Auovel: Affirming LE interpretation.

Me (Apos): Skeptic to LE interpretation.

Auovel:

Let's establish 3 motives for Battler:

1. Wanting to defeat Erika
2. Resurrection Beatrice's memories (I know you wont grant this yet, but we will investigate this matter soon)
3. Prove he's reached Beatrice's truth.

and let's establish a fact, this one is a spoiler in regards to the culprits identity: ||Sayo Yasuda (Shannon) is the culprit, and Shannon also = Kanon, So Beatrice = Shannon = Kanon.||

If you take a look at what you're saying, you're positing that Battler had pitied her and fell for her traps, which is true, I agree that this occurred, but with Battler intentionally falling for it:

When you take a look at Battler and his previous interactions with Erika (Episode 5), she has made it clear that she's hostile and an enemy towards Battler. Towards the end of Episode 5, Battler infers the truth about Beatrice, and he now knows who the culprit is, they try to trap him into revealing who the culprit is, but he then presents himself as the culprit inside this theory, to try and not reveal who the culprit is (Shannon and Kanon), if Battler this second did reveal who the culprit is, then they would've been able to genuinely destroy Beatrice forever.

and I'm here expressing Erika's intentions, she wouldn't mind just stepping over Battler and doing that to Beatrice.

So if you look at Episode 6 where he pitied her, it was done in a strategic manner, when you look at these 2 actions, they actually conflict with Battler right? Battler wants to win, he is insanely dedicated towards Beatrice, while Erika on the other hand is not the least empathetic towards him and Battler has SEEN the lengths she would pursue just to crush Beatrice.


So why is it that Battler pitied her in Episode 6? Seems very contradictory yes, so this is how you interpret it, it would logically follow as this:

Battler having infinite more reasons to not pity her ---> Continues to do so, in the sense that he pitied her to misdirect her and pretend that he actually does pity her, it would make her believe she's has the upper hand and lower her guard down as she executes her scheme.

This is how you tackle this plot hole, and it seems most logical to view it in this manner to ensure there are no contradictions.

and if you have seen Battler in Episode 6, we can see him being furious and violent because you know, he realized that this Beatrice isn't the same Beatrice he knew, she didn't have the same memories, so this would only serve as the biggest motivator for him to actually resurrect Beatrice's memories, it would follow along with this motive, I'll head into more stuff soon.





Statement in episode 8, the context is in regards to them playing cards, but Battler himself acknowledges that this is his style, his way of problem solving. Playing dumb and losing

intentionally to win in the end to not contradict his character and narrative, you must see Episode 6 as: he knew what Erika was gonna do, inferred everything, playing into it and won in the end by making Erika believe she had the upper hand.

And this statement feels so out of hand like, it feels so random and sudden. It's almost as if they didn't mean to put it in there without a reason, it was put there intentionally to try and give the viewer more premises to make sense of Battler's approach of outsmarting, and then make sense of it during Episode 6.

So yes you might try and land a reductio and say does that mean in the previous Episodes 1-5 he also knew and foresaw everything but was playing dumb? No, it doesn't work like that, those situations in there are actually new and he had no way of knowing and had to adapt to everything, as opposed to episode 6 where he became a game master, had prep time and allat, actually had some premises about Erika , so this statement is applicable to that.



Apos:

I don’t have much time atm, so I’ll cover the main points.

Firstly, my stance is that I actually agree that Battlers goal was to resurrect Beatrice, but the only thing he actually did was to resurrect her as a newborn. And this makes more sense when you look at the dynamic between Battler and Beatrice in epi6: he is confused and feels a certain hostility towards "the new" Beatrice. There would be no reason for such behaviour

if he had planned in advance to become the GM, so since he had planned to fully resurrect Beatrice, he must have known that the new Beatrice was integrated into his plan; yet he reacted as if he were completely at a loss. I mean he didn't have to pretend around her.

"So if you look at Episode 6, where he took pity on her, it was done strategically. When you consider these two actions, they actually contradict Battler, don't they? Battler wants to win; he is incredibly devoted to Beatrice, whilst Erika, on the other hand, has not the slightest empathy towards him, and Battler has SEEN the lengths she would go to just to crush Beatrice.

So why did Battler take pity on her in Episode 6? It does seem very contradictory, doesn't it? So this is how you interpret it; it would logically follow as this..."

He gave her the advantage of sealing off three rooms so that he could execute his scheme involving the movement of the actors, who were pretending to be corpses. (Pretending he'd done it out of pity). This is the most logical and plot-integrated explanation, and it does not require the alternative explanation that you presented to me in accordance with Occam's Razor. More precisely, X does not in any way imply Z, because there is Y.

