is actually up for debate (the topic of the existence of a god is a dead issue – god-belief is irrational and your god is merely imaginary);
- (d) you demonstrate that you can stick with an issue and will resist your urges to redirect the conversation to some other topic (as you have done right here in these exchanges); and
- (e) you could show me where the bible lays out a distinctively Christian theory of concepts. Start by explaining what your worldview means by ‘concept’; show where your worldview provides this meaning; present the steps by which your worldview analyzes the process by which the human mind forms concepts; explain the relationship between concepts and the units which they integrate (assuming your worldview conceives of concepts as integrating units to begin with); show how your worldview’s theory of concepts is compatible with your worldview’s denial of the primacy of existence (good luck there!). Those would be for starters.

Game?

If not, I guess I must admit I’ve never seen someone so soundly defeated even before a debate has had a chance to take place.

[Continued...]

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 6, 2011 12:04 AM

Sye: “as the amount that one has to sift through to determine if there is even a point in the diaper, is too laborious to bother.”

So far as I know of, only Christians have had this complaint. Those who have attention spans greater than a 30-second toothpaste commercial are in a position to gain from what I’ve written. But this a choice that each individual makes for himself. We all know what choice you’ve made for yourself.

Sye: “If you could condense your thoughts such that you could debate them in a 1 to 2 hour time-frame, I’m sure that it would benefit many on both sides.”

Did you read my comment regarding Chris Bolt’s statement assuming the truth of the primacy of existence? If that’s too lengthy for you to examine and consider, then you couldn’t possibly have anything of value to offer in a discussion of worldviews. So again you’re just confirming that you would be ill-suited to hold a verbal discussion with me.

Sye: “I skimmed some of your primacy of existence posts, and although I am not a philosopher, saw holes that one could drive a truck through. Surely, if nothing else you could set me straight on those in a debate.”

Debate would not be the proper format to discuss your misunderstanding of the primacy of existence. A written exchange would be far more suitable for this. Why not identify what you here call “holes that one could drive a truck through” and I would be happy to explore them with you. That would be the intellectual thing to do. A verbal exchange is simply not suited for this kind of inquiry. In such a format, I would simply ask you to state what you consider to be problems, I would then write them down and say that I would get back to you on them in my blog. They would be answered that way, and they’d be answered in writing, which means anyone could examine them at their leisure. I would also be able to support my points with quotations and references to the relevant literature. So not only would it be the intellectual thing to do, it would be the scholarly thing to do. What you propose – and your precedents simply confirm this – is neither intellectual nor scholarly.

Sye: “What do you do if people meet you on the street who want to discuss this?”

This has happened only a few times in my life, and it’s usually Mormons and JW’s who do this. Their intent is to con me into believing a fantasy. But if they approach me, I always have an open door. In such cases, I first of all let them have their say. I listen. I try to understand the basics of their view of the world in terms of fundamentals, beginning with the relationship their points assume between consciousness and its objects. Once I’ve gathered enough information, I try to explain to them as carefully as I can if and where there are any flaws in their thinking.

If you want an example, I wrote about one on my blog [here](#). Time and time again, these folks never want to come back to me, even though I am always cordial, I'm happy to listen to them, and I usually invite them to come back. But once they encounter me, they want nothing to do with me. I'm sure they go back to their congregations and tell others never to come to my door, for none ever do.

Sye: "Do you tell them to get out their laptop so you can talk?"

No. I don't make the presumption that they have laptops to begin with.

[Continued...]

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 6, 2011 12:07 AM

Sye: "It all seems so very odd to me that you have never, to my knowledge, done anything other than write about your view."

I've done many things other than write about my views. The other day, for instance, I traveled to Burma. That's not equivalent to writing about my view.

Sye: "If I have missed something, please tell me where I can listen to one of your talks or debates?"

You've missed a lot, but your loss won't be compensated by a mere wave file.

Sye: "Sorry, but your writing bores me out of my gourd."

Good. It's time to get out of your gourd to begin with. Come out of the darkness and absorb some light. But to do this, Sye, you need to make the commitment to be honest. That's what's holding you back more than anything.

Sye: "We could get this over with really quickly."

But it is over with already. I've already proved that your god-belief is irrational. But if you want something in the form of a syllogism to sink your teeth into, try this (from my blog [A Proof that the Christian God Does Not Exist](#)):

Premise 1: That which is imaginary is not real.

Premise 2: If something is not real, it does not actually exist.

Premise 3: If the god of Christianity is imaginary, then it is not real and therefore does not actually exist.

Premise 4: The god of Christianity is imaginary.

Conclusion: Therefore, the god of Christianity is not real and therefore does not actually exist.

Of course, I'm guessing that you'll dispute Premise 1. As for Premise 4, I have presented 13 points of evidence in support of it [here](#).

Sye: "Aside from all the bluster, I'd really like to have this exchange."

Then you'll have to start on the points I gave above. Let me know when you've satisfied them.

Sye: "I'm sure that even your 'fans' would love to hear it."

Perhaps so. But I'm not in this to impress my fans. I'm in this to indulge my own passion.

Sye: "Really, that's all I'm interested in. If you are not, then that's simply too bad."

Then you willfully pass on the opportunity to answer my refutation of your arguments, simple as that. It's your

choice. Live with it.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Alex B Nov 6, 2011 01:44 AM

"P.S. Delete away Alex!"

Nah, I'm leaving this stuff for all to see, as you're being utterly shown up.

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 6, 2011 05:30 AM

Does anyone need any more evidence that Dawson Bethrick is afraid to debate his views, and simply tries to hide it an an avalanche of verbiage? I don't.

Certainly there is enough evidence in this thread alone, but by all means, go to his blog and see for yourself.

To those reading along, if I have missed something, and Dawson has indeed debated anyone, or given any talk, please let me know, I'd really like to hear it, instead of the crickets.

Cheers.

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 6, 2011 05:32 AM

"Nah, I'm leaving this stuff for all to see, as you're being utterly shown up."

Oh, so now the criteria for allowing posts is whether or not you feel I have been shown up? So let me guess, you delete the posts where you are being shown up! Brilliant!

Reply

Alex B Nov 6, 2011 05:38 AM

Dawson has made you look like a fool.

As for what I keep and delete, that's up to me. My blog, my rules.

Reply

Alex B Nov 6, 2011 05:39 AM

BTW, Sye, I'll be sure to let you know the second you 'show me up' - you've not succeeded yet, so I'll not be waiting in anticipation.

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 6, 2011 05:50 AM

Sye: "Does anyone need any more evidence that Dawson Bethrick is afraid to debate his views, and simply tries to hide it an an avalanche of verbiage? I don't."

There there. Feel better now?

Perhaps now we can get back to discussing the real issues. Let's start with the question of whether or not Christianity has its own account for conceptualization. Presuppositionalists tell me that their worldview provides the necessary preconditions for knowledge. But we retain our knowledge in the form of concepts, and I've never seen a specifically Christian account for concepts. So it seems that in order to make good on the claim that only Christianity provides the necessary preconditions of knowledge, it would at the very minimum need to have its own theory of concepts. But where can such an animal be found? Apologists whom I've consulted on this quintessential epistemological matter are conspicuously silent on this matter.

Sye, do you have anything of value to offer on this question?

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 6, 2011 05:55 AM

Alex: "Dawson has made you look like a fool."

Well, not really me. Sye's done perfectly fine on this all by himself. If he could demonstrate some willingness simply to stick to the topic of the discussion and forget about making this a personal matter ("He's afraid to debate his views!"), perhaps he might acquire at least some credibility as a thinker. But so far, I've never seen this from him.

That being said, I'm always willing to give a presupper an opportunity to address the issues, or evade. Unfortunately the latter is the typical choice with this crowd.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 6, 2011 05:56 AM

"Sye, do you have anything of value to offer on this question?"

Bring it to the debate sunshine! Make it your first questions. Wow, won't you show me up then!

Cheers

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 6, 2011 06:11 AM

I asked: "Sye, do you have anything of value to offer on this question?"

Sye responded: "Bring it to the debate sunshine! Make it your first questions. Wow, won't you show me up then!"

So there's our answer from the great Sye. If his worldview truly did have its own account for concepts, does anyone believe for half a second that Sye would continue squirming on the matter as he does? If he had anything of value to offer, any knowledge to impart, anything worthwhile to share, any biblical teaching which addressed my question, why would he carry on in such a childish cagey manner as he does?

I Peter 3:15 tells believers to "be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you." Does anyone think Sye Ten Bruggencate appears to be "ready" to give an answer on a straightforward question pertaining to epistemology?

Not so far as I can tell.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Pvblivs Nov 6, 2011 07:17 AM

Sye doesn't have an argument. It is pointless for him to show up for a "debate." All he does is repeat "how do you know that?" like a broken record.

Dawson:

Sye wants you to agree to a debate blind. Then he will set the terms that, before he answers any questions that you must use your reason to show that your reasoning is valid without using your reasoning.

Reply

Pvblivs Nov 6, 2011 07:19 AM

Oh, and Sye, if you really think that you have shown Alex up, post it to your blog on Blogger. I'm sure we'd all like to see what you think constitutes showing him up.

Reply

Alex B Nov 6, 2011 07:52 AM

Pvb, Sye probably thinks the three times I've been involved in a podcast debate with him were glowing victories - despite the fact the in every single one he acted like a child, failed to acknowledge answers had been given, and gave such a poor showing that I'd be surprised if his attitude hasn't created MORE atheists.

Sye pretty much defines the Dunning Kruger effect IMO

Reply

Alex B Nov 6, 2011 07:59 AM

"Bring it to the debate sunshine! Make it your first questions. Wow, won't you show me up then!"

Sye, not everyone has to debate you one on one, and you're even more deluded than I thought if you believe you can demand this of anyone, with the expectation that they'll agree. I'd have thought you'd learned your lesson when you 'challenged' Penn Gillette (by 'challenged' I mean 'badgered on Twitter') and then spun his refusal to talk to a nobody like yourself as some fabulous win.

