
Subject: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [reborn](#) on Thu, 13 Jan 2011 09:33:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If there is no deity that created the universe, how did the universe come to be? Specifically I am talking about the creation of something from nothing. If we are to believe the "Big Bang Theory" then where did the Two giant gas clouds come from? How do you get something from nothing? Where does all matter come from?

Why do so many people feel the need to worship?

If there is no significance to life, no meaning to it, you must reflect that life is nothing more than an experience that will end, and therefore be a waste of time?

Are we as humans different to other animals? We have more intelligence and we have higher reasoning. Why are we the only ones?

If God does not exist, then can someone still hope for better times when in despair? Is hope just a random chance of roulette? There is no universal force of fairness and equality, no Karma?

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Thu, 13 Jan 2011 10:15:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

reborn wrote on Thu, 13 January 2011 03:33If there is no deity that created the universe, how did the universe come to be? Specifically I am talking about the creation of something from nothing. If we are to believe the "Big Bang Theory" then where did the Two giant gas clouds come from? How do you get something from nothing? Where does all matter come from?

I've no idea, but at least I'll be honest about the fact I've no idea. If someone thinks they know the answers to these questions, they'd better be ready for the follow-up questions.

Quote:Why do so many people feel the need to worship?

I'm not sure, but if I can reply to the question with a question, why are so many people wrong in what they worship?

Quote:If there is no significance to life, no meaning to it, you must reflect that life is nothing more than an experience that will end, and therefore be a waste of time?

Whoah, whoah, whoah, steady on there. Since when was "significance" and "meaning" in life a synonym for a god? You're not saying that the only way a life could have "meaning" is if that meaning was determined by a super-powerful celestial dictator?

I do think that life is an experience and I do think it'll end, but I wouldn't use the words "nothing more" in that sentence and I certainly wouldn't call it a waste of time.

You have a child, don't you?

Quote:Are we as humans different to other animals? We have more intelligence and we have

higher reasoning. Why are we the only ones?

Your statement about intelligence and reasoning surely is one possible answer to the first question. The second one's an evolutionary matter.

Quote:If God does not exist, then can someone still hope for better times when in despair? Again, why are you equating these two concepts? You might as well swap "God" for "Kim Jong-Il" or "McDonalds"

Quote:Is hope just a random chance of roulette?

How are you defining hope?

Quote:There is no universal force of fairness and equality, no Karma?

Universal...? Well, the concept of God doesn't qualify as that. Read the bible - the character of Yahweh is absolutely monstrous.

If we were to suppose that there isn't a "universal force of fairness and equality", then that's all the more reason to create as fair a system of laws as we can.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to atheists

Posted by [reborn](#) on Thu, 13 Jan 2011 11:28:45 GMT

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

Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 January 2011 05:15

I've no idea, but at least I'll be honest about the fact I've no idea. If someone thinks they know the answers to these questions, they'd better be ready for the follow-up questions.

What possible explanation could satisfy the question? Does this not make you ponder that there could be a God?

Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 January 2011 05:15

I'm not sure, but if I can reply to the question with a question, why are so many people wrong in what they worship?

Perhaps that is not the important part of the question, perhaps it's the fact that so many people do worship that should be interesting?

Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 January 2011 05:15

Whoah, whoah, whoah, steady on there. Since when was "significance" and "meaning" in life a synonym for a god? You're not saying that the only way a life could have "meaning" is if that meaning was determined by a super-powerful celestial dictator?

I do think that life is an experience and I do think it'll end, but I wouldn't use the words "nothing more" in that sentence and I certainly wouldn't call it a waste of time.

You have a child, don't you?

I'm saying what's the point of learning if what you gained is lost when you die. What will your experiences matter to anyone in a 1000 years time? If there is no real lesson plan for us, as there is no teacher, then why bother going to class?

I do have a child, she means more to me than anyone else. I would face anything for her well being. If I cease to exist when I die, then I would not be sad.

However, if you cannot reflect on your past (because you do not exist), then those experiences you had are lost.

Everything you take in is unique to you. All your experiences are interpreted by you, so are unique. If you cease to exist, then what was the point of you experiencing them if they are lost?

Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 January 2011 05:15

Your statement about intelligence and reasoning surely is one possible answer to the first question. The second one's an evolutionary matter.

I was trying to say that Yes we are different to the other animals, but why are we the only ones with higher reasoning?

No other animals have been capable of gaining this level of reasoning over the period of time the Earth has existed?

Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 January 2011 05:15

Again, why are you equating these two concepts? You might as well swap "God" for "Kim Jong-Il" or "McDonalds"

Because people can have faith in a God that their prayers will be heard. If it is just chance, then you just have to wait and see.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 January 2011 05:15

How are you defining hope?

I am asking you how you define it.

You are in a room with a murderer holding a gun who hates you.

You hope he doesn't kill you. Do you hope for a 1 in a million chance, but realsie you're probably going to die as that is extremely far fetched?

Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 January 2011 05:15

Universal...? Well, the concept of God doesn't qualify as that. Read the bible - the character of Yahweh is absolutely monstrous.

If we were to suppose that there isn't a "universal force of fairness and equality", then that's all the more reason to create as fair a system of laws as we can.

Yeah, you're right. But logically there are people that will miss out. Are you saying that some people exist, have bad luck, and then die? There is no higher power at work that can save them, or causing them to have this existence so they can learn this hardship? They have this lot in life, experience some shittiness, then just cease to exist? What's the point of their life?

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to atheists
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Thu, 13 Jan 2011 11:53:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

you're dumb. please stop being dumb.

reborn wrote on Thu, 13 January 2011 03:33If there is no deity that created the universe, how did the universe come to be? Specifically I am talking about the creation of something from nothing. If we are to believe the "Big Bang Theory" then where did the Two giant gas clouds come from? How do you get something from nothing? Where does all matter come from? Where does god come from? If he can just be there without reason, so can the universe.

Quote:Why do so many people feel the need to worship?

1. Why do so many people feel the need to worship SO MANY DIFFERENT THINGS?
2. why do so many people listen to ke\$ha? cause dum. k?

Quote:If there is no significance to life, no meaning to it, you must reflect that life is nothing more than an experience that will end, and therefore be a waste of time? do you realize just how dumb you are?

Quote:Are we as humans different to other animals? We have more intelligence and we have higher reasoning. Why are we the only ones? your reasoning seems to be about as high as that one of a giraffe

Quote:If God does not exist, then can someone still hope for better times when in despair? Is hope just a random chance of roulette? There is no universal force of fairness and equality, no Karma?

yes. does that bother you?

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to atheists
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Thu, 13 Jan 2011 11:56:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:

Yeah, you're right. But logically there are people that will miss out. Are you saying that some people exist, have bad luck, and then die? There is no higher power at work that can save them, or

causing them to have this existance so they can learn this hardship? They have this lot in life, experiance some shittyness, then just cease to exist? What's the point of their life? You're right, the fact that half a billion people are severely underfed is totally an argument in favor of the existence of a deity, not against it. ololo

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [reborn](#) on Thu, 13 Jan 2011 12:11:30 GMT

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

Herr Surth wrote on Thu, 13 January 2011 06:53you're dumb. please stop being dumb.

I never said I believed, I was curious about the answers people had. I do not believe it is worth replying to you further, as you're just rude.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Thu, 13 Jan 2011 12:45:20 GMT

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

your curiosity is just as dumb. you silly troll you.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Thu, 13 Jan 2011 16:46:33 GMT

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

reborn wrote on Thu, 13 January 2011 05:28What possible explanation could satisfy the question? Does this not make you ponder that there could be a God?
there are two problems with that. firstly that doesn't answer the question at all, it aggravates the question. now instead of having to explain the origin of a few blobs of hydrogen or whatever, you've got to explain the origin of a super-powerful entity capable of willing planets and stars and shit into existence, and creating life on a whim. this isn't progress.

secondly, the furthest this could get you is deism, not theism. you use the word God in singular with a capital G - anyone reading this is likely to think you're talking about the Judeo-Christian one, as opposed to say Thor or Zeus. the closest anybody's ever come to inferring the existence of a deity is by saying they don't know how something could have happened; there's an enormous logical gap between that (i.e. supposing that maybe some entity did it on purpose) and determining that entity's qualities (such as: "He listens to my prayers" or "He disapproves of homosexuals" or indeed thinking that He is the right word to use here)

btw, if you have an hour to spare, let me recommend the lecture A Universe from Nothing by Lawrence Krauss.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 January 2011 05:15

I'm not sure, but if I can reply to the question with a question, why are so many people wrong in what they worship?

Perhaps that is not the important part of the question, perhaps it's the fact that so many people do worship that should be interesting?

No, I think the follow-up question is more important. "Why do so many people think this?" Well, are they right to think it? We're fallible. The mind plays tricks, and there are people out there who profit by misleading us.

Here's another point. Your question implies that there's a majority of people in the world who believe in a god. Well, look at it another way. The majority of people in the world do not think Christianity is correct (and if you split Christianity down into its innumerable different sects, the numbers are even more damning). The majority of people in the world do not think Islam is correct. The majority of people in the world do not think Hinduism is correct. I could go on. There's no religion that cannot be inserted into that sentence.

Quote:I'm saying what's the point of learning if what you gained is lost when you die. What will your experiences matter to anyone in a 1000 years time? If there is no real lesson plan for us, as there is no teacher, then why bother going to class?

Isn't life wonderful for its own sake? Doesn't it rather devalue human life to suppose that its meaning must be determined by a god we've got to obey, that we're being tested in preparation for an afterlife, etc?

What will my life matter to anyone in 1000 years time? I couldn't care less. Most people's endeavours won't matter in that timeframe. Maybe if someone develops a cure for cancer or something, but if you're going to say human life is a waste of time then it seems you shouldn't be impressed by that either.

Quote:I do have a child, she means more to me than anyone else. I would face anything for her well being. If I cease to exist when I die, then I would not be sad.

There you go. Life for you has meaning and it has absolutely nothing to do with a god.

Quote:However, if you cannot reflect on your past (because you do not exist), then those experiences you had are lost.

Everything you take in is unique to you. All your experiences are interpreted by you, so are unique. If you cease to exist, then what was the point of you experiencing them if they are lost? this question's very easy to turn on its head. if death is the end, if there's no afterlife, then this life is all we have and it becomes even more precious, so let's make the best of it for ourselves, our children and our fellow creatures, and let's try to keep the world intact for succeeding generations.

if you think that's a waste of time, i invite you to say so.

Quote:I was trying to say that Yes we are different to the other animals, but why are we the only ones with higher reasoning?

No other animals have been capable of gaining this level of reasoning over the period of time the Earth has existed?

once homo sapiens starts to develop intellectually, it becomes an upward spiral. figuring out how to use tools, standing upright which lets us develop bigger brains, etc... it's like saying once a child

can read it'll learn stuff a lot faster.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 January 2011 05:15

Again, why are you equating these two concepts? You might as well swap "God" for "Kim Jong-Il" or "McDonalds"

Because people can have faith in a God that their prayers will be heard. If it is just chance, then you just have to wait and see.
or do something about it yourself instead of wasting your time praying

Quote:Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 January 2011 05:15

How are you defining hope?

I am asking you how you define it.

You are in a room with a murderer holding a gun who hates you.

You hope he doesn't kill you. Do you hope for a 1 in a million chance, but realsie you're probably going to die as that is extremely far fetched?

the chances that the police will burst in, or that i can talk my way out of it, or that i can live my life in such a way that nobody hates me enough that they want to risk a hefty prison sentence on my life's account... the chances of any of those are much much greater than one in a million, and they're probably a lot greater than the odds that an intervening God exists.

however, there's a problem with the 3rd option - that i can live my life in such a way that nobody hates me that much. the problem with that is there are people in the world who loathe everyone here with a level of murderous bloodthirst that none of us really appreciate. and why? religion.

Quote:Yeah, you're right. But logically there are people that will miss out. Are you saying that some pople exist, have bad luck, and then die? There is no higher power at work that can save them, or causing them to have this existance so they can learn this hardship? They have this lot in life, experienace some shittyness, then just cease to exist? What's the point of their life?

certainly the governments in place could be better than they are (although it absolutely must be said that governments work better in every way when religion is kept out of them), but they work a shitload better than the concept of god would. see my earlier statement about the sheer monstrousness of the depiction of Yahweh in the bible. if what christians keep saying is true, people like me are going to be tortured for ever just for what we think. well, even the poor people of North Korea have a better deal than that.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Thu, 13 Jan 2011 19:26:04 GMT

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

I never believed the theory of 'the big bang.'

IMO, it just contradicts itself. Nothing within nothing creates something that creates everything?
What?

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Pyr0man1c](#) on Thu, 13 Jan 2011 19:36:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It's more along the lines of a singularity 'exploding', so the question is what created the singularity OR what caused the singularity to form.
Herr suth has had the best post here.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Pyr0man1c](#) on Thu, 13 Jan 2011 21:14:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote: A rather weird theory would be to say that the Universe really just holds a circle of events. For example a million trillion days from now in this universe, I will be sitting on my chair typing this essay. You could also say that a million trillion days ago in the universe I will be sitting down on this chair typing out this essay; the world exists in such a way that the universe doesn't have to literally add days on, time just moves around the cycle. {so time is infinite}

I wrote this a while back, it's part of an essay so it might seem a bit out of context. Have you ever heard of the "big crunch" theory? That would explain how the universe would end. Another "big bang" would occur and everything would happen again. The thing about the Big Bang Theory is that if any variable such as gravity was even slightly different, the universe would not be able to hold life.

For example if the value of gravity was too high, stars would not form. If it was too low matter would float out from the blast and nothing would happen. So it's questionable how in this one universe life exists, by something as "random" as the big bang.

Edit: sorry for the double post

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Thu, 13 Jan 2011 22:19:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

They say that for a lot of things. "If concentration of THIS was just a little bit less or a little bit more, life couldn't be sustained."

However, when you think about it, it isn't really that amazing that the concentration of forces and elements are so perfect to hold life.

Why? Because it's only measuring life by our standards of living.

If you support the theory of evolution, then reason stands that even if various concentrations of universal forces and matter were totally different from what they actually are, life could have just as easily been created... however they would be living under those circumstances saying to themselves "wow, if our planet had even the slightest bit of oxygen, we could have never had a chance at life!"

And that doesn't just count for life forms, it would also count for stars and planets as well. Perhaps

in another universe, stars don't exist because they couldn't be created. That doesn't mean life couldn't have found another way. Sure, it would mean that OUR life would be impossible (or perhaps even the stability of OUR universe as we know it) but it doesn't mean that some other way for life to develop couldn't have taken place instead.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [appshot](#) on Thu, 13 Jan 2011 22:48:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

the universe creation is a circular argument. Some believe that God/Gods created it, but then the underlying question is who created him/her? On the other hand, if it wasn't God, who was it, someone had to precede and create the universe, and so who/what created him? and who/what created the thing who/what created the universe? But in the end, something had to create the universe, an thus some type of higher being so atheists lose on this debate. Logic fails them to win on this argument.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Thu, 13 Jan 2011 23:01:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

appshot wrote on Thu, 13 January 2011 17:48...On the other hand, if it wasn't God, who was it, someone had to precede and create the universe...
Why do you assume that "someone" had to precede everything? Why does it have to have been a person?

A person doesn't have to be the thing to set everything into motion... so there is no logical reason to assume anything about some "higher being."

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Pyr0man1c](#) on Thu, 13 Jan 2011 23:07:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

@R3: you make a good point, but I doubt any one man, or even a team of scientists could tell us if intelligent life is possible by using completely different elements than the ones we are made of. It really is more of a scientific question than a philosophical one though.
@appshot: it could perhaps be normal for matter to exist. Matter(well, energy) cannot be created or destroyed, so either the laws of physics CAN change, and somehow energy was created, or energy has existed for an infinite time. (assuming there is no god). However actual infinitude are thought to be logically impossible (check the internets), unless it goes in a loop.
Edit: R3: a conscious being can create the universe for intelligent life, a random event is less likely to do so.
Question: how less likely?

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Thu, 13 Jan 2011 23:53:31 GMT

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

Less likely, sure... but not impossible.

But to be honest, there really is no point in debating it. No matter what the answer is, our minds can't comprehend it (at least in this point in time). It's like trying to imagine what an object would look like without any color or shade. It isn't possible for our minds to do that.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 14 Jan 2011 00:07:30 GMT

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

R315r4z0r wrote on Thu, 13 January 2011 11:26I never believed the theory of 'the big bang.'

IMO, it just contradicts itself. Nothing within nothing creates something that creates everything?
What?

Makes much more sense than the idea of some ancient boat-builder going around and gathering a male and female of every species of creature from the far reaches of the Earth, including the millions of different varieties of insects, then keeping them all alive and obedient on his aforementioned boat for over a month.

One of the main reason the "big bang" theory holds and water is because it at least makes an attempt to understand the science and physics behind it, your oversimplified interpretation notwithstanding. It makes itself accountable to something, rather than just coping out with "Let there be light".

Of course, human knowledge is incomplete, and nobody really -knows- how existence came to exist. I'm not sure anyone reasonable would ever claim otherwise. It's just simply the best explanation we have right now given our current level of information. Which is another reason why the big bang theory is awesome. If ever one day we can prove it's wrong, we just throw it out. No burning at the stake required.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 14 Jan 2011 00:16:47 GMT

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

Pyr0man1c wrote on Thu, 13 January 2011 15:07@appshot: it could perhaps be normal for matter to exist. Matter(well, energy) cannot be created or destroyed, so either the laws of physics CAN change, and somehow energy was created, or energy has existed for an infinite time. (assuming there is no god). However actual infinitude are thought to be logically impossible (check the internets), unless it goes in a loop.

We already know the laws of physics as we know them haven't always held true. In order for the

universe to reach the (known) size it is now, matter would have to have traveled at faster than the speed of light shortly after (Our estimated time of) the "big bang".

As for your infinite loop, it's very possible. One possible theory is the "Closed Universe" theory, which assumes that the force of gravity is strong enough to slow down and eventually reverse the expansion of the universe (As opposed to "Open Universe" theories that say that the force of gravity is NOT strong enough to overcome the expansion of the universe, and that the the universe is a one-shot affair). This would mean that, at "the end of time", the universe will eventually re-condense into another super-singularity and the big bang will repeat itself all over again. It doesn't explain how it all came into being in the first place, but there is something poetic about it.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Fri, 14 Jan 2011 00:44:27 GMT

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

no message body

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Fri, 14 Jan 2011 00:52:07 GMT

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

anyone watched the lecture i linked to?

sum total of the universe is zero thanks to negative energy. matter and energy are interchangeable. so if he's right, the universe can come from nothing.

Quote:the universe creation is a circular argument. Some believe that God/Gods created it, but then the underlying question is who created him/her? On the other hand, if it wasn't God, who was it, someone had to precede and create the universe, and so who/what created him? and who/what created the thing who/what created the universe? But in the end, something had to create the universe, an thus some type of higher being so atheists lose on this debate. Logic fails them to win on this argument.

you misunderstand atheism. it's a rejection of theism, not deism. theism is the claim that not only is there a god(s) but that we can know and indeed do know a lot of stuff about it/them, e.g. that he listens to our prayers and disapproves of homosexuality. to be an atheist all you need to really do is reject the VERY SPECIFIC claims made by the religious.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Fri, 14 Jan 2011 01:19:18 GMT

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

Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 January 2011 19:52anyone watched the lecture i linked to?

sum total of the universe is zero thanks to negative energy. matter and energy are interchangeable. so if he's right, the universe can come from nothing.
I think it's the other way around... but I have no experience in this so correct me if I'm wrong.

$1 + -1 = 0$. With energy plus negative energy you get nothing, correct?

But doesn't that only work in one way? You can't add or subtract something from nothing and get something, but you can add or subtract something and something to get nothing.

$0 + 0 - 0 = 0$

and

$0 / X = ?????$

but

$1 - 1 = 0$

Let's say that 1000 is the value of all energy in the universe. Let's also say that -1000 is the value of all negative energy. If you combine these two entities into one, you get nothing in return. However, how do you go about doing that in the other direction?

That theory shows that it's possible to obtain nothing by combining everything. However, what it doesn't explain is how to divide nothing to gain something.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to atheists
Posted by [grant89uk](#) on Fri, 14 Jan 2011 01:20:34 GMT

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

Spoony wrote on Fri, 14 January 2011 00:52 anyone watched the lecture i linked to?

sum total of the universe is zero thanks to negative energy. matter and energy are interchangeable. so if he's right, the universe can come from nothing.

Quote: the universe creation is a circular argument. Some believe that God/Gods created it, but then the underlying question is who created him/her? On the other hand, if it wasn't God, who was it, someone had to precede and create the universe, and so who/what created him? and who/what created the thing who/what created the universe? But in the end, something had to create the universe, and thus some type of higher being so atheists lose on this debate. Logic fails them to win on this argument.

you misunderstand atheism. it's a rejection of theism, not deism. theism is the claim that not only is there a god(s) but that we can know and indeed do know a lot of stuff about it/them, e.g. that he listens to our prayers and disapproves of homosexuality. to be an atheist all you need to really do is reject the VERY SPECIFIC claims made by the religious.

Yeah I watched it all, I personally find things on astronomy very interesting so it was actually time well spent.

However like the lecturer said there are people who agree with him and people who disagree with him. Not just random people who know very little about the subject its people who are very

respected in their fields. So it all comes down to what you personally think.

Good watch though.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [_SSnipe_](#) on Fri, 14 Jan 2011 10:45:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I always thought of it this way, if there is a god, why take your chances? if there is not a god then ok but if there is, its to late your fucked when you die, but its more then that its a faith that brings you happiness and most people who I know who are religious are good hard working people, while most people who dont believe him so they think they can create all chaos they want which led to horrible things. Yes alot of people take religion and turn it into something bad cults, terrorist, but we only notice them for that reason while more of the world has crime create form the ones who don't believe.

On a side note, what if, just if the big bang was real, the way we were created and evolved was real, but what if god was behind all of that.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Fri, 14 Jan 2011 11:02:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

(SSnipe) -BLU3Y3Z- wrote on Fri, 14 January 2011 04:45I always thought of it this way, if there is a god, why take your chances? if there is not a god then ok but if there is, its to late your fucked when you die
this is what religion always boils down to in the end... threats.

by "take your chances" i presume you mean being honest about having doubts about the extremely specific claims made by religion, bearing in mind the complete lack of evidence for them.

secondly, belief isn't a choice. i don't know how your mind works, but i can't choose to believe something even if i'm threatened with punishment if i don't.

thirdly, there are several contradictory religions who make this threat. the pope says only catholics are going to heaven and other non-catholic christians are going to hell with all the other atheists. some protestant churches say the same thing in reverse. islam says all non-muslims are going to hell. who's right, blu3y3z? which of these if any are correct, and which are liars and frauds?

fourthly, you're saying this god of yours is going to torture people just for not being convinced of his existence (again, see above re: complete lack of evidence). what a colossal prick. what a cruel, merciless monster this god of yours seems to be. you want to worship something as evil as that? what does this say about you?

Quote:but its more then that its a faith that brings you happiness and most people who I know who are religious are good hard working people, while most people who dont believe him so they think they can create all chaos they want which led to horrible things. Yes alot of people take religion and turn it into something bad cults, terrorist, but we only notice them for that reason while more of the world has crime create form the ones who don't believe.

interesting you say that. you're pro-torture and anti-freedom of religion, and the reason you take these extraordinary positions is religion. you wouldn't think that if it wasn't for religion, surely. you talk about people "taking religion and turning it into cults and terrorists". well, i presume you consider yourself a moderate, yet you're anti-freedom of religion and pro-torture as a punishment for not being the right religion. as for the fundamentalists, i hope you're aware that islamic jihadism isn't a misinterpretation or corruption of the quran and hadith. i invite you to read them.

"most people don't believe him so they think they can create all chaos they want" - the religious always like to find a hidden agenda for anyone who doesn't believe their extremely specific claims. it can't be because you've got fuck all evidence or because your holy book is revolting, can it?

"more of the world has crime create form the ones who don't believe."

in america, the proportion of prison inmates who are atheists is significantly lower than the proportion of atheists in the free population. i wouldn't necessarily argue that this proves anything, but you said it. as for the rest of the world, the more secular countries always do best in societal health - low crime, good education, good health, low teenage pregnancy etc.

Quote:On a side note, what if, just if the big bang was real, the way we were created and evolved was real, but what if god was behind all of that.

like i said, you take the problem and you grossly multiply it. you go from having to explain the origin of a few blobs of hydrogen or whatever, to having to explain the origin of an enormously powerful creature. this is not progress.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [argathol3](#) on Fri, 14 Jan 2011 13:40:31 GMT

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

I don't need a church to tell me how to be a decent person.

And also religion has been all about "Do what I say to do or your damned for all of eternity"
....sounds like more of a threat than a chance for enlightenment.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [jnz](#) on Fri, 14 Jan 2011 23:32:33 GMT

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

Outside our universe the laws of physics we are bound to do not exist! If a cosmos really exists

(which unfortunately we cannot prove) then it is totally reasonable for very strange things to happen. Such as:- an infinitely dense, infinitely hot soup of particles and energy appearing out of no where! Also include laws of space, time and force constants and you have a delicious recipe for a universe.

As the soup cooled, the space around it expanded slightly. Matter had anti-matter, and when matter collided with anti-matter it is destroyed releasing pure energy. There was more matter than anti-matter and that is why there was some left over.

After roughly 3 minutes the universe is the size of a football, around 3000 million kelvin in temperature. At this time, in the tiniest fraction of a second, it expanded by millions of light years in all directions. As the universe cooled down simple particles formed, and atoms and eventually the universe we know today.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Dover](#) on Sat, 15 Jan 2011 00:29:06 GMT

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

jnz wrote on Fri, 14 January 2011 15:32Outside our universe the laws of physics we are bound to do not exist! If a cosmos really exists (which unfortunately we cannot prove) then it is totally reasonable for very strange things to happen. Such as:- an infinitely dense, infinitely hot soup of particles and energy appearing out of no where!

True. In a truly infinite universe, anything that can happen, will happen. In fact, in a truly infinite universe, anything that can happen must happen.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Sat, 15 Jan 2011 03:05:17 GMT

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

Dover wrote on Fri, 14 January 2011 19:29jnz wrote on Fri, 14 January 2011 15:32Outside our universe the laws of physics we are bound to do not exist! If a cosmos really exists (which unfortunately we cannot prove) then it is totally reasonable for very strange things to happen. Such as:- an infinitely dense, infinitely hot soup of particles and energy appearing out of no where!

True. In a truly infinite universe, anything that can happen, will happen. In fact, in a truly infinite universe, anything that can happen must happen.

Hey! Dover just stumbled onto another paradox!

If the universe truly is infinite then anything and everything must happen at one point in time. However, it is also true that one day the universe must end... But if infinity is the never ending expansion of something, how can the execution of everything possible happen but at the same time manage to end some day? You can't end when you are counting to infinity!

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Pyr0man1c](#) on Sat, 15 Jan 2011 09:22:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Do you mean an infinite cosmos? Even then everything that could happen might not, depending on the rules of the cosmos. And what evidence do we have that there is one?

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sat, 15 Jan 2011 09:35:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I classify myself as an atheist. I was given the great gift (thought they may not have known it at the time) of not being taken to a church for regular worship. Though I will admit I did attend a couple of "Vacation Bible Schools" as a kid but even then I thought the whole idea of the "imaginary friend" that is the Judeo-Christian "God" to be silly and felt the people around me were delusional. But I digress...

As for the creation of the universe, I like the idea of the infinite universe, the zero-sum concept. I'm going to watch that video tomorrow as I am very intrigued. Before reading this thread, I had always said that I'm open to the possibility that some conscious being started the Big Bang and/or created the conditions for it to exist. But, that being said, to also go on to say that this being requires me to worship it, will subject me to heaven or hell when I die, listens to me if I pray... that is wayyyy too far-fetched for me.

From here on the outside of religion, I see it simply as a form of mass control. The root being threat of eternal hell if you fuck up. The "Powers That Be" decided to prey on peoples' fear of what happens when you die to create a hard-to-refute scenario (since no one can tell you what happens after you die, I believe you cease to be, but I secretly hope you reincarnate and start all over) where if you are bad, even if no one sees you do it, Lord Almighty sees you do it and you'll be judged to be damned to hell after you die. It's a GREAT way to control massive amounts of people! Everything else was added on after the fact. Prayer is a way to get you into a ritual where you are constantly reminded of Big Brother watching your every move.

But, believing that after this, there's nothing, I am driven only to be as good to others as I can be and enjoy the time I have here, however long it may be. I don't need the threat of eternal damnation. There's enough punishment here in life, and I usually end up getting punished in a karmic way if I do something I shouldn't do and don't get caught.

As for Pascal's Wager that was posed earlier, I believe that if there is in fact a judgment after I die, a silly little thing like not believing in something I can't perceive with any of my 5 senses isn't going to keep me from an eternal reward if I've been relatively good.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Dover](#) on Sat, 15 Jan 2011 13:22:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R315r4z0r wrote on Fri, 14 January 2011 19:05Dover wrote on Fri, 14 January 2011 19:29jnz wrote on Fri, 14 January 2011 15:32Outside our universe the laws of physics we are bound to do not exist! If a cosmos really exists (which unfortunately we cannot prove) then it is totally reasonable for very strange things to happen. Such as:- an infinitely dense, infinitely hot soup of particles and energy appearing out of no where!

True. In a truly infinite universe, anything that can happen, will happen. In fact, in a truly infinite universe, anything that can happen must happen.

Hey! Dover just stumbled onto another paradox!

If the universe truly is infinite then anything and everything must happen at one point in time. However, it is also true that one day the universe must end... But if infinity is the never ending expansion of something, how can the execution of everything possible happen but at the same time manage to end some day? You can't end when you are counting to infinity!

I'm not sure where you're getting "However, it is also true that one day the universe must end...". That's a mighty big claim you're leaving completely unsupported out there. I'm sure it's feeling pretty lonely and would appreciate the company of some explanation.

At any rate, I wouldn't be so hasty with calling things paradoxes. Neither you nor I can fathom the concept of "the end of time", so neither you or I are in any position to say what's paradoxical and what isn't. A one-sided geometrical shape seems pretty paradoxical at first glance, too. If you've ever studied calculus, I'm sure you recall the first time hearing that "9.99999999..." repeated endlessly and "10" are actually the same number, and I'm sure that probably struck you as paradoxical at the time.

For someone who doesn't seem to understand all of this very well (And doesn't seem to be trying to understand very hard), you're certainly stubborn in trying to "refute" all of this.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [jnz](#) on Sat, 15 Jan 2011 16:28:28 GMT

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

We live in a 4 dimensional world, obviously the 4th one being time.

There doesn't have to be this concept in the cosmos, there could be one - or millions of dimensions! Like I said, the laws of physics are unknown and no one can say or predict what happens there. And, it doesn't even have to "expand" or come to an end. It could have existed for an infinite time and it will last for an infinite time. It could be infinite in all dimensions (if there are any!) or a tiny singularity.

You also never know, it could be turmoil there; and any day or any time our universe may just cease to exist.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Sat, 15 Jan 2011 17:40:16 GMT

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

No, you're right. I had a hard time picking the word for what I said. Admittedly, I don't think paradox is the right one, but what other would could I use?

Dover wrote on Sat, 15 January 2011 08:22I'm not sure where you're getting "However, it is also true that one day the universe must end...". That's a mighty big claim you're leaving completely unsupported out there. I'm sure it's feeling pretty lonely and would appreciate the company of some explanation.

I don't have to explain it. You did it for me.

You said that anything and everything would have to happen, correct? The universe ending is something that would therefore have to end up happening... eventually.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Pyr0man1c](#) on Sat, 15 Jan 2011 21:42:35 GMT

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

Crimson wrote on Sat, 15 January 2011 03:35

(since no one can tell you what happens after you die, I believe you cease to be, but I secretly hope you reincarnate and start all over)

Just wondering what you mean by reincarnation? Why would you want to be reincarnated?

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Dover](#) on Sun, 16 Jan 2011 00:23:00 GMT

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

R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 15 January 2011 09:40No, you're right. I had a hard time picking the word for what I said. Admittedly, I don't think paradox is the right one, but what other would could I use?

Well, in elementary school, people would raise their hand and say "I don't get it" when they didn't understand something, not "This is wrong."

R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 15 January 2011 09:40Dover wrote on Sat, 15 January 2011 08:22I'm not sure where you're getting "However, it is also true that one day the universe must end...". That's a mighty big claim you're leaving completely unsupported out there. I'm sure it's feeling pretty lonely and would appreciate the company of some explanation.
I don't have to explain it. You did it for me.

You said that anything and everything would have to happen, correct? The universe ending is something that would therefore have to end up happening... eventually.

Reread what I said carefully. Anything that can happen, must happen. Assuming the universe in

truly infinite, if time ends the universe is no longer infinite and the statement no longer holds. No paradox, just a finite universe.

You're also making the assumption that time ending is something that "can happen". The theory behind what I said is that any number greater than zero multiplied by infinity will yield infinity, which in statistical terms is the surest guarantee you can ever have that something will happen. This is not the case if you multiply infinity by zero (in which case you get just zero). Without knowing more about "the end of time", neither of us can say for sure what the odds of it occurring are.

This is entirely different from the things mentioned earlier in this thread (like the laws of physics no longer applying, or a big bang occurring), because we "know" (As much as we can "know") that they have already occurred at least once, and therefore the probability of it happening again are greater than zero.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to atheists
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Sun, 16 Jan 2011 03:43:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Thinking about it again, paradox was the correct word to use.

If everything must happen, then the end of the universe must be one of the things to happen. Anything that begins must eventually come to an end. That's how our level of reality works. If the universe is infinite, then it can't end. But if it can't end, then it is therefore not infinite because that is something that can't happen. For something to be infinite, there can't be anything that cannot happen; even if it doesn't make any sense to us.

What I was saying earlier is that we can't comprehend a lot of things that is supposed to happen in the universe. That means that it is very possible for the laws of physics, logic, and reality to change drastically. However, despite that, it doesn't change the idea that an infinite universe must encompass all things possible. All things in our level of reality included; meaning all things must eventually come to an end.

I don't think that the concept of infinity can really be applied to the universe. Perhaps there is a concept, other than infinity, that isn't possible for humans to comprehend.

Think about it, infinity really isn't a hard concept to understand. It's a human concept after all. It just means endless possibilities. If the universe really has states that we can't understand, why are we so sure that it can be measured by a human concept? That goes beyond simply not understanding how a scenario plays out... it goes to a level where we just can't measure the vastness of what the universe encompasses.

For example, to us, there are two ways to order things: Sequentially and non-sequentially. But what if there is a concept that we just can't comprehend? Counting (1,2,3,...) in a different dimension could be totally different than we know of it. So why assume that the vastness of the universe can be measured by the human concept of infinity?

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Dover](#) on Sun, 16 Jan 2011 07:52:31 GMT

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

R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 15 January 2011 19:43Thinking about it again, paradox was the correct word to use.

If everything must happen, then the end of the universe must be one of the things to happen. Anything that begins must eventually come to an end. That's how our level of reality works. If the universe is infinite, then it can't end. But if it can't end, then it is therefore not infinite because that is something that can't happen. For something to be infinite, there can't be anything that cannot happen; even if it doesn't make any sense to us.

What I was saying earlier is that we can't comprehend a lot of things that is supposed to happen in the universe. That means that it is very possible for the laws of physics, logic, and reality to change drastically. However, despite that, it doesn't change the idea that an infinite universe must encompass all things possible. All things in our level of reality included; meaning all things must eventually come to an end.

It's like you didn't read my response. If you did, you certainly didn't understand it. Let me try going slower;

- 1) There is a certain probability that any given event will occur.
- 2) If that probability is greater than zero...
- 3) and given an infinite amount of time...
- 4) then that event will eventually occur.

Does "the universe coming to an end" satisfy condition 2? If you think so, why?

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Pyr0man1c](#) on Sun, 16 Jan 2011 09:29:18 GMT

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

We don't live in an infinite universe?

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Spyder](#) on Sun, 16 Jan 2011 11:18:19 GMT

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

Quote:Why do so many people feel the need to worship?

People believe in a God because they need something in life to hold on to. Things like Gods give them hope and make life just that much easier for them. People who believe in something higher always have the idea that there is someone who always listens to them and makes them feel good, because they always have someone with them who they "know" and trust.

Quote:If there is no significance to life, no meaning to it, you must reflect that life is nothing more than an experience that will end, and therefore be a waste of time?

Life and death are still something we do not know much about. I have read a lot about these subjects, but there is no clear answer yet.

I have been baptized/holy communion etc. I grew up being a catholic, but I would rather call myself an atheist. I believe in an afterlife, but not in a so-called "heaven" or "hell". I am very confident that there are things around us, which we often call "ghosts" or "spirits", the souls of the deceased. But this has nothing to do with worshiping a god or religions. Life after death and the significance of life is a globally discussed subject.

First, the significance of life. While reading books and articles on the internet I encountered this question many times. There are many different answers to it, but the one that I found most interesting was the following: "We are (re)born with a purpose. We contribute to the world for our successors. We are born with a task to complete and to gain more experience to grow. Then, when we are reborn again, we will have more experience already and become a better, more successful person. When we have served our purpose about eight times you become an elderly spirit (the wisest of all) and you have lived eight human lives already. When that time is up, your spirit/soul will move to the astral world and you have the ability to travel between several dimensions. You are a free spirit that will (probably) never be reborn again. But remember that during the time on earth, you have shared your experience with much younger spirits and created a better world."

Now the life after death part. I have read a lot of stories on near-death-experiences, ghost encounters (apparitions) and more paranormal things (now don't laugh at me, it's just what I'm interested in). When my grandmother was in the hospital in a bad condition, in her dream (don't know if it was a dream/lucid dream or reality) she saw her husband (my grandfather), who told her to come to him, because he missed her so much. He wanted to be with her. A few days later my grandmother died, but before that, she told this story to my mother, who then told me the story about 6 months ago. This, for me, is enough proof that there is something after death. Also people with near-death-experiences. It cannot be a coincidence that everyone has the same experience when they are on the verge of life and death, it's impossible to be a coincidence.

There are even stories of people who had been blind for their entire life who had a near-death-experience. These people had never been able to see hospital equipment, but after they had a near-death-experience and found themselves floating over their dead bodies, they could describe in detail what the room looked like, what the equipment looked like and even what the doctors looked like!

A friend of mine had a theory, which he thought would prove that there was life after death. This one: "On this very day, you still have memories of your childhood, last year's birthday party, holidays etc. Would it sound logical if this all ends when you are dead? All those well kept memories vanish, just like that."

A scientist would say that it's possible, because after death, there is no more brain activity. A paranormal person would say that it is not possible for those memories to vanish, because they are kept in the subconscious, which is the soul and not the brain (like scientists would say).

Now back to your questions. I understand that you want to have answers to your questions, but it would be better to ask your questions in a different way. Because the majority of them has nothing to do with religion, they are just commonly asked questions which can be answered by any random person, religious or not. I also suggest you start looking up articles or books on those subjects, compare the answers and draw your own conclusions, because the things you are asking for now, are nothing more than opinions.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Dover](#) on Sun, 16 Jan 2011 12:11:44 GMT

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

Pyr0man1c wrote on Sun, 16 January 2011 01:29We don't live in an infinite universe?

Debatable, especially in regards to time.

In spatial terms, if we have an "open universe" (Gravity is insufficient to reverse the universe's expansion), then we do live in an infinite universe in the strictest sense. The mathematical definition of infinite is "To increase without bound". We know for a fact that the size of universe is increasing, and unless some force exists to curb its expansion, then "infinite" is the exactly proper term for it.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Pyr0man1c](#) on Sun, 16 Jan 2011 16:28:08 GMT

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

True, but the amount of matter isn't increasing (as far as we know), and so i don't think we can describe the universe as "infinite".

Infinite in time and space maybe, but that's quite different.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Sun, 16 Jan 2011 17:47:52 GMT

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

Dover wrote on Sun, 16 January 2011 02:52R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 15 January 2011 19:43Thinking about it again, paradox was the correct word to use.

If everything must happen, then the end of the universe must be one of the things to happen. Anything that begins must eventually come to an end. That's how our level of reality works. If the universe is infinite, then it can't end. But if it can't end, then it is therefore not infinite because that is something that can't happen. For something to be infinite, there can't be anything that cannot happen; even if it doesn't make any sense to us.

What I was saying earlier is that we can't comprehend a lot of things that is supposed to happen in

the universe. That means that it is very possible for the laws of physics, logic, and reality to change drastically. However, despite that, it doesn't change the idea that an infinite universe must encompass all things possible. All things in our level of reality included; meaning all things must eventually come to an end.

It's like you didn't read my response. If you did, you certainly didn't understand it. Let me try going slower;

- 1) There is a certain probability that any given event will occur.
- 2) If that probability is greater than zero...
- 3) and given an infinite amount of time...
- 4) then that event will eventually occur.

Does "the universe coming to an end" satisfy condition 2? If you think so, why?
That's what the second part of my post pertains to (the part you failed to quote.)

You're only talking about time and the probability of something happening according to our (human) way of comprehension.

The term infinity is similar to the term omnipotent in that both are used to describe the presence of all things.

Just like mathematical number sets such as
whole numbers [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.....]
odd numbers [1, 3, 5, 7, 9.....]
Integers [...-3, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, 3....]
etc.

An infinite set encompasses every single combination of numbers possible. From every single number to every single tiny trillionth decimal place and forever onward. There is literally no end to each number and no end to the amount of numbers in this set.

If any one element of this set is not present, then, by definition, the set cannot be considered infinite. This includes the number 0, which is symbolic for nothing or the absence of something. Therefore, when you're talking about things in terms of reality, this also has to encompass things that have 0% probability of happening.

Something with a 0% probability obviously doesn't exist and cannot happen, however it still needs to be calculated if the universe is truly infinite. It's the lack of their probability to happen that needs to be observed and taken into consideration.

Whether or not the universe can truly end is beyond our understanding, but if the universe is truly infinite we have to accept that the idea of it ending (or lack thereof) cannot be omitted. Doing so would be like omitting the number 0 from the number set infinity; if you do that, the number set is no longer considered infinite. So, taking away the idea of the universe ending means that the universe is therefore not infinite.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by **GEORGE ZIMMER** on Mon, 17 Jan 2011 00:00:49 GMT

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

I never really see why science and the belief in a higher being are mutually exclusive... I guess because of the general retardation that religious folk bring, but still. I think it's rather reasonable to assume the big bang happened as science described it, and that was caused by some greater being.

That being said, the bible/quar'ran/torah/etc aren't factbooks, and everyone who takes them as such should be removed from society. They're storybooks with interesting tales and some (repeat: some) lessons in them. Not a guidebook or a factbook.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by **Dover** on Mon, 17 Jan 2011 02:09:35 GMT

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

Oh, I see the problem. You don't know what "infinite" means. You think it means "all numbers", for some strange reason. Again, you're making things complicated than they are on behalf of your ignorance.

R315r4z0r wrote on Sun, 16 January 2011 09:47You're only talking about time and the probability of something happening according to our (human) way of comprehension.

Obviously. What other way of comprehension do we know about?

R315r4z0r wrote on Sun, 16 January 2011 09:47The term infinity is similar to the term omnipotent in that both are used to describe the presence of all things.

Incorrect.

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

<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/infinite>

If you took a given number "x", and began to add (or subtract) any other given non-zero number "y" to (from) x repeatedly without end, you would still end up at infinity (or negative infinity), even though you would obviously "miss" numbers that are not multiples of y. The condition of not having a bound or ending point is still satisfied.

R315r4z0r wrote on Sun, 16 January 2011 09:47Just like mathematical number sets such as whole numbers (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.....)

odd numbers (1, 3, 5, 7, 9.....)

Integers (...-3, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, 3.....)

etc.

An infinite set encompasses every single combination of numbers possible. From every single number to every single tiny trillionth decimal place and forever onward. There is literally no end to

each number and no end to the amount of numbers in this set.

You're obviously confused.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Infinite_set

Every single set you just posted is an infinite set. They all have no bound or endpoint, since there is no known greatest whole number or integer. For any number x you cared to name, I would only have to provide you with $x+1$ ($x+2$ in the case of your odd numbers set), and the set would continue. Boundless, endless.

The set you're thinking of would be termed "All real numbers", but even that doesn't encompass everything the way you think it does. The only part you're actually right about is that there's no end to the amount of numbers in such a set.

R315r4z0r wrote on Sun, 16 January 2011 09:47If any one element of this set is not present, then, by definition, the set cannot be considered infinite. This includes the number 0, which is symbolic for nothing or the absence of something. Therefore, when you're talking about things in terms of reality, this also has to encompass things that have 0% probability of happening.

Something with a 0% probability obviously doesn't exist and cannot happen, however it still needs to be calculated if the universe is truly infinite. It's the lack of their probability to happen that needs to be observed and taken into consideration.

Whether or not the universe can truly end is beyond our understanding, but if the universe is truly infinite we have to accept that the idea of it ending (or lack there of) cannot be omitted. Doing so would be like omitting the number 0 from the number set infinity; if you do that, the number set is no longer considered infinite. So, taking away the idea of the universe ending means that the universe is therefore not infinite.

You have your definitions mixed up, but since I straightened that out already above, I'll mostly ignore this. Keep in mind that the set of natural numbers (1, 2, 3, 4... $x+1$) is still an infinite set, despite not encompassing zero. And besides, nobody is omitting anything. We're here discussing the possibility of the world ending, aren't we? I simply questioned your assumption that the universe will end one day.

I swear, R3. Sometimes I feel like you post just because you enjoy reading your own bullshit. >:[

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Mon, 17 Jan 2011 03:10:32 GMT

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

Dover wrote on Sun, 16 January 2011 21:09Every single set you just posted is an infinite set. I'm going to be completely honest here. I ignored every single thing you just wrote in your post and only focused on this.

You could have just wrote that in your post and I would have stood down.

Now it isn't that I don't know what infinity is; I'm not confining it to a number definition as I was only trying to play an example, it's just that when I was writing my post I apparently had a brain fart and failed to realize what I quoted you saying.

What makes it even more embarrassing is the fact that I actually put the "..." before and after the numbers representing forever until infinity...

For some reason I was confusing it with the idea of omnipotence. (Which, by the way, I was wrong about in that other thread too. I had it misdefined slightly).

So you're right. I don't really know what else to say.

"Lol"?

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Dover](#) on Mon, 17 Jan 2011 03:11:37 GMT

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

R315r4z0r wrote on Sun, 16 January 2011 19:10Dover wrote on Sun, 16 January 2011 21:09Every single set you just posted is an infinite set.

I'm going to be completely honest here. I ignored every single thing you just wrote in your post and only focused on this.

You could have just wrote that in your post and I would have stood down.

Now it isn't that I don't know what infinity is; I'm not confining it to a number definition as I was only trying to play an example, it's just that when I was writing my post I apparently had a brain fart and failed to realize what I quoted you saying.

What makes it even more embarrassing is the fact that I actually put the "..." before and after the numbers representing forever until infinity...

For some reason I was confusing it with the idea of omnipotence. (Which, by the way, I was wrong about in that other thread too. I had it misdefined slightly).

So you're right. I don't really know what else to say.

"Lol"?

<3

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Tue, 18 Jan 2011 06:33:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ahem

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Georges_Lemaître

note "Belgian ROMAN CATHOLIC PRIEST"

who said that science and religion were mutually exclusive?

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Tue, 18 Jan 2011 10:12:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

well, what happened next was quite funny. he went to the pope and told him about his theory, and the pope offered to make it dogma - i.e. something catholics are told they must believe. there's certainly nothing scientific about that.

certainly you can point to scientists throughout the centuries who believed some batshit crazy things, such as alchemy or catholicism.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Tue, 18 Jan 2011 10:58:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

reborn wrote on Thu, 13 January 2011 10:33If there is no deity that created the universe, how did the universe come to be? Specifically I am talking about the creation of something from nothing. If we are to believe the "Big Bang Theory" then where did the Two giant gas clouds come from? How do you get something from nothing? Where does all matter come from?

Why do so many people feel the need to worship?

If there is no significance to life, no meaning to it, you must reflect that life is nothing more than an experience that will end, and therefore be a waste of time?

Are we as humans different to other animals? We have more intelligence and we have higher reasoning. Why are we the only ones?

If God does not exist, then can someone still hope for better times when in despair? Is hope just a random chance of roulette? There is no universal force of fairness and equality, no Karma? If we believe the creationist theory, then who created the creator? God must've come from somewhere as well.

Just for reference, I'm agnostic.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Tue, 18 Jan 2011 11:00:26 GMT

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

R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 15 January 2011 04:05Dover wrote on Fri, 14 January 2011 19:29jnz wrote on Fri, 14 January 2011 15:32Outside our universe the laws of physics we are bound to do not exist! If a cosmos really exists (which unfortunately we cannot prove) then it is totally reasonable for very strange things to happen. Such as:- an infinitely dense, infinitely hot soup of particles and energy appearing out of no where!

True. In a truly infinite universe, anything that can happen, will happen. In fact, in a truly infinite universe, anything that can happen must happen.

Hey! Dover just stumbled onto another paradox!

If the universe truly is infinite then anything and everything must happen at one point in time. However, it is also true that one day the universe must end... But if infinity is the never ending expansion of something, how can the execution of everything possible happen but at the same time manage to end some day? You can't end when you are counting to infinity!

The universe isn't infinite, it's still growing. We know how big it is (13 billion lightyears afaik), so ...

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Tue, 18 Jan 2011 11:06:12 GMT

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

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Mon, 17 January 2011 01:00I never really see why science and the belief in a higher being are mutually exclusive... I guess because of the general retardation that religious folk bring, but still. I think it's rather reasonable to assume the big bang happened as science described it, and that was caused by some greater being.

