

<http://anatheistviewpoint.blogspot.com/2011/11/were-still-waiting-for-sye-to-answer.html>

March 22, 2012

Thursday, 17 November 2011

We're Still Waiting for Sye to Answer

Sye Ten Bruggencate, chief liar at Sinner Ministries, and owner of the fallacy riddled and entirely inaccurately named 'proofthatgodexists.org', has been asked several questions during the course of the last week or so.

He has failed to answer even the simplest of them. Just as s reminder, here are the questions Dawson presented him with in comments on this blog -

"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?"

There are several other questions in the comments [here](#) that have also been left unanswered.

In an attempt to make things easier on Sye, Dawson has reworded his initial questions, and added a couple of new ones, the revised list looks like this -

1) Why does Chris Bolt (and now Eric Hovind) assume the truth of the primacy of existence when Dustin Segers insists that the primacy of existence is false, self-refuting, question-begging and internally incoherent?

2) According to your worldview, is evil ever morally justifiable?

3) How can Christians claim that their worldview alone accounts for knowledge, when their worldview can't account for concepts?

4) Do you think nature is truly uniform? If yes, do you think nature's uniformity was caused by some form of conscious activity? If yes, how do you justify this assumption? If no, what's the problem?

Unsurprisingly Sye has failed to answer. Can any of the other presubullshitters do any better? David Smart? Chris Bolt? Dustin Segers? Eric Hovind? Hell, even Shawn 'VenomFangX' Karon can have a stab! The challenge is there - guys, please attempt to answer these questions. If you can't manage to then I think we can safely assume that the TAG fails miserably to account for the very thing it claims Christians have a monopoly on, knowledge.

Posted by [Alex B](#) at [13:15](#)

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

61 comments:

Sye TenB Nov 17, 2011 08:23 AM

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. God's revealed Word.

1a. I don't know their respective positions, will not take your word on it, and it has no bearing on what I believe.

2a. Commission of it, no, ordination of it by God, yes.

3a. I deny the premise of the question. I have given my justification for concepts.

4a. See 1, 2 and 3 above.

Okay, now blather on about how I have not answered. Go!

Reply

Alex B Nov 17, 2011 09:19 AM

"3. God's revealed Word."

Hilarious.

"3a. I deny the premise of the question. I have given my justification for concepts."

No, you haven't. So this question remains unanswered.

I believe I can hear Dawson loading his gun with the ammo you've just handed to him.

Reply

Alex B Nov 17, 2011 09:20 AM

But really, more than a week to finally answer? And only doing so because you've been thoroughly shamed into doing so? Utterly pathetic, Sye.

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 17, 2011 09:40 AM

"But really, more than a week to finally answer?"

I was waiting for the deadline to pass in which I challenged Dawson to debate me, and it has (predictably declining my challenge).

And yes, I have answered 3a, just ask Dawson. He, like you, did not like my answer, but I did give an answer (Romans 11:36).

So there, I have answered the questions, and Dawson is still (not surprisingly) unwilling to debate.

I realize that you are waiting for Dawson to respond, cause you have no clue what he's on about. Kind of takes the wind out of your sails though eh? :-)

Anyhow, for those reading along, as if it is not abundantly clear already, I am willing and able to answer these questions (and have), and Dawson (and Alex) are unwilling to debate me. Should not take a rocket scientist to figure out what's going on here.

Here's my prediction. Dawson will pan my answers and come up with a list of new questions. When I do not engage him, both he and Alex will accuse me of dodging again - and they wonder why people don't stick around :-D

Prediction #2, Alex will cry that he has already debated me for X number of hours, then say that he IS willing to debate me formally, as long as I do not use the TAG (transcendental argument for God's existence), as he has already debated it for X number of hours.

Again, you don't need to be a rocket scientist to figure out why Alex and Dawson REALLY do not want to debate.

Ciao!

Reply

Alex B Nov 17, 2011 10:13 AM

Sye, I feel very sorry for you, your delusion has clearly disconnected you completely from reality.

'Ciao'!

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 17, 2011 01:35 PM

This is beautiful! Yes, I will be examining Sye's responses later. He really knows how to give me what I want, and then some. Sye would've been better off just refusing to answer. Now we have his week-long refusals AND now this. Absolutely dazzling!

Just briefly though... Look at Sye's answer to 1a: "I don't know their respective positions". He's speaking of Chris Bolt and Dustin Segers, both internet Christian apologists. Like Sye himself. Of the Calvinist tradition to boot. And Sye doesn't know their respective positions? Their respective positions are Christian positions.

Wow! Just wow!

I'll be back.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

JC Nov 17, 2011 03:35 PM

Many delusional people will believe they are something or someone they are not and make claims to have abilities they do not actually have. We have ways of diagnosing these kinds of people.

Sye's whole world view is based on the "revealed word" of some being he calls God. My question to Sye is this:

How do you know the being you call God is not delusional?

