
Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.
Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 30 May 2006 13:18:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:Guess what, scientists have to abide by certain laws, Religion's don't. Way to miss the point..

Guess what, Religion does.

Quote:Sorry, I must've read "science" instead of "philosophy" the first time...that doesn't change, however, that you have no reason to bring philosophy into this when we're talking about science vs religion.

Except when, Philosophy has as much backing as science does as a means to explain things.

Quote:So you agree that God is superfluous?

Of course God is being beyond what is required or sufficient. That doesn't prove one way or the other as to his existance. Using molecules to explain the makeup of something is just as superfluous.

Quote:That's what I've been saying all along after I corrected myself...

It's not poilte to change positions mid-argument, without announcing it, while still tying everything into the first argument.

So I can assume then, that you concede that science has not proven how we were created? In which case, God doing the creation is still very much a avalid argument.

Quote:The universe hasn't changed, it's still universal...just the ingredients, which are subject to the laws of physics, have.

Last I checked, the Universe is always changing. Going from a small concentration of matter, to a nearly-ever expanding thing. If it wasn't subject to the laws of physics, then physics would never be able to measure it, as the variables would not be constant.

Quote:You've been arguing over the last few pages and all of a sudden you're too good to explain yourself? Haha...looks more like someone can't explain something.

You got me there. It's near impossible to explain something to someone who is ignorant of anything not told to him by someone else. (Oh wait, that almost sounds like a religion!)

Quote:There was never any evidence supporting those pre-evolved solutions,

Exactly! Perhaps there is hope for you yet!.. For the most part, anyways.

You may have missed the reference,though, so I'll explain it for you.

There was no evidence to support them, yet they were held as Scientific truths! The idea of the world being flat, worked.. so it was used.

However, there is evidence fot pre-evolved solutions such as what was used back when the basic computers were used. They worked, so it was used, before evolving into the computers we know today, and before evolving into the computers of tomorrow.

Infact, most comercial products had a pre-evolved form, that changes into something better over time. Yet, there is more than enough evidece, as the product exists in the first place.

Quote:The existance of molecules isn't debatable...

Then you should be able to prove it beyond a shadow of a doubt. Oh, and you can't refer to what some scientist said in some book. If Religion is restricted from using its text as "proof", then so is science. Both rely on the person reading to choose to believe the person or not, as there is no way of independantly verifying the item in question without relying on something outside your realm of control.