That being said, the bible/quar'ran/torah/etc aren't factbooks, and everyone who takes them as such should be removed from society. They're storybooks with interesting tales and some (repeat: some) lessons in them. Not a guidebook or a factbook.

The problem is that religion tends to empathise on the all knowing part. Something that is simply impossible, this is why science claims religion to be rubbish. Science however cannot prove or deny the truth of religion either, since there is no evidence that supports or denies the existence of a higher being. However science makes it rather plausible there is no such thing as a creator (God according to Christs).

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 18 Jan 2011 11:50:28 GMT

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

EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Tue, 18 January 2011 03:00R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 15 January 2011 04:05Dover wrote on Fri, 14 January 2011 19:29jnz wrote on Fri, 14 January 2011 15:32Outside our universe the laws of physics we are bound to do not exist! If a cosmos really exists (which unfortunately we cannot prove) then it is totally reasonable for very strange things to happen.

Such as:- an infinitely dense, infinitely hot soup of particles and energy appearing out of no where!

True. In a truly infinite universe, anything that can happen, will happen. In fact, in a truly infinite universe, anything that can happen must happen.

Hey! Dover just stumbled onto another paradox!

If the universe truly is infinite then anything and everything must happen at one point in time. However, it is also true that one day the universe must end... But if infinity is the never ending expansion of something, how can the execution of everything possible happen but at the same time manage to end some day? You can't end when you are counting to infinity!

The universe isn't infinite, it's still growing. We know how big it is (13 billion lightyears afaik), so ...

We were discussing the universe being infinite in regards to time. At least I was, I can't speak for R3.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Tue, 18 Jan 2011 12:27:50 GMT

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

Dover wrote on Tue, 18 January 2011 12:50EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Tue, 18 January 2011 03:00R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 15 January 2011 04:05Dover wrote on Fri, 14 January 2011 19:29jnz wrote on Fri, 14 January 2011 15:32Outside our universe the laws of physics we are bound to do not exist! If a cosmos really exists (which unfortunately we cannot prove) then it is totally reasonable for very strange things to happen. Such as:- an infinitely dense, infinitely hot soup of particles and energy appearing out of no where!

True. In a truly infinite universe, anything that can happen, will happen. In fact, in a truly infinite universe, anything that can happen must happen.

Hey! Dover just stumbled onto another paradox!

If the universe truly is infinite then anything and everything must happen at one point in time. However, it is also true that one day the universe must end... But if infinity is the never ending expansion of something, how can the execution of everything possible happen but at the same time manage to end some day? You can't end when you are counting to infinity!

The universe isn't infinite, it's still growing. We know how big it is (13 billion lightyears afaik), so ...

We were discussing the universe being infinite in regards to time. At least I was, I can't speak for R3.

Well, since it's expanding, and the furthest bits are now 13 billion lightyears away, one can conclude the universe started 13 billion years ago. Now the question is, does indeed everything have an end? Since everything needs energy (or mass) and there is a law of physics saying that energy never disappears, one has to conclude that the universe will not end. This is, unless somehow there will be a lot more anti-matter, this would adsorb the matter and thus energy (or transform it to an unknown type of mass/energy).

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 18 Jan 2011 13:15:23 GMT

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

EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Tue, 18 January 2011 04:27Dover wrote on Tue, 18 January 2011 12:50EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Tue, 18 January 2011 03:00R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 15 January 2011 04:05Dover wrote on Fri, 14 January 2011 19:29jnz wrote on Fri, 14 January 2011 15:32Outside our universe the laws of physics we are bound to do not exist! If a cosmos really exists (which unfortunately we cannot prove) then it is totally reasonable for very strange things to happen. Such as:- an infinitely dense, infinitely hot soup of particles and energy appearing out of no where!

True. In a truly infinite universe, anything that can happen, will happen. In fact, in a truly infinite universe, anything that can happen must happen.

Hey! Dover just stumbled onto another paradox!

If the universe truly is infinite then anything and everything must happen at one point in time. However, it is also true that one day the universe must end... But if infinity is the never ending expansion of something, how can the execution of everything possible happen but at the same time manage to end some day? You can't end when you are counting to infinity!
The universe isn't infinite, it's still growing. We know how big it is (13 billion lightyears afaik), so ...

We were discussing the universe being infinite in regards to time. At least I was, I can't speak for R3.

Well, since it's expanding, and the furthest bits are now 13 billion lightyears away, one can conclude the universe started 13 billion years ago. Now the question is, does indeed everything have an end? Since everything needs energy (or mass) and there is a law of physics saying that energy never disappears, one has to conclude that the universe will not end. This is, unless somehow there will be a lot more anti-matter, this would adsorb the matter and thus energy (or transform it to an unknown type of mass/energy).

Can we really conclude that? If we can see bits 13 billion light years away, that's light that's 13 billion years old that we're picking up, which means that those bits were at the location we see 13 billion years ago. Where are those bits now? If the universe actually is 13 billion years old, then we can assume that the laws of physics as we know them don't always (or at least haven't always) applied. Is this some sort of side-effect of the big bang? I'd say the universe coming into existence is a reasonable enough reason to give the laws of physics pause. Or is it a property of the expanding-edge of the universe? There's so little we actually know.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Tue, 18 Jan 2011 20:07:41 GMT

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

Toggle SpoilerDover wrote on Tue, 18 January 2011 06:15EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Tue, 18 January 2011 04:27Dover wrote on Tue, 18 January 2011 12:50EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Tue, 18 January 2011 03:00R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 15 January 2011 04:05Dover wrote on Fri, 14 January 2011 19:29jnz wrote on Fri, 14 January 2011 15:32Outside our universe the laws of

physics we are bound to do not exist! If a cosmos really exists (which unfortunately we cannot prove) then it is totally reasonable for very strange things to happen. Such as:- an infinitely dense, infinitely hot soup of particles and energy appearing out of no where!

True. In a truly infinite universe, anything that can happen, will happen. In fact, in a truly infinite universe, anything that can happen must happen.

Hey! Dover just stumbled onto another paradox!

If the universe truly is infinite then anything and everything must happen at one point in time. However, it is also true that one day the universe must end... But if infinity is the never ending expansion of something, how can the execution of everything possible happen but at the same time manage to end some day? You can't end when you are counting to infinity!

The universe isn't infinite, it's still growing. We know how big it is (13 billion lightyears afaik), so ...

We were discussing the universe being infinite in regards to time. At least I was, I can't speak for R3.

Well, since it's expanding, and the furthest bits are now 13 billion lightyears away, one can conclude the universe started 13 billion years ago. Now the question is, does indeed everything have an end? Since everything needs energy (or mass) and there is a law of physics saying that energy never disappears, one has to conclude that the universe will not end. This is, unless somehow there will be a lot more anti-matter, this would adsorb the matter and thus energy (or transform it to an unknown type of mass/energy).

Can we really conclude that? If we can see bits 13 billion light years away, that's light that's 13 billion years old that we're picking up, which means that those bits were at the location we see 13 billion years ago. Where are those bits now? If the universe actually is 13 billion years old, then we can assume that the laws of physics as we know them don't always (or at least haven't always) applied. Is this some sort of side-effect of the big bang? I'd say the universe coming into existence is a reasonable enough reason to give the laws of physics pause. Or is it a property of the expanding-edge of the universe? There's so little we actually know.

And that's assuming constant motion, there are likely gravitational forces that are at work that will have changed the acceleration of stuff over the billions of years, things likely started moving much faster than what they are now so the universe could be even older than the 13 billion years+13 billion years for light to travel.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to atheists

Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Wed, 19 Jan 2011 11:19:05 GMT

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

Jerad Gray wrote on Tue, 18 January 2011 21:07Toggle SpoilerDover wrote on Tue, 18 January 2011 06:15EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Tue, 18 January 2011 04:27Dover wrote on Tue, 18 January 2011 12:50EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Tue, 18 January 2011 03:00R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 15 January 2011 04:05Dover wrote on Fri, 14 January 2011 19:29jnzs wrote on Fri, 14 January 2011 15:32Outside our universe the laws of physics we are bound to do not exist! If a cosmos really exists (which unfortunately we cannot prove) then it is totally reasonable for very strange things to happen. Such as:- an infinitely dense, infinitely hot soup of particles and energy

appearing out of no where!

True. In a truly infinite universe, anything that can happen, will happen. In fact, in a truly infinite universe, anything that can happen must happen.

Hey! Dover just stumbled onto another paradox!

If the universe truly is infinite then anything and everything must happen at one point in time. However, it is also true that one day the universe must end... But if infinity is the never ending expansion of something, how can the execution of everything possible happen but at the same time manage to end some day? You can't end when you are counting to infinity!

The universe isn't infinite, it's still growing. We know how big it is (13 billion lightyears afaik), so ...

We were discussing the universe being infinite in regards to time. At least I was, I can't speak for R3.

Well, since it's expanding, and the furthest bits are now 13 billion lightyears away, one can conclude the universe started 13 billion years ago. Now the question is, does indeed everything have an end? Since everything needs energy (or mass) and there is a law of physics saying that energy never disappears, one has to conclude that the universe will not end. This is, unless somehow there will be a lot more anti-matter, this would adsorb the matter and thus energy (or transform it to an unknown type of mass/energy).

Can we really conclude that? If we can see bits 13 billion light years away, that's light that's 13 billion years old that we're picking up, which means that those bits were at the location we see 13 billion years ago. Where are those bits now? If the universe actually is 13 billion years old, then we can assume that the laws of physics as we know them don't always (or at least haven't always) applied. Is this some sort of side-effect of the big bang? I'd say the universe coming into existence is a reasonable enough reason to give the laws of physics pause. Or is it a property at of the expanding-edge of the universe? There's so little we actually know.

And that's assuming constant motion, there are likely gravitational forces that are at work that will have changed the acceleration of stuff over the billions of years, things likely started moving much faster than what they are now so the universe could be even older than the 13 billion years+13billion years for light to travel.

Since the speed of light is a constant (in a vacuum), and the oldest light we've seen is 13 billion years, it cannot be older than that, unless you can speed up/slow down the speed of light. Einstein's relativity theorem suggests that this is impossible, since it would get an infinite mass.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to atheists

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Wed, 19 Jan 2011 14:09:36 GMT

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

This might just be me being stupid, but wouldn't it be double that?

From a source, light will travel in all directions. If the furthest source of light (star) we know of is 13 billion light years away, then we know that light from that star took 13 billion years to travel from that star to our planet. But what about on the opposite side of the star? Wouldn't light travel that way too? The star should be like a mid point in the calculation rather than an endpoint.


(making a total of 26 billion light years from Earth all the way to the farthest reaches of light from a star 13 billion light years away.)

In the following diagram, the blue dot is Earth and the yellow dot is a star 13 billion light years away:

Granted there is no way to confirm this. The universe could very well have an edge just beyond that star at the 13 billion light year mark. But logically, the space between any star and our planet could also be considered a radius of which we know space resides in. (The distance from Earth to a star is 10 billion light years for example, therefore, there is a radius of 10 billion light years all around that particular star that the universe at least extends to.)

File Attachments

1) [lyrs.jpg](#), downloaded 1149 times



Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Dover](#) on Wed, 19 Jan 2011 16:41:50 GMT

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

EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Wed, 19 January 2011 03:19Jerad Gray wrote on Tue, 18 January 2011 21:07Toggle SpoilerDover wrote on Tue, 18 January 2011 06:15EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Tue, 18 January 2011 04:27Dover wrote on Tue, 18 January 2011 12:50EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Tue, 18 January 2011 03:00R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 15 January 2011 04:05Dover wrote on Fri, 14 January 2011 19:29jnz wrote on Fri, 14 January 2011 15:32Outside our universe the laws of physics we are bound to do not exist! If a cosmos really exists (which unfortunately we cannot prove) then it is totally reasonable for very strange things to happen. Such as:- an infinitely dense, infinitely hot soup of particles and energy appearing out of no where!

True. In a truly infinite universe, anything that can happen, will happen. In fact, in a truly infinite universe, anything that can happen must happen.

Hey! Dover just stumbled onto another paradox!

If the universe truly is infinite then anything and everything must happen at one point in time. However, it is also true that one day the universe must end... But if infinity is the never ending expansion of something, how can the execution of everything possible happen but at the same

time manage to end some day? You can't end when you are counting to infinity! The universe isn't infinite, it's still growing. We know how big it is (13 billion lightyears afaik), so ...

We were discussing the universe being infinite in regards to time. At least I was, I can't speak for R3.

Well, since it's expanding, and the furthest bits are now 13 billion lightyears away, one can conclude the universe started 13 billion years ago. Now the question is, does indeed everything have an end? Since everything needs energy (or mass) and there is a law of physics saying that energy never disappears, one has to conclude that the universe will not end. This is, unless somehow there will be a lot more anti-matter, this would adsorb the matter and thus energy (or transform it to an unknown type of mass/energy).

Can we really conclude that? If we can see bits 13 billion light years away, that's light that's 13 billion years old that we're picking up, which means that those bits were at the location we see 13 billion years ago. Where are those bits now? If the universe actually is 13 billion years old, then we can assume that the laws of physics as we know them don't always (or at least haven't always) applied. Is this some sort of side-effect of the big bang? I'd say the universe coming into existence is a reasonable enough reason to give the laws of physics pause. Or is it a property at of the expanding-edge of the universe? There's so little we actually know.

And that's assuming constant motion, there are likely gravitational forces that are at work that will have changed the acceleration of stuff over the billions of years, things likely started moving much faster than what they are now so the universe could be even older than the 13 billion years+13billion years for light to travel.

Since the speed of light is a constant (in a vacuum), and the oldest light we've seen is 13 billion years, it cannot be older than that, unless you can speed up/slow down the speed of light. Einstein's theory of relativity suggests that this is impossible, since it would get an infinite mass.

The oldest light we've seen is 13 billion years old, which means whatever created that light was 13 billion light years away 13 billion years ago. It doesn't tell us how large the universe is -right now-.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to atheists
Posted by: [Spyder](#) on **Wed, 19 Jan 2011 18:51:25 GMT**

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

We live in a vicious circle. The sun will destroy itself in another 4.5 billion years. With this explosion a lot of material, gases, fluids etc. will be released into the universe. Then with these materials new planets start forming and a new system such as ours will probably start to exist. Then this will destroy itself again and rebuilt itself again.

It's an odd world we live in.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to atheists
Posted by: [Tunaman](#) on **Thu, 20 Jan 2011 01:42:10 GMT**

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

Wasn't there a theory that light was affected by gravity, anyways?

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Starbuzzz](#) on Sun, 30 Jan 2011 14:42:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Billions of stars explode and implode everyday and humans observe them all. We have seen the pictures too. I don't think anyone concludes that such gigantic explosions are the result of the whim of some super intelligent sentient being. They just happen due to a natural repeating process of birth, life and death. Why the heck would someone not apply the same concept to the universe as well? And why do people think there was "nothing" before the Big Bang? Also why do people think there is nothing outside out universe? I can't/won't accept that!

When are we going to relieve ourselves from this silly extremely limited-in-scope circular way of thinking?! I think this is just humans confusing and confusing ourselves with our too-unflexible linear way of thought. That's the source of all this confusion. The Big Bang makes sense but its failure to properly explain what was before it has lead to confusion.

So according to most people: there was a massive god who had always existed in the darkness of nothingness. All of a sudden, "he"/"she"/"it" decides to make something and boom, makes a big bang happen and we all came out of it. OR, there was nothing and a Big Bang occurred. Come on now, what if there were billions of universes. That's why I find the current model very unsatisfying:

We are looking at the universe from the inside and assuming it to be a house outside which there is nothing. What if "our" universe was just 1 house in a giant cosmic street which was part of a massive suburb full of other "houses" outside of a massive cosmic city which was part of a giant cosmic country which in turn was part of a giant cosmic superplanet and which in turn was part of a cosmic solar system and we go on and on and on. Are you following me on this analogy? This makes sense to me personally.


I think it's something to do with a magnifying glass. Our position on earth is supremely magnified from our point of view. And if we magnify more, we see bacteria and atoms and what makes them up beyond which we can't really magnify any further. Now when we "zoom out" the possibilities are supremely endless and infinite. We maybe wrongly thinking that there is a maximum "zoomed out" position. And we call this position "god." It simply doesn't click for me...not making sense. Because there needs to more zooming out than that too and it seems possible to do so.

So the universe imo has no boundaries. It stretches on and on. So let me make a summary: Let's say we hop on Battlestar Galactica and keep going in one direction hoping to reach the edge of the universe, we will keep failing cos no matter how far we go...we will only uncover more and more. We will never be able to go outside the universe because there is no outside! Eventually we will reach a point so far into deep space that we can see the gigantic contents of our universe in one giant tangled ballweb of smoke and dust. And we can still keep going and going and going in the vain hope of reaching the place outside the universe but we won't be able to. We will eventually end up finding yet another universe or just squirming around in deep dark space.

This is what makes the most sense for me; maybe I am misunderstanding/overlooking some things. Seems possible but any comments?

File Attachments

1) [BigBang.jpg](#), downloaded 1087 times



Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Mon, 31 Jan 2011 02:54:01 GMT

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

You know the saying "there is always a bigger fish"? It's sort of the same way with science. No matter what great question you solve, there will always be a bigger one behind it.

Q: Why do things fall to the ground?

A: Because of gravity.

Q: Where does gravity come from?

A: The pull of the planet's core.

Q: Why does the planet's core generate a gravitational force?

etc

etc...

You can go on forever that way and eventually end up with the question "what caused the big bang?" to which there is probably an answer that will lead to another larger question.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [snpr1101](#) on Mon, 31 Jan 2011 07:33:53 GMT

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

For me; I think the reasoning we make in relation to everything having a purpose is a little odd.

We seem to make rational statements about simpler lifeforms until we get to ourselves. For example:

If you asked 100 people (Half of which believe the Universe was created by a God; and half of which did not) - "What is the purpose of this tree? (common tree species)"

I would presume that the answers would be a combination of the following:

1. To grow and to die.
2. To photosynthesize and provide oxygen.
3. To stabilize the soil beneath.

Etc

All practical and rational answers.

Yet, when you pose the question, "What is the purpose of a human being?" The answers would vary wildly.

Is it likely that Human Beings are that much more special than simpler lifeforms in terms of having a purpose? Is it irrational to believe that we might have a similar purpose to these less complex lifeforms? Do we not grow and die as they do? Does the fish suddenly have a destiny because it is a more evolved or complex lifeform than algae?

I think not.

The main problem I see with this entire issue begins in the earliest of days. The days where Man first started to ask and investigate why things worked the way they did. The first scientific endeavors and thirst for knowledge.

You have this rational group of people; and then you have a group of people who at the same time, claimed a God of some form existed without any scientific evidence at all.

Can you see the problem?

Worlds worst graph, I know. It's a quick way of demonstrating how behind Science is in comparison to the weight of conclusions due to the need to have actual scientific evidence to support claims, which takes a lot of effort, understanding which all come with the most important aspect - Time. Conversely, the only requirement to acknowledge that a certain God exists is "faith".

If we knew back then what we know now, I wonder how religion and the claims that a God exists would be perceived today?

Apologies for the rant / incoherent sentences and ideas. Incredibly tired, yet the thread title sparked a what little energy I have left atm to say something.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [blunts](#) on Sat, 16 Apr 2011 04:37:44 GMT

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

[quote title=reborn wrote on Thu, 13 January 2011 04:33]If there is no deity that created the universe, how did the universe come to be? Specifically I am talking about the creation of something from nothing. If we are to believe the "Big Bang Theory" then where did the Two giant gas clouds come from? How do you get something from nothing? Where does all matter come from?

Why do so many people feel the need to worship?

If there is no significance to life, no meaning to it, you must reflect that life is nothing more than an experience that will end, and therefore be a waste of time?

Are we as humans different to other animals? We have more intelligence and we have higher reasoning. Why are we the only ones?

If God does not exist, then can someone still hope for better times when in despair? Is hope just a random chance of roulette? There is no universal force of fairness and equality, no Karma?[/quote]

Quantum physics can explain most of this. Kinda like how things can indeed be in more than one place at one time, or how atoms can exist and then just not exist for no reason at all. Or how the impossible (ie a dinosaur wearing a pink tutu singing lady gaga can appear in front of you then vanish)

people feel the need to worship because w/o this where would many of the week minded people morals end up. If it weren't for worship then people would just do whatever fearing no consequences. And way back when, when worship started they were worshiping stars.

We are not the only ones. It's called evolution. And I'm sure in the next million years or so we will see a higher evolutionary product of ourselves.

As for the final question in your statement. Hope is for the weak. Realize that things are bad and like any other action that gets its opposite yet equal reaction that it will change. Of course there is no fairness or equality. Look at our world, or civilization for this matter. Why is it that there are people starving and people eating like there's no tomorrow. Why did the tsunami hit Japan and only fuck their shit up. If the world were fair and equal then events like this would bone the entire world in the same fashion it did Japan. However this does not exist. As for karma, it's an extreme set of coincidence that is the same as the law I stated earlier for every action there is an equal yet opposite reaction.

Now if you made it this far you deserve to read this from me.

Religion and worship is a much needed part of life. Without this process the world would be a much more violent and full of despair because we would not have the people that believe if they do something wrong or unjust that they are going to burn in hell forever because of this. If in the beginning of days nothing ever happened for people to want to worship (whether it was actually a god, some person making shit up, or for the realists out there an extra-terrestrial being) then we would be in a far worse off place. I'm only glad that I live in a day in age where the majority of

things can be proven or disproven, because I dislike and find things that there are no physical evidence for extremly rediculous. If I cant see it, touch it, smell it, taste it, or have rational explanation for then it more than likely doesnt exist. If it walks like a duck, quacks like a duck, looks like a duck, smells like a duck, chances are pretty good its a duck.

Another philosophical moment broughten to you by blunts.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [shippo](#) on Sat, 16 Apr 2011 17:37:34 GMT

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

snpr1101 wrote on Mon, 31 January 2011 00:33

You have this rational group of people; and then you have a group of people who at the same time, claimed a God of some form existed without any scientific evidence at all.

keeping in mind about the definitiion of science

Science (from Latin: *scientia* meaning "knowledge") is an enterprise that builds and organizes knowledge in the form of testable explanations and predictions about the world

I'm not sure I understand your graph. If science is the study of testable explanations, why is it being depicted or though of as a separate "theory" vs "The Theory of God"? What I mean by this is, as an example, "The Theory of Evolution" is thought of by many as being "science" and the "Theory of Creation" as "non science". Both are theories on how the world began, and since neither can be physicly tested, or are repeatable, neither can be called true science.

To me it is easier to believe that God created us and people come from people, than to believe that people came from rocks.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Sat, 16 Apr 2011 19:22:45 GMT

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

shippo wrote on Sat, 16 April 2011 10:37 Science (from Latin: *scientia* meaning "knowledge") is an enterprise that builds and organizes knowledge in the form of testable explanations and predictions about the world

I'm not sure I understand your graph. If science is the study of testable explanations, why is it being depicted or though of as a separate "theory" vs "The Theory of God"? What I mean by this is, as an example, "The Theory of Evolution" is thought of by many as being "science" and the "Theory of Creation" as "non science". Both are theories on how the world began, and since neither can be physicly tested, or are repeatable, neither can be called true science.

To me it is easier to believe that God created us and people come from people, than to believe that people came from rocks.
"people came from rocks"? oh dear

firstly, evolution doesn't attempt to explain "how the world began". the world is not a living thing. evolution is a process whereby living things - including humans - change over an extremely long timeframe.

as for physically tested, there is an enormous amount of evidence for evolution in the fossil record and the record of molecular biology. there's none at all for "God". as for "repeatable", evolution is still happening.

if you want to say that "God" created people, what a great deal more complicated you've just made the question; now the origin of life is wherever this god of yours came from.
if we instead accept the theory of evolution, humans developed over an almost incomprehensibly long period of time from lower lifeforms, so the origin of life is really primitive forms of life which can arise through abiogenesis.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Sat, 16 Apr 2011 19:25:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

shippo wrote on Sat, 16 April 2011 10:37snpr1101 wrote on Mon, 31 January 2011 00:33
You have this rational group of people; and then you have a group of people who at the same time, claimed a God of some form existed without any scientific evidence at all.

keeping in mind about the definition of science

Science (from Latin: *scientia* meaning "knowledge") is an enterprise that builds and organizes knowledge in the form of testable explanations and predictions about the world

I'm not sure I understand your graph. If science is the study of testable explanations, why is it being depicted or thought of as a separate "theory" vs "The Theory of God"? What I mean by this is, as an example, "The Theory of Evolution" is thought of by many as being "science" and the "Theory of Creation" as "non science". Both are theories on how the world began, and since neither can be physically tested, or are repeatable, neither can be called true science.
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/E._coli_long-term_evolution_experiment

Quote:To me it is easier to believe that God created us and people come from people, than to believe that people came from rocks. I wonder, did god come from rocks?

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Tunaman](#) on Sun, 17 Apr 2011 08:23:04 GMT

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

Why can't something come from nothing? In reality, we cannot experience "nothing", so we don't know what is possible and what is not possible with it. What if "nothing" is just a concept that we try to base arguments on, but also a concept that isn't actually real?(basically, this is an idea that we cannot experience nothing, and it may have never existed)

Why do we think all things have to begin and end? This is something that we accept without question, but what if this is not actually true? What if things have always existed, and have always been ever-changing?

Crazy.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Sun, 17 Apr 2011 11:45:00 GMT

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

Look at that tunafish with his glasses, talking crazy physics!

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [shippo](#) on Sun, 17 Apr 2011 13:19:38 GMT

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

Spoony wrote on Sat, 16 April 2011 12:22"people came from rocks"? oh dear

firstly, evolution doesn't attempt to explain "how the world began". the world is not a living thing. evolution is a process whereby living things - including humans - change over an extremely long timeframe.

as for physically tested, there is an enormous amount of evidence for evolution in the fossil record and the record of molecular biology. there's none at all for "God". as for "repeatable", evolution is still happening.

Could you give an example of evolution?

Quote:

if you want to say that "God" created people, what a great deal more complicated you've just made the question; now the origin of life is wherever this god of yours came from.
if we instead accept the theory of evolution, humans developed over an almost incomprehensibly long period of time from lower lifeforms, so the origin of life is really primitive forms of life which can arise through abiogenesis.

Abiogenesis is a theory that tries to explain how life arises from nonlife. There are 2 or 3 different

theories on it which do you believe?

Herr Surth wrote on Sat, 16 April 2011 12:25

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/E._coli_long-term_evolution_experiment

Quote: To me it is easier to believe that God created us and people come from people, than to believe that people came from rocks. I wonder, did god come from rocks?

interesting experiment. however it does not really support evolution at least not the kind required in The Theory of Evolution. First of all in the experiment the E. coli did not change into another species of bacteria it only changed some of its genetic characteristics.

simplified definitions:

Microevolution-change in genotype or phenotype (general characteristics)

Macroevolution-change in species

microevolution aka (natural selection) has been proven and is scientifically repeatable. I don't dispute this. However it is Macroevolution I dispute.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to atheists

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Sun, 17 Apr 2011 13:24:14 GMT

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

shippo wrote on Sun, 17 April 2011 06:19
Spoony wrote on Sat, 16 April 2011 12:22 "people came from rocks"? oh dear

firstly, evolution doesn't attempt to explain "how the world began". the world is not a living thing. evolution is a process whereby living things - including humans - change over an extremely long timeframe.

as for physically tested, there is an enormous amount of evidence for evolution in the fossil record and the record of molecular biology. there's none at all for "God". as for "repeatable", evolution is still happening.

Could you give an example of evolution?

look up just about any animal or plant you like - including homo sapiens - and read up on how it evolved.

but make sure it's a living thing, not a rock or a planet

Quote: Abiogenesis is a theory that tries to explain how life arises from nonlife. There are 2 or 3 different theories on it which do you believe?

i don't really care, it's enough to believe that it's plausible.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Sun, 17 Apr 2011 13:29:05 GMT

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

shippo wrote on Sun, 17 April 2011 06:19

simplified deffinitions:

Microevolution-change in genotype or phyenotype (general characteristics)

Macroevolution-change in speice

microevolution aka (natural selection)has been proven and is scientifcily repeatable. I don't despute this. However it is Macroevolution I despute.

sup, guess what? you fail science! congrats. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Macroevolution>

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Tunaman](#) on Sun, 17 Apr 2011 23:28:39 GMT

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

Herr Surth wrote on Sun, 17 April 2011 07:45Look at that tunafish with his glasses, talking crazy physics!

yeah, what was going through his mind at whatever time in the morning that was?!

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [MUDKIPS](#) on Sun, 17 Apr 2011 23:59:11 GMT

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

I have one question for christians in specific.

How much of your religion do you think, is truly christian? Down to the core, like it's supposed to be designed by jesus and his apostles. Straight from god. The only real way.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [shippo](#) on Mon, 18 Apr 2011 01:25:58 GMT

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

Spoony wrote on Sun, 17 April 2011 06:24

but make sure it's a living thing, not a rock or a planet

eh i was trying to get at the point that evolutionists don't have a very good explanation of how life came from non life.

according to evolution, each animal decends from a less complex organism this ultimataly leads however to the problem of how life originated.

food for thought: if 4.6 billion years ago the earth is formed (made up of water and rock) and you get some molecules that form and create amino acids, DNA and a cell, you sill have to consider that this all came from, esentially rock or mineral.

MUDKIPS wrote on Sun, 17 April 2011 16:59I have one question for christians in specific.

How much of your religion do you think, is truly christian? Down to the core, like it's supposed to be designed by jesus and his apostles. Straight from god. The only real way.

eh depends on your definition of christian, originally the term "Christian" meant follower of Christ, which was given to the early followers of Jesus. however over the 2000 someodd years there have been many cults and offshoots that claim to be "Christian" but are not really.

basicly I believe the Bible is 100% fact and that it is what we are to live our lives by. tradition or other sources are not to be accepted in place of the Bible.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Mon, 18 Apr 2011 01:32:14 GMT

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

IF WE CAME FROM MONKEYS THEN WHY THERE STILL BE MONKEYS?

HA, CHRISTIANS 1, ATHEISTS 0

I thought the mass of religion threads were over...

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Mon, 18 Apr 2011 01:58:23 GMT

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

shippo wrote on Sun, 17 April 2011 18:25eh i was trying to get at the point that evolutionists don't have a very good explanation of how life came from non life.

according to evolution, each animal decends from a less complex organism this ultimataly leads however to the problem of how life originated.

yes, it does, and abiogenesis is the most plausible theory so far advanced.

Quote:food for thought: if 4.6 billion years ago the earth is formed (made up of water and rock) and you get some molecules that form and create amino acids, DNA and a cell, you sill have to consider that this all came from, esentially rock or mineral.

miller urey experiment proved that organic material can arise from inorganic matter. but don't say "this all came from" as if the person next door's grandfather was a lump of granite

Quote:basicly I believe the Bible is 100% fact and that it is what we are to live our lives by. tradition or other sorces are not to be accepted in place of the Bible.
why do you think that?

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [grant89uk](#) on Mon, 18 Apr 2011 11:32:36 GMT

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

The bible is the biggest selling fiction book ever.

Tru story.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [MUDKIPS](#) on Mon, 18 Apr 2011 20:26:25 GMT

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

shippo wrote on Sun, 17 April 2011 18:25

basicly I believe the Bible is 100% fact and that it is what we are to live our lives by. tradition or other sorces are not to be accepted in place of the Bible.

Exactly what I was hoping for.

The vast majority of the bible, and christian religion, is not remotely christian.

During the 4th, 5th and 6th centuries when Christianity became prominent, there was a need for it to be defined. In a number of councils (most famously the council of Nicaea) various elements of bible literature and rites were being decided on.

One major issue was the split between Aristotelean and Platonic philosophy: Which one would christianity follow?

Aristotelean philosophy meant following a certain set of rules based mainly on virtues, that would provide a system to base your actions on, and judge them by.

Platonic philosophy meant following exalted ideals. Inattainable perfect goals and states of being, that one should strive for their whole life.

The most fervent follower of the Platonic line (and one of the "founding fathers" of it) was Augustinus, and it's his system of beliefs that was adapted in christianity. What does this mean? Basically, a load of bishops sat down, and decided what was and was not to be put in the bible. Some gospels were removed, others were altered (this is all on paper)

(cant be arsed to type the rest now, ill continue later)

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [shippo](#) on Tue, 19 Apr 2011 03:10:48 GMT

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

Spoony wrote on Sun, 17 April 2011 18:58yes, it does, and abiogenesis is the most plausible theory so far advanced.

Abiogenesis is an interesting subject. I think that if they could get this to work we could do a lot of things with this for the benefit of the medical field. However keep in mind that they still can't get a living cell yet and that's with them knowing what they are trying to create. With evolution, it is random. So trying to create something as complicated as a living cell randomly, that's preaty difficult.

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Abiogenesis> under topic Current Models

No one has synthesized a "protocell" using basic components which would have the necessary properties of life (the so-called "bottom-up-approach"). Without such a proof-of-principle, explanations have tended to be short on specifics.

Quote: miller urey experiment proved that organic material can arise from inorganic matter. but don't say "this all came from" as if the person next door's grandfather was a lump of granite

Actually I would like to apologize for that comment earlier. That was a little pointed of me and I am sorry.

Quote:why do you think that?

Well I haven't found any thing to prove it not being 100% accurate.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [MUDKIPS](#) on Tue, 19 Apr 2011 08:22:40 GMT

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

Alright, time to resume my post.

Basically, what was really being decided was, what was more important: worshipping an ideal, or practicing an ideal? The decision was obviously made to worship the ideal. This was very problematic, although people at the time did not realise it.

The original jewish faith that christianity is based on evolved from and among the various polytheistic religions in the fertile crescent and around, heavily influenced by Assyrian and Babylonian religions, which in turn were influenced by Sumerian religions.

These were very focused on worshipping the king as an agent of the gods, who was given the tools to build cities, empires, you name it. This was a religion that was very much based on action, and deeds, through a system of beliefs that was reinforced with rituals and religious tablets all over the land. For instance, seals were stamped with godly symbols, and if any thief would break them he would call the wrath of that particular god upon himself.

Judaism evolved to be a monotheistic mirror of this kind of religion; based on an ideal of a promised land in which the people shall live according to the laws laid down by their god.

Jesus of Nazareth, someone other than him, or maybe the same man who went by a different line, wanted to distantiate himself from the promised land ideal, and focus more on the "good life" aspect of Judaism, ie, if everyone follows the rules and lives by these loving ideals, we might have a good world.

So, instead of following the original Aristotelean ideals of Jesus, a Platonic way of thinking was adapted. This meant more focus on the worship and belief, rather than actual acts. This meant that instead of making an effort for a more virtuous and better world, more effort was made to make people believe. This in time led to the persecution of heretics (that are now considered saints in some of the more orthodox christian ways) and the enforcement of silly doctrines, based on superstition. A lot of adaptations were made to the bible to reinforce this new way of thinking about christianity, so many that if you compare original greek manuscripts to say, a 7th century bible, you'd think they were from two completely different religions.

What is my "problem" with this? Let's have a look at the differences: Jews are known for their entrepreneurship, ingenuity and perseverance. They thrive in difficult environments (like in the early medieval ghettos in italy, or during the roman occupation where a whole new form of judaism was born) and through all their hardships have still survived.

Christians are no longer known for their compassion, which is what the original focus of christianity was. Instead they are known for their unrelenting quest to convert everyone (inquisitions, burning of heretics, conversion attempts of indians), corruption, arrogance and in modern days, pedophile priests.

(again, cant be arsed to continue, maybe later today)

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Tue, 19 Apr 2011 09:30:45 GMT

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

shippo wrote on Mon, 18 April 2011 20:10Abiogenesis is an interesting subject. I think that if they could get this to work we could do a lot of things with this for the benefit of the medical field.

However keep in mind that they still can't get a living cell yet and that's with them knowing what they are trying to create. With evolution, it is random. So trying to create something as complicated as a living cell randomly, that's preaty difficult.

Sure. But according to what you've said so far, the origin of life is however this god of yours came into being; you haven't yet said how you think that happened. If you find it difficult to believe that a single cell could arise, I'm not sure why you find it easier to account for an enormously powerful and super-intelligent entity instead.

Quote:Quote:why do you think that?

Well I haven't found any thing to prove it not being 100% accurate.
that's a really bizarre way to reason.

firstly there are a whole lot of books in the bible, written by different authors - in most cases, almost nothing is known about those authors. and which books were included in the bible and which weren't (lots of them were rejected) was decided by a group of bickering politicians and religious leaders well over a thousand years ago, but hundreds of years after Jesus and

thousands of years after Moses (if there was such person as either). if you want to say you trust this bickering group of men, at least some of whom clearly had vested interests in the question, to decide which books were "inspired by God" and which were not, go ahead - you're then left with the question of proving there's a god at all, then that these books really were inspired by that god, then that this god is right all the time.

instead you seem to be taking the position of swallowing this 1000-page book in its entirety until someone can point out a flaw.

well, OK then. two things. you said a few posts ago that you not only think it's 100% accurate, but that we should live our lives by it and reject other sources in favour of the Bible. OK then. i'll take one point about the supposed 'truth' of the books and one point about the way we should live our lives.

truth first. who was Joseph's father? two of the gospels give entirely different answers to this question. (joseph referring to jesus's father, not the technicolor dreamcoat guy in Genesis)

now, on the way we should live. here's a question: what should we as a society do when a man commits the crime of rape against a woman? what should the laws be?

i say the man should be put in prison for a long time, and the woman should have counselling available if she wants it.

the bible says the victim is forced to marry her attacker.

which of these two is better? or do you have a better idea than either?

i say that if that really did come from a god, he has no fucking idea.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [shippo](#) on Tue, 19 Apr 2011 22:44:14 GMT

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

Spoony wrote on Tue, 19 April 2011 02:30Sure. But according to what you've said so far, the origin of life is however this god of yours came into being; you haven't yet said how you think that happened. If you find it difficult to believe that a single cell could arise, I'm not sure why you find it easier to account for an enormously powerful and super-intelligent entity instead.

we as christians believe that he has always existed, and that he is outside the time line of us here one earth, so He has existed past, present and future.. (I can explain and go more indeepth with this if you like)

Quote:

truth first. who was Joseph's father? two of the gospels give entirely different answers to this question. (joseph referring to jesus's father, not the technicolor dreamcoat guy in Genesis)

Well I'm no Biblical schollar, but I will try to answer both questions as best I can.

from what I have learned and read most biblical scholars believe that one line was purly the male or Joseph's line the other was Mary's and the part where it says son of, probably meant son-in-law of, which would make sense, because even now it is not uncommon to be referred to as son or father for in-laws.

Quote:

now, on the way we should live. here's a question: what should we as a society do when a man commits the crime of rape against a woman? what should the laws be?

i say the man should be put in prison for a long time, and the woman should have counselling available if she wants it.

the bible says the victim is forced to marry her attacker.

which of these two is better? or do you have a better idea than either?

Well I'm no Sociologist, but you have to keep in mind that they have a much different culture than ours. Also keep in mind that the attacker would be put to death if she was married. But as far as the question you put forth I don't know enough about the Middle eastern culture and values to make an honest opinion on it.

@MUDKIPS interesting stuff. I see you're still typing though so I'll wait until you're done.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to atheists

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Wed, 20 Apr 2011 01:54:05 GMT

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

shippo wrote on Tue, 19 April 2011 15:44 we as Christians believe that He has always existed, and that He is outside the time line of us here on earth, so He has existed past, present and future.. (I can explain and go more in-depth with this if you like)

I think you'd better, because you're making an enormous claim here. What do you have to back up such a huge assertion, much much much bigger than anything any scientist says about the origin of life?

Quote:Quote:

truth first. Who was Joseph's father? Two of the gospels give entirely different answers to this question. (Joseph referring to Jesus's father, not the technicolor dreamcoat guy in Genesis)

Well I'm no Biblical scholar, but I will try to answer both questions as best I can.

from what I have learned and read most biblical scholars believe that one line was purly the male or Joseph's line the other was Mary's and the part where it says son of, probably meant son-in-law of, which would make sense, because even now it is not uncommon to be referred to as son or father for in-laws.

Yeah, "Biblical scholar" is a phrase you'll hear whenever someone tries to get around the fact that something the Bible says is either obviously wrong or morally appalling. Another is "theology".

What a Biblical scholar or a theologian will never tell you is "Yeah, that's wrong, I dunno why he

wrote that"

Quote:Well I'm no Sociologist, but you have to keep in mind that they have a much different culture than ours. Also keep in mind that the attacker would be put to death if she was married. But as far as the question you put forth I don't know enough about the Middle eastern culture and values to make an honest opinion on it.

Firstly, what makes you think this only instructs those people at that time and place? The commandment is not repudiated later in the book. God gave you this rule and He has not repealed it.

Secondly, the point about whether the attacker was married shows you what's going on here; it's a culture where women are seen as property, and this is hardly the only thing in the bible which shows that. If she's married then raping her is a terrible offence - not because of any consideration of the woman as a human being, but because you're using another man's property. If she's not married then you can just rape her, pay off her dad and you've bought yourself a wife, if "wife" is the right word... "sex slave" is probably nearer the mark.

I'm going to repeat the original assertion just to see if I can get the reaction such a monstrous thing deserves. If a man rapes a woman, they have to get married. The victim of a violent sexual assault is then forced to spend the rest of her life married to the scum who violated her. Anyone of normal moral sensibilities ought to "have an opinion" on it without needing to research the culture; this alone tells you all you need to know about the culture. And remember, this law is coming to you from this god of yours. Go ask your mother or your sister's opinion on it, if you dare. Stand up in church next time you're there and say there's a law in the Bible we as a society are not following. Write to your congressman about it, maybe.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to atheists

Posted by [shippo](#) on Wed, 20 Apr 2011 12:25:58 GMT

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

We believe that God has always existed. He created the world and universe. Like The Theory of Evolution, we have no scientific(imperial) evidence of how the world/universe began, but it is what we believe, just like your belief.

Quote:yeah, "biblical scholar" is a phrase you'll hear whenever someone tries to get around the fact that something the bible says is either obviously wrong or morally appalling. another is "theology".

what a biblical scholar or a theologian will never tell you is "yeah, that's wrong, i dunno why he wrote that"

Would it help you if I just removed the biblical scholar part? I always thought a biblical scholar was a person who studied the Bible and its authenticity.

Quote:Firstly, what makes you think this only instructs those people at that time and place?

This is found in Leviticus which is made up of laws and rules to govern the Israelite's society.

If you don't mind me asking what (in your opinion) makes moral values right?

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to atheists

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Wed, 20 Apr 2011 13:42:25 GMT

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

shippo wrote on Wed, 20 April 2011 05:25We believe that God has always existed. He created the world and universe. Like The Theory of Evolution, we have no scientific(imperial) evidence of how the world/universe began, but it is what we believe, just like your belief.

oh dear. i thought we'd already cleared up the fact that evolution doesn't attempt to explain the origin of the "world and universe". evolution is a theory and a fact that explains a biological process whereby living things develop over time (very very long periods of time, of course), and there's actually quite a lot of evidence for it. the fossil record, the record of molecular biology, the genome project... the fact it's been physically observed, the fact that like a good theory it makes predictions which have borne out, etc.

please free yourself of the "just like your belief" idea. a few posts ago you said that you thought everything in the bible was 100% true, and later you said this was because nobody had found anything to suggest otherwise. this is nothing at all like the way scientists approach darwin's theory.

but i'm glad to hear you say you have no evidence for creationism. most creationists aren't that honest.

Quote:yeah, "biblical scholar" is a phrase you'll hear whenever someone tries to get around the fact that something the bible says is either obviously wrong or morally appalling. another is "theology".

what a biblical scholar or a theologian will never tell you is "yeah, that's wrong, i dunno why he wrote that"

Would it help you if I just removed the biblical scholar part? I always thought a biblical scholar was a person who studied the Bible and its authenticity.

if someone studied the bible and its authenticity and came up with conclusions unflattering to christianity and/or judaism, would you consider him/her to be a biblical scholar?

Quote:Firstly, what makes you think this only instructs those people at that time and place?

This is found in Leviticus which is made up of laws and rules to govern the Israelite's society. deuteronomy actually, though that's a forgivable error. those two books are pretty similar in terms of barbarism.

well, if you think these laws - sick, disgusting, unjust laws that strip human beings of their dignity - only apply to one particular group of people, do you think the same about the rest of the old testament? the ten commandments, for example? and you said earlier that you didn't know much about the culture at the time. well, the laws are coming from god, aren't they? if it's as brutal and unjust a society as it sounds, you have your god to thank for it; his laws reinforce the appalling state of affairs.

Quote:If you don't mind me asking what (in your opinion) makes moral values right? you're still talking about the law that says a rape victim must marry her attacker, are you? someone has to explain to you what's wrong with that?

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to atheists
Posted by [shippo](#) on Wed, 20 Apr 2011 23:55:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

(question refrased)

Creationists believe: in the begining was God, and he created the univers, our world, ect.

as Evolutionists what do you believe was the begining of the univers? (I'm going somewere with this)

Quote:if someone studied the bible and its authenticity and came up with conclusions unflattering to christianity and/or judaism, would you consider him/her to be a biblical scholar?

Yes

if a scientist studied biology and came up with conclusions unflattering to The Theory of Evolution you would still consider him/her to be a "valid" scientist right?

Quote:Quote:Quote:Firstly, what makes you think this only instructs those people at that time and place?

This is found in Leviticus which is made up of laws and rules to govern the Isrealite's society. deutoronomy actually, though that's a forgivable error. those two books are pretty similar in terms of barbarism.

well, if you think these laws - sick, disgusting, unjust laws that strip human beings of their dignity - only apply to one particular group of people, do you think the same about the rest of the old testament? the ten commandments, for example? and you said earlier that you didn't know much about the culture at the time. well, the laws are coming from god, aren't they? if it's as brutal and unjust a society as it sounds, you have your god to thank for it; his laws reinforce the appalling state of affairs.

I was talking with my mom (she likes to study the Bible indeepth)
she was saying that back then in those times, the culture had arranged marriages, and the men were the head of the house hold and were required to work and provide for their house holds,

make all decisions, and were generally responsible for them. the law in Dureronomy was more of a protection for the woman and a punishment for the man. back then the concept of marriage was way different than what it has become today. the man was forced to pay the father 50 shekels (large sum) and he had to marry her and was forced to take care of and provide for her as long as he lived.

Do you know who the Jews for Jesus are? if you don't they are jews who have become christians but they know all the history and culture of the jews and the old testament. they also answer question people have about things, like this question you gave. if you like I can im the email address of one of them to you.

Quote:If you don't mind me asking what (in your opinion) makes moral values right?

I'm asking about them in general in your opinion why do you believe your morals or values are right? what is your basis for saying your morals are "good" and other things are "bad"?

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to atheists
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Thu, 21 Apr 2011 01:26:11 GMT

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

shippo wrote on Wed, 20 April 2011 16:55(question refrased)

Creationists believe: in the begining was God, and he created the univers, our world, ect. you've said you have no evidence for this, so if you want to assert that some entity did create the universe, it's an enormous jump from there to saying you know the first thing about that entity (using the word "he", for example)

Quote:as Evolutionists what do you believe was the begining of the univers? (I'm going somewhere with this)

i don't have the faintest idea, but at least i won't pretend i do.

Quote:Yes

if a scientist studied biology and came up with conclusions unflattering to The Theory of Evolution you would still consider him/her to be a "valid" scientist right?
of course.

Quote:I was talking with my mom (she likes to study the Bible indeepth)
she was saying that back then in those times, the culture had arranged marriages, and the men were the head of the house hold and were required to work and provide for their house holds, make all decisions, and were generally responsible for them. the law in Dureronomy was more of a protection for the woman and a punishment for the man.

i expect if you had told her that the verse came from the Quran rather than the bible, her response would not be so polite.

forcing the victim of a violent sexual assault to marry her attacker is for her protection? no, putting the bastard in prison would be for her protection, and the protection of other women. punishment

for the man? no, it's barely a punishment at all; it effectively means that a man can pick a wife just by raping her. it's a punishment for the woman. that's literally what it is. it is a punishment for the victim of a violent sexual assault; it makes her situation even worse. without any regard for what she wants for her future, whether she wants to get married at all or if she likes some other man, she's forced to marry a violent sexual predator.

Quote:back then the concept of marriage was way different than what it has become today. the man was forced to pay the father 50 shekels (large sum) and he had to marry her and was forced to take care of and provide for her as long as he lived.

the concept of marriage certainly is different. the bible approves of polygamy, for example; and it clearly views women as something like the property of men. think about that when you say the rapist has to look after her; you might as well say he's got to look after his livestock.

Quote:Do you know who the Jews for Jesus are? if you don't they are jews who have become christians but they know all the history and culture of the jews and the old testament. they also answer question people have about things, like this question you gave. if you like I can im the email address of one of them to you.

whatever. christianity may have made a bad choice in deciding to keep the barbarism and brutality of the Old Testament when establishing itself as a religion.

can i press you for an answer about the ten commandments? you said the rape law is only for the israelites, doesn't that apply to the ten commandments then?

Quote:I'm asking about them in general in your opinion why do you believe your morals or values are right? what is your basis for saying your morals are "good" and other things are "bad" i'd rather stay specific than go general if it's all the same with you. we were talking about a law that says the victim of a violent sexual assault has to marry her attacker, which adds to the trauma of the crime by destroying her future. i've unequivocally condemned this as primitive barbarism; you've defended it. i don't think i'm the one with the explaining to do.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to atheists

Posted by [shippo](#) on Thu, 21 Apr 2011 03:57:23 GMT

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

Quote:Quote:as Evolutionists what do you believe was the begining of the univers? (I'm going somewhere with this)

i don't have the faintest idea, but at least i won't pretend i do.

you believe in Evolution but you have no idea how it happened. so doesn't that mean you believe this on faith?