Now let's move on to Ep8 arg. This does not in any way contradict Battler's performance in Ep6. He pretended to give Erika the seals out of pity, in order to set up a scheme to move the actors around, but it wasn't as deep as you might think. He simply underestimated her, thinking that such subhuman tactics would work





About Ep8, I haven’t quite finished Umineko yet, so I won’t be so categorical. But based on ur justifications and the arg you pulled from Ep8 as you can see there’s no worth premise to support LE Battler theory, and they aren’t convincing.

Auovel:

"There would be no reason for such behaviour if he had planned in advance to become the GM"

For one, Battler didn't plan to become GM, he just inferred Beatrice's truth and became the game master via that. it's not like he had some specific objective to specifically become GM.

"so since he had planned to fully resurrect Beatrice, he must have known that the new Beatrice was integrated into his plan; yet he reacted as if he were completely at a loss. I mean he didn’t have to pretend around her."

The behavior may seem weird, but this doesn't contradict anything, If you take a look at the present, when Chick Beato is still around, Battler would still be hostile, having a scheme in advance doesn't necessitate you still can't be hostile towards her, because if he had a scheme in advance, that scheme will occur in the future, and as of right now, the present, his true Beato still hadn't come, he was still stuck with chick Beato.

Think of it like this, let's say I know a person who killed my family --> I set up a scheme to kill that person, as a means of getting revenge for what he did to my family, even though I had a scheme ready in advance, does that automatically mean I would be happy, or not hostile towards that individual just because I know there exists a scheme that would avenge my family?

No, that's absolute nonsense. Even then, another logical explanation for this is that, even if he knew he had a scheme in advance, there's always a miniscule chance of the scheme not working, it's not something that is 100% certain, even if it has a 99.5% success rate, and with that you can say Battler was still hostile or sad because he knows there's always a chance of it not working, but I prefer the previous solution rather than this.

The narration literally states that having a conversation with Chick Beato would be no better than talking with yourself, this is in Battler's scenario at least, of course he would be hostile cause he's literally shadow boxing with himself 😭 he can't stand this "Beatrice."

"He gave her the advantage of sealing off three rooms so that he could execute his scheme involving the movement of the actors, who were pretending to be corpses. (Pretending he'd done it out of pity). This is the most logical and plot-integrated explanation, and it does not require the alternative explanation that you presented to me in accordance with Occam's Razor. More precisely, X does not in any way imply Z, because there is Y."

I don't really get what you are trying to say by "to move the actors", he gave her the advantage with the tapes, knowing that she would seal the rooms, and intentionally not report it back to him that she had sealed the rooms, in which Battler moved his piece as the culprit and placed the letter outside, knowing that it would create a logic error, because Erika had already sealed the rooms so in no way could the culprit have been outside.

"Now let's move on to Ep8 arg. This does not in any way contradict Battler's performance in Ep6"
What do you think is the point of that very random statement then? how would it not apply to his approach of outsmarting, when he states that this is his methodology, his style.

This response of yours doesn't stand as a defeater to anything I've posited so far.



I just understood what you meant by moving the actors, I hadn't even looked at the scans you presented, I'll respond to this now.

You realize Erika is just enacting her scheme, she foresaw that Battler would try to do this, and she's explaining it from HER point of view, what she foresaw, the whole point is that Battler knew that Erika would try to foresee this, so he intentionally played into it so it may look like that Battler has no clue and is getting fucked

Apos:

"I don't really get what you are trying to say by to move the actors"

This is a basic outline of his main plan. He arranged with some of the participants in the Ep6 game to play dead, and also staged his own ‘death’. They all simply played dead, pretending to be victims; in a way, they were actors who were supposed to help him escape from the locked room whilst avoiding a logical error.

"how would it not apply to his approach of outsmarting, when he states that this is his methodology, his style."

Ye you don't understand what I said. The methodology Battler chose in ep8 is entirely consistent with his scheme:

P1. He pretends to grant her the authority to seal a limited number of rooms ‘out of pity’

P2. In reality, he deliberately calculates that this quantity will not be enough to seal all the rooms, and that he will be able to utilise the scheme involving the living corpses, which move around the field and can free Battler from a locked room from the outside by removing the chains.

This misdirection is a kind of ‘fool’s’ style. Therefore there's no contradiction in his behavior and it does not require the existence of the LE theory in order to hand it. Therefore, this evidence is of no use if you willing to prove LE.
Well, I can accept your explanation for his strange behaviour; it’s not that important anyway

Auovel:

He just rewrites the premise of the participants basically, anyways it literally wouldn't be consistent with his scheme, if he does get himself in a logic error then that would follow logically that he wanted to, it literally has to be because a logic error is a losing move.

