
Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.
Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 31 May 2006 14:58:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:We're not talking about the rules of a single church, we're talking about rules that determine what we can call religion in general. Scientology is an exemple for even a sci-fi novel being sufficient.

There is no universal law governing Science, so why should religion be saddled with it?

Quote:...and it can be refuted, something you can't do with false religions

That's nice. Tell me again how a false religion proves God doesn't exist?

Quote:If there were no clue or evidence that it could work, the belief would be as irrational as the belief in God. I don't know what the stages were, but I'm guessing there were clues from the start.

Ugh, I believe I mentioned this before. There are clues or evidence that suggest God exists, you just refuse to believe them as cluse or evidence.

Quote:Acceptable for what?

Philosophy backs up science, as per your statement.

Philosophy is the same as religion. Dealing with the currently unprovable.

Religion backs up the existance of God.

If Philosophy is acceptable for backing up science as truth, then Religion should be acceptable as backing up God as truth.

Quote:I'm saying that it's the only way that has been proven to work, thus believing in it is logical.

Logical does not equal truth, just aa illogical does not equal untruth.

Quote:It's the friggan definition...next thing you'll tell me is that I can't know what a chair is.

That's nice. So you are choosing to believe what someone else told you it is. A definition is only what the current generation makes it. Definitions change over time, and only prove what is real right now.

Remember: The definition of the earth, not that long ago was that it was a flat piece of rock, where you could fall off the edge if you went to far. It must have been true, as "It's the friggan definition"

Quote:Ability, yes. Too bad you didn't even make a point.

Well, nothing I can do about your inability to grasp things.

Quote:How thick are you? You can't blame science for something that isn't science.

See my point above. I didn't blame science for something that isn't science. I blame you for thinking that science is always right, all the time, and any wrong of science is somehow different than a wrong of religion.

Quote:I however could...you don't have that possibility with religion

How many times do I have to say it. If you can prove it beyond a shadow of a doubt, then prove it. I've been waiting for you to do this the entire time, yet all you do is make mention of your ability to do it.

Quote:It is, if you want to prove something.

And if I don't need to prove it?

Quote:My point is that I could prove the existence of molecules while you can't prove the existence of God.

Once again, if you can prove it, then prove it. I never claimed to be able to prove the existence of God, nor can it be proven that he doesn't exist.