Quote:

forcing the victim of a violent sexual assault to marry her attacker is for her protection? no, putting the bastard in prison would be for her protection, and the protection of other women. punishment for the man? no, it's barely a punishment at all; it effectively means that a man can pick a wife just by raping her. it's a punishment for the woman. that's literally what it is. it is a punishment for the

victim of a violent sexual assault; it makes her situation even worse. without any regard for what she wants for her future, whether she wants to get married at all or if she likes some other man, she's forced to marry a violent sexual predator.

Like I have said before you are looking at this with the western culture in mind. this is Midle Eastern culture.

it's like the Europeans when they came to the Americas and were trying to trade and buy land from the Native Americans who had no concept of land ownership. Then they get mad at them for trespassing on THEIR land.

Even Jesus commented on this concept in Mark 10:2-6 on divorce.

2 Some Pharisees approached Him to test Him. They asked, "Is it lawful for a man to divorce his wife?" 3 He replied to them, "What did Moses command you?"

4 They said, "Moses permitted us to write divorce papers and send her away."

5 But Jesus told them, "He wrote this commandment for you because of the hardness of your hearts.

6 But from the beginning of creation God made them male and female.

7 For this reason a man will leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife,

8 and the two will become one flesh. So they are no longer two, but one flesh.

9 Therefore what God has joined together, man must not separate."

God does not aproove of divorce yet he alowed it and gave ruels to govern it. God does not aproove of rape but He puts ruels in place for that too.

You keep gripeing about "I don't think its fair" or "that's not right" WHY is it right or wrong? what is your basis for saying this? And it beter not be, because laws or society says so. because in 1939 Nazi German society said it was fine to murder 3 million people, 1831 the American government said it was fine to take thousands of acers of Indian land and relocate the polulation, in 1949 China's society thought it was fair to take everyone's wealth, rich or poor and "redistribute" it.

Quote:can i press you for an answer about the ten commandments? you said the rape law is only for the israelites, doesn't that apply to the ten commandments then?

I would be happy to answer it, but I think it would be best to finish the others first.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Thu, 21 Apr 2011 04:47:21 GMT

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

shippo wrote on Wed, 20 April 2011 20:57Quote:Quote:as Evolutionists what do you believe was

the begining of the univers? (I'm going somewhere with this)
i don't have the faintest idea, but at least i won't pretend i do.

you believe in Evolution but you have no idea how it happened. so doesn't that mean you believe this on faith?

this is getting ridiculous, shippo. how many times have i told you that evolution does not attempt to explain the origin of the universe or the world? it covers living things. it does not say anything about planets and such.

as for "believe in evolution" and "evolutionists", are you trying to make it sound like the theory of evolution is equivalent to a religion? and no, faith is believing stuff without evidence, and there's an overwhelming amount of evidence for evolution.

Quote:Like I have said before you are looking at this with the western culture in mind. this is Middle Eastern culture.

yes, i'm looking at it from the perspective of someone who views women as human beings, you're talking about a culture that doesn't. spare me your moral relativism, i'm right and the barbarians who wrote your holy book were wrong. modern secular western culture is better than the barbarism of the middle east a few thousand years ago. and please don't humiliate yourself by asking why, have more self-respect than that.

Quote:God does not approve of divorce yet he allowed it and gave rules to govern it. God does not approve of rape but He puts rules in place for that too.

I don't approve of rape, which is why I suggested a different rule: the offender is put in prison for a long time, and counselling made available to the victim. by contrast, the bible's rules punish the victim and come pretty close to rewarding the offender? rules which take a traumatized victim of a violent sexual assault and make it so much worse for her by destroying her future, forcing her to marry her attacker. if you think a god came up with that, what a complete retard he is. he has no idea, NO IDEA of right and wrong. any person on the street could come up with a better law on rape than the idiot who wrote deuteronomy.

i don't think that came from a god, i think it was written and conceived by men, and since it clearly favours men my position seems a bit safer. there's no mystery. it was a barbaric culture and these barbarians wanted to make it easier to behave the way they liked, treating women as their property... so yeah, make laws they liked and say a god said so. of course.

as for "god does not approve of rape", that's not a safe assertion at all. even if we didn't have this rule on rape which punishes the victim and in a sense rewards the offender, perhaps you also wanna look at deuteronomy 20:10, samuel 12:11-14, deuteronomy 21:10-14, zezariah 14:1-2, numbers 31:7-18, judges 21:10-24... some of these are very enthusiastically in favour of rape.

Quote:You keep griping about "I don't think it's fair" or "that's not right" WHY is it right or wrong? what is your basis for saying this? And it better not be, because laws or society says so. because in 1939 Nazi German society said it was fine to murder 3 million people, 1831 the American government said it was fine to take thousands of acres of Indian land and relocate the population, in 1949 China's society thought it was fair to take everyone's wealth, rich or poor and "redistribute" it.

again, it's really funny that you think i'm the one with the explaining to do. maybe you should ask why this god of yours punishes rape victims.

as for the ridiculous examples you degraded yourself by citing, that's easy. ask a European Jew if it was right to murder them for being the wrong religion. do you want to be murdered for being the wrong religion? no? then that's easy. don't murder someone else for being the wrong religion. hooray, we've learned that murdering people for not being the right religion is morally wrong, but it's very alarming that you didn't seem to know that already. if you are raped, do you want to be further punished by being forced to marry your attacker? do you mind the idea of your future being destroyed so you can be the plaything of a violent sex offender? if not, why not?

what a stupid question. no, worse than stupid... insulting. what a shining example of the damage religion can do to a person's mind.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Thu, 21 Apr 2011 09:26:12 GMT

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

hey shippo, why is your english so horrible? Or, to put it into your terms, horibel?

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [shippo](#) on Thu, 21 Apr 2011 12:17:43 GMT

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

Spoony wrote on Wed, 20 April 2011 21:47shippo wrote on Wed, 20 April 2011 20:57Quote:Quote:as Evolutionists what do you believe was the begining of the univers? (I'm going somewhere with this)
i don't have the faintest idea, but at least i won't pretend i do.

you believe in Evolution but you have no idea how it happend. so doesn't that mean you believe this on faith?

this is getting ridiculous, shippo. how many times have i told you that evolution does not attempt to explain the origin of the universe or the world? it covers living things. it does not say anything about planets and such.

The Theory does and that is what I was talking about. But it's ok I should have stated that more clearly above.

You said there is overwhelming evidence in support of evolution, the process, and not the theory I assume. Are you talking about macro evolution (process of one specie evolving into another) or micro evolution (process of smaller changes within the same specie)? I define specie as a group of animals that look similar and can reproduce like (dogs and wolves I group them under the dog specie).

Quote:as for "god does not approve of rape", that's not a safe assertion at all. even if we didn't have this rule on rape which punishes the victim and in a sense rewards the offender, perhaps you also wanna look at deuteronomy 20:10, samuel 12:11-14, deuteronomy 21:10-14, zechariah 14:1-2, numbers 31:7-18, judges 21:10-24... some of these are very enthusiastically in favour of rape.

Those are very poor examples. Most of them are prophecies about the Israelites being attacked and plundered. Judges 21:10-24 is the only one that even comes close and even in that one God never commanded any of it.

Quote:You keep griping about "I don't think it's fair" or "that's not right" WHY is it right or wrong? what is your basis for saying this? And it better not be, because laws or society says so. because in 1939 Nazi German society said it was fine to murder 3 million people, 1831 the American government said it was fine to take thousands of acres of Indian land and relocate the population, in 1949 China's society thought it was fair to take everyone's wealth, rich or poor and "redistribute" it.

again, it's really funny that you think I'm the one with the explaining to do. maybe you should ask why this god of yours punishes rape victims.

as for the ridiculous examples you degraded yourself by citing, that's easy. ask a European Jew if it was right to murder them for being the wrong religion. do you want to be murdered for being the wrong religion? no? then that's easy. don't murder someone else for being the wrong religion. hooray, we've learned that murdering people for not being the right religion is morally wrong, but it's very alarming that you didn't seem to know that already. if you are raped, do you want to be further punished by being forced to marry your attacker? do you mind the idea of your future being destroyed so you can be the plaything of a violent sex offender? if not, why not?

what a stupid question. no, worse than stupid... insulting. what a shining example of the damage religion can do to a person's mind.

What a nice way to beat about the bush. I asked one simple question: what is the basis of your moral values (why is it right or wrong). You have avoided it 3 times. If you don't want to answer it, just say so but please don't keep avoiding it.

You don't have to reply but at least think about this, if you don't have God telling you what is morally right or wrong, who then decides what is?

@ Herr Surth lol sorry, spelling was my worst subject in school. I have used spell check so now it should be easier to read.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to atheists

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Thu, 21 Apr 2011 13:55:40 GMT

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

please don't lie and say I avoided the question, as insulting and degrading a question as it was (seriously, I can't believe I've just had to explain to someone why murdering the Jewish population of Europe was wrong) - any idiot can see I answered it.

and for the record, it was never me who had the explaining to do in terms of morality; my moral sense, while not perfect, is obviously superior to yours and MASSIVELY superior to whoever conceived your holy books. i would ask where you get your sense of right and wrong from, but i'm not persuaded you have one.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [shippo](#) on Fri, 22 Apr 2011 04:34:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I used those 3 examples to prove that moral values based on just society alone is subject to the whims of man. If man decides what is right or wrong, then we have no moral absolutes and hence nothing to say what is right or wrong.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Fri, 22 Apr 2011 08:01:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

shippo wrote on Thu, 21 April 2011 21:34I used those 3 examples to prove that moral values based on just society alone is subject to the whims of man.
and i proved you don't need to base moral values on the majority or who's in power, you just need to ask one person who'll be the victim of what you're talking about.

does anyone want to be murdered for being the wrong religion? no? then don't be the one doing the murdering. do you want to be a slave? then don't be a slave-holder.

design the rules of society as if you didn't know whereabouts in that society you would be. for example, say slavery is wrong because you don't know whether you might be a slave or not.

Quote:If man decides what is right or wrong, then we have no moral absolutes and hence nothing to say what is right or wrong.

good lord, see what i said before about how much damage religion can do. it's completely shredded your moral sensibilities.

firstly, you seem to define a "moral absolute" as a moral idea that was decided by something non-human. well, suppose the ideas in your bible really did come from a god, though they look like they came from men - primitive, barbaric men at that. doesn't mean that god has any fucking clue about how to run a civilised society. see the rape rule - this god has NO FUCKING CLUE. his moral ideas are TERRIBLE. get that word, shippo - TERRIBLE. if your god's moral ideas are "absolute", they're absolutely awful.

secondly, if there really was no such thing as a moral absolute, it would in no way follow that there was "nothing to say" on right and wrong. maybe your preacher has been telling you otherwise, but he wasn't telling you for your own good, just like whoever told you the absurd ideas about evolution didn't want you to be educated on the subject.

thirdly, your argument destroys itself. if you think humans can't decide right and wrong, then you can't decide who can decide right and wrong for you either. see? you have such a low opinion of humanity that we have "nothing to say" on morality; then how do you know this god of yours is good?

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by **GEORGE ZIMMER** on Fri, 22 Apr 2011 08:21:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Man's moral compass is bad!

I'm going to trust a book written by man that claim it wasn't written by man!

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by **shippo** on Fri, 22 Apr 2011 11:30:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

So in your opinion, you say that moral, values and absolutes come from one's opinion of how one would wish to be treated?

ex. someone steals my car from me. I don't like it. so I don't think stealing is a good thing.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by **Herr Surth** on Fri, 22 Apr 2011 11:31:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

why are you still arguing with shipp? Its obvious that he is mentally deficient...

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by **Spoony** on Fri, 22 Apr 2011 12:17:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

shippo wrote on Fri, 22 April 2011 04:30So in your opinion, you say that moral, values and absolutes come from one's opinion of how one would wish to be treated?

ex. someone steals my car from me. I don't like it. so I don't think stealing is a good thing. it's a good start, and it's miles and miles and miles better than the crap you read in the bible.

and no, surth, i don't think he's mentally deficient, i think he's been indoctrinated.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Fri, 22 Apr 2011 14:55:19 GMT

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

Well he certainly wasnt very bright to begin with...

hey shippo:

Is the pious loved by god because it is pious, or is it pious because it is loved by god?

RANDOM QUOTES

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Altzan](#) on Fri, 22 Apr 2011 16:49:09 GMT

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

Herr Surth wrote on Fri, 22 April 2011 07:55RANDOM QUOTES

"When you have come to the edge Of all light that you know And are about to drop off into the darkness Of the unknown, Faith is knowing One of two things will happen: There will be something solid to stand on or You will be taught to fly"

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Fri, 22 Apr 2011 17:22:17 GMT

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

yeah

thats bullshit

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [HaTe](#) on Fri, 22 Apr 2011 19:49:48 GMT

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

Altzan wrote on Fri, 22 April 2011 09:49Herr Surth wrote on Fri, 22 April 2011 07:55RANDOM QUOTES

"When you have come to the edge Of all light that you know And are about to drop off into the darkness Of the unknown, Faith is knowing One of two things will happen: There will be something solid to stand on or You will be taught to fly"
It must be true if you have faith! I'd rather not kid myself, personally.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Altzan](#) on Fri, 22 Apr 2011 22:31:00 GMT

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

Herr Surth wrote on Fri, 22 April 2011 10:22yeah
thats bullshit

Inplying yours wasn't

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Sat, 23 Apr 2011 10:16:31 GMT

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

you go and inply whatever you want, lol.

Do yourself a favor and educate yourself at least a little bit on the topic of morality.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Divine_command_theory

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Moral_realism

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anti-realism>

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Morality_without_religion

Wikipedia has all the answers! Well, its a nifty introduction anyway.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Tue, 26 Apr 2011 22:59:42 GMT

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

There isn't much left to argue; whether it is right or not isn't debatable because God says it is, and will punish anyone breaking it.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [renalpha](#) on Wed, 27 Apr 2011 07:12:04 GMT

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

In my opinion there is no god...

People need a leader just like animals do, and we are nothing different then dogs, cows and or fish.

We always will follow a leader, for example the government.

God is just a made up figure of some very intelligent people in order to practise out, how to let people work for you.

Its really not that to figure out to be really honest.

If there was a god, then there would be a whole more less difference between different people. Take Africa for example...

What would be the meaning of life for monkeys or chickens for example. Or white-sharks?
Are we better then these creatures which god desides to make?
That would be strange because god would love every individual on earth, but why would he love the people instead of taking care of his trees, animals instead of the humans since we seem to know it better then he does.

Note:

We are trying to be a God, we are doing natures work. Donating sperm, freeze our eggcells and cloning sheep.

God just has been made up by very very clever people trying to let people do. What they want to do. It just got out of the hand.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [iRANian](#) on Wed, 08 Jun 2011 20:57:52 GMT

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

you are a very deep person renalpha

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [MUDKIPS](#) on Thu, 09 Jun 2011 14:23:15 GMT

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

religion basically means you are afraid to take responsibility of your own life, it's a runaway world for people who can't face living their own life.

It used to be a great tool to help form and unify society, to give itself a purpose and goal. Now it is obselete, and anyone who follows religion is simply a weak link in the chain that is human civilization.

End of story.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Altzan](#) on Thu, 09 Jun 2011 20:31:08 GMT

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

MUDKIPS wrote on Thu, 09 June 2011 07:23It used to be a great tool to help form and unify society, to give itself a purpose and goal. Now it is obselete, and anyone who follows religion is simply a weak link in the chain that is human civilization.

Just curious: why do you consider it obsolete, now? Are you saying the world now has a purpose and goal, as opposed to the past?

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by **MUDKIPS** on Fri, 10 Jun 2011 00:21:33 GMT

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

Altzan wrote on Thu, 09 June 2011 13:31MUDKIPS wrote on Thu, 09 June 2011 07:23It used to be a great tool to help form and unify society, to give itself a purpose and goal. Now it is obselete, and anyone who follows religion is simply a weak link in the chain that is human civilization.

Just curious: why do you consider it obsolete, now? Are you saying the world now has a purpose and goal, as opposed to the past?

As an archaeologist I can tell you that the way the world is now, religion can only be detrimental.

Look at it like this. In the past people had no idea how things worked, how life worked, how nature worked, they just lived their lives, and did their best. When a certain human consciousness evolved (which can be distinguished in the archaeological record to some extend) people obviously started wondering about their existance, how things worked, what they should do with their lives.

So for lack of an explaination, they began to band together and form religions, a coalescent for society basically, which allowed people to live their lives together in a framework that was understandable for them, and motivating.

As time passes, and we see prehistory and history unfold, people discover more and more about life. Gravity, electricity, magnetism, psychology, you name it.

Right know, a far greater percentage of what our daily life encompasses is known, than in the past. Say, maybe in the 15th century, the average person knew 20% of what was actually happening in his life, like, he knew how leverage worked, or he knew about the hardness of certain metals and stones, whatever basically.

Nowadays, people roughly know 75% of what is happening in their life, there is a very high degree of predictability and certainty to life around us. The common argument against leading an atheist life is that "science hasn't explained everything yet". It has explained the MAJORITY.

Religion is only detrimental because it shields you from the reality of daily life, of what is really going on and how strongly you can influence your life, which is not in the hands of some bearded ghost floating above our heads. Religion tends to absolve people of their responsibilities.

A society in which people are driven by their responsibilities, to themselves, to other people (rather than fairy tales) the more they will accomplish, since they are knowledgeable to what is around them, why, and how to manipulate (not in a negative sense, in a general sense) it best to achieve their goals.

If you place your own self-actualization (both in the sense of individual accomplishment as well as what a society can achieve) in the centre of your life, you will achieve far more. Individually, and cooperatively.

If you take the responsibility for your own life and other people's lives out of everybody's hands, you're only putting a brake on humanity. Simply, because you cannot face the reality of life, the fact that it begins, and it ends, and in that timespan good and bad things happen, and YOU have to make the best of it while you can.

Praying to a non-existing god, placing responsibility with him is a waste of time, it achieves nothing and is in effect more detrimental than beneficial.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Sat, 11 Jun 2011 18:51:56 GMT

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

people want to know everything
they can't so this works for them
some people wouldn't function without religion
it does many positive things for the human race

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [wubwub](#) on Sat, 11 Jun 2011 23:29:50 GMT

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

If you believe in religion, than you must believe an autocracy to be the best form of government.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Ryan3k](#) on Sun, 26 Jun 2011 00:01:15 GMT

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

religious folks say god created the universe. the natural question that follows is, 'who created god?' their inevitable answer is that, because god is god, he is exempt from needing an inception point. i dismiss that simply as an excuse not to think.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Sun, 26 Jun 2011 20:46:53 GMT

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

from another forum:

frankieMost of you here will already know that I have no personal issues with Atheists, and their beliefs (yes, Atheism is a belief just like any other religion (yeah, it is. It's BELIEVING that there is no deity without any proof. Just like religion is believing there is one without proof.)), but that NOT what the thread is about. It's about petty complaints.

A group of atheists in New York City have their panties in a wad over a street sign dedicated to firefighters who died in 9/11. The sign, which reads "Seven in Heaven Way," was dedicated in Brooklyn outside the firehouse where the firefighters once served. The atheists are upset because they say the word "Heaven" is a violation of the separation of church and state.

Really?

Hey ... NY atheists! Can you pull your heads out of your asses long enough to realize and then

perhaps acknowledge that the phrase "separation of church and state" does not exist in our founding documents?

Just tell me where in the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution does it mention "the separation of church and state"? Answer: nowhere.

The First Amendment states: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion." It does NOT say, "There should be no signage or displays of religious nature in the public domain."

That is something made up by Ken Bronstein, president of New York City Atheists and those who make completely stupid arguments on this subject.

Ken Bronstein also says that the sign is really "insulting to us."

Cry me a freaking river, Ken. Get the atheist chip off your shoulder and find someone who gives a damn about you being insulted by the word "Heaven."

in response: Lone YankeeMy experience is that true atheists are actually somewhat rare and typically make a policy of minding their own business.

Most of the folks like these losers are actually anti-religious in general or anti-christian / Jewish /etc in particular.

In either case there is nothing wrong with them that can not be fixed with a fine piece of hickory.

-LY

The second part reminds me a lot of the "so called" atheists on this forum. In fact I've only met one atheist who doesn't seem to have a massive vendetta against Christianity, unlike Spoony, Ryan3k, or Starbuzz. In their perfect world religion would be outlawed on the pain of death. Oh excuse me, Christianity would be outlawed. Seriously guys, the way you act towards us is completely hypocritical contrary to how you say you are in rl. I don't get near as much hate towards the libs on the forum that this is from as I do towards any conservatives here. If you get what I mean.

Have to work, I'll finish this later.

guzzimikeAs an atheist myself, I can tell you guys that these fukktards protesting in New York are shameless, self serving, attention-whore assholes.

I look at it this way:

If they are so self righteous about their notion of separating "Church and State", then I would assume that they absolutely refuse to touch or utilize Dollar Bills, as the bills have "in God We trust" printed on them..

Since we can safely assume that these fukkwits have NO PROBLEM spending and receiving

Dollar paper money during purchases, I see their "New-Found" indignation at the street sign as pure ASSHOLINESS of the Highest Magnitude on their part.

This is the guy I was talking about and I'm quite sure he would look at you the same way.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Tue, 28 Jun 2011 04:03:08 GMT

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

I've had some discussions with atheists since my last spat here on these forums. They were quite nice about the affair, sharing their opinions with a respectful regard for the opinions of those on the other side of the issue.

I definitely prefer those types of discussions.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [HaTe](#) on Tue, 28 Jun 2011 04:38:25 GMT

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

Quote:In fact I've only met one atheist who doesn't seem to have a massive vendetta against Christianity, unlike Spoony, Ryan3k, or Starbuzz.

I have nothing against Christians and I'm atheist..

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Tue, 28 Jun 2011 05:13:36 GMT

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

And you notice that I didn't say your name unless you are one of them and created a separate account... Which I'm quite certain you didn't, so you have nothing to worry about. You aren't anything like those three from what I've seen which means I have no reason to name you as being a Christian hater like them.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Tue, 28 Jun 2011 13:24:58 GMT

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

Muad Dib15 wrote on Sun, 26 June 2011 13:46yeah, it is. It's BELIEVING that there is no deity without any proof. Just like religion is believing there is one without proof.) not the same thing at all. i would rephrase it from "believing there is no deity" to "not believing there is a deity". but there are quibbles about what the word "atheism" means, as well as the view that we don't even need the word for it at all, etc

Quote: The second part reminds me a lot of the "so called" atheists on this forum. In fact I've only met one atheist who doesn't seem to have a massive vendetta against Christianity, unlike Spoony, Ryan3k, or Starbuzz. In their perfect world religion would be outlawed on the pain of death. Oh excuse me, Christianity would be outlawed. dude... you're a fucking liar.

how many times do i need to defend the right of freedom of thought? how many times do you have to try to lie by saying i'm against it? we've been here before, when you accused me of "believing in thought police"; you were caught lying then too.

for you to say i would want to see someone killed for being the wrong religion is a fucking disgrace, and you owe me an apology for saying it, you liar.

perhaps you've also noticed any of my repeated criticisms of hell, where supposedly people are tortured forever for being the wrong religion? you must have noticed me ripping this idea apart for the evil bullshit it is, and you might also have noticed the religious "moderates" on this forum occasionally defending it? is this consistent with the lie you tried to spin up there? me saying "people shouldn't be punished for not being the right religion" and religious folks on this forum disagreeing with me? oh wait, you've gotta pretend you haven't seen that, your ridiculous accusation doesn't work when you take all that into account, does it?

as for what this guzzimike said:

Quote: As an atheist myself, I can tell you guys that these fukktards protesting in New York are shameless, self serving, attention-whore assholes.

I look at it this way:

If they are so self righteous about their notion of separating "Church and State", then I would assume that they absolutely refuse to touch or utilize Dollar Bills, as the bills have "in God We trust" printed on them..

Since we can safely assume that these fukkwits have NO PROBLEM spending and receiving Dollar paper money during purchases, I see their "New-Found" indignation at the street sign as pure ASSHOLINESS of the Highest Magnitude on their part.

hasn't he noticed that many atheist/secularist groups have long been advocating removing the "in god we trust" bullshit from the US money? it should never have been put on there in the first place, just like the "under god" should never have been put into the pledge of allegiance.

it's really cheap to say "hah, if these atheists were serious they wouldn't touch money again!"... what an idiot.

Quote: This is the guy I was talking about and I'm quite sure he would look at you the same way. that's ok, he doesn't know what he's talking about any more than you do, though i suspect his stupidity is more to do with ignorance, whereas yours was sheer dishonesty.

Quote: And you notice that I didn't say your name unless you are one of them and created a

separate account... Which I'm quite certain you didn't, so you have nothing to worry about. You aren't anything like those three from what I've seen which means I have no reason to name you as being a Christian hater like them.

again, this is the kind of trick you see religious people try to pull.

i'm gonna type two sentences below:

- person X views Islam with contempt
- person X views Muslims with contempt

they look very similar on paper, but they're incredibly different. i shouldn't have to explain the difference, i really hope you are bright enough to understand why one is fine and the other is not fine at all. unfortunately, if you do understand the difference, it just makes you a liar again.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Tue, 28 Jun 2011 13:40:11 GMT

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

HaTe wrote on Mon, 27 June 2011 21:38Quote:In fact I've only met one atheist who doesn't seem to have a massive vendetta against Christianity, unlike Spoony, Ryan3k, or Starbuzz. I have nothing against Christians and I'm atheist..

The only real reason you didn't make it on Muad's hitlist was because you never posted anything that had the unintended consequence of stumping these folks. These walls of pink text before us is a outcry against the well-thought out arguments they received when their dogma's fallacies were systematically and objectively deconstructed and given back to them in a thousand pieces thru the religious debates here. I guess doing a mediocre job of defending your position means those they debated had a murderous vendetta. Such shortsightedness...

You do that HaTe and you will end up as a "Christian hater" atheist who has a "massive vendetta against Christianity" where you want to have "religion...outlawed on the pain of death" especially "Christianity..." that "would be outlawed."

What a shameless abhorrent immoral accusation Muad made: that Ryan3K, Spoony, and Starbuzz want to kill Christians and wipe out their religion.

Thinking critically, asking scrutinizing questions, and to come to the defense of people like homosexuals (who like women and blacks before them) have been unfairly treated with their same set of narrow tyranny enforced on them makes us all "shameless, self serving, attention-whore assholes."

We know these theists very well and we can't do anything but staunchly defend their rights so they too will have their rights; afterall basic human rights is a concept they don't seem to understand.

edit:

Spoony wrote on Tue, 28 June 2011 06:24Quote:The second part reminds me a lot of the "so called" atheists on this forum. In fact I've only met one atheist who doesn't seem to have a

massive vendetta against Christianity, unlike Spoony, Ryan3k, or Starbuzz. In their perfect world religion would be outlawed on the pain of death. Oh excuse me, Christianity would be outlawed. dude... you're a fucking liar.

how many times do i need to defend the right of freedom of thought? how many times do you have to try to lie by saying i'm against it? we've been here before, when you accused me of "believing in thought police"; you were caught lying then too.

for you to say i would want to see someone killed for being the wrong religion is a fucking disgrace, and you owe me an apology for saying it, you liar.

perhaps you've also noticed any of my repeated criticisms of hell, where supposedly people are tortured forever for being the wrong religion? you must have noticed me ripping this idea apart for the evil bullshit it is, and you might also have noticed the religious "moderates" on this forum occasionally defending it? is this consistent with the lie you tried to spin up there? me saying "people shouldn't be punished for not being the right religion" and religious folks on this forum disagreeing with me? oh wait, you've gotta pretend you haven't seen that, your ridiculous accusation doesn't work when you take all that into account, does it?

That's what I thought too.

I thought it was odd that Muad was comparing what you have been saying about human rights and freedom of thought along with generally debating on religion with the "petty complaints" of what is taking place in NY. Either he is a liar or he hasn't been reading what you had been writing.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by: [iRANian](#) on Tue, 28 Jun 2011 14:41:33 GMT

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

atheists are scum

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by: [MUDKIPS](#) on Tue, 28 Jun 2011 16:03:14 GMT

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

File Attachments

1) [1309270539743.jpg](#), downloaded 1072 times



Iran 1970



Iran 2009

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [grant89uk](#) on Tue, 28 Jun 2011 16:14:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

iRANian wrote on Tue, 28 June 2011 15:41atheists are the smartest bastards ever

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Tue, 28 Jun 2011 17:54:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Just incase Muad may not be able to connect the dots on this one or won't bother to read it carefully enough to understand it, I will expand on what Spoony wrote; read carefully what is within the brackets, Muad...simplified and customized in pink:

1) a person views Islam (the religion, the doctrine, the instructions) with contempt

2) a person views Muslims (religious people, fellow human beings) with contempt

#1 is vastly justified if it produces educated criticism of an idea while #2 is a universal no-no. If you are not fine with #1, then you are against freedom of speech.

It was dead wrong of Muad to address both groups above as one and collectively brand them "Christian haters."

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Tue, 28 Jun 2011 18:33:40 GMT

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

Muad Dib15 wrote on Sun, 26 June 2011 13:46I don't get near as much hate towards the libs on the forum that this is from as I do towards any conservatives here. If you get what I mean.

I don't get what this means at all...

My sentiment continues throughout the rest of your post, too.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [iRANian](#) on Tue, 28 Jun 2011 20:24:59 GMT

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

just look at the atheists in this thread, you can't deny their jackasses and scum cant you

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Wed, 29 Jun 2011 23:43:15 GMT

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

iRANian wrote on Tue, 28 June 2011 13:24just look at the atheists in this thread, you can't deny their jackasses and scum cant you

The way I see it is, they stand up for what they believe in (no offense to those who say it isn't a belief, even though I have no idea why calling it a belief is a bad idea) and don't hide their contempt for religion. That expression of their thoughts on religion can easily be seen as jackassery, especially since the term is mostly opinionated.

Spoony and Starbuzz are simply very vocal about the issue. And Spoony has indeed mentioned

the defense of free idea and thought.

While being respectful to another concerning their beliefs is nice and commendable, it's by no means necessary.

Just my two cents.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [HaTe](#) on Thu, 30 Jun 2011 02:09:07 GMT

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

Quote:While being respectful to another concerning their beliefs is nice and commendable, it's by no means necessary.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Thu, 30 Jun 2011 04:26:22 GMT

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

^Yes, that happened. Unfortunately.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Thu, 30 Jun 2011 11:12:04 GMT

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

i have a feeling we won't see a reply to me and starbuzz's rebuttals from muaddib, instead he'll come back in six months and spout the same bullshit lies again about how the big bad atheists want to kill him

seriously, what a lying little twat

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Taz](#) on Fri, 08 Jul 2011 18:48:52 GMT

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

There are only 2 reasons we live.

To live and fornicate.

We may have evolved into thinking beings, but we are still animals. 99% of our behavior is centered around surviving and finding a mating partner.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [iRANian](#) on Fri, 08 Jul 2011 18:59:40 GMT

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

Taz wrote on Fri, 08 July 2011 11:48There are only 2 reasons we live.

To live and fornicate.

We may have evolved into thinking beings, but we are still animals. 99% of our behavior is centered around surviving and finding a mating partner.

And trolling rebarn

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [renalpha](#) on Mon, 11 Jul 2011 01:47:12 GMT

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

I only can prove that there is no god. Well its called common sence though.

Animals dont worship a god. Dont pray every day and just do their thing. Cats dont do it, dogs and not even bugs take their time to pray.

People cant do things by theirself. Human are even programmed to work together. Thats why some people worship leaders. We cant get things done, if we roll all by ourselfs. Better of all. Humans are plain retarded. A lot of people don't think properly and just run around thinking they are important. Now a good i seriously have no idea amounth of years. There were or was a smart person, thinking. How can i control a lot of people instead of just my wife and kids.

He wrote the bible. Managed to get some retarded people convincing them, that this was the way of life. Well what happens. Retarded people. (think about the germans in the 1940's) agreed with this bible writer and followed the rules. Now after all those years. Finally people start thinking and there are a lot lesser wackjobs then we had running on earth a few thousands years ago.

Why would anyone actually wouldn't do something because of its fate? Why do muslims and the jews and i have no idea what other religion refuse, to paralyse their food before killing it. But hurt it instead (politics subject in holland). Animals do it for example. Snakes.... Snakes paralyze their victims in order to eat them and survive. Thanks to religion, stupith idiots refuse to do that. Because they believe its improper. Really... it just pisses me off. I cant stand people who refuse things just because of their religion. Its stupith, dumb and just a way to control the most stupith lifeform in this universe. Humans. Humans are plain retarded. Animals manage to treath theirselfs fine in the foodchain. For some stupith reason we managed to get above them... All of them.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Taz](#) on Mon, 07 Nov 2011 17:40:56 GMT

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

Fart.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Sineponev](#) on Mon, 30 Jan 2012 02:44:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

By far, the most interesting thread I have read here. Well, basically throughout my whole internet career! Really enjoyed reading through all this.

Please keep this discussion going, so interesting!

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Mon, 30 Jan 2012 06:44:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It's been a while since I made some flame bait.

Theists, for the most part, are peacefully misguided people following a simple ideology/concept that has been around since ancient times. Granted, some are less peaceful than others, most tend to stay to themselves.

Atheists, for the most part, are pretty much the same as stated above. Except for the peaceful part and the staying to themselves part. They tend to be the type of person who will cram their beliefs down your throat if you even hint and the idea of a God or deity. Atheists also tend to have a "moocher" layer of people who are merely calling themselves Atheists because they are too lazy and too ignorant to follow a religious belief. IE "God can't exist because I don't feel like reading the Bible."

Neither is proven true (or false) and both are merely religious beliefs. And yes, for your moochers, BOTH are religious beliefs. Atheism is a rejection of a God, not a rejection of religion since the rejection of a God is a religion in and of itself.

That's why the only true belief, for anyone who holds logic above all that they believe, is Agnosticism. The position of understanding that there is no definitive proof for or against the existence of a supreme, mighty deity.

TL;DR version:
Stop debating things that can't be proven.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Mon, 30 Jan 2012 09:34:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 30 January 2012 00:44 Stop debating things that can't be proven.

ah; then how do you explain the bible kind sir?

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Mon, 30 Jan 2012 16:42:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

you're a fool, r4z0r.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Mon, 30 Jan 2012 20:38:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

liquidv2 wrote on Mon, 30 January 2012 04:34R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 30 January 2012 00:44Stop debating things that can't be proven.

ah; then how do you explain the bible kind sir?

It's a book. Someone wrote it. It's existence doesn't prove that there is a God. For all anyone knows all of the stories in it could have been simply made up.

Spoony wrote on Mon, 30 January 2012 11:42you're a fool, r4z0r.

Elaborate, please.

Anyone who claims to be a true supporter of science should know there are no such things as absolute truths. And they should also know that science is not an opponent of religion or the belief in a God or deity.

Saying, as fact, that there is no God is the foolish thing. It's just as foolish as saying, as fact, that there is a God.

You don't make assumptions and then try finding things to support your assumption. Doing that narrows your mind and makes you tend to ignore the things that would disprove your assumption. The absence of proof for one side of an argument is not proof for the other side. There is a big difference between making stuff up and forming a hypothesis.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Mon, 30 Jan 2012 21:34:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 30 January 2012 13:38Anyone who claims to be a true supporter of science should know there are no such things as absolute truths. And they should also know that science is not an opponent of religion or the belief in a God or deity.
unless the religion makes claims about the way stuff is, as they so frequently do.

Quote:Saying, as fact, that there is no God is the foolish thing. It's just as foolish as saying, as fact, that there is a God.

may i ask why you used a capital G in 'god'? is it because you're referring to a specific god?

Quote: The absence of proof for one side of an argument is not proof for the other side. depends what you think "the other side" is. despite the ludicrous earlier post, an atheist needn't assert the non-existence of this or that god; an atheist can simply reject religion, and/or say they do not find any of these religions convincing. the complete absence of evidence for this or that religion does support this atheist position.

Quote: Theists, for the most part, are peacefully misguided people following a simple ideology/concept that has been around since ancient times. Granted, some are less peaceful than others, most tend to stay to themselves.

it often depends whether they have power or not.

Quote: Atheists, for the most part, are pretty much the same as stated above. Except for the peaceful part and the staying to themselves part. They tend to be the type of person who will cram their beliefs down your throat if you even hint at the idea of a God or deity. when you say "cram their beliefs down my throat", is it possible what you actually mean is "engage in civilised conversation"? cos that's what people who say that usually turn out to mean

Quote: Atheists also tend to have a "moocher" layer of people who are merely calling themselves Atheists because they are too lazy and too ignorant to follow a religious belief. IE "God can't exist because I don't feel like reading the Bible."

where did you see anyone say that? is it possible you just made it up?

Quote: Neither is proven true (or false) and both are merely religious beliefs. And yes, for your moochers, BOTH are religious beliefs. Atheism is a rejection of a God, not a rejection of religion since the rejection of a God is a religion in and of itself.

That's why the only true belief, for anyone who holds logic above all that they believe, is Agnosticism.

there are at least three words here you seem to have pretty weird definitions for.

Quote: That's why the only true belief, for anyone who holds logic above all that they believe, is Agnosticism. The position of understanding that there is no definitive proof for or against the existence of a supreme, mighty deity.

The position of understanding that there is no definitive proof for or against the existence of a supreme, mighty deity.

k, swap the christian god for Zeus. no proof for him, and you can't strictly prove his non-existence either (and that's even after we more or less know how and why thunder and lightning happens). one group of people says zeus is real and spends time praying to him in the expectation that he can hear them, the other group goes about their business as if zeus were fictional.

if you think both of these positions are equally supported by the lack of evidence for zeus, you're a fool.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to atheists

Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Mon, 30 Jan 2012 21:43:45 GMT

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

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 30 January 2012 14:38It's a book. Someone wrote it. It's existence doesn't prove that there is a God. For all anyone knows all of the stories in it could have been simply made up.

God wrote it through his disciples
you will burn in hell for denying the truth placed before your eyes

[Toggle Spoiler](#)

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [argathol3](#) on Mon, 30 Jan 2012 23:25:17 GMT

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

Prove it

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Tue, 31 Jan 2012 06:52:33 GMT

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

Spoony wrote on Mon, 30 January 2012 16:34unless the religion makes claims about the way stuff is, as they so frequently do.

I don't understand. What do their claims have anything to do with the way you or I or anyone else perceives things? They can believe what they want to believe and I can do the same. Just because we may not agree doesn't mean I have to get all pissy and argue with their beliefs.

Spoony wrote on Mon, 30 January 2012 16:34

may i ask why you used a capital G in 'god'? is it because you're referring to a specific god?
No, not specifically. That's just how I've always seen the word written, so I just assumed it was correct. To be honest, I'm actually not very good at grammar...

Spoony wrote on Mon, 30 January 2012 16:34

depends what you think "the other side" is. despite the ludicrous earlier post, an atheist needn't assert the non-existence of this or that god; an atheist can simply reject religion, and/or say they do not find any of these religions convincing. the complete absence of evidence for this or that religion does support this atheist position.

I'm not sure if you're under the wrong impression of what atheism is or what religion is. Atheism is the rejection of theism (hence the prefix "a"). The broadest definition of theism is merely the belief that at least one 'god' exists. Therefore, the rejection to that would be the idea that not even one 'god' exists. Both are under the even broader term of religion.

But to get back to what you were saying, failing to prove the claims of one religion is not evidence

to support the belief in atheism. Thinking so is a fallacy and is just as bad any other religion out there claiming to be right. What reason do you have to hold your beliefs over the beliefs of others? Just because they can't prove their religious beliefs are true doesn't mean you don't have to in return.

If someone on a murder trial cannot produce evidence to prove that they aren't guilty, that doesn't mean that they are guilty. Until one side can display evidence then the point remains neutral.

You can continuously swat down the theories of god(s) that people propose for years on end. But doing so will not progress the final verdict of the debate anywhere. The only thing that doing that proves is the fact that nobody actually knows anything.

Spoony wrote on Mon, 30 January 2012 16:34

it often depends whether they have power or not.

I can see why you would say that. And I would actually agree with you. But I also want to point out my original post wasn't speaking in absolutes; it was more of an observational opinion of mine I was sharing. (Also my attempt to troll the thread back to life)

I can see why having someone in power who harbors firm beliefs for something can be a threat against the ideals of those who disagree. But the thing is, however, if we go this route then we wouldn't be talking about the belief in whether or not a supreme being exists anymore. We would be talking about politics and how said person in power is running their country (or town, or group or whatever it is they have power over).

Spoony wrote on Mon, 30 January 2012 16:34

when you say "cram their beliefs down my throat", is it possible what you actually mean is "engage in civilised conversation"? cos that's what people who say that usually turn out to meanNo, I did not. A civilized conversation is what I'd assume to be what we are having now. But an instance of cramming one's ideals into someone else would be getting defensive whenever someone mentions something that is disagreeable.

Spoony wrote on Mon, 30 January 2012 16:34

where did you see anyone say that? is it possible you just made it up? Applying the concept of a moocher here is something I made up. But the idea is most certainly not something I made up.

Most people who I see that claim to be atheists are usually students. I once new someone who was so outspoken about their belief in atheism that they didn't even know that Jesus was a real person. He thought that the existence of Jesus was part of the religious belief itself and therefore argued that he never existed.

I find it very rare to find someone my age who is actually informed enough to make an actual decision about the their beliefs. There are people like that, but they are in the minority.

But that is why I said a layer of people who claim to be atheists are moochers. To put it another way, it's very similar to the "TL;DR" concept that you find online. If something is too long, people will just decide to ignore it completely. These people I'm talking about just don't have an interest to learn about other religions and simply turn to atheism by default since they think it is the easiest. If asked to explain why they are atheists, they probably wouldn't be able to provide a convincing

position as to why they believe what they believe.

However, don't take that as me saying that all atheists are like that. No, that's why I specifically said a layer of people. Also, I realize that the observations I made are purely from my little slice of the population and obviously is in no way a representation of people as a whole.

Spoony wrote on Mon, 30 January 2012 16:34Quote:Neither is proven true (or false) and both are merely religious beliefs. And yes, for your moochers, BOTH are religious beliefs. Atheism is a rejection of a God, not a rejection of religion since the rejection of a God is a religion in and of itself.

That's why the only true belief, for anyone who holds logic above all that they believe, is Agnosticism.

there are at least three words here you seem to have pretty weird definitions for.

Which ones would that be? I'll venture a guess and say atheism, logic and agnosticism?

Spoony wrote on Mon, 30 January 2012 16:34

k, swap the christian god for Zeus. no proof for him, and you can't strictly prove his non-existence either (and that's even after we more or less know how and why thunder and lightning happens). one group of people says zeus is real and spends time praying to him in the expectation that he can hear them, the other group goes about their business as if zeus were fictional.

if you think both of these positions are equally supported by the lack of evidence for zeus, you're a fool.

You've lost me. I don't understand your example or why it is any different from any other system of beliefs. Also, I've already said that the lack of evidence is NOT evidence in itself. Meaning if neither belief can prove they are right then neither belief is can be supported.

Saying both sides are supported through the lack of proof to disprove either of them is a fallacy. Without evidence, neither are right nor wrong.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to atheists

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Tue, 31 Jan 2012 13:50:49 GMT

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

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 30 January 2012 23:52I don't understand. What do their claims have anything to do with the way you or I or anyone else perceives things? They can believe what they want to believe and I can do the same. Just because we may not agree doesn't mean I have to get all pissy and argue with their beliefs.

I know you don't understand. But now you're moving the goalposts; earlier you were saying science isn't opposed to religion - this is only the case if religions don't make scientific claims, which they do all the time. now you're saying you personally don't care whether they're right or not, which is a huge difference.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Mon, 30 January 2012 16:34

may i ask why you used a capital G in 'god'? is it because you're referring to a specific god?

No, not specifically. That's just how I've always seen the word written, so I just assumed it was

correct. To be honest, I'm actually not very good at grammar... well, whether the question refers to a specific god (when people say 'God', they invariably have a specific one in mind) or just any god makes it a completely different question, so it's worth drawing a distinction.

Quote: I'm not sure if you're under the wrong impression of what atheism is or what religion is. Atheism is the rejection of theism (hence the prefix "a"). The broadest definition of theism is merely the belief that at least one 'god' exists. Therefore, the rejection to that would be the idea that not even one 'god' exists. Both are under the even broader term of religion. trust me, you're the one who doesn't know what those two words mean. an atheist need not assert the non-existence of any particular god. yes, it is theism that is rejected, and theism is a positive belief in a specific god (or several gods) and specific claims about the nature of that god. someone who is not convinced that these things are true - that's enough to be considered an atheist. one might even reject theism on moral grounds rather than (or as well as) on the basis that they consider it fiction.

as for "religion", no. not thinking there's a god doesn't qualify as a religion.

Quote: But to get back to what you were saying, failing to prove the claims of one religion is not evidence to support the belief in atheism. Thinking so is a fallacy and is just as bad any other religion out there claiming to be right. again, you're just being foolish. the complete lack of evidence for religion X is a good reason to go about your business as if religion X were fiction. it may not conclusively demonstrate that the gods and prophets and commandments held dear by the adherents of religion X are fictional, but it doesn't need to go that far.

Quote: What reason do you have to hold your beliefs over the beliefs of others? Just because they can't prove their religious beliefs are true doesn't mean you don't have to in return. and yet again you're being foolish.

the first sentence, is that even a serious question? i hope not. as for the second, you're just plain wrong. "hi, these guys over here worship a god and make very specific claims about that god and how he wants us to behave. these guys over here don't find this convincing and go about their lives as if it were fictional. both of you have the same amount of proving to do" listen to how stupid this is when it's played back to you, r4z0r

Quote: If someone on a murder trial cannot produce evidence to prove that they aren't guilty, that doesn't mean that they are guilty. Until one side can display evidence then the point remains neutral.

actually, i'm glad you brought up this analogy, because it shows why you're wrong. the neutral position is "not guilty". if there's no evidence that the guy did it, and no evidence that the guy didn't do it, the verdict will be "not guilty".

Quote: You can continuously swat down the theories of god(s) that people propose for years on end.

Sure can.

Quote: But doing so will not progress the final verdict of the debate anywhere. The only thing that

doing that proves is the fact that nobody actually knows anything. foolish again. but hey, the conclusion that at least one side of the argument (that side being composed of thousands of mutually contradictory factions) plainly doesn't have a good reason to think their claims are true is enough of a conclusion.

Spoony wrote on Mon, 30 January 2012 16:34I can see why you would say that. And I would actually agree with you. But I also want to point out my original post wasn't speaking in absolutes; it was more of an observational opinion of mine I was sharing. doesn't change the fact you were being stupid

Quote:I can see why having someone in power who harbors firm beliefs for something can be a threat against the ideals of those who disagree. But the thing is, however, if we go this route then we wouldn't be talking about the belief in whether or not a supreme being exists anymore. We would be talking about politics and how said person in power is running their country (or town, or group or whatever it is they have power over).

uh? we can talk about politics too. but whether there's a god who really does behave like the god of the bible - that's an important question. it's an enormous relief to me to think there isn't one. finding out there really was such a thing would be the worst news i could possibly imagine, worse than the outbreak of nuclear war. no, this is an important question.

Spoony wrote on Mon, 30 January 2012 16:34

when you say "cram their beliefs down my throat", is it possible what you actually mean is "engage in civilised conversation"? cos that's what people who say that usually turn out to meanNo, I did not. A civilized conversation is what I'd assume to be what we are having now. But an instance of cramming one's ideals into someone else would be getting defensive whenever someone mentions something that is disagreeable. [/quote]

well then, there you go. "cram their beliefs down my throat" is one of those phrases where, once you examine it a little, usually doesn't mean a damn thing. it's like "whoring" in renegade. you might as well not have said it.

Spoony wrote on Mon, 30 January 2012 16:34Most people who I see that claim to be atheists are usually students. I once new someone who was so outspoken about their belief in atheism that they didn't even know that Jesus was a real person. He thought that the existence of Jesus was part of the religious belief itself and therefore argued that he never existed. so?

two things. firstly the evidence for the historical Jesus is not conclusive. secondly asserting that a man called Jesus lived in this time and place doesn't vindicate a single word of the bible or christianity.

Quote:I find it very rare to find someone my age who is actually informed enough to make an actual decision about the their beliefs. There are people like that, but they are in the minority. i'll restrain the urge to just say "that's because you're American", it's too cheap. i'll simply say you're not that well-informed yourself.

Quote:But that is why I said a layer of people who claim to be atheists are moochers. To put it another way, it's very similar to the "TL;DR" concept that you find online. If something is too long, people will just decide to ignore it completely. These people I'm talking about just don't have an

interest to learn about other religions and simply turn to atheism by default since they think it is the easiest. If asked to explain why they are atheists, they probably wouldn't be able to provide a convincing position as to why they believe what they believe.

why do they have to? why does the person who just wants to go about their life without any of this religious bullshit have any explaining to do?

of course, many religions say that not only will there be questions for this person... there will be suffering for this person.

Spoony wrote on Mon, 30 January 2012 16:34Which ones would that be? I'll venture a guess and say atheism, logic and agnosticism?
atheism, agnosticism and religion.

