

---

Subject: Darkknight's other thread: "does God exist?"  
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Thu, 11 Dec 2008 14:42:15 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Darkknight wroteNo its a simple question. Doesn't need a full book of explanation. What will you do if your wrong and their is a God?  
I already answered that fully and clearly. I even went to the trouble of giving you a long version and a short version.

But like I said, you never actually read what the person you're arguing with is saying, so I'll give it another go.

Firstly, I never said "it is certain that there is no God". Scientifically, you cannot prove something does not exist. You just can't, like you can't prove the tooth fairy doesn't exist. What you can do is analyse how likely its existence is, based on how logical it is and how much evidence there is supporting it. In the case here, the question of does God exist, he scores no higher than the tooth fairy.

Secondly, I specifically said that if God's existence was proven somehow, then I would accept the fact of his existence. I would, however, not worship him due to the fact I find many of the teachings related to Yahweh to be morally repugnant, as well as the fact that the Bible depicts him as a staggeringly evil monster.

So, yes, you prove to me God exists and I'll admit he exists, but I won't worship him. If someone proved to you the devil exists, would you worship it? (If you already believe the devil exists, why don't you worship it?) Believing something's existence is not enough to worship it. I believe Hitler existed, but I would not worship him.

Thirdly, your question seems to be about what happens when we die. If you're wrong, then presumably your life will be over in a conscious sense, and your body will eventually decompose, although I do not claim to know this as a fact; I can only guess, based on what we know about the human body.

Well, if I'm wrong and there really is a God, a point needs to be made before we go any further. The point is this: if I'm wrong, it doesn't mean you're right. If I say  $2+2=5$  and you say  $2+2=6$ , and I prove that  $2+2$  is not 6, that doesn't mean  $2+2=5$ . Likewise if everything we think we know about evolution turns out to be wrong, that does not mean creationism is correct.

1. Even if a god did exist, it would not automatically be Yahweh. It might be a different god. It might be Allah, Thor, Horus, Quetzaceptl (sp?), Shiva, the invisible pink unicorn, the Golden Calf, the Flying Spaghetti Monster... (As far as all of these gods go - except perhaps Allah since Islam says Allah and Yahweh are the same god - you are just as much an atheist as I am.)
2. Even if a god did exist and it was Yahweh, the Bible would not automatically be true. It was, after all, written by humans. How did they know what to write? Did they have agendas of their own? When they wrote the Bible could they have been crazy, or lying for their own purposes, or honestly mistaken?

So, you see the train of logic we have to follow in answering your question about what happens if I'm wrong. You have not followed it, you've skipped a few necessary steps. If a God's existence

was proven, that would not vindicate the Bible; it would not automatically be Yahweh. Every religion might still be wrong in its description of the god.

When you said "what if you're wrong and there really is a god?" what you probably meant was "what if you're wrong, which automatically means that I'm right and my religion is right, and all the other religions are wrong" (which is the kind of non-logic religious people love to use). You see, your question is so stupid and makes so many baseless assumptions, that it takes me longer to explain the flaws in the question than it takes me to answer it. Still, here goes:

"If I am wrong and there really is a god, that does not mean it is the God you talk about. Even if it was the God you talk about, that does not mean anything you think you know about that God is true. But if it is true, despite how many times you've been wrong about so many things, then I would probably end up going to hell."

After all, I reject Christianity, and I have already explained why. I have specifically said that the main reason for this rejection IS NOT because I don't think there is a God (although, indeed, I don't and that is certainly part of the reason, but not the biggest part). It is primarily on moral grounds, because I am repelled by many of its central teachings. The implementation of thoughtcrime, the punishment of innocents for the crime of someone else, the doctrine of redemption through the torture and execution of somebody else, etc etc etc. So even if I am wrong about God's existence, which I would be quite willing to admit if it were proven to me, I would still not become a Christian, I would still presumably go to hell upon my death.

I have already said, too, that if every word in the Bible is true, then I will likely go to hell for this moral stance. I've also said that I will take my chances. I am essentially given a choice:

A. Keep my moral ideas, even if it means I will suffer for it.

B. Abandon my moral ideas, and join a religion I find to be immoral - because I am scared of punishment if I don't.

I choose option A. I would rather live in a way I see as moral, than live in a way I see as immoral just to safeguard myself against punishment. So there you have it. Everything you've said so far indicates that your "belief" has nothing to do with morality (or fact) and everything to do with self-interest. In my case the reverse is true, and on that note I'll repeat a question I asked before: so who's the better man, you or I? You hold your beliefs because you've been promised heaven or hell (by people who have no more knowledge of their existence than you do). I hold my beliefs because I see them as moral, even under threat of punishment.

I would argue that I am the better man, morally speaking. I've also said that I think the world would be a vastly better place if people thought the same, but I would not make threats of horrific torture to persuade them, especially when I have no knowledge of hell's existence at all.

There is no moral difference between the Islamic fanatic who holds a knife to a victim's throat and says convert to Islam or die, and between the Christian who tells a non-Christian that they will go to hell for not being a Christian. Actually, there is one moral difference: the Muslim is not lying about the punishment for disobedience. After all, we know the knife is really there.

Darkknight wrote See that's where your wrong. I've read everything you've wrote. Every one of your responses indicates the opposite.

Darkknight wrote I find it very amusing. It would be like an infant telling Neil Armstrong what he did wrong in regards to walking on the moon without having a clue what the moon is or even knowing how to walk.