But no, here you are again, demanding debate when you have no real right to do so, claiming victory when you've achieved nothing of the sort, and generally coming across as insufferably smug despite the lack of reasons to be so.

Sye, you're a horrible spokesman for your faith, a very poor debater, and an all round unpleasant individual. Seems I got you spot on when I described you as a 'dismal human being' who 'sickened' me, all those months ago.

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 6, 2011 10:13 AM

"I Peter 3:15 tells believers to " be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you." Does anyone think Sye Ten Bruggencate appears to be "ready" to give an answer on a straightforward question pertaining to epistemology?"

Oh, I'm ready, just not interested in playing your games. How is offering to engage you directly on a podcast not willing to engage you?

Reply

Alex B Nov 6, 2011 10:14 AM

Sye, you really need to start answering some of Dawson's questions, it's embarrassing how much you're dodging right now.

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 6, 2011 10:19 AM

"But no, here you are again, demanding debate when you have no real right to do so"

Prove this please. How does an atheist justify an absolute claim about rights?

"claiming victory when you've achieved nothing of the sort"

Where have I claimed victory, please cut and paste.

"Sye, you're a horrible spokesman for your faith"

And what exactly would you consider to be a good spokesman for faith in the God that you hate? I submit that

anyone who you would consider a good spokesman, for a faith that you could tolerate (as Jim as said), would not be honouring God in their apologetic.

"Sye, you really need to start answering some of Dawson's questions, it's embarrassing how much you're dodging right now."

He can add me on Skype right now, and I'll be glad to talk with him.

Reply

Alex B Nov 6, 2011 11:16 AM

"Prove this please. How does an atheist justify an absolute claim about rights?"

Jesus Christ, you never fucking STOP!! You see, Sye, THAT is why people think you're a prick - you utterly incapable of deviating from your script, you're like a robot.

"Where have I claimed victory, please cut and paste."

http://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=glqJXRrp2Kg

"And what exactly would you consider to be a good spokesman for faith in the God that you hate?"

How can I hate something that doesn't exist? You've yet to make this clear.

"I submit that anyone who you would consider a good spokesman, for a faith that you could tolerate (as Jim as said), would not be honouring God in their apologetic."

So you act like an absolute fuckwit everywhere you go. Right.

"He can add me on Skype right now, and I'll be glad to talk with him."

He's asked you on this blog, you should answer in kind. Are you fingers broken? Are you unable to type? It seems not, as you've typed your latest dodge without any problems.

I put it to you that you CAN'T answer, and that's why you're dodging. Disagree? Prove me wrong and answer - after all, surely you want to be able to show Dawson up, if he's as wrong as you claim he is!

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 6, 2011 01:18 PM

"you utterly incapable of deviating from your script, you're like a robot."

You still don't get it Alex. Do I really need to explain it again? Okay. Since God is the necessary precondition for debate, debating ANYTHING other than that point would be denying the very point. It's not that I am incapable of "leaving my script" it's that it would be a sin to do so. Now granted, Alex may disagree with my point that God is the necessary precondition to make "debate" intelligible, but to deny that that is my point is incredibly asinine.

As far as telling people that other methodologies are sinful? You obviously have not listened to or watched my material.

http://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=glqJXRrp2Kg

Please give us the timestamp of that video where I claim victory. It's only just over 3 minutes long, you should be able to do that (Watch him dodge folks).

"So you act like an absolute..."

Good argument. Your profanity is a clear demonstration of your 'intellect' by the way.

"He's asked you on this blog, you should answer in kind."

Should??? Hmm, a moral imperative? Where did you get that from Alex? Um, because it is good for society to follow arbitrary moral imperatives. Why would it be wrong to go against society Alex? Um, because you make a contract by being a citizen of the country you live in, that you will not break the laws of that country. But why would violating that non-existent contract be wrong Alex? Um, well if you have to ask that there is no hope for you.

And if you think I'm joking folks, listen to Alex respond to Shawn on part 2 of Episode 21 at about the 58 minute mark. Priceless!

"I put it to you that you CAN'T answer, and that's why you're dodging."

And I put it to you that I'd be more than happy to answer his questions in a recorded Skype conversation at his convenience.

"after all, surely you want to be able to show Dawson up, if he's as wrong as you claim he is!"

I have no interest in "showing Dawson up." If that is the consequence of the exchange, then so be it, (I've had to deal with that before (wink wink nudge nudge), but I am merely commanded to speak the truth to him, and to cast down vain reasoning.

Reply

Alex B Nov 6, 2011 02:12 PM

"It's not that I am incapable of "leaving my script" it's that it would be a sin to do so."

Please cite the Biblical verse that says this.

"Please give us the timestamp of that video where I claim victory. It's only just over 3 minutes long, you should be able to do that (Watch him dodge folks)."

Here you go -

"PENN JILLETTE'S GREATEST TRICK EXPOSED ON CHRISTIAN SHOW"

Don't need to post a time stamp, as it's the title I was referring to. If you don't see that as you claiming you've shown Penn Jillette up, then you are even thicker than I thought.

"Should??? Hmm, a moral imperative? Where did you get that from Alex? Um, because it is good for socie.....blah blah blah typical Sye bullshit....And if you think I'm joking folks, listen to Alex respond to Shawn on part 2 of Episode 21 at about the 58 minute mark. Priceless!"

Really Sye? So you don't see part of being a citizen of a country being an agreement to keep to the laws of that country, and to accept the punishment if you break those laws? Weird, because when someone applies for citizenship in the UK or the US one of the things they have to do is agree to obey the laws of those countries!!! Do you obey the speed limit, Sye? In fact, isn't having a driving license part of a contract with your country? You really are a fucking moron if you think that *I* was being unreasonable during that point of the podcast! Readers, he's referring to a part where Shawn aka Youtube vlogger VenomFangX tried to explain that he was above the law (after we quizzed him about a charity scam he ran)

"And I put it to you that I'd be more than happy to answer his questions in a recorded Skype conversation at his convenience."

And he has put it to YOU that he'd like your answers HERE. I don't think you can answer.

"I have no interest in "showing Dawson up." If that is the consequence of the exchange, then so be it, (I've had to deal with that before (wink wink nudge nudge), but I am merely commanded to speak the truth to him, and to cast down vain reasoning."

You wouldn't know actual reasoning if it punched you in the face and screamed 'I'M REASON' into your bloodied face, as you lay stunned on the floor.

The truth, as is evident to everyone reading here, is that Sye Ten Bruggencate is incapable of breaking out of his little TAG box, and is terrified that Dawson is showing him up. So far Sye has been unable to meet ANY of Dawson's requests.

You're useless, Sye.

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 6, 2011 05:02 PM

It's curious, Sye, how you're willing to explain certain things over and over and over again to Alex and others, and repeat things that simply sound like a rehearsed series of soundbites with no argumentative support whatsoever, such as "God is the necessary precondition for debate" and "debating ANYTHING other than that point would be denying the very point." You say you're not "incapable of 'leaving [your] script" but turn around and say that "it would be a sin to do so," which indicates to me that you're just unwilling to discuss anything beyond the safety of a rehearsed set of lines. It's *you* who's afraid, Sye, and statements like this and your actions which go along with them prove this to a T. Someone who is truly confident in his worldview would be willing to discuss the issues that have been raised in this conversation. For instance, in accounting for concepts, I've discussed this numerous times on my blog. Where have you ever discussed it? Where???????

Meanwhile, the fact that we're not in a podcast has not stopped you from firing off a bunch of questions about new topics that you apparently expect others to take seriously and discuss in the present format. For instance:

- "Prove this please. How does an atheist justify an absolute claim about rights?"

- "And what exactly would you consider to be a good spokesman for faith in the God that you hate?"

- "Should??? Hmmm, a moral imperative? Where did you get that from Alex? Um, because it is good for society to follow arbitrary moral imperatives. Why would it be wrong to go against society Alex?"

Hundreds more examples could be found in your many video appearances.

Your goal here is: throw out anything – ANYTHING – in order to drag the dialogue away from discussing anything having to do with what Christianity affirms or what it has to offer as a worldview. That's your entire MO, Sye. One can watch one video of yours and see it in action; watch a second and see that it's your stock in trade.

The thing here is that you clearly want to get the focus off of Christianity, which you're claiming is the worldview which "provides the necessary preconditions of knowledge," and yet you're unwilling to show us where the Christian worldview offers an account of concepts!

You simply don't want to discuss Christianity's teachings is all!

You see, Sye, it's you who is engaged wholly in game-playing here. I've simply asked you to tell us how the Christian worldview accounts for concepts, and you indicate that you'll only be willing to discuss it in a podcast. But as your podcasts that I've listened to have shown, when you get a question that's difficult for you to address from the perspective of the Christian worldview, you insist that you can address it, but also insist that you'll only address it in one of your bible study sessions and not on the podcast. Or, you'll just say you're not willing to discuss the matter with "God-haters" and that will be the end to it. So why would I trouble myself with getting in touch with you on my Skype account only to find out that you're not going to be willing to discuss the matter there for some reason?

Besides, I use my Skype account exclusively for family. I would NEVER add you to my Skype account for anything. Ain't happenin' ever. It would be like taking my smartphone and smearing it in roadkill. There's just no good reason to do something like that.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 6, 2011 05:16 PM

Sye,

Let's suppose your reasons for not discussing the particulars of how the Christian worldview accounts for concepts are perfectly legitimate. Okay, fine. Let's assume that just for sake of getting some kind of answer on the matter to me. Can you at least point me to a site on the internet that does lay out the Christian worldview's account for concepts (assuming there is one in the first place)? Perhaps you've discussed the matter in one of your video appearances. If so, post a link to it and, if you can, indicate the minute marker where you start to issue out your pearls of wisdom on the matter.

