

---

Subject: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Wed, 08 Feb 2006 00:07:00 GMT

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

---

Listen, I don't give a fuck if it is against your religion, I don't give a fuck if it insults you, and I don't give a fuck if you protest peacefully. BUT, when you start burning flags, walking on flags, shooting and burning effages of my leaders I get PISSED. Arabs have shown themselves nothing better than animals. Then you start this "Holocaust cartoon contest." These Arab countries make me sick.

France has recently announced that they will use nuclear weapons against any terrorist organization that threatens there country and I say "GOOD FOR THEM." Let those fuckers burn if they attack you. I feel that we should have blown all of them the fuck up.

Now I realize what kind of backlash this post is going to produce and I am ready to say I don't appoligize for any of this. Hear me out, I am Catholic and how many times of day to I and others break the rules of my religion. I say God and here God said all the time, am I throwing a fit about it no. Am I out burning down embassies and beating people, NO. So grow the fuck up you stupid little Arab (Muslim) pussies.

\*Note: Please excuse any grammatical errors I typed this very fast.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [Ryan3k](#) on Wed, 08 Feb 2006 01:36:09 GMT

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

---

Surprisingly, I must say that I completely agree with you.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [fl00d3d](#) on Wed, 08 Feb 2006 01:40:32 GMT

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

---

I agree with you 200% as well.

AMEN, BROTHA!

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 08 Feb 2006 01:46:50 GMT

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

---

Well, speaking of the cartoon in question:

The LAST way to say that Mohommad is not a terrorist is to take up arms and threaten an entire

country for the act of one newspaper.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Wed, 08 Feb 2006 01:51:45 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

warranto wrote on Tue, 07 February 2006 19:46Well, speaking of the cartoon in question:

The LAST way to say that Mohommad is not a terrorist is to take up arms and threaten an entire country for the act of one newspaper.

The great irony of this situation.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Kamuix](#) on Wed, 08 Feb 2006 03:08:45 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Do we not have more inportant things to worry about.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [PointlessAmbler](#) on Wed, 08 Feb 2006 04:21:45 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Burning flags and effigies is an acceptable form of expression (OH NO NOT SYMBOLISM), but burning down embassies? That sure isn't.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Dr. Lithius](#) on Wed, 08 Feb 2006 08:31:51 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Alright, I heard something light on this on that other news show on Comedy Central or something... Someone wanna gimme a link to the news article or somethin'?

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Wed, 08 Feb 2006 09:40:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

the retard in London dressing himself as a suicide bomber to "avenge the slur on his religion" was a convicted drug dealer... which is, of course, strictly forbidden by the Koran, but who cares because cartoons are a much more damaging issue than crack could ever be.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Wed, 08 Feb 2006 10:48:37 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

gbull wrote on Tue, 07 February 2006 20:51warranto wrote on Tue, 07 February 2006 19:46Well,  
speaking of the cartoon in question:

The LAST way to say that Mohommad is not a terrorist is to take up arms and threaten an entire  
country for the act of one newspaper.

The great irony of this situation.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [YSLMuffins](#) on Wed, 08 Feb 2006 21:43:29 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Isn't this being perpetuated by mostly Iran's new president to draw attention away from nuclear  
ambitions and a struggling economy?

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 08 Feb 2006 23:29:34 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Saudi Arabia is actually buying protestors for this.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Aprime](#) on Thu, 09 Feb 2006 01:46:10 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

A French newspaper "did it" today too.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Kamuix](#) on Thu, 09 Feb 2006 15:27:45 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

The muzlums and go Muzzle off.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Toolstyle](#) on Thu, 09 Feb 2006 18:23:28 GMT

---

I was reading the paper a couple of days ago and the Muslim writer of the article pretty much said that it's ok to take the piss out of the Pope and Christianity but not ok to take the piss out of Mohammed.

Found the quote:

"Over the years, we have become de-sensitised to issues our forefathers would have been tried for as heretics. No one thinks twice about lampooning the Pope, or Christianity and for most non-Muslims this is just another bit of fun within our rights to freedom of speech.

But with freedom of speech comes responsibility and the cartoon was plain irresponsible."

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Renegade](#) on Fri, 10 Feb 2006 06:47:21 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Ok, we're sittin in Civis class (grade 10) our tecaher, whos very apathetic to the worlds needs and what not tells us about this.  
Shes telling about his mohammus blah blah blah.

Then its funny, its mostly boys, so all I had to say was, "who cares" The whole class agreed.  
She sat down, and cried. And shes a white christian.  
lol funny shit.  
Who cares, its a fucking picture.

OT: I heard this in an old thread, and its funny shit.  
Link to Topic: <http://www.renegadeforums.com/index.php?t=msg&th=252&start=0&rid=19649>  
Link to funny shit AFTER you read the topic  
<http://www.beaconpedestal.com/ack-reply.mp3>

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Dave Mason](#) on Fri, 10 Feb 2006 12:43:44 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

cheekay77 wrote on Fri, 10 February 2006 06:47OT: I heard this in an old thread, and its funny shit.  
Link to Topic: <http://www.renegadeforums.com/index.php?t=msg&th=252&start=0&rid=19649>  
Link to funny shit AFTER you read the topic  
<http://www.beaconpedestal.com/ack-reply.mp3>

Have you been living under a rock?

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [Renerage](#) on Fri, 10 Feb 2006 17:11:14 GMT

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

---

DJM wrote on Fri, 10 February 2006 07:43cheekay77 wrote on Fri, 10 February 2006 06:47OT: I heard this in an old thread, and its funny shit.

Link to Topic: <http://www.renegadeforums.com/index.php?t=msg&th=252&start=0&rid=19649>

Link to funny shit AFTER you read the topic

<http://www.beaconpedestal.com/ack-reply.mp3>

Have you been living under a rock?

lol i usually dont go to those forums. this was the first time ive wondered what they were about. I literally shit my pants when i heard that.

And besides, i didnt join until mid 05

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [Jaspah](#) on Fri, 10 Feb 2006 19:26:18 GMT

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

---

DarkDemin wrote on Tue, 07 February 2006 19:07Listen, I don't give a fuck if it is against your religion, I don't give a fuck if it insults you, and I don't give a fuck if you protest peacefully. BUT, when you start burning flags, walking on flags, shooting and burning effages of my leaders I get PISSED. Arabs have shown themselves nothing better than animals. Then you start this "Holocaust cartoon contest." These Arab countries make me sick.

France has recently announced that they will use nuclear weapons against any terrorist organization that threatens there country and I say "GOOD FOR THEM." Let those fuckers burn if they attack you. I feel that we should have blown all of them the fuck up.

Now I realize what kind of backlash this post is going to produce and I am ready to say I don't appologize for any of this. Hear me out, I am Catholic and how many times of day to I and others break the rules of my religion. I say God and here God said all the time, am I throwing a fit about it no. Am I out burning down embassies and beating people, NO. So grow the fuck up you stupid little Arab (Muslim) pussies.

\*Note: Please exscuse any grammatical errors I typed this very fast.

QFT!

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Kamuix](#) on Sat, 11 Feb 2006 05:57:27 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quantitative Feedback Theory?

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [ogreomg](#) on Sat, 11 Feb 2006 21:51:24 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

DarkDemin wrote on Tue, 07 February 2006 18:07 Listen, I don't give a fuck if it is against your religion, I don't give a fuck if it insults you, and I don't give a fuck if you protest peacefully. BUT, when you start burning flags, walking on flags, shooting and burning effages of my leaders I get PISSED. Arabs have shown themselves nothing better than animals. Then you start this "Holocaust cartoon contest." These Arab countries make me sick.

France has recently announced that they will use nuclear weapons against any terrorist organization that threatens there country and I say "GOOD FOR THEM." Let those fuckers burn if they attack you. I feel that we should have blown all of them the fuck up.

Now I realize what kind of backlash this post is going to produce and I am ready to say I don't appoligize for any of this. Hear me out, I am Catholic and how many times of day to I and others break the rules of my religion. I say God and here God said all the time, am I throwing a fit about it no. Am I out burning down embassies and beating people, NO. So grow the fuck up you stupid little Arab (Muslim) pussies.

\*Note: Please exscuse any grammatical errors I typed this very fast.

I have to agree.

I do believe that this was an offenisve thing to do towards muslims, but the pure unintellectual rage these people went into when this cartoon hit they're streets is just beyond ridiculous. It's more an excuse to create anarchy in the streets than it is anything else, IMO.

And then they do this "Holocaust" contest thing...dropping to the same low levels as the folks who made the bomb on the head cartoon. It's simply deplorable...

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Dave Mason](#) on Sat, 11 Feb 2006 23:10:38 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Argh what is this "QFT" I keep reading on forums around the place?

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Kamuix](#) on Sat, 11 Feb 2006 23:23:07 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Buckery wrote on Sat, 11 February 2006 00:57 Quantitative Feedback Theory?

This is all I found.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [csskiller](#) on Sat, 11 Feb 2006 23:24:36 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hmm, is it French for WTF?  
Quoi = What

and the letters are usually backwards relative to english.

ie KFC = PFK

[Edit] Then again I might have taken this a bit seriously

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Nightma12](#) on Sat, 11 Feb 2006 23:36:45 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:Quoted For Truth (Internet jargon) - Used on internet forums following a quote to make sure that the first 'poster' cannot go back and change what they've already posted.

Source: <http://opera.answers.com/QFT>

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [csskiller](#) on Sat, 11 Feb 2006 23:45:51 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Bah!

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [SCOTT9](#) on Sun, 12 Feb 2006 00:30:29 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

it was funny though they had a arab school girl with a i love al qiada hat on!!! ROFL!!

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [bandie63](#) on Sun, 12 Feb 2006 01:37:16 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I'm all for freedom of the press, and I'm not condoning the riots, which are just using this as an excuse, but that was poor judgement on the news paper's part. What makes it even worse, are the stupid papers feeding the fire by re-printing it.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [bigjoe14](#) on Sun, 12 Feb 2006 01:43:05 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Toolstyle](#) on Mon, 13 Feb 2006 19:10:05 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Nightma12 wrote on Sat, 11 February 2006 23:36Quote:Quoted For Truth (Internet jargon) - Used on internet forums following a quote to make sure that the first 'poster' cannot go back and change what they've already posted.

Source: <http://opera.answers.com/QFT>

I though it stood for "Quite F\*cking True" never mind.

What's really annoying about all this is that if Christian's had been offended by something a took to the streets we'd be condemned by everyone and the police would arrest as many as they could but because they're Muslims in a Christian country nothing happens.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [runewood](#) on Thu, 16 Feb 2006 19:47:41 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Ok, these events have made me sad. I know what I'm about to say may be wrong but for me its true.

I have lost all my respect for the Muslim world. I use to think, sure some extremists but mostly normal down to earth types. Then this happened. Now I don't see them a civilized people. It just sickens me. To think that a people, in the civilized world, could do this...I'm sorry for anyone who is Muslim but what the hell is wrong with you people? Someone draws on paper and you start killing each other and burning down buildings? You can't do shit like that. Sure you can have your rallies and such but when you kill innocent people and your own people then something is wrong. Islam



needs to take a good long look at itself and wonder if it can survive in the world as it is.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [thrash300](#) on Wed, 26 Apr 2006 20:13:04 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

God Bless You! You see what is going on and all the bullshit that goes with it. But a little thing you should know is that Alquada is said to start these things. But they should be smart, but when you hear only one voice you get determined, and think that it is the act of God. You see, they don't have CNN, or ABC, they don't have the truth, so these Alquada bastards take advantage of that. Some Arabs knew the truth and did not protest, and told others not to as well.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Fri, 28 Apr 2006 19:47:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Thanks alot for Nodbuggering my post. Oh and suggesting that CNN and ABC are truthful is a joke.

See entry 1  
<http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=nodbugger>

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [thrash300](#) on Fri, 28 Apr 2006 22:10:21 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Yea, your kind of right they just talk talk talk, I mean seriously yap, yap, yap, like it, going to fix anything. Have you watched it?  
They get off topic sometimes!

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [thrash300](#) on Fri, 28 Apr 2006 22:12:39 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Ow, and IM NOT A NODBUGGER I only follow when its for the right!!!!!!!!!!!!!! Im a free person I can follow then leave!!!!

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Sat, 29 Apr 2006 02:50:43 GMT

---

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

---

Heh, Nodbugger. That just ruined the Nod Buggy for me...

Dover wrote on Tue, 25 April 2006 14:46thrash300:

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [SCOTT9](#) on Sat, 13 May 2006 21:03:34 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Muslims=pricks who are making a 65 decibal speaker mosque in my town and guess how much they paid for the land 1 fucking pound

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Dave Mason](#) on Sat, 13 May 2006 23:22:34 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

SCOTT9 wrote on Sat, 13 May 2006 22:03Muslims=pricks who are making a 65 decibal speaker mosque in my town and guess how much they paid for the land 1 fucking pound

Not you again.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [mision08](#) on Sun, 14 May 2006 04:54:29 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

thrash300 wrote on Fri, 28 April 2006 17:10Yea, your kind of right they just talk talk talk, I mean seriously yap, yap, yap, like it, going to fix anything. Have you watched it? They get off topic sometimes!

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Wed, 17 May 2006 14:43:44 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

SCOTT9 wrote on Sat, 13 May 2006 16:03Muslims=pricks who are making a 65 decibal speaker mosque in my town and guess how much they paid for the land 1 fucking pound

And you're a racist. Prejudiced/Religionist/whatever the hell you call him these days.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Feetseek](#) on Thu, 18 May 2006 04:12:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hmmmmmmmmmmmm..... I heard that almost the same thing is happening with Christians and the DaVinci code. Although I don't think they did anything destructive, I find this rather ironic that they taunted the Muslims for being mad over a cartoon while they get mad over a book/movie.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Thu, 18 May 2006 23:21:48 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

You couldn't be more wrong. Muslims ATTACKED AND KILLED PEOPLE AND DESTROYED PROPERTY over these cartoons. The most any Christian has done over The Da Vinci Code is boycott them both or publish rebuttals.

Don't even try comparing the two.

Besides, even if they WERE comparable, the most your ridiculous attack on Christians can be considered is, at most, off topic for this thread. This thread is about how muslims RIOTED AND KILLED over the publishing of these cartoons.

Take your attacks on Christianity somewhere else.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Feetseek](#) on Fri, 19 May 2006 01:50:37 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

It's not an attack.... I'm just saying that I find both Muslims and Christian do different things, but have a somewhat similar anger.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Fri, 19 May 2006 15:21:19 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

It most certainly was an attack. You try to excuse the actions of muslims because Christians, you claim, respond to criticism in a way similar to muslims.

You're equating peaceful protests with violent riots, which is just plain ludicrous.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

---

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Fri, 19 May 2006 15:52:42 GMT

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

---

No he didn't. He said exactly what he reiterated to you in his second post. The irony is not really all that intriguing, but it's still there. I spoke to many Christians about the cartoons, and none of them responded to "well, it's what they believe, they have a right to be mad", whereas most of them responded with "wow, it's just a cartoon".

I think you need to reevaluate why it is you got so angry in the first place. Because it certainly wasn't over anything that was inferred.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 19 May 2006 19:16:01 GMT

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

---

Question:

Hydra, are attacks on Christianity any worse than attacks on Islam? If so, why?

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Fri, 19 May 2006 19:43:45 GMT

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

---

Javaxcx wrote on Fri, 19 May 2006 11:52: No he didn't. He said exactly what he reiterated to you in his second post. The irony is not really all that intriguing, but it's still there. I spoke to many Christians about the cartoons, and none of them responded to "well, it's what they believe, they have a right to be mad", whereas most of them responded with "wow, it's just a cartoon".

I think you need to reevaluate why it is you got so angry in the first place. Because it certainly wasn't over anything that was inferred.

A right to be mad yes, but not throw molotov cocktails at embassies.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [Dover](#) on Mon, 22 May 2006 14:52:09 GMT

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

---

But then again, what rights do European knights have for pillaging the holy land?

Quote: As long as there has been one true god, there has been killing in his name.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Tue, 23 May 2006 06:09:11 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Javaxcx wrote on Fri, 19 May 2006 11:52No he didn't. He said exactly what he reiterated to you in his second post. The irony is not really all that intriguing, but it's still there. It may not be as vehement as I suggested in my earlier post, but it was still an attack in that he tried to downplay the actions of those muslims by saying "well Christians complain about stupid stuff like this too."

Quote:I spoke to many Christians about the cartoons, and none of them responded to "well, it's what they believe, they have a right to be mad", whereas most of them responded with "wow, it's just a cartoon".  
They probably said "wow, it's just a cartoon" because of the way the muslims responded to them; no sane person is going to say, "They have a right to be mad, which justifies their rioting."

Quote:I think you need to reevaluate why it is you got so angry in the first place. Because it certainly wasn't over anything that was inferred.  
Where did I get angry? The all-caps? Those are there simply for emphasis.

DoverQuestion:

Hydra, are attacks on Christianity any worse than attacks on Islam? If so, why?  
No, though you want me to say yes.

Both religions have been attacked in similar ways--Islam with the cartoons, Christianity with The DaVinci Code book and movie.  
Both have responded in starkly different ways--Islam with violent riots, Christianity with peaceful protests (and banning of the movie in some countries at the worst; nothing violent (to my knowledge))

Is it an attack to say Islam responded in a much more violent way to criticism than Christianity? How about if I said that it is illegal and punishable by death to be a Christian in every country governed by Islamic law while it is perfectly legal to be a muslim in most countries founded on Christian principles?  
Of course not; it's a simple observation of reality. The modern-day media leads us to believe that these are attacks because it has become politically incorrect to confront the brutal facts.

Quote:But then again, what rights do European knights have for pillaging the holy land? If you want to bring the Crusades into this (wars started IN REACTION TO muslim aggression), you can throw all relevancy of your argument to today's world (that's the year 2006, not the year 1306) right out the window.

Quote:As long as there has been one true god, there has been killing in his name.  
As long as there have been multiple true gods, there has been killing in their name.  
As long as there has been no god, there has been killing in our name.  
As long as there has been a human race, there has been killing in man's name.  
For as long as I don't have what you have, I have always been killing you to get it.

You can't blame on religion what has been caused by our nature.

If anything, religion serves to assist us in controlling our nature and NOT killing each other just to get the other guy's stuff. That whole "love your neighbor" and "serve others" thing wouldn't even exist had it not been for religion. Mankind would have never left the caves and advanced to where we are now had we never had any religion.

Sure there's been killing in His name, but moreso than killing, there has been innovation.

Amen.

P.S. Word to the wise: don't take anything in The DaVinci Code for fact without doing your own independent research.

There's more evidence for a secret treasure hidden by Freemasons that our Founding Fathers left clues to find in our founding documents than there is for Jesus's supposed daughter.

Disney ends up making a more compelling case than Ron Howard.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Tue, 23 May 2006 11:16:51 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Durka Durka!

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 23 May 2006 17:35:50 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Funny. I saw The DaVinci Code this past weekend, and I didn't see it as an attack at all. Quite the opposite, I saw it as a call for free-thinking. It simply presents a case and allows the viewer to form his or her own conclusions. Christianity on the other hand, basically says "This is what the bible says, therefore it's right. Any deviance from this is wrong. If you don't believe you're going to hell."

What's an attack on what, exactly?

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Tue, 23 May 2006 17:57:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It's fiction...I don't know why religious loonies are getting all worked up over it.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Tue, 23 May 2006 18:02:50 GMT

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

---

Say someone calls your mother a slut. Even if it clearly isn't true, are you going to respond to that or just let it happen?

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 23 May 2006 18:36:10 GMT

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

---

Just let it happen. Duh. What kind of insecure nut would get worked up over WORDS?

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Tue, 23 May 2006 19:11:52 GMT

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

---

SpyGuy246 wrote on Tue, 23 May 2006 13:02 Say someone calls your mother a slut. Even if it clearly isn't true, are you going to respond to that or just let it happen?

That must be the most retarded thing I've ever read...

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Tue, 23 May 2006 22:14:25 GMT

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

---

So your mother is a slut, I take it.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Tue, 23 May 2006 22:47:49 GMT

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

---

Hydra wrote on Tue, 23 May 2006 02:09 It may not be as vehement as I suggested in my earlier post, but it was still an attack in that he tried to downplay the actions of those muslims by saying "well Christians complain about stupid stuff like this too."

After rereading his posts a few times, I really don't know how this conclusion could be reached. He didn't downplay anything, especially since he didn't suggest such a matter was even in contention. As stated before, the irony he mentioned isn't very spectacular in the first place, but it still exists regardless of the specifics of the situation. Religious people tend to take this process of non-thinking epistemology to such an extreme that belligerence is a repercussion of whatever the situation is. It is highly unfortunate that the poor and stupid Muslims of the world take to violence to express such anger, don't get me wrong. But the fact that Christians also get so angry over

similar stimulus does not dismiss the fact that they take extreme action in turn. In this case, it's obviously not violence, it's smear campaigns against a fiction being purported as fact by none other than the conservative wing in the first place! Mr. Brown may have stated that his work contains factual information regarding certain categories, but he also made quite clear (and reiterated in that trial) that the work is nothing but a fiction to be taken with a grain of sand as a whole. The point the person who started this was trying to make was that both sides do stupid things for immensely stupid reasons. To such a thing I say "fucking duh" and move on.

Quote:They probably said "wow, it's just a cartoon" because of the way the muslims responded to them; no sane person is going to say, "They have a right to be mad, which justifies their rioting."

On the contrary, I don't believe that anyone in the western world with a shred of sense ever pretended that the action they took was justified. I have the utmost reason to believe it was over the fact that the belief of the muslims states that Muhammed must not be drawn-- or whatever the still retarded dogma is.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Tue, 23 May 2006 23:09:27 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dan Brown should consider putting a huge disclaimer at the front of his book. STOP FUCKING CALLING THIS THE TRUTH YOU FUCKING RELIGIOUS NUTS! He already publicly denounced the fact that people think it is the truth.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Wed, 24 May 2006 10:39:21 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Aircraftkiller wrote on Tue, 23 May 2006 17:14So your mother is a slut, I take it.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Wed, 24 May 2006 14:45:41 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You know, what my mother does extramaritally is none of my business, so for all I know, she could be.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Wed, 24 May 2006 22:55:15 GMT



I think there would be some warning signs...

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Thu, 25 May 2006 03:47:06 GMT

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

---

I love how everyone expects me to shit bricks like a bible-thumper watching The DaVinci Code because my mother was dragged into this conversation.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Thu, 25 May 2006 05:12:43 GMT

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

---

Dover wrote on Tue, 23 May 2006 13:35 Funny. I saw The DaVinci Code this past weekend, and I didn't see it as an attack at all. Quite the opposite, I saw it as a call for free-thinking. Free-thinking as long as it's a humanist form of thinking, right?

Quote:It simply presents a case and allows the viewer to form his or her own conclusions. It presents a case against the Catholic church and steers the viewer to form an anti-Catholic/Christianity conclusion.

It tells us that Christ was simply another figure in history rather than the Son of God and even had a wife of His own.

It goes on to expose some of the atrocities committed by the Catholic church.

I don't see how any viewer who may have been on the fence about religion can draw any other conclusion other than "Christianity is bad" from this movie.

Quote:Christianity on the other hand, basically says "This is what the bible says, therefore it's right. Any deviance from this is wrong. If you don't believe you're going to hell."

I don't know what Christians you've been talking to, but if THAT'S what you think the basic message of Christianity is, you've missed the point completely.

Want to know what the basic message of Christianity is? "Love God, and love people." Love God (in all three forms) with all your strength, and love your neighbor as yourself.

What you've said is the basic message of Christianity is a misinterpretation of what SOME judgmental Christian fundamentalists have said over the years. Sadly, many Christians do not know how to tactfully share the gospel with non-believers without being too abrasive or judgmental. It's really not your fault you think the way you do about Christianity; rather, it's the fault of those abrasive and judgmental Christians who failed to explain their beliefs in a tactful way without being too offensive.

Quote:What's an attack on what, exactly?

The DaVinci Code is an attack on a message of love.

Quote:Just let it happen. Duh. What kind of insecure nut would get worked up over WORDS? When those words have the power to destroy your reputation and add to the slander that's already out there against you, thus giving people on the fence one more reason to turn away from you.

Quote:I love how everyone expects me to shit bricks like a bible-thumper watching The DaVinci Code because my mother was dragged into this conversation.

Quote:What's an attack on what, exactly?

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Thu, 25 May 2006 05:38:14 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hydra wrote on Thu, 25 May 2006 00:12

Quote:Just let it happen. Duh. What kind of insecure nut would get worked up over WORDS? When those words have the power to destroy your reputation and add to the slander that's already out there against you, thus giving people on the fence one more reason to turn away from you.