Well, my knowledge of the Bible and of Christianity in general is evidently a good deal more extensive than yours, so that analogy falls at the first hurdle. I very much doubt you have even read the Bible fully.

Darkknight wrote IT'S ALL YOUR OPINION.

If you are referring to the fact that I find many of Christianity's teachings to be evil and disgusting, then yes, that is my opinion. If you are referring to my statement that there is no evidence of God's existence, then I am not sure "opinion" is the right word.

Darkknight wrote Please share with us the facts. You keep saying there is no proof of God and therefore you won't believe one even exists. You have not shown me one thing to make me see otherwise.

I am not required to prove to you that God exists.

I am in favour of a secular society where everyone is free to believe whatever the hell they like, so long as they don't use that belief to interfere in others' lives. If every religious person on this planet felt the same, then oh my, what a better world this would be. If all religious people were content to keep their religion to themselves, without harming others and without imposing their religious rules onto non-believers, I wouldn't even bother questioning how much truth or fiction their religion contains. It would be of no interest to me at all.

Unfortunately this is not the world we live in. The religious are not content in their own beliefs; they must interfere with the lives of non-believers. They always have and they still do. As long as that is the case, we must ask whether God exists at all. There is no evidence, none, zip, zero, that he does. It is not up to me to prove he doesn't exist; it is up to his advocates, those who wish to impose his rules upon me, to prove he does. In the last two thousand years, this has still not happened.

I'll just use the tooth fairy analogy again. If I wanted to subject all humans to the rules of the tooth fairy, it would not be up to you to prove the tooth fairy doesn't exist. It would be up to me to prove she does. You would also be quite justified in pointing out that the Tooth Fairy Commandments were written by humans rather than by a tooth fairy, and therefore even if the tooth fairy DID exist the writings concerning her are not necessarily true.

But oh no. According to you, everyone would have to follow my tooth fairy rules all the way until the point when someone proved the tooth fairy didn't exist. Sadly, once again you cannot disprove something's existence scientifically, so that point would never arrive. How unfortunate for atheists like you, who reject the sublime truth of the tooth fairy. Oh, and by the way, an eternity of horrific torment awaits you after you die.

If it wasn't obvious, those last two sentences are a joke. I hope you will find them as ridiculous as they are intended to be, and I'll leave you to figure out the moral of the story yourself.

Finally, a question for you. What if you're wrong, you say. Well, you've been wrong about every single thing you said about evolution... are you too embarrassed to admit you were wrong? Aren't you something of a hypocrite for asking me "what if you're wrong?" We've seen that when you're wrong, you are incapable of accepting it.

---

---

Subject: Re: Darkknight's other thread: "does God exist?"  
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Thu, 11 Dec 2008 15:06:11 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

tl;dr;aftp

---

Subject: Re: Darkknight's other thread: "does God exist?"  
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Thu, 11 Dec 2008 16:43:57 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I'm actually starting to think I should write a book on religion and secularism... I'm just not sure I can stomach the inevitable death-threats.

---

Subject: Re: Darkknight's other thread: "does God exist?"  
Posted by [u6795](#) on Thu, 11 Dec 2008 19:46:14 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Spoony wrote on Thu, 11 December 2008 11:43 I'm actually starting to think I should write a book on religion and secularism... I'm just not sure I can stomach the inevitable death-threats. Have you ever heard about Pat Condell? He didn't exactly write a book, but a Youtube video blog these days is right up there.

I love that dude, and I'm pretty sure you'd enjoy his videos too. Search him on Youtube, you'll see what I mean.

---

Subject: Re: Darkknight's other thread: "does God exist?"  
Posted by [DrasticDR](#) on Thu, 11 Dec 2008 19:51:24 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

can someone edit this gif?

---

Subject: Re: Darkknight's other thread: "does God exist?"  
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Thu, 11 Dec 2008 20:04:41 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

u6795 wrote on Thu, 11 December 2008 13:46 Spoony wrote on Thu, 11 December 2008 11:43 I'm actually starting to think I should write a book on religion and secularism... I'm just not sure I can stomach the inevitable death-threats. Have you ever heard about Pat Condell? He didn't exactly write a book, but a Youtube video blog these days is right up there.

I love that dude, and I'm pretty sure you'd enjoy his videos too. Search him on Youtube, you'll see what I mean.

Yes, I've seen a few of his videos; he's very good tbh.

---

---

Subject: Re: Darkknight's other thread: "does God exist?"

Posted by [Dover](#) on Thu, 11 Dec 2008 21:53:18 GMT

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

---

That Pat guy is kind of a douche.

---

---

Subject: Re: Darkknight's other thread: "does God exist?"

Posted by [u6795](#) on Thu, 11 Dec 2008 21:54:40 GMT

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

---

Dover wrote on Thu, 11 December 2008 16:53 That Pat guy is kind of a douche.

He's also a comedian, so some of his statements may indeed come off a bit douchey, but he definitely does a good job.

---

---

Subject: Re: Darkknight's other thread: "does God exist?"

Posted by [MGamer](#) on Thu, 11 Dec 2008 22:29:32 GMT

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

---

Frontier Psychiatrist wrote on Thu, 11 December 2008 09:06 t;l;dr;aftp

I agreed.

---

---

Subject: Re: Darkknight's other thread: "does God exist?"

Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Fri, 12 Dec 2008 01:03:45 GMT

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

---

Spoony wrote on Thu, 11 December 2008 08:42 Darkknight wrote No its a simple question. Doesn't need a full book of explanation. What will you do if your wrong and their is a God?

