

Eri vs Luther vs Kazuma

7/25/2024 6:27 PM Eri: 18/07, 17:52 Eri: These rules are the concepts governing reality and can be seen as universal laws

There are rules ,such as language, race, sex, sickness, and death. These rules are being mirrored in the physical world , such as sickness, various languages, showing these rules are conceptual (Type 1).

18/07, 17:53 Eri: "Negators are people who negate the rules of the world"

18/07, 17:53 Eri: This is number one

18/07, 17:56 Eri: OK breakdown of the premise;

A1: Negators Negate the the rules of the world

A2: These Rules are conceptual(T1)

18/07, 17:56 Eri: Contention?

18/07, 17:56 Eri: Ehn my fans

18/07, 17:58 Eri: As you can see. Eliminating the concept eliminates its spatiotemporal occurrences within reality.

18/07, 17:59 Luther : For starters, it's unclear how you arrived at the conclusion that these rules are type 1 concepts. It seems as though you have a rationale behind that, I'm curious, y'know

18/07, 18:01 Eri: My character Unknown has been narratively established as a negator

18/07, 18:03 Eri: As you can see. The alteration of these concepts change every object across all of their area of influence but not vice versa

18/07, 18:03 Kazuma: I understand you're using Plato's theory correct?

18/07, 18:05 Luther : I see

Oya, lemme read through

18/07, 18:06 Luther : Are you done?

18/07, 18:06 Eri: No. Table your contentions before proceeding

18/07, 18:07 Eri: Why would this be relevant to the discourse

18/07, 18:10 Luther : Just go on. I'll do so when you're done

18/07, 18:10 Kazuma: So what's the basis/idea behind your belief for those rules being conceptual?

For all we know, it could as well just be a labeling and have nothing to do with what you're asserting

18/07, 18:13 Eri: I'm approaching this debate strictly in a sequential manner. Abstinence will be taken as silence

18/07, 18:14 Luther : Abeg

18/07, 18:14 Luther : Go on Eri

I can't piece it together without its completion

18/07, 18:15 Eri: Basis for rules being conceptual.? I

have ascribed it to an ability as per vsbw standards.

Each person has their own basis/idea which serves as a backbone for their conceptions. I Have no need to ascribe one to mine at this moment unless you give me a reason

18/07, 18:19 Eri: Piece what together?

My premise in completion actualizes my character as a Negator, which possesses inherent characteristics.

Only after existing can one act.

Hence, my wincon will be put forth after my Premise is accepted

18/07, 18:39 Kazuma: - You haven't proved them being conceptual in the sense you explained outside my interpretation of them just being labels

- Exactly; You're basis of it being conceptual is an ideology made by you, subjective, it is just a categorization for all things within the workings of the series.

-

- Each person has their own idea/basis which serves as a backbone for their conception< so you're saying that the interpretation of your work is dependent on the person receiving that info?

18/07, 19:09 Eri: - I haven't proved what being conceptual?The rules. It's been implied by my scan. Refer to the scan

- For this second point. Prove it " is a categorization for all things within the workings of the series".

- No that statement means I do not need to state its a platonic concept at this moment

How did you go from "are you using Plato's theory" to that last sentence "so you're saying that the interpretation of your work is dependent on the person receiving that info"

18/07, 19:11 Eri: I have already portrayed how altering thirst changed every object linked to it

18/07, 19:35 Eri: Long story short.

1. It's conceptual manip

2. I will not state the nature of conceptual I.e platonism. It can be inferred

19/07, 00:07 Luther : Well

Time for immeasurable speed Goku

19/07, 00:28 Luther : As shown, time skip enables the user to move forward in time for 0.1secs. Within this time, the user is able to move freely outside the constraints of what we call Linea Time. The delineation of this ability seamlessly aligns with the speed level categorized as immeasurable. We can conclude that the use of this ability would bare results akin to that of one with immeasurable speed.

19/07, 00:28 Luther : Goku is able to react to this ability, which I have portrayed as a technique that is likened to immeasurable speed movement.

19/07, 00:28 Luther : Here, it is stated by King Kai and confirmed by Goku that Goku was indeed performing a feat on par with the user of Time skip. Goku, not possessing this ability, was able to execute this via his sheer speed alone. King Kai did say Goku was predicting his movements. However, prediction is inconsequential when devoid of the concomitant capacity for expeditious action.

19/07, 00:41 Luther : Vados verbatim states that Jiren possesses power that transcends time itself. The addition of "itself" which is a reflexive pronoun, is emphasizing that Jiren wasn't just transcending some arbitrary or ambiguous time, it proves that he was indeed transcending time in all it's fundamentality, it's quintessentiality.

19/07, 00:41 Luther : Further substantiation for the immeasurable speed to consolidate its consistence. Goku is keeping up with and slightly out-pacing the one who transcends time; Jiren.

19/07, 02:11 Kazuma: - Those rules, as I said are just labels to encompass the properties participating in them, you haven't proven they exist as an objective reality since you're mirroring platonism

- Self explanatory, your Unhealthy scan verbatim said "Any and all things that pertain to health" my base for why it's how it's how it works in the series isn't defeated(why is this even argued)

- You already implied platonism when you referred them(the rules) to be universal laws

No worries about that. Keep going

19/07, 02:16 Kazuma: If we use the nature of the ability for the time skip

Doesn't that imply a jump in time instead of a able to move outside of it's constraints?

How does that imply immeasurable

19/07, 02:17 Kazuma: Eg: He use Time manipulation to go forward in time

That's it's own thing

19/07, 02:19 Luther : I never ascribed immeasurable speed to the time skip ability. I merely likened it. The crux of my argument lies on Goku's reaction to the ability.

Character A has an ability that allows him to jump forward in time, and character B doesn't have this ability but is able to react to character A's leap forward

19/07, 02:27 Kazuma: Then what did you mean by

> The delineation of this ability seamlessly aligns with the speed level categorized as immeasurable

You were clearly trying to ascribe The time skip to such feat

Norms, Goku peak, but that manipulation of time was resisted was it not?

Goku was still in place during the skip and by the near end of it he managed to land one on him which diverged the hit aimed at his face

He couldn't move during the ability, so my idea is, at the near end of it, it's weaker, which left room for movement and Goku could take advantage of such a situation

So, limited resistance to that ability

19/07, 02:44 Luther : That doesn't really go against what I said, though. As I said, I simply likened it, I then followed up with a statement implicative of that;

> We can conclude that the use of this ability would bear similar results akin to that of immeasurable speed.

My argument centers around Goku's reaction. Other movements that are not in line with this reaction are inconsequential for this reason, your argument that Goku couldn't move is, thus, unnecessitated. He reacted to the apparent jump in time, that's all.

Your argument that Goku only barely reacted to the attack still doesn't demean my stance. If the speed is nonexistent, he wouldn't even "barely" react.

Finally, your argument of the ability being weaker towards the end is directly addressed with the scan, which King Kai highlighted Goku's actions. He was forcing his way into the future.

19/07, 02:45 Luther : By forcing his way into the future, Goku was able to keep pace with Hit. While devoid of this time manipulation

19/07, 03:18 Kazuma: It does actually, it's clearing up incongruities between Time skip and Immeasurable speed

Why are did liken Time manipulation to a speed feat?

> We can conclude that the use of the ability would bare results akin to that of immeasurable speed

You literally just implicitly tried to ascribe and speed to the ability

"Goku couldn't move is this unnecessitated" as if a reaction isn't movement

And looking closely at it, the ability did end until Goku could "move" again

Another incongruity

Substantiate his IS

Ehn, so Goku has to power up to a level greater than what you showed to be able to pull all that off

That wasn't within what you showed priori

19/07, 03:19 Kazuma: As we've seen now

Goku requires an amplifier in order to reach the asserted speed implied by your statements and scan presented earlier

Anything below that amp doesn't constitute his ability to ignore the constraints of time

19/07, 03:32 Luther : - I can liken teleportation to infinite speed. A person able to react to said teleportation can be granted infinite speed. That's the exact same case here, Kazuma. It's that simple. In this case, their results are the same. Similarly, a time machine and a character with immeasurable speed will have similar results if they were to travel from coordinate A to coordinate B. That again is exactly the same thing here. I highlighted similarities and never blatantly stated, "Time skip is immeasurable speed"

- I said quite clearly that any movement aside that of reaction is shifting away from my initial argument. Goku reacted to the attack. Whether he moved within Hit's zone or not is not of any relevance.

- The ability ended immediately after that lethal blow to his gut. What's this point of yours meant to do?

- King Kai generalized by saying, "That fight with Hit, you weren't just predicting his moves..." Why would you assume the only time Goku was predicting his moves was after powering up, when my scan shows Goku predicting his movements prior to that? Then, he followed up with Goku, not just predicting, but also forcing his way through time. By virtue of King Kai's initial generalization, this should apply to all the times Goku predicted his movements, shouldn't it?

19/07, 03:37 Luther : It was a Kaioken boost that peaked at a $\times 10$ multiplier. You can see that in my scan. Immeasurable speed is infinitely above infinite speed, and infinite speed is infinitely above any finite level of speed. It introduces an illogicality to assume a $\times 10$ boost is sufficient to get a character to Immeasurable speed from an inferior speed tier

19/07, 07:23 Eri: So this is your argument

1; The rules are not concepts but are labels inverse, i.e., a verse mechanic

2; I do not need to prove it as its "self-explanatory"

> Response to third point

3; Yes, a hint of platonism is implied, albeit not by me. Other people's explanations of concepts could also portray them to be universal laws

19/07, 07:41 Eri: Now Kazuma. Why should your argument take precedence over mine.

You can't keep saying they are just labels that encompass after seeing their interaction with reality. All phenom of thirst eliminated due to the rule of thirst being eliminated

19/07, 09:07 Eri: Can you explain more about the time skip, or is this sufficient?

Should I take your explanations as literal?

19/07, 09:18 Luther : This is what is needed

19/07, 09:22 Eri: So it's sufficient. Yes?

19/07, 09:23 Luther : I'll determine what needs to be added when contending to aid your understanding

19/07, 09:24 Eri: Off to the next bit;

For the interpretation of the ability we have that

|----- A -----|

0 .1

Where A indicates your character's ability to move within that "tenth of a second"

19/07, 09:26 Luther : I don't know where you're going, I can't answer that, sorry. Proceed with your point if you may.

19/07, 09:36 Eri: OK sir.

So, as portrayed, the ability is still within linear time, although within said time, your character is able to move freely.

19/07, 09:37 Eri: This is evinced by the transition from 0 to .1 being a prerequisite for usage

19/07, 09:37 Luther : Explain

19/07, 09:41 Eri: I'm just regurgitating what is written here

19/07, 09:47 Luther : I'd like to know what what you think the term "Linear time" entails 19/07,

09:51 Eri: As implied in its name

19/07, 09:52 Eri: Monodirectional transition of time

19/07, 09:53 Eri: i.e 0 -> 1

19/07, 09:54 Eri: And during this transition, your character can escape for a tenth of a second

|----- A -----|

.1 .2

19/07, 09:54 Eri: Is this correct sir

19/07, 10:07 Luther : Give me about an hour I'm on
my way home

19/07, 10:07 Luther : Partially

19/07, 13:07 Luther : That's not the only thing that constitutes "Linear time"

It is monodirectional, yes. However, it is also sequentialized. Hit circumvents this normal progression of conventional time by virtue of temporarily removing himself from the linear flow of time, albeit temporarily and for a short duration.

Nonetheless, your argument centered around the ability still being governed by linear time has been addressed.

Moving on, I'd like to point out that I never ascribed a certain speed to Hit's ability, I just likened this ability to immeasurable, akin to how one would liken teleportation to infinite speed. A character with immeasurable speed can perform an action similar to Hit's time skip, although with his sheer expeditiousness. Goku, not having this ability, is able to force his way through time (limited transcendence over linear time as he has withdrawn himself from the conventional progression and sequential nature of time) and keep up with Hit.

19/07, 13:17 Eri: I know you didn't state Hit's ability is immeasurable speed directly.

19/07, 13:25 Eri: Also, the notion of time being sequentialized is agreed upon.

As I said before, it's just illustrated in this manner

|-----0.1--- A ---0.2 -----|

0 1

The explanation you brought strictly for the portrayal of the ability said it's within said limited time that one gets to act freely

19/07, 13:26 Eri: For you to claim segregation, you may need to provide extra evidence in line with ECREE

19/07, 16:01 Luther : A character being able to move outside (transcend) of linear time \neq the character being completely transcendent of time in its entirety. The limited time being referred to is the 0.1 secs timeframe for his ability, not linear time itself. The ability enables his short termed movement outside the conventional flow of time, albeit he is still limited/bound by how long his ability can maintain that segregated state. You're cherry-picking atp. Look at the surrounding context.

For your employment of Sagan's standard. No further evidence is requisite. The evidence provided is sufficient, and I have made use of logical arguments to further strengthen my stance.

19/07, 16:23 Eri: > The limited time being referred to is the 0.1 secs timeframe for the ability.

So we both agree that his ability is quantified strictly on our metrics founded on linear time.

19/07, 16:28 Luther : Is quantified strictly on metric founded by time itself. Linear time is just a flow of time

19/07, 16:40 Eri: In this particular case, a transition to the end of 0.1 secs works without a linear application?

Kindly prove it.

19/07, 16:41 Eri: This also requires an ECREE justification

19/07, 16:49 Luther : Why is all this relevant, though?

You're trying to debunk immeasurable speed from the amount of time spent in the state unconfined by linear time, when in actuality that time spent in said state can be measured under the same metrics?

I don't see that as a rebuttal to my stance of the result of this ability being akin to immeasurable speed, and the fact that he was withdrawn temporarily from the linear flow of time perceived by others. The efficacy of this ability lies at the end (result), this unwarranted intricacies can be avoided

19/07, 18:00 Eri: Why is all this relevant?

Linear time is monodirectional and sequential. Any ability quantified within this framework (e.g., 0.1 seconds) inherently operates within linear time constraints.

Thus, Hit's ability isn't likened to immeasurable speed in any form. ECREE STILL STANDS

19/07, 18:03 Eri: Also, you are conflating 2 distinct ontological categories by equating a finite, measurable ability within linear time to a Transcendental speed thereof, you committing a category error.

19/07, 18:15 Eri: Is there any point in including temporal realism and emphasising that time's sequential progression is immutable. An argument, suggesting a deviation from this progression, must reconcile with the rule of Causal Determinism

20/07, 01:15 Luther : I have expounded on how even the slightest jump into the future is already segregation from your typical time flow. I get your argument, but it still isn't defeating my stance. As I have said, these intricacies hold little relevance. A time machine is traversing to the future and has infiltrated that realm that removes it from the typical time flow, the time machine stays in that realm for an amount of time that can be measured using out conventional metric. Nonetheless, the efficacy of this ability still consists at the end.

Mind telling me how it still stands? I have made no extraordinary claim. Your ineptitude is in no way undermining the inherent logic applied in my elucidation

20/07, 01:25 Luther : I'm going to refrain from further addressing your argument, which imputes measurability to my argument as I have constantly highlighted the irrelevance of it. Moreover, I'll repeat, the result of Hits time skip is analogous to that of character A with immeasurable speed, forcing his way into the future, that is all there is to it. Your involutions are unnecessitated. The pith for my argument lies in Goku's ability to force himself into the future to keep up with Hit, one who ignores the linear progression and chronologization of events.

20/07, 01:34 Luther : There is no point in doing that, sir.

My argument doesn't deviate from that. I never argued that the sequential progression of time is mutable. My argument stems from the notion that Hit indeed isolated himself from that systematized flow of linear time by hopping forward in time, the linear flow continued unaltered

20/07, 01:43 Luther : Eri giving A tier with these arguments 20/07, 01:54 Eri:

Abeg. You are still regurgitating the same points.

Should I accept this analogy of a time machine to explain how hit's ability works completely?

> The time machine stays in that realm for the amount of time that can be measured using our conventional metric

As you can see. Inability to be measured is an inherent property of immeasurable speed. Hit's ability remains distinct from all properties and intentions of immeasurable as its evidently measurable

20/07, 01:56 Luther : Oya measure Hit's speed with the speed formula na Do I

need to keep repeating how this is unnecessary, though?

20/07, 02:04 Eri: Also asserting that Hit's slight jump into the future constitutes a segregation from the typical flow of time is alright. But temporal realism posits that time's sequential progression is immutable and monodirectional. Any action or ability operating within a quantifiable duration, such as the 0.1 seconds you describe, is intrinsically bound by the linear and sequential nature of time.

If you liken it to a time machine, you are only shifting its temporal position. It doesn't illustrate segregation or transcendence, as stated earlier.

20/07, 02:06 Eri: Just because I'm unable to perform an action doesn't mean the action is impossible. Hence as you've stated. It can be measured

20/07, 02:06 Luther : I'll address it later abeg. Una wan give me high blood pressure from anxiety "Eri is typing..."

20/07, 04:19 Luther : You still do not understand what that 0.1 entails. I have explained to you how it's irrelevant.

Since you still persist, allow me to make use of my exceptional artistic prowess to demonstrate

20/07, 04:46 Luther : Sorry, I had to take care of something.

I believe this is pretty "self-explanatory".

20/07, 04:55 Luther : Now, this will raise another irrelevant tangent. For the progression of my speed scale, all that needs to be noted is Hit's ability enables him to jump out of the usual flow of time, which we have come to a consensus on. I have also reiterated how the efficacy is a replica to that of immeasurable speed, and also said effectiveness consists at the end of this ability. Goku, being able to force through time to keep up with him is the crux of my argument. Thus, I repeat, the intricacies of Hit's abilities are inconsequential, seeing how we have come to an agreement on the main part of the argument, further buttressing my stance

20/07, 09:26 Eri: You do realise your scan never stated anything about a pocket dimension where time does not exist.

I'd like you to prove this assertion

20/07, 09:27 Eri: If this is actually true and you refused to send the scan since then you are mad.

20/07, 09:28 Luther : I wanted to aguuu

20/07, 09:28 Eri: The inherent property of immeasurable speed is its elusiveness to any form of quantification. Hit's ability, confined within a 0.1-second duration, is intrinsically measurable and thus distinct from the concept of immeasurable speed.

20/07, 09:29 Eri: Your analogy to a time machine, which shifts temporal position without altering the linear flow of time, still fails to demonstrate any true segregation or transcendence of time

20/07, 09:29 Eri: Abeg this doesn't help your argument sef

20/07, 09:30 Eri: So when he forcefully changes temporal position, the previous 0.1 secs is stored.

Cool ability(mid)

20/07, 09:31 Eri: The then proceeds to create a parallel world wit h time.

Good for him I guess

20/07, 09:32 Luther : Guy, you are just going into unnecessary details

20/07, 09:32 Eri: This doesn't state that during the skip, he goes into Said Parallel World as you've posited

20/07, 09:32 Eri: If the dimension he creates is devoid of time why does he create it with time

20/07, 09:33 Eri: There's a need for scrutiny when dealing with Extraordinary claims

20/07, 09:34 Luther : I don tire

You have agreed that he removes himself from our typical flow of time, our linear flow of time. Goku reacts to his ability that removes him from said time by forcing his way into the future, simple.

Goku is the focus here

He "forced his way into the future to keep up with Hit's ability.

20/07, 09:34 Luther : No extraordinary claims have been made. 20/07,

09:34 Eri: When did i agree to that

20/07, 09:35 Eri: Forcing your way to the future?

Cool. goku has time manipulation

20/07, 09:35 Luther : He doesn't

20/07, 09:37 Luther : Let me look at your argument btw

20/07, 09:37 Luther : Look at the diagram I drew please

20/07, 09:39 Eri: I said it's alright to assert something if you want to but x,y,z and hence you are wrong.