Let's begin with talking about the love trials, basically if you recall in episode 6, kanon brought jessica and george along with shannon to challenge eachother in the love trials, now this couldnt have been orchestrated by anyone other than battler, what it basically does is whoever loses in the gun fight they will be chosen to help beatrice perform the memory recall, and kanon was specifically chosen because kanon = beatrice, of course kanon would, and same would go for shannon if she had lost.

and make sure to pay attention to this detail stated previously, battler's goa;l is to also prove hes learnt beatrice's truth, understood everything about beato's gameboard, and how does he do it? he utilizes the thing i said above, this is the only explanation because if he utilized shannon or kanon to resurrect beatrice, he would basically be affirming he knows who the true culprits are, the true identity.

and this couldnt happen if battler wasnt stuck in a logic error, since you said that battlers goal was to resurrect beatrice, and I do believe this aswell, and this is exactly what Battler did to resurrect beatrice, he resurrected the true beatrice with the memories.

He orchestrated the love trials, kanon lost and he empathised with beatrice, because kanon IS the culprit, he helped her regain her memories by reminding her of what a witch does and yatta yatta, and then kanon sacrificed himself and went to save battler and hid in the closet himself.


If you take a look at the near end of the episode like final minutes ig, Beatrice jumps onto Battler in joy, and Battler says "what a nasty trick," and Beatrice responds with "No, it was a splendid trick, people without love cannot see it"

This is in the context of Battler performing the trick, ill explain why this is the case:

1. Beatrice is the one whos seeking confirmation, she approached Battler, and shes happy he pulled it off

2. Beatrice's response when shes in joy saying "No it was a splendid trick, people without love cannot see it," it seems weird because in the first screenshot she was unable to understand what "without love the truth cannot be seen," only when Kanon helped her regain her memories, and that she saw the love trials with kanon and she remembered who she really was, only then was she able to see the truth, all of this indicates that this is Battler's doing, he helped her see the truth by showing her love, she literally put no effort into any "trick," Kanon was the one who did everything, and she didnt make any effort into coming up with a solution her self, so it must be the case that it was Battler's trick, they are basically confirming it here.

and all of this could've only worked if he got himself into a logic error, which he used to prove that hes learnt beatrices truth by using kanon and shannon (who are the true culprits), and establish a victory against Erika, and to also resurrect Beatrice's memories.





Apos:

"It literally wouldn't be consistent with his scheme, if he does get himself in a logic error then that would follow logically that he wanted to, it literally has to be because a logic error is a losing move."

No, it does not logically follow from this that he did it intentionally. All the narrative implications indicate that Battler attempted to misdirect Erika from his scheme to move the actors around the field, giving her an advantage by sealing off three rooms, supposedly out of ‘mercy’, but Erika saw through him and outsmarted, killing all his multi-agents, thereby trapping Battler in a logical error. He did not predict anything and, via his own stupidity and incompetence, fell into the trap. I don’t see any inconsistencies here and that's my interpretation.

“If you take a look at the near end of the episode like final minutes ig, Beatrice jumps onto Battler in joy, and Battler says "what a nasty trick," and Beatrice responds with No, it was a splendid trick, people without love cannot see it"

Ironically, the scan you provided to support this argument actually undermines your entire position. Let’s consider the semantics of these sentences. Note that immediately after ‘what a nasty trick’ comes ‘are you sure something like this will count?’ – a question addressed by Battler TO Beatrice. The semantic meaning of these sentences and their logical implication clearly establish Beatrice’s authority of scheme X; the statement literally attributes ts predicate to her. In simple words, he asks her about a trick whose authority belongs to Beatrice and expects a justification from her; would make no sense if the authority belonged to Battler, which once again proves the inconsistency of the LE theory. Consequently, the answer she gives to Battler refers to her own scheme. She praises her own trick, and it was Battler who was seeking confirmation from her.

I do not consider your justifications sufficient to consider LE valid. But even if I were to accept that the LE theory contains no contradictions and is statistically valid, the opposing interpretation, in turn, also contains no contradictions, because you have not provided sufficient grounds to establish that LE is necessary, or I have already refuted them.
Thus, both of these interpretations are, at best, equally plausible, but interpretation X (that Battler did not do all these things in order to resurrect Beatrice) holds greater authority due to the narrative implications that serve as a doxastic justification. Therefore, according to Occam's razor, interpretation X is more justified.



Ohh and yeah regarding love trials. I do agree that this act could have been orchestrated by Battler to restore Beatrice’s memories, though by its very essence, this would not be enough to prove the entire LE theory, given the lack of cause-and-effect relationships and the contradictions I raised earlier.