Which was my point in bringing it up in the first place. Thank you for seeing it when a couple people missed it.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Thu, 25 May 2006 09:28:58 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I didn't read through this whole thread, but something here is very, very wrong.

Quote:It presents a case against the Catholic church and steers the viewer to form an anti-Catholic/Christianity conclusion.

It tells us that Christ was simply another figure in history rather than the Son of God and even had a wife of His own.

It goes on to expose some of the atrocities committed by the Catholic church.

I don't see how any viewer who may have been on the fence about religion can draw any other conclusion other than "Christianity is bad" from this movie.

You do know that it's just a fictional story, right? That's like secret service agents getting mad because some thriller portrays them as evil...if people take that stuff for real, then it should really be their fault instead of the author's, don't you think?

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Thu, 25 May 2006 14:53:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hydra wrote on Wed, 24 May 2006 22:12 Free-thinking as long as it's a humanist form of thinking, right?

No, just thinking outside what's normally accepted.

Hydra wrote on Wed, 24 May 2006 22:12 It presents a case against the Catholic church and steers the viewer to form an anti-Catholic/Christianity conclusion.

But a viewer is free to, as you have I'm sure, form a different opinion.

Hydra wrote on Wed, 24 May 2006 22:12 It tells us that Christ was simply another figure in history rather than the Son of God and even had a wife of His own.

There's no actual proof to say otherwise, other than a book.

Hydra wrote on Wed, 24 May 2006 22:12 It goes on to expose some of the atrocities committed by the Catholic church.

Which should be kept secret...why? If I'm going to cast my vote for the Catholic church, I expect to know all the crap they've done in their history, similar to the press having a field day with George Bush and the choking on the pretzel, or the fact that he's snorted cocaine in his college years. In the same way the Americans have a right to know the information before electing him to any position, people have a right to know about these atrocities committed by the Catholic church before dedicating part of their lives and wallets to it.

Hydra wrote on Wed, 24 May 2006 22:12 I don't see how any viewer who may have been on the fence about religion can draw any other conclusion other than "Christianity is bad" from this movie.

Maybe, but there are more than enough "Pro-Christian" influences in the world. Too many, in fact. One movie on the other side isn't going

Hydra wrote on Wed, 24 May 2006 22:12 I don't know what Christians you've been talking to, but if THAT'S what you think the basic message of Christianity is, you've missed the point completely.

Want to know what the basic message of Christianity is? "Love God, and love people." Love God (in all three forms) with all your strength, and love your neighbor as yourself.

...And if you don't want to love god, because you don't believe, you're going to hell, right?

Hydra wrote on Wed, 24 May 2006 22:12 What you've said is the basic message of Christianity is a misinterpretation of what SOME judgmental Christian fundamentalists have said over the years. Sadly, many Christians do not know how to tactfully share the gospel with non-believers without being too abrasive or judgmental. It's really not your fault you think the way you do about Christianity; rather, it's the fault of those abrasive and judgmental Christians who failed to explain their beliefs in a tactful way without being too offensive.

Amongst the most "fundamentalist" of Christian groups are the Catholics. They're literally the

foundation for all the churches that came thereafter. Last I checked the Catholic church numbered about 1,000,000,000 people. Hardly SOME.

Hydra wrote on Wed, 24 May 2006 22:12 The DaVinci Code is an attack on a message of love.

Christianity does not hold a monopoly on them messege of love. To continue the metaphor, they own very little shares of the messege of love.

Hydra wrote on Wed, 24 May 2006 22:12 When those words have the power to destroy your reputation and add to the slander that's already out there against you, thus giving people on the fence one more reason to turn away from you.

That's implying I give a shit about what people I've never met and never will meet care about me. Who cares if they turn away from me. Similarly, why should you care if The DaVinci Code results in less recruitment for the church?

Hydra wrote on Wed, 24 May 2006 22:12 Quote: I love how everyone expects me to shit bricks like a bible-thumper watching The DaVinci Code because my mother was dragged into this conversation.

Quote: What's an attack on what, exactly?

You're implying that I attacked Christianity, I'm assuming?

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Thu, 25 May 2006 17:27:06 GMT

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

---

You've stated a mouthful there, Hydra.

Hydra wrote on Thu, 25 May 2006 01:12

Free-thinking as long as it's a humanist form of thinking, right?

This is an interesting point to make. As someone who pertains but doesn't subscribe to Christianity, and having been immersed in Christian schools since the age of four, I feel I have at least an informed opinion on this matter. The DaVinci Code does not, at least to me, come off as a humanist dogma. It lends itself to a thoroughly agnostic position. That IS free-thinking. It's the mean between the extremes of deism and atheism, which as far as I'm concerned is the sweet spot.

Just because something squelches what you believe does not mean it is wrong, evil, or even slander. That's a harsh point to make, seeing how DVC is also a fiction-- something to reiterate thoroughly because it doesn't seem to be sinking in with those who believe it has ever been purported as anything but.

On a side note, Christianity is supposed to be a free-thinking institution. And while I think that is an oxymoron to boundless extremes given the criteria that come standard with the [Christian] tag, I ask why it is considered such a pox on the institution to facilitate alternatives to what is

commonly accepted? Is Christianity only free-thinking when it's in line with the accepted dogma? Or am I missing something here that wasn't revealed to me over nearly 15 years of Christian schooling and 5 years of independent study?

Quote:It presents a case against the Catholic church and steers the viewer to form an anti-Catholic/Christianity conclusion.

JohnDoe made a very ample comparison to this.

Quote:That's like secret service agents getting mad because some thriller portrays them as evil

Similarity, should you subscribe to Christianity, wouldn't this fiction allow you to ask questions to strengthen your faith? Mind you, I've never bought into that standard response to discernment from the Christian front either, but some people find logic in it so I'll toss it out there.

Quote:It tells us that Christ was simply another figure in history rather than the Son of God and even had a wife of His own.

So? Metal Gear Solid uses factual coincidences to establish a hidden sub-government within the US government dating back to the birth of America that runs the world secretly. But that was a fiction too, right?

I certainly don't believe that if Jesus lived, He lived any other way than what the Bible purported Him as (seeing how the Biblical texts and similar books are our only "reliable" source on His life). I certainly don't think that, nor ever did, Da Vinci would be privvy to such information contrary in the first place.

Quote:It goes on to expose some of the atrocities committed by the Catholic church. I don't see how any viewer who may have been on the fence about religion can draw any other conclusion other than "Christianity is bad" from this movie.

The Catholic Church is guilty of atrocities. They are one of the most corrupt institutions in history. Mind you, they're also one of the most long-standing, so they've had a long time to rack in the distrust and reputation they have. They are guilty of doing vastly good things, but that's shadow in comparison when they commit an evil thing. That goes a great deal farther when you hear what Catholic dogma says about the nature of the papacy.

Quote:I don't know what Christians you've been talking to, but if THAT'S what you think the basic message of Christianity is, you've missed the point completely.

Want to know what the basic message of Christianity is? "Love God, and love people." Love God (in all three forms) with all your strength, and love your neighbor as yourself.

I think that you'll find that most people who don't subscribe to the Bible or Christianity will fit the description of the Christian version of "love thy neighbour". You'll also find that they may also have contention with your description of the Divine. Personally, I'd like to know how it is you know that God is the way you claim He is and not like the way I say He is. It certainly isn't as simple as just saying "love God and love your neighbour", because loving God is a pretty big freaking

commitment to make. Let me elaborate:

In order to love God, you need to know what God is. You can throw that idea that God is in people, but the Old Testament and New Testament seem to suggest that God is Himself a separate entity from all of us and should be loved in such a respect. Further, that claim is dismissed when the second piece of message says "love thy neighbour" which further suggests God is something other than people. I say this because in previous discussions, this point has been raised and I want to nip it in the bud. In order to love God, you need to know what He is-- or in fact, that He IS a He. In order to do this, we refer to the Bible, the Koran, the Torah, whatever. All books say that God is. You read through them and you come to the conclusion that God exists simply because He does. So, now you are told to love someone whom you have no reason to believe actually exists in the manner described. So the problem is clear, and the problem with Christianity is clear.

Those people who love their neighbours without subscribing to Christianity tend not to have a problem with loving each other, they have a problem with loving a logical being extrapolated into an immensely illogical fallacy\*\*\*.

Quote:The DaVinci Code is an attack on a message of love.

Why? Please define love, because I think we're referring to different things.

Quote:When those words have the power to destroy your reputation and add to the slander that's already out there against you, thus giving people on the fence one more reason to turn away from you.

Turn away from you, or turn away from your beliefs? Is being offered material to study and confirm or dispute constitute this? Or should the information claimed to be truth by Mr. Brown be left secret for those only privy to a theology degree or an impulse to study church history? I'm not saying everything he claims as truthful is truthful, because there are several debatable points. However, there are many others that raise important questions that have every right to see the light of day. If they cause your belief system to suffer, that is not the truth's fault. It is your institution. It is most definitely not slander.

\*\*\*I say that God is a logical conclusion based on the works of Thomas Aquinas. I say that the Bible however is an illogical extrapolation because there is no proof outside conjecture suggesting that anything supernatural in the Bible has ever happened or could happen. I can say that God probably exists, but He certainly isn't the God that turned a woman to salt and flooded the world. That God has evidence stacked against him, while mine has nothing but evidence FOR Him.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Thu, 25 May 2006 17:50:13 GMT

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

---

I agree with most you've said, but what evidence is there for your form of god? There's no evidence for either.

Thomas Aquinas just assumes that there is a first cause to everything and that it is god...but why should it be that way? I mean, if god can exist without a reason, then why can't the universe?

And maybe there isn't a first cause at all...how could we possibly know?

Suck my nuts, Tom!

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Thu, 25 May 2006 17:55:14 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Some of Thomas Aquinas' proof for a god was, being frank, just plain silly.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Javafx](#) on Thu, 25 May 2006 17:55:38 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

What I should have said is there is MORE evidence for my concept of God than the Biblical one. I'm thoroughly agnostic, so I tend to pertain to ideas that have a probability attached to them. Aquinas (it was the reader's digest version for complexity's sake) and Kant combined generally make up my theory. I'm not gonna go into too much depth lest I throw this thread off topic, but in a nutshell it seems to be far more probable to me that all things are caused by a causee than an infinite regression of causality.

Aquinas (again, reader's digest) says that an infinite regression of causality is very possible, but it doesn't account for the existence of the regression. That's where the first cause comes in. There are no stipulations on the nature of the first cause, merely that it has happened. Which is also why we have no reason to believe anything other than God probably exists. You can call him Zummpledumple for all I care. It's not the same God as the Bible, but I call Him that nonetheless because His existence is akin to that God.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Thu, 25 May 2006 18:16:19 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

No, that's exactly the flaw in Aquinas' logic...he assumes that there is a god in the first place (call him zumpledumple if you wish), but why couldn't there just be the universe? It's much more probable since we have proof that the universe exists.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Javafx](#) on Thu, 25 May 2006 18:28:08 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---



Not quite. Aquinas himself might have assumed God existed and went on to prove it, but the theory does not. The theory suggests that because all things are caused, there must be a causer. This is why I say it is probable and not definite that God exists. Aquinas himself thought it absolutely certain, whereas everything we know about this universe today suggests things are only probable.

To me personally, all things I have experienced suggest to me that all things are almost certainly caused by something else. As this regression proceeds to a single first cause (to which I also don't know existed, I can only speculate), I can call it God, Java, Xcx, whatever. It's the first cause that exists only in such a form that is transcendental. That's why there can be the appearance of a universe that has always been here but it has also been caused into being. Similarly, it can simpler and the universe could have started at a single point. I didn't want to touch too much on Kant here because his theories are just as far out there.

But it's like string theory. The conclusions are pretty intense, but it is challenging to prove them wrong. Make note though, this God doesn't even need to be all that special. It's merely the cause that allowed all things today to happen. It doesn't necessarily mean that such a God isn't capable of anything else, but it doesn't negate that possibility.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Thu, 25 May 2006 18:33:18 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

JohnDoe wrote on Thu, 25 May 2006 14:16It's much more probable since we have proof that the universe exists.

This is another thing to consider. When you say that you have proof that the universe exists, what is it? I'm not trying to be a broad spectrum here, but when you start mixing theories of proof it's necessary to bring it up. If you can say that we can prove that the universe exists, I'm assuming you're basing this on the experience that you exist IN the universe. Then suddenly you're comparing apples and apples because the universe you claim exists under mostly probable objective circumstances must also probably follow some kind of logic. If it's causality, then Aquinas' theory is still applicable because of Kant's Transcendental Aesthetic theory.

Long story short, read a few excerpts on the TA and see what you can come up with. I'd be interested in discussing it with you.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 25 May 2006 18:58:10 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Just based on the last few comments regarding the universe and God, in short form:

Either everything had a beginning, or some things simply just existed, and always have.



Taking this premise, you have three choices (for all three, assume "the Universe" includes its pre-big bang form):

1) The Universe has always existed. Therefore God did not create the universe.

However, this can not be used to disprove the overall idea of God's existence, as if the universe has always existed, then the possibility of God always existing is still there.

2) The Universe did not exist at one point in time. It simply created itself.

This can also not be used to disprove the existence of God. After all, if an unintelligent thing such as the universe can create itself, why can an intelligent being not do the same?

3) The Universe did not exist at one point in time. Something must have created it.

Self-explanatory. Something created it. That would be the being we call God. Who created God then? Well, something somewhere had to create itself in order to begin creating new things. Whether or not it is true "God" came from nothing, or was simply always there, there had to be a beginning at some point.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Thu, 25 May 2006 19:03:55 GMT

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

---

Quote:Not quite. Aquinas himself might have assumed God existed and went on to prove it, but the theory does not. The theory suggests that because all things are caused, there must be a causer. This is why I say it is probable and not definite that God exists. Aquinas himself thought it absolutely certain, whereas everything we know about this universe today suggests things are only probable.

It's not even probable...there is no evidence whatsoever that he exists.

Quote:To me personally, all things I have experienced suggest to me that all things are almost certainly caused by something else. As this regression proceeds to a single first cause (to which I also don't know existed, I can only speculate), I can call it God, Java, Xcx, whatever. It's the first cause that exists only in such a form that is transcendental. That's why there can be the appearance of a universe that has always been here but it has also been caused into being. Similarly, it can be simpler and the universe could have started at a single point. I didn't want to touch too much on Kant here because his theories are just as far out there.

Like you've said, it's nothing more than speculations. What if after your god there is another god and then another,...? The theory just has too many flaws and assumptions. Why does there have to be a first cause? The universe could just exist forever for what I care...

Quote:This is another thing to consider. When you say that you have proof that the universe exists, what is it? I'm not trying to be a broad spectrum here, but when you start mixing theories of

proof it's necessary to bring it up. If you can say that we can prove that the universe exists, I'm assuming you're basing this on the experience that you exist IN the universe. Then suddenly you're comparing apples and apples because the universe you claim exists under mostly probable objective circumstances must also probably follow some kind of logic. If it's causality, then Aquinas' theory is still applicable because of Kant's Transcendental Aesthetic theory.

It doesn't need to be causality, tho. I personally think the universe exists forever and is always expanding and decreasing.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Thu, 25 May 2006 19:11:27 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Warranto is right. God's existance can neither be disproven not proven.

But, from a logical point of view, assuming that there is something you have no proof of whatsoever makes no sense at all.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Thu, 25 May 2006 19:42:10 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

JohnDoe wrote on Thu, 25 May 2006 15:03It's not even probable...there is no evidence whatsoever that he exists.

That's not exactly true. Probability is the assumption that things will act a certain way in the future, or similarly, things in the past acted in a predictable manner similar to the immediate present. Based solely on the present, most if not all things I've experienced suggest a universal law of causality. For every action, there is a reaction, and every reaction requires an action. Of course, it's a theory and it is valid because the future has not yet proven it to be truth or not. However, based on this, we have a model by which we can say that the past MAY have been like it is right now. The sample data is as big as I can remember and has remained consistent throughout. Which means by extrapolation I have probability on my side when I say all things are probably caused. That invariably includes the universe, as the universe is comprised by definition of energy. Thus, all energy originated at a single point as a result of some kind of stimulation. I choose to call it God. The proof is based on the same scientific method used to prove simple things like inertia or force. The beauty is that it isn't definiate and is still fallable. Which means while I might be right, there is just a good, if not greater chance that I'm wrong. Which means there is still mystery in the universe for my mind to experience and apply to my understanding. However, as it stands now I can merely say THAT God exists based on my experience, I simply can't tell you how He does, why He does, or what He might be capable of.

Quote:Like you've said, it's nothing more than speculations. What if after your god there is another god and then another,...? The theory just has too many flaws and assumptions. Why does there have to be a first cause? The universe could just exist forever for what I care...

Then there is one god, then another, then another. I don't know, or have any recourse to suggest such a thing even is probable. So my position is that it is merely possible, but infinitely unprovable. I don't try and figure out the nature of what the first cause is like. I only need to be convinced as much as I am sure the sun will rise tomorrow THAT such a cause existed.

As for the universe existing forever, I'm assuming you're talking about the universe having existed forever as opposed to existing forever in the future. To which Aquinas' argument still works because of the TA of Kant. Our concepts of past, present, and future are the means by which our consciousness makes sense of the universe around it. There is no doctrine to suggest that the universe itself must revolve around these concepts. Like warrant0 said, should the universe have existed forever, then it lends there must be some kind of means to an end. It must mean that infinity is a tangible construct and not an abstract attributed ONLY to the transcendental. There is so little evidence for this that I can't help but be inclined to think it isn't true. Now, that doesn't mean that it ISN'T true, it's merely saying that the chances of it being true are significantly less than the universe having begun at some point. If you can provide enough evidence for a claim, I'd be forced to reevaluate the situation.

Quote:It doesn't need to be causality, tho. I personally think the universe exists forever and is always expanding and decreasing.

Why? What makes you think this is more likely than the universe starting at some point?

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Thu, 25 May 2006 21:03:20 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:That's not exactly true. Probability is the assumption that things will act a certain way in the future, or similarly, things in the past acted in a predictable manner similar to the immediate present. Based solely on the present, most if not all things I've experienced suggest a universal law of causality. For every action, there is a reaction, and every reaction requires an action. Of course, it's a theory and it is valid because the future has not yet proven it to be truth or not. However, based on this, we have a model by which we can say that the past MAY have been like it is right now. The sample data is as big as I can remember and has remained consistent throughout. Which means by extrapolation I have probability on my side when I say all things are probably caused. That invariably includes the universe, as the universe is comprised by definition of energy. Thus, all energy originated at a single point as a result of some kind of stimulation. I choose to call it God. The proof is based on the same scientific method used to prove simple things like inertia or force. The beauty is that it isn't definite and is still fallable. Which means while I might be right, there is just a good, if not greater chance that I'm wrong. Which means there is still mystery in the universe for my mind to experience and apply to my understanding. However, as it stands now I can merely say THAT God exists based on my experience, I simply can't tell you how He does, why He does, or what He might be capable of.

The whole idea of "god" is based on something resembling an intelligent life form, right? What can possibly make you think that something like that should exist? It's about as probable as the pink

unicorns in my front yard that only become visible once the moon explodes. I can understand why people would think that there is a starting point to the universe, but isn't a Big Bang that we can't fully understand with our current knowledge of physics a lot more likely than some kind of creature? After all, god is just something people invented in order to explain things that they couldn't themselves.

Quote:Then there is one god, then another, then another. I don't know, or have any recourse to suggest such a thing even is probable. So my position is that it is merely possible, but infinitely unprovable. I don't try and figure out the nature of what the first cause is like. I only need to be convinced as much as I am sure the sun will rise tomorrow THAT such a cause existed.

Well, that's just your feeling. I just don't see why a chain of actions and reactions should even come to sudden halt. It kind of defeats the purpose of it, don't you think?

Quote:As for the universe existing forever, I'm assuming you're talking about the universe having existed forever as opposed to existing forever in the future. To which Aquinas' argument still works because of the TA of Kant. Our concepts of past, present, and future are the means by which our consciousness makes sense of the universe around it. There is no doctrine to suggest that the universe itself must revolve around these concepts. Like warranto said, should the universe have existed forever, then it lends there must be some kind of means to an end. It must mean that infinity is a tangible construct and not an abstract attributed ONLY to the transcendental. There is so little evidence for this that I can't help but be inclined to think it isn't true. Now, that doesn't mean that it ISN'T true, it's merely saying that the chances of it being true are significantly less than the universe having begun at some point. If you can provide enough evidence for a claim, I'd be forced to reevaluate the situation.

No, I said "exists" on purpose, because that means past, present and future.

If for every action there is a reaction, then why should that chain stop at some point? Why should there be something that didn't come from a previous action? There is no proof for either of the theories and since it's beyond the current level of human knowledge, both are equally probable.

Quote:

Why? What makes you think this is more likely than the universe starting at some point?

My feeling, just like your feeling tells you that there is a starting point. None of them is more likely than the other, tho. What however is extremely unlikely is that there is a god in any shape or form.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Thu, 25 May 2006 21:15:33 GMT

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

---

JohnDoe wrote on Thu, 25 May 2006 17:03The whole idea of "god" is based on something resembling an intelligent life form, right? What can possibly make you think that something like that should exist?

It doesn't have to be intelligent. I have no recourse to suggest that the God that probably caused the universe into being is intelligent or not. So I don't pretend to speculate.

Quote:Well, that's just your feeling. I just don't see why a chain of actions and reactions should even come to sudden halt. It kind of defeats the purpose of it, don't you think?

Because for every movement, evidence suggests a mover. Nothing can simply come into motion on its own. To suggest that it can is doing exactly what you're accusing me of: assumption of something you have no proof of. It's interesting that you mention purpose. Aristotle did some very interesting work on "purpose". Have a read.

Quote:No, I said "exists" on purpose, because that means past, present and future.

If for every action there is a reaction, then why should that chain stop at some point? Why should there be something that didn't come from a previous action? There is no proof for either of the theories and since it's beyond the current level of human knowledge, both are equally probable.

The question isn't why can't there be an action prior to every reaction, it's how such an action can occur. Science, physics, and everything euclidian about our universe suggests it is impossible. That doesn't mean it actually IS impossible, but it suggests that it is not probable that such a thing defined our universe. You're purporting a theory based on science and evidence, but the long term past doesn't seem to coincide.

Quote:My feeling, just like your feeling tells you that there is a starting point. None of them is more likely than the other, tho. What however is extremely unlikely is that there is a god in any shape or form.

Have a read of this. It's a bit complicated and pretty long, but it establishes a firm foundation that one certainly IS more likely then the other based on the definite existence of a priori abstracts that do not necessarily follow the laws of physics, but defininately do play crucial roles in experience.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Thu, 25 May 2006 21:25:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'll read and reply 2morrow...I'm tired and spent too much time at the PC today anyway.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Thu, 25 May 2006 21:36:08 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Fair enough

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 25 May 2006 21:37:26 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

JohnDoe wrote on Thu, 25 May 2006 13:11Warranto is right. God's existence can neither be disproven nor proven.

But, from a logical point of view, assuming that there is something you have no proof of whatsoever makes no sense at all.

Oh! Oh! The "You have no proof, therefore it does not exist" argument. I LOVE completely obliterating this argument!

At one point in time, no had any proof of the following:

1 Billion dollars  
Anything at the molecular level  
The shape of North America (or any landmass)  
The "fact" that the earth orbits the sun  
electricity  
motor vehicles  
the wheel

etc.

A bit of trivia. At one point around the end of the 19th century (or 1900's, I forget), the Scientific authority in Britain actually declared (or was about to declare) science to be obsolete as everything there was to discover, had been discovered.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Fri, 26 May 2006 05:09:35 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

warranto wrote on Thu, 25 May 2006 16:37

A bit of trivia. At one point around the end of the 19th century (or 1900's, I forget), the Scientific authority in Britain actually declared (or was about to declare) science to be obsolete as everything there was to discover, had been discovered.

Similar to when around that same time the head of the U.S. Patent Office resigned for the same reason.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Fri, 26 May 2006 08:23:57 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

warranto wrote on Thu, 25 May 2006 16:37JohnDoe wrote on Thu, 25 May 2006 13:11Warranto is right. God's existence can neither be disproven nor proven.

---

But, from a logical point of view, assuming that there is something you have no proof of whatsoever makes no sense at all.

Oh! Oh! The "You have no proof, therefore it does not exist" argument. I LOVE completely obliterating this argument!