How does that depict agreement

20/07, 09:39 Eri: Is your diagram the dbz manga?

20/07, 09:40 Luther : The 0.1 sec is the amount of time he skipped into the future. An immeasurable speed character moved 3 mins into the future with speed. Would you say his speed is confined within a 3 mins duration so it isn't immeasurable?

20/07, 09:40 Luther : Does it have to be?

20/07, 09:42 Luther : I see. A misinterpretation on my path then. However, the fact that he ignores the progression of events and reappears 0.1 seconds in the future is still analogous with the effects of immeasurable speed, sorry.

20/07, 09:42 Luther : Goku kept up with that.

20/07, 09:43 Luther : Overcomplicating things won't help your argument or make up for the fact you are ignoring the crux of my argument

20/07, 09:53 Eri: Why shouldn't it be from source material.

20/07, 09:54 Luther : It's just a diagrammatic representation of what I have been saying since tho

20/07, 09:55 Eri: Again. Category error by conflating the 2 distinct ontological conceptions whereas one traverses a linearly temporal dimension while the other doesn't.

20/07, 09:56 Eri: No. The diagram introduces more points, nuances, and conclusions.

20/07, 09:59 Eri: The fact that he travels through time very briefly is analogous to immeasurable speed?

Time travel is the ability to travel through time.

I'm sure you agree with this

20/07, 10:00 Eri: Indeed, the simplest conclusion would be that goku also possesses the ability to move forward in time, albeit briefly without circumventing linearity

20/07, 10:02 Eri: I'm not overcomplicated anything.

My argument just contends your point while binding its possibility

20/07, 10:05 Luther : Highlight the one that traverses a linearly temporal dimension and the one that doesn't.

20/07, 10:05 Luther : What part needs validation then?

20/07, 10:05 Luther : Immeasurable speed is a form of time travel but with sheer speed. What are you getting at?

20/07, 10:06 Luther : Hold

Let me address your argument before you type

20/07, 10:06 Eri: It's implied

20/07, 10:07 Luther : How does he do that, though? There is an underlying contradicting in your logical application.

20/07, 10:07 Luther : You just started attacking my main point 20/07,

10:09 Eri: I've been attacking it since

20/07, 10:10 Eri: Everything that you've posited that isn't in the dbz material you presented i.e. hit goes to his pocket dimension devoid of time to circumvent time

20/07, 10:11 Eri: Several nuances and distinctions between them one a concept such as linearity is introduced.

20/07, 10:11 Eri: I already stated how he does that

20/07, 10:12 Luther : Okay

Hold.

20/07, 10:21 Luther : He goes to his pocket dimension:

20/07, 10:22 Luther : In this pocket dimension, time flow doesn't exist:

20/07, 10:23 Luther : Eri, the only difference between Time Travel and immeasurable speed movement is that for immeasurable speed, it is achieved via sheer speed only

20/07, 10:23 Luther : Let me address you before you type 20/07,

10:30 Eri: As I said earlier

20/07, 10:30 Eri: There's a need for scrutiny when dealing with Extraordinary claims

20/07, 10:32 Eri: This, without further context doesn't show that it's completely devoid of time.

20/07, 10:34 Eri: It has already been established that it's bound by a minuscule quantity(i.e., 0.1s) of linear time.

20/07, 10:34 Luther : I ain't reading allat 20/07,

10:34 Luther : I no get stamina

20/07, 10:35 Eri: Maybe we can add 2 more paragraphs

Tuff Papi Vs Luther

6/15, 6:49 PM  papi: gojo blitzes

6/15, 6:59 PM Luther~★: You are pushing infinite speed.

A viewer's definition of "instantaneous" is limited to their perception or perspective.

Hence, anything faster than he can keep up with or perceive would logically be labeled by him as "instantaneous"

Similarly, the speed of light would be seemingly perceived as instantaneous to me.

Ultimately, this is a subjective view point, you'll need further substantiation to validate the objectivity of this statement also to show there was no hyperbolism

6/15, 7:08 PM **ff≡papi**: abeg
it doesn't require any additional validation.

are you attempting to discredit the proficiency of the individuals speaking?

are you insinuating their commonplace nature?

the concept of "a viewer's interpretation" is inconsequential in this context. why should your personal assessment of how "viewers" perceive things hold relevance?

why should it be regarded as a subjective perspective?

you're imposing significant burdens upon yourself.

the discourse pertained to gojo's capacity to traverse the aforementioned domain, a depiction unequivocally evident in the panel. the author possesses the prerogative to illustrate his intentions through the characters' dialogues. within this exchange, it was elucidated that gojo indeed possesses infinite speed, thank you.

6/15, 7:21 PM Luther~★: - A simple statement of a character deeming another's movement "instantaneous" requires extra context and isn't enough to draw a conclusion

- I am not discrediting the proficiency of any individual. I am questioning the credibility of his statement

- It is not just personal assessment. it is logical reasoning. I did give an instance of the speed of light being perceived to have instantaneous movement by us humans. That is strictly a subjective viewpoint. A character with perception speed superior to the speed of light wouldn't perceive the aforementioned as instantaneous. As such, I can conclude that the definition of 'instantaneous' varies across the observer of said 'instantaneous' movement.

- What burdens?

- You'd have to demonstrate the author's knowledge on 'instantaneous' movement equating to infinite speed (Finite distance in 0 time)

-

6/15, 7:38 PM **ff≡papi**: - sufficient unto the task is the attainment of the author's intended volition.

- .your disparagement of his expertise & the facile notion of perceiving ls as instantaneous due to you being you ig.

- this lacks substantive refutation. what justification underpins your assertion? why interject the human element into the discourse as a purported validating factor? revisit my the previous last point for elucidative responses.

- subjective yarns

- wherefore the necessity of such an action? the auctorial decree dictates the character's possession of instantaneous celerity, thus duly instantiated.

- ?

6/15, 9:14 PM Luther~★: - You have yet to prove the author's statement or intention of instantaneous implied infinite speed

- Yes, as I have established the term "instantaneous" as a variable amongst observers

- I am bringing a human element to analogically buttress my point of th subjectivity of the term "instantaneous".

- I see



































- You don't understand. The only way the author's statement of instantaneous movement implying infinite speed in coherence with the standard definition is if the author himself has applicable knowledge of the standard definition. I am asking you to prove he does.

Having said this, you have committed the following fallacies;

- Linguistic fallacy - misinterpreting the author's intended meaning of "instantaneous" by imposing a definition from a different context (battle wiki definition).

- Hasty generalization - jumping to a conclusion (infinite speed) based on a single statement without considering alternative interpretations or contextual evidence.

- Authorial intent fallacy - assuming that the author's use of "instantaneous" inherently implies infinite speed without explicit confirmation or clear context

6/16, 8:16 AM                                  

- baba shattap

Luther Vs Mina

7/24, 10:21 PM Luther : Vados verbatim states that Jiren possesses power that transcends time itself. The addition of "itself" which is a reflexive pronoun, is emphasizing that Jiren wasn't just transcending some arbitrary or ambiguous time, it proves that he was indeed transcending time in all it's fundamentality, it's quintessentiality.

7/24, 10:21 PM Luther : Further corroboration: Goku is keeping up with and slightly out-pacing the one who transcends time; Jiren.

7/24, 10:22 PM Luther : Putting Goku at immeasurable speed

7/24, 10:29 PM +234 812 610 3660: So if this Scenario was taken out of context it would naturally grant Jiren Immeasurable Speed naturally but however if we look at what led to this Scene we could see that Jiren resisted or rather broke through Hit's Timestop ability and that doesn't qualify for Immeasurable Speed as that only means that Jiren has Resistance to Time Stop and Vados was exaggerating or simply didn't know what she was talking about

7/24, 10:33 PM Luther : The crux of the argument lies in "that transcends time itself". If it was a resistance, wouldn't it have just been mentioned like so? However, he is stated to transcend time itself. Authorial intent matters, and judging from the statement, it wouldn't be absurd to assume that was the author's intended. Ultimately, the delineation provided for us within the cosmological framework holds more weight than any deduction based on your own subject reliant observation

7/24, 10:34 PM Luther : Why would you assume vados is exaggerating and doesn't know what she is talking about? Angels don't exaggerate

7/24, 10:35 PM Luther : Your rationale behind that thought process should be provided accordingly

7/24, 11:11 PM +234 812 610 3660: Yeah and I'm saying that the credibility of the statement "that transcends time itself" is defeated as the reason for the Statement doesn't align with the requirement for Immeasurable Speed

If I make a Statement like "Taylor Swift is a Lesbian" and the reason for me making that Statement was because she has Female Friends that would be a Non-Sequitur Conclusion and that's the same thing in play here

Authorial intent??

How do you know that was what Toriyama intended when he put that Statement in DB

There's no Subjective Interpretation or deduction in play here, I am simply stating what happened in the events that led to the scan you're presenting and how that discredits the agenda you're pushing

7/24, 11:11 PM +234 812 610 3660: That was merely a would I say suggestion of the reason behind why she said that another thing we could consider is that maybe that's not what she meant when she

said and what she meant by "Transcending Time" could be an interpretation subjective to the DB Verse as it definitely doesn't align with the Powerscaling Definition of Immeasurable Speed

7/24, 11:20 PM Luther : Wrong. Your employment of your knowledge in power scaling is inconsequential (resistance to time stop), and your analogy fails to validate your point simply because her friends aren't the author/God's of her story/life. In this case, an attempt has been made to provide a clear description in order to expel subjective deductions as yours, which is why Vados made that statement. Nonetheless, Toriyama, being the author, would only voice a description of an event through a character whose words can be taken as the objective truth as angels don't lie, which is why this was deemed authorial intent, attributed to the fact that the author indirectly provided that description.

Again, your deduction is of little relevance as opposed to what has been provided for us.

7/24, 11:23 PM Luther : Your argument is unfounded as I haven't ascribed immeasurable speed to Jiren. However, immeasurable speed requires someone to transcend the flow of time. Wouldn't an illogicality be introduced to assume someone who transcends the quintessence of time itself doesn't transcend its flow???

7/24, 11:26 PM Luther : Again. You'd have to provide your rationale behind that thought process duly.

The unequivocal implication of my scan was to accurately describe what was going on for the viewers' comprehension. "This means Jiren possesses power that Transcends Time Itself."

A clear connotation of events taking place

7/24, 11:29 PM Luther : Btw. I'm not assuming the author intended immeasurable speed. That will be fallacious. However, I am solely reiterating and elaborating further on the statement evidently made

7/25, 12:10 AM +234 812 610 3660: Didn't you say Jiren has Immeasurable Speed via Vados's Statement

7/25, 12:10 AM +234 812 610 3660: No one said Vados is lying, but it's possible that she isn't too informed of what she was talking about, if the reason or the core behind a Statement doesn't correlate with the following conclusion then the statement is rendered not credible and the reason for Vados's Statement doesn't correlate with the Requirement for Immeasurable Speed so yeah

So you're saying that it counts as Authorial Intent because the Author chose a supposedly credible character to make the statement??

7/25, 12:11 AM +234 812 610 3660: Nawa

7/25, 12:11 AM +234 812 610 3660: Ohhh

7/25, 12:11 AM +234 812 610 3660: My Rationale behind what??

Mehn you're saying the same thing tbh

7/25, 12:21 AM Luther : Why wouldn't she be informed? If she wasn't informed, why would she define the situation with such infallibility? On what basis is that your argument founded? Are you arguing that the statement doesn't denote immeasurable speed or Vados's conclusion being incorrect? Well, for the latter, you can't say the core doesn't correlate unless you believe a character who transcends time itself is unable to bypass time based abilities. For the former, however, as I said, I have addressed how transcending time itself suggests movement beyond the chronological flow of time. Non point, next.

It also seems you deem Vados an incredible source. A reason for that should be provided as well.

Indeed. The author makes his intents clear by making it known through a credible source. Sounds perfectly logical to me.

7/25, 12:21 AM Luther : You can tag it incase I forgot 7/25,

12:22 AM Luther : Why you think it's a suggestion

7/25, 8:20 PM +234 812 610 3660: You can be uninformed about a Topic and still talk about it with such boldness, and I've already told you my basis for that conclusion as the reason for her reaching the conclusion "Transcending Time" doesn't correlate with the Requirements needed for being unbound from the flow of Linear time hence she doesn't know what she's talking about

Also No I'm not saying the Statement isn't enough to denote Immeasurable Speed, I'm saying that the reason for the character making the Statement is Incoherent hence the Statement isn't credible, I'm simply saying Jiren doesn't transcend time and that Vados Statement is simply incorrect

I believe I've given my reason as to why Vados isn't credible, which is because the reason she made the statement doesn't correlate with the conclusion she arrived at hence she doesn't know what she's talking about

7/25, 9:01 PM Luther : First paragraph (1) - You really didn't defeat my point, and I'll repeat myself and simplify. Why would you assume such a descriptor was uninformed on the topic? You are pulling out possibilities that are easily defeated by logic. Angels don't make bold claims about what they are unaware or uninformed about. If you believe so otherwise, the onus lies on you to provide your reason for that.

First paragraph (2) - It's also very clear to me that you do not understand other crucial aspects of my argument. For instance, I neither said Vados made an attempt to grant Jiren immeasurable speed, nor did I say she has knowledge on the respective criterion to achieve it. So, your reason behind your statement, "she doesn't know what she's talking about" has been rendered moot, simply because you're attacking a phantom argument. Now that's settled, you seem to be stacking a lot of burdens on yourself, I have highlighted priori the illogicality that will be brought to light if you assume transcending time itself doesn't equate to transcending its flow, and you dismiss my argument by just saying it doesn't correlate without providing a reason why.

Second paragraph: I'll be forced to keep repeating myself then and keep it simple again. YOUR SUBJECTIVE opinion < AUTHOR'S INTENDED MESSAGE. No matter how many times you repeat that the reason behind vados statement is incoherent with the statement itself by virtue of utilizing your power

scaling knowledge, its irrelevant simply because the Author made a simple, clear statement and that statement already disregarded your own deduction and upscaled Jiren, that statement had a clear implications and it was to establish time itself as useless against Jiren's power. Again, you call Vados a liar. Your first reason for doing that is ultimately found upon your subjective inference, which we don't really care about (mainly because it's subjective). You're to provide a more plausible reason.

Oh, as I said, it's your subjective deduction, and we were aptly provided with an objective deduction that ultimately abolishes any sort of speculation. Hence, until further notice, Vados doesn't lie or give uniformed descriptions

TP Vs Brian

12/06, 22:01 COSMO : Ok so lemme just use the small talk I did with Ralph

12/06, 22:02 COSMO : 09/06, 22:33 COSMO : Aren't lies just what we don't want to hear

09/06, 22:33 Ralph The ancestor: I want to hear some lies

09/06, 22:35 COSMO : But if you want to hear lies, doesn't that conversely mean you don't want to hear truths

So If I were to tell you a truth and you reject it then doesn't that mean In a sense, that truth is in itself falsifiable and unjust

12/06, 22:02 COSMO : This Is the context

12/06, 22:10 Tuff Puppy: so is the crux "AREN'T LIES JUST WHAT WE DON'T WANT TO HEAR" or is it laying the groundwork for the main point.

12/06, 22:12 COSMO : Make I give more context

12/06, 22:12 COSMO : Well there's no more context

12/06, 22:13 COSMO : That's not really

12/06, 22:13 COSMO : The Crux is his own text

12/06, 22:13 COSMO : I want I hear some liee 12/06,

22:13 COSMO : Lies

12/06, 22:14 Tuff Puppy: ohh

12/06, 22:14 Tuff Puppy: aiit

12/06, 22:14 Tuff Puppy: I want to hear some lies

12/06, 22:15 COSMO : Yeah then I just idk

Did some Modus Tollens or something

12/06, 22:16 COSMO : If P then Q

If I want to hear lies, then I don't want to hear truths

12/06, 22:17 COSMO : Then blah blah

12/06, 22:17 COSMO : How did I even do this

12/06, 22:19 Tuff Puppy: but don't really see the argument.

bc one can just say; im open to hearing lies, but that doesn't change the fact that truths still exist.

12/06, 22:19 Tuff Puppy: then you'd just dwell on the subjective side of things

12/06, 22:20 COSMO : Did I ever dispute that truths exist?

We delved into the POV of a "Being"

12/06, 22:21 COSMO : So this being wants to hear lies, and they don't want to hear truths

But this being does not know these are inherently lies or truths

The being only knows they are propositions

12/06, 22:21 COSMO : Us as Gods, as know they are lies and truths

12/06, 22:21 COSMO : We*

12/06, 22:21 Tuff Puppy: "the truth is in itself falsifiable & unjust"

12/06, 22:21 COSMO : That's the pov of the Being

12/06, 22:21 COSMO : Anti Realismtic

12/06, 22:22 COSMO : However, as Gods we are, we can see it Realism-istically

12/06, 22:22 COSMO : You get me

12/06, 22:23 Tuff Puppy: is this a R>F thing?

like let's say,

person A: I'm a boy — he's behind a screen

person B: this is a lie.

god being person A & "being" being person B ?

12/06, 22:25 Tuff Puppy: bc person B lacks knowledge of the "truth" due to its concealment within a "screen".

12/06, 22:27 COSMO : Abeg

12/06, 22:27 COSMO : R F

12/06, 22:27 COSMO : We are Gods

We see the being and contemplate upon it and this conversation

12/06, 22:28 COSMO : I'm not sure the analogy you used is accurately descriptive

12/06, 22:29 COSMO : Just imagine this in a structure with a "Being"

We as Gods are as we are

Transcendent of this structure, where we contemplate and delegate

We ponder

12/06, 22:29 COSMO : God is not the being

The being is itself

We are Gods

What we are is who we are

And who we are is what we are

12/06, 22:34 COSMO : Firstly

The being does not know what it is being told are lies or truths, it only knows it as propositions

However, we know

The being wants to hear lies, Only us as Gods know it is a lie, so we proffer

The being desires to hear it, they listen closely

They understand, it shapes their notions and foundation

The being rejects another proposition, which Is "truth"

It does not know it is truth

But we do

So the notion are now formulated, the beings existence and coherent beliefs, as well as it's basic beliefs are all founded on it

Time will pass, the being will see this proposition as a belief, a belief being what you hold as true

This Is the anti realism

Now the being will reject the other proposition cause it now sees It as a lie

Even though we know It is true

This Is the mind independent existence, the objective reality that can not be accessed by the being

Metaphysical Anti Realismtic

12/06, 22:35 COSMO : Basically, this justifies my proposition

12/06, 22:35 COSMO : "So If I were to tell you a truth and you reject it then doesn't that mean In a sense, that truth is in itself falsifiable and unjust"

Anti realistically, from the experiment of the being

Isn't my assertion justified?

12/06, 22:40 Tuff Puppy: I'm still tryna process the whole "God's" talk

12/06, 22:40 Tuff Puppy: I sha get the gist of it

12/06, 22:40 COSMO : A mind independent existence is Existentially existent

This can not be perceived by the being, but it can be perceived by us

12/06, 22:40 COSMO : By Gods I just mean the Interlocutors 12/06,

22:40 COSMO : You and I

12/06, 22:41 Tuff Puppy: but this in itself is flawed in many ways, firstly, veracity of a concept is not rendered falsifiable by mere disbelief, as falsifiability is a concept inherent to the scientific methodology, necessitating testability & potential refutation, won't you agree ?

12/06, 22:41 COSMO : Schrödingerism, we observe and contemplate it

12/06, 22:41 Tuff Puppy: the essence of "truth", particularly within metaphysical stuff, resides in its fidelity to objective reality, wherein the acknowledgment or rejection of such verity by a sentient entity holds no sway over its intrinsic essence.

