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Science that isn't science

The materialist argument against testimonial evidence is that it relies heavily on the truthfulness of the witness.

VOX, MATERIALISTS DON'T NEED AN ARGUMENT AGAINST TESTIMONIAL EVIDENCE. TESTIMONIAL EVIDENCE HAS PROVEN ITSELF A POOR SOURCE OF INFORMATION BASED ON THOUSANDS OF YEARS OF EXPERIENCE.

The great irony is that this is also true of science as it is actually practiced,

VOX, AND YOU WOULD KNOW THAT BECAUSE ... YOU ARE A PRACTICING SCIENTIST? YOU *WERE* A PRACTICING SCIENTIST? YOU PLAN TO BE A PRACTICING SCIENTIST? OR BECAUSE YOU THINK YOU'RE SMARTER THAN EVERYONE ELSE? (VOX, I THINK WE CAN SAFELY RULE OUT THE FIRST 3).

as opposed to that imaginary ideal science in which every experimental result is duly replicated multiple times.

VOX, EXPERIMENTS INVOLVING YOUR IMAGINARY FRIENDS IN THE SPIRIT WORLD HAVE NEVER BEEN REPLICATED EVEN ONCE, YET THAT DOESN'T SEEM TO BE A PROBLEM FOR YOU.

The Economist describes an episode of scientific misconduct that reveals how most of what passes for science today holds no claim to even being called science, let alone possesses any scientific authority.

(VOX THEN COPIED A STORY THAT REPORTED ON DUKE CANCER RESEARCHER ANIL POTTI WHO WAS FORCED TO RESIGN WHEN IT WAS DISCOVERED THAT HE HAD MADE A FRAUDULENT CLAIM OF BEING A RHODES SCHOLAR ON HIS GRANT APPLICATION, WHICH THEN LED TO A REEXAMINATION OF HIS RESEARCH. THE REEXAMINATION UNCOVERED EVIDENCE OF "RESEARCH ANOMALIES" THOUGH THE UNIVERSITY STOPPED SHORT OF CALLING IT FRAUD. HIS GRANT WAS SUSPENDED, CLINICAL TRIALS WERE ENDED, JOURNAL PAPERS WERE RETRACTED, AND POTTI LEFT IN DISGRACE).

Now, there are two significant points here. First, the reason the hypothesis was eventually falsified wasn't due to the scientific method, but because of historical documentary evidence, namely, the false claim of Dr. Potti to have been a Rhodes Scholar in Australia.

VOX, WHAT HYPOTHESIS WAS FALSIFIED? THERE WAS NO FALSIFIED HYPOTHESIS. HIS RESEARCH WAS FOUND TO BE FILLED WITH ERRORS. THAT HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH ANY HYPOTHESIS.

AND POTTI'S FALSE CLAIM DID NOT FALSIFY A HYPOTHESIS; IT LED INVESTIGATORS TO QUESTION HIS RESEARCH AND THAT IS HOW THEY DISCOVERED THE ANOMALIES.

SO YOUR "2 SIGNIFICANT POINTS" ARE ACTUALLY 2 COMPLETE MISUNDERSTANDINGS ON YOUR PART.

Second, most "science" is not only never experimentally replicated, but the unscientific editing process known as peer review isn't even performed properly in most cases.

VOX, IF A CLAIM CAN'T BE REPLICATED BY INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATORS, IT ISN'T CONSIDERED SCIENCE - IT REMAINS A HYPOTHESIS; SO OBVIOUSLY, ALL ACCEPTED SCIENCE HAS BEEN EXPERIMENTALLY REPLICATED. BUT THAT DOESN'T PROHIBIT FUTURE EXPERIMENTS FROM OVERTURNING ACCEPTED SCIENCE; AND WHEN THEY DO, THE NEW DISCOVERIES BECOME ACCEPTED SCIENCE, AND THE OLD THEORIES ARE DISCARDED. THAT IS WHY SCIENCE ALWAYS ADVANCES VOX, WHILE YOUR BELIEFS REMAIN MIRED IN THE DARK AGES OF IGNORANCE.

AS FOR PEER REVIEW, PERHAPS YOU COULD TELL US HOW MANY PEER REVIEW PROCESSES YOU HAVE BEEN INVOLVED IN, OR PROVIDE SOME OTHER EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT YOUR CLAIMED EXPERTISE ON THAT SUBJECT.

SORRY VOX, BUT YOUR MENSA MEMBERSHIP CARD ... DOESN'T QUALIFY.

When comparing science and other forms of knowledge,

VOX, COMPARING WHAT? WHAT OTHER FORMS OF KNOWLEDGE?

it is not logically consistent to compare ideal science versus the practical real world application of those alternatives.

VOX, AS A GHOST WORSHIPPER THE LAST THING IN THE WORLD YOU SHOULD BE TALKING ABOUT ... IS LOGICAL CONSISTENCY.

Either ideal science can be compared to ideal alternatives or actual science can be compared to actual alternatives. It is as nonsensical to claim that all reported science is reliable as it would be to claim that all historical documents are accurate and all eyewitness testimony is true.

VOX, WHO ARE YOU CLAIMING, IS SAYING THAT ALL REPORTED SCIENCE IS RELIABLE? NO ONE IN SCIENCE MAKES THAT CLAIM. THAT WAS A STRAW MAN ARGUMENT. SCIENTISTS ARE WELL AWARE THAT NOT ALL REPORTED SCIENCE IS RELIABLE WHICH IS WHY THE PEER REVIEW PROCESS IS SO IMPORTANT.

THEN YOU TRIED TO EQUATE THAT BOGUS CLAIM TO A PAIR OF OUTRAGEOUS CLAIMS IN ORDER TO SUPPORT YOUR STRAW MAN ARGUMENT. THAT PARAGRAPH PROVES THAT YOU DON'T EVEN UNDERSTAND THE BASIC CONCEPTS OF HOW LOGIC WORKS.

