

---

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

---

JohnDoe wrote on Sat, 27 May 2006 02:57

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

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

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

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