

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Wed, 30 Aug 2006 06:50:19 GMT

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

---

Crimson wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 17:08I still don't get it, I guess. I don't believe there's a "God". I don't know why I have to prove he doesn't exist. If you want me to believe in "God", I need proof.

The only time when you have to prove he doesn't exist is when you "KNOW" he doesn't exist. You can claim not to know any better and say that you don't know for sure, and no one would have any problem with it.

What creates conflict is you saying, "I KNOW THERE IS NO GOD! YOUR BELIEF IN GOD IS STUPID BECAUSE I KNOW I'M RIGHT!!!"

You say we Christians are abrasive in our evangelistic techniques while you atheists are equally, if not more-so, vehement in your attacks on religion.

No one is taking up issue with WHAT you believe; it's how you're presenting your beliefs, sitting all smug in your place ABSOLUTELY SURE you know you're right, while everyone else has been claiming that God is ONE POSSIBLE REASON (and, to most people, the most likely reason) for the cause of existence. Once you come up with an idea logically better than God, we might begin agreeing with you. Until then, who are you to say "YOU'RE ALL WRONG!!!" and insult our beliefs ("BELIEVING IN GOD IS STUPID AND CLOSE-MINDED!") when you don't know yourself?

Quote:I won't say that I know for a fact that there is no "God", but it ranks low on the probability charts. Really, really low.

What evidence do you have that makes you say that? What is it about the concept of a higher power or other supernatural cause that "ranks it [so] low on the probability charts"?

What makes the belief in God "stupid" and the belief in the Big Bang "smart"? Because a bunch of other "smart" people believe it to be true? Isn't that appeal to the masses or something like that?

Quote:The problem is that I'm stuck with two sets of people:

- 1) Those of you who believe in "God" AND one of the religions that worships "him".
- 2) Those of you who believe no religion has it right and all forms of worship are bullshit, but you believe in a conscious being who created us.

When I argue against one, the other one attacks me. And you guys can't even see it, or maybe you thrive on it to continue to look like you're getting somewhere.

You see, that's where the problem starts. You think you're the victim here when you're just as guilty as those you claim began attacking you.

Look at your first post in this thread:

Quote:For religion to claim that a "god" or "intelligent being" created the universe is just closed-minded. And even IF there was a "god" who put the big bang into motion, it does NOT mean we need to worship it/her/him and it DOESN'T mean that anything in the Bible is more than a big bunch of brainwashing hooey. It also does NOT mean there's a heaven or a hell. I prefer to remain open minded about where we came from until and unless science finds a cause (quantum physics is awesome).

Your first sentence is an attack on the religious perspective of the origin of the universe ("close-minded") (never mind the fact that you're COMPLETELY DISCOUNTING THE POSSIBILITY of an ultimate creator (wait, nevermind; you're just "ranking it low on the probability charts")). 27 words later, you start an attack on the Christian religion ("THE BIBLE IS MEANT ONLY TO CONTROL THE DUMB MASSES!! YOU'RE ALL SHEEP!!!") You close it out with an affirmation of your smugness about being so much more "open-minded" and "superior" (implied) to your religious counterparts.

Now, what kind of response from that could you expect? "Gee, Crimson, you're right. I guess I should give up what I've been taught since I could walk (who needs pie-in-the-sky ideas like an eternal god that loves you infinitely, right?), since it's all a brainwashing tool meant to control children and turn them into Muslim-killing crusaders."

Unless your forum is made up of the most fickle people on the internet (for some, I don't know how far that is from the truth (I'm lookin' at you, j\_ball)), all that's going to do is ruffle some feathers and stir up more virulent opposition--"throwing gas onto the fire," if you will.

You can't make posts like that and try to play the victim ("Help! Help! I'm being repressed!") when we only do what is in our nature--vehemently defend that in which we believe when it comes under scathing attack.

You can see what kind of responses you got:  
j\_ball430How the fuck is that being closed-minded?

...

If we're going to play those semantics, then you're closed-minded in saying that I'm closed-minded. I think you're wrong, therefore, your opinion isn't absolute and thusly closed-minded.

Quit playing these games. You think you're right. I think I'm right. Neither of us can prove each other wrong, so leave it at that. God can neither be proven nor disproven, so to tell me I'm wrong (or closed-minded) gets you nowhere because you have no factual evidence supporting your claim as I don't have any factual evidence supporting my claim.

DarkDeminPsuedo-intellectual bullshit isn't going to get you anywhere.

And then, to make things even better, you continue to belittle our beliefs:

Quote:You tell us this crazy story of an immaculate conception and a big imaginary friend who grants us our wishes if we ask but only if he wants to because he has a plan for you from the moment you're born until the day you die, but oh yeah, you have free will even though "God" has a plan for you.

You tell us this crazy story about this imaginary dude and challenge US to disprove his existence? Sounds like a huge COP OUT to me, theists!

...

The funniest part is that you all come down to the argument that basically says "You can't explain how we got here, therefore God exists." What the fuck kind of retarded garbage is that?

"God" is just a grown-up version of Santa Claus, a concept invented by man as a way to control people en masse. Be good or you'll get coal in your stocking/go to hell!

At this point, it's hard for EITHER side to keep its cool about the debate before an outright shouting match ensues (I am claiming no innocence; a number of my posts have some obvious heat to them).

After all of this has heated up, how can you possibly try to make yourself out to be the victim here? It's like prodding a dog with a stick incessantly for thirty minutes, and when he finally bites you, you scream and cry to your parents and say "THE DOG BIT ME FOR NO REASON!"

There's nothing wrong with debating passionately about these things, but once that passion turns into anger, anger that begins to attack the other side with an intent to harm not the argument but the other side's personal feelings, THAT'S when you start getting out of line.

I am in no way saying the other side is immune to it; to say it's one side's fault ALL the time, though, is to be ignorant to reality. BOTH sides start the fire, BOTH sides keep adding fuel to the fire, and BOTH sides get hurt when the fire finally gets out of hand and blows up in the faces of both sides.

What BOTH sides need to do is to be equally and TRULY open-minded about the subject and about the other side's argument (not simply CLAIM open-mindedness just to give yourself some air of superiority compared to the other side). Only then can we TRULY begin to start deeply discussing these big questions that NO ONE HAS AN ABSOLUTE ANSWER TO. And no matter how outlandish we may think someone's answer is, we must not remain so smug in our own beliefs that we fail to respect that person's own beliefs and feelings.

There are certain ways of debating subjects like these. Emotionally, defensively, and abrasively is not one of them.

P.S. Don't take anything I've said here personally, Crimson. Know that I don't think myself better than or somehow superior to you simply because of what I believe. We have often agreed on a myriad of issues in the past, so your reasoning was easy for me to understand since I often had similar reasoning. We simply need to agree to respect each other's beliefs on this topic (I am in no way absolving myself of any guilt; much of what I have said in this thread could easily be misconstrued as a personal attack, and I apologize it may have come across that way). I'm sorry if I made my point a little unclear at times and conveyed an abrasive meaning that I did not intend. I mean none of this personally and all of this professionally.

---