Just as some eyewitness testimony is false and some historical documents are inaccurate, most scientific reports are neither properly peer-reviewed nor replicated in any manner. Therefore, no scientific paper can credibly claim the authority of science until it has been demonstrated that it has been both properly peer-reviewed and duly replicated.

VOX, THAT IS EXACTLY WHAT HAPPENED IN THIS CASE. POTTI'S SCHEME FAILED WHEN HIS WORK WAS UNABLE TO SURVIVE THE REPLICATION PROCESS. SCIENCE FUNCTIONED JUST AS IT WAS DESIGNED TO DO. SOMETIMES IT DOESN'T GET CAUGHT AS EARLY IN THE PROCESS AS WE WOULD LIKE, BUT IN THIS CASE, IT DID GET CAUGHT.

WE SHOULD CONTRAST HOW SCIENCE HANDLED THIS MISCONDUCT WITH HOW THE VATICAN HANDLED ITS EMBARRASSING SCANDAL "THE SHROUD OF TURIN." AFTER FAILING 3 SCIENTIFIC DATING TESTS, THAT FRAUD IS STILL CIRCULATING THE EARTH, DRAWING IN BIG MONEY FROM THE GULLIBLE AND THE POOR ... JUST AS IT WAS DESIGNED TO DO 700 YEARS AGO.

OH, I'M SORRY VOX, THAT WASN'T ONE OF YOUR PET BELIEFS WAS IT?

COMMENTS FROM "THE DREADED ILK"

Leahn Novash

Cue atheists saying this is an isolated incident and doesn't prove anything in 10... 9...

LEAHN, YOU DON'T HAVE TO CUE THEM, THEY ALREADY KNOW THAT THIS DOESN'T PROVE ANYTHING THAT WE DIDN'T ALREADY KNOW.

VD, what authority has science? Since science, by their own admission, is almost always wrong, why do people still rely on it as some sort of source of knowledge?

LEAHN, BECAUSE THERE IS NO OTHER ALTERNATIVE. IT'S THE ONLY METHOD WE'VE GOT. YOUR SOURCE OF KNOWLEDGE, THE BIBLE, HAS NEVER BEEN PROVEN RIGHT ABOUT ANYTHING, YET YOU HAVE NO PROBLEM SLOPPING DOWN EVERY PIECE OF CRAP IT OFFERS. WHY THE DOUBLE STANDARD LEAHN? DON'T ANSWER ... WE ALREADY KNOW WHY: IT'S BECAUSE SCIENCE DOESN'T THREATEN YOU WITH ETERNAL TORTURE.

Leahn Novash

Stickwick: "And replication is the name of the game. Nobody believes any result until at least three other groups have replicated it, and even then the sense is that it could be overturned at any time."

Not to diss you, as I am sure that you take your work very seriously, but a while ago I read of something that scientists were dreading repeating experiments because of an effect that the experiments stopped giving the same results after a while. I don't remember exactly the details, so it may not apply on this case. Maybe you remember what I am talking about. It will take a while for me to google it. Give me half an hour.

(There goes my plans of reading a bodyweight exercise book).

LEAHN, FAT AND STUPID. WHY AM I NOT SURPRISED? I'M USED TO THE ILK ARROGANTLY ASSUMING THEY KNOW MORE THAN THE EXPERTS THEY CRITICIZE, BUT IT WAS A SURPRISE TO SEE ONE ILK MEMBER PULL THAT ON ANOTHER. AND THEN, TO TOTALLY EMBARRASS YOURSELF, YOU COULDN'T EVEN REMEMBER WHAT YOU WERE TALKING ABOUT; AND THEN, YOU HUMILIATED YOURSELF EVEN FURTHER BY ASKING STICKWICK IF *HE* REMEMBERED WHAT YOU WERE TALKING ABOUT.

LEAHN, QUESTION: DOES YOUR FAMILY HAVE TO WATER YOU TWICE A WEEK?

My Google-Fu is mighty.

(AREN'T THEY PRECIOUS?).

It is called "The Decline Effect". A good article here: http://www.newyorker.com/reporting/2010/12/13/101213fa\_fact\_lehrer

SO LEAHN, YOU OVERRULE ALL OF STICKWICK'S EXPERIENCE BECAUSE ... YOU READ AN ARTICLE WHICH IMPRESSED YOU SO MUCH YOU COULD BARELY REMEMBER IT?

Although I noticed it has been heavily criticized, I'd still like your take on it.

LEAHN, THE REASON IT WAS HEAVILY CRITICIZED IS BECAUSE IT WAS FULL OF CRAP. IT SOUNDED LIKE IT WAS WRITTEN BY VOX HIMSELF.

Mr Green Man

the whole abomination that is "scientific consensus" is designed to oppose any sort of antagonism beyond pride/ego in the peer review process -- and enforce orthodoxy of opinion.

GREEN MAN, SCIENTIFIC CONSENSUS IS NOT DESIGNED, IT RESULTS WHEN AN OVERWHELMING MAJORITY AGREE ON A CONCLUSION.

If people say things that are non-controversial, why bother to even inquire into whether it's correct or not? Submit something that's in the consensus and you'll get no challenge and move up in your publication count -- submit something that's not in the consensus and you'll get opposition, which is designed to slow publication until you can get a tenure review, at which time you'll have insufficient publications, and orthodoxy can be maintained in the modern university by bouncing you as unproductive.

GREEN MAN, IF THAT WERE TRUE, THEN SCIENCE WOULD GRIND TO A HALT. SCIENCE ADVANCES AT AN ASTOUNDING PACE PRECISELY BECAUSE SCIENTISTS MAKE DISCOVERIES THAT OVERTHROW THE PARADIGM. THEY DON'T GIVE OUT NOBELS FOR VERIFYING WORK ... ONLY FOR MAKING NEW DISCOVERIES.

