

<http://anatheistviewpoint.blogspot.com/2011/11/ive-heard-some-bullshit.html>

March 22, 2012

Sunday, 6 November 2011 **I've Heard Some Bullshit.....**

....but this takes the biscuit.

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

That's the latest **excuse** from the Mr Bean of Apologists, Sye Ten Bruggencate. Needless to say I have asked him to supply the exact Bible verse that tells believers that to debate using anything other than Van Tillian presuppositions is a sin, I'm looking forward to how far he's prepared to take this nonsense.

In the same comments thread, you'll see that Circular Sye is desperately trying to avoid answering some basic questions asked by Dawson, go and have a look - it's most amusing.

Posted by **Alex B** at **22:47**

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

83 comments:

William Wilburhorse Nov 6, 2011 08:13 PM

I have to say, after reading this blog for quite sometime, you are an unbelievably sad individual that I will continue to pray for for the rest of my years.

You are unbelievably deluded. It's disgusting. You have no moral standard, and that's clear reading past debates and conversations you've had with Sye, Alan Maricle and the like. You can't even finish a conversation without getting into ad hominem attacks. You accuse us, the Christians, who have developed all sorts of good for the world of 'lying to children', when you are telling children that their lives are meaningless.

Angels on your body,

William Wilburhorse

Abolishhorseabortion.blogspot.com

Reply

Alex B Nov 7, 2011 12:29 AM

"I have to say, after reading this blog for quite sometime, you are an unbelievably sad individual that I will continue to pray for for the rest of my years."

Hey! Thanks for dropping by! Feel free to pray for me, but can I ask you that, for every prayer, you donate \$5 to UNICEF? At least then some good will come of it.

"You are unbelievably deluded. It's disgusting."

Hmmm, well, I have to stop you there, Mr Poe. If you were a real Fundamentalist Christian you'd believe in talking snakes, asses, bushes, winds, and clouds, axe heads that float on water, cloned rib women, and magic fruit. I think we can all see who would be the most deluded. As you're a Poe, I've absolutely no idea what you believe, but you

seem set on spreading Alan Maricle aka Rhology's name around, so good on you.

"You have no moral standard, and that's clear reading past debates and conversations you've had with Sye, Alan Maricle and the like."

Hmmm, again, if you were an actual Christian I'd point out that this is horse shit (like what I did there?)

"You can't even finish a conversation without getting into ad hominem attacks. You accuse us, the Christians, who have developed all sorts of good for the world of 'lying to children', when you are telling children that their lives are meaningless."

Actually I tell my two sons that their lives are full of meaning, and to make the absolute most of them, as it's the only time around they'll get. They appreciate my honesty and try to be the best people they can be. I love the way you used an ad hom there though, that's some clever satire.

"Angels on your body, "

And on yours.

Reply

cootey59 Nov 7, 2011 02:06 AM

hmmm ... 'Wilburhorse' heh, I'm old enough to remember 'Mr. Ed' and I smell a poe. 'William' commits so many logical fallacies it almost has to be deliberate, either that or he really is a complete twat. let's see now how does it go " a horse is a horse of course of course, and no one can talk to a horse of course that is, of course, unless the horse is the famous Mr. Ed."

Reply

Alex B Nov 7, 2011 02:41 AM

Having looked at his site I am 100% certain that he's a Poe.

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 7, 2011 05:41 AM

Okay Alex, I'll be happy to expound on this.

Proverbs 26:4

"Do not answer a fool according to his folly, lest you be like him yourself."

Now, what is the fools folly?

Psalm 14:1

"The fool says in his heart, "There is no God."

Now, put them together!

Any apologetic which argues towards God, does not start with God, and is violating a clear command in Scripture. All those other methodologies assume autonomous reasoning, the very thing we are arguing against.

You see Alex, if you get on the fool's plane, it doesn't matter what you argue about, you are going to the fool's destination.

Reply

Alex B Nov 7, 2011 07:42 AM

Sye, neither of those verses say anything about Van Tillian apologetics.

Please try again.

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 7, 2011 08:16 AM

"Sye, neither of those verses say anything about Van Tillian apologetics."

Well, I didn't expect you to be able to figure it out Alex. It's more for those reading along.

Cheers.

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 7, 2011 08:54 AM

Alex wrote: "Sye, neither of those verses say anything about Van Tillian apologetics."

Sye responded: "Well, I didn't expect you to be able to figure it out Alex. It's more for those reading along."

Hi Sye, I'm "reading along," and I too didn't see anything about Van Tillian (V'illain) apologetics. Can you take a few moments and explain?

By the way, I still haven't received your wave file. Are you having some problems?

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 7, 2011 08:57 AM

"Hi Sye, I'm "reading along," and I too didn't see anything about Van Tillian (V'illain) apologetics. Can you take a few moments and explain?"

Sure. I didn't expect Alex or you to be able to figure it out (or any who profess atheism for that matter), it was more for those who do not profess atheism who may be reading along.

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 7, 2011 09:04 AM

Sye: "Sure. I didn't expect Alex or you to be able to figure it out (or any who profess atheism for that matter), it was more for those who do not profess atheism who may be reading along."

In other words, you didn't expect your words to be persuasive to anyone who didn't already tow the party line. Got it.

Well, you know what, your words haven't been persuasive at all. So reality is for once in line with at least one of your expectations.

By the way, still waiting for that wave file. Any idea when you'll be ready to send it?

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Alex B Nov 7, 2011 09:12 AM

"Sure. I didn't expect Alex or you to be able to figure it out (or any who profess atheism for that matter), it was more for those who do not profess atheism who may be reading along."

A typically presubullshitter reply - Sye (and his fellow PAs) assume the truth of their position, so don't even try to support it with evidence. As seen here, he's failed to provide the evidence I've requested.