I already answered that fully and clearly. I even went to the trouble of giving you a long version and a short version.

But like I said, you never actually read what the person you're arguing with is saying, so I'll give it another go.

Firstly, I never said "it is certain that there is no God". Scientifically, you cannot prove something does not exist. You just can't, like you can't prove the tooth fairy doesn't exist. What you can do is analyse how likely its existence is, based on how logical it is and how much evidence there is supporting it. In the case here, the question of does God exist, he scores no higher than the tooth

fairy.

Secondly, I specifically said that if God's existence was proven somehow, then I would accept the fact of his existence. I would, however, not worship him due to the fact I find many of the teachings related to Yahweh to be morally repugnant, as well as the fact that the Bible depicts him as a staggeringly evil monster.

So, yes, you prove to me God exists and I'll admit he exists, but I won't worship him. If someone proved to you the devil exists, would you worship it? (If you already believe the devil exists, why don't you worship it?) Believing something's existence is not enough to worship it. I believe Hitler existed, but I would not worship him.

Thirdly, your question seems to be about what happens when we die. If you're wrong, then presumably your life will be over in a conscious sense, and your body will eventually decompose, although I do not claim to know this as a fact; I can only guess, based on what we know about the human body.

Well, if I'm wrong and there really is a God, a point needs to be made before we go any further. The point is this: if I'm wrong, it doesn't mean you're right. If I say  $2+2=5$  and you say  $2+2=6$ , and I prove that  $2+2$  is not 6, that doesn't mean  $2+2=5$ . Likewise if everything we think we know about evolution turns out to be wrong, that does not mean creationism is correct.

1. Even if a god did exist, it would not automatically be Yahweh. It might be a different god. It might be Allah, Thor, Horus, Quetzalcoatl (sp?), Shiva, the invisible pink unicorn, the Golden Calf, the Flying Spaghetti Monster... (As far as all of these gods go - except perhaps Allah since Islam says Allah and Yahweh are the same god - you are just as much an atheist as I am.)
2. Even if a god did exist and it was Yahweh, the Bible would not automatically be true. It was, after all, written by humans. How did they know what to write? Did they have agendas of their own? When they wrote the Bible could they have been crazy, or lying for their own purposes, or honestly mistaken?

So, you see the train of logic we have to follow in answering your question about what happens if I'm wrong. You have not followed it, you've skipped a few necessary steps. If a God's existence was proven, that would not vindicate the Bible; it would not automatically be Yahweh. Every religion might still be wrong in its description of the god.

When you said "what if you're wrong and there really is a god?" what you probably meant was "what if you're wrong, which automatically means that I'm right and my religion is right, and all the other religions are wrong" (which is the kind of non-logic religious people love to use). You see, your question is so stupid and makes so many baseless assumptions, that it takes me longer to explain the flaws in the question than it takes me to answer it. Still, here goes:

"If I am wrong and there really is a god, that does not mean it is the God you talk about. Even if it was the God you talk about, that does not mean anything you think you know about that God is true. But if it is true, despite how many times you've been wrong about so many things, then I would probably end up going to hell."

After all, I reject Christianity, and I have already explained why. I have specifically said that the main reason for this rejection IS NOT because I don't think there is a God (although, indeed, I don't and that is certainly part of the reason, but not the biggest part). It is primarily on moral

grounds, because I am repelled by many of its central teachings. The implementation of thoughtcrime, the punishment of innocents for the crime of someone else, the doctrine of redemption through the torture and execution of somebody else, etc etc etc. So even if I am wrong about God's existence, which I would be quite willing to admit if it were proven to me, I would still not become a Christian, I would still presumably go to hell upon my death.

I have already said, too, that if every word in the Bible is true, then I will likely go to hell for this moral stance. I've also said that I will take my chances. I am essentially given a choice:

A. Keep my moral ideas, even if it means I will suffer for it.

B. Abandon my moral ideas, and join a religion I find to be immoral - because I am scared of punishment if I don't.

I choose option A. I would rather live in a way I see as moral, than live in a way I see as immoral just to safeguard myself against punishment. So there you have it. Everything you've said so far indicates that your "belief" has nothing to do with morality (or fact) and everything to do with self-interest. In my case the reverse is true, and on that note I'll repeat a question I asked before: so who's the better man, you or I? You hold your beliefs because you've been promised heaven or hell (by people who have no more knowledge of their existence than you do). I hold my beliefs because I see them as moral, even under threat of punishment.

I would argue that I am the better man, morally speaking. I've also said that I think the world would be a vastly better place if people thought the same, but I would not make threats of horrific torture to persuade them, especially when I have no knowledge of hell's existence at all.

There is no moral difference between the Islamic fanatic who holds a knife to a victim's throat and says convert to Islam or die, and between the Christian who tells a non-Christian that they will go to hell for not being a Christian. Actually, there is one moral difference: the Muslim is not lying about the punishment for disobedience. After all, we know the knife is really there.

Darkknight wrote See that's where your wrong. I've read everything you've wrote. Every one of your responses indicates the opposite.

Darkknight wrote I find it very amusing. It would be like an infant telling Neil Armstrong what he did wrong in regards to walking on the moon without having a clue what the moon is or even knowing how to walk.

Well, my knowledge of the Bible and of Christianity in general is evidently a good deal more extensive than yours, so that analogy falls at the first hurdle. I very much doubt you have even read the Bible fully.