Icarius

I m curious about one thing here...what is the criteria for judging the credibility of biblical testamonial evidence?

IKY, THERE ARE NONE. EVERYTHING IS ACCEPTED ON FAITH.

Stickwick

I have a side business involving science education materials for Christians, and if this is backed up by reliable evidence, I would like to include it in the literature I provide to my clients.

STICKWICK, SCIENCE EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIANS? THAT MUST BE ABOUT AS LUCRATIVE AS TRYING TO SELL SHAVING SUPPLIES TO MUSLIMS. I CAN THINK OF NO BETTER WAY TO RID THE WORLD OF THE CANCER THAT IS CHRISTIANITY THAN BY PROVIDING THEM WITH SCIENCE EDUCATION. BUT WHY DO I HAVE THE SNEAKY SUSPICION THAT WHAT YOU CALL SCIENCE EDUCATION, AND WHAT ACADEMIA CALLS SCIENCE EDUCATION, ARE 2 COMPLETELY DIFFERENT THINGS?

Stickwick:

REPLIES TO LEAHN:

I've never heard of the decline effect in physics or any of its subfields, which may or may not reflect my ignorance. I only had time to scan the article you mentioned, but note that all of the results cited were for experiments in psychiatry + other medical disciplines, and biology. The former (psychiatry) is notably not a real science, as it doesn't even have one formal law of human behavior on the books. The latter (biology) are not noted for their scientific rigor or honesty either.

STICKWICK, THAT LAST CLAIM ABOUT DISHONEST BIOLOGISTS WAS HYSTERICAL COMING FROM SOMEONE WHO RUNS A SIDE BUSINESS THAT INTENTIONALLY LIES AND MISREPRESENTS SCIENCE TO GULLIBLE GHOST WORSHIPPERS IN ORDER TO PERPETUATE YOUR NASTY LITTLE DEATH CULT.

Icarius

Stickwick: "but also because I have a side business involving science education materials for Christians."

And just what is scientific education material for christians? why do christians have specific scientific education needs that is not covered by general scientific material?

IKY, IF YOU'LL PARDON THE INTERRUPTION, I CAN ANSWER THAT ONE. STICKWICK CAN'T PROVIDE THEM ACTUAL SCIENCE INFORMATION OR HE WOULD BE OUT OF BUSINESS. THE SURVIVAL OF HIS BUSINESS RELIES ON DENYING SCIENCE, AND TRYING TO CONVINCE HIS VICTIMS THAT REAL SCIENCE COMES FROM THE BIBLE. SCIENCE LIKE: THE GARDEN OF EDEN, NOAH'S FLOOD, THE SUN FREEZING IN THE SKY FOR ONE DAY, A RIVER SPLITTING INTO TWO, YOU KNOW ... REAL SCIENCE.

Stickwick

Two things. 1. As a professor/lecturer, I have observed that the vast majority of students I teach have poor scientific knowledge and critical thinking skills.

STICKWICK, IF YOU ARE THEIR PROFESSOR, THEN I HAVE A STRONG FEELING THAT THINGS ARE GOING TO STAY THAT WAY.

My materials are designed to give Christians an edge in this regard, so that they will be far ahead of most students whether they go to university or not.

NOT EVEN CLOSE STICKWICK. YOUR MATERIALS ARE DESIGNED TO HIDE THE TRUTH BY LYING TO THEM ABOUT THE FACTS OF SCIENCE SO THAT WHEN THEY REACH UNIVERSITY THEY WILL REJECT REALITY BY RELYING ON THE MISINFORMATION YOU HAVE PROVIDED THEM.

2. To support their faith, particularly for younger Christians.

STICKWICK, YOU HAVE TO GET TO THEM WHILE THEY'RE YOUNG, BEFORE THEIR MINDS HAVE HAD A CHANCE TO MATURE, AND LEARN TO REASON. YOUR CHANCES GO WAY DOWN AFTER THAT.

I help them put science in context with scripture and biblical commentary.

STICKWICK, WHEN GOD STOPPED THE SUN FROM CIRCLING THE EARTH, AS THE BIBLE STATES, WHAT SCIENTIFIC CONTEXT DO YOU PUT THAT IN?

This includes teaching them the limits of science.

STICKWICK, YOU TEACH THEM THE LIMITS OF SCIENCE BECAUSE SCIENCE HAS PROVEN THAT YOUR ANCIENT SCRIPTURES ARE NOTHING MORE THAN A COLLECTION OF HIDEOUS, BARBARIC FAIRY TALES. YOU THINK THAT BY BRAINWASHING THEM INTO REJECTING SCIENCE THAT YOU WILL BE ABLE TO KEEP THE TITHES ROLLING IN. AND SADLY, IN MOST CASES ... YOU'RE RIGHT.

Icarius:

"General" scientific material assumes a materialist paradigm.

YOU KNOW IKY, WHEN I TRIED TO TYPE "CHRISTIAN SCIENTIFIC MATERIAL," MY KEYBOARD THREATENED TO REPORT ME TO THE POLICE FOR USING AN OXYMORON.

Roffle

SPEAKING TO: Just A Random Atheist.

I think you should drop the argument. You're not going to change any minds here.

BINGO ROFFLE. MINDS UNDER THE THREAT OF ETERNAL TORTURE FROM THE SPIRIT WORLD ARE NOT ABOUT TO RISK THAT PUNISHMENT BY DARING TO DOUBT THAT WHICH THEY HAVE BEEN ORDERED TO BELIEVE. THERE IS NOTHING ANYONE CAN DO TO HELP YOU PEOPLE. IT'S NOT THAT WE DON'T WANT TO, IT'S JUST THAT THERE IS NO WAY TO COMPETE WITH THREATS OF ETERNAL TORTURE. SCIENCE DOESN'T HAVE TO THREATEN YOU IF YOU DON'T BELIEVE, BECAUSE SCIENCE HAS SOMETHING NO RELIGION HAS EVER HAD ... EVIDENCE.