But so far as I can tell – and I've been inquiring into this for well over a decade now – the Christian worldview simply has NO ACCOUNT WHATSOEVER for concepts.

In condensed form: ***Christianity can't account for concepts.***

To prove me wrong, all you would need to do is point me to where Christianity actually does provide an account for concepts. A discussion on a podcast would not be necessary for you to do this. And if you don't want to discuss it with me yourself here, just point me where I need to go to learn more about it, and I can be on my merry way and I'll go explore the matter without your charitable guiding hand.

Perhaps the matter has been addressed by other Christians. After all, if the Christian worldview does have its own account for concepts, I somehow don't think you would be the exclusive source for it, or its originator, and would suppose that others have elucidated the matter already. So perhaps you're aware of such a resource, and can point me to it.

What do you say?

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 6, 2011 06:05 PM

"Please cite the Biblical verse that says this."

Proverbs 26:4, 1 Timothy 6:20

"If you don't see that as you claiming you've shown Penn Jillette up "

Erm, you said: ***"claiming victory when you've achieved nothing of the sort"***

You have to change your charge to try to conceal the fact that you were caught out – again.

"Weird, because when someone applies for citizenship in the UK or the US one of the things they have to do is agree to obey the laws of those countries!!!"

I have never made any such contract with my country, and you STILL miss the point that even if one did, you have no basis for claiming that breaking such a contract would be absolutely wrong!

*"if you think that *I* was being unreasonable during that point of the podcast!"*

Didn't say you were being unreasonable, just saying that you have no justification for ANY moral imperative as was clearly shown in that exchange.

"And he has put it to YOU that he'd like your answers HERE. "

And I have put it to him that I will gladly answer his questions on Skype, and especially not where the host of the blog makes up his own rules to delete comments on a whim.

"I don't think you can answer."

And this has bearing how?

"You wouldn't know actual reasoning if it punched you in the face and screamed 'I'M REASON' into your bloodied face, as you lay stunned on the floor."

Well, I'm a pretty big dude, and although I recognize the nonsensical screaming part of your argument, you wouldn't get away with the other part :-)

"The truth, as is evident to everyone reading here, is that Sye Ten Bruggencate is incapable of breaking out of his little TAG box"

Um, would that be the truth that you didn't know what it was in our first 2 podcasts, or the truth that you now claim you know but refuse to discuss?

" and is terrified that Dawson is showing him up."

Dawson is free to record the Skype call as well.

" So far Sye has been unable to meet ANY of Dawson's requests."

So far Dawson has refused to discuss them with me live.

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 6, 2011 06:09 PM

"To prove me wrong, all you would need to do is point me to where Christianity actually does provide an account for concepts."

Sure. Romans 11:36 **"For from him and through him and to him are all things."**

All things necessarily include concepts, thus my account. QED

Cheers

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 6, 2011 06:26 PM

Alex,

Check your comments filter. I submitted a comment earlier that hasn't shown up yet. In it I explain precisely why a live exchange with him on Skype or some other interface will not do the trick, since he'll just come up with other reasons not to discuss the matters that he should be perfectly capable and willing to discuss right here.

Flat and simple: Christianity cannot account for concepts, and Sye's not going to go near this topic with a ten-foot pole. It can only mean death for his stupid worldview.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 6, 2011 06:36 PM

"Flat and simple: Christianity cannot account for concepts, and Sye's not going to go near this topic with a ten-foot

pole."

Erm, scroll up (before Alex deletes it).

You can always delete people off of your Skype account once the conversation is over (as I have done with Alex and Jim).

Your excuses are really quite lame Dawson. Which one is it now, that you think I am dishonest, that you are too busy, that you don't do debates, or that you only add family onto Skype? It's getting harder for me to keep track of them, and I have probably missed a few.

C'mon man, you might not do that badly at all :-)

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 6, 2011 06:38 PM

"Alex,

Check your comments filter. I submitted a comment earlier that hasn't shown up yet."

Dawson filtered again? Rats, I KNEW I should have went with Blogger! :-D Very intuitive program that :-D

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 6, 2011 06:52 PM

I wrote: "To prove me wrong, all you would need to do point me to where Christianity actually does provide an account for concepts."

Sye responded: "Sure. Romans 11:36 "For from him and through him and to him are all things. All things necessarily include concepts, thus my account. QED"

As I suspected – nothing of any intellectual or scholarly value here.

To clarify – I guess I need to! – I was not asking how Christianity seeks to hijack and assimilate concept theory into its mainframe.

After all, "all things" would also necessarily fallacious thinking, abortion, murder, genocide, divorce, infanticide, fraud, evasion, deceit, etc., etc., etc. So by using this verse to claim ownership of concepts on behalf of Christianity as you do, you get a lot more than you bargained for. So it is "from him and through him and to him" that babies are aborted, that people are murdered, that people lie, cheat and steal, that politicians defraud their electorates, that folks like you evade and rely on fallacious reasoning. Fine. But that's not an account of concepts any way one slices it, and it only shows how unserious you are as a thinker to even propose this. Really, it's baffling, and shows that you just aren't worth taking seriously at all. So what I will do is pin this conversation on my blog and show the world exactly what you do when you're challenged to present the Christian worldview's account for concepts. You have none. So you make a last-ditch effort to save face. It just shows how hollow your worldview really is. NO CONTENT. It's just about glory-grabbing, which is what you, Sye, are all about.

If you truly think Romans 11:36 qualifies as a serious account for concepts (really, amazing if you do!), then please elaborate:

According to Christianity:

- 1) What is a concept?
- 2) What is the nature of a concept's relationship to its referents?
- 3) How are concepts formed?
- 4) How does the process of abstraction work?
- 5) What is the process by which new units are added to already-existing concepts?
- 6) What is the relationship of a definition to the concept it defines?

These are just for starters. If you truly had a serious account for concepts, you should be able to address these and

many related questions. So, please, use this opportunity to educate us. Don't forget to cite your sources – we wouldn't want you borrowing from a non-Christian worldview or simply making this up as you go.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 6, 2011 06:59 PM

Sye: "Dawson filtered again? Rats, I KNEW I should have went with Blogger! :-D Very intuitive program that :-D"

Sye, I have never tried to post a comment on any blog of yours in the first place, so I don't understand your statements on this matter. You make it sound like I'm over at your blog (I don't even know where it would be!) posting comments left and right and that you'd hope your system had some means of automatically censoring me. I'm not even at your blog, and you want me censored. Now why is that? How are my questions about how Christianity accounts for concepts at all unreasonable, when you tell us to accept - pretty much on your say so - that the Christian worldview is the only worldview which provides the necessary preconditions for knowledge? Indeed, even to say that a *worldview* provides the necessary preconditions for knowledge is by itself ludicrous - it's just a massive stolen concept. Strange how people don't even sense this problem - it's so blatant!

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 6, 2011 07:08 PM

Sye wrote: "Your excuses are really quite lame Dawson. Which one is it now..."

Again, Sye, you're just showing that you can't stick with the issues and deal with them in the current discussion. I've already indicated the conditions you would have to meet in order for me to consider having a verbal discussion with you. You've ignored this and haven't shown any indication that you're making progress on meeting any of them. When the use of Skype was suggested, that's when I explained that I use Skype only for my family. I don't know why anyone would have a problem with this. It's my account, not yours, Sye.

So back to the issue, Sye: Just indicate where I can find the Christian worldview's account for concepts. If you can't do this, then clearly I have nothing of value to be gained from an exchange with you. Your worldview is as hollow as a chocolate Easter bunny - and it crumbles like one with one poke. At least the chocolate Easter bunny tastes good. But your worldview is merely a repository for habitual evaders like you.

So one last time: Where can we examine the Christian worldview's account for concepts?

Going once...

Going twice...

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 6, 2011 08:09 PM

"As I suspected – nothing of any intellectual or scholarly value here."

You asked for an account, I gave you an account. All things necessarily includes concepts. Your list of what that also would entail is not at all a problem for the Calvinist.

You say that my response is engaging fallacious reasoning, but I have yet to see you account for the standard by which you call ANY reasoning fallacious, and how you can know anything to be fallacious, so your claim kinda falls flat.

"Where can we examine the Christian worldview's account for concepts?"

You can examine my account here: <http://www.biblegateway.com/>

Cheers.

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 6, 2011 10:02 PM

I wrote: "1 Peter 3:15 tells believers to 'be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you.' Does anyone think Sye Ten Bruggencate appears to be 'ready' to give an answer on a straightforward question pertaining to epistemology?"

Sye responded: "Oh, I'm ready,"

You *claim* that you're ready – of course! You wouldn't want to admit that you're in violation of a biblical teaching – but you certainly don't appear to be ready. After being pressed on the matter, you eventually cited Romans 11:36 ("For from him and through him and to him are all things") and stated "All things necessarily include concepts, thus my account. QED" So if this was your account for concepts all along, it's strange that it took so much pressing for you to finally cough it up. In actuality, it appears that in your scramble to finally comply with 1 Peter 3:15 and give some kind of answer, however desperate it may appear, you had to come up with something, and my oh my how lame it is!

To be sure, Romans 11:36 tells us nothing about concepts. It gives us no understanding of their nature, how they are formed, how they are properly applied, their relationship to other concepts, the nature of definitions, etc., etc., etc. It gives no information on the epistemology of concepts whatsoever. If a string of 12 words which make no mention of a topic can serve as an "account" for that topic, then it's really moot for Christian presuppositionalists to challenge non-Christians to give an account for ANYTHING! Any string of 12 words will do just fine. No data pertinent to the matter need be involved. That pretty much puts the lid on this tactic of presuppositionalism.

Sye continued: "just not interested in playing your games."