12/06, 22:42 Tuff Puppy: I'm aware now

12/06, 22:42 Tuff Puppy: you're conflating belief & reality

12/06, 22:42 Tuff Puppy: & this stuff sef is iff

12/06, 22:44 COSMO : > Veracity of a concept is not rendered falsifiable by mere disbelief

It is not a mere disbelief my brethren, the notions of the being have been shaped by the converse, so it goes deeper than simple incredulity + Anti realistically, the being's reality is shaped by such, and so the concept is indeed rendered "untrue" in a sense

You speak from an objective - Realistic standpoint, only because you are a good who can perceive such (hypothetically), so you know the concepts remain without the input of the being

But for the being, it is not so

By falsifiable I just mean it is not true

It was late night when I ran that thing I couldn't think of better words

> falsifiability is a concept inherent to the scientific methodology, necessitating testability & potential refutation, won't you agree ?

I believe the above sheds light on this

12/06, 22:47 COSMO : Hence why I enlist the card of "metaphysical Anti realism"

The "truth" is what the being perceives it as

But the Truth as you say, objective reality is what we as Gods know it as

The being can not Access this mind independent existence, this objective reality to fully understand what it believes and it's foundation, it's essentialism-istic essentials are in fact erroneous

12/06, 22:48 Tuff Puppy: secondly, I'm aware that the doctrine of anti-realism avers that the verities are contingent upon belief systems; but, this your proposition doesn't insinuate the incapacity of entities to apprehend an external reality objectively—mentioned that earlier.

there's sth like scientific scrutiny & cogent dialogue which aspire to surmount the chasm between perceptual constructs & the authentic "real" or "reality"

the anti realism approach won't help your case bc you aren't accounting for other factors

12/06, 22:49 Tuff Puppy: won't be the "truth" till you do

12/06, 22:55 Tuff Puppy: no, to posit the falsehood of a concept within a subjective reality literally diverges from the principles of falsifiability as understood in any scientific department/stuff, idk yg. your assertion just signifies the adherence of an entity to a misguided belief, rather than casting doubts on the validity or verifiability of the objective truth. it's literally termed in a literally manner — "subjective reality"

this is what I've been hammering on, this line of reasoning accentuates the primacy of subjective interpretations over the concrete bedrock of objective actuality.

the crucial point that endures is that subjective convictions wield no power to modify the objective verities. It's entirely feasible for an entity to inhabit a realm molded by erroneous beliefs, but like I've been reiterating such a circumstance fails to distort the immutable essence of factual assertions.

go back to where I said you're conflating the two. truth, as an entity distinct from just belief, subsists independently, impervious to the whims of acceptance or repudiation by a given entity, steadfast in its intrinsic essence.

12/06, 22:55 COSMO : - Metaphysical Anti realism already addresses that, they can not perceive it even if it exists

What other factors and why are they needed?

The truth is totally dependent on what they perceive

You forget I also enlist a foundherent approach for the being to justify (passively) their belief

The justification may not be needed anyway

12/06, 22:56 COSMO : What's with this scientific yarns

12/06, 22:56 Tuff Puppy: if I'm going to argue metaphysically with you then you'd probably win

12/06, 22:56 COSMO : What are the principles of falsifiability

12/06, 22:57 COSMO : Abeg abeg

12/06, 22:58 COSMO : You're just saying the same thing na, the "objective reality" can only be discussed by us Gods as we know it exists

The being, cannot perceive it

12/06, 22:58 COSMO : So the beings reality is shaped by such

12/06, 22:59 COSMO : So in the beings reality, it is justified the truth (which only we can perceive as inherent truth) is not true

12/06, 23:00 COSMO : Omo all these words come give me like 20% of your vocab

12/06, 23:01 COSMO : The beings beliefs as well are not erroneous

They coherently justified

And Anti realistically true

You can only call it erroneous because FSI↑FSI↓ As God know it is so

12/06, 23:02 Tuff Puppy: this is the answer to two of your messages btw

brian objective truth remains constant with or without subjective reality yarns.

the limitation lies in the being's epistemic access, not in the existence or nature of truth itself.

okay, even when adopting a foundherentist approach or wtv, the vindication of beliefs within the confines of subjectivity fails to alter the constitution of objective verity, I've been saying that.

the "web" (see what I did there) of substantiation may exude coherence & internal alignment or will I say harmony, but it can remain steeped in erroneous postulations.

12/06, 23:07 COSMO : Objective truth, more mind independent conversations

Such can not be perceived by the being, aren't you getting me?

To this being this objective-ness does not exist

Their reality is completely shaped by the notions begat from these propositions

It's like you're still not getting me, you're still talking from an objective standpoint as God

Stoop down to the level of being and understand that the "truth" is not truth and the objective cannot be perceived

Only us as Gods can perceive it

And while yes we know that what the being believes does not alter the mind independent existence we know and we can perceive

In the POV of being, it is not the same

I get what you're trying to say, you're attacking this from the objective standpoint like anybody would

But when you then bring it into contemplations like this, you would see

Your eyes will be opened up

12/06, 23:07 COSMO : You shall believe

12/06, 23:08 Tuff Puppy: ydk, that the fallibility of beliefs transcends perceptual constructs and hinges on their alignment with the verities of objective existence?

yeah a being might perceive its convictions as valid & irrefutable, such subjective validation doesn't preclude the possibility of those beliefs deviating from the established tenets of objective reality.

identifying erroneous beliefs doesn't hinge on subjective perspectives but on their fidelity to empirical truths.

it's imperative to reiterate that an objective normative framework operates autonomously from subjective validations

12/06, 23:08 Tuff Puppy: & again I've told you why you can't use anti realism here

12/06, 23:09 COSMO : What postulations? Are you trying to tell me, A God

That my postulations are erroneous?

Or do you forget that We are the ones who divulged these propositions to the being

12/06, 23:10 COSMO : Omo, all these are irrelevant I've already told you I just meant it was untrue

And I was tired, couldn't find a better word

12/06, 23:11 COSMO : What other factors?

12/06, 23:15 COSMO : > ydk, that the fallibility of beliefs transcends perceptual constructs and hinges on their alignment with the verities of objective existence?

Realist, from the POV of the being it is totally contingent on their own notions and stuff

> yeah a being might perceive its convictions as valid & irrefutable, such subjective validation doesn't preclude the possibility of those beliefs deviating from the established tenets of objective reality.

The being cannot perceive the objective reality, it is impossible for it. So it shapes its reality on what it perceives. It is also justified, fundamentally.

> identifying erroneous beliefs doesn't hinge on subjective perspectives but on their fidelity to empirical truths.

You can only call the beliefs erroneous because you are a God, what you know as truth has already been proposed to be rejected by the being, so even in the pov of the being, empirically it's subjective reality is still truth

> it's imperative to reiterate that an objective normative framework operates autonomously from subjective validations

It is mind independent? Realist, the being knows naught

Are you Refuting Me or

the being?

I'm using the POV of the being to justify my arguments btw

12/06, 23:22 Tuff Puppy: this will be addressing all replies in continuation of my antecedent proclamation.

"the limitation lies in the beings epistemic access, not in the existence or nature of truth itself", do you agree?

but this recognition in question, though significant, lacks the categorical guarantee of concurrence with the being's belief system with that which accords with an independent, universal veracity. the being functions within the confines of its individualized reality, one whose congruence with objective criteria remains subject to evaluation.

don't get me wrong, I understand wym. per the being's internal perspective, its reality is defined by its perceived truths, which in turn govern its comprehension and behaviors. grasping this particular standpoint proves pivotal in elucidating the being's cognitive milieu. but, such acknowledgment stops short of affirming the alignment of the being's convictions with an external, objective reality. within the house/domain of its subjectivity, the being's assertions hold validity, albeit potentially at odds with an objective litmus test(the approach I talked about).

though the being may be disinclined to validate or acknowledge objective verities, these truths maintain a position of paramount importance. they function as a yardstick against which the accuracy of the being's convictions is calibrated. the apparent inconsequence of objective truth vis-à-vis the being's interior narrative doesn't diminish the pivotal role ascribed to objective truth in furnishing a consistent and dependable framework for comprehension. ydk that objective truths endure as the standard against which subjective convictions are gauged,right? not even withstanding the being's obliviousness to this evaluative process.

the involvement of "Gods" in the provision of propositions accentuates the dichotomy between pedagogical content and actual truth. while beings may acquiesce to propositions originating from authoritative sources, the genuineness of these propositions hinges upon their harmony with objective reality, talked about this. the dissemination of erroneous propositions configures the being's subjective reality, though it leaves the essence of objective truth unaltered.

12/06, 23:25 Tuff Puppy: this isn't what I was implying. what may engender fallibility in the provenance of objectivity?

& this your anti realism stuff sef

12/06, 23:25 Tuff Puppy: havent we gone pass that

12/06, 23:27 COSMO : Limitations of what exactly

12/06, 23:27 Tuff Puppy: you're the one saying the being cannot perceive it

12/06, 23:27 COSMO : So for that second point you're just asking me how the beings beliefs concur with universally set facts

12/06, 23:27 Tuff Puppy: a limitation

12/06, 23:28 Tuff Puppy: basically letting yk it's literally just subjective reality

12/06, 23:29 COSMO : Yeah, the mind independent stuff only exists cus as Gods we can perceive it

But the being can't, it don't exist to the being

12/06, 23:33 COSMO : That's not really the same thing...

It's objective reality

A reality that exists wether you perceive it or not

If you perceive the drink, it exists

If you don't, it doesn't

That's the anti realistic-ness

They perceive their reality as is, made by different notions and beliefs

So that is what the being comes to accept as reality

12/06, 23:34 COSMO : Your third point

12/06, 23:41 COSMO : Tis a limitation to us, not the being. The inexistence of this objective-ness is inconsequential, the epistemic justification is done so... Foundherently

The truth is what the being knows as truth

Still not understanding that this objective reality is only perceived by us Gods

In this experiment it doesn't exist to the being so there's nothing to "congrue" with

Your fourth point, the objectives aren't objective to the being, they are merely propositions

One the being accepts and another it rejects

Calibrated? There's nothing to calibrate

The beings truth is truth anti realistically

The objective-ness doesn't exist my good man, the beings reality

Shaped by propositions, justified foundherently

So there is nothing to gauge, what the being knows it knows

The objective reality is mind independent, can only be seen by us Gods, so whatever comes from there is Inherently correct

There are no erroneous propositions from the objective reality we can see, ahan

12/06, 23:45 COSMO : Oh, are you asking me what proves the objective-ness of the postulations. That is "The lie and truth"

Well, I've already explained that. The truth and lies are begat from the objective reality imperceivable by the being

The being however sees this as just propositions

Propositions we have stipulated that it wants to hear and doesn't want to hear

12/06, 23:48 COSMO : Eh, the truth will still be truth to us solely because we can perceive the objective realm

As gods of course.

But to the being it will not

Its like you've gone off course

13/06, 02:20 Tuff Puppy: this has already been addressed na

13/06, 02:25 Tuff Puppy: addressed. it being not the truth to these beings remains unmitigated & unaltered.

13/06, 02:29 Tuff Puppy: let's get some things right

1. you have to acknowledge the constraints of cognitive perception doesnt precipitate the annulment of an objective ontological reality.

2. yeah, while subjective convictions kinda finds vindication within their own paradigm, they can yet deviate from objective truth.

3. the objective normative framework functions independently of subjective endorsements, affording the only or a reliable foundation for veracity.

4. the veritable existence of an objective reality remains unassailable apart from personal perception & serves as a criterion for veracity

13/06, 10:14 COSMO : Abeg

13/06, 10:14 COSMO : You're just attacking air at this point

13/06, 10:15 COSMO : I've justified my proposition that in a sense the truth can be viewed as fale

13/06, 10:15 COSMO : False

13/06, 10:15 COSMO : By enlisting the help of the being

13/06, 10:15 COSMO : So like

13/06, 10:15 COSMO : I no really care icl

13/06, 10:16 Tuff Puppy: it cannot, God damnit

13/06, 10:16 Tuff Puppy: when you go care?

13/06, 10:16 COSMO : You don go forget "In a sense"

You still dey use objective God standpoint see am na why you no wan acknowledge the being

13/06, 10:16 Tuff Puppy: do you have anybody in mind to hire it ?

13/06, 10:16 COSMO : Hire weitin

13/06, 10:17 Tuff Puppy: wetin be in a sense ke

13/06, 10:17 COSMO : Well, does the being not see it as false?

13/06, 10:17 Tuff Puppy: I don defeat such rationale

13/06, 10:17 COSMO : Then through anti realistic arguments, I have justified my proposition

13/06, 10:17 Tuff Puppy: I say hire, meant judge

13/06, 10:17 Tuff Puppy: oboy, addressed

13/06, 10:17 COSMO : So in a sense, the truth can be viewed as false

13/06, 10:18 COSMO : For if I were to enlist the POV of the being 13/06,

10:18 COSMO : Then I'm justified

13/06, 10:18 COSMO : Which I've stated multiple times btw

13/06, 10:18 Tuff Puppy: that's not even your argument, the truth can be viewed as false, ofc.

13/06, 10:19 Tuff Puppy: but his subjective reality doesn't mean anything in the grand scheme of things

13/06, 10:19 COSMO : It does when I enlist an anti realistic argument

13/06, 10:19 COSMO : Ahan pl

13/06, 10:19 COSMO : Oh boy

13/06, 10:19 Tuff Puppy: you're claiming bc he views it as false then it's false

13/06, 10:19 COSMO : You're still talking as God

13/06, 10:19 Tuff Puppy: oboy I don debunk that anti realistic nonsense

13/06, 10:19 Tuff Puppy: leave all this small talk

13/06, 10:19 COSMO : It is false to the being

13/06, 10:19 Tuff Puppy: panache or Benard ?

13/06, 10:20 COSMO : But to us it's a a nuh uh Only

cus we are Ghods

13/06, 10:20 COSMO : Panache

13/06, 10:20 Tuff Puppy: e no mean anything na

13/06, 10:20 Tuff Puppy: Omg

13/06, 10:20 Tuff Puppy: bet

13/06, 10:21 COSMO : It literally does hence the anti realism

I've justified it, in a sense it can be viewed as false

The being views it as false

13/06, 10:22 Tuff Puppy: read the first yap here

13/06, 10:22 Tuff Puppy: idk why you keep bringing anti realism

13/06, 10:22 Tuff Puppy: .

13/06, 10:22 Tuff Puppy: also won't be "false"

13/06, 10:23 COSMO : I ask you what other factors

13/06, 10:23 COSMO : The they can't perceive objective whatever

Metaphysical Anti realism addresses that

13/06, 10:23 Tuff Puppy: I literally listed one there

13/06, 10:23 Tuff Puppy: oboy

13/06, 10:23 Tuff Puppy: e don do

13/06, 10:24 Tuff Puppy: I've dmd panache

13/06, 10:24 COSMO : Scientific scrutiny?

For the being?

Why are you ascribing that to his reality shaped by his own notions?

Abeg abeg

13/06, 10:24 COSMO : So you're still trying to look at it from an objective standpoint

13/06, 10:25 Tuff Puppy: ehh? why won't I ?

13/06, 10:25 Tuff Puppy: oboy

13/06, 10:25 COSMO : There's only an "authentic" reality cus you're God

The authentic reality is the beings reality shaped by their conceptual schemes notions and so on

13/06, 10:25 Tuff Puppy: just wait

13/06, 10:25 Tuff Puppy: no guy

13/06, 10:25 Tuff Puppy: it remains authentic to whoever

13/06, 10:26 Tuff Puppy: it's literally the criterion for veracity wdym

13/06, 10:26 Tuff Puppy: abeg

13/06, 10:26 COSMO : Irrelevant when we're contemplating on the being and not on anybody else

13/06, 10:26 COSMO : Abeg na

13/06, 10:27 Tuff Puppy: why would it be irrelevant to the being when it is

13/06, 10:27 Tuff Puppy: not what he think is

13/06, 10:27 Tuff Puppy: abeg

13/06, 10:27 Tuff Puppy: omo

13/06, 10:28 COSMO : What he thinks is, will become what it is

That is the pawa of anti realism and how it has shaped the Being and his reality

13/06, 10:28 Tuff Puppy: how do I export chat

13/06, 10:28 COSMO : I nor sabi

13/06, 10:28 Tuff Puppy: you're just reiterating debunked claims na

13/06, 10:29 Tuff Puppy: omo

13/06, 10:29 COSMO : Just export na

13/06, 10:31 COSMO : You literally did not debunk it

You're just saying that what the being views is inconsequential to what is

Failure to take into account what the being views is what is

If it views it as false then it is

Justifying Me than In a sense It has been falsified

You can only speak on what is as a God

13/06, 10:39 Tuff Puppy: this is false.

the essence discourse thoroughly exposed the fallacy within the realm of your aforementioned contentions.

Idk if yk this but anti-realism, doesn't embody objectivity, it remains ensconced within the realm of low-key unfounded conjectures, not like that's a problem, since we're dealing with metaphysics , it's just debunkable.

13/06, 10:40 COSMO : And wait sef

13/06, 10:40 COSMO : Weitin be debunk

13/06, 10:40 COSMO : For small tall again

13/06, 10:40 COSMO : Talk

13/06, 10:40 Tuff Puppy: I can literally highlight why everything here is false rn

13/06, 10:42 COSMO : What Fallacy?

Omo, "Objectivity" can only be discussed cus well, You are a God

You're still going back to your realist points

MP AR addresses

"Unfounded conjectures"?

13/06, 10:45 Tuff Puppy: noooo

13/06, 10:45 Tuff Puppy: why would objectivity be only discussed bc I'm a "God"

13/06, 10:45 Tuff Puppy: abeg

13/06, 10:45 Tuff Puppy: need to add sth there

13/06, 10:45 COSMO : Cus you can only perceive the objective realm for that reason

13/06, 10:46 COSMO : Or did you ignore my implementation of metaphysical Anti Realismn

13/06, 10:46 Tuff Puppy: this has been thoroughly debunked, but I'm going to add it to this text I'm about to drop

13/06, 10:46 Tuff Puppy: omgggg

13/06, 10:46 COSMO : IT CAN'T BE DEBUNKED CUS THAT'S THE ONLY REASON YOU CAN

13/06, 10:46 COSMO : My guy what?

13/06, 10:46 Tuff Puppy: haewwwww

13/06, 10:46 COSMO : Are you forgetting this is a contemplation on the being

13/06, 10:47 COSMO : As God's

We can observe the objective realm

The being CANNOT

You can only speak about the objective within this experiment because you're a God

13/06, 10:48 Tuff Puppy: 1. the cognition of an "untruth" as verity or vice versa by an entity fails to modify the verifiable state of affairs . the constancy of objective verity perseveres unaffected by individual outlooks .

2. the subjective encounter delineates an individual's cognizance of actuality, while objective verity thrives independently of such perceptions . the self-governing nature of objective verity absolves it from reliance on any singular entity's perspective aka subjective reality. this self-sufficiency engenders objective truths as dependable benchmarks for assessing convictions & propositions, like I mentioned earlier. thus, its untenable to repudiate the meticulous & methodical scrutiny emblematic of scientific inquiry.

3. for your current wtv—the cognitive constraints (limitations on what an entity can discern or recognize) don't impinge on the ontological essence (the inherent existence) of objective truths. objective truths persist irrespective of whether an entity can grasp or comprehend them. the differentiation between cognitive access & ontological veracity is paramount; the inability of an entity to access or grasp objective truths doesn't negate their existential validity.