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 17, 2011 04:37 PM

"How do you know the being you call God is not delusional?"

Careful, JC, he's going to insist for the next week that you do a live debate with him on Skype before he answers this question....

Just sayin'...

Regads,
Dawson

Reply

Pvblivs Nov 17, 2011 05:39 PM

Well, Alex, I like to be fair. I have to accept challenging the premise of a question to be a satisfactory answer, even if I think it is rather detached from reality. However, I do not consider "god's word" to be a satisfactory answer to number 3. A justification is a logical reasoning process and Sye would have to give a chain of reasoning that leads to a conclusion that the uniformity of nature is caused by conscious activity. And he has not done this. Alternately, he could say that it is just a premise of his worldview and does not require justification. That's even believable. But it would defeat the fake question that he poses to outsiders.

Reply

Reynold Nov 17, 2011 06:27 PM

I've tried to get in touch with Sye on Skype, but so far he hasn't "shared his information with you" yet or whatever. Basically, no reply.

Meh.

Reply

Reynold Nov 17, 2011 09:16 PM

Sye...how can "god's revealed word" account for knowledge when it's demonstrated to have errors in it?

ex) the mustard seed being the "least of all seeds" for instance? As well as numerous "copyist errors" (as JP Holding et al) likes to call them.

Reply

freddies_dead Nov 18, 2011 02:46 AM

Sye TenB said...

(as a justification for why he believes a conscious activity causes the uniformity of nature)

God's revealed Word.

Which of course leads us to ask:

How do you know, with absolute certainty, that the source and veracity of the revelation is as you claim it is, when you aren't omniscient?

Reply

Dave Nov 18, 2011 02:57 AM

freddies_dead: I've asked Sye this before. His response to needing omniscience in order be absolutely certain is...."are you certain of this".

It's circles all the way down!

Reply

freddies_dead Nov 18, 2011 04:37 AM

Dave said...

freddies_dead: I've asked Sye this before. His response to needing omniscience in order be absolutely certain is...."are you certain of this".

It's circles all the way down!

I've had a similar response in the past. My answer was that "of course I'm not certain about it, that's why I'm asking you the question, can you answer?" ... deafening silence ensues.

Reply

Alex B Nov 18, 2011 05:18 AM

I've pointed the same out to him - basically the only way anyone can be certain that they are indeed speaking to an omniscient being is by being omniscient themselves so they can confirm the claim.

At the end of the final debate with him I asked if he'd take the word of the source of his 'revelation' on faith, without checking the accuracy of it - he said he would. It's during the last 5 or 6 minutes here <http://fundamentally-flawed.com/2011/10/25/special-%E2%80%93-alex-vs-sye/>

Chris Bolt claimed that I would have to be omniscient myself to know that his god doesn't exist, then claimed he'd never said that, and illustrated just how much he'd never it by going on at length about how I'd need to be omniscient to know his god didn't exist. Insane.

The more the whole PA thing is looked at, the more it falls apart.

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 18, 2011 05:34 AM

"At the end of the final debate with him I asked if he'd take the word of the source of his 'revelation' on faith, without checking the accuracy of it - he said he would."

You can't check the accuracy, of the necessary precondition for accuracy. I do not need to check the accuracy of what God reveals to all of us, such that we can know it for certain.

Let me ask that question back to you, do you check the accuracy of YOUR justification for accuracy? If so, how do you do this without assuming the accuracy of that justification?

Cue: "I've already answered that you (insert juvenile cuss word) – existence exists, then I use my senses, memory and reasoning to justify my senses, memory and reasoning and doing so is not viciously circular." As I said, the more people that listen to those podcasts the better:

Round 1

Round 2

Round 3.

"The more the whole PA thing is looked at, the more it falls apart."

In your dreams perhaps :-D

Reply

freddies_dead Nov 18, 2011 06:17 AM

Sye TenB said...

You can't check the accuracy, of the necessary precondition for accuracy.

You could if you were omniscient.

I do not need to check the accuracy of what God reveals to all of us, such that we can know it for certain.

And just how does the revelation give **you** absolute certainty sans omniscience on your part?

Reply

Alex B Nov 18, 2011 06:23 AM

How do you know that the Bible wasn't written by a trickster Sye? How do you know Satan didn't write it to pull people away from the REAL god?

Tell me, Sye, how would you tell the difference between a revelation from a just god and a revelation from a trickster god, if both are of equal power?

Reply

freddies_dead Nov 18, 2011 06:27 AM

Alex B said...

Tell me, Sye, how would you tell the difference between a revelation from a just god and a revelation from a trickster god, if both are of equal power?

And I want to know how he'd tell the difference between either of those and simply having the overwhelming feeling that a revelation had happened when it hadn't i.e. self-delusion.

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 18, 2011 06:28 AM

I'm taking a break to my blog-writing to make this comment.

