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TAKEN FROM THE WEB SITE OF SYE TEN BRUGGENCATE

PROOF FOR THE EXISTENCE OF GOD

*Step One: Laws of Logic*

*In the introduction page I mentioned 'logical proof.' The first step towards the proof that God exists is to determine whether you actually believe that laws of logic exist. Logical proof would be irrelevant to someone who denies that laws of logic exist. An example of a law of logic is the law of non-contradiction. This law states, for instance, that it cannot both be true that my car is in the parking lot and that it is not in the parking lot at the same time, and in the same way.*

Sye, good start.

*Step Two: Laws of Mathematics*

*The basic operations of arithmetic are addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division. Laws of mathematics then, are basically descriptions of what happens within these operations (and more complex ones as well) . For example, with the law of addition we know that if you take 4 things and add them to 3 things, you end up with 7 things.*

Sye, you're on a roll. I think Atheists may be in big trouble.

*Step Three: Laws of Science*

*Laws of science are basically descriptions of what matter does based on repeated observations, and are usually expressed in mathematical equations. An example of a law of science is the law of gravity.*

Sye, let me help you out a little here: gravity is not a law - it is a theory. But please continue.

*Using the law of gravity, we can predict how fast a heavier than air object will fall to the ground given all the factors for the equation.*

Sye, if you don't mind (or even if you do) here is a little more help: the theory of gravity attempts to explain one of the four forces we observe in nature. It has nothing to do with calculating the speed of objects - that is physics. Physics is a scientific field of study that combines mathematics with scientific facts in order to make computations like the one you described.

*Step Four: Absolute Moral Laws*

*I have seldom heard anyone deny that laws of logic, mathematics, or science exist,*

Sye, then start hanging around with more Christians and you will. It defies the laws of logic to believe that a virgin could give birth 2,000 years before in vitro fertilization - yet they do. It defies the laws of mathematics to feed a crowd of people and end up with more food than when you began - yet they do. It defies the laws of science to believe that the sun could stop in the sky for a whole day - yet they believe it did.

Come to think of it, you do too, don't you Sye? You deny the laws of logic, mathematics, and science, when they contradict your religious beliefs. So if it is true that you have seldom heard anyone denying those things, then you aren't listening to yourself Sye.

*but I have often heard people deny the existence of absolute moral laws.*

Sye, it's not that we deny the existence of absolute moral laws, we are just waiting for someone to prove they exist. I think that is what you are promising to do in this essay. Please continue.

*Whereas some laws like those that govern science, and mathematics describe reality, and how things do behave, absolute moral laws 'prescribe' how humans ought to, or ought not to behave.*

Sye, the reason that we here in America live under a code of law designed by humans, is because the absolute moral laws found in your Bible are the most despicable collection of morals ever found in any literature on Earth.

*Rape, and child molestation, are two examples of absolute moral wrongs.*

Sye, rape apparently wasn't wrong for your God since He ordered it quite often in His autobiography.

Sye, would you agree that to enslave another human being is an absolute moral wrong? No, you can't call slavery an absolute moral wrong because you never know ... when He is listening.

*Step Five: The Nature of Laws*

*(a) By reaching this page you have acknowledged that laws of logic, mathematics, science, and absolute morality exist.*

Well not exactly Sye; I was forced to click on the "I believe" button in order to read this proof. I had no problem clicking on the first 3, but clicking on the absolute morality button, in light of what I've learned about your Bible, made me feel ... almost dirty.

*Next we will examine what you believe about these laws. Are these laws material, or are they immaterial? In other words, are they made of matter, or are they 'abstract' entities? - are they physical or non-physical things?*

Sye, humans have discovered some of the transcendental properties of our Universe like logical absolutes and the laws of mathematics. They are not matter nor are they contingent upon a mind - they simply exist as properties of the Universe.

*Step Six: The Nature of Laws*

*(b) You have acknowledged that laws of logic, mathematics, science, and absolute morality exist and that they are not made of matter.*

Sye, I have acknowledged all except absolute morality. Please continue.

*The next question is whether you believe they are universal or up to the individual. Does 2 + 2 = 4 only where you are, and only because you say it does, or is this a universal law?*

Sye, they are universally true, and they were universally true before there were any minds to acknowledge them. The exception is absolute morality - I believe that exists only in your mind and in the minds of other delusional people.

