
Subject: Church of FSM
Posted by [runewood](#) on Mon, 17 Oct 2005 23:15:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Funny site. realy makes a point.

<http://www.venganza.org/>

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Tue, 18 Oct 2005 06:57:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

runewood wrote on Mon, 17 October 2005 19:15 Funny site. realy makes a point.

<http://www.venganza.org/>
ROFLMAO

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [spazbeast](#) on Thu, 20 Oct 2005 00:07:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Evolution is BULLSHIT

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Thu, 20 Oct 2005 02:31:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Evidence_of_evolution

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [MrBob](#) on Thu, 20 Oct 2005 02:47:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I really don't mind if people disagree with the Intelligent Design theory or the movement to teach it in public schools. But to dis my God? Now I'm pissed.

I'm so sick and tired of this bullshit these people put out. They talk of themselves being wonderful, tolerant, and loving people, but their actions show otherwise. They're tolerant of everyone except those who follow Christ. Everyone's "tolerated" and "accepted" except us. But their lies are transparent. Robert Ingersoll, a non-believer, wrote that the church must ultimately be destroyed. This is their true goal. Don't be fooled by their sugar-coated words.

It doesn't surprise me though, Jesus said they are already antichrists in the world (1 John 2:18). We're in a war, but not with guns and tanks and bombs. This is a war for lives, the lives of everyone.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [xptek](#) on Thu, 20 Oct 2005 02:49:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Many of them brought it on themselves.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Thu, 20 Oct 2005 03:41:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

MrBob wrote on Wed, 19 October 2005 22:47 I really don't mind if people disagree with the Intelligent Design theory or the movement to teach it in public schools. But to dis my God? Now I'm pissed.

I'm so sick and tired of this bullshit these people put out. They talk of themselves being wonderful, tolerant, and loving people, but their actions show otherwise. They're tolerant of everyone except those who follow Christ. Everyone's "tolerated" and "accepted" except us. But their lies are transparent. Robert Ingersoll, a non-believer, wrote that the church must ultimately be destroyed. This is their true goal. Don't be fooled by their sugar-coated words.

It doesn't surprise me though, Jesus said they are already antichrists in the world (1 John 2:18). We're in a war, but not with guns and tanks and bombs. This is a war for lives, the lives of everyone.

The idea of tolerance with logic doesn't include the induction-based logic of religion and supernatural "superstition". Don't get me wrong, induction proves to me very concretely that God must exist, but that doesn't mean that say, the Bible or the Koran is any more legitimate than the information you'd find on a marijuana party site. The point is, the tolerance works *half decently* for the realist world of "this is what I see, and it is not any god that was outlined in some book of morality." Now that doesn't negate God's existence by any means, but it sure makes it easier for people to comprehend reality when they toss away the shackles of anthropomorphized deities and senseless sophisms coming from a "religion authority".

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Thu, 20 Oct 2005 12:49:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Wed, 19 October 2005
21:31 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Evidence_of_evolution

your source is laughable.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 20 Oct 2005 13:04:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

That wikipedia article is VERY incomplete. I have plenty of OTHER reasons to not believe in "God".

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 20 Oct 2005 13:10:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

<http://abstractfactory.blogspot.com/2005/10/only-debate-on-intelligent-design-that.html>

A lot of pro-atheistic links have been popping up on del.icio.us lately... It's nice to know I'm in good company.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 20 Oct 2005 14:39:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Meh, people seem to be so involved with the argument they fail to realize that the two are not mutually exclusive of one another.

I personally believe in the combined theory. The world did "evolve" as science claims, however it had a little help in the process. I'll get into what I mean at a later date if people want me to.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Thu, 20 Oct 2005 17:06:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Know what you mean warranto. That's pretty much how I see it as well.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [runewood](#) on Thu, 20 Oct 2005 22:43:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The question is not what you personally believe, it's that ID isn't science and shouldn't be taught in

science class. They don't say at church "some people think there is no god", and explain that, and if they do its to say these sinners will go to hell. I like how Christians are suddenly the victum...like 2000 years of religous persicution by them isnt enough? You affend people and you don't even know it. When i sneeze and you say god bless you i get pissed. How would you like it if you sneezed and i said there is no god? Most christians are tolerable but some just piss me off so much.

Tolerant means that i don't persacute you or try to convert you like most religions do. The extream people who follow Christ have done alot to ruin the name Christian. Why the hell shouldn't we hate those extreamists who do evil things? I am fine with you worshiping god aslong as you dont force it on me, even if you don't know it. And if you do i will call you out on it.

Religion conclusions based on faith, science is conclusions based on observations.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 21 Oct 2005 00:33:46 GMT

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

Oh, please, you're just one of those idiots that seeks any chance you can get to be "offended", so you can go spouting off at the mouth about how much it "offends" you and why it "offends" you.

If I Say "God bless, you" when you sneeze, take it as being sincere not that I'm forcing my beliefs on you.

You want to bitch about how we persecute non-believers... go ahead, but I don't see us killing you like the Romans did to us. I don't see your life being ruined by our beliefs. If you want to talk persecution, learn up on your history, and then see who the REAL victims are, and I'll give you a little head start: it sure isn't the non-believers.

Also, the Creatonist theory is science, and that's why it should be taught. Tell me it's not science, and you've lost all credibility... not that you had any to begin with.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [runewood](#) on Fri, 21 Oct 2005 01:01:58 GMT

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

Proves my point, you offend me without even knowing or caring. What abotu "Under god" "In god we trust" and such. Are you saying that that isnt offensive? Would you liek you kid saying everyday one nation, denying god?

Your religion does thier persicution under the radar, its slow, mothodical and worse then others. You slowly covert people to your beliefs over time like the Native Americans. The romans may have killed you but can they say they wiped out an entire culture? not even hitler could. You hear about how your church does help with things like relief, nice right? but wait, there is a catch. Look

at the name of one of the organizations, Christian Children's Fund. If you look at it who do they help? Christian children. During the Tsunami Disaster they talked about how lots of people were converting to christianity, why? So they can get the food your handing out. No this is much worse then anything the Romans did. You claim to care, but only if they join your religion.

Right, because i say so is science...well I say FSM is a vaild scientific theory....

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 21 Oct 2005 01:15:06 GMT

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

No, you're just a little punk who gets offended over the stupidest shit because you don't have the common sense to look past the fact that it contains the words "Jesus", "God", "Christian", and "Christ". Do you even know the history as to WHY we have "Under God" and "In God We Trust"? Of course, not.

OH NOES! Christian-based organizations have the word "Christian" in their names, RUN FOR THE HILLS FOLKS, IT'S A MASS INVASION!!! We're not forcing people to convert to Christianity for food. If people feel that they have to convert to get food, then it's their fault for thinking that's what we require. Once again, you look past the OBVIOUS meaning of things and scrounge around to find something offensive about it.

Unlike FSM, Intelligent Design and Creation are real scientific theories with scientific studies on them. They're real issues tackled by real science, so why deny children from learning them? Are public schools afraid that the children may find some truth to them? How dare schools just force feed children one major theory without discussing others. Hell, even my Christian school taught me Evolution along with Creation.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Fri, 21 Oct 2005 01:33:24 GMT

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

Being offended by what is in the Pledge of Allegiance and what is on our money is stupid, and anyone who is offended by it needs to jump off of the face of the earth. Say the damn pledge of Allegiance for what it is meant for: PLEDGING YOUR ALLEGIANCE TO YOUR COUNTRY. Saying "Under God" does not convert you to Christianity dumbfuck. You're the type of person who bitches just to hear yourself bitch. If you believe in a different religion, then just say Under Shiva or something instead, but the least you can do is show respect to your country.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Sniper_De7](#) on Fri, 21 Oct 2005 02:56:15 GMT

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

I pledge allegiance to the flag of the united states of america, and to the republic for which it stands: one nation under the Flying Spaghetti Monster, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [runewood](#) on Sun, 23 Oct 2005 14:37:07 GMT

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

I pledge allegiance to the flag of the united states of america, and to the republic for which it stands: one nation saying god isnt real u dumb fucks, with liberty and justice for all. Better gbull?

When you involve god it is no longer science. Plain and simple. We don't have to nor are we supposed to teach all the main theorys. We are here to teach science and nothing else. If your shit isnt science then we arnt going to teach it. If you cant deal with the fact that you kid is being taught FACTS then take him to a private school.

We put in god we trust and under god in to prove we were better then godless communism, im not dumb, despite most of you thinking I am.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 23 Oct 2005 14:52:01 GMT

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

runewood wrote on Sun, 23 October 2005 09:37When you involve god it is no longer science. Plain and simple. We don't have to nor are we supposed to teach all the main theorys. We are here to teach science and nothing else. If your shit isnt science then we arnt going to teach it. If you cant deal with the fact that you kid is being taught FACTS then take him to a private school.

We put in god we trust and under god in to prove we were better then godless communism, im not dumb, despite most of you thinking I am.

How the Hell do you figure that? Simply because we add a spiritual being into the mix, that automatically means it's no longer science? It's called a THEORY (and just happens to be a religion). It IS a scientific theory, no matter how much your tiny mind may wish different.

We're not supposed to teach all the main theories? I'd love to see where your twisted mind gets all of this. If we don't teach the kids all the main theories, kids are going to be misinformed. Maybe that's one reason why today's world is getting stupider. They're only being taught half of what they need to know because we have your fucked up philosophy. Telling half the story is never any good. It's bias. If there are more than one theories, you should teach them and let the people choose what to believe rather than just making them believe in Evolution since Creationism is banned. That's just more fucked up thinking of today's society. OMG WE KANT TEECH KIDZ

STUFF IN TEH BIBEL! THEY MAY AKTULLY BELEEVE IT AN MAKE A DECIZUN ON THERE OWN! I don't give a fuck what their parents want. It's not the parents' decision on what the kid is to believe or not. I'm going to want my children to accept the Christian faith, but I'm not going to force them to. That's just absurd.

If you understand its purpose, then what the fuck are you complaining about? They're just words. They're not going to make you melt. Get over your ego, and just say them. If you can't, just skip over them. Nobody's forcing you to say the pledge.

If you're smart, you obviously don't show it.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 23 Oct 2005 15:08:49 GMT

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

The difference between the scientific theories and the religious claims (which in essence, as far as "religion" go, are considered facts to them), which are actually merely theories, is that scientific theories can be tested for continuity. It's not possible (or easily possible) to do the same when you're trying to affirm something in the Bible.

It's easy to say and prove that God exists, but it isn't so easy to prove that the Bible is His truth, and is thus infallible. That's why I think that God absolutely SHOULD be taught in schools as a theory as much as the THEORY of conservation of energy/mass/momentum/etc. I, however, do not think that any type of theoretical morality should be taught outside a philosophy classroom; where the opinion of the matter is stressed, and no objectives are established. This allows people the reason their own morality based on what they know, and not what some pompous Vatican lacky in a big hat says morality is.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Sun, 23 Oct 2005 17:45:17 GMT

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

Javaxcx wrote on Sun, 23 October 2005 11:08It's easy to say and prove that God exists...

I am honestly interested to see this. Explanation/URL/something please.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Oblivion165](#) on Sun, 23 Oct 2005 18:08:25 GMT

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

Quote:Our heaven is WAY better. We've got a Stripper Factory AND a Beer Volcano.

Woot

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [runewood](#) on Sun, 23 Oct 2005 19:23:50 GMT

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

mrpirate wrote on Sun, 23 October 2005 12:45Javaxcx wrote on Sun, 23 October 2005 11:08It's easy to say and prove that God exists...

I am honestly interested to see this. Explanation/URL/something please.

I would too

By your idea we need to teach FSM in school. God is not science. Untill science proves him he isnt science. There is no scientific edv at all the points to a god. We arnt here to teach your damn kid about god, its a fucking science class not church. We have no oblogation, nor should be allowed to teach god. If my kid was in school, in science, learning about god id sue them. Point to me in one way god has ANY science to him.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 23 Oct 2005 20:11:03 GMT

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

We can't prove the theory of Evolution either, idiot. By what you just said, we have absolutely no place to be teaching anything on the creation/beginning of the world as we know it because we can't prove it. Ever think as to maybe that's because it's a THEORY?

They wouldn't be teaching kids about God, you fucking twit. They'd be teaching kids about Creation. Sure, God is included in the discussion, but the lessons wouldn't be about God. They'd be about THE ORIGIN OF THE UNIVERSE. Is it really that fucking hard to understand?

Here's what you're implying. Say you're in a World History class. You're talking about World War II, and you mention Hitler as to what caused World War II. You're claiming that the class is teaching fascist ideals and doctrine simply because you're explaining how Hitler had influence in WWII. Sound ridiculous? It is. You're saying that because we're including God in a theory, we're somehow teaching religion to the kids and it's no longer about science.

You're wrong. You're a fucktard. Quit while you're ahead.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [runewood](#) on Sun, 23 Oct 2005 20:42:53 GMT

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

Right, stateing god created the universe has nothing to do with the beleif in god...

Eveloution can be proven with fossels and such, while god cant be proven.

Thats right i am ahead because your shit is just religous bs. If it metions god its no longer in the

relm of science, its faith. We don't teach the diffrent ways people think life came to be, we only teach the scientific ones. I would still like to know how you can prove there is a god and what proof there is about god. (a book with words in it doesnt count)

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 23 Oct 2005 20:51:35 GMT

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

runewood wrote on Sun, 23 October 2005 16:42Right, stateing god created the universe has nothing to do with the beleif in god...

Eveloution can be proven with fossels and such, while god cant be proven.

Thats right i am ahead because your shit is just religious bs. If it metions god its no longer in the relm of science, its faith. We don't teach the diffrent ways people think life came to be, we only teach the scientific ones. I would still like to know how you can prove there is a god and what proof there is about god. (a book with words in it doesnt count)

It's a THEORY. It's not stating whether it's fact or not, but it does state that it's a POSSIBILITY. Just because it's taught doesn't mean it has to be believed.

You have no clue what you're talking about. If Evolution was proven, religion would be proven wrong and I would have no reason to believe what I do. However, it hasn't been disproven, so I'm still religious.

You realize that the Theory of Evolution is a theory, therefore you BELIEVE it to be true. It's no different than me believing that God created the universe.

What part of "Creation is a scientific theory" don't you understand?

You honestly have no clue what faith is about, so I won't even answer you to that respect.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 23 Oct 2005 21:29:55 GMT

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

mrpirate wrote on Sun, 23 October 2005 13:45Javaxcx wrote on Sun, 23 October 2005 11:08It's easy to say and prove that God exists...

I am honestly interested to see this. Explanation/URL/something please.

Thomas Aquinas explains it better than I ever could. It deals with the cause and effect relationship between all existence. It insists that at the beginning of the universe there was a prime cause which caused the rest of the universe into happening.

That's easy to explain. What is difficult is how to explain that something which is uncaused (God)

can cause a cause to happen. It goes by a few names; unmoved mover, first cause, and so on. The Summa Contra Gentiles explains this whole deal in a much more methodical way. Yes, it is a Catholic book, but there is very little Catholicism in it-- at least the first book. The point is, it is a rational explanation for how God must exist.

What is important to understand however, is that the nature of this universe and other things suggest that no thing is 100% certain. This includes the existence of God. So while I can say that God must exist, I mean it in the same context that I can say that the sun will rise tomorrow. There is a chance that it will not, but the probability is so unbelievably negligible that we don't even regard it with an answer.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [runewood](#) on Sun, 23 Oct 2005 22:08:06 GMT

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

j_ball430 wrote on Sun, 23 October 2005 16:51
runewood wrote on Sun, 23 October 2005 16:42
Right, stating god created the universe has nothing to do with the belief in god...

Evolution can be proven with fossils and such, while god can't be proven.

That's right I am ahead because your shit is just religious BS. If it mentions god it's no longer in the realm of science, it's faith. We don't teach the different ways people think life came to be, we only teach the scientific ones. I would still like to know how you can prove there is a god and what proof there is about god. (a book with words in it doesn't count)
It's a THEORY. It's not stating whether it's fact or not, but it does state that it's a POSSIBILITY. Just because it's taught doesn't mean it has to be believed.

You have no clue what you're talking about. If Evolution was proven, religion would be proven wrong and I would have no reason to believe what I do. However, it hasn't been disproven, so I'm still religious.

You realize that the Theory of Evolution is a theory, therefore you BELIEVE it to be true. It's no different than me believing that God created the universe.

What part of "Creation is a scientific theory" don't you understand?

You honestly have no clue what faith is about, so I won't even answer you to that respect.

That's just the thing, god can't be proven. Unless he shows his will to everyone he can't be proven.

Even if we prove evolution, faith will say oh god guided evolution. Not matter what science says god can't be disproven because god is all powerful and his will is done. Just the same, god can't be proven, thus the problem. Science can be proven or disproven even if it is beyond our means currently. God can't be disproven because he is all powerful and if he doesn't want to be found he won't be.

Creation isn't science, *poof it's here*, isn't science.

I dont know what faith is because i dont have it. If you dont have it you cant understand it, Plain and simple.

All your arguments hold as much weight as FSM. If we teach evolution we must teach ID and we must teach FSM ID and my thoery of ID which is I am god and I made man evolve...

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 23 Oct 2005 22:25:17 GMT

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

...The existence of God can be proven within as much certainty as dropping a pencil off a table and predicting it falling.

That doesn't mean the Bible and God are one and the same. THAT is a faith choice. God's existence does not call for the necessity of the Bible. If that's the case, then whatever God's will is, it is unknown to us and He is under no obligation to show it to us. But we can still prove He exists.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 24 Oct 2005 00:19:09 GMT

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

The definition of "theory" in the scientific world is not opposite of "fact". The evidence of evolution is quite expansive.