13/06, 10:48 COSMO : All your talks about verity and Objectivity is just because you're a God who can perceive it

Nothing else

It is still largely inconsequential to the being and how I justify my proposition

13/06, 10:49 Tuff Puppy: idk if this being & God bs is messing up with your brain or sth but you can literally look at this from our own personal experiences. God being God & the "being" being us.

13/06, 10:49 Tuff Puppy: no guy

13/06, 10:49 Tuff Puppy: abeg

13/06, 10:52 COSMO : 1. God, you're a God, you are God, the being is being, it see truth as false, I have been justified. The being cannot perceive objective, it's reality is what it perceives and believes

2. Metaphysical Anti realism, you can only propose "Objective verity" cus you're God who can perceive it, in this experiment of the being it can not, hence there is nothing to "assess" it with

3. How can you regurgitate the same thing with different wording 3 times? Addressed with God and MP AR

You're forgetting that anti realism literally makes it so that if the being perceives it as truth or false, then it is so

That Is it's reality

13/06, 10:54 COSMO : Abeg, that's so irrelevant it's crazy, we can not discourse on the nature of a Transcendent one. Nor how they view this or that, but in this experiment we are the Transcendent ones

This Is an experiment proffered by I, Which you chose to indulge in

13/06, 10:54 COSMO : You didn't address it really, just manifested some real irrelevant things

13/06, 10:54 COSMO : If you believe you address it

13/06, 10:54 COSMO : Alright

13/06, 10:54 Tuff Puppy: 3. huh? i just elucidated the concept utilizing an alternate methodology, but I still preserved the essential significance just albeit through a divergent avenue, which is why I used terms like "ontological essence" & the rest.

13/06, 10:55 Tuff Puppy: addressed.

idk if you think "anti realism" is & can't be debunked or can't be talked about.

13/06, 10:55 Tuff Puppy: okay guy

13/06, 10:59 COSMO : Ontological essence is just talking referring to an objective na

The ontological essence of an "objective" does not exist

But only to us as Gods does it

You wan debunk your only way to interact with the objective realm

13/06, 11:03 Tuff Puppy: omo idk what to say to you again o. you're talking like you think anti realism is what is& can't be debunked. even when till date philosophers still have arguments on it.

ive previously expounded upon the insignificance of subjective realities, even elucidated the capacity for "beings" to apprehend the objective verity of phenomena via scientific inquiry, & underscored the salience of the principle of falsehood within this context, idk what you want me to say.

13/06, 11:03 Tuff Puppy: Idk how this addresses that

13/06, 11:03 Tuff Puppy: why can't we discuss the essence of God ?

13/06, 11:03 Tuff Puppy: abeg

13/06, 11:07 COSMO : It is what is to the being

Oh, I told you that those scientific inquiries are like, irrelevant in this experiment

You get me?

These are truths and lies (propositions) not Experimented laws, and plus through MP AR there is no objective verity to apprehend

Principle of falsifiability or falsehood?

Well whatever, to refute the Beings reality Is inane, virtually impossible

What is to the being, IS

If you refute what IS then that is to refute reality as a whole

13/06, 11:08 COSMO : That essence is pretty much irrelevant in this debacle

So to discuss from his Pov and us as beings would just be making assumptions on this and that

13/06, 11:09 Tuff Puppy: anti realism is an assumption in that sense too

13/06, 11:09 Tuff Puppy: God knows what is & what isn't. he's God, he made all

13/06, 11:09 Tuff Puppy: idk how that is irrelevant

13/06, 11:09 Tuff Puppy: we can view what is

13/06, 11:10 Tuff Puppy: via other methods

13/06, 11:10 COSMO : Nah

13/06, 11:10 Tuff Puppy: I don't have to be God to know what is & isn't

13/06, 11:10 Tuff Puppy: okay

13/06, 11:10 Tuff Puppy: we done

13/06, 11:10 COSMO : Pretty sure what I've proffered is enough

13/06, 11:10 COSMO : That we are Gods and can view the objective realm

13/06, 11:10 COSMO : Innit

13/06, 11:10 Tuff Puppy: it's LITERALLY JUST A THEORY.

I've been saying allat, there's no objectivity in anti realism

13/06, 11:10 COSMO :

13/06, 11:11 Tuff Puppy: God abeg

13/06, 11:11 Tuff Puppy: okay guy

13/06, 11:11 Tuff Puppy: ydk that this is metaphysics right ?

13/06, 11:11 COSMO : I am enlisting the logic tied with it to justify my propositions through experimentations and contemplations

13/06, 11:11 Tuff Puppy: the logic has been debunked na

13/06, 11:11 Tuff Puppy: shuuu

13/06, 11:11 COSMO : As if it being a theory is gonna stop anything

13/06, 11:12 COSMO : You nor debunk anything

13/06, 11:12 COSMO : You still talked about objective this and objective that

13/06, 11:12 Tuff Puppy: im telling you it's a theory so you won't carry the rationale that it can't be debunked

13/06, 11:12 Tuff Puppy: abeg

13/06, 11:12 Tuff Puppy: okay guy

13/06, 11:12 Tuff Puppy: we get judge

13/06, 11:12 Tuff Puppy: no need for allat

13/06, 11:14 COSMO : Huh, I just used the logic

It can be debunked with logic of another philosophical stance or whatever

13/06, 11:14 Tuff Puppy: baba

13/06, 11:14 Tuff Puppy: it's been debunked

13/06, 11:14 Tuff Puppy: I don tire to dey talk this thing

13/06, 11:14 COSMO : Like

So easily?

You didn't debunk anything, if na your Objective yarns - God

13/06, 11:14 COSMO : What other yarns?

13/06, 11:14 Tuff Puppy: Okay na

13/06, 11:14 Tuff Puppy: kilode

13/06, 11:14 COSMO : E no really pass objective

13/06, 11:14 COSMO : - God

13/06, 11:15 Tuff Puppy: I literally gave you POV from a being

13/06, 11:15 Tuff Puppy: you say e dey irrelevant

13/06, 11:15 COSMO : I don't know why you're even trying to debunk it in the first place

13/06, 11:15 Tuff Puppy: okay na

13/06, 11:15 COSMO : Which was?

13/06, 11:15 Tuff Puppy: omo

13/06, 11:15 Tuff Puppy: . 13/06,

11:15 Tuff Puppy: abeg

13/06, 11:15 Tuff Puppy: Brian ITS OKAY

13/06, 11:15 Tuff Puppy: WE HAVE A JUDGE

13/06, 11:15 COSMO : Mtchew

13/06, 11:16 COSMO : Well well well

13/06, 11:16 Tuff Puppy: abeg

13/06, 11:16 COSMO : Scientific scrutiny to attain objective verity wey no exist

13/06, 11:16 COSMO : Let's clap hand for Jesus

13/06, 11:16 Tuff Puppy: wey no exist ke ?

13/06, 11:16 Tuff Puppy: abeg

13/06, 11:16 Tuff Puppy: I don die

13/06, 11:20 COSMO : Hm

13/06, 11:20 COSMO : It seems you didn't read

13/06, 11:22 COSMO : insha'Allah

13/06, 11:22 COSMO : Not like I wanted it to get judged but aight

13/06, 11:23 COSMO : Are you going to send the rest orrr? 13/06,

11:27 Tuff Puppy: i have

13/06, 11:27 Tuff Puppy: you don't ?

13/06, 11:27 Tuff Puppy: won't post the verdict anywhere

13/06, 11:27 Tuff Puppy: I'd just send it to you

13/06, 11:27 Tuff Puppy: but this thing funny me sha

13/06, 11:32 COSMO : It's cool I guess

13/06, 11:32 COSMO : You were still implementing that objective realist stuff with that

13/06, 11:34 Tuff Puppy: guy the "truth" will always exist with or without our truth, they'll always be an "objective verity".

13/06, 11:40 COSMO : It seems you didn't read

Luther Vs Wale

Luther : Negators possess the ability to nullify rules, either those governing their own actions or those that impose constraints on others

7/17, 4:31 PM Luther : These rules are deemed fundamental in nature. Negators have the ability to invert or negate these rules in their entirety, altering their fundamental essence

7/17, 4:31 PM Luther : Juiz, being a negator, can negate justice directed towards her. This ability inverts/alters the actions of one, as those actions are predicated on what is ostensibly just

7/17, 4:31 PM Luther : This is;

UNJUSTICE

7/17, 4:31 PM Luther : As shown, their view of justice has been altered, as such, their attacks directed towards her were inversed

7/17, 4:31 PM Luther : Billy has this ability.

He negates fairness UNFAIR . He is able to perfectly replicate his target's ability if he is viewed as a threat by them

7/17, 4:31 PM Luther : He was viewed as a threat by Juiz, as a result, ability to utilize

UNJUSTICE

7/17, 4:31 PM Luther : "One bound to protect" "One

bound to live and lead"

"One bound to fight powerful foes and become stronger".

These are what these three see as Just. In essence, your character, Bill is one bound to exist to defeat mine.

@FSJ, the very existence of Bill inherently satisfies the stipulated guidelines and assumptions delineated to us by vsbw, hence, is negated due to its adherence to the aforementioned guidelines. Simply put, the conception of your character in this simulated system (vs battle), is solely for the purpose of fulfilling these stipulated guidelines, this is your character's view of what is indeed JUST. That existence which is predicated on that system is thus invalidated along with your character's will to defeat me

7/17, 4:42 PM Wale: When did you get the right to impose morals on my character

7/17, 4:52 PM Luther : I didn't impose any morals on your character. I just made it evident. Of course, these "morals" are those which your character indisputably falls under by default

7/17, 4:54 PM Wale: What necessitates the default is what I'm asking

7/17, 4:57 PM Wale: One sentence go answer that question dawg

7/17, 5:00 PM Luther : In this simulated battle, that's the rationale behind your character's existence

7/17, 5:05 PM Wale: But like, it's to attain victory

7/17, 5:07 PM Wale: The most irreducible reason for victory is to leave the vsbattle

7/17, 5:09 PM Luther : Is that the path you choose to take ?

7/17, 5:11 PM Wale: Yeah, yeah it is

7/17, 6:05 PM Luther : Oh fuck

Sorry, I was waiting for you to reply since not knowing I already opened the group by mistake

7/17, 6:06 PM Luther : So you've withdrawn from the battle? Or...

I'm trying to understand

7/17, 7:58 PM Wale: You say I see you as a threat yada yada

I'm saying the simplest reason to strike your character down is so I can conclude the battle and go home, I don't necessarily have to see you as a threat

7/17, 11:30 PM Luther : No

That's not the case.

This ability doesn't need you to see my character as a threat. Your character is brought into existence for one purpose, striking his opponent down. Once that objective has been completed, the bill ideated solely for this simulated encounter ceases to exist until further notice. This is what your character views

as just. So, I'll repeat, Bill is one bound to exist to defeat me. That is his view of justice, and it is inversed. Bill ceases to exist to not defeat me. ♂

7/18, 4:43 AM Wale: Wasn't injustice someone else's ability?

7/18, 8:16 AM Luther : Oh

You didn't understand my scans, then

Injustice is Juiz's ability. However, with UNFAIR, Billy stole that ability when she viewed him as a threat. In essence, viewing him as a threat is only a prerequisite for UNFAIR, not UNJUSTICE

7/18, 8:17 AM Wale: But as at now, Unjustice doesn't exist for Billy to have stolen it

7/18, 8:19 AM Luther : He has the ability. I'm permitted to use the strongest version of my character, aren't I?

7/18, 8:20 AM Wale: We didn't stipulate keys, & it's a version derived from external influence, which are nonexistent in this

7/18, 8:22 AM Luther : He gained the ability. It's that simple. He has it. There is really no need for an event that had already taken place to repeat itself in this encounter, don't you think?

7/18, 9:15 AM Wale: Oh

He keeps the ability when he copies them?

7/18, 9:20 AM Luther : Yes

7/18, 9:23 AM Wale: Okay

Well, fairness, justice, judgement, vision, rule, all are meaningless before Cipher

7/18, 9:24 AM Wale: Ascribing ration or reason in the form of justice to his will to defeat you is erroneous

7/18, 9:24 AM Luther : How so?

7/18, 9:26 AM Wale: THIS PARTY NEVER STOPS. TIME IS DEAD AND MEANING HAS NO MEANING. EXISTENCE IS UPSIDE DOWN AND I REIGN SUPREME. WELCOME ONE AND ALL, TO WEIRDMAGEDDON!

Transcripted

7/18, 9:27 AM Luther : Okay? So?

How does this help?

7/18, 9:28 AM Wale: Everything pertaining to your character is meaningless

7/18, 9:30 AM Luther : How does meaning has no meaning highlight that? 7/18,

9:31 AM Luther : Thought provoking fr

7/18, 9:35 AM Wale: I Reign Supreme is what's most important

Anyways, meaning has no meaning shows Bill's imperviousness to reality

7/18, 9:38 AM Luther : Why should his supreme reign prove relevant to Billy? Why should his supreme reign extend outside his cosmology?

How does it show his imperviousness to reality? Please be more elaborate

7/18, 9:41 AM Wale: Because Billy is real, & for the same reason Unjustice extends beyond Billy's cosmology

Bill denies the verity of concepts & follows with an assertion of his superintendence, that's elaborate enough, of his unreliance & superiority to them

7/18, 9:47 AM Luther : For your first point, Billy being real doesn't prove anything. You can't liken this to my character's ability, Billy manipulates concepts that are ubiquitous. Supreme reign is the authority one has over a given domain, yes? Can you elaborate on how you think that domain extends past his cosmology?

7/18, 9:49 AM Luther : Okay. So, in essence, Bill claims he is above the aforementioned concepts? 7/18,

9:52 AM Wale: But Luther, if the concepts weren't real, we wouldn't be talking about them & like I said, his supremacy is applicable for the same reason Unjustice is applicable

7/18, 9:53 AM Wale: Not the aforementioned alone

7/18, 9:53 AM Wale: But they're all that's currently relevant

7/18, 9:57 AM Luther : I never said the concepts aren't real . I am saying Billy being real isn't justification for your assertion that Bill's "supreme reign" extends to Billy.

I have explained why the case of my character's ability extending past his cosmology differs from your case, which is the notion that your character's supreme reign extends to mine.

7/18, 9:57 AM Luther : So he transcends meaning?

7/18, 9:58 AM Wale: But if it doesn't extend to Billy then Billy isn't real

What's the justification for yours?

7/18, 9:58 AM Wale: Why're you asking, I've said all that needs saying

7/18, 10:31 AM Luther : You are postulating that the quintessential nature of my character is the rationale behind the extension and applicability of your character's supreme reign over mine? How can you draw such a conclusion from that one statement? My justification is solely based on the semantical implication of supreme reign and how it extends within a certain domain unless shown otherwise

7/18, 10:31 AM Luther : Just for further clarification

7/18, 10:34 AM Wale: The certain domain in this case includes reality

7/18, 10:35 AM Wale: Welp, everything has been said that needs saying

7/18, 10:38 AM Wale: I answered it na

7/18, 10:38 AM Luther : I missed Tag

biko

7/18, 10:44 AM Luther : Wouldn't that be inconsequential seeing how he is still confined within the vs battle's view of justice?

7/18, 10:45 AM Wale: What vs battle's view of justice

7/18, 10:45 AM Luther : Defeating their opponent 7/18,

10:46 AM Wale: That's more of an inaccessible meta

7/18, 10:47 AM Wale: Same way a character who allegedly transcends causality still follows the sequence of battle

7/18, 10:47 AM Wale: I don't see supporting evidence of your character's ability reaching that high

7/18, 10:47 AM Wale: Or any ability in fiction, really

7/18, 10:48 AM Luther : Inacceptable, huh?

7/18, 10:48 AM Luther : Then he doesn't 7/18,

10:48 AM Wale: ? He does

7/18, 10:48 AM Wale: The vsb rules are just created by real world humans, who are completely inaccessible to fictional characters

7/18, 10:49 AM Luther : My wincon, which you've silently conceded to based off that "inaccessible meta"

7/18, 10:49 AM Luther : I'm just playing na

7/18, 10:50 AM Wale: Where was the silent concession, + your need for a concession shows unreliability

7/18, 10:50 AM Wale: If it's true, then my concession or contention is irrelevant

7/18, 10:52 AM Luther : Your attempt to bypass this ability or to establish an immunity is implicative of the common ground that exists between us in regards to my win con

7/18, 10:53 AM Luther : Unreliability? My wincon is predicated on that "inaccessible meta". I just called out your concession to make it evident that we have agreed my character can indeed access that "inaccessible meta"

7/18, 10:56 AM Wale: Or because if I don't counter it, it's assumed true

7/18, 10:56 AM Luther : Huh?

7/18, 10:56 AM Wale: Regardless of verity

7/18, 10:57 AM Wale: If I don't counter, then what you say applies

7/18, 10:57 AM Luther : I don't get

7/18, 10:58 AM Luther : How does this address my point? Sorry

7/18, 10:58 AM Wale: Eh, I'm saying if it was veritably true, then you wouldn't need my concession as a meter

7/18, 10:59 AM Wale: You said my attempt to bypass the ability implies me acknowledging its truth
I'm saying, if I don't counter, then it would be assumed true by the judge, so my counter is to avoid that

7/18, 11:01 AM Luther : What necessitates the objective verity? That's not necessary. I just wanted it to be made known that we were on an agreement

7/18, 11:02 AM Luther : Oh

Providing resistance for your character would also lead the judge to assume the antecedent is true

7/18, 11:02 AM Wale: It's necessary because that's what's true

7/18, 11:04 AM Luther : It is what is true. But your attempt to resist without providing further counterarguments makes it true, too

7/18, 11:05 AM Luther : Wtf did I type

7/18, 11:05 AM Wale: Nawa, the resistance in this case explains your ability to be otherwise un-all-encompassing

7/18, 11:07 AM Wale: Like I said, my resistance serves to undermine the range of your ability, therefore acknowledging my disagreement with your supposed applicability

7/18, 11:08 AM Wale: But say we take the route; Unjustice extends to the inaccessible, then the reality of this vsb has taken shelter inside Cipher's domain

7/18, 11:09 AM Luther : Alright You're
done

7/18, 11:09 AM Wale: Ah

7/18, 11:09 AM Wale: How

7/18, 11:09 AM Luther : No

Like I was waiting for you to finish typing na

7/18, 11:10 AM Luther : So I can attack 7/18,

11:10 AM Wale: Oh

7/18, 11:18 AM Luther : Your resistance was less of an undermination and more of a disregard. My wincon was unequivocally predicated on the concept behind vs. battle's framework, the encompassing, and you procured and provided a resistance for the concept that is encompassed by this

system (vs Battle). You disregarded the basis for my premise and attempted to resist with something else. Your resistance not being up to a certain level doesn't prove an attempt to undermine the superiority of my ability

7/18, 11:19 AM Luther : Which route you wan take abeg

7/18, 11:21 AM Luther : If it was an attempt to undermine my position, it should have been brought up earlier, I believe

7/18, 11:21 AM Luther : I am forced to believe you disregarded that aspect of my wincon 7/18,
11:22 AM Wale: Not being up to a certain level?

7/18, 11:23 AM Wale: Didn't I mention his supremacy extends?

7/18, 11:25 AM Wale: Luther, if you're going to base your arguments on what is agreed & disagreed upon, then we can conclude the debate in the grounds I disagree Billy wins

Eri Vs Luther

Eri: Sir?

13/06, 09:19 +234 815 816 1252: Make we run wan debate

13/06, 09:19 +234 815 816 1252: I know say you dey rusty, so I wan take advantage before it's too late

13/06, 09:19 Eri: No thank you

13/06, 09:20 Eri: Imagine

13/06, 09:20 +234 815 816 1252: Yes na

13/06, 09:21 +234 815 816 1252: Why na?

