

---

Subject: Jesus

Posted by [Fish](#) on Sat, 26 Aug 2006 06:58:39 GMT

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

---

Everybody who walks the earth is destined to die at some point. It's a depressing thought, however it is nevertheless true. What happens then? Are we just obliterated or is there a life after this one? If there is eternal life, then the next life will be a lot longer than this one. If we win the genetic lottery here, we may live to be 100 years old. Most of us will live a shorter life than this. By comparison, the next life will last forever.

Bearing this in mind it is very important to consider how we live this life and to give some serious thought to the choices we make. Unless you subscribe to the notion that life is a random accident then you need to consider what you will say to your maker when you meet Him. The Bible says that we will all face judgement when we die. The Bible also says that all of us have done bad things in the eyes of God, we have all sinned. If we are to be held accountable for these things that we have done, then our eternal destination is going to be very unpleasant. We will not be able to tell God that we deserve to go into His heaven, because we don't deserve to go into His heaven.

God has made a way for us to avoid hell, which is where I deserve to go along with everyone else. He sent Jesus Christ to earth to live the perfect life that we couldn't live, pay for our sins with His suffering on the cross and to purchase a place in heaven for us. The way to receive the gift of eternal life is to do the following:

1. Trust Jesus to save you from your sins.
2. Accept Him as your Savior.
3. Make Him the Lord of your life (Giving Him control of your life).
4. Confess your sins to God (He knows them all anyway) and ask Him to forgive you of them.

These are not steps to be taken lightly. If you follow Jesus, it can't help but change your life. It will also make the next life a lot more enjoyable.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [z310](#) on Sat, 26 Aug 2006 07:06:56 GMT

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

---

I subscribe to the notion that life is a random accident.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Dover](#) on Sat, 26 Aug 2006 08:22:22 GMT

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

---

Fish wrote on Fri, 25 August 2006 23:58 Everybody who walks the earth is destined to die at some point. It's a depressing thought, however it is nevertheless true. What happens then? Are we just obliterated or is there a life after this one? If there is eternal life, then the next life will be a lot

longer than this one. If we win the genetic lottery here, we may live to be 100 years old. Most of us will live a shorter life than this. By comparison, the next life will last forever.

Bearing this in mind it is very important to consider how we live this life and to give some serious thought to the choices we make. Unless you subscribe to the notion that life is a random accident then you need to consider what you will say to your maker when you meet Him. The Bible says that we will all face judgement when we die. The Bible also says that all of us have done bad things in the eyes of God, we have all sinned. If we are to be held accountable for these things that we have done, then our eternal destination is going to be very unpleasant. We will not be able to tell God that we deserve to go into His heaven, because we don't deserve to go into His heaven.

God has made a way for us to avoid hell, which is where I deserve to go along with everyone else. He sent Jesus Christ to earth to live the perfect life that we couldn't live, pay for our sins with His suffering on the cross and to purchase a place in heaven for us. The way to receive the gift of eternal life is to do the following:

1. Trust Jesus to save you from your sins.
2. Accept Him as your Savior.
3. Make Him the Lord of your life (Giving Him control of your life).
4. Confess your sins to God (He knows them all anyway) and ask Him to forgive you of them.

These are not steps to be taken lightly. If you follow Jesus, it can't help but change your life. It will also make the next life a lot more enjoyable.

I don't believe it.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [puddle\\_splasher](#) on Sat, 26 Aug 2006 10:35:35 GMT

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

---

Bear in mind that the gospels from the Bible were printed over 300 years after Jesus died.

Now what you have is a story told by word of mouth, just like "chinese whispers" where the story becomes longer, twisted and more corrupt.

The gospels were originally supposed to tell you about his life and were NOT meant to rules our lifes.

Think long and hard! We are still believing in things 2000 years later printed by people that thought Thunder was the gods talking.

Is there life after death? lets just say that no-one has ever came back to tell me. It is all about faith.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [Dethdeath](#) on Sat, 26 Aug 2006 12:37:20 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Religions suck

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 26 Aug 2006 14:52:53 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Fish wrote on Sat, 26 August 2006 02:58 Everybody who walks the earth is destined to die at some point. It's a depressing thought, however it is nevertheless true. What happens then? Are we just obliterated or is there a life after this one? If there is eternal life, then the next life will be a lot longer than this one. If we win the genetic lottery here, we may live to be 100 years old. Most of us will live a shorter life than this. By comparison, the next life will last forever.

Bearing this in mind it is very important to consider how we live this life and to give some serious thought to the choices we make. Unless you subscribe to the notion that life is a random accident then you need to consider what you will say to your maker when you meet Him. The Bible says that we will all face judgement when we die. The Bible also says that all of us have done bad things in the eyes of God, we have all sinned. If we are to be held accountable for these things that we have done, then our eternal destination is going to be very unpleasant. We will not be able to tell God that we deserve to go into His heaven, because we don't deserve to go into His heaven.

God has made a way for us to avoid hell, which is where I deserve to go along with everyone else. He sent Jesus Christ to earth to live the perfect life that we couldn't live, pay for our sins with His suffering on the cross and to purchase a place in heaven for us. The way to receive the gift of eternal life is to do the following:

1. Trust Jesus to save you from your sins.
2. Accept Him as your Savior.
3. Make Him the Lord of your life (Giving Him control of your life).
4. Confess your sins to God (He knows them all anyway) and ask Him to forgive you of them.

These are not steps to be taken lightly. If you follow Jesus, it can't help but change your life. It will also make the next life a lot more enjoyable.  
Evangellicals suck.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [runewood](#) on Sat, 26 Aug 2006 16:28:40 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

If there is a god, he would not be the Christian god. Christianity is a religion created by man. Its book, rules, history, and ideals were made by men, not a god.

Life was a random mess up, that is until I see otherwise.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Sat, 26 Aug 2006 18:59:19 GMT

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

---

z310 wrote on Sat, 26 August 2006 03:06I subscribe to the notion that life is a random accident. How depressing.

puddle\_splasherBear in mind that the gospels from the Bible were printed over 300 years after Jesus died.

Bear in mind that the blurb in your science textbook about Sir Isaac Newton's three main laws of physics were written over 400 years after he actually tested them. That's more than 300 years, so according to your logic, we can't believe what is written in our science textbooks today.

Hell, according to that logic, we can't believe a single written record, whether scientific, religious, historical, or anything else, older than 100 years.

Quote:Think long and hard! We are still believing in things 2000 years later printed by people that thought Thunder was the gods talking.

You're right. Let's completely renounce all of our beliefs in all religions AND science and not attempt to learn anything about our environment, nor should we base any of our current knowledge on past experiences and written accounts.

j\_ball430Evangelicals suck.  
NOU

Quote:If there is a god, he would not be the Christian god.

And you know this to be absolutely true, don't you, despite your complete lack of evidence?

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [puddle\\_splasher](#) on Sat, 26 Aug 2006 19:23:21 GMT

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

---

Don't we just love Religious Zealots.

You are just the same as the Muslim race. Only problem there, is that they came after Christianity.

Have you ever known scientifically, of anyone, animal or any living thing to be resurrected and not after being "dead" for a few seconds or minutes?

What you have is Faith and there is nothing wrong with that.

However science can and frequently rips the Old Testament apart with stone cold, hard facts.

Google "The Dead Scrolls" and learn something different. Do not let yourself become brainwashed. Always ask questions, for there are a lot more questions for every answer that you will be given.

Again we still believe in stories written by people who thought that Thunder was God speaking. Even in todays world of science when we have disproved that theory, do people still believe in ancient writings of what was a good mans story of his life and teachings, that was sadly corrupted by a few interpreters 300 years later.

What happened to the gospel of Mary Magdalene or the gospel of Josuah of Nazareth? there are approximately another 50+ gospels that have been revealed. Try reading some of them.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Sat, 26 Aug 2006 19:54:25 GMT

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

---

Wow I can't believe someone started this topic. Don't people learn to avoid religious discussions? There is nothing that anyone can say, from any religion or point of view, that will sway the other person(s). Religion, or lack thereof is deeply ingrained in people, they are either taught it from childbirth or they have come to their own decision at some point, and in my experience everyone almost violently defends whichever their point of view is.

This does not only apply to religious versus non-religious people...I have seen practical knock-down-dragout fights between which god is the "true" god (one person may believe Jesus is the son of God, while another belives in Buddah...one follows the bible and another follows the Koran, etc)

There's no winning the "argument", and no amount of pasting what you believe or referencing scientific materials is going to sway the other person one bit, so all that happens is everyone flames each other to death and gets pissed off. There are exceptions to the rule of course, and I have seen calm intelligent discussion on opposing sides...but one thing that I have never seen is someones mind changed due to the discussion.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Renx](#) on Sat, 26 Aug 2006 19:56:51 GMT

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

---

Dethdeath wrote on Sat, 26 August 2006 09:37 Religions suck

Religion is great, just look at what it has done for the middle east

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [GoArmy44](#) on Sat, 26 Aug 2006 19:58:04 GMT

---

Quote:You are just the same as the Muslim race. Only problem there, is that they came after Christianity.

Muslims are a race?

---

---

Subject: Conversation with an Atheist  
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Sat, 26 Aug 2006 20:07:36 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

(Revised and updated from its last posting; if you notice any inconsistencies and blatant fallacies, let me know.)

"Atheist in quotes."  
\*Theist in asteriks.\*

"God doesn't exist; God is just some fairytale people made up to give purpose to their meaningless lives. It's easy for people to attribute to 'God' that which they cannot explain. I absolutely KNOW there is no God and believe strictly in science and logic."  
\*Sure God exists. How else did we get here, completely unorganized randomness? You call THAT science?\*

"Well, it all started with the Big Bang...."  
\*What initiated the Big Bang? What even originated the matter that supposedly exploded in the Big Bang?\*

"It was the result of a long chain of nuclear and chemical reactions among all the concentrated matter."  
\*Still doesn't answer my question as to what originated that matter or what caused those chemical reactions in the first place.\*

"Why does it have to be created? Like your God, why couldn't it just always have existed without any initial creation?"  
\*Because everything finite, unlike an omnipotent deity, must have a beginning and something that caused it into being. Something outside the realm of our universe must have created it because it couldn't just create itself.\*

"Sure it could. In fact, when you think about it, matter is hardly finite at all, anyway, since it only changes from one form to another. It has simply always existed."  
\*Yet matter does not have omnipotent powers and cannot create more of itself, nor could it have created itself in the first place, so what created it?\*

"Haven't we gone over this about five times already? Nothing created it; if anything, it created itself."  
\*So you believe in spontaneous generation of matter out of nothing... (a "theory" science has failed to substantiate with any reputable evidence/experimentation). Why doesn't this seem to

happen anymore within our observable realm of space?\*

"Well, the universe has changed much since the time of the Big Bang. The conditions that caused the Big Bang to occur in the first place aren't present anymore."

\*Conditions such as...?\*

"Proper temperature, pressure, close proximity of all matter to itself... stuff like that."

\*Uh-huh... and what caused all those things to be set just right in order for everything to explode? (Never mind that you still haven't answered my question as to where it all came from.)\*

"Random collisions and reactions of millions of atoms with each other. All matter was contained in a single point, so billions of reactions could be occurring at the same point in time. The Big Bang occurred when the outward forces caused by the billions of nuclear and chemical reactions became too great for the forces holding the matter together to overcome. KA-BOOM! It swelled up and exploded."

\*So how did just the right reactions occur at just the right moments to leave us with our current roster of elements, polyatomic ions, etc. and their various properties 'n' such?\*

"Randomness occurring over an infinite timescale. Given enough time, all possibilities that can happen, will happen. Matter had all the time in the universe to get everything right."

\*So, you're saying that you believe in an infinite chain of finite, causal events that have no beginning or any outside cause to exist?

Also, if time is infinite, how did we ever get to now?\*

"Which do you want me to answer first?"

\*Take your pick.\*

"Time is infinite because it never stops ticking. It has always been ticking and always will be ticking. I assume you're going to ask what initiated time to start its ticking, so let me just ask why it couldn't have always been around just like you claim your God has?"

\*Because we could never have gotten to this current point in time if we were spending an eternity trying to catch up with ourselves. With no starting point and ending point on an infinitely long line of duration, how could we possibly progress from one spot to the next when we are moving forever into the past?\*

"Whoa, wait a minute; time flows in one direction. We don't go from present to past; we go into the future at an infinitely fast rate since time does not stop. In fact, you could argue that the past doesn't even exist and that we are just forever transitioning from the present to the future."

\*Okay... your point?\*

"Well, we're here in one point in time that instantly progresses to the next...."

\*Still doesn't explain how we got there in the first place if the starting point is an infinite distance away from where we are now.\*

"..."

\*Right.... Let's move on, to a different point, shall we?\*

"Okay, let's."

\*You mentioned earlier that “given enough time, all possibilities that can happen, will happen.” Does this include the possibility of total system failure?\*

“What do you mean by ‘system failure?’”

\*Meaning that given the right conditions, the entire universe would “undo” itself.\*

“The universe has ‘undone’ itself already many times over. At some point in time, possibly billions of years from now, all the matter that was flung to the far reaches of space by the Big Bang will come back together at a single point, just like it was from before the Big Bang.”

\*That’s not what I meant.\*

“Well, what did you mean, then?”

\*By total system failure, I meant that the laws governing that entire process, from Big Bang to Big Crunch, will cease to properly function, halting the process altogether and destroying all matter in the universe. This is certainly a possibility, and according to you, all possibilities have already occurred, meaning we shouldn’t be here having this discussion since the universe should have been zapped out of existence an infinity ago.\*

“...Obviously, since we’re still here, this hasn’t happened, meaning...”

\*...Meaning not all possibilities have happened or are happening at the same time (like string theory tells us) since one of those possibilities is the possibility of total system failure that would negate existence... meaning we aren’t on an infinite timescale (since we haven’t been blinked out of existence yet)... meaning our universe had a definite starting point when something outside the boundaries of our physical laws caused it into being.\*

“\*sigh\* There’s nothing I can do with you, is there? You’re just too blindly devoted to this idea of a higher being just so you can feel morally superior to me. Congratulations, you religious zealot.”

\*How am I being a religious zealot if all I did was logically defend the idea of a higher power outside the realm of this universe that caused it into being? If anything, that’s only the agnostic point of view and doesn’t even bring other religions into play. I haven’t even BEGUN to delve into the logic behind my belief in the Christian god Jehovah....\*

“That’s because GOD DOES NOT EXIST.”

\*Funny how you keep saying that, yet you aren’t able to defend it, it seems.\*

“I don’t NEED to defend it because IT’S TRUE!”

\* \*scoff\* Who’s the religious zealot now?\*

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [puddle\\_splasher](#) on Sat, 26 Aug 2006 20:33:23 GMT

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

You are brainwashed and unable to think for yourself

P.S. delve into the true meaning behind "The Rampant Lion" on your crest. Prepare to be shocked, its about your religion.



Start thinking Templar Knights and Christianity and before anyone says, "Oh, that's that D'Vinci code", no, it's not mentioned in there.

No! It's not about being a Scotsman. That's a red lion on a yellow background.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Javacx](#) on Sat, 26 Aug 2006 20:43:13 GMT

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

---

I think you'll find, Hydra, that such Atheists are in minority.

---

---

Subject: Re: Conversation with an Atheist

Posted by [Scythar](#) on Sat, 26 Aug 2006 21:25:55 GMT

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

---

Hydra wrote on Sat, 26 August 2006 16:07 (Revised and updated from its last posting; if you notice any inconsistencies and blatant fallacies, let me know.)

...

In fact, when you think about it, matter is hardly finite at all, anyway, since it only changes from one form to another. It has simply always existed."

\*Yet matter does not have omnipotent powers and cannot create more of itself, nor could it have created itself in the first place, so what created it?\*

"Haven't we gone over this about five times already? Nothing created it; if anything, it created itself."

\*So you believe in spontaneous generation of matter out of nothing... (a "theory" science has failed to substantiate with any reputable evidence/experimentation). Why doesn't this seem to happen anymore within our observable realm of space?\*

So, first the atheist says that matter has always existed, and then for some reason he says "if anything, it created itself" which is a completely different case, and the rest of the conversation is based on that statement... This is an interesting text but seems too made-up for me.

Matter could be infinite, i.e. it has always existed, and no, I don't understand why it should thus be omnipotent as well.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sat, 26 Aug 2006 23:01:32 GMT

---

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

---

puddle\_splasher wrote on Sat, 26 August 2006 14:33 You are brainwashed and unable to think for yourself

P.S. delve into the true meaning behind "The Rampant Lion" on your crest. Prepare to be shocked, its about your religion.

Start thinking Templar Knights and Christianity and before anyone says, "Oh, thats that D'Vinci code", no, its not mentioned in there.

No! Its not about being a Scotsman. Thats a red lion on a yellow background.

"One religion may have gotten it wrong! Therefore God must not exist!"

Ugh... please. Will people stop arguing the falacies of religion in their quest to prove that God does not exist. Religion and God have nothing in common other than the idea of worshiping a divine being.

The ideas of religion are human-made. There have been 1000's of different religions throughout history. Yet NONE of those being wrong either proves or disproves the existance of God.

Quote:Have you ever known scientifically, of anyone, animal or any living thing to be resurrected and not after being "dead" for a few seconds or minutes?

I do. His name was Jesus. I know this because a book, filled with words that I am not able to witness for myself, tells me so.

Quote:However science can and frequently rips the Old Testament apart with stone cold, hard facts.

I'd like to see some of these facts (Honestly).

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 02:30:09 GMT

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

---

This idiot posted this to stir up shit and I'll leave it at that just like the rest of you should.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 02:47:50 GMT

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

---

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 hooley. 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).

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 03:44:46 GMT

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

---

Just in relation to your "what if" scenario:

Very true. It's a concept of humanity as to how to interpret "God".

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 04:00:37 GMT

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

---

Crimson wrote on Sat, 26 August 2006 22:47 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 DOES mean that anything in the Bible is more than a big bunch of brainwashing hooley. 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).

How the fuck is that being closed-minded? I choose to believe in something and disagree with other things. So? If that's the case then EVERYBODY is closed minded to some extent. I'm not denying that there IS a possibility that there's no God or no Heaven and Hell. However, I choose to believe differently. Just as you choose to believe that there's nothing. Believing in nothing is still believing in something... a principle, an idea, a thought.

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.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 04:25:24 GMT

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

---

j\_ball430 wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 00:00

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.

Blazer wrote

There's no winning the "argument", and no amount of pasting what you believe or referencing scientific materials is going to sway the other person one bit, so all that happens is everyone flames each other to death and gets pissed off. There are exceptions to the rule of course, and I have seen calm intelligent discussion on opposing sides...but one thing that I have never seen is someones mind changed due to the discussion.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [icedog90](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 04:26:43 GMT

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

---

warranto wrote on Sat, 26 August 2006 16:01Quote:Have you ever known scientifically, of anyone, animal or any living thing to be resurrected and not after being "dead" for a few seconds or minutes?

I do. His name was Jesus. I know this because a book, filled with words that I am not able to witness for myself, tells me so.

People to this day are still being raised from the dead. it IS a fact. There are stories all over the internet, and heck, even videos if you search hard enough.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 04:47:24 GMT

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

---

Crimson wrote on Sat, 26 August 2006 22:47For 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 DOES 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).

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

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 05:06:49 GMT

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

---

Neither will empty retorts.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 05:22:50 GMT

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

---

I'm not a "pseudo" intellectual, thank you very much.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [xptek](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 05:49:23 GMT

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

---

Crimson wrote on Sat, 26 August 2006 22:47 For religion to claim that a "god" or "intelligent being" created the universe is just closed-minded.

Implying everyone following a religion is "close-minded" doesn't really help your argument.

