Subject: Darkknight's other thread: "does God exist?"
Posted by Spoony on Thu, 11 Dec 2008 14:42:15 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Darkknight wroteNo its a simple question. Doesn't need a full book of explanation. What will you do if your wrong and their is a God?
I already answered that fully and clearly. I even went to the trouble of giving you a long version and a short version.

But like I said, you never actually read what the person you're arguing with is saying, so I'll give it another go.

Firstly, I never said "it is certain that there is no God". Scientifically, you cannot prove something does not exist. You just can't, like you can't prove the tooth fairy doesn't exist. What you can do is analyse how likely its existence is, based on how logical it is and how much evidence there is supporting it. In the case here, the question of does God exist, he scores no higher than the tooth fairy.

Secondly, I specifically said that if God's existence was proven somehow, then I would accept the fact of his existence. I would, however, not worship him due to the fact I find many of the teachings related to Yahweh to be morally repugnant, as well as the fact that the Bible depicts him as a staggeringly evil monster.
So, yes, you prove to me God exists and I'll admit he exists, but I won't worship him. If someone proved to you the devil exists, would you worship it? (If you already believe the devil exists, why don't you worship it?) Believing something's existence is not enough to worship it. I believe Hitler existed, but I would not worship him.

Thirdly, your question seems to be about what happens when we die. If you're wrong, then presumably your life will be over in a conscious sense, and your body will eventually decompose, although I do not claim to know this as a fact; I can only guess, based on what we know about the human body.

Well, if I'm wrong and there really is a God, a point needs to be made before we go any further. The point is this: if I'm wrong, it doesn't mean you're right. If I say 2+2=5 and you say 2+2=6, and I prove that 2+2 is not 6, that doesn't mean 2+2=5. Likewise if everything we think we know about evolution turns out to be wrong, that does not mean creationism is correct.

1. Even if a god did exist, it would not automatically be Yahweh. It might be a different god. It might be Allah, Thor, Horus, Quetzaceptl (sp?), Shiva, the invisible pink unicorn, the Golden Calf, the Flying Spaghetti Monster... (As far as all of these gods go - except perhaps Allah since Islam says Allah and Yahweh are the same god - you are just as much an atheist as I am.)
2. Even if a god did exist and it was Yahweh, the Bible would not automatically be true. It was, after all, written by humans. How did they know what to write? Did they have agendas of their own? When they wrote the Bible could they have been crazy, or lying for their own purposes, or honestly mistaken?

So, you see the train of logic we have to follow in answering your question about what happens if I'm wrong. You have not followed it, you've skipped a few necessary steps. If a God's existence

was proven, that would not vindicate the Bible; it would not automatically be Yahweh. Every religion might still be wrong in its description of the god.

When you said "what if you're wrong and there really is a god?" what you probably meant was "what if you're wrong, which automatically means that I'm right and my religion is right, and all the other religions are wrong" (which is the kind of non-logic religious people love to use). You see, your question is so stupid and makes so many baseless assumptions, that it takes me longer to explain the flaws in the question than it takes me to answer it. Still, here goes:
"If I am wrong and there really is a god, that does not mean it is the God you talk about. Even if it was the God you talk about, that does not mean anything you think you know about that God is true. But if it is true, despite how many times you've been wrong about so many things, then I would probably end up going to hell."

After all, I reject Christianity, and I have already explained why. I have specifically said that the main reason for this rejection IS NOT because I don't think there is a God (although, indeed, I don't and that is certainly part of the reason, but not the biggest part). It is primarily on moral grounds, because I am repelled by many of its central teachings. The implementation of thoughtcrime, the punishment of innocents for the crime of someone else, the doctrine of redemption through the torture and execution of somebody else, etc etc etc. So even if I am wrong about God's existence, which I would be quite willing to admit if it were proven to me, I would still not become a Christian, I would still presumably go to hell upon my death.

I have already said, too, that if every word in the Bible is true, then I will likely go to hell for this moral stance. I've also said that I will take my chances. I am essentially given a choice:
A. Keep my moral ideas, even if it means I will suffer for it.
B. Abandon my moral ideas, and join a religion I find to be immoral - because I am scared of punishment if I don't.

