

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Wed, 31 May 2006 10:15:31 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:Rules relating to what is acceptable as religious text, rules as to what qualifies (as least in the Roman Catholic faith) as a "miracle".

Please...which rules? Apparently sci-fi novels are acceptable as religious text, so don't get me started.

Quote:As for making up your own religion, that is true. However, science can, and has, done the same thing. You just need to falsify every, just as you would need to falsify every with a fake religion.

Not to the extent of what's possible with religion. If a scientist falsifies something, others can still tell you if it's either plain wrong (something you can't do with fake religions) or how realistic it is (compare evidence, something you can't do with fake religions either).

Quote:Besides, we're not arguing the quality of a religion, but the idea of the existance of God himself. You can have an infinite number of wrong religions without being wrong about the existance of God. A religion is just one interpretation of someone's idea of God.

That's true indeed, but after all the idea of a God is irrational if you can't support it with something.

Quote:

Right. Thank you for proving my point.

That science is more trustworthy than religion because it can actually back the stuff up it proclaims? Nice.

Quote:Not when you keep relating it back to your first post in attempting to refute my point.

Uhm when did I do that?

Quote:Ah, so you're saying that the universe is it's own package, and the matter is simply expanding to fill the universe.

Ok, prove it.

I'll let wikipedia speak here: In cosmological terms, the universe is thought to be a finite or infinite space-time continuum in which all matter and energy exist.

Quote:That I am. Nice avoidance of the arugment though. Although, I thank you for conceding that my points have the same validity as a scientist.

If you can back your point up, sure. Can you?

Quote:Hind-sight is 20/20 isn't it? They weren't mislabeled at the time they were proclaimed to be true. They were honestly thought to be the correct answer.

There wasn't anything even resembling proof to support those theories, so they weren't the truth, thus were mis-labelled. It's irrelevant what they thought...

Quote:Pre-evolved means how something existed before today. This includes anything and everything.

Thanks for the info.

Quote:I highly doubt that as you can not see molecules with the naked eye. It has nothing to do with intelligence, but simple genetics. Humans can not see something that small, just as People can not see God.

It can still be measured and it's existence proven...good luck doing that with God!

Quote:But lets take your point anyways. I can prove the existence of religious text, I just need to go to my local book store and purchase one.

That's not the point...the point is proving or even getting evidence that your religious text isn't bogus without using it.

---