Crimson wrote on Sat, 26 August 2006 22:47 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 DOES mean that anything in the Bible is more than a big bunch of brainwashing hooey.

Can you back that up at all?

I'm an atheist. Fire away.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [glyde51](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 06:56:34 GMT

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

---

Oh no! I need to give myself up to a higher power! I can't save myself!

Lol, I found a pamphlet about it lying around on the ground in the U.S. while I was on vacation. I laughed. kk?

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 07:58:22 GMT

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

---

I said "DOES" when I meant "DOESN'T". Corrected.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [puddle\\_splasher](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 10:01:12 GMT

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

---

icedog90 wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 00:26warranto wrote on Sat, 26 August 2006 16:01Quote:Have you ever known scientifically, of anyone, animal or any living thing to be resurrected and not after being "dead" for a few seconds or minutes?

I do. His name was Jesus. I know this because a book, filled with words that I am not able to witness for myself, tells me so.

People to this day are still being raised from the dead. it IS a fact. There are stories all over the internet, and heck, even videos if you search hard enough.

I already stated that we do not want to know of people that have been "dead" for seconds or minutes, because that argument goes along the lines that say:- because the heart stops doesnt mean you are dead. When all body functions stop, thats really when you are dead.

the heart pumps blood that carries the oxygen that goes to the brain.....blah blah blah, its all medical.

However ther is NO-ONE that has ever brought anyone BACK FROM BEING DEAD. It does take a genius to understand and accept this, even the village idiot comprehends that his pet mouse is dead. otherwise every grave will be getting dug up and everyone coming back to us.

The person that has crowned and understands better than most is BLAZER.

We can discuss all day and no-one will change their minds. Its a totally useless discussion.

Stick with your faith until you see your younger brother dead at 27, followed on a few years later by his Son, my nephew 15. Then tell me there is a God working for a better need and we will still argue otherwise.

Ask me if I believe in God and you will get another different concept.

We shall see when my time comes if I was right.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Scythar](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 11:35:25 GMT

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

---

puddle\_splasher wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 06:01icedog90 wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 00:26warranto wrote on Sat, 26 August 2006 16:01Quote:Have you ever known scientifically, of anyone, animal or any living thing to be resurrected and not after being "dead" for a few seconds

or minutes?

I do. His name was Jesus. I know this because a book, filled with words that I am not able to witness for myself, tells me so.

People to this day are still being raised from the dead. it IS a fact. There are stories all over the internet, and heck, even videos if you search hard enough.

I already stated that we do not want to know of people that have been "dead" for seconds or minutes, because that argument goes along the lines that say:- because the heart stops doesn't mean you are dead. When all body functions stop, that's really when you are dead.

the heart pumps blood that carries the oxygen that goes to the brain.....blah blah blah, it's all medical.

However there is NO-ONE that has ever brought anyone BACK FROM BEING DEAD. It does take a genius to understand and accept this, even the village idiot comprehends that his pet mouse is dead. otherwise every grave will be getting dug up and everyone coming back to us.

The person that has crowned and understands better than most is BLAZER.

We can discuss all day and no-one will change their minds. It's a totally useless discussion.

Stick with your faith until you see your younger brother dead at 27, followed on a few years later by his Son, my nephew 15. Then tell me there is a God working for a better need and we will still argue otherwise.

Ask me if I believe in God and you will get another different concept.

We shall see when my time comes if I was right.

Cryonics poses an interesting twist to that way of thinking though. I'm not an expert on the matter, but doesn't the body lose all activity when deep-frozen? Sure, we can't revert the process yet, but it shouldn't be impossible.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 14:17:32 GMT

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

---

puddle\_splasher wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 04:01

Stick with your faith until you see your younger brother dead at 27, followed on a few years later by his Son, my nephew 15. Then tell me there is a God working for a better need and we will still

argue otherwise.

Ask me if I believe in God and you will get another different concept.

We shall see when my time comes if I was right.

LOL. Yes, I'm laughing at you. One of those people who thinks God doesn't exist because something bad happened to him. Pathetic. You're going to claim that something doesn't exist, simply based on the fact that "he let something [that you didn't like] happen"?

Oh my goodness, how much more pathetic can you get? Why should an unfortunate thing such as death prove one way or the other as to God's existence. All that proves is that he won't be there at your beck and call. I mean, grow up.

Oh but wait, "why would God let things happen if he really exists?", right? That's a religious concept. Something HUMANS thought up. That doesn't mean that it is true. It may be, and perhaps there is a reason something that bad happened, but it doesn't mean it's a fact. Perhaps God simply doesn't care... but that doesn't mean that there is no God, just one that doesn't care.

Quote:However there is NO-ONE that has ever brought anyone BACK FROM BEING DEAD. It does take a genius to understand and accept this, even the village idiot comprehends that his pet mouse is dead. otherwise every grave will be getting dug up and everyone coming back to us.

I already gave you one example.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 15:17:53 GMT

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

---

glyde51 wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 02:56 Oh no! I need to give myself up to a higher power! I can't save myself!

Lol, I found a pamphlet about it lying around on the ground in the U.S. while I was on vacation. I laughed. kk?

Why is it that we're mocked because we believe in something we can't see? Do you not have faith that you will have a house tomorrow? You don't know if that'll be true until the day ends. It's a physical impossibility unless you have some sinister plan to burn down the house or have it destroyed by some other means.

Why is that so much easier to believe in than a higher being? Simply because you've had a roof over your head for your entire life? That doesn't mean anything when tomorrow comes and your house suddenly goes up in flames. Yet, you still believe that you're going to be in your bed tomorrow night in the comfort of your own home.



The fact is, you believe in something that you can't see. I believe in something that I can't see. The only difference is what I can't see is a little bit more life-changing. Disagree with my beliefs? Fine, but don't dare mock me because I believe in something.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 15:26:38 GMT

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

---

j\_ball430 wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 11:17

Why is it that we're mocked because we believe in something we can't see? Do you not have faith that you will have a house tomorrow? You don't know if that'll be true until the day ends. It's a physical impossibility unless you have some sinister plan to burn down the house or have it destroyed by some other means.

Why is that so much easier to believe in than a higher being? Simply because you've had a roof over your head for your entire life? That doesn't mean anything when tomorrow comes and your house suddenly goes up in flames. Yet, you still believe that you're going to be in your bed tomorrow night in the comfort of your own home.

The fact is, you believe in something that you can't see. I believe in something that I can't see. The only difference is what I can't see is a little bit more life-changing. Disagree with my beliefs? Fine, but don't dare mock me because I believe in something.

Faith and belief are two vastly differing concepts that get routinely used in place of each other. Faith is an epistemological conundrum because it defines objectively that which is not known or further; knowable. Belief is a concept similar to desire, or more appropriately: hope. Consider belief to be "hopeful necessity", which encompasses both adjectives fully.

When someone says they have faith in something, they are by association encompassing belief through that faith. For if you can make the jump that a certain god is (Biblical or not), you must also have the hope that such a god exists. However, it is possible to believe that a god is, but not be so arrogant as to suggest that any concept of such a god is knowable through faith. That is why I say that I believe that God exists, albeit God is unknowable so I don't pretend to have faith in any component of Him.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [glyde51](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 15:28:14 GMT

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

---

j\_ball430 wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 11:17 glyde51 wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 02:56 Oh no! I need to give myself up to a higher power! I can't save myself!

Lol, I found a pamphlet about it lying around on the ground in the U.S. while I was on vacation. I laughed. kk?

Why is it that we're mocked because we believe in something we can't see? Do you not have faith

---

that you will have a house tomorrow? You don't know if that'll be true until the day ends. It's a physical impossibility unless you have some sinister plan to burn down the house or have it destroyed by some other means.

Why is that so much easier to believe in than a higher being? Simply because you've had a roof over your head for your entire life? That doesn't mean anything when tomorrow comes and your house suddenly goes up in flames. Yet, you still believe that you're going to be in your bed tomorrow night in the comfort of your own home.

The fact is, you believe in something that you can't see. I believe in something that I can't see. The only difference is what I can't see is a little bit more life-changing. Disagree with my beliefs? Fine, but don't dare mock me because I believe in something.

What? I was laughing because it said I couldn't save myself, and in order to save myself (from an unknown problem) I'd have to give myself up to a higher power. I'm not laughing because it said a "higher power" or something. Misreading things for the win.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [icedog90](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 15:33:34 GMT

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

---

puddle\_splasher wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 03:01 I already stated that we do not want to know of people that have been "dead" for seconds or minutes, because that argument goes along the lines that say:- because the heart stops doesn't mean you are dead. When all body functions stop, that's really when you are dead.

the heart pumps blood that carries the oxygen that goes to the brain.....blah blah blah, it's all medical.

However there is NO-ONE that has ever brought anyone BACK FROM BEING DEAD. It does take a genius to understand and accept this, even the village idiot comprehends that his pet mouse is dead. otherwise every grave will be getting dug up and everyone coming back to us.

The person that has crowned and understands better than most is BLAZER.

We can discuss all day and no-one will change their minds. It's a totally useless discussion.

Stick with your faith until you see your younger brother dead at 27, followed on a few years later by his Son, my nephew 15. Then tell me there is a God working for a better need and we will still argue otherwise.

Ask me if I believe in God and you will get another different concept.

We shall see when my time comes if I was right.

I'm afraid you're one of the "worse" arguers/debaters. I was also talking about people who have

been dead for hours, or days. You're getting way ahead of yourself and fighting something that isn't even there in this thread. The only person who is trying to change people's minds here in this topic is the starter. He (or she) hasn't posted ONE reply, and you're running around saying that everyone is trying to change another's mind. Please, knock it off and wake up. We're only defending anything that has to do with Christianity, ourselves, and anything else that has been defended in here.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 15:35:00 GMT

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

---

Javafx wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 11:26: However, it is possible to believe that a god is, but not be so arrogant as to suggest that any concept of such a god is knowable through faith. That is why I say that I believe that God exists, albeit God is unknowable so I don't pretend to have faith in any component of Him.

Well, to me, God is omnipotent, omnipresent, omniscient. While I don't know this to be true, and cannot further be proven, this is what I accept as truth.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [pulverizer](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 15:35:57 GMT

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

---

I'm pretty anti religic. its just not right, most religions have done so many bad things. Priests raping kids, wars and all that stuff. and I don't believe things I cannot see, touch or feel .

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Dover](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 15:40:12 GMT

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

---

Religion is cheap. Religion is easy. It gives a simpliestic answer to the near unanswerable.

In response to Hydra's sample Athiest/Theist coversation:

The evidence backing up the religious, creationist answer is no more concrete than the big bang theory. True, I cannot explain how the world came to be, but "The guy up there did it" is just too simple of an answer.

Religion was created by man, taking Christianity as an example (Because it's widespread), The bible was written and published by men. The gospels were men. Their stories were about men. The prophets were men. Jesus is believed to be the son of god, but he was on earth in the form of man. Religion is an institution created by man. So it's absolutely teaming of human error.

I cannot--and will not--spend my life muttering into the sky hoping for things to go my way.

History tells us (Or at least, it tells me) that more harm from good comes from the institution of religion. Therefore I avoid it.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 15:41:48 GMT

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

---

j\_ball430 wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 11:35Javaxcx wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 11:26However, it is possible to believe that a god is, but not be so arrogant as to suggest that any concept of such a god is knowable through faith. That is why I say that I believe that God exists, albeit God is unknowable so I don't pretend to have faith in any component of Him. Well, to me, God is omnipotent, omnipresent, omniscient. While I don't know this to be true, and cannot further be proven, this is what I accept as truth.

It's entirely possible to accept something as truth and admit it unprovable. You accept it as truth because you believe it to be true; not because you are as arrogant as to say it is objectively true and of that there is no question. Faith is a stubborn mistriss, and would do even the most devout believers good to be rid of it.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 15:44:09 GMT

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

---

pulverizer wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 11:35I'm pretty anti religic. its just not right, most religions have done so many bad things. Priests raping kids, wars and all that stuff. and I don't believe things I cannot see, touch or feel .

Religions are created by man and are prone to corruption due to that fact. Don't refuse to put faith or belief into a higher power simply because man has corrupted every aspect of it. It doesn't mean that the idea is corrupt, just the result of man's follies.

As for not believing in things you cannot see... you do all the time. Do you not put trust in others? You can't see, touch, or feel people's true intentions. You don't know if they're out to get you or not, yet you still put trust in them.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Dover](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 15:53:05 GMT

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

---

j\_ball430 wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 08:44Do you not put trust in others? You can't see, touch, or feel people's true intentions. You don't know if they're out to get you or not, yet you still put trust in them.

Well, personally I put trust exclusively in people who have proved trustworthy before, such as

---

close friends and family. People who I've had past experiences with, which make me reasonable sure of their intentions. Which renders your argument ineffective, since religions don't have an equivalent for past experiences, except for "I was raised a (Insert religion here)", which is a stupid reason to believe in anything. Or "I once had (Insert random 'miracle' here) happen to me!", which usually gets giant holes punched in it.

And you can "feel" a person's intentions, in a way. Can't you tell when someone is lying, or when someone means you harm?

Trust isn't "given" to anyone or "put" anywhere. It's earned.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 15:54:04 GMT

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

---

pulverizer wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 09:35 I don't believe things I cannot see, touch or feel .

Ugh.. too easy. I almost can't help myself.

Let's see here... things you can not see, touch, or feel:

The fact that your parents are truly your own parents;

Molecules;

The mind ( I don't mean the brain, but rather the consciousness);

The Ozone layer;

Space;

Other planets;

Radio waves;

Wireless internet signals;

Electricity;

Data being written to a hard drive;

ok, that's enough for now.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 15:58:51 GMT

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

---

Dover wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 11:53 Well, personally I put trust exclusively in people who have proved trustworthy before, such as close friends and family. People who I've had past experiences with, which make me reasonable sure of their intentions. Which renders your argument ineffective...

Again with my argument with glyde, you're only relying on what you know from past experiences.

That has no bearing if tomorrow someone goes behind your back and ruins any and all trust that you had in them. Simply because you trusted them before doesn't mean they'll keep being trustworthy. You, however, believe that they will.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Dover](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 16:10:41 GMT

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

---

j\_ball430 wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 08:58Dover wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 11:53Well, personally I put trust exclusively in people who have proved trustworthy before, such as close friends and family. People who I've had past experiences with, which make me reasonable sure of their intentions. Which renders your arguement ineffective...

Again with my argument with glyde, you're only relying on what you know from past experiences. That has no bearing if tomorrow someone goes behind your back and ruins any and all trust that you had in them. Simply because you trusted them before doesn't mean they'll keep being trustworthy. You, however, believe that they will.

Shit happens. If someone does that, I stop trusting them, since my past experiences with them and now muddied with backstabbery.

But basically, yeah. People who have been trustworthy in the past have a tendency to keep being trustworthy. I don't see anything wrong with that.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Dover](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 16:12:24 GMT

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

---

warranto wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 08:54pulverizer wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 09:35I don't believe things I cannot see, touch or feel .

Ugh.. too easy. I almost can't help myself.

Let's see here... things you can not see, touch, or feel:

The fact that your parents are truly your own parents;

Molecules;

The mind ( I don't mean the brain, but rather the consciousness);

The Ozone layer;

Space;

Other planets;

Radio waves;

Wireless internet signals;

Electricity;

Data being written to a hard drive;

ok, that's enough for now.

Human senses are far from perfect, but all these things can be captured, utilized, measured, controlled, or a combination of the above. God is not a measurable quantity.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 16:16:30 GMT

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

---

True, but with the things I listed, you still "cannot see, touch or feel" them.

Besides, in order for what you say to be true, you have to either do all that data calculation yourself, or trust that you are being told the truth... something else that you "cannot see, touch or feel".

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Dover](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 16:22:10 GMT

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

---

History has proven things like:

- DNA testing for parental testing
- Electron microscopes
- Those brain-activity-measure-doochickies
- Telescopes
- Radios
- Wireless internet routers
- Electricity
- Hard drives

To hold truth almost all the time. The same cannot be said for God.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [pulverizer](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 16:28:03 GMT

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

---

I think you can "feel" thrust. but what is thrust? I'd never tell anyone my creditcard number. not even my best friend, if you know what I mean. and what I ment with I don't believe in things I cannot see/feel etc, is like "god".

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [runewood](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 16:55:05 GMT

While this is a great argument, what is the point? Can anyone tell me what they hope to accomplish at the end of this topic?

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 16:56:38 GMT

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

---

Dover wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 10:22: History has proven things like:

- DNA testing for parental testing
- Electron microscopes
- Those brain-activity-measure-doo-hickies
- Telescopes
- Radios
- Wireless internet routers
- Electricity
- Hard drives

To hold truth almost all the time. The same cannot be said for God.

Oh? You mean you're going to believe what someone said, in some book? YOU have not proven it, therefore all you can do is take the word of someone else, who could very much be lying in some sort of grand scheme.

DNA is only available as proof, if you believe the person interpreting the results of an experiment, that you did not do, is correct.

the measurement of brain activity in no way proves a consciousness exists. It just measures... brain activity.

Telescopes prove nothing, other than you can see what the telescope tells you to see. You didn't follow it through the production stage, so you have no way of knowing if what you say is true. It could very well be a large-scale lie in order to get you to believe something is a certain way.

Radios also prove nothing. You have no way of knowing if it is "radio waves" that are transmitting the voice, or some sort of magic. You must rely on what someone else told you that things are the way THEY say they are.

Once again, you have not proven that electricity exists. You are choosing to believe what someone else told you about its existence. For all you know, it could, once again, be magic that makes things run.

Hard drives are simply a device that we are told is used to store data. We don't actually know if data is being written to it. We simply choose to believe what someone else told us about it. For all you know, it could be little creatures that can only carry small things, and those creatures are what transport the "data" to our screen.



Quote:and what I ment with I don't believe in things I cannot see/feel etc, is like "god".

Sorry, that excuse doesn't work. Modifying your reasoning to create exceptions, just to make yourself right, in no way gives your argument credibility. In fact, most people who do that are considered to be dillusional, and often end up requiring psychological help.

It would be the same thing as using the following as a defence against murder.

You: "I killed that guy, but it wasn't murder."

Judge: "Why?"

You: "Because that guy is exempt from being murdered, because I say so. Only if someone else was killed would it be murder!"

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 16:59:00 GMT

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

---

runewood wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 10:55While this is a great argument, what is the point? Can anyone tell me what they hope to accomplish at the end of this topic?

(Double post, I know)

I can't speak for others, but what I'm hoping is that people will stop using such awful arguments when trying to prove their reasoning. I could care less who believes in God, or not; just stop with arguments that are so fallacious.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 17:15:26 GMT

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

---

warranto wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 12:59runewood wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 10:55While this is a great argument, what is the point? Can anyone tell me what they hope to accomplish at the end of this topic?

(Double post, I know)

I can't speak for others, but what I'm hoping is that people will stop using such awful arguments when trying to prove their reasoning. I could care less who believes in God, or not; just stop with arguments that are so fallacious.

Yeah, that's pretty much my same intention.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [runewood](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 18:48:38 GMT

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

---

But thier reasoning cant be proven wrong and nor can yours. Its like is star wars a good movie, is cake good, ect. It cant be proven one way or the other. So even if u argue with with for years nothing will change.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Dover](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 21:14:36 GMT

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

---

warranto wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 09:56Dover wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 10:22History has proven things like:

- DNA testing for parental testing
- Electron microscopes
- Those brain-activity-measure-doochickies
- Telescopes
- Radios
- Wireless internet routers
- Electricity
- Hard drives

To hold truth almost all the time. The same cannot be said for God.

Oh? You mean youre going to believe what someone said, in some book? YOU have not proven it, therefore all you can do it take the word of someone else, who could very much be lying in some sort of grand scheme.