At one point in time, no had any proof of the following:

1 Billion dollars  
Anything at the molecular level  
The shape of North America (or any landmass)  
The "fact" that the earth orbits the sun  
electricity  
motor vehicles  
the wheel

etc.

A bit of trivia. At one point around the end of the 19th century (or 1900's, I forget), the Scientific authority in Britian actually declared (or was about to declare) science to be obsolete as everything there was to discover, had been discovered.

Ouch. I thought you were a bit more clever after your first post.  
I said that it doesn't make sense to assume something exists than you have no proof whatsoever for. I didn't say it doesn't exist, because that's impossible to find out. Get the difference? So yea gj obliterating something I haven't said, genius.

I'm saying that assuming that there is a planet with pink unicorns which are high on glue is nuts, because there is no proof whatsoever. I can't however say that it doesn't exist for sure. Exchange the unis with god and you get the picture.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Fri, 26 May 2006 08:41:37 GMT

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

---

Quote:It doesn't have to be intelligent. I have no recourse to suggest that the God that probably caused the universe into being is intelligent or not. So I don't pretend to speculate.

Take the intelligent away then and leave some kind of life form and answer my question.

Quote:Because for every movement, evidence suggests a mover. Nothing can simply come into motion on its own. To suggest that it can is doing exactly what you're accusing me of: assumption of something you have no proof of. It's interesting that you mention purpose. Aristotle did some very interesting work on "purpose". Have a read.



On the contrary. Nothing suggests a mover. Do you know a single thing that isn't moved by something else? So what does evidence suggest?

Quote:The question isn't why can't there be an action prior to every reaction, it's how such an action can occur. Science, physics, and everything euclidian about our universe suggests it is impossible. That doesn't mean it actually IS impossible, but it suggests that it is not probable that such a thing defined our universe. You're purporting a theory based on science and evidence, but the long term past doesn't seem to coincide.

That's not right...the Big Bang - Big Crush theory is pretty popular among scientists. The long term past seems to coincide...tell me one thing that hasn't been affected by another.

Quote:Have a read of this. It's a bit complicated and pretty long, but it establishes a firm foundation that one certainly IS more likely then the other based on the definite existence of a priori abstracts that do not necessarily follow the laws of physics, but defininately do play crucial roles in experience.

That's definitely too long for me to read without getting good grades for it . Is there some wikipedia thing that sums it up or something?

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Fri, 26 May 2006 13:52:13 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:That's not right...the Big Bang - Big Crush theory is pretty popular among scientists. The long term past seems to coincide...tell me one thing that hasn't been affected by another.

Spontaneous generation was popular among scientists, too.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Fri, 26 May 2006 14:03:28 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Your point?

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Fri, 26 May 2006 14:23:52 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I thought it was obvious, but I guess I have to waste my time making a longer post.

Spontaneous generation was the thought that life originated from non-living objects. For example, flies being created by a slab of rotting meat. This was a widely held scientific belief during its



heyday.

My point is that scientific theory is simply nothing more than theory. It may take extensive testing to come to its acceptance as a theory, but it remains nothing but a theory - there is nothing proven in science, because facts in science continually change on a daily basis.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 26 May 2006 14:53:12 GMT

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

---

Over the past year I've been adjusting my views on the Creation. I'm still a Creationist in the sense that I believe that God DID, in fact, create the heavens and earth and all of which it contains and is surrounded by. However, who says that how God created the universe wasn't by this oh-so-famous Big Bang Theory? The Bible says God created the heavens and the earth. It didn't say how.

It also doesn't state how long each "day" was. Each day had a different state of the world, who says it was 24 hours? These "days" could have been thousands or millions of years. To God, time is nothing.

Also, we were made in God's image, but was it physical form, as well? God has no form, so that can't be. We must then be modeled after him spiritually. This would make sense as to think that man wasn't necessarily man as we know it today. Evolution does happen in the world as species continue to change. Who says this wasn't the case?

I'm not really sure what I believe in terms of Creation or the existence of the universe, but I do know for sure about one thing. God exists and He created the heavens and the earth. He is real, and to deny it makes me chuckle. Take a look at the beauty of untouched land. Land that hasn't been torn apart and replaced with concrete and steel. It's too beautiful and perfect to just have happened by chance.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Fri, 26 May 2006 15:32:51 GMT

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

---

Aircraftkiller wrote on Fri, 26 May 2006 09:23 I thought it was obvious, but I guess I have to waste my time making a longer post.

Spontaneous generation was the thought that life originated from non-living objects. For example, flies being created by a slab of rotting meat. This was a widely held scientific belief during its heyday.

My point is that scientific theory is simply nothing more than theory. It may take extensive testing to come to its acceptance as a theory, but it remains nothing but a theory - there is nothing proven in science, because facts in science continually change on a daily basis.

I know what spontaneous generation is and I know what you were trying to say...I just don't see how that affects my argument in the slightest. You might as well have told us that you like zebras..

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Fri, 26 May 2006 15:37:19 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

j\_ball430 wrote on Fri, 26 May 2006 10:53 Over the past year I've been adjusting my views on the Creation. I'm still a Creationist in the sense that I believe that God DID, in fact, create the heavens and earth and all of which it contains and is surrounded by. However, who says that how God created the universe wasn't by this oh-so-famous Big Bang Theory? The Bible says God created the heavens and the earth. It didn't say how.

It also doesn't state how long each "day" was. Each day had a different state of the world, who says it was 24 hours? These "days" could have been thousands or millions of years. To God, time is nothing.

Also, we were made in God's image, but was it physical form, as well? God has no form, so that can't be. We must then be modeled after him spiritually. This would make sense as to think that man wasn't necessarily man as we know it today. Evolution does happen in the world as species continue to change. Who says this wasn't the case?

I'm not really sure what I believe in terms of Creation or the existence of the universe, but I do know for sure about one thing. God exists and He created the heavens and the earth. He is real, and to deny it makes me chuckle. Take a look at the beauty of untouched land. Land that hasn't been torn apart and replaced with concrete and steel. It's too beautiful and perfect to just have happened by chance.

Why would you assume that God did it? What makes you think that something exist of which you have no proof whatsoever? You might as well believe in the pink unicorn planet in the anus star system...it's as likely as God.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 26 May 2006 15:39:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

You completely missed (or ignored) the whole point of his post. Check the last paragraph to his post... you quoted it.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 26 May 2006 15:42:01 GMT

---

JohnDoe wrote on Fri, 26 May 2006 11:37j\_ball430 wrote on Fri, 26 May 2006 10:53Over the past year I've been adjusting my views on the Creation. I'm still a Creationist in the sense that I believe that God DID, in fact, create the heavens and earth and all of which it contains and is surrounded by. However, who says that how God created the universe wasn't by this oh-so-famous Big Bang Theory? The Bible says God created the heavens and the earth. It didn't say how.

It also doesn't state how long each "day" was. Each day had a different state of the world, who says it was 24 hours? These "days" could have been thousands or millions of years. To God, time is nothing.

Also, we were made in God's image, but was it physical form, as well? God has no form, so that can't be. We must then be modeled after him spiritually. This would make sense as to think that man wasn't necessarily man as we know it today. Evolution does happen in the world as species continue to change. Who says this wasn't the case?

I'm not really sure what I believe in terms of Creation or the existence of the universe, but I do know for sure about one thing. God exists and He created the heavens and the earth. He is real, and to deny it makes me chuckle. Take a look at the beauty of untouched land. Land that hasn't been torn apart and replaced with concrete and steel. It's too beautiful and perfect to just have happened by chance.

Why would you assume that God did it? What makes you think that something exist of which you have no proof whatsoever? You might as well believe in the pink unicorn planet in the anus star system...it's as likely as God.  
Why do you have to have proof of something to believe in it? That's absolute nonsense. That completely defeats the purpose of faith.

How do you figure it's unlikely? Because science can't prove it? Wake up. There aren't always going to be answers. You can't just go by living on what you do know and refuse to try and stretch your knowledge into the unknown. Get out of your little safety net and try thinking outside the box for once.

Also, why would I assume God did it? Because I... believe in it, maybe? Shocking, I know. Having faith in something is obviously beyond your comprehension.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Fri, 26 May 2006 15:49:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

You do realize that science was invented to prove faith. It just proved somethings in faith untrue. Now, it can be used to build on faith and make people realize the true wonders of the Deity that most likely created us all. That or space just decided to randomly explode.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 26 May 2006 15:57:29 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I just find it funny how people who stand by what science has proven to base their opinions on, yet completely disregard the idea of believing in something that hasn't been proven. What do you think science has done for the past milleniums? It proved or disproved the unknown. People had an idea as to how they thought things worked, and then they experimented and researched. They didn't know if atoms existed. They didn't know that the world was round. It was all an idea, a thought, a question. Then what happened? They experimented and proved the "impossible" to be true. Those who once disregarded any slight probability that the world was a sphere was proven wrong. Why only agree with something after it's been proven. Isn't that a little closed-minded?

Oh, and the same can go for some Christians. The ones who blasphem science. Science only tries to prove or disprove the unknown. It's not going to prove God to be non-existing unless he DOESN'T exist. If God does exist, then he won't be disproven. It's that simple.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Fri, 26 May 2006 16:54:16 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

j\_ball430 wrote on Fri, 26 May 2006 10:39You completely missed (or ignored) the whole point of his post. Check the last paragraph to hist post... you quoted it.

No...you say that you don't need proof, because you are sure that God exists. I'm asking you, how can you be sure about something without having any proof at all? Don't you think believing in pink unicorns is ridiculous?

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 26 May 2006 16:59:09 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

JohnDoe wrote on Fri, 26 May 2006 12:54j\_ball430 wrote on Fri, 26 May 2006 10:39You completely missed (or ignored) the whole point of his post. Check the last paragraph to hist post... you quoted it.

No...you say that you don't need proof, because you are sure that God exists. I'm asking you, how can you be sure about something without having any proof at all? Don't you think believing in pink unicorns is ridiculous?

That post of mine has nothing to do with what I said or in response to your post.

I'm not 100% sure that God exists. I have faith that He does exist, but there's no way to be 100% sure. However, that doesn't shake that I do believe God exists. It's all faith. I had faith that my plane was going to land safely in Greensboro, NC on Friday. If I didn't, I wouldn't have flown, but I

had no proof. A number of things could have happened, and the plane could have crashed.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Fri, 26 May 2006 17:04:51 GMT

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

---

j\_ball430 wrote on Fri, 26 May 2006 10:42JohnDoe wrote on Fri, 26 May 2006 11:37j\_ball430 wrote on Fri, 26 May 2006 10:53Over the past year I've been adjusting my views on the Creation. I'm still a Creationist in the sense that I believe that God DID, in fact, create the heavens and earth and all of which it contains and is surrounded by. However, who says that how God created the universe wasn't by this oh-so-famous Big Bang Theory? The Bible says God created the heavens and the earth. It didn't say how.

It also doesn't state how long each "day" was. Each day had a different state of the world, who says it was 24 hours? These "days" could have been thousands or millions of years. To God, time is nothing.

Also, we were made in God's image, but was it physical form, as well? God has no form, so that can't be. We must then be modeled after him spiritually. This would make sense as to think that man wasn't necessarily man as we know it today. Evolution does happen in the world as species continue to change. Who says this wasn't the case?

I'm not really sure what I believe in terms of Creation or the existance of the universe, but I do know for sure about one thing. God exists and He created the heavens and the earth. He is real, and to deny it makes me chuckle. Take a look at the beauty of untouched land. Land that hasn't been torn apart and replaced with concrete and steel. It's too beautiful and perfect to just have happened by chance.

Why would you assume that God did it? What makes you think that something exist of which you have no proof whatsoever? You might as well believe in the pink unicorn planet in the anus star system...it's as likely as God.

Why do you have to have proof of something to believe in it? That's absolute nonsense. That completely defeats the purpose of faith.

How do you figure it's unlikely? Because science can't prove it? Wake up. There aren't always going to be answers. You can't just go by living on what you do know and refuse to try and stretch your knowledge into the unknown. Get out of your little safety net and try thinking outside the box for once.

Also, why would I assume God did it? Because I... believe in it, maybe? Shocking, I know. Having faith in something is obviously beyond your comprehension.

You can believe in it all you want, just like kids believe in Santa and the Easter Bunny, but don't go around telling people that it's the truth, because that is a straight up lie since you don't know that.

How do I figure it's unlikely? Hmm let's see...not a single thing indicates that there is or was a god, your only sources are a couple of books about magictricks that all disagree with each other, written by men just like yourself.

You can have as much faith all you want, but don't tell me that it's a logical or obvious thing, because in fact it is exactly the opposite.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Fri, 26 May 2006 17:09:49 GMT

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

---

j\_ball430 wrote on Fri, 26 May 2006 11:59JohnDoe wrote on Fri, 26 May 2006 12:54j\_ball430 wrote on Fri, 26 May 2006 10:39You completely missed (or ignored) the whole point of his post. Check the last paragraph to hist post... you quoted it.

No...you say that you don't need proof, because you are sure that God exists. I'm asking you, how can you be sure about something without having any proof at all? Don't you think believing in pink unicorns is ridiculous?

That post of mine has nothing to do with what I said or in response to your post.

I'm not 100% sure that God exists. I have faith that He does exist, but there's no way to be 100% sure. However, that doesn't shake that I do believe God exists. It's all faith. I had faith that my plane was going to land safely in Greensboro, NC on Friday. If I didn't, I wouldn't have flown, but I had no proof. A number of things could have happened, and the plane could have crashed.

You can't even be 1% sure for what I'm concerned...all you can have is faith.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Fri, 26 May 2006 17:15:42 GMT

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

---

j\_ball430 wrote on Fri, 26 May 2006 10:57I just find it funny how people who stand by what science has proven to base their opinions on, yet completely disregard the idea of believing in something that hasn't been proven. What do you think science has done for the past milleniums? It proved or disproved the unknown. People had an idea as to how they thought things worked, and then they experimented and researched. They didn't know if atoms existed. They didn't know that the world was round. It was all an idea, a thought, a question. Then what happened? They experimented and proved the "impossible" to be true. Those who once disregarded any slight probability that the world was a sphere was proven wrong. Why only agree with something after it's been proven. Isn't that a little closed-minded?

Oh, and the same can go for some Christians. The ones who blasphem science. Science only tries to prove or disprove the unknown. It's not going to prove God to be non-existing unless he DOESN'T exist. If God does exist, then he won't be disproven. It's that simple.

What makes you think that God exists? Just answer me that...and tell me how it's more likely than pink unicorns in the anus star system.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 26 May 2006 17:42:04 GMT

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

---

I don't go around telling others that what I believe in is truth. You should probably listen to yourself, as well. You shouldn't be telling me that my thoughts are illogical when you have no proof that they are. Just because YOU believe that they are, doesn't make you right. The same goes for me, as you said.

God existing is just as likely as Him not existing. It's a 50/50 chance. Not 99/1, not 80/20. Either He does or doesn't exist.

It IS logical for us to have faith in things. You believe in material things all the time. The only difference is that what I have faith in is spiritual and cannot be seen, felt, or smelled.

-----

Faith is all I need. In my mind, I'm quite sure of God's existance. Whether or not you believe in it.

-----

I believe that God exists because of the world around me. I look at the beauty, the intricacy, and I see God. I don't see how any of this could have just spontaneously generated. It's far too complicated to have just came from nowhere. At least, that's my opinion. If you place all the components of a watch next to each other, they're not going to come together and form the watch. Not even if you added heat, pressure, or seismic activity. It's just not going to happen.

How is it more likely than pink unicorns existing? I can't, nor can you... same with God. God cannot be disproven. I'm also not going to discount the possibility of pink unicorns. We have no proof to say that they don't exist. Do I personally believe they do? No, but I'm not going to argue back and forth about their existance if I'm just as unsure as the people who DO believe in them.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Fri, 26 May 2006 17:47:45 GMT

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

---

JohnDoe wrote on Fri, 26 May 2006 04:41Take the intelligent away then and leave some kind of life form and answer my question.

You misunderstand. It doesn't have to be intelligent, it doesn't have to be unintelligent, it doesn't



even have to be alive. The fact is, I don't KNOW or pretend to know what it is that probably caused the universe into being. I merely know that SOMETHING did. I choose out of preference to call it God. Don't confuse me with the anthropomorphized diety of the superstitious, because frankly I have no way of proving such a thing. So I don't try to.

Quote:On the contrary. Nothing suggests a mover. Do you know a single thing that isn't moved by something else? So what does evidence suggest?

That there is a mover. I haven't thought of a single thing that hasn't been moved by a mover, but I also have just reason to believe that what we experience or have the POTENTIAL to experience is not the be all and end all of existence. Kant supports this, and it is explained on the link I gave you. Unfortunately, I don't have a condensed copy handy, so you'll either have to look around yourself or muddle through it. Infinite regression is still possible (although negated by contemporary physics), but it still doesn't negate the necessity for some form of transcendental causality.

Quote:That's not right...the Big Bang - Big Crush theory is pretty popular among scientists. The long term past seems to coincide...tell me one thing that hasn't been affected by another.

Dispite my affinity toward the big bang theory, not even science can explain how it is the whole process started. Should it have progressed on infinitely, then science has just contradicted itself in its most generic form-- that infinity is an abstract and not something tangible. There is, however, absolutely no evidence suggesting that infinity actually exists in our universe.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Fri, 26 May 2006 17:51:19 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

j\_ball430 wrote on Fri, 26 May 2006 13:42  
It IS logical for us to have faith in things.

This isn't exactly true. You might be confusing faith with belief. There IS a difference between the two, remember. Belief is a form of hopeful necessity, based on hypotheses that we unconsciously formulate and apply to our lives. Sitting on a chair and assuming it's there when you're not looking for example so you don't fall down.

Faith on the other hand, is not hopeful necessity, it's unproven necessity. I use that loosely however, because the proof can be fleeting based on how you look at it. Conjecture, heresay, "feelings" can all be forms of proof to the individual, but they're not very concrete.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Sat, 27 May 2006 01:35:11 GMT

---



JohnDoe wrote on Fri, 26 May 2006 02:23warranto wrote on Thu, 25 May 2006 16:37JohnDoe wrote on Thu, 25 May 2006 13:11Warranto is right. God's existance can neither be disproven not proven.

But, from a logical point of view, assuming that there is something you have no proof of whatsoever makes no sense at all.

Oh! Oh! The "You have no proof, therefore it does not exist" arguement. I LOVE completely obliterating this arguement!

At one point in time, no had any proof of the following:

1 Billion dollars  
Anything at the molecular level  
The shape of North America (or any landmass)  
The "fact" that the earth orbits the sun  
electricity  
motor vehicles  
the wheel

etc.

A bit of trivia. At one point around the end of the 19th century (or 1900's, I forget), the Scientific authority in Britian actually declared (or was about to declare) science to be obsolete as everything there was to discover, had been discovered.

Ouch. I thought you were a bit more clever after your first post.  
I said that it doesn't make sense to assume something exists than you have no proof whatsoever for. I didn't say it doesn't exist, because that's impossible to find out. Get the difference? So yea gj obliterating something I haven't said, genius.

I'm saying that assuming that there is a planet with pink unicorns which are high on glue is nuts, because there is no proof whatsoever. I can't however say that it doesn't exist for sure. Exchange the unis with god and you get the picture.

What you said was that it doesn't make any sense to assume something exists, when you have no proof of it.

That's what I countered.

At one point in time, someone thought the idea of electricity might exist, and others thought that it couldn't. However, we know (at least now) that it made perfect sense to assume electricity existed, and that to assume the idea of electricity made no sense, was wrong.

At some point in time, people thought the world was flat, and one person decided to challenge that, stating that it was round. He was deemed insane, because the idea that the world was round

didn't make any sense.

Assuming something is "nuts" to believe in, just because of the lack of proof, is ignorance at its finest.

The argument you make is simply a variation of the argument summary I made. It has every relevance to the problem at hand, and as such your attempt at making it irrelevant due to me arguing the "wrong thing" is null and void.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Sat, 27 May 2006 01:36:23 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Javaxcx wrote on Fri, 26 May 2006 11:51j\_ball430 wrote on Fri, 26 May 2006 13:42  
It IS logical for us to have faith in things.

This isn't exactly true. You might be confusing faith with belief. There IS a difference between the two, remember. Belief is a form of hopeful necessity, based on hypotheses that we unconsciously formulate and apply to our lives. Sitting on a chair and assuming it's there when you're not looking for example so you don't fall down.

Faith on the other hand, is not hopeful necessity, it's unproven necessity. I use that loosely however, because the proof can be fleeting based on how you look at it. Conjecture, heresay, "feelings" can all be forms of proof to the individual, but they're not very concrete.

Meh, if he has trouble trusting anyone he knows, then there is nothing much we can do about it.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Sat, 27 May 2006 08:23:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:I don't go around telling others that what I believe in is truth. You should probably listen to yourself, as well. You shouldn't be telling me that my thoughts are illogical when you have no proof that they are. Just because YOU believe that they are, doesn't make you right. The same goes for me, as you said.

You said that you're sure that God exists and non-believers make you chuckle...

It doesn't work that way...you have to prove to me that your far-fetched idea is correct.

Quote:

God existing is just as likely as Him not existing. It's a 50/50 chance. Not 99/1, not 80/20. Either He does or doesn't exist.

That's so untrue...so you're saying there is a 50/50 chance that there are invisible pink unicorns walking on my front yard, because they either exists or don't? That's just plain wrong...how can something be unlikely then at all?

Quote:I believe that God exists because of the world around me. I look at the beauty, the intricacy, and I see God. I don't see how any of this could have just spontaneously generated. It's far too complicated to have just came from nowhere. At least, that's my opinion. If you place all the components of a watch next to each other, they're not going to come together and form the watch. Not even if you added heat, pressure, or seismic activity. It's just not going to happen.

You think it's beautiful because people tend to need a place where they can feel happy like that...wouldn't we all commit suicide if we couldn't think of something beautiful?

Quote:How is it more likely than pink unicorns existing? I can't, nor can you... same with God. God cannot be disproven. I'm also not going to discount the possibility of pink unicorns. We have no proof to say that they don't exist. Do I personally believe they do? No, but I'm not going to argue back and forth about their existance if I'm just as unsure as the people who DO believe in them

So you don't feel stupid about believing in something as likely as pink unicorns, since there is no evidence whatsoever for both?

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Sat, 27 May 2006 08:49:04 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:You misunderstand. It doesn't have to be intelligent, it doesn't have to be unintelligent, it doesn't even have to be alive. The fact is, I don't KNOW or pretend to know what it is that probably caused the universe into being. I merely know that SOMETHING did. I choose out of preference to call it God. Don't confuse me with the anthropomorphized diety of the superstitious, because frankly I have no way of proving such a thing. So I don't try to.

Call it Big Bang then and not God. You're basically believing into something that fit with the definition of "God" and has started the universe.

Quote:That there is a mover. I haven't thought of a single thing that hasn't been moved by a mover, but I also have just reason to believe that what we experience or have the POTENTIAL to experience is not the be all and end all of existence. Kant supports this, and it is explained on the link I gave you. Unfortunately, I don't have a condensed copy handy, so you'll either have to look around yourself or muddle through it. Infinite regression is still possible (although negated by contemporary physics), but it still doesn't negate the necessity for some form of transcendental causality.

Yes, but every mover has been moved by another mover. I don't understand why there should be a mover that can't be moved.

Quote:Dispite my affinity toward the big bang theory, not even science can explain how it is the whole process started. Should it have progressed on infinitely, then science has just contradicted itself in its most generic form-- that infinity is an abstract and not something tangible. There is, however, absolutely no evidence suggesting that infinity actually exists in our universe.

Right now we can measure how the star systems have moved away from a center...it makes sense to me that the dark matter will slow the star systems down and ultimatly pull them back together with it's gravity, where the energy will build up again and another Big Bang occurs.

If you believe in Big Bang you will ultimatly have to believe in infinity. Believing in infinity however will tell you that there is no starting point/God. Basically, you can't believe in God and the Big Bang at the same time and since we have clues and our physics suggest that a Big Bang has occured, I will believe in the latter.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Sat, 27 May 2006 08:57:41 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

warranto wrote on Fri, 26 May 2006 20:35JohnDoe wrote on Fri, 26 May 2006 02:23warranto wrote on Thu, 25 May 2006 16:37JohnDoe wrote on Thu, 25 May 2006 13:11Warranto is right. God's existance can neither be disproven not proven.

But, from a logical point of view, assuming that there is something you have no proof of whatsoever makes no sense at all.

Oh! Oh! The "You have no proof, therefore it does not exist" arguement. I LOVE completely obliterating this arguement!