Spoony wrote on Mon, 30 January 2012 16:34You've lost me. I don't understand your example or why it is any different from any other system of beliefs. Also, I've already said that the lack of evidence is NOT evidence in itself. Meaning if neither belief can prove they are right then neither belief is can be supported.

you've gone back to talking like a damn fool again, i'm afraid.

read the analogy to zeus again. one side behaves as if this god were real and if specific claims about this god and the things he does and the way he wants us to behave are known. the other side behaves as if this were fiction. if there's no evidence for the existence of zeus, this positively supports the way the second group of people are behaving. if however it cannot be conclusively proven that zeus is not real (and it can't), that does not support the way the first group of people are behaving. and you're just an idiot for acting as though the two positions are equivalent and have the same amount of proving to do.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Tue, 31 Jan 2012 17:02:29 GMT

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

Spoony wrote on Tue, 31 January 2012 06:50

So what's your point, to my knowledge all theories on how we came into being have some missing evidence in some way or another. Is it safe to conclude that it's best not to believe anything at all as all of it could be proven wrong eventually thus making us look stupid for learning about it in the first place?

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Tue, 31 Jan 2012 17:36:56 GMT

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

Jerad Gray wrote on Tue, 31 January 2012 10:02Spoony wrote on Tue, 31 January 2012 06:50
So what's your point, to my knowledge all theories on how we came into being have some missing evidence in some way or another.

and some don't have a damn thing to support them at all, and don't deserve to share the same

conversation as the others.

Quote: Is it safe to conclude that it's best not to believe anything at all as all of it could be proven wrong eventually thus making us look stupid for learning about it in the first place?
no, it's best to care about whether the things you believe are true or not, and to welcome your beliefs being challenged where you can be vindicated on the bits you're right about, and be corrected and thereby learn more from the bits you thought you were right about.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Tue, 31 Jan 2012 18:07:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Spoony wrote on Tue, 31 January 2012 10:36
no, it's best to care about whether the things you believe are true or not.
Then science would never be able to take a single step forward, something can't be true or false until its known; otherwise your just as easily walking on false ideas as you are on true.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Tue, 31 Jan 2012 18:27:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

i'm sure you think you're making a good point there

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Tue, 31 Jan 2012 18:31:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Spoony wrote on Tue, 31 January 2012 11:27 i'm sure you think you're making a good point there
I try not to think I am making a good point to anyone on-line; it is hard enough making a point to people you know in real life.

However if you disagree or agree with my statement I am all for hearing why.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Tue, 31 Jan 2012 18:41:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

your post basically said don't try to figure stuff out because we don't already know it all for certain

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Tue, 31 Jan 2012 18:52:21 GMT

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

Spoony wrote on Tue, 31 January 2012 11:41your post basically said don't try to figure stuff out because we don't already know it all for certain

First one yes, second one I was trying to say that it is not always best to believe what is true, sometimes you make good discoveries by going against the grain; other times it is just a waste of that person's time. Whatever makes them happy is worth it in their eyes.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Tue, 31 Jan 2012 19:05:00 GMT

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

Jerad Gray wrote on Tue, 31 January 2012 11:52Spoony wrote on Tue, 31 January 2012 11:41your post basically said don't try to figure stuff out because we don't already know it all for certain

I was trying to say that it is not always best to believe what is true, sometimes you make good discoveries by going against the grain;
yes, which is why it's worth checking what you think you know

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Tue, 31 Jan 2012 19:35:35 GMT

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

Spoony wrote on Tue, 31 January 2012 12:05Jerad Gray wrote on Tue, 31 January 2012 11:52Spoony wrote on Tue, 31 January 2012 11:41your post basically said don't try to figure stuff out because we don't already know it all for certain

I was trying to say that it is not always best to believe what is true, sometimes you make good discoveries by going against the grain;
yes, which is why it's worth checking what you think you know

You've never stumped across things in your own life where people told you that they were true and instead of just going with it you did the opposite and learned something from it? That's cool I guess.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Tue, 31 Jan 2012 19:43:36 GMT

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

you've well and truly stopped making sense tbh

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Tue, 31 Jan 2012 19:45:41 GMT

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

Spoony wrote on Tue, 31 January 2012 12:43you've well and truly stopped making sense tbh
Sorry, I'm unable to think of a way to simplify what I'm trying to convey, so just forget it.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Rocko](#) on Wed, 01 Feb 2012 17:07:59 GMT

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

r4zor and jerad's posts in the last two pages of this topic made me vomit all over my computer screen.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Wed, 01 Feb 2012 18:03:03 GMT

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

Rocko wrote on Wed, 01 February 2012 10:07r4zor and jerad's posts in the last two pages of this topic made me vomit all over my computer screen.

Sorry to hear you have such poor control over your digestive system.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [appshot](#) on Wed, 01 Feb 2012 18:59:48 GMT

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

lol atheism

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Wed, 01 Feb 2012 22:51:15 GMT

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

it seems the more open-minded a person is the less likely they're going to be a religious bigot

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Thu, 02 Feb 2012 20:52:30 GMT

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

liquidv2 wrote on Wed, 01 February 2012 15:51it seems the more open-minded a person is the less likely they're going to be a religious bigotEither that or the majority of the religious people on the forum don't want to post because they known it'll just cause RENDRAMA.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Thu, 02 Feb 2012 21:32:11 GMT

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

i'm talking about the human race in general
i suppose it applies to these forums as well
i have an easier time believing science than magic and whatnot
one day science will win

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Thu, 02 Feb 2012 22:36:52 GMT

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

liquidv2 wrote on Thu, 02 February 2012 14:32 i'm talking about the human race in general
i suppose it applies to these forums as well
i have an easier time believing science than magic and whatnot
one day science will win

Does mutual nuclear destruction of the human race count as a scientific win?

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Fri, 03 Feb 2012 02:22:50 GMT

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

maybe God will save us

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Fri, 03 Feb 2012 14:08:00 GMT

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

Depends which one it was up to I'd assume?

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Fri, 03 Feb 2012 15:14:10 GMT

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

stick with Scientology, it's new and edgy
what makes you think religion would be enough to save the human race?

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Sat, 04 Feb 2012 17:28:00 GMT

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

liquidv2 wrote on Fri, 03 February 2012 08:14
stick with Scientology, it's new and edgy
what makes you think religion would be enough to save the human race?
Didn't say I thought any would be enough, I just think some religions god's would be more likely to
laugh at our misfortune than help us with it.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Sat, 04 Feb 2012 20:52:54 GMT

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

it's pretty much inevitable
we're crude, primitive beasts
you can blame them for making us this way; self-destruction is an unavoidable outcome
malevolent, malicious jerk gods

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Sat, 04 Feb 2012 22:13:45 GMT

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

but but it was the fallen angels fault for corrupting humans! the gods were just thick and slow.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Sat, 04 Feb 2012 22:24:32 GMT

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

why do people beef on scientology so much when most religions involve supernatural and
unexplainable or magical events and themes
just because it's a bit more "out there" doesn't make it any less valid; anything is possible

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [appshot](#) on Sun, 05 Feb 2012 01:56:51 GMT

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

spoony, you are a fool, not r31521039810z0r

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Sun, 05 Feb 2012 04:04:22 GMT

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

liquidv2 wrote on Sat, 04 February 2012 15:24
why do people beef on scientology so much when

most religions involve supernatural and unexplainable or magical events and themes just because it's a bit more "out there" doesn't make it any less valid; anything is possible it couldn't be much more obvious what a money-making crackpot cult scientology is, and was intended to be in the beginning. but as batshit crazy as it is, i don't know of anything in scientology as downright evil as the christian and islamic concepts of hell.

i don't even know of anything about kim jong-il or robert mugabe as bad as that, in fact. i suppose hitler's treatment of the jews is morally similar, although the fact that it actually happened (whereas hell is fiction, ljbh) makes it seem more horrific.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [eatcow](#) on Mon, 27 Feb 2012 10:29:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Howdy reborn. The first two paragraphs is mostly a summary of one argument for God coming from Fundamentals of the Faith by Peter Kreeft. One of the prominent Catholic theologians of our era. The paragraph on Jesus comes from another book, one that does not apply to the discussion at hand except for the information posted here. It does not apply since it is discussing a specific issue within Catholic-Protestant theology not relevant.

Either the universe was created by chance or from a deity. The odds of chance for the universe can be compared to a million monkeys on typewriters and one of them by chance in a million years will have typed out Hamlet, only the odds for chance is even more staggering. The odds that life evolved as we see it today, is smaller then the inverse of the USA government's debt. So many things could have gone wrong, but here we are. The logical explanation placed by Christians and religions is a deity/deities created.

One argument put forth for a deity is called the argument of design. Looking at how the universe was designed, that mankind evolved to the way it did. 1 trillionth of a degree difference, and the carbon molecule could have never formed. The intricacies of evolution is so vast. Theory that it happened without a deity and that a survival of the fittest principle does not explain the altruistic love, abstract thinking, and our conscience. Our brain is perhaps the most complicated thing ever created. If the brain is the product of random chance, then this violates the principal of causality, (you cannot get more in the effect than the cause). If there is intelligence in us, man, the effect, then there must be intelligence in the cause. The universe built off random chance has no intelligence thus there must be a cause for human intelligence that transcends the universe, an intelligence behind our physical universe.

There is 6 other arguments discussed in his book. Excellent read if you ever get the chance.

The first two paragraphs establish there exists a deity of some sort, atleast one deity.

The next thing to ponder is if there exists such a being(s), then God(s) must have made an appearance in history.

An argument for Jesus. Secular, Jewish, and Christian sources attest to such a man living with revolutionary teaching. This man Jesus cannot be simply a good teacher. He claimed he was the

Son of God. Either this is true or false. If true, then he is more then a good teacher. If false, he is far worse for he got nearly 2 billion people to believe a package of lies. The Bible claims this man Jesus was crucified and died. Everyone from that time period agree (Christians, Jews, Romans, etc), history reveals such. Death by crucifixion is guaranteed, the Romans would break the legs of the people to ensure asphyxiation. The question is whether he rose from the dead. This is the key, for if he truly did, then he is the Son of God and we should believe in what he taught. Jesus was buried in a cave with a massive stone weighing thousands of pounds barring the entrance. Roman soldiers guarded the entrance. Since Jesus died as an enemy of the state (crucifixion was the penalty for such people), the Roman soldiers guarded the tomb because if something happened, their lives were at stake so they were vigilant at their duty. History does not show they abandoned their posts yet the body of Jesus was missing. The 11 apostles (the main followers of Jesus, Judas had hung himself so 11 at this time) were not soldiers. They were scared shitless because history reveals they were hiding during this time from the time of the crucifixion to 3 days later (when Jesus was discovered missing from the tomb). It would be highly skeptical to presume these 11 men overpowered professional soldiers. It is also skeptical that they stole the body from the tomb while the guards were sleeping. Not a likely proposition remembering how massive the stone weighed, the psychological state of the 11, and the fact the Roman soldiers would have hunted them down and killed them. Historically, there are more than a dozen secular sources noting Jesus' rising from the dead coming from the time period, not to mention the Jewish sources and hundreds of Christian sources. End result is the historical conclusion that Jesus lived, was crucified, died, was buried, but rose from the dead therefore the logical conclusion is Jesus is the Son of God.

No other religion can show their deity existing in history.

The Jewish God is the same Christian God. Christianity of these times may seem like a pool of confusion. After all, there is over 33,000 different denominations in Christianity due to backbiting, doctrine issues, interpretation, etc. Truth itself cannot be divided. Each denomination has various amounts of truth, but only one can be 100% true. This does not mean to give up for the Christian God is a God of love and He always waiting for the lost to come home.

Let me know if you have questions
~eatcow0

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to atheists
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Mon, 27 Feb 2012 12:08:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

eatcow wrote on Mon, 27 February 2012 03:29 Either the universe was created by chance or from a deity. The odds of chance for the universe can be compared to a million monkeys on typewriters and one of them by chance in a million years will have typed out Hamlet, only the odds for chance is even more staggering. The odds that life evolved as we see it today, is smaller then the inverse of the USA government's debt. So many things could have gone wrong, but here we are. The logical explanation placed by Christians and religions is a deity/deities created. ...which only aggravates the question rather than answers it. now, instead of having to explain the origins of a few blobs of hydrogen or whatever, you've got to explain the origins of a super-intelligent, incomprehensibly powerful being.

Quote:One argument put forth for a deity is called the argument of design. Looking at how the universe was designed, that mankind evolved to the way it did. 1 trillionth of a degree difference, and the carbon molecule could have never formed.

i will admit that the "fine tuned universe" is the only semi-thought-provoking argument i've ever heard from the religious. it doesn't prove a word of their own assertions, of course, it simply shows that the origin of the universe is more complicated than we're capable of understanding right now... and certainly more complicated than the fools who wrote the bible and quran could ever dream of.

Quote:The intricacies of evolution is so vast. Theory that it happened without a deity and that a survival of the fittest principle does not explain the altruistic love, abstract thinking, and our conscience.

that's easy... we (most of us, anyway) have figured out that we do better if we work together. we aren't the only species intelligent enough to notice this.

Quote:Our brain is perhaps the most complicated thing ever created. If the brain is the product of random chance, then this violates the principle of causality, (you cannot get more in the effect than the cause). If there is intelligence in us, man, the effect, then there must be intelligence in the cause. The universe built off random chance has no intelligence thus there must be a cause for human intelligence that transcends the universe, an intelligence behind our physical universe. uh, random chance? you used the phrase "survival of the fittest" earlier, so i presume you have heard of the theory of evolution.

Quote:The first two paragraphs establish there exists a deity of some sort, atleast one deity. they try to...

Quote:The next thing to ponder is if there exists such a being(s), then God(s) must have made an appearance in history.

that doesn't follow. even if i accept that yes the universe was created by a god (which i don't), then it doesn't follow that this god has revealed itself to us. it might have gone away, it might have died or something, it might simply not give a shit about us or not have noticed us turning up billions of years after it started the universe up...

Quote:An argument for Jesus. Secular, Jewish, and Christian sources attest to such a man living with revolutionary teaching. This man Jesus cannot be simply a good teacher. He claimed he was the Son of God. Either this is true or false. If true, then he is more then a good teacher. If false, he is far worse for he got nearly 2 billion people to believe a package of lies.

false dichotomy. there are more than two options here. if he claimed to be the son of god, then he may have been lying, he may have been crazy, he may have been joking, he may have been honestly mistaken, he may have been correct (definitely the least plausible option so far), or he may not even have made the claim at all.

and even if he did say so, it's not necessarily his fault that 2 billion people believe it now.

i also take issue with the claim that he was a good teacher.

Quote:The Bible claims this man Jesus was crucified and died. Everyone from that time period

agree (Christians, Jews, Romans, etc), history reveals such. Death by crucifixion is guaranteed, the Romans would break the legs of the people to ensure asphyxiation. The question is whether he rose from the dead. This is the key, for if he truly did, then he is the Son of God and we should believe in what he taught.

whoah, what? you were doing fine until the last sentence. some guy did something you don't understand and therefore you know he was the "son of god"? you know what he was because you don't understand how he did X?

secondly, why does surviving death make someone a good and wise person?

Quote:Jesus was buried in a cave with a massive stone weighing thousands of pounds barring the entrance. Roman soldiers guarded the entrance. Since Jesus died as an enemy of the state (crucifixion was the penalty for such people), the Roman soldiers guarded the tomb because if something happened, their lives were at stake so they were vigilant at their duty. History does not show they abandoned their posts yet the body of Jesus was missing. The 11 apostles (the main followers of Jesus, Judas had hung himself so 11 at this time) were not soldiers. They were scared shitless because history reveals they were hiding during this time from the time of the crucifixion to 3 days later (when Jesus was discovered missing from the tomb). It would be highly skeptical to presume these 11 men overpowered professional soldiers. It is also skeptical that they stole the body from the tomb while the guards were sleeping. Not a likely proposition remembering how massive the stone weighed, the psychological state of the 11, and the fact the Roman soldiers would have hunted them down and killed them.

Historically, there are more than a dozen secular sources noting Jesus' rising from the dead coming from the time period, not to mention the Jewish sources and hundreds of Christian sources. End result is the historical conclusion that Jesus lived, was crucified, died, was buried, but rose from the dead

where are you getting these supposed historical facts from?

Quote:The Jewish God is the same Christian God. Christianity of these times may seem like a pool of confusion. After all, there is over 33,000 different denominations in Christianity due to backbiting, doctrine issues, interpretation, etc.

and the garbled and contradictory nature of the bible (which is only to be expected)

Quote:Truth itself cannot be divided. Each denomination has various amounts of truth, but only one can be 100% true. This does not mean to give up for the Christian God is a God of love and He always waiting for the lost to come home.

Let me know if you have questions

OK, then. Question: What happens if we don't "come home"?

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to atheists

Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Mon, 27 Feb 2012 15:49:16 GMT

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

Spoony wrote on Mon, 27 February 2012 05:08Quote:Our brain is perhaps the most complicated thing ever created. If the brain is the product of random chance, then this violates the principle of causality, (you cannot get more in the effect than the cause). If there is intelligence in us, man, the

effect, then there must be intelligence in the cause. The universe built off random chance has no intelligence thus there must be a cause for human intelligence that transcends the universe, an intelligence behind our physical universe.

uh, random chance? you used the phrase "survival of the fittest" earlier, so i presume you have heard of the theory of evolution.

I disagree with "survival of the fittest" its survival of anything that lives long enough to reproduce. And I'd have to say that anything is the "fittest" it'd be single cell organisms, as they've reproduced trillions of times more than us multi-cell organisms and yet they have remained at that base single cell level.

Spoony wrote on Mon, 27 February 2012 05:08

Quote: The next thing to ponder is if there exists such a being(s), then God(s) must have made an appearance in history.

that doesn't follow. even if i accept that yes the universe was created by a god (which i don't), then it doesn't follow that this god has revealed itself to us. it might have gone away, it might have died or something, it might simply not give a shit about us or not have noticed us turning up billions of years after it started the universe up...

He's sitting their with his mouse pointer over that "major flood" cheat menu right now.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Mon, 27 Feb 2012 16:51:54 GMT

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

Jerad Gray wrote on Mon, 27 February 2012 08:49I disagree with "survival of the fittest" its survival of anything that lives long enough to reproduce. And I'd have to say that anything is the "fittest" it'd be single cell organisms, as they've reproduced trillions of times more than us multi-cell organisms and yet they have remained at that base single cell level.

I think Darwin never actually used the phrase "survival of the fittest", and it's a bit of a tautology anyway.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Mon, 27 Feb 2012 17:07:35 GMT

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

Spoony wrote on Mon, 27 February 2012 09:51Jerad Gray wrote on Mon, 27 February 2012 08:49I disagree with "survival of the fittest" its survival of anything that lives long enough to reproduce. And I'd have to say that anything is the "fittest" it'd be single cell organisms, as they've reproduced trillions of times more than us multi-cell organisms and yet they have remained at that base single cell level.

I think Darwin never actually used the phrase "survival of the fittest", and it's a bit of a tautology anyway.

So.... its random chance then? Or something else?

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Mon, 27 Feb 2012 17:12:36 GMT

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

i was simply saying that the phrase "survival of the fittest" doesn't seem to have come from the mouth or pen of Charles Darwin.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [eatcow](#) on Mon, 27 Feb 2012 20:56:54 GMT

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

Spoony wrote on Mon, 27 February 2012 05:08eatcow wrote on Mon, 27 February 2012 03:29Either the universe was created by chance or from a deity. The odds of chance for the universe can be compared to a million monkeys on typewriters and one of them by chance in a million years will have typed out Hamlet, only the odds for chance is even more staggering. The odds that life evolved as we see it today, is smaller then the inverse of the USA government's debt. So many things could have gone wrong, but here we are. The logical explanation placed by Christians and religions is a deity/deities created.

...which only aggravates the question rather than answers it. now, instead of having to explain the origins of a few blobs of hydrogen or whatever, you've got to explain the origins of a super-intelligent, incomprehensibly powerful being.

If a deity created the universe, then the deity created time. The creator is greater then the creation by principle of causality so the deity is outside of time. This gets us the deity must be infinite.

Quote:One argument put forth for a deity is called the argument of design. Looking at how the universe was designed, that mankind evolved to the way it did. 1 trillionth of a degree difference, and the carbon molecule could have never formed.

i will admit that the "fine tuned universe" is the only semi-thought-provoking argument i've ever heard from the religious. it doesn't prove a word of their own assertions, of course, it simply shows that the origin of the universe is more complicated than we're capable of understanding right now... and certainly more complicated than the fools who wrote the bible and quran could ever dream of.

Quote:The intricacies of evolution is so vast. Theory that it happened without a deity and that a survival of the fittest principle does not explain the altruistic love, abstract thinking, and our conscience.

that's easy... we (most of us, anyway) have figured out that we do better if we work together. we aren't the only species intelligent enough to notice this.

natural selection fails here as well since it does not explain conscience, or abstract thinking. Neither of which are necessary in terms of surviving yet exist.

Quote:Our brain is perhaps the most complicated thing ever created. If the brain is the product of random chance, then this violates the principal of causality, (you cannot get more in the effect than the cause). If there is intelligence in us, man, the effect, then there must be intelligence in the cause. The universe built off random chance has no intelligence thus there must be a cause for

human intelligence that transcends the universe, an intelligence behind our physical universe. uh, random chance? you used the phrase "survival of the fittest" earlier, so i presume you have heard of the theory of evolution.

yes I have heard the theory. But your comments here does not address the argument made here.

Quote:The first two paragraphs establish there exists a deity of some sort, atleast one deity. they try to...

Quote:The next thing to ponder is if there exists such a being(s), then God(s) must have made an appearance in history.

that doesn't follow. even if i accept that yes the universe was created by a god (which i don't), then it doesn't follow that this god has revealed itself to us. it might have gone away, it might have died or something, it might simply not give a shit about us or not have noticed us turning up billions of years after it started the universe up...

Since the deity is above time and is infinite, the deity cannot die. Does a gardener abandon his garden? Does a mother abandon her child?

Quote:An argument for Jesus. Secular, Jewish, and Christian sources attest to such a man living with revolutionary teaching. This man Jesus cannot be simply a good teacher. He claimed he was the Son of God. Either this is true or false. If true, then he is more then a good teacher. If false, he is far worse for he got nearly 2 billion people to believe a package of lies.

false dichotomy. there are more than two options here. if he claimed to be the son of god, then he may have been lying, he may have been crazy, he may have been joking, he may have been honestly mistaken, he may have been correct (definitely the least plausible option so far), or he may not even have made the claim at all.

and even if he did say so, it's not necessarily his fault that 2 billion people believe it now.

He did claim to be the Son of God, the Bible reveals such along with Roman and Jewish authorities from that era. If he was crazy or joking this proves my point on how he cannot simply be a good teacher (either case, he several times claimed to be divine and the Son of God) for no good teacher would teach something drastically false.

Quote:The Bible claims this man Jesus was crucified and died. Everyone from that time period agree (Christians, Jews, Romans, etc), history reveals such. Death by crucifixion is guaranteed, the Romans would break the legs of the people to ensure asphyxiation. The question is whether he rose from the dead. This is the key, for if he truly did, then he is the Son of God and we should believe in what he taught.

whoah, what? you were doing fine until the last sentence. some guy did something you don't understand and therefore you know he was the "son of god"? you know what he was because you don't understand how he did X?

secondly, why does surviving death make someone a good and wise person?

You misread, there is a if in the sentence. I am not claiming at this point of my argument that he is and so your argument here falls apart. For the second part, you and I have already ruled out Jesus cannot be a good person, leaving the options of his divinity or him being an imposter. If he was an imposter then he would have stayed dead. What person do you know who can come back from the dead and not be divine?

Quote:Jesus was buried in a cave with a massive stone weighing thousands of pounds barring the entrance. Roman soldiers guarded the entrance. Since Jesus died as an enemy of the state (crucifixion was the penalty for such people), the Roman soldiers guarded the tomb because if something happened, their lives were at stake so they were vigilant at their duty. History does not show they abandoned their posts yet the body of Jesus was missing. The 11 apostles (the main followers of Jesus, Judas had hung himself so 11 at this time) were not soldiers. They were scared shitless because history reveals they were hiding during this time from the time of the crucifixion to 3 days later (when Jesus was discovered missing from the tomb). It would be highly skeptical to presume these 11 men overpowered professional soldiers. It is also skeptical that they stole the body from the tomb while the guards were sleeping. Not a likely proposition remembering how massive the stone weighed, the psychological state of the 11, and the fact the Roman soldiers would have hunted them down and killed them.

Historically, there are more than a dozen secular sources noting Jesus' rising from the dead coming from the time period, not to mention the Jewish sources and hundreds of Christian sources. End result is the historical conclusion that Jesus lived, was crucified, died, was buried, but rose from the dead

where are you getting these supposed historical facts from?

Here is a list of some

Jewish sources:

Flavius Josephus
Mara bar Sarapion
The Talmud

Secular:

Suetonius
Tacitus
Pliny the Younger
Lucian
Celsus
Galen

Christian:

Mark, Matthew, Luke, John (4 writers of the Gospel)
Paul
Ignatius of Antioch
Justin the Martyr
Irenaeus
Tertullian
Clement of Alexandria

Clement of Rome
Cyprian
Dionysius of Corinth

Quote: The Jewish God is the same Christian God. Christianity of these times may seem like a pool of confusion. After all, there is over 33,000 different denominations in Christianity due to backbiting, doctrine issues, interpretation, etc.
and the garbled and contradictory nature of the bible (which is only to be expected)

Actually this has more to do with Catholic-Protestant theology versus the Bible. If you make a religion based off the complete works of Edgar Allan Poe and your main tenant of faith is that everyone is to take his poetry and decided what they believed, you will end up with the same result as you see within Christianity today. Protestant theology claims exactly this with the Bible. It is called sola scriptura. Christianity can be broken down like this. There is Catholicism and Protestantism. Every other Christian denomination stems from Protestantism except Eastern Orthodoxy which came from Catholicism. Protestants also broke away from the Catholic Church. For 1000 years there was only one Christian Church, Catholicism. Eastern Orthodoxy rejected the authority of the Pope in 1054 (the only major theological difference between the two). Christianity was not as broken as you see it today until the reformation, when the idea of sola scriptura was born.

Quote: Truth itself cannot be divided. Each denomination has various amounts of truth, but only one can be 100% true. This does not mean to give up for the Christian God is a God of love and He always waiting for the lost to come home.

Let me know if you have questions
OK, then. Question: What happens if we don't "come home"?

It is not my place to judge. No Christian should judge you for anything. Whether or not you "come home" is entirely based on your free will.

I ran out of time, but I am going to post more later today

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to atheists
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Mon, 27 Feb 2012 23:20:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

eatcow wrote on Mon, 27 February 2012 13:56If a deity created the universe, then the deity created time. The creator is greater than the creation by principle of causality so the deity is outside of time. This gets us the deity must be infinite.
Sheer guesswork. You haven't even scratched the question of how this deity - a deity you've only inferred rather than demonstrated - came about. And, indeed, how could you?

Quote: natural selection fails here as well since it does not explain conscience, or abstract thinking. Neither of which are necessary in terms of surviving yet exist.

try thinking about it for a second.

looking after your family, for example, gives your DNA a better chance of passing on. so it makes sense to look after your kids, right? quite a lot of species do this.

lots of animals work together - hunt in packs, stick together to better survive against predators. with these two concepts, you have the very rudimentary concept of society.

Quote:Our brain is perhaps the most complicated thing ever created. If the brain is the product of random chance, then this violates the principle of causality, (you cannot get more in the effect than the cause). If there is intelligence in us, man, the effect, then there must be intelligence in the cause. The universe built off random chance has no intelligence thus there must be a cause for human intelligence that transcends the universe, an intelligence behind our physical universe. uh, random chance? you used the phrase "survival of the fittest" earlier, so i presume you have heard of the theory of evolution.

yes I have heard the theory. But your comments here does not address the argument made here. you said the brain can't be the product of "random chance". the theory of evolution does not say it was; it says it's the product of millions of years of evolution by natural selection.

Quote:Since the deity is above time and is infinite, the deity cannot die. Does a gardener abandon his garden? Does a mother abandon her child?

you're saying here's something your deity cannot do? is he not all-powerful, then?

does a gardener abandon his garden? some of them would. does a mother abandon her child? no, and that's the point; she hopes the child will outlast her.

Quote:He did claim to be the Son of God, the Bible reveals such along with Roman and Jewish authorities from that era.

be careful with that word "reveals".

a few scribblings from dubious authorship, written decades after jesus supposedly died and which get a lot of other stuff wrong, "reveal" anything? that's very generous of you.

Quote:If he was crazy or joking this proves my point on how he cannot simply be a good teacher (either case, he several times claimed to be divine and the Son of God) for no good teacher would teach something drastically false.

i don't even grant him the prerequisite of being a good teacher, let alone that he made such a vast claim.

Quote:You misread, there is a if in the sentence. I am not claiming at this point of my argument that he is and so your argument here falls apart.

no, it doesn't. putting an "if" in a stupid sentence doesn't make it any less stupid.

Quote:For the second part, you and I have already ruled out Jesus cannot be a good person, i didn't say he wasn't a good person, i said he wasn't a good teacher. because i think his moral teachings aren't very good. i didn't comment on whether he was an inherently good person; had you asked me that, i might have mentioned the bit where he threatens to murder children because of the crimes of their mother.

Quote:leaving the options of his divinity or him being an imposter. If he was an imposter then he would have stayed dead. What person do you know who can come back from the dead and not be divine?

why are you asking me? i'm not the one who thinks anybody's come back from the dead (other than resuscitation etc). you still have this massive gap if your argument. my question was: so what if he did come back from the dead, why does that make his moral teachings any better?

Quote:Quote:where are you getting these supposed historical facts from?

Here is a list of some

Jewish sources:

Flavius Josephus

Mara bar Sarapion

The Talmud

Secular:

Suetonius

Tacitus

Pliny the Younger

Lucian

Celsus

Galen

Christian:

Mark, Matthew, Luke, John (4 writers of the Gospel)

Paul

Ignatius of Antioch

Justin the Martyr

Irenaeus

Tertullian

Clement of Alexandria

Clement of Rome

Cyprian

Dionysius of Corinth

you gave a very detailed account of one person's death and disposal. you're gonna have to do a bit better than just spit out a list of names here, i'm afraid.

Quote:Actually this has more to do with Catholic-Protestant theology versus the Bible. If you make a religion based off the complete works of Edgar Allan Poe and your main tenant of faith is that everyone is to take his poetry and decided what they believed, you will end up with the same result as you see within Christianity today. Protestant theology claims exactly this with the Bible. It is called sola scriptura. Christianity can be broken down like this. There is Catholicism and Protestantism. Every other Christian denomination stems from Protestantism except Eastern Orthodoxy which came from Catholicism. Protestants also broke away from the Catholic Church. For 1000 years there was only one Christian Church, Catholicism. Eastern Orthodoxy rejected the authority of the Pope in 1054 (the only major theological difference between the two). Christianity was not as broken as you see it today until the reformation, when the idea of sola scriptura was

born.

do you want to say that there is one particular denomination that's got it right?

Quote:Quote:OK, then. Question: What happens if we don't "come home"?

It is not my place to judge. No Christian should judge you for anything. Whether or not you "come home" is entirely based on your free will.

firstly, i didn't ask you to "judge", i asked you a simple question of what you think will happen.

secondly, whether i become a christian or not is not (or at least, not just) a question of free will.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to atheists

Posted by [eatcow](#) on Tue, 28 Feb 2012 03:21:42 GMT

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

Spoony wrote on Mon, 27 February 2012 16:20eatcow wrote on Mon, 27 February 2012 13:56If a deity created the universe, then the deity created time. The creator is greater than the creation by principle of causality so the deity is outside of time. This gets us the deity must be infinite.

Sheer guesswork. You haven't even scratched the question of how this deity - a deity you've only inferred rather than demonstrated - came about. And, indeed, how could you?

My point here is to show the existence, not to argue how such a being came into being. And this is precisely what my argument shows in its logical construction off of the principle of causality.

Quote:natural selection fails here as well since it does not explain conscience, or abstract thinking. Neither of which are necessary in terms of surviving yet exist.
try thinking about it for a second.

looking after your family, for example, gives your DNA a better chance of passing on. so it makes sense to look after your kids, right? quite a lot of species do this.

lots of animals work together - hunt in packs, stick together to better survive against predators.
with these two concepts, you have the very rudimentary concept of society.

But this fails to address conscience and abstract thinking. By abstract thinking, for example, who would spend time contemplating that the natural numbers, the integers, and the rationals all have the same size of infinity whereas the infinity of the irrationals is the same size of the reals which is a bigger infinity than the natural numbers, the integers, and the rationals. Newton's laws, Rawl's theory and hyperbolic geometry do not matter when it comes to survival. Why is man the only creature on earth with such talents and conscience? Natural selection fails this.

Quote:Quote:Our brain is perhaps the most complicated thing ever created. If the brain is the product of random chance, then this violates the principle of causality, (you cannot get more in the effect than the cause). If there is intelligence in us, man, the effect, then there must be intelligence in the cause. The universe built off random chance has no intelligence thus there must be a cause for human intelligence that transcends the universe, an intelligence behind our physical universe. uh, random chance? you used the phrase "survival of the fittest" earlier, so i presume you have heard of the theory of evolution.

yes I have heard the theory. But your comments here does not address the argument made here. you said the brain can't be the product of "random chance". the theory of evolution does not say it was; it says it's the product of millions of years of evolution by natural selection.

which is all left to chance without a creator and his design.

Quote:He did claim to be the Son of God, the Bible reveals such along with Roman and Jewish authorities from that era.

be careful with that word "reveals".

a few scribblings from dubious authorship, written decades after jesus supposedly died and which get a lot of other stuff wrong, "reveal" anything? that's very generous of you.

The earliest piece of literature from Plato we have was written 1300 years after he wrote it. For Herodotus, 1,400 years, and Euripedes 1,600 years. Yet no historian disputes the authenticity of these three writers. The earliest shred of Bible manuscript we have comes from the 2nd century, 100 years after the last book of the Bible was written as historians on all sides agree upon. We have over 5,300 bits and pieces, and whole compilations of the Bible in Aramaic, Greek, Latin, Hebrew, plus several more. Out of all these different manuscripts running around, the majority of the textual variants amongst all of them is a single letter or word. All these different pieces can be cross referenced with greater accuracy then these ancient authors yet people still doubt.

In the Bible, Jesus specifically states his claim as Son of God. The Jewish and Roman authorities did not necessary follow his teaching or anything, but do mention that Jesus did make this claim. That is as revealing as it gets.

Quote:You misread, there is a if in the sentence. I am not claiming at this point of my argument that he is and so your argument here falls apart.

no, it doesn't. putting an "if" in a stupid sentence doesn't make it any less stupid.

Here is what I said "This man Jesus cannot be simply a good teacher. He claimed he was the Son of God. Either this is true or false. If true, then he is more then a good teacher. If false, he is far worse for he got nearly 2 billion people to believe a package of lies."

My question for you is what makes this stupid when it is logically consistent? Is it because you disagree with either of the outcomes?

Quote:For the second part, you and I have already ruled out Jesus cannot be a good person, i didn't say he wasn't a good person, i said he wasn't a good teacher. because i think his moral teachings aren't very good. i didn't comment on whether he was an inherently good person; had you asked me that, i might have mentioned the bit where he threatens to murder children because of the crimes of their mother.

If a person was a bad teacher who had everyone believe lies and falsely worship him, then he is also a bad person, probably worse.

A off subject, but where at does Jesus talk about murdering children for the crimes of their mother? Psalm 127 describes children as a blessing.

Quote:leaving the options of his divinity or him being an imposter. If he was an imposter then he would have stayed dead. What person do you know who can come back from the dead and not be divine?

why are you asking me? i'm not the one who thinks anybody's come back from the dead (other than resuscitation etc). you still have this massive gap in your argument. my question was: so what if he did come back from the dead, why does that make his moral teachings any better?

Because it means Jesus is divine if he was able to raise from the dead and do the miracles he did.

Quote:Quote:where are you getting these supposed historical facts from?

Here is a list of some

Jewish sources:

Flavius Josephus
Mara bar Sarapion
The Talmud

Secular:

Suetonius
Tacitus
Pliny the Younger
Lucian
Celsus
Galen

Christian:

Mark, Matthew, Luke, John (4 writers of the Gospel)

Paul

Ignatius of Antioch
Justin the Martyr
Irenaeus
Tertullian
Clement of Alexandria
Clement of Rome
Cyprian
Dionysius of Corinth

you gave a very detailed account of one person's death and disposal. you're gonna have to do a bit better than just spit out a list of names here, i'm afraid.

What would you like me to say? Josephus lived in the 1st century and was a historian. Ignatius was a student of John. The 4 Gospels were written by Mark, Matthew, Luke, and John in the first century. Lucian was a Greek satirist who lived in the 2nd century. Each is a primary source and lived in the 1st-3rd century. They all talk about Jesus being crucified, died, or resurrected and

various combinations of the three.

Quote:Actually this has more to do with Catholic-Protestant theology versus the Bible. If you make a religion based off the complete works of Edgar Alan Poe and your main tenant of faith is that everyone is to take his poetry and decided what they believed, you will end up with the same result as you see within Christianity today. Protestant theology claims exactly this with the Bible. It is called sola scriptura. Christianity can be broken down like this. There is Catholicism and Protestantism. Every other Christian denomination stems from Protestantism except Eastern Orthodoxy which came from Catholicism. Protestants also broke away from the Catholic Church. For 1000 years there was only one Christian Church, Catholicism. Eastern Orthodoxy rejected the authority of the Pope in 1054 (the only major theological difference between the two). Christianity was not as broken as you see it today until the reformation, when the idea of sola scriptura was born.

do you want to say that there is one particular denomination that's got it right?

You targeted the Bible as being full of inconsistencies and this is to propose that perhaps instead of the Bible, it is some of the people who "teach" what the Bible says since man is a fallible creature by nature. I would argue one Christian group has gotten it right.

Quote:Quote:OK, then. Question: What happens if we don't "come home"?

It is not my place to judge. No Christian should judge you for anything. Whether or not you "come home" is entirely based on your free will.

firstly, i didn't ask you to "judge", i asked you a simple question of what you think will happen.

secondly, whether i become a christian or not is not (or at least, not just) a question of free will.

What I think will happen is irrelevant precisely because in order to determine what I think would happen would be equal to judging. What I mean by free will is that you have the choice, but its entirely yours. If I thought so and so is going to heaven for doing such and such or hell for such and such or etc, this is passing a judgment upon the individual.

Before I forget, I wanted to add this argument for the existence of God which originated with Thomas Aquinas. Again, this comes from Fundamentals of the Faith by Peter Kreeft. Paraphrasing.

It starts with the instinct of the mind that everything needs an explanation. Everything has a reason why it is. This is called the Principle of Sufficient Reason. This is something we never deny or we are left to conclude things just pop into existence for no reason at all(Pop Theory). Thus, we may never find the cause, but there must be a cause for everything that comes into existence.

The universe can be viewed as a massive interlocking chain of things that came into existence. My parents caused me, my grandparents caused them, my great-grandparents caused them... You and I would not be here without billions of causes, from the Big Bang to the expansion of the universe to the protein molecule going to our ancestors.

The question now is does the universe as a whole have a cause. A first cause, uncaused cause. If

not, then there is a infinite regress of causes with no first link in our cosmic chain. If so, then there is a eternal, independent being with nothing above it, before it, supporting it and it would have to explain for itself as well as for everything else. For if the being needed something else for its explanation then it is not a first cause and the uncaused cause. This being would have to be God.

If there is no first cause, the uncaused cause, then the whole universe is unexplained and the Principle of Sufficient Reasoning is violated. Everything can be explained in the short run, but not the long run. The universe would be a massive chain of many links, each held up by the link before it, but the chain as a whole is held up by nothing. This would be like a railroad train moving without an engine. each box car is pulled by the one in front but there is no engine which pulls the first car which is impossible. If this is what the universe is like without a first cause then it is also impossible.

The next analogy is this: Suppose there is a book that explains everything you want explained. You want the book and ask me if you can borrow it. I say no because my neighbor has it. The neighbor doesn't have and has to get it from his teacher. The teacher has to go get from someone else etc to infinity. End result, no one has this book. You will only get the book when someone has it to give to you to borrow. Existence is like the book. Existence is handed down a chain of causes. If there is no first cause, no eternal self sufficient being, then no being who has existence by their own nature can borrow it from someone else. Thus the gift of existence can never be passed down the chain to others and no one will get it. But we exist. Therefore there must be a first cause to existence, a God.

The book goes much further then I am going to, but here is the link if you are interested. I left off on page 31.

<http://books.google.com/books?id=isu3dqRiqg0C&printsec=frontcover&dq=Peter%20Kreeft%20fundamentals%20of%20the%20faith&hl=en&sa=X&ei=HkpLT5yvLuWpiALFnaH5Dw&ved=0CDYQ6AEwAA#v=onepage&q=Peter%20Kreeft%20fundamentals%20of%20the%20faith&f=false>

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Tue, 28 Feb 2012 03:48:22 GMT

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

eatcow wrote on Mon, 27 February 2012 20:21My point here is to show the existence, not to argue how such a being came into being. And this is precisely what my argument shows in its logical construction off of the principle of causality.

it isn't any better than just saying you don't know how the universe came into being, and it's less intellectually honest.

Quote:But this fails to address conscience and abstract thinking.

when you say "conscience" you mean intellectually or morally? if you meant morally, then yes it does address it.

Quote:By abstract thinking, for example, who would spend time contemplating that the natural

numbers, the integers, and the rationals all have the same size of infinity whereas the infinity of the irrationals is the same size of the reals which is a bigger infinity than the natural numbers, the integers, and the rationals. Newton's laws, Rawl's theory and hyperbolic geometry do not matter when it comes to survival. Why is man the only creature on earth with such talents and conscience? Natural selection fails this.

...you have noticed that humans are the most intelligent species we're aware of?

question, when do you think we became this intelligent?

Quote:you said the brain can't be the product of "random chance". the theory of evolution does not say it was; it says it's the product of millions of years of evolution by natural selection. which is all left to chance without a creator and his design.

natural selection is pretty much the opposite of chance, sorry bud

Quote:The earliest piece of literature from Plato we have was written 1300 years after he wrote it. For Herodotus, 1,400 years, and Euripides 1,600 years. Yet no historian disputes the authenticity of these three writers.

and nobody says these men were perfectly good, or right about everything they said...

Quote:The earliest shred of Bible manuscript we have comes from the 2nd century, 100 years after the last book of the Bible was written as historians on all sides agree upon. We have over 5,300 bits and pieces, and whole compilations of the Bible in Aramaic, Greek, Latin, Hebrew, plus several more. Out of all these different manuscripts running around, the majority of the textual variants amongst all of them is a single letter or word. All these different pieces can be cross referenced with greater accuracy than these ancient authors yet people still doubt.
Doesn't vindicate a single word of its content.

Quote:In the Bible, Jesus specifically states his claim as Son of God. The Jewish and Roman authorities did not necessarily follow his teaching or anything, but do mention that Jesus did make this claim. That is as revealing as it gets.

the book says he said so. that is all. the book says he said so.

Quote:Here is what I said "This man Jesus cannot be simply a good teacher. He claimed he was the Son of God. Either this is true or false. If true, then he is more than a good teacher. If false, he is far worse for he got nearly 2 billion people to believe a package of lies."

My question for you is what makes this stupid when it is logically consistent? Is it because you disagree with either of the outcomes?

i've already answered this, go back a few posts.

Quote:A off subject, but where at does Jesus talk about murdering children for the crimes of their mother? Psalm 127 describes children as a blessing.

It's in Revelation, he threatens to murder the children of Jezebel. She's a false prophet and an adulteress, apparently; he threatens to kill her children as punishment.

You can, if you like, say "children" actually means "followers", if you're in the business of claiming that the book means something other than what it says (i.e. theology), but it would still be the ravings of an awful man.

Quote: Because it means Jesus is divine if he was able to raise from the dead and do the miracles he did.
really? magic powers = moral superiority? that's basically might is right.

Quote: What would you like me to say?
i did ask you where you got that very specific account of one man's death and the disposal of his body.

Quote: Josephus lived in the 1st century and was a historian. Ignatius was a student of John. The 4 Gospels were written by Mark, Matthew, Luke, and John in the first century. Lucian was a Greek satirist who lived in the 2nd century. Each is a primary source and lived in the 1st-3rd century. They all talk about Jesus being crucified, died, or resurrected and various combinations of the three.

Still waiting.

Quote: do you want to say that there is one particular denomination that's got it right?

You targeted the Bible as being full of inconsistencies and this is to propose that perhaps instead of the Bible, it is some of the people who "teach" what the Bible says since man is a fallible creature by nature. I would argue one Christian group has gotten it right.

Well, which one?

Quote: What I think will happen is irrelevant precisely because in order to determine what I think would happen would be equal to judging. What I mean by free will is that you have the choice, but it's entirely yours. If I thought so and so is going to heaven for doing such and such or hell for such and such or etc, this is passing a judgment upon the individual.

it sounds like you think there's such a thing as hell. If yes, give details. i.e. what is it, what goes on there, who's going there.

re: free will, whether i think something is true or not is not a question of free will. nor is whether or not i think a particular character - real or fictional - is a good guy.

Quote: It starts with the instinct of the mind that everything needs an explanation. Everything has a reason why it is. This is called the Principle of Sufficient Reason. This is something we never deny or we are left to conclude things just pop into existence for no reason at all (Pop Theory). Thus, we may never find the cause, but there must be a cause for everything that comes into existence.

The universe can be viewed as a massive interlocking chain of things that came into existence. My parents caused me, my grandparents caused them, my great-grandparents caused them... You and I would not be here without billions of causes, from the Big Bang to the expansion of the universe to the protein molecule going to our ancestors.

The question now is does the universe as a whole have a cause. A first cause, uncaused cause. If not, then there is an infinite regress of causes with no first link in our cosmic chain. If so, then there is an eternal, independent being with nothing above it, before it, supporting it and it would have to explain for itself as well as for everything else. For if the being needed something else for its explanation then it is not a first cause and the uncaused cause. This being would have to be God.

If there is no first cause, the uncaused cause, then the whole universe is unexplained and the Principle of Sufficient Reasoning is violated. Everything can be explained in the short run, but not the long run. The universe would be a massive chain of many links, each held up by the link before it, but the chain as a whole is held up by nothing. This would be like a railroad train moving without an engine. each box car is pulled by the one in front but there is no engine which pulls the first car which is impossible. If this is what the universe is like without a first cause then it is also impossible.

The next analogy is this: Suppose there is a book that explains everything you want explained. You want the book and ask me if you can borrow it. I say no because my neighbor has it. The neighbor doesn't have and has to get it from his teacher. The teacher has to go get from someone else etc to infinity. End result, no one has this book. You will only get the book when someone has it to give to you to borrow. Existence is like the book. Existence is handed down a chain of causes. If there is no first cause, no eternal self sufficient being, then no being who has existence by their own nature can borrow it from someone else. Thus the gift of existence can never be passed down the chain to others and no one will get it. But we exist. Therefore there must be a first cause to existence, a God.

The book goes much further then I am going to, but here is the link if you are interested. I left off on page 31.
someone actually got this drivel published? a child can see through this.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Tue, 28 Feb 2012 03:53:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

In this thread: People who don't believe (or care) continue posting about things they don't believe in or care about. More at 11.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Tue, 28 Feb 2012 04:43:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Whether this stuff is true or not is a serious question. Especially if there's a hell. The stakes are quite high.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [eatcow](#) on Tue, 28 Feb 2012 07:11:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You missed the point. If there is a God, that explains the universe's existence. That is not being less intellectually honest. The origin of such a being is a different subject.

The conscience is not intelligence or a moral. It is that little voice inside your head that nags at you when you do something wrong or tells you to do something that is right. This is beyond the scope of altruistic behavior.

Don't know about enough about evolution to dig into intelligence.

The point in bringing up Plato is not to say they were perfectly good or to follow their teaching or anything. It was the accuracy of their writings. You presented the idea of the Bible not being an accurate historical text, and I was showing you a very condensed reasoning why it is. I am not trying to say "everyone follow what the Bible says", just establishing historical accuracy.

You ridicule the Bible yet fail to answer the Jewish and Roman sources outside of the Bible that also discuss Jesus' claim to being the Son of God...

You nevered answered it. You only said it was stupid that Jesus could be the Son of God but failed to answer with logic as to why.

The history comes from those sources I mentioned, the Bible (as a historical document), and then some logical induction from The Biblical Basis for Tradition by John Salza.

I would argue Catholicism (based upon Christian history) but this is a different subject.

Hell is the depravity of all love. Every Christian will agree to that.

Might is right is not at all what I am arguing. I am arguing that Jesus' miracles and him rising from the dead is a major clue to his divinity. If Jesus wished to teach might is right, he could have snapped his fingers and defeated all his enemies if he was divine. If he wasn't, he could have raised an army just as easy due to the political instability of that time in Israel. There was already skirmishes breaking out between the Essenes and the Romans.

Back to our subject of how the universe was created. I have presented two arguments the idea of a God creating the universe but you have neglected to show any logical fallacies in them and instead attack the teachings of Jesus and the Bible and sent out several logical fallacies, specifically red herrings.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Tue, 28 Feb 2012 13:58:55 GMT

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

eatcow wrote on Tue, 28 February 2012 00:11 You missed the point. If there is a God, that explains the universe's existence. That is not being less intellectually honest. The origin of such a being is a different subject.

and you don't have the faintest idea how to explain it. you think you've answered the question, you've only aggravated it.

Quote: The conscience is not intelligence or a moral. It is that little voice inside your head that nags at you when you do something wrong or tells you to do something that is right. This is

beyond the scope of altruistic behavior.

no, it's not a "little voice", unless you're schizophrenic or something. "a little voice" is just a poetic way of describing the emotions that restrain us from doing bad things.

Quote:Don't know about enough about evolution to dig into intelligence.

you certainly don't know enough about evolution, you said it was all "random chance".