Darkknight wrote IT'S ALL YOU'RE OPINION.

If you are referring to the fact that I find many of Christianity's teachings to be evil and disgusting, then yes, that is my opinion. If you are referring to my statement that there is no evidence of God's existence, then I am not sure "opinion" is the right word.

Darkknight wrote Please share with us the facts. You keep saying there is no proof of God and therefore you won't believe one even exists. You have not shown me one thing to make me see otherwise.

I am not required to prove to you that God exists.



I am in favour of a secular society where everyone is free to believe whatever the hell they like, so long as they don't use that belief to interfere in others' lives. If every religious person on this planet felt the same, then oh my, what a better world this would be. If all religious people were content to keep their religion to themselves, without harming others and without imposing their religious rules onto non-believers, I wouldn't even bother questioning how much truth or fiction their religion contains. It would be of no interest to me at all.

Unfortunately this is not the world we live in. The religious are not content in their own beliefs; they must interfere with the lives of non-believers. They always have and they still do. As long as that is the case, we must ask whether God exists at all. There is no evidence, none, zip, zero, that he does. It is not up to me to prove he doesn't exist; it is up to his advocates, those who wish to impose his rules upon me, to prove he does. In the last two thousand years, this has still not happened.

I'll just use the tooth fairy analogy again. If I wanted to subject all humans to the rules of the tooth fairy, it would not be up to you to prove the tooth fairy doesn't exist. It would be up to me to prove she does. You would also be quite justified in pointing out that the Tooth Fairy Commandments were written by humans rather than by a tooth fairy, and therefore even if the tooth fairy DID exist the writings concerning her are not necessarily true.

But oh no. According to you, everyone would have to follow my tooth fairy rules all the way until the point when someone proved the tooth fairy didn't exist. Sadly, once again you cannot disprove something's existence scientifically, so that point would never arrive. How unfortunate for atheists like you, who reject the sublime truth of the tooth fairy. Oh, and by the way, an eternity of horrific torment awaits you after you die.

If it wasn't obvious, those last two sentences are a joke. I hope you will find them as ridiculous as they are intended to be, and I'll leave you to figure out the moral of the story yourself.

Finally, a question for you. What if you're wrong, you say. Well, you've been wrong about every single thing you said about evolution... are you too embarrassed to admit you were wrong? Aren't you something of a hypocrite for asking me "what if you're wrong?" We've seen that when you're wrong, you are incapable of accepting it.

Very well said... And I respect you for no name calling or flame bating as so many do when this subject comes up.

I read everything you said word for word and I understand your points clearly. Yes I have read the bible several times and still study it. I believe the bible is the word of God so whats in the bible is the truth to me. You see God no different then the tooth fairy so anything associated with God like the bible is just another story book. So i won't even use the bible as proof because it means nothing to you. Its just a book.

It doesn't do any Christian any good to explain why they believe in God in a spiritual sense to someone who doesn't believe in a spiritual world. their just spinning their wheels and butting their heads up against a wall.

So I won't even try. Lets talk about the facts of evolution and what is known today.



## Theory Of Evolution:

Even before I became a Christian I questioned it. Later in life i got married and my ex-wife's father was a science teacher. By this time I was a Christian but his story i found interesting. After studying evolution he came to the conclusion their was no way all this just happened by accident. One of the things he would tell me is that the eyeball does not evolve and that things that evolve decay and get worse not evolve into something better.

Quote:

<http://www.big-bang-theory.com/> (maybe not the best source but wanted to find one that wasn't affiliated with anything religious)

The Big Bang theory is an effort to explain what happened at the very beginning of our universe. Discoveries in astronomy and physics have shown beyond a reasonable doubt that our universe did in fact have a beginning. Prior to that moment there was nothing; during and after that moment there was something: our universe. The big bang theory is an effort to explain what happened during and after that moment.

Ok that's nice but what happened to cause the bang. Now I know how could we possibly know what happened millions and millions of years ago right??? Like the big bang theory

It continues to say....

Quote:

Another misconception is that we tend to image the singularity as a little fireball appearing somewhere in space. According to the many experts however, space didn't exist prior to the Big Bang.

So again we get this nothingness that just one day decided not to be nothing anymore and something happened out of nothing.

Quote:

So where and in what did the singularity appear if not in space? We don't know. We don't know where it came from, why it's here, or even where it is. All we really know is that we are inside of it and at one time it didn't exist and neither did we.

Guess if i sit here long enough a 747 will appear out of the blue in my living room.

I have lots more to talk about when it comes to evolution besides the beginnings of life and very much look forward to a discussion on evolution because after all if evolution isn't really real then where did we all come from?

This will have to wait till after i get back from my trip on Monday.

---

---

Subject: Re: Darkknight's other thread: "does God exist?"  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 12 Dec 2008 01:12:25 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I have two things in response to what you just said.

Eyes haven't evolved? You do realize that there is a series on History, Evolve, that even tackled "Eyes".

[http://thepiratebay.org/torrent/4367940/%5BHST%5D\\_Evolve\\_-\\_Eyes.divx](http://thepiratebay.org/torrent/4367940/%5BHST%5D_Evolve_-_Eyes.divx)

Also, even if there is something that created the universe (as I believe), that does not prove the existence of a god. It certainly doesn't prove the God of Islam, the Judeo-Christian God, or any other god created by man throughout history.

