

Re: Peterson's Death Sentence

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2005-02/0190.html>

From: John Fields (jfields_at_austininstruments.com)

Date: 01/31/05

Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 14:26:57 -0600

On Sun, 30 Jan 2005 23:40:53 +0000 (UTC), Willem <willem@stack.nl> wrote:

>John wrote:

>) On Sun, 30 Jan 2005 19:29:50 +0000 (UTC), Willem <willem@stack.nl>

>) wrote:

>)>The person **has** very clearly interpreted what they saw.

>) ---

>) *But, because the person can't differentiate between a parlor trick and*

>) *a supernatural event, their interpretation of what either event was*

>) *would be worthless. Read the sentence before your last again; I said*

>) *the same thing there.*

>

>So why did you respond in disagreement when someone said that a person

>who can't see the difference has no credibility ?

That was an error.

>I should note also that if a person interprets an event, his description
>of that event will very probably be influenced by that interpretation.

I'm not sure what you're trying to get at, since the way you stated it
sounds pretty circular.

>)> However, even if they could tell the difference, their credibility
>)> would be suspect because of the nature of the claim. For instance,
>)> so-called "miracles" are supposed to have happened from time to time,
>)> and even when "verified" by those who can allegedly tell the
>)> difference, their credibility is denied by those who simply don't
>)> believe in the existence of supernatural events. You, for instance?
>)>

>)>This is a very bold assertion. Basically, you are accusing people who
>)>don't believe in miracles of dismissing any evidence contrary to their
>)>belief. Do you have any evidence to back up this claim ?

>)

>) ---

>) Well, first things first. Since you seem to be so intent on

>) procedure, I suggest that if you expect an answer to your question,

>) you answer my earlier one; specifically, "Do you believe in miracles?"

>

>I'm mostly an agnostic, although I do have some things that I take on

sci.electronics.design: Re: Peterson's Death Sentence

>faith. I do that mostly because otherwise life would be unreasonably
>difficult. One of the things I take on faith is that everything in the
>universe is bound by the laws of nature.
>
>This means that I believe anything that can be classified as a miracle
>is an indication that our understanding of the laws of nature is not
>complete enough.
>
>I also believe that our understanding of the laws of the universe is not
>complete, so yes, I do believe in miracles, but I don't believe these
>miracles actually defy the laws of nature.

OK

>
>And finally, I believe that

???

>>Any examples of such miracles ?
>
> ---
> Yes, but first answer the question.
> ---
>
>>By the way, your black-and-white thinking show up clearly here.
>>You seem to be assuming that people either can or cannot distinguish
>>between parlor tricks and supernatural events. Has it ever occurred
>>to you that people can usually identify some but not all parlor tricks
>>as such, and that some people can distinguish more than others ?
>
> ---
> Geez, no, that never crossed my mind... Neither did the possibility
> that visiting extraterrestrials could perform parlor tricks which none
> of us would be able to explain as other than miracles...
>
>But which are parlor tricks. Bound by the laws of nature.
>No proof of the supernatural whatsoever.
>In other words, you're saying that **everything** that could be considered
>a miracle could very well be a parlor trick.

No, I'm saying that some parlor tricks might look like miracles
because we don't know enough, yet, to tell the difference between
them. That doesn't preclude the possibility of genuine miracles
existing.

>That would indicate that
>you think no miracle is proof for the existence of the supernatural.

Well, no. I prefer to believe that until all miracles are proven not
to be supernatural occurrences, the existence of a supernatural is
possible.
--
John Fields