(emphasis mine)

"Mark Thomas" It's important to remember that the term "theory" in science is not the same as it is in general usage. A scientific theory is a unifying concept that explains a large body of data. It is a hypothesis that has withstood the test of time and the challenge of opposing views. The Theory of Evolution is the basic unifying concept of biology. The CEO of The American Association for the Advancement of Science, Alan Leshner, wrote, "Although scientists may debate details of the mechanisms of evolution, there is no argument among scientists as to whether evolution is taking place." The National Academy of Sciences, the nation's most prestigious scientific organization, has declared evolution "one of the strongest and most useful scientific theories we have," and notes that evolution is supported by an overwhelming scientific consensus. The Theory of Evolution has as much validity as the theory of gravity, atomic theory, or the germ theory of disease.

Look at it this way. Back in ancient Greece, it was believed that Helios pulled the sun across the sky every day. In fact there were "gods" for every action that was unexplained. A god for fertility, one for thunder/lightning, etc. But the more that was learned over the years, the less we needed "gods" to explain them.

I find this particularly scary: (emphasis mine)

"Mark Thomas"Galileo took the new invention of the telescope, refined it, and used it to look at the night sky. He was astounded. On the moon he could see mountains and valleys. It wasn't just some strange heavenly object; it was probably made out of the same stuff as Earth. In 1609 Galileo looked at Jupiter, and discovered that it had four moons. If moons orbited Jupiter, then not everything orbited the Earth, as the Catholic Church taught at the time. Astronomy made more sense if the theories of Copernicus were true, and the Earth and planets orbited the sun. After writing a book about this, Galileo was called to Rome in 1633 by the Catholic Church's Inquisition, and told to recant his heretical ideas.

This was no "simple request" by the Church. Just 33 years before, the Inquisition had executed Galileo's friend Giordano Bruno. Have you heard of him? In 1600, the Christian authorities in Rome took him out of the dungeon he had been in for eight years, drove a nail through his tongue, tied him to a metal post, put wood and some of his books under his feet, and burned him to death. Bruno's crime was writing ideas that the Catholic leaders didn't like — there might be other worlds with other intelligent beings on them, Jesus didn't possess god-like power, and souls can't go to heaven. For these heretical ideas, the Catholic Church punished this brilliant thinker with a slow, agonizing death.

Galileo knew what he was up against. For the crime of heresy the Inquisition could put him in a dungeon, torture or even execute him. So, after a long trial, this proud 70-year-old man obediently got on his knees and recanted. But even after recanting, he was still sentenced to house arrest for the rest of his life. The Catholic Church officially condemned heliocentrism 31 years later, when Pope Alexander VII banned all books that affirmed the earth's motion. But, even as powerful as the Church was, they could not hold back the tidal wave of scientific discovery, and the Church eventually lost its battle over our view of the Universe. It only took them over three hundred years to admit it. In 1992, after 12 years of deliberations, they grudgingly noted that Galileo had been right in supporting the theories of Copernicus. But no such admission has been made for Bruno; his writings are still on the Vatican's list of forbidden texts, and Pope John Paul II refused to even apologize for the Catholic Church's torture killing of Bruno.

1992!!! This was not ancient history! A mere 13 years ago, the Catholic church finally admitted that the solar system revolves around the sun.

So, as science progresses and explains what we previously didn't know, "God"s role in this universe gets smaller and smaller. Losing your ignorance is when you can finally let go of trusting a supernatural cause of something, and instead looking for the scientific cause.

"Mark Thomas"The "god of the gaps" is the basic premise behind all the "scientific" arguments for the existence of a god. The logic of "god of the gaps" goes like this (as an argument that Martin Luther could have used): Isn't lightning amazing! I don't understand how lightning could be, without something else (that I don't really understand either) making lightning. This something else must be a god because I can't come up with a better explanation.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Mon, 24 Oct 2005 00:20:15 GMT

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

Many people forget that the Bible was written by men, in several different books by probably different men. Men are imperfect, they may have deciphered his will in wrong ways. The important thing is not to let the bible dictate your life, but to follow its teachings. Examples like: be a good person, do not steal, love your parents and neighbors, ect.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 24 Oct 2005 00:45:49 GMT

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

runewood wrote on Sun, 23 October 2005 18:08j_ball430 wrote on Sun, 23 October 2005 16:51runewood wrote on Sun, 23 October 2005 16:42Right, stating god created the universe has nothing to do with the belief in god...

Evolution can be proven with fossils and such, while god can't be proven.

That's right I am ahead because your shit is just religious BS. If it mentions god it's no longer in the realm of science, it's faith. We don't teach the different ways people think life came to be, we only teach the scientific ones. I would still like to know how you can prove there is a god and what proof there is about god. (a book with words in it doesn't count)

It's a THEORY. It's not stating whether it's fact or not, but it does state that it's a POSSIBILITY. Just because it's taught doesn't mean it has to be believed.

You have no clue what you're talking about. If Evolution was proven, religion would be proven wrong and I would have no reason to believe what I do. However, it hasn't been disproven, so I'm still religious.

You realize that the Theory of Evolution is a theory, therefore you BELIEVE it to be true. It's no different than me believing that God created the universe.

What part of "Creation is a scientific theory" don't you understand?

You honestly have no clue what faith is about, so I won't even answer you to that respect.

That's just the thing, god can't be proven. Unless he shows his will to everyone he can't be proven.

Even if we prove evolution, faith will say oh god guided evolution. Not matter what science says god can't be disproven because god is all powerful and his will is done. Just the same, god can't be proven, thus the problem. Science can be proven or disproven even if it is beyond our means currently. God can't be disproven because he is all powerful and if he doesn't want to be found he won't be.

Creation isn't science, *poof its here*, isn't science.

I dont know what faith is because i dont have it. If you dont have it you cant understand it, Plain and simple.

All your arguments hold as much weight as FSM. If we teach evolution we must teach ID and we must teach FSM ID and my thoery of ID which is I am god and I made man evolve...

science - The observation, identification, description, experimental investigation, and theoretical explanation of phenomena.

Tell me where it states that it HAS to be proven or disproven in order to account as science or a scientific theory? I sure as hell don't see it.

Faith is very simple to understand. You have faith right now. You probably have faith that you will be married some day. You don't know this for sure, and you sure as hell can't prove it until it happens, but you still probably have faith that you will marry. At least, I have that faith.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [Oblivion165](#) on Mon, 24 Oct 2005 00:48:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I find it amazing how "God" has stayed so constant over the years. Things have been believed and burried for centuries. Witches and Sacrifices, all the things that have happened since man has written down events. Nothing has stayed constant like this. As time goes on people realise that by killing a goat the rain still didnt come as it did when they didnt.

These things have no bases. Why? Because there is no support under it. You can give and give, and nothing is thrown back. Therefore its a lost practice. I kill a goat, the room stays quite, nothing changes. Life is unalterd. The dust remains in the corner.

Now take that same logic and apply it to god. I goto church, nothing, nothing has changed. I pray to god for help, do i receive it? No, no one does. "But god helps those who helps themselves." now place that into a common sentence "If you sweep up your mess, god will assist you." Wait...how many times have you been sweeping up the kitchen and that second broom walk out of the broom closet and assist your duties?

Its the same message, it has no bases, no support, no facts. It was just written so that people can feel like their life wasnt a waste and after their short life is over, there is something else to exist in.

Man bet i pissed alot of people off with these paragraphs. Here comes the churchies! \\/

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Mon, 24 Oct 2005 01:09:35 GMT

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

Javaxcx wrote on Sun, 23 October 2005 18:25...The existence of God can be proven within as much certainty as dropping a pencil off a table and predicting it falling.

That doesn't mean the Bible and God are one and the same. THAT is a faith choice. God's existence does not call for the necessity of the Bible. If that's the case, then whatever God's will is, it is unknown to us and He is under no obligation to show it to us. But we can still prove He exists.

Congratulations on finding the one irrefutable work of philosophy.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [runewood](#) on Mon, 24 Oct 2005 01:10:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

^^ thank you. Saying "god did it" isn't science and I don't care wtf you think, real scientists agree with me.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Mon, 24 Oct 2005 01:27:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Actually, most scientists that contend that causality is so very affirmed that it can be considered a natural LAW will not agree with you.

Whether or not God acts in the world today is another story. But I would hold you to the idea that "God did it" is a very good explanation for this universe. Anthropomorphizing God is something I do by choice. If you want to call Him a prime force then go for it. We're talking about the same thing. Thomas Aquinas proves to me through solid reason that the same thing I would call a prime mover is the same thing as I would call God.

Somehow, even if you won't admit it on these forums, I think you'd agree.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 24 Oct 2005 01:46:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Causality is a human concept. You can't use a human concept to prove a supernatural concept.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Mon, 24 Oct 2005 02:06:22 GMT

Of course not. But you can prove to within almost absolute certainty that something is using our empirical constructs and observations.

The notion of causality doesn't necessarily fit into the human sensorial fallacy that you're relating it to. Causality is the immediate result of having an existence of time. You can't have time without causality, and you can't have causality without time (or space). Immanuel Kant did a very good job in outlining the transcendental validity of why this is so. He, like I, would suggest that causality is no more a human construct than time or space (both of which, are considered very much a priori).

This is also the reasoning that Aquinas used in validating the transcendental validity of an unmoved mover. Of course he wasn't able to figure out why, (Kant did) but the information was still there.

Keep in mind that proving that something supernatural *exists* doesn't negate the possibility of using contemporary, general logic, as well as via negativa and transcendent applicables to achieve that goal. It would be highly, HIGHLY improbable to use any of the aforementioned to try and describe the supernatural. I believe it is that which you are talking about, and in which case I agree.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 24 Oct 2005 02:37:07 GMT

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

So, in 'proving' that nothing else could have possibly "caused" all of this to come into existence, what is the "cause" that brought this "god" figure, or mover, into existence?

It seems to me that belief in a "god" is a grown-up and more far-reaching psychosis of an imaginary friend.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Mon, 24 Oct 2005 02:44:21 GMT

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

It's not reducing it down to simply "it could be nothing BUT God who caused this, therefore it is", but that is a tool that you can use to DEDUCE that conclusion. You've got to take a little bit from each way of thinking, do a vulcan mind meld, and come out with a theory that works (until it is successfully refuted).

As for the cause of God... Aquinas suggests that God is NOT caused. Hence "unmoved mover". There is no way (that I'm aware of) that you could explain HOW an unmoved mover can be scientifically explained, but you can most certainly posit that it can merely exist. That's the difference between the transcendental logic and aesthetic and the general logic you're applying when you're looking for a means to an ends. It's not as much just saying how He is as much as

just saying THAT He is. That's not to say you can't try and figure out HOW He is, by all means. But it definitely supports the argument THAT He is as opposed to that He is not.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 24 Oct 2005 03:00:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It still seems like assumptions are being made of the existence of a "god" rather than where I "assume" that "he" does not exist. Furthermore, your conclusions in fact lead to the possibility that this "mover" could possibly be the FSM.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Mon, 24 Oct 2005 03:07:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

That's the beauty of it. He COULD be the FSM!

If you're calling it an assumption, you're mostly correct. All of our intuitions are assumptions. Some can be said with near absolute certainty (like the sun rising), but none can be absolute. Which is why I try and emphasize that what I'm saying is only extremely probable, but never definite. I say it is probable because all the reasoning and empirical datum I can find suggest to me that above all else, all things are caused.

If you can prove/suggest to me otherwise, then I would gladly lend an ear.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 24 Oct 2005 03:45:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Never dispute the FSM's possibilities.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Mon, 24 Oct 2005 06:54:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

People tend to get confused about this: God and the Catholic church are something very different. I believe in God but I have many trouble of believing in many things the pope declares.

How can you reckon that there is more certainty in a scientific theory than in believing God made the universe. For all you know, the human scientific "brain" (soz, I'm not English) had a mistake programmed in it. Or our maths system maybe is not 100 % correct.

You can say I only believe what my eyes see but maybe there is stuff out there that your eyes cannot see... That doesn't mean it isn't there.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 24 Oct 2005 09:54:37 GMT

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

Um, of course I know that all religion is not Catholicism... It was an example of how fucking EVIL organized religion is.

The fact that organized religion gets away with what they get away with is proof enough to me that there is NO GOD. There is no omnipotent, omnipresent, omniscient God who would stand by and let these fuckholes do what they do in "his" name.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Goztow](#) on Mon, 24 Oct 2005 09:58:19 GMT

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

Crimson wrote on Mon, 24 October 2005 05:54

The fact that organized religion gets away with what they get away with is proof enough to me that there is NO GOD. There is no omnipotent, omnipresent, omniscient God who would stand by and let these fuckholes do what they do in "his" name.

Aha! I rather see it that there is something out there but 'it' doesn't "monitor" the earth, if so, only passively, but I do find comfort in the believe that there is something more after this miserable life.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Sniper_De7](#) on Mon, 24 Oct 2005 14:30:29 GMT

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

Goztow wrote on Mon, 24 October 2005 05:58Crimson wrote on Mon, 24 October 2005 05:54

The fact that organized religion gets away with what they get away with is proof enough to me that there is NO GOD. There is no omnipotent, omnipresent, omniscient God who would stand by and let these fuckholes do what they do in "his" name.

Aha! I rather see it that there is something out there but 'it' doesn't "monitor" the earth, if so, only passively, but I do find comfort in the believe that there is something more after this miserable life.

Who wouldn't? I think that's one of a religion's biggest way to convince people and it's pretty logical. I mean no one would seriously want to just die and rot in the earth, when considering the religious alternative is going wherever depending on what religion.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 24 Oct 2005 15:28:38 GMT

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

Crimson wrote on Mon, 24 October 2005 05:54Um, of course I know that all religion is not Catholicism... It was an example of how fucking EVIL organized religion is.

The fact that organized religion gets away with what they get away with is proof enough to me that there is NO GOD. There is no omnipotent, omnipresent, omniscient God who would stand by and let these fuckholes do what they do in "his" name.

Organized religion is very dangerous. It's one damn good reason why I'm no longer Catholic. It's very fucked up ideology. However, just because organized religion is bad, doesn't mean that God is. God allows us to have freewill and do as we please with our lives. We'll soon see the consequences of our actions, but He's not going to prevent anyone from doing what they want.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [runewood](#) on Mon, 24 Oct 2005 18:40:59 GMT

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

Why would god even interfere with us if that were true. Why would he supposedly send his son to talk to us. If god wanted to not be known we wouldn't know about him. And if he is an observer why create the human race with evolution?

A lot of this may hold philosophical (can't spell) weight but, it's not scientific. In order for god to have an effect in science you must assume he exists before there is any edv. to point out he does. Did you ever think that there is no creator and the universe has just always existed? I can't understand how it would work but you never know. However we aren't talking about the beginning of the universe. We aren't talking about if there is a god. We are talking about ID, and the fact is you must have faith to believe it, and faith is not science.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Javacx](#) on Mon, 24 Oct 2005 18:48:06 GMT

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

runewood wrote on Mon, 24 October 2005 14:40In order for god to have an effect in science you must assume he exists before there is any edv. to point out he does.

Not necessarily true. You can hypothesize that God is with no scientific evidence to support that He does, and work backwards to that goal, OR, you can take the scientific datum that you've accumulated and work back to an inevitable conclusion; that there is a first cause that caused all things into being. It just so happens that is the same thing that many people call God. And no, that does not mean the same God as that described in the Bible.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [bandie63](#) on Mon, 24 Oct 2005 23:15:09 GMT

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

warranto wrote on Thu, 20 October 2005 11:39I personally believe in the combined theory. The world did "evolve" as science claims, however it had a little help in the process. I'll get into what I mean at a later date if people want me to.

That is the exact belief I have.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Mon, 24 Oct 2005 23:39:35 GMT

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

A bit out of order, but whatever...

CrimsonSo, in 'proving' that nothing else could have possibly "caused" all of this to come into existence, what is the "cause" that brought this "god" figure, or mover, into existence?

CrimsonCausality is a human concept. You can't use a human concept to prove a supernatural concept.

Likewise, you cannot disprove the existence of God/a supernatural concept using a human concept such as causality if God supposedly created it in the first place.

God's nature is not dictated by our science; He created it in the first place, so He is obviously not bound by His own creation's laws.

That's why you can't really say, "If God caused all this, then what caused God?" because nothing has to have caused God.

Was our physical world and nature suddenly dictated by the virtual laws governing Renegade when it was first created? Of course not. We are independent from the game's laws and mechanics as God is independent of this world.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 24 Oct 2005 23:41:48 GMT

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

runewood wrote on Sun, 23 October 2005 16:42. I would still like to know how you can prove there is a god and what proof there is about god. (a book with words in it doesnt count)

I would like to know how you can prove there are things called atoms, and what prove there is about atoms. (a book with words in it doesn't count)

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Renerage](#) on Tue, 25 Oct 2005 00:06:09 GMT

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

warranto wrote on Mon, 24 October 2005 19:41runewood wrote on Sun, 23 October 2005 16:42. I

would still like to know how you can prove there is a god and what proof there is about god. (a book with words in it doesnt count)

I would like to know how you can prove there are things called atoms, and what prove there is about atoms. (a book with words in it doesn't count)

I agree with Rune, how do i know theres a god?

How does anyone?

Its just a belief nd sorry, a book from 2000 yrs ago aint exactly the thing thats going to make it concrete in my mind.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 25 Oct 2005 00:21:00 GMT

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

That's the beauty of belief. No one CAN know, ever. If it was anything more, it couldn't be a belief.

No one CAN know if the next time you ask a friend something, that they are telling the truth... yu must chose whether or not to believe them.

No one CAN know whether or not they will die tomorrow, we just have to go on with the belief that everything will be fine.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Sniper_De7](#) on Tue, 25 Oct 2005 00:27:20 GMT

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

are you saying you can't disprove beliefs? so... sun gods and water gods can't be disproven?

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 25 Oct 2005 00:31:27 GMT

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

What sun god do you mean?