Sye wrote: "I do not need to check the accuracy of what God reveals to all of us, such that we can know it for

certain.”

Sye is very much like the Blarkian. The Blarkian believes in the revelation of Blarko. He essentially says, very similarly to what Sye says here, “I do not need to check the accuracy of what Blarko reveals to all of us, such that we can know it for certain.” The Blarkian has the same “assurance” in the supernatural that Sye claims for himself. I find neither claim – Sye’s Christian claim or the Blarkian claim – to be at all persuasive. Rather, both seem to be playing with less than a full deck.

I don’t believe in imaginary beings, whether it’s Blarko, or the Christian god. Only Christians and Blarkians will have a problem with this.

Sye also wrote: “Let me ask that question back to you, do you check the accuracy of YOUR justification for accuracy?”

I have.

Sye then asked: “If so, how do you do this without assuming the accuracy of that justification?”

Well, first, by doubting it. Since my standard of any justification is the primacy of existence, I tried to see how far I could go by doubting its truth. But I found that when I doubted the primacy of existence, I was actually assuming it’s truth. Then I tried outright denying it. But I found that even then, I was tacitly assuming its truth. Then I tried imagining alternatives. But then I realized that I was now imagining things, and reality continually reminds me, by keeping me in check, that the things that I imagine (such as Harry Potter, the Wizard of Oz, Darth Vader, centaurs, the Christian god, etc.) are not real. So, given my devotion to honesty, I acknowledged the fact that imagining alternatives to the primacy of existence will only lead to self-refuting futility. I can compare what I do volitionally with what I perceive (which is non-volitional), and if there is a conflict, the problem is not in my perception, but in what I’m doing volitionally. The primacy of existence remedies this by guiding my volitional consciousness according to an objective standard – namely the facts of reality.

Do you see now why Dustin Segers sought to refute the primacy of existence?

I do.

Alex wrote: "The more the whole PA thing is looked at, the more it falls apart."

Sye: “In your dreams perhaps :-D”

I don’t think it’s a mere dream, Sye, that presuppositional apologetics will collapse into fallacies when it’s scrutinized according to an objective standard (say, the primacy of existence, which Chris Bolt and Eric Hovind assume to be true while Dustin Segers fruitlessly attempts to refute it). I’ve shown this on my blog. And my, behold what I have uncovered!

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 18, 2011 06:32 AM

God has revealed the truth of His Word such that we can be certain of it. He has revealed that there are no other 'gods' (Psalm 96:5).

Now, you can decry revelational epistemology all you like, but you simply do not have a competing claim from which to level ANY objection. It would take sheer intellectual dishonesty (which I naturally do not put past you, since that is how you roll) to claim that God could not reveal some things to us, such that we can know them for certain. Problem is, when you do this you imply that it is certain that my claim to certainty is false, which carries with it HUGE problems that you are unwilling, and unable to see.

We have been over this MANY times, and I realize that you need folks like me to get your viewership up, but this

broken record of yours is EXTREMELY dull.

Reply

Dave Nov 18, 2011 06:36 AM

And how do you know Psalm 96:5 isn't a lie Sye?

Reply

freddies_dead Nov 18, 2011 06:47 AM

Sye TenB said...

God has revealed the truth of His Word such that we can be certain of it. He has revealed that there are no other 'gods' (Psalm 96:5).

And how does this revelation work in order to give you absolute certainty?

Now, you can decry revelational epistemology all you like, but you simply do not have a competing claim from which to level ANY objection.

But we do. Dawson has presented you with an epistemology that not only competes but rather destroys your claims in to the bargain.

It would take sheer intellectual dishonesty (which I naturally do not put past you, since that is how you roll) to claim that God could not reveal some things to us, such that we can know them for certain.

I haven't claimed that and instead I have happily conceded that a deity could grant you omniscience which would give you the absolute certainty you claim to have. However, you say you're not omniscient but are still absolutely certain. So I ask, just how does that work?

Problem is, when you do this you imply that it is certain that my claim to certainty is false, which carries with it HUGE problems that you are unwilling, and unable to see.

No problem when I haven't taken that position. I have simply asked you to clarify your position.

We have been over this MANY times,

And not once have you explained how you can be absolutely certain sans omniscience. Care to try?

and I realize that you need folks like me to get your viewership up, but this broken record of yours is EXTREMELY dull.

You could stop the record being played if you'd only explain how you can be absolutely certain whilst not omniscient.

Reply

Alex B Nov 18, 2011 06:49 AM

Sye accusing someone else of being a 'broken record' - ACTUAL LOL

Reply

Alex B Nov 18, 2011 06:51 AM

Sye said: God has revealed the truth of His Word such that we can be certain of it. He has revealed that there are no other 'gods' (Psalm 96:5).