I think it is best to simply move beyond the words.

SO ROFFLE, WHAT DOES THAT MEAN? WITHOUT WORDS, WHAT KIND OF COMMUNICATION DID YOU HAVE IN MIND?

Some people think that a scientist is someone who conducts experiments for a living. Some people think that a scientist is someone who embodies the scientific method. Some people think that a scientist is someone who is able to state a lot of facts.

ROFFLE, GRAMMAR HINT: INSTEAD OF SAYING "SOME PEOPLE THINK THAT A SCIENTIST IS ..." 3 TIMES, JUST SAY IT ONCE, AND THEN USE CONJUNCTIONS TO CONNECT THE 3 PHRASES. REALLY, IT'S NOT THAT HARD. NOW I SEE WHY YOU WANT TO MOVE BEYOND WORDS: THEY DON'T SEEM TO BE YOUR BEST FRIEND; OR ANY CHRISTIAN'S FOR THAT MATTER.

This bickering over words is futile. Use the definition you want to make your point and move on, the designation of words is not important.

ROFFLE, THAT STATEMENT PROVES THAT FOR YOU, NOT ONLY ARE WORDS UNIMPORTANT, BUT SO IS THINKING.

For example, Neil Tyson uses scientist to refer to the profession,

WRONG ROFFLE, TYSON USES "SCIENTIST" TO REFER TO THOSE WHO WORK *IN* THE PROFESSION.

and calls people who embody the scientific method “scientifically literate”.

ROFFLE, PEOPLE DON'T "EMBODY" THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD ... THEY PRACTICE IT. MAYBE YOU CAN ASK MARKKU IF HE'LL LET YOU TAG ALONG TO HIS NEXT ESL CLASS. BUT IN YOUR CASE, I WOULD BRING A DICTIONARY; A DICTIONARY WITH LOTS AND LOTS OF PICTURES.

If you use the word scientist whereas someone else uses the phrase scientifically literate, there is no disagreement of fact and I don’t think we are too interested in the lexicon of certain populations.

ROFFLE, YOU MISSED THE FACT THAT "SCIENTIST" AND "SCIENTIFICALLY LITERATE" ARE NOT THE SYNONYMOUS TERMS ... YOU IMAGINE THEM TO BE.

the abe

and plenty of science wouldn't exist if it wasn't for technology.

ABE, I DON'T KNOW HOW YOU DID IT: PERHAPS BAD DNA, PERHAPS A COUPLE OF STICKWICK'S CLASSES; BUT HOWEVER YOU DID IT, YOU JUST MANAGED TO SHOW EVERYONE HOW IT IS POSSIBLE FOR A HUMAN TO EXHIBIT LESS INTELLIGENCE THAN AN APPLE.

And yet we can use the scientific method without a single piece of kit and the overwhelming body of technological development was created without the aid of the scientific method.

ABE, I THINK THE BASIC PROBLEM IS THAT YOU DON'T UNDERSTAND THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD. IT ISN'T RESTRICTED TO BEAKERS AND LAB COATS. IT IS A PROCESS OF DISCOVERY, WITHOUT WHICH, ALMOST NOTHING WE HAVE DEVELOPED WOULD EXIST. AND IF YOU WERE HOPING TO RETREAT TO "TRIAL AND ERROR" AS A SOURCE OF KNOWLEDGE, YOU WILL MAKE MY POINT, BECAUSE TRAIL AND ERROR IS AN IMPORTANT COMPONENT OF THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD.

"Science" is a bit of a tautology if all things that are "true" are scientifically replicated and all things that can be scientifically replicated are true.

ABE, 2 THINGS:

1. YOU ARE CONFUSING TAUTOLOGY WITH CIRCULAR REASONING, AND
2. IT ISN'T CIRCULAR REASONING EITHER.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tautology\_(logic)

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Circular\_reasoning

ONE MORE THING ABE, IT WAS ALSO A STRAW MAN ARGUMENT SINCE SCIENCE DOESN'T MAKE THE CLAIMS YOU ATTRIBUTED TO IT.

NOW ABE QUOTES "JUST A RANDOM ATHEIST": "Do you think we could create modern gadgets if people like Ohm and Joules had never existed?"

Well, we had mathematics and brewing before the two of them.

BRILLIANT ABE, WAY TO BLOW HIM OUT OF THE WATER.

ABE, HERE'S A THIRD LINK: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nonsequitur

I mean, according to the atheist/materialist/physicalist/naturalism account of things, we have existence and an ordered, physical universe without prior causation so I'd have to conclude yes, because \*scientifically speaking\* anything is possible. Right?

ABE, HERE'S A FOURTH LINK: IT'S TO THE ENTIRE LIST OF LOGICAL FALLACIES: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List\_of\_logical\_fallacies

ABE, YOU REALLY NEED TO START AT THE BEGINNING, AND REORGANIZE YOUR BRAIN FROM THE BOTTOM UP. PERHAPS IN YOUR HASTE TO REPLY TO RANDOM ATHEIST, YOU FAILED TO REALIZE THAT YOUR ACCUSATION "PHYSICAL UNIVERSE WITHOUT PRIOR CAUSATION" DOESN'T REPRESENT THE POSITION OF SCIENCE ... BUT YOURS. IT IS YOUR GOD WHOM YOU CLAIM EXISTS WITHOUT PRIOR CAUSATION.

AND SCIENTIFICALLY SPEAKING, "ANYTHING" IS NOT POSSIBLE. ONE EXAMPLE: CREATION OF MATTER OUT OF NOTHING AS DESCRIBED IN GENESIS. SO THE ONLY ONE WHO BELIEVES THAT ANYTHING IS POSSIBLE ... WOULD BE YOU.

