

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Dover](#) on Mon, 28 Aug 2006 21:39:41 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

warranto wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 09:58My mistake, I should included that one. ONE exception out of them all.

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Religions>

One exception? I think not.

warranto wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 09:58But if you want to talk about "exceptions".. not all light bulbs function the same way.

I've never met a light bulb who's function wasn't to create light.

warranto wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 09:58Continuing without that exception, the number of Gods doesn't matter. The idea God exists is still the same.

But the details matter. The gods of the Roman and Greek myths are remarkably similar to men, both in their bodies and in their actions. The Christian god has no physical form, "moves in mysterious ways", "Is the one true god", and is omnipotent/omniscient. Scientology doesn't have a God. Pagan Gods each have different functions and limitations.

Who is right? A lot of these religions claim the exact opposite of each other.

warranto wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 09:58IF the inventor knows, what makes you think he'd actually tell you the truth regarding it? You have no choice but to believe him regarding that aspect.

Fine. I guess I'm forced to admit that there is a slight possibility that there's a worldwide conspiracy involving the true functionality of the radio. I don't believe it, but it's possible.

warranto wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 09:58That's nice... it was established many threads ago that you can not prove the existence of him. However, you can not disprove his existence either.

Excuse me, then. I'm relatively new to the Politics subforum. But as Crimson said in a reply above mine, the burden of proof doesn't rest with the atheists, like I hinted at in my Invisible Purple Flying Unicorn rant above.

warranto wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 09:58So, humanity is "simply" the sum of its parts? Well, so much for the consciousness (yet to be measured).. I guess that the thought process is ONLY a chemical reaction.

It's nice to romanticize humanity and glue glitter onto individual thought and personality, but yeah. It's a chemical reaction, and here's some proof to back it up. When people have thought processes, certain chemical reactions are present. When people don't have thought processes, certain chemical reactions are absent.

warranto wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 09:58 Kind of like the THEORY of evolution, no?

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Theory\\_of\\_evolution](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Theory_of_evolution)

Too bad that theory has soon measureable, touchable, feelable, tasteable, concrete proof behind it, eh?

---