13/06, 09:40 Eri: Tor no wam.

13/06, 09:44 Eri: Not really. Just occupied with chores. Nothing serious

13/06, 09:44 Eri: Make I drop wincon sha

13/06, 09:51 Eri: I'm using anno un

13/06, 09:51 Eri: Premise;

13/06, 09:53 Eri: Umas are rules/concepts thst govent reality. These rules are fundamental necessary and eliminating them remove the satio temporal instantiations in reality

13/06, 09:54 Eri: There are rules ,such as language, race, sex, sickness, and death which are universal laws. These rules are being mirrored in the physical world , such as sickness, various languages, showing these rules are conceptual (Type 1).

13/06, 09:57 Eri: A negator is an entity that negates any and all forms of the rules

13/06, 09:58 Eri: Do you have any refutations?

13/06, 10:08 +234 815 816 1252: I do have a problem here

13/06, 10:08 Eri: Kindly state them

13/06, 10:09 +234 815 816 1252: How are language, race, sex and sickness seen as universal laws?

13/06, 10:17 Eri: They are simply fundamental logical principles/truth/facts with which reality may function - vsbw

13/06, 10:18 +234 815 816 1252: Okay then

13/06, 10:18 +234 815 816 1252: State your win con

13/06, 10:24 Eri: My character, Anno Un is UNKNOWN Rule:

Known

Negator: Unknown I.e ~Known

13/06, 10:25 Eri: Anno Un, the negator of any and all things pertaining to know, a character as shrouded in mystery as the very essence he represents.

Intension of the term known.

- Recognised

- Within the scope of knowledge

The threshold of unknown begins outside the scope of human knowledge, which encompasses concepts, facts, etc.

13/06, 10:34 Eri: As He embodies the negation of knowledge, existing in a perpetual state of unknowability. Perception, quantification, and even human language, with its inherent verbosity, fails to describe who Anno Un is . Any attempt to capture his essence results in a cacophony of failed descriptions, a testament to the inadequacy of human comprehension.

Thereby establishing via negationis we can only describe him as what he is not.

13/06, 10:37 Eri: The author has ascribed to this notion as even his details are unknown

13/06, 10:37 Eri: So who do I direct this attack to(who is your character)

13/06, 10:42 +234 815 816 1252: Yhwach

13/06, 12:10 Eri: As anno Un(unknown) is ontologically a type 1 concept(completely independent from reality but shape it), he is aspatial and atemporal. This corresponds with the requirements for the tiering of attack potency that involves being on a level that trivializes all forms of time and the notion of spatiotemporal dimensions completely.

Anno Un simply punches Yhwach with his H1A punch

13/06, 12:20 +234 815 816 1252: Yhwach is unaffected

13/06, 12:21 Eri: Why

13/06, 12:22 +234 815 816 1252: Because he isn't affected

13/06, 12:23 +234 815 816 1252: Yhwach simply gets back up

13/06, 12:24 Eri: The reason for "Yhwach is unaffected" is because he isn't affected?

13/06, 12:24 Eri: Kindly elucidate on this action

13/06, 12:25 +234 815 816 1252: jus trolling

13/06, 12:25 +234 815 816 1252: There is no implication of your action in your win con

No death, incapacitation, BFR whatsoever

13/06, 12:26 +234 815 816 1252: You punch, yhwach recovers. Simply because he is immortal

13/06, 12:26 +234 815 816 1252: That's assuming your character can interact with him in the first place

13/06, 12:29 Eri: The implication would've been uncovered by the result of this dialectic. In a case where your character is unable to circumvent the effect of the attack, death would be implied

13/06, 12:30 Eri: Can he or can he not?.

Is your counterargument immortality or np

13/06, 12:33 +234 815 816 1252: I am not using NPI

He will be unable to interact with Yhwach because the future where such interaction never took place would become the present/reality

13/06, 12:34 +234 815 816 1252: Yhwach simply altered the future of their reality to one where your punch never landed.

Hence, the interaction is circumvented

13/06, 12:36 Eri: Why would this be the case. Kindly substantiate your characters ability to enable this

13/06, 12:52 +234 815 816 1252: He simply shifts from one possibility to the other. Analogically, there is a grain of sand for every distinct possibility. He is able to make any possibility reality as he so chooses

13/06, 12:52 +234 815 816 1252: He can see each and every one of the countless possibilities clearly.

13/06, 12:52 +234 815 816 1252: He merely transforms the future to seamlessly align with his will.

13/06, 12:52 +234 815 816 1252: He simply transformed the future, subsequently breaking Ichigo's Bankai as a result. He jumped from a possibility where Ichigo's Bankai was intact to one, which it wasn't, making that possibility reality ultimately transforming the future of said reality.

Observe as he did so instantaneously, before the particles of light or aura at the back could even move the slightest inch (appeared completely stationary).

13/06, 12:52 +234 815 816 1252: He did the same here but simply jumped from a possibility where he was dead to one where he wasn't and made that reality

13/06, 13:05 +234 815 816 1252: My win con is simple and conditional. By chance, you are able to bypass this. Any physical attack that lands on Yhwach invokes two designations; Designations "M" - "The Miracle"

Designations "B" - "The Balance".

Nonetheless, if your character proves unable to bypass "The Almighty", your character is poisoned to death or incapacitated by "The Death-Dealing"

Address the resistance I propounded. Subsequently, sufficient elaboration will be provided on these abilities

13/06, 13:07 Eri: He predicated his ability on being able to see all possible futures and picking the best "grain of salt" correct?

As explicitly stated;

> To change the future is to jump from one grain of salt to the other

Put simply, he has precognition

13/06, 13:07 +234 815 816 1252: He does

13/06, 13:07 +234 815 816 1252: Wan carry Acausality ke

13/06, 13:10 Eri: I already stated my character is atemporal.

This is total independence from the infinite amount of the dimensional construct

13/06, 13:10 Eri: Kindly substantiate these also

13/06, 13:11 +234 815 816 1252: When you surrounded this with all your yap and glazing, it's easy for me to disregard

13/06, 13:11 +234 815 816 1252: This will take a lot of scans

Be ready

13/06, 13:12 Eri: Nawa. You should see me glaze ronaldo

13/06, 13:12 +234 815 816 1252: Mid

MESSI>>>

13/06, 13:13 +234 815 816 1252: Well, my scan is implicative of Yhwach possessing the abilities of these Quincies known as Sternritters upon death

13/06, 13:18 Eri: You have proven. Yhwach can share a piece of his soul

13/06, 13:19 Eri: And sternritters offer their soul to yhwach upon death

13/06, 13:19 Eri: Does he also receive their powers?

13/06, 13:20 Eri: Correlate this with your wincon

13/06, 13:20 Eri: Possession of M and B

Physical attack nullification

13/06, 13:22 +234 815 816 1252: Chill first

Let's go step by step

13/06, 13:29 Eri: Intersting

13/06, 13:29 Eri: Oya next one

13/06, 13:32 Eri: These powers being returned. Did they belong to yhwach previously?

13/06, 13:32 Eri: Or he just gains the power of the dead person

13/06, 13:35 +234 815 816 1252: Why is that necessary?

13/06, 13:41 Eri: I just want to know if there is a prerequisite/condition for ability usage

13/06, 13:49 +234 815 816 1252: The user just has to be deceased

13/06, 13:49 +234 815 816 1252: As shown

13/06, 13:51 Eri: So I shouldn't take this literally?

13/06, 13:52 +234 815 816 1252: What specific statement?

13/06, 13:58 Eri: He could share soul with people.

They returned back upon death.

He discovered a way to be specific by engraving letters

These letters signify abilities.

If the only prerequisite is the death then I don't need to know what letters these people possess

13/06, 14:00 +234 815 816 1252: If you say so.

I just want you to understand Yhwach possesses every ability of the deceased Sternritters

13/06, 14:01 Eri: Prove this

13/06, 14:03 Eri: The pivot in this case is "every ability"

13/06, 14:03 Eri: Show me the scan that depicts this

13/06, 14:04 +234 815 816 1252: If the ability returns along with his soul, why wouldn't he be able to use it?

13/06, 14:07 +234 815 816 1252: If every Sternritters is dead, every Sternritters' abilities return. Hence, he can use every ability of the Sternritters that are dead. Modus Ponens

13/06, 14:10 Eri: The conclusion seems valid but not sound as the premises haven't been proven true.

P1: Every sternritter is dead(not proven)

P2: Every ability of the sternritter returns to yhwach(Not Proven)

13/06, 14:13 +234 815 816 1252: They will have their powers returned to Yhwach

That's simple.

13/06, 14:13 +234 815 816 1252: - I never said every Sternritter is dead

13/06, 14:13 +234 815 816 1252: I said he receives every ability of the Sternritters who are dead

13/06, 14:14 +234 815 816 1252: If you need evidence that the Sternritters that possess those designations are dead, tell me

13/06, 14:17 Eri: All their powers?

If not, then what power?.

The one given by yhwach which is signified by a letter?.

13/06, 14:18 Eri: I already did

13/06, 14:20 +234 815 816 1252: That is all their powers, na

Quincies are humans

The only powers they have aside are general abilities that all Quincies have

13/06, 14:20 +234 815 816 1252: Okay okay

13/06, 14:20 +234 815 816 1252: I dey come

Make I choo

13/06, 14:22 Eri: Prove this

13/06, 14:42 Eri: Remember, anno negates any and all things pertaining to knowledge as established.

As per the intentions, it includes;

- The knowledge of how to inflict damage
- The knowledge of how to resist an attack
- The knowledge of how to utilise active abilities

Do you see where I'm going with this?

13/06, 14:43 +234 815 816 1252: The abilities are passive sha

No knowledge is needed

13/06, 14:44 Eri: Prove this

13/06, 14:46 Eri: What is the limit of this ability

13/06, 14:46 Eri: What's the maximum attack potency he can circumvent

13/06, 14:48 +234 815 816 1252: The Balance is Active

13/06, 14:48 +234 815 816 1252: Inconsequential

13/06, 14:49 Eri: Why?

13/06, 14:49 +234 815 816 1252: Omo

Seems they are both active

13/06, 14:52 Eri: Well. GGs

13/06, 14:55 +234 815 816 1252: Go

Your character's sha

Eri VS TP

Eri: Negators are people who negate the rules called uma of the world. These rules are the concepts governing reality, and can be seen as universal laws

There are rules ,such as language, race, sex, sickness and death. These rules are being mirrored in the physical world ofc i.e have their spatiotemporal instantiations in physicality, such as actual race of people, sickness, various languages, showing these rules are conceptual (Type 1).

10/04, 16:55 Eri: These rules are fundamental necessary and eliminating them remove the satio temporal instantiations in reality

10/04, 16:56 Eri: Negators simply negates this rule on a conceptual level

10/04, 16:57 Eri: And Billy is one of said negators : UNFAIR

10/04, 17:12 +234 908 641 6707: how does this evidence suggest the ability is conceptual?

10/04, 17:12 +234 908 641 6707: let's just debate on this

10/04, 17:13 +234 908 641 6707: rdc about anything else

10/04, 17:15 Eri: That evidence describes the nature of "negators," i.e., negate rules. the conceptual aspect is depicted in the rest of the premise

10/04, 17:22 +234 908 641 6707: why would negating "rules" confirm its conceptual nature.?

your premise also lacks sufficient support

10/04, 17:29 Eri: The rules are concepts that govern reality, as I've explained. They negate said concepts

If there's anything you need me to expound on please let me know

10/04, 17:29 Eri: Rule : Fair

~Rule: Unfair

10/04, 17:30 +234 908 641 6707: prove his conceptual influence, as everything is merely a concept.

10/04, 17:30 +234 908 641 6707: I understand your write up

10/04, 17:30 +234 908 641 6707: there's just no conceptual influence there

10/04, 17:32 Eri: You don't contend that the rules are concepts but that the negators have an influence on said concept?

10/04, 17:33 +234 908 641 6707: Incase your not understanding what I'm saying
everything is a concept, so him affecting it doesn't prove he's conceptually affecting it.

10/04, 17:33 Eri: Him affecting what?

10/04, 17:33 +234 908 641 6707: the concept he's "negating"

10/04, 17:33 +234 908 641 6707: do you agree with me that water is a concept ?

10/04, 17:35 Eri: It it part of the narrative that negators negate rules

If the rules are concepts and not the instantiation of the concept. They do influence concepts

10/04, 17:35 Eri: Are we talking about the idea of water?

10/04, 17:35 Eri: Physical water is only and instantiation

10/04, 17:37 +234 908 641 6707: the issue isn't altering concepts.

they may negate rules, yet you argue this is done conceptually because rules are concepts.

merely interacting with a concept doesn't equate to conceptual influence.

so demonstrate their conceptual impact.

10/04, 17:37 +234 908 641 6707: I merely employed this example for clarity in my explanation.

10/04, 17:38 +234 908 641 6707: now you're strawmaning

10/04, 17:38 +234 908 641 6707: nobody talked about physical water

10/04, 17:39 +234 908 641 6707: is water a concept ?

10/04, 17:39 +234 908 641 6707: is air a concept ?

10/04, 17:39 +234 908 641 6707: is my bed a concept?

10/04, 17:39 +234 908 641 6707: is sleep a concept?

10/04, 17:40 Eri: it would help to be less ambiguous

10/04, 17:40 Eri: Explain how I'm strawmaning

10/04, 17:41 Eri: Interacting with an abstract concept does infact Equate to conceptual manipulation

10/04, 17:41 Eri: Mostly since its negation

10/04, 17:42 +234 908 641 6707: I didnt eference "physical" water; your introduction of it suggests your strawmaning

10/04, 17:42 +234 908 641 6707: *reference

10/04, 17:42 +234 908 641 6707: substantiate

10/04, 17:45 Eri: Rules = Concept

Negates rules= Negate concept

10/04, 17:45 +234 908 641 6707: .

10/04, 17:45 +234 908 641 6707: .

10/04, 17:45 +234 908 641 6707: .

10/04, 17:45 Eri: Seemed a bit ambiguous to me

10/04, 17:45 +234 908 641 6707: dk what that was meant to prove

10/04, 17:50 Eri: You said you understand the premise

10/04, 17:52 Eri: In the instance of UNDEAD

Rule : Death

Negator : ~Death

10/04, 17:53 +234 908 641 6707: .

10/04, 17:53 +234 908 641 6707: .

10/04, 17:53 +234 908 641 6707: .

10/04, 17:53 +234 908 641 6707: when are you going to go this ??

10/04, 17:55 +234 908 641 6707: okay

10/04, 17:55 +234 908 641 6707: I think you dey confused

10/04, 17:55 +234 908 641 6707: umm

10/04, 17:56 +234 908 641 6707: time, being an abstract concept now implies that those interacting with it consequently acquire conceptual manipulation?

10/04, 18:03 Eri: I have proved that they don't "merely interact with it," as you've stated.

You keep reiterating about interactions with the physical instantiations a concept.

My substantiations prove otherwise. UNDEAD didn't merely interact with dead but rather "negates any and all things that pertain to his death". Indicating that the conceptual influence that all of reality is bound by is negated ontologically.

10/04, 18:03 +234 908 641 6707: you haven't proven anything

10/04, 18:04 +234 908 641 6707: until you do this

10/04, 18:04 Eri: ?

10/04, 18:04 +234 908 641 6707: your character just has luck manipulation

10/04, 18:04 +234 908 641 6707: have you done that ?

10/04, 18:04 Eri: What character

10/04, 18:05 +234 908 641 6707: .

10/04, 18:05 +234 908 641 6707: isn't this who you're using ? 10/04,

18:05 Eri: Maybe expantiate on what you think I should prove 10/04,

18:05 Eri: So how did you come to that conclusion

10/04, 18:05 Eri: This is a positive

10/04, 18:07 +234 908 641 6707: what remains to be elaborated? demonstrate how interaction with abstract concepts yields conceptual manipulation.

10/04, 18:07 +234 908 641 6707: wasn't that your assertion ?

10/04, 18:07 +234 908 641 6707: "unfair" "fair"

10/04, 18:07 +234 908 641 6707: luck seemed like the best word for it 10/04,

18:09 Eri: What interactions have you observed so far in this discourse 10/04,

18:09 Eri: Meh

10/04, 18:09 +234 908 641 6707: wetin be all this

10/04, 18:09 +234 908 641 6707: your scan talks all about somebody negating ideas abi concepts

10/04, 18:10 +234 908 641 6707: that's interaction

10/04, 18:10 +234 908 641 6707: ehh if you can't prove that I think this is enough sha

10/04, 18:11 Eri: I mean: give an example of a noted interaction.

10/04, 18:11 +234 908 641 6707: you're saying he is negating a concept is it not ?

10/04, 18:13 Eri: Yes

10/04, 18:13 +234 908 641 6707: good

10/04, 18:13 +234 908 641 6707: isn't that interaction ?

10/04, 18:13 +234 908 641 6707: do you want to negate something you don't interact with ?

10/04, 18:13 +234 908 641 6707: abi idg

10/04, 18:13 +234 908 641 6707: isn't negating it interaction on it's own

10/04, 18:27 Eri: I didn't claim you they didn't interact with it .

The point of my question noted that interaction was a means to an end of determining how important said interaction is

To negate(logically): invert, denoted as \sim

negation, also called the logical not, is an operation that takes a proposition P to another proposition "not P." This is evident as the negators are named "un" indicating "not", before the concept.

10/04, 18:28 Eri: This argument stems from your downplaying of negation to mere interaction in not inversion

10/04, 18:28 Eri: Sorry I took long I'm kinds busy

10/04, 18:29 Eri: Manipulation of the concept from the truth state 1 to 0 throughout their area of influence as it pertains to the negator

10/04, 18:31 +234 908 641 6707: mehn

10/04, 18:31 +234 908 641 6707: see

10/04, 18:32 +234 908 641 6707: im not diminishing the negating issue; Im simply presenting the facts.

to negate is to deny the validity or existence of something, which inherently constitutes interaction. the issue of negation is irrelevant. It remains your obligation to demonstrate that interaction with or denial of an abstract concept indeed qualifies as conceptual manipulation.

10/04, 18:32 +234 908 641 6707: that's basically it

10/04, 18:33 +234 908 641 6707: whether it turns the concept/idea from 0 to 1 abi 1 to 0 in that instance is irrelevant

10/04, 18:33 Eri: This is an equivocation. That isn't the negate we are talking about

10/04, 18:34 +234 908 641 6707: any definition you want to bring remains irrelevant

10/04, 18:34 Eri: It was narratively said to

10/04, 18:34 +234 908 641 6707: unless you're saying he doesn't interact with the idea/concept

10/04, 18:34 +234 908 641 6707: what exactly was ?

10/04, 18:36 Eri: It was narratively stated that negators as the power system these characters ascribe to "negate the rules of the world"

10/04, 18:36 Eri: Either theirs or others

10/04, 18:36 +234 908 641 6707: nobody is disputing this

10/04, 18:36 Eri: Cool

10/04, 18:37 +234 908 641 6707: .

10/04, 18:37 +234 908 641 6707: it's becoming circular

10/04, 18:40 Eri: So the narrative isn't sufficient empirical evidence to draw a conclusion?

10/04, 18:42 +234 908 641 6707: your conclusion is not contentious; debate exists to discern its correctness

10/04, 18:42 +234 908 641 6707: I understand that

10/04, 18:42 +234 908 641 6707: he negates all things that pertain to his own death

10/04, 18:42 +234 908 641 6707: so?

10/04, 18:45 Eri: It's a power system ascribed to the verse.

