

Re: Latest News

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.misc/2004-11/0562.html>

From: Mark Ferguson (*nunya_at_biz.ness*)

Date: 11/23/04

Date: Tue, 23 Nov 2004 15:02:17 -0700

R. Steve Walz wrote:

<snip Steve's incomprehension of his doublespeak infatuation with renaming dogma as "Truth">

<interspersed unmarked brevity snips>

>>> *Nothing I say needs any proof at all, it's all structural argument*

>>> *that is based only on the common human experience.*

>>

>>

>> *Yet another unsubstantiable claim.*

> *It needs no "substantiation", it is simply what I said I always*

> *intend to do. It is statement of my own principles.*

"Principles". IOW assumptions not relatable to objective reality. You will not define "common human experience" because there is no such thing.

>> *Your experience is not*

>> *mine, and vice versa. Be extremely careful trying to refute*

>> *that statement; you'll be reduced to using "spurious factoids".*

> *I need no such thing.*

Then attempt to do so without them. Explicate precisely what your and my experiences have in common.

>>> *In fact I personally refuse to believe or even hold anything to be*

>>> *important that cannot be argued solely from structure without any*

>>> *assertion of spurious factoids.*

>> *That's nice. That kind of "reasoning" must rest on
>> untestable assumptions. That kind of structuredstructure an
>> "opinion".*

> *At some point all rests on assumptions. I consider mine
as necessary
> and part of the fabric of existence. You have been warped
by your
> upbringing so as to deny them.*

Your assumptions are fantasies not based on reality.

>>> *Anything that is merely evidenciary can always be
disingenuously
>>> contradicted by anyone Evil enough to wish to do so,
and any kind
>>> of evidence can be undermined by enough repetitious
deceit unless
>>> offered in a majority-respected peer-reviewed settin*