That the sun is a god? Disproven when we went out and saw that it was a burnin globe of gasses

That there is a god attributed to the sun (polytheism)? Not disproven, as we can not know.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Sniper_De7](#) on Tue, 25 Oct 2005 00:38:58 GMT

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

The heck do i remember what the egyptians believed or the Greeks i just used it as an example.(if from what i remember the one for the greeks was about some chariot or whatever and that was the sun. Which obviously isn't true. what about if someone believed he could fly to the other end of the universe? beliefs can be disproven mate. or what about the belief that the earth was flat? disproved.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 25 Oct 2005 00:54:19 GMT

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

I'm not saying "beleifs" can not be disproven or proven.

I'm saying that the purpose of a belief is that you DON'T know, not in your ability to prove it right or wrong.

At the time the person had the belief that he could fly, did he know if he could? No, he simply had the belief that he could, he did not know.

In regards to God, this does not work as God is not a testable being (ie. testable under our current scientific knowledge). Flying, on the other hand, is testable. You just have to go and jump, and you will find out the answer.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Sniper_De7](#) on Tue, 25 Oct 2005 00:59:57 GMT

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

well i don't get the point of you saying "no one can know, ever".

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 25 Oct 2005 01:12:11 GMT

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

Because once they know, it can no longer BE a belief. It is then knowledge.

If you possess a belief about something, it is because you do not, can not, have knowlledge of the answer to that belief. Once you gain that knowledge (and the ONLY way to gain it is through personal experiance), you can no longer possess the belief as you now know.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Sniper_De7](#) on Tue, 25 Oct 2005 01:22:55 GMT

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

i think the confusion is about you saying no one can ever know, when they certainly well can know. if you meant to just say how good it is to believe in something because at the moment a person does not know the answer, then i could see that.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 25 Oct 2005 01:33:30 GMT

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

The only thing is, is that if you know the answer, you know the answer. You can not choose to believe something or not, because it is not a belief; it is knowledge.

You can not choose to believe something that you know the answer to. If it is a belief, then that person CAN'T know. It is physically impossible to say you believe something, and claim to know the truth.

A person who simply believes something can never know. Because once they know, it is no longer a belief.

Try this:

Ask your friend if they think you are good a particular game. (Simple enough)

Now, consider how well you think you can trust their responce. Do you know for 100% absolute certainty that what they say is the honest to goodness truth? Or is there even the slightest bit of a possiblity they may be lying, even if it is to be nice?

My bet is on the latter. You can not know for 100% absolute certainty that the person is telling the truth, and claim that you "trust/believe them". You can not KNOW, EVER if they are telling the truth. Sure, you can find out, but then you would say that you KNOW that they are telling the truth, you could not say that you BELIEVE them.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Sniper_De7](#) on Tue, 25 Oct 2005 01:48:11 GMT

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

I was just questioning the wording used

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Tue, 25 Oct 2005 02:04:16 GMT

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

Beliefs, as warranto is using them, are precisely akin to opinions. Does that make it any clearer?

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 25 Oct 2005 02:07:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

that's a bit of an over simplification, but I guess it can work.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Tue, 25 Oct 2005 02:38:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hydra wrote on Mon, 24 October 2005 16:39A bit out of order, but whatever...
CrimsonSo, in 'proving' that nothing else could have possibly "caused" all of this to come into existence, what is the "cause" that brought this "god" figure, or mover, into existence?
CrimsonCausality is a human concept. You can't use a human concept to prove a supernatural concept.
Likewise, you cannot disprove the existence of God/a supernatural concept using a human concept such as causality if God supposedly created it in the first place.
God's nature is not dictated by our science; He created it in the first place, so He is obviously not bound by His own creation's laws.

That's why you can't really say, "If God caused all this, then what caused God?" because nothing has to have caused God.
Was our physical world and nature suddenly dictated by the virtual laws governing Renegade when it was first created? Of course not. We are independent from the game's laws and mechanics as God is independent of this world.

I play both sides of the coin. I like to flirt around with different ideas and arugments.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [Oblivion165](#) on Tue, 25 Oct 2005 10:08:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Crimson wrote on Mon, 24 October 2005 22:38Hydra wrote on Mon, 24 October 2005 16:39A bit out of order, but whatever...
CrimsonSo, in 'proving' that nothing else could have possibly "caused" all of this to come into existence, what is the "cause" that brought this "god" figure, or mover, into existence?
CrimsonCausality is a human concept. You can't use a human concept to prove a supernatural concept.
Likewise, you cannot disprove the existence of God/a supernatural concept using a human concept such as causality if God supposedly created it in the first place.
God's nature is not dictated by our science; He created it in the first place, so He is obviously not bound by His own creation's laws.

That's why you can't really say, "If God caused all this, then what caused God?" because nothing has to have caused God.
Was our physical world and nature suddenly dictated by the virtual laws governing Renegade

when it was first created? Of course not. We are independent from the game's laws and mechanics as God is independent of this world.

I play both sides of the coin. I like to flirt around with different ideas and arguments.

Just like a woman, Does whatever she can to win.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Tue, 25 Oct 2005 12:34:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Too many people base definitions here on "what I see is what's right". That's all but true, for example: a "color blind" person will see red as brown. So who's right? And don't tell me that what the majority sees is the definition of what's right then...

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [Oblivion165](#) on Tue, 25 Oct 2005 13:26:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Goztow wrote on Tue, 25 October 2005 08:34 Too many people base definitions here on "what I see is what's right". That's all but true, for example: a "color blind" person will see red as brown. So who's right? And don't tell me that what the majority sees is the definition of what's right then...

Dont forget that colors maybe something completely different to someone else. My green maybe your blue or even closer to your red. There is no way to see what the other person is seeing. When we are young, people point to a color and say "thats green" so if infact that color is blue to you, you will never know.

Yup im aware thios has nothing to do with what you said, i just like to tell people stuff they may have never thought about.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Tue, 25 Oct 2005 17:47:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Goztow wrote on Tue, 25 October 2005 08:34 Too many people base definitions here on "what I see is what's right". That's all but true, for example: a "color blind" person will see red as brown. So who's right? And don't tell me that what the majority sees is the definition of what's right then...

That's why you don't rely on sensorial experience to define objective truths.

Rationality is the key to determining that which you see as blue, and I as green. Reason might impose "red" to that colour, thus nullifying both intuitions. The point is, the notion of reason not a sensorial thing, and thus we can call it absolutely objective if used correctly. Of course different

conditions result in different applications of reason, and some of the CONCLUSIONS are false, but what is important is that reason itself is never false as its very existence is a priori.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [runewood](#) on Wed, 26 Oct 2005 00:15:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I missed too many posts and this is getting into theory/phalosophy so im out.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Wed, 26 Oct 2005 02:46:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Crimson wrote on Mon, 24 October 2005 22:38 I play both sides of the coin. I like to flirt around with different ideas and arugments.
Wouldn't you be contradicting yourself in many instances (such as this one), then?

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Wed, 26 Oct 2005 09:24:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

No, not really. I can prove the non-existence of "God" in my own mind using any approach.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [DaveGMM](#) on Wed, 26 Oct 2005 17:33:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The non-existance of God was proved some years ago by Douglas Adams.

And, like a few people around here, I believe in a God (She's a lesbian, if anyone cares), but not in religion. Because no God these so-called religions claim to worship, as Crimson has said, would let them get away with the atrocities that they have committed (Inquisition, anyone?).

God is out there. As is religion.

And religion is WAAAY fucking out there.

Cha-ching £0.02

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Thu, 27 Oct 2005 00:47:59 GMT

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

Crimson wrote on Wed, 26 October 2005 05:24No, not really. I can prove the non-existence of "God" in my own mind using any approach.

Even if the approach is contradictory and logically fallacious?

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [MrBob](#) on Thu, 27 Oct 2005 00:56:19 GMT

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

Javafx...it sure makes it easier for people to comprehend reality when they toss away the shackles of anthropomorphized deities and senseless sophisms coming from a "religion authority".

<http://www.resort.com/~prime8/Orwell/patee.html>

Anyway, one must find the difference between religion and true fellowship with God. There is a difference. Instead of the common conception of who Jesus is, we can see in the Gospels that he abhorred "religion." Do a search for "Pharisee" and you'll see what I mean. Also, you might want to take a look at this: <http://heaven.net.nz/visions/escape-from-christendom.htm>

runewood...a book with words in it doesn't count...

As opposed to a book without words in it?

Crimson wrote on Wed, 26 October 2005 05:24No, not really. I can prove the non-existence of "God" in my own mind using any approach.

Psalms 53:1

Proverbs 3:5

Proverbs 28:26

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Thu, 27 Oct 2005 01:24:05 GMT

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

Orwell was just jealous because he couldn't understand the higher vernacular of philosophical discussion.

You posted that Christianity thing a while ago. Great article. Well worth the read.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 27 Oct 2005 09:20:45 GMT

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

MrBob wrote on Wed, 26 October 2005 17:56Psalm 53:1

Proverbs 3:5

Proverbs 28:26

Psalm 53:1 = "THE [empty-headed] fool has said in his heart, There is no God. Corrupt and evil are they, and doing abominable iniquity; there is none who does good."

Proverbs 3:5 = "Trust in the Lord with all your heart, And lean not on your own understanding; In all your ways acknowledge Him, And He shall direct your paths. Do not be wise in your own eyes; Fear the Lord and depart from evil...."

Proverbs 28:26 = "He that trusteth in his own heart is a fool: but whoso walketh wisely, he shall be delivered."

Wow... seriously? SERIOUSLY?! You are SERIOUSLY using quotes from a book I do not believe is the word of "God" to do... what? Insult me? Call me empty-headed, corrupt, evil, etc?

Here's a nice summary of the arguments I have heard here.

"300 proofs of God's existence"

13) ARGUMENT FROM THE BIBLE

(1) [arbitrary passage from OT]

(2) [arbitrary passage from NT]

(3) Therefore, God exists.

53) ARGUMENT FROM HISTORY

(1) The Bible is true.

(2) Therefore, the Bible is historical fact.

(3) Therefore, God exists.

63) ARGUMENT FROM HUMAN NECESSITY

(1) Atheists say that they don't need God.

(2) Which just goes to show that they need God.

(3) Therefore, God exists.

81) ARGUMENT FROM INEVITABILITY (This one is for Javacx)

(1) I have proof that God exists.

(2) I won't bother to tell you what it is because, being Atheists, you would be hostile to the conclusion anyway.

(3) Therefore, God exists.

84) ARGUMENT FROM POSTMODERNISM

(1) I'm going to prove to you that God exists.

(2) [Insert any of the other arguments on this page in here.]

(3) [Atheist refutes argument.]

(4) I cannot prove there is a God anymore than anyone of us can prove we really exist in a tangible world.

(5) Therefore, God exists.

109) ARGUMENT FROM LACK OF DISPROOF

- (1) You can't prove God doesn't exist!
- (2) Therefore, God exists.

118) ARGUMENT FROM FOOLISHNESS

- (1) The Bible says Atheists are fools.
- (2) I don't want to be a fool.
- (3) Therefore, God exists.

227) ARGUMENT FROM THE BIBLE (II)

- (1) The Bible says the Bible is true.
- (2) Therefore the Bible is true.
- (3) The Bible says God exists.
- (4) Therefore, God exist.

259) ARGUMENT FROM NOT-BELIEVING

- (1) The New Testament says people like you would question us.
- (2) You question us.
- (3) Therefore the Bible is true.
- (4) Therefore, God exists.

Source: <http://www.godlessgeeks.com/LINKS/GodProof.htm>

I can't believe that so many people can't see that this "God" character is the perfect way to control you. It's the biggest and most successful manipulation the world will ever see. This omnipresent, omnibenevolent character is the best thing man has ever invented to control billions of people. It's sheer genius is what it is.

I feel like this outside observer watching this manipulation on a grand scale and I sit here shaking my head at how easily people are indoctrinated from birth and just filled with this unprovable and high implausible STORY. You will NEVER convince me to fall for this bullshit EVER. The very idea of this just reminds me of a child with an imaginary friend.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [MrBob](#) on Thu, 27 Oct 2005 12:59:44 GMT

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

So you accuse me of being brainwashed by quoting something to make an argument, yet you're quoting something to make an argument.

Strange...

CrimsonI can't believe that so many people can't see that this "God" character is the perfect way to control you.

He's controlling me? The last time I checked, I still had free will. Yes, God tells us things to do, but it's our choice to listen.

Crimson

I feel like this outside observer watching this manipulation on a grand scale and I sit here shaking my head at how easily people are indoctrinated from birth and just filled with this unprovable and high implausible STORY. You will NEVER convince me to fall for this bullshit EVER...

Because you are so wise...

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 27 Oct 2005 13:50:14 GMT

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

Crimson wrote on Thu, 27 October 2005 05:20 Here's a nice summary of the arguments I have heard here.

"300 proofs of God's existence"

13) ARGUMENT FROM THE BIBLE

(1) [arbitrary passage from OT]

(2) [arbitrary passage from NT]

(3) Therefore, God exists.

53) ARGUMENT FROM HISTORY

(1) The Bible is true.

(2) Therefore, the Bible is historical fact.

(3) Therefore, God exists.

63) ARGUMENT FROM HUMAN NECESSITY

(1) Atheists say that they don't need God.

(2) Which just goes to show that they need God.

(3) Therefore, God exists.

81) ARGUMENT FROM INEVITABILITY (This one is for Javacx)

(1) I have proof that God exists.

(2) I won't bother to tell you what it is because, being Atheists, you would be hostile to the conclusion anyway.

(3) Therefore, God exists.

84) ARGUMENT FROM POSTMODERNISM

(1) I'm going to prove to you that God exists.

(2) [Insert any of the other arguments on this page in here.]

(3) [Atheist refutes argument.]

(4) I cannot prove there is a God anymore than anyone of us can prove we really exist in a tangible world.

(5) Therefore, God exists.

109) ARGUMENT FROM LACK OF DISPROOF

- (1) You can't prove God doesn't exist!
- (2) Therefore, God exists.

118) ARGUMENT FROM FOOLISHNESS

- (1) The Bible says Atheists are fools.
- (2) I don't want to be a fool.
- (3) Therefore, God exists.

227) ARGUMENT FROM THE BIBLE (II)

- (1) The Bible says the Bible is true.
- (2) Therefore the Bible is true.
- (3) The Bible says God exists.
- (4) Therefore, God exist.

259) ARGUMENT FROM NOT-BELIEVING

- (1) The New Testament says people like you would question us.
- (2) You question us.
- (3) Therefore the Bible is true.
- (4) Therefore, God exists.

Source: <http://www.godlessgeeks.com/LINKS/GodProof.htm>

I can't believe that so many people can't see that this "God" character is the perfect way to control you. It's the biggest and most successful manipulation the world will ever see. This omnipresent, omnibenevolent character is the best thing man has ever invented to control billions of people. It's sheer genius is what it is.

I feel like this outside observer watching this manipulation on a grand scale and I sit here shaking my head at how easily people are indoctrinated from birth and just filled with this unprovable and high implausible STORY. You will NEVER convince me to fall for this bullshit EVER. The very idea of this just reminds me of a child with an imaginary friend.

Come on Crimson, I've mentioned this to you before. Stop quoting things that prove how religion got it wrong to "prove" that God doesn't exist.

It doesn't work that way. Something can still be truth, despite the idea that no one has the proper understanding of it.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Thu, 27 Oct 2005 15:15:27 GMT

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

I'm not certain that quoting a passage from the bible which states that atheists are stupid even really qualifies as an argument for god's existence.

Java: I think I get now what your argument is, although if there's more to it that hasn't been touched upon in this thread then never mind this. However, as you stated yourself, there is a stretch between saying that there was an initial cause to the universe, and saying that this cause is the god so many religions are so wound up over.

Looking back at history, there have been billions of people who have believed in the most bizarre, contrived, and, frankly, silly gods and deities. And they all believed just as earnestly as you do. To me, this is what really marginalizes any belief in god.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 27 Oct 2005 15:28:52 GMT

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

mrpirate wrote on Thu, 27 October 2005 11:15 Looking back at history, there have been billions of people who have believed in the most bizarre, contrived, and, frankly, silly gods and deities. And they all believed just as earnestly as you do. To me, this is what really marginalizes any belief in god.

Kind of like science, no?

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Thu, 27 Oct 2005 15:59:04 GMT

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

It is kind of like science, I agree. Sometimes I wonder what, out of our science, will be laughed at by future generations. Although, I find it easier to believe in what science tells us, since it is backed up with proof (theoretical and empirical). If science says that there are some forces, and using these forces we can build something that does function x, and so we build it and it does perform function x, then I believe that science has got this right. It's possible, I suppose, that science being right most of the time is a coincidence, but that seems fairly unlikely. That being said, I do not believe that science is absolutely right about everything.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Thu, 27 Oct 2005 17:42:04 GMT

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

mrpirate wrote on Thu, 27 October 2005 11:15

Java: I think I get now what your argument is, although if there's more to it that hasn't been touched upon in this thread then never mind this. However, as you stated yourself, there is a stretch between saying that there was an initial cause to the universe, and saying that this cause is the god so many religions are so wound up over.

The difference, as far as I'm concerned, is that the religions who get so wound up are the same religions that starting defining characteristics of God they, as human beings, could never possibly know. That being said, I don't contend that the God I'm arguing for the sake of is the same God as the Bible, Koran, Buddha, or whatever.

He (personified, even though I can't prove yet that He can be called a pronoun accurately) simply is the initial force that allowed all things to come into essence. I'm currently writing up a thesis on transcendental causality which would point precisely to everything I haven't explained or have left as a loose thread. Doitle's in on the idea too and we were going to try and work it all out and present a concise, logical necessity for a God who at the very fundamental level exists. It doesn't rely on faith or any sort of abstract, for lack of a better word, bullshit, but rather a coherent and highly plausible explanation that the existentialists can't refute, or refute easily.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [Javacx](#) on Thu, 27 Oct 2005 18:03:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Crimson wrote on Thu, 27 October 2005 05:20
81) ARGUMENT FROM INEVITABILITY (This one is for Javacx)
(1) I have proof that God exists.
(2) I won't bother to tell you what it is because, being Atheists, you would be hostile to the conclusion anyway.
(3) Therefore, God exists.