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 7, 2011 09:18 AM

"In other words, you didn't expect your words to be persuasive to anyone who didn't already tow the party line. Got it."

Looks like you are finally getting it. Indeed, proof does not equal persuasion and is only useful for those who have "eyes to see, and ears to hear."

Reply

Alex B Nov 7, 2011 09:25 AM

"Looks like you are finally getting it. Indeed, proof does not equal persuasion and is only useful for those who have "eyes to see, and ears to hear.""

And so you prove your desire for debate to be nothing more than relentless self promotion, not interested in furthering your own knowledge or challenging your set in concrete beliefs.

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 7, 2011 09:35 AM

"And so you prove your desire for debate to be nothing more than relentless self promotion, not interested in furthering your own knowledge or challenging your set in concrete beliefs."

Actually, I am merely obeying what I am commanded to do. You see Alex, the degree of Hell that you will attain should you die unrepentant is contingent on the degree of truth you have been given and reject. Indeed, I would, in my own selfish desires, rather see you repent and come to know Jesus Christ as your Lord and Saviour, but that it may be that the intended result of our communications is to further your condemnation.

Reply

Alex B Nov 7, 2011 09:52 AM

Lucky that hell, heaven, gods, sin, and all the other nonsense theists call upon don't exist then!

Disagree? Prove they do (and, no, saying 'my god must exist for you to be even able to ask' is NOT proof, it is a naked assertion without any supporting evidence)

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 7, 2011 03:55 PM

Sye wrote: "Actually, I am merely obeying what I am commanded to do."

Compare: "I was only following orderz!"

Regards,

Dawson

Reply

Alex B Nov 7, 2011 04:26 PM

I take Sye's silence on the proof for heaven, hell, etc means he has no evidence. Good, glad we settled that.

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 7, 2011 04:29 PM

Alex: "I take Sye's silence on the proof for heaven, hell, etc means he has no evidence. Good, glad we settled that."

Yep. Case closed. Had he any real evidence, you can be sure he would have been rushing forward with it. But all we here is - how does Sye himself put it - crickets.

Seriously, the guy is most derranged. He's basically the poster boy for "This is your mind on religion." Remember the fried egg?

Regards,

Dawson

Reply

Alex B Nov 7, 2011 04:32 PM

I've suspected he's in the throws of some mania or breakdown for some time now.

Reply

William Wilburhorse Nov 7, 2011 05:05 PM

Alex-

You humor me with your call for evidence. Evidence, evidence and evidence is all you base your truths on. Tell me Alex- what makes truth? Is it your subjective worldview? In that case, the Idi Amin's truth was just as valid as yours, no? Maybe a child molester's 'truth' is valid as well. How about we all go off your system and watch the world collapse. Thank God for giving us humans, sinful, lustful humans a chance to redeem ourselves by adhering to his morality. I pray every night for people like you.

Also, I Don't know where you're getting this 'Poe' talk from, but it sounds like an ad hominem attack to me. Why fall back to name-calling, Alex? Because your argument has no base? And once again, Sye is verbally destroying you. No need to engage fools, Sye. May the Lord Jesus Christ make himself known to sinners like Alex, so we may see him in heaven someday.

Angels on your body,

William Wilburhorse

PS Ever wonder that your evidence that your describe is just as subject to human fallibility as you claim the Bible to be? Ignorance is bliss, right Alex?

Reply

Alex B Nov 7, 2011 05:08 PM

Truth is that which conforms to reality or actuality.

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 7, 2011 07:28 PM

"Truth is that which conforms to reality or actuality."

Me: "Okay, so you are saying that truth is that which conforms to reality." 49:23 (Fundamentally Flawed - Alex and Sye)

You: "No" 49:26

Priceless!

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 7, 2011 07:39 PM

Sye: "Priceless!"

Sye, are you intimating that there's something wrong with the presence of contradictions in one's worldview? But how? The basis of the worldview you want to affirm and defend is choking with contradictions. Examples include the affirmation of the truth of the primacy of consciousness implicit throughout the Christian worldview (to say that the primacy of consciousness is true is self-contradictory); the doctrine of the trinity (whopping contradictions there); the doctrine of Christ (a walking, talking contradiction - a being that is said to be both "wholly God" *and* "wholly man"); the employment of the primacy of existence (a la Chris Bolt in the other thread) and the express denial of its truth (a la Dustin Segers' dismantled blog), etc., etc., etc. Perhaps it was the presence of all these contradictions which are systemic to Christianity that prompted Van Til to claim that "all teaching of Scripture is apparently contradictory" and that the resolution of those contradictions was found in a "mystery" that may never

be revealed (meaning: he's just in complete denial over the fact that they're contradictory).

I'm glad these aren't my problems.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

William Wilburhorse Nov 7, 2011 08:49 PM

But Alex, what is reality or actuality? Please explain your reasoning. Which is faulty at best.

Reply

imnotandrei Nov 7, 2011 08:59 PM

To Mr. Wilburhorse:

I can't speak for Alex. But to me reality is that which is directly knowable, via sense-experience, or inferrable from same, via logical reasoning.

To Mr. TenB:

"Indeed, proof does not equal persuasion and is only useful for those who have "eyes to see, and ears to hear."

Then your notion of proof is fatally flawed, and effectively useless.

I admit that I am new to the debate; I had not heard of the particular logical...something-or-other that Mr. TenB and those of his ilk are promoting until recently.

I was trained (in part) as a mathematician, in part as a physicist; two very different ways of "knowing" things -- and of proving them.

If your proof is not persuasive, Mr. TenB, and it is logically sound, there is only one conclusion that can be drawn; people don't buy your axioms. And while your axioms may comfort you at night, if other people don't accept them, then there is no point in your using them in debate.