Quote:The point in bringing up Plato is not to say they were perfectly good or to follow their teaching or anything. It was the accuracy of their writings. You presented the idea of the Bible not being an accurate historical text, and I was showing you a very condensed reasoning why it is. I am not trying to say "everyone follow what the Bible says", just establishing historical accuracy. historical accuracy?

people living to like 800 years old? the world being created in 6 days? a zombie apocalypse? a deliberate flood covering the entire planet?

historical accuracy?

Quote:You ridicule the Bible yet fail to answer the Jewish and Roman sources outside of the Bible that also discuss Jesus' claim to being the Son of God...

Because you haven't given one yet. I keep asking you to. I've asked you like four times and you haven't answered it yet. Where did you get the extremely specific account of Jesus' death and the disposal of his body? Don't just give a name, answer the question.

Quote:You nevered answered it. You only said it was stupid that Jesus could be the Son of God but failed to answer with logic as to why.

sigh... i think you need to read what the person you're talking to is saying. go back and have another crack at it

Quote:I would argue Catholicism (based upon Christian history) but this is a different subject.

Interesting. Do you think Vatican II was right or wrong? Specifically the dumping of the Catholic Church's official teaching that all Jews are guilty of murder.

It reversed centuries of its own dogma right there, in the 60's. What do you think about that? Was it right or wrong to teach - for centuries - that all Jews are murderers? Was it right or wrong to stop teaching that?

Quote:Hell is the depravity of all love. Every Christian will agree to that.

Funny, cos I keep hearing - from people who call themselves Christians - that hell is a place of fiery torture.

Quote:Might is right is not at all what I am arguing.

no, you're arguing that power = goodness, which is very similar. even the bible doesn't agree with you on that point. satan has some powers beyond what humans can do, you wouldn't say he was a good guy, would you? when aaron gets into a magic showdown with the egyptian priests, they can do miracles too... they're still on the bad side of things.

and jesus isn't the only guy to rise from the dead in the bible. lazarus, the daughter of jairus, the zombie apocalypse in one of the gospels (very hard to find another source that agrees that

happened); here, the power comes from someone else, doesn't it?

Quote: Back to our subject of how the universe was created. I have presented two arguments the idea of a God creating the universe but you have neglected to show any logical fallacies in them and instead attack the teachings of Jesus and the Bible and sent out several logical fallacies, specifically red herrings.

a little more honesty, eatcow, please.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Tue, 28 Feb 2012 16:48:49 GMT

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

eatcow wrote on Tue, 28 February 2012 00:11 The conscience is not intelligence or a moral. It is that little voice inside your head that nags at you when you do something wrong or tells you to do something that is right. This is beyond the scope of altruistic behavior.

this is such an uneducated opinion. from another thread:

cheesesoda wrote on Sat, 03 March 2007 15:57 Ghostshaw wrote on Sat, 03 March 2007 13:10 Common sense is not part of the uman nature, its something you get taught by your mum and dad. If you don't get it, its called indcotronation and thats exactly what these girls have had. Their minds are so stuck in their beliefs that nothing will convince them otherwise.

-Ghost-

OMFG... SOMEONE GETS IT. HALLELUJAH!

Thank you, thank you, thank you, etc... these forums actually have some hope left in them.

As for the whole "you have a conscience" argument... it has so many flaws, it's not even funny. Everybody has their own set values. One's moral code is learned, you're not automatically born with it.

As Ghostshaw said, it's indoctrination. You're pretty much brainwashed into thinking the way you do. Your conscience doesn't automatically know right from wrong. It's a learned behavior. Just like a dog doesn't know that it shouldn't do its business on the carpet immediately. It has to be trained. The same thing goes with your moral code.

Honestly, it's quite a simple concept. I fail to see your logic in disagreeing.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Tue, 28 Feb 2012 18:33:29 GMT

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

Spoony wrote on Mon, 27 February 2012 10:12 i was simply saying that the phrase "survival of the fittest" doesn't seem to have come from the mouth or pen of Charles Darwin.

So I take it you do believe it is just random chance then?

And, what is the difference between natural selection/survival of the fittest or random chance?

Spoony wrote on Mon, 27 February 2012 21:43 Whether this stuff is true or not is a serious question. Especially if there's a hell. The stakes are quite high.

The stakes are of no consequence as the people that believe this stuff have their reasons for believing it just like the ones that don't have their reasons for not believing it; and I highly doubt either party will be able to convince any members of the other to believe otherwise, especially in a forum setting.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [eatcow](#) on Tue, 28 Feb 2012 20:35:55 GMT

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

There is a wall between our communications.

The origin of a being was actually explained in my second argument which you did nothing to show why it was wrong, just dismissed it as drivel. I already told you the sources. Evolution without some being designing it immediately implies the products of evolution must be by chance. Historical accuracy and interpretation of the Bible are two different subjects and you are confusing the two and meshing them as one. You refer to the flood. Ancient secular sources like the Epic of Gilgamesh also describe a catastrophic flood. Archaeological evidence also point to a major flood that covered the area described in the Bible where Noah resided which if you remember your history was the known world at that time.

Hell in terms of Christian theology, which I believe you to have inadequate knowledge of, is at its core, the absence of God. God is love and love is God. True love stems from God. Thus Hell is the absence of love since God is love. God is fiery love, Bible describes Him to fire. Therefore Hell is a fiery place of torture because the soul is deprived of the burning love of God.

More Christian theology. Lazarus was raised from the dead through the power of Jesus. The devil has his power because God permits him to have it. This does not mean God endorses the devil, instead it makes people who follow God true lovers of God. I believe you are referring to Zechariah with the zombie stuff. Those passages describe a disease, nothing about the undead so some of it depends on how you define zombie. Leprosy was major back then and had these kinds of symptoms described, not to mention others.

Catholic theology: The Catholic Church never stated as official dogma that all Jews were guilty of murder. If so, state which Church Council and what year. This idea stems from some Christians (unfortunately) who read the Bible and condemn the Jews for the murder of Jesus, deicide. These Christians sadly took out their anger on Jews. People point to the murder of the Jews in Germany during the Crusades as more examples of Catholic hate for the Jews but if you research deeper, you will find it was Catholic priests, monks, and bishops who stopped the senseless slaughter and some were slaughtered with the Jews. Look at WW2. The Pope and the Catholic Church saved thousands of Jewish lives by smuggling them out of Europe, hiding them in monasteries and churches. A Catholic priest gave up his life to save a Jew in a concentration camp because the

nazis were sending the Jew to the gas chamber and the priest took his place. My point is Anti-Antisemitism was never a official Catholic policy and that the history of this subject is so muddled that it is hard for people find what truly happened in history.

Vatican 2 was needed.

This is my last post for at least a week. If your going to respond Spoony, then please show the fault(s) in my two arguments for the existence of a God since this is what pertained to our original subject of the creation of the universe. Spend time and actually read what it was I posted in my arguments.

Here is a link for Fundamentals of the Faith by Peter Kreeft you can read if so desired.

<http://books.google.com/books?id=isu3dqRiqg0C&printsec=frontcover&dq=Peter+Kreeft+fundamentals+of+the+faith&hl=en&sa=X&ei=HkpLT5yvLuWpiALFnaH5Dw&ved=0CDYQ6AEwAA#v=onepage&q=Peter%20Kreeft%20fundamentals%20of%20the%20faith&f=false>

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Tue, 28 Feb 2012 21:09:43 GMT

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

eatcow wrote on Tue, 28 February 2012 13:35There is a wall between our communications. that's exactly right, and it's that one of us is intellectually honest and the other is not.

Quote:Evolution without some being designing it immediately implies the products of evolution must be by chance.

the only honest thing you've said so far was when you admitted that you don't know enough about evolution. it's ok, i get that. you don't need to prove it further by saying its products are down to chance.

Quote:Historical accuracy and interpretation of the Bible are two different subjects and you are confusing the two and meshing them as one.

ah, you wanna do some "theology", you wanna pretend that what the bible says isn't what it means (cos that's what theology is when you look at it from the outside)

Quote:You refer to the flood. Ancient secular sources like the Epic of Gilgamesh also describe a catastrophic flood. Archaeological evidence also point to a major flood that covered the area described in the Bible where Noah resided which if you remember your history was the known world at that time.

...so the biblical version of events was wrong. Not an "interpretation" - downright wrong.

Quote:Hell in terms of Christian theology, which I believe you to have inadequate knowledge of, is at its core, the absence of God. God is love and love is God. True love stems from God. Thus Hell is the absence of love since God is love. God is fiery love, Bible describes Him to fire. Therefore Hell is a fiery place of torture because the soul is deprived of the burning love of God.

If this is what an adequate knowledge of theology makes you end up saying, I'm glad I'm not a theologian.

You're talking about a place where people are sent to burn as a punishment. Don't talk to me about "love". You obviously don't know the meaning of that word either.

Quote:More Christian theology. Lazarus was raised from the dead through the power of Jesus. ...which debunks your earlier statement that Jesus's teachings must be valid if he rose from the dead. Even the Bible disagrees with you.

Quote:The devil has his power because God permits him to have it. This does not mean God endorses the devil, instead it makes people who follow God true lovers of God.

again, debunks your earlier statement that if someone has supernatural powers, it must make them a good guy.

Quote:I believe you are referring to Zechariah with the zombie stuff. Those passages describe a disease, nothing about the undead so some of it depends on how you define zombie. Leprosy was major back then and had these kinds of symptoms described, not to mention others. no... i was referring to the zombie uprising described in one of the four gospels. i forget which one, it doesn't matter. when jesus is crucified all the graves open up and the saints rise from the dead and flood into the city. quite a lot of people rise from the dead in the bible, eh? btw, do you think that happened too?

Quote:Catholic theology: The Catholic Church never stated as official dogma that all Jews were guilty of murder. If so, state which Church Council and what year.

did you actually know this about your church? that it was deliberately and systematically pumping out anti-semitism as a core teaching?

Quote:This idea stems from some Christians (unfortunately) who read the Bible and condemn the Jews for the murder of Jesus, deicide. These Christians sadly took out their anger on Jews. christian antisemitism is, indeed, rooted in the Bible.

Quote:Look at WW2. The Pope and the Catholic Church saved thousands of Jewish lives by smuggling them out of Europe, hiding them in monasteries and churches.

maybe so, but only after the catholic church had collaborated with the Nazis in the first place. the church had been pumping anti-semitic propaganda into Europe since before Hitler was even born, let alone rose to power. the church instructed catholics to vote for hitler in exchange for catholic control of education, the church supported and collaborated with the Nuremberg laws, etc etc etc. about half of the SS were practicing and confessing catholics, and not one of them - not a single one - was thrown out of the church either for war crimes or for their part in the holocaust. and this was at a time when the church was very fond of excommunication - every communist, for example, was automatically expelled. lots of people were excommunicated for various dissenting theological writings. but war crimes and the holocaust? nah, go ahead.

Quote:A Catholic priest gave up his life to save a Jew in a concentration camp because the nazis were sending the Jew to the gas chamber and the priest took his place.

one individual priest? you think that absolves the guilt of the church?

Quote: This is my last post for at least a week. If you're going to respond Spoony, then please show the fault(s) in my two arguments for the existence of a God since this is what pertained to our original subject of the creation of the universe. Spend time and actually read what I posted in my arguments.

i think you're the one who needs to read what you posted... it's a dishonest, glorified way of saying you don't know how the universe started so you know who must have done it. that's like saying you know who a masked man is because he's wearing a mask.

Jerad Grey So I take it you do believe it is just random chance then?

...no?

Quote: And, what is the difference between natural selection/survival of the fittest or random chance?

...seriously?

natural selection means those species that are able to adapt to their environment survive and propagate their DNA, while less successful species die out... this is not random chance, it's basically the opposite of chance.

Quote: Whether this stuff is true or not is a serious question. Especially if there's a hell. The stakes are quite high.

The stakes are of no consequence as the people that believe this stuff have their reasons for believing it just like the ones that don't have their reasons for not believing it; and I highly doubt either party will be able to convince any members of the other to believe otherwise, especially in a forum setting.

perhaps eatcow would like to examine his own posts about hell, and wonder how it is he ended up posting euphemisms and apologetics to explain away his god's torture chamber.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to atheists

Posted by [eatcow](#) on Wed, 07 Mar 2012 12:57:45 GMT

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

I gave you the historical sources (the list of names). Here is what they have to say:

Cornelius Tacitus:

"Consequently, to get rid of the report, Nero fastened the guilt and inflicted the most exquisite tortures on a class hated for their abominations, called Christians by the populace. Christus, from whom the name had its origin, suffered the extreme penalty during the reign of Tiberius at the hands of one of our procurators, Pontius Pilatus, and a most mischievous superstition, thus checked for the moment, again broke out not only in Judaea, the first source of the evil, but even in Rome, where all things hideous and shameful from every part of the world find their centre and become popular. Accordingly, an arrest was first made of all who pleaded guilty; then, upon their information, an immense multitude was convicted, not so much of the crime of firing the city, as of hatred against mankind. Mockery of every sort was added to their deaths. Covered with the skins of beasts, they were torn by dogs and perished, or were nailed to crosses, or were doomed to the flames and burnt, to serve as a nightly illumination, when daylight had expired. Nero offered his gardens for the spectacle, and was exhibiting a show in the circus, while he mingled with the

people in the dress of a charioteer or stood aloft on a car. Hence, even for criminals who deserved extreme and exemplary punishment, there arose a feeling of compassion; for it was not, as it seemed, for the public good, but to glut one man's cruelty, that they were being destroyed."

Gaius Suetonius Tranquillas:

"Because the Jews of Rome caused continuous disturbances at the instigation of Chrestus, [Claudius] expelled them from the city."

Flavius Josephus:

"At this time there was a wise man who was called Jesus. And his conduct was good and he was known to be virtuous. And many people from among the Jews and other nations became his disciples. Pilate condemned him to be crucified and to die. And those who had become his disciples did not abandon his discipleship. They reported that he had appeared to them three days after his crucifixion and that he was alive; accordingly, he was perhaps the messiah concerning whom the prophets have recounted wonders."

Mara Bar-Serapion:

"What advantage did the Athenians gain from putting Socrates to death? Famine and plague came upon them as a judgment for their crime. What advantage did the men of Samos gain from burying Pythagoras? In a moment their land was covered with sand. What advantage did the Jews gain from executing their wise king? It was just after that that their kingdom was abolished. God justly avenged these three wise men: the Athenians died of hunger; the Samians were overwhelmed by the sea; the Jews, ruined and driven from their land, live in complete dispersion. But Socrates did not die for good; he lived on in the teaching of Plato. Pythagoras did not die for good; he lived on in the statue of Hera. Nor did the wise king die for good; he lived on in the teaching which he had given."

The Bible:

John 19:17-42, 20:1-29

Luke 23:26:56, 24:1-26

You can also find the same story in Mark and Matthew. Not going to look them up.

I can create a rather extensive list, but going to move on to your other remarks.

"you wanna pretend that what the bible says isn't what it means"

No, I do not wish to pretend for this would be inaccurate, illogical, and not truthful. However, what I was saying what you were confusing my argument for the Bible's historicity with people's interpretations. What the Bible says and what people think it says can be two different things, this is an interpretation issue. If you are only looking for developing the historical reliability of the Bible, instead of trying to argue theology, this is another task and the majority of historians today consider the Bible to be historically accurate.

You need to reread what the Bible says about the flood and what I posted, they augment nicely as one example for the Bible's historicity. The Bible as History by Werner Keller is a book that deals with the Bible in terms of archaeology and history purely. Only read a few sections in it.

My God's torture chambers, really...

Remember what I said earlier, man has the choice, the free undamped will, to choose hell. God

does not wish it, but even some children disown their parents no matter how much the parents love their children.

Again, you misread my argument. The resurrection of Jesus from the dead is a sign of his divinity. This implies his teaching as Son of God is true. Jesus raising Lazarus from the dead is also another argument for Jesus' divinity. There is no contradiction here as you are trying to imply. My bringing up of the devil and his power is to show you that I am not arguing that someone with magical powers imply they must be the good guy. However, what I do show is the origin of his power and explain as to why God permits the devil's mischievousness.

"that it was deliberately and systematically pumping out anti-semitism as a core teaching?" As I said, state what year from what official council of the Catholic Church that proclaimed anti-antisemitism is ok, otherwise your statement here is derogatory and academically dishonest since you cannot provide historical evidence for it. If anti-antisemitism is rooted in the Bible, then please give us what passage.

WW2 history time: "one individual priest? you think that absolves the guilt of the church?" The story of the priest was to show an example of Catholic persecution and that Catholicism is not the super anti Jewish organization as you like to hypothesize. You will like this article, secular and they provide all the sources you've been craving. It talks about the origin of Nazism's Jewish hatred stemming from Martin Luther. Provides quotes from leading members of the Nazi party during the Nuremberg trials, and from Martin Luther.
<http://nobeliefs.com/luther.htm>

The source listed below talks about Nazi's persecuting Catholics. Over 5,600 Catholic clergy were executed. This does not include laity either.

Craughwell, Thomas J., The Gentile Holocaust Catholic Culture, Accessed July 18, 2008

Finally, here is an article that instead of summarizing I am posting the link. It talks about the Catholic Church's role in hiding Jews during the war and the Pope's role.

<http://www.catholic.com/documents/how-pius-xii-protected-jews>

Here is a book if your interested that deal's with Hitler's attempts to kidnap/murder the Pope.
<http://www.amazon.com/Special-Mission-Hitlers-Secret-Vatican/dp/0306814684>

The Gospels do talk about the dead raising from the graves, but this does not mean zombie apocalypse, only accentuates your lack of Christian theological understanding. The city is a description of heaven, further supported in Revelations. The saints are the people who have not the stain of sin and dwell in heaven. When Jesus died, he opened up the gates of heaven. They were closed due to Adam and Eve's original sin. The Pharisees and Christianity teaches the bodily resurrection of those who go to heaven.

Coming back to the universe. My original argument for the existence of the universe was that God created the universe. The next obvious question is does God exist. I provided you with two logical constructions for the existence of God, one of which also satisfies the origin of God.

Here is what you did:

1) you failed to address my two arguments repeatedly

- 2) you attacked or used derogatory phraseology on what I believed multiple times
- 3) you dismissed arguments as drivel or stupid without further explanation
- 4) you sent several wild goose chases that deal with all sorts of subjects but not what the original academic pursuit was
- 5) out of all this you accuse me of being academically dishonest

I leave it at that.

I am not going to post any further based upon my list of five points. If you actually wish to discuss the existence of the universe and God, and not go to myriads of random subjects where you have little historical or theological knowledge, then I'll continue. Otherwise, adios.

My final quote: 1 Cor 13:4-13

"Love is patient, love is kind. It does not envy, it does not boast, it is not proud. It does not dishonor others, it is not self-seeking, it is not easily angered, it keeps no record of wrongs. Love does not delight in evil but rejoices with the truth. It always protects, always trusts, always hopes, always perseveres.

Love never fails. But where there are prophecies, they will cease; where there are tongues, they will be stilled; where there is knowledge, it will pass away. For we know in part and we prophesy in part, but when completeness comes, what is in part disappears. When I was a child, I talked like a child, I thought like a child, I reasoned like a child. When I became a man, I put the ways of childhood behind me. For now we see only a reflection as in a mirror; then we shall see face to face. Now I know in part; then I shall know fully, even as I am fully known.

And now these three remain: faith, hope and love. But the greatest of these is love."

There isn't a truer description of love then this and every Christian agrees with it.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [iRANian](#) on Wed, 07 Mar 2012 12:59:06 GMT

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

fuck athiests

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Wed, 07 Mar 2012 16:29:42 GMT

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

eatcow wrote on Wed, 07 March 2012 05:57I gave you the historical sources (the list of names). Here is what they have to say:

Cornelius Tacitus:

"Consequently, to get rid of the report, Nero fastened the guilt and inflicted the most exquisite tortures on a class hated for their abominations, called Christians by the populace. Christus, from whom the name had its origin, suffered the extreme penalty during the reign of Tiberius at the

hands of one of our procurators, Pontius Pilatus, and a most mischievous superstition, thus checked for the moment, again broke out not only in Judaea, the first source of the evil, but even in Rome, where all things hideous and shameful from every part of the world find their centre and become popular. Accordingly, an arrest was first made of all who pleaded guilty; then, upon their information, an immense multitude was convicted, not so much of the crime of firing the city, as of hatred against mankind. Mockery of every sort was added to their deaths. Covered with the skins of beasts, they were torn by dogs and perished, or were nailed to crosses, or were doomed to the flames and burnt, to serve as a nightly illumination, when daylight had expired. Nero offered his gardens for the spectacle, and was exhibiting a show in the circus, while he mingled with the people in the dress of a charioteer or stood aloft on a car. Hence, even for criminals who deserved extreme and exemplary punishment, there arose a feeling of compassion; for it was not, as it seemed, for the public good, but to glut one man's cruelty, that they were being destroyed."

Cornelius Tacitus (AD 56 – AD 117) - i.e. didn't live at the same time as Jesus was supposed to have lived, so the best you can say is he was repeating what he'd heard, this at a time and place when most people couldn't read or write. And all he says is that "Christus...suffered the extreme punishment"; hardly an uncommon thing at the hands of the Roman Empire, and furthermore it doesn't even identify him as Jesus. Christ is a title, not a name. Doesn't attribute anything supernatural to "Christ" either.

Quote:Gaius Suetonius Tranquillas:

"Because the Jews of Rome caused continuous disturbances at the instigation of Chrestus, [Claudius] expelled them from the city."

Gaius Tranquillus (ca. 69/75 – after 130) - again, born long after Jesus is supposed to have died. Have any accounts from an actual contemporary of his?

and what he says is even less helpful than tacitus. furthermore, he describes Christians as "a group of people of a new and maleficent superstition"; he didn't seem to find it very convincing himself.

Quote:Flavius Josephus:

"At this time there was a wise man who was called Jesus. And his conduct was good and he was known to be virtuous. And many people from among the Jews and other nations became his disciples. Pilate condemned him to be crucified and to die. And those who had become his disciples did not abandon his discipleship. They reported that he had appeared to them three days after his crucifixion and that he was alive; accordingly, he was perhaps the messiah concerning whom the prophets have recounted wonders."

Titus Flavius Josephus (37 – c. 100) - notice the recurring theme here? yet another source the best you can say of whom is that he is repeating what he'd heard.

and what is he repeating? this is the passage which most people think has been tampered with; maybe you're in the minority who thinks it hasn't? and the only unusual thing in the passage is that he had followers who considered him miraculous. given the time and place, i'm being generous when i call that unusual.

Quote:Mara Bar-Serapion:

"What advantage did the Athenians gain from putting Socrates to death? Famine and plague came upon them as a judgment for their crime. What advantage did the men of Samos gain from burying Pythagoras? In a moment their land was covered with sand. What advantage did the

Jews gain from executing their wise king? It was just after that that their kingdom was abolished. God justly avenged these three wise men: the Athenians died of hunger; the Samians were overwhelmed by the sea; the Jews, ruined and driven from their land, live in complete dispersion. But Socrates did not die for good; he lived on in the teaching of Plato. Pythagoras did not die for good; he lived on in the statue of Hera. Nor did the wise king die for good; he lived on in the teaching which he had given."

...people don't even know when this was written, the earliest estimate i've seen is 73 AD. we're stuck with that recurring theme. i'll repeat the earlier question so you can't pretend you didn't see it: do you have any contemporary accounts?

as for what it says, he might just as well have said that if your society goes around executing people as wise as Socrates for not being the right religion, it's obvious got something seriously wrong with the way it's being run, and it'll probably end in tears. that would be more truthful than to say "god punished the society".

also, i'd be careful with this concept of "god punishes the jews for killing jesus".

Quote:The Bible:

John 19:17-42, 20:1-29

Luke 23:26:56, 24:1-26

You can also find the same story in Mark and Matthew. Not going to look them up.

I can create a rather extensive list, but going to move on to your other remarks.

Then my question still has not been answered. Where did you get the historical evidence for very specifically detailed account of the disposal of Jesus' body? I've asked you like five times now, and all you've come up with is the odd passage from people who weren't alive at the time and were, at best, repeating what they'd heard.

Quote:You need to reread what the Bible says about the flood and what I posted, they augment nicely as one example for the Bible's historicity. The Bible as History by Werner Keller is a book that deals with the Bible in terms of archaeology and history purely. Only read a few sections in it. i've read the flood story, i'm not entirely sure you have. the story says the flood was created by a superbeing as a deliberate act of genocide, deliberately killing everything in the world besides a handful of humans and a few of each animal. this is plainly bullshit, and you should be glad it's bullshit because if it were true, it would be the single worst act of genocide ever.

Quote:My God's torture chambers, really...

Remember what I said earlier, man has the choice, the free undamped will, to choose hell. stop beating around the bush. two questions:

1. are people who are not the right religion going to be tortured for it
2. is that a good thing

Quote:God does not wish it, but even some children disown their parents no matter how much the parents love their children.

what an awful analogy.

a child who "disowns" his parents actually knows who his parents are, presumably. the child acknowledges the parents' existence. what your analogy should say is "some children don't know

who their parents are and therefore go through life as if they didn't have parents. the parents are understandably furious at this, because the parents love the child so much (so much so that the child doesn't know they exist), and so they send the child to a torture chamber as punishment."

Quote:Again, you misread my argument. The resurrection of Jesus from the dead is a sign of his divinity. This implies his teaching as Son of God is true. Jesus raising Lazarus from the dead is also another argument for Jesus' divinity. There is no contradiction here as you are trying to imply. i think i hear the sound of a goalpost scraping along the ground.

boils down to two basic points.

1. if someone rises from the dead, that doesn't necessarily mean they're the one with the power.
2. power =/= goodness. that's basically another way of saying might is right.

Quote:"that it was deliberately and systematically pumping out anti-semitism as a core teaching?" As I said, state what year from what official council of the Catholic Church that proclaimed anti-antisemitism is ok, otherwise your statement here is derogatory and academically dishonest since you cannot provide historical evidence for it.

<http://www.sullivan-county.com/news/mine/timeline.htm>

Quote:If anti-antisemitism is rooted in the Bible, then please give us what passage. this isn't the first time you've used the word "anti-antisemitism". i think you mean "antisemitism". but to answer the question, it's mainly based on the bit in one of the four gospels where pilate says he washes his hands of the blood of jesus, and "the Jews" cry out that the blood is on them and their children.

a ludicrous statement, of course, but one that's led to an enormous amount of misery throughout the centuries.

Quote:The story of the priest was to show an example of Catholic persecution and that Catholicism is not the super anti Jewish organization as you like to hypothesize.

You will like this article, secular and they provide all the sources you've been craving. It talks about the origin of Nazism's Jewish hatred stemming from Martin Luther. Provides quotes from leading members of the Nazi party during the Nuremburg trials, and from Martin Luther.

<http://nobeliefs.com/luther.htm>

i already knew luther was a fanatical anti-semit as well; the catholic church was by no means the only christian organisation guilty of anti-semitism.

Quote:The source listed below talks about Nazi's persecuting Catholics. Over 5,600 Catholic clergy were executed. This does not include laity either.

That's awful. Truly awful. But I can honestly say that, because unlike you I'm firmly against people being horribly punished for not being the right religion.

Quote:Finally, here is an article that instead of summarizing I am posting the link. It talks about the Catholic Church's role in hiding Jews during the war and the Pope's role.

<http://www.catholic.com/documents/how-pius-xii-protected-jews>

Here is a book if your interested that deal's with Hitler's attempts to kidnap/murder the Pope.
<http://www.amazon.com/Special-Mission-Hitlers-Secret-Vatican/dp/0306814684>

I'm aware of both of these things; it does not absolve the guilt of the Catholic Church.

Quote: The Gospels do talk about the dead raising from the graves, but this does not mean zombie apocalypse, only accentuates your lack of Christian theological understanding. The city is a description of heaven, further supported in Revelations. The saints are the people who have not the stain of sin and dwell in heaven. When Jesus died, he opened up the gates of heaven. They were closed due to Adam and Eve's original sin. The Pharisees and Christianity teaches the bodily resurrection of those who go to heaven.

yet again, you're saying that what the bible means is not what it says. that is, after all, what "theology" basically is. and you have to do this, don't you, because what the bible actually says about this is a really ridiculous story that obviously didn't happen.

Quote: Coming back to the universe. My original argument for the existence of the universe was that God created the universe. The next obvious question is does God exist. I provided you with two logical constructions for the existence of God, one of which also satisfies the origin of God.

Here is what you did:

1) you failed to address my two arguments repeatedly
that's an obvious lie, and one i've come to expect.

Quote: 2) you attacked or used derogatory phraseology on what I believed multiple times
this, on the other hand, is absolutely right.

Quote: 3) you dismissed arguments as drivel or stupid without further explanation
well, your arguments are drivel and they are stupid.

Quote: 4) you sent several wild goose chases that deal with all sorts of subjects but not what the original academic pursuit was
will you please try to be a bit more honest?

Quote: 5) out of all this you accuse me of being academically dishonest
fucking right i do.

Quote: There isn't a truer description of love then this and every Christian agrees with it.
it certainly is different from your earlier definition of love, which was a euphemism for people being tortured for not being the right religion.

Quote: If you actually wish to discuss the existence of the universe and God, and not go to myriads of random subjects where you have little historical or theological knowledge, then I'll continue.
Otherwise, adios.

another one bites the dust. just remember on what footing you flee this argument.

- you haven't carried your point about the existence of any god, let alone a specific one.
- you haven't provided any contemporary accounts of jesus.
- you haven't given the slightest evidence for the very specifically detailed account of the disposal of jesus' body, and i asked you over and over again to do so. (is it so hard for you to be honest enough to admit you've got nothing?)
- you've defended the use of torture as a punishment for people who are not the right religion

if you're content to remain on such a terrible intellectual and moral position, then don't come back. if you'd rather redeem yourself, i'll still be here.

in either case, i encourage you to reflect on the fact that my opinion of your religion is lower than it was before you posted.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [i0ncl0ud9](#) on Thu, 08 Mar 2012 06:44:04 GMT

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

good fucking god

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Thu, 08 Mar 2012 20:05:44 GMT

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

Quote:

stop beating around the bush. two questions:

1. are people who are not the right religion going to be tortured for it
2. is that a good thing

1. Depends what religion is right?
2. Does it make a difference, it isn't our choice if said god/gods are real.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Thu, 08 Mar 2012 21:17:24 GMT

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

Jerad Gray wrote on Thu, 08 March 2012 13:05

1. Depends what religion is right?

yes, that's right. several different religions both make the same claim. the pope says only catholics are going to be "saved" (by "saved" he means "not going to be tortured", kinda like the mafia saying "protection" when they mean "we won't break your legs") and non-catholics are going to hell with all the other infidels. many - not all - protestant churches say it's the other way around. islam says all non-muslims are going to hell.

this is one of my three major objections to the whole hell concept. i'll briefly list all three

1. a god who is in favour of torturing people as a punishment for what you think is obviously a complete asshole and does not deserve worship

2. i cannot choose what to think. i could pretend to be a christian or a muslim or whatever, but what i cannot do is flick a switch inside my brain and decide that i believe something. i've said this many times to christians and i've never gotten a single one of them to understand it; maybe my brain just works differently from everyone else's?

3. even if i did want to do this, several religions make contradictory claims (the problem you mention and i outlined above), so it becomes a question of which of these people - if any - are telling the truth. in other words, it becomes necessary for the religious to prove what they say, and they can't... and i would be a little less disdainful if, just once, they would be honest enough to admit they can't, instead of talking about why "faith" is somehow a good thing.

so there you go, i've repeatedly stated these three objections and never had a good answer to a single one of them; if anyone here thinks hell is real, i encourage them to have a crack at those objections.

Quote:2. Does it make a difference, it isn't our choice if said god/gods are real.
let people answer the question: do they think people being tortured as a punishment for not being the right religion is a good thing.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Fri, 09 Mar 2012 15:41:27 GMT

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

Spoony wrote on Thu, 08 March 2012 14:17

Quote:2. Does it make a difference, it isn't our choice if said god/gods are real.
let people answer the question: do they think people being tortured as a punishment for not being the right religion is a good thing.

I just meant that it doesn't make a difference, if there is a god he probably doesn't give a damn what we think and will do what he sees fit. If there isn't, it still doesn't matter what we think.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 08 March 2012 14:17

2. i cannot choose what to think. i could pretend to be a christian or a muslim or whatever, but what i cannot do is flick a switch inside my brain and decide that i believe something.

I think you choose to believe that you can't choose to believe stuff.

Trollface

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Fri, 09 Mar 2012 16:07:08 GMT

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

Jerad Gray wrote on Fri, 09 March 2012 08:41Spoony wrote on Thu, 08 March 2012 14:17

2. i cannot choose what to think. i could pretend to be a christian or a muslim or whatever, but what i cannot do is flick a switch inside my brain and decide that i believe something.

I think you choose to believe that you can't choose to believe stuff.

Trollface

i'm being completely sincere when i say that is the most intelligent response i've ever heard to that point.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [eatcow](#) on Sun, 15 Apr 2012 16:21:31 GMT

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

Spoony, you only reveal your ignorance of Christians. A source that gives a very detailed account of Jesus is the one you quoted in asking where is one. Another key thing your ignorant of, if you are of a different religion and did not come to Catholicism, this does not necessary mean your going to hell. If someone is wicked, most likely they are. If they are a good humble person, regardless of religion, it is possible to go to heaven. If the person comes to an intellectual understanding of God and chooses to reject Him, then they are going to hell. Spoony, I mean an understanding which your far from. If you actually want to argue with Christians, then you should actually know some basics of what they teach.

Academic dishonesty?

This is the only thing you can say because you have no other argument to offer. The only thing you have been able to demonstrate is hate. You read an argument, and dismiss it as stupid. That is not honesty. Any person in love and pursuit of truth would debate the various points. You disregard it simply because the implications you do not like and want to not agree with it. And you want to claim the opposite as being dishonest academically?

The best argument for God to you specifically is you yourself. You haven proven to be a miserable hateful individual without Him. Atheists can still love, the negation is not what I am implying. But for you, what good is a love that is so tainted by hatred and is miserable? What good is your miserableness when you know there is something better. If you were honest with yourself, then you would be honest with the world. Haters gonna hate until the day they break out of that shell and look back and wonder how could they be so depraved.

If a child did not know their parents, do you honestly think that the parents would just throw them into the fire and hypocritically call that love? If a child knew their parents, but disowned them. When the child came back seeking forgiveness, do you honestly think that the parents would throw him into the fire and hypocritically call that love also?

Here is my question for you in regards to your definition of theology: What part of Catholic teaching is contrary to the Bible? If you answer this, first be honest, second, actually understand what it is Catholicism teaches before attempting, thirdly, you must have Bible verses and Church Father quotes to back up your point.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Major-Payne](#) on Sun, 15 Apr 2012 17:16:12 GMT

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

Religion is a hobby, end of story.

As long as people don't interfere with my freedom on "religious" grounds I don't care, except that wherever anyone goes you're limited by and confronted by (not confronted WITH, confronted BY) religion. By default that makes me anti-religion until basically me and everyone around me can live their lives as they see fit. Do whatever we want on any day (because one random day, which

is one full earth rotation and 1/365th of a solar orbit, every, single one, none is special) without every store being closed because of some outdated religious principle. In Mississippi they abolished the right to abortion. In this day and age. Now, I don't personally care because, as we say in Dutch, it's a "far away from my bed show", but to think that this might be a precedent for other states in the USA, and might thus influence other religious nuts in other countries to pressure for shit like this...

Or maybe it's also the fact that every local store has been bought up by Turks in my city and you need to go to a fucking big store all the way at the mall to get some PORK.

It could also be the fact that people like me (archaeologists) cant do their jobs, that we have to change reports and adapt our findings not to upset "christian beliefs" about the earth being made in like 4008BC or something.

This is why, whenever I get the chance I love to point out how pointless religion is. I may have even said it before in this thread ages ago, I dunno, but I'll just say it again for fun.

Religion is something you see starting to exist around the time humans became sedentary, at ANY rate. The moment you find humans making any kind of home, whether it's temporary or permanent, you will start finding depictions, figurines, "symbols" that don't seem functional. This is in direct relation to the amount of settling a certain group or unit of people does/do. Completely nomadic hunter-gatherers have shown no sign whatsoever of attributing any meaning to anything that is not functional.

As soon as humans become sedentary, social interactions change. People have to do things together, and organize, to maintain whatever they have, to survive. The more sedentary a group of people is (we cannot speak of "societies" at this point since there are no real established cultures at this time) the more this need arises, because they are far more dependant on each other. Religion is the one binding and unifying social element that keeps these groups together. Patterns start occurring that have simply NO functional sense, other than to gather people together for one common goal.

Now, this is at a development stage where humans have no real scientific knowledge of the world they live in. They live with sort of the same mentality as animals, they take whatever happens in life for what it is, and just keep on doing their thing. Slowly you can see society changing over time, where after a few thousand years after a great deal of humans have become fully sedentary, you can see a distinction between objects in the context of ownership. Seals and personal stamps.

People start identifying themselves with what they own, and this is when real cultures start to appear. Villages distinguish themselves in their style, and as different villages adapt themselves to different lifestyles and different environments, they view life from different perspectives, and form their mythology around those perspectives. Thus you get different cultures and religions associated with them, and it's all functional, everything is binding.

Now when Sargon formed the first ever empire in mankind, things start to change. This is around the time that writing starts to appear, and we see societies start using and experiencing religion not as a way to bind people, but as a sign of power, or as a way to exert control over people. Kings attribute themselves with godly symbols, and base their authority on their association with them.

In this way religion is still a functional element of human society, since it helps preserve the status quo, it's still a binding element, though a bit more of a forceful one.

Basically, ever since then, humanity has been finding out more and more about life, about how our bodies work, about how everything around us works, how physics influences every little bit of our lives. Basically, ever since Sargon, religion has been a tool of power, used by those who want to control, and lived by those who want to give meaning to their lives. The more people know about their lives however, the more control they have over it, and the less control the religious leaders will have. That is why so many scientists were persecuted by the Catholic church in the 15th/16th and 17th centuries, because they knew this. Whether they ACTUALLY believed in God is irrelevant, they knew that they would lose power if people knew more about what was actually going on.

For instance, take the bible. The bible you know today IS NOT the original scripture written down by the supposed jesus christ and his disciples. It's actually written down by the council of Nicaea that a conscious decision was made (in the 4th century that is) to omit and/or add certain parts to the bible to enunciate certain elements of christinaty. In those days there were two big philosophies, Aristotelian and Platonic. Aristoteles basically claimed that, everything that is, is as it is, is bound by natural rules, and that you should do your best to live within them, guided by virtues that are generally agreed upon to be... well, virtuous. Plato believed that everything in this world is modelled, or made after an ideal (on a higher plane), and that all you can do in life is live up to that ideal, in whatever you do. Both philosophies go MUCH deeper than that, but that's it in a nutshell.

In the councils that followed basically established christianity along a Platonic guideline, mostly set forth by Augustine on Hippo. This decision was pretty much finalized at the second council of Nicaea, where it was decreed that altars were required to contain relics, and that houses of worships required icons, preferably high. In almost any pre 18th century church, all the artwork requires you to look UP. This stems from Nicaea II.

Anyway, I love it when christians say: WELL THIS IS IN THE BIBLE or EXPLAIN IT TO ME WITH THE BIBLE, when conscious decisions were made by conscious human beings with certain interests to DECIDE FOR THEIR OWN what would and wouldn't be in the bible, what they wrote THEMSELVES (so not the disciples) and anyway, jesus christ was just a man, just a rebellious jew who had his own ideas and wrote them down, as did his followers. All perfectly normal, ordinary, human beings, just like everybody else.

This was all done in a time when scientific knowledge was NOT common. When people NEEDED guidance by nature. When people simply believed things on authority of others because they did not know better.

In this day and age, when all that we know about life, and living, and the way religion has evolved, we do not need it. The guiding principle of our lives is the realisation of the human potential, your own, and humankind as a whole. I personally believe that putting energy in a fictitious entity is a waste of valuable time and energy you could use to enrich and improve your own life and the lives of people around you.

I again personally do not mind what ANYBODY believes, it's your life, but when all this outdated and obsolete crap gets shoved into my and other people's lives then that wall of respect crumbles.

Modern day "religion" should be humanity's potential.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [iRANian](#) on Sun, 15 Apr 2012 17:46:03 GMT

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

nice essay

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [F1r3st0rm](#) on Sun, 15 Apr 2012 18:24:33 GMT

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

indeed where did you google that essay

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [eatcow](#) on Mon, 16 Apr 2012 06:52:38 GMT

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

Why do people keep trying to argue about Christianity when they are ignorant of various subjects they are discussing...

The 2nd council of Nicaea was called in response to a group of heretics who thought it was wrong to venerate statues and images. This explains the art aspect.

In regards to the Bible, the 1st council had nothing to do with that instead its main goal was fighting another heresy, the Arians. The key point almost every council was called in response to a heresy that was contrary to what the Church was teaching and the Church fine tuning what it is the Church means with her various dogmas. You are right that the canon of the Bible was not finalized till the 4th century, but near the end and it was a series of councils that all drew up the same list.

The key in regards to spoony and my final paragraph is this, he opened the subject for debate. He made a claim and I asked him to back it up.

There is a large group of scientists who believed in God, and a lot who were Catholic. Kepler, Einstein, Newton, Boyle, Faraday, Kelvin, and Planck all believed in the existence of God and/or were Christian.

Here is a list of some Catholic scientists:

<http://www.catholicbook.com/AgredaCD/MyCatholicFaith/mcfc014a.htm>

Giordano Bruno was persecuted for theological differences, not his scientific views.

Galileo was brought up before the court for teaching heliocentrism because he was teaching it as truth instead of a conjecture. He had no solid arguments to support the view so he used the Bible to support his views and this was what made the Church angry considering the mess Protestants created with their theological position of sola scriptura.

Key point: Bruno and Galileo were brought up before the church for theological matters.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to atheists
Posted by [Major-Payne](#) on Mon, 16 Apr 2012 10:04:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

eatcow wrote on Sun, 15 April 2012 23:52 Why do people keep trying to argue about Christianity when they are ignorant of various subjects they are discussing...

LOLOL WUT

Dude.

Fucking lol.

Early Christianity was one of my specialities early in uni (back when I was still a student of archaeology). Don't call me ignorant.

Read the following articles then get back to me.

Quote: "A brief history of Western Philosophy" by Anthony Kenny, revised edition 2005, page 99 to 131, chapters "Early Christian Philosophy" and "Early Medieval Philosophy"

"Religions of the Hellenistic-Roman Age" by Antionia Tripolitis", 2002, page 91 to 118, "Christianity"

"Christianity, an introduction" by Alister E. McGrath, Second edition 2006. Read the whole book, its only about 350 pages, so a pretty light read

eatcow wrote on Sun, 15 April 2012 23:52 Why do people keep trying to argue about Christianity when they are ignorant of various subjects they are discussing... bla bla bla nonsensical bullshit about the councils

Fucking lol. Just lol.

To illustrate how wrong you are.

Quote: The 2nd council of Nicaea was called in response to a group of heretics who thought it was wrong to venerate statues and images. This explains the art aspect.

The use of imagery and symbolism was actually discouraged by an earlier Christian council (at

Hieria), about 350 bishops in all, organized by the Byzantine emperor. Due to wars with the arabs, not all the patriarchs were present, which made the decisions pretty easy to dispute. The council of Nicaea II sought to reverse this decision, even though they had as little authority as the Hierian council, since the patriarchs were absent, just as at Hieria. Only at Nicaea II were the decisions at Hieria deemed to be heretical decisions.

You make it seem as if the council gathered with the pre-existing notion that the edicts of leo and his son were heretical, which is completely untrue.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [iRANian](#) on Mon, 16 Apr 2012 11:50:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

mudkips studied archaeology and ended up working at the dutch equivalent of walmart

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Major-Payne](#) on Mon, 16 Apr 2012 14:14:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Kinda hard to work in your specialized field when your dig site is in a country that's in the middle of a civil war

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [iRANian](#) on Mon, 16 Apr 2012 17:56:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

didnt stop the germans

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Tue, 17 Apr 2012 20:38:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

eatcow wroteSpoony, you only reveal your ignorance of Christians. A source that gives a very detailed account of Jesus is the one you quoted in asking where is one. I've asked you five or six times to provide a single good source for the remarkably specifically detailed version of events you gave regarding the disposal of Jesus' body. Everyone reading this thread can see me asking you over and over again, and can see you dodging it over and over again.

Quote:Another key thing your ignorant of, if you are of a different religion and did not come to

Catholicism, this does not necessary mean your going to hell. If someone is wicked, most likely they are. If they are a good humble person, regardless of religion, it is possible to go to heaven. Prove it.

Go on, prove it. You claim you know a single damn thing about the afterlife? Prove it. Even claiming that there is an afterlife at all is an extraordinary claim. Prove it. Then go on to prove that you know its nature, and who's going where.

Don't dodge this one, like you did with the resurrection business. Prove it or admit you can't prove it.

Quote:If the person comes to an intellectual understanding of God and chooses to reject Him, then they are going to hell.

Well. I asked you two questions about hell:

stop beating around the bush. two questions:

1. are people who are not the right religion going to be tortured for it
2. is that a good thing

You just answered the first one. Well done. Have a crack at number two. You just said that yes, people can and will be horribly tortured for not being the right religion. Well then, do you think that's a good thing? I won't necessarily assume the answer is yes just because you worship the god who you think is in charge of this thing. I'll give you the chance to say for yourself whether you think this god of yours is doing the right or wrong thing: sending people to be tortured if they are not the right religion.

Quote:This is the only thing you can say because you have no other argument to offer. And yet anyone reading this thread can see me make quite a few points you obviously couldn't answer.

Quote:The only thing you have been able to demonstrate is hate.

Oh, please. If you think you're on the wrong end of hate right now, I have good news for you: you've never experienced hate. Consider yourself fortunate.

Quote:You read an argument, and dismiss it as stupid. That is not honesty.

Your arguments were stupid. Get over it. Don't call me dishonest because you said something stupid and I called it stupid.

Quote:Any person in love and pursuit of truth would debate the various points.

We saw a page or two ago that you don't know what love is. Remember? You were using the word "love" to describe your god's torture chamber.

Quote:You disregard it simply because the implications you do not like and want to not agree with it.

You're a damn fool.

Quote:The best argument for God to you specifically is you yourself. You haven proven to be a miserable hateful individual without Him.

Do you really want to say that that's the best argument? This is the internet. You can't know too much about how "miserable" or "hateful" I am; you can only judge by my posts themselves, which

are neither miserable nor hateful. If you want to assume I am both of those things personally, in spite of my posts, I suppose you may. But you must realise it's damaging to your own position to say that it's the best you've got, surely?

Quote:Atheists can still love, the negation is not what I am implying. But for you, what good is a love that is so tainted by hatred and is miserable? What good is your miserableness when you know there is something better.

...you're saying I know there really is a god?

if so, you'd have to be a bit more specific than that; you're not talking about Zeus - for example - are you. If so, what you're really saying is "you know this specific God and the details about him is real", isn't it?

Quote:If you were honest with yourself, then you would be honest with the world. Haters gonna hate until the day they break out of that shell and look back and wonder how could they be so depraved.

Take my advice and lay off the rhetoric, you aren't any good at it.

Quote:If a child did not know their parents, do you honestly think that the parents would just throw them into the fire and hypocritically call that love? If a child knew their parents, but disowned them. When the child came back seeking forgiveness, do you honestly think that the parents would throw him into the fire and hypocritically call that love also?

No, I don't think a powerful creature throwing a weaker creature into a fire should be considered an act of love. I don't think a scenario could ever be found where an adult throwing a living child into a fire would be just at all, and yet this is the analogy you selected.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [freduc9](#) on Wed, 25 Apr 2012 22:50:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ill entertain you spoony since its been too long.

Quote:I've asked you five or six times to provide a single good source for the remarkably specifically detailed version of events you gave regarding the disposal of Jesus' body. Everyone reading this thread can see me asking you over and over again, and can see you dodging it over and over again.

Im not so sure if any outside sources other than the gospels document "detailed events" of the disposal of his body. However, the gospels can be trusted as to the details of his life, death and resurrection and here is why:

You have biblical sources (the gospels) then you have non biblical sources of course. The gospels in a nutshell do not contradict secular history and were written anywhere from 10-40 years after Christs death depending on the letter/gospel you refer to. We know from the writings themselves and based on what they reference that several were written before the temple destruction and some were written after. This is a fact and I would be quite enthralled to see anyone prove otherwise.

The outsides sources are explained now

here we discuss Flavious Josephus and I will be quotting from a website that did provide accurate details here, if you question the source you will be up to the task of disproving them with another

source.

"Josephus was a Jewish historian who was born around AD 38. He served Roman commander Vespasian in Jerusalem until the city's destruction in AD 70. Josephus personally believed Vespasian to be Israel's promised Messiah. When Vespasian later became emperor of Rome, Josephus served under him as court historian. 2 In AD 93, Josephus finished his work *Antiquities of the Jews* in which at least three passages specifically confirm portions of Scripture:"

Quote:But to some of the Jews the destruction of Herod's army seemed to be divine vengeance, and certainly a just vengeance, for his treatment of John, surnamed the Baptist. For Herod had put him to death, though he was a good man and had exhorted the Jews to lead righteous lives, to practice justice towards their fellows and piety towards God, and so doing to join in baptism compare this to

Luke 9:7-9

Quote:7 Now Herod the tetrarch heard about all that was going on. And he was perplexed because some were saying that John had been raised from the dead, 8 others that Elijah had appeared, and still others that one of the prophets of long ago had come back to life. 9 But Herod said, "I beheaded John. Who, then, is this I hear such things about?" And he tried to see him.

Mat 4:12

Quote:Now when Jesus heard that John had been put in prison, He departed to Galilee.

