

Graphic - Arch-Enemy of Determinism and Skepticism

Post by "Cassius" of June 20, 2020 at 9:19 AM

Poster Elsewhere:

I tend to doubt claims of self-refuting arguments because, like here, they seem more semantic than anything. For instance, I've read from a number of determinists who'd admit at once they're not responsible for reasoning correctly, nor any non-determinist reasoning (so they think) incorrectly. Even if they were inconsistent though that wouldn't show determinism is false, just that a person is determined to act in one way. If they're a determinist, they might be inconsistent, as determined by necessity. The fact that certain views can't be lived out easily doesn't tell you much about if they're right or not.

Cassius:

Yes MC but therein is exactly the point - it is necessary to examine the foundations of what we think are right and what we think is wrong, and in the end there is no one who has an ultimate absolute claim to authority. The self-refuting argument may ultimately "prove" nothing from an "objective" point of view, but that is because there IS no "objective" point of view. The "self-refuting" argument is 100% satisfactory to me for that reason - because it tells me that the advocate of the argument is a manipulator and liar, and that I want nothing to do with him. It would be my view that the best friends I will have in life will also live to the same standard. That is the only standard of proof that I can ultimately have, or ultimately that I need. There IS no higher standard of proof than our own canonical faculties (senses, anticipations, feelings). The advocate of a self-refuting argument is leading you to mistrust and put aside those faculties.