DNA is only available as proof, if you believe the person interpreting the results of an experiment, that you did not do, is correct.

the measurement of brain activity in no way proves a conciousness exists. It just measures... brain activity.

Telescopes prove nothing, other than you can see what the telescope tells you to see. You didn't follow it through the production stage, so you have no way of knowing if what you say is true. It could very well be a large-scale lie in order to get you to believe something is a certain way.

Radios also prove nothing. You have no way of knowing if it is "radio waves" that are transmitting the voice, or some sort of magic. You must rely on what someone else told you that things are they way THEY say they are.

Once again, you have not proven that electricity exists. You are chosing to believe what someone else told you about it's existance. For all you know, it could, once again, be magic that makes things run.

Hard drives are simply a device that we are told is used to store data. We don't actually know if

data is being written to it. We simply choose to believe what someone else told us about it. For all you know, it could be little creatures that can only carry small things, and those creatures are what transport the "data" to our screen.

If you'll notice, I said that history has proved these things to be true. While I may not be an expert on the way radio waves are supposed to function, I know that when I turn on my radio and tune to a certain frequency, I hear my favorite radio station. I know this, because it has happened every time I turn it on, without fail.

The same with the other things. I know electricity exists, because when I flip the switch in my room a light comes on. Is that switch connected to magic? Are my parents getting a monthly Magic bill? I don't visually survey my hard drive when I install Renegade on it, but I know it's been installed and by whatever means, Renegade's data has been stored on my hard drive. I don't pretend to be an expert in any of these things (Especially the electron microscopes and DNA testing), but I believe they work, because up until now they've worked.

God is a different story. God moves in mysterious ways. God helps those whom he/she chooses. You cannot compare the two at all. All these (modern) technologies that you listed are in measureable quantities and above all, they're consistant. These are two qualities that religions as a whole lack.

So is what I'm saying that I'll become a believer when someone can bottle God? Yes. Not when I touch it, or I see it, or I feel it, but when you can put it in a labratory and examine it and pick it apart. The day preists and other religious leaders stop shrugging their shoulders whenever you ask them something that isn't a default bible-answered question is the day I become a holy-roller.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [puddle\\_splasher](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 21:16:49 GMT

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

---

[quote title=warranto wrote on Sat, 26 August 2006 19:01]

I do. His name was Jesus. I know this because a book, filled with words that I am not able to witness for myself, tells me so.

[quote]

If you cannot witness the book that is filled with words, then HOW CAN IT TELL YOU HIS NAME WAS JESUS? therefore what you say and see is a lie, or a made up phalacy. It is but a dream, a story, its but a thought in your interpretation of a misconceived idea.

Have you looked up, yet again "Joshua Of NaZareth" or are you scared to read and see both sides of the coin/story?

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 21:27:41 GMT

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

---

j\_ball430 wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 08:35 Well, to me, God is omnipotent, omnipresent, omniscient. While I don't know this to be true, and cannot further be proven, this is what I accept as truth.

Is God willing to prevent evil, but not able? Then he is not omnipotent. Is he able, but not willing? Then he is malevolent. Is he both able and willing? Then whence cometh evil? Is he neither able nor willing? Then why call him God?

Thus is the paradox that disproves the combined omnipotence, omnipresence, and omniscience of this so-called God.

Dover wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 08:40 Religion is cheap. Religion is easy. It gives a simpliestic answer to the near unanswerable.

In response to Hydra's sample Athiest/Theist coversation:

The evidence backing up the religious, creationist answer is no more concrete than the big bang theory. True, I cannot explain how the world came to be, but "The guy up there did it" is just too simple of an answer.

Religion was created by man, taking Christianity as an example (Because it's widespread), The bible was written and published by men. The gospels were men. Their stories were about men. The prophets were men. Jesus is believed to be the son of god, but he was on earth in the form of man. Religion is an institution created by man. So it's absolutely teaming of human error.

I cannot--and will not--spend my life muttering into the sky hoping for things to go my way.

History tells us (Or at least, it tells me) that more harm from good comes from the institution of religion. Therefore I avoid it.

Dover, that is awesome. I doubt it would sway any religious people into disbelief but it is exactly how I feel about religion.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 22:14:17 GMT

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

---

Crimson wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 17:27 Is God willing to prevent evil, but not able? Then he is not omnipotent. Is he able, but not willing? Then he is malevolent. Is he both able and willing? Then whence cometh evil? Is he neither able nor willing? Then why call him God?

The irony of the paradox you've described is that it is as guilty of defining God by human standards as those who scream Biblical phrases at abortion parties. The bolded section is the loose thread.

The concept of "evil" seems to be an unwritten definition. I suggest to you that it is possible that what we deem "evil" in nothing but a sensual means to an ends. It is utterly possible that pain, to God, is not bad or evil at all but as wholesome as apple pie. It is arrogance to say that our definition of evil is the same as God's (whatever it may be), and thus to judge HIM by our standards is more or less a joke.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 22:32:58 GMT

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

---

Crimson wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 17:27: Is God willing to prevent evil, but not able? Then he is not omnipotent. Is he able, but not willing? Then he is malevolent. Is he both able and willing? Then whence cometh evil? Is he neither able nor willing? Then why call him God?

Thus is the paradox that disproves the combined omnipotence, omnipresence, and omniscience of this so-called God.

Why does it have to be one or the other? Why can't he desire to have no "evil", be able to prevent it, yet restrain Himself? Is it because that's not your view on how a god should act? If so, who are you to define that which you cannot measure?

It's entirely possible that God chooses to let man have free-will, therefore He restrains Himself from preventing man from having that free-will.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Dover](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 22:39:04 GMT

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

---

j\_ball430 wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 15:32: Crimson wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 17:27: Is God willing to prevent evil, but not able? Then he is not omnipotent. Is he able, but not willing? Then he is malevolent. Is he both able and willing? Then whence cometh evil? Is he neither able nor willing? Then why call him God?

Thus is the paradox that disproves the combined omnipotence, omnipresence, and omniscience of this so-called God.

Why does it have to be one or the other? Why can't he desire to have no "evil", be able to prevent it, yet restrain Himself? Is it because that's not your view on how a god should act? If so, who are you to define that which you cannot measure?

It's entirely possible that God chooses to let man have free-will, therefore He restrains Himself from preventing man from having that free-will.

If such is the case, j\_ball, what does God do? Why does he/she exist, if not to guard mankind

from evil? If God does nothing, why should mankind worship him/her?

Isn't it also entirely possible that God is a human invention, thought up to explain the unexplainable and give the masses some comfort?

Edit: Looking back, this sounds a bit flimsy. Disregard this post if you'd like...

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 22:45:26 GMT

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

---

Crimson wrote on Sat, 26 August 2006 22:47(quantum physics is awesome).

Awesome? The only thing awesome about quantum physics is how it proves even smart people can be idiots. I'll never understand how a whole branch of physics developed around a principle like  $0+0=1$ . The best way to see the flaws in quantum physics is to pick up something and let go of it. If it falls, you just disproved quantum physics. According to quantum physics, gravity doesn't exist.

Yeah, I know it's off topic, but I couldn't help myself. Quantum physics is just so... so... stupid.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 22:56:58 GMT

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

---

Nothing you said has anything to do with quantum physics. You shouldn't bash things you don't know about. It's like saying that HTML sucks "because of the apples"...in other words, your arguments make no sense and just show that you don't know what you are arguing about...so what is stupid then?

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 23:24:38 GMT

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

---

Quantum physics is premised on the idea that all sub atomic particles are zero dimensional. They are infinitely nothing, yet they are supposed to be the 'building blocks' of reality. How do you build with something that isn't there? In principle,  $0+0$  equals 1 according to quantum physics. Things that don't have size come together to form size. Things that have no dimension come together to form dimensions. Nothing added to nothing makes something in quantum physics.

When applied to reality, the chaotic frenzy stated to exist by quantum theory doesn't allow gravity to exist. The equations that form quantum physics not only can't explain it, they deny it to be possible. Gravity is the easiest force for a person to test for (drop something), yet quantum physics would deny the possibility.

It's why string theory even came about. Quantum mechanics is so incapable of explaining things, it needs to be replaced.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Mon, 28 Aug 2006 01:36:54 GMT

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

---

All I'm going to say is LOL and suggest you actually read up on quantum physics. I've read many books on the subject and its obvious to me that you have not. Until then I hope you stop saying crazy things like quantum physics says that gravity doesn't exist and other things that are totally false. If anything the true nature of the universe is something that we cannot truly comprehend, and things like quantum mechanics are the closest we can come to explaining things.

In short, I'm not a quantum physicist, but science has been a passion of mine for as long as I can remember, and I have read more than my share of books on quantum physics. Most of what you have said is stuff that makes me go "wtf is he talking about". I understand what you are saying, and the meaning you are trying to convey. I'm just saying that the examples you provide are NOT describing quantum physics. Quantum physics does not say that  $0+0=1$ . It would be more accurate to say that a bit could be both a 0 or 1, depending on how (or if) it is measured.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 28 Aug 2006 01:43:38 GMT

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

---

Dover wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 15:14

If you'll notice, I said that history has proved these things to be true. While I may not be an expert on the way radio waves are supposed to function, I know that when I turn on my radio and tune to a certain frequency, I hear my favorite radio station. I know this, because it has happened every time I turn it on, without fail.

But why (or how) does the box the sound come out of get that sound?

Quote:

The same with the other things. I know electricity exists, because when I flip the switch in my room a light comes on. Is that switch connected to magic? Are my parents getting a monthly Magic bill?

They could be. Can you prove that electricity is what we are told it is?

Quote:

I don't visually survey my hard drive when I install Renegade on it, but I know it's been installed and by whatever means, Renegade's data has been stored on my hard drive. I don't pretend to be an expert in any of these things (Especially the electron microscopes and DNA testing), but I believe they work, because up until now they've worked.

It has been installed, but how is it stored?

They work the way they've worked, yes. But that is not what I'm arguing. I'm arguing that you don't know HOW/WHY they work the way they do. You simply choose to believe what you are told, seemingly on the principle that it does what they say it does.

Quote:

God is a different story. God moves in mysterious ways. God helps those whom he/she chooses. You cannot compare the two at all. All these (modern) technologies that you listed are in measureable quantities and above all, they're consistent. These are two qualities that religions as a whole lack.

Who says God has no "measurable quantities"? (though that would be the wrong term, after all, even humans have no "measurable quantities"). Perhaps we just haven't discovered the means to "measure" him.

Quote:

So is what I'm saying that I'll become a believer when someone can bottle God? Yes. Not when I touch it, or I see it, or I feel it, but when you can put it in a laboratory and examine it and pick it apart. The day priests and other religious leaders stop shrugging their shoulders whenever you ask them something that isn't a default bible-answered question is the day I become a holy-roller.

So, are you saying that because the means to "measure" it are not currently available, you say it does not exist? (Careful how you answer that)

Quote:If you cannot witness the book that is filled with words, then HOW CAN IT TELL YOU HIS NAME WAS JESUS? therefore what you say and see is a lie, or a made up phalacy. It is but a dream, a story, its but a thought in your interpretation of a misconceived idea.

Err... witness the book? All I have to do is pick it up and read it to tell you that his name was Jesus...

Quote:Have you looked up, yet again "Joshua Of NaZareth" or are you scared to read and see both sides of the coin/story?

err.. perhaps you can direct me to a specific link? After 10 pages on Google, all I found was that it's another name for Jesus. I fail to see what that has to do with the resurrection (or lack thereof) of someone.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 28 Aug 2006 04:51:15 GMT

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

---

j\_ball430 wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 15:32 Why does it have to be one or the other? Why can't he desire to have no "evil", be able to prevent it, yet restrain Himself? Is it because that's not your



view on how a god should act? If so, who are you to define that which you cannot measure?

It's entirely possible that God chooses to let man have free-will, therefore He restrains Himself from preventing man from having that free-will.

He's your god, not mine.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Mon, 28 Aug 2006 05:56:50 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-8545585184878490822> &q=michael+tsarion

This is a few hours long, but its interesting.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [puddle\\_splasher](#) on Mon, 28 Aug 2006 08:41:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Is this all a project for you and your Church?

Are you getting a badge for demonstrating a willingness to discuss religion?

Are you getting a further badge for imposing on us your interpretation, just as all Jehovahs witnesses and mormons do?

Nothing here is being proven, merely ripped apart slowly but surely like a Jack-Russel with a huge bone.

Yet still you have not answerwd a simple question or are you avoiding it.

You say that you believe in a book that you are not allowed to see? therefore the book could be full of blank pages and still you believe in it?

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Mon, 28 Aug 2006 09:16:02 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

warranto wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 18:43But why (or how) does the box the sound come out of get that sound?

---

Through some process a radio-wave expert could tell you more about. Although it's true that I'm being told something and I believe it, and I can't say for sure if radio waves exist or not, but for whatever reason, when I turn on my radio I hear good music. I know this and take this to be fact, because it has happened every time I turn on my radio. How can you argue with that? I hear the music. Everyone else who walks into my room hears the music. The effect is consistent with all radios within a mile of mine. Consistency. Even religious people can't agree on how God works, or doesn't work.

warranto wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 18:43 They could be. Can you prove that electricity is what we are told it is?

See above.

warranto wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 18:43 It has been installed, but how is it stored?

See above.

warranto wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 18:43 They work the way they've worked, yes. But that is not what I'm arguing. I'm arguing that you don't know HOW/WHY they work the way they do. You simply choose to believe what you are told, seemingly on the principle that it does what they say it does.

If I had the desire to, I could probably study up on how all these things work. Maybe even learn first hand (Hopefully not with the electricity), but that's not the important part. HOW/WHY is irrelevant. The fact is that they do. All the time. CONSISTENCY. It makes no difference if it's called "electricity" or "magic". Those are just words. Labels. In Bulgarian, it's called "Tok", but it refers to the same thing.

warranto wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 18:43 Who says God has no "measurable quantities"? (though that would be the wrong term, after all, even humans have no "measurable quantities"). Perhaps we just haven't discovered the means to "measure" him.

Humans have measurable quantities. We live, we die. We have a weight and height. We occupy a certain amount of space at one given point in time. We can bench press a certain amount of weight. We can measure how large our muscles are. How many words per minute we type, etc. The list goes on.

You cannot measure God. God does not live or die. Have a height and weight, occupy space or time, have any limit on what he/she bench presses, has no muscles to measure, and doesn't type.

What means could you possibly use to measure God?

warranto wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 18:43 So, are you saying that because the means to "measure" it are not currently available, you say it does not exist? (Careful how you answer that)

Currently available is one thing, but God can never be measured. By nature, God is immeasurable because he/she "Exists somewhere out there", and Jesus "is everywhere", like Santa Clause knowing when you're sleeping and when you're awake.

I'm not saying that a means of measuring God is not currently available. I'm saying that God, by nature, is immeasurable.

warranto wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 18:43Err... witness the book? All I have to do is pick it up and read it to tell you that his name was Jesus...

I've read lots of things in my life not, and I've learned that not everything I've read is true. Even works of non-fiction have been falsified. How do you know his name was Jesus? It could have been Bob or Tom or Joe or Dover or Warranto. How do you know?

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 28 Aug 2006 12:39:06 GMT

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

---

Quote:Is this all a project for you and your Church?

Are you getting a badge for demonstrating a willingness to discuss religion?

Are you getting a further badge for imposing on us your interpretation, just as all Jehovahs witnesses and mormons do?

Nothing here is being proven, merely ripped apart slowly but surely like a Jack-Russel with a huge bone.

You started the topic....

Quote:Yet still you have not answerwd a simple question or are you avoiding it.

You say that you believe in a book that you are not allowed to see? therefore the book could be full of blank pages and still you believe in it?

Actually ask a question, and I will attempt to answer it.

I can see the book whenever I want. (Looks over to bible, opens it) Oh? It has pages with words that I can actually see!

Quote:The effect is consistant with all radios within a mile of mine. Consistency.

If consistency is all that matters, people have been quite consistent in the belief that God exists. Far longer than people have been telling us radio waves exist.

Quote:HOW/WHY is irrelevant.

Sorry, but you're wrong here. How and why are the most important factors of understanding the

truth of something. Why do you think people believed that rain was caused directly by a supreme being for so long? No one bothered to answer the why or how for themselves... they just decided to believe the why and how that someone else of authority told them.

Quote:umans have measurable quantities. We live, we die. We have a weight and height. We occupy a certain amount of space at one given point in time. We can bench press a certain amount of weight. We can measure how large our muscles are. How many words per minute we type, etc. The list goes on.

Those are aspects of the human. Not the human itself. If you want to use the aspects of something to prove it's measurability, we could use the universe itself to "measure" God. The only problem is, we can not readily identify what God is responsible for in order to measure it.

The human, itself can not be measured. We are not just chemicals making up a body. There are still a multitude of unknowns that prevent us from measuring ourselves.

Apply this to your next statement as well.

Quote:I've read lots of things in my life not, and I've learned that not everything I've read is true. Even works of non-fiction have been falsified. How do you know his name was Jesus? It could have been Bob or Tom or Joe or Dover or Warranto. How do you know?

I don't. But then again, how do you know that the person named "George Washington", actually had that name? How do you know that ANY historical figure actually had the name it did. If you question one historical text, you have to question them all.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 28 Aug 2006 12:52:55 GMT

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

---

puddle\_splasherIs this all a project for you and your Church?

So we can't defend our beliefs (and ourselves) without having some ulterior motive besides getting you idiots to stop trying to disprove that of which you cannot?

puddle\_splasherAre you getting a badge for demonstrating a willingness to discuss religion?

Again, it's merely defending our beliefs. It's what you're doing in here, too, else you wouldn't be trying to disprove us.

puddle\_splasherAre you getting a further badge for imposing on us your interpretation, just as all Jehovahs witnesses and mormons do?

Read above.

puddle\_splasherNothing here is being proven, merely ripped apart slowly but surely like a Jack-Russel with a huge bone.

Nothing's being disproven, either.

puddle\_splasherYet still you have not answerwd a simple question or are you avoiding it.

What one? The one about raising dead? I think icedog mentioned it, but you just haven't responded. It's answering your question whether or not you choose to respond to it.

puddle\_splasherYou say that you believe in a book that you are not allowed to see? therefore the book could be full of blank pages and still you believe in it?

Umm, I can see, touch, caress, kiss, lick, eat, and even smell my Bible. It's very much a physical object that is obtainable. You can do the same thing. You can go to any store like Target, go to the book section, and you'll probably see a Bible. Go ahead, pick it up, open it, read it. Maybe you'll learn something.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Dover](#) on Mon, 28 Aug 2006 14:01:44 GMT

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

---

warranto wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 05:39people have been quite consistant in the belief that God exists. Far longer than people have been telling us radio waves exist.

Is that some kind of joke? There are a million and a half religions all with their own idea of how God works, and they defend it to the death. It's truely a rare thing to get two random people together and have them agree on religion. The very fact that we're argueing about this now is proof that religion isn't consistant. Meantioning all the wars fought and atrocities commited because of religions would be overkill.

warranto wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 05:39Sorry, but you're wrong here. How and why are the most important factors of understanding the truth of something. Why do you think people believed that rain was caused directly by a supreme being for so long? No one bothered to answer the why or how for themselves... they just decieded to believe the why and how that someone else of authority told them.

You can't compare the rain and radios. Radios are made by man. They're a tool constructed from raw materials for a purpose. Their inventor (a man), and constructor (also a man), would be considered an authority on how the radio works. If you can't believe them, who can you believe?

warranto wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 05:39Those are aspects of the human. Not the human itself. If you want to use the aspects of something to prove it's measurability, we could use the universe itself to "measure" God. The only problem is, we can not readily identify what God is reponsible for in order to measure it.