DIDN'T THINK THOSE OUT VERY WELL DIDJA ABE?

MarkkuKoponen

My view is that we should read all text with the benefit of the doubt, and choose the least stupid interpretation that can reasonably be made.

MARKKU, TOO BAD YOU NEVER THOUGHT OF APPLYING THAT TO YOUR BIBLE. BUT YOU CAN'T APPLY THAT TO THE BIBLE CAN YOU? BECAUSE YOU KNOW WHAT THE INVISIBLE MONSTER HAS THREATENED TO DO TO YOU ... IF YOU DO.

the abe ADDRESSES Random Atheist: Consider your fellow atheist Bertrand Russell's Two Head conundrum. It's a bit of a pons asinorum separating the rational from the irrational among atheists.

ABE, HERE'S A FIFTH LINK: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pons\_asinorum

ABE, A PONS ASINORUM IS UNNECESSARY IN THE CASE OF CHRISTIANS. THINK ABOUT IT ABE.

MiksaRD

(OUT OF PITY FOR MY AUDIENCE, I WILL OMIT MIKSA'S LONG-WINDED, ANTI-SCIENCE TIRADE WHICH HE PRESENTED IN AN EFFORT TO BRING VOX TO ORGASM, AND SKIP STRAIGHT TO HIS CONCLUSION):

And from there, further extrapolations could be made to show that relatively speaking, scientism is thus a weak philosophical position in comparison to its competitors.

MIKSA, SCIENCE HAS NO COMPETITORS. THE ONLY CLAIMED COMPETITOR IS RELIGION, AND WE'VE ALL SEEN HOW WELL THAT WENT.

Good Day MarkkuKoponen, You said: "Actually, they're probably not. The assertion is that he doubts. The rest of the sentences in context almost certainly describe the contents of his doubts."

After re-reading what Just a Random Atheist wrote, I agree that your assessment is the most probable/reasonable one.

MIKSA, YOU WERE MUCH TOO QUICK TO KISS MARKKU'S ASS. YOU WERE ORIGINALLY CORRECT: MARKKU'S ASSESSMENT WAS COMPLETELY BACKWARDS. THE ONLY NON-ASSERTION MADE BY THE ATHEIST WAS HIS OPENING STATEMENT IN WHICH HE SAID "I DOUBT," AND THEN MARKKU, IN A STUNNING DISPLAY OF REVERSE LOGIC, DETERMINED THAT THIS WAS THE ONLY STATEMENT THAT *WAS* AN ASSERTION. I GET THE DISTINCT IMPRESSION THAT MARKKU MIGHT DO BETTER FINDING A BLOG THAT COMMENTED IN A LANGUAGE OTHER THAN ENGLISH.

MarkkuKoponen

Icarius: "But the apostles and paul are themselves characters of that very narrative as is their supposed struggle and as such they are useless as objective element for the purpose of credibility check unless there is evidence independant from the gospel that confirms the stories contained in it."

It should be obvious on its face that the deaths of the apostoles are contained in documents other than the Bible.

MARKKU, ENGLISH ISN'T YOUR FAVORITE, IS IT SPORT? I KNOW THIS IS JUST A COMMENT SECTION, BUT AT LEAST HAVE ENOUGH SELF-RESPECT IN WHAT YOU POST TO USE A SPELL-CHECKER ONCE IN A WHILE. OR YOU COULD HAVE JUST COPIED ICARIUS: HE SPELLED "APOSTLES" CORRECTLY.

It would be extraordinary, to say the least, if for example Paul's letters to the churches recorded his own death.

MARKKU, THERE ARE 14 EPISTLES ATTRIBUTED TO PAUL. THAT DOESN'T MEAN HE WROTE THEM, IT ONLY MEANS SOME SCHOLARS BELIEVE THAT HE DID. ALSO, THE AUTHORSHIP OF HALF OF THOSE ARE DISPUTED BY EXPERTS. YOU BLINDLY ACCEPTED THAT HE AUTHORED ALL OF THEM AND THEREFORE COULD NOT HAVE RECORDED HIS OWN DEATH. YOU BELIEVE THAT, BECAUSE THAT IS WHAT HAS BEEN DRILLED INTO YOUR TINY LITTLE CHRISTIAN HEAD EVER SINCE YOU WERE ... A TINY LITTLE CHRISTIAN.

The evidence for these later events indeed merits investigation. However, the problem is that testimonial evidence is almost always rejected out of hand with the argument to science.

MARKKU, ONLY IN CASES WHERE THE TESTIMONIAL EVIDENCE LACKS CORROBORATION. TESTIMONIAL EVIDENCE FOR THOUSANDS OF HISTORICAL EVENTS IS NOT REJECTED BECAUSE THEY HAVE SUFFICIENT CORROBORATING EVIDENCE. TESTIMONIAL EVIDENCE FOR BIBLICAL CLAIMS ARE REJECTED BECAUSE THERE IS NO EVIDENCE TO SUGGEST THEY ARE ANYTHING OTHER THAN GRUESOME FAIRY TALES.

the abe

RESPONDS TO Icarius STATEMENT THAT INDEPENDENT VERIFICATION OF THE GOSPELS IS REQUIRED.

Same could be said of Socrates and Plato.

ABE, YOU ARE ASSUMING THAT SOCRATES AND PLATO ACTUALLY EXISTED. IKY'S POINT APPLIES TO THEM AS WELL. THEY MAY OR MAY NOT HAVE LIVED. WHAT IS IMPORTANT IS THE WORDS ATTRIBUTED TO THEM. WORDS THAT, UNLIKE YOUR JEWISH CARPENTER, DON'T INVOLVE BELIEVING IN SUPERNATURAL EVENTS; WHICH IS WHY MOST PEOPLE DON'T DOUBT THE EXISTENCE OF SOCRATES AND PLATO.

MarkkuKoponen

You know, atheists generally make the job way too easy for the Christian by sticking to their guns at the scientific argument which is so easy to deal with.

