
Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.
Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 30 May 2006 00:14:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ugh.. You're almost as bad as nodbugger.

Quote:Ya and you can't trust anything you see through your glasses...wow I can't believe you actually said that. Scientists won't lie to me since they have to respect the laws of physics and their metier...and if one of them should be lying, I can always consult others. I have no idea where you're going with this...are you telling me that molecules and atoms don't exist for sure or what? This is getting even more ridiculous than believing in God.

Way to miss the point. All you have to go on is what one scientist says, and is backed up by another. Guess what, Religion is the same way.

Quote:We're talking about science here, not philosophy...philosophical ideas don't have to follow any rules, but that's not what we're arguing about. I understand why you would like to change the subject tho..

Actually, we were talking philosophy. Remember this exchange?

Quote:Quote:

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.

I bring up philosophy, and you counter with that they need laws. THEN you switch your position and say they don't need laws, trying to pin me with changing the topic. Sorry, won't work.

Quote:What do you think God was created for then? Way to dodge my question concerning God being superfluous btw...

Who says God was "created" for a reason? And I appologise for not speaking up about your comment regarding God creating the universe being beyond what is required or sufficient. I didn't realize you were arguing only what was the easiest answer. Though some things are starting to make sense.

Quote:I'm not going to read through this thread again, but my latest statement was that science has proven how life can start from the chemicals that earth was made up of, so I still don't know

what you're trying to say, since I see nothing wrong with it.

Fine, I'll explain it again...

You can not prove something DID occur, by saying that it CAN occur. Science has proven that life CAN begin through a chemical reaction, but it does not prove it DID happen back during the coalescence of the primordial ooze.

Quote:I have no idea to think outside of conventional means? It's completely logical to go with the most realistic explanation and I'll believe that. I can always change my opinion, however. Give me a good reason why God and not the universe should be the starting point and I'll believe that.

I think you mean "the most convenient explanation". Here's a question for you: if the universe is not subject to the laws of physics (after all, it created itself - refer to my initial post relating to this point), why did it not start in a completed form? Why did it have to go through the stages of the big bang before it could even form?

I have no reason to even begin to try to explain why or why not God may be the starting point. Ignoring the idea that all that compressed matter had to come from somewhere. Ignoring the idea that the universe was not always there (Remember that thing called the big bang, while on the topic?). And, ignoring that the universe runs in (as far as we can tell) a perfect format.

Quote:It's simple logic. On the one hand we have a method that works, but we can't prove if it actually happened that way since we can't travel back in time, on the other we have a method that is completely based on assumptions for which we don't even have clues. With which would you go?

A method completely based on assumptions for which we don't have any clues... you mean like:

Electricity, Light storing information, Transportation of matter through the air, etc.

Or a method that works, such as:

The Earth being flat, any other pre-evolved solution. Remember that just because it works, doesn't mean it's right, or the best.

Oh, and just something to point out, not necessarily related to this argument.

Quote:Scientists won't lie to me since they have to respect the laws of physics and their metier

Such as those scientists who argue that Global Warming is real, and those who argue it is not. Such as those scientists who argue that breaking the speed of light is impossible, and those who say it is possible. Such as scientists who state that Dinosaurs became extinct as a result of a meteorite/insert one of the numerous theories here.

Because there are two or more sides to this story, someone must be lying.