I'll believe it when it happens. How do we use the Universe to measure God? I used to have a pretty crazy imagination when I was younger, but I can't even begin to think of how someone would measure God, let alone using the Universe.

At any rate, humans having measureable aspects is more than you can say for God. You can't even find God, much less measure him/her. How are you going to point at something and say "There, that right there. That's God."

warranto wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 05:39 The human, itself can not be measured. We are not just chemicals making up a body. There are still a multitude of unknowns that prevent us from measuring ourselves.

No, we're not just chemicals. There's a spark there in a live body that's missing in a dead body. Consciousness, personality. That's what you mean, right? Who says that can't be measured? There are personality tests and other mountains of garbage like that. Dating websites and "See-which-career-is-right-for-you" tests are based on being able to measure personality. It may not be perfect, or even accurate in some cases, but it's a measurement nonetheless.

warranto wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 05:39 I don't. But then again, how do you know that the person named "George Washington", actually had that name? How do you know that ANY historical figure actually had the name it did. If you question one historical text, you have to question them all.

The bible has been translated and retranslated more times than either you or I can fathom. I'm sure that there aren't two words next to each other that have been kept the same. No other historical text can boast this, giving the bible a wider margin of error than any other historical text.

If the bible itself did not exist, was never written, all copies were destroyed, or whatever, modern Christianity would not exist. Does that mean that the modern Christian God would not exist? I say he/she would not.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 28 Aug 2006 14:31:13 GMT

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

---

Quote: Is that some kind of joke? There are a million and a half religions all with their own idea of how God works, and they defend it to the death. It's truly a rare thing to get two random people together and have them agree on religion. The very fact that we're arguing about this now is proof that religion isn't consistent. Mentioning all the wars fought and atrocities committed because of religions would be overkill.

Ugh.. as I said... they ALL believe that God exists. I mean, how many different types of lightbulbs are there? How many different types of electrical current? How many different types of computer processors? IF you're going to argue the particulars of a subject, then NOTHING is consistent. I mean, radio waves have a near infinite type of amplitude and frequency.

Quote: You can't compare the rain and radios. Radios are made by man. They're a tool constructed from raw materials for a purpose. Their inventor (a man), and constructor (also a man), would be considered an authority on how the radio works. If you can't believe them, who can you believe?

I'm not comparing ancient beliefs of rain and current beliefs of radio, I'm comparing the source of the belief as to how they are. BOTH deal with someone telling someone else how they work, and that receiving person simply believing it at face value.

Quote:At any rate, humans having measureable aspects is more than you can say for God. You can't even find God, much less measure him/her. How are you going to point at something and say "There, that right there. That's God."

And that proves his lack of existence... how?

Quote:No, we're not just chemicals. There's a spark there in a live body that's missing in a dead body. Consciousness, personality. That's what you mean, right? Who says that can't be measured? There are personality tests and other mountains of garbage like that. Dating websites and "See-which-career-is-right-for-you" tests are based on being able to measure personality. It may not be perfect, or even accurate in some cases, but it's a measurement nonetheless.

Once again, you're measuring the particularities of a human, not humanity itself.

Quote:The bible has been translated and retranslated more times than either you or I can fathom. I'm sure that there aren't two words next to each other that have been kept the same. No other historical text can boast this, giving the bible a wider margin of error than any other historical text.

The bible is also considered to be the most accurately and carefully translated text. No other historical text can boast that either.

<http://www.greatsite.com/timeline-english-bible-history/>

(Link speaks to how accuracy was a focal point)

If you can't trust the accuracy of the bible, you can't trust the accuracy of ANY translated historical text.

Quote:If the bible itself did not exist, was never written, all copies were destroyed, or whatever, modern Christianity would not exist. Does that mean that them modern Christian God would not exist? I say he/she would not.

Not quite. The Christian interpretation of God would not exist. The lack of an interpretation does not disprove the existence of anything.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [puddle\\_splasher](#) on Mon, 28 Aug 2006 15:40:32 GMT

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

---

[quote title=warranto wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 07:01] do. His name was Jesus. I know this because a book, filled with words that I am not able to witness for myself, tells me so.

[quote]

The above is what you said.

My question was:- If you are not able to witness for yourself, a book filled with words, then how can you claim to know what is in it? Afterall that is what you said.

Perhaps you meant to say that you HAVE seen and witnessed a book filled with words, but that is not what you wrote.

Now before we go any further, it should be known that I do not attend church or do any religious things, but I do believe in "A Supreme Being", now if people want to call that person GOD then who am I to say otherwise. God has many names "Jehovah" is but one name for him but I imagine that you knew that.

You say that I didnt reply to "Cryogenics"? I have never heard of anyone being deep frozen on purpose and being thawed out after a considerable period of time and being brought back to life.

Here is another thought, bear in mind that we have "Born again Christians", people that have seen the light.

Is it not possible that this was how Jesus was brought back from the dead (or outside world of disbelievers) and came into a new world, (of believers) one with the light that knowledge brings.

It may all sound figurative, because thats what it is. So for everyone else, figuratively speaking, they may die, fall by the wayside, be led astray, fall upon hardship in life. Only to be born again, after finding Faith in any religion. To see the light in a different way, to see the new world and be born again.

Thus the parable may be interpreted differently, But thats all this is, interpretations.

No amount of discussion can change that. Thats what faith is all about, especially if it brings comfort.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 28 Aug 2006 15:52:01 GMT

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

---

My mistake, I was speaking in a dialect foreign to you called "legalese"

To witness something written in law means to see it actually being written. (Specifically, a signature).



Applying that to what I wrote, "filled with words that I am not able to witness for myself" means someone wrote the words, but I was not able to see them write it.

Quote:Is it not possible that this was how Jesus was brought back from the dead (or outside world of disbelievers) and came into a new world, (of believers) one with the light that knowledge brings.

Except that when you take into account that Jesus had been crucified, and then stabbed with a spear and left hanging to bleed out, it's hard to imagine "death" meaning anything other than what it says.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Dover](#) on Mon, 28 Aug 2006 16:20:27 GMT

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

---

warranto wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 07:31Ugh.. as I said... they ALL believe that God exists. I mean, how many different types of lightbulbs are there? How many different types of electrical current? How many different types of computer processors? IF you're going to argue the particulars of a subject, then NOTHING is consistent. I mean, radio waves have a near infinite type of amplitude and frequency.

No, they don't all believe God exists. I don't. The buddhaist belief doesn't believe. Some religions believe in many Gods, which the Christian faith does not. Some religions believe in one god which is a God different from the Christian God.

All lightbulbs function the same way. All computer processors compute the same information. All radio waves have the same, constant shape.

There is nothing about religion that's consistent.

warranto wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 07:31I'm not comparing ancient beliefs of rain and current beliefs of radio, I'm comparing the source of the belief as to how they are. BOTH deal with someone telling someone else how they work, and that receiving person simply believing it at face value.

I'd think that radio's inventor (Whoever he/she may be) or constructor (again, whoever he/she may be) will be more of an authority on how the radio works than an ancient holy man is an authority on how rain works.

warranto wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 07:31And that proves his lack of existence... how?

It doesn't, but it makes proving his existence quite a bit harder. And if you can't prove his existence, what do you have to begin with? You, Warranto, can't disprove the existence of the invisible purple flying unicorn, but that doesn't mean that the invisible purple flying unicorn exists.

warranto wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 07:31Once again, you're measuring the particularities of a human, not humanity itself.

How else do you measure something? You measure how big, how wide, how many, what color, it's mass, etc.

I say again, God has no particularities to measure. None of those things I just mentioned apply.

warranto wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 07:31

The bible is also considered to be the most accurately and carefully translated text. No other historical text can boast that either.

<http://www.greatsite.com/timeline-english-bible-history/>

(Link speaks to how accuracy was a focal point)

If you can't trust the accuracy of the bible, you can't trust the accuracy of ANY translated historical text.

Perhaps it was a bad idea to bring up how well the bible has been translated, since I don't know much about it. In any case, you're probably right here.

warranto wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 07:31 Not quite. The Christian interpretation of God would not exist. The lack of an interpretation does not disprove the existence of anything.

That's my point. God has never moved beyond an idea, a theory. This, partly, accounts for God's lack of measureability. How do you measure an idea?

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 28 Aug 2006 16:58:29 GMT

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

---

Quote: No, they don't all believe God exists. I don't. The buddhaist belief doesn't believe. Some religions believe in many Gods, which the Christian faith does not. Some religions believe in one god which is a God different from the Christian God.

All lightbulbs function the same way. All computer processors compute the same information. All radio waves have the same, constant shape.

My mistake, I should have included that one. ONE exception out of them all.

But if you want to talk about "exceptions".. not all light bulbs function the same way.

Continuing without that exception, the number of Gods doesn't matter. The idea God exists is still the same.

Quote: I'd think that radio's inventor (Whoever he/she may be) or constructor (again, whoever he/she may be) will be more of an authority on how the radio works than an ancient holy man is an authority on how rain works.

IF 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.

Quote:It doesn't, but it makes proving his existance quite a bit harder.

That's nice... it was established many threads ago that you can not prove the existance of him. However, you can not disprove his existance either.

Quote:How else do you measure something? You measure how big, how wide, how many, what color, it's mass, etc.

So, 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.

Quote:That's my point. God has never moved beyond an idea, a theory. This, partly, accounts for God's lack of measureability. How do you measure an idea?

Kind of like the THEORY of evolution, no?

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Mon, 28 Aug 2006 17:37:22 GMT

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

---

runewood wrote on Sun, 27 August 2006 14:48But thier reasoning cant be proven wrong and nor can yours.

It certainly can be proven incorrect and fallacious when the whole premise of the arguments is based on logical fallacies.

All we're doing is pointing out the logical fallacies in them and asking you all to defend your positions without contradicting yourselves and without negating your entire arguments.

DoverThere is nothing about religion that's consistant.

"Do not kill, do not rape, do not steal - these are principles which every man of every faith can embrace." -Boondock Saints

How can you say that when so many religions have so much in common? Many of them believe in a higher power, whether it's one power or many powers; many of them have moral codes to which its followers should adhere--it goes against just about every religion to steal from your neighbor, lie to your neighbor, and kill your neighbor (except Islam; they're allowed to kill infidels (I wonder how many atheists are ready to jump up and defend Islam now that I said that...)). So many religions have certain rituals they practice during which they try to grow closer to their deity: Christians pray and have baptisms and confirmations; Muslims pray five times a day, worship in mosques, etc.; Buddhists meditate to remove their thoughts from reality in an effort to reach Nirvana; Hindus worship whatever god they choose and perform rituals specific to that god.

Again, I ask, how can you say that religion is inconsistent?

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 28 Aug 2006 18:23:27 GMT

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

---

The burden of proof is NOT on Atheists! We simply do not believe in this particular something that there is no logical evidence for the existence of. The burden of proof is on YOU who believe. Why do you all keep trying to pin it on us to DISPROVE the existence of "God"? 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 burden of proof is on YOU, not ME. I don't have to disprove "God"'s existence to affirm my decision to not believe in this "God" character. If you want me to believe and participate in your rituals, you need to convince me that he exists. And in the nearly 27 years I've been here, everyone has failed.

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!

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 28 Aug 2006 18:44:52 GMT

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

---

Crimson wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 14:23e simply do not believe in this particular something that there is no logical evidence for the existence of.

Why does it have to be logical? A lot of things aren't logical. Love is an example.

Love isn't logical. Sure, we can explain it with chemical reactions and brain functions, but it's still not logical. How can something so irrational be logical? You can't choose who you love. You can't decide that you can only love this type of person. Sure, you can try and convince yourself of it, but true love cannot be forced.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Mon, 28 Aug 2006 18:51:40 GMT

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

---

You will find that psychological conditions and emotions do follow some form of logic. The mind is a complex organ, but it is not free some the constraints put upon it by causality.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 28 Aug 2006 18:59:22 GMT

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

---

Javaxcx wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 14:51 You will find that psychological conditions and emotions do follow some form of logic. The mind is a complex organ, but it is not free some the constraints put upon it by causality.

As does the idea of a higher power.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Mon, 28 Aug 2006 19:07:50 GMT

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

---

I've not doubted that.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 28 Aug 2006 19:13:51 GMT

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

---

Crimson wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 12:23 The burden of proof is NOT on Atheists! We simply do not believe in this particular something that there is no logical evidence for the existence of. The burden of proof is on YOU who believe. Why do you all keep trying to pin it on us to DISPROVE the existence of "God"? 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 burden of proof is on YOU, not ME. I don't have to disprove "God"'s existence to affirm my decision to not believe in this "God" character. If you want me to believe and participate in your rituals, you need to convince me that he exists. And in the nearly 27 years I've been here, everyone has failed.

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!

We're not (or, rather, I'm not) trying to place any burden on you to disprove it. That is, unless you're going to come and say "I KNOW he does not exist". If you know it, then you will be able to prove it. The same goes with people who claim to KNOW that God exists.

And, to point it out again, God /= religion. Claiming that God does not exist on the basis of one religion "getting it wrong", as you claim, has no bearing on the overall existence or nonexistence of God.

I could care less whether or not you choose to believe in God, or to follow a particular religion. Just don't go claiming you "KNOW" the answer, because I will challenge you to prove your knowledge every time.

"You can't explain how we got here, therefore God exists."? I have never once claimed that. Anything remotely resembling that was when I stated that the idea of the universe coming into existence is just as likely to be explained as attributable to God, as the only other alternatives, spontaneous creation or non-creation (has simply always existed).

Quote:"God" is just a grown-up version of Santa Claus, a concept invented by man as a way to control people en masse.

Only one problem with your argument. Santa Clause does, or rather did, exist!

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Mon, 28 Aug 2006 19:26:40 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Oye...another one of these threads.

I'll break this down as much as possible:

Athiests think there is no God. No one will ever convince them otherwise, it's pointless to try.

Monothiests, the light bulbs in Warrano's argument if you will, will always believe there is a sole God. No one will ever convince them otherwise, it's pointless to try.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [icedog90](#) on Mon, 28 Aug 2006 19:35:34 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If you're pointing to us, nobody here is trying to convince another. The topic starter hasn't replied at all.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 28 Aug 2006 19:37:23 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

gbull wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 13:26 Monothiests, the light bulbs in Warrano's argument if you will, will always believe there is a sole God. No one will ever convince them otherwise, it's pointless to try.

Sorry, couldn't help it...

See, when you believe in God, the lights come on!

ok, bad joke. Don't use this as an arguement for anything...

Edit:

Quote:The topic starter hasn't replied at all.

Meh, probably just someone who joined for the sole purpose of amusing him/herself while we get riled up over the topic.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 28 Aug 2006 20:09:19 GMT

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

---

warranto wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 12:13

Quote:"God" is just a grown-up version of Santa Claus, a concept invented by man as a way to control people en masse.

Only one problem with your arguement. Santa Clause does, or rather did, exist!

You know damned well that I am referring to the modern day version of "Santa Claus", the fat jolly guy who can deliver presents around the world in one night and flies in a sleigh, and will fill your stocking with coal if you misbehave during the year. That story is no more or less ridiculous than the story of a god who sends you to an imaginary hell or heaven when you die.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Mon, 28 Aug 2006 20:21:38 GMT

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

---

Quote:The burden of proof is NOT on Atheists! We simply do not believe in this particular something that there is no logical evidence for the existence of. The burden of proof is on YOU who believe. Why do you all keep trying to pin it on us to DISPROVE the existence of "God"? 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.

Well the burden of proof is on you considering you're saying God doesn't exist. When you call someone a liar, aren't you expected to prove that they're lying? When you say we went to war for

oil, aren't you supposed to prove it?

Or do we just make bullshit accusations and expect the other party to make up for it?

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 28 Aug 2006 20:37:24 GMT

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

---

You are the one with this strange story about a mystical conscious being who created the world for us. Why do I have to prove that's false? I'm not the one making up a story!

On the same token, there's an invisible pink unicorn in my garage. Now you must provide evidence that there isn't one. Why should I have to prove that there's an invisible pink unicorn in my garage? You're the one calling me a liar, now you have to prove it!

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Mon, 28 Aug 2006 20:44:00 GMT

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

---

I agree with you in the sense that you have a unicorn in your garage...



Mostly because I don't care enough to disagree. Why should you have to prove it to be false? Because if you were ever interested in a true discussion of dieties and whether or not they exist, you'd give reasons we could discuss without having to resort to childish games like "flying spaghetti monster"

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Mon, 28 Aug 2006 20:46:56 GMT

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

---

CrimsonThe burden of proof is NOT on Atheists! We simply do not believe in this particular something that there is no logical evidence for the existence of. The burden of proof is on YOU who believe. Why do you all keep trying to pin it on us to DISPROVE the existence of "God"? As Warranto said, you place the burden of proof on yourself when you claim "I ABSOLUTELY KNOW GOD DOES NOT EXIST."

Besides, we've already given our logical reasoning behind our belief in the existence of god (none of this could have suddenly created itself out of nothing; some initial cause had to make it all happen), yet all you have been able to do so far is attack our logic rather than come up with alternatives of your own (of course, I don't mean you specifically, Crimson).

You all base your arguments on fallacious, circular reasoning ("How can you believe in a book, written 2000 years ago, meant to persuade and control the masses? I'm going to believe in another book written 500 years ago meant to persuade and control masses TO BELIEVE DIFFERENT THINGS! MY ARGUMENT SO MUCH BETTER!!!"), while you have yet to punch holes in any of our arguments. Simply saying "YOU'RE WRONG BECAUSE I SAY SO!!" won't do much to discredit any of our arguments (which, so far, have been pretty much based on agnosticism as opposed to Christianity).

We've already given our logical evidence for our belief in a higher power; now it's your turn to give us your logical evidence of HOW YOU ABSOLUTELY KNOW there is no such higher power instead of simply attacking us with the same fallacious arguments.

Quote:Why do I have to prove that's false? I'm not the one making up a story!

That's exactly what I'm talking about. Right there.

"I DON'T HAVE TO DISCREDIT YOU BECAUSE YOU'RE WRONG ANYWAY BECAUSE I SAY SO"

There's got to be a name for that kind of logical fallacy, isn't there

If we're so wrong, then give us an alternative and explain your reasoning for it, and we'll see if it can hold up when put to the logic test.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 28 Aug 2006 21:08:05 GMT

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

---

I 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.

If someone tells me that that I can turn this radio on an adjust an antenna and I'll receive music from waves in the air, I can turn on the radio and get music and believe them.

If someone tells me that if I turn on a light bulb, then light waves will come from the bulb and bounce off nearby objects and hit receptors in my eyeball, and I turn on a light and can see things around me, I believe in the existence of light waves.

But, if someone tells me that there's a holy being in the sky (or wherever you say he is) that I can see NO trace of evidence for, then I'm just not going to believe that "he" exists.

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.

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.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 28 Aug 2006 21:15:19 GMT

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

---

Crimson wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 14:09warranto wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 12:13  
Quote:"God" is just a grown-up version of Santa Claus, a concept invented by man as a way to control people en masse.

Only one problem with your arguement. Santa Clause does, or rather did, exist!

You know damned well that I am referring to the modern day version of "Santa Claus", the fat jolly guy who can deliver presents around the world in one night and flies in a sleigh, and will fill your stocking with coal if you misbehave during the year. That story is no more or less ridiculous than the story of a god who sends you to an imaginary hell or heaven when you die.

And the modern day version is a perversion of the "real" Santa Clause. But, I'll take your exclusion of the story (as I was permitted one of my own when dealing with Buddhism).

The difference here is that there is real evidence to prove that a person, magical or not, named Santa Clause does not exist. All you have to do, is look at everyone who went without presents this year. However, as has been stated by both sides repeatedly, there is no proof as to the

existence of God. We possess the ability to "Know" that Santa Clause, in his current inagination, is not real. We do not have that luxury with the idea of God.