Sye, how does asking how the Christian worldview accounts for concepts constitute "playing a game"? Really, how? I'm inquiring on the epistemological mechanics of your worldview which you say is the necessary for reason, knowledge, logic, etc. So, I'm simply inquiring on this and giving you an opportunity to show how uniquely informative Christianity is on this topic. But so far, all you've offered is utter, vapid fail. And you don't like having to be pressed to admit that your worldview can't account for concepts. You resent this fact, so you seek to ridicule and humiliate me. That's *your game*, Sye. This is the game *you play* every time you get a chance, whether it's in blog comments, on a podcast, or open-air preaching. You can't deal with it, so you try to make it a *personal* matter for the other party. It's your signature tactic, Sye. You call it "apologetics," I call it pure evasion.

Sye: "How is offering to engage you directly on a podcast not willing to engage you?"

We are engaging each other right now, Sye, and you have the opportunity to make good on the claim that Christianity provides the necessary preconditions of knowledge by telling us how the Christian worldview accounts for concepts. But you don't use this opportunity to do this, because you can't, and that's because your worldview has NO account for concepts. Period. That's not my fault, Sye. Don't blame me. I'm simply exposing this problem. Getting sore at me won't undo the mess you're in.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 6, 2011 10:21 PM

I wrote: "As I suspected – nothing of any intellectual or scholarly value here."

Sye: "You asked for an account,"

And you failed to provide one.

Sye: "I gave you an account."

You didn't. You simply quoted 12 words from the bible. The passage you quoted states nothing about the nature of concepts, how they are formed, how they relate to the units they integrate, how one concept relates to others, how definitions relate to the concepts they define, etc., etc., etc. Your "account" leaves us completely in the dark on such matters. Perhaps it is darkness that you prefer instead of knowledge – if so, that's your choice. But ignorance on a matter does not in any way qualify as a legitimate "account" on that matter.

Sye: "All things necessarily includes concepts."

Even if one accepts this, it does not even begin to address the issue. At most, if one takes such a claim seriously, it only serves to claim ownership of the matter, in which case: if the Christian worldview cannot address the concerns I raised about concepts in the paragraph above, it simply shirks the responsibility claimed on behalf of it by its defenders. So now not only does the Christian worldview fail to offer an account for concepts, it's clear that it cannot meet the responsibilities that apologists' claims on behalf of it bestow upon it.

Sye: "Your list of what that also would entail is not at all a problem for the Calvinist."

Oh, don't get me wrong - I don't think Calvinists would have a problem **with** any of these things. That in itself is part of the problem though. While Christianity cannot overcome the problem *of* evil, Christians themselves have no problem *with* evil. Just consider the following question: On your worldview, is evil ever morally justifiable? A simple yes or no will do here.

Sye: "You say that my response is engaging fallacious reasoning, but I have yet to see you account for the standard by which you call ANY reasoning fallacious, and how you can know anything to be fallacious, so your claim kinda falls flat."

My standard is the primacy of existence. Remember when Dustin Segers tried to refute it? He even posted a blog entry presenting his would-be refutation, but then decided to take it down because he was so blitheringly mistaken about the topic that he didn't want it accessible to the public any more. He had to hide his mistake from the world. But no worries, I resurrected it [here](#). I suggest everyone take a look at that. Dushman really pulled a doosie! Then he withdrew it out of shame.

I asked: "Where can we examine the Christian worldview's account for concepts?"

Sye responded: "You can examine my account here: <http://www.biblegateway.com/>"

Yes, I already checked there. I found nothing that accounts for concepts.

Got anything else?

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Alex B Nov 7, 2011 12:32 AM

"Check your comments filter. I submitted a comment earlier that hasn't shown up yet."

Hi Dawson, checked as soon as I got up, and fixed. There seems to be no way to turn off the filter, so if you put anything up and it vanishes rest assured that I'll check the spam folder the moment I'm able to, and get your words to the screen.

Reply

Alex B Nov 7, 2011 12:39 AM

""Please cite the Biblical verse that says this."

Proverbs 26:4, 1 Timothy 6:20"

How strange! I looked up those verses (btw, why don't you just save everyone some time and copy them instead of just giving the reference? Would save us all some time...but I guess it would stop your little game)

The Proverbs verse - "Do not answer a fool according to his folly, or you will be like him yourself." Hmmmm, that says nothing about Van Tillian Apologetics, I assume you mistyped?

Perhaps Timothy will mention Van Til, or even Bahnsen "Timothy, guard what has been entrusted to your care. Turn away from godless chatter and the opposing ideas of what is falsely called knowledge," No! It doesn't either!! What's going on here Sye? Why are you quoting irrelevant verses when I've asked you a direct question?

So, again, please cite the verses that tell us that to use ANYTHING OTHER THAN VAN TILLIAN APOLOGETICS is a sin.

Reply

Alex B Nov 7, 2011 12:41 AM

Penn Jillette issue - Sye, you're in such denial you can't even see your own crowing.

"I have never made any such contract with my country, and you STILL miss the point that even if one did, you have no basis for claiming that breaking such a contract would be absolutely wrong!"

If you own a passport or driving license you have. BTW, you need to check your Bible, it COMMANDS you to obey the rulers of your country.

Reply

Alex B Nov 7, 2011 12:42 AM

"And I have put it to him that I will gladly answer his questions on Skype, and especially not where the host of the blog makes up his own rules to delete comments on a whim."

I'm leaving your stuff up at the moment, because you're making such a hilarious arse of yourself.

Anyway, tell me, what's wrong with changing or deleting things on a whim?

Reply

Alex B Nov 7, 2011 12:47 AM

"Well, I'm a pretty big dude, and although I recognize the nonsensical screaming part of your argument, you wouldn't get away with the other part :-)"

You're commanded by your holy book to 'turn the other cheek' - so reason would be able to land at least two blows.

"Um, would that be the truth that you didn't know what it was in our first 2 podcasts, or the truth that you now claim you know but refuse to discuss?"

Sye, just because I didn't want to give a definition of something I had never really considered (but innately understand) does not make me some kind of failure. I answered honestly, went away and thought about it, and came back with a straight answer - truth is what conforms to reality or actuality. I've spent over 5 hours of podcast time discussing things with you Sye, hardly a 'refus[a] to discuss'.

"Dawson is free to record the Skype call as well."

And you are free to answer here - please do so, or I WILL start deleting you again as I'm getting tired of your constant dodging.

"So far Dawson has refused to discuss them with me live."

So? Why should he? You're more than capable of typing, Sye, I want you to respond here.

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 7, 2011 04:21 AM

Thanks for rescuing my comments from the spam filter, Alex. I know it's annoying – it happens occasionally over on my blog.

The point I wanted to make in that particular comment was that even if one engages Sye in a verbal dialogue on some podcast or other venue, there's a very high likelihood that he will simply dodge the issues there just as he has here. His own choices and actions demonstrate exactly this both here and elsewhere.

It's clear that Sye does not want to participate in any discussion in which the teachings of Christianity are explored and scrutinized. He really doesn't want to discuss Christianity's teachings at all. He simply wants to assert their truth and then direct the spotlight towards interrogating any non-Christian who happens to be conversing with him. Non-belief in his god and worldview are personally offensive to him, and that's why he continually needs to make the issue a personal matter. He cannot deal with the issues; he must assassinate the character of anyone who doesn't accept his worldview on his say so. Non-believers must be brought down for their insolence.

If a non-Christian makes any kind of pronouncement in a verbal discussion with Sye, expect Sye to whip out his series of stock "How do you know?" questions fired off in rapid succession, hoping to get the attention of the discussion off of what Christianity teaches and putting the non-Christian squarely on the defensive. The apologist may act as though he were truly interested in learning and understanding the details of the non-Christian's epistemology. But the fact is he really doesn't care what the non-Christian's epistemology is because he really doesn't care about knowledge in the first place. If he did, he surely would not adopt a mind-negating worldview like Christianity. Rather, he would be intellectually curious about how the mind actually works, how it acquires knowledge from what it is aware of, and adopt an honest attitude toward knowledge, the human mind and his own fallibilities. We do not observe any of this in Sye Ten Bruggencate. On the contrary, we find in him a smug, self-important and self-righteous specimen bent on maximizing his own face time while ridiculing others for not believing in invisible magic beings and trying to do his best to intimidate them, typically without success.

[Continued...]

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 7, 2011 04:22 AM

If I joined Sye in a podcast, all evidence indicates that he would do there precisely what he has done here and in other podcasts: he would not stick with the issues; instead he will evade, try to conceal his Christian worldview from scrutiny, and do whatever he could to redirect the spotlight onto the non-Christian's position so that the entire focus of the discussion would revolve around exposing its alleged flaws while the Christian viewpoint remains safely out of sight and avoids inquiry by veneering it with one version or another of "God did it." There's absolutely no accountability in such pretentious posturing.

Had I found myself in a podcast discussion with Sye and I asked him how Christianity accounts for concepts, I'm guessing he would simply say something like "the thing is those are the kind of things we talk about in Bible study, and if you want to come to our Bible studies Sundays after church you're more than welcome" as [he said to Justin Schieber](#), or "I am not about to engage a God-hater in a Bible study" as [he wrote to me](#). Of course, these are obviously dichotomous remarks, but so is saying that he's "not about to engage a God-hater" while continually whining about having a live discussion with the same person! That there's an internal conflict here never seems to occur to him, but the record shows that he does precisely this. So there's no reason to fall for his gimmicky.

Besides, I now know how Sye's worldview "accounts" for concepts (it doesn't), so I've got my answer, and I'm happy to run with that. Thank you Sye Ten Bruggencate for confirming in writing what I already knew.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 7, 2011 04:43 AM

Wow, I could put most of that on my résumé!

You are exactly right, I refuse to put God on trial for God-haters. God is the judge, you are not.

"It's clear that Sye does not want to participate in any discussion in which the teachings of Christianity are explored and scrutinized."

I participate in LOTS of discussion in which the teachings of Christianity is explored, just not with God-haters who cannot account for what they are doing.