Trickster god has revealed the 'truth' of his 'word' such that we can be certain of it. Trickster god has lied that there are no other 'gods' (Psalm 96:5)

Sye, the only way you can check the validity of that verse is to be omniscient - are you omniscient? (I know the answer to this, but it amuses me to have you answer again)

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 18, 2011 06:57 AM

"Sye, the only way you can check the validity of that verse is to be omniscient"

1. Are you certain?
2. If so, how are you certain?

(I know how you 'answer' those questions, but it it amuses me to have you avoid the answers again).

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 18, 2011 07:01 AM

"I acknowledged the fact that imagining alternatives to the primacy of existence will only lead to self-refuting futility."

And how do you know that this universe is NOT a place of self-refuting futility or that your reasoning about any of this is accurate?

(Go back to your break DB :-D)

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 18, 2011 07:05 AM

Sye wrote: "God has revealed the truth of His Word such that we can be certain of it."

In other words...

A being which we **must imagine** has "revealed" (by some unclear means that is ultimately beyond rational identification) that an ancient collection of primitive writings is "true" such that we can be deluded that we're certain of it.

Got it.

Sye: "He has revealed that there are no other 'gods' (Psalm 96:5)."

Someone back in year BC-whatever wrote that there are no other gods, so we are to take this primitive writing as "revelation" and believe it's true, and pretend that it's a sufficient basis for "certainty."

In this case, "certainty" is euphemistic for the determination to treat a pretense as a reliable means of knowing what is true.

Sye: "Now, you can decry revelational epistemology all you like,"

Well, for one, my likes or dislikes have nothing to do with it, since I'm guided by the primacy of existence. (Remember?)

But, secondly, the notion of "revelational epistemology" is oxymoronic: to claim that one "knows" something because it was "revealed" to be such, is to deny epistemology altogether, since it is an attempt, however implicit, to repudiate the very notion that there is a process which one's own mind performs to acquire and validate knowledge to begin with. It's an attempt to deny not only fallibility, but also one's own volitional involvement.

Sye: "but you simply do not have a competing claim from which to level ANY objection."

This claim assumes the truth of the very "competing claim from which" I level my objections, namely the primacy of existence. Yes, Sye, you're assuming the truth of the primacy of existence here, just as you do whenever you affirm anything (even a fiction) as truth. You're saying that something is the case, not because you **wish** it or **want** it to be so, but because what you say (presumably) corresponds to a state of affairs that obtains

independent of your conscious activity (e.g., wishing, imagining, wanting, liking, disliking, ignorance, preferences, etc.). So I embrace the primacy of existence, and am willing to let it take me where it goes. But folks like Dustin Segers insist that the primacy of existence is false, self-refuting, question-begging and internally incoherent. Which do you think is right?

Sye: "It would take sheer intellectual dishonesty (which I naturally do not put past you, since that is how you roll) to claim that God could not reveal some things to us, such that we can know them for certain."

It would take sheer intellectual dishonesty (which I wouldn't put past Sye Ten Bruggencate) to imagine that an invisible magic being "revealing" itself to us is a *rational* basis for certainty, in spite of the fundamental self-contradiction such a claim makes at the level of metaphysical primacy.

Sye: "Problem is, when you do this you imply that it is certain that my claim to certainty is false, which carries with it HUGE problems that you are unwilling, and unable to see."

Well, which is it – am I "unwilling" to see these alleged problems (which you do not identify), or am I "unable" to see them? If on the basis of your worldview you think I'm "unable" to see these alleged problems (which you do not identify), how is that my fault? If you think I'm "unwilling," how did you come to this assessment? How do you know what I'm willing and unwilling to do? How? Please, speak to this. (I guess you'll appeal to revelation again at this point.... How's that going?)

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 18, 2011 07:11 AM

I wrote: "I acknowledged the fact that imagining alternatives to the primacy of existence will only lead to self-refuting futility."

Sye asked: "And how do you know that this universe is NOT a place of self-refuting futility or that your reasoning about any of this is accurate?"

In the case of both areas of your inquiry, I know this by consistently the primacy of existence to my inquiries into the nature of reality. That's how.

Any more questions?

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 18, 2011 07:12 AM

I wrote: "I acknowledged the fact that imagining alternatives to the primacy of existence will only lead to self-refuting futility."

Sye asked: "And how do you know that this universe is NOT a place of self-refuting futility or that your reasoning about any of this is accurate?"

In the case of both areas of your inquiry, I know this by consistently applying the primacy of existence to my inquiries into the nature of reality. That's how.

Any more questions?

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 18, 2011 07:15 AM

Sye wrote: "Go back to your break DB"

Yes, Sye, I know you want me gone from the scene. But your wishes are not my commands. This is a fact that you need to recognize, understand, and embrace.

But don't worry, I will resume my blog-writing soon.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 18, 2011 07:55 AM

"I know this by consistently applying the primacy of existence to my inquiries into the nature of reality. That's how. Any more questions?"