I find the evidence is enough as it's been explicitly stated multiple times. There are different ways to portray an ability, it mustn't be shown as it's been stated

10/04, 18:47 +234 908 641 6707: bro your repetition is unproductive. my understanding is limited to your exposition, which fails to substantiate your initial claims

10/04, 19:19 Eri: My "evidence for" takes precedence in this sha. Your contentions are predicated on the opinion that the narratives introduction of the power system isn't sufficient evidence for some reason.

You've no oppositions other than ;

> 10/04, 18:32 +234 908 641 6707: im not diminishing the negating issue; Im simply presenting the facts.

> to negate is to deny the validity or existence of something, which inherently constitutes interaction. the issue of negation is irrelevant. It remains your obligation to demonstrate that interaction with or denial of an abstract concept indeed qualifies as conceptual manipulation.

10/04, 19:20 Eri: Omor, anyhow, you don get wetin you need ba. Because I don tire for this tangent

10/04, 19:30 +234 908 641 6707: yeah yeah

Benard Vs McKelly

5/26, 12:30 PM BENARD☺Ω: Alright First off, consider the Logicity. Before any sort of existence could arise, there had to be a condition of absolute darkness . This state is known as "Primordial Darkness", because it encapsulates the emptiness from which all creation originated. It is the canvas on which the universe was painted, the primordial womb from which all of existence emerged... That is what the "darkness" here is all about, and is entailing.

5/26, 12:31 PM BENARD☺Ω: It can also be understood to mean that the Primordial Darkness is the ultimate source and destination of everything(all things that comes to be). The NOTION precedes the dawn of creation and awaits at the conclusion/the end of existence/creation, symbolizing the Cosmos' cyclic nature. In most philosophical traditions, the idea of a " primordial void " or "abyss" reflects both the genesis and the ultimate destination of the cosmos, gaining idea of absolute eternity. It never fades nor seize. This primordial darkness is inherently The beginning and the End.

5/26, 12:33 PM BENARD☉ Ω: Death is inherently a facet of this Primordial Darkness; let us see death not only as THE END of life, but as a return to the initial state of non-being. Death, at its core, is a reunion with the Primordial Darkness, a collapse of individuality and All back into its cosmic origin. Death, from this perspective, is not just THE END in itself, but rather a transition, a return to the source of all life, creation, and existence. And thus returning to All-death, the one who embodies the totality of this "primordial darkness"(from my first scan). (This is not an argumentum on the brothers Death being a separate idea from the primordial darkness, but rather death being a small facet of All-Death, whose identity is The Primordial darkness.)

5/26, 12:35 PM BENARD☉ Ω: All things that was or is created created(creation) belongs to All-Death, because it is easily narrated that he is the creator of all things, the Noosphere being a part of that creation itself...he is logically the wielder of all platonic Concepts/ideas that exist within the Noosphere (Also being transcendent of the perfect form of death in itself, which is to reside within the Noosphere.) Because in the end, he would take back the things that was spawned from that Darkness Creation itself.

5/26, 12:39 PM BENARD☉ Ω: All death precedes said reality denoted as the Noosphere..a Platonic reality that all human influenced concepts are collected upon. The origin point of all Ideas which a manifested upon the material/physical reality.

This idea is to clear you on the notion, that Plato's theory suggests that there's an unflawed original version of all things and Concepts that already exists unconventionally, Transcendent of all existing things completely. This is to clarify that Death is a conventional phenomena, hence the Noosphere houses the idea of the Perfect form of death, which is Unconventional by origin... Perfect and not flawed, it is beyond the Conceptual idea of Death by far, since according to Plato's philosophy, the Plato reality Exists beyond the Concept of space and time, that's denoting full transcendence over Dimensionality itself.

And All-Death precedes this, being the omnigenesis and creator of all things, and all FORMS also being THE END OF ALL, Death is simply a facet of him.

5/26, 12:41 PM BENARD☉ Ω: So the Noosphere, according to my scans above you can see what the Anti-Noosphere is defined as. It's the set of all thoughts which humans are incapable of conceiving. so the converse definition to that would simply be "The Noosphere"; The set of all thoughts which humans are capable of conceiving. a human thought-space.

5/26, 12:41 PM BENARD☉ Ω: Now, this is a portion of the SCP site, that was made for the soul purpose of correcting any Questions Randoms had, in regard to the verse, i.e. the one who would Answer is known as "GOD" (Authors rep, basically) link to the site (<http://scp-vn.wikidot.com/news-06-2022>).

The scan shows a question about how it was possible for every idea ever prospected by man to exist in some way within the Noosphere, and how all physical existence are somehow copies of what exists within the intellectual reality(The Noosphere).

5/26, 12:41 PM BENARD☉ Ω: God/Authors, Go ahead to make clear that the physical world contains the shadow of all such existences within the "Plato's world of divine forms" (indicating the abilities of the Noosphere). As Plato suggests, forms are ideas that are Conceived by humans. and what has never_been/cannot_be 'perceived' is not a form, since it has no shadow or imperfect copy within the Physical/material reality that can be "perceived".

5/26, 12:44 PM BENARD☺ Ω: The Theory of Forms in regard to the Noosphere and the validity of it being the world of forms. Hope y'all know it is Plato's Idea that the material world is merely a shadow, imperfect duplicate, or depiction of the Real reality, which is composed of ideas or forms which are abstract, perfect, Unchanging notions. In Plato's POV, forms are the essential characteristics of the many attributes and entities we encounter in the material world.. Human thought processes and intellectual inquiry are the tools that allow people to conceive of these forms, and in the process bringing them into the material reality... The human soul, especially its thinking part, is intrinsically linked to the world of Forms since it has witnessed these Forms prior to taking on the shape of a physical body. As a result, even when abstract concepts like justice, beauty, and equality are not fully realised in our actual world, people can nevertheless understand and recognise Them, i.e. humans being able to conceive these.

So many yen yen, I'll be going off coz my battery is low, make I cope electricity real Quick.

5/26, 12:51 PM Marvel McKelly: So, All Death's at the level of the World of Forms due to an indeterminate degree he's above, right?

5/26, 12:53 PM BENARD☺ Ω: The Tree created from All death's breathe, Exists as a case or box or holder of the Three major Triosphere that form up creation basically.

Noosphere—> the intellectual sphere, (which is like the most relevant here.)

5/26, 1:24 PM BENARD☺ Ω: Indeed.

ALL-DEATH BEING THE personification of Primordial darkness, (which is inherently THE END) transcends the perfect form of Death which is simply a facet of "THE END".

Absolute Death.

5/26, 1:27 PM BENARD☺ Ω: Let me break it down like this.

Death exists as an inevitable concept within conventional realities.

i.e., death exists even within an Infinitesimal sized reality. And from that point it's noted that Death(an inevitable Concept) exists non-stop, within all spatialtemporal Reality that exists. But rather Unconventional from the point of transcending the 3rd dimensional spatial reality.

Death within Spatialtemporal exist<the Conceptual Form of Death within the Noosphere<<<<All Death=The End=Primordial darkness.

5/26, 1:51 PM Marvel McKelly: Noosphere=World of Forms is duly acknowledged.

However, the All Death as depicted does not transcend the Noosphere as postulated. Your rationale for this superiority, was All Death predating "creation" as the Primordial Death, and the Noosphere being part. Not only is this a Fallacy of Accident, as the term "creation" is undefined, thus a possible conflation

to encompass the "Noosphere"; it is contradictory to the fundamentals of the World of Forms. Plato's World of Forms is simply a refurbishment of Parmenidean Monism, wherewith he disputed any and all notions of change and transformations, especially one such as the change from NOTHING to SOMETHING. All Death preceding the Noosphere denotes an origin point for the World of Forms, from the previous state of nothingness/darkness to their state of something-ness.

5/26, 2:09 PM BENARD⊗Ω: > Noosphere=World of Forms is duly acknowledged.

Gg's.

> However, the All Death as depicted does not transcend the Noosphere as postulated. Your rationale for this superiority, was All Death predating "creation" as the Primordial Death, and the Noosphere being part. Not only is this a Fallacy of Accident, as the term "creation" is undefined, thus a possible conflation to encompass the "Noosphere"; it is contradictory to the fundamentals of the World of Forms.

This, The idea of what Exactly I explained to be creation is based on my first scans, as you saw there was "Nothing" absolute nothing, the idea of "Primordial darkness" this denotes the Notion that there was literally the complete lack in an existence, before Primordial darkness itself came projected it's Existence(which is yet Primordial darkness) into itself—> All-Death .. from my scans here{the third scans}..(<https://files.fm/f/b2x8qh6qus>) sorry for the scan link, but it's my third scan describing All- death the scan narrates, the First Creation being Thr tree of knowledge, This Tree being the Existence that house all forms of creation, Noosphere no different being part of said creation, since it's existence iz Based on influencing the properties of supposed flawed Existence..i.e. The Noosphere is an original creation, while every Existing influenced beneaths are Flawed copies of the original Creation.

- I do hope your fallacy pin is Subdued.

> Plato's World of Forms is simply a refurbishment of Parmenidean Monism, wherewith he disputed any and all notions of change and transformations, especially one such as the change from NOTHING to SOMETHING. All Death preceding the Noosphere denotes an origin point for the World of Forms, from the previous state of nothingness/darkness to their state of something-ness.

- Indeed, but Plato -suggested- that Idea due to the existence of time, I can denote that, within my argumentative push for the Noosphere<<All-Death, the Noosphere did indeed Have a dawn in accordance to primordial darkness Absolute Eternal Existence, having no start and No end. All-death's Encompassment should be known as Absolute transcendence, over what's Denoted to Be "Inaccessible" No existence of the idea of Time, nor space, so Logically no beginning and no expiry AKA end. It can be established that Such idea on "Not having a begining would only align" with the existence of What's known as 'Time'. So an origin PT from what's Denoted a an absolute Existence is valid.

- The idea of it not having a Dawn, is strictly based on the perception of beings within the Lower beneath realities, of course they would not know, because they are simply flawed copies of what's Been There.

5/26, 2:42 PM Marvel McKelly: - Well, the fallacy remains rather vibrant. You're presupposing Tree of Knowledge being the "first creation" overarches the Noosphere's existence, without correlating evidence, but still making that generalization. The Noosphere being the World of Forms is purely notional, changeless, thus no such causal relationship as "nothing" to "something" can exist, and being a monistic concept CANNOT be CONTAINED, as presupposed by being a part of the Tree of Knowledge.

- The World of Forms is aspatial & atemporal, as stated by Plato. Stating Noosphere does have a beginning is asserting they are subject to change, which contradicts their fundamentals as changeless ideas. Also, All Death being aspatial or atemporal is not a guarantor for it preceding the WoF. In fact, the "time" & "space" it's independent of would simply be their phenomena, a lower iteration of their Platonic Forms.

- Elaborate. To what is this referencing?

5/26, 3:13 PM BENARD☺ Ω: My scan above is the cosmological map of the SCP mythos.

> Well, the fallacy remains rather vibrant. You're presupposing Tree of Knowledge being the "first creation" overarches the Noosphere's existence, without correlating evidence, but still making that generalization. The Noosphere being the World of Forms is purely notional, changeless, thus no such causal relationship as "nothing" to "something" can exist, and being a monistic concept CANNOT be CONTAINED, as presupposed by being a part of the Tree of Knowledge.

Ahan...

Indeed, the WOF is essentially conceptual and unchanging. In my previous scan, I explained that plato forms are forms with inherently Falwed ideas that are conceivable inside the imperfect world... If an inconceivable thought exists inside said broken reality, it cannot be a Form. The concept of an unconventional beginning is not related to traditional conventional "beginnings", as you indicated, 'atemporal and aspatial'. Only temporal effect would decide a conventional concept of a beginning to something, which is not contradictory because human perception determines forms. I will restate my first Clearance.....What is not Conceived by humans perception is not a platonic form, because all that exist are Flawed copies of an original existence within said Aspatial-Atemporal reality. Thus, indeed it has a creation, but not the conventional type definitive that's dependent on Temporal Effect but rather an unconventional type one, beyond. What is not perceived by humans is not a platonic form, because everything that exists is a flawed copy of an original existence inside the Aspatial-Atemporal reality. Thus, it does have a creation, but not the traditional kind that is dependent on Temporal Effect, but rather an unusual type that goes beyond. Now, The Noosphere cannot exist without it's Forms being conceivable I stated above, so the idea on "primordial Darkness not being Transcendent of The Noosphere is false" because as I stated, Primordial darkness is an absolute Nothingness, that pushes the idea that "there was completely No existence" the WOF is infact embued into what's denoted as Existence due to it's Notions being Conceivable, since by stands, The WOF is the set of Human conceivable ideas.

> The World of Forms is aspatial atemporal, as stated by Plato. Stating Noosphere does have a beginning is asserting they are subject to change, which contradicts their fundamentals as changeless ideas. Also, All Death being aspatial or atemporal is not a guarantor for it preceding the WoF. In fact, the "time" & "space" it's independent of would simply be their phenomena, a lower iteration of their Platonic Forms.

No, they do not change via perception. What cannot be perceived in a faulty condition is not an existent Form, but something else. The common understanding of the beginning is subject to the presence of "time". According to perception and idealistic definition, the Noosphere and Primordial darkness are not reliant on one another. It has been and will always be there; but, there is no documented date/time in which it was postulated, therefore it is not of such agreement. It just came to light, but also did not come to light, and is both not the light and the light. A condition of supporting truths.

> Elaborate. To what is this referencing?

I mean, the notion of unchanging and everlasting is merely predicated on the definition of conventionality. Not unconventionality. What is typical is normal, whereas what is not normal is abnormal. Only water can have sex with water, and only non-existence can perceive nonexistence. Conventional and unconventional meanings are very different.

5/26, 3:22 PM Marvel McKelly: Now I'm gonna be really stubborn

5/26, 3:22 PM BENARD☹ Ω: Kai this boy .

5/26, 3:39 PM Marvel McKelly: - Eh. Prove the cosmological map of the SCP mythos is thematically hierarchical ALL-ROUND.

- Plato's Forms are perfect, subsist apart from notions of flawness. The very concept of changelessness is "unconventional", as it's a deviation from the constant changing nature of the physical world. Plato posited WoF to be completely vacuous of the concept of change, which overarches all it's intensions and extensions such as a "beginning" of whatever notion. Also, Platonic Forms aren't subject to humans conceptualizing/perceiving them.

- Never stated/implied WoF is subject to perception. The Primordial Darkness aspatial+atemporal nature would be "flawed" iterations of the WoF, if you admit it to be home to ALL notionality.

- Refer to point 2.

5/26, 4:16 PM BENARD☹ Ω: > Eh. Prove the cosmological map of the SCP mythos is thematically hierarchical ALL-ROUND.

Eh, my map indicates such; it proposes supremacy based on named realities, and as you can see, it is aligned based on line differences and such. My explanation of the relationship between 'Existence' and 'the Tree' was standardized by the definition I proposed of primordial darkness. In other words, the Noosphere is simply a presence within the pinnacle of acknowledged existence (The Tree). As you can see, it highlights the presence of the proxy verse, which is literally the site where we read from. That's enough.

If you believe my scan is fraudulent, you must prove it and invalidate its authenticity..

> Plato's Forms are perfect, subsist apart from notions of flawness. The very concept of changelessness is "unconventional", as it's a deviation from the constant changing nature of the physical world. Plato posited WoF to be completely vacuous of the concept of change, which overarches all it's intensions and extensions such as a "beginning" of whatever notion. Also, Platonic Forms aren't subject to humans conceptualizing/perceiving them.

The concept of changelessness, like 'the beginning', is unconventional, it having An unconventional statehood, doesn't posit that it is is changing state, i can posit that unyil whatever exists within it exists then manipulating said existence is impossible. Bingo, it's merely static, dependent on what exists in the Flawed reality; for example, while the perfect idea of a Cup exists in the Platonic reality, the flawed reality has numerous copies of that cup and changes with time. This means that what is stationary there remains untouched by changes in lower realities . It is meaningless if the concept of change is not the Transcendental idea of Its repeating. This includes the definitions of its existence from the start . Its escape is posited as an inaccessibility, and I posit a transcendence of said reality as a 'ABSOLUTE TRANSCENDENCE' the

Alh Vs Pana Verdict

THE STRONGEST DEBATER OF TODAY VS THE STRONGEST DEBATER OF TODAY

Topic: Abstract Physicality

Stands:

@FSI Panache_xFSI The Strongest Debater Of Today : Existential

@FSI AlhamdullilahFSI The Strongest Debater Of Today : Non-Existential

Venue: @FSI The Magic Arena (Where The Magic Happens)FSI

Adjudicator: The Most High God

Time: Tuesday, 5 March 2024 - Tuesday, 12 March 2024

Victor: THE STRONGEST DEBATER OF TODAY!!!

> The greatest battle in debating history started off with THE STRONGEST DEBATER OF TODAY issuing Physicality attributed to Concepts, and how they exist in Solid or Concrete forms as matter exists physically and concretely to us.

> THE STRONGEST DEBATER OF TODAY speedily refutes this, arguing in an intertwined objective philosophy, on the subjectiveness of this Concreteness. Sharply breaking the grounds the initiated argumentation is built on. Shoving in Reductionism, Schrödingerism, Infallibilism, Foundationalism, Idealism, Propounded logicalities, Cognitology and sufficiently more. Creation a bedrock from an amalgamation of Ontologies, cardinally placing its father: Metaphysics to surf through epistemological waves.

> THE STRONGEST DEBATER OF TODAY equally addresses this, starting with a God-complex, placing in several philosophies such as Acceleratism, Coherentism, \exists -Monism, Assertive Cognitology, Platonism, Realism, Naïve Realisms, Reversed Infinitism, and more, founding them metaphysically, logically and epistemologically, creating a net of elucidated conceptions as relatums for espousements of that which cannot be perceived.

> The Conceptual Clash raged on for days, burning down the very fabric of knowledge and reality, tearing down the separational walls keeping percepts apart. Both participants offer insightful perspectives on the existential status of Abstract Physicality, each emphasizing different aspects of perception, doubt, and coherence. Ultimately, the winner may depend on the criteria used to evaluate the arguments, as both Alhamdullilah and Panache contribute valuable insights to the discourse. Until... God intervened.

> God, after reading through (or bring aware, since His omniscience), passed His verdict on the debate. And thus, THE STRONGEST DEBATER OF TODAY emerged the singular Victor.

Panache Vs TP and Benard

26/05, 08:00 Not That Guy: sorry baby but allat won't work.

you asserting that "satoru" resides within a "unique reality" that purportedly elevates him above all other fictions is fallacious. the notion of a "unique reality" doesn't intrinsically confer any form of superiority over other realms. each fictional universe is governed by its own distinctive set of principles and internal coherence. so your comparison is inherently subjective. so trying to confer it's objectivity is a misstep.

okay i see you Jeffery, invocation of spatiotemporal planes is misplaced, as it doesnt denote any intrinsic superiority. it's common knowledge that these are narrative mechanisms employed to shape the settings & dynamics within stories. the manipulation of spatial & temporal dimensions is literally common & doesnt substantiate any claim of one universe being superior to another.

explain this hylomorphism more, i don't really know much about allat & why we would take this bc with the limited information i possess, this seems highly subjective.

also the structures that underpin realism within any & these fictional constructs arent objectively recognized, be it within the domain of philosophy or any other thing. the rules & frameworks of a fictional universe are sculpted by its creators & don't inherently establish any hierarchical preeminence over other universes.

your hierarchical stratification of fictions lacks a basis in objectivity & is heavily rooted in subjective interpretation. each universe exists within its own isolated framework, & attempts to compare their worth or superiority are inherently laden with personal biases rather than grounded in any form of objective/universal truth

26/05, 08:06 Panache_x: Okay, the first paragraph doesn't address the mechanics to the point; made irrelevant

The setting and background is indeed the Spatiotemporality and more. Manipulation of Spatiotemporalities isn't the mechanics. Are you lost?