(I apologize to members of this blog for whom this is doubtless very old territory.)

People who've known me for a long time are well aware that when I start a sentence 'Would you accept that...' the answer is "No." Because there's a logical trap waiting for them.

Can you convince me of something without including that which you wish to convince me of among your axioms?

(And, for that matter, can you defend your assertion regarding the Christian God's centrality against the argument that his existence is rather like Euclid's Parallel Postulate -- fun things happen when you change it, but they're still *consistent* things?)

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 7, 2011 09:25 PM

///"I can't speak for Alex. But to me reality is that which is directly knowable, via sense-experience, or inferrable from same, via logical reasoning."

Problem is, you presuppose the validity of your senses, memory, reasoning, the uniformity of nature, and the laws of logic (to name but a few), none of which your worldview can account for.

""Then your notion of proof is fatally flawed, and effectively useless.""

Perhaps then, you will give me an example of a proof which will persuade those who refuse to believe it?

"I was trained (in part) as a mathematician, in part as a physicist; two very different ways of "knowing" things -- and of proving them."

Neither of which can be justified without God.

"If your proof is not persuasive, Mr. TenB, and it is logically sound, there is only one conclusion that can be drawn; people don't buy your axioms."

Well, I do not argue that God is an axiom, but that they reject Him is in accordance with what Scripture teaches.

"And while your axioms may comfort you at night, if other people don't accept them, then there is no point in your using them in debate."

Again, I don't, I argue from necessary presuppositions. Since according to my view the very concept of debate presupposes God, I must argue from that presupposition, lest I concede my presupposition at the outset.

"Can you convince me of something without including that which you wish to convince me of among your axioms?"

Again, I do not argue that God is an axiom, but a necessary presupposition, and no, I cannot convince you of something against your will. "A man convinced against his will is of the same mind still."

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 7, 2011 09:27 PM

"Sye, are you intimating that there's something wrong with the presence of contradictions in one's worldview?"

Well, I'm glad that you recognize Alex's contradiction. Mind explaining it to him? :-)

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 7, 2011 09:35 PM

Sye: "Well, I'm glad that you recognize Alex's contradiction. Mind explaining it to him? :-)"

Mind answering my question?

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

imnotandrei Nov 7, 2011 09:42 PM

Problem is, you presuppose the validity of your senses, memory, reasoning, the uniformity of nature, and the laws of logic (to name but a few), none of which your worldview can account for.

Actually, I presuppose none of it.

You see, my senses, reasoning, the uniformity of nature, and the laws of logic regularly reinforce each other; they bootstrap confidence in each other by repeated reinforcement of correctness.

To give a small example: the non-intuitive ways in which physics work get a boost in confidence every time the television turns on and shows me a TV show -- because if electromagnetism didn't work the way it does, then the TV wouldn't work.

Now, this isn't a claim of absolute knowledge -- but it is a claim of knowledge. (And since I already know that there are unprovable truths, and physical limits to precision of understanding, I'm willing to accept a lack of absolute knowledge.)

Perhaps then, you will give me an example of a proof which will persuade those who refuse to believe it?

I have regularly convinced people of the differences between types of infinite numbers by means of Cantor's

diagonal proof, even when they had extreme philosophical and emotional objections.

I have yet to have someone refuse to believe it -- probably because its bases are clear, and its method, while tricky, is explicable.

Neither of which can be justified without God.

Above, you'll find the beginning of a construction of my justification, in mutual reinforcement. Having only some experience as a philosopher, I can only put it in those informal terms.

And that is a model which does not require God.

(I also note you chose to omit my challenge regarding the parallel postulate from your reply, so I'll ask: What are the required characteristics of a God that fulfills your need for justification, and why?)

Again, I don't, I argue from necessary presuppositions.

You say presupposition, I say axiom. That which is required, before the logical processes are applied, to prove your conclusion.

Since according to my view the very concept of debate presupposes God, I must argue from that presupposition, lest I concede my presupposition at the outset.

That's a very neat structure you've built there; to argue with you either requires accepting your argument as true before you begin, or (according to you) not debating with you at all, because you refuse to debate on such terms.

I now see very starkly why people consider arguing with you a waste of time.

I cannot convince you of something against your will.

Actually, you might be surprised; I didn't believe in the difference between the degree of infinity of integers and reals the first time I ran across it. ;) What you can't do is convince me of something simply by telling me it has to be so.

Reply

Alex B Nov 8, 2011 12:07 AM

"Me: "Okay, so you are saying that truth is that which conforms to reality." 49:23 (Fundamentally Flawed - Alex and Sye)

You: "No" 49:26

Priceless!"

Sye, you seem to have a real problem with the concept of people changing their minds, or researching further and altering their opinion. When you asked me what 'truth' was I hadn't sat down and thought about it, so answered accordingly. I have subsequently clarified the issue in my mind, and have stated that truth is that which conforms to reality or actuality.

It's ok though, I understand WHY you have a problem with the notion of people changing their opinion - after all, you believe something that was written a couple of thousand years ago, a book that practically commands you to not change your mind. What you see as a weakness in others (the ability to grow, change position, and clarify as one's knowledge increases) is actually a strength.

Too bad you can't see that.

But feel free to keep quote mining me in your desperate attempt to belittle me, as you're doing a brilliant job of showing just how ridiculous Christians can be.

Reply

Alex B Nov 8, 2011 12:12 AM

"Problem is, you presuppose the validity of your senses, memory, reasoning, the uniformity of nature, and the laws of logic (to name but a few), none of which your worldview can account for."

Oh for fucksake, Robo Sye! Haven't you read a fucking WORD of what's been said? Didn't you listen when you spoke to Jim and I? We've explained over and over that our worldview more than adequately accounts for these things! Dawson has explained it, Reynold (on Debunking Atheists) has explained it, JC has explained it on his blog, Jim on his....are you so locked into your argument that you can't see that?