At one point in time, no had any proof of the following:

1 Billion dollars  
Anything at the molecular level  
The shape of North America (or any landmass)  
The "fact" that the earth orbits the sun  
electricity  
motor vehicles  
the wheel  
  
etc.

A bit of trivia. At one point around the end of the 19th century (or 1900's, I forget), the Scientific authority in Britian actually declared (or was about to declare) science to be obsolete as everything there was to discover, had been discovered.

Ouch. I thought you were a bit more clever after your first post. I said that it doesn't make sense to assume something exists than you have no proof whatsoever for. I didn't say it doesn't exist, because that's impossible to find out. Get the difference? So yea gj obliterating something I haven't said, genius.

I'm saying that assuming that there is a planet with pink unicorns which are high on glue is nuts, because there is no proof whatsoever. I can't however say that it doesn't exist for sure. Exchange the unis with god and you get the picture.

What you said was that it doesn't make any sense to assume something exists, when you have no proof of it.

That's what I countered.

At one point in time, someone thought the idea of electricity might exist, and others thought that it couldn't. However, we know (at least now) that it made perfect sense to assume electricity existed, and that to assume the idea of electricity made no sense, was wrong.

At some point in time, people thought the world was flat, and one person decided to challenge that, stating that it was round. He was deemed insane, because the idea that the world was round didn't make any sense.

Assuming something is "nuts" to believe in, just because of the lack of proof, is ignorance at its finest.

The argument you make is simply a variation of the argument summary I made. It has every relevance to the problem at hand, and as such your attempt at making it irrelevant due to me arguing the "wrong thing" is null and void.

First off, there is a difference between the assumption that something exists and something existing.

The people that thought electricity existed, that the world was around, that the earth moved around the sun, etc had either CLUES OR EVEN EVIDENCE that gave them the idea in the first place. Did any caveman have that idea? No, because he didn't stumble on any clues. You're doing the complete opposite...you have no clues or evidence whatsoever that God exists, but you believe in it. It's a random thought just like my pink unicorns and believing that there is any truth behind it is, yes, nuts.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sat, 27 May 2006 15:34:48 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Assuming God does exist, you're going to be hard pressed to make him start pulling rabbits out of thin air just to amuse you and others who think like you.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Sat, 27 May 2006 15:42:43 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Sat, 27 May 2006 16:06:53 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

JohnDoe wrote on Sat, 27 May 2006 02:57

First off, there is a difference between the assumption that something exists and something existing.

The people that thought electricity existed, that the world was around, that the earth moved around the sun, etc had either CLUES OR EVEN EVIDENCE that gave them the idea in the first place. Did any caveman have that idea? No, because he didn't stumble on any clues. You're doing the complete opposite...you have no clues or evidence whatsoever that God exists, but you believe in it. It's a random thought just like my pink unicorns and believing that there is any truth behind it is, yes, nuts.

There is no difference. In both instances, you are claiming that something exists. The existence of proof is irrelevant, because it is subjective to the individual choosing to believe the proof. People claim that there is proof of God's existence all the time. You just decide not to believe it. Just as people claimed they "knew" the world was round, etc. the others just chose not to believe them.

The same concept is there for the "clues or even evidence that gave them the idea in the first place". The clues that people have about God, are the religious text, and the world around them. You just happen to think that this isn't proof. Just as, I'm sure, those countering the idea of the world being round, etc. decided that the "proof" of the respective discoverer wasn't actual proof at all.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sat, 27 May 2006 16:14:08 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

JohnDoe wrote on Sat, 27 May 2006 04:49Call it Big Bang then and not God. You're basically believing into something that fit with the definition of "God" and has started the universe.

But it's not even remotely tied to the big bang. The evidence (and there IS evidence based on physics and the transcendental aesthetic) suggests that the unmoved mover can exist and not be corporeal. The suggestion that an unmoved mover is corporeal is a contradiction of all things about natural law. However, to suggest that there is no unmoved mover is also a contradiction of all natural law. That's why the TA is so vital in explaining all this.

Quote:Yes, but every mover has been moved by another mover. I don't understand why there should be a mover that can't be moved.

Because it's a violation of the laws of thermodynamics and causality. You're purporting a universe where all things are the sum of their parts, however that extrapolates to contradiction when you establish a generalization for the nature of the universe. "Infinity" is not a concrete construct in our universe-- at ALL. Neither is the notion that the universe has exploded and contracted an infinite number of times.

That's interesting to note though, because you have absolutely no evidence that is any different then mine (albeit less likely then mine) for an infinite regression of causality. The irony is that regardless of infinite causality, the necessity for a mover still exists in a transcendental state.

Quote:Right now we can measure how the star systems have moved away from a center...it makes sense to me that the dark matter will slow the star systems down and ultimately pull them back together with it's gravity, where the energy will build up again and another Big Bang occurs.

We actually have no evidence to suggest this happens or ever happened. It's a mathematical extrapolation based on--> you guessed it, causality in the terms that I am arguing it.

Quote:If you believe in Big Bang you will ultimately have to believe in infinity. Believing in infinity however will tell you that there is no starting point/God. Basically, you can't believe in God and the Big Bang at the same time and since we have clues and our physics suggest that a Big Bang has occurred, I will believe in the latter.

Belief in infinity in our universe is a violation of all our physics principles. The irony is that your supposed proof for infinity uses said principles to prove itself, which is a contradiction.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Sat, 27 May 2006 18:01:23 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

warranto wrote on Sat, 27 May 2006 11:06JohnDoe wrote on Sat, 27 May 2006 02:57  
First off, there is a difference between the assumption that something exists and something existing.

The people that thought electricity existed, that the world was around, that the earth moved around the sun, etc had either CLUES OR EVEN EVIDENCE that gave them the idea in the first place. Did any caveman have that idea? No, because he didn't stumble on any clues. You're doing the complete opposite...you have no clues or evidence whatsoever that God exists, but you believe in it. It's a random thought just like my pink unicorns and believing that there is any truth behind it is, yes, nuts.

There is no difference. In both instances, you are claiming that something exists. The existence of proof is irrelevant, because it is subjective to the individual choosing to believe the proof. People



claim that there is proof of God's existence all the time. You just decide not to believe it. Just as people claimed they "knew" the world was round, etc. the others just chose not to believe them.

The same concept is there for the "clues or even evidence that gave them the idea in the first place". The clues that people have about God, are the religious text, and the world around them. You just happen to think that this isn't proof. Just as, I'm sure, those countering the idea of the world being round, etc. decided that the "proof" of the respective discoverer wasn't actual proof at all.

In one instance I still leave the possibility for the other side, in the other I don't. You're saying apples and oranges are the same because they're both fruits...

The religious text is written by ordinary men and each one contradicts the other...how can that be evidence? The judge would laugh at you in court if you try to make a case with that. In that part Scientology is even more believable since there's only one Hubbard sci-fi story...which clue do you mean with the world around you? Science has proven how life here started and evolved. You can't label those things as proof or clues, since they're nothing more than intuition. You can believe in that stuff however, since it can't be completely disproven, just like the pink unicorns, the flying spaghetti monster and Xenu.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Sat, 27 May 2006 18:26:53 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Javaxcx wrote on Sat, 27 May 2006 11:14JohnDoe wrote on Sat, 27 May 2006 04:49Call it Big Bang then and not God. You're basically believing into something that fit with the definition of "God" and has started the universe.

But it's not even remotely tied to the big bang. The evidence (and there IS evidence based on physics and the transcendental aesthetic) suggests that the unmoved mover can exist and not be corporeal. The suggestion that an unmoved mover is corporeal is a contradiction of all things about natural law. However, to suggest that there is no unmoved mover is also a contradiction of all natural law. That's why the TA is so vital in explaining all this.

Quote:Yes, but every mover has been moved by another mover. I don't understand why there should be a mover that can't be moved.

Because it's a violation of the laws of thermodynamics and causality. You're purporting a universe where all things are the sum of their parts, however that extrapolates to contradiction when you establish a generalization for the nature of the universe. "Infinity" is not a concrete construct in our universe-- at ALL. Neither is the notion that the universe has exploded and contracted an infinite number of times.

That's interesting to note though, because you have absolutely no evidence that is any different than mine (albeit less likely than mine) for an infinite regression of causality. The irony is that

regardless of infinite causality, the necessity for a mover still exists in a transcendental state.

Quote:Right now we can measure how the star systems have moved away from a center...it makes sense to me that the dark matter will slow the star systems down and ultimately pull them back together with its gravity, where the energy will build up again and another Big Bang occurs.

We actually have no evidence to suggest this happens or ever happened. It's a mathematical extrapolation based on--> you guessed it, causality in the terms that I am arguing it.

Quote:If you believe in Big Bang you will ultimately have to believe in infinity. Believing in infinity however will tell you that there is no starting point/God. Basically, you can't believe in God and the Big Bang at the same time and since we have clues and our physics suggest that a Big Bang has occurred, I will believe in the latter.

Belief in infinity in our universe is a violation of all our physics principles. The irony is that your supposed proof for infinity uses said principles to prove itself, which is a contradiction.

I'll have to jump out of the Big Bang - Big Crunch argument here, since I'm not that good in astronomy or physics that I can argue about it in a foreign language where I would have to google every second scientific term.

I've never said that my theory was any more likely than the other...it's just my feeling. What I do know is that the Big Bang can't be described by any of your current physics, but that we can measure how the galaxies moved away from each other over the years (with the theory of relativity) and that we know how long ago they were together very close and that is was extremely hot at that point. What we know as well is that dark energy exists and that the presumed dark matter is capable of pulling the universe back together...if you want to explain me how those aren't true in more simple terms, then good, if not take it to a professor of astronomy, since I just can't explain how the Big Bang, etc thoroughly works.

BTW Explain to me in simple terms as well, how an unmoved mover can exist instead of spamming terms without explanation.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Sat, 27 May 2006 18:40:23 GMT

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

---

JohnDoe wrote on Sat, 27 May 2006 14:26I've never said that my theory was any more likely than the other...it's just my feeling. What I do know is that the Big Bang can't be described by any of your current physics, but that we can measure how the galaxies moved away from each other over the years (with the theory of relativity) and that we know how long ago they were together very close and that is was extremely hot at that point. What we know as well is that dark energy exists and that the presumed dark matter is capable of pulling the universe back together...if you want to explain me how those aren't true in more simple terms, then good, if not take it to a professor of astronomy, since I just can't explain how the Big Bang, etc thoroughly works.

Since this argument depends on "dark matter" I'll start with that. We actually have no experimental evidence suggesting dark matter even exists. In fact, we've just called the astronomical anomalies of the universe out and said that whatever dark matter is, it's effecting them somehow. Astronomers are literally walking blind and making up possibilities based on assumptions that this unobserved matter and energy exist. Which is kind of silly, because this epistemological conundrum is exactly what you have used to suggest that a first cause doesn't need to exist.

Quote:BTW Explain to me in simple terms as well, how an unmoved mover can exist instead of spamming terms without explanation.

There are no simple terms to describe the transcendental idealism in the full. It literally (and I am not exaggerating this in any way) was one of the hardest concepts I've actually tried grasp and understand fully. The book alone, "critique of pure reason" by Kant took a solid year of reading and re-reading just to make sense of his logic; which by the end doesn't clusterfuck like many of the moderns today. The simplest and most concise way to describe it I've found is:

<http://www.bright.net/~jclarke/kant/element1.html>

It's a ridiculously condensed version of the conclusions drawn, and many of them are useless to comprehend without the text to back them up. Luckily for you, I provided the text for you before should it peek your curiosity.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Sat, 27 May 2006 20:43:31 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:Since this argument depends on "dark matter" I'll start with that. We actually have no experimental evidence suggesting dark matter even exists. In fact, we've just called the astronomical anomalies of the universe out and said that whatever dark matter is, it's effecting them somehow. Astronomers are literally walking blind and making up possibilities based on assumptions that this unobserved matter and energy exist. Which is kind of silly, because this epistemological conundrum is exactly what you have used to suggest that a first cause doesn't need to exist.

But there is dark energy, right? I've always thought that dark energy being in the so-called dark matter explains how the universe expanded the way it did...but then again I'm not a physics/astronomy wiz.

Quote:There are no simple terms to describe the transcendental idealism in the full. It literally (and I am not exaggerating this in any way) was one of the hardest concepts I've actually tried grasp and understand fully. The book alone, "critique of pure reason" by Kant took a solid year of reading and re-reading just to make sense of his logic; which by the end doesn't clusterfuck like many of the moderns today. The simplest and most concise way to describe it I've found is:

<http://www.bright.net/~jclarke/kant/element1.html>

It's a ridiculously condensed version of the conclusions drawn, and many of them are useless to comprehend without the text to back them up. Luckily for you, I provided the text for you before should it peek your curiosity.

I'll have a try at it tomorrow, because nighttime would probably be the worst time to try to understand something like that.

I must say that I have refused to read pretty much anything from Kant since he was pedantic weirdo and I think his categorical imperative is utterly detached from reality..

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sat, 27 May 2006 21:39:58 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

His categorical imperative worked for him and him alone. His epistemology and metaphysics made a bit more sense once you get your head around them.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Sat, 27 May 2006 21:52:54 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I'm curious about something...how old are you anyway? haha

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Sat, 27 May 2006 23:25:28 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

JohnDoe wrote on Sat, 27 May 2006 12:01warranto wrote on Sat, 27 May 2006 11:06JohnDoe wrote on Sat, 27 May 2006 02:57

First off, there is a difference between the assumption that something exists and something existing.

The people that thought electricity existed, that the world was around, that the earth moved around the sun, etc had either CLUES OR EVEN EVIDENCE that gave them the idea in the first place. Did any caveman have that idea? No, because he didn't stumble on any clues. You're doing the complete opposite...you have no clues or evidence whatsoever that God exists, but you believe in it. It's a random thought just like my pink unicorns and believing that there is any truth behind it is, yes, nuts.

There is no difference. In both instances, you are claiming that something exists. The existence of proof is irrelevant, because it is subjective to the individual choosing to believe the proof. People claim that there is proof of God's existence all the time. You just decide not to believe it. Just as people claimed they "knew" the world was round, etc. the others just chose not to believe them.

The same concept is there for the "clues or even evidence that gave them the idea in the first place". The clues that people have about God, are the religious text, and the world around them. You just happen to think that this isn't proof. Just as, I'm sure, those countering the idea of the world being round, etc. decided that the "proof" of the respective discoverer wasn't actual proof at all.

In one instance I still leave the possibility for the other side, in the other I don't. You're saying apples and oranges are the same because they're both fruits...

The religious text is written by ordinary men and each one contradicts the other...how can that be evidence? The judge would laugh at you in court if you try to make a case with that. In that part Scientology is even more believable since there's only one Hubbard sci-fi story...which clue do you mean with the world around you? Science has proven how life here started and evolved. You can't label those things as proof or clues, since they're nothing more than intuition. You can believe in that stuff however, since it can't be completely disproven, just like the pink unicorns, the flying spaghetti monster and Xenu.

True, in one you leave a possibility open for the alternative. It doesn't matter though, in both instances you express that the idea "makes no sense", and is "nuts". In both instances, you qualify it as not existing; it "might not exist, therefore I don't believe" and "it doesn't exist, therefore I don't believe" both convey the same message: that you don't think something exists.

The Religious text don't contradict each other. They ALL state that God exists. The only problem is that each text states one is more right than the other. That isn't a contradiction, just a disagreement on the fact.

You state that Science has proven how life has started and evolved. I challenge you to show me this proof.

As for the "labeling things as proof", who is to say that something hasn't been mislabeled? Do you have anything that could suggest the label given something is the correct one?

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Sat, 27 May 2006 23:55:20 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:

True, in one you leave a possibility open for the alternative. It doesn't matter though, in both instances you express that the idea "makes no sense", and is "nuts". In both instances, you qualify it as not existing; it "might not exist, therefore I don't believe" and "it doesn't exist, therefore I don't believe" both convey the same message: that you don't think something exists.

Yes, now tell me what's wrong with that? The existance of God is highly unlikely to me, since the only "clue" is intuition, which isn't a clue at all. I'm still leaving the opportunity open for God

existing after all, tho, since I can't prove that he doesn't exist, same goes for the pink unicorns.

Quote:The Religious text don't contradict each other. They ALL state that God exists. The only problem is that each text states one is more right than the other. That isn't a contradiction, just a disagreement on the fact.

Uhm that God exists is the only thing they agree on...call it disagreement on everything else then, my point was that it doesn't help their crediability in either way.

Quote:You state that Science has proven how life has started and evolved. I challenge you to show me this proof.

Life has evolved through mutation and selection.

Life can start through chemical reactions which has been done in an experiment...I'll get more material tomorrow if you haven't heard of that before.

Quote:As for the "labeling things as proof", who is to say that something hasn't been mislabeled? Do you have anything that could suggest the label given something is the correct one?

Intuition is neither clue, evidence or proof, Simple as that. It's a bit late and I'm tired, so tell me tomorrow if I missed what you were trying to bring across by that.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 28 May 2006 03:56:17 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

First, intuition is one of the primary sources of discovery. I highly doubt that every single discovery/invention/whatever had nothing to do with someone's intuition not comming into play.

In fact, most successful people out there will tell you that their intuition assisted them at some point in thier life.

Quote:Life has evolved through mutation and selection.

Life can start through chemical reactions which has been done in an experiment...I'll get more material tomorrow if you haven't heard of that before.

That's nice. It doesn't prove that's how we got here. Unless you're suggesting that you are deciding to actually believe the person when he says this experiment is evidence of how we got here, and not simply anther possibility.

Quote:Uhm that God exists is the only thing they agree on...call it disagreement on everything else then, my point was that it doesn't help their crediability in either way.

I see you don't trust science either then.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Sun, 28 May 2006 08:15:30 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:First, intuition is one of the primary sources of discovery. I highly doubt that every single discovery/invention/whatever had nothing to do with someone's intuition not coming into play.

In fact, most successful people out there will tell you that their intuition assisted them at some point in their life.

Of course, but not intuition alone.

Quote:That's nice. It doesn't prove that's how we got here. Unless you're suggesting that you are deciding to actually believe the person when he says this experiment is evidence of how we got here, and not simply another possibility.

It proves how life can start out of the chemicals the world was made of, so unless you have another plausible way (that doesn't include magic), I'll believe that, thank you.

Quote:I see you don't trust science either then.

Scientists have evidence or clues to support their theories, the religions have not.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Sun, 28 May 2006 11:37:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On a side note, I have changed my opinion on the whole universe thing. I now think that there can be something that is uncaused, but I cut the superfluous God and say that the universe is that thing. Therefore, I believe the Big Bang sounds more plausible than the Big Crunch.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sun, 28 May 2006 13:46:20 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

What about heat death and gravity death?

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

---



Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 28 May 2006 22:23:24 GMT

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

---

JohnDoe wrote on Sun, 28 May 2006 02:15

Scientists have evidence or clues to support their theories, the religions have not.

Religion has as much "evidence" as science does. Religious text that explain things , Religious leaders who have personal knowledge relating to God and documented "experiments" that can only qualify if they have no scientific explanation.

The only difference is who you choose to believe, as you have no personal knowledge of almost anything science or religion claims.

Quote:It proves how life can start out of the chemicals the world was made of

Please don't contradict yourself in the same sentence. You can not prove how something "can", you can only prove how something "did".

True, the experiments give an explanation as to how life "can" start, but it in no way proves how life "did" start.

Another possibility (without invoking the word "God") is that we spontaneously generated. After all, if the universe can do it, so should we be able to. Or, we were not created, but we always existed, in some other form than we had now. There is not always a chemical reaction required to change forms (ie. evolution), so perhaps humanity came to exist through reasons of that.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Mon, 29 May 2006 09:17:26 GMT

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

---

Quote:Religion has as much "evidence" as science does. Religious text that explain things , Religious leaders who have personal knowledge relating to God and documented "experiments" that can only qualify if they have no scientific explanation.

The only difference is who you choose to believe, as you have no personal knowledge of almost anything science or religion claims.

Religious texts, that all disagree with each other and were written by men, something everybody can do (see book of mormon). Scientific explanations must abide by the laws of physics to be considered, however, everybody can claim that he has spoken to God. It's nothing but an empty statement that everybody can say. I would say there is a difference between those two types of "evidence". One is intuition and the other is real evidence.

Where exactly are you going here? Are you claiming that a Big Bang never happened or that "God" started the Big Bang?

Quote:Please don't contradict yourself in the same sentence. You can not prove how something

"can", you can only prove how something "did".

True, the experiments give an explanation as to how life "can" start, but it in no way proves how life "did" start.

Another possibility (without invoking the word "God") is that we spontaneously generated. After all, if the universe can do it, so should we be able to. Or, we were not created, but we always existed, in some other form than we had now. There is not always a chemical reaction required to change forms (ie. evolution), so perhaps humanity came to exist through reasons of that.

How is that a contradiction? Before the experiment, there wasn't any proof that it could have happened that way, now there is. The next step is proving that it did. It was proven that life can start from chemicals...how is that a contradiction?

Yes, I've never claimed otherwise. However, it is the only possible way that has been proven to work. There is no proof or evidence whatsoever that life can start spontaneously, but there is that it started out of chemicals. You're not only assuming that life can start spontaneously, but you're assuming as well that the same rules that apply to the universe apply to a single planet inside the universe...that's extremely far-fetched especially considering that we've found a much more plausible way.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Mon, 29 May 2006 09:18:51 GMT

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

---

Aircraftkiller wrote on Sun, 28 May 2006 23:46 What about heat death and gravity death?

Don't we need to know how the universe is shaped in the first place in order to know what will happen to it?

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 29 May 2006 12:09:58 GMT

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

---

Quote:Scientific explanations must abide by the laws of physics to be considered, however, everybody can claim that he has spoken to God. It's nothing but an empty statement that everybody can say. I would say there is a difference between those two types of "evidence". One is intuition and the other is real evidence.

Everybody can claim they "know" molecules exist. However, I doubt that even you have seen a molecule with your naked eye. It's nothing but an empty statement that everyone can say. It's only considered "intuition" by you, because you don't recognize the evidence, as evidence.

Quote:Religious texts, that all disagree with each other and were written by men, something

everybody can do (see book of mormon).

Have you ever studied in the field of philosophy? Every single book out there contradicts another one in some form or another, and this field is given much more credit than even some scientific fields.

Quote:Where exactly are you going here? Are you claiming that a Big Bang never happened or that "God" started the Big Bang?

Oh, I believe that the Big Bang occurred, but can you prove that "God" had no hand in it?

Quote:How is that a contradiction? Before the experiment, there wasn't any proof that it could have happened that way, now there is. The next step is proving that it did. It was proven that life can start from chemicals...how is that a contradiction?

You stated:

Quote:Science has proven how life here started and evolved.

So I counter with a request for this proof. You then come up with:

Quote:Life can start through chemical reactions which has been done in an experiment...

So I make mention of how that doesn't prove how we got here, simply that it's one way life can begin.

You follow up with:

Quote: proves how life can start out of the chemicals the world was made of,

There is the contradiction, with the back story. Once again, you can not Prove this is how we got here, simply that a chemical reaction is one possibility. That is not proof.

Quote:that's extremely far-fetched especially considering that we've found a much more plausible way.

Ah, but plausible does not equate to definitive.

Quote:you're assuming as well that the same rules that apply to the universe apply to a single planet inside the universe...

Any reason why it shouldn't? Both are based on the "rules" of physics (I wonder how those rules developed, anyways), so why should one be exempt? Oh yes, so that it can fit in the THEORY of how the universe began.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Mon, 29 May 2006 15:48:43 GMT

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

---

Quote:Everybody can claim they "know" molecules exist. However, I doubt that even you have seen a molecule with your naked eye. It's nothing but an empty statement that everyone can say.

You can measure molecules and "see" them through instruments...can you do that with any of your supernatural nonsense? Didn't think so...so much for "empty statement".

Quote:Have you ever studied in the field of philosophy? Every single book out there contradicts another one in some form or another, and this field is given much more credit than even some scientific fields.

So? They still need to abide by certain laws, which religious nonsense doesn't...everybody can say something and tell people that it's the truth, shown by the book of mormon.

Quote:Oh, I believe that the Big Bang occurred, but can you prove that "God" had no hand in it?

Tell me...why should God have a hand in it? It doesn't make any sense whatsoever. The whole idea of God was to explain things that people couldn't. If you think that there is a starting point, an unmoved mover, then give me one reason why that should be God instead of the universe itself. It's completely superfluous.

Quote:Quote:

How is that a contradiction? Before the experiment, there wasn't any proof that it could have happened that way, now there is. The next step is proving that it did. It was proven that life can start from chemicals...how is that a contradiction?