He simply wants to assert their truth and then direct the spotlight towards interrogating any non-Christian who happens to be conversing with him.

Can we get an AMEN!!!

"Had I found myself in a podcast discussion with Sye and I asked him how Christianity accounts for concepts"

Er, I gave you the account. I really don't know why you have your shorts in knot about concepts though, I do not call the laws of logic concepts, and I have never heard Bahnsen call them concepts either.

"Thank you Sye Ten Bruggencate for confirming in writing what I already knew."

Hmm, is your epistemology similar to Alex's?

1. Existence exists.
2. I use my senses, memory and reasoning to validate my senses, memory and reasoning.
3. Therefore I, Dawson Bethrick know "X"

If not, how do you know anything according to your worldview?

Reply

Alex B Nov 7, 2011 06:01 AM

"The point I wanted to make in that particular comment was that even if one engages Sye in a verbal dialogue on some podcast or other venue, there's a very high likelihood that he will simply dodge the issues there just as he has here. His own choices and actions demonstrate exactly this both here and elsewhere."

I can speak from experience and confirm that he does exactly that. Even when you explain how a non-Christian world view can account for knowledge, morality, and truth, he ignores the answers, claims you've not responded to his question, and tries to for the response he needs for the next part of his script. You can hear this most clearly on the last discussion I had with him

(<http://fundamentally-flawed.com/2011/10/25/special-%e2%80%93alex-vs-sye/>), where he kept insisting that I'd not answered his first question.

Sye isn't interested in winning converts for his faith, he's merely a relentless self promoter who loves the sound of his own voice.

Reply

Alex B Nov 7, 2011 06:10 AM

"Er, I gave you the account. I really don't know why you have your shorts in knot about concepts though, I do not call the laws of logic concepts, and I have never heard Bahnsen call them concepts either."

More dodging, Sye. You DIDN'T give an account at all.

"Hmm, is your epistemology similar to Alex's?

1. Existence exists.
2. I use my senses, memory and reasoning to validate my senses, memory and reasoning.
3. Therefore I, Dawson Bethrick know "X"

More misrepresentation!

It runs more like this -

1. as evidenced by the irrefutable Primacy of Existence (that something has to exist before it can do anything else) I am confident that the reality I experience is real.
2. I can use the many independent senses I have to investigate this reality, and these various sense corroborate one another - eg. when I see my hand touch something, I feel my hand touching it (and hear it, in some cases). I can also compare these multiple experiences against those of others. Moreover I can have machines objectively check my subjective experience (as in the case of automatic eye testing equipment) and come up with the same result.
3. As point 2 successfully allows me to explore, interact with, alter, and predict the reality I find myself in, I am confident that this apparatus is successful at allowing me to know certain things.

I explained that to you the last time we spoke, Sye, why are you unable to remember these things?

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 7, 2011 06:11 AM

"You can hear this most clearly on the last discussion I had with him (<http://fundamentally-flawed.com/2011/10/25/special-%e2%80%93-alex-vs-sye/>), where he kept insisting that I'd not answered his first question."

No, actually it's the third question that you never answered.

First question was: "Are viciously circular arguments logically invalid?"

You answered: "Yes."

Second question: "Is it viciously circular to employ your reasoning to justify your reasoning?"

You remarkably answered: "No."

Third question: "Why not?"

You "answered:" "Because we're not using our reasoning to justify our reasoning," and variations thereof.

That you cannot see that that is NOT an answer to that question is both astounding and expected.

Reply

Alex B Nov 7, 2011 06:12 AM

"I participate in LOTS of discussion in which the teachings of Christianity is explored, just not with God-haters who cannot account for what they are doing."

As we saw on the last time we spoke, you do avoid discussing the Bible at all costs, cos you fall apart when faced with a difficult issue with it.

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 7, 2011 06:29 AM

Sye wrote: "You are exactly right"

Yes, I know I am.

Sye: "I refuse to put God on trial for God-haters. God is the judge, you are not."

I know you don't like the thought of me exercising my own independent mind. I realize this threatens you. But anyone who says "this is true" or "that is false" is exercising judgment. The alternative to exercising judgment is to

forgo the use of one's mind. Your own words make it clear that you don't want people using their own mind, that you want people to forgo exercising judgment. That is why you will hate the philosophy of reason, for reason and a shackled mind cannot reside together.

I wrote: "It's clear that Sye does not want to participate in any discussion in which the teachings of Christianity are explored and scrutinized."

Sye: "I participate in LOTS of discussion in which the teachings of Christianity is explored, just not with God-haters who cannot account for what they are doing."

Sye, you're simply conceding my points here. You want to shield your worldview from critical analysis, because you know deep down that it won't survive critical analysis. Really, it won't get past the first stage. You can't even provide an account of concepts for darned sakes! You've got so much of your psychology emotionally invested in protecting Christianity and, even more, saving your own face, that you simply can't handle your worldview being examined critically. You know that your worldview won't hold up. It's so easily demolished. So you make up excuses (e.g., "you can join our bible study on Sundays" or "I won't discuss the bible with God-haters," etc.) so that you can avoid discussing what it actually teaches. You want agreement, not understanding. You want obedience, not knowledge. You want unearned authority, not intellect.

I wrote: "Had I found myself in a podcast discussion with Sye and I asked him how Christianity accounts for concepts"

Sye: "Er, I gave you the account."

What you call an "account" tells us nothing about the nature of concepts, how they are formed, how they relate to what they denote, how they are properly defined, etc. I already covered all this. If that's your account, it is to be rejected due to its stupefying inadequacy.

Sye: "I really don't know why you have your shorts in knot about concepts though,"

If by "have your shorts in knot about concepts" you mean why I consider them so important, your confessed ignorance here is really due to your worldview's failure to provide an account for concepts. You don't know the first thing about concepts, so you don't know why they're important, and consequently can't figure out why rational philosophy does in fact take concepts seriously. Your darkness, Sye, all boils down to your own self-inflicted, self-referencing ignorance. And round and round you go in your haughty conceit.

[Continued...]

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 7, 2011 06:30 AM

Sye: "I do not call the laws of logic concepts,"

You don't have a *conceptual* understanding of logic, Sye. Instead, you have a **storybook** understanding, which treats logic as if it were a prop in a child's bedtime story.

Sye: "and I have never heard Bahnsen call them concepts either."

Bahnsen didn't understand concepts either. I have shown this on my blog. He accepted the JTB analysis of knowledge, which mistakenly treats 'beliefs' as primaries. But this doesn't hold up. Beliefs are not primaries, even on Bahnsen's own conception of them.

Sye asked: "Hmm, is your epistemology similar to Alex's? 1. Existence exists. 2. I use my senses, memory and reasoning to validate my senses, memory and reasoning. 3. Therefore I, Dawson Bethrick know 'X'"

I'm not familiar with Alex's epistemology, so I can't say whether or not mine is similar to his; also, since I don't know his epistemology firsthand, I cannot assume that your characterization of it here is at all accurate.

Sye: "If not, how do you know anything according to your worldview?"

By means of reason. That's how. It teaches me how to identify that of which I have awareness. The alternative which your worldview offers – namely faith in revelations – simply allows you to pretend that what you imagine is real. It's a fantasy fueling a delusion.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 7, 2011 06:33 AM

"I explained that to you the last time we spoke, Sye, why are you unable to remember these things?"

Erm, my summary is exactly accurate.

By the way, thanks for continuing to post the link to our exchange. I listened to the beginning again to rebut your error that I claimed you never answered my first question. The more people that hear your nonsense, the better!

Alex: **"We are not using our reasoning to justify our reasoning."** 02:15

Alex: **"I don't use my reasoning to justify reasoning"** 06:37

Me: **"Are you using your reasoning to justify the validity of your reasoning?"** 07:03

Alex: **"I am, because I have no other tool to use."** 07:06

I don't care how childish you think it is, but THAT has got to go onto a video!!!

P.S. Oops, looks like the deleting will resume - screenshot :-)

Reply

Alex B Nov 7, 2011 06:34 AM

"That you cannot see that that is NOT an answer to that question is both astounding and expected."

Wow, you're verging into insanity! You QUOTE ME ANSWERING and then claim I didn't answer!! Bonkers.

Reply

Alex B Nov 7, 2011 06:38 AM

"I don't care how childish you think it is, but THAT has got to go onto a video!!!

P.S. Oops, looks like the deleting will resume - screenshot :-)"

Sye, cherry picking single sentences out of an hour long discussion does nothing but make you appear to be a quote miner. The context of what I was saying is clear on the recording, and becomes clearer as it continues. Also you forget that, if I occasionally stumble, it's only because I've not spent the last five years thinking about this stuff, and was working it out as I went along.

If your fans are impressed by a video made up of statements cut adrift from their context and surrounding framework, then they are even denser than you.

Reply

Alex B Nov 7, 2011 06:40 AM

Dawson is right though, you're not remotely interested in honest debate, instead you choose to belittle your opponent in an attempt to, what? punish? them for not believing in your god.

You are transparent and, as previously stated, a HORRIBLE spokesman for your faith.

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 7, 2011 06:48 AM

Sye, I'm still hoping you can help me understand something.

Earlier you said you had found "holes that one could drive a truck through" when you "skimmed" some writings I have published on my blog regarding the primacy of existence. You did not give any details on this even though I had made it clear that I would be more than willing to explore the matter with you. It's not clear what exactly you intended this to mean – perhaps you yourself don't know – whether you were trying to suggest that the primacy of existence is false, that my reasoning about it is faulty, that my application of this principle to critiquing theism is off, or whatnot. Most importantly, you do not make it clear where you stand on the primacy of existence. It may even be the case that you don't know what it is, since I've seen no indication from anything you've stated that you do understand it.