You repeat your phrases like a particularly arse witted parrot, seemingly not understanding the replies, and taking your own lack of comprehension as a sign of weakness in your opponent which it's nothing of the sort.

You're an idiot, Sye.

Reply

Alex B Nov 8, 2011 12:20 AM

"But Alex, what is reality or actuality? Please explain your reasoning. Which is faulty at best."

Hello Mr Horse-Obsessed-Poe! The question has already been answered further up by another poster.

Sye, you've been dodging a question of mine for a couple of days now, and I'd appreciate an answer.

In the 'Bahnsen' thread you complained that I could delete your comments at any moment, based on my whims - I asked 'what would be wrong with me doing so?' - you have yet to answer. Please do.

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 8, 2011 05:23 AM

"Actually, I presuppose none of it."

Alright, perhaps you can tell us how you know that the laws of logic are valid, without presupposing that they are. Perhaps you can tell us on what basis you expect nature to be uniform without presupposing that it is, and perhaps you can tell us how you know that your reasoning is working properly without presupposing that it is.

I have yet to have someone refuse to believe it -- probably because its bases are clear, and its method, while tricky, is explicable."

That was not the question. The question was: "Perhaps then, you will give me an example of a proof which will persuade those who refuse to believe it?"

"Above, you'll find the beginning of a construction of my justification, in mutual reinforcement. Having only some experience as a philosopher, I can only put it in those informal terms."

I'd be please with your non-philosophical answers to those questions above.

'What are the required characteristics of a God that fulfills your need for justification, and why?'

Omniscience, and personality for 2. If you don't know everything or have revelation from someone who does, then you can't know anything.

"You say presupposition, I say axiom. That which is required, before the logical processes are applied, to prove your conclusion."

The difference being that axioms are merely assumed without proof.

"That's a very neat structure you've built there; to argue with you either requires accepting your argument as true

before you begin, or (according to you) not debating with you at all, because you refuse to debate on such terms."

No, we debate on the necessary preconditions of intelligibility. I offer my position, the opponent offers theirs.

"Actually, you might be surprised; I didn't believe in the difference between the degree of infinity of integers and reals the first time I ran across it. ;)"

As I said, I cannot convince you of something AGAINST your will.

"What you can't do is convince me of something simply by telling me it has to be so."

Not if it is against your will.

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 8, 2011 05:35 AM

"Sye, you seem to have a real problem with the concept of people changing their minds, or researching further and altering their opinion."

Not at all, it just shows that any truth claims prior to your new understanding were bogus, and any truth claims since are unjustified since you refuse to answer questions on reality.

"But feel free to keep quote mining me in your desperate attempt to belittle me,"

To "quote mine" is to quote out of context. That's your problem Alex, all of these quotes are IN context, hence the auto-belittling :-)

"We've explained over and over that our worldview more than adequately accounts for these things!"

Um no, you have claimed it, but you have not explained it. You have not gone from "existence exists," to "I know "X"" without a huge viciously circular mess in between.

"I asked 'what would be wrong with me doing so?'"

Um, I'm not dodging the question, as I have never said that there was anything wrong with doing so. It just makes it look like you are trying to hide something, so actually it works to my favour :-)

Reply

Alex B Nov 8, 2011 05:54 AM

I'm starting to think you're insane, Sye

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 8, 2011 06:06 AM

Alex: "I'm starting to think you're insane, Sye"

Perhaps the name "Sye" is short for Syecho.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 8, 2011 06:12 AM

"I'm starting to think you're insane, Sye"

Well, based on our last discussion, of the two of us, you are the only one who claims that he can't know he isn't :-)

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 8, 2011 06:20 AM

Sye wrote: "Alright, perhaps you can tell us how you know that the laws of logic are valid, without presupposing that they are."

Can you help me understand where you're coming from here, Sye? Logic itself provides the formal standard of validity. You do realize that, right? But your question – if I'm reading it right – suggests that you think logic itself needs to conform to some standard of validity beyond itself in order to be "valid," and that one must have knowledge of this more fundamental standard by some means. Can you clarify? Am I reading you correctly, and if so, can you identify:

- a) what this more fundamental standard is;
- b) the means by which one is supposed to have awareness of this more fundamental standard that supplies logic as such with the validity your question attributes to it; and
- c) what exactly is the relationship between logic and this allegedly more fundamental standard of validity?

Then can you tell us how you know that *that standard* is valid, without presupposing it's valid?

Then explain how your entire course of thinking here avoids an infinite regress?

That would be nice. Thanks!

Sye wrote: "Perhaps you can tell us on what basis you expect nature to be uniform without presupposing that it is,"

I have some basic questions for you in regard to the uniformity of nature. I'm hoping you have clear answers since presuppositionalists make this a central issue in part of their apologetic. 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?

Sye continued: "perhaps you can tell us how you know that your reasoning is working properly without presupposing that it is."

This goes back to the point I made in [the other discussion](#) where I pointed out that this line of questioning trades on ignoring a relevant but crucial distinction. So far you've not been able to bring any good points against my response to this. Do you need help understanding the error your line of inquiry commits? If so, I'll be glad to do some more hand-holding with you.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 8, 2011 06:39 AM

"if I'm reading it right – suggests that you think logic itself needs to conform to some standard of validity beyond itself in order to be "valid,""

Nope, just exposing the fact that he presupposes it contrary to his claim.

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 8, 2011 06:46 AM

I asked: "if I'm reading it right – suggests that you think logic itself needs to conform to some standard of validity beyond itself in order to be 'valid'"

Sye responded: "Nope,"

Okay, so you *don't think* that logic needs to adhere to some standard beyond itself in order to be "valid"? Is that right? Please confirm, or correct me if this is not your view.

