

---

Subject: Re: The meaning of life?

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 13 Aug 2007 00:53:50 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Ugh... why is it that people continuously have to use the supposed failings in the understanding of something to "prove" the subject of that understanding is false?

For arguments sake, lets say that every single religion in the world got it wrong in what they think God is. Does that mean the source of this idea (God) is also false?

No, it just means the understanding of that subject matter is wrong. Heck, science does this quite often. Thinks the answer is something, only to eventually prove that understanding wrong. Does it mean that the subject matter was also wrong? No, just the understanding of it. One thing that I love to quote in this is the SCIENTIFICALLY PROVEN AS TRUTH idea of Caloric. An INVISIBLE liquid is responsible for heat transfer. Science, through experiments PROVED this to be correct. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Caloric>

As it is known now, this is not how heat transfer occurs. The understanding was mistaken, but the subject matter was still very much valid.

The same could be said for religion. To "prove" God's existence is wrong because some religion got it wrong is ludicrous.

Tell me what you think of this statement(Sorry Crimson, only using this because it's something common to this forum):

"Crimson created cheating programs. I know this to be true because many people have said it."

That would be a false/misunderstood statement. Therefor because that is wrong, Crimson must not exist. After all, that's the same logic that is being used whenever people use something religion got wrong as "proof" God does not exist.

"Crim

---