I also pointed out – in my first comment on this blog post – how Christian apologist Chris Bolt, in the very first comment above, clearly assumes the truth of the primacy of existence in his response to Alex's dismissal of Bahnsen. This occurs specifically where Bolt states: "It is not, 'just a mass of circular reasoning and appeals to authority' either, *and merely asserting that does not make it so*" (italics added). Essentially Bolt is saying (in the italicized portion) that conscious activity (in this case, "asserting") does **not** have the power to conform its objects to its dictates – that one cannot expect reality to simply revise itself to conform to one's wishes, commands, affirmations, feelings, etc. The old adage "wishing doesn't make it so" is a direct expression of the truth of the primacy of existence.

I also reminded you of Dustin Segers' claim that the primacy of existence is false. He even posted an entry on his blog dedicated to proving that the primacy of existence is false. Of course, he has since pulled that blog down in order to do "further research," but so far he does not seem interested in my help (he will not publish any more comments of mine on his blog, even though I've been cordial). Notwithstanding Segers' glaring errors in this matter (which I have discussed on my blog), to say that the primacy of existence is false is tantamount to saying (among other things) that wishing *does* make it so, that "merely asserting" that something is the case will actually "make it so," that conscious activity has the power to revise reality at will and cause the objects of one's awareness to conform to one's dictates.

Clearly these two positions – Bolt's unwitting assumption of the primacy of existence on the one hand, and Segers' insistence that the primacy of existence is false – are in fundamental conflict. And even after Segers had been informed that he was incorrect in his attempts to refute the primacy of existence and had even taken down his blog post on the matter, he still affirmed in a subsequent podcast on Fundamentally Flawed that he had refuted the primacy of existence! Yep, he did, and I can show you if you need convincing.

So I'm wondering if you could help me understand all this, since here we have two Christians affirming diametrically opposed viewpoints on a matter that is fundamental to worldview grounding – the nature of the relationship between consciousness and its objects.

Who's right – Chris Bolt or Dustin Segers (for they can't both be right) – and how would you establish who is right in this conflict?

Looking forward to your answer.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 7, 2011 06:51 AM

"You QUOTE ME ANSWERING and then claim I didn't answer!! "

Erm, I put "answered" in quotes, as it was clearly not an answer to my question. That you continue to think it is, is both astounding and expected.

"The context of what I was saying is clear on the recording, and becomes clearer as it continues."

I agree :-D

"Also you forget that, if I occasionally stumble, it's only because I've not spent the last five years thinking about this stuff, and was working it out as I went along. "

Stumble??? That was a blatant, flat-out contradiction!

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 7, 2011 06:53 AM

"You are transparent and, as previously stated, a HORRIBLE spokesman for your faith."

Actually Alex, you might be surprised at how many people appreciate having your nonsense exposed. That you find me a horrible spokesman for the God you hate makes perfect sense.

Reply

Tom Nov 7, 2011 06:54 AM

I've been enjoying reading these exchanges so thank you for hosting, Alex.

I thought everyone might be interested in an excerpt from Stephen Law's book "Believing Bullshit". This tactic that Sye employs is straight out of his chapter on Going Nuclear which can be found here:

<http://stephenlaw.blogspot.com/2011/09/going-nuclear.html>

Sye is mentioned (although not by name) based on the exchanges he and Stephen Law had a while back.

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 7, 2011 06:55 AM

Dawson, I promise to answer all your questions regarding concepts, to the best of my ability, on Skype. Right now if you like. Feel free to record the conversation to use, unedited, how you please.

Cheers.

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 7, 2011 07:01 AM

"This tactic that Sye employs is straight out of his chapter on Going Nuclear which can be found here"

Of course the mistake is in assuming that Christians are skeptical about reason. We are not. The point is that Christians can justify reason, whereas the unbeliever cannot.

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 7, 2011 07:02 AM

Sye: "Dawson, I promise to answer all your questions regarding concepts, to the best of my ability, on Skype."

Good. Then Skype away to your heart's content. Answer all my questions and record your answers. Then post your file someplace where I can access it. I promise to download it and listen to it sometime.

I'm looking forward to your answers.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 7, 2011 07:03 AM

Sye: "The point is that Christians can justify reason"

How do you do this without a theory of concepts? Please explain this.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 7, 2011 07:11 AM

"Good. Then Skype away to your heart's content."

Hmmm, I thought you were familiar with how Skype works. Skype is a communication tool for more than one person. Perhaps you use it with yourself, but I don't.

I trust that I am not the only one who envisions poultry feces with your continued reluctance to engage me.

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 7, 2011 07:26 AM

Sye stated: "Are you using your reasoning to justify the validity of your reasoning?" 07:03

I'm wondering how Sye's line of interrogation here avoids either overt context-dropping or an inevitable infinite regress. I don't think it does.

On the one hand (indeed, how it is intended to be used), his line of questioning feasts on context-dropping, a fallacy which chokes many theistic defenses. In the present case, it uses a very general term ("reasoning") in two different instances without allowing for any relevant contextual distinction between those two different instances.

Take for example: There is a tree in my backyard and it's leaning towards my house, and due to unusual amounts of rainfall the ground is saturated, and based on this input I reason that the tree may topple onto my house. Call this reasoning context #1.

When my neighbor comes over to look at the situation, he asks me to explain my reasoning context #1 and justify its inference. I explain the steps that I took, and I even give him some meta-reasons which support the basis of my reasoning context #1.

Both reasoning context #1 and reasoning context #2 are instances of reasoning, but they are contextually distinct such that using reasoning context #2 to justify reasoning context #1 clearly is not an instance of circular reasoning, either vicious or Vantillian, since reasoning context #2 is not assuming the truth of reasoning context #1 from the outset, nor is it relying on the stolen concepts which characterize Vantillian circularities.

But Sye's line of inquiry does not seem prepared to allow for such distinctions. On the contrary, it seems to be designed expressly to prey on a thinker's present inability to articulate such relevant distinctions in order to score an apologetic brownie point. Upon analysis, however, this fails because it clearly seeks to deploy a form of subterfuge (namely context-dropping) in order to catch a thinker off-guard. This strategy is not characteristic of an honest thinker.

On the other hand, if one ignores these distinctions and seeks to stick with this course of interrogation to its logical conclusion, it's hard to see how the questioner can avoid going down the road of an infinite regress. He asks if his interlocutor is using his reasoning to justify the validity of his reasoning, and if his interlocutor offers some reasoning to justify his reasoning, he asks him to offer additional reasoning to justify that reasoning, and then to offer yet further reasoning to justify that reasoning, and so on, ad infinitum. This allows for some distinction between each instance of reasoning, but it ignores the need for an objective starting point.

Fortunately in Objectivism we have an objective starting point, such there's no such need to indulge in such time-wasting, fruitless and point-missing activities.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Alex B Nov 7, 2011 07:37 AM

"Dawson, I promise to answer all your questions regarding concepts, to the best of my ability, on Skype. Right now if you like. Feel free to record the conversation to use, unedited, how you please."

Sye, why are you unable to answer the questions here?

Reply

Alex B Nov 7, 2011 07:37 AM

Tom, thanks :)

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 7, 2011 07:42 AM

"When my neighbor comes over to look at the situation, he asks me to explain my reasoning context #1 and justify its inference. I explain the steps that I took, and I even give him some meta-reasons which support the basis of my reasoning context #1."

Problem is, you cannot justify the steps you took in context # 1 or context # 2 without being viciously circular. How do you know that there is a tree in your backyard? (assuming that you could justify knowing that you exist, or even have a backyard – which you can't). How do you know that it has rained, that the ground is saturated, or that it is reasonable to assume that those conditions may lead to the tree toppling?"

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 7, 2011 07:44 AM

"Sye, why are you unable to answer the questions here?"

I am available to right now. Don't you get it though, I'm trying to lure Dawson out of his verbiage bunker ;-)
Shhhhhhhh.

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 7, 2011 07:44 AM

I wrote: "Good. Then Skype away to your heart's content."

Sye responded: "Hmmm, I thought you were familiar with how Skype works."

Only minimally. Skype has many functions that I'm not at all familiar with.

Sye: "Skype is a communication tool for more than one person."

It is? I see. So you're basically saying you can't use it to record your responses to the questions I've asked you in these comments. Drat!

Well, I've got a solution then. Use your sound recorder. I realize you want to hear your voice, so you should like this alternative. Open your sound recorder, hit the record button, record your voice speaking the questions that I've posed to you in my comments - read them nice and clearly - and then record your voice answering those questions. Once you're done, save the file (you could call it "Answering that asshole Dawson.wav") and then upload it to your website. Then send me a link to it at my e-mail address: sortion@hotmail.com. Assuming it's virus-free, I'd be happy to download it and examine your "answers." How's that?

I'll await your e-mail.

Sye: "Perhaps you use it with yourself, but I don't."

No, I typically only use it to communicate with my wife. On a couple occasions I've used it to speak with other

family members. But that's pretty rare given the time differences.

Sye: "I trust that I am not the only one who envisions poultry feces with your continued reluctance to engage me."

"...continued reluctance to engage" you? My, you really are in a fantasyland. I'm engaging you right here in these comments!!!!

By the way, Sye, how is the method by which we're communicating – namely via the written word – relevantly different from how your god allegedly communicates its intentions to you? You certainly don't insist that your Lord Jesus hold conferences with you on Skype, do you? Presumably you're quite content to rest with "it is written" in the case of your god. Well, if it's good enough for your god, why isn't it good enough for others?

Besides, I'm getting everything I want out of this. Aren't you? Too bad if you aren't.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Alex B Nov 7, 2011 07:45 AM

"I am available to right now."

Then TYPE your answer right now, stop dodging.

Reply

Alex B Nov 7, 2011 07:47 AM

"I trust that I am not the only one who envisions poultry feces with your continued reluctance to engage me"

Sye, you do realise that you're engaging with Dawson right now, don't you?