Sye continued: "just exposing the fact that he presupposes it contrary to his claim."

Please be more specific here, as I want to learn. You say you're "just exposing the fact that he presupposes" *WHAT* "contrary to" *WHAT CLAIM*?

Once you've clarified the two points above (in caps), please document *how you know* that he is presupposing something contrary to what he has claimed. Make sure not to leave out any steps in your reasoning process here. This is very important, Sye. Every step of your inference needs to be documented here, if you can.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 8, 2011 06:59 AM

Are you really that thick? Among the things I said he presupposes are the laws of logic, he said that he did not. I am merely exposing the fact that his claim was false.

Reply

freddies_dead Nov 8, 2011 07:04 AM

Sye TenB said...

If you don't know everything or have revelation from someone who does, then you can't know anything.

As you don't claim to know everything can you please explain how revelation grants you the absolute certainty you claim to have?

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 8, 2011 07:07 AM

Sye: "Are you really that thick?"

It almost feels like that, since your statements are constantly borderline incoherent. That's why I ask you for clarification. Just trying to understand. I don't know why you think asking for clarification is indicative of being "thick." Can you explain that?

Sye: "Among the things I said he presupposes are the laws of logic, he said that he did not."

And one of the questions I asked above is: HOW DO YOU KNOW THIS? Are you so thick that you can't read what I stated explicitly above? Or are you deliberately ignoring what I asked???????

Sye wrote: "I am merely exposing the fact that his claim was false."

Again, HOW DO YOU KNOW THIS?????? Please, spell it out. Walk us through the steps by which you came to this conclusion.

Meanwhile, how are you coming on the other questions I asked you?

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Alex B Nov 8, 2011 07:41 AM

Sye said "Omniscience, and personality for 2. If you don't know everything or have revelation from someone who does, then you can't know anything."

Sye, you have yet to address how you would be sure that the being revealing things to you is trustworthy, and you admitted that you would take the word of this being on trust without checking (this can be heard right at the end of our third encounter).

I have also pointed out to you that the ONLY way you could know that the being revealing things to you was omniscient would be to be omniscient yourself, you have admitted that you are not omniscient, so you cannot be certain that you are being correctly revealed to.

Since Dustin made his claim that the Bible was his revelation you've started to parrot him, up until then you'd always given the impression that yours was some kind of supernatural experience. As the Bible can be checked for accuracy against reality, your revelation can now be tested, and it comes up short.

Anyway, I'll wait for you to address these issues, you've got questions from Dawson ahead of me in the queue.

Reply

freddies_dead Nov 8, 2011 07:52 AM

Alex B said...

Since Dustin made his claim that the Bible was his revelation you've started to parrot him, up until then you'd always given the impression that yours was some kind of supernatural experience. As the Bible can be checked for accuracy against reality, your revelation can now be tested, and it comes up short.

Added to which, the Bible can only be perceived through the senses and interpreted through the use of reason - neither of which can be trusted by the presuppositionalist until *after* they've perceived and interpreted their revelation.

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 8, 2011 08:00 AM

"I have also pointed out to you that the ONLY way you could know that the being revealing things to you was omniscient would be to be omniscient yourself"

Yes, you have said this over and over and over again, but you have given exactly zero justification for your knowledge claim, and since you have admitted that you cannot know that you are not deranged, you are unable to do so.

"Since Dustin made his claim that the Bible was his revelation you've started to parrot him"

You are dreaming dude. Do I actually have to post a link to where I claimed Scripture as my revelation (years ago), and further expose your foolishness? Will you then concede that you are wrong - again?

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 8, 2011 08:01 AM

"Added to which, the Bible can only be perceived through the senses and interpreted through the use of reason - neither of which can be trusted by the presuppositionalist until after they've perceived and interpreted their revelation."

Are you honestly suggesting that God cannot reveal some things VIA our senses such that we can be certain of them?

Reply

Alex B Nov 8, 2011 08:08 AM

I said "I have also pointed out to you that the ONLY way you could know that the being revealing things to you was omniscient would be to be omniscient yourself"

Sye said "Yes, you have said this over and over and over again, but you have given exactly zero justification for

your knowledge claim, and since you have admitted that you cannot know that you are not deranged, you are unable to do so."

Yes Sye, you keep using that line to dodge the problem this presents you with, I really don't expect anything different from you now.

I said "Since Dustin made his claim that the Bible was his revelation you've started to parrot him"

Sye said "You are dreaming dude. Do I actually have to post a link to where I claimed Scripture as my revelation (years ago), and further expose your foolishness? Will you then concede that you are wrong - again?"

Yes, you are going to need to do that, because I've seen no sign of that being your claimed revelation until Dustin said it. If you can show me a genuine link to a genuine page which says this, then I will ask you why you STOPPED making that claim when people asked you what your revelation was.

Sye said "Are you honestly suggesting that God cannot reveal some things VIA our senses such that we can be certain of them?"

Sye, you've altered your wording of this phrase in the last few weeks, previously you used to say 'Are you sure that my god cannot reveal something such that we can be certain of them?'. Why is that?

Anyway, you're dodging again, answer Dawson's questions (if you can, which I doubt)

Reply

freddies_dead Nov 8, 2011 08:09 AM

Sye TenB said...

Are you honestly suggesting that God cannot reveal some things VIA our senses such that we can be certain of them?

I'm not suggesting anything - it's a logical implication of your professed worldview. You claim that revelation means you can be certain of the validity of your senses yet you don't explain how you can use the senses that haven't been validated yet to perceive the claimed revelation (Bible).

Maybe you could explain exactly how this works?

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 8, 2011 08:10 AM

Sye asked: "Are you honestly suggesting that God cannot reveal some things VIA our senses such that we can be certain of them?"