I choose option A. I would rather live in a way I see as moral, than live in a way I see as immoral just to safeguard myself against punishment. So there you have it. Everything you've said so far indicates that your "belief" has nothing to do with morality (or fact) and everything to do with self-interest. In my case the reverse is true, and on that note I'll repeat a question I asked before: so who's the better man, you or I? You hold your beliefs because you've been promised heaven or hell (by people who have no more knowledge of their existence than you do). I hold my beliefs because I see them as moral, even under threat of punishment.

I would argue that I am the better man, morally speaking. I've also said that I think the world would be a vastly better place if people thought the same, but I would not make threats of horrific torture to persuade them, especially when I have no knowledge of hell's existence at all.

There is no moral difference between the Islamic fanatic who holds a knife to a victim's throat and says convert to Islam or die, and between the Christian who tells a non-Christian that they will go to hell for not being a Christian. Actually, there is one moral difference: the Muslim is not lying about the punishment for disobedience. After all, we know the knife is really there.

Darkknight wroteSee that's where your wrong. I've read everything you've wrote.
Every one of your responses indicates the opposite.

Darkknight wroteI find it very amusing. It would be like an infant telling Neil Armstrong what he did wrong in regards to walking on the moon without having a clue what the moon is or even knowing how to walk.

Well, my knowledge of the Bible and of Christianity in general is evidently a good deal more extensive than yours, so that analogy falls at the first hurdle. I very much doubt you have even read the Bible fully.

Darkknight wroteIT'S ALL YOU'RE OPINION.

If you are referring to the fact that I find many of Christianity's teachings to be evil and disgusting, then yes, that is my opinion. If you are referring to my statement that there is no evidence of God's existence, then I am not sure "opinion" is the right word.

Darkknight wrotePlease share with us the facts. You keep saying there is no proof of God and therefore you won't believe one even exists. You have not shown me one thing to make me see otherwise.

I am not required to prove to you that God exists.

I am in favour of a secular society where everyone is free to believe whatever the hell they like, so long as they don't use that belief to interfere in others' lives. If every religious person on this planet felt the same, then oh my, what a better world this would be. If all religious people were content to keep their religion to themselves, without harming others and without imposing their religious rules onto non-believers, I wouldn't even bother questioning how much truth or fiction their religion contains. It would be of no interest to me at all.

Unfortunately this is not the world we live in. The religious are not content in their own beliefs; they must interfere with the lives of non-believers. They always have and they still do. As long as that is the case, we must ask whether God exists at all. There is no evidence, none, zip, zero, that he does. It is not up to me to prove he doesn't exist; it is up to his advocates, those who wish to impose his rules upon me, to prove he does. In the last two thousand years, this has still not happened.

I'll just use the tooth fairy analogy again. If I wanted to subject all humans to the rules of the tooth fairy, it would not be up to you to prove the tooth fairy doesn't exist. It would be up to me to prove she does. You would also be quite justified in pointing out that the Tooth Fairy Commandments were written by humans rather than by a tooth fairy, and therefore even if the tooth fairy DID exist the writings concerning her are not necessarily true.

But oh no. According to you, everyone would have to follow my tooth fairy rules all the way until the point when someone proved the tooth fairy didn't exist. Sadly, once again you cannot disprove something's existence scientifically, so that point would never arrive. How unfortunate for atheists like you, who reject the sublime truth of the tooth fairy. Oh, and by the way, an eternity of horrific torment awaits you after you die.

If it wasn't obvious, those last two sentences are a joke. I hope you will find them as ridiculous as they are intended to be, and I'll leave you to figure out the moral of the story yourself.

Finally, a question for you. What if you're wrong, you say. Well, you've been wrong about every single thing you said about evolution... are you too embarrassed to admit you were wrong? Aren't you something of a hypocrite for asking me "what if you're wrong?" We've seen that when you're wrong, you are incapable of accepting it.