---

---

Subject: Re: Darkknight's other thread: "does God exist?"  
Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Fri, 12 Dec 2008 01:17:20 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

cheesesoda wrote on Thu, 11 December 2008 19:12 I have two things in response to what you just said.

Eyes haven't evolved? You do realize that there is a series on History, Evolve, that even tackled "Eyes".

[http://thepiratebay.org/torrent/4367940/%5BHST%5D\\_Evolve\\_-\\_Eyes.divx](http://thepiratebay.org/torrent/4367940/%5BHST%5D_Evolve_-_Eyes.divx)

Also, even if there is something that created the universe (as I believe), that does not prove the existence of a god. It certainly doesn't prove the God of Islam, the Judeo-Christian God, or any other god created by man throughout history.

The eyes comment was not mine it was from someone else. I believe i made that clear.

As to rest the reason for the post is to discredit evolution and to say as you said, something created all this. Wasn't just an accident that spontaneously happened out of nothing.

---

---

Subject: Re: Darkknight's other thread: "does God exist?"  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 12 Dec 2008 03:41:06 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

That still doesn't discredit Evolution. Evolution admits that it can't go back before the bang. It just explains everything after the Big Bang.

---

---

Subject: Re: Darkknight's other thread: "does God exist?"

---

Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 12 Dec 2008 04:42:30 GMT

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

---

u6795 wrote on Thu, 11 December 2008 13:54Dover wrote on Thu, 11 December 2008 16:53That Pat guy is kind of a douche.

He's also a comedian, so some of his statements may indeed come off a bit douchey, but he definitely does a good job.

He's not very funny, either.

I kind of agree with him, but the way he says things make me stop and think "Not cool, douche".

---

---

Subject: Re: Darkknight's other thread: "does God exist?"

Posted by [MGamer](#) on Fri, 12 Dec 2008 06:50:59 GMT

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

---

why you guys keep wasting your time posting long text walls for something stupid like God

---

---

Subject: Re: Darkknight's other thread: "does God exist?"

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Fri, 12 Dec 2008 13:34:32 GMT

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

---

About the big bang: I personally believe that there wasnt any time before the big bang in which "nothing" could have existed. Think I got that from a Terry Pratchett book which was co-written with 2 scientists, so it might just be bullshit. it sounds nice though

About the evolution: I suggest reading "the selfish gene" by richard dawkins.

About;blank:

---

---

Subject: Re: Darkknight's other thread: "does God exist?"

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Fri, 12 Dec 2008 14:40:28 GMT

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

---

Darkknight wrote on Thu, 11 December 2008 19:03Very well said... And I respect you for no name calling or flame bating as so many do when this subject comes up.

I read everything you said word for word and I understand your points clearly.

That's odd, because pretty much everything I said in this post has already been said in the previous post in the other thread; the one where you made some incoherent bleating about me not answering the question.

Darkknight wrote on Thu, 11 December 2008 19:03Yes I have read the bible several times and still study it. I believe the bible is the word of God so whats in the bible is the truth to me. You

---

see God no different then the tooth fairy so anything associated with God like the bible is just another story book. So i won't even use the bible as proof because it means nothing to you. Its just a book.

The last two sentences are contradictory. It doesn't mean nothing to me. It means what it is; it's a book.

When you use a book as evidence you've got to ask certain questions. Who wrote it? When? Why? How did they know what to write? How much of it did they see for themselves, and is it possible they were mistaken? How much of it did they hear from other people, and if so how reliable were those people? When they wrote what they wrote, how much of it was literal reporting and how much was metaphor?

Finally, what were the odds that the writers - or the people the writers used as source - were crazy, or lying for some purpose, or honestly mistaken?

When a book about science is written, other scientists are always waiting to check its facts. If you can't answer these questions, it is a bit silly to claim the Bible is all true and inerrant. There is also the (not minor) point that the Bible contradicts itself again and again, starting right from Genesis. The New Testament is no better; the gospels manage to contradict each other about every single major event in Jesus' life; the birth, the genealogy of Jesus, the sermon on the mount, the treachery of Judas, Peter's denial, the crucifixion and even the resurrection.

Darkknight wrote on Thu, 11 December 2008 19:03It doesn't do any Christian any good to explain why they believe in God in a spiritual sense to someone who doesn't believe in a spiritual world. their just spinning their wheels and butting their heads up against a wall.

You are not entirely wrong about this.

Darkknight wrote on Thu, 11 December 2008 19:03So I won't even try. Lets talk about the facts of evolution and what is known today.

We already did; you tried to make some points about evolution in your previous post, and every single thing you said was wrong. Let's recap.

Darkknight wrote on Mon, 08 December 2008 20:41They have such a hard time believing in God but have absolutely no problem believing there was nothing then one day all the nothingness banged and everything accidently fell into perfect order, the fish jumped out of the sea, turned into monkeys and one day decided to stand up and talk, boom we have man. That they have no problem believing.

Quite clearly you have not been properly taught evolution or the origin of life. I'll come back to that.

Darkknight wrote on Mon, 08 December 2008 20:41Science once believed the earth was flat until it was proven otherwise.

Like I keep saying, the whole point about science is that it develops as we learn more. Religion doesn't. See my post earlier. When the Bible was written, we didn't know fuck all about the world. Now we know about the shape and composition of the planet, that it is still cooling with a molten core and fissures in its crust, and a turbulent weather system. These are completely valid explanations for hurricanes, earthquakes, volcanoes etc. We also know about bacteria, germs etc; which explains most diseases. When the Bible was written, we knew none of the above, so when the shit hits the fan and a city gets flattened, why not think it was the wrath of a celestial super-bully? Quite probably nobody could think of a better explanation.