Why would this question be unreasonable, Sye? Please explain. Try your best to be precise. Also try to anticipate critical questions. Explain your thought process. Spell out the steps you take to reach your conclusions. Every step. Don't leave anything out. Explain.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Alex B Nov 8, 2011 08:18 AM

Sye, I'm also waiting on you supplying the Biblical verses that say that it is a sin to argue using anything other than Van Tillian apologetics. The two verses you quoted said nothing of Van Til.

Reply

Alex B Nov 8, 2011 08:19 AM

Seems to me that Sye has at least 20 questions on the table at the moment which he has either dodged, or failed to answer satisfactorily.

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 8, 2011 08:23 AM

Alex wrote: "Sye, I'm also waiting on you supplying the Biblical verses that say that it is a sin to argue using anything other than Van Tillian apologetics. The two verses you quoted said nothing of Van Til."

Good question. I, too, have not read of Van Til in the bible. Nor have I ever read of "presuppositionalism," "presuppositional apologetics," "transcendental argument" or "TAG" in the bible. I don't see where these things occur anywhere in the bible. It seems that Sye (or anyone else who claims what Sye has claimed) needs to do some explaining here. A LOT of explaining. Unfortunately, that explaining never seems to present itself. Again, darkness seems to prevail in the presuppositionalist's camp.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 8, 2011 08:29 AM

Alex: "Seems to me that Sye has at least 20 questions on the table at the moment which he has either dodged, or failed to answer satisfactorily."

Of course, how can one expect to answer questions when the essence of his basic modus operandi is evasion, obfuscation and diversion? Such an MO is by intent and design geared precisely to leaving such questions unanswered.

I'm really curious how Sye would address my questions about the uniformity of nature. Good for him we aren't in a Skype debate!! What would he do? He'd have no out then.

Regards,
Dawson

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 8, 2011 08:33 AM

"Yes, you are going to need to do that, because I've seen no sign of that being your claimed revelation until Dustin said it. If you can show me a genuine link to a genuine page which says this, then I will ask you why you STOPPED making that claim when people asked you what your revelation was."

Here is a link to a screenshot from my website from February 18, 2007 clearly stating what I believe my revelation to be. This has been on my website from the beginning, and is still on there now.

Will Alex admit his error? Of course not.

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 8, 2011 08:34 AM

"Sye, you've altered your wording of this phrase in the last few weeks, previously you used to say 'Are you sure that my god cannot reveal something such that we can be certain of them?'. Why is that?"

Erm, to specifically address his claim perhaps?

Reply

Alex B Nov 8, 2011 08:38 AM

'Special Revelation on the other hand is what God has revealed to us through SUPERNATURAL MEANS, including His Son Jesus Christ, His Spirit, and His Word The Bible' (emphasis mine)

That's not what you've been saying though, is it? You've been saying that your revelation was supernatural for the last few years, of course you're going to mention the Bible, but that's NOT what you've been saying. And it's NOT what you're saying above. You claim, in that screen shot, that your 'special revelation' was supernatural, and also

includes the Bible - you are now claiming that your revelation is ENTIRELY the Bible.

Are you unable to see the change of tack you've taken?

Reply

Alex B Nov 8, 2011 08:40 AM

Dawson said "Good question. I, too, have not read of Van Til in the bible. Nor have I ever read of "presuppositionalism," "presuppositional apologetics," "transcendental argument" or "TAG" in the bible. I don't see where these things occur anywhere in the bible. It seems that Sye (or anyone else who claims what Sye has claimed) needs to do some explaining here. A LOT of explaining. Unfortunately, that explaining never seems to present itself. Again, darkness seems to prevail in the presuppositionalist's camp."

Indeed, also conspicuously absent from the Bible is the word 'logic'

Reply

Alex B Nov 8, 2011 08:40 AM

Sye, please link to your current page.

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 8, 2011 08:51 AM

"You claim, in that screen shot, that your 'special revelation' was supernatural, and also includes the Bible - you are now claiming that your revelation is ENTIRELY the Bible."

Dude, get a grip. I knew you would not acknowledge your error. Now, how about you post where I claim that my revelation is ENTIRELY the Bible. (And as always, I ain't holdin' me breath :-)

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 8, 2011 08:53 AM

"Sye, please link to your current page."

It's only identical Alex. I won't post the link to save you further embarrassment.

Reply

Alex B Nov 8, 2011 09:00 AM

"I knew you would not acknowledge your error. Now, how about you post where I claim that my revelation is ENTIRELY the Bible. (And as always, I ain't holdin' me breath :-)"

Here

<http://debunkingatheists.blogspot.com/2011/10/fundamentally-flawed-indeed.html?showComment=1320118973704#c7390624975010980810> "Our revelation complete with handy search engine."

Reply

Alex B Nov 8, 2011 09:02 AM

Btw, Sye, that podcast with your pal Shawn, the one you claimed I was trying to bury? Front page of the Fundie Flawed website right now - www.fundamentally-flawed.com

Once again you got it wrong.

Why would I be embarrassed by your fuck-ups?

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 8, 2011 09:18 AM

"Here

<http://debunkingatheists.blogspot.com/2011/10/fundamentally-flawed-indeed.html?showComment=1320118973704#c7390624975010980810> "Our revelation complete with handy search engine."

And where is the claim that my revelation is ENTIRELY the Bible? If you claim that I have no car, and I say Here, my car, it would not follow that I do not have another car.

"Btw, Sye, that podcast with your pal Shawn, the one you claimed I was trying to bury? Front page of the Fundie Flawed website right now"

Ya, you did the same thing when I caught you out on "NEVER shying away from a challenge." You post it front and center in a vain attempt to hide the fact that you were caught out. I do like the tactic though, cause the more people that see and hear your nonsense, the better!