Mark 1:14

Quote:Now after John was arrested, Jesus came into Galilee, proclaiming the gospel of God, 15 and saying, "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent and believe in the gospel.

Jesus was baptized by John and this is entirely supported through all the gospels. If you need those scriptures I can post em.

More on Josephus:

Quote:...convened the judges of the Sanhedrin and brought before them a man named James, the brother of Jesus who was called the Christ, and certain others. He accused them of having transgressed the law and delivered them up to be stoned.

in scripture:

Mark 6:3

Quote:Isn't this the carpenter? Isn't this Mary's son and the brother of James, Joseph, Judas and Simon? Aren't his sisters here with us?" And they took offense at him.

Galatians 1:19

Quote:I saw none of the other apostles--only James, the Lord's brother.

More Josephus

Quote:At this time there was a wise man who was called Jesus. And his conduct was good, and [he] was known to be virtuous. And many people from among the Jews and the other nations became his disciples. Pilate condemned him to be crucified and to die. And those who had become his disciples did not abandon his discipleship. They reported that he had appeared to them three days after his crucifixion and that he was alive;...

Now I certainly do not have to post the scriptures coinciding with this do I?

PLINIUS SECUNDUS:

quick background

"Pliny was the governor of Bithynia in Asia Minor. Much of his correspondence has survived including a particular letter written circa AD 112 to the Roman emperor Trajan. This letter does not reference Christ directly, but it does establish several beliefs and practices of early Christians. This includes their loyalty to Christ even when it cost them their lives."

Quote:In the meantime, the method I have observed towards those who have been denounced to

me as Christians is this: I interrogated them whether they were in fact Christians; if they confessed it, I repeated the question twice, adding the threat of capital punishment; if they still persevered, I ordered them to be executed.

Hopefully that helps you see the extreme threat to a simple belief system that if it was a hoax couldnt possibly survive...

Quote:...They affirmed, however, that the whole of their guilt, or their error, was that they were in the habit of meeting on a certain fixed day before it was light, when they sang in alternate verses a hymn to Christ, as to a god, and bound themselves by a solemn oath, not to perform any wicked deed, never to commit any fraud, theft or adultery, never to falsify their word, nor deny a trust when they should be called upon to make it good; after which it was their custom to separate, and then reassemble to partake of food - but food of an ordinary and innocent kind

These are all in line with Jesus teachings, no one else came around teaching these things and I highly doubt everyone would be gathering around singing to Christ even under penalty of death if he wasnt even real...

CORNELIUS TACITUS

"Tacitus was a senator under Emperor Vespasian and later became governor of Asia. Around AD 116 in his work entitled Annals, he wrote of Emperor Nero and a fire which had swept Rome in AD 64"

as here

Quote:Consequently, to get rid of the report, Nero fastened the guilt and inflicted the most exquisite tortures on a class hated for their abominations, called Christians by the populace. Christus, from whom the name had its origin, suffered the extreme penalty during the reign of Tiberius at the hands of one of our procurators, Pontius Pilate, and a most mischievous superstition thus checked for the moment, again broke out not only in Judea, the first source of the evil, but even in Rome...

I always was found of tiberius given tiberium lol

GAIUS SUETONIUS TRANQUILLAS

"Suetonius was a chief secretary to Emperor Hadrian writing around AD 120 in his work Life of Claudius"

Quote:Because the Jews at Rome caused continuous disturbances at the instigation of Chrestus, he expelled them from the city

Christ was king of the Jews, the populace called them christians, its not unreasonable to assume hes referring to the christians here.

LUCIAN

"Lucian, the Greek satirist, wrote this rather scathing attack in The Death of Peregrine circa AD 170"

Quote:The Christians, you know, worship a man to this day - the distinguished personage who introduced their novel rites, and was crucified on that account... You see, these misguided creatures start with the general conviction that they are immortal for all time, which explains the contempt of death and voluntary self-devotion which are so common among them; and then it was impressed upon them by their original lawgiver that they are all brothers, from the moment that they are converted, and deny the gods of Greece, and worship the crucified sage, and live after his laws

THE TALMUD

"The Talmud is essentially the collection of Jewish oral traditions that were put into writing with additional commentary between the years of AD 70 and 200. From the Babylonian Talmud, Sanhedrin 43a includes"

Quote:On the eve of Passover they hanged Yeshu. And an announcer went out, in front of him,

for forty days (saying): 'He is going to be stoned because he practiced sorcery and enticed and led Israel astray. Anyone who knows anything in his favor, let him come and plead in his behalf.' But, not having found anything in his favor, they hanged him on the eve of the Passover. Yeshu is another name for Jesus in case you didnt know.

You can go here to read it in the orig: <http://www.provethescriptures.net/T2-Divin/D-0201.htm> but I pretty much outlined everything for you here. Its quite undeniable that Jesus at the very least existed as a person. The fact the gospels align with these other writings is quite amazing, it shows that the things of Jesus were quite common knowledge for people in that area. The apostles didnt have an internet or public distribution center for their writings so its impossible for them to have based their writings on the gospel accounts and vice versa. Its always come down to if you believe he was the Christ he claimed to be. People will always deny he was, even the high priests of the Jews at the time did and continued to do so. The fact Christianity spread so rapidly and quickly, still surviving to today and its given history really stands testimony enough that the gospel writers are not lying, people acknowledged a man Christ had died and rose from the grave otherwise others in the time period would have written about the lunacy of all these christians worshiping a man that never existed.

since I just jumped in here, Im not going to answer the rest of your posts aimed at that guy of course unless you wish me to. I wont be dodging anything, as I expect you not to either.

EDIT: just wanted to add to this already long post what happened to the disciples and their associates.

Matthew - killed by stabbing as ordered by King Hircanus

James, son of Alphaeus - crucified

James, brother of Jesus - thrown down from a height, stoned and then beaten to death at the hands of Ananias (circa AD 66)

John - tortured by boiling oil, exiled to Patmos in AD 95

Mark - burned during Roman emperor Trajan's reign

Peter - crucified upside-down by the gardens of Nero on the Vatican hill circa AD 64

Andrew - crucified on an "X" shaped cross by Aegeas, governor of the Edessenes, around AD 80

Philip - stoned and crucified in Hierapolis, Phrygia

Simon - crucified in Egypt under Trajan's reign

Thomas - death by spear thrust in Calamina, India

Thaddaeus - killed by arrows

James, son of Zebedee - killed by sword in AD 44 by order of King Herod Agrippa I of Judea

Bartholomew - beaten, flayed alive, crucified upside down, then beheaded

^Find me in history ANY religion that claimed that God was in human form, walked amongst them, did not forcibly take over or preach through force, written about by the sources of said religion and outside sources wrote and corroborate their story of the "god" that walked among them, the founders of said religion were also tormented and died still claiming that their "god" was god, in such ways as pointed out above and grew rapidly lasting to even this day.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to atheists

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Thu, 26 Apr 2012 01:36:08 GMT

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

firstly, do you still think the following:

1. people who preach a different religion deserve to be killed
2. it is permissible to deliberately slaughter children to frighten the adults in their society
3. people who are not convinced in the truth of your religion deserve to be tortured

if you've changed your mind on the positions you previously held, i'll be interested to hear why

i've already responded to the crap from josephus etc, go back a page or two. eatcow couldn't come up with a single contemporary account of jesus' life; perhaps you can succeed where he failed? nothing you said in that post qualifies. written way too late, and would be unimpressive if true.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Jerad2142](#) **on Thu, 26 Apr 2012 12:38:03 GMT**

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

Spoony wrote on Wed, 25 April 2012 19:36

1. people who preach a different religion deserve to be killed
2. it is permissible to deliberately slaughter children to frighten the adults in their society
3. people who are not convinced in the truth of your religion deserve to be tortured

I am 100% sure there is at least 1 athiest out there that believes all of those things. (Removing the word 'different' from 1 obviously, and adding the words 'lack of' between your and religion in 3).

There are nuts on both sides of the coin, and I'm sure if religion didn't exist they'd find some other reason to kill people.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [iRANian](#) **on Thu, 26 Apr 2012 12:42:31 GMT**

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

hahahahaha

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Spoony](#) **on Thu, 26 Apr 2012 13:39:43 GMT**

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

what is the point of that statement, jerad?

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [fredcow9](#) **on Thu, 26 Apr 2012 16:51:19 GMT**

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

Spoony wrote on Wed, 25 April 2012 18:36firstly, do you still think the following:

1. people who preach a different religion deserve to be killed

Never felt this way, I think its something you just assumed from talking about the israelites trip back to Canaan. If we are talking the afterlife and eternal torment? of course. If God is assumed to exist and made man ect, he would obviously have some sort of interaction with him. Why should those that didnt believe get the same fate as those who were tormented on earth and did believe. Quote:2. it is permissible to deliberately slaughter children to frighten the adults in their society This tactic isn't even in the bible but I never felt this way to begin with. Im not so sure what reference of killing children to frighten adults in society would be tbh.

Quote:3. people who are not convinced in the truth of your religion deserve to be tortured ah I guess my answer to question 1 falls under this category. the relevance of my being ok with it is kind of moot although I am. Whats really relevant about this question is if that's the case and you are fully aware the christian God would do this then what is your excuse for not believing? (just hypothetically of course)

i've already responded to the crap from josephus etc, go back a page or two. eatcow couldn't come up with a single contemporary account of jesus' life; perhaps you can succeed where he failed? nothing you said in that post qualifies. written way too late, and would be unimpressive if true.[/quote]

Titus Flavius Josephus (37 – c. 100) - notice the recurring theme here? yet another source the best you can say of whom is that he is repeating what he'd heard.

Quote:and what is he repeating? this is the passage which most people think has been tampered with; maybe you're in the minority who thinks it hasn't? and the only unusual thing in the passage is that he had followers who considered him miraculous. given the time and place, i'm being generous when i call that unusual.

This is more than what he heard, its what he was made well aware of and felt important enough to include in his history writings. Do you think the government at the time for whom he worked (you do know he worked for the romans) would have accepted an account based on "what he heard" ... If you think its been tampered with, what era did this occur? Who did the tampering or at least who had the most to gain by digging into his writings and changing the originals? Jesus died at 33 years of age. Josephus wrote these things 4 years after min. They coincide with the writings of tacitus who wrote during Christ life up to about the 40s ad. I will need some evidence for all these claims your making here.

Heres what you NEED to dispute. Christ lived amoungst and showed himself to many peoples. thousands at times. He was rejected by the Jewish authority at the time and his life was pretty much constantly being sought out by them. The apostles lived with broke bread with slept and did everything with Jesus. If your looking for an eyewitness account they are the best ones your going to get. Note all the apostles were Jews and also note the ways in which they died as I stated above.

What in secular history DISCOUNTS the writings of Jesus, where are the contradictions of secular writings at the time e.g A man named Jesus existed, claimed to be the king of the Jews, he was killed and the Christians foolishly went around claiming he rose again kind of thing.

What is your biggest distrust in the gospels? assume they have no motive. what is their biggest error?

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Thu, 26 Apr 2012 18:01:17 GMT

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

fredcow9 wrote on Thu, 26 April 2012 09:51Spoony wrote on Wed, 25 April 2012 18:36firstly, do you still think the following:

1. people who preach a different religion deserve to be killed

Never felt this way

Spoony: so you're ok with the instruction for genocide if another town worships another god, or the instruction of what to do if a friend or family member tries to tell you about a different religion?

Fredcow: you said earlier that the punishment hell was an unbearable one and yet if someone comes along false preaching to try to entrap you in hell then he doesn't deserve death? yet that's what he's trying to get you is eternal death and torment.

Quote: 2. it is permissible to deliberately slaughter children to frighten the adults in their society

This tactic isn't even in the bible but I never felt this way to begin with. I'm not so sure what reference of killing children to frighten adults in society would be tbh.

Toggle SpoilerSpoony: god murders the egyptian firstborn. of what crime is every single one of these children guilty that would justify their death? and why does it make sense to murder these children, as opposed to... say... the pharaoh who keeps the slaves and won't let them go?

firstly, I have asked you to demonstrate that the innumerable victims of your god were all guilty - look at my previous post. the egyptian firstborn, for example, what crime did they commit? secondly, it would still qualify as genocide if they were all guilty.

while we're on the subject of you trying to explain away the more despicable parts in the bible, how about the egyptian firstborn? god kills all the firstborn of egypt. what is your way of explaining why this is not the sickening genocide of innocent children it appears to be?

^^ took me quite a few posts before you had a go at replying

Fredcow: The egyptian story is an ultimatum, stop holding my people as slaves or I'll put your people through so much misery you'll regret it. now if you're thinking that all these firstborns have hell fire to answer to after their death that's probably not the case, and I actually imagine that the truly innocent in a case like that are dealt with accordingly. do I know for sure? nah. again these are all cases where people are warned in advance they just don't listen.

Spoony: nothing here, absolutely nothing, mitigates the fact that the punishment is the indiscriminate genocide of innocent children. it doesn't make a damn bit of difference what the pharaoh did or how many times he was threatened. if the story said that god killed the pharaoh, you wouldn't hear any objection from me. what's more, I think it'd be more likely to work. the pharaoh's already ignored like 10 warnings, right? and there's been all sorts of punishment on his people. we've already seen that the pharaoh doesn't seem to care about his people suffering. threaten him personally and you might get a result.

Fredcow: well then I guess we have to agree to disagree because obviously if you have read entirely and understand the bible to what you believe would be your own understanding then there's nothing I can do, you either see something like the egyptian story as an example of why people should listen to God or you see it as a mass genocide against the innocent regardless of

the details

Quote:Quote:3. people who are not convinced in the truth of your religion deserve to be tortured ah I guess my answer to question 1 falls under this category. the relevance of my being ok with it is kind of moot although I am. Whats really relevant about this question is if thats the case and you are fully aware the christian God would do this then what is your excuse for not believing? (just hypothetically of course)

i've already gone over the quite major problems with the concept of hell, the system of torture for not being the right religion that you have repeatedly defended. you had no response to any of them. shall i repeat them?

Quote:This is more than what he heard, its what he was made well aware of and felt important enough to include in his history writings.

Not important enough to believe it himself, though

This is a Jewish man, apparently quite devout. He believes in Yahweh and the Jewish concept of an oncoming messiah (he thought it was some other guy at one point)... and he obviously didn't think Jesus was it.

Quote:Do you think the government at the time for whom he worked (you do know he worked for the romans) would have accepted an account based on "what he heard"...

easy tiger, i just asserted that he is not a contemporary of jesus. you can't seem to find any, can you?

Quote:If you think its been tampered with, what era did this occur? Who did the tampering or at least who had the most to gain by digging into his writings and changing the originals?

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Josephus_on_Jesus#Arguments_challenging_authenticity

Quote:Jesus died at 33 years of age. Josephus wrote these things 4 years after min. much, much later than that. josephus wasn't even born until after jesus is supposed to have died. he probably wrote this stuff half a century or so after jesus was supposed to have been crucified.

Quote:They coincide with the writings of tacitus who wrote during Christ life up to about the 40s ad.

eh? Publius (or Gaius) Cornelius Tacitus (AD 56 – AD 117)? that Tacitus?

Quote:Heres what you NEED to dispute. Christ lived amoungst and showed himself to many peoples. thousands at times. He was rejected by the Jewish authority at the time and his life was pretty much constantly being sought out by them.

Suppose for a moment that this was true. Why do you think this helps your case? The Jewish authorities of the time - men who believed in God and believed in the messiah - they'd been propagating the messiah concept for centuries - did not think Jesus was it. And they were so angry that they wanted him silenced, and even killed. This helps your case? Really? If Jesus really was doing miracles and whatnot, they would have accepted him as the messiah. They didn't. What say you to that? You think the Jewish authorities simply didn't know he was the messiah? Or you think they purposely had the messiah killed, which would have to be pretty fucking brave of them given what they believed about Yahweh in the old testament? (the god of the old testament kills people all the time for, like, nothing. what would he do to people who killed

the messiah?)

Quote: The apostles lived with broke bread with slept and did everything with Jesus. If your looking for an eyewitness account they are the best ones your going to get.

It's true you can't seem to come up with a better one, discounting the Jewish authorities themselves. Or are they not eyewitnesses?

Quote: What is your biggest distrust in the gospels? assume they have no motive. what is their biggest error?

....just the gospels or the whole bible?

quick summary

1. i don't believe any of the supernatural bullshit (including the existence of a god or the supernatural nature of Jesus). if it turned out that there really was a guy called jesus who did some preaching and got crucified, so what? really was a
2. it obviously has nothing to teach me about morality. the good stuff i already knew, the bad stuff is - well, bad.
3. following on with the bad stuff, i could refer you to the stuff above, such as the concept of hell... which is a strong contender for the most evil idea anyone came up with. what a relief it is to think it's a lie. but then i'm not the target demographic, am i? the main targets for proselytising are children, and old/sick/dying people.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [fredcow9](#) on Thu, 26 Apr 2012 19:55:35 GMT

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

Quote:[b]Spoony: so you're ok with the instruction for genocide if another town worships another god, or the instruction of what to do if a friend or family member tries to tell you about a different religion?

If they are wicked yes. I still dont get this part and I would like some explaination.

Quote: or the instruction of what to do if a friend or family member tries to tell you about a different religion?

Whats the famed biblical instruction?

[quote title=Quote:]Quote: 2. it is permissible to deliberately slaughter children to frighten the adults in their society

The slaughtering of children was to show to what extent pharaoh would go to in holding Gods people and the fact that God could kill all the firstborns would prove that hes God because only God could do such a thing could he not?

The quoted question still doesnt really pertain to the Egyptian story. The point was not to frighten anyone but to show who is really who.

Quote: i've already gone over the quite major problems with the concept of hell, the system of torture for not being the right religion that you have repeatedly defended. you had no response to any of them. shall i repeat them?

If you have a problem with the concept of gravity, its still going to exist and be an acting force. gravity does not care if you accept it or dont think gravity is a permissible thing. Its still there. You

knowing its there are unexcused for jumping off a cliff and not expecting to fall.

Quote:Not important enough to believe it himself, though

So? the High priest according to the bible itself didnt believe Jesus was the son of God that was supposed to come. Many people you would have expected to believe simply did not despite miracles being performed right in front of their face. Instead theyd rather believe Jesus got his authority from demons in mat 12:24

Quote:This is a Jewish man, apparently quite devout. He believes in Yahweh and the Jewish concept of an oncoming messiah (he thought it was some other guy at one point)... and he obviously didn't think Jesus was it.

As didnt many others. Saul of tarsus didnt believe Christ either till he hit the road to Damascus.

Quote:easy tiger, i just asserted that he is not a contemporary of jesus. you can't seem to find any, can you?

He was alive a reasonable time afterwards and lived to probably see some of the people that actually saw Jesus face to face. thus why he wrote that

Quote:And many people from among the Jews and the other nations became his disciples. Pilate condemned him to be crucified and to die. And those who had become his disciples did not abandon his discipleship. They reported that he had appeared to them three days after his crucifixion and that he was alive

This is not inheritable false and it just so happens that the same events he wrote are also written in the gospels/new testament.

Quote:Quote:If you think its been tampered with, what era did this occur? Who did the tampering or at least who had the most to gain by digging into his writings and changing the originals?

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Josephus_on_Jesus#Arguments_challenging_authenticity

I dont need an overview for argument of Jesus not being authentic from wikipedia. Lets talk specifics. What did you even want me to do with that?

Quote:much, much later than that. josephus wasn't even born until after jesus is supposed to have died.

of course.

Quote:he probably wrote this stuff half a century or so after jesus was supposed to have been crucified.

According to who? Also what time period is someone writing about a person after they existed can that not be trusted?

Quote:They coincide with the writings of tacitus who wrote during Christ life up to about the 40s ad.

Quote:eh? Publius (or Gaius) Cornelius Tacitus (AD 56 – AD 117)? that Tacitus?
yes, $40 + 33 = 73$...

Quote:Suppose for a moment that this was true. Why do you think this helps your case?

If the gospels can be trusted and they claim Jesus was the son of God then I have good reason to believe them especially considering.

Quote:The Jewish authorities of the time - men who believed in God and believed in the messiah - they'd been propagating the messiah concept for centuries - did not think Jesus was it. And they were so angry that they wanted him silenced, and even killed. This helps your case? Really? If Jesus really was doing miracles and whatnot, they would have accepted him as the messiah.

You should read the interactions with the pharisees and Jesus. You will quickly discover they had the power and Jesus was literally striping it away from them and allowing the gentiles into Gods grace as well. You will notice the Jewish authority constantly brings up our father abraham and moses taught us this and that. The Jewish authority was flat our racist tbh.

Why would they automatically accept him as the messiah anyway? Why did the jewish disciples believe Jesus was the son of God and not deny it even unto death?

9/11 is one of the most witnessed events in history because of the major footage covered by it yet you have a division of people that think 9/11 was fake and then you have people that think 9/11 was legitimate. People will always believe or not believe what they wish regardless of evidence.

Quote:They didn't. What say you to that? You think the Jewish authorities simply didn't know he was the messiah? Or you think they purposely had the messiah killed, which would have to be pretty fucking brave of them given what they believed about Yahweh in the old testament?

They expected Jesus to come and destroy the romans, slay all the non believers and grant the grace of God to the Jews only.

Jesus came in peace, preached humbleness, preached against their adopted customs at the time and really preached against everything the Jewish authority at the time stood for. They were really just evil men who wanted God all to themselves and no one else.

Quote:(the god of the old testament kills people all the time for, like, nothing. what would he do to people who killed the messiah?)

They are probably enjoying the uber tropical weather.

Quote:The apostles lived with broke bread with slept and did everything with Jesus. If your looking for an eyewitness account they are the best ones your going to get.

Quote:It's true you can't seem to come up with a better one, discounting the Jewish authorities themselves. Or are they not eyewitnesses?

Wheres their discounting writings?

Quote:....just the gospels or the whole bible?

For now just the gospels.

Quote:quick summary

1. i don't believe any of the supernatural bullshit (including the existence of a god or the supernatural nature of Jesus). if it turned out that there really was a guy called jesus who did some preaching and got crucified, so what?

If a man claimed to be the son of God, died fulfilled prophecies the son of God was supposed to AND rose from the dead, thats someone Im willing to believe. You just sound like your not willing to believe no matter what. You would really fall in line with the pharisees at the time. unless im wrong and you would be convinced by direct witnessing.

Quote:2. it obviously has nothing to teach me about morality. the good stuff i already knew, the bad stuff is - well, bad.

Gods image is in every man, everyone has some feeling of morality no matter how evil they really are.

Quote:3. following on with the bad stuff, i could refer you to the stuff above, such as the concept of hell... which is a strong contender for the most evil idea anyone came up with.

According to what you think. You might also think the death penalty is cruel and unusual, but yet somewhere in the world people dont agree with you. Why do you assume that your 100% correct on your judgement other than you being the one making it?

Quote:what a relief it is to think it's a lie. but then i'm not the target demographic, am i? the main targets for proselytising are children, and old/sick/dying people.

You disagree with the way God does things. So did Satan. Good luck. As for target demographic? everyone who doesn't believe is. I don't know why you would belittle a commandment to "go and make disciples of all nations" to old/sick/dying people and children.

I'll leave you with this to answer at some point

Quote: Its quite undeniable that Jesus at the very least existed as a person. The fact the gospels align with these other writings is quite amazing, it shows that the things of Jesus were quite common knowledge for people in that area. The apostles didn't have an internet or public distribution center for their writings so its impossible for them to have based their writings on the gospel accounts and vice versa. Its always come down to if you believe he is the Christ he claimed to be. People will always deny he was, even the high priests of the Jews at the time did and continued to do so. The fact Christianity spread so rapidly and quickly, still surviving to today and its given history really stands testimony enough that the gospel writers are not lying, people acknowledged a man Christ had died and rose from the grave otherwise others in the time period would have written about the lunacy of all these christians worshiping a man that never existed. since I just jumped in here, I'm not going to answer the rest of your posts aimed at that guy of course unless you wish me to. I won't be dodging anything, as I expect you not to either.

EDIT: just wanted to add to this already long post what happened to the disciples and their associates.

Matthew - killed by stabbing as ordered by King Hircanus

James, son of Alphaeus - crucified

James, brother of Jesus - thrown down from a height, stoned and then beaten to death at the hands of Ananias (circa AD 66)

John - tortured by boiling oil, exiled to Patmos in AD 95

Mark - burned during Roman emperor Trajan's reign

Peter - crucified upside-down by the gardens of Nero on the Vatican hill circa AD 64

Andrew - crucified on an "X" shaped cross by Aegeas, governor of the Edessenes, around AD 80

Philip - stoned and crucified in Hierapolis, Phrygia

Simon - crucified in Egypt under Trajan's reign

Thomas - death by spear thrust in Calamina, India

Thaddaeus - killed by arrows

James, son of Zebedee - killed by sword in AD 44 by order of King Herod Agrippa I of Judea

Bartholomew - beaten, flayed alive, crucified upside down, then beheaded

^Find me in history ANY religion that claimed that God was in human form, walked amongst them, did not forcibly take over or preach through force, written about by the sources of said religion and outside sources wrote and corroborate their story of the "god" that walked among them, the founders of said religion were also tormented and died still claiming that their "god" was god, in such ways as pointed out above and grew rapidly lasting to even this day.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to atheists

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Thu, 26 Apr 2012 21:17:30 GMT

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

fredcow9 wrote on Thu, 26 April 2012 12:55Quote:[b]Spoony: so you're ok with the instruction for genocide if another town worships another god, or the instruction of what to do if a friend or family

member tries to tell you about a different religion?

If they are wicked yes. I still dont get this part and I would like some explaination.

Quote:or the instruction of what to do if a friend or family member tries to tell you about a different religion?

Whats the famed biblical instruction?

Deuteronomy 13:13-19 Suppose you hear in one of the towns the LORD your God is giving you that some worthless rabble among you have led their fellow citizens astray by encouraging them to worship foreign gods. In such cases, you must examine the facts carefully. If you find it is true and can prove that such a detestable act has occurred among you, you must attack that town and completely destroy all its inhabitants, as well as all the livestock. Then you must pile all the plunder in the middle of the street and burn it. Put the entire town to the torch as a burnt offering to the LORD your God. That town must remain a ruin forever; it may never be rebuilt. Keep none of the plunder that has been set apart for destruction. Then the LORD will turn from his fierce anger and be merciful to you. He will have compassion on you and make you a great nation, just as he solemnly promised your ancestors. "The LORD your God will be merciful only if you obey him and keep all the commands I am giving you today, doing what is pleasing to him.

Deuteronomy 13:7-12 If your own full brother, or your son or daughter, or your beloved wife, or you intimate friend, entices you secretly to serve other gods, whom you and your fathers have not known, gods of any other nations, near at hand or far away, from one end of the earth to the other: do not yield to him or listen to him, nor look with pity upon him, to spare or shield him, but kill him. Your hand shall be the first raised to slay him; the rest of the people shall join in with you.

You shall stone him to death, because he sought to lead you astray from the Lord, your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, that place of slavery. And all Israel, hearing of this, shall fear and never do such evil as this in your midst.

Deuteronomy 17:2-5 Suppose a man or woman among you, in one of your towns that the LORD your God is giving you, has done evil in the sight of the LORD your God and has violated the covenant by serving other gods or by worshiping the sun, the moon, or any of the forces of heaven, which I have strictly forbidden. When you hear about it, investigate the matter thoroughly. If it is true that this detestable thing has been done in Israel, then that man or woman must be taken to the gates of the town and stoned to death.

Quote:Quote:2. it is permissible to deliberately slaughter children to frighten the adults in their society

The slaughtering of children was to show to what extent pharaoh would go to in holding Gods people and the fact that God could kill all the firstborns would prove that hes God because only God could do such a thing could he not?

The quoted question still doesnt really pertain to the Egyptian story. The point was not to frighten anyone but to show who is really who.

isn't there some small part of you that wonders why you're trying to justify intentional and systematic genocide of innocent children?

Quote:Quote:i've already gone over the quite major problems with the concept of hell, the system of torture for not being the right religion that you have repeatedly defended. you had no response to any of them. shall i repeat them?

If you have a problem with the concept of gravity, its still going to exist and be an acting force. gravity does not care if you accept it or dont think gravity is a permissible thing. Its still there. You

knowing its there are unexcused for jumping off a cliff and not expecting to fall.

i guess i do need to repeat them, then?

Toggle SpoilerSpoony: isn't the concept of hell revolting and intolerable? why is it a mainstream religious view? i'm talking about the most common description of hell, i.e. a place of torture where you go after you die if you're either a criminal or a non-member of insert-religion-here.

why's it considered acceptable to make such a sick, demented threat to someone? agree with me or you will be tortured in the afterlife? what the fuck? if anyone thinks that hell is real, perhaps they can explain what kind of sick bastard of a god would send someone there just for not worshipping him, and why would you worship a god as merciless and unjust as that?

Fredcow: youv been warned, if your willing to do the crime then be willing to pay the time

Spoony: firstly, you use the word "crime". not being convinced in the truth of your religion is a "crime". having doubts, thinking for yourself... crimes. wow.

secondly, the threatened punishment for this "crime" is torture, forever. you've just defended torture... and we're not talking waterboarding here, we're talking endless inescapable torture. i repeat: you just defended torture. you think kids are going there too or just adults? and isn't god a COLOSSAL twat for doing something so... let's not beat about the bush here... evil? torturing someone FOR EVER just for not believing in him? what a prick.

thirdly, suppose that non-belief in your god and your jesus was a crime, though nobody of any normal moral sense would think it was. suppose it was. i'm not "willing" to do the crime, and it's pointless "warning" me not to do it, because this law (i.e. Believe in God!) is not one i can choose to follow. do you understand that? i don't believe it, but i didn't choose not to believe it. i can't flick a switch and make myself believe in your religion. i could pretend i did, and that's about the best i could do. maybe i could fool the people around me, but i'd be lying, and i won't do that. i'd rather be honest about my non-belief. and according to the usual crap we keep hearing about your god, he seems to know everything and he'd know i was lying too. do you think god would prefer i PRETENDED to believe in him just to get myself out of a punishment, or would he prefer i continued being honest about the fact i just don't believe any of this crap?

fourthly, supposing i COULD choose to take heed of the threat and believe in god. which one? which religion? the pope says only catholics are going to heaven, all the other christian denominations are "deficient". many protestant churches say the same thing in reverse. islam says all non-muslims are going to hell, which would include all christians. who's right here? none of them ever come with any evidence.

Fredcow: you either agree with the concept that God created the world and set up laws both spiritual and scientific or you dont, there really is no discussion to be had here. I still see no problem with hell, you either accept him or you reject him

Spoony: I said you were literally defending torture. You don't mind that.

I said that I cannot choose to follow this law, and therefore the threat of endless torture is not something I could avoid if I wanted to. You don't mind that.

I said that even if I could, which god and which religion am I supposed to obey? The pope who says only Catholics will be saved because other forms of Christianity are "deficient"? The various Protestant churches who say it's the other way around? Islam which says all non-Muslims (i.e. puts you and I in the same category) are going to hell? I say none of you have come up with a damn shred of evidence as to who's right, because they can't all be. You don't even answer the question of which of the above is right, or if it's a different denomination altogether... LET ALONE

show any evidence.

No. You "see no problem" with any of this. I've been saying for a while what a fundamentalist you are and how you obviously don't know right from wrong (that became obvious when you said it's OK to kill someone if they preach a different religion, and when you said you'd murder an innocent child if God told you to) - thanks for making it even clearer what a complete lack of moral sense you suffer. Aren't you even remotely ashamed of yourself for supporting such a wicked, oppressive concept of hell? Actively supporting it against its intended victims? Do you have any humanity inside you at all?

Torture as punishment for not being the right religion. What a horrible idea, how completely opposite to the idea of religious freedom. I'm very much in favour of religious freedom - you're a fanatical opponent of it.

Fredcow: I dont mind that you cant avoid endless torture, sorry thats just the way it is

Spoony: Then what a sick, demented, evil god your God is. He's gonna torture me and there's absolutely nothing I can do about it. What a mean lady. What an evil prick, what a cruel, merciless, bloodthirsty tyrant. Why do you worship him?

Do me a favour? say that out loud. say "I'm in favour of the idea that people who are the wrong religion are going to be tortured. This guy said it was wrong, but I defended it." Say that out loud, alone in your room. Then say it to your family. Then go into the street and say it to a complete stranger.

I assume you have no qualms about saying it? It is what you think, isn't it?

Fredcow: sure, you will be tortured for eternity if you dont accept Jesus as your lord and savior, and i firmly believe this.

Spoony: so you're officially pro-torture for people who are not of the right religion, and you're completely unmoved by the 3-4 rather major objections i raised to that.

^^

Quote:Quote:Not important enough to believe it himself, though

So? the High priest according to the bible itself didnt believe Jesus was the son of God that was supposed to come. Many people you would have expected to believe simply did not[/quote]

Quote:Quote:This is a Jewish man, apparently quite devout. He believes in Yahweh and the Jewish concept of an oncoming messiah (he thought it was some other guy at one point)... and he obviously didn't think Jesus was it.

As didnt many others.

Quote:Quote:easy tiger, i just asserted that he is not a contemporary of jesus. you can't seem to find any, can you?

He was alive a reasonable time afterwards and lived to probably see some of the people that actually saw Jesus face to face. thus why he wrote that

i've been asking for pages and pages a simple question about where the likes of Josephus got their information from... nobody seems to know. they were repeating what they'd heard... from whom? even if these historians believed it themselves, which they generally don't, there's still not

much credibility to what they write, and what they write would be unimpressive even if it were true (generally stuff along the lines of "there was a group of people who believed X...")

Quote:he probably wrote this stuff half a century or so after jesus was supposed to have been crucified.

According to who?

...when do you think josephus wrote about jesus?

Quote:Also what time period is someone writing about a person after they existed can that not be trusted?

in a time when most people couldn't read or write, and the world (at the time and place) was frothing with messianic delusions and schismatic sects?

sorry, but you're gonna have to do a little better than a few droning scribblings written decades after the guy they're talking about is supposed to have died. that's feeble, and if your god is intelligent, he'd know how feeble it is. a decent god who was interested in people all over the world joining his religion ought to be able to do better than this.

Quote:They coincide with the writings of tacitus who wrote during Christ life up to about the 40s ad.

Quote:eh? Publius (or Gaius) Cornelius Tacitus (AD 56 – AD 117)? that Tacitus?

yes, 40+ 33= 73...

"tacitus wrote during Christ's life"? are you sure you meant to say that?

Quote:Why did the jewish disciples believe Jesus was the son of God and not deny it even unto death?

why don't so many people believe it even though you threaten them with worse than death?

not quite the same thing in practice, because you're obviously full of shit, but the principle is the same.

Quote:9/11 is one of the most witnessed events in history because of the major footage covered by it yet you have a division of people that think 9/11 was fake and then you have people that think 9/11 was legitimate. People will always believe or not believe what they wish regardless of evidence.

let's not compare the two.

Quote:They didn't. What say you to that? You think the Jewish authorities simply didn't know he was the messiah? Or you think they purposely had the messiah killed, which would have to be pretty fucking brave of them given what they believed about Yahweh in the old testament? They expected Jesus to come and destroy the romans, slay all the non believers and grant the grace of God to the Jews only.

Jesus came in peace, preached humbleness, preached against their adopted customs at the time and really preached against everything the Jewish authority at the time stood for.

which is another way of saying that jesus and god have nothing to do with each other.

Quote:They were really just evil men who wanted God all to themselves and no one else. sounds quite devout, by old testament standards.

Quote:Quote:It's true you can't seem to come up with a better one, discounting the Jewish authorities themselves. Or are they not eyewitnesses?
Wheres their discounting writings?
you misunderstand.
"you can't seem to come up with better eyewitness accounts, not counting the Jewish authorities"

Quote:If a man claimed to be the son of God, died fullfilled prophecies the son of God was supposed to AND rose from the dead, thats someone Im willing to believe. You just sound like your not willing to believe no matter what. You would really fall in line with the pharisees at the time. unless im wrong and you would be convinced by direct witnessing.
whatever makes you feel better about the fact that you can't prove anything important about jesus.

"claimed to be the son of God" - plenty of people claimed stuff like that
"died" - woop de doo
"fulfilled prophecies" - wanna give a few examples?
"rose from the dead" - prove it

as for me "falling in line with the pharisees", let's remember that i've consistently been in favour of religious freedom, whereas you've openly defended murder and torture as punishments for not being the right religion, for offending the religious bullies of the time... which happened to jesus, didn't it? doesn't that make you reconsider? can you really be in favour of persecuting people for not being the right religion when someone you admire was the victim of the same thing?

Quote:Quote:2. it obviously has nothing to teach me about morality. the good stuff i already knew, the bad stuff is - well, bad.
Gods image is in every man, everyone has some feeling of morality no matter how evil they really are.
what utter drivel

Quote:Quote:3. following on with the bad stuff, i could refer you to the stuff above, such as the concept of hell... which is a strong contender for the most evil idea anyone came up with.
According to what you think.
no, you're just too fucking retarded to realise that you think it too.

do you want to live in a society where you can be horribly punished for not being the right religion according to those in power? where the ones in power say that the right religion is not the same as yours?

Quote:You disagree with the way God does things.
you're still aware that i don't think this god of yours is real?

Quote:So did Satan.
so?

i have a question. why's satan the villain of the bible?

Quote:Good luck. As for target demographic? everyone who doesnt believe is. I dont know why

you would belittle a commandment to "go and make disciples of all nations" to old/sick/dying people and children.

isn't it true that the overwhelming majority of conversions are done by indoctrinating children?

telling kids that religion X or Y is real when they're too young to know any better. kids are taught this bullshit with the same certainty as what they're taught in maths and science, and they're not told "by the way, there's basically no evidence that any of this crap is true, and you can just live your life without a religion btw", and they're threatened with extraordinary punishments.

and of course children are the target demographic, because it doesn't work on intelligent adults. i've debated dozens of religious people and not a single one has said anything to make me think their religions are worthwhile. seriously, not a damn thing. (most of them were less fanatical than you)

Quote:Its quite undeniable that Jesus at the very least existed as a person.
so?

Quote:The fact the gospels align with these other writings is quite amazing, it shows that the things of Jesus were quite common knowledge for people in that area.
the gospels don't even agree with each other. but then, i wouldn't expect them to.

Quote:The apostles didnt have an internet or public distribution center for their writings and their writings didn't even turn up until decades after the events they purport to describe. sorry, are you still talking about why they're reliable?

Quote:People will always deny he was, even the high priests of the Jews at the time did and most of the secular historical sources you cite, josephus etc, they deny it too despite believing in the jewish messiah. sorry, are you still talking about why jesus really was the messiah?

Quote:The fact Christianity spread so rapidly and quickly, still surviving to today and its given history really stands testimony enough that the gospel writers are not lying
the fact it became so widespread is because it was given power by the roman empire
collusion with secular dictatorship + indoctrination of children = survival. but despite all this, you still can't prove it's true.

Quote:people acknowledged a man Christ had died and rose from the grave otherwise others in the time period would have written about the lunacy of all these christians worshiping a man that never existed.

first, swap "never existed" for "was a man, not the son of a god". as for lunacy, have you even read the "secular historical sources" you keep citing? they tend to refer to "the christians" derisively, calling them superstitious and troublemakers, and the jewish ones among them who do believe in the messiah don't think jesus was it.

Quote:EDIT: just wanted to add to this already long post what happened to the disciples and their associates.

Matthew - killed by stabbing as ordered by King Hircanus

James, son of Alphaeus - crucified

James, brother of Jesus - thrown down from a height, stoned and then beaten to death at the

hands of Ananias (circa AD 66)

John - tortured by boiling oil, exiled to Patmos in AD 95

Mark - burned during Roman emperor Trajan's reign

Peter - crucified upside-down by the gardens of Nero on the Vatican hill circa AD 64

Andrew - crucified on an "X" shaped cross by Aegeas, governor of the Edessenes, around AD 80

Philip - stoned and crucified in Hierapolis, Phrygia

Simon - crucified in Egypt under Trajan's reign

Thomas - death by spear thrust in Calamina, India

Thaddaeous - killed by arrows

James, son of Zebedee - killed by sword in AD 44 by order of King Herod Agrippa I of Judea

Bartholomew - beaten, flayed alive, crucified upside down, then beheaded

Nasty stuff. But I can say that, cos unlike you i've always been against people being persecuted for their religion (if that is, indeed, why they were all killed...), whereas you're enthusiastically in favour of it.

Quote:^Find me in history ANY religion that claimed that God was in human form, walked amongst them, did not forcibly take over or preach through force, written about by the sources of said religion and outside sources wrote and corroborate their story of the "god" that walked among them, the founders of said religion were also tormented and died still claiming that their "god" was god, in such ways as pointed out above and grew rapidly lasting to even this day.

it's a shame you didn't put any full stops in here, because this might be a record for the most number of fallacies in a single sentence.

1. "find me in history any religion..." - you must realise you're asking the wrong guy here

2. "claimed that God was in human form" - you haven't proven that jesus said any such thing.

3. "did not forcibly take over or preach through force" - are you fucking retarded? what is Hell? jesus says follow me and do as i say or you'll go to hell.

4. "outside sources corroborate the story" - they do more to undermine than corroborate

5. this isn't exactly a fallacy, but rather something odd i've noticed about you.

you speak highly of the disciples who supposedly stuck to their religion even in the face of threats of death and torture. if this is admirable, why are you so contemptuous towards me sticking to my intellectual position in the face of torture?

it isn't exactly the same thing, if only because your threats are obviously lies, but if you're gonna praise the disciples who kept their faith under fire, can't you admit a grudging respect for someone like me who continues to be honest and open about my non-belief no matter what you threaten me with?

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [freduc9](#) on Fri, 27 Apr 2012 20:25:36 GMT

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

Quote:Deuteronomy 13:13-19 Suppose you hear in one of the towns the LORD your God is giving you that some worthless rabble among you have led their fellow citizens astray by encouraging them to worship foreign gods. In such cases, you must examine the facts carefully. If you find it is true and can prove that such a detestable act has occurred among you, you must attack that town and completely destroy all its inhabitants, as well as all the livestock. Then you must pile all

the plunder in the middle of the street and burn it. Put the entire town to the torch as a burnt offering to the LORD your God. That town must remain a ruin forever; it may never be rebuilt. Keep none of the plunder that has been set apart for destruction. Then the LORD will turn from his fierce anger and be merciful to you. He will have compassion on you and make you a great nation, just as he solemnly promised your ancestors. "The LORD your God will be merciful only if you obey him and keep all the commands I am giving you today, doing what is pleasing to him.

Deuteronomy 13:7-12 If your own full brother, or your son or daughter, or your beloved wife, or you intimate friend, entices you secretly to serve other gods, whom you and your fathers have not known, gods of any other nations, near at hand or far away, from one end of the earth to the other: do not yield to him or listen to him, nor look with pity upon him, to spare or shield him, but kill him. Your hand shall be the first raised to slay him; the rest of the people shall join in with you. You shall stone him to death, because he sought to lead you astray from the Lord, your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, that place of slavery. And all Israel, hearing of this, shall fear and never do such evil as this in your midst.

Deuteronomy 17:2-5 Suppose a man or woman among you, in one of your towns that the LORD your God is giving you, has done evil in the sight of the LORD your God and has violated the covenant by serving other gods or by worshiping the sun, the moon, or any of the forces of heaven, which I have strictly forbidden. When you hear about it, investigate the matter thoroughly. If it is true that this detestable thing has been done in Israel, then that man or woman must be taken to the gates of the town and stoned to death.

ok...whats the famed instruction to me? I dont blame God for suggesting the killing of people regardless of who they are trying to entice them to serve other gods. Only makes sense if you drag a group of people out of slavery, perform great wonders before them all, give them a nice plot of land as an inheritance and then they go and worship something else? Of course that threats going to be eliminated. If you really think God commanded that for anyone except the Israelites then you must think I cant eat anything without cloven hooves...

Quote:isn't there some small part of you that wonders why you're trying to justify intentional and systematic genocide of innocent children?

Im not even trying to justify pharaohs actions...he was just a dumbass.

Quote:i guess i do need to repeat them, then?

Toggle SpoilerSpoony: isn't the concept of hell revolting and intolerable? why is it a mainstream religious view? i'm talking about the most common description of hell, i.e. a place of torture where you go after you die if you're either a criminal or a non-member of insert-religion-here. why's it considered acceptable to make such a sick, demented threat to someone? agree with me or you will be tortured in the afterlife? what the fuck? if anyone thinks that hell is real, perhaps they can explain what kind of sick bastard of a god would send someone there just for not worshipping him, and why would you worship a god as merciless and unjust as that?

Fredcow: youv been warned, if your willing to do the crime then be willing to pay the time

Spoony: firstly, you use the word "crime". not being convinced in the truth of your religion is a "crime". having doubts, thinking for yourself... crimes. wow.

secondly, the threatened punishment for this "crime" is torture, forever. you've just defended torture... and we're not talking waterboarding here, we're talking endless inescapable torture. i

repeat: you just defended torture. you think kids are going there too or just adults? and isn't god a COLOSSAL twat for doing something so... let's not beat about the bush here... evil? torturing someone FOR EVER just for not believing in him? what a prick.

thirdly, suppose that non-belief in your god and your jesus was a crime, though nobody of any normal moral sense would think it was. suppose it was. i'm not "willing" to do the crime, and it's pointless "warning" me not to do it, because this law (i.e. Believe in God!) is not one i can choose to follow. do you understand that? i don't believe it, but i didn't choose not to believe it. i can't flick a switch and make myself believe in your religion. i could pretend i did, and that's about the best i could do. maybe i could fool the people around me, but i'd be lying, and i won't do that. i'd rather be honest about my non-belief. and according to the usual crap we keep hearing about your god, he seems to know everything and he'd know i was lying too. do you think god would prefer i PRETENDED to believe in him just to get myself out of a punishment, or would he prefer i continued being honest about the fact i just don't believe any of this crap?

fourthly, supposing i COULD choose to take heed of the threat and believe in god. which one? which religion? the pope says only catholics are going to heaven, all the other christian denominations are "deficient". many protestant churches say the same thing in reverse. islam says all non-muslims are going to hell, which would include all christians. who's right here? none of them ever come with any evidence.

Fredcow: you either agree with the concept that God created the world and set up laws both spiritual and scientific or you dont, there really is no discussion to be had here. I still see no problem with hell, you either accept him or you reject him

Spoony: I said you were literally defending torture. You don't mind that.

I said that I cannot choose to follow this law, and therefore the threat of endless torture is not something I could avoid if I wanted to. You don't mind that.

I said that even if I could, which god and which religion am I supposed to obey? The pope who says only Catholics will be saved because other forms of Christianity are "deficient"? The various Protestant churches who say it's the other way around? Islam which says all non-Muslims (i.e. puts you and I in the same category) are going to hell? I say none of you have come up with a damn shred of evidence as to who's right, because they can't all be. You don't even answer the question of which of the above is right, or if it's a different denomination altogether... LET ALONE show any evidence.

No. You "see no problem" with any of this. I've been saying for a while what a fundamentalist you are and how you obviously don't know right from wrong (that became obvious when you said it's OK to kill someone if they preach a different religion, and when you said you'd murder an innocent child if God told you to) - thanks for making it even clearer what a complete lack of moral sense you suffer. Aren't you even remotely ashamed of yourself for supporting such a wicked, oppressive concept of hell? Actively supporting it against its intended victims? Do you have any humanity inside you at all?

Torture as punishment for not being the right religion. What a horrible idea, how completely opposite to the idea of religious freedom. I'm very much in favour of religious freedom - you're a fanatical opponent of it.

Fredcow: I dont mind that you cant avoid endless torture, sorry thats just the way it is

Spoony: Then what a sick, demented, evil god your God is. He's gonna torture me and there's absolutely nothing I can do about it. What a mean lady. What an evil prick, what a cruel,

merciless, bloodthirsty tyrant. Why do you worship him?

Do me a favour? say that out loud. say "I'm in favour of the idea that people who are the wrong religion are going to be tortured. This guy said it was wrong, but I defended it." Say that out loud, alone in your room. Then say it to your family. Then go into the street and say it to a complete stranger.

I assume you have no qualms about saying it? It is what you think, isn't it?

Fredcow: sure, you will be tortured for eternity if you dont accept Jesus as your lord and savior, and i firmly believe this.

Spoony: so you're officially pro-torture for people who are not of the right religion, and you're completely unmoved by the 3-4 rather major objections i raised to that.

^^

I dont know what you want me to do with this... am I responding to myself and you? just you? or are you pointing out that your going to just say the same things over and over again. why is hell in religion. why are you punished for being the wrong religion. why is god so merciless to people who dont believe in him. the short answer is because they are very real.

Quote:

ok?

Quote:

ok?

Quote:i've been asking for pages and pages a simple question about where the likes of Josephus got their information from...

He said his disciples reported these things in the quote. I dont know why you would ask pages and pages as to how a historian is getting his information about things hes telling you hes got.

Quote:nobody seems to know. they were repeating what they'd heard... from whom?

Jesus disciples, they reported it.

Quote:even if these historians believed it themselves,

Thats not relevant, what is, is if they contradict the gospels or not.

Quote:which they generally don't, there's still not much credibility to what they write, and what they write would be unimpressive even if it were true (generally stuff along the lines of "there was a group of people who believed X...")

right, but again thats not even the point at all. The whole point is that secular historians recorded accounts of Jesus that do exist only confirm what the gospels are saying.

Quote:...when do you think josephus wrote about jesus?

probably around 60-70 ad. He completed his work in the 90s so its only reasonable for him to accuire information over this time period so he could write his great work hes known for.

Quote:in a time when most people couldn't read or write, and the world (at the time and place) was frothing with messianic delusions and schismatic sects?

