

- Referent is unclear.
- Repetitive; restates the previous sentence.
- Statement of the obvious.
- Referent unclear.
- Incredibly stupid word choice. Mr Thesaurus is not your friend.
- Referent unclear again.
- The way this is written blames materialism qua materialism.
- There is no connection between these ideas. Needs a linking sentence.
- Erotema is ineffective if your reader can't see the answer.
- What logic? Referent unclear. AGAIN.
- No clear logical connection to support your claim.
- This word you use is not mean what you think it mean.
- Redundant. "Binary opposition" encompasses these things you specify.
- Referent unclear, again. "It" is singular, "binary opposition" is de facto plural.
- Redundant.
- Referent unclear. Also, the entire sentence merely states the bloody obvious.
- Unsupported generalization.
- "serve" implies deliberation, which is inaccurate.
- Straw man. No one suggested it was.
- Awkward. Is this a golf metaphor? Who is "playing through"?
- Goodness, you are fond of these unclear pronouns.
- What system? This is so broad a generalization as to be meaningless.
- Again, that's a straw man.
- Then why start by saying you did? Your position is inconsistent.
- You are using this word in an unclear way. Do you mean "jouissance"?
- This is still so general as to be meaningless.
- You are using this pronoun to refer to two, or possibly 3 different things in the same sentence. UNCLEAR REFERENT.

Suffice it to say, I apparently understand your position well enough. However, you have not reproduced the logic of my position-at all here, hence the intentionally stupid macro indicating that ([i]you[/i], Pescado, are as responsive as a wall. You are apparently incapable of hearing anyone but yourself. It is a metaphor, not a literal assertion. [Any decent philosopher would have understood that, Spock: I guess I underestimated you. Don't get me wrong, I chose that precise term specially for you.]

Oppression is a human problem. The responsibility to change it belongs to everyone, not only to those people who are members of the submerged groups. Of course, you disagree with this-my position owing to taking a position representing a radical Hobbesian materialism that reduces the will of man to a biological impulse and secures the legitimacy of power through violence. What keeps a man from beating his mail-order bride, then? Her own threat of violence? The product of such a logic is one wherein which our lives are indeed "nasty, brutish, and short."

In your reductivist logic, there are only two possible positions, strength and weakness; King and Peasant. However, you fail to grasp the ways in which these binary oppositions are defined in, through, and against the other. It is never either/or, one or the other. Social problems are always more complicated than this. Power structures create the very oppositions that they seek to control. Ultimatums serve to construct the very forms of deviance and malfeasance they seek to eliminate. "Power" is not a commodity or a possession; what is bought and sold under the rubric of "power" is the right to access the system that legitimates it. Power is culturally constructed and plays through the system: stomp this here, deviance emerges there. The system never has the full control of its own game.

According to your logic, the truth of the human condition is one wherein one brand of totalitarianism is traded for another. I don't necessarily disagree with this thesis; however, it is important to recognize that even in an absolutist system, there will be play that the system a) created of its own accord, and b) which exists in direct response to its perceived illegitimacy, and c) which it cannot fully control.

—

Another fallacy. Failure to take you seriously is a legitimate response to your inability to express yourself with any clarity.

Sentence fragment.

I will take your failure to answer me seriously as an indication that you have not understood me. Which will not surprise, but only continue to please.