Nope, that'll do :-D

Cheers! (And thanks :-)

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 18, 2011 08:25 AM

I wrote: "I know this by consistently applying the primacy of existence to my inquiries into the nature of reality. That's how.

"Any more questions?"

Sye responded: "Nope, that'll do"

Then you've been answered.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 18, 2011 08:49 AM

"Then you've been answered."

Indeed!!! No wonder you do not want to debate me with that viciously circular nonsense! How do you know that your reasoning is accurate when you are "applying the primacy of existence to your inquiries???" Um, lemme guess, "by applying the primacy of existence to your inquiries???"

This is a joke! Look folks what your hero, the 'great' Dawson Beckrick has to offer!

Never doubt why he will not put this garbage up to debate folks. I thought perhaps it was because he was a snivelling pipsqueak (well that could also be the case), turns out this is all he's got! :-D

Reply

Alex B Nov 18, 2011 08:56 AM

Sye, your disconnect from reality is worse than I thought, please seek psychiatric help.

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 18, 2011 09:10 AM

"Sye, your disconnect from reality is worse than I thought, please seek psychiatric help."

Good argument there Alex! Your hero randroid's argument is destroyed, and you resort to the insults. Sad.

Expected, but sad.

Reply

Alex B Nov 18, 2011 09:14 AM

"Your hero randroid's argument is destroyed"

Hmmm, having read ALL the comments here, I must have missed that post! Did you make it invisible? Perhaps you merely thought you'd posted it, but in reality left the page?

Sye, you still haven't explained how, without being omniscient yourself, you can know that your 'revelation' is from a truly omniscient being.

"resort to the insults"

I think you'll find I started with insults as well, have to be consistent when dealing with deluded maniacs like yourself!

Reply

JC Nov 18, 2011 02:21 PM

I did not see an answer from Sye to my question.

Sye, if you can, please tell me how do you know the being you call God is not delusional?

Also, I would be happy to debate with you over Skype.

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 18, 2011 03:18 PM

Sye asked: "And how do you know that this universe is NOT a place of self-refuting futility or that your reasoning about any of this is accurate?"

I responded: "In the case of both areas of your inquiry, I know this by consistently applying the primacy of existence to my inquiries into the nature of reality. That's how."

Sye says that my answer is "viciously circular," but to say this, notice that he had to change what he originally asked in order to retrofit my answer to a context that appears viciously circular. Here's what he wrote:

"How do you know that your reasoning is accurate when you are 'applying the primacy of existence to your inquiries???' Um, lemme guess, 'by applying the primacy of existence to your inquiries???'"

In his original question, he asked something quite specific: "how do you know that the universe is NOT a place of self-refuting futility or that your reasoning about any of this is accurate." The context of this question is confined to a specific area of inquiry: whether or not the universe is a place of self-refuting futility. In the second portion of the question, the context is clear that the antecedent to the demonstrative pronoun 'this' is found in the first portion of Sye's original question. In his follow-up, he's clearly altered this by means of equivocation, a somewhat clumsily executed sleight of hand that's not hard to spot. Now the demonstrative pronoun 'this' is to be taken to mean something much broader than the specific area of inquiry denoted in his original question.

Essentially, what Sye is telling us is that any epistemological operation performed by the mind in acquiring and validating knowledge is going to be circular in nature. But how did he establish this, if not by using his mind, and thus committing the very circularity he charges against everyone else? Perhaps the only alternative is that he simply accepted this on someone's say so, which is characteristic of what he expects of others when he talks at them: he says that his god has revealed things to him, for instance, and expects everyone to accept this on his mere say so. No cognitive action on the part of the listener beyond that is allowed, for Sye himself performs no cognitive action beyond that, for his worldview does not allow it. His apologetic disallows any further action on the part of the thinker by condemning all such action as circular, even if it isn't (as in the case of my above reply to his original question).

On thing that Sye doesn't get is the fact that the primacy of existence is not the conclusion of some prior chain of reasoning, but that it is in fact an axiom, an objective starting point. Sye has difficulty grasping this because his own worldview does not have an objective starting point. It begins with an emotion (fear) in response to something imaginary ("God"), as Proverbs 1:7 makes crystal clear. Nothing objective about this – it's pure subjectivism. What he also does not get is the fact that the fallacy of viciously circular reasoning is not instanced by coming back to re-check one's course of thought on an issue to ensure that an error has not been made.

Nor is it instanced by applying a fundamental standard, which is general in nature (you can't get any more general than the axioms), to a specific knowledge question. Obviously my response was not given in reply to the question "How do you prove that the primacy of existence is true?" for I did not seek to prove it. Sye asked an epistemological question ('How do you know...?') about a metaphysical area of inquiry. That's where a fundamental standard comes into play. Sye doesn't have one, so he doesn't understand what it is to apply one, so he dismisses it as circular. It's like an ancient primitive being transported to modern times and calling cell phones "the work of the devil." It's really no different, philosophically speaking.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 18, 2011 04:08 PM

So erm, Dawson, how do you know that your reasoning about any of this is accurate?