I'm suggesting the latter is a product of the other to become superior upon the given grounds

Indeed, the author craft it. The author crafted Jujutsu Kaisen to be so. I don't think you really understood the point

That's fine, I didn't compare or link them independently, Gege Akutami did. That bolded part ain't an objective rule, by the way

26/05, 08:06 Panache_x: I told you to request explanation if you nor understand o

26/05, 08:16 Not That Guy: fine boy it does, your claim is subjective

I think you got me wrong. i'm saying that the purported superiority among various universes is inherently a subjective appraisal & isn't adjudicated by the intricacy or distinctiveness of their respective spatiotemporal configurations.

each universe operates autonomously under its unique set of governing principles; for this reason, deriving inspiration from another doesnt concomitantly denote supremacy.

prove he did. prove that he indeed meticulously engineered jjk to surpass other works.

exactly, comparison between fictions are subjective. so we've agreed on that

26/05, 08:19 Not That Guy: prove the objectivity of these principles & allat so we can move on

26/05, 08:38 Panache_x: First part fails to attend to necessity again

It's subjective to themselves, we work on that subjectivity made objective by the author

They do, initially, the concepts are built on it. The flow of existence itself, preceding ideologies births the others, and in this case, transcendental ones under certain considerations

It's based on interpretation with logic fused into it. That's what "tiering" is all about. Effectively proven upon that. Your refutation is dependent on the logic dismantling. So you'd have to dismantle it first

Reference the 4th point on the Subjectivity issue

26/05, 08:39 Panache_x: I think i get your point tho

Isolation

I'll create better arguments for it as time goes on

26/05, 11:12 Not That Guy: which necessity?

it looks like we're not moving, I'll try to construct my argument to your understanding while refuting yours(I'm not saying you don't understand)

the comparison of fictions is inherently subjective. in the absence of a universal framework, assertions of "superiority" are predicated on personal bias rather than objective fact. would you agree?, you should bc an author's design pertaining to power levels & mechanics is circumscribed within the boundaries of their own universe. to proclaim superiority over another fiction necessitates transcending internal consistency and establishing a universal standard—a criterion conspicuously absent in fiction.

no the manipulation of spatiotemporal elements is merely a narrative device rather than an indicator of "supremacy". loads of fictions, deftly employ intricate space-time mechanics; yet, these do not lay claim to any form of objective preeminence.

sorry but your argument here is entrenched in abstract philosophical paradigms that are ill-suited for the evaluation of "power scaling". allat constructs from metaphysical are purely speculative & arent calibrated to measure the potency of fiction niggas

no "tiering" are inherently subjective, hinging on fan interpretations & consensual agreement rather than any objective veracity. whereas the internal logic of a universe can facilitate the determination of a character hierarchy, crossverse "tiering" remains conjectural. the coherence of a tiering system is contingent upon the consensus from which it derives, varying significantly across fan sites, comms(vsb, csab) etc.

each fiction maintains its own internal consistency.

within their respective contexts, such comparisons are aiit but asserting supremacy across disparate contexts is just not it.

26/05, 11:37 Panache_x: Mechanism necessity

Interpreting someone's work is fundamentally subjective, imposition of refined logics is just done. It's not a new thing. The logic to scale is left untouched

Nobody manipulated Spatiotemporalities. I don't even know what you're arguing. You're arguing with isolation, not attacking my logic

They aren't, it's pure logic to be addressed. I'm not philosophical about my argument

They are subjective except outrightly stated by the author

Nobody stops them from having their internal consistency, Jujutsu Kaisen has referenced an element and with logic, above the element. The reason for the connection is what the whole initial explanation is for

26/05, 12:41 Not That Guy: let's focus on this topics rn, kinda getting confused . sorry if it still looks long

what exactly is your contention again this? the author intent can make subjective elements objective within the story context but the scope of it doesn't extend beyond the parameters of his own universe.

& this? okay gege wants to create a powerful & transcendent character within the confines of their narrative, but that endeavor doesn't equate to an objective hierarchy applicable across all fictions, I've said this before. the comparison remains inherently subjective due to the absence of a universal standard or metric by which to gauge and compare the ontological frameworks or power dynamics that operate within disparate fictions.

26/05, 12:47 Panache_x: There is no objective Hierarchy anywhere, in and out. He's used an element to denote the state of his own reality, accurately passing the message of where and what level he wishes his reality be

You're just the one ignoring that message and choosing to create some sort of "objective" hierarchy that exists nowhere but in presented and confined logical discussions as these

26/05, 12:50 Not That Guy: prove allat

26/05, 12:50 Panache_x: It's effectively proven there

26/05, 12:50 Panache_x: You'll like, have to be detailed

26/05, 12:52 Not That Guy: okay first point, you're saying that gojos existence is not confined to the canvas; he is the space that holds the potential for all canvases. the canvas being the universe, yeah ?

26/05, 12:53 Panache_x: Not necessarily

26/05, 12:53 Panache_x: Issue your arguments

26/05, 12:53 Not That Guy: I'm asking so I'll get wym

26/05, 12:53 Not That Guy: need to know what I'm arguing against

26/05, 12:54 Panache_x: He's at the top of all there is

26/05, 12:54 Panache_x: If that includes possibility, it includes possibility

26/05, 12:55 Not That Guy: sha second point; you're saying that there's sth that connects different or level of existence? this being your whole kant philosophy?

26/05, 12:55 Not That Guy: noted

26/05, 12:56 Panache_x: I mean, I'm willing to downscale to place him maybe at y'all's level of existence

26/05, 12:56 Not That Guy: no no

26/05, 13:00 Panache_x: I'm saying preceding ideologies are bedrocks to create transcendental ones

26/05, 13:01 Panache_x: I'm not being philosophical with my arguments, don't go that far. Just the underlining logics about them

26/05, 13:02 Not That Guy: third point; you're saying that Gojo transcends conventional dimensions of spatiotemporalities?

26/05, 13:02 Not That Guy: okay

26/05, 13:03 Not That Guy: wanted to argue on the philosophy initially

26/05, 13:08 Panache_x: Transcend is like an odd word there

He's like a - Universal - Constant

26/05, 13:08 Panache_x: I'm really being nice answering your questions

26/05, 13:08 Not That Guy: you have to be nice

26/05, 13:09 Not That Guy: like what I proposed here right ?

26/05, 13:10 Panache_x: He's not the holder

26/05, 13:10 Panache_x: Neither is the space

26/05, 13:10 Panache_x: He's the projected

26/05, 13:11 Panache_x: You'll Unnecessarily complicate it with this methodology of simplicity

26/05, 13:12 Not That Guy: last point; I see you used the term "morphe" & "hyle". tell me if I'm understanding, 'morphe' refers to the form or structure that satoru embodies, while 'hyle' represents the material or substance of the previous existences or realities. in hylomorphistic view, which combines form and matter, satoru's form (morphe) is shaped by the substance (hyle) of prior realities, right?.

26/05, 13:15 Panache_x: Should be applicable to an extent

26/05, 13:15 Not That Guy: noted

26/05, 13:20 Not That Guy: can you substantiate satoru 'place' in the hierarchy

26/05, 13:20 Not That Guy: him being above it & allat

26/05, 13:21 Panache_x: It's proven in the origin text

26/05, 13:21 Not That Guy: ahh

26/05, 13:21 Panache_x: You asking that is the exact same thing you asked previously

26/05, 13:21 Panache_x: He's the end point of it

26/05, 13:22 Not That Guy: im not seeing the proof, maybe I just no understand.

26/05, 13:22 Panache_x: Well, the proof is there

26/05, 13:22 Not That Guy: all these dependency-coherentist argument

26/05, 13:22 Panache_x: That's what the whole explanation is for 26/05,

13:23 Panache_x: Except you break it down and ask

26/05, 13:23 Not That Guy: that's what I tired to do na

26/05, 13:23 Not That Guy: I was breaking it down & asking

26/05, 13:23 Panache_x: For example, "hey, where was this referenced in Jay Jay Kay"

26/05, 13:23 Not That Guy: you said I was being too simple

26/05, 13:23 Panache_x: Nah, that's different

26/05, 13:23 Panache_x: Nawa

26/05, 13:23 Panache_x: Sorry

26/05, 13:23 Not That Guy: hey where was this referenced in jjk

26/05, 13:24 Panache_x: Abeg

26/05, 13:24 Panache_x: Was when Gojo was to teach his student

26/05, 13:24 Not That Guy: please prove that

26/05, 13:24 Panache_x: Referenced the verses on which the argument is built

26/05, 13:24 Panache_x: In what manner exactly

26/05, 13:25 Panache_x: Yuji Itadori, that is

26/05, 13:25 Not That Guy: in the referencing manner.

26/05, 13:25 Panache_x: Would you seriously think I'm lying about that?

26/05, 13:25 Not That Guy: no of course not

26/05, 13:25 Panache_x: I nor dey do all these scans thingy

26/05, 13:25 Panache_x: Abeg

26/05, 13:25 Panache_x: I'm aware you know the scene

26/05, 13:25 Panache_x: Nor stress your papa

26/05, 13:25 Not That Guy:

26/05, 14:06 +234 814 443 9990: > Your idea of A Unique Reality and Realistic Structures

- You propose that Satoru Gojo resides in a distinct world that elevates him above all others owing to "realismistic structures." but this need better clarification. What exactly are these "realismistic structures", and how do they naturally elevate Gojo beyond other characters from various universes like as Dragon Ball or Naruto?

> Your definitions to Spatiotemporal Planes and Highe existent Structures

- You again propose that existence that are Dragon Ball and Naruto use spatiotemporal notions along the X--Y axis, implying a need for higher structures. But, the interpretation of spatiotemporal dimensions sometimes in these fictional works is not consistent with greater existential realism. Different universes follow different rules and internal logic, making direct comparison very very hard. And there's also the idea that we don't really know if these existence truly have said X--Y transcendental axis within them. Ish.

> The two different philosophical Transcendental State you proposed.

- you proposed the notion of Aristotelian hylomorphism (matter and Concept) and Kantian transcendental states are completely difficult within the discussion bro, wtf . Hylomorph notion applies to physical entities, and Kant's transcendental idealism follows the conditions for the possibility of experience. Applying these philosophical concepts to our fictional characters' power levels is highly subjective sha and not posited as a universally accepted idea .

> Gojo's Existence and Potentialities, being a factor to his >

- You proposed again that the existence or prospective existence of higher realism in other verses would grant Satoru Gojo to be transcendent. This posits a hierarchical structure of fictional worlds, with higher potentiality or realism automatically implying superiority. This is a problematic assumption because other fictional power levels and type shii are not standardised, with the exception of the Vsbw standards, which do not correspond with this theory.

- you also went ahead declaring Satoru Gojo as "Boundless Tier 0", so I believe that should rely a on specific tiering system used, like I said in my above Definition...if it is in relation to Vsbw, idea. Then it doesn't follow^{[FSI][FSI]}.

Power Scaling is Fiction-Specific

- Power scaling accorss fictional universes is inherently subjective. Each universe follows its own rules and logic. For example, Satoru Gojo's powers in Jujutsu Kaisen are not directly equivalent to those in Dragon Ball or Naruto, which each have their own set of laws and power systems that they abide by.

Consistency In Comparibg two versss

- Fictional works are usually played in the context of their own story. Satoru Gojo's "Limitless" and "Infinity" Hax make him very powerful in the Jujutsu Kaisen reality, but they don't always translate to superiority in other universes coz of the completely different Existence, narrative and power structures, this is why it's Subject to feat placement within fivtional work.

Your Subjective Tiering system is not Definitive

- The "Boundless Tier 0" classification is definitely part of a subjective power scaling tiering systems and lacks a universal standard. But mostly, the classifications are based on interpretations and debates, i.e; proposing no evidence makes it not really fair or relevant, as it is Subjective to You.

Transcendental States

- Applying those two philosophical notions (Kantian transcendental states andhylomorphism) to subjective fictional power levels is nice but ultimately speculative activity... These philosophical theories are not intended to quantify fictitious power levels, so yeah, they do not provide empirical evidence of Gojo's superiority, over all that fictional reality.

.

Your argument is creative constructed, I've never seen it in my life... But it is based on speculative interpretations and assumptions that are not universally accepted in the evaluation of fictional characters's power scaling. So without a standard system in which we are all to follow, it'll be just that.

26/05, 14:16 Panache_x: Nawa

26/05, 14:16 Panache_x: How did you even type that much from just that

26/05, 14:16 Panache_x: I'll shorten my reply anyways

26/05, 14:16 Panache_x: Make I see how you wan extend am again

26/05, 14:16 Panache_x: Rubbish nonsense

26/05, 14:17 Panache_x: Na later I go read am o

26/05, 14:39 Not That Guy: abeg

26/05, 14:56 Panache_x: - Reality-based structures. Basically any thing "Reality" as related to those verses. How they elevate Satoru is the cause of the whole explanation. Except you want me to copy and paste it, it's been explained there

- it's unnecessary, so long there's a concept of Space and Time, my presentation stands (they indeed have higher structures in their verses, anyways). There is relevant consistency, I don't really see the point making there honestly

- I'm not applying a philosophy, please don't make that mistake. I'm applying logic. The logic in those Philosophy helps explain the relationship between predecessors and successors

- That's not the case. The lack of standardisation is the point. There is always a possibility of them going higher, and as such, Satoru Gojo is above all possibilities. There's no vsb standard applied there

- It's not, the 'Boundless Tier 0' is only to make it somewhat simplistic to understand, not operating under their standard

- It's fine, they follow their own rules, Jujutsu Kaisen built its upon another. It's not an equivalency situation, it's successorship

- Same point above

- Again, it's a term to help people understand. It is unnecessary if not that. Treat the write-up without it. Not necessary to the argument

- Fiction is Reality on the opposite side of the World. Anyways, we're addressing Fiction as Realisms currently, Philosophy do apply to them. However, I'd preach to you again that I'm not making a Philosophical argument

Indeed, your refutations are similarly sophisticated, but then again, there's a But. I assumed not, by the way

26/05, 15:16 +234 814 443 9990: > Reality-based structures. Basically any thing "Reality" as related to those verses. How they elevate Satoru is the cause of the whole explanation. Except you want me to copy and paste it, it's been explained there

Okay, Reality is a universal idea, even our "reality" ..{Guess that's it}.. but reality cannot be generalized as a totality in this due to Subjectivity in each in each fictional reality verses... I.e., the reality within Naruto is completely different, and so is that within Dragon ball, and so is the reality Gojo satoru was originally based upon, which he strictly is subjective to.

> it's unnecessary, so long there's a concept of Space and Time, my presentation stands (they indeed have higher structures in their verses, anyways). There is relevant consistency, I don't really see the point making there honestly

I don't think there is that bro . Nawa Panache, they have attempted such but in case of Dimensionality what's has been shown is dimensionality in scattered horizontal existence but not vertical Y axis type

shi.. i.e; they lack the ability in conveying $R > f$, to solidify a fully transcendental spatial temporal existence within their said reality.

> I'm not applying a philosophy, please don't make that mistake. I'm applying logic. The logic in those Philosophy helps explain the relationship between predecessors and successors

Ohh, I see ... But that Logic, isn't the application of that logic simply subjective to your system of power Scale, since said logicity is not universally accepted upon

> That's not the case. The lack of standardisation is the point. There is always a possibility of them going higher, and as such, Satoru Gojo is above all possibilities. There's no vsb standard applied there

"Possibilities" so I believe we're Positing this on the idea of Head canonicity, because as long as it is not depicted as such, I don't think we can place a solid standings for Gojo, if his existence is Subjective to Your standards alone, since this is a Vsb, the battle should be working on a standard that you and your Co rival, are hand in hand with.

> It's not, the 'Boundless Tier 0' is only to make it somewhat simplistic to understand, not operating under their standard

So, it's another idea Postulated from your Personal placement for said Character . So where do we place our characters in an act to scale them in relations to yours(I mean assuming we were to attempt that)?

> It's fine, they follow their own rules, Jujutsu Kaisen built its upon another. It's not an equivalency situation, it's successorship

Jesus Christ bro. so you're saying it's built upon the structure of said Referential realities? Omo

> Again, it's a term to help people understand. It is unnecessary if not that. Treat the write-up without it. Not necessary to the argument

I believe this is in relation to the philosophy thing?

> Fiction is Reality on the opposite side of the World. Anyways, we're addressing Fiction as Realisms currently, Philosophy do apply to them. However, I'd preach to you again that I'm not making a Philosophical argument

Okay, I can agree that philosophy applies to them, but what I'm saying is it's not something universally accepted to be placed upon in an argument were individuals follow an objective setting for Argument and power scaling.

Omo, I think I'm tired, not actually debate Stamina wise, but mehn my brain is exerted to the point it can't take no more.

26/05, 15:23 Panache_x: Why is it this long again na

26/05, 16:09 Panache_x: - What are you even saying. Reality is reality. It's simply existence. That's all to it. Jujutsu Kaisen is based off that. There's subjective existence. Subjective existence means it doesn't exist in anywhere but your mind

- They do. Space and Time itself is a higher dimensional structure. The "4-D" they claim to be is. There no necessity for any higher. I told you it's not relevant to the argument, Possibility is. I don't wanna explain lengthily, but you aren't understanding. Via Necessity and to not go against Logic, Jujutsu Kaisen must be at a point Superior to all possibilities of their Existential level

- It's not Subjective, that's what is currently being discussed. It's only subjective to the argument, although you'd say it's subjective to me, we're currently on the argument

- No, it's not a "Head canon" issue, it's a Necessity issue. So long as the possibility of an Item reaching 5 exists, the object that has been illustrated to be above the Item MUST and NECESSARILY be above 5 and all possibilities that the Item can reach

- He's above all possible existential level. "Always a step ahead" will be a suitable description

- It is built upon what it referenced. The author is trying to pass a message of the Level of his Realism; above what he based it on

- It's not. The Boundless talk is to help people understand he sits at the very end of all existence level. Just that, it's not deep

- Indeed, Philosophy isn't my argument, I only took concepts that coveys my logic

26/05, 17:19 +234 814 443 9990: > - What are you even saying. Reality is reality. It's simply existence. That's all to it. Jujutsu Kaisen is based off that. There's subjective existence. Subjective existence means it doesn't exist in anywhere but your mind

Yeah, what I'm saying is your referential scale is subjective, and can have many interpretations, since you accepted above that it has no Standardized system in which it works upon.

> - They do. Space and Time itself is a higher dimensional structure. The "4-D" they claim to be is. There no necessity for any higher. I told you it's not relevant to the argument, Possibility is. I don't wanna explain lengthily, but you aren't understanding. Via Necessity and to not go against Logic, Jujutsu Kaisen must be at a point Superior to all possibilities of their Existential level

Abeg bro, ㄟ... Why you de force this Power on me . how are we to argue upon possibility which are also subjective assumptions that have not been asserted, Okay sure until those possibilities are posited as a fact then yes, He can be beyond said expressed Possibilities...but rn, we use Empirical depiction of An already existent likelihood, which you are to repair.

