Tree by nikluk April, 2020

n: Do you think this corresponds to what happens when we try to discuss?

*Idea tree of how discussions get dropped due to lack of goals w/ discussion attached.*
(see FB discussion 2020-04-24 start @ 14:53)

j: Not sure.

n: I think we always quit our discussions before we get anywhere.

We lack goals w/ our discussions. Became clear to me when you said: (quote from j) j: *~*when we discuss it takes mental effort & you can discuss forever. That doesn't interest me. But would be a shame if I was nor interested in other ppls opinions.*

j: The one time I really tired was when you said oil was taxed and solar was subsidised.

I trusted you but looked into it and it was the the opposite. I pointed this out but you quibbled claiming we talked about another subject.

n: Our opinions differ on that discussion. You may analyse and sum it up if you want.

I do not think that you want a truth seeking and rational discussion w/ me on energy issues.

j: That fails when one part presents evidence and the other one doesn't take it in but continues finding counterarguments.

You keep finding counterarguments and the discussion can go on forever despite evidence. It becomes meaningless to discuss.

n: I do not remember the specifics of our discussion. It's confusing to start in the middle of something already confusing.
We can start over if you want.

j: We seem to have different views on what constitutes evidence b/c different backgrounds.

To me evidence is statistical significance.

n: Yes, we differ on epistemology. I think CR is correct.

We can discuss it. I like Popper & DD.

**Impasse 1.**

**No response.**

**Effort to break impasse 1.**

n: Do you wish to continue with any of the suggestions or do you want to quit?

j: If I have the energy to discuss CR?
I partly agree with CR. As I do with plenty other orientations. I agree partly with some, not fully with all.

n: Thats an odd position you hold. But fine. You have expressed that you do not wish to discuss before.

j: Why I do not agree w/ Popper fully?
~*Example of drug study with p=0.001. Should we not use that drug b/c trial is not 100%?*

Maths & phy is where CR is most applicable. In medicine, social sciences etc it's worse.

n: Do you think CR says not to use such a drug?

What you said is not CR.

j: No, you are odd and totally get stuck w/ some old men / women for periods and then change you views instead of seeing value in many bring but also the mistakes all do.

n: It's problematic to mix ideas as one pleases. A philosophy needs to be integrated and free from contradictions.

n: When I learn new and better ideas that do not contradict things I hold to be true I change my mind.

n: Neither CR nor Objectivism believe in infallibility. Nor do I.

n: If you know of any substantial errors with either CR or Objectivism I'd like to know of it.

**Impasse 2.**

**No response.**

**Effort to break impasse 2.**

*n sent discussion tree up until Impasse 2 to j. (see node below.)*

n: Do you intend to answer any of the nodes in this tree or comment on the actual tree?

Do you wish to end this discussion?

Tree by nikluk, April 2020 - discussion on methods

j: I don't think ppl have lengthy discussions about things.

Intelligent ppl are busy w/ demanding & stressful jobs, family etc.

If they have intellectual interests outside of work maybe they read a book or other stuff they feel is relaxing / recreational.

**This continues after impasse 2 happens.**

n: Do you think CR says not to use such a drug?

What you said is not CR.

j: According to the principle, the hypothesis "the drug works" is false. I claim the opposite.

n: What you presented is not CR. Your answer has other issues too but no need to address since you do not wish to continue (*see last j comment in linked node.*)

j: I have studied some theory of science (at Uni) and I am aware of diff philosophies and the criticism of each.

n: What you have said re CR thus far indicates that you do not understand CR well.

Read Deutsch & Temple or tell me what you think is the best the criticism of CR.

**This continues after impasse 2 happens.**

n: It's problematic to mix ideas as one pleases. A philosophy needs to be integrated and free from contradictions.

How much time do you have, dude lol? (*comment on n making discussion tree.*)

j: I think that ppl who stick to one "-isms" are distinguished by a limited & too "black and white kind of thinking".

A dynamic and flexible intellect has a bigger depth.

I will as usual not prioritise endless discussions b/c busy w/ life.

n: You seem confused and unwilling to sort things out.