What? I've shown THAT God is, simply not HOW He is. The former is what is important for this discussion. The latter I haven't even touched on outside the assumption that I don't think that anyone can know anything supernatural using natural laws.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Thu, 27 Oct 2005 18:10:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Javacx wrote on Thu, 27 October 2005 14:03 I don't think that anyone can know anything supernatural using natural laws.

Would this not be a property of the supernatural? And if so, how can one know it?

If you were to successfully lay down evidence suggesting that the universe was begun by something (a "god," for lack of a better word--since it would not need to be a god in the traditional sense at all), would everything else stated about this god not be mere conjecture?

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Thu, 27 Oct 2005 18:22:59 GMT

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

That should be, know ABOUT anything supernatural. I contend that you can know that something supernatural IS, but you may not necessarily (I haven't figured this out yet) know anything ABOUT it save that it is.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 27 Oct 2005 19:26:26 GMT

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

mrpirate wrote on Thu, 27 October 2005 11:59 It is kind of like science, I agree. Sometimes I wonder what, out of our science, will be laughed at by future generations. Although, I find it easier to believe in what science tells us, since it is backed up with proof (theoretical and empirical). If science says that there are some forces, and using these forces we can build something that does function x, and so we build it and it does perform function x, then I believe that science has got this right. It's possible, I suppose, that science being right most of the time is a coincidence, but that seems fairly unlikely. That being said, I do not believe that science is absolutely right about everything.

The only point I was bringing about this is that despite the inaccuracies expressed through current and past religions, the simple fact that they got something wrong should have no bearing on whether or not the idea of God is wrong.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Thu, 27 Oct 2005 20:10:20 GMT

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

How did a topic that started with talk on intelligent design and evolution degenerate so fast into "God exists", "No he doesn't", "Yes, He does", "No, he doesn't"... Is it just a way of avoiding the issue?

So, back on topic for a sec: Evolution isn't a scientific theory, yet it's taught in schools. Intelligent Design is equally a hypothesis that has little to no testable evidence, so why not teach it as well? At least ID includes information that's more modern, whereas evolution is typically taught with information that is, at best, decades out of date. Honestly, I don't think either should be taught until college, at the earliest. Neither merits being taught to children, since there's no scientific experiments to support them.

But people never actually look at that stuff. Debates always seem to turn into one side saying "Evolution is a theory, not a fact", and the other saying "ID is religion, not science"

If you use the argument "Evolution is a theory, not a fact", you might as well concede the entire debate right there. A scientific theory is so well tested, it might as well be 'fact'. A real scientific theory is Einstein's General Relativity, evolution is a joke by comparison.

Then there's the people who say ID is religion, not science. Intelligent Design is a statistical analysis of scientific evidence that indicates things were designed with intent. It's essentially 'the scientific evidence of God'. It is approaching the whole issue of 'is there a God' from a scientific perspective. Whether you agree with the hypothesis or not you can't just dismiss it as 'religion'.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Thu, 27 Oct 2005 20:53:45 GMT

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

Doesn't the rabid dismissal of religion equate to religion itself?

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Thu, 27 Oct 2005 23:41:07 GMT

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

Everybody has a religion. That religion doesn't, necessarily, need to include supernatural beings that create and govern. Religion is a set of beliefs and morals on which a person relies for guidance- especially when the rules of society do not or can not apply.

Considering the vast number of religions all through history, all of which have claimed to represent the ultimate Truth, I just cannot subscribe to the belief that any one of them is in any way superior. Religions have a tendency to evolve and adapt to societies as they, in turn, grow and adapt. For all the millions of people that have believed in any one of today's major religions, there have been billions more that have not. It simply makes no sense to say ANYONE has the keys to the universe, let alone one faith in particular.

That said, it is unthinkable that so many billions of people could ALL be wrong. I propose that no one religion, no one set of beliefs has, or could ever have, all the answers.

On a related note, I highly doubt science will ever uncover the deepest mysteries of the universe, either. There's only so far back in history we can look back with our space telescopes and dating systems- and death remains a curtain beyond which we cannot see. The "Unknown" personified would be a Hydra- the more we discover, the smaller the sum total of our knowledge becomes (compared to the Truth, that being all knowledge that could ever be known).

I have a hard time believing that there ever was an absolute beginning of time, and I likewise cannot believe that there could ever be an ending. Likewise for life and death- for all its complexity, life cannot possibly end with the destruction of the shell of matter in which it is contained. What lies beyond bodily death, I could not begin to guess. Compared to the infinity that is existence, each person is the tiniest particle, an invisible speck with no influence whatsoever (and yet our power grows with each passing day). We can never know everything, because that "everything" will keep right on getting bigger and bigger, far faster than we will ever be able to learn.

When I say that I am an Atheist, I say so because I do not believe that there is one class of beings that is superior to all others- as I have said before, for every creation there is a creator- nothing can be wholly responsible for its own existence, for it could not exist if there was nothing there before it to set events in motion. Therefore, there is no such thing as a god in my mind. Only differing levels of forces that could be viewed as godlike when viewed by those of a vastly lower level.

And just to make one thing ABUNDANTLY clear, I have plenty of doubt in myself- I harbor no delusions of being some kind of prophet who can see everything while everyone else is blind. That would be hypocritical to an extreme, not to mention arrogant and stupid. It might very well be that I'm bound for Hell on the 6:00 express and don't even realize it- I just don't believe that to be the case.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Fri, 28 Oct 2005 05:58:03 GMT

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

NeoSaber wrote on Thu, 27 October 2005 16:10How did a topic that started with talk on intelligent design and evolution degenerate so fast into "God exists", "No he doesn't", "Yes, He does", "No, he doesn't"... Is it just a way of avoiding the issue?

So, back on topic for a sec: Evolution isn't a scientific theory, yet it's taught in schools. Intelligent Design is equally a hypothesis that has little to no testable evidence, so why not teach it as well? At least ID includes information that's more modern, whereas evolution is typically taught with information that is, at best, decades out of date. Honestly, I don't think either should be taught until college, at the earliest. Neither merits being taught to children, since there's no scientific experiments to support them.

But people never actually look at that stuff. Debates always seem to turn into one side saying "Evolution is a theory, not a fact", and the other saying "ID is religion, not science"

If you use the argument "Evolution is a theory, not a fact", you might as well concede the entire debate right there. A scientific theory is so well tested, it might as well be 'fact'. A real scientific theory is Einstein's General Relativity, evolution is a joke by comparison.

Then there's the people who say ID is religion, not science. Intelligent Design is a statistical analysis of scientific evidence that indicates things were designed with intent. It's essentially 'the scientific evidence of God'. It is approaching the whole issue of 'is there a God' from a scientific perspective. Whether you agree with the hypothesis or not you can't just dismiss it as 'religion'.

Hahahahaha

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Fri, 28 Oct 2005 07:02:36 GMT

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

That's about what I expected...

I was hoping someone would try to prove me wrong, expanding everyone's knowledge on the subject in the process. I should of known better...

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 28 Oct 2005 12:51:18 GMT

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

MrBob wrote on Thu, 27 October 2005 05:59So you accuse me of being brainwashed by quoting something to make an argument, yet you're quoting something to make an argument.

Strange...

That's where you're wrong. Knowing how I feel about the Bible and its origins makes it the single worst way to approach me on this subject. This is a summary of what you thought would happen:

Me: The bible is a book written by corrupt men and passed off as the word of some imaginary deity.

You: But the bible says there would be people like you who don't believe and are consequently EVIL.

Me: Oh, well, if the bible says that, it must be true. I believe in God now so you and the rest of the believers won't think I am evil!

Did you really expect quoting Bible passages would make me a believer?!

Quote:CrimsonI can't believe that so many people can't see that this "God" character is the perfect way to control you.

He's controlling me? The last time I checked, I still had free will. Yes, God tells us things to do, but it's our choice to listen.

That's NOT what I said, AGAIN you got it wrong. The concept of "God" is what controls you. Yes, you have free will. But if you decide you want to kill someone, there are consequences. However, if you kill someone and you're not caught (which I imagine was a lot more likely back in the days before forensic science and DNA testing) then you are essentially able to kill someone without any punishment whatsoever!

Even a fool can see that this is NO way to run a society! Not 2000 years ago when detective skills and sciences were primitive at BEST! So... what's the solution? Ah, yes, the "God" who can see everything. Just like a grown-up version of Santa Claus who sees you when you're sleeping and knows when you're awake. Sure, now if you kill someone and no one sees it or proves it, you get away scot free in this life, but NOW there's a greater punishment. Eternity in the flames of hell!

But oh no! No one will believe this story! Sure they will... they can't prove it's wrong because no one knows what happens when you die. So now we have this imaginary character we dreamed up and we'll make sure that "he" told some guy how we humans are supposed to behave and act so

that we will be forever fearful of eternal punishment.

Quote:Crimson

I feel like this outside observer watching this manipulation on a grand scale and I sit here shaking my head at how easily people are indoctrinated from birth and just filled with this unprovable and high implausible STORY. You will NEVER convince me to fall for this bullshit EVER...

Because you are so wise...

Well, all I can say is that I was given the advantage of growing up without going to church. Many/most people are brought to church or at least raised with the "existence" of "God" from birth. If you are taught from birth that this deity exists and what he wants you to do, etc, then you are controlled. You live in fear of eternal punishment and you're more likely to behave even when no one is watching.

Like I said, the biggest manipulation the world has ever known.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 28 Oct 2005 12:57:07 GMT

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

If you want to think of it on a smaller scale, look at shows like Cops, CSI, etc. Every time you watch them you get it drilled into your head that if you fuck up, the cops will find you and bring you down. Sometimes they even SAY it directly. No one ever gets away with anything on TV. This is exactly the same type of influence that this "God" concept is supposed to have on you.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Goztow](#) on Fri, 28 Oct 2005 13:52:50 GMT

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

Crimson wrote on Fri, 28 October 2005 08:57 If you want to think of it on a smaller scale, look at shows like Cops, CSI, etc. Every time you watch them you get it drilled into your head that if you fuck up, the cops will find you and bring you down. Sometimes they even SAY it directly. No one ever gets away with anything on TV. This is exactly the same type of influence that this "God" concept is supposed to have on you.

Somehow, i think you're afraid of things you don't understand.

I see on TV that cops always get the bandits but I know damn well that hardly ever happens in real life.

Never go into a discussion like this with women though... you can't win... Nothing personal.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Oblivion165](#) on Fri, 28 Oct 2005 14:24:49 GMT

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

Aircraftkiller wrote on Thu, 27 October 2005 16:53Doesn't the rabid dismissal of religion equate to religion itself?

No.

The dismissal of all religion doesnt equal religion. Thats like saying "Taking away all the apples equals apples."

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Fri, 28 Oct 2005 15:13:51 GMT

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

Even if the dismissal of religion is done in such a way that the ideas and beliefs used to dismiss it are just like the religion(s) being dismissed; or if the dismissal is so fanatic and rabid that it's just as religious as the religion being dismissed?

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [MrBob](#) on Fri, 28 Oct 2005 15:53:08 GMT

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

Crimson wrote on Fri, 28 October 2005 08:51MrBob wrote on Thu, 27 October 2005 05:59So you accuse me of being brainwashed by quoting something to make an argument, yet you're quoting something to make an argument.

Strange...

That's where you're wrong. Knowing how I feel about the Bible and its origins makes it the single worst way to approach me on this subject.

Knowing how I feel about "godless geeks" makes it the single worst way to approach me on this subject.

CrimsonDid you really expect quoting Bible passages would make me a believer?!

Did you really expect quoting a bullshit list would make me a nonbeliever?

CrimsonI can't believe that so many people can't see that this "God" character is the perfect way to control you.

That's NOT what I said, AGAIN you got it wrong. The concept of "God" is what controls you. Yes, you have free will. But if you decide you want to kill someone, there are consequences. However, if you kill someone and you're not caught (which I imagine was a lot more likely back in the days

before forensic science and DNA testing) then you are essentially able to kill someone without any punishment whatsoever!

Even a fool can see that this is NO way to run a society! Not 2000 years ago when detective skills and sciences were primitive at BEST! So... what's the solution? Ah, yes, the "God" who can see everything. Just like a grown-up version of Santa Claus who sees you when you're sleeping and knows when you're awake. Sure, now if you kill someone and no one sees it or proves it, you get away scot free in this life, but NOW there's a greater punishment. Eternity in the flames of hell!

A "concept" for fear didn't free me from pornography addiction, nor did it assist me in casting off hatred. As I said before, I still have free will. I still had to make the choice to be free. Not because of fear for eternal punishment, but to be closer with God and follow Him. You see, I love God. There is no fear in love (1 John 4:1). Therefore, I don't fear God. (Yes, I used the Bible as a source again--sue me)

Fear doesn't drive me, love does. If you still want to continue the way you're going, I'll still love you. If you ban me from the forums, I'll still love you. If you sent the mophia to try to kill me (These are just examples, Jesus used the same technique), I'd still love you. I even love Osama bin Laden. This is why people take so much offense with what Jesus taught. They're not willing to lay down their pride and change their lives. My earlier posts may have sounded like I hated you (I hope not), but sometimes you have to be hard. Being nice isn't always the way of love.

If you were only willing to read the Bible and see what Jesus really said, and what he really did, and who he really was, instead of looking at Christendom. Paul wrote there are people preaching another Jesus (2 Corinthians 11:3-5). If you really search and open up you'll see what he meant.

I probably should've realized that you've never grown up in a "church". I was blessed enough to grow up in an environment where people really love God, and aren't full of hypocrisy and deceit. I've been to other "churches" before, and I can understand why people hate them so much. Those places with the high ceilings leave such an empty feeling. Instead of focusing on love, they focus on things of the world. It's a shame that these institutions drive people away from God (It's not unintentional, either). I know they're places that aren't like that, but they're few. I hope and pray that you'll find a place that is truly for and with God.

Anyway, if you skimmed through this post, don't. It took me awhile (55 min) to write this, many people would just walk away or insult you. I expect you to read into this. Things aren't always what they seem to be. I can't force you to do anything, neither will God, but remember that He loves you.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 28 Oct 2005 15:57:25 GMT

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

Quote:Well, all I can say is that I was given the advantage of growing up without going to church. Many/most people are brought to church or at least raised with the "existence" of "God" from birth. If you are taught from birth that this deity exists and what he wants you to do, etc, then you are controlled. You live in fear of eternal punishment and you're more likely to behave even when no

one is watching.

Not always so. Perhaps with some people yes. However, there are many people who take what they know and choose to believe, such as me. I don't do it because I fear eternal punishment, nor do I behave in private because I feel God is watching me.

I believe in God because I believe it is the right thing to do. I choose the Catholic religion because I believe they have the better understanding of the idea of God (the practice of the faith is a different question...), even though it is, in my opinion, not 100% correct.

I behave in private, not for fear of being caught doing something wrong (by some omnipresent being, or otherwise), but because it is the right thing to do. It is my own choice, not brought about by any reasoning other than it is the right thing to do.

Edit: just to touch on something that Mrbob stated, as he wrote that while I was writing mine.

Keep in mind that "love thy neighbour" does not mean you have to like them. So before the accusations that he LIKES Osama Bin Laden start, keep that in mind. You can "love" someone without liking them, or supporting what they do.

This isn't an accurate depiction of it, but to use it as an example: If any of you have been in a fight with a loved one, I'm sure you know what I'm talking about. You may not like them at that particular moment of the fight, but you still love them.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 28 Oct 2005 23:42:59 GMT

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

Well see, now you're interpreting that my disbelief in a "god" makes me evil. I am far from evil. My personal motto is "do no harm". When I do something (usually), I ask myself if what I want to do will harm someone. I just don't need "God" to tell me how to act.

And I didn't skim your post. I have already explored belief and found no evidence to support it. It all seems a little too Pascal's Wager for me. Of all the gods that mankind has worshipped over the centuries, I just believe in one less than you do. And once you understand why you don't believe in the other gods, maybe you'll begin to understand why I don't believe in yours.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sat, 29 Oct 2005 00:54:25 GMT

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

For not being able to convince each other of anything, you sure make a fuss over nothing.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [PointlessAmbler](#) on Sun, 30 Oct 2005 07:07:07 GMT

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

NeoSaber wrote on Thu, 27 October 2005 16:10 How did a topic that started with talk on intelligent design and evolution degenerate so fast into "God exists", "No he doesn't", "Yes, He does", "No, he doesn't"... Is it just a way of avoiding the issue?

So, back on topic for a sec: Evolution isn't a scientific theory, yet it's taught in schools. Intelligent Design is equally a hypothesis that has little to no testable evidence, so why not teach it as well? At least ID includes information that's more modern, whereas evolution is typically taught with information that is, at best, decades out of date. Honestly, I don't think either should be taught until college, at the earliest. Neither merits being taught to children, since there's no scientific experiments to support them.

But people never actually look at that stuff. Debates always seem to turn into one side saying "Evolution is a theory, not a fact", and the other saying "ID is religion, not science"

If you use the argument "Evolution is a theory, not a fact", you might as well concede the entire debate right there. A scientific theory is so well tested, it might as well be 'fact'. A real scientific theory is Einstein's General Relativity, evolution is a joke by comparison.

Then there's the people who say ID is religion, not science. Intelligent Design is a statistical analysis of scientific evidence that indicates things were designed with intent. It's essentially 'the scientific evidence of God'. It is approaching the whole issue of 'is there a God' from a scientific perspective. Whether you agree with the hypothesis or not you can't just dismiss it as 'religion'.