Quote:You are the one with this strange story about a mystical conscious being who created the world for us. Why do I have to prove that's false? I'm not the one making up a story!

True, but you are the one claiming you "know" it's false.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 28 Aug 2006 21:19:57 GMT

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

---

Crimson wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 15:08

If someone tells me that that I can turn this radio on an adjust an antenna and I'll receive music from waves in the air, I can turn on the radio and get music and believe them.

If someone tells me that if I turn on a light bulb, then light waves will come from the bulb and bounce off nearby objects and hit receptors in my eyeball, and I turn on a light and can see things around me, I believe in the existence of light waves.

Those were never in question. What was in question, related to those examples is the why/how.

Sure, you turn it on and get music; that can be easily observed. Now, HOW do you get the music to the radio? We are told radio waves, but must rely on "the experts" who tell us that.

Sure, you can turn on a light bulb and get light. Now, HOW does it light up? We are told electricity, but must rely on "the experts" who tell us that.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 28 Aug 2006 21:23:33 GMT

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

---

warranto wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 14:15 True, but you are the one claiming you "know" it's false.

No I'm not.

---

---

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 09:58 My 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 09:58 But 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 09:58 Continuing 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 09:58 IF 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 09:58 That'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 09:58 So, 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 measurable, touchable, feelable, tasteable, concrete proof behind

it, eh?

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 28 Aug 2006 21:49:20 GMT

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

---

If you're not then I apologise. I guess I misinterpreted some of your more deliberate comments about making things up.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 28 Aug 2006 22:13:03 GMT

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

---

Quote:One exception? I think not.

I see nothing in that link that suggests other religions do not believe in God.

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

Ugh.. read what I write. the FUNCTION is not in question. the WHY/HOW it does what it does, is.

Quote:Scientology doesn't have a God.

Oh, really?

Quote:Does Scientology have a concept of God?

Most definitely. Scientology affirms the existence of a Supreme Being, although its dogma is unique and does not include the worship of one.

[http://www.scientology.org/en\\_US/news-media/faq/pg015.html](http://www.scientology.org/en_US/news-media/faq/pg015.html)

Quote:But the details matter.

Nope, the details don't. All the details do is dictate how one is different from the other. They all (I know, I know) believe in God.

Quote: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.

But, if you have no proof, why believe?

Quote:But as Crimson said in a reply above mine, the burden of proof doesn't rest with the atheists,

It does once the athiest states that he/she "knows" the answer.

Quote:When people have thought processes, certain chemical reactions are present. When people don't have thought processes, certain chemical reactiosn are absent.

Is that ALL it is though? Science has yet to prove even that. True that chemicals are part of the equations, but is it all the equation?

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

Too bad it's still a theory, huh? And one that is not as of yet "measureable, touchable, feelable, tasteable, concrete proof behind it,"

And remember, the idea that is may be provable sometime in the future has no bearing on it being real or not. It's whether or not it's provable "now", correct? After all, that's your arguement against the lack of proof of God, right? No measurable proof at this time?

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [runewood](#) on Tue, 29 Aug 2006 00:32:52 GMT

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

---

I give up. Have your damn war and kill eachother so I can have peace.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [msgtpain](#) on Tue, 29 Aug 2006 03:09:45 GMT

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

---

Crimson, the irony of this entire conversation is that if anyone could "prove" to you that God exists, there would no longer be a need for you to know.

So many people claim that God doesn't exist, because he lets evil happen on the earth. If you've made any attempt at all to understand his teachings, you would know that he has no choice but to allow it. To call him malevolent because of this is outright silly, he doesn't "intend" you any harm, he doesn't "wish" you any hurt, there is no ill-will at all.

The problem (or catch-22 if you will) is that what he has promised, requires blind-faith on your (our) part. If he were to say "hey guys, here I am, I really do exist", then there would be no reason for anyone not to believe. He has promised that those who do believe will inherit the kingdom of heaven. That's a pretty big prize, assuming that it is all true; and all you have to do is live your life in a way that makes him happy --- And in the end, all you're really doing is living a life that makes your fellow man happy.

Personally, I don't believe that you have to follow any one religion to gain the reward he has promised, but you do have to actually believe in him, and agree to attempt to live in a manner that he approves of. If you succeed at this, you'll win in the end, regardless of which thief you give your money to here on earth.

If God promised you eternal salvation in exchange for believing him, and he took away the ability to Not believe in him, then his promise would be sort of meaningless... everyone would be rewarded in the end.

If you're simply in to science, take a look at Pascal's Wager.. while it provides no proof, it does show you how you have a 75% chance of being better off in the end, simply by believing in god whether or not he exists. The other 25% will be miserable

For me, it isn't a matter of what bad things men have done in the name of religion. These are the same men that you claim "created" religion for their own benefit. They are simply "men", and they aren't perfect -- some are far from it. However, God's underlying message has not changed, only those who attempt to persuade you in to believing for their own gain. God's message is simple.. Love one another, live in a manner that brings respect to you, your elders and your children; "be a good person" -- you're probably already doing it without even trying.

</unTypicalReligiousRant>

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Tue, 29 Aug 2006 03:21:53 GMT

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

---

msgtpain wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 23:09

For me, it isn't a matter of what bad things men have done in the name of religion. These are the same men that you claim "created" religion for their own benefit. They are simply "men", and they aren't perfect -- some are far from it. However, God's underlying message has not changed, only those who attempt to persuade you in to believing for their own gain. God's message is simple.. Love one another, live in a manner that brings respect to you, your elders and your children; "be a good person" -- you're probably already doing it without even trying.

I tend to subscribe to the contextual moral code "Do unto others..." not because Jesus said it (granted it seems to coincide conveniently) but because it makes rational sense. Philosophers almost accross the board have agreed on this one ethical truth from both ends of the spectrum.

Now I'm not familiar with Mormonism at all, so correct me if I'm mistaken, but the Bible itself says that following that one commandment from Jesus just simply isn't enough. You have to "give yourself to God" (whatever the hell that means), "accept Salvation", and a myriad of submissive commands in order to get the prize at the end. It just simply is not as simple as following a moral code and that is where the Bible loses it's appeal to the skeptical masses. Unfortunately a lot, if not all of these commands have no rational basis at all. You can go about living your life as Jesus would have but you might not subscribe to say... Tithing for whatever reason you can conjure up that will produce just as much good. If the moral code of the Bible were as simple as "To unto others as you would have done unto you" then I assure you we wouldn't be having this discussion.

But the problem lies much farther than simple morals. Some of the prerequisites to see the kingdom of God are downright illogical and not worth subscribing to.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [msgtpain](#) on Tue, 29 Aug 2006 03:37:55 GMT

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

---

The actual beliefs of Mormonism are far more in-depth than 'believing' or 'not believing', and a conversation in these forums wouldn't help shed any light on the subject

There is quite a bit of terminology involved which paints the picture completely differently if you're thinking one way, and I'm explaining it another. For example: You state "the Bible itself says that following that one commandment from Jesus just simply isn't enough", enough for what? salvation? Mormonism teaches that all men receive eternal salvation, that was the gift we were given by the sacrifice. Mormon doctrine does not subscribe to the beliefs in heaven and hell, so there is no "if you believe you will be saved".. that's from the born-again bible.

I'm of the opinion that we will all see each other again one day, we will all be resurrected, we will all be given eternal salvation... you don't even have to be good for that.

And that's where the 'simple' discussion ends

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Tue, 29 Aug 2006 04:44:52 GMT

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

---

That was downright decent of you, msgtpain

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Tue, 29 Aug 2006 04:48:08 GMT

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

---

So, how about we stop arguing about Christianity for awhile and take our fight to Scientology (or is that just too easy?)

"You believe in a science fiction novel, okay."

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Tue, 29 Aug 2006 05:17:41 GMT

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

---

If I live my life following the Golden Rule and do my best not to cause harm to anyone, then under

---



my beliefs, that's good enough for to get an eternal reward if there actually is one, which I highly doubt. I gave up imaginary friends when I was very young.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [ghost](#) on Tue, 29 Aug 2006 05:42:59 GMT

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

---

Its all lies. "Hes" not real. Whats more to say? Just the very idea of what he can do and did... My parents praise the lord every day yet bad things happen. I myself wear my cross around my neck everyday. Yet i get hurt and whatnot. Where is "he" then?

Its just like saying the toothfairy is real...

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [puddle\\_splasher](#) on Tue, 29 Aug 2006 06:07:18 GMT

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

---

"Father forgive them, they know not what they do", was that not Jesus's last words on the cross?

What if they mis-heard, mis-spelt, mis-interpreted and it was "Father forgive them, they know not what to do".

Now by changing one word" They and substituting to", shows the sentence in a totally new light.

This is a question that has been discussed by many Christians and atheists apart.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Tue, 29 Aug 2006 06:18:06 GMT

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

---

msgtpain wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 23:37The actual beliefs of Mormonism are far more in-depth than 'believing' or 'not believing', and a conversation in these forums wouldn't help shed any light on the subject

There is quite a bit of terminology involved which paints the picture completely differently if you're thinking one way, and I'm explaining it another. For example: You state "the Bible itself says that following that one commandment from Jesus just simply isn't enough", enough for what? salvation? Mormonism teaches that all men receive eternal salvation, that was the gift we were given by the sacrifice. Mormon doctrine does not subscribe to the believe in heaven and hell, so there is no "if you believe you will be saved".. that's from the born-again bible.

I'm of the opinion that we will all see each other again one day, we will all be ressurected, we will

---

all be given eternal salvation... you don't even have to be good for that.

And that's where the 'simple' discussion ends

Ahh of course. It's hard to argue damnation with someone who thinks similarly for different reasons.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Berkut](#) on Tue, 29 Aug 2006 06:37:21 GMT

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

---

Hmm? Christians referring to their beliefs as a 'religion?' That's odd...

...and what right do humans think they have instructing others how to believe? Inefficient. Realize you can only tell each other what you believe. No amount of pride can sway a person's mind in an argument. Especially one of such critical nature. Attempting to create with something as destructive as pride...

As far as the teachings of evolution as a science, I have lost all faith in the doctrine. 'A fish in this layer is approximately X billion years old.' 'How do you know?' 'Because of the rocks in the layers.' 'How do you know the age of the rocks?' 'Because of the fossils they contain, of course.' 'So... the fossils dated the rocks, the rocks dated the fossils?' 'Uh...yeah. They did.' 'O...k. Sounds good to me.'

Why am I being told the Earth is billions of years old? If the sun does shrink upon itself as my school once taught, if we spun the clock backwards several billion years, wouldn't the Earth have once been a component of the Sun, itself?

If this truly is a dead-end existence, why do humans persist? What do they hope to gain? What could they possibly hope for? Some empty glory, though they will not exist to realize? A feeling that they were right, even if the feeling would forever remain intangible? If all that you have accomplished, loved, and held vanished, what is your point of life? What keeps the human world from succumbing to entropy, and falling into complete anarchy?

I have wanted answers to these questions my entire life, and those 'teachers' could not find them.

...I found one. The last one; faith.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [jnz](#) on Tue, 29 Aug 2006 11:06:03 GMT

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

---

guys... i have a secret, i am the one you call god. lol.  
prove i am not

"had god ever put a Jaguar XJR in my driveway? NO!  
has god ever give my enemys the hurpies? NO!" - little nicky.

i like these sort of threads, it is interesting to see poeple's stupid arguments on somthing that doesn't exist.

i do beleve in after life, but not as poeple imagine it. i don't think you die and then thats it. because i belive that there is a cosmos(outside our universe) that there are infinite universes being created and destroyed. when one of those universes are just right, your life startes again.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 29 Aug 2006 12:10:46 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ghost wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 23:42Its all lies. "Hes" not real. Whats more to say? Just the very idea of what he can do and did...

My parents praise the lord every day yet bad things happen. I myself wear my cross around my neck everyday. Yet i get hurt and whatnot. Where is "he" then?

Its just like saying the toothfairy is real...

wow... how many times do I have to mention this? Let's see if caps works...

THE BELIEF IN THE CONCEPTS OF ONE RELIGION DOES NOT DICTATE THE EXISTANCE OF GOD.

Just because one faith teaches that "God will save you from evil if you pray" DOES NOT DICTATE HIS EXISTANCE, REGARDLESS OF WHETHER OR NOT SOMETHING BAD HAPPENS.

Quote:i like these sort of threads, it is interesting to see poeple's stupid arguments on somthing that doesn't exist

So, you know, and can provide proof, that he doesn't exist?

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [Scythar](#) on Tue, 29 Aug 2006 13:41:49 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Berkut wrote on Tue, 29 August 2006 02:37Hmm? Christians referring to their beliefs as a 'religion?' That's odd...

...and what right do humans think they have instructing others how to believe? Inefficient. Realize you can only tell each other what you believe. No amount of pride can sway a person's mind in an argument. Especially one of such critical nature. Attempting to create with something as destructive as pride...

As far as the teachings of evolution as a science, I have lost all faith in the doctrine. 'A fish in this layer is approximately X billion years old.' 'How do you know?' 'Because of the rocks in the layers.' 'How do you know the age of the rocks?' 'Because of the fossils they contain, of course.' 'So... the fossils dated the rocks, the rocks dated the fossils?' 'Uh...yeah. They did.' 'O...k. Sounds good to me.'

Why am I being told the Earth is billions of years old? If the sun does shrink upon itself as my school once taught, if we spun the clock backwards several billion years, wouldn't the Earth have once been a component of the Sun, itself?

If this truly is a dead-end existence, why do humans persist? What do they hope to gain? What could they possibly hope for? Some empty glory, though they will not exist to realize? A feeling that they were right, even if the feeling would forever remain intangible? If all that you have accomplished, loved, and held vanished, what is your point of life? What keeps the human world from succumbing to entropy, and falling into complete anarchy?

I have wanted answers to these questions my entire life, and those 'teachers' could not find them.

...I found one. The last one; faith.

Yeah, it's obvious that faith can give our lives a meaning. However, why is that? Isn't it because of hope? HOPE is the word it all falls down to, and both religion and science offer it. Religion in the form of somekind of immortality and eternal happiness, science in the form of.....somekind of immortality and eternal happiness! I'm not going to argue about either way of hoping, even if they don't necessarily even exclude each others, but what I'm saying is that the REASON why we persist is HOPE. Hope for a better life in the vague future.

Does hope equal the instinct of survival?

The human race, or better yet, every living being, seems to stubbornly do anything it takes to live on and continue to the future, knowingly and subconsciously. It's how we were built, either by nature or by a higher being. Those who fall and are no longer motivated at fighting and surviving for their future are the ones who have no hope left. They die. Hope seems to equal the instinct of survival, looks like it's just a more elaborate term for it, just like greed or jealousy.

Now the problem is that without the instinct of survival(greediness, hope...), you die. But with too much of it, you also die. A person with not enough of it doesn't care about himself and dies. If the whole race consists of these types of individuals, the race will go extinct. A person with too much of it doesn't care about OTHERS and eventually dies too, on his quest of terminating other individuals to gain the safest position to continue life from (ultimate anarchy?\*). This too results in

extinction.

Am I wrong here? Is there a major flaw? I rambled on again, without thinking too much. ./

\* Anarchy is used with varying meanings...basically, it just means there's no government/police/guardians of order, which doesn't mean no order. If a race has no survival instinct, it doesn't need "guardians of order", but such a state wouldn't last long. It's used as a word to directly describe disorder and chaos too, though.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 29 Aug 2006 14:21:10 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

While I can't speak for "macro" evolution, as there are still holes, making it a theory, "micro" evolution is very much a reality. It doesn't take long for it to occur, and over the period of even one human lifespan we can see the results start to occur.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [jnz](#) on Tue, 29 Aug 2006 14:40:26 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:

Quote:i like these sort of threads, it is interesting to see poeple's stupid arguments on somthing that doesn't exist

So, you know, and can provide proof, that he doesn't exist?

ok, i ment

Quote:i like these sort of threads, it is interesting to see poeple's stupid arguments on somthing that has no proof what so ever

don't say "prove that he doesn't exist" because the poeple that don't belive in god already have proof because there is no proof to say weather he does exist!

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 29 Aug 2006 14:59:15 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

That lack of proof for the positive is not proof of the negative.

I'll let you choose how many examples you want me to give you of this fact.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [jnz](#) on Tue, 29 Aug 2006 15:42:39 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

and what do you mean by "positive" and "negative"?

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 29 Aug 2006 15:47:58 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

help-linux wrote on Tue, 29 August 2006 11:42 and what do you mean by "positive" and "negative"?

He means that just because there's no proof for God's existence doesn't mean that the lack of proof is proof unto itself for the lack of God's existence.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 29 Aug 2006 15:49:28 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I mean in favor, or against the existence of God.

The argument being proposed is one of "Does God exist?"

Positive being proof in favour, negative being proof against. It has nothing to do with which side is right or wrong.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Tue, 29 Aug 2006 18:16:50 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Berkut wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 23:37...and what right do humans think they have instructing others how to believe? Inefficient. Realize you can only tell each other what you believe. No amount of pride can sway a person's mind in an argument. Especially one of such critical nature. Attempting to create with something as destructive as pride...

It depends how deeply the beliefs are held. When someone's beliefs are in flux or the foundation of their faith rocked, they are much more perceptible to listen to logic and rethink what they believed.

Berkut wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 23:37As far as the teachings of evolution as a science, I have lost all faith in the doctrine. 'A fish in this layer is approximately X billion years old.' 'How do you know?' 'Because of the rocks in the layers.' 'How do you know the age of the rocks?' 'Because of the fossils they contain, of course.' 'So... the fossils dated the rocks, the rocks dated the fossils?' 'Uh...yeah. They did.' 'O...k. Sounds good to me.'

Sounds to me like you don't know anything about evolution, then. Like... absolutely nothing.

Over 300 proofs of God's existence

ARGUMENT FROM CREATION, aka ARGUMENT FROM PERSONAL INCREDULITY (I)

- (1) If evolution is false, then creationism is true, and therefore God exists.
- (2) Evolution can't be true, since I lack the mental capacity to understand it; moreover, to accept its truth would cause me to be uncomfortable.
- (3) Therefore, God exists.

Berkut wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 23:37Why am I being told the Earth is billions of years old? If the sun does shrink upon itself as my school once taught, if we spun the clock backwards several billion years, wouldn't the Earth have once been a component of the Sun, itself?

Yes, dabble in quantum mechanics. Read about the Big Bang. That's exactly what "they" are saying.

Berkut wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 23:37If this truly is a dead-end existence, why do humans persist? What do they hope to gain? What could they possibly hope for? Some empty glory, though they will not exist to realize? A feeling that they were right, even if the feeling would forever remain intangible? If all that you have accomplished, loved, and held vanished, what is your point of life? What keeps the human world from succumbing to entropy, and falling into complete anarchy?

Response:

300 Proofs of God's Existence  
COSMOLOGICAL ARGUMENT

- (1) If I say something must have a cause, it has a cause.
- (2) I say the universe must have a cause.
- (3) Therefore, the universe has a cause.
- (4) Therefore, God exists.

Quote:I have wanted answers to these questions my entire life, and those 'teachers' could not find them.

...I found one. The last one; faith.

Congratulations for giving up at a young age and taking the easy way out, the cop out, instead of

searching for a greater truth.

Also pertinent to you and warranto:

300 Proofs of God's Existence

ARGUMENT FROM INFINITE REGRESS

- (1) Ask Atheists what caused the Big Bang.
- (2) Regardless of their answer, ask how they know this.
- (3) Continue process until the Atheist admits he doesn't know the answer to one of your questions.
- (4) You win!
- (5) Therefore, God exists.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 29 Aug 2006 18:31:19 GMT

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

---

Quote:ARGUMENT FROM INFINITE REGRESS

- (1) Ask Atheists what caused the Big Bang.
- (2) Regardless of their answer, ask how they know this.
- (3) Continue process until the Atheist admits he doesn't know the answer to one of your questions.
- (4) You win!
- (5) Therefore, God exists

Perhaps that would apply to me, if I were trying to prove God existed.