Eg what do you mean by "too 'black and white kind of thinking'"?
Is science "too 'black and white kind of thinking'"? If not, why?
You haven't learned think in concepts.

j: You want to make it sound like it is I that is confused when anyone who has seen how you search and argue can see the opposite to be true.

n: I gave you an example on how you are confused.

In what way am I confused? Could you give an example from this discussion?

j: The one who is confused needs solid structures to cling to. Many in extreme ideologies & sects are confused and thus seek such communities. That's why you can appear confused when supporting the need to cling to an "-ism".

n: As said before. If you know of any substantial errors with either CR or Objectivism - let me know.

j: Objectivism is often criticised for its inability to put things into context. Ie to eg ~human nature is not objective but dependent of context. I agree w/ this.

n: I don't understand what this means. Oism puts a lot of effort on integrating everything with reality.

Could you elaborate and give me examples?

j: Even I can see that you have not looked for or are aware of criticism of the "-ism" you hold dear.

Links to a site w/ really bad Platonic / Kantian criticism of Oism.
https://bjornaxen.wordpress.com/2008/03/16/objektivismen-rationell-men-oformuflig/?fbclid=IwAR36HkY28coCfNwsAUP7Lqew-J4PcJwuVzZJsCalyuwzW9UdDs1pdc0F78

j: Attention! I am NOT interested in discussing this. You may do that somewhere else.

j: A criticism of your whole take on that the best "-ism" is the one with the best arguments regarding its excellens and that it should apply to all is:
If an AI could logically prove without a doubt that eg socialism or nazism was the best for you and everyone. Would you agree?
Or is it more likely your **emotions** would tell you otherwise?

n: Does this mean that you believe CR & Oism to not be reality bound?

Do you think that CR & Oism are some variety of Rationalism?

n: I think that you are driven primarily by emotions. If not, why do you refuse to read everything that I recommend?
(*see linked nodes.*)

n: Emotions are not tools of cognition according to Oism. Quote from "Philosophy: Who needs it?", Rand, explaining this.

j: No. On the contrary. Read and think about it again.

*(*Not entirely sure if this was a comment on this or not. It was too vague.*)*

n: I think you equate philosophy w/ bad philosophy based on what you think intelligent ppl do (*see linked node.*)

Good philosophy teaches how to separate bad and good ideas and how to integrate the latter w/ each other and w/ reality.
I can send ~11 pages from Rand making a good argument for this.

j: I am in need of intellectual stimulus but I get it in other ways.

(*note: former statements do not indicate sincerity w/ this claim - see linked nodes.*)

n: What do you consider constituting "intellectual stimulus"?

n: In what other ways do you get this "intellectual stimulus"?

j: I have different ways to activate my brain on my free time. Reading.

Other creative ways: cooking and cultivation (plants) is what I spend a lot of time on.

**End of discussion.**
*(*Black arrow linked nodes where stated in the same message as the info in this node*)*

j: This is my last reply. I have already said 10 times that I have no real interest nor time to discuss this kind of stuff w/ you.

You seem to have a hard time realising that others have different interests, or rather a hard time to see that your interests are not other peoples focal point.

n: Multiple times I asked if you wanted us to stop [the discussion]. Since you didn't say anything but continued the discussion I found it reasonable to think you wanted to continue discussing.

We will end here if that is what you wish.

**n's comment post discussion:**

*I (n) do not cling to an "-ism" for it's own sake. I cling to reality. I think that CR and Oism are best att dealing w/ reality. I think j didn't want to deal with this possibility. No substantial criticism of why I should reconsider CR or Oism was brought up. Just emotional and vague things.*

**n's comment post discussion:**

It was my mistake to discuss w/ j since I knew our discussion history of failing to have rational discussion and j has expressed disinterest.

At both impasses a way to end the discussion was offered.

j has also expressed interest in discussion at times - discussions end similarly regardless. Hence the starting topic of this discussion (effort at problem solving and get better at rational discussion).

A lacking goal re discussion was not the issue - not wanting to discuss rationally at all was the issue --> stop trying to discuss ideas rationally w/ ppl that do not want to do it.