It's nice to know someone actually knows the definition of a scientific theory.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sun, 30 Oct 2005 12:12:06 GMT

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

I stated the definition of a scientific theory on page 2.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Mon, 31 Oct 2005 07:02:02 GMT

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

Yeah, let's go back to that quote for a sec...

Crimson wrote on Sun, 23 October 2005 20:19(emphasis mine)
"Mark Thomas" It's important to remember that the term "theory" in science is not the same as it is in general usage. A scientific theory is a unifying concept that explains a large body of data. It is a hypothesis that has withstood the test of time and the challenge of opposing views.

The Theory of Evolution is the basic unifying concept of biology. The CEO of The American Association for the Advancement of Science, Alan Leshner, wrote, "Although scientists may debate details of the mechanisms of evolution, there is no argument among scientists as to whether evolution is taking place." The National Academy of Sciences, the nation's most prestigious scientific organization, has declared evolution "one of the strongest and most useful scientific theories we have," and notes that evolution is supported by an overwhelming scientific consensus. The Theory of Evolution has as much validity as the theory of gravity, atomic theory, or the germ theory of disease.

Your quote generalizes the most important part of a theory in order to ignore its true definition. A theory requires experimentation. Its not a hypothesis that withstood the test of time, its a hypothesis that withstood the test of science.

It doesn't matter whether or not scientists agree on something, it matters whether or not science itself, the experimentally verified data, agrees on something. 'Piltdown Man' was a huge hoax that lasted for decades because scientists only 'tested' the bones with their hypothesis that a human ancestor would look like that. There was no argument among scientists that its was the 'missing link' and other real discoveries were ignored because they didn't fit the preconceived 'theory'. When someone actually bothered to do a real test, it was shown to be an obvious forgery. One that should never have been allowed to happen. These days man made global warming is starting to get passed off as a theory because 'everyone agrees'.

When it comes to evolution, finding fossils is observation, and explaining them is hypothesis. Finding more fossils is more observation. Predicting finding fossils is predicting observation. What is the scientific test used to determine that the fossils are actually what people think they are? What is used to test the fossil to show it is an earlier/later evolutionary stage of an animal in question?

When they've come up with real tests for bones, the hypothesis that led to the tests have, at times, been falsified. Neanderthals were once considered evolutionary ancestors of humans. This was based solely on the way their remains looked. When science reached the point that these remains could be genetically tested, it was discovered they are not human ancestors. Their DNA was too different from ours. The hypothesis based on the 'look' of the bones was wrong. This only happened a few years ago. How can evolution be a hypothesis that withstood the 'test of time' if its ideas get thrown out the window, in present day, when real scientific testing is done? The fossil record can't be used as evidence for a theory. It only supports a hypothesis.

Then there's "Natural Selection", the one idea of Darwin's that has actually withstood to this day. Natural selection comes after evolution, to kill off the weak and let the strong, or better adapted, survive. Evolution has to already have occurred for natural selection to be effective, and any idea on where animals come from can incorporate this. If animals were all artificially assembled in an alien lab and then placed on earth, natural selection would still occur. All natural selection does for evolution is not outright dismiss the concept.

Theories on gravity and atoms are actually experimentally tested and verified through those tests, that's how they became real theories. (Interesting side note: theories on gravity, aka General Relativity, and theories on atoms, aka Quantum Physics, actually contradict each other and claim the other is impossible, yet both are accurate about their subject). Experiments with light particles

and super colliders are used in atomic theory. Experiments with space travel are used in gravitational theories.

A scientific theory must be falsifiable. There has to be a repeatable test that can be done that will show it's right. A theory must have these tests or it's simply a belief and might as well be classified as philosophy.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Mon, 31 Oct 2005 10:38:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

who ever thought that a topic this long could have been stemmed from a pasta monster who flies?

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [Javafx](#) on Mon, 31 Oct 2005 13:12:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

NeoSaber wrote on Mon, 31 October 2005 02:02
A scientific theory must be falsifiable. There has to be a repeatable test that can be done that will show it's right. A theory must have these tests or it's simply a belief and might as well be classified as philosophy.

Just remember though, the very science used to falsify must be, in turn, falsifiable. It's a slippery slope that ultimately defines all science as accepted philosophy.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Mon, 31 Oct 2005 15:27:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

NeoSaber wrote on Mon, 31 October 2005 02:02Yeah, let's go back to that quote for a sec...

Crimson wrote on Sun, 23 October 2005 20:19(emphasis mine)
"Mark Thomas" It's important to remember that the term "theory" in science is not the same as it is in general usage. A scientific theory is a unifying concept that explains a large body of data. It is a hypothesis that has withstood the test of time and the challenge of opposing views. The Theory of Evolution is the basic unifying concept of biology. The CEO of The American Association for the Advancement of Science, Alan Leshner, wrote, "Although scientists may debate details of the mechanisms of evolution, there is no argument among scientists as to whether evolution is taking place." The National Academy of Sciences, the nation's most prestigious scientific organization, has declared evolution "one of the strongest and most useful scientific theories we have," and notes that evolution is supported by an overwhelming scientific consensus. The Theory of Evolution has as much validity as the theory of gravity, atomic theory, or the germ theory of disease.

Your quote generalizes the most important part of a theory in order to ignore its true definition. A theory requires experimentation. Its not a hypothesis that withstood the test of time, its a hypothesis that withstood the test of science.

It doesn't matter whether or not scientists agree on something, it matters whether or not science itself, the experimentally verified data, agrees on something. 'Piltdown Man' was a huge hoax that lasted for decades because scientists only 'tested' the bones with their hypothesis that a human ancestor would look like that. There was no argument among scientists that its was the 'missing link' and other real discoveries were ignored because they didn't fit the preconceived 'theory'. When someone actually bothered to do a real test, it was shown to be an obvious forgery. One that should never have been allowed to happen. These days man made global warming is starting to get passed off as a theory because 'everyone agrees'.

When it comes to evolution, finding fossils is observation, and explaining them is hypothesis. Finding more fossils is more observation. Predicting finding fossils is predicting observation. What is the scientific test used to determine that the fossils are actually what people think they are? What is used to test the fossil to show it is an earlier/later evolutionary stage of an animal in question?

When they've come up with real tests for bones, the hypothesis that led to the tests have, at times, been falsified. Neanderthals were once considered evolutionary ancestors of humans. This was based solely on the way their remains looked. When science reached the point that these remains could be genetically tested, it was discovered they are not human ancestors. Their DNA was too different from ours. The hypothesis based on the 'look' of the bones was wrong. This only happened a few years ago. How can evolution be a hypothesis that withstood the 'test of time' if its ideas get thrown out the window, in present day, when real scientific testing is done? The fossil record can't be used as evidence for a theory. It only supports a hypothesis.

Then there's "Natural Selection", the one idea of Darwin's that has actually withstood to this day. Natural selection comes after evolution, to kill off the weak and let the strong, or better adapted, survive. Evolution has to already have occurred for natural selection to be effective, and any idea on where animals come from can incorporate this. If animals were all artificially assembled in an alien lab and then placed on earth, natural selection would still occur. All natural selection does for evolution is not outright dismiss the concept.

Theories on gravity and atoms are actually experimentally tested and verified through those tests, that's how they became real theories. (Interesting side note: theories on gravity, aka General Relativity, and theories on atoms, aka Quantum Physics, actually contradict each other and claim the other is impossible, yet both are accurate about their subject). Experiments with light particles and super colliders are used in atomic theory. Experiments with space travel are used in gravitational theories.

A scientific theory must be falsifiable. There has to be a repeatable test that can be done that will show it's right. A theory must have these tests or it's simply a belief and might as well be classified as philosophy.

It's pretty difficult to prove evolution using experiments, considering the time-frame that would be necessary. This is not to say, however, that there is no empirical evidence for evolution. And

Darwin did provide a way to prove evolution wrong, just so you know.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 31 Oct 2005 16:07:03 GMT

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

Keep this in mind.

Empirical evidence is nothing but a belief itself. One that attempts to predict the future, nonetheless. It happened a certain way through experiments in the past, so that means it must hold true for instances in the future. For science apparently being incompatible with a belief structure, it's strange that so much emphasis is placed on it.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Mon, 31 Oct 2005 16:17:15 GMT

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

I believe it's more incompatible with certain belief structures, rather than a belief structure in general.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 31 Oct 2005 16:58:41 GMT

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

If you have a couple hours, read THIS. If you close the page before getting to the end of all the chapters, you will have proven to yourself that you do NOT have an open mind.

<http://whydoesgodhateamputees.com/>

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 31 Oct 2005 19:49:59 GMT

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

oh? and I suppose reading all that junk means you've somehow bettered yourself?

The Bible mentions slavery, THEREFOR IT SUPPORTS IT!

Give me a break.

By that logic, Crimson has talked about others using cheats, THEREFOR SHE SUPPORTS THEM!

Same logic, therefore it can not be disputed, correct?

I also found this amusing:

Quote: Not only does God condone slavery, but here God places a value on slaves -- 30 shekels of silver. Note that God is not sophisticated enough to understand the concept of inflation. It is now 3,000 years later, and a gored slave is still worth 30 shekels of silver according to God's word.

Highly entertaining. It must mean something that because a book has not been changed, that whatever in it must account for things that happen after it! Amazing!

Give me a break.

Things written in the bible are there because they existed at the time the bible was written.

Once again, the humour carries on.

Quote: There really is no middle ground. The Bible has to be an all-or-nothing book. Either the entire Bible came from God, or none of it did.

Except, perhaps the idea of free will, or did the writer of this forget about this little idea?

Quote: God is all-powerful. Therefore, God can do anything, and regenerating a leg is trivial.

God is perfect, and he created the Bible, which is his perfect book. In the Bible, Jesus makes very specific statements about the power of prayer. Since Jesus is God, and God and the Bible are perfect, those statements should be true and accurate.

God is all-knowing and all-loving. He certainly knows about the plight of the amputee, and he loves this amputee very much.

God answers prayers. If he is answering millions of other prayers like Jeanna's every day, God should be answering the prayers of amputees too.

God has no reason to discriminate against amputees.

God is ready and willing to answer your prayers no matter how big or small. All that you have to do is believe. He says it in multiple places in the Bible. Surely, with millions of people in the prayer circle, at least one of them will believe and the prayer will be answered.

Gasp! Not every single prayer in the world is answered! God must be false!

Or, perhaps, he does not think that the person NEEDS assistance?

Here's a little experiment. Go make billions of dollars and have a kid. Then, give that kid everything they want, do everything that kid asks you to do, and get that kid out of every bit of trouble that he/she may get in.

I await your answer that this kid will turn out perfect.

I did not read all of it, because it all says pretty much the same thing. "God doesn't exist, because the Christian Religion is not perfect".

I DARE you to call me close minded.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Mon, 31 Oct 2005 21:33:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Crimson wrote on Mon, 31 October 2005 11:58If you have a couple hours, read THIS. If you close the page before getting to the end of all the chapters, you will have proven to yourself that you do NOT have an open mind.

<http://whydoesgodhateamputees.com/>

Firstly, I agree very much with a lot of the information described on that site (I've only read about half of it thus far).

Secondly, the concept of God as a being described by the Bible, and basing your belief of His non-existence on that alone is *very* closed minded. I have nothing wrong with you harping about how the Bible is inconsistent (because I think it is too), but I do have a problem with the idea that God cannot exist because the Bible is inconsistent.

I would agree with you when you say not to follow the morals of the Bible to the letter-- because I, like you, probably find them to be senseless in many cases. Many more cases I'm sure you'd agree, do make coherent sense. Don't steal, don't murder, and so on. I like those morals, and I would prefer to live in a society that works with them.

The ancient Greeks were able to rationalize a world without any gods, while other ancient Greeks were able to rationalize a world that consisted of at least a single arche. I personally find the latter to be more reasonable. Whether or not we all get a big juicy reward at the end is another story, but I would very much maintain that God exists even if He is wrongly documented in an ambiguous book of prophecy that is either self-validating or considered proven after the fact. Which is pretty interesting, because Christians have this annoying habit of dismissing phophets like Nostradamus for doing the exact same thing they do-- validating events after the matter of fact.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 31 Oct 2005 22:30:46 GMT

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

I'm only on Chapter 7 by now and I continue to be fascinated at the accuracy of this "book" in mirroring the thoughts I've had as long as I can remember.

The Bible does a bit more than "mention" slavery, it in fact condones it as far as beating your slave within an inch of his/her life.

But I sure as FUCK do not base my atheism on the bible. Especially because I never read the dumb thing in the first place! Simply put, I feel ZERO connection with a nameless deity. I feel ZERO willingness to pray to someone/thing who MAY or MAY NOT exist. There is NO evidence to suggest a deity exists at all to me. I see beyond the religion to the part of humans that latches onto this concept. From this vantage point there is no way to go into this valley of 'believers'.

If you grew up every day of your life "knowing" there's a "God" and whatnot, then I don't know if there will ever be help for you. I truly pity those who can't even fathom the possibility that this "God" character is a big fat lie and explore it.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 01 Nov 2005 01:17:08 GMT

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

First, I must congratulate you. That link was of such absurdity, it got even me arguing redundant points.

That aside though, I have yet to see even one shred of proof that "God" doesn't exist. All that has been provided is instances where, perhaps, a particular religion may have got it wrong. (Slavery thing aside, because the concepts of what we consider to be slavery varies greatly from the Hebrew and Roman style of slavery -do some research the next time you want to argue something like this)

Quote:If you grew up every day of your life "knowing" there's a "God" and whatnot, then I don't know if there will ever be help for you. I truly pity those who can't even fathom the possibility that this "God" character is a big fat lie and explore it.

Never ONCE did I claim I "knew" if God existed. I find it interesting, though, how you claim to "know" otherwise. You hve no proof that there is no such thing as a "God", yet you claim to "know" that he doesn't exist.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Tue, 01 Nov 2005 01:19:43 GMT

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

A college professor of mine described religion in past civilizations as the unseen authority that

kept them together. An interesting perspective I thought.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Tue, 01 Nov 2005 03:22:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

That sounds very close to my own beliefs. If nothing else, I do have to applaud the good things that religion brings people. I do understand why some people need to have this imaginary friend in their lives.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 01 Nov 2005 03:34:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Prove they're imaginary

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [YSLMuffins](#) on Tue, 01 Nov 2005 03:59:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Aircraftkiller wrote on Thu, 27 October 2005 15:53Doesn't the rabid dismissal of religion equate to religion itself?

YES! This may not be what you were intending, but I wish more people would see how often science and religion overstep each other's boundaries. Religion masquerading as science is just as stupid as science trying to impose a belief system on religion. The two ideologies are completely different, but that doesn't mean they aren't complementary. They're just two microscopes in the same pair of binoculars used to gaze upon the same question.

I don't think it should be a paradox or an oxymoron to be a person of both science and faith.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 01 Nov 2005 04:57:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

and, it's quite easy to accomplish both.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 01 Nov 2005 05:24:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Crimson wrote on Mon, 31 October 2005 16:30 I'm only on Chapter 7 by now and I continue to be fascinated at the accuracy of this "book" in mirroring the thoughts I've had as long as I can remember.

The Bible does a bit more than "mention" slavery, it in fact condones it as far as beating your slave within an inch of his/her life.

But I sure as FUCK do not base my atheism on the bible. Especially because I never read the dumb thing in the first place! Simply put, I feel ZERO connection with a nameless deity. I feel ZERO willingness to pray to someone/thing who MAY or MAY NOT exist. There is NO evidence to suggest a deity exists at all to me. I see beyond the religion to the part of humans that latches onto this concept. From this vantage point there is no way to go into this valley of 'believers'.

If you grew up every day of your life "knowing" there's a "God" and whatnot, then I don't know if there will ever be help for you. I truly pity those who can't even fathom the possibility that this "God" character is a big fat lie and explore it.

Interestingly enough, I was just discussing this subject with Joey.

Why is it always that because someone can't simply understand something, therefore it must be false? This reminds me of the 2000 election. Liberals can't simply understand how Bush won, so they write it off as incorrect and some type of "rigging" went on to ensure that Bush won the Presidency.

Also, why is it because there's no proof that something, it automatically "proves" that it "doesn't" exist? I don't understand why many people think this. This ideal has been proven wrong so many times.

Here's an example: Many thought that the atom was the smallest thing, that nothing could be broken up any more. It wasn't accepted that there were protons, neutrons, and electrons, but that didn't stop it from being true, did it? Nope, now it's KNOWN that protons, neutrons, and electrons do in fact exist. Now we're finding evidence that quarks exist.

Also, read through the whole thing before you start making judgements on it and its validity. As warranto said, slavery was different back in the ancient world, not to mention that the Old Testament is what we call the "Old Covenant". It's what God had with the Isrealites and nobody else. This was scrapped when Christ died on the cross creating the "New Covenant" which Gold has with everybody. With the old covenant you could have more than one wife, have slaves, etc...

I can fathom God or any other diety existing, but there's so much evidence pointing to intelligent design, it's not even funny. It's just up to people to accept it.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Tue, 01 Nov 2005 07:29:45 GMT

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

Where is this evidence? Because from what I've read, science has figured out the beginning of the universe down to a billionth of a billionth of a second after the big bang.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Tue, 01 Nov 2005 13:38:58 GMT

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

Quote:Negative proof

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia.

Jump to: navigation, search

The fallacy of appealing to lack of proof of the negative is a type of logical fallacy of the following form:

"This exists because there is no proof that it does not exist."

Non-fallacious ways to prove something include the use of logical syllogisms and/or the incorporation of empirical observations. But it is not logical to argue that something exists simply because there is no proof to the contrary; one cannot say, "No one has proven that aliens do not exist. Therefore, based on that alone, they must exist, notwithstanding that I have no evidence that they do exist". Given (as it is above) that it was not proven that aliens do not exist, they might exist, but this alone does not prove them to exist.