Unfortunately for you, I'm not.

Besides, that Infinite Regress works both ways. All you have to do is replace "Atheists" with "Theologists" to arrive at the answer that God does not exist.

My arguments are solely aimed at people who claim to know, or suggest that they know by stating their answer as an absolute. (ie. "God doesn't exist", or "Believing in God is stupid" instead of "I don't believe that God exists" or "Believing in God doesn't make sense to me")

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Tue, 29 Aug 2006 18:43:38 GMT

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

---

So you're arguing semantics in a theological debate. Why don't you correct our spelling, too?

---

Subject: Re: Jesus



Posted by [Scythar](#) on Tue, 29 Aug 2006 19:00:25 GMT

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

---

Seems more like defending agnosticism to me...on a debate where you can pick either side or anything between, I don't see what's so bad in that.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 29 Aug 2006 19:07:33 GMT

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

---

Crimson wrote on Tue, 29 August 2006 12:43So you're arguing semantics in a theological debate. Why don't you correct our spelling, too?

Not semantics. The difference between knowledge and belief is small but profound. To "know" something removes all belief from the subject as there is nothing left to believe... it's already known.

Hence the reason for arguing it. If it is "known" that the existence of God is either true or false, then that exterminates any reason for "believing" the opposite. While I have no problem being told that I am 100% wrong, if you're going to tell me you "know" that I am wrong, you'd better be able to back it up. If you simply tell me that you "believe" that I am wrong, go ahead and there is no reason to prove anything.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Tue, 29 Aug 2006 19:44:23 GMT

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

---

So you're picking on the WAY an argument is presented rather than considering its merits. Just because you believe yourself to be a world-reknowned expert on absolute meanings and differences between knowing, knowledge, and belief, doesn't negate the points being made surrounding the usage of the word you pick apart.

If I say "I know there's no God because X, X and X." or I say "I believe there's no God because of X, X, and X", it doesn't negate X, X, and X, but you take them out of the debate and pick on the person for saying "know" instead of "believe". That's not good debate skills.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 29 Aug 2006 19:46:45 GMT

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

---

Don't use words you don't mean then.

If you mean that you "know" something, then say it, and provide the proof that goes with your knowledge. If you don't "know" it, don't claim that you do.

---

Edit: Actually, it does negate x, x, and x.

Try this: I know that Bush himself rigged the last election to ensure that he won.

The obvious response would be to "prove it".

Now try this: I'm not sure but did Bush rig the last election to ensure that he won?

The response would most likely be "no" rather than "prove it".

The first one is claiming it to be a truth (I know), while the later is simply expressing a belief (I'm not sure).

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 29 Aug 2006 19:48:41 GMT

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

---

Crimson wrote on Tue, 29 August 2006 15:44: If I say "I know there's no God because X, X and X." or I say "I believe there's no God because of X, X, and X", it doesn't negate X, X, and X, but you take them out of the debate and pick on the person for saying "know" instead of "believe". That's not good debate skills.

It's still pointless trying to prove either side wrong simply because you see a few things differently than others. Obviously we're all going to see each other's point of view as wrong if they disagree, but these religious debates are as pointless as arguing politics with the opposite side. It really does prove nothing. How many times has SFE been proven to be an idiot, yet he dredges on with his bullshit because he "can't" be proven wrong. Only, in this case, neither side can be proven wrong.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Tue, 29 Aug 2006 19:55:33 GMT

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

---

The reasons X, X, and X are immaterial when the profession of knowledge is in question. If you say you believe X, X, and X, go for it because it has no merit on anyone else. Your reasons are your own and whether or not you 'know' them or 'believe' them are entirely based on your epistemological tendencies. The issue arises when you start claiming some form of objective knowledge against someone else saying the same thing but with differing content. If you subscribe to agnosticism across the board then there is no need to argue because everyone is likely objectively incorrect.

X, X, and X themselves become an issue when you're arguing for probability, in which case we start all over again. How/why do you know/believe what you know/believe? Ultimately, unless you have some kind of fundamental epistemological insight, you'll find that the reasons you believe God to be probable or improbable are as much in question as anything else. David Hume

is very important reading on this topic.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 29 Aug 2006 20:24:36 GMT

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

---

Quote: Just because you believe yourself to be a world-reknowned expert on absolute meanings and differences between knowing, knowledge, and belief,

Never claimed, nor believed that. Interesting point though, I was the first to write a paper about it (at least as far as I know or have been told).

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Wed, 30 Aug 2006 01:06:57 GMT

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

---

j\_ball430 wrote on Tue, 29 August 2006 15:48

It's still pointless trying to prove either side wrong simply because you see a few things differently than others. Obviously we're all going to see each other's point of view as wrong if they disagree, but these religious debates are as pointless as arguing politics with the opposite side. It really does prove nothing. How many times has SFE been proven to be an idiot, yet he dredges on with his bullshit because he "can't" be proven wrong. Only, in this case, neither side can be proven wrong.

Blazer wrote (again)

There's no winning the "argument", and no amount of pasting what you believe or referencing scientific materials is going to sway the other person one bit, so all that happens is everyone flames each other to death and gets pissed off. There are exceptions to the rule of course, and I have seen calm intelligent discussion on opposing sides...but one thing that I have never seen is someones mind changed due to the discussion.

---

---

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.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Goztow](#) on Wed, 30 Aug 2006 07:16:19 GMT

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

---

I have followed this post from a distance but do have one remark. I can understand that people who believe in God, want to stand up and defend their believe.

What I don't understand is why people are putting considerable time in this topic to convince that this isn't the case.

If you believe in something, I can understand that you want to convince people that what you believe is right. However, how can you want to convince people that there is nothing?

It's like a cookie. If you find it good, you might want to convince people it is good. If it is bad, then why would you even put the effort into convincing people it is bad (even though they think it is good)? You won't gain anything by it.

People that like the cookie will want the others to have the joy of eating the cookie. People who don't like it, will shut up about it.

Does any of you actually think that you'll convince the other? I don't think so...

This complete topic is all about "I'm right and I want to have the last word".

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Wed, 30 Aug 2006 11:00:42 GMT

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

---

What you don't understand is that I fully intend to offend you and shake you and call you names. I won't get anywhere by placating you. Some people NEED their faith so viciously attacked once in a while so they can either affirm their beliefs or open their mind to other possibilities. The human experience is vast and complex and I thoroughly enjoy poking you with a stick and watching your reaction. I love saying totally whacky things to see what you do.

Now, why do I want you all to be atheists and convince you of my position? Let me float a few ideas your way:

1) Christianity and maybe other religions tell you that those who don't believe are going to hell and may even tell you that we're EVIL. I don't want you praying for me or worrying about me.

2) You are my friends and I believe several of you are intelligent enough to really step back and examine your faith. I'm waiting for someone to swallow their long-held pride and ask the difficult questions you may not want to know the answer to. I'm waiting for someone to be brave enough to take a small journey in the path of an atheist and see what makes us tick. I've taken a tour through the Christian faith and have spent many a sleepless night discussing with my brother who is still a theist but becoming less so every day as we talk. If you really want to know my path relating to religion in detail, I will be glad to share it. However I do currently believe I have had more exposure to your religion than you have to my non-religion. (speaking in the most general of terms I possibly can, of course)

3) From where I currently am in my path of theories and playing with ideas and debating with my brother, I am of the current mindset that religion is often more harmful than good and if I can help just one person see that and see why I think that way, then maybe it will help speed us along to the day I see when religion is categorized as insanity and humans experience life completely differently than we do now.

I will no longer entertain replies that deal in wording or semantics. I do not care to have a theological debate. My desire is to entice someone or someones to make the brave leap and follow the path of an atheist and find out why I and many others are so. I'm not saying I'm right, though of course I do believe I am. And if you end the journey more sure of your faith, then fine, and if you decide that you need to re-examine what you believe to be true, then I will do anything I can to point you in some of the directions you may ultimately desire to take.

Simply put, my brother and I talk about this stuff all the time, and in the last year or so I've watched my brother change from a hardcore Christian to where he is today where he can see religion from a different perspective but is currently not yet ready to let go of "God". I wish to share some of these things with you.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 30 Aug 2006 13:04:24 GMT

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

---

ugh.. Time and time again I've stated this. You can not use Religion to debate the existance of God.

Religion, even with it's God-derived holy books, is still a human interpretation of something. It's inherrent falability does not dictate the non-existance of a God.

The Christian faith is NOT the absolute authority on all-things-God. Proving it is fallible will NOT prove that God does not exist.

Religion being good or bad does NOT prove or disprove the existance of God.

If someone is not going to believe in God's existance due to the failings of ANY religion, then I feel sorry for them. Not because they no longer believe God exists, nor becaues they're "going to Hell". I feel sorry for them because that is such pathetic reasoning on their part. That's just as bad as me stating: Crimson's idea's of following the rules are faulty, because of the special treatment her brother gets. Therefore, because there is some fault in the way Crimson does things, she must not exist!

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Scythar](#) on Wed, 30 Aug 2006 14:02:40 GMT

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

---

The fact is we don't know anything for sure. As Java said, nothing we think we know can be proven to be an absolute truth. You can say you know an apple falls down or that flames are hot or God exists, but we don't know it to be an ultimate truth. Perhaps gravity, a force we don't understand completely, changes at times, and causes objects to push each others instead? However, our world is too complex if we live it like that. For the world to work, a society has to accept some beliefs as an absolute truth, otherwise you could just go and rob everyone and say "I didn't do it" despite you being shown on security cameras. There's still a small chance that there was a weird anomaly in the cameras that made it look like you were in it, after all.

What Crimson, for example, is doing is trying to spread (more or less) the idea that we should accept "God doesn't exist" into the category of absolute truths of ours, and not really spend any more time thinking about such improbable and outright silly things. Same applies inversely to theists.

And as to why atheists are trying to turn theists....the answer is personal of course. Happiness is usually the main argument: some atheists believe we would advance huge leaps in technology if everyone donated to science instead of churches. We could probably find cures for bad diseases. Some just don't want any religions to exists because they often cause conflicts and wars. Some don't think too far into it, they just give into the instinct that makes you believe such large groups of people thinking differently could be a potential threat to your way of living in some way. This all, again, applies to theists too. They also think the world would be a happier place if people believed, or they think atheists as a threat.

---

---



Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Wed, 30 Aug 2006 14:52:52 GMT

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

---

Crimson wrote on Wed, 30 August 2006 07:00: What you don't understand is that I fully intend to offend you and shake you and call you names. I won't get anywhere by placating you. Some people NEED their faith so viciously attacked once in a while so they can either affirm their beliefs or open their mind to other possibilities. The human experience is vast and complex and I thoroughly enjoy poking you with a stick and watching your reaction. I love saying totally whacky things to see what you do.

Now, why do I want you all to be atheists and convince you of my position? Let me float a few ideas your way:

1) Christianity and maybe other religions tell you that those who don't believe are going to hell and may even tell you that we're EVIL. I don't want you praying for me or worrying about me.

2) You are my friends and I believe several of you are intelligent enough to really step back and examine your faith. I'm waiting for someone to swallow their long-held pride and ask the difficult questions you may not want to know the answer to. I'm waiting for someone to be brave enough to take a small journey in the path of an atheist and see what makes us tick. I've taken a tour through the Christian faith and have spent many a sleepless night discussing with my brother who is still a theist but becoming less so every day as we talk. If you really want to know my path relating to religion in detail, I will be glad to share it. However I do currently believe I have had more exposure to your religion than you have to my non-religion. (speaking in the most general of terms I possibly can, of course)

3) From where I currently am in my path of theories and playing with ideas and debating with my brother, I am of the current mindset that religion is often more harmful than good and if I can help just one person see that and see why I think that way, then maybe it will help speed us along to the day I see when religion is categorized as insanity and humans experience life completely differently than we do now.

I will no longer entertain replies that deal in wording or semantics. I do not care to have a theological debate. My desire is to entice someone or someones to make the brave leap and follow the path of an atheist and find out why I and many others are so. I'm not saying I'm right, though of course I do believe I am. And if you end the journey more sure of your faith, then fine, and if you decide that you need to re-examine what you believe to be true, then I will do anything I can to point you in some of the directions you may ultimately desire to take.

Simply put, my brother and I talk about this stuff all the time, and in the last year or so I've watched my brother change from a hardcore Christian to where he is today where he can see religion from a different perspective but is currently not yet ready to let go of "God". I wish to share some of these things with you.

Not to sound like an arrogant asshole, but you've just proven me correct.

No longer can you call atheism anything other than a religion (your version, at least).

It exhibits all the qualities of a proselytizing religion that you claim to hate. Hell, you admit that you want to create harmful conflict ("...I fully intend to offend you and shake you and call you

names....") simply to get a rise out of people ("...I love saying totally whacky things to see what you do....") (wouldn't that make you a troll in your own forum? better get to banning yourself quick!).

In other words, you're attacking other religions for doing only the exact same things that you have been doing this whole time.

I don't want to say that makes you a hypocrite because I would think you to be above something like that, but if it looks like a duck and quacks like a duck....

So when are you going to organize your fellow atheists into an army against us infidels (non-believers in nothing, that is) who have been oppressing you all for so, so long?

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 30 Aug 2006 14:56:27 GMT

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

---

Crimson wrote on Wed, 30 August 2006 07:001) Christianity and maybe other religions tell you that those who don't believe are going to hell and may even tell you that we're EVIL. I don't want you praying for me or worrying about me.

2) You are my friends and I believe several of you are intelligent enough to really step back and examine your faith. I'm waiting for someone to swallow their long-held pride and ask the difficult questions you may not want to know the answer to. I'm waiting for someone to be brave enough to take a small journey in the path of an atheist and see what makes us tick. I've taken a tour through the Christian faith and have spent many a sleepless night discussing with my brother who is still a theist but becoming less so every day as we talk. If you really want to know my path relating to religion in detail, I will be glad to share it. However I do currently believe I have had more exposure to your religion than you have to my non-religion. (speaking in the most general of terms I possibly can, of course)

3) From where I currently am in my path of theories and playing with ideas and debating with my brother, I am of the current mindset that religion is often more harmful than good and if I can help just one person see that and see why I think that way, then maybe it will help speed us along to the day I see when religion is categorized as insanity and humans experience life completely differently than we do now.

1) How is being prayed for offensive? As you care for us as friends, that's the same sentiment that we share.

2) I've examined my faith... a lot. I am no longer the brainwashed Christian that my high school made me. I was blind as to why I believed what I believed. I thank public education and a maturing brain for my release from the religious prison. I have questioned my faith. I have also brought in the Big Bang and other evolutionist ideas into my beliefs. I still believe God is the ultimate authority, is infinite, and I do believe in a Heaven and Hell. However, I do see that the Bible is more or less a story book. Not in the sense that you see it as, but in the sense where it's telling historical events in a more children story book type of way.

3) Religion is harmful. Religion is very much corrupt and evil. However, belief isn't. Believing in a higher power poses no threat to mankind. However, joining everybody together and shunning the rest of the world and considering them heathens is bad. Fortunately, that's not what true Christianity is about.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Wed, 30 Aug 2006 14:58:34 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:...the most fickle people on the internet... (I'm lookin' at you, j\_ball)  
I rest my case.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 30 Aug 2006 15:59:26 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hydra wrote on Wed, 30 August 2006 10:58Quote:...the most fickle people on the internet... (I'm lookin' at you, j\_ball)  
I rest my case.  
Lies. I'm not that fickle. It's quite normal for people our age to change our beliefs and feelings towards certain things. As non-religious science was being taught to me, I slowly started to combine the two to create a happy medium. They both satisfy each other. What Crimson has said has not change my position one bit as there's not much more I can change on. I've found my happy medium. I will always believe in God, the sacrifice Jesus made, and his Resurrection. That I cannot and will not let go of.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [Carrierll](#) on Wed, 30 Aug 2006 23:11:58 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

(the first version made no sense on re-reading)  
Second try:  
No authority on religion has said that God (in whatever form) DID or DID NOT create the big bang. Therefore, it's fine for a Christian (or whatever) to beleive that God DID create the big bang. Heck, I arrived that conclusion about... 10 years ago... (I am 15)

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [Oblivion165](#) on Wed, 30 Aug 2006 23:15:36 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I never believed in life after death, people die all the time and are brought back..the story is always the same.

Blackness, and nothing.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 31 Aug 2006 01:16:41 GMT

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

---

warranto wrote on Wed, 30 August 2006 06:04ugh.. Time and time again I've stated this. You can not use Religion to debate the existance of God.

Religion, even with it's God-derived holy books, is still a human interpretation of something. It's inherrent falability does not dictate the non-existance of a God.

The Christian faith is NOT the absolute authority on all-things-God. Proving it is fallible will NOT prove that God does not exist.

Religion being good or bad does NOT prove or disprove the existance of God.

If someone is not going to believe in God's existance due to the failings of ANY religion, then I feel sorry for them. Not because they no longer believe God exists, nor becaues they're "going to Hell". I feel sorry for them because that is such pathetic reasoning on their part. That's just as bad as me stating: Crimson's idea's of following the rules are faulty, because of the special treatment her brother gets. Therefore, because there is some fault in the way Crimson does things, she must not exist!

That's funny that you speak in such absolutes. I'm sure a Christian would disagree with you, for while you (if I understand you correctly) believe that there's a God but religion is made by man, fallible, and faulty, there are millions of others who believe the bible is the word of God etc. So don't SCOLD me for speaking in absolutes and then go and do the same thing you accuse me of. These are YOUR beliefs on how God is in your opinion.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 31 Aug 2006 01:19:36 GMT

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

---

Scythar wrote on Wed, 30 August 2006 07:02What Crimson, for example, is doing is trying to spread (more or less) the idea that we should accept "God doesn't exist" into the category of absolute truths of ours, and not really spend any more time thinking about such unprobable and outright silly things. Same applies inversely to theists.

You failed 100%. I never said that you should accept that as an absolute truth. I am speaking to those who don't consider it a possibility, and suggest that they consider it as a possibility.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 31 Aug 2006 01:22:14 GMT

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

---

Hydra wrote on Wed, 30 August 2006 07:52 Not to sound like an arrogant asshole, but you've just proven me correct.

No longer can you call atheism anything other than a religion (your version, at least). It exhibits all the qualities of a proselytizing religion that you claim to hate. Hell, you admit that you want to create harmful conflict ("...I fully intend to offend you and shake you and call you names...") simply to get a rise out of people ("...I love saying totally whacky things to see what you do...") (wouldn't that make you a troll in your own forum? better get to banning yourself quick!).

In other words, you're attacking other religions for doing only the exact same things that you have been doing this whole time.

I don't want to say that makes you a hypocrite because I would think you to be above something like that, but if it looks like a duck and quacks like a duck....

So when are you going to organize your fellow atheists into an army against us infidels (non-believers in nothing, that is) who have been oppressing you all for so, so long?

A troll? Do you know what a troll is or not? Oh noes, I popped your little safe bubble where no one is allowed to question you? I'm sorry, I thought this was the Hot Topics forum, but what I do I know, I just established it!

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [jnz](#) on Thu, 31 Aug 2006 01:23:01 GMT

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

---

wow, triple post.

Oblivion165 wrote on Thu, 31 August 2006 00:15 I never believed in life after death, people die all the time and are brought back..the story is always the same.

Blackness, and nothing.

that is a good thing to hope for.