So everything we know about ancient history cant be trusted because all the historians at their respective times would have been delusional? You dont think anyone wrote what they ACTUALLY SAW. I understand the skepticism but you honestly cant think everyone had some sort of an agenda, those that did, they failed. greek mythology is known as greek mythology for a reason.

Christ is not mythology.

Yes they are in a time when most couldnt read or write which is why its amazing the gospels are not lying when matched with secular writings dont you think?

Quote: sorry, but you're gonna have to do a little better than a few droning scribblings written decades after the guy they're talking about is supposed to have died.

Oh did you want writings from people that believed Jesus was the son of God? I was only using people who rejected him and would be the most neutral source.

Quote: that's feeble, and if your god is intelligent, he'd know how feeble it is. a decent god who was interested in people all over the world joining his religion ought to be able to do better than this.

I'd say considering how Christianity swept the world pretty quick did a fine job. the disciples went around getting lots of believers for a reason.

Quote: "tacitus wrote during Christ's life"? are you sure you meant to say that?
no its not lol, my bad.

Quote: why don't so many people believe it even though you threaten them with worse than death?
In the meantime, the method I have observed towards those who have been denounced to me as Christians is this: I interrogated them whether they were in fact Christians; if they confessed it, I repeated the question twice, adding the threat of capital punishment; if they still persevered, I ordered them to be executed.-pliny

Quote: not quite the same thing in practice, because you're obviously full of shit, but the principle is the same.

nice question dodge. please answer it next time.

Quote: let's not compare the two.

ok...

Quote: which is another way of saying that jesus and god have nothing to do with each other.
no its a way of saying the jewish elders at the time didnt care about God, his prophecies or following his orders anymore. They were the heads of state and enjoyed their power even amongst roman occupation.

Quote: sounds quite devout, by old testament standards.
regardless its the case.

Quote: "you can't seem to come up with better eyewitness accounts, not counting the Jewish authorities"

all writings in secular and church history do not discredit the gospels but support what they said. I can post the pro Jesus peoples writings at the time if you wish, just let me know right here.

Quote: whatever makes you feel better about the fact that you can't prove anything important about jesus.

So far I have proved the gospels can be trusted, the say hes the son of God. Im not so sure what else you need to classify it as "important"

Quote: "claimed to be the son of God" - plenty of people claimed stuff like that
not like him, who else who claimed to be the son of God fullfilled over 300 prophecies, written

about in secular history, started a whole religion that exists till today where the direct disciples didnt deny their son of god till the bitter end?

Quote:"died" - woop de doo

an innocent man dying one after reading your posts would think they would have more concern and be blasting the roman government for such atrocities. Of course when it comes to your enemies though you dont care.

Quote:"fulfilled prophecies" - wanna give a few examples?

Isaiah 7:14 Therefore the Lord himself will give you a sign: The virgin will be with child and will give birth to a son, and will call him Immanuel.

Quote:Matthew 1:20-23 [20] But after he had considered this, an angel of the Lord appeared to him in a dream and said, "Joseph son of David, do not be afraid to take Mary home as your wife, because what is conceived in her is from the Holy Spirit. [21] She will give birth to a son, and you are to give him the name Jesus, because he will save his people from their sins." [22] All this took place to fulfill what the Lord had said through the prophet: [23] "The virgin will be with child and will give birth to a son, and they will call him Immanuel" --which means, "God with us."

Isaiah 37:31 Once more a remnant of the house of Judah will take root below and bear fruit above.

Quote:Matthew 1:1-2, 16 [1] A record of the genealogy of Jesus Christ the son [descendant] of David, the son of Abraham: [2] Abraham was the father of Isaac, Isaac the father of Jacob, Jacob the father of Judah and his brothers, [16] and [a later] Jacob the father of Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ.

Isaiah 16:5 In love a throne will be established; in faithfulness a man will sit on it--one from the house of David--one who in judging seeks justice and speeds the cause of righteousness

Quote:Matthew 1:1-2A, 6, 16 [1] A record of the genealogy of Jesus Christ the son of David, the son of Abraham: [2] Abraham was the father of Isaac, ... [6] and Jesse the father of King David. [16] and Jacob the father of Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ.

Micah 5:2 But you, Bethlehem Ephrathah, though you are small among the clans of Judah, out of you will come for me one who will be ruler over Israel, whose origins are from of old, from ancient times.

Quote:Matthew 2:1 After Jesus was born in Bethlehem in Judea, during the time of King Herod, Magi from the east came to Jerusalem

Jeremiah 31:15 This is what the LORD says: "A voice is heard in Ramah, mourning and great weeping, Rachel weeping for her children and refusing to be comforted, because her children are no more."

Quote:Matthew 2:16-18 [16] When Herod realized that he had been outwitted by the Magi, he was furious, and he gave orders to kill all the boys in Bethlehem and its vicinity who were two years old and under, in accordance with the time he had learned from the Magi. [17] Then what was said through the prophet Jeremiah was fulfilled: [18] "A voice is heard in Ramah, weeping and great mourning, Rachel weeping for her children and refusing to be comforted, because they are no more."

Hosea 11:1 When Israel was a child, I loved him, and out of Egypt I called my son.

Quote:Matthew 2:14-15 [14] So he got up, took the child and his mother during the night and left for Egypt, [15] where he stayed until the death of Herod. And so was fulfilled what the Lord had said through the prophet: "Out of Egypt I called my son."

Isaiah 49:6 he [the Lord] says: "It is too small a thing for you to be my servant to restore the tribes of Jacob and bring back those of Israel I have kept. I will also make you a light for the Gentiles, that you may bring my salvation to the ends of the earth."

and

Isaiah 42:1-4, 6 [1] "Here is my servant, whom I uphold, my chosen one in whom I delight; I will put my Spirit on him and he will bring justice to the nations. [2] He will not shout or cry out, or raise his voice in the streets. [3] A bruised reed he will not break, and a smoldering wick he will not snuff out. In faithfulness he will bring forth justice; [4] he will not falter or be discouraged till he establishes justice on earth. In his law the islands will put their hope." [6] "I, the LORD, have called you in righteousness; I will take hold of your hand. I will keep you and will make you to be a covenant for the people and a light for the Gentiles,

Quote:Matthew 12:14-21 [14] But the Pharisees went out and plotted how they might kill Jesus. [15] Aware of this, Jesus withdrew from that place. Many followed him, and he healed all their sick, [16] warning them not to tell who he was. [17] This was to fulfill what was spoken through the prophet Isaiah: [18] "Here is my servant whom I have chosen, the one I love, in whom I delight; I will put my Spirit on him, and he will proclaim justice to the nations. [19] He will not quarrel or cry out; no one will hear his voice in the streets. [20] A bruised reed he will not break, and a smoldering wick he will not snuff out, till he leads justice to victory. [21] In his name the nations will put their hope."

Isaiah 35:5-6a [5] Then will the eyes of the blind be opened and the ears of the deaf unstopped. [6a] Then will the lame leap like a deer, and the mute tongue shout for joy.

Quote:Luke 7:20-22 [20] When the men came to Jesus, they said, "John the Baptist sent us to you to ask, 'Are you the one who was to come, or should we expect someone else?'" [21] At that very time Jesus cured many who had diseases, sicknesses and evil spirits, and gave sight to many who were blind. [22] So he replied to the messengers, "Go back and report to John what you have seen and heard: The blind receive sight, the lame walk, those who have leprosy are cured, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, and the good news is preached to the poor."

this one pertains to you lol

Psalm 69:4 Those who hate me without reason outnumber the hairs of my head; many are my enemies without cause, those who seek to destroy me. I am forced to restore what I did not steal. and

Isaiah 49:7 This is what the LORD says-- the Redeemer and Holy One of Israel-- to him who was despised and abhorred by the nation, to the servant of rulers: "Kings will see you and rise up, princes will see and bow down, because of the LORD, who is faithful, the Holy One of Israel, who has chosen you."

Quote:John 7:48-49 "Has any of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed in him? [49] No! But this mob that knows nothing of the law--there is a curse on them."

and

Quote:John 15:24-25 [24] If I had not done among them what no one else did, they would not be guilty of sin. But now they have seen these miracles, and yet they have hated both me and my Father. [25] But this is to fulfill what is written in their Law: 'They hated me without reason.'

Psalm 118:22 The stone the builders rejected has become the capstone [cornerstone of a building]; [23] the LORD has done this, and it is marvelous in our eyes

Quote:Matthew 21:42 Jesus said to them, "Have you never read in the Scriptures: " 'The stone the builders rejected has become the capstone; the Lord has done this, and it is marvelous in our eyes' ?

Zechariah 11:12 I told them, "If you think it best, give me my pay; but if not, keep it." So they paid me thirty pieces of silver.

Quote:Matthew 26:14-15 [14] Then one of the Twelve--the one called Judas Iscariot--went to the chief priests [15] and asked, "What are you willing to give me if I hand him over to you?" So they counted out for him thirty silver coins.

Psalm 22:16 Dogs have surrounded me; a band of evil men has encircled me, they have pierced my hands and my feet.

Quote:John 20:25 So the other disciples told him, "We have seen the Lord!" But he said to them, "Unless I see the nail marks in his hands and put my finger where the nails were, and put my hand into his side, I will not believe it."

Psalm 22:17 I can count all my bones; people stare and gloat over me.

and

Psalm 34:20 he protects all his bones, not one of them will be broken.

Quote:John 19:33; 36a [33] But when they came to Jesus and found that he was already dead, they did not break his legs. [36a] These things happened so that the scripture would be fulfilled: "Not one of his bones will be broken,"

Psalm 22:18 They divide my garments among them and cast lots for my clothing.

Quote:Matthew 27:35 When they had crucified him, they divided up his clothes by casting lots

Isaiah 53:9 He was assigned a grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death ...

Quote:Matthew 27:57,59-60 [57] As evening approached, there came a rich man from Arimathea, named Joseph, who had himself become a disciple of Jesus. [59] Joseph took the body, wrapped it in a clean linen cloth, [60] and placed it in his own new tomb that he had cut out of the rock. He rolled a big stone in front of the entrance to the tomb and went away.

Isaiah 53:8, 11 [8] By oppression and judgment he was taken away. And who can speak of his descendants? For he was cut off from the land of the living; for the transgression of my people he was stricken. [11] After the suffering of his soul, he will see the light of life and be satisfied; by his knowledge my righteous servant will justify many, and he will bear their iniquities.

Quote:Matthew 28:2, 5-7, 9 [2] There was a violent earthquake, for an angel of the Lord came down from heaven and, going to the tomb, rolled back the stone and sat on it. [5] The angel said to the women, "Do not be afraid, for I know that you are looking for Jesus, who was crucified. [6] He is not here; he has risen, just as he said. Come and see the place where he lay. [7] Then go quickly and tell his disciples: 'He has risen from the dead and is going ahead of you into Galilee. There you will see him.' Now I have told you." [9] Suddenly Jesus met them. "Greetings," he said. They came to him, clasped his feet and worshiped him.

Now one might say oh they just orchestrated all these things ect ect blah blah blah. get real. No one in history has done such a thing going to their dying grave believing it to be true expecting a hoax to carry through the government in a time when said government has made it illegal to even believe such things under penalty of death.

Quote:"rose from the dead" - prove it

the gospels claim it, the secular writings claim others claiming it. Im really not sure what your expecting. you think the roman government at the time cared at all what some random local in israel was doing? let alone record anything specifically about him?

Quote:as for me "falling in line with the pharisees", let's remember that i've consistently been in favour of religious freedom, whereas you've openly defended murder and torture as punishments for not being the right religion,

no, you are talking about the things the ancient israelites were commanded, because I believe God carried out these commandments and I dont doubt the reasonableness of them then you automatically attach some label to me of defending murder and torture for being the wrong religion. please try again.

Quote:for offending the religious bullies of the time... which happened to jesus, didn't it?

No if you are talking about ot commandments these are directly from God. the pharisees are not

God.

Quote:doesn't that make you reconsider? can you really be in favour of persecuting people for not being the right religion when someone you admire was the victim of the same thing?
Its not the same, Christ was guilty of nothing according to the scriptures except trying to save everyone.

Quote:what utter drivel
well I could have guessed that!

Quote:no, you're just too fucking retarded to realise that you think it too.
So because I dont share the same life values and what punishments are deserving in life im retarded?
Quote:do you want to live in a society where you can be horribly punished for not being the right religion according to those in power?
Where does the bible command anyone in this age to do such a thing?
Quote:where the ones in power say that the right religion is not the same as yours?
This happens but not from a christian point of view. All over the world christians are killed on a daily basis for not conforming to the governments belief system. I dont think thats right and it is fucked up, its why in america the constitution is written the way it is.

Quote:you're still aware that i don't think this god of yours is real?
even if you thought he was, you wouldnt believe. I think you even said that once a long time ago, though i could be wrong.

Quote:So did Satan.

Quote:i have a question. why's satan the villain of the bible?
In a grasp of greed, satan sought to take over the throne of God with 1/3 the angels. as punishment for this he was condemned to hell (made just for him and the angles originally). Since he cant do anything to God, hes decided to go after Gods children. Now why does God permit this I dont know, however its reality and thats just the way things are so I accept it.

Quote:isn't it true that the overwhelming majority of conversions are done by indoctrinating children?

no, its more than likely that the work done overseas creates more real followers.
Quote:telling kids that religion X or Y is real when they're too young to know any better.
I know alot of people that had christian upbringings. They are not christian in the least lol.
Quote:kids are taught this bullshit with the same certainty as what they're taught in maths and science, and they're not told "by the way, there's basically no evidence that any of this crap is true, and you can just live your life without a religion btw", and they're threatened with extraordinary punishments.

You dont think theres any evidence and that its all just that faith crap. the bible itself regarding the existence of God? "the fool hath said in his heart, there is no God" thats it because its just outlandish to even THINK FOR ONE SECOND that we were put here by chance or some other retarded theory running around of evolving species. Look at the bullshit "science" they teach kids at a young age and tell me whoes really lying to who?

Quote:and of course children are the target demographic, because it doesn't work on intelligent

adults.

are you saying I cant come up with a list of intelligent people through history that were christian?
Quote:i've debated dozens of religious people and not a single one has said anything to make me think their religions are worthwhile. seriously, not a damn thing. (most of them were less fanatical than you)

How is that relevant? if anything it just sounds like your full of yourself tbh.

Quote:so?

If he existed he either died on a cross or didnt. he either rose from the dead or didnt. Based on all I have presented thus far your not doing the best job of showing me my errors here.

Quote:the gospels don't even agree with each other. but then, i wouldn't expect them to. where?

Quote:and their writings didn't even turn up until decades after the events they purport to describe. sorry, are you still talking about why they're reliable?

I asked you what reasonable amount of time after a persons death is a source reliable. I dont see the problem with them being written decades after. Thier instruction wasnt "go and write a book" it was "go and make disciples of all nations" they went and did their work then they wrote about it. I dont see the problem.

Quote:and most of the secular historical sources you cite, josephus etc, they deny it too despite believing in the jewish messiah.

I purposely picked people who denied him...Yet even they agree with the gospels.

Quote:sorry, are you still talking about why jesus really was the messiah?

are you talking about why he wasnt? Im yet to see anything from you on this.

Quote:the fact it became so widespread is because it was given power by the roman empire
why was it given power by the roman empire

Quote:collusion with secular dictatorship + indoctrination of children = survival. but despite all this, you still can't prove it's true.

what are you talking about?

Quote:first, swap "never existed" for "was a man, not the son of a god". as for lunacy, have you even read the "secular historical sources" you keep citing?

It seems thus far you havent even glanced at them.

Quote:they tend to refer to "the christians" derisively, calling them superstitious and troublemakers, and the jewish ones among them who do believe in the messiah don't think jesus was it.

They affirmed, however, that the whole of their guilt, or their error, was that they were in the habit of meeting on a certain fixed day before it was light, when they sang in alternate verses a hymn to Christ, as to a god, and bound themselves by a solemn oath, not to perform any wicked deed, never to commit any fraud, theft or adultery, never to falsify their word, nor deny a trust when they should be called upon to make it good; after which it was their custom to separate, and then reassemble to partake of food - but food of an ordinary and innocent kind

In the meantime, the method I have observed towards those who have been denounced to me as Christians is this: I interrogated them whether they were in fact Christians; if they confessed it, I repeated the question twice, adding the threat of capital punishment; if they still persevered, I

ordered them to be executed.

some quotes you clearly dont want to deal with.

Quote:EDIT: just wanted to add to this already long post what happened to the disciples and their associates.

Matthew - killed by stabbing as ordered by King Hircanus

James, son of Alphaeus - crucified

James, brother of Jesus - thrown down from a height, stoned and then beaten to death at the hands of Ananias (circa AD 66)

John - tortured by boiling oil, exiled to Patmos in AD 95

Mark - burned during Roman emperor Trajan's reign

Peter - crucified upside-down by the gardens of Nero on the Vatican hill circa AD 64

Andrew - crucified on an "X" shaped cross by Aegeas, governor of the Edessenes, around AD 80

Philip - stoned and crucified in Hierapolis, Phrygia

Simon - crucified in Egypt under Trajan's reign

Thomas - death by spear thrust in Calamina, India

Thaddaeus - killed by arrows

James, son of Zebedee - killed by sword in AD 44 by order of King Herod Agrippa I of Judea

Bartholomew - beaten, flayed alive, crucified upside down, then beheaded

Quote:Nasty stuff. But I can say that, cos unlike you i've always been against people being persecuted for their religion (if that is, indeed, why they were all killed...), whereas you're enthusiastically in favour of it.

I thought the Christians were doing the persecuting according to you?

Quote:it's a shame you didn't put any full stops in here, because this might be a record for the most number of fallacies in a single sentence.

Quote:1. "find me in history any religion..." - you must realise you're asking the wrong guy here fair enough, point though is you wont. anyone else reading this the challenge is also at you.

Quote:2. "claimed that God was in human form" - you haven't proven that jesus said any such thing.

long scripture post #2

Quote:John 14:7-10 [7] If you really knew me, you would know my Father as well. From now on, you do know him and have seen him." [8] Philip said, "Lord, show us the Father and that will be enough for us." [9] Jesus answered: "Don't you know me, Philip, even after I have been among you such a long time? Anyone who has seen me has seen the Father. How can you say, 'Show us the Father'? [10] Don't you believe that I am in the Father, and that the Father is in me? The words I say to you are not just my own. Rather, it is the Father, living in me, who is doing his work.

Quote:John 10:30 "I and the Father are one."

Quote:John 14:11 Believe me when I say that I am in the Father and the Father is in me; or at least believe on the evidence of the miracles themselves.

Quote:John 10:37-38 [37] Do not believe me unless I do what my Father does. [38] But if I do it, even though you do not believe me, believe the miracles, that you may know and understand that the Father is in me, and I in the Father."

Quote:Matthew 27:43 He trusts in God. Let God rescue him now if he wants him, for he said, 'I am the Son of God.'"

Quote:John 17:11 I will remain in the world no longer, but they are still in the world, and I am coming to you. Holy Father, protect them by the power of your name--the name you gave me--so that they may be one as we are one.

Quote:John 10:31-33 [31] Again the Jews picked up stones to stone him, [32] but Jesus said to them, "I have shown you many great miracles from the Father. For which of these do you stone me?" [33] "We are not stoning you for any of these," replied the Jews, "but for blasphemy, because you, a mere man, claim to be God."

Quote:John 17:5 And now, Father, glorify me in your presence with the glory I had with you before the world began.

Quote:3. "did not forcibly take over or preach through force" - are you fucking retarded? what is Hell? jesus says follow me and do as i say or you'll go to hell.
wheres the force?

Jesus: Im God heres a consequence if you dont believe me even though Iv been performing miracles for years and it shouldnt be this difficult

Man: I dont believe you anyway. why are you forcing me to go to hell?

Quote:4. "outside sources corroborate the story" - they do more to undermine than corroborate where and how?

Quote:5. this isn't exactly a fallacy, but rather something odd i've noticed about you.
you speak highly of the disciples who supposedly stuck to their religion even in the face of threats of death and torture. if this is admirable, why are you so contemptuous towards me sticking to my intellectual position in the face of torture?

of course its intellectual to you . The point of the disciples sticking to their death and torture is that its reasonable to assume they are not lying.

Quote:it isn't exactly the same thing, if only because your threats are obviously lies, but if you're gonna praise the disciples who kept their faith under fire, can't you admit a grudging respect for someone like me who continues to be honest and open about my non-belief no matter what you threaten me with?

of course, I have no contempt for you or your positions even though it may come across that way its just because we are in debate. I greatly appreciate people being open bout their beliefs. what I do not respect however are people who claim to be open but when questions come up they are dodged or twisted around. believe it or not I have respect for you spoony.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Major-Payne](#) on Sat, 28 Apr 2012 07:37:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Funny how christians say: YOU CANT USE SCIENCE TO DISPROVE MY FAITH yet they quote the bible as "proof" they are right all the time.

Kind of a double standard eh. "MY BOOK IS BETTER THAN ALL YOUR BOOKS"

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [freecow9](#) on Sun, 29 Apr 2012 00:36:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Major-Payne wrote on Sat, 28 April 2012 00:37Funny how christians say: YOU CANT USE SCIENCE TO DISPROVE MY FAITH

These Christians need to examine their faith then

Quote:yet they quote the bible as "proof" they are right all the time.

The bible as a historical source gives a lot of info that can be trusted as has been backed up by archaeology, extra biblical sources and secular history.

Quote:Kind of a double standard eh. "MY BOOK IS BETTER THAN ALL YOUR BOOKS"

If one will claim that it should be supported.

Its like when people claim that God and science are not supposed to mix. whoever has been brainwashing you with that nonsense is failable in the first place in that if God does exist, then he would have had to make the rules of science and mathematics. Its when the interpretation of science is done to purposefully EXCLUDE God or some sort of a creator that the objectiveness of scientists are broken. Its why there are so many creation scientists who are well credited in their respective fields.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to atheists

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Sun, 29 Apr 2012 01:27:13 GMT

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

fredcow9 wrote on Fri, 27 April 2012 13:25ok...whats the famed instruction to me? I dont blame God for suggesting the killing of people regardless of who they are trying to entice them to serve other gods. Only makes sense if you drag a group of people out of slavery, perform great wonders before them all, give them a nice plot of land as an inheritance and then they go and worship something else? Of course that threats going to be eliminated. If you really think God commanded that for anyone except the Israelites then you must think I cant eat anything without cloven hooves...

firstly, when did you think this instruction was rescinded?

secondly, interesting you classify worshipping a different religion as a "threat"; previously you called non-belief a "crime" so i suppose i shouldn't be surprised

thirdly, haven't you noticed that one of them is a command for completely indiscriminate slaughter? just a few people in the city worship golden calves or whatever, and that's enough to slaughter the entire city's population down to the last child? good grief

Quote:Quote:isn't there some small part of you that wonders why you're trying to justify intentional and systematic genocide of innocent children?

Im not even trying to justify pharaohs actions...he was just a dumbass.

uh no, i was referring to yahweh's deliberate targeting of children.

Quote:I dont know what you want me to do with this... am I responding to myself and you? just you? or are you pointing out that your going to just say the same things over and over again. why is hell in religion. why are you punished for being the wrong religion. why is god so merciless to people who dont believe in him. the short answer is because they are very real.

i think that exchange is very telling as to the difference between us; me going into quite some detail as to serious problems with your religion, and you having no answer to any of it beyond "join my religion or be tortured" over and over again

Quote:He said his disciples reported these things in the quote. I dont know why you would ask pages and pages as to how a historian is getting his information about things hes telling you hes

got.

Jesus disciples, they reported it.
who? when? what did they say?

Quote:even if these historians believed it themselves,
Thats not relevant, what is, is if they contradict the gospels or not.
it's not relevant whether a devout Jewish man who seriously believes in the oncoming messiah is
convinced that Jesus is the real deal or not?

which they generally don't, there's still not much credibility to what they write, and
what they write would be unimpressive even if it were true (generally stuff along the lines of "there
was a group of people who believed X...")
right, but again thats not even the point at all. The whole point is that secular historians recorded
accounts of Jesus that do exist only confirm what the gospels are saying.
that's much too generous a statement.

...when do you think josephus wrote about jesus?
probably around 60-70 ad. He completed his work in the 90s so its only reasonable for him to
accuire information over this time period so he could write his great work hes known for.
so again, decades after jesus is supposed to have died.

So everything we know about ancient history cant be trusted because all the historians at
their respective times would have been delusional? You dont think anyone wrote what they
ACTUALLY SAW. I understand the skepticism but you honestly cant think everyone had some
sort of an agenda, those that did, they failed. greek mythology is known as greek mythology for a
reason. Christ is not mythology.

Yes they are in a time when most couldnt read or write which is why its amazing the gospels are
not lying when matched with secular writings dont you think?
uh no, cos all these "secular writings" basically say is "there's a group of people who believed this
guy who lived a few decades ago was their messiah". even if this wasn't in a time and place
where there was basically no such thing as education, where superstition was rampant and where
most people already believed in god(s) anyway, this would still not vindicate the gospels.

i'm glad you mention greek mythology, because there's an analogy i can make. have you read the
Iliad? if not, quick summary: story of (some of) the Trojan War, the greek city-states send armies
to lay siege to Troy and eventually take it thanks to the wooden horse. while most of the action is
done by greek and trojan heroes such as achilles, hector, odysseus etc, the greek gods are also
involved and sometimes interfere in events. e.g. at one point the god Apollo sends a plague
against the greeks because they were rude to a priest.

now, there is a city which seems like a good candidate for Troy. there might have been a war that
destroyed it. suppose some evidence cropped up that a plague ravaged the armies besieging the
city. i doubt such evidence could be found - this was centuries before jesus - but suppose it was.
or suppose one of the besieging warriors was named Achilles.
this, i'm sure you'll agree, would not prove the greek gods were real.

in other words, finding out that one or two details of the Iliad to be vaguely accurate says nothing

about the rest of it, especially the supernatural bits.

same for the gospels.

Quote:Quote:sorry, but you're gonna have to do a little better than a few droning scribblings written decades after the guy they're talking about is supposed to have died.

Oh did you want writings from people that believed Jesus was the son of God? I was only using people who rejected him and would be the most neutral source.

you're saying you deliberately picked devout jewish people who rejected the idea that jesus was the messiah thinking this would be the best way to prove your case?

Quote:Quote:that's feeble, and if your god is intelligent, he'd know how feeble it is. a decent god who was interested in people all over the world joining his religion ought to be able to do better than this.

Id say considering how Christianity swept the world pretty quick did a fine job. the disciples went around getting lots of believers for a reason.

i can suggest a few reasons

- the enormous amount of superstition and credulity of the time and place
- the fact loads of people there already believed in god(s), specifically judaism and the prospect of an imminent messiah
- the fact there was basically no such thing as education
- the coercive nature of the religion itself, i.e. follow me or you will be tortured

Quote:Quote:why don't so many people believe it even though you threaten them with worse than death?

In the meantime, the method I have observed towards those who have been denounced to me as Christians is this: I interrogated them whether they were in fact Christians; if they confessed it, I repeated the question twice, adding the threat of capital punishment; if they still persevered, I ordered them to be executed.-pliny

yes, there were obviously people who refused to deny their religion when threatened with death, and the point i was making is there are far more people who won't join this religion when threatened with even worse.

Quote:Quote:not quite the same thing in practice, because you're obviously full of shit, but the principle is the same.

nice question dodge. please answer it next time.

eh?

Quote:Quote:which is another way of saying that jesus and god have nothing to do with each other.

no its a way of saying the jewish elders at the time didnt care about God, his prophecies or following his orders anymore. They were the heads of state and enjoyed their power even amongst roman occupation.

how do you know that?

Quote:Quote:whatever makes you feel better about the fact that you can't prove anything important about jesus.

So far I have proved the gospels can be trusted

again, this is a laughable overstatement

Quote:Quote:"died" - woop de doo

an innocent man dying one after reading your posts would think they would have more concern and be blasting the roman government for such atrocities. Of course when it comes to your enemies though you dont care.

not the point i was making. everybody dies. being put to death in horrible ways for non-crimes was not uncommon at all at that time and place. i've consistently been opposed to blasphemy/heresy trials, and unelected religious bullies having power over the rest of us; i don't need to make a special point of each victim.

Quote:Quote:"fulfilled prophecies" - wanna give a few examples?

Isaiah 7:14 Therefore the Lord himself will give you a sign: The virgin will be with child and will give birth to a son, and will call him Immanuel.

Quote:Matthew 1:20-23 [20] But after he had considered this, an angel of the Lord appeared to him in a dream and said, "Joseph son of David, do not be afraid to take Mary home as your wife, because what is conceived in her is from the Holy Spirit. [21] She will give birth to a son, and you are to give him the name Jesus, because he will save his people from their sins." [22] All this took place to fulfill what the Lord had said through the prophet: [23] "The virgin will be with child and will give birth to a son, and they will call him Immanuel" --which means, "God with us."

i think i heard that "virgin" was a mistranslation of "young woman" or something like that?

but suppose it really is "virgin". how do you know mary was a virgin?

Quote:Isaiah 37:31 Once more a remnant of the house of Judah will take root below and bear fruit above.

Quote:Matthew 1:1-2, 16 [1] A record of the genealogy of Jesus Christ the son [descendant] of David, the son of Abraham: [2] Abraham was the father of Isaac, Isaac the father of Jacob, Jacob the father of Judah and his brothers, [16] and [a later] Jacob the father of Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ.

what's special about this?

Quote:Isaiah 16:5 In love a throne will be established; in faithfulness a man will sit on it--one from the house of David--one who in judging seeks justice and speeds the cause of righteousness

Quote:Matthew 1:1-2A, 6, 16 [1] A record of the genealogy of Jesus Christ the son of David, the son of Abraham: [2] Abraham was the father of Isaac, ... [6] and Jesse the father of King David. [16] and Jacob the father of Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ.

joseph counts as jesus' father, does he? interesting

jesus had a throne?

Quote:Micah 5:2 But you, Bethlehem Ephrathah, though you are small among the clans of Judah, out of you will come for me one who will be ruler over Israel, whose origins are from of old, from ancient times.

Quote:Matthew 2:1 After Jesus was born in Bethlehem in Judea, during the time of King Herod, Magi from the east came to Jerusalem

sorry, i'm not following this one.

[quote]Jeremiah 31:15 This is what the LORD says: "A voice is heard in Ramah, mourning and great weeping, Rachel weeping for her children and refusing to be comforted, because her children are no more."

Quote:Matthew 2:16-18 [16] When Herod realized that he had been outwitted by the Magi, he was furious, and he gave orders to kill all the boys in Bethlehem and its vicinity who were two years old and under, in accordance with the time he had learned from the Magi. [17] Then what was said through the prophet Jeremiah was fulfilled: [18] "A voice is heard in Ramah, weeping and great mourning, Rachel weeping for her children and refusing to be comforted, because they are no more."

that's not really a prediction, is it? rachel was waaaaaay before herod. what's the connection?

Quote:Hosea 11:1 When Israel was a child, I loved him, and out of Egypt I called my son.

Quote:Matthew 2:14-15 [14] So he got up, took the child and his mother during the night and left for Egypt, [15] where he stayed until the death of Herod. And so was fulfilled what the Lord had said through the prophet: "Out of Egypt I called my son."

again, this isn't really a prediction.

Quote:Isaiah 49:6 he [the Lord] says: "It is too small a thing for you to be my servant to restore the tribes of Jacob and bring back those of Israel I have kept. I will also make you a light for the Gentiles, that you may bring my salvation to the ends of the earth."

and

Isaiah 42:1-4, 6 [1] "Here is my servant, whom I uphold, my chosen one in whom I delight; I will put my Spirit on him and he will bring justice to the nations. [2] He will not shout or cry out, or raise his voice in the streets. [3] A bruised reed he will not break, and a smoldering wick he will not snuff out. In faithfulness he will bring forth justice; [4] he will not falter or be discouraged till he establishes justice on earth. In his law the islands will put their hope." [6] "I, the LORD, have called you in righteousness; I will take hold of your hand. I will keep you and will make you to be a covenant for the people and a light for the Gentiles,

Quote:Matthew 12:14-21 [14] But the Pharisees went out and plotted how they might kill Jesus. [15] Aware of this, Jesus withdrew from that place. Many followed him, and he healed all their sick, [16] warning them not to tell who he was. [17] This was to fulfill what was spoken through the prophet Isaiah: [18] "Here is my servant whom I have chosen, the one I love, in whom I delight; I will put my Spirit on him, and he will proclaim justice to the nations. [19] He will not quarrel or cry out; no one will hear his voice in the streets. [20] A bruised reed he will not break, and a smoldering wick he will not snuff out, till he leads justice to victory. [21] In his name the nations will put their hope."

if this is a prediction, and despite its vagueness i'll say it kinda is, isn't it obvious jesus failed to fulfil it?

[quote]Isaiah 35:5-6a [5] Then will the eyes of the blind be opened and the ears of the deaf unstopped. [6a] Then will the lame leap like a deer, and the mute tongue shout for joy.

Quote:Luke 7:20-22 [20] When the men came to Jesus, they said, "John the Baptist sent us to you to ask, 'Are you the one who was to come, or should we expect someone else?'" [21] At that very time Jesus cured many who had diseases, sicknesses and evil spirits, and gave sight to many who were blind. [22] So he replied to the messengers, "Go back and report to John what you have seen and heard: The blind receive sight, the lame walk, those who have leprosy are cured, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, and the good news is preached to the poor."

barely a prediction. how do you know jesus cured anybody?

Quote:this one pertains to you lol

Psalm 69:4 Those who hate me without reason outnumber the hairs of my head; many are my enemies without cause, those who seek to destroy me. I am forced to restore what I did not steal. stop me if i'm wrong, but it's David who says this? what does it have to do with Jesus?

[quote]Isaiah 49:7 This is what the LORD says-- the Redeemer and Holy One of Israel-- to him who was despised and abhorred by the nation, to the servant of rulers: "Kings will see you and rise up, princes will see and bow down, because of the LORD, who is faithful, the Holy One of Israel, who has chosen you."

Quote:John 7:48-49 "Has any of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed in him? [49] No! But this mob that knows nothing of the law--there is a curse on them."

and

Quote:John 15:24-25 [24] If I had not done among them what no one else did, they would not be guilty of sin. But now they have seen these miracles, and yet they have hated both me and my Father. [25] But this is to fulfill what is written in their Law: 'They hated me without reason.' notice the vagueness?

Quote:Psalm 118:22 The stone the builders rejected has become the capstone [cornerstone of a building]; [23] the LORD has done this, and it is marvelous in our eyes

Quote:Matthew 21:42 Jesus said to them, "Have you never read in the Scriptures: 'The stone the builders rejected has become the capstone; the Lord has done this, and it is marvelous in our eyes' ?

again, it's hard to see in what sense this is a prediction?

[quote]Zechariah 11:12 I told them, "If you think it best, give me my pay; but if not, keep it." So they paid me thirty pieces of silver.

Quote:Matthew 26:14-15 [14] Then one of the Twelve--the one called Judas Iscariot--went to the chief priests [15] and asked, "What are you willing to give me if I hand him over to you?" So they counted out for him thirty silver coins.

again, not a prediction.

Quote:Psalm 22:16 Dogs have surrounded me; a band of evil men has encircled me, they have pierced my hands and my feet.

Quote:John 20:25 So the other disciples told him, "We have seen the Lord!" But he said to them, "Unless I see the nail marks in his hands and put my finger where the nails were, and put my hand into his side, I will not believe it."

says david. nothing to do with jesus as far as i can tell. and again, not a prediction. for example, three or four verses previously - the same speech - he says he's beset by "bulls of Bashan". if this is a prophecy, jesus failed to fulfil it.

Quote:Psalm 22:17 I can count all my bones; people stare and gloat over me.

and

Psalm 34:20 he protects all his bones, not one of them will be broken.

Quote:John 19:33; 36a [33] But when they came to Jesus and found that he was already dead, they did not break his legs. [36a] These things happened so that the scripture would be fulfilled: "Not one of his bones will be broken,"

the first one is in the very same speech as the bulls of bashan, which isn't a prophecy and has nothing to do with jesus. and you should be glad of that, because if you want to claim it's a prophecy, you can only conclude that jesus failed to fulfil it.

the second one contains an interesting turn of phrase. a variation of it crops up quite a lot: "and this happened so that it would be fulfilled that which was spoken by the prophets". very interesting turn of phrase. sounds like "we did it because the scriptures said it would happen", and there's nothing supernatural about that, is there?

but once again, the bit in psalms seems to have nothing to do with a messiah.

Quote:Psalm 22:18 They divide my garments among them and cast lots for my clothing.

Quote:Matthew 27:35 When they had crucified him, they divided up his clothes by casting lots still in the bulls of bashan speech

Quote:Isaiah 53:9 He was assigned a grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death ...

Quote:Matthew 27:57,59-60 [57] As evening approached, there came a rich man from Arimathea, named Joseph, who had himself become a disciple of Jesus. [59] Joseph took the body, wrapped it in a clean linen cloth, [60] and placed it in his own new tomb that he had cut out of the rock. He rolled a big stone in front of the entrance to the tomb and went away.

all of this chapter so far is written in the past tense. in what sense, therefore, is it a prediction?

i wonder how long it would take for a man to cut a tomb out of the rock.

Quote:Isaiah 53:8, 11 [8] By oppression and judgment he was taken away. And who can speak of his descendants? For he was cut off from the land of the living; for the transgression of my people he was stricken. [11] After the suffering of his soul, he will see the light of life and be satisfied; by his knowledge my righteous servant will justify many, and he will bear their iniquities.

Quote:Matthew 28:2, 5-7, 9 [2] There was a violent earthquake, for an angel of the Lord came down from heaven and, going to the tomb, rolled back the stone and sat on it. [5] The angel said to the women, "Do not be afraid, for I know that you are looking for Jesus, who was crucified. [6] He is not here; he has risen, just as he said. Come and see the place where he lay. [7] Then go quickly and tell his disciples: 'He has risen from the dead and is going ahead of you into Galilee. There you will see him.' Now I have told you." [9] Suddenly Jesus met them. "Greetings," he said. They came to him, clasped his feet and worshiped him.

again, notice the vagueness?

got any better ones than these? cos these are not impressive.

Quote:Quote:"rose from the dead" - prove it

the gospels claim it, the secular writings claim others claiming it. Im really not sure what your expecting.

certainly not that you could prove it.

Quote:Quote:as for me "falling in line with the pharisees", let's remember that i've consistently been in favour of religious freedom, whereas you've openly defended murder and torture as punishments for not being the right religion,

no, you are talking about the things the ancient israelites were commanded, because I believe

God carried out these commandments and I dont doubt the reasonableness of them then you automatically attach some label to me of defending murder and torture for being the wrong religion. please try again.

okay, let's say the stuff in deuteronomy and leviticus etc is only talking to the people of the time, and not instructions for you. scratch those. we've still got hell, haven't we? (which is worse than the instructions in deuteronomy)

Quote:Quote:doesn't that make you reconsider? can you really be in favour of persecuting people for not being the right religion when someone you admire was the victim of the same thing?

Its not the same, Christ was guilty of nothing according to the scriptures except trying to save everyone.

it's worse. jesus repeatedly threatens people with hell if they don't do as he says. and if he claimed to be god, then that's much worse than when your local priest makes the same threats.

Quote:Quote:no, you're just too fucking retarded to realise that you think it too.

So because I dont share the same life values and what punishments are deserving in life im retarded?

no, you missed the point. i speculated that you might actually agree that being tortured for not being the right religion is indeed a bad thing, but just haven't realised that you think so. i wonder if you've ever really thought about it, i.e. hell.

think about it now.

Quote:Quote:do you want to live in a society where you can be horribly punished for not being the right religion according to those in power?

Where does the bible command anyone in this age to do such a thing?

cough hell *cough*

Quote:Quote:where the ones in power say that the right religion is not the same as yours?

This happens but not from a christian point of view. All over the world christians are killed on a daily basis for not conforming to the governments belief system. I dont think thats right and it is fucked up

interesting. so you think people can be horribly tortured for not being the right religion by God, but you think it's "not right" and "fucked up" when the same thing (or rather, a much more lenient thing) is inflicted by humans?

try extending your thoughts a little. consider the following question.

Should a person be tortured as a punishment for not being the right religion?

i say: no. you say: yes, but only when it's my religion and when my dictator is doing the torturing.

Quote:Quote:you're still aware that i don't think this god of yours is real?

even if you thought he was, you wouldn't believe. I think you even said that once a long time ago, though i could be wrong.

what do you mean by "believe"?

i've definitely said that it would take more than evidence of god and jesus to make me a christian, because there is more than one objection for me. it's not just the fact that i don't think it's true, there's also the fact that i morally object to a lot of it. finding out that the god of the bible really was

real would be very bad news as far as i'm concerned. it's a great relief to think there's no hell. finding out that it was true would mean a few friends and family members are being horribly tortured right now. good people, just not the right religion. i don't think it's possible for me to grasp what a crushing blow this would be.

Quote:Quote:i have a question. why's satan the villain of the bible?

In a grasp of greed, satan sought to take over the throne of God with 1/3 the angels. as punishment for this he was condemned to hell (made just for him and the angles originally). Since he cant do anything to God, hes decided to go after Gods children. Now why does God permit this I dont know, however its reality and thats just the way things are so I accept it. haven't you noticed that satan barely appears in the bible at all?

the war in heaven stuff is only in Revelation, which - let's face it - is so ridiculous it probably shouldn't even be in the bible. even christians can't agree on what the fuck it's talking about.

satan barely appears in the books besides that; mainly in Job, where he is a dick but only a secondary antagonist, the primary antagonist obviously being God (may as well be satan's boss, apparently... if this is even the same Satan commonly referred to, and there's a strong argument for saying it isn't)

that, and when he tempts jesus in the wilderness, which isn't much of a big deal

no, the villain of the book is very obviously Yahweh. what mischief does satan do? he kills a few people in Job, certainly an awful thing to do, albeit a thing done with Yahweh's permission. compare that to the enormous death toll Yahweh racks up in the bible, either by wiping people out himself or ordering people to do it (arguably worse) and the whole hell business.

Quote:Quote:telling kids that religion X or Y is real when they're too young to know any better. I know alot of people that had christian upbringings. They are not christian in the least lol. interesting. i hear this a lot when i talk to christians, "those people aren't really christians". sometimes in the same post as claims of how many christians there are.

Quote:Quote:kids are taught this bullshit with the same certainty as what they're taught in maths and science, and they're not told "by the way, there's basically no evidence that any of this crap is true, and you can just live your life without a religion btw", and they're threatened with extraordinary punishments.

You dont think theres any evidence and that its all just that faith crap. christians - or perhaps not christians in your view - never tire of telling us so.

Quote:"the fool hath said in his heart, there is no God"

this bit of demagoguery is completely discredited by the following verses, where it says that these non-believers are all horribly wicked and none of them have ever done any good thing. that is so obviously untrue that i wonder why christians ever want to draw attention anywhere near it.

Quote:thats it because its just outlandish to even THINK FOR ONE SECOND that we were put here by chance or some other retarded theory running around of evolving species. Look at the bullshit "science" they teach kids at a young age and tell me whoes really lying to who? you must realise how stupid you sound at this point, surely?

Quote:and of course children are the target demographic, because it doesn't work on intelligent adults.

are you saying I cant come up with a list of intelligent people through history that were christian? moving the goalposts a bit there.

you can also come up with a list of intelligent people who believed other fucking retarded stuff like alchemy and the phlogiston (sp?) theory.

question is why were they christians? could it be because they were brought up christians, i.e. indoctrinated as kids, because education was fucking awful at the time, because christianity had all kinds of political power, because of hell threats, because of how dangerous it was to admit you weren't a christian?

no, fast-forward to now. it's very, very rare for an intelligent person to convert to christianity through logical, civilised debate without coercion. but then, without coercion, christianity wouldn't be christianity.

Quote:i've debated dozens of religious people and not a single one has said anything to make me think their religions are worthwhile. seriously, not a damn thing. (most of them were less fanatical than you)

How is that relevant? if anything it just sounds like your full of yourself tbh.

no, it's an observation on the abject failure of my debate opponents to prove anything important, or answer any of my moral objections.

Quote:so?

If he existed he either died on a cross or didnt. he either rose from the dead or didnt. Based on all I have presented thus far your not doing the best job of showing me my errors here. died on a cross wouldn't be unusual. rising from the dead would be (though it wouldn't vindicate his moral teachings, or even prove that he himself had the supernatural power), so what a shame we've had no evidence of that.

Quote:the gospels don't even agree with each other. but then, i wouldn't expect them to. where?

we can skip over the numerous times when the speeches of jesus don't agree with each other, because that's exactly what you would expect from reports written decades after a person died. who was Joseph's father?

Quote:and most of the secular historical sources you cite, josephus etc, they deny it too despite believing in the jewish messiah.

I purposely picked people who denied him...Yet even they agree with the gospels.

i'm not sure i believe that you intentionally picked people who do more to undermine your case than support it.

Quote:the fact it became so widespread is because it was given power by the roman empire

why was it given power by the roman empire

i don't know. to pacify rebellious minorities, perhaps?

Quote:Quote: first, swap "never existed" for "was a man, not the son of a god". as for lunacy, have you even read the "secular historical sources" you keep citing?
It seems thus far you havent even glanced at them.
sigh... don't be silly

Quote:Quote:Nasty stuff. But I can say that, cos unlike you i've always been against people being persecuted for their religion (if that is, indeed, why they were all killed...), whereas you're enthusiastically in favour of it.
I thought the Christians were doing the persecuting according to you?
"the Christians"?

Quote:Quote:1. "find me in history any religion..." - you must realise you're asking the wrong guy here
fair enough, point though is you wont.
and indeed, why would i? to say your religion can claim something other religions can't is hardly impressive.

Quote:Quote:2. "claimed that God was in human form" - you haven't proven that jesus said any such thing.
long scripture post #2
so, like i said, you haven't proven that jesus said any such thing. the gospels say he said it, so what? prove he said it, please... and then your real work will be still ahead of you: prove he was right.

Quote:Quote:3. "did not forcibly take over or preach through force" - are you fucking retarded?
what is Hell? jesus says follow me and do as i say or you'll go to hell.
wheres the force?
Jesus: Im God heres a consequence if you dont believe me even though Iv been performing miracles for years and it shoudlnt be this difficult
Man: I dont believe you anyway. why are you forcing me to go to hell?
what is hell? a place of torture made by jesus's dad (apparently). obey me or that's where you will go as a punishment. this is an awful way to behave. jesus was not a good person if he said what the gospels say he said.

Quote:Quote:4. "outside sources corroborate the story" - they do more to undermine than corroborate
where and how?
see above re: jewish men obviously not thinking jesus was the messiah, christians being referred to derisively, nothing supernatural being vindicated

Quote:Quote:5. this isn't exactly a fallacy, but rather something odd i've noticed about you.
you speak highly of the disciples who supposedly stuck to their religion even in the face of threats of death and torture. if this is admirable, why are you so contemptuous towards me sticking to my intellectual position in the face of torture?
of course its intellectual to you . The point of the disciples sticking to their death and torture is that its reasonable to assume they are not lying.
who said they were? i'm more inclined to think they ("they" is such a vague word, we really should specify who are we talking about) were just plain wrong

Quote:it isn't exactly the same thing, if only because your threats are obviously lies, but if you're gonna praise the disciples who kept their faith under fire, can't you admit a grudging respect for someone like me who continues to be honest and open about my non-belief no matter what you threaten me with?

of course, I have no contempt for you or your positions even though it may come across that way its just because we are in debate. I greatly appreciate people being open bout their beliefs. what I do not respect however are people who claim to be open but when questions come up they are dodged or twisted around.

why would a petty little thing like that bother you? you're ok with people being horribly tortured for not being the right religion. if that can't bother you, why get worked up about what some guy says?

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Mon, 30 Apr 2012 18:11:40 GMT

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

Spoony wrote on Thu, 26 April 2012 07:39what is the point of that statement, jerad?

I'm just saying people are people, they do bad shit regardless of their beliefs, there could be absolutely no religion in the world and they'd still find something to fight over... probably borders.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Gohax](#) on Tue, 01 May 2012 05:02:32 GMT

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

I find this fun to read, lol. Honestly (this coming from someone that doesn't know much about Christianity [besides what I learned through history, which was a lot] nor the other side) it's all about Faith. Nothing is proven. People use the Bible as proof, yet even it has false statements. There was only one thing that really got me about the Bible, and that it was 99.98% correct in it's translations. However, that's only because the time-frame it was written in, 10-40 years after the events of Jesus' crucifixion.

There was no doubt he lived, I think there was actual historic evidence. But him actually being a the son of God, that's a different story.

You can either choose to live your life serving a god that may, or may not, exist. And in the end you lived your life how you wanted to, and either you wasted it or you didn't. However, there are people that realize that you only have one life. And they want to live it how they want to. I find it almost ridiculous that a god should judge that person based on how they want to live their life. What really gets me about Christianity (and I've even talked with an avid Christian about this) is the fact that someone that lives there life, not through God, but going to school as a kid, being a good kid, making good grades all the way through school. Graduating highschool/college, getting a nice job, raising a family, and staying out of trouble; just living a good life. That person that I just described could possibly go to hell because they didn't live their life through Christ.

However, someone that has murdered people, even raped people, could still go to heaven by

repenting their sins and living the rest of their life through Christ? I don't understand how that works.

I was forced to take a class in college (religion class) and the professor stated that all sin is seen as the same type of sin. There is no "scale" of sin. Stealing a candy bar at a store or murdering someone is seen as the same type of "sin" to God. How is that?

Anyhow, before I drag myself into this, I'll leave with that. However, my views are rather mixed. I guess I believe in an afterlife because I don't want to believe that whenever you die that's it. However, I don't live my life everyday thinking that way, I live it doing what I want and how I want.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Tue, 01 May 2012 05:26:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

when you consider the possibility of an afterlife you're essentially dipping into magic
that's Harry Potter shit right there

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Wed, 02 May 2012 17:56:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:Prove it.