Another common example is that, "A supernatural force must exist because there is no proof that it does not exist". However, the converse is also true, according to the Argument from Ignorance: One also cannot say that, "I have not seen proof that something supernatural exists, therefore a supernatural force cannot exist". Also, similar to the aliens in the above example, since no proof is available that this does not exist, it might exist, but this alone does not prove it to exist.

Here's another one for ya:

Quote:Argument from ignorance

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia.

(Redirected from Argument from Ignorance)

Jump to: navigation, search

The argument from ignorance, also known as argumentum ad ignorantiam or argument by lack of imagination, is the assertion that if something is currently inexplicable to some people, then it did not (or could not) happen, or that if evidence of something has not been scientifically proven to their satisfaction, then it cannot exist. "Absence of evidence is not evidence of absence" is an adage used to explain that one's own "ignorance" (or, one's "absence of evidence") does not disprove anything (or, "is not absence of evidence"). In other words, mere personal belief, poor logic, or closed-mindedness masquerading as certainty is not logical.

This is similar to (but not the same as) the Argument from Personal Incredulity (also known as Argument from Personal Belief or Argument from Personal Conviction), where a person asserts that because they personally find a premise unlikely or unbelievable, it can be safely assumed not to be true.

Aside from that, though, let me ask you, what happened a second before the billionth of a billionth of a second after the Big Bang? Did all the matter concentrated at that one point exist, or did it appear out of nothing (which science has proven cannot happen)? What caused it to explode in the first place? What was the cause of that cause? What was the cause of the cause of that cause, and so on infinitely if nothing outside the physical laws of this world exists?

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Tue, 01 Nov 2005 15:15:18 GMT

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

Even if some "god" or some mouse or some pigeon caused the "big bang", it still doesn't match your little creationism aka ID theory.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Tue, 01 Nov 2005 16:03:51 GMT

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

Whether or not it matches is irrelevant, all you're doing is trolling (I never thought I'd have to actually tell Crimson this on her own forum) for responses. You're obviously not out for debate on the subject of God, you already made up your mind; as far as I can tell the only thing you're doing now is writing one liners that say "God doesn't exist" so that someone will come along and entertain you.

You don't believe, that's fine. You don't want to search for proof, that's fine too. We'll all find out who was wrong and who was right when we die, anyway.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Parad0x](#) on Tue, 01 Nov 2005 16:26:12 GMT

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

warranto wrote on Tue, 01 November 2005 03:34 Prove they're imaginary

Prove they aren't imaginary?

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 01 Nov 2005 17:21:14 GMT

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

Whether or not "God" is the one and only superior being, it's quite obvious that there is, infact, some higher power. Look at the world around you. You just suppose that all this came to be by CHANCE? We're somehow to believe that an explosion created the prime conditions to spawn life? A perfect atmosphere to sustain life? Spherical celestial objects? That by the process of evolution, a man and a woman came to be? That the penis and vagina just happened to form to be used as instruments to spawn offspring? That the elements and how they combine with each other is some fluke? The intricacy of the atom. How protons, neutrons, and electrons combine to create the elements? This was obviously thought of, planned out, and executed. The beauty and intricacy of the universe is too perfect to have been brought about by some random explosion in the universe. Believe what you will, but this is so obvious to me, I laugh at how people can just ignore it simply because they refuse to believe in a higher power.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Tue, 01 Nov 2005 17:36:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

j_ball430 wrote on Tue, 01 November 2005 12:21 Whether or not "God" is the one and only superior being, it's quite obvious that there is, infact, some higher power. Look at the world around you. You just suppose that all this came to be by CHANCE?

Pretty much. And don't worry, atheists are laughing at you too.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [Parad0x](#) on Tue, 01 Nov 2005 17:40:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If i were to say i was a higher being, you would not beleive me, and ask where is the proof, but where is the proof i am not?

Whether you choose to believe in a God or a higher being, science has been proven as Crimson mentioned, what happened before that is just theories and what people choose to believe.

The perfect atmosphere to sustain life you mention means you dont beleive in other forms of life. Any other planet could be a perfect atmosphere to sustain a different life form.

If God or this higher power is infact real, why is this "perfect" world for us not so perfect?

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Tue, 01 Nov 2005 18:35:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Crimson wrote on Mon, 31 October 2005 11:58 If you have a couple hours, read THIS. If you close the page before getting to the end of all the chapters, you will have proven to yourself that you do NOT have an open mind.

<http://whydoesgodhateamputees.com/>

I haven't had much time to read this, so I've only gotten through 4 or 5 chapters, but something is becoming increasingly obvious the more I read: this guy is the Michael Moore of atheism. He keeps pulling out quotes (which he doesn't really cite properly to begin with), attaches crazy ideas I doubt he even believes, and then before readers have a chance to think for themselves, he attempts to steer them into one of two bullshit conclusions. (One of which he knows the reader will reject, but is only there to make the other conclusion seem acceptable by comparison.)

He tries to twist reality and keep people from thinking for themselves about the evidence. He constantly tries to demean and belittle people who may think different in an attempt to drive more people to accept his propaganda, after all how many people will stand there and be laughed at

when they can just go along with the crowd. Needing to rely on insults like this just reveals how weak his position really is.

Even the title of this book is something I'd expect from Michael Moore. It's designed to imprint a suggestion on the reader's mind. If it were in any way 'fair', it would have been written "Does God hate amputees?". By starting off with "Why does God hate amputees?", it's jumping to the conclusion that he does hate them, and hoping to drag the reader into that prejudged conclusion.

Everything I've read so far has him taking an extreme position, in hopes that even the 'fair, open-minded person' will get caught in a trap of trying to compromise between two views. This is done so that the person gets drawn to the position he really wants them to be at while making them think they have come to a 'fair' compromise. By essentially making someone lie to themselves, it makes the twisted reality all the more difficult to realize and correct.

He is so transparent it isn't even funny. How blind does a person have to be to accept what this guy is saying?

Crimson wrote on Mon, 31 October 2005 17:30The Bible does a bit more than "mention" slavery, it in fact condones it as far as beating your slave within an inch of his/her life.

Crimson wrote on Mon, 31 October 2005 17:30But I sure as FUCK do not base my atheism on the bible. Especially because I never read the dumb thing in the first place!

Oh... I guess I have my answer...

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 01 Nov 2005 20:38:10 GMT

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

mrpirate wrote on Tue, 01 November 2005 11:36j_ball430 wrote on Tue, 01 November 2005 12:21Whether or not "God" is the one and only superior being, it's quite obvious that there is, infact, some higher power. Look at the world around you. You just suppose that all this came to be by CHANCE?

Pretty much. And don't worry, atheists are laughing at you too.

That's fine because I'm laughing right back at them.

We can easily disprove your claim of being a higher being. We have the means to do it. However, we don't have the means to prove that God doesn't exist. We also don't have the means to prove that he does, either.

Science can't "prove" anything if they're not physically there to observe it. They can't take into account the phenomenons or any other event that could throw off their data. They can only make estimates on their ideas by using constants. There are plenty of variables unaccounted for in their

observations.

Of course, I don't. Besides, no other planet in our solar system is capable of sustaining life as we know it.

Because WE are destroying His creation. His creation was perfect. It's sin that ruined it all for us.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Wed, 02 Nov 2005 00:41:25 GMT

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

Parad0x wrote on Tue, 01 November 2005 12:40 If i were to say i was a higher being, you would not beleive me, and ask where is the proof, but where is the proof i am not?
If I'm not mistaken, it's kind of impossible to prove a negative.

Anyways, you would have to prove that you're a god; you simply saying it does not make it true, and it is not up to us to disprove it.

Crimson Even if some "god" or some mouse or some pigeon caused the "big bang", it still doesn't match your little creationism aka ID theory.

Where did I say I supported the theory of Intelligent Design?

You're putting words into my mouth; you're also not confronting what I said and are simply trying to get a stir out of Christians, thus proving Aircraftkiller right.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Sniper_De7](#) on Wed, 02 Nov 2005 00:47:21 GMT

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

it only seems so much "perfect" to us because given what can only be seen in our solar system, we cannot begin to realize what the possibilities are. Seeing as WE are in the position to recognize that there is life here shows how remote the chances seem to be that no where else can there sustain life. From our point of view it would only seem impossible that life can exist anywhere else. But given infinity possibilities for life to occur elsewhere one can't just distinguish the fact that it's possible. Sure, it might be that we may be the most advanced out of life out there. I mean if we absolutely knew there was life somewhere else. Wouldn't it seem more conclusive that it's possible for life to exist without the help of a higher power? The very fact that the universe being as big and large as it is, means that life could exist given another chance like Earth does. We know that Earth is an extreme case, and the fact we know this is the very reason that it is one. The biggest thing i don't see why people rely on is that the universe is huge perhaps even unlimited. The odds for life out of infinity does not seem so ridiculous. The only problem is that seeing as how small the chances for life are, we will probably never see it before something happens to us first.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Wed, 02 Nov 2005 06:42:18 GMT

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

Look, if some dude 2000 years ago was born here on earth and said he was God, I WANT SOME DAMN PROOF! Believing in a higher power takes a shitload of faith that I don't give out freely just because other people say "he's" out there. You guys grew up and stopped believing in Santa, now it's time to go the next step.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Wed, 02 Nov 2005 06:44:52 GMT

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

You're still dodging us.

We'd prefer it if you'd directly address Neosaber's, my, or Aircraftkiller's points since we all responded directly to what you have said. Or, if you like, you can respond to what J_Ball said, even though he didn't direct it toward you.

C'mon, Crimson, this isn't like you.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Wed, 02 Nov 2005 06:47:15 GMT

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

Not exactly sure what I'm supposed to reply to here...

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Wed, 02 Nov 2005 06:52:52 GMT

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

Hydra*insert wikipedia quotations*

Aside from that, though, let me ask you, what happened a second before the billionth of a billionth of a second after the Big Bang? Did all the matter concentrated at that one point exist....

AircraftkillerWhether or not it matches is irrelevant, all you're doing is trolling (I never thought I'd have to actually tell Crimson this on her own forum) for responses....

NeosaberI haven't had much time to read this, so I've only gotten through 4 or 5 chapters, but something is becoming increasingly obvious the more I read: this guy is the Michael Moore of atheism....

You can read the full posts further up on the previous page; I just did this to highlight the ones directly challenging your statements.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Wed, 02 Nov 2005 07:31:05 GMT

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

Hydra wrote on Tue, 01 November 2005 23:52Hydra*insert wikipedia quotations*

Aside from that, though, let me ask you, what happened a second before the billionth of a billionth of a second after the Big Bang? Did all the matter concentrated at that one point exist....

That's a good question. I wonder about that, too. I hope I might have the answer in my lifetime. I don't see how me not knowing the answer to this question is supposed to make me believe in God though.

AircraftkillerWhether or not it matches is irrelevant, all you're doing is trolling (I never thought I'd have to actually tell Crimson this on her own forum) for responses....

I wouldn't call it trolling for responses. It is always fascinating to me to watch how people respond to things, whether it's seeing someone who doesn't believe in what they believe, or whether I make a certain move in a poker game. Religion aside, I have been very interested in quantum theory lately and it's interesting to see the behaviors and thoughts that become so natural and conditioned to us. There's a saying in the Catholic Church: "Give me a child before the age of 5 and I'll make it a Catholic for life." It's fascinating how I was never really exposed to God in a church, but merely as motherly mentions of heaven and such. It gives me a very different view of religions and beliefs in higher beings than someone who was taken to church on Sunday for their entire lives.

NeosaberI haven't had much time to read this, so I've only gotten through 4 or 5 chapters, but something is becoming increasingly obvious the more I read: this guy is the Michael Moore of atheism....

Yeah, and of course I see right through his manipulations. In fact I would have written this information quite differently because of what I saw as blatant word twisting and assumptions. I guess I thought everyone else would see through that and still think about the content. The passages from the Bible aren't faked. You could look them up yourself and read the surrounding context. I'm not sure what context surrounding this passage would make it any better though:

"Exodus Chapter 21, verse 20" If a man beats his male or female slave with a rod and the slave dies as a direct result, he must be punished, but he is not to be punished if the slave gets up after a day or two, since the slave is his property.

"actual text" 21:20 And if a man smite his servant, or his maid, with a rod, and he die under his hand; he shall be surely punished.

21:21 Notwithstanding, if he continue a day or two, he shall not be punished: for he is his money.

Reference: <http://www.cforc.com/kjv/Exodus/21.html>

If the bible is in fact the word of your God then is this not him directly condoning beating your servant/maid?

And what about this blatant sexism? What other interpretation?

"Timothy chapter 2"

2:11 Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection.

2:12 But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence.

2:13 For Adam was first formed, then Eve.

It took centuries of change to allow women an equal voice. Now we have woman CEOs, and we've have female teachers for quite a while. Aren't we all disobeying God then?

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 02 Nov 2005 15:08:38 GMT

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

Crimson wrote on Wed, 02 November 2005 01:42You guys grew up and stopped believing in Santa, now it's time to go the next step.

Let's look at the reasons WHY people stop believing in Santa (though I assume you mean the marketing-gimic Santa as we use it today and not St. Nicholas, because he WAS a real person).

1. You parents admitted they were the ones who bought you the gifts.
2. Failing (1) occuring, the gift magically stop appearing when you are no longer in immediate contact with your parents.

These are two physical evidences that Santa (as the marketing department would want you to believe in) does not exist. This proof does not hold for the idea of God. You can't equate God to Santa. One has physical evidence to disprove the existance of, and the other has no proof for or against it.

Quote:I WANT SOME DAMN PROOF! Believing in a higher power takes a shitload of faith that I don't give out freely just because other people say "he's" out there.

Infact, please stop referring to "proof" and "faith/belief" in the same sentence. The two are exclusive of one another. You can not claim to have faith in ANYTHING if you have proof of it. The reason it is called faith if because there is NO proof of it's existance.

Though I do admit you're being a bit hypocritical here. I'm sure you beleive in the existance of atoms, electrons, bacteria, etc. But tell me, have you ever seen them with your own eyes (unaided by any devices)? If you haven't then you have no PROOF of their existance. Yet you chhose to believe the person that says they exist. I'd think-follownig your request above= that you'd want some proof before acknowleging that those things exist.

Quote:"Give me a child before the age of 5 and I'll make it a Catholic for life."

Quite interesting how a countries education system starts around the same time.... I suppose the education system is just as evil as you seem to be implying the church is...

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Wed, 02 Nov 2005 15:22:46 GMT

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

warranto wrote on Wed, 02 November 2005 08:08Let's look at the reasons WHY people stop believing in Santa (though I assume you mean the marketing-gimic Santa as we use it today and not St. Nicholas, because he WAS a real person).

1. You parents admitted they were the ones who bought you the gifts.
2. Failing (1) occuring, the gift magically stop appearing when you are no longer in immediate contact with your parents.

These are two physical evidences that Santa (as the marketing department would want you to believe in) does not exist. This proof does not hold for the idea of God. You can't equate God to Santa. One has physical evidence to disprove the existance of, and the other has no proof for or against it.

Of course I mean the Santa who lives in the North Pole in the stories. I fail to see much different in the fanciful notions between these two stories:

Story 1# There is a man who lives at the North Pole.
He lives there with his wife and a bunch of elves.
During the year, he and the elves build toys.
Then, on Christmas Eve, he loads up a sack with all the toys.
He puts the sack in his sleigh.
He hitches up eight (or possibly nine) flying reindeer.
He then flies from house to house, landing on the rooftops of each one.
He gets out with his sack and climbs down the chimney.
He leaves toys for the children of the household.
He climbs back up the chimney, gets back in his sleigh, and flies to the next house.
He does this all around the world in one night.
Then he flies back to the North Pole to repeat the cycle next year.

Story 2# God inseminated a virgin named Mary, in order to bring his son incarnate into our world.
Mary and her fiancé, Joseph, had to travel to Bethlehem to register for the census. There Mary gave birth to the Son of God.
God put a star in the sky to guide people to the baby.
In a dream God told Joseph to take his family to Egypt. Then God stood by and watched as Herod killed thousands and thousands of babies in Israel (see Chapter 16) in an attempt to kill Jesus.
As a man, God's son claimed that he was God incarnate: "I am the way, the truth and the life," he said (see Chapter 18).
This man performed many miracles. He healed lots of sick people. He turned water into wine. These miracles prove that he is God.
But he was eventually given the death sentence and killed by crucifixion.
His body was placed in a tomb.
But three days later, the tomb was empty.
And the man, alive once again but still with his wounds (so anyone who doubted could see them

and touch them), appeared to many people in many places.

Then he ascended into heaven and now sits at the right hand of God the father almighty, never to be seen again.

Today you can have a personal relationship with the Lord Jesus. You can pray to this man and he will answer your prayers. He will cure your diseases, rescue you from emergencies, help you make important business and family decisions, comfort you in times of worry and grief, etc.

This man will also give you eternal life, and if you are good he has a place for you in heaven after you die.

The reason we know all this is because, after the man died, four people named Matthew, Mark, Luke and John wrote accounts of the man's life. Their written attestations are proof of the veracity of this story.

Both of these stories are filled with things that seem impossible to we us mere mortals, and yet as children, both are expressed to us as equally true.

Quote:Infact, please stop referring to "proof" and "faith/belief" in the same sentence. The two are exclusive of one another. You can not claim to have faith in ANYTHING if you have proof of it. The reason it is called faith if because there is NO proof of it's existence.

Though I do admit you're being a bit hypocritical here. I'm sure you beleive in the existance of atoms, electrons, bacteria, etc. But tell me, have you ever seen them with your own eyes (unaided by any devices)? If you haven't then you have no PROOF of their existance. Yet you chhose to believe the person that says they exist. I'd think-follownig your request above= that you'd want some proof before acknowleging that those things exist.

At least these other things make SENSE. I can look at diagrams of atoms and learn how they work and it all makes sense. Bacteria is in fact something I have seen through a microscope. I have seen no evidence of this "God" character.