CarrierII wrote on Thu, 31 August 2006 00:11(I am 15)

cool, so am i.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 31 Aug 2006 01:29:20 GMT

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

---

j\_ball430 wrote on Wed, 30 August 2006 07:561) How is being prayed for offensive? As you care for us as friends, that's the same sentiment that we share.

I don't remember specifically saying it was offensive. Considering what I believe, why would I be offended that you sit alone talking to the air about me?

Quote:2) I've examined my faith... a lot. I am no longer the brainwashed Christian that my high school made me. I was blind as to why I believed what I believed. I thank public education and a maturing brain for my release from the religious prison. I have questioned my faith. I have also brought in the Big Bang and other evolutionist ideas into my beliefs. I still believe God is the ultimate authority, is infinite, and I do believe in a Heaven and Hell. However, I do see that the Bible is more or less a story book. Not in the sense that you see it as, but in the sense where it's telling historical events in a more children story book type of way.

I completely respect that. You took a step back from what's been drilled into your head all your life and removed the stuff that didn't make sense to you. I hope that you don't plan to stop there and evolve (if you will) your beliefs as new thoughts and ideas come around that make sense to you.

Quote:3) Religion is harmful. Religion is very much corrupt and evil. However, belief isn't. Believing in a higher power poses no threat to mankind. However, joining everybody together and shunning the rest of the world and considering them heathens is bad. Fortunately, that's not what true Christianity is about.

I agree. I totally understand that some people need to believe in a higher power watching over them and protecting them, and others need to believe someone is watching them when no one else is to keep them from doing bad things. In fact, I suggested to someone just in the last couple of months that their schizophrenic, bipolar son would probably do good to "find Jesus".

Thank you for addressing the subject matter instead of the other posts that attempt to derail.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 31 Aug 2006 01:31:49 GMT

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

---

I can quadruple and quintuple post. I'm the boss. I think people who get upset about multiple posts are retards, unless those posts are spam.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [jnz](#) on Thu, 31 Aug 2006 01:39:54 GMT

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

---

300 Proofs of God's Existence  
ARGUMENT FROM INFINITE REGRESS

- (1) Ask Atheists what caused the Big Bang.
- (2) Regardless of their answer, ask how they know this.
- (3) Continue process until the Atheist admits he doesn't know the answer to one of your questions.
- (4) You win!
- (5) Therefore, God exists.

ask me any question about the big bang and i will give you my theory.

Crimson wrote on Thu, 31 August 2006 02:31 I can quadruple and quintuple post. I'm the boss. I think people who get upset about multiple posts are retards, unless those posts are spam.

i don't mind double posting(or more), just pointing out. i must admit when poeple complanin it is annoying.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 31 Aug 2006 03:30:37 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Crimson wrote on Wed, 30 August 2006 19:16

That's funny that you speak in such absolutes. I'm sure a Christian would disagree with you, for while you (if I understand you correctly) believe that there's a God but religion is made by man, fallible, and faulty, there are millions of others who believe the bible is the word of God etc. So don't SCOLD me for speaking in absolutes and then go and do the same thing you accuse me of. These are YOUR beliefs on how God is in your opinion.

I was scolding you for speaking in absolutes? Please enlighten me as to where I did that. All I did was say to speak what you mean; if you mean the absolute, then use the absolute. That's what I did. I never once suggested my ideas were held by fellow Christians.

I believe in God, and I believe that the bible is the word of God. I also know that Religion is a human interpretation of a religious text, which is why the Christian faith (as well as many others) have more than one religion based around those teachings.

As for the expression of my personal beliefs, I have yet to reveal any but the most basic of my position. Everything I've been arguing is not necessarily what I believe.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 31 Aug 2006 05:41:55 GMT

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

---

warranto wrote on Wed, 30 August 2006 06:04 The Christian faith is NOT the absolute authority on all-things-God.

I'm sure Christians would disagree with that. This is your opinion. I agree with it, but it's still an opinion. It's POSSIBLE that the Christian faith has it 100% right, and while it is possible, you can't state for a fact that it's not.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Scythar](#) on Thu, 31 Aug 2006 10:07:17 GMT

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

---

Crimson wrote on Wed, 30 August 2006 21:19 Scythar wrote on Wed, 30 August 2006 07:02 What Crimson, for example, is doing is trying to spread (more or less) the idea that we should accept "God doesn't exist" into the category of absolute truths of ours, and not really spend any more time thinking about such improbable and outright silly things. Same applies inversely to theists.

You failed 100%. I never said that you should accept that as an absolute truth. I am speaking to those who don't consider it a possibility, and suggest that they consider it as a possibility.

But why do you say some people should find flaws in their faiths and then couple posts later you say some people should find Jesus?

Isn't faith just that: a state in where you believe into something 100%? If you accept flaws and consider that your target of devotion might not be true, or otherwise question it, it's no longer faith, is it? The more you accept the possibility that God doesn't exist, the more you lose your faith.

Unless you just think of religion as a cure for treating asshats. Those who are not asshats should not believe, while idiots should believe, to become better human beings.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 31 Aug 2006 11:48:06 GMT

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

---

Crimson wrote on Wed, 30 August 2006 23:41 warranto wrote on Wed, 30 August 2006 06:04 The Christian faith is NOT the absolute authority on all-things-God.

I'm sure Christians would disagree with that. This is your opinion. I agree with it, but it's still an opinion. It's POSSIBLE that the Christian faith has it 100% right, and while it is possible, you can't state for a fact that it's not.

Exactly.

---

---



Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [Blazer](#) on Thu, 31 Aug 2006 15:32:46 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Scythar wrote on Thu, 31 August 2006 06:07

Isn't faith just that: a state in where you believe into something 100%? If you accept flaws and consider that your target of devotion might not be true, or otherwise question it, it's no longer faith,

Isn't faith actually, by definition, believing in something even though there is no proof, and even though there is doubt, and even though there are logical flaws?

Dictionary.com has this for its 2nd definition of faith:  
2. belief that is not based on proof:

So it seems that faith doesn't mean 100% blind devotion...you can still consider other possibilities. In fact, if you permitted yourself to consider flaws in the target of your devotion, and believed in it anyway, wouldn't that in fact mean that you had even more faith?

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 31 Aug 2006 20:06:54 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

warranto wrote on Thu, 31 August 2006 04:48Crimson wrote on Wed, 30 August 2006 23:41warranto wrote on Wed, 30 August 2006 06:04The Christian faith is NOT the absolute authority on all-things-God.

I'm sure Christians would disagree with that. This is your opinion. I agree with it, but it's still an opinion. It's POSSIBLE that the Christian faith has it 100% right, and while it is possible, you can't state for a fact that it's not.

Exactly.

Then why did you do it?

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 31 Aug 2006 20:21:24 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

To get you to acknowledge that it is possible that a religion can be correct.

This acknowledgment then lets me start into the idea that if you can acknowledge that there is a possibility that at least one religion may have it right, then it lessens your argument about comparing God imaginary friends and the current marketing-idea of Santa Clause. Somehow I doubt you'd be willing to argue that imaginary friends and Santa Clause "might" be real.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Thu, 31 Aug 2006 20:23:10 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

According to string theory, they ARE real.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 31 Aug 2006 23:31:25 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

The problem is, I already do acknowledge that one religion might have it right. However, I still feel that "God" is an imaginary friend. As I said before, I have been exposed to religion and even as a small child in perfect brainwashing age, it never took. I always knew the idea was insane and once I discovered that there were other people who didn't believe it, I knew I was a part of that for now and forever.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 01 Sep 2006 01:18:44 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

CrimsonI already do acknowledge that one religion might have it right  
CrimsonI always knew the idea was insane  
...

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [jnz](#) on Fri, 01 Sep 2006 02:23:48 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hydra wrote on Thu, 31 August 2006 21:23According to string theory, they ARE real.

that was random

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Fri, 01 Sep 2006 03:39:39 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

What everyone has seemed to miss from this topic is the fact that one of us is wrong. So, if one of us is wrong and only the athiests will get the repercussions of being wrong, then you might as well be associated with a religion becuase that way if you were right you win.

That or you can live a good life and not berate people just because they believe in something different, it all works out.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 01 Sep 2006 04:32:51 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Pascal's wager... that's a good one. Sorry, but I can't pretend to believe in something I don't. How the hell would that get me into "heaven"?

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [xptek](#) on Fri, 01 Sep 2006 04:38:17 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

DarkDemin wrote on Thu, 31 August 2006 23:39: So, if one of us is wrong and only the atheists will get the repercussions of being wrong, then you might as well be associated with a religion because that way if you were right you win.

That is possibly the stupidest reason to follow a religion ever.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 01 Sep 2006 04:46:10 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

xptek wrote on Fri, 01 September 2006 00:38: DarkDemin wrote on Thu, 31 August 2006 23:39: So, if one of us is wrong and only the atheists will get the repercussions of being wrong, then you might as well be associated with a religion because that way if you were right you win.

That is possibly the stupidest reason to follow a religion ever.  
Exactly. If this is the reason why you believe in God, then God is going to see right through your ploy and it'll fail, so basically you've done nothing but forced yourself to play Christian and still failed at tricking God. God can't be made to look like a fool, however, humans can.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 01 Sep 2006 08:14:35 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I completely agree. My current belief structure falls thus: There MAY be a "God". I do not believe he exists, but if he does, so long as I strive to be good to others and/or not harm them, then I believe that is enough to get the eternal reward should one exist.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [puddle\\_splasher](#) on Fri, 01 Sep 2006 08:52:58 GMT

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

---

8 pages later and we are finally heading for some normality.

The subject has been discussed, ripped apart, opinions and beliefs given.

Now the short sharp statements are being given.

So far Crimson is one of the few, with a view that is logical, credible and entirely understandable without lots of words in between.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Goztow](#) on Fri, 01 Sep 2006 09:33:45 GMT

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

---

puddle\_splasher wrote on Fri, 01 September 2006 10:528 pages later and we are finally heading for some normality.

The subject has been discussed, ripped apart, opinions and beliefs given.

Now the short sharp statements are being given.

So far Crimson is one of the few, with a view that is logical, credible and entirely understandable without lots of words in between.

Define what you mean with "logical". Oh, maybe you mean your own way of finding things logical, then I must agree with you.

As for understandable: if a scientist explains chemical formulas to his colleague, that will be completely understandable for the colleague but for most people it will not be. You cannot understand religion if you didn't study it. That's why you in particular do not understand the other's views.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [puddle\\_splasher](#) on Fri, 01 Sep 2006 14:08:22 GMT

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

---

Goztow wrote on Fri, 01 September 2006 04:33puddle\_splasher wrote on Fri, 01 September 2006 10:528 pages later and we are finally heading for some normality.

The subject has been discussed, ripped apart, opinions and beliefs given.

Now the short sharp statements are being given.

So far Crimson is one of the few, with a view that is logical, credible and entirely understandable

---

without lots of words in between.

Define what you mean with "logical". Oh, maybe you mean your own way of finding things logical, then I must agree with you.

As for understandable: if a scientist explains chemical formulas to his colleague, that will be completely understandable for the colleague but for most people it will not be. You cannot understand religion if you didn't study it. That's why you in particular do not understand the other's views.

Hey HOLD ON, matey.

I for one am very much likely "IN PARTICULAR" to understand that everyone has different views.

Im not the one saying "I KNOW THERE IS A GOD or I KNOW THERE IS NOT A GOD" so dont give me any of your BS.

Never once have I forced any views on anyone nor have I rubbished any other persons views.

So please dont start the flaming now as the discussion appears to be coming to a close.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Fri, 01 Sep 2006 14:56:40 GMT

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

---

puddle\_splasher wrote on Fri, 01 September 2006 10:08Never once have I... rubbished any other persons views.

Quote:Don't we just love Religious Zealots.

You are just the same as the Muslim race. Only problem there, is that they came after Christianity.

....

However science can and frequently rips the Old Testament apart with stone cold, hard facts.

....

Do not let yourself become brainwashed....

Quote:You are brainwashed and unable to think for yourself

Quit talking or get the hell out.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [puddle\\_splasher](#) on Fri, 01 Sep 2006 15:52:43 GMT

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

I believe as previously stated in a "Supreme Being".

Therefore, although I am not a Christian, in your eyes that appears to make me a non-believer?

I don't need to be told what to think and even if you try to change my views, I won't change them. nor will I ask anyone to change their views.

Understand that this topic was a discussion and not an argument. It was not meant to have folk flaming and getting angry. This is life not a classroom. people will always have a variety of views.

Now I personally have followed this topic with zest. Many good arguments and statements from both sides have put forward and that's all it's been. That's all it was meant to be.

But to say to someone for daring to have any view regardless of how you personally interpret it is wrong.

The phrase used "Quit talking or get the hell out." is highly inappropriate.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 01 Sep 2006 16:02:11 GMT

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

---

Quote:It was not meant to have folk flaming and getting angry.

Hmm.. I think calling people "brainwashed" for believing what they do qualifies as flaming.

Quote:The phrase used "Quit talking or get the hell out." is highly inappropriate.

I think I'd prefer that, than some of the insults you've thrown.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Fri, 01 Sep 2006 18:11:31 GMT

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

---

Crimson wrote on Fri, 01 September 2006 04:14I completely agree. My current belief structure falls thus: There MAY be a "God". I do not believe he exists, but if he does, so long as I strive to be good to others and/or not harm them, then I believe that is enough to get the eternal reward should one exist.

That is pretty much what I was trying to get at. But really is believing in Him going to hurt you in anyway, shape, or form?

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 01 Sep 2006 21:39:02 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Yeah, I can't make myself believe in something when all logic in my brain tells me otherwise. :\

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Sat, 02 Sep 2006 01:14:31 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Fuck, in the time it takes me to get back to my own Country this topic has doubled in size. Can anyone give me a quick summary?

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 02 Sep 2006 01:43:32 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dover wrote on Fri, 01 September 2006 21:14 Fuck, in the time it takes me to get back to my own Country this topic has doubled in size. Can anyone give me a quick summary?  
I'm sure you've seen other religion debate threads. Take a wild guess at what this one was about.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Sat, 02 Sep 2006 04:33:03 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Crimson wrote on Fri, 01 September 2006 15:39 Yeah, I can't make myself believe in something when all logic in my brain tells me otherwise. :\

Only because it's convenient (and yes, for the majority of people that applies to BOTH sides of the arguemnt).

I say this based on your over-all argument regarding the "invisible friend" example.

Of course, that would then apply to anything you had no physical proof on. And no, I'm not going back to that whole current science examples, I mean things of a lesser physical entity.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus  
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sat, 02 Sep 2006 04:52:32 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Crimson wrote on Fri, 01 September 2006 17:39 Yeah, I can't make myself believe in something

when all logic in my brain tells me otherwise. :\

So do you believe in love?

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sat, 02 Sep 2006 07:39:37 GMT

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

---

ARGUMENT FROM FAITH IN THE OBVIOUS

- (1) You have faith that the sun will rise tomorrow, don't you?
  - (2) See! Atheists have faith too!
  - (3) Just like I have faith in Jesus.
  - (4) Therefore, God exists.
- 

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 02 Sep 2006 11:34:28 GMT

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

---

Crimson wrote on Sat, 02 September 2006 03:39 ARGUMENT FROM FAITH IN THE OBVIOUS

- (1) You have faith that the sun will rise tomorrow, don't you?
- (2) See! Atheists have faith too!
- (3) Just like I have faith in Jesus.
- (4) Therefore, God exists.

We're not talking about the "obvious" we're talking about the logical.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Goztow](#) on Sat, 02 Sep 2006 14:44:59 GMT

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

---

Aircraftkiller wrote on Sat, 02 September 2006 06:52 Crimson wrote on Fri, 01 September 2006 17:39 Yeah, I can't make myself believe in something when all logic in my brain tells me otherwise. :\

So do you believe in love?

Intresting remark, ACK.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Scythar](#) on Sat, 02 Sep 2006 16:54:18 GMT

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

---

I don't see what's so illogical about love, to be honest. Because it just happens and you can't choose when? You can't choose many other emotions either. You can't choose to be angry or



sad, it's a feeling that simply happens after certain events. Being angry is often very illogical, since attacking someone usually gets \*you\* in trouble, instead of the other. But I'm sure our brains don't consider our jurisdic systems when it decides a person should be hated, that happens in more conscious levels.

Same with love. Just because you can fall in love with a person who is geographically or morally unreachable doesn't mean it's illogical. It more likely just means that either a) the person "higher in ranks" and harder to reach is a more desirable target since a safe life with him/her is more likely, or b) The idea that a person can be somehow "unreachable" is very recent when compared to the lifespan of life on earth, and so our brain can't take such facts into account when love happens.

From our current point of view, yes, love is illogical. But when you consider love as part of the development of our species, it's suddenly more logical again. That's the problem, isn't it? We can't decide whether something is logical or not, since we base our facts on things we know, which are likely often not true or just parts of truth.

Do you think God thinks love is logical? Is God capable of understanding what makes love happen? Most likely, it would certainly make God less God if something was illogical to him. The more knowledge you have, the more logical things seem, no? But if someone or something is capable of viewing something as logical, i.e. love, then why should we not try to achieve the same point of view?

That last bit is a bit outside of the argument, but I think it's worth adding it.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sun, 03 Sep 2006 05:02:14 GMT

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

---

I guess in the grand scheme of things, I don't know if I actually believe in love. If you look at evolution, how the strongest survive, it could be that somewhere along the way, a woman had a child and developed this fierce desire to protect, amongst other women who regarded their children passively. And with a mother to protect it and hear its cry while sleeping, these children survived while the others were carried off by wild animals while their mothers slept obliviously on.

Think about it... men have this hormonal, instinctual desire to have sex and lots of it. This is necessary for procreation. Women, both through societal influences and instinct, get a desire to have children. These evolutionary result which ensures the survival of our species, requires that most or all people want to have children, And that they love their children unconditionally. There seems to be a distinctly low percentage of parents who get married and decide they want to have offspring and pass on their seed rather than those who have babies to take advantage of laws or rules of society (to get across the border "legally", to hook a man and his money, etc).

So, basically, love is an instinct that evolved because the connection we call "love" ensures the survival of our species.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Sun, 03 Sep 2006 21:14:35 GMT

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

---

Actually, wouldn't emotions such as love (depending on how you define "love"), compassion, and sympathy run counter to the processes and natural tendencies of evolution?

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sun, 03 Sep 2006 22:39:17 GMT

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

---

No, for the reasons I stated. Human babies are weak and helpless and need protection from their parents in order to survive the first decade or so of their lives. Without the instinctual feeling of love for a child, the baby is left to its own devices and quickly dies, ensuring the human race stops.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Carrierll](#) on Mon, 04 Sep 2006 00:20:54 GMT

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

---

Shall we define love as a very strong feeling of attraction to a particular member of the opposite sex? (something close to that is probably good enough)

I think Crimson is right, it's there so the parent who, being "grown up" and physically strong can kill the big, scary lion-esque animal which wants to eat the defenceless child.

It's our physically large brains that give us this whole problem in the first place. Lambs, for example, can walk within a few hours of their birth. I'm not sure for humans, but I know it's not a few hours.

But, that was a good comment ACK; Love, I'm sure, has made many people, do many, very crazy things. It does SEEM illogical.

Love, however, can only be illogical to the social barriers we put up, as people, for ourselves (wow, this again! see the "what the bleep do we know" topic) Social barriers, which only exist whilst we choose to let them do so.

Debate on!

(edit was typos and making my last sentence a little clearer)

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Mon, 04 Sep 2006 05:00:35 GMT

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

---

Crimson wrote on Sun, 03 September 2006 18:39No, for the reasons I stated. Human babies are weak and helpless and need protection from their parents in order to survive the first decade or so of their lives. Without the instinctual feeling of love for a child, the baby is left to its own devices and quickly dies, ensuring the human race stops.