Go on, prove it. You claim you know a single damn thing about the afterlife? Prove it. Even claiming that there is an afterlife at all is an extraordinary claim. Prove it. Then go on to prove that you know its nature, and who's going where.

Don't dodge this one, like you did with the resurrection business. Prove it or admit you can't prove it.

no rush, eatcow

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [YesNoMayb](#) on Wed, 02 May 2012 21:27:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I personally don't believe in the afterlife. The key reason for this is there is no concrete evidence of an afterlife. We only have theories and beliefs to go on and these are not reliable. You can't say that something is in existence without proof. There are beliefs and theories that extraterrestrial life does exist elsewhere but again, those are only beliefs and theories.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [iRANian](#) on Wed, 02 May 2012 21:42:59 GMT

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

It's pretty easy to prove/disprove, just ask a person who died and started breathing again more than 15 minutes later.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lazarus_syndrome

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [ehhh](#) on Wed, 02 May 2012 21:46:09 GMT

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

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/sport/0/football/17460781>

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [YesNoMayb](#) on Wed, 02 May 2012 23:12:45 GMT

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

I bet you that anyone that is even the least bit skeptical would not believe the person. Tell me about one scientist you know of that doesn't make conclusions based on concrete evidence.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Thu, 03 May 2012 02:37:42 GMT

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

iRANian wrote on Wed, 02 May 2012 16:42It's pretty easy to prove/disprove, just ask a person who died and started breathing again more than 15 minutes later.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lazarus_syndrome

HMMMM

i have connected all of this to Renegade

http://cnc.wikia.com/wiki/Optic_camo

Stealth Tanks use what Westwood referred to as the Lazarus shield

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [iRANian](#) on Thu, 03 May 2012 03:08:32 GMT

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

The SBH technology is referred to as the "Lazarus Cape" or something like that so this means SBHs are zombies

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Thu, 03 May 2012 04:44:43 GMT

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

i never noticed a cape
i call shenanigans on that one

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [TankClash](#) on Thu, 03 May 2012 11:11:58 GMT

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

Continue to waste time on trying to do so... I'm quite sure they'll review this argument in heaven or something.

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [iRANian](#) on Thu, 03 May 2012 11:16:25 GMT

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

Oh it's the Ezekiel's Cape.

http://cnc.wikia.com/wiki/Stealth_suit

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Fri, 04 May 2012 19:40:48 GMT

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

Quote:By scaling down and redesigning the Lazarus shield generator of the stealth tanks, Nod scientists were able to create a powerful suit of armor powered by an internal reactor that was capable of rendering the wearer almost completely invisible in broad daylight by refracting light. The armor is equipped with a special four-visor helmet designed to not interfere with the stealth bubble generated and the vision not corrupted by it.

i quite seriously doubt something like that would cost only 400
considering the LCG is just a fat guy in a suit with a laser chain gun
call Westwood up and question their logic on that one

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [iRANian](#) on Fri, 04 May 2012 19:58:02 GMT

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

maybe they forgot a 0

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [iRANian](#) on Fri, 04 May 2012 19:59:50 GMT

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

diablo 2 is pretty addicting btw

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Sat, 05 May 2012 23:55:28 GMT

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

diablo 2 was awesome

they could have made a ton of money by just adding more acts to it and expansions
like they did with WoW later on

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [appshot](#) on Sun, 06 May 2012 07:53:43 GMT

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

"There are hundreds of paths up the mountain,
all leading in the same direction,
so it doesn't matter which path you take.
The only one wasting time is the one
who runs around and around the mountain,
telling everyone that his or her path is wrong."

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Sun, 06 May 2012 15:45:16 GMT

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

appshot wrote on Sun, 06 May 2012 01:53" There are hundreds of paths up the mountain,
all leading in the same direction,
so it doesn't matter which path you take.
The only one wasting time is the one
who runs around and around the mountain,
telling everyone that his or her path is wrong."

What religion is that from?

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [ehhh](#) on Sun, 06 May 2012 16:14:48 GMT

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

hindu

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [iRANian](#) on Sun, 06 May 2012 16:33:52 GMT

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

doesn't hinduism have a caste system

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [ehhh](#) on Sun, 06 May 2012 17:05:57 GMT

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

well yeah, india has one

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [iRANian](#) on Sun, 06 May 2012 17:49:05 GMT

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

cool religion

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by [freddcow9](#) on Tue, 08 May 2012 23:32:06 GMT

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

Quote: firstly, when did you think this instruction was rescinded?
after they were established. They did hold to the custom but its officially no longer relevant after
Jesus death.

Quote: secondly, interesting you classify worshipping a different religion as a "threat";
given the circumstances, you dont think other religions enticing Gods people was?

Quote: previously you called non-belief a "crime" so i suppose i shouldn't be surprised
under Gods rules yes, mans no.

Quote: thirdly, haven't you noticed that one of them is a command for completely indiscriminate
slaughter?

The one your referring to after this?

Quote: just a few people in the city worship golden calves or whatever, and that's enough to
slaughter the entire city's population down to the last child? good grief

When the people saw that Moses was so long in coming down from the mountain, they gathered
around Aaron and said, "Come, make us gods[a] who will go before us. As for this fellow Moses

who brought us up out of Egypt, we don't know what has happened to him."

^let alone when moses just leaves for a little bit, they already start going astray, and you dont think enticing peoples would be a threat to Gods startup plan?

3 So all the people took off their earrings and brought them to Aaron. 4 He took what they handed him and made it into an idol cast in the shape of a calf, fashioning it with a tool. Then they said, "These are your gods,[b] Israel, who brought you up out of Egypt."

sounds like more than a handful of people to me

Quote:uh no, i was referring to yahweh's deliberate targeting of children.

Iv always assumed a silent death is not a big deal, this is more damaging to the parents than the children themselves. Besides, its pharaoh who is allowing this to continue.

Quote:i think that exchange is very telling as to the difference between us; me going into quite some detail as to serious problems with your religion, and you having no answer to any of it beyond "join my religion or be tortured" over and over again

Why do you always annotate your own arguments specifying yourself as some kind of victor all the time?

Your not even touching my religion yet alone bringing even one serious problem up besides your moral objection to something. As I have said before and Ill say it again, if you object to gravity, its still there. When your told not to jump off a cliff or else... then dont do it unless your willing to risk the or else...If you dont care then continue and enjoy the life your living and hopefully things work out for you.

Quote:

who? when? what did they say?

I dont know, I dont think Josephus bothered to note it as his testimony was official enough.

Quote:it's not relevant whether a devout Jewish man who seriously believes in the oncoming messiah is convinced that Jesus is the real deal or not?

Saul of Tarsus?

Quote:that's much too generous a statement.

Gospels contradiction with details of Jesus, work on it.

Quote:so again, decades after jesus is supposed to have died.

yes, is that supposed to be unreasonable by historys standards of proof?

Quote:uh no, cos all these "secular writings" basically say is "there's a group of people who believed this guy who lived a few decades ago was their messiah".

Its an acknowledgement and an important one.

Quote:even if this wasn't in a time and place where there was basically no such thing as education,

I was led to believe the Romans were some smart people actually. Didnt the whole empire "fall for this ridiculousness"

Quote:where superstition was rampant and where most people already believed in god(s) anyway, this would still not vindicate the gospels.

So if they already have a belief system you dont think there has to be some element of apparent truth for them to switch in a time period facing death for switching to that religion?

Hey convert to Christianity

Nah dude I could get killed for that

^Thats how it would go if it were not real and people in the area hadent, seen or at least through another source heard about Jesus or seen some sort of miracle.

Quote:i'm glad you mention greek mythology, because there's an analogy i can make. have you read the Iliad? if not, quick summary: story of (some of) the Trojan War, the greek city-states send armies to lay siege to Troy and eventually take it thanks to the wooden horse. while most of the action is done by greek and trojan heroes such as achilles, hector, odysseus etc, the greek gods are also involved and sometimes interfere in events. e.g. at one point the god Apollo sends a plague against the greeks because they were rude to a priest.

now, there is a city which seems like a good candidate for Troy. there might have been a war that destroyed it. suppose some evidence cropped up that a plague ravaged the armies besieging the city. i doubt such evidence could be found - this was centuries before jesus - but suppose it was. or suppose one of the besieging warriors was named Achilles.

this, i'm sure you'll agree, would not prove the greek gods were real.

No, but it would prove some weight behind the iliad and its writers testimony. If he wrote specifically about certain descriptions and more of those descriptions are coming up true than false, its likely you can to at least some extent his story. This especially applies to the bible as the field of archaeology has only worked for it and not against it.

Quote:in other words, finding out that one or two details of the Iliad to be vaguely accurate says nothing about the rest of it, especially the supernatural bits.

indeed

Quote:same for the gospels.

Its why theres way more than 1 or 2 bits that are accurate as shown by secular history.

Quote:Yes they are in a time when most couldnt read or write which is why its amazing the gospels are not lying when matched with secular writings dont you think?

This is still a valid point.

Quote:you're saying you deliberately picked devout jewish people who rejected the idea that jesus was the messiah thinking this would be the best way to prove your case?

Theres plenty of other devout Jewish people that DID believe. This only adds to the weight of Christ being a real person, now all that is left in the mix are the details about his life.

Quote:i can suggest a few reasons

- the enormous amount of superstition and credulity of the time and place

Still going to have to say that in a time and place where its definitely not the "cool" thing to believe the only ground it could gain would be because there was truth in it. People dont just up and change their whole belief system as a result of some cool preaching words especially facing death.

Quote:- the fact loads of people there already believed in god(s), specifically judaism and the prospect of an imminent messiah

So as a Jew one would examine, did this Christ fulfill his obligations? was he really the one? The fact these people converted so massively would only be expected if the gospels are telling the truth.

Quote:- the fact there was basically no such thing as education

trying to undermine someones choice to a reality based on if they have their masters degree is not

really a valid argument at all. If that's the case I could just say poor people are heathens because they don't know any better and are stupid. see how ignorant that really sounds?

Quote:- the coercive nature of the religion itself, i.e. follow me or you will be tortured

That's not really the point. It's follow me because you love me, not because you're scared of torture. anyone following Jesus because they are scared of torture are really falsely being led. It may be a fact of reality but it's not the cause. They all threaten you with something bad for not following.

Even the U.S government does.

Besides, I thought your reasoning for why people are Christian is because they are brought up that way. which is it?

Quote:

yes, there were obviously people who refused to deny their religion when threatened with death, and the point I was making is there are far more people who won't join this religion when threatened with even worse.

Who is being threatened with death for not believing? Where did the apostles go and do that?

Quote:nice question dodge. please answer it next time.

eh?

[/QUOTE]

I'm too lazy to look it up lol, but you did dodge it.

Quote:how do you know that?

history...look it up lol

Quote:So far I have proved the gospels can be trusted

again, this is a laughable overstatement

[/QUOTE]

care to finally dispute this at all?

Quote:not the point I was making. everybody dies. being put to death in horrible ways for non-crimes was not uncommon at all at that time and place. I've consistently been opposed to blasphemy/heresy trials, and unelected religious bullies having power over the rest of us; I don't need to make a special point of each victim.

Didn't seem like "died" "woop de doo" made the same statement. At least be consistent.

Quote:i think I heard that "virgin" was a mistranslation of "young woman" or something like that?

nah it's pretty clear it means virgin and his name will be Immanuel

Quote:but suppose it really is "virgin". how do you know mary was a virgin?

Jesus came from mary, we are told she was a virgin, Jesus performed all these miracles so one can trust he's probably someone special. The prophecy stated he was of virgin birth, mary didn't dispute this. That's how I know.

Quote:

what's special about this?

The lineage tracings being accurate even when predicted many moons ago.

Quote:joseph counts as jesus' father, does he? interesting

I suppose earthly wise yes, he raised him from birth.

Quote:jesus had a throne?

In love a throne will be established from the house of David, Jesus is of Davids lineage came preaching Love and claimed to be the king of Love essentially. I dont see the confusion.

Quote:

sorry, i'm not following this one.

Just more evidencing that Jesus is from the clan of Judah. Specifically Bethlehem

Quote:that's not really a prediction, is it? rachel was waaaaay before herod. what's the connection?

Just supporting this weeping for children in Bethlehem.

Rachel was buried there according to Gen 35:19

19 And Rachel died, and was buried in the way to Ephrath--the same is Beth-lehem.

Quote:Quote:Hosea 11:1 When Israel was a child, I loved him, and out of Egypt I called my son.

Quote:Matthew 2:14-15 [14] So he got up, took the child and his mother during the night and left for Egypt, [15] where he stayed until the death of Herod. And so was fulfilled what the Lord had said through the prophet: "Out of Egypt I called my son."

again, this isn't really a prediction.

It is, Jesus is supposed to be Gods son, its written about in the OT and fulfilled by how it played out when the time came.

Quote:if this is a prediction, and despite its vagueness i'll say it kinda is, isn't it obvious jesus failed to fulfil it?

seemingly vague or not, he is establishing his laws as a servant of God and going around healing all the sick, This should help, its some of the previous verses leading up the that one

Quote:9 Going on from that place, he went into their synagogue, 10 and a man with a shriveled hand was there. Looking for a reason to bring charges against Jesus, they asked him, "Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath?"

11 He said to them, "If any of you has a sheep and it falls into a pit on the Sabbath, will you not take hold of it and lift it out? 12 How much more valuable is a person than a sheep! Therefore it is lawful to do good on the Sabbath."

13 Then he said to the man, "Stretch out your hand." So he stretched it out and it was completely restored, just as sound as the other. 14 But the Pharisees went out and plotted how they might kill Jesus.

Quote:barely a prediction. how do you know jesus cured anybody?

The testimonials.

Quote:stop me if i'm wrong, but it's David who says this? what does it have to do with Jesus?

Yes, it parallels the same as Jesus, He had an extreme amount of enemies and he still does to this day.

Quote:Quote:John 7:48-49 "Has any of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed in him? [49] No! But this mob that knows nothing of the law--there is a curse on them."

and

showing the rules at the time these as you claim "devout" Jews.

Quote:Quote:John 15:24-25 [24] If I had not done among them what no one else did, they would not be guilty of sin. But now they have seen these miracles, and yet they have hated both me and my Father. [25] But this is to fulfill what is written in their Law: 'They hated me without reason.' notice the vagueness?

notice that they are being ignorant of their own law?

The similar theme of hating for no reason is still applied throughout all of those. Thats the whole point.

Quote:again, it's hard to see in what sense this is a prediction?

Prediction: Rejected stone will become capstone

Fullfill: Jesus has become the capstone

Quote:again, not a prediction.

Right just so happens hundreds of years before his existence that it was known he would be betrayed for 30 pieces of silver. come on bro

Quote:says david. nothing to do with jesus as far as i can tell. and again, not a prediction. for example, three or four verses previously - the same speech - he says he's beset by "bulls of Bashan". if this is a prophecy, jesus failed to fulfil it.

Dont recall davids hand or feet being pierced ever...

Quote:the first one is in the very same speech as the bulls of bashan, which isn't a prophecy and has nothing to do with jesus.

he protects all his bones

Quote:and you should be glad of that, because if you want to claim it's a prophecy, you can only conclude that jesus failed to fulfil it.

The scriptures have timeless relevance. David doesnt even know it to be honest.

Quote:the second one contains an interesting turn of phrase. a variation of it crops up quite a lot: "and this happened so that it would be fulfilled that which was spoken by the prophets". very interesting turn of phrase. sounds like "we did it because the scriptures said it would happen", and there's nothing supernatural about that, is there?

I dont think the roman government gives a rats ass about fulfilling scripture.

Quote:but once again, the bit in psalms seems to have nothing to do with a messiah.

Its David writings in psalms about this man who is coming that are relevant. That is all.

[Quote:quote title=Quote:]Psalm 22:18 They divide my garments among them and cast lots for my clothing.

Quote:Matthew 27:35 When they had crucified him, they divided up his clothes by casting lots still in the bulls of bashan speech[/QUOTE]

Who divided KING davids garments and cast his lots for clothing?

Quote:all of this chapter so far is written in the past tense. in what sense, therefore, is it a prediction?

Its written in the tense of fulfillment. (you know what I mean)

Quote:i wonder how long it would take for a man to cut a tomb out of the rock.

ask a mason.

Quote:

again, notice the vagueness?

I have serious doubts your even reading each one at least once let alone analyzing it for more than 30 seconds.

Quote:got any better ones than these? cos these are not impressive.

These are sufficient imo.

Quote:

certainly not that you could prove it.

you can do otherwise? the testimony have not been denied yet...

Quote:okay, let's say the stuff in deuteronomy and leviticus etc is only talking to the people of the time, and not instructions for you. scratch those. we've still got hell, haven't we? (which is worse than the instructions in deuteronomy)

sure, and when you provide me some logic for punishment to not exist Ill be welcome to entertain it.

Quote:it's worse.

I bet!

Quote:jesus repeatedly threatens people with hell if they don't do as he says.

Youd better go out and help the poor, helpless and save people. Be kind to others and treat your neighbor as thyself. Sounds like a pretty fucked up world to me too.

Quote:and if he claimed to be god, then that's much worse than when your local priest makes the same threats.

No priest has any authority to threaten anyone with anything. Only educate someone on what Gods plan is and details about it.

Quote:no, you missed the point. i speculated that you might actually agree that being tortured for not being the right religion is indeed a bad thing,

Why do you refuse to accept following the wrong religion? People have choices...

Quote: but just haven't realised that you think so. i wonder if you've ever really thought about it, i.e. hell.

yes

Quote:think about it now.

Iv pondered it and it doesnt seem outside the norm one would expect if a God exist.

Quote:interesting. so you think people can be horribly tortured for not being the right religion by God, but you think it's "not right" and "fucked up" when the same thing (or rather, a much more lenient thing) is inflicted by humans?

Yes, Humans are not an ultimate judge, and as much as humans would like to think they are all knowing and supreme they arent. So they have no authority to commit such acts.

Quote:Should a person be tortured as a punishment for not being the right religion?

no

Quote:i say: no. you say: yes, but only when it's my religion and when my dictator is doing the torturing.

My God sending someone to a torturous place they already know about is not my fault, or his. Its an established way that life goes. You either accept it exists and then decide fuck it, i dont care if I wind up there, decide I dont want to go there, so Ill give God pitty worship to get by, or some crazy thought, hell becomes an irrelevant factor in your life decisions and your worship God out of pure willingness! Impossible sounding I know!

Quote:what do you mean by "believe"?

acknowledgement to the extent in full. Same as knowing a bullet to the chest will kill you.

Quote:i've definitely said that it would take more than evidence of god and jesus to make me a christian, because there is more than one objection for me. it's not just the fact that i don't think it's true, there's also the fact that i morally object to a lot of it. finding out that the god of the bible really was real would be very bad news as far as i'm concerned. it's a great relief to think there's no hell. finding out that it was true would mean a few friends and family members are being horribly tortured right now. good people, just not the right religion. i don't think it's possible for me to grasp what a crushing blow this would be.

It seems how if even God himself came down and sat next to you, you wouldnt believe lol. You seem more concerned with the moral objections (your own view of morality), than actual proof or tangible facts here.

Quote:haven't you noticed that satan barely appears in the bible at all?

yes I have

Quote:the war in heaven stuff is only in Revelation, which - let's face it - is so ridiculous it probably shouldn't even be in the bible. even christians can't agree on what the fuck it's talking about.

Some of its clear, some of its not. I dont see how something one doesnt understand should just be written off as it seems youd rather have information censored.

Quote:satan barely appears in the books besides that;

In life theres not much need to pay attention to satan at all. Hes kind of moot.

Quote: mainly in Job, where he is a dick but only a secondary antagonist, the primary antagonist obviously being God (may as well be satan's boss, apparently... if this is even the same Satan commonly referred to, and there's a strong argument for saying it isn't)

that, and when he tempts jesus in the wilderness, which isn't much of a big deal

Yes hes in job.

Quote:no, the villain of the book is very obviously Yahweh.

That evil God telling man to live properly. How fucked up a world his commandments of thou shalt not kill and love they enemy as thyself. fucked up man

Quote:what mischief does satan do? he kills a few people in Job, certainly an awful thing to do, albeit a thing done with Yahweh's permission. compare that to the enormous death toll Yahweh racks up in the bible, either by wiping people out himself or ordering people to do it (arguably worse) and the whole hell business.

Satan tries to falsify things, give false information, get people to worship other things besides God.

Quote:interesting. i hear this a lot when i talk to christians, "those people aren't really christians". sometimes in the same post as claims of how many christians there are.

hm, I dont hear that alot at all. Mainly I hear some story of how "I worship God how I think he should be" ect ect. pretty much setting God in the realm of a fairy tale where your the only one who provides its testimony.

Quote:christians - or perhaps not christians in your view - never tire of telling us so.
Of course not, because why would one not want to discuss whats true and whats not?
[Quote:quote=Quote:]"the fool hath said in his heart, there is no God"
this bit of demagoguery is completely discredited by the following verses, where it says that these non-believers are all horribly wicked and none of them have ever done any good thing. that is so obviously untrue that i wonder why christians ever want to draw attention anywhere near it.[/QUOTE]

It just points out the ridiculousness of not even believing in a Gods existence at all. Its comparable to one actually thinking the monkey at the zoo is actually genetically related to you somehow.

Quote:you must realise how stupid you sound at this point, surely?
of course according to yourself.

Quote:Quote:and of course children are the target demographic, because it doesn't work on intelligent adults.

are you saying I cant come up with a list of intelligent people through history that were christian?

Quote:moving the goalposts a bit there.

actually no, you explicitly stated: "it doesn't work on intelligent adults"

"are you saying I cant come up with a list of intelligent people through history that were christian"
one reading the first quote would reasonably assume the second quote response would be in order.

Quote:you can also come up with a list of intelligent people who believed other fucking retarded stuff like alchemy and the phlogiston (sp?) theory.

You didnt claim that though.

Quote:question is why were they christians? could it be because they were brought up christians, i.e. indoctrinated as kids, because education was fucking awful at the time,

lol hold on, do you think christianity only exists through lineage? is that your position.

Quote:because christianity had all kinds of political power,

Thats why it was illegal to be christian at its begging right?

Quote:because of hell threats, because of how dangerous it was to admit you weren't a christian?

Any men killing you because you are not a christian are about as christian as the men who crucified Jesus.

Its no different if you oppose a law of state, dont break the rule. If you do then expect ramifications.

no, fast-forward to now. it's very, very rare for an intelligent person to convert to christianity through logical, civilised debate without coercion. but then, without coercion, christianity wouldn't be christianity.

Quote:no, it's an observation on the abject failure of my debate opponents to prove anything important, or answer any of my moral objections.

Have you ever objectively analyzed yourself of some kind of failure to adhere to points?

Quote:died on a cross wouldn't be unusual. rising from the dead would be (though it wouldn't

vindicate his moral teachings, or even prove that he himself had the supernatural power), so what a shame we've had no evidence of that.

So you can at LEAST agree, a man named Jesus of a specific lineage lived in Israel under Roman occupation, died and crucified at the hands of Pontius Pilate (sorry the spelling), gained many followers in a short period of time and was extensively written about by his closest followers and historians?

disprove the testimony of the gospels. They are why one can conclude what they do about Christ.

Quote: we can skip over the numerous times when the speeches of Jesus don't agree with each other, because that's exactly what you would expect from reports written decades after a person died. Who was Joseph's father?

sure whatever you wanna skip.

Matthew 1:16

And Jacob begot Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus who is called Christ.

Quote: I'm not sure I believe that you intentionally picked people who do more to undermine your case than support it.

How are they undermining in the least? Where are they hurting the gospels?

Quote: I don't know. To pacify rebellious minorities, perhaps?

Or maybe, just maybe there was apparent truth.

Quote: sigh... don't be silly

Just saying, doesn't seem like you analyze much instead just have predetermined answers and responses. Enough of this though because it's irrelevant and time wasting to argue about the person rather than the subject itself.

Quote: "the Christians"?

yes

Quote: and indeed, why would I?

It would take away from the uniqueness and probability of this one religion actually being the one that's correct.

Quote: to say your religion can claim something other religions can't is hardly impressive.

If its claims are true? I don't see how you don't get that relevance.

Quote: so, like I said, you haven't proven that Jesus said any such thing. The gospels say he said it, so what? Prove he said it, please... and then your real work will be still ahead of you: prove he was right.

The gospels are a reliable source on what Jesus said. This all comes down to if you can show the gospels can be trusted to show what Jesus said or not?

Quote: what is hell? A place of torture made by Jesus's dad (apparently). Obey me or that's where you will go as a punishment. This is an awful way to behave. Jesus was not a good person if he said what the gospels say he said.

Well Jesus is part of gods plan, and the world killed Gods son so the world will pay for what it had done unless it reconciles itself. Same for every person. your disagreement doesnt seem to extend more beyond "I just dont want to live that way" or "be accountable" for anything

Quote:see above re: jewish men obviously not thinking jesus was the messiah, christians being referred to derisively, nothing supernatural being vindicated

Establishing these facts about Jesus are important, these sources back up the gospels. They dont have the luxury of just dusting Jesus under the rug because he was just around not even a generation ago in this time. So they simply just deny his claims lol. I mean you even have people that legitimately dont think Jesus existed at all these days. Thats not even an argument and these sources show this.

Quote:who said they were? i'm more inclined to think they ("they" is such a vague word, we really should specify who are we talking about) were just plain wrong

ok, so when they wrote the gospels they WERE indeed writing what was what they saw and experienced.

Quote:why would a petty little thing like that bother you?

Its a form of censorship and displaying of ignorance.

Quote:you're ok with people being horribly tortured for not being the right religion. choosing to not worship God.

Quote:if that can't bother you, why get worked up about what some guy says?

I dont personally care, but it just shows weak character

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Wed, 09 May 2012 06:54:45 GMT

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

fredcow9 wrote on Tue, 08 May 2012 16:32Quote: previously you called non-belief a "crime" so i suppose i shouldn't be surprised under Gods rules yes, mans no. your god's rules are awful.

Quote:When the people saw that Moses was so long in coming down from the mountain, they gathered around Aaron and said, "Come, make us gods[a] who will go before us. As for this fellow Moses who brought us up out of Egypt, we don't know what has happened to him."

^let alone when moses just leaves for a little bit, they already start going astray, and you dont think enticing peoples would be a threat to Gods startup plan?

3 So all the people took off their earrings and brought them to Aaron. 4 He took what they handed him and made it into an idol cast in the shape of a calf, fashioning it with a tool. Then they said, "These are your gods,[b] Israel, who brought you up out of Egypt."

sounds like more than a handful of people to me

quite funny that these people would rather worship a fucking metal cow than yahweh, eh

Quote:Quote:uh no, i was referring to yahweh's deliberate targeting of children.

Iv always assumed a silent death is not a big deal, this is more damaging to the parents than the

children themselves. Besides, its pharaoh who is allowing this to continue. couple of interesting bits in the narrative:

1. before moses makes the final threat, yahweh tells moses that he'll bring one more plague against the egyptians and then the israelites will be let go.
2. who hardened pharaoh's heart, fredcow?

it kinda looks like yahweh was hell-bent on wiping those kids out.

anyway, do you think that if it wasn't for your religion, you'd be justifying the deliberate and systematic genocide against innocent children? when you first became a christian, did you think that this is where it would lead you?

Quote:Why do you always annotate your own arguments specifying yourself as some kind of victor all the time?

Your not even touching my religion yet alone bringing even one serious problem up besides your moral objection to something.

why lie? anyone can see i brought up quite a few major problems with your cartoonish threats, and they can also see you couldn't answer them.

Quote:As I have said before and Ill say it again, if you object to gravity, its still there. When your told not to jump off a cliff or else... then dont do it unless your willing to risk the or else... that's pretty dense, as analogies go. firstly, gravity is real and demonstrable (pick up a pen and drop it. throw a rock off the cliff and see what happens to it). hell is not real. (unless you wanna answer the challenge i posed to eatcow, which was prove it) secondly falling off the cliff isn't a punishment for a crime, it's just a consequence of a foolish action according to the nature of physics.

Quote:Quote:

who? when? what did they say?

I dont know

Quote:Quote:it's not relevant whether a devout Jewish man who seriously believes in the oncoming messiah is convinced that Jesus is the real deal or not?

Saul of Tarsus?

and what do you know about him?

Quote:Quote:so again, decades after jesus is supposed to have died.

yes, is that supposed to be unreasonable by historys standards of proof?

...if you're trying to prove something extraordinary, then yes, you need a lot better than that.

Quote:Quote:uh no, cos all these "secular writings" basically say is "there's a group of people who believed this guy who lived a few decades ago was their messiah".

Its an acknowledgement and an important one.

it's an entirely unimpressive one. it can be made about any number of false messiahs.

Quote:Quote:even if this wasn't in a time and place where there was basically no such thing as

education,

I was led to believe the Romans were some smart people actually. Didn't the whole empire "fall for this ridiculousness"

no... it took hundreds of years before there was any significant number of Christians in the roman empire (this in a society already rife with credulity and superstition), and even after a few centuries it was only like 10% of the population... it eventually got itself some political power, although it was already schisising the fuck out of itself and its political proponents could barely go a decade without changing their mind on most of it

Quote:Quote:where superstition was rampant and where most people already believed in god(s) anyway, this would still not vindicate the gospels.

So if they already have a belief system you don't think there has to be some element of apparent truth for them to switch in a time period facing death for switching to that religion?

Hey convert to Christianity

Nah dude I could get killed for that

^Thats how it would go if it were not real and people in the area hadn't, seen or at least through another source heard about Jesus or seen some sort of miracle.

are you under the impression that the average person could not become a christian or he'd be killed?

it's true there was persecution of christians in the roman empire, just like there was persecution of other religions once christianity had the power (and persecution of christians by christians...) but i think you may be overstating the extent of it.

Quote:No, but it would prove some weight behind the illiad and its writers testimony. If he wrote specifically about certain descriptions and more of those descriptions are coming up true than false, its likely you can to at least some extent his story.

it's completely inadequate if you are trying to prove the extraordinary parts of the story; i.e. the stuff about gods and whatnot.

Quote:This especially applies to the bible as the field of archaeology has only worked for it and not against it.

...you can't be serious?

israeli archaeologists have tried their utmost to vindicate the exodus story (david ben-gurion tasked them with it to add legitimacy to the state of israel), and they eventually had to admit they got nothing. that's an admirable admission, by the way.

Quote:Quote:same for the gospels.

Its why there's way more than 1 or 2 bits that are accurate as shown by secular history.

the closest you can seriously claim to establish with the 'secular history' is "there was a guy called Jesus who some people followed", and even that's a bit of a stretch (note the disconnect between 'Jesus' and 'Christ'...)

Quote:Quote:Yes they are in a time when most couldn't read or write which is why its amazing the gospels are not lying when matched with secular writings dont you think?

This is still a valid point.

no it's not. you still haven't vindicated the gospels.

Quote:Quote:- the fact loads of people there already believed in god(s), specifically judaism and the prospect of an imminent messiah

So as a Jew one would examine, did this Christ fulfill his obligations? was he really the one? The fact these people converted so massively would only be expected if the gospels are telling the truth.

"so massively"? again, you may be gravely overstating the situation. a few churches cropped up, but they were partly political organisations, and they couldn't agree on very much.

Quote:Quote:- the fact there was basically no such thing as education trying to undermine someones choice to a reality based on if they have their masters degree is not really a valid argument at all. If thats the case I could just say poor people are heathens because they dont know any better and are stupid. see how ignorant that really sounds? there's no need for populism, nobody else is reading your posts anyway.

Quote:Quote:- the coercive nature of the religion itself, i.e. follow me or you will be tortured Thats not really the point. Its follow me because you love me, not because your scared of torture. anyone following Jesus because they are scared of torture are really falsely being led. say it's not the point if it makes you feel better, doesn't change the fact the threat is made.

Quote:Besides, I thought your reasoning for why people are Christian is because they are brought up that way. which is it?

i think you'll notice i said there are several reasons for christianity's success, none of them praiseworthy

Quote:Quote:

yes, there were obviously people who refused to deny their religion when threatened with death, and the point i was making is there are far more people who won't join this religion when threatened with even worse.

Who is being threatened with death for not believing? Where did the apostles go and do that? come on, fredcow. don't be a fucking retard. you were talking about hell in this very post.

Quote:Quote:nice question dodge. please answer it next time.

eh?

Im too lazy to look it up lol, but you did dodge it.[/quote]
no need to lie.

Quote:Quote:how do you know that?

history...look it up lol

the internal motives of the jewish religious leaders are not "history". guess all you like.

Quote:Quote:So far I have proved the gospels can be trusted again, this is a laughable overstatement

care to finally dispute this at all?[/quote]

sure, i can just point out that not a single one of the many supernatural claims has been vindicated yet.

Quote:Quote:not the point i was making. everybody dies. being put to death in horrible ways for non-crimes was not uncommon at all at that time and place. i've consistently been opposed to blasphemy/heresy trials, and unelected religious bullies having power over the rest of us; i don't need to make a special point of each victim.

Didnt seem like "died" "woop de doo" made the same statement. At least be consistent.
"woop de doo" = "that's not an impressive claim"

Quote:Quote:i think i heard that "virgin" was a mistranslation of "young woman" or something like that?

nah its pretty clear it means virgin
it really isn't clear.

Quote:Quote:but suppose it really is "virgin". how do you know mary was a virgin?
Jesus came from mary, we are told she was a virgin, Jesus performed all these miracles so one can trust hes probably someone special. The prophecy stated he was of virgin birth, mary didnt dispute this. Thats how I know.
that's a pretty odd use of the word "know".

Quote:Quote:
what's special about this?
The lineage tracings being accurate even when predicted many moons ago.
predicted? it predicts nothing about jesus.

Quote:Quote:joseph counts as jesus' father, does he? interesting
I suppose earthly wise yes, he raised him from birth.

Quote:jesus had a throne?
In love a throne will be established from the house of David, Jesus is of Davids lineage came preaching Love and claimed to be the king of Love essentially. I dont see the confusion.
again, the prediction says nothing about jesus or a messiah. you could say that for any king or whatever.

Quote:Quote:
sorry, i'm not following this one.
Just more evidencing that Jesus is from the clan of Judah. Specifically Bethlehem
it's much too vague to be worth anything.

Quote:Quote:that's not really a prediction, is it? rachel was waaaaay before herod. what's the connection?
Just supporting this weeping for children in Bethlehem.
Rachel was buried there according to Gen 35:19
19 And Rachel died, and was buried in the way to Ephrath--the same is Beth-lehem.
like i said, it's not a prediction and it's nothing to do with a messiah

Quote:Quote:Quote:Hosea 11:1 When Israel was a child, I loved him, and out of Egypt I called my son.
Quote:Matthew 2:14-15 [14] So he got up, took the child and his mother during the night and left

for Egypt, [15] where he stayed until the death of Herod. And so was fulfilled what the Lord had said through the prophet: "Out of Egypt I called my son."

again, this isn't really a prediction.

It is, Jesus is supposed to be Gods son, its written about in the OT and fulfilled by how it played out when the time came.

you're very easily impressed.

it's not a prediction.

Quote:Quote:barely a prediction. how do you know jesus cured anybody?

The testimonials.

have to do a bit better than that tbh. btw, curing someone is not all that unusual.

Quote:Quote:stop me if i'm wrong, but it's David who says this? what does it have to do with Jesus?

Yes, it parallels the same as Jesus, He had an extreme amount of enemies and he still does to this day.

it's not a prediction - again - and it's nothing to do with the messiah - again. but omg, "he had lots of enemies", plenty of people have had lots of enemies.

Quote:Quote:John 7:48-49 "Has any of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed in him? [49] No! But this mob that knows nothing of the law--there is a curse on them."

and

showing the rules at the time these as you claim "devout" Jews.

Quote:Quote:John 15:24-25 [24] If I had not done among them what no one else did, they would not be guilty of sin. But now they have seen these miracles, and yet they have hated both me and my Father. [25] But this is to fulfill what is written in their Law: 'They hated me without reason.'

notice the vagueness?

notice that they are being ignorant of their own law?

The similar theme of hating for no reason is still applied throughout all of those. Thats the whole point.[/quote]

there isn't a point here ^^

Quote:Quote:again, it's hard to see in what sense this is a prediction?

Prediction: Rejected stone will become capstone

Fullfill: Jesus has become the capstone

that's not a prediction either, it's just a recurring metaphor, and not a particularly good one.

Quote:Quote:again, not a prediction.

Right just so happens hundreds of years before his existence that it was known he would be betrayed for 30 pieces of silver. come on bro

Zechariah 11:12 I told them, "If you think it best, give me my pay; but if not, keep it." So they paid me thirty pieces of silver.

not a prediction. nothing about betrayal. nothing about messiahs.

Quote:Quote:says david. nothing to do with jesus as far as i can tell. and again, not a prediction. for example, three or four verses previously - the same speech - he says he's beset by "bulls of Bashan". if this is a prophecy, jesus failed to fulfil it.

Dont recall davids hand or feet being pierced ever...
and i don't recall jesus being attacked by "bulls of Bashan", but whatever. not a prediction.

Quote:Quote:the first one is in the very same speech as the bulls of bashan, which isn't a prophecy and has nothing to do with jesus.
he protects all his bones
plenty of people go through life without breaking a bone.

not a prediction. nothing to do with jesus.

Quote:Quote:and you should be glad of that, because if you want to claim it's a prophecy, you can only conclude that jesus failed to fulfil it.

The scriptures have timeless relevance. David doesnt even know it to be honest.
you're dangerously close to a good point there; david is, indeed, talking bollocks.

Quote:Quote:the second one contains an interesting turn of phrase. a variation of it crops up quite a lot: "and this happened so that it would be fulfilled that which was spoken by the prophets". very interesting turn of phrase. sounds like "we did it because the scriptures said it would happen", and there's nothing supernatural about that, is there?

I dont think the roman government gives a rats ass about fulfilling scripture.
the people who wrote the gospels obviously did. how easy it would've been to throw in the odd detail to make it sound like old messiah prophecies were fulfilled.

Quote:Quote:but once again, the bit in psalms seems to have nothing to do with a messiah.
Its David writings in psalms about this man who is coming that are relevant. That is all.
that is, indeed, all.

Quote:[Quote:quote title=Quote:]Psalm 22:18 They divide my garments among them and cast lots for my clothing.

Quote:Matthew 27:35 When they had crucified him, they divided up his clothes by casting lots still in the bulls of bashan speech

Who divided KING davids garments and cast his lots for clothing?[/quote]
how do you know such a thing happened in jesus' case?

Quote:Quote:
again, notice the vagueness?
I have serious doubts your even reading each one at least once let alone analyzing it for more than 30 seconds.
i seem to be paying more attention than you are, cos i'm noting that most of these are not predictions and the ones that MAYBE are (if you stretch a bit) haven't been fulfilled.

Quote:Quote:got any better ones than these? cos these are not impressive.
These are sufficient imo.
only if you're really, really easily impressed. what about those of us with a slightly higher bar?

Quote:Quote:

certainly not that you could prove it.
you can do otherwise? the testimony have not been denied yet...
this quote ^ was referring to the claim that jesus rose from the dead.

like i said, prove it.

Quote:Quote:okay, let's say the stuff in deuteronomy and leviticus etc is only talking to the people of the time, and not instructions for you. scratch those. we've still got hell, haven't we? (which is worse than the instructions in deuteronomy)

sure, and when you provide me some logic for punishment to not exist Ill be welcome to entertain it.

punishment for not being the right religion? that shouldn't be a crime in the first place, and i still hold out hope that there's some tiny little part of you that thinks so too.

Quote:Quote:and if he claimed to be god, then that's much worse than when your local priest makes the same threats.

No priest has any authority to threaten anyone with anything. Only educate someone on what Gods plan is and details about it.
threaten.

"be this religion or you will be tortured."

threat ^^

Quote:Quote:interesting. so you think people can be horribly tortured for not being the right religion by God, but you think it's "not right" and "fucked up" when the same thing (or rather, a much more lenient thing) is inflicted by humans?

Yes, Humans are not an ultimate judge, and as much as humans would like to think they are all knowing and supreme they arent. So they have no authority to commit such acts.
so might makes right? you can torture people for not being the right religion just so long as you're all-powerful?

Quote:Quote:Should a person be tortured as a punishment for not being the right religion?
no
whoops

are you in any confusion about this?

Quote:Quote:i say: no. you say: yes, but only when it's my religion and when my dictator is doing the torturing.

My God sending someone to a torturous place they already know about is not my fault, or his. Its an established way that life goes. You either accept it exists and then decide fuck it, i dont care if I wind up there, decide I dont want to go there, so Ill give God pitty worship to get by, or some crazy thought, hell becomes an irrelevant factor in your life decisions and your worship God out of pure willingness! Impossible sounding I know!

firstly, i suppose i need to repeat myself: prove hell exists
secondly, maybe belief is a choice for some people, for a lot of people it is not

Quote:Quote:what do you mean by "believe"?
acknowledgement to the extent in full. Same as knowing a bullet to the chest will kill you.
you're not making sense (again)

Quote:Quote:i've definitely said that it would take more than evidence of god and jesus to make me a christian, because there is more than one objection for me. it's not just the fact that i don't think it's true, there's also the fact that i morally object to a lot of it. finding out that the god of the bible really was real would be very bad news as far as i'm concerned. it's a great relief to think there's no hell. finding out that it was true would mean a few friends and family members are being horribly tortured right now. good people, just not the right religion. i don't think it's possible for me to grasp what a crushing blow this would be.

It seems how if even God himself came down and sat next to you, you wouldnt believe lol. You seem more concerned with the moral objections (your own view of morality), than actual proof or tangible facts here.

spin it how you like, if you don't mind looking dishonest. i'm just glad you're finally noticing that there are several major objections to your ridiculous threats. it's a shame i had to repeat them several times.

Quote:Quote:the war in heaven stuff is only in Revelation, which - let's face it - is so ridiculous it probably shouldn't even be in the bible. even christians can't agree on what the fuck it's talking about.

Some of its clear, some of its not. I dont see how something one doesnt understand should just be written off as it seems youd rather have information censored.

no, i'm just pointing out that Revelation is batshit crazy even by the standards of the rest of the bible.

Quote:Quote:no, the villain of the book is very obviously Yahweh.

That evil God telling man to live properly. How fucked up a world his commandments of thou shalt not kill and love thy enemy as thyself. fucked up man
then there's the enormous death toll, killing people including innocents and including children, often in horribly extravagantly ways... and sending them to hell.

yes, that is fucked up, but thankfully it's not true.

Quote:Quote:what mischief does satan do? he kills a few people in Job, certainly an awful thing to do, albeit a thing done with Yahweh's permission. compare that to the enormous death toll Yahweh racks up in the bible, either by wiping people out himself or ordering people to do it (arguably worse) and the whole hell business.

Satan tries to falsify things, give false information, get people to worship other things besides God. so?

Quote:Quote:christians - or perhaps not christians in your view - never tire of telling us so.
Of course not, because why would one not want to discuss whats true and whats not?
don't ask me, ask the majority of christians who - like i just said - never tire of telling us that it's about faith, not evidence.

Quote:[Quote:quote title=Quote:]"the fool hath said in his heart, there is no God"
this bit of demagoguery is completely discredited by the following verses, where it says that these non-believers are all horribly wicked and none of them have ever done any good thing. that is so obviously untrue that i wonder why christians ever want to draw attention anywhere near it.
It just points out the ridiculousness of not even believing in a Gods existence at all.[/quote]
it doesn't succeed.

Quote:Its comparable to one actually thinking the monkey at the zoo is actually genetically related to you somehow.
ah, evolution.

i read your post in the other thread. darwin's black box? i'm sorry to hear you were exposed to such a dishonest, incompetent book at such a young age. the scientific community laughed at it from the beginning, and even Behe himself has had to abandon the bullshit he tried to pass off in that book. eventually, of course... i think it was the dover court case that did it, where he lied under oath that his research was peer reviewed, then had to admit it wasn't.

btw, if you still admire behe, ask him what he did when his son wanted to become an atheist.

Quote:Quote:Quote:and of course children are the target demographic, because it doesn't work on intelligent adults.

are you saying I cant come up with a list of intelligent people through history that were christian?

Quote:moving the goalposts a bit there.

actually no, you explicitly stated: "it doesn't work on intelligent adults"

"are you saying I cant come up with a list of intelligent people through history that were christian"
one reading the first quote would reasonably assume the second quote response would be in order.

it's still moving the goalposts. christian evangelism doesn't work on intelligent adults now. the fact you have to go back in time - to when churches had more power, education was poorer etc - just proves my point

Quote:Quote:question is why were they christians? could it be because they were brought up christians, i.e. indoctrinated as kids, because education was fucking awful at the time,
lol hold on, do you think christianity only exists through lineage? is that your position.

"only"? come on, i know you're a habitual liar, but why make such a feeble as that? i give 4 or 5 reasons, and you jump on the first one and say "only"?

Quote:Quote:because christianity had all kinds of political power,

Thats why it was illegal to be christian at its begging right?

welcome to what happens when a religion has power... sometimes that religion isn't yours.

Quote:Quote:because of hell threats, because of how dangerous it was to admit you weren't a christian?

Any men killing you because you are not a christian are about as christian as the men who crucified Jesus.

like i said, the "no true Christian" objection is extremely common.

Quote:Quote: no, it's an observation on the abject failure of my debate opponents to prove anything important, or answer any of my moral objections.

Have you ever objectively analyzed yourself of some kind of failure to adhere to points? do you want to have another crack at that sentence?

Quote:Quote: died on a cross wouldn't be unusual. rising from the dead would be (though it wouldn't vindicate his moral teachings, or even prove that he himself had the supernatural power), so what a shame we've had no evidence of that.

So you can at LEAST agree, a man named Jesus of a specific lineage lived in Israel under Roman occupation, died and crucified at the hands of pontais pilot (sorry the spelling), gained many followers in a short period of time and was extensively written about by his closets followers and historians?

even that is too generous.

"specific lineage" - no

"extensively" - no

"closest followers" - no

"named Jesus" - even that's a stretch

Quote:Quote: we can skip over the numerous times when the speeches of jesus don't agree with each other, because that's exactly what you would expect from reports written decades after a person died. who was Joseph's father?

sure whatever you wanna skip.

Matthew 1:16

And Jacob begot Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus who is called Christ. why does one of the other gospels say Heli?

Quote:Quote: i don't know. to pacify rebellious minorities, perhaps?

Or maybe, just maybe there was apparent truth.

it's by far the less likely of the two.

Quote:Quote: "the Christians"?

yes

your question was pointless. have another go if you like.

Quote:Quote: and indeed, why would i?

It would take away from the uniqueness and probability of this one religion actually being the one that's correct.

let's not start from the premise that one religion is correct and we need to find out which one.

Quote:Quote: to say your religion can claim something other religions can't is hardly impressive. If its claims are true? I dont see how you dont get that relevance.

when are its claims - the important ones, that is, i.e. the supernatural stuff - going to be proven? i'm still waiting

Quote:Quote: so, like i said, you haven't proven that jesus said any such thing. the gospels say he

said it, so what? prove he said it, please... and then your real work will be still ahead of you: prove he was right.

The gospels are a reliable source on what Jesus said.
how do you know? and how do you account for the discrepancies in his speeches between them?

Quote:Quote:what is hell? a place of torture made by jesus's dad (apparently). obey me or that's where you will go as a punishment. this is an awful way to behave. jesus was not a good person if he said what the gospels say he said.

Well Jesus is part of gods plan, and the world killed Gods son so the world will pay for what it had done unless it reconciles itself. Same for every person.

what's it like having a brain that works this way?

i.e. a fucking retarded one that talks complete bollocks?

Quote:your disagreement doesnt seem to extend more beyond "I just dont want to live that way" or "be accountable" for anything

i don't think it's true

i think it would be horrible if it was true

these ^ are serious, honest and sensible objections and you haven't been able to answer them.
it's dishonest of you to paint these straw men, but dishonesty is what i expect from you.

Quote:Quote:see above re: jewish men obviously not thinking jesus was the messiah, christians being referred to derisively, nothing supernatural being vindicated

Establishing these facts about Jesus are important, these sources back up the gospels. They dont have the luxury of just dusting Jesus under the rug because he was just around not even a generation ago in this time. So they simply just deny his claims lol. I mean you even have people that legitimately dont think Jesus existed at all these days. Thats not even an argument and these sources show this.

when is anything supernatural going to be proven?

Quote:Quote:who said they were? i'm more inclined to think they ("they" is such a vague word, we really should specify who are we talking about) were just plain wrong

ok, so when they wrote the gospels they WERE indeed writing what was what they saw and experienced.

that's more than you can know.

Quote:Quote:you're ok with people being horribly tortured for not being the right religion.
choosing to not worship God.

i'll repeat my earlier question...

when you first became a Christian, did you think this is the kind of opinion you'd end up with as a result?

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Major-Payne](#) on Wed, 09 May 2012 07:48:06 GMT

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

such an enlightened philosophy

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Wed, 09 May 2012 08:50:10 GMT

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

how does God feel about you cheating in video games fredcow
and consequently lying about it, to everyone involved
he's got a sweet spot for you next to Him in heaven, you magnificent being

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Major-Payne](#) on Wed, 09 May 2012 20:50:43 GMT

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

<http://www.landoverbaptist.net/showthread.php?t=54668>

HAHAHAHAHAH CHRISTIANS

FUCKING LOL

Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Wed, 09 May 2012 21:41:07 GMT

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

that looks like a parody, but Poe's law says parody of religious fundamentalism is almost indistinguishable from the real thing (or something)

and of course, the bible really does contain monstrously vile things.