In fact, I'm sure you would not be opposed to me putting a little video together of some of your stellar moments from our exchanges (in context of course). What do you say? You don't have anything to hide or be ashamed of do you?

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 8, 2011 09:27 AM

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?

Reply

Alex B Nov 8, 2011 09:36 AM

"Ya, you did the same thing when I caught you out on "NEVER shying away from a challenge." You post it front and center in a vain attempt to hide the fact that you were caught out. I do like the tactic though, cause the more people that see and hear your nonsense, the better!"

Er....did you actually read my blog that day? The podcast was mentioned in THREE out of the five posts I made. You're a cunt if you can't see that and think that it's some great 'victory' for you!

"What do you say?"

To be in full context they need to be the entire podcast....anything less and I will consider it out of context.

So, use the entire 5 hours, go ahead, I believe Youtube can handle long videos these days. Use anything less, you'll be quote mining.

Reply

Alex B Nov 8, 2011 09:36 AM

Sye, when are you going to answer Dawson's questions?

And when are you going to show me the Bible verse that mentions Van Til?

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 8, 2011 10:00 AM

"So, use the entire 5 hours, go ahead, I believe Youtube can handle long videos these days. Use anything less, you'll be quote mining."

That is simply HI-larious :-). Nothing can be taken from the podcasts in context without the entire podcast! Don't worry, I'll make sure I give the URL to the whole thing so people can see that the quotes are exactly in context :-D

Reply

Alex B Nov 8, 2011 10:06 AM

No, as I say, you need to use the WHOLE thing for the context to be apparent, and they need to be played in order. There's no monkeying around with this, Sye.

Anyway, enough of your fucking smokescreens and attempts to avoid answering questions!! You've diverted attention enough.

Answer the questions you've been asked. If you can't then I will assume you cannot, and write you off as the insane, deluded, wank that I think you are.

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 8, 2011 10:16 AM

"No, as I say, you need to use the WHOLE thing for the context to be apparent, and they need to be played in order. There's no monkeying around with this, Sye."

Look, when I ask you how you know that you are not one of those people whose reasoning is reliable, and you say: "I don't," THAT is in context. When you say that the Bible is not true, and I ask you what truth is, when you say: "I don't know," THAT is in context! When I ask you if truth is that which corresponds to reality and you say "No," THAT is in context. Don't worry, I will be more than happy to add where you later say that truth IS that which corresponds to reality :-)

I can see why you are worried that that gets out to a larger audience though :-)

Reply

imnotandrei Nov 8, 2011 10:22 AM

Alright, perhaps you can tell us how you know that the laws of logic are valid, without presupposing that they are. Perhaps you can tell us on what basis you expect nature to be uniform without presupposing that it is, and perhaps you can tell us how you know that your reasoning is working properly without presupposing that it is.

I think part of the psychology of your argument is revealed here; there is no "validation" involved, no outside entity approving of them. ;)

The laws of logic and reasoning that I use a) do not self-contradict, b) produce reproducible results, and c) allow me to make predictions about things that I do not know beforehand are true -- in other words, that I have not presupposed. ;)

That's my knowledge-claim, as it has been from the beginning.

"Perhaps then, you will give me an example of a proof which will persuade those who refuse to believe it?"

Sigh. No, I cannot. However, I can give examples of proofs that are not persuasive due to errors in the proof, and proofs that are not persuasive due to axioms that are not accepted. The two combined produce the set of "proofs that fail to persuade", and I can then demonstrate into which category your proof falls. If you need me to go there, I can do that, but I suspect your knowledge of logic is sufficient to construct one of each class.

Omniscience, and personality for 2. If you don't know everything or have revelation from someone who does, then you can't know anything.

1) I find it highly amusing that knowledge is binary -- either there exists something that knows everything, or nothing is knowable. That is one very impressive excluded middle you've got there.

2) So, the Parmenidean God would suit your conditions? Or an all-knowing Watchmaker? I fail, I admit, to see "Therefore Jesus" in there. ;)

The difference being that axioms are merely assumed without proof.

As opposed to presuppositions, which are merely...assumed without proof?

No, we debate on the necessary preconditions of intelligibility. I offer my position, the opponent offers theirs.

And if the opponent refuses to accept your preconditions, then you have no argument. Understood.

I cannot convince you of something AGAINST your will.

You seem to want, desperately, to believe that I am refusing to accept your position for reasons outside of reason and logic.

My will is to follow the conclusions that reason leads me to, combined with my own sensory impressions and understanding of the world. If that will leads me to a God, so be it. If not, then not. It's that simple, Sye. And you are failing abjectly at giving any reasons for me to follow your word to God.

Reply

Alex B Nov 8, 2011 10:51 AM

"I can see why you are worried that that gets out to a larger audience though :-)"

Sye, the podcast is already reaching a 'larger audience', don't flatter yourself that it's some unknown thing.

I'm not at all worried, as I understand that people make mistakes, learn, and correct their opinions. You, on the other hand, have a solid, never changing POV. For some reason you think this is a strength, but anyone who has even the slightest interest in learning and growing as an individual knows that the exact opposite is true.

I had never thought about what 'truth' was, as it was something I just knew instinctively and had never denied. You seem to take the fact that I didn't have a robotically repeated answer ready for you as a sign that I am weak and should be ridiculed via a mocking video - Sye, as I've said, the opposite is true, I've gone away and learned something as a result of our encounters, I've clarified my thinking, and I've moved forward. You, on the other hand, have seen a chance to belittle, insult, and attempt to humiliate. Yet, according to YOU, *I'm* the one who lacks morality, who can't account for knowledge, who is hell-bound.

So, you worship a god who you believe will reward you for your dishonesty and childishness, whilst punishing me for wanting to learn and improve myself.

No wonder I wouldn't worship that being if it existed!