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 18, 2011 04:23 PM

Sye asked: "So erm, Dawson, how do you know that your reasoning about any of this is accurate?"

By identifying the fact that my reasoning conforms to an objective standard. Identification is a legitimate operation of the human mind.

Here's a question for you, since you are in the mood for questions.

I'm sure you'll come back saying "That's circular!" And even though this will only betray the fact that you're unclear on what circularity is, you also have to use your consciousness to make this claim. Thus you assume that your own consciousness is valid. But how did you validate it? If you claim that your consciousness is validated by "God," you would be begging the question, for you would be using your consciousness - and thus assuming its validity - in order to make such statements (whether they're true or not), which is precisely what you've been called to prove. So on what basis do you assume the validity of your own consciousness, Sye?

Or, can you not answer this question for some reason?

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 18, 2011 04:35 PM

"By identifying the fact that my reasoning conforms to an objective standard."

And erm do you use your reasoning in this identification process?

See how easy this is folks?

Reply

imnotandrei Nov 18, 2011 04:52 PM

And erm do you use your reasoning in this identification process?

See how easy this is folks?

Parroting is easy, yes.

Of course, I don't see you putting out your basis for belief in your own reasoning here, to be asked the same repeated questions until you give up.

As far as I can tell, Dawson pegged you right here:

Perhaps the only alternative is that he simply accepted this on someone's say so,

Because you seem utterly unable to accept that anyone could have valid reasoning, so you need external injection of truth.

Now, you'd like to claim that that someone is God. To which the obvious question is, "How do you know?"

I do believe (and I apologize again for boring people on this thread, if I am) I see why you're so interested in a Skype debate. It's because you like to play Mornington Crescent (look it up) with your "How do you know?" question. Whoever asks it first then gets to keep asking it until the other party gives up in frustration, like dealing with a three-year-old, and since other people might actually be trying to have a discussion rather than play "gotcha" games, you get to ask first.

Really rather informative.

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 18, 2011 05:54 PM

Sye asked: "So erm, Dawson, how do you know that your reasoning about any of this is accurate?"

I answered: "By identifying the fact that my reasoning conforms to an objective standard."

Now Sye asks: "And erm do you use your reasoning in this identification process?"

Of course. Reason is the faculty which identifies and integrates what we perceive. It performs this process by means of concepts (remember those?). Reason is the proper function of the human mind. It is the means by which we identify the objects of our awareness. As I stated, identification is a legitimate operation of the human mind.

So in answer to your charge of circularity, waiting like a spider to catch some unsuspecting fly:

- Using reason to identify objects is not circular, and

- Using reason to identify the operation of my consciousness in identifying those objects, and thus recognize that the operation I used in identifying those objects is in fact reason, is not circular.

You seem to be suffering from the same confusion that troubled Dustin Segers when he tried to refute the secondary objectivity of consciousness. I try my best to educate folks like you, but your commitment to an irrational worldview premised on blatant subjectivism renders you attitudinally unteachable.

The alternative to reason is evasion, or simply shutting down the mind. You have chosen the first alternative for yourself, and you seek to force the second alternative on everyone you "debate" with.

Got any more "nuclear strength" weapons in your arsenal, Sye? Bring it on.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 18, 2011 06:04 PM

"Using reason to identify objects is not circular"

No, but trusting its accuracy in the identification process with which you try to justify its accuracy is.

"Using reason to identify the operation... ..is not circular.

No, but trusting its accuracy in the identification process with which you try to justify its accuracy is.

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 18, 2011 06:05 PM

Imnotandrei wrote: "Now, you'd like to claim that that someone is God. To which the obvious question is, 'How do you know?'"

In the final analysis, he "knows" by means of his *imagination*. Only he will resist admitting this at all costs, and he will do anything to keep the focus off of his worldview in order to keep people from catching onto the fact that all he has going for him is something that he can only imagine. He has no epistemology to present and inform us about. All he can do at this point is seek some way to discredit any and all detractors. It's a deepseated insecurity that he is trying to protect. This insecurity is particularly strong in Sye's case. It's why he's always trying to confront people in some public setting - he needs to compensate for the holy terror of his fears. It's basically a form of the small man complex.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 18, 2011 06:08 PM

Projecting again there Dawson? Again, of the two of us, I am more than happy to discuss our respective worldviews live on Skype. You are not (for obvious reasons).

Cheers.

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 18, 2011 06:09 PM

I wrote: "Using reason to identify objects is not circular"

Sye responded: "No,"

Good. At least now you acknowledge that my epistemological methodology is in fact not circular. I'm glad I could finally help you see this. But I'm guessing you'll put it safely out of your mind so that you can continue to use your fallacious apologetic which trades on denying what you've just admitted.

Sye continued: "but trusting its accuracy in the identification process with which you try to justify its accuracy is."