MARKKU, IF YOU BELIEVE THAT *ANY* CHRISTIAN APOLOGETIC ARGUMENT HAS EVER WITHSTOOD RATIONAL SCRUTINY THEN YOU ARE ONE SADLY DELUDED LITTLE GHOST WORSHIPPER. WHICH, IN FACT, IS EXACTLY WHAT YOU ARE.

EVERY SINGLE ARGUMENT YOU MAKE ALWAYS RETREATS TO "IT'S MAGIC!" THE FACT THAT YOU ACTUALLY BELIEVE *THAT* TO BE A RATIONAL ANSWER SHOWS HOW UTTERLY PATHETIC YOUR DEGRADED REASONING SKILLS ARE.

Icarius

But the thing that bugs me the most here is how the very same people who find all manor of reasons, good or bad, to distrust the findings in certain scientific fields, such as biology, geology or astronomy basically go out of their way to avoid subjecting their scriptures to even a mere fraction of that skepticism.

IKY, THAT WAS FLAWLESS. NICE JOB.

MarkkuKoponen

When I got involved in internet apologetics, I was worried about how much stuff there is to remember. But luckily it turned out that atheists just use the same couple of arguments over and over again. Should I ever get so unlucky as to have to get to the good stuff, I could just say "I'll get back to you on that" and then refresh my memory. Hasn't happened so far.

MARKKU, IT WOULDN'T MATTER IF IT DID. AS LONG AS YOU ARE BEING THREATENED WITH TORTURE FROM THE SPIRIT WORLD, THERE IS NO EVIDENCE ON EARTH YOU ARE INCAPABLE OF DENYING ... AS YOUR COMMENTS PROVE.

AND MARKKU, GET THAT ENGLISH DICTIONARY OUT THAT I TOLD YOU ABOUT EARLIER. ATHEISM DOESN'T MAKE ARGUMENTS: IT IS MERELY A REJECTION OF YOUR ARGUMENTS. IF ATHEISTS SEEM TO BE REPEATING THEMSELVES, IT'S BECAUSE IT IS YOU PEOPLE WHO ARE USING THE SAME TIRED ARGUMENTS, ARGUMENTS WHICH, IN EVERY SINGLE CASE MARKKU, HAVE BEEN REFUTED BY SCIENCE.

Remember, everyone, apologetics is easy if you have the humility to be able to say "that is a good argument and I don't know how to answer it right now, so I'll do some research and get back to you".

MARKKU, THE PROBLEM IS THAT WE HAVE BEEN WAITING FOR YOU PEOPLE TO GET BACK TO US FOR 2,000 YEARS NOW. JUST WHEN EXACTLY, DID YOU PLAN ON PROVIDING SOME ANSWERS?

ALSO, TRY PUTTING THE ENDING PERIOD *INSIDE* THE FINAL QUOTE MARK.

There is very little you have to actually know, in order to deal with 99% of what's out there. The only danger is when you can't deal with an argument and can't admit it, so you start talking out of your ass and embarrass yourself.

MARKKU, IF YOU CONTINUE TO ENGAGE IN CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS, I WOULD SUGGEST CARRYING LOTS OF K-Y JELLY.

MiksaRD

Actually, being something of a Theistic Evolutionist, I don’t much care about evolution per se. Although I disagree that it, if considered as a purely naturalistic/random process, is well cemented at all.

MIKSA, THE WORLD DOESN'T CARE WHAT IGNORANT GHOST WORSHIPPERS BELIEVE. BIOLOGY IS BASED ENTIRELY ON EVOLUTIONARY PRINCIPLES WHICH HAVE BEEN PROVEN TO BE FACT TO ALL THE PEOPLE WHO MATTER. SORRY MIKSA ... BUT YOU DON'T.

Kriston

What I am saying is that Science follows Technology at least as often as the other way around. I'm told constantly that we need to give money to strangers to produce the science that will produce the technology that we use.

KRISTON, YOU ARE ALSO TOLD CONSTANTLY (EVERY SUNDAY) THAT YOU NEED TO GIVE MONEY TO YOUR CHURCH TO PRODUCE THE, THE, WELL, WHATEVER IT IS THEY PRODUCE.

Edison used trial and error to produce the first usable filament for the electric light bulb.

KRISTON, TRIAL AND ERROR *IS* PART OF THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD. NOW I'M STARTING TO SEE THE PROBLEM KRISTON: IT'S NOT JUST THAT YOU'RE IGNORANT ... IT'S THAT *YOU* ARE *REALLY* IGNORANT.

He wasn't a Scientist because he did not have a degree. I've heard this so often it just makes me laugh now:

KRISTON, THE FACT THAT YOU HEAR THIS SO OFTEN TELLS US ALL WE NEED TO KNOW ABOUT THE PEOPLE YOU HANG OUT WITH ... THEY DON'T SOUND ANY SMARTER THAN YOU - AND THAT'S KINDA SCARY.

I'll say it again (just like Vox), Science needs technology way more than technology needs Science.

KRISTON, YOU HAVE MANUFACTURED A DICHOTOMY WHERE NONE EXISTS. BUT I'LL BE SURE TO ADD THE BONUS POINTS TO YOUR SCORE FOR THE ASS KISS YOU JUST GAVE VOX.

MarkkuKoponen

Icarius "I'm quoting the very first definition of the current webster dictionary ... science, from the latin word scientia which literally means knowledge. Is there a more modern definition that doesnt mean exactly that?"

Yes. In the context of the accusation that something is not to be taken seriously because it is not scientific, what is meant is knowledge that is received using the scientific method.

MARKKU, YOU CLAIMED TO HAVE A MORE MODERN DEFINITION, AND THEN, DIDN'T PROVIDE IT, BUT RATHER, WENT INTO A DOG AND PONY SHOW ABOUT CONTEXT. YOU PEOPLE ARE SO PREDICTABLE.