> - It's not Subjective, that's what is currently being discussed. It's only subjective to the argument, although you'd say it's subjective to me, we're currently on the argument

Omo naw bro

> - No, it's not a "Head canon" issue, it's a Necessity issue. So long as the possibility of an Item reaching 5 exists, the object that has been illustrated to be above the Item MUST and NECESSARILY be above 5 and all possibilities that the Item can reach

Hmm, let's use Statistical analytics within fiction. If a character is placed to have Infinite speed within a made Statistical board within his verse, it doesn't necessarily mean he has "Infinite speed" that aligns with the accepted definition, it's only a Statistical placement until said Feat is actually depicted to happen, so until said Item wasn't Empirically stated to reach "5" or shown to reach "5" then the possibility is only a possibility and subjective to many interpretations.

> - He's above all possible existential level. "Always a step ahead" will be a suitable description

Nawa bro. Okay, so his Frontal clearance in distance is simply in relations to the Referential Realities that he supposedly transcends yes?. I don't think that places him above all existential level in a universally acceptable basis but rather in the setting that relate to his underlying scale. I.e; simply in relations to his Referential settings (prolly)and his verse.

> - It is built upon what it referenced. The author is trying to pass a message of the Level of his Realism; above what he based it on

Bro, you sure say you no be the author . I've been asking you this, Gege? Are you Gege? Let's be real please, coz I swear I de doubt say you no be Gege ATP... The authors passing of his realism can be considered to be many things sha.

- Hyperbolism

- filler situation.

- fan service(which does not apply to the canon work)

- authors Postulation which is interpreted subjectively different by the fans of this work

> - It's not. The Boundless talk is to help people understand he sits at the very end of all existence level. Just that, it's not deep

Nawa, so he seats atop the Existential Kini Kini, ko? I think I've adjusted that above somewhere.

> Indeed, Philosophy isn't my argument, I only took concepts that conveys my logic

Ohh I see ..

Sleep de my eyes, no mind my Grammar,

26/05, 17:30 Panache_x: - There is no standardised Level of existence for the verses, was my agreement. Reality remains Reality. Existence is Existence

- Possibilities are all I need. Not actualisation of those possibilities. So long as it's possible, my point remains firm

- Yeah, so long as it's possible to reach Infinite Speed, then the item must be completely above Infinite Speed. Necessity

- Simply in relation to the referenced Possibilities, yes. All Existential level are possible within the referenced verses because there exist no logic that prevents the author of those verses causing their verse to get to those level. All is the possibility

- It can be considered many things, I'm logically arguing it to be something. Trying to trash the argument without addressing the logic isn't a hindrance to the logic

- That somewhere is above all. He's *The One Above All*

26/05, 17:43 +234 814 443 9990: - but it not having a standardized system in which it flows with makes the argumentative reasoning for Both parties in the debate chaotic. Reality is not consistently eq to reality in all fiction... Existence is different within all fictions na. I.e; some fiction might have the existence of Soul system in relation to their scales, others may not.

- yeah, but those possibilities would simply be interpreted Subjectively due to them not actually being slapped to actuality... The possibility of me being Superman, does not actually make me Superman.

- No na, the possibility can be considered to be a system of abandoned story frame or that type shii, hence can't be applicable na. I.e; the possibility of a character having infinite speed is simply a head canonical assumption, due to it not actually being Depicted as a feat, and because of the lack in that empirical proof, the interpretations become subjective.

- The ideas of those Authors doing that is yet again another fan posited idea, as those Authors indeed can do it but do not, and hence said existential levels do not exist, except as Non canon or fanon

- No na, I'm not trashing it na bro ,

- omo .

Omo.

Panache na real Chef, Ong.

26/05, 17:50 Panache_x: - I'll keep telling you how this is irrelevant to the argument. Naruto and Dragon Ball exists according to Spatiotemporalities. I wish not to dive into any unneeded

- That's fine, but I am completely transcendent over you and any possibility of you. I am above all possibilities of you because necessity placed me there. Necessity placed me there because I am above you completely. The possibility of you Being Supermarket and me not being above Supermarket means I'm not above what you are on a fine level

- Beautiful, nobody said it's an actualisation, it's just a possibility, and Jujutsu Kaisen is necessarily above all possibilities on that aspect. You aren't attacking the argument yet

- Excellent, but I'm arguing my interpreted Logic into ultimate flawlessness which would make it a Truth. That's what the whole argument is about

26/05, 18:22 +234 814 443 9990: > PICK UP POINTS IF YOU CAN

Panache 🗨️:

- Satoru Gojo from Jujutsu Kaisen exists in a superior reality, transcending the spatiotemporal dimensions of universes like Dragon Ball and Naruto. By applying hylomorphism and Kantian transcendentalism, he's positioned above all other characters, existing on a "Boundless Tier 0" level. Thus, any opponent must demonstrate interaction at this highest level to challenge his supremacy. As he Exists above possibilities of Referential Possibilities and potential.

26/05, 18:30 +234 814 443 9990: What I do know is;

1. It's an argument from silence.
2. The Referential settings is busted
3. It no longer Gojo as long as it's outside the Referential settings with the JJK verse
4. Author never approved validity for JJK link to those Referential Realities
5. Naruto and dragon ball do not have said, Spatiotemporal vertical Y axis... In a large Hierarchical order that sets him to be beyond existential limits
6. His definition for existential Transcendence is unknown.
7. His idea of boundless doesn't correlate with any tiering system.
8. The logical application in relation to the dual philosophy can't be applicable sha.
9. There're no canonical approval for Both Referential verses to be used in said context.
10. Possibilities cannot be a thing if feat of placement of said feat, are non-existent. (Anything would basically be considered Head canon)

So like, you got anything extra?

26/05, 18:38 Not That Guy: 1. aiiit

2. yeah but like we can't win that one. we can try but

3. yh it's subjective
4. subjective
5. I don't see an argument that can be made for this
6. he's basically saying that whatever it is Gojo is that
7. indeed
8. yh
9. yh

10. he said sum about in character earlier

26/05, 18:43 +234 814 443 9990: 1. It's an argument from silence. ✓

2. The Referential settings is busted ✓

3. It no longer Gojo as long as it's outside the Referential settings with the JJK verse. ✓

4. Author never approved validity for JJK link to those Referential Realities ✓

5. ~Naruto and dragon ball do no have said, Spatiotemporal vertical Y axis... In a large Hierarchical order that sets him to be beyond existencial limits~

6. His definition for existencial Transcendence is unknown. we attack that then.

7. His ideo to boundless doesn't correlate with any tiering system. ✓

8. The logical application in relation to the dual philosophy can't be applicable sha. ✓

9. There're no canonical approval for Both Referential verses to be used in said context. ✓

10. Possibilities cannot be a thing if feat of placement of said feat, are non-existent. _(Anything would basically be considered Head canon)_

Is that it?

26/05, 18:44 +234 814 443 9990: So can we actually go at it, and attack this Gojo scale? With idealistic points?

26/05, 19:45 +234 814 443 9990: Alright let's take this from the top again.

- This is basically an argument from silence, as there are no proof that makes this grounded on solidity.

- The Referential settings is busted, and does not posit any formulation to understand what exactly that is...if you application is to work for said character because of Referential ideation, then such idea can work in all fictional works, making them all hit the same spot again.

- That is no longer Gojo as long as it's outside the Referential settings with the JJK verse, what ever that is, is no longer Satoru Gojo of the canon line for JJK, but rather something different.

- The author never approved validity for JJK link to those Referential Realities. Also the authors of those Referential Reality never agreed to a superiority of their own respective verses
- Your assertion does not finalize the ideation of Gojo being Transcendent of all realities but rather the Referential ones, which is not applicable.
- your idea of boundless doesn't correlate with any tiering system.
- The logical application in relation to the dual philosophy can't be applicable too, due to it not being universally accepted.
- There're no canonical approval for Both Referential verses to be used in said context.

26/05, 19:49 Not That Guy: so you concede to the fact that there's no objective hierarchy?, good. which means you also concede that authors may indeed endeavor to augment the caliber of their works within the bounds of their distinct narrative realms, & you acknowledged that these endeavors dont transmute into a universally acknowledged preeminence or categorical superiority over other narratives. okay.

wdym "in", there can be one in bc he's the author of said verse.

no, the "message" embodied within any given narrative remains circumscribed within its own imaginative verse & cannot be extrapolated to substantiate a global hierarchy of literary merit—which I pointed out earlier. the intentions of an author doesn't constitute a universal edict that presides over the totality of narrative constructs, do you agree ?

yes, discussions regarding such hierarchical evaluations are confined to theoretical discourse & doesnt manifest as objective reality. i trust that you get why I keep emphasizing the term "objective."

26/05, 20:22 Panache_x: - Your argument of silence is the only silence here. Proofs are incorporated in the text, attack their quality before you could call it silent

- Irrelevant to the argument. My focused reference stands. That's your personal concern on how you see things to be
- That is Satoru Gojo. What sort of argument is this. Jujutsu Kaisen based on Dragon Ball and Naruto, Satoru Gojo is a member of Jujutsu Kaisen. There's no "outside", just a successor
- Permissions from authors are needed for such a thing, else it'll be copyright infringement. The verses don't need to be intimately involved, their concepts were simply taken to act as a base
- I've explained this previously, this is repetitive: Simply in relation to the referenced Possibilities, yes. All Existential level are possible within the referenced verses because there exist no logic that prevents the author of those verses causing their verse to get to those level. All is the possibility
- I don't care, it's not needed. He's above All. That simple. I've constantly repeated how nothing is based off some site's "tiering system"
- Repeated point again. It's not a philosophical argument, logics from the philosophy is applied to describe the occurrence or presentation

- It is used as a base, he didn't "steal" it. That would lead to Gege Akutami being sued

26/05, 20:22 Panache_x: I don't even see the argument you're making

There is no "global hierarchy" law that states he cannot achieve that. I've highlighted the Subjectivity of things. You just typed the same thing in a different manner

Since the author chooses to pass the message that way, it is being scaled that way in the verse and put up against another verse. It is not scaled outside the verse

The author carefully selected elements to help suggest the level of his verse. So it is scaled inverse according to that

There is no objective reality anywhere. All verse are scaled independently with their elements which is what is currently being done to Jujutsu Kaisen, after that is done, they are put up against another verse by people who interpret the workings

The initial parts of your text are answered here

27/05, 03:03 +234 814 443 9990: Indeed, Already did that with Gojo.

Mehn, I'll try something some other time.

27/05, 03:04 Panache_x: You did well

27/05, 03:04 Panache_x: Copyright infringement hit

Brian Vs Dayo

7/25/2024 8:58 PM Eri: 14/04, 18:36 COSMO : @COSMO vs @~Dayo

Debate Topic: Saitama is Boundless

@COSMO opposes

@~Dayo supports

Verdict: @COSMO wins via a concession from @~Dayo

Difficulty: Make God sha dey help us

14/04, 19:54 COSMO : Debate Topic: Saitama is Boundless

Opposing the notion: @+234 904 465 8699, @~EI THE ÇRÆTØR, @~Wayne

Supporting the notion: @COSMO

Verdict ↓

@~EI THE ÇRÆTØR and @+234 904 465 8699 both lost via a concession

@COSMO argued that the narrative the comic gave was what supported his arguments, @~Wayne brought up a tangent involving Satoru Gojo, @COSMO argued against that, asserting that his premise wasn't based on Satoru Gojo hence that tangent was inconsequential to him

and that @Wayne was operating under a false reasoning, a fallacy, @Wayne failed to refute that.

@Wayne asked for a “boundless feat” or should I say an explicit showing of Saitama arriving at Tier 0, @COSMO argued that the narrative served as a feat, no further logical refutations came up again as @Wayne continually kept on asking for evidence and tried using Hitchen’s razor to invalidate the opposing argument, @COSMO however argued that logic served as his evidence, a refutation wasn’t seen to that.

So yea, @COSMO rhetorically slammed all three, @COSMO wins

Judge: Finest boy, Tony

Brian Vs Bishop

29/04, 12:56 COSMO : @BISHOP-ネ!! vs @COSMO

YHWACH vs AKUTO SAI

THE ALMIGHTY vs THE DEMON KING

The bout;

Brian's Proof

In response to Brian's evidential material, Bishop attempts an invalidation, putting canonicity under question. Brian rebuts however, suspending the pre-placed burden of proof, through apt use of toulmin's argumentation pattern requesting a basis for assumption on non-canonicity, which Bishop failed to provide

Death of the Author

The author's death, however grievous, provides us the liberty and right to our own interpretation of given intellectual property. Brian equips this doctrine, with an intent for dissolution of Bishop's grounds on characterization, professing a dissociative relationship between the character subsumed in the narrative domain, and that adopted into the simulated world of battle. The Bishop, following his diagonal thought patterns, attempts a debunk, expressing his sentiment towards the author before death. He doesn't, unfortunately, provide good reason, showcasing a fault in Brian's employed dissociation.

Yhwach's Transcendence

No, Bishop did not also provide extraordinary evidence for his extraordinary claim

Verdict: Stand proud Bishop, you were strong. Brian will never forget you.

7/25/2024 8:58 PM Eri: *GEEKULTURE DEBATE • THE A-TIER CLASH*

Conflict: Akuto Sai Vs Buu

Debaters:

@FSI COSMO FSI Akuto Sai

@FSI Sas Is Sas FSI Buu

Victor: @FSI COSMO FSI Akuto Sai

Judicator: @FSI Panache_x FSI

> _An was an argument of *Reason*, with the initial proposer, Brain - Akuto Sai, Teleologically arguing this "reason"._

> His opponent argued against it Etiologically.

> With "Reason" encompassing both, the opposer's refutation was misplaced and inapplicable to the carefully presented, yet conceited Teleological Reason proposed by the proposer.

> _The opposer also flooded in a new tactical spear against the "Power" or "Right" of the propose, of which the proposer termed himself a "Storyteller", a God within the story. A grand manipulator, able to determine the beginning and the end._

> This was also argued against in fashion of the proposer being unable to decide the end of the story singularly without the "Judge".

> The opposer carefully gallantly cleaved this, making vivid his absolute control over the beginning and end of his story, with the "Judge" only existing to decide if his proposed end is True and Just. For him, he is a "Judge" of the story by being a Storyteller, existing within the realism of the story.

> Shaken, the opposer, Sas - Buu, sought to introduce his own conflicting story. The initial story teller requested why his story telling should be heeded to. Unable to attribute the reason to his status as a Story teller, he (Sas - Buu) pegged the on misplaced and sinking grounds, ultimately giving true story to none other but the initial story proposer.

> Grandly, the Victory lies in a single statement:

> _ 11/05, 12:19 pm Brian: A proposition can either be true or false. In a Dialectic, once manifested, if remained unopposed, it holds true.

> The proposer's Teleological argument stays firm as the WHY {Reason} to the occurrence is due to him being a Storyteller, and his Story WAS MANIFESTED AND NOT OPPOSED. It was just asked to be elucidated on Etiologically.

Eri Vs Brian

7/10/2024 12:59 PM : I'll use my Anno Un.

7/10/2024 1:00 PM : No need for scans just pick a ch.

7/10/2024 1:02 PM : My character is superior to Akashu and my character defeats akashi.

7/10/2024 1:06 PM : As I said. I'm using "my anno un".

As the author, my intent perpetuates superiority of my ch. over akashi.

7/10/2024 1:07 PM Eri: In this universe of discourse we have

A: akashi

B: someone superior to akashi(my anno un) in totality

7/10/2024 1:14 PM : As stated. I proffered a new instance of the Philosophy of Language x Aesthetics and issued it in our Universe of Dicourse

7/10/2024 1:19 PM : Here na

7/10/2024 1:19 PM : My character

7/10/2024 1:20 PM : > The translation is I created a new fictional character and made him battle another fictional character.

7/10/2024 1:22 PM : What makes me an author?

7/10/2024 1:22 PM : I'm already an author

7/10/2024 1:22 PM : I said I'm using my anno un

7/10/2024 1:26 PM : You asked when* 7/10/2024

1:26 PM : But I get the gist

7/10/2024 1:27 PM : The evidence is actualized in the characters existence

7/10/2024 1:47 PM : I apologise for using implicit speech.

Your character is allegedly superior because, as an author, you have word over them

But since that's what the actuality of it is predicated on

I'll ask you to provide evidence for your character being totally superior to mine

> In this text, you stated a position, stated that the position is predicated on my authority as the author of the character. You then proceeded to place an onus for my character being superior to yours.

In my response, I've implied that the existence of my character proves I'm an author, and as the author, I have presented my character's state of superiority.

Hence, just as someone would say; I have actualized my dream of being the fastest runner, I say I have actualized my character's existence, therefore I'm an Author.

> Secondly, The characters existence is predicated on your words as the author

> Are they not?

> I'm asking [FSI:FSI] to provide evidence that supports this

I should provide evidence that my character's existence is predicated on my words?.

7/10/2024 1:50 PM : Prove you are the author of the fictional character akashi.

7/10/2024 1:54 PM : Interesting. Placing it on my words isn't a dogmatic argument. You would need to highlight how you inferred that.

My authority as the author of the character is something you agreed to.

Why refute the foundation of the debate

7/10/2024 1:55 PM : What do you mean by "technical author:

7/10/2024 1:55 PM : I have already issued evidence via statement of my character's nature

7/10/2024 2:09 PM : prove I refused to provide evidence

A dismissed evidence isn't refusal to provide evidence.

Your first statement makes the rest of your statement less justified.

Are you confuting my alleged belief or my argument?.

7/10/2024 2:10 PM : Why am I not the objective author of my anno un

7/10/2024 2:11 PM : The metaphysical reality is founded on that. Negating it would render the debate non-existent

7/10/2024 2:14 PM : Basically, do you think the debate is.

My character wins because I'm the author?

A: My character wins because he is superior.

B: He is superior because I'm the author

I'm the author. Therefore A

Or

A: Eri is the creator of this character.

B: Eri coincidentally is the author of the character.

C: The author proffered the characters' nature

Abductively, the character nature is x,y,z.

7/10/2024 2:15 PM : 3 routes omo

7/10/2024 2:16 PM : This would be refuted depending on your response to my newly issued text

7/10/2024 2:29 PM : Sha for this last refutation I for just why?

7/10/2024 2:31 PM : I'm required to justify my statement?.

The testimony of the subject is sufficient justification unless you can prove otherwise.

7/10/2024 2:32 PM : Refuting it is an appeal to non-authority

7/10/2024 2:33 PM : Since you stated you are attacking the predication the subject is the author.

Me

7/10/2024 2:33 PM : I go just go draw stickman come

7/10/2024 2:37 PM : Yes

7/10/2024 2:40 PM : Nawa

7/10/2024 2:41 PM : Testimonies dey always get small refutation resistance

7/10/2024 2:42 PM : e.g fallacy if false attribution get burdens

7/10/2024 2:42 PM : You go first prove say I do this. If person find one mistake go slam then

7/10/2024 2:45 PM : Why is it biased

7/10/2024 2:46 PM : Can you put my argument in a logical form that aligns with its definition.

A typical logical form for such argument is either:

Y occurred once when X.

Therefore, Y will occur every time when X.

Or:

Person Y told me that he saw/heard X.

Therefore, X must be true.

7/10/2024 2:52 PM : An authors work should be exemplified by their work?.

Prove this

7/10/2024 2:55 PM : Being an author doesn't necessitate publication and robustness 7/10/2024

2:55 PM : It's just an instance of the philosophy of language and Aesthetics as I stated previously

7/10/2024 2:59 PM : So I'm an author it just hasn't been acknowledged by people.

That isn't necessary. Authors present their work in multiple ways. I go gain recognition after I slam you Alh

7/10/2024 3:08 PM : How it's made known isn't relevant. This is no longer a debate on position and now on recognition?

7/10/2024 3:13 PM : No need to quantify my amount of recognition. My position is realistic now. There is always going to be a gradient of authority. Justification remains regardless