You stated:

Quote:

Science has proven how life here started and evolved.

So I counter with a request for this proof. You then come up with:

Quote:

Life can start through chemical reactions which has been done in an experiment...

So I make mention of how that doesn't prove how we got here, simply that it's one way life can begin.

You follow up with:

Quote:

proves how life can start out of the chemicals the world was made of,

There is the contradiction, with the back story. Once again, you can not Prove this is how we got here, simply that a chemical reaction is one possibility. That is not proof.

Oh that was directed at my first statement...I have no idea why you would say that then

considering I corrected myself already.

Quote:Ah, but plausible does not equate to definitive.

No, but I'll go with the most plausible solution until a better emerges...you can go on and believe in your stuff, but live with it being irrational.

Quote:Any reason why it shouldn't? Both are based on the "rules" of physics (I wonder how those rules developed, anyways), so why should one be exempt? Oh yes, so that it can fit in the THEORY of how the universe began.

You're assuming that the same rules that apply to the surrounding, the universe, apply to the material things inside the universe, of which you have no clues and no reason to believe whatsoever. It's utterly far-fetched, whereas life starting through the chemicals of which the universe is made of has been proven to work and seems by far more plausible...

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 29 May 2006 20:24:58 GMT

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

---

Quote:You can measure molecules and "see" them through instruments...can you do that with any of your supernatural nonsense? Didn't think so...so much for "empty statement".

Wrong. You can trust that what the instrument is showing you is true. But you have no way of verifying that yourself. You have no ability to see it with the naked eye (even then, you have to assume there is nothing wrong with your vision), so you have to trust what someone else tells you is there, be that a scientist, or the microscope manufacturer.

Quote:So? They still need to abide by certain laws, which religious nonsense doesn't...everybody can say something and tell people that it's the truth, shown by the book of mormon.

Tell that to Descarte, who attempted to decide whether or not we truly exist. There were no conventional "laws" in place there. Yet, his "experiment" is highly regarded, be it ultimately true or not.

With the idea of Philosophy still having to abide by certain rules, what about those who argue that God exists? The are all part of the same field, and by your definition, they follow those same rules. Therefore, by your definition, God must also exist.

Quote:Tell me...why should God have a hand in it? It doesn't make any sense whatsoever. The whole idea of God was to explain things that people couldn't. If you think that there is a starting point, an unmoved mover, then give me one reason why that should be God instead of the universe itself. It's completely superfluous.

The whole idea about God was to explain things that people couldn't? Sure, people invoked God when there was something unexplained (even the laws of our contry do this with complete legal backing, but that aside) however that doesn't mean it was what God was "created" for. It's just what he is used (incorrectly) for.

Quote:Oh that was directed at my first statement...I have no idea why you would say that then considering I corrected myself already.

Wrong, it was aimed at your last statement. Hence why I said contradiction AND HISTORY. Meaning everything that was stated leading up to the contradiction.

Quote:No, but I'll go with the most plausible solution until a better emerges...you can go on and believe in your stuff, but live with it being irrational.

LOL, I think I'll stop arguing with you then. Obviously you have no ability to think outside conventional means, and just go with "what's best"... or should that be "what's best for what I believe". Convenient, isn't it.

Quote:You're assuming that the same rules that apply to the surrounding, the universe, apply to the material things inside the universe, of which you have no clues and no reason to believe whatsoever. It's utterly far-fetched, whereas life starting through the chemicals of which the universe is made of has been proven to work and seems by far more plausible...

You have no reason to believe otherwise. And as you seem to enjoy stating, you have nothing but "intuition" to go on with the idea that the rules of the universe itself do not apply to what is in the universe.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Mon, 29 May 2006 22:47:49 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:Wrong. You can trust that what the instrument is showing you is true. But you have no way of verifying that yourself. You have no ability to see it with the naked eye (even then, you have to assume there is nothing wrong with your vision), so you have to trust what someone else tells you is there, be that a scientist, or the microscope manufacturer.

Ya and you can't trust anything you see through your glasses...wow I can't believe you actually said that. Scientists won't lie to me since they have to respect the laws of physics and their metier...and if one of them should be lying, I can always consult others. I have no idea where you're going with this...are you telling me that molecules and atoms don't exist for sure or what? This is getting even more ridiculous than believing in God.

Quote:Tell that to Descarte, who attempted to decide whether or not we truly exist. There were no conventional "laws" in place there. Yet, his "experiment" is highly regarded, be it ultimately true or not.

With the idea of Philosophy still having to abide by certain rules, what about those who argue that God exists? They are all part of the same field, and by your definition, they follow those same rules. Therefore, by your definition, God must also exist.

We're talking about science here, not philosophy...philosophical ideas don't have to follow any rules, but that's not what we're arguing about. I understand why you would like to change the subject tho..

Quote:

The whole idea about God was to explain things that people couldn't? Sure, people invoked God when there was something unexplained (even the laws of our country do this with complete legal backing, but that aside) however that doesn't mean it was what God was "created" for. It's just what he is used (incorrectly) for.

What do you think God was created for then? Way to dodge my question concerning God being superfluous btw...

Quote:

Wrong, it was aimed at your last statement. Hence why I said contradiction AND HISTORY. Meaning everything that was stated leading up to the contradiction.

I'm not going to read through this thread again, but my latest statement was that science has proven how life can start from the chemicals that earth was made up of, so I still don't know what you're trying to say, since I see nothing wrong with it.

Quote:

LOL, I think I'll stop arguing with you then. Obviously you have no ability to think outside conventional means, and just go with "what's best"... or should that be "what's best for what I believe". Convenient, isn't it.

I have no idea to think outside of conventional means? It's completely logical to go with the most realistic explanation and I'll believe that. I can always change my opinion, however. Give me a good reason why God and not the universe should be the starting point and I'll believe that.

Quote: You have no reason to believe otherwise. And as you seem to enjoy stating, you have nothing but "intuition" to go on with the idea that the rules of the universe itself do not apply to what is in the universe.

It's simple logic. On the one hand we have a method that works, but we can't prove if it actually happened that way since we can't travel back in time, on the other we have a method that is completely based on assumptions for which we don't even have clues. With which would you go?

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 30 May 2006 00:14:00 GMT



Ugh.. You're almost as bad as nodbugger.

Quote:Ya and you can't trust anything you see through your glasses...wow I can't believe you actually said that. Scientists won't lie to me since they have to respect the laws of physics and their metier...and if one of them should be lying, I can always consult others. I have no idea where you're going with this...are you telling me that molecules and atoms don't exist for sure or what? This is getting even more ridiculous than believing in God.

Way to miss the point. All you have to go on is what one scientist says, and is backed up by another. Guess what, Religion is the same way.

Quote:We're talking about science here, not philosophy...philosophical ideas don't have to follow any rules, but that's not what we're arguing about. I understand why you would like to change the subject tho..

Actually, we were talking philosophy. Remember this exchange?

Quote:Quote:

Quote:Have you ever studied in the field of philosophy? Every single book out there contradicts another one in some form or another, and this field is given much more credit than even some scientific fields.

So? They still need to abide by certain laws, which religious nonsense doesn't...everybody can say something and tell people that it's the truth, shown by the book of mormon.

I bring up philosophy, and you counter with that they need laws. THEN you switch your position and say they don't need laws, trying to pin me with changing the topic. Sorry, won't work.

Quote:What do you think God was created for then? Way to dodge my question concerning God being superfluous btw...

Who says God was "created" for a reason? And I appologise for not speaking up about your comment regarding God creating the universe being beyond what is required or sufficient. I didn't realize you were arguing only what was the easiest answer. Though some things are starting to make sense.

Quote:I'm not going to read through this thread again, but my latest statement was that science has proven how life can start from the chemicals that earth was made up of, so I still don't know what you're trying to say, since I see nothing wrong with it.

Fine, I'll explain it again...

You can not prove something DID occur, by saying that it CAN occur. Science has proven that life CAN begin through a chemical reaction, but it does not prove it DID happen back during the coalescence of the primordial ooze.

Quote:I have no idea to think outside of conventional means? It's completely logical to go with the most realistic explanation and I'll believe that. I can always change my opinion, however. Give me a good reason why God and not the universe should be the starting point and I'll believe that.

I think you mean "the most convenient explanation". Here's a question for you: if the universe is not subject to the laws of physics (after all, it created itself - refer to my initial post relating to this point), why did it not start in a completed form? Why did it have to go through the stages of the big bang before it could even form?

I have no reason to even begin to try to explain why or why not God may be the starting point. Ignoring the idea that all that compressed matter had to come from somewhere. Ignoring the idea that the universe was not always there (Remember that thing called the big bang, while on the topic?). And, ignoring that the universe runs in (as far as we can tell) a perfect format.

Quote:It's simple logic. On the one hand we have a method that works, but we can't prove if it actually happened that way since we can't travel back in time, on the other we have a method that is completely based on assumptions for which we don't even have clues. With which would you go?

A method completely based on assumptions for which we don't have any clues... you mean like:

Electricity, Light storing information, Transportation of matter through the air, etc.

Or a method that works, such as:

The Earth being flat, any other pre-evolved solution. Remember that just because it works, doesn't mean it's right, or the best.

Oh, and just something to point out, not necessarily related to this argument.

Quote:Scientists won't lie to me since they have to respect the laws of physics and their meter

Such as those scientists who argue that Global Warming is real, and those who argue it is not. Such as those scientists who argue that breaking the speed of light is impossible, and those who say it is possible. Such as scientists who state that Dinosaurs became extinct as a result of a meteorite/insert one of the numerous theories here.

Because there are two or more sides to this story, someone must be lying.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Tue, 30 May 2006 09:40:45 GMT

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

---

Quote:Way to miss the point. All you have to go on is what one scientist says, and is backed up by another. Guess what, Religion is the same way.

Guess what, scientists have to abide by certain laws, Religion's don't. Way to miss the point..

Quote:

Actually, we were talking philosophy. Remember this exchange?

Quote:

Quote:

Quote:

Have you ever studied in the field of philosophy? Every single book out there contradicts another one in some form or another, and this field is given much more credit than even some scientific fields.

So? They still need to abide by certain laws, which religious nonsense doesn't...everybody can say something and tell people that it's the truth, shown by the book of mormon.

I bring up philosophy, and you counter with that they need laws. THEN you switch your position and say they don't need laws, trying to pin me with changing the topic. Sorry, won't work.

Sorry, I must've read "science" instead of "philosophy" the first time...that doesn't change, however, that you have no reason to bring philosophy into this when we're talking about science vs religion.

Quote:Who says God was "created" for a reason? And I appologise for not speaking up about your comment regarding God creating the universe being beyond what is required or sufficient. I didn't realize you were arguing only what was the easiest answer. Though some things are starting to make sense.

So you agree that God is superfluous?

Quote:Fine, I'll explain it again...

You can not prove something DID occur, by saying that it CAN occur. Science has proven that life CAN begin through a chemical reaction, but it does not prove it DID happen back during the coalescence of the primordial ooze.

That's what I've been saying all along after I corrected myself...

Quote:How is that a contradiction? Before the experiment, there wasn't any proof that it could have happened that way, now there is. The next step is proving that it did. It was proven that life can start from chemicals...how is that a contradiction?

Quote:It proves how life can start out of the chemicals the world was made of, so unless you have another plausible way (that doesn't include magic), I'll believe that, thank you.

Quote:Life has evolved through mutation and selection.

Life can start through chemical reactions which has been done in an experiment...I'll get more material tomorrow if you haven't heard of that before.

Do you see anything wrong with those statements?

Quote:I think you mean "the most convenient explanation". Here's a question for you: if the universe is not subject to the laws of physics (after all, it created itself - refer to my initial post relating to this point), why did it not start in a completed form? Why did it have to go through the stages of the big bang before it could even form?

The universe hasn't changed, it's still universal...just the ingredients, which are subject to the laws of physics, have.

Quote:I have no reason to even begin to try to explain why or why not God may be the starting point. Ignoring the idea that all that compressed matter had to come from somewhere. Ignoring the idea that the universe was not always there (Remember that thing called the big bang, while on the topic?). And, ignoring that the universe runs in (as far as we can tell) a perfect format.

You've been arguing over the last few pages and all of a sudden you're too good to explain yourself? Haha...looks more like someone can't explain something.

Quote:A method completely based on assumptions for which we don't have any clues... you mean like:

Electricity, Light storing information, Transportation of matter through the air, etc.

Or a method that works, such as:

The Earth being flat, any other pre-evolved solution. Remember that just because it works, doesn't mean it's right, or the best.

Oh, and just something to point out, not necessarily related to this argument.

There was never any evidence supporting those pre-evolved solutions, so good job making an analogy that doesn't apply.

Quote:Such as those scientists who argue that Global Warming is real, and those who argue it is not. Such as those scientists who argue that breaking the speed of light is impossible, and those who say it is possible. Such as scientists who state that Dinosaurs became extinct as a result of a meteorite/insert one of the numerous theories here.

Because there are two or more sides to this story, someone must be lying.

The existance of molecules isn't debatable...

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 30 May 2006 13:18:04 GMT

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

---

Quote:Guess what, scientists have to abide by certain laws, Religion's don't. Way to miss the point..

Guess what, Religion does.

Quote:Sorry, I must've read "science" instead of "philosophy" the first time...that doesn't change, however, that you have no reason to bring philosophy into this when we're talking about science vs religion.

Except when, Philosophy has as much backing as science does as a means to explain things.

Quote:So you agree that God is superfluous?

Of course God is being beyond what is required or sufficient. That doesn't prove one way or the other as to his existence. Using molecules to explain the makeup of something is just as superfluous.

Quote:That's what I've been saying all along after I corrected myself...

It's not poilte to change positions mid-argument, without announcing it, while still tying everything into the first argument.

So I can assume then, that you concede that science has not proven how we were created? In which case, God doing the creation is still very much a avalid argument.

Quote:The universe hasn't changed, it's still universal...just the ingredients, which are subject to the laws of physics, have.

Last I checked, the Universe is always changing. Going from a small concentration of matter, to a nearly-ever expanding thing. If it wasn't subject to the laws of physics, then physics would never be able to measure it, as the variables would not be constant.

Quote:You've been arguing over the last few pages and all of a sudden you're too good to explain yourself? Haha...looks more like someone can't explain something.

You got me there. It's near impossible to explain something to someone who is ignorant of anything not told to him by someone else. (Oh wait, that almost sounds like a religion!)

Quote:There was never any evidence supporting those pre-evolved solutions,

Exactly! Perhaps there is hope for you yet!.. For the most part, anyways.

You may have missed the reference,though, so I'll explain it for you.

There was no evidence to support them, yet they were held as Scientific truths! The idea of the world being flat, worked.. so it was used.

However, there is evidence fot pre-evolved solutions such as what was used back when the basic computers were used. They worked, so it was used, before evolving into the computers we know today, and before evolving into the computers of tomorrow.

Infact, most comercial products had a pre-evolved form, that changes into something better over time. Yet, there is more than enough evidence, as the product exists in the first place.

Quote:The existance of molecules isn't debatable...

Then you should be able to prove it beyond a shadow of a doubt. Oh, and you can't refer to what some scientist said in some book. If Religion is restricted from using its text as "proof", then so is science. Both rely on the person reading to choose to believe the person or not, as there is no way of independantly verifying the item in question without relying on something outside your realm of control.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Tue, 30 May 2006 14:24:55 GMT

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

---

Quote:Guess what, Religion does.

Like what? That God exists? Well that's basically what religion means, so it's not a rule...everybody can start his own religion packed with utter nonsense and make it as unrefutable as any of the major ones.

Quote:Except when, Philosophy has as much backing as science does as a means to explain things.

Philosophy can help science, but it won't prove stuff, just like religions won't...science however can.

Quote:Of course God is being beyond what is required or sufficient. That doesn't prove one way or the other as to his existence. Using molecules to explain the makeup of something is just as superfluous.

What? How do you explain the makeup of the ozone layer for exemple without them?

Quote:It's not poilte to change positions mid-argument, without announcing it, while still tying everything into the first argument.

I'm so sorry...I said it wrong the first time and corrected myself in the following 3 or 4 times, so I would have guessed my position was quite clear.

Quote:

Last I checked, the Universe is always changing. Going from a small concentration of matter, to a nearly-ever expanding thing. If it wasn't subject to the laws of physics, then physics would never be able to measure it, as the variables would not be constant.

The ingredients, not the Universe.

Quote:You got me there. It's near impossible to explain something to someone who is ignorant of anything not told to him by someone else. (Oh wait, that almost sounds like a religion!)

Aren't you someone else?

Quote:Exactly! Perhaps there is hope for you yet!.. For the most part, anyways.

You may have missed the reference,though, so I'll explain it for you.

There was no evidence to support them, yet they were held as Scientific truths! The idea of the world being flat, worked.. so it was used.

However, there is evidence fot pre-evolved solutions such as what was used back when the basic computers were used. They worked, so it was used, before evolving into the computers we know today, and before evolving into the computers of tomorrow.

Infact, most comercial products had a pre-evolved form, that changes into something better over time. Yet, there is more than enough evedece, as the product exists in the first place.

They were mis-labelled as scientific truths.



I don't know where you're going with your pre-evolved forms, but if there is evidence for them, then they are a serious possibility, if there is not (like with a flat earth or God), then believing in them is irrational.

Quote:Then you should be able to prove it beyond a shadow of a doubt. Oh, and you can't refer to what some scientist said in some book. If Religion is restricted from using its text as "proof", then so is science. Both rely on the person reading to choose to believe the person or not, as there is no way of independantly verifying the item in question without relying on something outside your realm of control.

If I wanted and was smart enough, I could teach myself what I need to prove the existance of molecules...can you do the same with the religious text?

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 30 May 2006 14:49:44 GMT

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

---

Quote:Like what? That God exists? Well that's basically what religion means, so it's not a rule...everybody can start his own religion packed with utter nonsense and make it as unrefutable as any of the major ones.

Rules relating to what is acceptable as religious text, rules as to what qualifies (as least in the Roman Catholic faith) as a "miracle".

As for making up your own religion, that is true. However, science can, and has, done the same thing. You just need to falsify every, just as you would need to falsify every with a fake religion.

Besides, we're not arguing the quality of a religion, but the idea of the existance of God himself. You can have an infinite number of wrong religions without being wrong about the existance of God. A religion is just one interpretation of someone's idea of God.

Quote:Philosophy can help science, but it won't prove stuff, just like religions won't...science however can.

Right. Thank you for proving my point.

Quote:I'm so sorry...I said it wrong the first time and corrected myself in the following 3 or 4 times, so I would have guessed my position was quite clear.

Not when you keep relating it back to your first post in attempting to refute my point.

Quote:The ingredients, not the Universe.

Ah, so you're saying that the universe is it's own package, and the matter is simply expanding to

fill the universe.

Ok, prove it.

Quote:Aren't you someone else?

That I am. Nice avoidance of the argument though. Although, I thank you for conceding that my points have the same validity as a scientist.

Quote:They were mis-labelled as scientific truths.

I don't know where you're going with your pre-evolved forms, but if there is evidence for them, then they are a serious possibility, if there is not (like with a flat earth or God), then believing in them is irrational.

Hind-sight is 20/20 isn't it? They weren't mislabeled at the time they were proclaimed to be true. They were honestly thought to be the correct answer.

Pre-evolved means how something existed before today. This includes anything and everything.

Quote:If I wanted and was smart enough, I could teach myself what I need to prove the existence of molecules...can you do the same with the religious text?

I highly doubt that as you can not see molecules with the naked eye. It has nothing to do with intelligence, but simple genetics. Humans can not see something that small, just as People can not see God.

But lets take your point anyways. I can prove the existence of religious text, I just need to go to my local book store and purchase one.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Wed, 31 May 2006 10:15:31 GMT

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

---

Quote:Rules relating to what is acceptable as religious text, rules as to what qualifies (as least in the Roman Catholic faith) as a "miracle".

Please...which rules? Apparently sci-fi novels are acceptable as religious text, so don't get me started.

Quote:As for making up your own religion, that is true. However, science can, and has, done the same thing. You just need to falsify every, just as you would need to falsify every with a fake religion.

Not to the extent of what's possible with religion. If a scientist falsifies something, others can still tell you if it's either plain wrong (something you can't do with fake religions) or how realistic it is

(compare evidence, something you can't do with fake religions either).

Quote: Besides, we're not arguing the quality of a religion, but the idea of the existence of God himself. You can have an infinite number of wrong religions without being wrong about the existence of God. A religion is just one interpretation of someone's idea of God.

That's true indeed, but after all the idea of a God is irrational if you can't support it with something.

Quote:

Right. Thank you for proving my point.

That science is more trustworthy than religion because it can actually back the stuff up it proclaims? Nice.

Quote: Not when you keep relating it back to your first post in attempting to refute my point.

Uhm when did I do that?

Quote: Ah, so you're saying that the universe is it's own package, and the matter is simply expanding to fill the universe.

Ok, prove it.

I'll let wikipedia speak here: In cosmological terms, the universe is thought to be a finite or infinite space-time continuum in which all matter and energy exist.

Quote: That I am. Nice avoidance of the argument though. Although, I thank you for conceding that my points have the same validity as a scientist.

If you can back your point up, sure. Can you?

Quote: Hind-sight is 20/20 isn't it? They weren't mislabeled at the time they were proclaimed to be true. They were honestly thought to be the correct answer.

There wasn't anything even resembling proof to support those theories, so they weren't the truth, thus were mis-labelled. It's irrelevant what they thought...

Quote: Pre-evolved means how something existed before today. This includes anything and everything.

Thanks for the info.

Quote: I highly doubt that as you can not see molecules with the naked eye. It has nothing to do with intelligence, but simple genetics. Humans can not see something that small, just as People can not see God.

It can still be measured and it's existence proven...good luck doing that with God!

Quote:But lets take your point anyways. I can prove the existance of religious text, I just need to go to my local book store and purchase one.

That's not the point...the point is proving or even getting evidence that your religious text isn't bogus without using it.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 31 May 2006 12:54:38 GMT

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

---

Quote:Please...which rules? Apparently sci-fi novels are acceptable as religious text, so don't get me started.

I can't tell you which rules Scientology uses, so I can't help you there.

Two rules that the Roman Catholic church uses, off the top of my mind, are: Is that the Text must have been written by someone close to Jesus. And, in order for something to qualify as a "miracle" is must have no scientific explanation.

Quote:Not to the extent of what's possible with religion. If a scientist falsifies something, others can still tell you if it's either plain wrong (something you can't do with fake religions) or how realistic it is (compare evidence, something you can't do with fake religions either).

Not the point. It can still be falsified, and held as a scientific truth. The idea of a religion being false has nothing to do with the existence of God.

Quote:That's true indeed, but after all the idea of a God is irrational if you can't support it with something.

So was the existence of the light bulb. But after close to 1000 attempt at proving it, it was finally done. There have not even been that many religions created (as far as I can tell).

Quote:That science is more trustworthy than religion because it can actually back the stuff up it proclaims? Nice.

That Philosophy, which is on the exact same level as Religion, can be used to back up science. The idea of being unable to prove things as being an acceptable form of backup.

Quote:Uhm when did I do that?

You: Talking about us being created through a chemical reaction.

Me: Can't be proven.

You: Life can be created through a chemical reaction

Me: Can't prove it happened to us.

You: But life can be created through a chemical reaction

Me: Can't prove it happened to us.

That entire exchange was relating back to your first post. I keep talking about it can't be proven that it happened to us, and you keep arguing with my by talking about who life can be created through a chemical reaction. The same argument in instance three as it is in instance 1. If you had not been attempting to argue with me on that respect, you would not have continuously related your response with my argument.

Quote:I'll let wikipedia speak here: In cosmological terms, the universe is thought to be a finite or infinite space-time continuum in which all matter and energy exist.

That's nice. But I said to prove it. Telling me what someone else thinks is the truth, with his own evidence to back it up is evil, remember? After all, Religion does that, and Religion is bad!

Quote:If you can back your point up, sure. Can you?

I have as much ability to back up my points, as you do yours.

Quote:There wasn't anything even resembling proof to support those theories, so they weren't the truth, thus were mis-labelled. It's irrelevant what they thought...

Ok, so lets see the argument here.

You: Religion got it wrong, therefore God is false!

Me: Science has got it wrong as well.

You: That doesn't count! It was mislabelled!

Quote:It can still be measured and it's existence proven...

You keep saying it, yet you never actually do it.

Quote:good luck doing that with God!

Never said it could be done, or was required to be done.

Quote:That's not the point...the point is proving or even getting evidence that your religious text isn't bogus without using it

It was the point though, or at least how you stated it.