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 7, 2011 07:55 AM

"Sye, you do realise that you're engaging with Dawson right now, don't you?"

I realize that you and Dawson may not understand what I mean, but I mean to engage Dawson live on Skype, so that he cannot bury his non-answers under a ton of verbiage, and expose his nonsense as in my exchanges with you.

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 7, 2011 07:55 AM

I wrote: "When my neighbor comes over to look at the situation, he asks me to explain my reasoning context #1 and justify its inference. I explain the steps that I took, and I even give him some meta-reasons which support the basis of my reasoning context #1."

Sye opined: "Problem is, you cannot justify the steps you took in context # 1 or context # 2 without being viciously circular."

In response to this, I have two points and then a question:

Point 1: I am a *person* and a *person* is not "viciously circular" – if you want to say that a person is viciously circular, then we have to look at the ultimate person of your worldview.

Point 2: Even if this were truly a problem (and you nowhere establish that it really is a problem), it would not overturn the fact that your line of questioning relies on the fallacy of context-dropping. So my point remains.

Now for my question: *How do you know this?* (I see that you don't even anticipate this question in your opinion.)

Sye asked: "How do you know that there is a tree in your backyard?"

By means of reason.

Sye stated parenthetically: "(assuming that you could justify knowing that you exist, or even have a backyard – which you can't)."

How do you know that I cannot justify my knowledge of my own existence or of my backyard? Why must you imagine my mind does not exist in order to interact with my points? Again, you make this a personal matter while simultaneously ignoring the issues. You're confirming my entire analysis of your apologetic, Sye!!!!

Sye: "How do you know that it has rained, that the ground is saturated, or that it is reasonable to assume that those conditions may lead to the tree toppling?"

By means of reason.

Either you embrace reason, or you reject it. It's your call, Sye. Which choice do you make?

See! I'm engaging you – and successfully so – right here in these comments. Why don't you want to admit this?

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Sebastian Sirvas Nov 7, 2011 07:59 AM

I will show you some of the flaws of your "proof", Sye TenB

"I do not know if absolute truth exists"

Absolute truth or False

Absolute Truth - True for all people at all times everywhere (Your definition) I don't know all times (future, present, past), therefore talking about absolute truth under that definition is useless.

Also this can be turned around as:

"I do not know if absolute falsehood exists"

Absolute falsehood or True

This will force you to answer in a way that will end up in you supporting my beliefs (or more precisely, my absence of beliefs).

You are playing with words and your argument is invalid.

"He who hates correction is stupid" (Indeed)
Proverbs 12:1b (from a preposterously used book)

Now i would also like to make something else clear to you. When I say anything (including this sentence), I dont

claim absolute truth nor falsehood (including this sentence too). Let me put it in a more friendly way:

I say: "I do not believe in the existence of god" or "I do not believe (which is not the same than denying) in absolute truth"

You say: Is that an absolute truth?

I say: I do not know beyond a doubt.

You say: Is that an absolute truth?

I say: Maybe.

See how it works?

Good day sir.

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 7, 2011 08:04 AM

Sye wrote: "I realize that you and Dawson may not understand what I mean, but I mean to engage Dawson live on Skype, so that he cannot bury his non-answers under a ton of verbiage, and expose his nonsense as in my exchanges with you."

You seem quite frustrated, Sye. How are you coming on those five conditions for this that I laid out? If you can't recall, here they are again:

I would be happy to engage you if

(a) you could persuade me that you can be honest;

(b) you "repent" from your incessant habit of continually trying to drag the discussion down to a childish level (e.g., "grow some");

(c) you agree to settle on a topic that is actually up for debate (the topic of the existence of a god is a dead issue – god-belief is irrational and your god is merely imaginary);

(d) you demonstrate that you can stick with an issue and will resist your urges to redirect the conversation to some other topic (as you have done right here in these exchanges); and

(e) you could show me where the bible lays out a distinctively Christian theory of concepts. Start by explaining what your worldview means by 'concept'; show where your worldview provides this meaning; present the steps by which your worldview analyzes the process by which the human mind forms concepts; explain the relationship between concepts and the units which they integrate (assuming your worldview conceives of concepts as integrating units to begin with); show how your worldview's theory of concepts is compatible with your worldview's denial of the primacy of existence (good luck there!). Those would be for starters.

So far I've seen no indication that you've even started on any one of these tasks. But please keep me apprised of your progress on these.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 7, 2011 08:05 AM

"Either you embrace reason, or you reject it. It's your call, Sye. Which choice do you make?"

I embrace Christian reasoning, but not your viciously circular nonsense.

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 7, 2011 08:11 AM

"So far I've seen no indication that you've even started on any one of these tasks. But please keep me apprised of

your progress on these."

All you would do (and have done) is create your own arbitrary conditions, and your own arbitrary reasons for opining that I have not met those conditions.

Surely SOMEBODY has met the great Dawson Beckwith's conditions? What? No? Hmmm, perhaps they are just a smokescreen to hide cowardice? Couldn't be could it?

Has no one ever met your conditions for a live debate Dawson? If they have, please post the link here, I'd love to listen to it.

If not, you are free to resume dodging, but I suggest that you repent of sinning against the God that you know exists.

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 7, 2011 08:20 AM

I wrote: "Either you embrace reason, or you reject it. It's your call, Sye. Which choice do you make?"

Sye responded: "I embrace Christian reasoning,"

Sye, reason rests on the primacy of existence. Reason is not compatible with the assumption that wishing or any other exercise of conscious activity *makes* something true. You say you "embrace Christian reasoning," which only suggests to me that you embrace some attempted simulation of reasoning which cannot integrate the primacy of existence without contradiction. (I say this because I've already established in my writings that **theism violates the primacy of existence**.)

By the way, how's that wave file coming?

Sye wrote: "but not your viciously circular nonsense."

You obviously don't know anything about my worldview. Statements like this tell the story of your ignorance.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Alex B Nov 7, 2011 08:24 AM

Sye, I noticed you hadn't replied to a question I asked -

"Anyway, tell me, what's wrong with changing or deleting things on a whim?"

Want to answer?

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 7, 2011 08:29 AM

I wrote: "So far I've seen no indication that you've even started on any one of these tasks. But please keep me apprised of your progress on these."

Sye: "All you would do (and have done) is create your own arbitrary conditions, and your own arbitrary reasons for opining that I have not met those conditions."

Two points:

1) You've not established that my conditions are arbitrary. (Indeed, what could "arbitrary" possibly mean – and what could possibly be objectionable about anything "arbitrary" – on Christianity's terms? Blank out!)

2) You've not provided any evidence whatsoever that you've made any progress toward meeting my stated

conditions. So I would not need even to propose any "arbitrary reasons for opining that [you] have not met those conditions." If you think I'm wrong in my observation that you've not made any progress towards meeting my conditions, feel free to point to any progress you think you've made, and I will gladly take a look.

Sye: "Surely SOMEBODY has met the great Dawson Beckwith's conditions? What? No? Hmmm, perhaps they are just a smokescreen to hide cowardice? Couldn't be could it?"

So far, Sye, you're the only person I've ever encountered on the internet who insists as you do that I dialogue with you verbally instead of in writing, especially while ignoring the fact that we're dialoguing just fine in writing. As I stated above, I'm getting what I want out of this. Aren't you? If not, tough luck for you.

Sye wrote: "Has no one ever met your conditions for a live debate Dawson? If they have, please post the link here, I'd love to listen to it."

Hear that silence, Sye? I'm the only one listening to your pleas for self-pity.

Sye: "If not, you are free to resume dodging, but I suggest that you repent of sinning against the God that you know exists."

To whom is this directed, Sye? To me, or to the lurking readers you addressed in your previous sentence? If it's directed to me, rest assured: I WILL NOT CHANGE MY NATURE.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Alex B Nov 7, 2011 08:31 AM

"I embrace Christian reasoning, but not your viciously circular nonsense."

Hilarious, that a man who has basically said 'The Bible is true because the Bible says it is true' can bring himself to type that.

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 7, 2011 08:37 AM

Sye, I'm waiting for that wave file. Whenever it's ready, please e-mail it to me: sortion@hotmail.com

Don't keep me waiting for long. I just might infer that you're unable to address my questions about Chris Bolt, Dustin Segers, and the terrible incompatibility between their stated views.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 7, 2011 08:49 AM

"Don't keep me waiting for long. I just might infer that you're unable to address my questions about Chris Bolt, Dustin Segers, and the terrible incompatibility between their stated views."

Infer what you like, it bothers me nada. So, since I am the only one you claim to have run from a live debate, perhaps you can tell me who you would be willing to debate live, and I'll see if I can set it up. Dustin, Chris, Rhology, Ryft?

Resume excuses.

Reply

Alex B Nov 7, 2011 08:58 AM

Sye, you're actually incapable of answering.

You're worse than Dodger Dan over at Debunking Atheists.

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 7, 2011 08:59 AM

Sye wrote: "Infer what you like, it bothers me nada."

Then why are you so worried?

Sye wrote: "So, since I am the only one you claim to have run from a live debate,"

But I haven't claimed to have run from a live debate, Sye. I've simply stated my conditions. Do you expect people to do what you want them to do without any conditions? If so, that's quite naive.

Sye: "perhaps you can tell me who you would be willing to debate live, and I'll see if I can set it up. Dustin, Chris, Rhology, Ryft?"

Debate what exactly? What's there to debate?

By the way, when are you going to get back to discussing the issues with me?

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 7, 2011 10:30 AM

Here Dawson, fill yer boots :-)

Reply

Alex B Nov 7, 2011 11:39 AM

Sye, I don't think linking to a debate held by someone else is going to cut it.

I am now certain that you cannot answer Dawson's challenge.

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 7, 2011 11:47 AM

"I am now certain that you cannot answer Dawson's challenge"

How can you be? Remember you admitted that you cannot know that you are not a person whose reasoning is invalid (8:54 of our exchange).