Now, we can!

What's more (and very revealing) is the fact that religion has always stood in the way of scientific discovery, and still does. It makes me chuckle to hear religious people talk about how "LOL YOU USED TO THINK THE EARTH WAS FLAT". It took arduous scientific study from dedicated people to understand things about the world and universe we live in; the shape and nature of the world, what things are made of and how they work. There are countless examples of scientific discovery which were fanatically opposed by religion; Darwin, Newton, Galileo, Democritus, Einstein...

Yes, science used to think the earth was flat. If religion had its way, we probably still would.

Darkknight wrote on Mon, 08 December 2008 20:41 Christians are being called nut jobs cause we believe in God, but those who don't seem to think its totally sane to believe the universe all happened from nothing that went bang and formed life in perfect order all by accident  
There are a few words here which prove beyond all doubt that you know absolutely nothing about the theory of evolution.  
"in perfect order all by accident"

Firstly, "in perfect order". The origin of life was the most simple thing imaginable. It took MILLIONS OF YEARS for the first spark of life to appear. from there it took MILLIONS OF YEARS for it to develop and evolve into the most primitive example of life that still exists today, never mind the intelligent creatures we are now.

As for the original spark of life, it was (looking at it in isolation) an improbable event. One in a million, for all I care. Thankfully there are billions and billions and billions of planets in the universe, even assuming this universe is the only one (which is disputed). Looking at the numbers, it is not improbable at all that it would happen eventually. Over time (millions of years to work with, remember), nigh-impossible becomes improbable, improbable becomes feasible, feasible becomes likely, likely becomes nearly certain.

Secondly, "all by accident". WHAT THE FUCK? Do you know ANYTHING about evolution? Natural selection is the EXACT OPPOSITE of accident. It could not be further from an "accident" if it tried. The original spark of life was an accident, but an accident that was probably going to happen. Evolution is the exact opposite of an accident; it is the survival of successful creatures while less successful creatures die out, the genetic information of the successful creatures being passed on and developing over millenia.

Like I said, you have not been properly taught what evolution is, and it really does disappoint me that your educational system is obviously letting you down. Either that or your parents are brainwashing you.

Back to the present.

Darkknight wrote on Thu, 11 December 2008 19:03 Theory Of Evolution:

Even before I became a Christian I questioned it. Later in life i got married and my ex-wife's father was a science teacher. By this time I was a Christian but his story i found interesting. After studying evolution he came to the conclusion their was no way all this just happened by accident. Once again, the choice of wording shows your COMPLETE ignorance of the subject. If he thinks

this just happened by accident, he has not studied evolution. He does not know the most fundamental, crucial point about evolution. I've said it before, I'll say it again until it sinks in. IT IS NOT AN ACCIDENT, IT IS THE PRECISE OPPOSITE OF AN ACCIDENT.

Darkknight wrote on Thu, 11 December 2008 19:03 One of the things he would tell me is that the eyeball does not evolve and that things that evolve decay and get worse not evolve into something better.

This is just nonsense. Firstly the eye did evolve and is still evolving. I quote Michael Shermer: Evolution also posits that modern organisms should show a variety of structures from simple to complex, reflecting an evolutionary history rather than an instantaneous creation. The human eye, for example, is the result of a long and complex pathway that goes back hundreds of millions of years. Initially a simple eyespot with a handful of light-sensitive cells that provided information to the organism about an important source of the light; it developed into a recessed eyespot, where a small surface indentation filled with light-sensitive cells provided additional data on the direction of light; then into a deep recession eyespot, where additional cells at greater depth provide more accurate information about the environment; then into a pinhole camera eye that is able to focus an image on the back of a deeply-recessed layer of light-sensitive cells; then into a pinhole lens eye that is able to focus the image; then into a complex eye found in such modern mammals as humans.

And all that took millions of years ^^ . If you think he's making that up, all of the intermediate stages he mentioned have been observed in other animals. So yes, it did evolve from something very primitive, over millions of years, into something more advanced. Yet it is not perfect, and I'll give way to Shermer again:

The anatomy of the human eye, in fact, shows anything but "intelligence" in its design. It is built upside down and backwards, requiring photons of light to travel through the cornea, lens, aqueous fluid, blood vessels, ganglion cells, amacrine cells, horizontal cells, and bipolar cells before they reach the light-sensitive rods and cones that transduce the light signal into neural impulses - which are then sent to the visual cortex at the back of the brain for processing into meaningful patterns. For optimal vision, why would an intelligent designer have built an eye upside down and backwards?

To add my own question, why would he have given us the "blind spot"?

Anyway, moving on. I know less about the Big Bang theory than I do about evolution, but I'll give it a shot.

Darkknight wrote on Thu, 11 December 2008 19:03 Ok that's nice but what happened to cause the bang. Now I know how could we possibly know what happened millions and millions of years ago right??? Like the big bang theory

Indeed, they are speculative. Nobody was around to see it and it's not exactly happening again of its own volition. That just leaves speculation. It's very tempting to compare that speculation to speculation about how much truth is in the Bible, but there's an absolutely crucial difference between the two. I've already articulated it. Let's recap.

Darkknight wrote on Mon, 08 December 2008 20:41 Science once believed the earth was flat until it was proven otherwise.