Quote:If I wanted and was smart enough, I could teach myself what I need to prove the existence of molecules...can you do the same with the religious text?  
Remember this?

Let me highlight the "point" for you.

Quote:prove the existance of molecules.....can you do the same(prove the existance of )with the religious text?

Whether or not the religion I may or may not belong to (when did I state I was religious?) is bogus has no effect on the existence of God.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Wed, 31 May 2006 13:20:43 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:I can't tell you which rules Scientology uses, so I can't help you there.

Two rules that the Roman Catholic church uses, off the top of my mind, are: Is that the Text must have been written by someone close to Jesus. And, in order for something to qualify as a "miracle" is must have no scientific explanation.

We're not talking about the rules of a single church, we're talking about rules that determine what we can call religion in general. Scientology is an exemple for even a sci-fi novel being sufficient.

Quote:Not the point. It can still be falsified, and held as a scientific truth. The idea of a religion being false has nothing to do with the existence of God.

...and it can be refuted, something you can't do with false religions.

Quote:So was the existence of the light bulb. But after close to 1000 attempt at proving it, it was finally done. There have not even been that many religions created (as far as I can tell).

If there were no clue or evidence that it could work, the belief would be as irrational as the belief in God. I don't know what the stages were, but I'm guessing there were clues from the start.

Quote:  
That Philosophy, which is on the exact same level as Religion, can be used to back up science. The idea of being unable to prove things as being an acceptable form of backup.

Acceptable for what?

Quote:That entire exchange was relating back to your first post. I keep talking about it can't be proven that it happened to us, and you keep arguing with my by talking about who life can be created through a chemical reaction. The same argument in instance three as it is in instance 1. If you had not been attempting to argue with me on that respect, you would not have continuously related your response with my argument.

I'm saying that it's the only way that has been proven to work, thus believing in it is logical.

Quote:That's nice. But I said to prove it. Telling me what someone else thinks is the truth, with his own evidence to back it up is evil, remember? After all, Religion does that, and Religion is bad!

It's the friggan definition...next thing you'll tell me is that I can't know what a chair is.

Quote:

I have as much ability to back up my points, as you do yours.

Ability, yes. Too bad you didn't even make a point.

Quote:

Ok, so lets see the argument here.

You: Religion got it wrong, therefore God is false!

Me: Science has got it wrong as well.

You: That doesn't count! It was mislabelled!

How thick are you? You can't blame science for something that isn't science.

Quote:

You keep saying it, yet you never actually do it.

I however could...you don't have that possibility with religion.

Quote:

Never said it could be done, or was required to be done.

It is, if you want to prove something.

Quote:

It was the point though, or at least how you stated it.

Quote:

If I wanted and was smart enough, I could teach myself what I need to prove the existance of molecules...can you do the same with the religious text?

Remember this?

Let me highlight the "point" for you.

Quote:

prove the existance of molecules.....can you do the same(prove the existance of )with the religious text?

Whether or not the religion I may or may not belong to (when did I state I was religious?) is bogus has no effect on the existence of God.

My point is that I could prove the existance of molecules while you can't prove the existance of



God.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 31 May 2006 14:58:35 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:We're not talking about the rules of a single church, we're talking about rules that determine what we can call religion in general. Scientology is an exemple for even a sci-fi novel being sufficient.

There is no universal law governing Science, so why should religion be saddled with it?

Quote:...and it can be refuted, something you can't do with false religions

That's nice. Tell me again how a false religion proves God doesn't exist?

Quote:If there were no clue or evidence that it could work, the belief would be as irrational as the belief in God. I don't know what the stages were, but I'm guessing there were clues from the start.

Ugh, I believe I mentioned this before. There are clues or evidence that suggest God exists, you just refuse to believe them as cluse or evidence.

Quote:Acceptable for what?

Philosophy backs up science, as per your statement.

Philosophy is the same as religion. Dealing with the currently unprovable.

Religion backs up the existance of God.

If Philosophy is acceptable for backing up science as truth, then Religion should be acceptable as backing up God as truth.

Quote:I'm saying that it's the only way that has been proven to work, thus believing in it is logical.

Logical does not equal truth, just aa illogical does not equal untruth.

Quote:It's the friggan definition...next thing you'll tell me is that I can't know what a chair is.

That's nice. So you are choosing to believe what someone else told you it is. A definition is only what the current generation makes it. Definitions change over time, and only prove what is real right now.

Remember: The definition of the earth, not that long ago was that it was a flat piece of rock, where you could fall off the edge if you went to far. It must have been true, as "It's the friggan definition"

Quote:Ability, yes. Too bad you didn't even make a point.

Well, nothing I can do about your inability to grasp things.

Quote:How thick are you? You can't blame science for something that isn't science.

See my point above. I didn't blame science for something that isn't science. I blame you for thinking that science is always right, all the time, and any wrong of science is somehow different than a wrong of religion.

Quote:I however could...you don't have that possibility with religion

How many times do I have to say it. If you can prove it beyond a shadow of a doubt, then prove it. I've been waiting for you to do this the entire time, yet all you do is make mention of your ability to do it.

Quote:It is, if you want to prove something.

And if I don't need to prove it?

Quote:My point is that I could prove the existence of molecules while you can't prove the existence of God.

Once again, if you can prove it, then prove it. I never claimed to be able to prove the existence of God, nor can it be proven that he doesn't exist.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Wed, 31 May 2006 17:28:39 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:There is no universal law governing Science, so why should religion be saddled with it?

?!There are universal laws of physics..

Quote:That's nice. Tell me again how a false religion proves God doesn't exist?

It doesn't bring it up...you're the one who said that religious text is supposed to be proof for God, so I just went along and showed how easy it is to make that stuff up, thus it can't be called proof.

Quote:

Ugh, I believe I mentioned this before. There are clues or evidence that suggest God exists, you just refuse to believe them as clue or evidence.

It's hearsay.

Quote:Philosophy backs up science, as per your statement.  
Philosophy is the same as religion. Dealing with the currently unprovable.  
Religion backs up the existance of God.  
If Philosophy is acceptable for backing up science as truth, then Religion should be acceptable as backing up God as truth.

Philosophy isn't the only thing that backs up science, clues and evidence do, too. Religion however doesn't try to prove anything.

Quote:  
Logical does not equal truth, just aa illogical does not equal untruth.

Nope, I'm just telling you why I believe the way I do.

Quote:  
That's nice. So you are choosing to believe what someone else told you it is. A definition is only what the current generation makes it. Definitions change over time, and only prove what is real right now.

Remember: The definition of the earth, not that long ago was that it was a flat piece of rock, where you could fall off the edge if you went to far. It must have been true, as "It's the friggan definition"

The appropriate definition would be more like the place where we humans live; which hasn't changed at all.

Quote:Well, nothing I can do about your inability to grasp things.

OK let's go back in time and look what your arguement was:

Quote:I have no reason to even begin to try to explain why or why not God may be the starting point.

Nothing I can do about your inability to explain things..

Quote:  
See my point above. I didn't blame science for something that isn't science. I blame you for thinking that science is always right, all the time, and any wrong of science is somehow different that a wrong of religion.

If science actually manages to prove things, then why shouldn't I believe it? For the 5th time or so...don't call it science, since it was neither proven nor was there any evidence of it's truthfulness, which is exactly what science isn't about.

Quote:How many times do I have to say it. If you can prove it beyond a shadow of a doubt, then prove it. I've been waiting for you to do this the entire time, yet all you do is make mention of your

ability to do it.

Are you retarded? So if someone says "I could throw a stone through that window" your response will be "HAY I WONT BELIEVE YOU UNTIL YOU DO IT!!!", right?

Quote:And if I don't need to prove it?

Then it's your intuition and irrational. Live with it..

Quote:Once again, if you can prove it, then prove it. I never claimed to be able to prove the existance of God, nor can it be proven that he doesn't exist.

Read above...I'm still waiting for a reason to believe in God BTW.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 31 May 2006 22:16:17 GMT

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

---

Quote:?!There are universal laws of physics..

One Law of Physics: Nothing can travel faster than the documented speed of light (186,000 miles (299,300 kilometers) per second.)

However, Now, however, physicists are coming closer to finding out how, in some situations, light may actually travel faster than that

Not much of a law if it can be broken.

Quote:It doesn't bring it up...you're the one who said that religious text is supposed to be proof for God, so I just went along and showed how easy it is to make that stuff up, thus it can't be called proof

Nope, I didn't. What I said was:

Quote:The clues that people have about God, are the religious text, and the world around them. Clues do not equal proof. Clues equal a suggestion of something.

Quote:It's hearsay.

What about it is hearsay? Unless you're suggesting that makes it wrong, in which case science falls under the same category.

Quote:Philosophy isn't the only thing that backs up science, clues and evidence do, too. Religion however doesn't try to prove anything.

No the only thing, but it is one thing.

Quote:Nope, I'm just telling you why I believe the way I do.

Ok, so you believe in something simply based on the idea of it being illogical to you... ok then. I can't actually believe I'm going to reference Star Trek here, but by all Vulcan accounts, all human logic and intuition is illogical... however, that never made it wrong.

Quote:Nothing I can do about your inability to explain things..

Yes, quoting something that has nothing to do with your argument is going to work.

My choice not to explain something has nothing to do with my ability to.

Quote:If science actually manages to prove things, then why shouldn't I believe it? For the 5th time or so...don't call it science, since it was neither proven nor was there any evidence of it's truthfulness, which is exactly what science isn't about.

All you can do is possess the belief that science is not lying to you. You have no way to independently verify everything that is told to you, so you must rely on faith that it is correct.

Other than that, it was deemed science back then. Stating it wasn't science now, doesn't change that fact of what it was back then.

Quote:Are you retarded? So if someone says "I could throw a stone through that window" your response will be "HAY I WONT BELIEVE YOU UNTIL YOU DO IT!!!", right?

Finally resorted to blatant avoidance, huh? I can't blame you. And please don't start mixing belief with proof. Of course I believe he could throw the stone, just as I believe in the existence of molecules. However, that does not mean I can prove it until I can independently witness it.

Quote:Then it's your intuition and irrational. Live with it..

Kind of like your inability to prove the existence of molecules then, I take it?

Quote:Read above...I'm still waiting for a reason to believe in God BTW.

Ah, finally you're one the right track. No longer looking for proof in God, just a reason to believe. I applaud that.

Simplistic Reason: Something had to create the universe, why not God? Or, if the universe could have always been there, why not God?

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Thu, 01 Jun 2006 03:30:10 GMT

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

---

JohnDoe wrote on Tue, 30 May 2006 05:40 Sorry, I must've read "science" instead of "philosophy" the first time...that doesn't change, however, that you have no reason to bring philosophy into this when we're talking about science vs religion.

I've intentionally held back posting so you and warranto could continue your exchange unhindered. But this is a pretty outstanding point regardless of what is written on pages 6/7.

Philosophy literally is the unsung root of ALL epistemological discussions; especially this one. You can bring a priest and a biologist into the same room, and give them the one big philosophical question (the likes of which have been discussed in one form or another throughout this thread): "How do you know what you know?"

The problem is, neither the biologist or the priest can answer this question in its entirety. If you ask the biologist how he knows that DNA is comprised of phosphate groups, ribose sugars, and millions of amino acid combinations, he'll tell you that he knows this through evidence. Well, that's all well and good, but ask the question again. "How do you know that evidence is accurate"? The answer of course, is more evidence. The regression is pretty obvious. Eventually you'll get to a point where the biologist needs to prove the so-called "laws" that govern the universe. This is where science fails in lieu of agnostic philosophy. I'll come back to this in a moment.

Similarly, if you ask the priest how he knows that God exists, he'll use a similar but less reliable logic. He might tell you that he knows that God exists because "the watch must have a watchmaker". Or he might say that God must exist because, by definition God is the highest possible idea; of perfection. Thus, because we are able to consider the idea, the form must exist. He might even say he knows God exists based entirely on intuition and sensorial feelings. Compared to science, these proofs are pretty fleeting. But if you keep asking the big question "why", the priest hits the same road block; however clearly a lot faster than the biologist.

The point I'm trying to make here is that what you think you know is not necessarily what is truth. Your integrated knowledge, and mine, and warranto's, are all the byproducts of a combination of consistency and potential rational predictions. We say that there is a world outside our front doors because it was there before. But is it? Science, and not necessarily religion are both in the absolute dark when it comes to predicting the future with 100% certainty. David Hume was the guy who took this to the extreme. You exist in the absolute present. Therefore what happens now is knowable. But this is a contradiction. The past tense "happens" suggests that there is an ability of the mind to comprehend what has happened to it in the past and accurately predict the future in relation to that event. Well, science has been doing this for the... existence of science. And they've almost always been wrong. We thought that quantum mechanics was absolutely predictable based on mathematic models. Turns out, the very premise is ludicrous. What happens in the not-now is absolutely 100% INDEPENDENT of the immediate-now. That means that even though the sun rose today, we have no real evidence suggesting it will tomorrow. The only reason we say that it will, is because it has every day beforehand. This is technically an incorrect statement. We ASSUME the sun will rise tomorrow because it rose today, and supposedly yesterday and so on. The point is, in the same scale science does the same thing.

These "laws" of science that define reality are not laws. They're consistent theories. For example, in 2D space a triangle, in theory, has 180 degrees and three sides; "Angle Side Triangle Theorem". It's an idea that is demonstrably consistent, so we call it "proved" so we don't have to

say that it's only "99.9999999999% probable". Turns out though, according to just about every modern epistemologist (and some ancient ones) that technically, such a thing that says a triangle is to be 180 degrees and 3 sided is not necessarily true for the not-now. However, it's so unlikely that we don't even consider it an option. That does NOT mean, however, that it is impossible. This is extremely important, because epistemologically speaking, science and religion are precisely the same.

For every proposition stated by a biologist or priest, there is a basis extrapolated from reality. Neither man has the ability to prove his position absolutely. To science, we might call them laws of the universe, to religion, it might be God. Point is, neither are provable. They're only "likely". Thankfully, thanks to both science and religion, the "law of causality" and "law of conservation of energy" suggest that the universe has not existed forever, but began at one point.

Interesting enough, the concept of an infinite number of bangs and crunches has no demonstratable scientific probability attached to it. Mostly because the nature of such an event is untestable; like most of string theory. So while it is certainly possible that such an event could take place, it is also possible that the universe merely started once. We have more conclusive evidence to suggest this than not based on science's "laws". This, interestingly enough, provides us with more of rational and probable reason to suggest that something caused our universe to exist in the first place. Just so happens some people call this God. That's about as far as we can go though, because I'd sure like to know how it is a priest or a cleric knows what they claim to know came from God in terms of morality or ritual worship criteria. Also for the record, I'm 23.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [mision08](#) on Thu, 01 Jun 2006 04:49:59 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Stop feeding the troll!

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Thu, 01 Jun 2006 10:43:58 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:One Law of Physics: Nothing can travel faster than the documented speed of light (186,000 miles (299,300 kilometers) per second.)  
However, Now, however, physicists are coming closer to finding out how, in some situations, light may actually travel faster than that

Not much of a law if it can be broken.

Well that's a light pulse, not "real" light...but like Java said proof only means 99.999999% possibility.



Quote:

Nope, I didn't. What I said was:

Quote:

The clues that people have about God, are the religious text, and the world around them.

Clues do not equal proof. Clues equal a suggestion of something.

...and I've already said numerous times why the text can't realistically be considered a clue.

Quote:What about it is hearsay? Unless you're suggesting that makes it wrong, in which case science falls under the same category.

Do you know who wrote the New Testament?

...and once again Science can be self-taught, Christians have to fully rely on what those 4 guys wrote.

Quote:

No the only thing, but it is one thing.

Yes, and therefore you can't put them in the same category.

Quote:Ok, so you believe in something simply based on the idea of it being illogical to you... ok then. I can't actually believe I'm going to reference Star Trek here, but by all Vulcan accounts, all human logic and intuition is illogical... however, that never made it wrong.

I can't actually believe it, either...

Quote:Yes, quoting something that has nothing to do with your argument is going to work.

My choice not to explain something has nothing to do with my ability to.

Then don't argue..

Quote:All you can do is possess the belief that science is not lying to you. You have no way to independently verify everything that is told to you, so you must rely on faith that it is correct.

Other than that, it was deemed science back then. Stating it wasn't science now, doesn't change that fact of what it was back then.

1. I could walk the steps that lead to the scientific conclusion on my own.
2. Just because it was deemed science back then doesn't make it science...lol.

Quote:Finally resorted to blatant avoidance, huh? I can't blame you. And please don't start mixing belief with proof. Of course I believe he could throw the stone, just as I believe in the existence of molecules. However, that does not mean I can prove it until I can independently witness it.

I don't have to prove things over and over again that have been proven before. Yes, it's not 100% certainly, it's 99.9999%, which we call proof.

Quote:Kind of like your inability to prove the existence of molecules then, I take it?

I can get there with 99.9999% certainly....how close can you get with your belief?

Quote:Ah, finally you're on the right track. No longer looking for proof in God, just a reason to believe. I applaud that.

Simplistic Reason: Something had to create the universe, why not God? Or, if the universe could have always been there, why not God?

If God can exist as a starting point, then why not the universe? Follow your logic further and you'll see that someone must have created God. Or, why should God have always been there? What makes you think that something that superfluous exists?

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Thu, 01 Jun 2006 10:57:49 GMT

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

---

mision08 wrote on Wed, 31 May 2006 23:49 Stop feeding the troll!

Don't make me be mean to you again and make you snap like yesterday:

mision08 wrote on Wed, 31 May 2006 14:31 Go fuck yourself. You little cumtwat. I hope you fall on your head, leaving you with slurred speech and a lame leg.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 01 Jun 2006 11:56:48 GMT

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

---

Quote:Well that's a light pulse, not "real" light...

Actually, it's a full-fledged beam of light.

Quote:...and I've already said numerous times why the text can't realistically be considered a clue.

Ah yes, because a scientist, for some reason, has more credibility than people who claim to have witnessed it first hand.

Quote:Do you know who wrote the New Testament?

...and once again Science can be self-taught, Christians have to fully rely on what those 4 guys

wrote.

So what about that is so bad?

I mean, you rely on what people wrote before your time, nearly every day. In fact, schools are founded on that idea.

Quote:Yes, and therefore you can't put them in the same category.

Both deal with the unprovable, and the superfluous. Both are used to attempt to prove something without being able to present "proof". Yup, sounds like a different category to me.

Quote:1. I could walk the steps that lead to the scientific conclusion on my own.

2. Just because it was deemed science back then doesn't make it science...lol

First, I don't see you walking the steps to prove every single scientific discovery ever made. And if you can't do that, your argument here holds no water.

Second, just because it was deemed science back then, **MAKES** it science. The only difference was that the science was wrong.

After all, the idea that the sun revolved around the earth has some very convincing "proof".

Quote:I don't have to prove things over and over again that have been proven before.

Except it hasn't been proven. Some guy, some where, showed a group of people some pictures and called it "molecules". Unless you can prove differently, you have no choice but to simply believe what you were told, and go about your day.

Quote:If God can exist as a starting point, then why not the universe? Follow your logic further and you'll see that someone must have created God. Or, why should God have always been there? What makes you think that something that superfluous exists?

Ah, so to follow my logic, then some all powerful being must have created all things, and somewhere along the line we decided to worship the being that created the universe, instead of the actual primary creator itself. Well, I guess religion got it wrong, and that God still exists, just not as was previously believed.

And please, explain to me WHY qualifying as being beyond what is required or sufficient is so wrong?

Quote:....how close can you get with your belief?

There is a reason it is called a belief, meaning there is no proof for it.

Quote:Yes, it's not 100% certainly, it's 99.9999%, which we call proof.

Wrong. Any integer less than 100% is a belief. If it is "proof", it MUST be 100%, or else there is room to call it into question. And, if it can be questioned, then it can not be a proof. Now, 99.9999999% is the closest thing to "proof" that a belief can get to, but it is not qualified proof.

Unless you actually want to suggest that something that is proven still possesses the ability to be disproven....

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Thu, 01 Jun 2006 13:09:31 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:Actually, it's a full-fledged beam of light.

I could care less how you call it...end of the day it's not full-fledged light.

Quote:Most physicists, however, say that while a beam may travel faster than light, such a beam cannot carry a signal, that is, information. A signal is a sudden change in the character of light waves within the beam -- for example, a change in the wavelength, the length of the wave.

Quote:Ah yes, because a scientist, for some reason, has more credibility than people who claim to have witnessed it first hand.

Scientists have evidence for their theories, you've got 4 guys that heard a fantasy story and decided to write a book.

Quote:So what about that is so bad?

I mean, you rely on what people wrote before your time, nearly every day. In fact, schools are founded on that idea.

What I learn in school are either proven things, opinions or theories about what happened before our time...religion is only founded on one of those 3, just with no evidence.

Quote:Both deal with the unprovable, and the superfluous. Both are used to attempt to prove something without being able to present "proof". Yup, sounds like a different category to me.

That's only a part of it...I'm not going to rephrase Java's post for you.

Quote:First, I don't see you walking the steps to prove every single scientific discovery ever made. And if you can't do that, your argument here holds no water.

Second, just because it was deemed science back then, MAKES it science. The only difference was that the science was wrong.

After all, the idea that the sun revolved around the earth has some very convincing "proof".

First, it's possible, if you see it or not.

Second, I guess lightning is nothing but a God's anger...it was deemed that back then!

Quote:Except is hasn't been proven. Some guy, some where, showed a group of people some pictures and called it "molecules". Unless you can prove differently, you have no choice but to simply believe what you were told, and go about your day.

I could possibly come to the conclusion that there are things that are like the ones we call molecules myself.

Quote:Ah, so to follow my logic, then some all powerful being must have created all things, and somewhere along the line we decided to worship the being that created the universe, instead of the actual primary creator itself. Well, I guess religion got it wrong, and that God still exists, just not as was previously believed.

And please, explain to me WHY qualifying as being beyond what is required or sufficient is so wrong?

Too bad you don't know your own logic...there would be no primary creator if everything had to be created by someone else.

OK I'll explain it: It's not wrong, there's just no point in believing it.

Quote:There is a reason it is called a belief, meaning there is no proof for it.

There is a reason why some things are more realistic than others...once again, how close can you get to the 99.999%?

Quote:Wrong. Any integer less than 100% is a belief. If it is "proof", it MUST be 100%, or else there is room to call it into question. And, if it can be questioned, then it can not be a proof. Now, 99.9999999% is the closest thing to "proof" that a belief can get to, but it is not qualified proof.

Unless you actually want to suggest that something that is proven still possesses the ability to be disproven....

I said we call it proof, because there is no such thing as 100% proof.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 01 Jun 2006 13:39:08 GMT

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

---

Quote:I could care less how you call it...end of the day it's not full-fledged light

All you did was show me where it says the beam of "LIGHT" can't carry information. It's still light, just not one you can transport information along.

Quote:Scientists have evidence for their theories, you've got 4 guys that heard a fantasy story and decided to write a book.

Heard? From a credible source. And that's only the main four books. What about all the others included who witnessed the things themselves?

Quote:What I learn in school are either proven things, opinions or theories about what happened before our time...religion is only founded on one of those 3, just with no evidence.

Ok, we'll change the scope of things then.

Religion is founded on at least 2 of those things, then. There is no evidence for history text to state who did what (maybe that someone mentioned did exist, but not that it was them who did the act). You have to rely on what they were told by other sources of information. That, in itself, is less credible than the bible, as the majority of the New Testament is written by people who witnessed it themselves.

Quote:That's only a part of it...I'm not going to rephrase Java's post for you.

Java's post has nothing to do with what I said, although it doesn't discount what was mentioned.

Quote:First, it's possible, if you see it or not.

Second, I guess lightning is nothing but a God's anger...it was deemed that back then!

I'm not talking about what's possible, I'm talking about what's proven.

As for lightning being God's anger, that was Religion back then, but it was also wrong. Using what I said in a completely irrelevant context doesn't help your argument. I stated what science believed made it science, not that the belief itself was true. Turning that into an argument about the belief itself being true does nothing to assist your side.

Quote:I could possibly come to the conclusion that there are things that are like the ones we call molecules myself.

Based on what, that evil thing called intuition? You have no proof that what he says is real, so you can't rely on evidence. Nor can you expect your "guess" to be the correct one.

Quote:Too bad you don't know your own logic...there would be no primary creator if everything had to be created by someone else.

OK I'll explain it: It's not wrong, there's just no point in believing it.

Oh, I know my own logic, I was just waiting for you to say something like you did. As such: You are correct! There would be no primary creator if everything had to be created by someone else. So, where does it begin? If the universe has the ability to "always-exist", then the idea that a different being also "always-existing" could also be possible.