Reply

Alex B Nov 7, 2011 12:06 PM

I also said that I was confident that my reasoning IS valid, though I didn't expect you to include that in your little quote mine

Reply

Alex B Nov 7, 2011 12:07 PM

Nice attempt at dodging again, btw.

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 7, 2011 12:13 PM

"I also said that I was confident that my reasoning IS valid"

Problem is, those whose reasoning is not valid could say the exact same thing. :-D

Reply

Alex B Nov 7, 2011 12:35 PM

So?

How is this anything other than you trying to divert attention away from your rather sorry showing today?

Reply

Alex B Nov 7, 2011 12:36 PM

Answer my earlier question please - what's wrong with someone changing things (in this case deleting posts on a whim) whenever they feel like it? You were complaining about it, but never told me what was wrong with it.

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 7, 2011 12:37 PM

"How is this anything other than you trying to divert attention away from your rather sorry showing today?"

How ironic :-D

Reply

Alex B Nov 7, 2011 12:45 PM

Please explain why you see an irony. Of course, I guess your delusion may be so complete that you don't even realise you've made a huge arse of yourself today.....

Reply

Alex B Nov 7, 2011 12:45 PM

Now get to answering my question - what's wrong with me randomly deleting your comments?

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 7, 2011 01:02 PM

Please explain why you see an irony.

Sure.

You said : "How is this anything other than you trying to divert attention away from your rather sorry showing today?"

When earlier today you said: ""I am now certain that you cannot answer Dawson's challenge"

And I said: "How can you be? Remember you admitted that you cannot know that you are not a person whose reasoning is invalid (8:54 of our exchange)."

And you said: "I also said that I was confident that my reasoning IS valid"

And I said: "Problem is, those whose reasoning is not valid could say the exact same thing. :-D"

Irony being defined as: "a statement or situation where the meaning is contradicted by the appearance or presentation of the idea."

You see Alex, you claim that my comment was to divert attention away from a sorry showing, whereas the inverse clearly is the case – i.e. that you made that claim to divert attention away from your sorry showing, some of which I have quoted here.

Reply

Alex B Nov 7, 2011 02:20 PM

What sorry showing? You see, I am able to autonomously reason, unlike you.

My reasoning is valid, and my reasoning tells me that you're a deluded joke.

So, get to answering my question - what's wrong with me randomly deleting your posts? Quit dodging.

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 7, 2011 02:38 PM

"My reasoning is valid, and my reasoning tells me that you're a deluded joke."

Erm, but you said that you cannot know that you are not someone whose reasoning is invalid, so when you say that your reasoning IS valid, you refute yourself. As I said, one of those people (of whom you claimed you cannot know that you are not one) could also say that their reasoning is valid, and guess what, they'd be wrong! That you cannot see your error is testimony to your blindness.

Reply

Alex B Nov 7, 2011 03:50 PM

No, I said that I was confident that my reasoning is good. You're really struggling to remember things aren't you!

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 7, 2011 04:17 PM

Sye wrote: "Here Dawson, fill yer boots :-)"

Thanks for the link, Sye. But Alex is right: linking to a debate is no substitute for answering my questions. Then again, we've already seen that your worldview cannot account for concepts. Also, by linking to a debate like this, you overlook the enormous discrepancy between presuppositionalists like the one I've pointed out in this discussion between Chris Bolt and Dustin Segers. As a reminder, Bolt clearly assumes the truth of the primacy of existence in making his point against Alex (as I showed above) while Dustin Segers insists that the primacy of existence is false, self-refuting, question-begging and internally incoherent, as he did in a podcast and subsequently in a [blog post](#) that he removed from his website after he recognized he was humiliating himself. Because it is ultimately premised on the primacy of consciousness, presuppositionalism as a worldview (or qua defense of the Christian worldview) is unable to equip its adherents from detecting and avoiding such contradictions at the fundamental level of thought as this. Once this is recognized, what left is there to debate on the part of the presuppositionalist? It's clearly bankrupt intellectually, and only provides a home for evaders like you. The record shows this. The record shows that you cannot deal with the issues - you can't supply an account for concepts, nor can you reconcile the damning contradiction between Bolt and Segers - and you continually try to make this a **personal** matter by dragging the discussion off topic and focusing on trivialities that have no worldview importance to begin with ("Dawson's afraid to Skype with me!").

You have a most petty mind, Sye. It's clear for the world to see. Many Christians in fact see it and bristle when your name comes up in conversation. I've seen it happen. A recent example is David Smart, but there have been numerous others. You even consider the failure of your "arguments" to persuade others a triumph of sorts, and then slink back to the party line that is essentially no different from "I vaz just following orders."

May you get what you deserve. I know you already are.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Alex B Nov 8, 2011 12:16 AM

Sye, I have asked you several times now to answer my question - what is wrong with me arbitrarily and randomly deleting your posts on my whim?

Please answer, I'm getting very tired of your dodging.

Reply

Alex B Nov 8, 2011 09:50 AM

Seems that Sye has run away from this thread.

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 8, 2011 10:03 AM

Dawson, I have been in touch with the fellow I linked you to earlier, and he would consider engaging you in a written debate if you agree to a word limit and a moderator. What do you say?

Reply

Alex B Nov 8, 2011 10:04 AM

Sye, why are you now trying to palm off having to answer onto a third party?

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 8, 2011 10:09 AM

"Sye, why are you now trying to palm off having to answer onto a third party?"

Not at all. It should be abundantly clear to anyone reading along, that I have been more than willing to engage Dawson live on Skype. He is not interested, and only wants to hide behind his keyboard. I know a fellow who may be interested in engaging Dawson in his preferred form, with word limits and a moderator.

I could not care less if Dawson is interested or not, but a lack of interest for HIS CHOSEN FORM would speak volumes.

Reply

Alex B Nov 8, 2011 10:18 AM

It should be abundantly clear to anyone reading along, that Dawson has been more than willing to engage Sye here. Sye is not interested, and only wants to hide behind Skype. I know a fellow who may be interested in engaging Sye in his preferred form, he is called BoB, and has been trying to arrange this over on Debunking Atheists....sadly Sye has been dodging and coming up with objection after objection. You can read Sye's dodging here - <http://debunkingatheists.blogspot.com/2011/10/fundamentally-flawed-indeed.html?commentPage=2>

Reply

Alex B Nov 8, 2011 10:18 AM

Sye, you have zero interest in honest debate, and seek only to grandstand and self promote. You are a failure.

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 8, 2011 11:05 AM

"Sye, you have zero interest in honest debate, and seek only to grandstand and self promote. You are a failure."

You are insipring me to make that video, thanks! :-)

Reply

Alex B Nov 8, 2011 11:09 AM

"You are insipring me to make that video, thanks! :-)"

That's nice for you, I'm sure Jesus would approve.

Reply

rhiggs Nov 8, 2011 11:49 AM

This is hilarious.

Hey Sye, if you had a glass of water if front of you right now, would it be possible for God to turn it into wine?

Oh wait, let me guess, I have to be on Skype in order for you to answer.

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 8, 2011 04:57 PM

Sye wrote: "Dawson, I have been in contact with the fellow who I linked you to earlier. He would consider a written debate with you, if you would agree to word limits and a moderator. What do you say?"

There are numerous things you don't understand about me, Sye, so in response to your query, I say:

1) I do not constrain myself to arbitrary word limits in my personal writing – never have, never will. Not for you, not for anyone else.

2) I already have a moderator – myself. No one else can serve this function for me.

3) I have plenty of writings already published on my blog, which is my "chosen form." If you, or this fellow you've been in contact with, or anyone else wants to come and interact with what I've written over on my blog, my comments are open. Where are my challengers hiding, and why?

4) Again – debate what????

Now, as to my questions about the uniformity of nature in **the other discussion**, since you have not answered them, perhaps you need to see them again. So here they are:

1) *Do you think that nature is truly uniform? Yes or no? If yes, then:*

2) *Do you think the uniformity of nature is caused by some form of conscious activity? Yes or no?*

3) *If yes to 2), how do you justify this assumption? If no to 2), then what's the problem?*

I'm looking forward to a display of your penetrating intellect on this matter.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 8, 2011 05:00 PM

"I do not constrain myself to arbitrary word limits in my personal writing"

Understatement of the century!

No problem it was just an idea. Didn't think you'd chicken out in writing as well.

Cheers.

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 8, 2011 05:07 PM

Sye, when are you going to stop trying to make this a personal matter and interact with the issues on the table?

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Reynold Nov 8, 2011 06:50 PM

Sye TenB said...

Here Dawson, fill yer boots :-)

Here Sye, fill yours.

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 8, 2011 07:35 PM

And don't forget this: [A Critique of Sye Ten Bruggencate's www.proofthatgodexists.org](http://www.proofthatgodexists.org).

When a coffin needs no more nails, it's time to bury it.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Alex B Nov 9, 2011 06:41 AM

Has Sye finally run away?

Reply

Alex B Nov 9, 2011 10:58 AM

I guess he's had to acknowledge that he couldn't answer Dawson's questions!

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 9, 2011 05:14 PM

Alex: "I guess he's had to acknowledge that he couldn't answer Dawson's questions!"

This calls for a victory dance. Perhaps a few listenings of AC/DC's "Walk All Over You" - is in order.

But seriously, I don't know why Sye would be unwilling to discuss the uniformity of nature. After all, he's always bringing it up in his "debates." The way he carries on, one might get the impression that he's some sort of expert on the matter. Here's his opportunity to display that penetrating intellect of his.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Alex B Nov 10, 2011 12:35 AM

C'mon Sye! Answer the questions! Your failure to do so is here for all to see!

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 10, 2011 05:36 PM

Has anyone seen or heard from Sye? I wonder what happened. It was going so well here, and suddenly he's vanished. Perhaps he's gone elsewhere?

Regards,
Dawson