Icarius:

Once again quoting webster: "The scientific method; principles and procedures for the systematic pursuit of knowledge involving the recognition and formulation of a problem, the collection of data through observation and experiment, and the formulation and testing of hypotheses."

none of this changes the definition of science as being the state of knowledge or the definition of technology as being the practical application of knowledge, meaning that the knowledge must be aquired BEFORE it can be put to practical application.

IKY, QUOTE WEBSTER'S ALL YOU LIKE, YOU ARE JUST PISSING INTO THE WIND. THIS GUY COULD CARE LESS ABOUT DEFINITIONS. HELL, HE HASN'T EVEN DEMONSTRATED MIDDLE SCHOOL ENGLISH ABILITIES. BUT, HE HAS SOMETHING YOU DON'T ... AN INVISIBLE, ALL-KNOWING FRIEND WHO HAS GIVEN HIM THE ANSWERS TO THE ORIGIN OF THE UNIVERSE, THE ORIGIN OF LIFE ON EARTH, AND THE AFTERLIFE ... PROVIDED OF COURSE, THAT YOU WORSHIP HIM FOREVER.

T.L.

People work on things.

Unexpected things sometimes happen.

Note of this is made.

People follow up and discover things.

This leads to something useful and people may not know how or why it works, but it works.

Eventually people figure out how it works.

Much in history happens like this.

How do you suppose people learned to fire pottery?

Did they need a scientific principle, or did someone leave a clay pot too near the fire one day and came back to find it to be different and to have different properties that made it useful for extra purposes.

Later, someone figures out what causes the changes.

What the fire actually did to the material.

I would define the discovery of fired pottery to be an accident.

TL, WHAT YOU JUST DESCRIBED WAS AN "OBSERVATION," WHICH, IF YOU'LL CHECK THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD, IS AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE PROCESS. YOU THEN TRIED TO REDEFINE THE OBSERVATION AS AN ACCIDENT. AN ACCIDENT MIGHT DESCRIBE HOW SOMETHING GOT THERE, OR IT COULD HAVE BEEN A GIFT FROM YOUR GOOFY GHOST. REGARDLESS OF HOW IT GOT THERE, YOU ARE CONFUSING HOW IT GOT THERE WITH THE KNOWLEDGE THAT FIRST CAME FROM AN OBSERVATION.

The use of that accident as technology. The later development of an understanding of what actually happened to the material as science. So, here, the science came last.

TL, LET'S JUST FOCUS ON YOUR BIGGEST LOGICAL FLAW: DEFINING THE USE OF AN ACCIDENT AS TECHNOLOGY. LET'S COMPARE YOUR DEFINITION WITH WEBSTER'S: TECHNOLOGY

"the practical application of knowledge especially in a particular area."

WELL LOOKY THERE TL, THAT SOUNDS EXACTLY LIKE WHAT ICARIUS JUST SAID. HAD YOU MADE THE LEAST BIT OF EFFORT TO ACTUALLY LOOK THE WORD UP, LIKE HE DID, YOU MIGHT HAVE SAVED YOURSELF SOME EMBARRASSMENT.

MarkkuKoponen

Knowledge of my birth is indeed not scientific knowledge. But what generally happens when daddy loves mommy in a special way, is.

CAUTION MARKKU, YOU ONLY HAVE DADDY'S WORD FOR THAT. MILLIONS OF PEOPLE JUST LIKE YOU HAVE NEVER KNOWN THAT THEIR PARENTS MIGHT NOT BE THEIR REAL PARENTS. OR, FOR ALL YOU KNOW, LITTLE MARKKU JUST MAY HAVE BEEN ONE OF THE LUCKY ONES WHO SURVIVED ALL THOSE TRIPS TO THE ABORTION CLINIC.

Vidad

Dang, Vox. You nailed this one home.

VIDAD, HERE'S A LINK ... ESPECIALLY FOR YOU:

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

VIDAD, THE REASON I USED WIKIPEDIA INSTEAD OF WEBSTER'S IS BECAUSE I WANTED TO DIRECT YOUR ATTENTION TO THE "LIST OF ALTERNATIVE PHRASES" WHICH DESCRIBE YOU BETTER THAN ANY PICTURE EVER COULD.

Kriston

The point I was trying to make is that we do not need Government Funded Science to make progress.

KRISTON, IF YOU TOOK AWAY ALL THE DISCOVERIES OF GOVERNMENT FUNDED SCIENCE, WE WOULD ALL STILL BE HUNTING MAMMOTHS.

bethyada

Peer review is rubbish anyway. Various options include open identification of the reviewers, publishing the review. Peer review should limit itself to identifying simple logical and mathematical errors, or asking for improved clarity. The whole concept seems archaic anyway. Why do we restrict publishing in the internet age, the cost of an article is negligible. Publish everything and allow commenting on everything. Much better way of sorting the gold from the dross.

BETHY, IF YOU ARE A BIBLE BELIEVER, THEN YOU WOULDN'T KNOW THE DIFFERENCE ... BETWEEN GOLD AND DROSS.

Booch Paradise

Also if we are expanding the definition of science to include all knowledge gained from trial and error, then my belief in God is definitely a scientific one.

BOOCH, YOU DON'T HAVE TO EXPAND THE DEFINITION OF SCIENCE TO INCLUDE TRIAL AND ERROR BECAUSE IT IS ALREADY INCLUDED.

HOW YOU CONCLUDED THAT TRIAL AND ERROR SUPPORTS BELIEF IN A MAGIC GHOST IS BEYOND MY IMAGINATION, BUT APPARENTLY ... NOT BEYOND YOURS.