Like I keep saying, the whole point about science is that it develops as we learn more. Religion doesn't. See my post earlier. When the Bible was written, we didn't know fuck all about the world. Now we know about the shape and composition of the planet, that it is still cooling with a molten



core and fissures in its crust, and a turbulent weather system. These are completely valid explanations for hurricanes, earthquakes, volcanoes etc. We also know about bacteria, germs etc; which explains most diseases. When the Bible was written, we knew none of the above, so when the shit hits the fan and a city gets flattened, why not think it was the wrath of a celestial super-bully? Quite probably nobody could think of a better explanation.

Now, we can!

What's more (and very revealing) is the fact that religion has always stood in the way of scientific discovery, and still does. It makes me chuckle to hear religious people talk about how "LOL YOU USED TO THINK THE EARTH WAS FLAT". It took arduous scientific study from dedicated people to understand things about the world and universe we live in; the shape and nature of the world, what things are made of and how they work. There are countless examples of scientific discovery which were fanatically opposed by religion; Darwin, Newton, Galileo, Democritus, Einstein...

Yes, science used to think the earth was flat. If religion had its way, we probably still would.

Back to the present.

Darkknight wrote on Thu, 11 December 2008 19:03It continues to say....

Quote:

Another misconception is that we tend to image the singularity as a little fireball appearing somewhere in space. According to the many experts however, space didn't exist prior to the Big Bang.

So again we get this nothingness that just one day decided not to be nothing anymore and something happened out of nothing.

Sorry, "according to the many experts"? Alarm bells are ringing for me.

Aside from anything else, there are various different theories on the "very beginning" - the Hartle-Hawking initial state, string landscape, brane inflation, string gas cosmology, and the ekpyrotic universe. Some of these are mutually compatible, others are not.

Darkknight wrote on Thu, 11 December 2008 19:03Quote:

So where and in what did the singularity appear if not in space? We don't know. We don't know where it came from, why it's here, or even where it is. All we really know is that we are inside of it and at one time it didn't exist and neither did we.

Guess if i sit here long enough a 747 will appear out of the blue in my living room.

I can't help but laugh at the 747 analogy. Creationists love to use it; they compare evolution to a 747 just appearing out of nowhere, by accident. There is not one single level on which the analogy actually works.

Darkknight wrote on Thu, 11 December 2008 19:03I have lots more to talk about when it comes to evolution besides the beginnings of life and very much look forward to a discussion on evolution because after all if evolution isn't really real then where did we all come from?

This is the closest you've ever come to 'science'. Clearly there is an explanation. Evolution is one explanation. Creationism is another, a much more feeble one which does not even technically qualify as a theory. It is quite possible that neither are true and the true theory is something altogether different, but so far evolution is doing much, much, much better.

I'll just repeat some of my earlier statements. After all, look at this thread. The first time I said all the stuff in my first post, you completely disregarded it; the second time I said it, you said it was "very well said". So here goes.

Quote:"All this" didn't come from nothing. See my post above. As for "evolution is just a theory"... uh, lol. Do you know what the word theory means? It doesn't look like it.

A theory is an evolved explanation to fit the known facts. It becomes a successful theory if it survives the introduction of previously unknown facts, and it becomes an accepted theory if it can make predictions about future events.

There is no insult in saying "evolution is only a theory". The word "only" does not belong in that sentence.

By the same definition, creationism isn't EVEN a theory. It fails at every required hurdle. It's a guess, nothing more; a guess made thousands of years ago who didn't know jack shit about the world we live in.

Quote:By the way, you have not answered Frontier Psychiatrist's question, which is absolutely valid. If God made everything, who made God? Who designed the designer?

If you say there must be a God because everything around us is so complex (such as we humans, for example) then surely something capable of designing something so complex must be at least as complex itself, probably a great deal more complex. This defeats your entire argument, because something as complex as God would in turn need to be designed, by something even more powerful. This leads us to an infinite regression. Evolution doesn't; it says that things as complex as we humans took millions and millions of years to develop, at a staggering cost (over 99% of all species that have ever existed on this planet are now extinct, and I'm not talking about deforestation or pollution here, I'm talking about unsuccessful creatures dying while successful creatures survive and develop)

Quote:Science is about looking at the world, trying to figure out how it works, and testing your ideas against the facts, and developing your ideas when they are not correct. Religion is more along the lines of "this book was written over a thousand years ago, we aren't sure who by, we aren't sure exactly when, we don't know how they knew what to write, we don't know whether they had an agenda which influenced their writing... therefore it's true"

Quote:Like I keep saying, the whole point about science is that it develops as we learn more. Religion doesn't. See my post earlier. When the Bible was written, we didn't know fuck all about the world. Now we know about the shape and composition of the planet, that it is still cooling with a molten core and fissures in its crust, and a turbulent weather system. These are completely valid explanations for hurricanes, earthquakes, volcanoes etc. We also know about bacteria, germs etc; which explains most diseases. When the Bible was written, we knew none of the

above, so when the shit hits the fan and a city gets flattened, why not think it was the wrath of a celestial super-bully? Quite probably nobody could think of a better explanation.

Now, we can!

What's more (and very revealing) is the fact that religion has always stood in the way of scientific discovery, and still does. It makes me chuckle to hear religious people talk about how "LOL YOU USED TO THINK THE EARTH WAS FLAT". It took arduous scientific study from dedicated people to understand things about the world and universe we live in; the shape and nature of the world, what things are made of and how they work. There are countless examples of scientific discovery which were fanatically opposed by religion; Darwin, Newton, Galileo, Democritus, Einstein...