How do you know this?

Hint: Watch those stolen concepts! (E.g., how'd you get the concept 'trust'? Blank out.)

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 18, 2011 06:16 PM

"How do you know this?"

Do you deny that trusting the accuracy of your reasoning in the identification process with which you try to justify its accuracy is viciously circular???

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 18, 2011 06:25 PM

Sye had written: "trusting its accuracy in the identification process with which you try to justify its accuracy is."

I asked: "How do you know this?"

Notice that Sye has not answered this question. Instead, he just asked another:

Sye asked: "Do you deny that trusting the accuracy of your reasoning in the identification process with which you try to justify its accuracy is viciously circular???"

Sye, you need to go back and read what I wrote again, and carefully this time. Also, you need to address my question: Show me how you know that trusting the accuracy of the identification process is circular – and show that you can know this without committing the fallacy of the stolen concept. If you want your question taken seriously, you need to show that it is free of any hidden internal errors, errors which I've already spotted, but which have eluded your clouded mind. You have some homework. I suggest you get started on it.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 18, 2011 06:52 PM

I know it by revelation from God, now answer the question please:

Do you deny that trusting the accuracy of your reasoning in the identification process with which you try to justify its accuracy is viciously circular???

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 18, 2011 07:17 PM

Sye responded: "I know it by revelation from God,"

Several points here:

1) you haven't followed my instructions. I asked for you to explain how you could know without committing the fallacy of the stolen concept. You did just that.

2) If you want anyone to believe that this is a "revelation from God," you'll need to validate it as such. But you make no attempt to. So tell me this: Is this some sort of *private* revelation that was distributed directly to you from some being that we cannot distinguish from your mere imagination? Or did you find this somewhere in the bible? If the latter is the case, please cite book, chapter and verse that says trusting the identification process is viciously circular.

3) Claiming that you "know it by revelation from God" is woefully insufficient, because "revelation from God" does nothing to document an epistemological process by which you arrived at the knowledge you are claiming. I'm willing to consider the possibility that there is no epistemological process by which you arrived at the knowledge you are claiming, but are in fact just mindlessly mouthing something that was told to you and you've accepted on someone's say so, without any clue as to whether or not it's actually true. But either way, you've not explained *how you know* what you're claiming to know. Either you have a process by which you arrived at the knowledge you've claimed (and then can answer the question "How do you know?"), or you simply don't know and are playing the parrot.

Sye wrote: "now answer the question please: Do you deny that trusting the accuracy of your reasoning in the identification process with which you try to justify its accuracy is viciously circular???"

Apparently you've still not done your homework. You need to show how you know that this would be viciously circular. As I pointed out above, saying "by revelation from God" has no epistemological content. Anyone could

claim to know anything "by revelation from God," and many have. In such cases, truth is not the objective; psychological manipulation is. And I've already told you that this will not work on me. Yet you still try to do it. And still you do not explain how you can know this without committing the fallacy of the stolen concept (which is still lurking in your question).

If you can't answer my question and show that the question you've posed to me is conceptually valid, then I see no reason to take it seriously. You've already admitted that the epistemological process I've mentioned is not circular. You've not even shown that "trust" is involved in the epistemological process that I've described. And as you can see, it's not present in anything I stated. But clearly you want to charge me with circularity. Your entire apologetic hinges on just this. But you can't find any. You can't make it stick. You're up against a wall, Sye.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 18, 2011 07:22 PM

Yawn. Nevermind.

Cheers.

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 18, 2011 07:28 PM

Sye: "Yawn. Nevermind."

Yes, roll over and go back to sleep. Perhaps you've realize that you're not going to get your stolen concepts past me. If so, you're finally right about something: You won't. It's best that you abandon ship now.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

imnotandrei Nov 18, 2011 08:32 PM

I know it by revelation from God, now answer the question please:

How do you know that?

(See? It's Mornington Crescent, but this time *I* won.)

Reply

Reynold Nov 18, 2011 10:45 PM

Sye TenB:

Sye said: God has revealed the truth of His Word such that we can be certain of it. He has revealed that there are no other 'gods' (Psalm 96:5).

No he hasn't...what about all the mistakes and contradictions in the bible?

Ex) 1: **Job 39:13-17** about how the Ostrich is a bad parent who "is hardened against her young ones, as though they were not her's: her labour is in vain without fear;"

In **reality**, the mother takes care of her young for a month until they're able to keep up with the parents. Also, **this** : *The parents keep close watch over the chicks constantly. They will leading them to food (seeds and vegetation), water and they will provide shade for them. Even with the protection of the parents only about 1 chick in 10 will survive its first year of life.*

Isaiah 13:10 which says that the moon itself gives light, also the verse in genesis which talks about god making two lights in the sky, a major one for the day, and the minor one (the moon) at night.