My mistake for not being more clear; I was not referring simply to the love, compassion, and sympathy a parent feels for its defenseless child--an easy case can be made there for those specific emotions.

I was speaking more generally. What evolutionary purpose does compassion for the impoverished and sympathy for the sick serve? Wouldn't it better serve the greater good of the species if our weakest members were simply removed from the gene pool?

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 04 Sep 2006 05:17:10 GMT

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

---

Yep. It would be.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Kamuix](#) on Mon, 04 Sep 2006 05:21:33 GMT

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

---

Hydra wrote on Mon, 04 September 2006 01:00Crimson wrote on Sun, 03 September 2006 18:39No, for the reasons I stated. Human babies are weak and helpless and need protection from their parents in order to survive the first decade or so of their lives. Without the instinctual feeling of love for a child, the baby is left to its own devices and quickly dies, ensuring the human race stops.

My mistake for not being more clear; I was not referring simply to the love, compassion, and sympathy a parent feels for its defenseless child--an easy case can be made there for those specific emotions.

I was speaking more generally. What evolutionary purpose does compassion for the impoverished and sympathy for the sick serve? Wouldn't it better serve the greater good of the species if our weakest members were simply removed from the gene pool?

Nevermind, better not say that.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [thrash300](#) on Tue, 05 Sep 2006 01:16:10 GMT

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

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Tue, 05 Sep 2006 05:03:19 GMT

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

---

After you tell us why we should care about what you have to say.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Scythar](#) on Tue, 05 Sep 2006 12:32:28 GMT

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

---

Hydra wrote on Mon, 04 September 2006 01:00

I was speaking more generally. What evolutionary purpose does compassion for the impoverished and sympathy for the sick serve? Wouldn't it better serve the greater good of the species if our weakest members were simply removed from the gene pool?

But where would you draw the line? By "weakest members", do you mean "everyone but the strongest"? That would mean everyone but one would be removed by natural selection (or the instinct of survival, if you will), and would result in the end of human race. There has to be a balance.

Isn't compassion more or less part of empathy? It's the opposite of instinct of survival. Too much instinct of survival would mean that a race would destroy itself, when individuals would attack each others. Compassion for the weak works in the opposite way, no? Too much causes everyone to sacrifice themselves for the others, resulting in extinction. Too little of it causes everyone to attack each others, resulting in the same extinction. It's like the immune system in our body. Too good immune system causes allergies when your own body acts violently against itself and things beneficial to it. Too weak immune system causes your body to die to sicknesses. Also, we obviously don't like being alone. It makes us sad, perhaps unsafe too, when people close to us die. Sadness in turn can result in depression and suicidal behavior, which is not good for any race.

In our modern everyday lives compassion(empathy) is very strong. We're safe. But all it takes is some major threatening event like war and the emount of compassion decreases massively, and the instinct of survival increases. It's easy to say "Oh I'd never hurt anyone" now when you're sitting there by the PC, but if you had to choose between your life and the other's in a real situation...well, that's where many people really pick a side.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Carrierll](#) on Wed, 06 Sep 2006 13:16:49 GMT

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

---

Hydra wrote on Mon, 04 September 2006 00:00Crimson wrote on Sun, 03 September 2006

18:39No, for the reasons I stated. Human babies are weak and helpless and need protection from their parents in order to survive the first decade or so of their lives. Without the instinctual feeling of love for a child, the baby is left to its own devices and quickly dies, ensuring the human race stops.

My mistake for not being more clear; I was not referring simply to the love, compassion, and sympathy a parent feels for its defenseless child--an easy case can be made there for those specific emotions.

I was speaking more generally. What evolutionary purpose does compassion for the impoverished and sympathy for the sick serve? Wouldn't it better serve the greater good of the species if our weakest members were simply removed from the gene pool?

You want to start deciding who goes? You'll be killing people's family etc etc. And the moment you say "You're weak" and shoot someone, everyone would like to see the back of you.

That idea (I forget it's name) used to be widely accepted in America. That was before WWII. It was quietly dropped when the Nazis started committing acts of genocide, showing them how the idea would have to be implemented.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Wed, 06 Sep 2006 22:20:12 GMT

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

---

It's called eugenics. And history has proven time and time again that eugenics just doesn't work where humans are concerned.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Thu, 07 Sep 2006 00:12:20 GMT

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

---

(Kinda makes you wonder about euthenasia and abortion, doesn't it?)

If I were more motivated, I would have continued on this course of discussion, but I'll just go ahead and give away what my point was in bringing up that subject. It'd be more strong, of course, had I gone along with what I was planning, but whatever; I don't feel like dealing with it.

Here's another post I wrote on the APB forums from a thread about a similar subject (I don't see the reason to come up with something more original since it was about a similar subject)

(Iscream4pork is an atheist):

Hydralscream4porkI believe that Atheism doesn't have an explanation for emotions, But Quote:the law written on the heart actually comes from the bible where, I believe Paul, noticed the gentiles were nice even though they were not of his faith, or more correctly i suppose--not Jewish.

It is thought that everyone is born with this inner instinct, or that God intended it to be there...depending on what you believe.

I said this. Basically, almost all People are inherently born with the sense to not treat other humans unkindly for no reason.

Like I said, You can say genetics or God either way. But that is how I think most atheists would argue that.

And I would argue that those emotions exist because we were created from, by, to, and simply for love, which is the central message of the entire Christian religion. We're here to love God and love people. That's why most of us feel at least a little guilty when we do something that might end up hurting another person. That's why we all feel so sorry when we see those pictures on TV of starving children in Africa and those ads asking for people to sponsor a child and pay money to a Christian (there's that evil, oppressive religion again, shoving its beliefs down others' throats) organization that will provide that child with an education and basic medical care and opportunities that their parents maybe never had.

There is no evolutionary reason for those "feeling sorry for others" emotions to exist.

You may say it's because we needed them to survive early in our existence (which, once again, atheism cannot explain), and out of the bonds formed with other humans, complex societies evolved and solidified such emotions.

Let's take a look, however, at some other species that are almost as old as the human race and also exhibits a semblance of a society among members: the wolf.

Wolves are pack animals. They travel in groups so their chances of surviving in harsh conditions are better. They hunt in groups because they have learned that they have remarkable strengths in numbers; a small group of wolves could fight with a large bear, which would easily win in a one-on-one situation, and still emerge victorious simply because there were more wolves than the bear could handle. Wolves will fight viciously to protect their young; otherwise, the group cannot grow and will eventually die out. Wolves even have a bit of a hierarchy as to who is in charge, apparent in the leadership of the largest male, called the alpha male.

Yet these wolves do not necessarily share the same emotions humans do for one another. Do wolves experience or even know love? Of course not. They are driven by instinct and the need to survive. When an old and weak alpha male is challenged and beaten by a younger, faster, and stronger male, do the other wolves tend to the beaten wolf and lick his wounds? Of course not! They ostracize him from their society because he has been beaten by a wolf better than him.

In fact, it would be detrimental to the wolf pack if they kept the old dog because he would become a burden on the pack.

If I'm not mistaken, they do similar things not just to beaten alpha males but also their sick, decrepit, and physically handicapped. Think a wolf without a sense of smell carries much value to a wolf pack?

So what evolutionary sense would it make for us humans, who, apparently, are no better than other animals since we are animals ourselves, to care for our sick; to care for our elderly; to try to fix genetic disorders that are present in our gene pool; to try to fix foreign societies; to help our poor; to feel emotions that make us care about one another?

If you accept this world at face value and close your mind to all possible religion and accept no higher purpose other than to live for yourself, there is no reason to care about the suffering of

others. You are supposed to sit back and let mother nature run her course through the human race and kill off those who are weak, who are debilitated, and who are of no value to society. Oh well. That's as far as I'll go with that tangent.

We'll now return to our regularly scheduled bickering.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Thu, 07 Sep 2006 01:22:14 GMT

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

---

"Faith," by definition, is the firm belief in something which cannot be proven. Religion is faith based. Arguing about something that has no real right answer seems like a waste of time to me...

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 07 Sep 2006 01:33:12 GMT

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

---

mjfabian wrote on Wed, 06 September 2006 21:22 "Faith," by definition, is the firm belief in something which cannot be proven. Religion is faith based. Arguing about something that has no real right answer seems like a waste of time to me...

Yes, but it's still a subject that inspires debate/arguing. It's something that we hold close to us. Especially if someone calls me closed-minded because I disagree with them.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Scythar](#) on Thu, 07 Sep 2006 09:09:14 GMT

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

---

Hydra wrote on Wed, 06 September 2006 20:12

Let's take a look, however, at some other species that are almost as old as the human race and also exhibits a semblance of a society among members: the wolf.

Wolves are pack animals. They travel in groups so their chances of surviving in harsh conditions are better. They hunt in groups because they have learned that they have remarkable strengths in numbers; a small group of wolves could fight with a large bear, which would easily win in a one-on-one situation, and still emerge victorious simply because there were more wolves than the bear could handle. Wolves will fight viciously to protect their young; otherwise, the group cannot grow and will eventually die out. Wolves even have a bit of a hierarchy as to who is in charge, apparent in the leadership of the largest male, called the alpha male.

Yet these wolves do not necessarily share the same emotions humans do for one another. Do wolves experience or even know love? Of course not. They are driven by instinct and the need to survive. When an old and weak alpha male is challenged and beaten by a younger, faster, and stronger male, do the other wolves tend to the beaten wolf and lick his wounds? Of course not! They ostracize him from their society because he has been beaten by a wolf better than him.

In fact, it would be detrimental to the wolf pack if they kept the old dog because he would become a burden on the pack.

If I'm not mistaken, they do similar things not just to beaten alpha males but also their sick, decrepit, and physically handicapped. Think a wolf without a sense of smell carries much value to a wolf pack?

Wolves aren't driven by the instinct of survival alone. As I claimed in my earlier post, no species are. It's not possible. The fact that wolves are living in packs alone means that they trust the other members of the pack. They live in the wild, and in constant danger of starvation. They don't have the luxury of tending their weaker members. If they start caring for the weak, their whole pack is likely to die.

Put it this way: would you save a mans life if it meant your whole family had high chances of getting killed because of it? Would you seriously place your friends and sisters life on the line because you want to save some individual? It's easy to judge like that when you're sitting there in a safe society, but just look into any warfield and you'll see that we human don't act any differently than animals when our lifes are in serious danger.

Quote:

So what evolutionary sense would it make for us humans, who, apparently, are no better than other animals since we are animals ourselves, to care for our sick; to care for our elderly; to try to fix genetic disorders that are present in our gene pool; to try to fix foreign societies; to help our poor; to feel emotions that make us care about one another?

Again, sacrificing yourself for others and sacrificing others for yourself are in balance in nature. As I said in my previous post, too much of either will mean the end of a species. We are capable of compassion because we live in a safe world, so other species who actually have to fight for their existence seem brutal to us.

Quote:

If you accept this world at face value and close your mind to all possible religion and accept no higher purpose other than to live for yourself, there is no reason to care about the suffering of others. You are supposed to sit back and let mother nature run her course through the human race and kill off those who are weak, who are debilitated, and who are of no value to society.

That's not necessary for as long as our survival isn't threatened by compassion.

I think it like a line:

Instinct of		compassion,
survival,	-----1-----2---	sacrificing
sacrificing	-----1-----2---	yourself for
others for		others.
yourself.		

#1 is where we are, #2 is where most animals are. Animals have a lot more instinct of survival than us, and on the other hand, we have more compassion.

Also, how about this:



I have a dog, Sere, a german shepherd. We often play around, not by just throwing a ball but by teasing each others, e.g. I try to pinch his tail and he tries to evade and bites me gently. However, sometimes he bites too hard and I shout, and he immediately stops the play and comes close, tries to lick my hand and face, how do you explain that? And no, I don't punish him with pain when he does something wrong, so it's not fear of a punishment.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [fl00d3d](#) on Thu, 07 Sep 2006 11:03:07 GMT

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

---

I very quickly skimmed through this 9 page discussion about religion and wanted to throw my 2 cents in.

1- The person who started this thread spammed his beliefs then disappeared. Crimson have you cross-referenced the IP to see if this was a different user? Or maybe it was just someone jumping from one site to another trying to force their beliefs on someone else. \*shrug\* Either way I find it amusing that they posted a very controversial subject for the first and only post then disappeared. And here we are debating it like the weak-minded humans that we are.

2- I was brought up "Non-denominatonal protestant" in a dutch-reformed church ... to be specific. For those that haven't heard of this it is a "no bullshit" version of Christianity (comparatively speaking to other Christian faiths) that focuses on the central beliefs of the Christian FAITH and not all of the other details that many others seem to enjoy arguing about. I went from the time I was born until I left for military service (at 17).

3- Now, with that being said, I am now 25 years old and have only attended about 5 church services in the last 7 years - most of which were obligatory because of friends or family. I still have my faith and I still believe in the teachings of my religion, but I have noticed an incredible ingnorance growth in humanity and a dramatic series of abuse by 'the church'. For this reason I choose not to go.

4- What is even more interesting (I hope my fiancee forgives me for this, lol) is that my fiancee is Wiccan which is about as far from Christianity as you can get. Just imagine some of the conversations and debates that we have! But we manage to go through our lives with the understanding that religion is a part of your deepest sense of self (as most would call "your soul") and it is between you and your higher power. No one else. If you choose not to believe it, you simply don't. Because you accept the consequences of your own actions - whatever they may be - and you're OK with that. Even though I have VERY strong beliefs about a lot of things, I find myself just as tolerant because I am no better than the next guy (or gal). Our differences are what make us stronger and our forgiveness and tolerance is what makes us better people.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 07 Sep 2006 18:05:52 GMT

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

---

Quote:Crimson have you cross-referenced the IP to see if this was a different user? Or maybe it was just someone jumping from one site to another trying to force their beliefs on someone else.  
\*shrug\*

Yes, and there was no relation.

Quote:Either way I find it amusing that they posted a very controversial subject for the first and only post then disappeared. And here we are debating it like the weak-minded humans that we are.

I think it makes (some of) us the opposite of "weak-minded". I thoroughly enjoy debating religion, the greater meaning of things, where we came from, where we go when we die. I also spend a lot of time talking about the higher powers theoretically possible in all humans starting with the easiest one we can attain which is taking control of your dreams (lucid dreaming). The truly weak minded are the ones who get the answers to the "how did we get here? what happens when we die?" questions and just believes the answers given to them all their lives without coming up with their own nonsense predictions and sensical ones, and just having fun with the whole thing.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 07 Sep 2006 19:23:46 GMT

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

---

warranto wrote on Mon, 28 August 2006 13:37[Quote:The topic starter hasn't replied at all.

Meh, probably just someone who joined for the sole purpose of amusing him/herself while we get riled up over the topic.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [xptek](#) on Fri, 08 Sep 2006 20:47:23 GMT

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

---

Everybody who walks the earth is destined to die at some point. It's a depressing thought, however it is nevertheless true. What happens then? Are we just obliterated or is there a life after this one? If there is eternal life, then the next life will be a lot longer than this one. If we win the genetic lottery here, we may live to be 100 years old. Most of us will live a shorter life than this. By comparison, the next life will last forever.

Bearing this in mind it is very important to consider how we live this life and to give some serious thought to the choices we make. Unless you subscribe to the notion that life is a random accident then you need to consider what you will say to your maker when you meet Him. The Bible says that we will all face judgement when we die. The Bible also says that all of us have done bad things in the eyes of God, we have all sinned. If we are to be held accountable for these things that we have done, then our eternal destination is going to be very unpleasant. We will not be able to tell God that we deserve to go into His heaven, because we don't deserve to go into His

heaven.

God has made a way for us to avoid hell, which is where I deserve to go along with everyone else. He sent The Flying Spaghetti Monster Christ to earth to live the perfect life that we couldn't live, pay for our sins with His suffering on the cross and to purchase a place in heaven for us. The way to receive the gift of eternal life is to do the following:

1. Trust The Flying Spaghetti Monster to save you from your sins.
2. Accept Him as your Savior.
3. Make Him the Lord of your life (Giving Him control of your life).
4. Confess your sins to God (He knows them all anyway) and ask Him to forgive you of them.

These are not steps to be taken lightly. If you follow The Flying Spaghetti Monster, it can't help but change your life. It will also make the next life a lot more enjoyable.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 08 Sep 2006 21:07:10 GMT

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

---

Only if you think something like that will make yourself feel better about death.

But who am I to judge. Most people don't even bother will developing a Will because the idea of mortality scares them, religious or not.

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Berkut](#) on Sat, 09 Sep 2006 04:57:05 GMT

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

---

warranto wrote on Fri, 08 September 2006 16:07 Only if you think something like that will make yourself feel better about death.

But who am I to judge. Most people don't even bother will developing a Will because the idea of mortality scares them, religious or not.

Fearing Death? That sounds a bit depressing. Do people really do that?

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [xptek](#) on Sat, 09 Sep 2006 05:01:17 GMT

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

---

Why fear it when you're not going to know it happened?

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [\\*Metal Vixen\\*](#) on Sat, 09 Sep 2006 11:43:34 GMT

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

---

LOL fl00d! On the contrary, darling...all religions are parallel in some form.

Before Christianity, there was Druidism, a latter-day form of the modern Wicca. Then Christian Crusaders spread Christianity and this became the common religion.

I am curious to know more about the Bible's take on Egyptian culture and religion, as it was established thousands of years before Christ came for a visit.

I do consider myself Wiccan because it's simply what I believe. It works for me and it's what we call the Old Religion. To me, it explains more than any other religion.

Religion is also about tolerance. I admire all forms of religion.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [\\*Metal Vixen\\*](#) on Sat, 09 Sep 2006 11:50:30 GMT

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

---

And yes, people do fear death. Statistically, people fear two things: speaking in front of the public and death. Surprisingly, people fear the former more than the latter!

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [puddle\\_splasher](#) on Sun, 10 Sep 2006 11:49:46 GMT

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

---

\*Metal Vixen\* wrote on Sat, 09 September 2006 06:43LOL fl00d! On the contrary, darling...all religions are parallel in some form.

Before Christianity, there was Druidism, a latter-day form of the modern Wicca. Then Christian Crusaders spread Christianity and this became the common religion.

I am curious to know more about the Bible's take on Egyptian culture and religion, as it was established thousands of years before Christ came for a visit.

I do consider myself Wiccan because it's simply what I believe. It works for me and it's what we call the Old Religion. To me, it explains more than any other religion.

Religion is also about tolerance. I admire all forms of religion.

It looks like Cee has arrived?

---

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Wed, 13 Sep 2006 03:41:48 GMT

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

---

The original poster of this topic is copying and pasting the same damn message in multiple forums all over the place. I followed him from another one of these little "sermons". I don't know what your policy on advertising is here, but this poster is no better than an advertising bot.

Incidentally, someone created this account I am using at bugmenot. You may want to ban it.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [jnz](#) on Wed, 13 Sep 2006 06:59:15 GMT

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

---

nobug wrote on Wed, 13 September 2006 04:41The original poster of this topic is copying and pasting the same damn message in multiple forums all over the place. I followed him from another one of these little "sermons". I don't know what your policy on advertising is here, but this poster is no better than an advertising bot.

Incidentally, someone created this account I am using at bugmenot. You may want to ban it.

what is bugmenot?

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Wed, 13 Sep 2006 10:58:49 GMT

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

---

I deactivated the account and reported this site to bugmenot to be removed.

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Scythar](#) on Wed, 13 Sep 2006 11:25:45 GMT

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

---

Bugmenot is a site containing logins and passwords to huge amount of websites around the world, so you don't need to register yourself - just use a bugmenot account. Not suitable for forums, since anyone can use the accounts there, but it's handy for several news sites or somesuch.

---