

I think that we are seeing is an example of the ways people learn to debate. The underlying issue is how people approach faith and reason. Three examples follow. Atheist debate using reason and discounting faith. Christians debated using faith and reason together. Other groups such as Islam and the Watchtower use faith alone, discounting reason. I have grouped Islam and the Watchtower together because both make claims that are entirely faith-based. Islam embraces the Quran as the perfect revelation of God and the JW's embrace the teaching and direction of the GB without question. Reason is not given a place at the table. Therefore, for adherents of Islam or the WT their teachings are not questionable, they are without error. Anything challenging what they have been told must be in error. In order to confront that error any manner of argument or subterfuge will be engaged in to blunt the force of the argument against their faith. Reason is not employed. Misdirection, speculation and subterfuge are used in place of reason. While Adrian argues that he is not a Jehovah's Witness, it seems apparent that he has a position he holds as unquestioningly true and he has adopted the Watchtower's method of argumentation. He has positions that he holds by faith but not by reason. Therefore, he is committed to engage in misdirection, speculation and subterfuge to defeat arguments against what his personal faith tells him is correct. The problem is that reliance on that manner of debate ultimately pushes people and religions into an intellectual and theological dead end.