Auovel:

Yea I understand what your interpretation is, but these "narrative implications" from Erka don't attack anything, dude I don't really care about what Erika is saying, the point is that this very statement from episode 8 is applicable to Erika countering him and seeing through him giving the packing tapes "out of mercy," thats what im trying to get at, if its the case that the statement exists and that Erika countered him then he did it intentionally, because as you can see the entire love trials being orchestrated + him getting fucked over by Erika with the logic error aligns perfectly to resurrect Beatrice, prove he's learnt her truth, and also defeat Erika, and that is what im trying to get at by using this statement from episode 8, BECAUSE Erika saw through him giving the sealing tapes out of mercy, then it's because so he could get himself in a logic error and intentionally commit the mistake, which would go consistently with his episode 8 statement, what Erika 's saying IS correct, she saw through it and Battler intended that she would, that is what im interpreting given the statement.

No, the question addressed by Battler isn't in reference towards Beatrice, "are you sure something like this will count?" he's talking about his own trick because as I said, please pay attention to this part I beg you its INCREDIBLY important **It's impossible that Beatrice


could have done a trick, if you literally look at every moment of screen time with Beatrice at that time, she does not command, come up with a solution or try to save Battler because she didnt know what to do, that's why Kanon himself chose to sacrifice himself, because he felt bad for Beato that she couldnt do anything**

P1: Battler states: "What a nasty trick, are you sure something like this counts?"
P2: Beatrice didn't do anything that would refer to as a trick, and the narrative heavily goes against Beatrice doing something
C: The trick must be in reference to Battler's doing, and given the interpretation of LE, this would make sense and follow along with the statement, if it is the case that its in reference to Beatrice's doing it would contradict the narrative and story, as she had not done anything that is a "trick." hence rendering my solution as the only valid and certain conclusion.

Also Beatrice is literally jumping onto Battler, she's literally seeking confirmation from him.

Another narrative implication that Featherine is hinting at a trick and testing the readers aswell.

Therefore, under Occam's Razor my interpretation is more justified.



And your interpretation officially has a contradiction now, given the "what a nasty trick" statement, which could only be referring to Battler when you say it's Beatrice, which doesn't add up AT ALL thus being contradictory and making your interpretation invalid.

Apos:

I’ll keep it brief: she didn’t know how to save Battler until her memories returned, and once they had, she devised a plan to rescue him. Beatrice’s resurrection itself was the result of a series of coincidences, rather than part of his plan.
This statement makes no reference to Battler whatsoever, nor does it attribute authority to him. She could have referred to a trick as essence that could save him from that horrible predicament, including Beatrice’s trick. This in no way contradicts my interpretation
She didnt said "Battlers trick"
There is nothing in the text semantics to suggest that this is a trick by Battler
Yh we can conclude here cuz im bored to write long ass paragraphs 😭
We could simply hold life disc

I mean when we’re both free at the same time, so we don’t drag it out for hours on end, writing paragraphs

Auovel:

and neither does it say "beatrice's trick"

since we are on equal footing i guess, ill present this:

Battler literally said “you sure this counts?” and “those humans will start complaining that this isnt a mystery anymore”

under every rule of detective fiction, whether it may be Van Dine or the Knox Decalogue, Beato’s trick is completely applicable in a mystery framework and WOULD count, and since Battler literally had access to the knox decalogue he genuinely in no way would question the validity of Beato’s trick cause it literally got rid of Erika once and for all.

I can agree that Beato did save Battler yea cause she came in and i guess u can consider that as a trick from beatrice, but theres a reason why Battler is questioning the validity of this "trick," so its most likely referring to Battler himself, not to Beatrice as what Beatrice did could not be questioned and doesnt violate anything.

As the question of semantics remained unresolved from auovel’s part (like his final justification is very weak. Need I even to explain?), and auovel rejected my suggestion to hold a live discussion (meaning when we are both free and can type at the same time), I decided to conclude the discussion here, as we had not made any significant progress.

auovel YOP @Apóstolos Also I don't mean this without disrespect, but I think you are trying to be deceptive in your

Apóstolos Yesterday at 22:19

Not rly

We could simply hold life disc

I mean when we're both free at the same time, so we don't drag it out for hours on end, writing paragraphs

I think its the best option here

Up to yoy

auovel YOP Yesterday at 22:20

life disc?

Apóstolos I mean when we're both free at the same time, so we don't drag it out for hours on end, writing paragraphs

Apóstolos Yesterday at 22:21


.

auovel YOP Yesterday at 22:21

i dont think that changes much tbf we can continue as is

ill respond rq tho

Him conceding that he cannot properly substantiate the methodology arg so he leave it:



Yh you completely lost that methodology arg, you didn't address my constructive criticism and didn't try to defend that argument further. SS in ur doc js proves that as well: "I can't answer that sufficient" literally auto concession there.