Reply

Alex B Nov 8, 2011 10:53 AM

imnotandrei said "1) I find it highly amusing that knowledge is binary -- either there exists something that knows everything, or nothing is knowable. That is one very impressive excluded middle you've got there."

Sye's had this explained several times - being unable to know everything does not mean we can't know anything. The fact that he can't do anything with that info, and has to resort to claiming that you've never accounted for that knowledge, speaks volumes about just how pathetic and monomaniacal he has become.

Reply

imnotandrei Nov 8, 2011 11:00 AM

Sye's had this explained several times - being unable to know everything does not mean we can't know anything.

I figured I was probably rehashing some old ground -- you have my apologies. ;)

Clearly, Sye listened to too much late-period Bowie: "I don't want knowledge, I want certainty".

Reply

Alex B Nov 8, 2011 11:09 AM

Sye has ZERO interest in knowledge, as evidenced by his failure to engage with Dawson.

Reply

Sye TenB Nov 8, 2011 11:19 AM

"I think part of the psychology of your argument is revealed here; there is no "validation" involved, no outside entity

approving of them. ;)"

Just admit your error and don't do an Alex.

"That's my knowledge-claim, as it has been from the beginning."

And it is entirely presupposed, and unfounded.

"Sigh. No, I cannot."

My point exactly.

"I find it highly amusing that knowledge is binary -- either there exists something that knows everything, or nothing is knowable. That is one very impressive excluded middle you've got there."

Feel free to try to refute me. What do you know and how are you able to know it according to your worldview? If you appeal to your senses, memory and reasoning, please include how you know that they are valid.

"So, the Parmenidean God would suit your conditions? Or an all-knowing Watchmaker? "

Nope, just God, but if one of the above is your justification, I will be glad to engage you on it.

"As opposed to presuppositions, which are merely...assumed without proof?"

Nope, mine are proven transcendentally.

"And if the opponent refuses to accept your preconditions, then you have no argument. Understood."

They do not need to accept the preconditions for the concept of debate in order to debate the topic, but they cannot deny the necessity to debate that topic (as Alex seems to want to do).

"You seem to want, desperately, to believe that I am refusing to accept your position for reasons outside of reason and logic."

That is clearly the case. Let me ask you this: If you could be convinced on your terms that God exists, would you worship Him?

"My will is to follow the conclusions that reason leads me to, combined with my own sensory impressions and understanding of the world. If that will leads me to a God, so be it."

Autonomous reasoning CANNOT lead you to God, but only to an idol of your own making that is subject to your "reason and sensory impressions," rather than Lord of it.

Reply

Alex B Nov 8, 2011 11:37 AM

In other words - Sye has nothing.

Reply

imnotandrei Nov 8, 2011 01:07 PM

Just admit your error and don't do an Alex.

There's no error there to admit. ;)

And it is entirely presupposed, and unfounded.

Ahem. I have provided my foundation. That it is not the foundation you choose to recognize does not mean it is unfounded.

Feel free to try to refute me. What do you know and how are you able to know it according to your worldview? If you appeal to your senses, memory and reasoning, please include how you know that they are valid.

Um. THAT's what we were discussing before. My knowledge is based upon consistency, repeatability, and usefulness for prediction in unknown circumstances. I don't know, off the top of my head, what $(1722*(5642-123))$ to the twelfth power is, but I do know that the methods I have for calculating it will work, because they always have before, and they are consistent with themselves.

Nope, just God, but if one of the above is your justification, I will be glad to engage you on it.

But you've failed to explain why your "Nope". That's sort of the point of a discussion. I asked you what you needed, you told me two things. I gave you an example of something that fulfilled it, and now you're saying "No."

So either:

- a) You didn't give me all your requirements, or
- b) You're lying when you say "No" now.

Pick one.

Nope, mine are proven transcendently.

Ahem. In other words, assumed without a proof you can provide to anyone else.

They do not need to accept the preconditions for the concept of debate in order to debate the topic, but they cannot deny the necessity to debate that topic (as Alex seems to want to do).

As far as I can tell, Alex has been doing nothing but debating your topic. He's just refusing to accept your conclusions.

"You seem to want, desperately, to believe that I am refusing to accept your position for reasons outside of reason and logic."

That is clearly the case.

I am glad you agree that's what you believe.

Let me ask you this: If you could be convinced on your terms that God exists, would you worship Him?

That depends. I refuse to worship anything that cannot live up to the moral standards I set myself, through demonstrated behavior.

Autonomous reasoning CANNOT lead you to God, but only to an idol of your own making that is subject to your "reason and sensory impressions," rather than Lord of it.

Then why are you debating? Your argument is clear: "You agree with me, or you don't. If you don't, nothing I can do can change that."

So why argue at all?

Reply

imnotandrei Nov 8, 2011 01:10 PM

In other words - Sye has nothing.

Oh, he's got plenty. He'll clearly sell you all the Earplugs of Ignoring Questions you want, and will run off as many copies of "How do you know that?" on his mimeograph machine as you need.

Reply

Reynold Nov 8, 2011 04:20 PM

Sye

Nope, mine are proven transcendentally.

Any nutbar of any religion can say that and be equally justified in their beliefs as you than.

Autonomous reasoning CANNOT lead you to God, but only to an idol of your own making that is subject to your "reason and sensory impressions," rather than Lord of it.

So much for those bullshit verses in the bible about "test all things, hold to that which is good" and "come, let us reason together", eh?

In other words: just turn your brain off and hope you picked the right horse.

Reply

Dawson Bethrick Nov 8, 2011 04:55 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 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, 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 04:59 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 05:06 PM

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

Sye, your taunts and attempts to intimidate will not work on me.

Now, about the uniformity of nature? Or, are you really determined not to deal with the issues?

Regards,
Dawson