As for your second argument there, thank you for admitting it's not wrong. However,, it does not make it nonexistent. If the qualification of superfluous makes something wrong... see back to what I said about using the existence of molecules to explain things.

Quote:There is a reason why some things are more realistic than others...once again, how close can you get to the 99.999%?

99.999% is too subjective to adequately answer. Besides, there is a reason Religion is called a "belief"

Quote:I said we call it proof, because there is no such thing as 100% proof

So, you're willing to hold something that could be disproven, as a valid truth?

Gee, that sounds a lot like your argument against religion.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Thu, 01 Jun 2006 17:37:41 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:

All you did was show me where it says the beam of "LIGHT" can't carry information. It's still light, just not one you can transport information along.

Whatever...it's still not the usual light that we know, that's all I'm saying.

Quote:

Heard? From a credible source. And that's only the main four books. What about all the others included who witnessed the things themselves?

Who says it's credible? Besides, I think this is more going into the direction of supporting/disproving Christianity...if can tell you why the whole Christian faith doesn't make any sense, if you want to head into that direction.

Quote:Religion is founded on at least 2 of those things, then. There is no evidence for history text to state who did what (maybe that someone mentioned did exist, but not that it was them who did the act). You have to rely on what they were told by other sources of information. That, in itself, is less credible than the bible, as the majority of the New Testament is written by people who witnessed it themselves.

It's only theory that's said to be the truth tbh. Did the Evangelists witness Jesus' life themselves? Like I've said, if you want to discuss Christianity, then I'm going to try to disprove it as a whole



next time. If you'd rather talk about God in general without the religions, then we should just drop this.

Quote:Java's post has nothing to do with what I said, although it doesn't discount what was mentioned.

He explains how you can't really put religion and philosophy in the same shelf.

Quote:I'm not talking about what's possible, I'm talking about what's proven.

As for lightning being God's anger, that was Religion back then, but it was also wrong. Using what I said in a completely irrelevant context doesn't help your argument. I stated what science believed made it science, not that the belief itself was true. Turning that into an argument about the belief itself being true does nothing to assist your side.

It being possible is all I need to prove my point.

I used that to show how a phenomenon of nature was mislabeled as something religious, just like world being flat was mislabeled as science.

Quote:Based on what, that evil thing called intuition? You have no proof that what he says is real, so you can't rely on evidence. Nor can you expect your "guess" to be the correct one.

No, because every step had been walked before, so why should it be impossible to do the same?

Quote:Oh, I know my own logic, I was just waiting for you to say something like you did. As such: You are correct! There would be no primary creator if everything had to be created by someone else. So, where does it begin? If the universe has the ability to "always-exist", then the idea that a different being also "always-existing" could also be possible.

As for your second argument there, thank you for admitting it's not wrong. However,, it does not make it nonexistent. If the qualification of superfluous makes something wrong... see back to what I said about using the existence of molecules to explain things.

A different being could also be "always-existing", but why should there be such a thing if it works perfectly without?

I've never said it was wrong...I'm just saying that there's no point in believing into something that superfluous.

Quote:  
99.999% is too subjective to adequately answer. Besides, there is a reason Religion is called a "belief"

You're saying that the existance of God is as realistic as the existance of molecules?

Quote:So, you're willing to hold something that could be disproven, as a valid truth?

Gee, that sounds a lot like your argument against religion.

I'm willing to hold something that is 99.9999% sure as the truth, since that's as close as it'll get.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 01 Jun 2006 18:03:41 GMT

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

---

Quote:Whatever...it's still not the usual light that we know, that's all I'm saying

Point is, it's still travelling faster than what was thought to be the extreme speed limit.

Quote:Who says it's credible? Besides, I think this is more going into the direction of supporting/disproving Christianity...if can tell you why the whole Christian faith doesn't make any sense, if you want to head into that direction.

You brought up the "four main books", so thats what I argued based on. But I agree, save the religious-specific arguments for a different thread.

Quote:He explains how you can't really put religion and philosophy in the same shelf.

Actually, what he's saying is that Philosophy and Religion argue differently about the same thing. Kind of like apples and oranges. Not the same, but they are both in the "fruit" category. That's where Philosophy and Religion are the same. They argue the same thing, using the same "formulas", just argue it in a different manner.

I'm not trying to argue the "apples and oranges" here, I'm trying to get you to see that they are both fruit.

Quote:It being possible is all I need to prove my point.

I used that to show how a pheonomenon of nature was mislabeled as something religious, just like world being flat was mislabeled as science.

And Being possible is all I need to prove mine.

They weren't mislabeled. Religion held its perception to be true, even though it wasn't, just as Science held its perception to be true, even though it wasn't. Both were made claim to by their respective area.

Quote:You're saying that the existance of God is as realistic as the existance of molecules?

Neither are "realistic" as neither can be conclusively proven. I'll use a legal analogy, since that is

my area of profession. Science would be like a Criminal Trial. The burden of proof is beyond a reasonable doubt. The existence of God, since it is in itself unprovable, would only qualify in the Civil Trial, where the burden of proof is simply on a balance of probabilities.

While, admittedly, God is in the lower form of required "proof", it doesn't make it any less possible that he does exist. The innate lack of the availability of proof just makes it more likely that something like we are arguing about will come about.

Quote:I'm willing to hold something that is 99.9999% sure as the truth, since that's as close as it'll get.

But it still isn't certain that this belief is true. Sure, may seem to be true 99% of the time, but there is still the possibility that it may not come true. And, after all, you did say:

Quote:But, from a logical point of view, assuming that there is something you have no proof of whatsoever makes no sense at all.

Changing the definition to suit your needs doesn't make it any less than a lack of "proof" to make it 100%. Anything less, and (as I mentioned before) is simply a belief that what is thought of to be true, is.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Thu, 01 Jun 2006 18:23:06 GMT

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

JohnDoe wrote on Thu, 01 June 2006 12:37Did the Evangelists witness Jesus' life themselves?  
-Matthew was one of Jesus's apostles, called Levi in Luke and called by both names in Mark.

-Mark was the person to whom that specific gospel was attributed, a disciple of Peter the Apostle who recorded his discourses

-Luke's gospel was written by the same person as Acts and both are thought to have been written around the 60s A.D.

-Tradition states John's gospel was written by the apostle himself, though it is unclear if it was the same John who wrote the epistles and/or Revelation.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Fri, 02 Jun 2006 09:28:32 GMT

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

Quote:

Point is, it's still travelling faster than what was thought to be the extreme speed limit.

It's not the type of light they made the rules for I guess..

Quote:Actually, what he's saying is that Philosophy and Religion argue differently about the same thing. Kind of like apples and oranges. Not the same, but they are both in the "fruit" category. That's where Philosophy and Religion are the same. They argue the same thing, using the same "formulas", just argue it in a different manner.

I'm not trying to argue the "apples and oranges" here, I'm trying to get you to see that they are both fruit.

Philosophy digs deeper, but whatever, I guess you could both put them into the fruit category for your aspect.

Quote:And Being possible is all I need to prove mine.

They weren't mislabeled. Religion held its perception to be true, even though it wasn't, just as Science held its perception to be true, even though it wasn't. Both were made claim to by their respective area.

That's the "possible" taking out of context. I said it's possible that I feel the need to learn everything and am a genius, thus am able to walk those steps. Your possible is that everything's possible.

The world being flat has its roots in Religion, so you might as well put it in that area as well. Just because some so-called scientists were kissing religion's ass doesn't mean it's science since there's absolutely nothing scientific about it.

Quote:But it still isn't certain that this belief is true. Sure, may seem to be true 99% of the time, but there is still the possibility that it may not come true. And, after all, you did say:  
Quote:

But, from a logical point of view, assuming that there is something you have no proof of whatsoever makes no sense at all.

Changing the definition to suit your needs doesn't make it any less than a lack of "proof" to make it 100%. Anything less, and (as I mentioned before) is simply a belief that what is thought of to be true, is.

That's what we humans call "proof", tho...but you're right, I should've made that distinction earlier.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 02 Jun 2006 13:19:56 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:It's not the type of light they made the rules for I guess..

I'm sure that someone so in tune with Science as you claim to be would know that the rule was not made for light alone, but rather for all things. Hence the rule "nothing can travel faster than 186,000 miles (299,300 kilometers) per second."

Quote:Philosophy digs deeper, but whatever, I guess you could both put them into the fruit category for your aspect.

Philosophy digs as deep as the person arguing something wants to, same as religion. Most people, such as yourself, seem to argue, or rather, misinterpret Occam's Razor.

Quote:That's the "possible" taking out of context. I said it's possible that I feel the need to learn everything and am a genius, thus am able to walk those steps. Your possible is that everything's possible.

Since the "possible,proven" aspect is what started this, I'm going to assume that the because it's possible for you to go out and learn it, that automatically makes it proven. Sorry, that alone doesn't make it proven. Unless you want to concede that,because it is possible to go out and learn about God, that God must be proven as well.

Quote:The world being flat has it's roots in Religion, so you might as well put it in that area as well. Just because some so-called scientists were kissing religion's ass doesn't mean it's science since there's absolutely nothing scientific about it.

That might be, but science still held it as a scientific truth. Just as they did the idea of the sun moving around the earth (and there was evidence of that as well!), and the existence of caloric (which scientists believed in, simply because there was nothing else to answer the question).

Quote:That's what we humans call "proof", tho...but you're right, I should've made that distinction earlier.

Well, if we humans are basing proof on something that can not be proven absolutely, has to potential to be wrong, and must be believed in, in order to exist...

Then I guess that proves God's existence right there.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Fri, 02 Jun 2006 14:00:19 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:  
I'm sure that someone so in tune with Science as you claim to be would know that the rule was not made for light alone, but rather for all things. Hence the rule "nothing can travel faster than

186,000 miles (299,300 kilometers) per second."

Yea stuff that carries information...

Quote:Philosophy digs as deep as the person arguing something wants to, same as religion. Most people, such as yourself, seem to argue, or rather, misinterpret Occam's Razor.

That's just wrong...read Java's post again.

Quote:Since the "possible,proven" aspect is what started this, I'm going to assume that the because it's possible for you to go out and learn it, that automatically makes it proven. Sorry, that alone doesn't make it proven. Unless you want to concede that,because it is possible to go out and learn about God, that God must be proven as well.

No it's possible to have learned about God then. The difference is that people have proven molecules before, so it's possible to do it again, if the person is willing to, but God hasn't been proven.

Quote:

That might be, but science still held it as a scientific truth. Just as they did the idea of the sun moving around the earth (and there was evidence of that as well!), and the existence of caloric (which scientists believed in, simply because there was nothing else to answer the question).

Sun moving around the earth has it's roots in religion as well. Existence of caloric is a perfect example for people making stuff up because they can't explain something...it's not a scientific approach, so therefore it isn't science.

Quote:Well, if we humans are basing proof on something that can not be proven absolutely, has to potential to be wrong, and must be believed in, in order to exist...

Then I guess that proves God's existence right there.

Since when is there a 99.9999% certainty that God exists?

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Javafx](#) on Fri, 02 Jun 2006 17:32:43 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

JohnDoe wrote on Fri, 02 June 2006 10:00That's just wrong...read Java's post again.

My post reinforces warranto's issues.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 02 Jun 2006 18:48:50 GMT

Quote:Yea stuff that carries information...

not really, otherwise they would not have said "nothing can travel faster.."

Quote:No it's possible to have learned about God then. The difference is that people have proven molecules before, so it's possible to do it again, if the person is willing to, but God hasn't been proven.

People have said they have proven molecules exist. It's up to you to believe them or not. People have claimed to have proven God exists (hence the emergence of different religions), but you have to choose to believe them or not.

Quote:Sun moving around the earth has it's roots in religion as well. Existence of caloric is a perfect example for people making stuff up because they can't explain something...it's not a scientific approach, so therefore it isn't science.

Actually, the sun moving around the earth has its roots in science. Someone looked up into the sky, saw that the sun moved across the sky, in a continuous motion, and concluded with that evidence that the sun moves around the earth.

Caloric was something Scientists made up to explain the phenomenon of heat transfer, and held it as truth in the absence of anything to the contrary.

Quote:Since when is there a 99.9999% certainty that God exists?

There never has been, as far as we (meaning you and me), as individuals, can ascertain. Just as there is no proof (99% or 1%) to the existence of anything that we have not discovered for ourselves. It all comes down to a matter of belief. Both science and religion rely on that aspect (well, all things in humanity do) to succeed. There is no way we can honestly say "I know", unless we have experienced it ourselves, and can trust that our senses are not fooling us ( and for all intents and purposes, they don't... but it's still a concern)

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Fri, 02 Jun 2006 20:15:08 GMT

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

---

Quote:My post reinforces warrant's issues.

If Philosophy and Religion are so synchronous, then how should I understand this?

Quote:Eventually you'll get to a point where the biologist needs to prove the so-called "laws" that govern the universe. This is where science fails in lieu of agnostic philosophy.(...)But if you keep asking the big question "why", the priest hits the same road block; however clearly a lot faster



then the biologist.

Quote: not really, otherwise they would not have said "nothing can travel faster.."

Zzing

Quote: People have said they have proven molecules exist. It's up to you to believe them or not. People have claimed to have proven God exists (hence the emergence of different religions), but you have to choose to believe them or not.

The people who said they have proven molecules exist can walk you through to proving it yourself...the people that have "proven" God exists can't, I wonder why.

Quote:

Actually, the sun moving around the earth has its roots in science. Someone looked up into the sky, saw that the sun moved across the sky, in a continuous motion, and concluded with that evidence that the sun moves around the earth.

Caloric was something Scientists made up to explain the phenomenon of heat transfer, and held it as truth in the absence of anything to the contrary.

It was the Sungod cruising around...

Yea, that's exactly what I've been saying...that's everything but a scientific approach.

Quote: There never has been, as far as we (meaning you and me), as individuals, can ascertain. Just as there is no proof (99% or 1%) to the existence of anything that we have not discovered for ourselves. It all comes down to a matter of belief. Both science and religion rely on that aspect (well, all things in humanity do) to succeed. There is no way we can honestly say "I know", unless we have experienced it ourselves, and can trust that our senses are not fooling us ( and for all intents and purposes, they don't... but it's still a concern)

You can never be sure that your senses aren't fooling you...that's why I said that nothing can really be proven 100% before. We have to rely on not being involved in any conspiracy, so that we can call those things that belong in the .0001% "proven". God, however, doesn't belong into that category, the existence of molecules does.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Fri, 02 Jun 2006 20:24:57 GMT

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

---

JohnDoe wrote on Fri, 02 June 2006 16:15 If Philosophy and Religion are so synchronous, then how should I understand this?

That was the so-called laws of the universe are as provable as the existence of God, the existence of molecules, the existence of your favourite colour, or even the existence of yourself

one second from now. The world of our preceptions is not very distant from the world of our minds.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 02 Jun 2006 20:47:19 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:Zzing

Err... Huh?

What does that have to do with Science getting something wrong?

Quote:The people who said they have proven molecules exist can walk you through to proving it yourself...the people that have "proven" God exists can't, I wonder why.

Err, I've said this time and again, that the existance or lack thereof of God can not be proven... The people who have "proven" that molecules exist must rely on something outside of their control to prove it (outside of the control does not include the senses, which we will, for sanities sake, assume are "perfect"). That there is not proof, but trust once again.

But, to continue with the point I was making, the people who have claimed to proven God exists, can walk you through it just as easily.

Quote:It was the Sungod cruising around...

Yea, that's exactly what I've been saying...that's everything but a scientific approach.

That was one interpretation, far before the time that I am referring to. The Greek/Roman polytheism died out long before the idea that the sun revolved around the earth was wrong. It wasn't until the early 1600's that it was proven wrong. Unless, you are suggesting that science didn't exist before then.

Quote:You can never be sure that your senses aren't fooling you...that's why I said that nothing can really be proven 100% before. We have to rely on not being involved in any conspiracy, so that we can call those things that belong in the .0001% "proven". God, however, doesn't belong into that category, the existance of molecules does.

Why, then?

And please, don't go off again about things being provable.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Sat, 03 Jun 2006 12:41:15 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:That was the so-called laws of the universe are as provable as the existence of God, the existence of molecules, the existence of your favourite colour, or even the existence of yourself one second from now. The world of our preceptions is not very distant from the world of our minds.

I know, but it also means that the philisopher doesn't hit the road block, thus isn't synchronous.

Quote:Err... Huh?

What does that have to do with Science getting something wrong?

My way of saying "You were right!".

Quote:Err, I've said this time and again, that the existance or lack thereof of God can not be proven... The people who have "proven" that molecules exist must rely on something outside of their control to prove it (ouside of the control does not include the senses, which we will, for sanities sake, assume are "perfect"). That there is not proof, but trust once again.

But, to continue with the point I was making, the people who have claimed to proven God exists, can walk you through it just as easily.

Someone had to make the things that are outside of their control, so for sanity's sake, I assume that they don't try to screw you ever.

How can they walk me through it? God never shows himself after the "holy book" is written...if you're aiming at the people who saw God in their steak, then...yea, I'd probably kick them in the nuts for wasting my time.

Quote:That was one interpretation, far before the time that I am referring to. The Greek/Roman polytheism died out long before the idea that the sun revolved around the earth was wrong. It wasn't until the early 1600's that it was proven wrong. Unless, you are suggesting that science didn't exist before then.

That interpretation lead to people believing that it was the sun instead of the Sungod, that's all. The roots are found in Religion.

Quote:Why, then?

And please, don't go off again about things being provable.

Uhm I said something wrong the last time.

Quote:We have to rely on not being involved in any conspiracy, so that we can call those things

that belong in the .0001% "proven".  
^This should be changed in "belong in the 99.9999%".

What do you mean by "Why, then?"?

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Sat, 03 Jun 2006 17:44:16 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:Someone had to make the things that are outside of their control, so for sanity's sake, I assume that they don't try to screw you ever.

Right. But the idea is relating to the belief in someone that they aren't going to screw you, as you have no way of actually knowing if they will.

Quote:How can they walk me through it? God never shows himself after the "holy book" is written...if you're aiming at the people who saw God in their steak, then...yea, I'd probably kick them in the nuts for wasting my time.

Of course, for that to be true, someone must have to foolishly follow the "seeing is believing" phrase. At least in relation to God not showing himself as people would expect.

I'm relating more to the idea of religious experts being able to walk you through their idea of proof for God's existence. The same as scientists, they rely on their own means to get you to believe them.

Quote:That interpretation lead to people believing that it was the sun instead of the Sungod, that's all. The roots are found in Religion.

Most things have their roots in religion. That doesn't ignore the idea that it was supported and held true by science.

Quote:What do you mean by "Why, then?"?

If you have to choose to believe things that can not be 100% proven, that you must trust that you are not going to be subject to a conspiracy, why, based on that, does God not fit in to the same "subject to flaws, but does not mean its untrue" category?

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Sat, 03 Jun 2006 19:51:58 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:Right. But the idea is relating to the belief in someone that they aren't going to screw you,

---

as you have no way of actually knowing if they will.

You don't know if your eyes or whatever will screw you, either...it belongs to the basics that you have to live with.

Quote:Of course, for that to be true, someone must have to foolishly follow the "seeing is believing" phrase. At least in relation to God not showing himself as people would expect.

I'm relating more to the idea of religious experts being able to walk you through their idea of proof for God's existence. The same as scientists, they rely on their own means to get you to believe them.

Yes, the watchmaker stuff, but didn't I already explain before, why that logic is flawed?

Quote:Most things have their roots in religion. That doesn't ignore the idea that it was supported and held true by science.

Those roots however gave them the feeling that it must be that way...but yes, since they found "evidence" that the sun moves around the earth, I could say you're sort of right on that occasion. They eventually got it right, tho and I have faith in science being able to prove that the universe wasn't created by some kind of "God", seeing as how unrealistic the alternative seems.

Quote:If you have to choose to believe things that can not be 100% proven, that you must trust that you are not going to be subject to a conspiracy, why, based on that, does God not fit in to the same "subject to flaws, but does not mean its untrue" category?

I didn't say that we have to believe things that aren't 100% proven in general, I said that we can believe things that are 99.9999% certain, the kind of things that can only be flawed if all of a sudden everyone's senses are wrong or the equipment that we built for that reason chooses to malfunction all over the world...

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sat, 03 Jun 2006 21:18:54 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JohnDoe wrote on Sat, 03 June 2006 08:41 I know, but it also means that the philisopher doesn't hit the road block, thus isn't synchronous.

It is, because both scientists and theists are philosophers of varying degrees. Both of them hit the "road block" when it comes to epistemology.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Sun, 04 Jun 2006 08:43:04 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

...therefore it's wrong to say that philosopher is to science as theist is to religion.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Javalcx](#) on Sun, 04 Jun 2006 21:53:50 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Nope. Theists don't necessarily rely on faith. You can very much have a philosophically inspired reason for believing in the divine. Such a good reason infact, that it cannot be considered faith any more than you can say you have faith that the chair you're sitting in will be there as you sit down.

The philosopher is to science and religion equally.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Sun, 04 Jun 2006 23:08:39 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Exactly...that's why I'm trying to say.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Javalcx](#) on Mon, 05 Jun 2006 02:58:24 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Then I hope you can appreciate the scientific evidence that suggests an agnostic-theist approach to the origins of our existence.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Mon, 05 Jun 2006 08:50:01 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I can appreciate it, but I'll still find the scientific approach more compelling.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Javalcx](#) on Mon, 05 Jun 2006 14:10:04 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Then I'm glad we agree that it is more probable for a watchmaker of undiscernible composition or partiality.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 05 Jun 2006 14:26:31 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Just to bring in a "new" argument, there is nothing that says science and religion are incompatible.

I thoroughly believe that science will be able to prove everything wasn't made by God, at least not directly.

Consider this, if you would:

My personal belief is that God is the ultimate scientist. He's the one that developed the rules for the universe, and, perhaps as a result, initiated the big bang.

Everything after that, up to the point of life appearing, is pure coincidence. However with this "guiding hand" theory of mine (my own phrase), God tends to interfere a little bit in his "experiment" (don't read too much into that), simply to make things don't completely fall apart. He may have created humans (through scientific means), whether through evolution, or simply the "poof" factor. But more or less stays out of our hair to let us develop on our own.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Mon, 05 Jun 2006 15:42:46 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Javaxcx wrote on Mon, 05 June 2006 09:10 Then I'm glad we agree that it is more probable for a watchmaker of undiscernible composition or partiality.

What is more probable?!

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Mon, 05 Jun 2006 15:44:20 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

warranto wrote on Mon, 05 June 2006 09:26 Just to bring in a "new" argument, there is nothing that says science and religion are incompatible.

I thoroughly believe that science will be able to prove everything wasn't made by God, at least not directly.

Consider this, if you would:

My personal belief is that God is the ultimate scientist. He's the one that developed the rules for the universe, and, perhaps as a result, initiated the big bang.

Everything after that, up to the point of life appearing, is pure coincidence. However with this



guiding hand" theory of mine (my own phrase), God tends to interfere a little bit in his "experiment" (don't read too much into that), simply to make things don't completely fall apart. He may have created humans (through scientific means), whether through evolution, or simply the "poof" factor. But more or less stays out of our hair to let us develop on our own.

If God was the ultimate scientist, then why would he have to interfere?

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 05 Jun 2006 15:48:29 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

The same reason other scientists interfere with the natural course of things. To ensure that it doesn't become a complete failure.

If a Scientist is trying to develop a cure for something, he won't just leave it be once the start of the experiment has begun, he'll modify and assist the process to ensure that the end result is what he wants.

But like I said, don't read too much into the "experiment" word. That's mostly there as a placeholder until I can find a better comparison. It works, but gets people thinking of the wrong ideas.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Javalcx](#) on Mon, 05 Jun 2006 16:08:16 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

JohnDoe wrote on Mon, 05 June 2006 11:42: What is more probable?!

That we were caused.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Mon, 05 Jun 2006 16:35:21 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Javalcx wrote on Mon, 05 June 2006 11:08: JohnDoe wrote on Mon, 05 June 2006 11:42: What is more probable?!

That we were caused.

I'm losing you here tbh. What exactly are you arguing? Give me the whole picture.

My position is that God is superfluous, since all of his characteristics can be given to the universe. I can however appreciate people thinking that a thing like the universe must be made by "somebody", because we humans make things, too.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Mon, 05 Jun 2006 16:37:40 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

warranto wrote on Mon, 05 June 2006 10:48The same reason other scientists interfere with the natural course of things. To ensure that it doesn't become a complete failure.