MY SUMMARY

DEAR DREADED ILK: AFTER SPENDING WEEKS READING, WHAT PASSES FOR THINKING IN YOUR MINDS, I HAVE COME TO THE CONCLUSION THAT MOST OF YOU *SHOULD* STAY ON YOUR KNEES, AND PRAY TO YOUR INVISIBLE GHOST. AFTER YOUR HORRID EXISTENCE COMES TO A MERCIFUL END,

THEN YOU CAN ALL JUST FLOAT OFF TO FAIRYLAND TO LIVE FOREVER WITH JESUS, WHO UNFORTUNATELY, YOU WILL PROBABLY NEVER GET TO SEE, SINCE HE IS GOING TO BE VERY, VERY BUSY TORTURING BILLIONS OF HUMANS ... TILL THE END OF TIME.

YOU PEOPLE HAVE TO BE THE *SICKEST* PUPPIES ON THE PLANET.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

THE SCIENCE SEGMENT

BIRTHPLACE FOR PRIMITIVE LIFE ON EARTH? RESEARCHERS IDENTIFY MUD VOLCANOES IN GREENLAND AS A POSSIBLE NICHE FOR EARLY LIFE

THE MUD VOLCANOES AT ISUA, IN SOUTH-WEST GREENLAND, HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED AS A POSSIBLE BIRTHPLACE FOR LIFE ON EARTH. ALMOST FOUR BILLION YEARS AGO, THESE VOLCANOES RELEASED CHEMICAL ELEMENTS INDISPENSABLE TO THE FORMATION OF THE FIRST BIOMOLECULES, UNDER CONDITIONS FAVORABLE TO LIFE. IT IS THE FIRST TIME THAT SUCH AN ENVIRONMENT, MEETING ALL THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE EMERGENCE OF LIFE, HAS BEEN IDENTIFIED BY SCIENTISTS IN 3.8 BILLION YEAR- OLD FORMATIONS.

SERPENTINITE IS A DARK GREEN MINERAL USED IN DECORATION AND JEWELRY. IN NATURE, IT IS FORMED WHEN SEA WATER INFILTRATES INTO EARTH'S UPPER MANTLE, AT DEPTHS THAT CAN REACH 200 KM IN SUBDUCTION ZONES. THIS MINERAL, OFTEN FOUND IN THE WALLS OF HYDROTHERMAL SOURCES, COULD PLAY A MAJOR ROLE IN THE APPEARANCE OF THE FIRST BIOMOLECULES.

IT HAS OFTEN BEEN PRESUMED THAT LIFE DEVELOPED NEAR TO HYDROTHERMAL SOURCES KNOWN AS BLACK SMOKERS, SUCH AS THOSE FOUND AT THE BOTTOM OF THE OCEANS ALONG MID-OCEAN RIDGES. THE ABUNDANCE OF HYDROGEN, METHANE AND AMMONIA PRODUCED BY THESE UNDERWATER GEYSERS SEEMED FAVORABLE TO THE EMERGENCE OF PRIMITIVE LIFE. UNFORTUNATELY, THESE BLACK SMOKERS ARE VERY ACIDIC, WHICH PREVENTS AMINO-ACID STABILIZATION, AND THUS THE FORMATION OF ORGANIC MOLECULES.

THE TEAM OF SCIENTISTS FOCUSED THEIR STUDIES ON SERPENTINITES FROM ISUA, IN SOUTH-WEST GREENLAND, WHICH DATE FROM THE START OF THE ARCHEAN. DATING BACK SOME 3.8 BILLION YEARS, THE ROCKS OF ISUA ARE SOME OF THE OLDEST IN THE WORLD. USING ISOTOPES OF ZINC AS INDICATORS OF THE BASIC OR ACID NATURE OF AN ENVIRONMENT, THE RESEARCHERS HIGHLIGHTED THE BASIC CHARACTER OF THE THERMAL FLUIDS THAT PERMEATED THE ISUA SERPENTINITES, THUS DEMONSTRATING THAT THESE MINERALS FORMED A FAVORABLE ENVIRONMENT FOR AMINO-ACID STABILIZATION.

THE RESEARCHERS ALSO COMPARED THESE SERPENTINITES WITH RECENT EQUIVALENTS FROM THE MID-OCEANIC RIDGE OF THE ARCTIC OCEAN, THE ALPS AND MEXICO: THE ISUA ROCKS ARE MARKEDLY DEPLETED IN HEAVY ISOTOPES OF ZINC COMPARED TO THE LATTER. ON THE OTHER HAND, THEIR ZINC IS ISOTOPICALLY SIMILAR TO THAT FROM MUD VOLCANOES OF THE MARIANAS TRENCH. NEARLY FOUR BILLION YEARS AGO, AT A TIME WHEN THE CONTINENTS ONLY OCCUPIED A VERY SMALL PART OF THE SURFACE AREA OF THE GLOBE, THE OCEANIC CRUST OF ISUA WAS PERMEATED BY BASIC HYDROTHERMAL FLUIDS, RICH IN CARBONATES, AND AT TEMPERATURES RANGING FROM 100 TO 300°C. PHOSPHORUS, ANOTHER INDISPENSABLE ELEMENT TO LIFE, IS ABUNDANT IN ENVIRONMENTS WHERE SERPENTINIZATION TAKES PLACE. AS THIS PROCESS GENERATES MUD VOLCANOES, ALL THE NECESSARY CONDITIONS WERE GATHERED AT ISUA FOR ORGANIC MOLECULES TO FORM AND BE STABLE. THE MUD VOLCANOES AT ISUA THUS REPRESENT A PARTICULARLY FAVORABLE SETTING FOR THE EMERGENCE OF PRIMITIVE TERRESTRIAL LIFE.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

FAMOUS QUOTES

DOUG MCLEOD (UNABLE TO LOCATE ANY BIOGRAPHICAL INFO ON MCLEOD).

"I STILL SAY A CHURCH STEEPLE WITH A LIGHTNING ROD ON TOP

SHOWS A TOTAL LACK OF CONFIDENCE."