How to be a Refuter.

© 2006 by Joseph T. "Rick" Reinckens II
May be distributed if the website information is included.

For all you "newbies", here is a description of a ***refuter***. If you spend any time in chat rooms, bulletin boards, newsgroups, etc., you ***will*** run into such people.

- Dispute everything the other person says.

- Ask for proof of everything. If the person says today is Monday, ask for documentation.

- When the person responds, dispute that his sources are authoritative.

- Ask for proof that they are authoritative.

- When he responds, find things to dispute in that.

- Claim that cited documentation doesn't exist.

- Claim that the points made in the documentation have been abandoned by people in that field, discredited, etc.

- When the person cites authorities, claim "other authorities disagree".

- Don't name those other authorities.

- When the person asks for the names of the authorities, accuse him of being lazy, doing sloppy research, etc., and "they are easy to find if you just spend a little time looking instead of arguing."

- Cite obscure authorities with oddball views.

- Claim they are mainstream and the other person and his authorities have the oddball views.

- Claim the person doesn't know what he is talking about when he claims his views are mainstream.

- Cite books that have been long out of print and are virtually impossible to obtain.

- Claim the obscure books are "standard reference works" that are "readily available" with the use of "due diligence".

- Tell the person, "You know, you can't find *everything* on the Internet!" Explain in very condescending terms:"There are places called "libraries". *Books* are kept there. You can go there and read the books and even borrow some of them. People still do that."

- Then go back to the "lazy and sloppy research" argument.

- Cite newspaper articles, etc., that cannot be obtained.

- Cite speeches, seminars, conference presentations, etc., that were not recorded and cannot be obtained.

- Claim that the article author, conference speaker, etc., is "one of the leading authorities in this field".

- Don't give his credentials or any way for the person to find them easily (e.g., referring to website with a bio)--heck, if the other person wants proof, it's his job to verify them.

- Give an approximation of his name, so if the person does research he won't find it anyway. (Believe it or not, there is a Wolfgang Paul and a Wolfgang Pauli, and both have won the Nobel Prize in Physics!)

- When the person complains that it took him hours to find the right person, respond that he is making a big deal out of nothing, that you didn't say you were giving the exact name and he should have realized it might be a variation.

- Be a stickler about "the rules". If you dig deep enough, anything anyone says violates some rule. (Example: When I cited the publisher of some videos a refuter complained that they couldn't be found on the publisher's website and therefore questioned whether they even existed. No one claims that a book has to be available on a publisher's website. No one says that you have to prove that a source actually exists.)

- If the person cites a title, identifies a place, an author's name, an organization, etc., and does not have the exact correct official name, accuse him of deliberately trying to mislead you.

- Claim that his misidentification, etc., proves that he is a sloppy researcher, deliberate deceiver, etc., and cannot be trusted.

- Make a big stink about how could the person put out such junk.

- Complain that the person is wasting "everyone's" time.

- If others join with the other person against you, claim that he has brought in his "cronies" to "do his dirty work".

- Argue side issues that have nothing to do with the topic. (E.g., in the O.J. Simpson trial, whether Mark Furman ever used a racial slur.)

- When the person provides requested information regarding side issues, complain that he is off topic from the main topic and that he shouldn't be getting into minutia and wasting "everyone's" time.

- Find every little typo. Accuse the person of being an idiot and a moron. Tell him that he should use spell check so at least it won't be so obvious what an idiot and moron he is.

- Accuse the person of being a refuter because even an idiot could see that obviously you are correct, so if he disagrees it's obviously because he is a refuter.

- When the person gets tired of the endless fights, accuse him of being argumentative, emotional, etc., and claim that you are just making valid points and reasonable requests and if he has personality problems and can't be civil he shouldn't take it out on "everyone" and he probably should keep his "weird" opinions to himself.

And now you know why I don't have bulletin boards or chat rooms on my websites:

www.GodOnThe.Net   www.HubbleSpacePhotos.com   www.Temple-of-Faith.org