Yes, science used to think the earth was flat. If religion had its way, we probably still would.

Quote: There are a few words here which prove beyond all doubt that you know absolutely nothing about the theory of evolution.

"in perfect order all by accident"

Firstly, "in perfect order". The origin of life was the most simple thing imaginable. It took MILLIONS OF YEARS for the first spark of life to appear. From there it took MILLIONS OF YEARS for it to develop and evolve into the most primitive example of life that still exists today, never mind the intelligent creatures we are now.

As for the original spark of life, it was (looking at it in isolation) an improbable event. One in a million, for all I care. Thankfully there are billions and billions and billions of planets in the universe, even assuming this universe is the only one (which is disputed). Looking at the numbers, it is not improbable at all that it would happen eventually. Over time (millions of years to work with, remember), nigh-impossible becomes improbable, improbable becomes feasible, feasible becomes likely, likely becomes nearly certain.

Secondly, "all by accident". WHAT THE FUCK? Do you know ANYTHING about evolution? Natural selection is the EXACT OPPOSITE of accident. It could not be further from an "accident" if it tried. The original spark of life was an accident, but an accident that was probably going to happen. Evolution is the exact opposite of an accident; it is the survival of successful creatures while less successful creatures die out, the genetic information of the successful creatures being passed on and developing over millenia.

Like I said, you have not been properly taught what evolution is, and it really does disappoint me that your educational system is obviously letting you down. Either that or your parents are brainwashing you.

---

Subject: Re: Darkknight's other thread: "does God exist?"

Posted by [appshot](#) on Sat, 13 Dec 2008 01:30:26 GMT

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

---

^^ Tru Dat

---

Subject: Re: Darkknight's other thread: "does God exist?"

Posted by [Ma1kel](#) on Sun, 14 Dec 2008 21:56:00 GMT

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

---

/threa

---

Subject: Re: Darkknight's other thread: "does God exist?"

Posted by [Jamie or NuneGa](#) on Thu, 18 Dec 2008 13:31:40 GMT

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

---

watch zeitgeist

<http://www.zeitgeistmovie.com/>

---

Subject: Re: Darkknight's other thread: "does God exist?"

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Fri, 26 Dec 2008 21:58:01 GMT

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

---

I'll bet that's one hell of a timeshare.

---

Subject: Re: Darkknight's other thread: "does God exist?"

Posted by [pawky](#) on Sat, 27 Dec 2008 12:18:01 GMT

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

---

He says he went to hell after plane crash:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UGpxfoF3SYg&feature=related>

what ya'll think?

---

Subject: Re: Darkknight's other thread: "does God exist?"

Posted by [u6795](#) on Sat, 27 Dec 2008 21:19:37 GMT

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

---

Nune wrote on Thu, 18 December 2008 08:31watch zeitgeist

<http://www.zeitgeistmovie.com/>

Very, very good movie. Some parts are kind of fucking strange but makes a lot of good points.

---

Subject: Re: Darkknight's other thread: "does God exist?"  
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Sat, 27 Dec 2008 23:06:15 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

it makes almost no good points :/

---

Subject: Re: Darkknight's other thread: "does God exist?"  
Posted by [u6795](#) on Sat, 27 Dec 2008 23:27:32 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Frontier Psychiatrist wrote on Sat, 27 December 2008 18:06it makes almost no good points :/

Jesus is an unoriginal idea  
9/11 was mysterious

Good enough for me, even if I'm easily entertained.

---

Subject: Re: Darkknight's other thread: "does God exist?"  
Posted by [Ma1kel](#) on Sun, 28 Dec 2008 21:11:01 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

...idiots

---

Subject: Re: Darkknight's other thread: "does God exist?"  
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Sun, 28 Dec 2008 23:29:31 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

re: zeitgeist.

I'm quite happy to accept that a man called Jesus existed round about the alleged time and place (not that we have much to go on)... but the key word there is "man". A decent chap, sure... a great moral teacher (for the time, at least...) and philosopher, okay... but to say he was a supernatural, divine being is an extraordinary claim, with nothing to support it.

the business about the same attributes of previous messiahs is dead simple; relates to the emperor Constantine. he basically fused the existing pagan traditions with some of the alleged accounts of Jesus' life. that's why a lot of things relating to Jesus are astrological, have to do with the sun and stars' movements, etc.

I want to mention C.S.Lewis at this point. I've already gone over the fact I find a lot of Christianity's teachings to be morally repellent, such as the whole vicarious atonement business. Lewis was very dismissive of those who said that Jesus was a great moral teacher, but not actually anything more than a man - he pointed out that if Jesus was only a man, the whole business of redemption

and so on is nonsense and therefore that proves he was the son of God. the obvious argument against this is that Jesus may have been insane, or lying. what I think is more likely (though I don't hear it said...) is that Jesus never said any of that stuff anyway, and it was all added later, rather opportunistically, for the purposes of securing temporal power.

---

---

Subject: Re: Darkknight's other thread: "does God exist?"  
Posted by [cnc95fan](#) on Thu, 01 Jan 2009 22:38:38 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Well, there might aswell be ONE message posted here on the first day of '09 before it ends.

---

---

Subject: Re: Darkknight's other thread: "does God exist?"  
Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Fri, 02 Jan 2009 01:08:02 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

No, this is the last message of the first day of 09.

---