Battling Assumptions

Nobody asked but …

This looks like a logic fallacy to me, actually two different versions of fallacious usage.

In the first case, I am reflecting on a book that I am reading; *The Truth Machine: The Blockchain and the Future of Everything,* by Paul Vigna and Michael J. Casey. A disclaimer, I am not negatively disposed regarding cryptocurrency, rather I am pretty philosophical about the couple of gallons of blood I have lost. A little knowledge is a dangerous thing. But I will not recommend this book, to you in your search for knowledge. The message could be delivered much more painlessly in a short, well argued, article. The premise is that it took many centuries for the current paradigm, double entry bookkeeping, to revolutionize the marketplace, but now that the effect of those who would game the system pretty well offsets the increase of those who honestly abide by the system, it is time to find a new, greed-proof paradigm.

The argument fails for two reasons, 1) that a poorly described blockchain technology must be the basis of the paradigm, and 2) the battling assumptions referred to in this blog caption. The second cause is by far the more general, and damaging. The authors repeatedly pose one "what-if," offering the blockchain algorithm as the solution, then another, opposing "what-if" that is also uniquely solved by the process. If Blockchain A will solve X, then A, else if Blockchain B will solve X, then B, else if Blockchain C …

The second form of this fallacy is the "he said/she said" dilemma. We can see this in the continuing reportage on the vying pronouncements of George and Kellyanne Conway. A third party must make one assumption or another in gauging their respective outputs.

— Kilgore Forelle