If a Scientist is trying to develop a cure for something, he won't just leave it be once the start of the experiment has begun, he'll modify and assist the process to ensure that the end result is what he wants.

But like I said, don't read too much into the "experiment" word. That's mostly there as a placeholder until I can find a better comparison. It works, but gets people thinking of the wrong ideas.

So the "ultimate" doesn't imply all-knowing?

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 05 Jun 2006 17:09:43 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

It .could. The example doesn't discount him being all-knowing

Being all-knowing, all-powerful, all-whatever. Doesn't necessarily mean that we are going to be the same. For argument's sake, let's assume that he is all-knowing. That just means he'll know when and where to make the "fix" to put us back on course.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Mon, 05 Jun 2006 17:57:39 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

If he was all-knowing, he wouldn't need to fix anything. The outcome would be clear from the start.

All-powerful doesn't really work either, given the good 'ol exemple of telling God to make a stone that's too heavy for him to carry.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 05 Jun 2006 19:53:46 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

"all-knowing" simply means that he knows what will happen, that as an isolated thing, does not mean that he would necessarily be able to fix it.

Think of it as us being able to predict the future, We may know when something will occur, how it will happen, where it will happen, etc., but we won't be able to do anything about it simply by knowing about it.

The outcome may be clear, but that doesn't mean some modification won't be required to reach that. Cause and effect, and every other time-based paradox being as they are.

As for the all-powerful, just because you have the power, doesn't mean you'll use it. Besides, you know as well as I do that the universe (or, the substance within it ) are subject to rules. If he started to break them, despite his creation of them, there would be consequences.

More later, large workload came in.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Mon, 05 Jun 2006 20:12:25 GMT

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

---

Quote:"all-knowing" simply means that he knows what will happen, that as an isolated thing, does not mean that he would necessarily be able to fix it.

Think of it as us being able to predict the future, We may know when something will occur, how it will happen, where it will happen, etc., but we won't be able to do anything about it simply by knowing about it.

The outcome may be clear, but that doesn't mean some modification won't be required to reach that. Cause and effect, and every other time-based paradox being as they are.

The premise however is that he engineered it. So by being all-knowing he would know what consequences are going to happen with each "setup". The case that he will have to "fix" something would never occur.

Quote:As for the all-powerful, just because you have the power, doesn't mean you'll use it. Besides, you know as well as I do that the universe (or, the substance within it Wink ) are subject to rules. If he started to break them, despite his creation of them, there would be consequences.

The exemple with the stone shows that there is no "all-powerful". If he was all-powerful, then shouldn't he have the power to create every stone possible, even a stone that's too heavy for him to carry? On the other hand, by creating such a stone, he would stop being all-powerful since he has created a barrier for himself.

Quote:

More later, large workload came in.

Speaking of work, I should be studying for my final oral exams...too bad I'm a very lazy person

when it comes to those things.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Mon, 05 Jun 2006 22:01:45 GMT

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

---

If God is all-knowing, then "fix" is the wrong word to use because something being "broken" implies that something went in an unexpected way.

If God is all-powerful, then there simply is no rock so big that He couldn't lift it. It could be infinitely big and it would make no difference. "All" includes the infinite.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Mon, 05 Jun 2006 22:49:45 GMT

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

---

SpyGuy246 wrote on Mon, 05 June 2006 17:01 If God is all-knowing, then "fix" is the wrong word to use because something being "broken" implies that something went in an unexpected way.

If God is all-powerful, then there simply is no rock so big that He couldn't lift it. It could be infinitely big and it would make no difference. "All" includes the infinite.

1. Warranto said something about modifications, so I just used the verb fix in "" to express that...it doesn't change my point in the slightest.

2. So you're saying that God can't create such a rock? Hmmm...

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 06 Jun 2006 00:02:07 GMT

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

---

As to the "all-knowing" idea, you can engineer things a certain way and still expect to "fix" them on the way. The only difference between this type of fixing, and the type where an honest mistake has occurred, is that this one is a planned event.

Quote: The example with the stone shows that there is no "all-powerful". If he was all-powerful, then shouldn't he have the power to create every stone possible, even a stone that's too heavy for him to carry? On the other hand, by creating such a stone, he would stop being all-powerful since he has created a barrier for himself.

Ignorant question.

Only the all-powerful would be able to take their own power away. That's the beauty of being all-powerful. Of course, once you take it away, you cease being all-powerful.

---

So, until he actually does create that stone, he has not taken his own power away. You can't judge the current status of something by what will modify it in the future, by reasons that can ONLY be done by the person it would affect.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Tue, 06 Jun 2006 04:50:15 GMT

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

---

\*ahem\*

---

#### File Attachments

1) [normal\\_Retard\\_Win.jpg](#), downloaded 674 times



---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Tue, 06 Jun 2006 05:24:30 GMT

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

---

WITH ALL OF THE INTELLIGENT DEBATE IN THIS THREAD IT WAS ONLY A MATTER OF TIME BEFORE AN IDIOT CAME TO RUIN IT

GG K THX ALL THAT SHIT.

THANKS A LOT FOR RUINING WHAT WAS A PERFECTLY GOOD DISCUSSION WHERE PEOPLE HAD SOME KIND OF BRAIN UNLIKE YOU

BUT THEN I GUESS YOU JUST CAN'T HELP YOURSELF

"OMG INTELLIGENTE DEBATE!!! MIST RUINES!!!!!!1"

FUCKING RETARD.

GET OFF MY THREAD YOU SHIT

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Tue, 06 Jun 2006 05:34:01 GMT

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

---

Is it a sign of weakness to not create something that can't exist by your own laws? Also, is it safe to constrain God to the perception that he has to physically lift things? Couldn't he teleport the rock, or simply will it to another place? If so, the size of the rock would be irrelevant. Besides, in my view any God that can be explained without the presence of such paradoxes is hardly a God at all.

"Chuck Norris can create a rock so heavy that even he can't lift it. And then he lifts it anyways, just to show you who the fuck Chuck Norris is."

What was this thread about again?

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Tue, 06 Jun 2006 09:55:41 GMT

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

---

Quote:As to the "all-knowing" idea, you can engineer things a certain way and still expect to "fix" them on the way. The only difference between this type of fixing, and the type where an honest mistake has occurred, is that this one is a planned event.

He would "engineer" it in a way where he wouldn't have to intervene at all. His creation would take those turns by itself. I know what you mean by your fixing, I'm talking about the same.

Quote:Ignorant question.

Only the all-powerful would be able to take their own power away. That's the beauty of being all-powerful. Of course, once you take it away, you cease being all-powerful.

So, until he actually does create that stone, he has not taken his own power away. You can't

judge the current status of something by what will modify it in the future, by reasons that can ONLY be done by the person it would affect.

Touché.

Quote:Is it a sign of weakness to not create something that can't exist by your own laws? Also, is it safe to constrain God to the perception that he has to physically lift things? Couldn't he teleport the rock, or simply will it to another place? If so, the size of the rock would be irrelevant. Besides, in my view any God that can be explained without the presence of such paradoxes is hardly a God at all.

The all-powerful wouldn't have to abide by any laws.

Quote:"Chuck Norris can create a rock so heavy that even he can't lift it. And then he lifts it anyways, just to show you who the fuck Chuck Norris is."

Ooops wrong stone!

BTW Darkdemin, you should feel proud that this thread has turned into an intelligent debate despite being started by a retard.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Tue, 06 Jun 2006 14:16:47 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JohnDoe wrote on Mon, 05 June 2006 13:57All-powerful doesn't really work either, given the good 'ol exmple of telling God to make a stone that's too heavy for him to carry.

That's assuming a diety/higher power was bounded by the laws of logic. You yourself has said that a truely all-powerful being would have no barriers at all; this would include logic.

Is God bounded by the laws of logic? Don't know, but probably not since logic is a law created in and for this universe by that very diety.

I believe God is all-powerful, so my answer to that little paradox you proposed is that yes, God CAN create a rock too heavy for him to lift it, yet he can also lift it.  
Is it illogical? Yes, but who said God was restricted by logic? He MADE logic.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 06 Jun 2006 14:34:30 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)



Quote:He would "engineer" it in a way where he wouldn't have to intervene at all. His creation would take those turns by itself. I know what you mean by your fixing, I'm talking about the same.

And perhaps he hasn't had the necessity to intervene, which is why we don't see him, and he doesn't come when we demand him to.

And to jump your next argument, that doesn't mean he wouldn't take pity on some/all from time to time. You may not intervene, nor have the desire to when you know what will occur next, but that doesn't always stop us from doing so. He may not need to intervene, but choses to do so at times.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Tue, 06 Jun 2006 14:53:07 GMT

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

---

Quote:And perhaps he hasn't had the necessity to intervene, which is why we don't see him, and he doesn't come when we demand him to.

And to jump your next argument, that doesn't mean he wouldn't take pity on some/all from time to time. You may not intervene, nor have the desire to when you know what will occur next, but that doesn't always stop us from doing so. He may not need to intervene, but choses to do so at times.

He wouldn't chose to do so because all of his choices have been made prior to "creation".

Quote:That's assuming a diety/higher power was bounded by the laws of logic. You yourself has said that a truely all-powerful being would have no barriers at all; this would include logic.

Is God bounded by the laws of logic? Don't know, but probably not since logic is a law created in and for this universe by that very diety.

I believe God is all-powerful, so my answer to that little paradox you proposed is that yes, God CAN create a rock too heavy for him to lift it, yet he can also lift it.

Is it illogical? Yes, but who said God was restricted by logic? He MADE logic.

I have already scrapped the all-powerful arguement. The whole idea of what powers god possesses is nonsense anyway...we're giving an abstract idea human traits

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.

Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 06 Jun 2006 21:16:15 GMT

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

---

Well, by chosen, I mean he made the action. Not necessarily made the choice then and there to act.

Or, just because I sense a circular argument being possible, I'll throw in a new variable, perhaps his knowing is simply limited to "right now". and "all-knowing, right now" type of person. It doesn't

infringe upon the idea of "all-powerful", as the future is something that simply hasn't occurred yet. Or, simply that he knows the beginning and the end, but the idea of free will puts the whole "how do you get there" idea out the window.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Tue, 06 Jun 2006 22:32:15 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Why would you want to believe in some kind of prick that doesn't know what's going on?

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 06 Jun 2006 23:31:11 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Let's take the worst-case scenario, based on that remark.

God created the universe, and left us to our own devices. He neither cares what we do, nor how we turn out.

Does that mean he doesn't exist?

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Wed, 07 Jun 2006 09:40:13 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

The worst case scenario would be that he was no control.

I'm not talking about why people would feel the need to believe in God, not how likely his existence is (which isn't very).

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 07 Jun 2006 16:14:58 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I don't claim to know the reason for this "need", but I can give some educated guesses.

The human condition is that we need something to believe in, for us to continue on a psychologically-"normal" path. Whether it be friends, family, money, violence, sexual gratification, etc. there has to be something there. Some people decide to believe in an all-powerful, all-knowing, omnipotent being. From that, however, different interpretations arise in the form of the multiple religions in the world (Another one of my beliefs: One God, infinite interpretations of the same thing). However, even if the need is based on personal "gain", and the interpretation is

different, based on personal belief, it doesn't negate the idea that there IS something out there which we call God, in some sort of physical presence (I believe you quoted South Park earlier), that created everything to some extent. But that is also the reason why he can never be proven. The interpretation is, at least primarily, human-driven (that doesn't negate God intervening, but it doesn't prove it either), but the simple fact of that doesn't negate the overall ability of the matter. That being, the existence of "God".

Just for clarification: This is simply one reason for it. Not necessarily the one that I believe, or the one that would hold up to scrutiny. But it is a reason, nonetheless.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Thu, 08 Jun 2006 18:04:35 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Well, the Universe seems just to much more plausible as starting point...

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Thu, 08 Jun 2006 21:45:10 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

"When you have done everything right, they won't think you have done anything at all."

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Thu, 08 Jun 2006 22:29:46 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Have you noticed any pink unicorns lately? Man they sure know how to disguise themselves!!!

---

---

Subject: Conversation with an atheist  
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Sat, 10 Jun 2006 06:22:17 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

"God doesn't exist; God is just some fairytale people made up to give purpose to their meaningless lives. It's easy for people to attribute to 'God' that which they cannot explain. I absolutely KNOW there is no God and believe strictly in science and logic."  
Sure God exists. How the hell else did we get here, completely unorganized randomness? You call THAT science?

"Well, it all started with the Big Bang."  
Still doesn't answer my question as to what initiated the Big Bang or what even originated the matter that exploded in the Big Bang.

"It created itself."

So you believe in spontaneous generation of matter out of nothing (never mind living matter from non-living matter)... (hasn't science failed to substantiate this with any reputable evidence?). Why doesn't this seem to happen anymore within our observable realm of space?

"Um... because... the conditions that caused the Big Bang to occur in the first place aren't present anymore."

Conditions such as...?

"Um... the proper temperature, pressure, chemical reactions and stuff like that, I guess, made it all explode...."

Uh-huh... and what caused all those things to be set just right in order for everything to explode? (Nevermind that you still haven't answered my question as to where it all came from.)

"You know... all the reactions... and stuff.... Y'know, one thing led to another, which led to another, which led to another, which all culminated in the explosion known as the Big Bang."

So, you're saying that you believe in an infinite chain of finite, causal events that have no beginning or any outside cause to exist?

"Umm... well... erm... hmmm...."

...And you say you believe in science and logic when your explanation for our existence is neither scientific nor logical?

"...Religious tool...."

What was that?

"You heard me. You're a tool of your religion."

How am I a tool? Just because I believe that an omnipotent being not bound by any laws (other than those it set for itself) created all that we know?

"You buy into that whole 'God' nonsense; you have created 'God' in your mind in order to put yourself at ease with your inevitable demise."

How could I have created God when God created me? Unlike you, I don't believe I'm God.

"What?"

You heard me right. You believe that you are God.

"The hell are you talking about? There IS no God!"

Sure there is, and you believe in Him; you're just not calling him "God."

"What the hell AM I calling Him, then?"

Man.

"What're you smokin'?"

The same stuff that made you believe we sprung out from nothin'.

"That's not what I meant.... Could you explain yourself, please?"

Certainly. At the beginning of our little conversation, you said you believe strictly in science and

logic, both being incarnations of man to explain what we originally could not (isn't that one of the reasons you gave people believe in God?).

As we progressed, we discovered that you believe (since science does not know for sure whether the Big Bang theory is true (and actually has little evidence to support it)) the universe originated as the result of "an infinite chain of finite, causal events that have (1)no beginning or (2)any outside cause to exist" (both (1) and (2) run counter to the definition of "finite," rendering said belief ironically illogical).

In order for you to believe this, you must believe that something can come out of nothing (therefore accepting the unsubstantiated and unscientific theory of spontaneous generation) and that all the matter in the universe must have created itself.

One of the defining qualities of most deities in which most people believe (myself included) is that they have no beginning/always existed.

What you have done with your belief on the origin of our universe is attribute godly qualities to the events that shaped our universe. You have simply taken traditional, religious views on the origins of our universe and put a scientific spin on it, yet it requires the same "leap of faith" that any other religion requires and does absolutely nothing to disprove the existence of a deity outside the realm of this reality.

"Not only is that utter bullshit, but you completely forgot to mention where I said 'God is man.'" You said it when you said "[I] believe strictly in science and logic."

"Explain."

The concepts of science and logic are incarnations of man to explain our observations of our universe (no different, quite frankly, from religion). Man, through the mechanisms of science and logic, has created the universe. You have said, therefore, that man is God.

"Ridiculous. Preposterous and illogical. More illogical than your parents deciding to keep you for a son. Do you expect to convert me or something with this ridiculous rant?"

No; since I've hurt your ego, you're not going to be receptive to any of my arguments and are going to try to come up with some other (inevitably illogical) way of circumventing my logic to "prove" me wrong.

"So why the hell did you bother in the first place?"

Boredom.

(Could someone smart check the logical arguments and fluidity of that?)

---

Subject: Re: Conversation with an atheist  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Sat, 10 Jun 2006 08:55:21 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

The Atheist doesn't ask the right questions and the religious guy fails to give a reason why not to just give God's attributes to the universe. We know one of the two exists, so which makes sense

to believe in?

From which propagandasite did you get this?

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sat, 10 Jun 2006 19:48:20 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

JohnDoe wrote on Mon, 05 June 2006 12:35Javaxcx wrote on Mon, 05 June 2006 11:08JohnDoe wrote on Mon, 05 June 2006 11:42What is more probable?!

That we were caused.

I'm losing you here tbh. What exactly are you arguing? Give me the whole picture.

My position is that God is superfluous, since all of his characteristics can be given to the universe. I can however appreciate people thinking that a thing like the universe must be made by "somebody", because we humans make things, too.

The position I'm arguing suggests that we have no ability to know our origins definitively, but the evidence from what we have consistently observed suggests that we were created by some transcendental cause. Just so happens I call it God.

Unfortunately, the attributes of "God" cannot all be applied to the universe. The very existence of simple concepts like time and space suggest that even the universe is not truly the sum of its parts. Our experiences validate this (see the links I've given you over the course of this thread). This means that we have more reason to believe that some things are not dependent on the abstract notion of "universe" in order to exist. Couple that with the scientifically observed consistency of causality and you, in a reader's digest version, have a cause that allowed all things to come into motion.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Sat, 10 Jun 2006 21:40:59 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

You have no idea what it was like before the big bang, so how can you even say that?

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sat, 10 Jun 2006 21:42:20 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Through the same inductive arguments scientists use.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Sat, 10 Jun 2006 21:59:11 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Care to elaborate? From what I know no scientist has a clue of how it was like before the Big Bang, nor does a scientist have a clue about the existence of God. Therefore, isn't it logical to go with something that's in a way connected to what we know rather than to go with something that isn't?

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sat, 10 Jun 2006 22:13:26 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Think about it. Scientists have no real way to know that string theory is even applicable. However, they can induce it's probable coherency because everything adds up mathematically. There is no way to actually prove the definitive existence of strings, but we have a solid theory that suggests it is probable that they exist.

The same works for this. Inductive arguments, while an unreliable source of objective truth, are a good tool in clocking what is more probable in a given situation. We have every reason to believe that since probably everything we experience is in motion, it has a mover. This means that regardless of the conditions of the big bang--whether it be the start of the universe, or the next motion in a cosmic ballet--were caused by something that existed or exists. The flipside is to suggest that it is not probable that we can use inductive arguments prior to the big bang (for which ends are confusing, because we have no way to clock when we were caused into existence in the first place, so to assume the big bang was the point is kind of foolhearty). Unfortunately, we have no basis to say such a thing because the evidence suggests the exact opposite.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Sat, 10 Jun 2006 23:10:02 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:The flipside is to suggest that it is not probable that we can use inductive arguments prior to the big bang (for which ends are confusing, because we have no way to clock when we were caused into existence in the first place, so to assume the big bang was the point is kind of foolhearty).

God or the "prior-to-bigbang-state" are both prior to the big bang...so why should the more abstract one be more probable?!

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sat, 10 Jun 2006 23:56:56 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---



Because one fits the equation better than the other. If the universe is the end all and be all of existence, then it lends that the universe is exactly the sum of its parts and we couldn't possibly experience anything ever (again, see those links I provided) so we wouldn't even be aware of it. The opposite suggests that the universe isn't the end all and be all of existence; something more probable because we are able to sit here today and debate it. That's one way to look at it. There are others, but I don't want to trail off on several tangents at once. I'll stick to the transcendental idealism approach because it makes a great case for being a probable creator.

The point of creation is really a moot point anyway. The issue is that we were created, not when we were created or the nature of such an event. So creation might be before the big bang, at the big bang, or even after the big bang. Chances are we'll not know for certain. We can only speculate as to when based on what we experience today and tomorrow.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Sun, 11 Jun 2006 18:08:05 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:If the universe is the end all and be all of existence, then it lends that the universe is exactly the sum of its parts and we couldn't possibly experience anything ever (again, see those links I provided) so we wouldn't even be aware of it. The opposite suggests that the universe isn't the end all and be all of existence; something more probable because we are able to sit here today and debate it.

The "universe" prior to the big bang is something completely different to the universe that we know now so it still fits the equation.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Javafx](#) on Sun, 11 Jun 2006 18:20:39 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

How can you say that? What is your evidence suggesting that is probable?

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Sun, 11 Jun 2006 18:59:07 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

There is no evidence and it's impossible to understand...just like God.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Javafx](#) on Sun, 11 Jun 2006 19:51:58 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

So the universe prior to the big bang is totally different from the universe of today, because there is no evidence?

I'm sorry, but that's a logical paradox.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Sun, 11 Jun 2006 19:54:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I'm not even sure if you can even call it the universe since we have no clue whatsoever what it was like before the big bang and can simply not imagine it...just because we use the same words doesn't mean it's the same thing.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Tue, 13 Jun 2006 00:47:25 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Ok, here is a theory:

God gave the writers of Genesis divine inspiration to write a story that people could understand at the time. As humans progressed and began to question this story he allowed us to unlock the complicated sciences of our beginnings. In doing this he allowed himself to be questioned but he knew true believers would understand his plans. It's just a theory but I like it.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Tue, 13 Jun 2006 09:03:06 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Why would he need them to write a book?

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 13 Jun 2006 14:40:41 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Because people who hear voices in their heads are deemed crazy, and trying it in person resulted in others killing him for it?

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Tue, 13 Jun 2006 16:00:03 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

No, my point is that true believers wouldn't need a book or voices or anything.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 13 Jun 2006 18:53:35 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Except that verbal stories told through the generations tend to lose their effect.

Remember the children's rhyme "Ring around the rosy"? That is a perfect example of something starting out as a story about the plague, turning into a children's game, with no knowledge of its origin.

The believers don't really need it, as they already know about it. What about those who currently don't believe? There would be nothing for them to reference to, except for the times that they happen to go to the respective religion's church for instruction.

And of course, that leaves everything up to an individual's interpretation of what is correct. On a side note, this is also why laws are codified, and not simply left to the established precedents. Something written down has a lot more restrictions to its interpretation than one where there is no hard copy to reference.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Doitle](#) on Tue, 13 Jun 2006 19:55:05 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Tue, 13 Jun 2006 19:58:14 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

warranto wrote on Tue, 13 June 2006 14:53

The believers don't really need it, as they already know about it. What about those who currently don't believe? There would be nothing for them to reference to, except for the times that they happen to go to the respective religion's church for instruction.

There is no need to convey people to the belief since God gave people the ability to question him according to Dark's theory.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 13 Jun 2006 20:22:19 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

220 posts! ENOUGH!!

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [OWA](#) on Tue, 13 Jun 2006 20:25:52 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Wasnt this about protesting over cartoons... And I agree with Dover.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Tue, 13 Jun 2006 21:00:46 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Yea this topic has been changed from mindless ranting to an intellectual discussion...just don't read it if you're not interested or can't follow.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Tue, 13 Jun 2006 22:04:54 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

JohnDoeWhy would he need them to write a book?  
If people could memorize the contents of the Bible, there would be no need for it to be written.

JohnDoe  
There is no need to convey people to the belief since God gave people the ability to question him according to Dark's theory.  
But in order for people to question him, they need to know about him.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Wed, 14 Jun 2006 10:07:43 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Ya I overlooked the part that God only gave the writers of Genesis devine inspiration...my bad.

I guess that theory is quite compelling for people that believe in a God that actively interacts with his creation...too bad people writing a book to explain things they couldn't understand seems by far more probable.

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Thu, 15 Jun 2006 03:05:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

JohnDoe wrote on Wed, 14 June 2006 06:07Ya I overlooked the part that God only gave the writers of Genesis devine inspiration...my bad.  
Writers? Since when was there more than one Moses?  
(Oh, right, when Gweneth Paltrow decided to have a kid; nvm.)

Quote:I guess that theory is quite compelling for people that believe in a God that actively interacts with his creation...too bad people writing a book to explain things they couldn't understand seems by far more probable.  
"People trying to explain in a book stuff that they can't understand"  
Isn't that what the author of any science textbook tries to do?

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Thu, 15 Jun 2006 08:37:58 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:Writers? Since when was there more than one Moses?  
(Oh, right, when Gweneth Paltrow decided to have a kid; nvm.)

That's what he wrote, not me...

Quote:  
"People trying to explain in a book stuff that they can't understand"  
Isn't that what the author of any science textbook tries to do?

Are you kidding me? A textbook is written so that others can understand...the author already does.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Thu, 15 Jun 2006 15:31:57 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Just because you write about something doesn't mean you understand it. Journalists do it all the time.

---

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Thu, 15 Jun 2006 18:20:57 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In textbooks? Haha...

---