Quote:Quite interesting how a countries education system starts around the same time.... I suppose the education system is just as evil as you seem to be implying the church is...

I wasn't saying the Catholic Church was evil for saying their can make a Catholic for life if the child is available to them until the age of 5. It was a reference to the sentence directly before that quote where I said: "Religion aside, I have been very interested in quantum theory lately and it's interesting to see the behaviors and thoughts that become so natural and conditioned to us."

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 02 Nov 2005 17:03:04 GMT

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

Crimson wrote on Wed, 02 November 2005 01:31 "Exodus Chapter 21, verse 20" If a man beats his male or female slave with a rod and the slave dies as a direct result, he must be punished, but he is not to be punished if the slave gets up after a day or two, since the slave is his property.

"actual text"21:20 And if a man smite his servant, or his maid, with a rod, and he die under his hand; he shall be surely punished.

21:21 Notwithstanding, if he continue a day or two, he shall not be punished: for he is his money.
Reference: <http://www.cforc.com/kjv/Exodus/21.html>

If the bible is in fact the word of your God then is this not him directly condoning beating your servant/maid?

And what about this blatant sexism? What other interpretation?

"Timothy chapter 2"

2:11 Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection.

2:12 But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence.

2:13 For Adam was first formed, then Eve.

It took centuries of change to allow women an equal voice. Now we have woman CEOs, and we've have female teachers for quite a while. Aren't we all disobeying God then?
Two SEPARATE covenants with God. Old Testament = Old Covenant. New Testament = New Covenant. There's a HUGE difference between the two, and unless you read the Bible, you won't understand.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 02 Nov 2005 17:24:28 GMT

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

Quote:Both of these stories are filled with things that seem impossible to we us mere mortals, and yet as children, both are expressed to us as equally true.

SEEM impossible. That does not mean IS impossible.

As I said before the huge difference is the availability of proof for each.

Santa: Huge amounts of proof that anyone (including children) can discover.

God: No proof either way. Hence it is a system of belief.

Quote:At least these other things make SENSE. I can look at diagrams of atoms and learn how they work and it all makes sense.

How much would you like to bet that I can make up something completely false, and make it appear to make sense? The sensibility of things does not make it absolute.

Quote:Bacteria is in fact something I have seen through a microscope. I have seen no evidence of this "God" character.

Prove to me that the microscope has not been tampered with to display what people want you to see. When viewing things through a microscope, you are too depentant that it was manufactured properly, and without any "additions" being done. That is why I stated I doubt you've seen them

with unaided eyes. I'm sure if you look in the right places, you'd see examples of God's work. You just seem to rely on willful blindness as "proof" of not being able to see examples of God's work.

Quote:I wasn't saying the Catholic Church was evil for saying their can make a Catholic for life if the child is available to them until the age of 5.

And how is this bad?

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Wed, 02 Nov 2005 17:35:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

warranto wrote on Wed, 02 November 2005 10:08Infact, please stop referring to "proof" and "faith/belief" in the same sentence. The two are exclusive of one another. You can not claim to have faith in ANYTHING if you have proof of it. The reason it is called faith if because there is NO proof of it's existance.

Though I do admit I am being a bit hypocritical here. I'm sure you beleive in the existance of atoms, electrons, bacteria, etc. But tell me, have you ever seen them with your own eyes (unaided by any devices)? If you haven't then you have no PROOF of their existance. Yet you chhose to believe the person that says they exist. I'd think-follownig your request above= that you'd want some proof before acknowleging that those things exist.

Ding ding. You can prove something without seeing it with your own eyes.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Wed, 02 Nov 2005 20:29:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

warranto wrote on Wed, 02 November 2005 10:24SEEM impossible. That does not mean IS impossible.

As I said before the huge difference is the availability of proof for each.

Santa: Huge amounts of proof that anyone (including children) can discover.

God: No proof either way. Hence it is a system of belief.

So what you're saying is that in order to believe in God, you have to have belief that he exists because it can't be proven that he does. What reason or motivation is there for me as a rational thinking person to believe in this story, in this being?

Quote:How much would you like to bet that I can make up something completely false, and make it appear to make sense? The sensibility of things does not make it absolute.

I'm sure you can. Just because I don't HAVE to believe a science book doesn't mean I have any basis to believe in the "good book".

Quote: Prove to me that the microscope has not been tampered with to display what people want you to see. When viewing things through a microscope, you are too dependent that it was manufactured properly, and without any "additions" being done. That is why I stated I doubt you've seen them with unaided eyes. I'm sure if you look in the right places, you'd see examples of God's work. You just seem to rely on willful blindness as "proof" of not being able to see examples of God's work.

It would be an awesome stretch to put, say, a strand of my hair on a slide in a certain position and look at it through a microscope and see it in that same position. Then to see that hair and see it move in the scope real-time to my motions. Then, to put another slide with blood under that same microscope and see bacteria and say it's been tampered with.

Either way, though, let's say there is in fact a microprocessor in every microscope to put strange blobby things in a slide of blood when blood actually looks a different way when viewed that close. How does this prove God's existence?

Willful blindness? Because I look at something and don't see it as "God's work"? What exactly am I blind to? Where could I see God's work and know that's exactly what it is?

Quote: And how is this bad?

I NEVER SAID IT WAS BAD! My point was, for the THIRD TIME, that because this "God" being is all you've known from so young that you can't even seem to fathom that *I* might in fact be right, that there is no "God" at all. You can't even FATHOM this at all, while I have, as I've said before, considered the existence of God and found no justification.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Wed, 02 Nov 2005 20:37:23 GMT

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

Quote: So what you're saying is that in order to believe in God, you have to have belief that he exists because it can't be proven that he does. What reason or motivation is there for me as a rational thinking person to believe in this story, in this being?

Why, as a self-proclaimed rational thinking person, would you believe in everyday miracles that people take for granted? You believe that you'll make it to work safely when you drive on the interstate in the morning hours, don't you? What makes you believe something so foolish? Because you have faith in your own abilities to drive? Faith in the abilities of others? Why is faith and believe in God any more foolish, as a rational thinking person, than faith in yourself? There is, after all, no proof that you're competent beyond what the medical authorities say.

And what makes their testimony about your competency believable? Faith?

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Wed, 02 Nov 2005 20:49:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I think you're twisting the meaning of faith...

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Wed, 02 Nov 2005 20:58:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Faith has many contexts. The one we're discussing is not the one Aircraftkiller is using.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Wed, 02 Nov 2005 23:20:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Crimson wrote on Wed, 02 November 2005 02:31 Yeah, and of course I see right through his manipulations. In fact I would have written this information quite differently because of what I saw as blatant word twisting and assumptions. I guess I thought everyone else would see through that and still think about the content. The passages from the Bible aren't faked. You could look them up yourself and read the surrounding context.

I did look them up myself (in a beat up old bible I have on a bookshelf). My point was you said you never read the bible right after you said it condones slavery. If you had proclaimed the bible says Jesus was God and then said you never read the bible, I'd still question it.

When it comes to what he presents, if someone resorts to attempted manipulation like that guy does, then he isn't worth listening to. If his evidence is credible, then it can stand on its own, without his insults and piss poor attempts at mind control. He discredits his own arguments by acting like that.

Crimson wrote on Wed, 02 November 2005 02:31 I'm not sure what context surrounding this passage would make it any better though:

"Exodus Chapter 21, verse 20" If a man beats his male or female slave with a rod and the slave dies as a direct result, he must be punished, but he is not to be punished if the slave gets up after a day or two, since the slave is his property.

"actual text" 21:20 And if a man smite his servant, or his maid, with a rod, and he die under his hand; he shall be surely punished.
21:21 Notwithstanding, if he continue a day or two, he shall not be punished: for he is his money.
Reference: <http://www.cforc.com/kjv/Exodus/21.html>

If the bible is in fact the word of your God then is this not him directly condoning beating your servant/maid?

And what about this blatant sexism? What other interpretation?

"Timothy chapter 2"

2:11 Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection.

2:12 But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence.

2:13 For Adam was first formed, then Eve.

It took centuries of change to allow women an equal voice. Now we have woman CEOs, and we've have female teachers for quite a while. Aren't we all disobeying God then?

As already stated by others, the first quote comes out of the old testament, and is really irrelevant as it describes a code of conduct and law that was replaced by the new testament. It's more there as a statement of 'this happened', than it is a 'this is true'. Apparently the people who compiled the bible didn't want to hide things that looked bad on the surface. I applaud their honesty.

As to the second quote though, back up a moment to the previous few verses:

1 Timothy 2:8-10 It is my wish, then, that in every place the men should pray, lifting up holy hands, without anger or argument. Similarly, women should adorn themselves with proper conduct, with modesty and self-control, not with braided hairstyles, and gold ornaments, or pearls or expensive clothes, but rather, as befits women who profess reverence for God, with good deeds. (source: the beat up New American Bible I'm looking this up in.)

Then the verses go into your quote, continuing from 'Similarly, women should'. Note how he starts by telling men to stop bitching in church, and then tells women to do the same. I admit he adds in that women shouldn't dress like whores, and it isn't clear in this part he expects the same from men (although I think we can infer he does expect the same). This is all a clarification to his point that men and women have to behave respectfully in church. He doesn't want people thinking these rules only apply to men, they applied to all.

Jumping ahead a little into chapter 3 we get this:

1 Timothy 3:8-11 Similarly, deacons must be dignified, not deceitful, not addicted to drink, not greedy for sordid gain, holding fast to the mystery of the faith with a clear conscience. Moreover, they should be tested first; then, if there is nothing against them, let them serve as deacons. Women, similarly, should be dignified, not slanderers, but temperate and faithful in everything.

Again, we see people being told about proper conduct in church and life, and then he adds "Yes, I mean this applies to women too! Don't be a dumb-ass, Timothy!"

It should be noted that when I refer to the writer of this letter (that's what this particular book in the bible is, a letter) I'm not saying 'He', I'm saying 'he'. No where in the bible does it say God wrote this letter and sent it to Timothy, it's the 1st letter of Paul to Timothy. It's what Paul, a follower of Christ, had to say on the subject. I don't understand why you, or that Michael Moore wannabe, insist on saying that all this is the direct word of God when the bible itself says Paul is the author of this particular book. Yes Paul may have been inspired by God, or used the teachings of Christ in the writing of this letter, but still, it is filtered through a man and not the direct statements of God. Anyone who read this part of the Bible, and not just looked up quotes off a website, should be able to see that.

The bible was written by many people over a long period of time. By looking at the underlying philosophy they all shared, instead of getting "stuck on stupid" with the interpretations of those time periods, you can see the real message plain as day. It's the main reason there are 4 gospels instead of one. The teachings of Jesus were a little too important to rely on one person's account of them. Just as in a courtroom, witnesses state how they saw things, the bible is filled with people telling it 'like they saw it'. Declaring every last word to be God's direct statement is ridiculous. All it proves is a person doesn't understand the bible.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 03 Nov 2005 00:33:53 GMT

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

mrpirate wrote on Wed, 02 November 2005 12:35Ding ding. You can prove something without seeing it with your own eyes.

Oh? Like what, exacty?

Quote:What reason or motivation is there for me as a rational thinking person to believe in this story, in this being?

No more than a rational thinking person such as myself does.

Quote:Just because I don't HAVE to believe a science book doesn't mean I have any basis to believe in the "good book".

Exactly. Now, please tell me why there is this supposed difference between believing what someone tells you is truth, in some book, written by someone before your time, perhaps even in a language not native to you, with no way of validating that it's true except by believing what others educated in that area say... and religion?

Quote:It would be an awesome stretch to put, say, a strand of my hair on a slide in a certain position and look at it through a microscope and see it in that same position. Then to see that hair and see it move in the scope real-time to my motions. Then, to put another slide with blood under that same microscope and see bacteria and say it's been tampered with.

Prove to me that the hair you see under the microscope hasn't been distorted in some way? (And I don't mean distorted by magnification)

Quote:How does this prove God's existence?

I never said it does. Infact, I've never once said that "God Exists". As I've always said, the existance of God can not be proven or disproven, hence why it is (for the <unknown> time) a

system of belief.

Quote:Willfull blindness? Because I look at something and don't see it as "God's work"? What exactly am I blind to? Where could I see God's work and know that's exactly what it is?

You can see it every day if you just look out the window. Yes, even the weather.

Quote:"God" being is all you've known from so young that you can't even seem to fathom that *I* might in fact be right, that there is no "God" at all. You can't even FATHOM this at all, while I have, as I've said before, considered the existence of God and found no justification.

I can't fathom it? Oh, I can comprehend the non-existence of God very much. Just as easily as I can comprehend the idea that Descarte brought forth about whether or not the world exists.

As well, please stop with the hypocritical comments. Saying that I'm wrong because I believe in God, simply "because I was raised with "knowledge" of him", and then claiming that your way is better is completely redundant. You've even admitted it yourself that you did not grow up with "knowledge" of God. Well, the only reason you can claim a disbelief in him is because of that reason.

That argument works both ways, you know. Of course, this applies to everything else as well. Why Capitalism is better than socialism, why no Government funding of Health Care is better than funding it, why Social programs are a waste of time, or why the opposite of that is believed by people. It's what they grew up with.

So, if you're still wanting to continue with the train of thought regarding why I believe in God, you had better be willing to apply that same logic to everything you believe in yourself.

Oh, yes... and I'm still waiting to see some proof that God doesn't exist. No one seems willing, or able, to produce it.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Thu, 03 Nov 2005 00:46:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

warranto wrote on Wed, 02 November 2005 19:33Oh? Like what, exacty?

Let's start with all of math. Atoms are essentially intangible, but that doesn't mean that there is no proof they exist.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 03 Nov 2005 00:53:32 GMT

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

Prove to me that $2+2=4$. And remember, you can not use anything that is visible. (ie. take two of somethign and add another two of it)

Prove to me that atoms exist. I've seen scientists give demonstrations that they exist, and I've seen electron microscopes that show them, but I've never actually seen one myself.

Remember: according to the people arguing that God does not exist believing in the unseen is wrong, and believing people who have claimed to see him are wrong.

Therefore you can not believe what people tell you if you can not see the proof for yourself. As such, the use of material other than personal and unaided experiences do not count in the above to challenges.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Thu, 03 Nov 2005 00:56:34 GMT

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

I have reasons for not believing in a god that go beyond not being able to see it.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 03 Nov 2005 00:59:36 GMT

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

hey, I have no problem with people saying they don't believe. As long as you're not trying to say that you "know" that God doesn't exist, I have no argument with you.

My two challenges still stand, though.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Thu, 03 Nov 2005 02:20:56 GMT

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

warranto wrote on Wed, 02 November 2005 19:53 Prove to me that $2+2=4$. And remember, you can not use anything that is visible. (ie. take two of somethign and add another two of it)

You can. And here's why:

Immanuel Kant We might, indeed at first suppose that the proposition $7 + 5 = 12$ is a merely analytical proposition, following (according to the principle of contradiction) from the conception of a sum of seven and five. But if we regard it more narrowly, we find that our conception of the sum

of seven and five contains nothing more than the uniting of both sums into one, whereby it cannot at all be cogitated what this single number is which embraces both. The conception of twelve is by no means obtained by merely cogitating the union of seven and five; and we may analyse our conception of such a possible sum as long as we will, still we shall never discover in it the notion of twelve. We must go beyond these conceptions, and have recourse to an intuition which corresponds to one of the two- our five fingers, for example, or like Segner in his Arithmetic five points, and so by degrees, add the units contained in the five given in the intuition, to the conception of seven. For I first take the number 7, and, for the conception of 5 calling in the aid of the fingers of my hand as objects of intuition, I add the units, which I before took together to make up the number 5, gradually now by means of the material image my hand, to the number 7, and by this process, I at length see the number 12 arise. That 7 should be added to 5, I have certainly cogitated in my conception of a sum = 7 + 5, but not that this sum was equal to 12. Arithmetical propositions are therefore always synthetical, of which we may become more clearly convinced by trying large numbers. For it will thus become quite evident that, turn and twist our conceptions as we may, it is impossible, without having recourse to intuition, to arrive at the sum total or product by means of the mere analysis of our conceptions. just as little is any principle of pure geometry analytical. "A straight line between two points is the shortest," is a synthetical proposition. For my conception of straight contains no notion of quantity, but is merely qualitative. The conception of the shortest is therefore fore wholly an addition, and by no analysis can it be extracted from our conception of a straight line. Intuition must therefore here lend its aid, by means of which, and thus only, our synthesis is possible.

You're merely synthesizing two concepts (even if they are the same) to produce something that is not itself. But you'll never *know* (thus attempt to prove) that any math is a priori unless you can prove that a priori synthesis is possible-- and it is. But I'll let you figure that out. :>

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 03 Nov 2005 03:03:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Almost successful there Javaxcx (or, perhaps I should congratulate Kant?)

however, despite the fact that he could, for all intents and purposes, "prove" math, he still had to do it by using his hand as a reference point for 5.

Quote:and have recourse to an intuition which corresponds to one of the two

Unfortunately, it still required the sight of something to make the proof work. Even if it only is done as an intuition.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Thu, 03 Nov 2005 03:24:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Right, because all intuitions are the result of experience. The point in question is to whether or not that experience existed a priori or not. Thanks to the science of sensuality, it can be said that it does. Think Plato; it's quite similar.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Thu, 03 Nov 2005 03:59:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

2+2=4 only if the Party allows it.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 03 Nov 2005 04:03:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

a priori or not, by the simple fact that he required to use a visual reference point to prove something, states that the experience was required prior to the proof being usable. He had to know that the hand had 5 fingers before the idea of the hand could be used. In short, a visual representation of some sort was still required to prove it. The "seeing" part if it is, in Kant's instance, "seeing with the mind's eye," so to speak.

hmm.. perhaps restricting this to "seeing" is a bit misleading. "Experience" is the idea that I'm trying to get across, however the seeing aspect of that is the one that seems to get the most credit, so I decided to go with that simplification. Don't take this too broadly in regards to the challenge though. I'm not saying that you can't use ANY experiences to assist, you just can't use them to directly prove the aspect. (example: referencing a dog would constitute something that is being used to represent a visual effect. However, referencing the fact that every time you've done the equation you have reached that answer, while not a strong argument by itself, is valid. There is no representation of anything to prove a point.)