It's an easy mistake to make, but one would think that the so-called "creator" of the solar system could properly

explain that the moon is just reflecting the sun's light...after all, it's not any more weird than the rest of the bible, **and** it'd show amazing scientific foreknowledge.

Then there's the mustard seed being the "least" of all seeds, etc.

You get my point...if the bible which is part of god's revelation is shown to be inaccurate, then how can you be justified in being certain of the accuracy of whatever his "revelations" show you?

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 19, 2011 01:22 AM

Reynold wrote: "what about all the mistakes and contradictions in the bible?"

Sye will (or would, if he continued this dialogue; he's apparently absquatulated for good now) probably respond to this with something like: "Claiming that there are contradictions in the Bible presupposes the laws of logic, and your worldview has no standard for the laws of logic. How do you account for the unchanging laws of logic in a universe that's characterized by constant change?" This is not a direct quote, but a fairly accurate paraphrase from something I heard him say on YouTube video.

Of course, in Objectivism, we do have a standard: the primacy of existence. He's nowhere shown this standard to be false, inadequate or something less than the standard that Objectivism finds it to be. Indeed, to say it's false or inadequate would assume it's truth (the alternative would be to say that it's false because he wants it to be false, doesn't like it, wishes it weren't so, etc.). So he's really stuck here. That's why he won't discuss the Bolt-Segers dilemma I asked him about. It will slash off his whole worldview in one quick slice.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Alex B Nov 19, 2011 05:17 AM

Sye said: "Yawn. Nevermind."

Ladies and Gentlemen, I present an intellectual colossus.

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 19, 2011 08:13 AM

I didn't have time earlier today to elaborate on this, and seeing that Sye has apparently left the room, I will make further comment on his question to me.

He asked: "Do you deny that trusting the accuracy of your reasoning in the identification process with which you try to justify its accuracy is viciously circular???"

As I suggest in my response to Sye, the problem with his debating strategy here is that it trades on a stolen concept. It relies on making use of a concept while ignoring its genetic roots. That's what the fallacy of the stolen concept is. A blatant example would be someone denying the validity of basic arithmetic and then claiming that he can show its invalidity by means of a geometric proof. The problem is that geometry conceptually relies on the validity of basic arithmetic, and one would have to accept the validity of basic arithmetic in order to accept the results of the geometric proof proposed to prove that basic arithmetic is invalid.

Unfortunately most stolen concepts that linger in philosophical thought are much more subtle and not so easily detected. That's why they linger. And they can do considerable damage to one's position. An example is Sye's own question. There is such a thing as a fallacious question. For example, the fallacy complex question seeks to goad a person into accepting a premise assumed in the content of the question when that premise is in fact not true. A common example is the question: "Have you stopped beating your wife?" The question assumes that the one to whom it is posed not only has a wife, but also that he has been beating her. But either of these premises could be false, and if so, the question is fallaciously complex.

Sye's question ("Do you deny that trusting the accuracy of your reasoning in the identification process with which

you try to justify its accuracy is viciously circular???) is fallaciously complex because it contains a premise which commits the fallacy of the stolen concept. It does this by giving "trusting" a role which it could not have at the level at which it is being posited as operational, as indicated by the implication that trusting one's reasoning process in some way is viciously circular. Trust is a *product* of successful identification, not its basis, its means, or its standard. So circularity here is actually impossible on an objective model of knowledge (which is only possible if one consistently adheres to the primacy of existence). (An additional problem is that Sye's original question was of the "how do you *know*...?" variety, whereas now he's changed it to a matter of *justification*; these are not identical. It's a sleight of hand which may escape the unsuspecting; it probably escaped even Sye's notice.)

Any successful execution of the identification process provides a basis for trusting its effectiveness and reliability. The "trusting" of course comes later. Trust is not the starting point, nor is it the method of validation which the identification process uses. Rather, trust is a psychological by-product of the process, and a vital one at that. But trusting one's own faculties is not circular, since it is in fact a result of their successful operation, not their precondition.

Sye's question ignores the conceptual position of trust in the hierarchical structure of knowledge in relation to the identification process, and is phrased apparently with the intent of catching the one to whom it's been posed off guard. Luckily this time Sye's question was posed to someone who understands the conceptual nature of knowledge, and actually has a rational epistemology which is impervious to stolen concepts, given the explicit awareness of the nature of the breach in the knowledge hierarchy which stolen concepts commit. So it doesn't work on me. That's why Sye gave up: he saw not only that his gimmicks would not succeed, but also that the devices they employ will be exposed.

He should go back to being a tradesman.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Alex B Nov 19, 2011 02:39 PM

"He should go back to being a tradesman."

I've suggested the same many times.

Reply

felixmeister Nov 27, 2011 06:12 PM

Hi Sye.

I would like for you to answer a few simple questions.

1. Can it be possible for a thought to happen without something existing to have that thought?
2. If something has a thought can it therefore not exist?
3. If I think can I then know, absolutely, that I exist?