

---

Subject: Re: Protests over a cartoon... wtf.  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 01 Jun 2006 18:03:41 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:Whatever...it's still not the usual light that we know, that's all I'm saying

Point is, it's still travelling faster than what was thought to be the extreme speed limit.

Quote:Who says it's credible? Besides, I think this is more going into the direction of supporting/disproving Christianity...if can tell you why the whole Christian faith doesn't make any sense, if you want to head into that direction.

You brought up the "four main books", so thats what I argued based on. But I agree, save the religious-specific arguments for a different thread.

Quote:He explains how you can't really put religion and philosophy in the same shelf.

Actually, what he's saying is that Philosophy and Religion argue differently about the same thing. Kind of like apples and oranges. Not the same, but they are both in the "fruit" category. That's where Philosophy and Religion are the same. They argue the same thing,using the same "formulas", just argue it in a different manner.

I'm not trying to argue the "apples and oranges" here, I'm trying to get you to see that they are both fruit.

Quote:It being possible is all I need to prove my point.

I used that to show how a pheonomenon of nature was mislabeled as something religious, just like world being flat was mislabeled as science.

And Being possible is all I need to prove mine.

They weren't mislabeled. Religion held its perception to be true, even though it wasn't, just as Science held its perception to be true, even though it wasn't. Both were made claim to by their respective area.

Quote:You're saying that the existance of God is as realistic as the existance of molecules?

Neither are "realistic" as neither can be conclusively proven. I'll use a legal analogy, since that is my area of profession. Science would be like a Criminal Trial. The burden of proof is beyond a reasonable doubt. The existance of God, since it is in itself unprovable, would only qualify in the Civil Trial, where the burden of proof is simply on a balance of probabilities.

While, admittedly, God is in the lower form of required "proof", it doesn't make it any less possible

that he does exist. The innate lack of the availability of proof just makes it more likely that something like we are arguing about will come about.

Quote:I'm willing to hold something that is 99.9999% sure as the truth, since that's as close as it'll get.

But it still isn't certain that this belief is true. Sure, may seem to be true 99% of the time, but there is still the possibility that it may not come true. And, after all, you did say:

Quote:But, from a logical point of view, assuming that there is something you have no proof of whatsoever makes no sense at all.

Changing the definition to suit your needs doesn't make it any less than a lack of "proof" to make it 100%. Anything less, and (as I mentioned before) is simply a belief that what is thought of to be true, is.

---