
Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Mon, 29 May 2006 15:48:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

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

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

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

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

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

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

Quote:Quote:

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

You stated:

Quote:

Science has proven how life here started and evolved.

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

Quote:

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

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

You follow up with:

Quote:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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