
Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Thu, 01 Jun 2006 10:43:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:One Law of Physics: Nothing can travel faster than the documented speed of light (186,000 miles (299,300 kilometers) per second.)
However, Now, however, physicists are coming closer to finding out how, in some situations, light may actually travel faster than that

Not much of a law if it can be broken.

Well that's a light pulse, not "real" light...but like Java said proof only means 99.999999% possibility.

Quote:
Nope, I didn't. What I said was:
Quote:

The clues that people have about God, are the religious text, and the world around them.

Clues do not equal proof. Clues equal a suggestion of something.

...and I've already said numerous times why the text can't realistically be considered a clue.

Quote:What about it is hearsay? Unless you're suggesting that makes it wrong, in which case science falls under the same category.

Do you know who wrote the New Testament?

...and once again Science can be self-tought, Christians have to fully rely on what those 4 guys wrote.

Quote:
No the only thing, but it is one thing.

Yes, and therefore you can't put them in the same category.

Quote:Ok, so you believe in something simply based on the idea of it being illogical to you... ok then. I can't actually believe I'm going to reference Star Trek here, but by all Vulcan accounts, all human logic and intuition is illogical... however, that never made it wrong.

I can't actually believe it, either...

Quote:Yes, quoting something that has nothing to do with your argument is going to work.

My choice not to explain something has nothing to do with my ability to.

Then don't argue..

Quote:All you can do is possess the belief that science is not lying to you. You have no way to independently verify everything that is told to you, so you must rely on faith that it is correct.

Other than that, it was deemed science back then. Stating it wasn't science now, doesn't change that fact of what it was back then.

1. I could walk the steps that lead to the scientific conclusion on my own.
2. Just because it was deemed science back then doesn't make it science...lol.

Quote:Finally resorted to blatant avoidance, huh? I can't blame you. And please don't start mixing belief with proof. Of course I believe he could throw the stone, just as I believe in the existence of molecules. However, that does not mean I can prove it until I can independently witness it.

I don't have to prove things over and over again that have been proven before. Yes, it's not 100% certainly, it's 99.9999%, which we call proof.

Quote:Kind of like your inability to prove the existence of molecules then, I take it?

I can get there with 99.9999% certainly....how close can you get with your belief?

Quote:Ah, finally you're one the right track. No longer looking for proof in God, just a reason to believe. I applaud that.

Simplistic Reason: Something had to create the universe, why not God? Or, if the universe could have always been there, why not God?

If God can exist as a starting point, then why not the universe? Follow your logic further and you'll see that someone must have created God. Or, why should God have always been there? What makes you think that something that superfluous exists?