Keep in mind that I'm not disputing that Kant has proven it, rather he has quite nicely. However, the challenge is still whether it can be done without visual aids.

Experience is the idea of where knowing comes from. The phrase "seeing is believing" is a misnomer of sorts. It should actually state "experiencing is knowing". This is where a priori comes into effect. Whether it is knowable without appeal to a particular experience (keep in mind, the "appeal to an experience" is the important part. It has been experienced, but that experience is not used to prove <whatever>). However, the a priori argument does not apply here as he IS using the experience to prove his argument. He uses his experience of how his hand looks to create a basis for the number "five".

Note: this went through a number of edits before it was submitted. If something is not as coherent as could be, tell me and I'll fix it.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 03 Nov 2005 11:23:40 GMT

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

Rather than trying to prove to me that I can't possibly "know" anything at all, which is 100% irrelevant and just a not-very-underhanded attempt to make me doubt ALL my earthly knowledge and intellect and somehow twist that to make me fall on my knees and worship some imaginary deity with tears in my eyes and the holy gospel ricocheting through every core of my being... let's go another route.

As far as philosophy and the subjects you are speaking of, I don't read the books and works of others very much. I have my own theories and ideas. One, for example, I thought up sometime when I was in elementary school, turns out is a prevailing notion in quantum physics about alternate dimensions. But that's a subject for another time. You always seem to want to come back to "Yeah, but you don't REALLY know anything by true definition" thinking it will magically win you any argument.

Explain to me how I:

always conduct myself lawfully (aside from minor traffic infractions from time to time)

do good for other people (loan money, provide support, etc)

Have attained the age of 26 without serious illness

Am in a loving relationship

Have a great job

Have a great house

Have great friends

ALL without EVER praying for any of it. My life, even when you look deep inside, isn't all that much different from someone who does pray and believes with all their heart and soul that God or Jesus is choosing whether to answer that prayer or not. Explain this.

Next, Explain to me why, when you pray for something, and God/Jesus doesn't provide, you will say "It's God's will". So, if God was just going to do whatever is in his Plan anyway, then why bother to pray? Furthermore, how do you have "free will" if the events influencing your life are all "planned" by God?

Any time I ask why there is so much evil and bad luck in this world, while "God" allegedly "loves us", all I get is "free will". No one has been able to rationally explain this to me.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 03 Nov 2005 15:10:44 GMT

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

Quote:Explain to me how I:

(That's all I need to quote) Easy, you've made the right choices. I sincerely hope that your luck continues.

Quote:ALL without EVER praying for any of it.

Actually, neither do I. I don't ask anything of God, nor to I expect it.

Quote:Next, Explain to me why, when you pray for something, and God/Jesus doesn't provide, you will say "It's God's will"

Because, for whatever reason, the prayers are not granted. Think of whatever reason you want, but for whatever the reason, we do not NEED what we are praying for to occur.

Quote:Furthermore, how do you have "free will" if the events influencing your life are all "planned" by God?

This is one that I don't agree with. Perhaps God knows our future, perhaps not. This doesn't mean that he has it planned for us.

Quote:Any time I ask why there is so much evil and bad luck in this world, while "God" allegedly "loves us", all I get is "free will". No one has been able to rationally explain this to me.

perhaps the same reason your own parents didn't prevent bad things from happening to you. Someone else chose to do it (or in the event of an illness, your own body failed you).

The reason "free will" is used, is exactly that. Someone had the freedom to wrong you.

"But if God loves us so much, why doesn't he prevent that occurrence?", correct?

Easy. it's the same reason why murderers are allowed to go free in the American justice system simply because a "right" of theirs has been violated. If you make exceptions for one person, the whole thing falls, or at least starts to fall, apart. If one persons "free will" is violated, then the entire system of free will fails, simply because we are no longer free. We have a forced set of rules imposed on us.

edit: Missed this point:

Quote:As far as philsophy and the subjects you are speaking of, I don't read the books and works of others very much. I have my own theories and ideas. One, for example, I thought up sometime when I was in elementary school, turns out is a prevailing notion in quantum physics about alternate dimensions. But that's a subject for another time. You always seem to want to come back to "Yeah, but you don't REALLY know anything by true definition" thinking it will magically win you any argument.

The only reason I bring that up (at least for the purpose of this argument) is because you are stating that you KNOW God doesn't exist. That is all that I am challenging. I could care less if you believe that God doesn't exist, I could care less if you think that Satanism is "the way". That's your own choice.

Just don't claim to know things that you don't. At least not without backing it up with proof. And sorry, posting links about where the Christian religion got it wrong doesn't prove that God doesn't exist. It just proves where the Christian religion got it wrong.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Thu, 03 Nov 2005 16:28:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Crimson wrote on Wed, 02 November 2005 14:49I think you're twisting the meaning of faith...
I think you're not answering my statement.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 03 Nov 2005 16:56:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Because I don't understand your point, and especially how it's relevant to this discussion.

You think I'm going to say I have "faith" in my driving abilities? You're incorrect. I don't have "faith" in them. I have previous experience as well as wisdom passed along by those who drove before me to help me drive defensively. I also make assumptions about those who share the road with me. While I assume most of them have the same desires as me, to get to our destinations, I also assume they are morons who might make a mistake or forget to look before changing lanes. This prior knowledge and assumption that people are idiots has kept me accident-free for the 8 years I've been driving.

That said, I don't know where that leads to faith in "God". I think I can guess where you might be going with that, and this line of logic might work on a child or a guy with an IQ of 90, but you're going to have to reach quite a bit deeper than that with me.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 03 Nov 2005 17:11:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Regarding the prayer stuff, fine. We agree there is no power in prayer. We can agree that whether there is a God or not, praying to him for him to do things is not necessary to live a happy life or to make the right decisions.

Quote:This is one that I don't agree with. Perhaps God knows our future, perhaps not. This doesn't mean that he has it planned for us.

Then what role does God even have in your life? You don't pray to him, and you don't think he has a plan for you. All you concede at this point is that he may or may not know the future.

Quote:Easy. it's the same reason why murderers are allowed to go free in the American justice system simply because a "right" of theirs has been violated. If you make exceptions for one person, the whole thing falls, or at least starts to fall, apart. If one persons "free will" is violated, then the entire system of free will fails, simply because we are no longer free. We have a forced set of rules imposed on us.

Easy? That's not much of an explanation. You've made a very interesting leap from rights violations to free will violations.

Quote:The only reason I bring that up (at least for the purpose of this argument) is because you are stating that you KNOW God doesn't exist. That is all that I am challenging. I could care less if you believe that God doesn't exist, I could care less if you think that Satanism is "the way". That's your own choice.

Just don't claim to know things that you don't. At least not without backing it up with proof. And sorry, posting links about where the Christian religion got it wrong doesn't prove that God doesn't exist. It just proves where the Christian religion got it wrong.

I hope you're not implying that because I don't believe in God means I believe in Satan. You probably don't mean to imply that but to an outside observer, it sure would look like Moore-esque tactics. You don't believe in Santa, so I don't call you an asantaist. With that in mind, I'm not even technically an "atheist". I'm just normal. You don't believe in Thor, and neither do I. So are we athorists? No. In fact, once you understand why you don't believe in all the other deities that man has invented over the centuries, perhaps then you will understand why I don't believe in yours. Out of all those deities, I just believe in one less than you do, and somehow I'm the evil "atheist".

You say I can't claim to "know" there is no God. Maybe not by the definition you are pushing. But down to the very core of my being, with every bone in my body, I am absolutely sure there is no "God" as defined by ALL the major religions out there. Whatever or whoever started the Big Bang that created this universe has no bearing on the course of my life and has no influence or direction in the decisions I make. The Christian, Catholic, Muslim, and Greek gods all are equally fictional and ridiculous to me.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Thu, 03 Nov 2005 20:37:53 GMT

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

It's an example, it wasn't meant to be taken very seriously. All I was doing is getting you to think outside the box of "God doesn't exist because I don't see Him."

faith P Pronunciation Key (fth)

n.

Confident belief in the truth, value, or trustworthiness of a person, idea, or thing.

Belief that does not rest on logical proof or material evidence. See Synonyms at belief. See Synonyms at trust.

as·sume P Pronunciation Key (-sm)
tr.v. as·sumed, as·sum·ing, as·sumes

To take for granted; suppose: assumed that prices would rise. See Synonyms at presume.

That's just one of the word's many meanings, but notice how similar your assumption of "All drivers on the road are morons" is to faith.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM
Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Thu, 03 Nov 2005 20:56:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Crimson wrote on Thu, 03 November 2005 06:23Any time I ask why there is so much evil and bad luck in this world, while "God" allegedly "loves us", all I get is "free will". No one has been able to rationally explain this to me.

Warranto has tried a bit, but I figured I'd take a stab at it too.

For starters we need to determine a suitable definition of evil. After all, in science you can't hope to explain a phenomena properly if you can't define it. Newton had this problem with gravity, which was corrected by Einstein.

Evil is not a creation in itself, it does not exist like a rock exists. It exists like a shadow exists, or cold exists. It is defined by being the absence of a creation. In the case of a shadow, it is the absence of light. In the case of cold, it is the absence of heat. In the case of evil, it is the absence of good. Because it's 'existence' is entirely dependent on good, we need to define good as well.

Essentially, good is everything that comes from God. Good being something that is created, and all creations ultimately come from God. Since good is what God does, it is impossible by definition for God not to be benevolent. His nature requires that He is benevolent, as it is part of being omnipotent and omniscient. If you understood everything, you'd know what the 'right thing' was to do in every situation you could ever face. You'd have to do what was right because it violates your very nature to do otherwise.

It should be noted, that due to this relationship between good and evil. Evil can only exist if good exists somewhere else. However good can exist on its own, without the need for evil to occur. This makes evil powerless to good. If by some fluke, evil could overcome good, it would be self defeating as it would cease to exist as well. If good overcomes evil, it probably wouldn't even notice the event happened, as it shares no connection with evil from its perspective.

By all this, we can say good is what God wants, and evil is what He doesn't want. Good is His creation, His very essence. Evil is the lack of His creation, the absence of His presence. Hopefully, we've now hammered out a definition of what constitutes good and what constitutes evil.

Now we come to humans, who have the free will to choose whether to follow God's way or not.

You have the choice to do what's right, or not to do what's right. When you reject God's way, the absence you cause is 'evil'. Why would a supreme benevolence allow for this? It serves the purpose of teaching. Like a parent won't prevent every mistake of a child, so they can learn why it is 'wrong' to do something, God allows people to make mistakes because it helps people to learn why it is a mistake. Sure you can be told, but God wants you to understand, truly understand. As a finite being, understanding comes from experience. A human learns by pattern recognition. Seeing, hearing, etc the same thing over and over until you understand it.

God doesn't want you to 'be good', He wants you to 'want to be good'. He wants you to understand why you should be good. If He wanted He could have a race of mindless drones that did what He wanted, because they are programmed to. However, He made us. Creatures that can defy Him, that in doing so prove that to defy Him is pointless.

Free will is the ultimate test of His infinite power (as well as the ultimate test of a person's character). "Can God create a rock so heavy, He can't lift it?" as the saying goes. Can God sacrifice all His power over us, and yet still bring us back to Him? Will we understand and accept the ultimate truth about existence, the 'meaning of life' so to speak? Can God prove He is God, without using His dominant power over us? That'll probably be up to us, we have free will after all.

That's the way I see it anyway.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 03 Nov 2005 21:42:10 GMT

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

Crimson wrote on Thu, 03 November 2005 12:11 Then what role does God even have in your life? You don't pray to him, and you don't think he has a plan for you. All you concede at this point is that he may or may not know the future.

Quote:Easy. it's the same reason why murderers are allowed to go free in the American justice system simply because a "right" of theirs has been violated. If you make exceptions for one person, the whole thing falls, or at least starts to fall, apart. If one person's "free will" is violated, then the entire system of free will fails, simply because we are no longer free. We have a forced set of rules imposed on us.

Easy? That's not much of an explanation. You've made a very interesting leap from rights violations to free will violations.

Quote:The only reason I bring that up (at least for the purpose of this argument) is because you are stating that you KNOW God doesn't exist. That is all that I am challenging. I could care less if you believe that God doesn't exist, I could care less if you think that Satanism is "the way". That's your own choice.

Just don't claim to know things that you don't. At least not without backing it up with proof. And sorry, posting links about where the Christian religion got it wrong doesn't prove that God doesn't exist. It just proves where the Christian religion got it wrong.

I hope you're not implying that because I don't believe in God means I believe in Satan. You probably don't mean to imply that but to an outside observer, it sure would look like Moore-esque tactics. You don't believe in Santa, so I don't call you an asantaist. With that in mind, I'm not even technically an "atheist". I'm just normal. You don't believe in Thor, and neither do I. So are we athorists? No. In fact, once you understand why you don't believe in all the other deities that man has invented over the centuries, perhaps then you will understand why I don't believe in yours. Out of all those deities, I just believe in one less than you do, and somehow I'm the evil "atheist".

You say I can't claim to "know" there is no God. Maybe not by the definition you are pushing. But down to the very core of my being, with every bone in my body, I am absolutely sure there is no "God" as defined by ALL the major religions out there. Whatever or whoever started the Big Bang that created this universe has no bearing on the course of my life and has no influence or direction in the decisions I make. The Christian, Catholic, Muslim, and Greek gods all are equally fictional and ridiculous to me.

The role that God has in my life is that he exists. There is some power out there that we don't (and potentially can not) understand. He created and is the cause everything (even if he doesn't have a direct connection, ie. influencing the weather, sickness and disease, microevolution, etc.) and as such I acknowledge (or, more directly, believe) that he exists.

As for the leap from rights violations to free will violations: that was done because the principles of why they are there are similar to each other. Rights exist to keep us from taking advantage of others, while this is not the reason for free will, the result if they did not exist is similar to that of free will not existing. That being people would have nothing. We would be under a strict rule of someone who could dictate what we do as he pleases (be that God, or someone else).

And no, I'm not suggesting that you believe in Satan. All I'm doing is getting across that I don't care what you believe in, just don't suggest that you "know" the truth. Be that a belief for God's existence, or against God's existence. With your disbelief being from the "very core of your being", that tells me that you possess a very strong belief. However, that still doesn't mean that you know, with an absolute 100% certainty (as that's is the minimum requirement for knowing) whether or not he exists.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 03 Nov 2005 22:12:50 GMT

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

NeoSaber wrote on Thu, 03 November 2005 13:56Warranto has tried a bit, but I figured I'd take a stab at it too...

This seems more directed at a believer than a non-believer. See, I believe that man created the concepts of "good" and "evil", pretty much based on the Golden Rule.

Some of the things God has "done" also seem pretty evil. Such as punishing man for eating the forbidden fruit, killed everyone in the big flood. Also, why is there an "old covenant" and a "new covenant" with God? Did he change his mind?

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 03 Nov 2005 23:20:51 GMT

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

Created by God or man, good and evil (in simplist terms) is just a by-product of free will.

Someone had the freedom to act in a certain way, and the group didn't like it and deemed it evil. God, then saw how man was acting, and passed down a few rules, using what people at the time saw as good and evil, and made a few suggestions on how to make sure that we always acted in a "good" way.

As for the old and new testament, while I'm not claiming that this is the correct reason, perhaps it wasn't God who changed, but man? Enough so that a new agreement had to be made so that it was more relevant to the times.

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Thu, 03 Nov 2005 23:24:24 GMT

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

Crimson wrote on Thu, 03 November 2005 17:12 This seems more directed at a believer than a non-believer. See, I believe that man created the concepts of "good" and "evil", pretty much based on the Golden Rule.

You asked how can a benevolent God exist if there is evil in the world. The question presumed the existence of God and therefore so did the answer.

Crimson wrote on Thu, 03 November 2005 17:12 Some of the things God has "done" also seem pretty evil. Such as punishing man for eating the forbidden fruit, killed everyone in the big flood. Also, why is there an "old covenant" and a "new covenant" with God? Did he change his mind?

In a way you could say God changed His mind. I see it that He 'changed reality', to correct a human failing we were unable to repair ourselves. Like a parent will let a child make mistakes, to learn a lesson, they will also prevent a child from making a fatal mistake while they are still learning.

The change between the old covenant and new covenant centers entirely on Jesus, God come to earth to overcome sin. Prior to this event, you could make the argument that someone who turned away from God had no way of returning to Him. This would be indicated by God's 'harsh' method of dealing with extreme sins in the old testament. People that had completely turned their backs on God were a burden on those who followed God, without any potential benefit. They could not come back, and only served to turn the faithful against the creator.

With the introduction of Jesus, overcoming the human's inability to come back from oblivion, the new covenant was required as the reality of the old was no longer valid. Humans now had the potential to come back to God, no matter what they'd done in life and so the 'harsher' methods of the past had to be done away with. Like patching a game, a new set of rules were now in effect.

As to God seeming to do 'evil', like killing everyone in a flood, we need to look at a few different things. First, is killing by its very nature 'evil'? When God handed down the ten commandments He said "Thou shall not kill" (or a more accurate translation may be 'thou shall not murder'), not "Killing is wrong no matter what, even if I do it". He created the universe, and understands it to its very core. Animals, plants, etc all die eventually, this is written into their nature, by what created them. God understands why and when things must die, and takes appropriate action to that end. He told the rest of us not to interfere as we lack the knowledge to understand why something is alive to begin with, let alone when it should die.