*Step Seven: The Nature of Laws*

*(c) You have acknowledged that laws of logic, mathematics, science, and absolute morality exist, that they are not made of matter, and that they are universal. The next question is whether you believe they are changing or unchanging.*

Sye, unchanging. The only thing that changes is our understanding of them as science advances. Again, this doesn't apply to absolute morality, only to things that actually exist. Transcendental properties do actually exist - just not as matter or energy.

*To reach this page you had to acknowledge that immaterial, universal, unchanging laws of logic, mathematics, science, and absolute morality exist. Universal, immaterial, unchanging laws are necessary for rational thinking to be possible.*

Sye, that is an assertion. If a law were applicable only in our galaxy, how would that prevent us from thinking rationally? If a law changed in some faraway galaxy, how would that prevent us from thinking rationally?

Any conclusion that now follows your unproven assertion is merely speculation or wishful thinking.

*Universal, immaterial, unchanging laws cannot be accounted for if the universe was random or only material in nature.*

Sye, if our Universe were only material in nature, why would that preclude universal laws? Sye, that makes two unproven assertions in a row.

Also, while our Universe is only made up of matter and energy, it also has immaterial, transcendental properties like those you mentioned earlier.

*The Bible teaches us that there are 2 types of people in this world,*

Well Sye, like everything else it mentions, the Bible got that one wrong too. The truth is exactly the opposite of what your Bible claims. Science can prove that there are no two people on Earth who are exactly alike. That means that there aren't two types of people in the world, but that there are as many types as there are people.

*those who profess the truth of God's existence and those who suppress the truth of God's existence.*

Sye, what about those Ghost Worshippers who believe in a different ghost than you do? Are they suppressing the truth or are they professing the truth, in which case, you are the one suppressing the truth?

*The options of 'seeking' God, or not believing in God are unavailable.*

Sye, apparently the option of not believing in God is available because ... I took it.

*The Bible never attempts to prove the existence of God as it declares that the existence of God is so obvious that we are without excuse for not believing in Him.*

Actually Sye, in the 21st century with all the advancements that science has made, I would have to agree with you - you have no excuse.

*Romans 1 vs. 18 - 21 says:*

*"The wrath of God is being revealed from heaven against all the godlessness and wickedness of men who suppress the truth by their wickedness, since what may be known about God is plain to them,*

Sye, having read the Bible, I have to agree that what I know about God is plain to see - He is the nastiest, meanest, most evil creature ever described in any book in history. The fact that you, don't just believe in, but actually worship this hideous monster, is what is really without excuse.

*because God has made it plain to them.*

Sye, if God has made it so plain, why do 2/3 of the world still doubt his existence after 2,000 years of intense Christian missionary effort?

It doesn't look to me like He's trying all that hard.

*For since the creation of the world God's invisible qualities - his eternal power and divine nature - have been clearly seen,*

Sye, how can "invisible qualities" be clearly seen?

*being understood from what has been made, so that men are without excuse. For although they knew God, they neither glorified him as God nor gave thanks to him,*

Sye, they knew Him yet refused to glorify or even thank Him. It sounds like maybe they didn't think too much of Him either.

*but their thinking became futile and their foolish hearts were darkened."*

*The God of Christianity is the necessary starting point to make sense of universal, abstract, invariant laws by the impossibility of the contrary.*

Sye, the majority of scientists do not agree with you. They make sense out of the Universe and its laws without any necessity to resort to belief in invisible ghosts. So apparently "the contrary" is not as impossible as you would like to believe.

*These laws are necessary to prove ANYTHING. Therefore...*

*The Proof that God exists is that without Him you couldn't prove anything.*

Sye, your conclusion does not follow from your premises. Also, your conclusion is assumed in your premises. So your conclusion contains at least two major logical fallacies.

Possibility one: God exists, and we can prove things by using the laws of science, logic, and mathematics.

Possibility two: God does not exist, but we can still prove things because there is no evidence that logic, mathematics, and science can't exist without God. You are claiming that they can't. What you need to do is produce evidence that they can't, not merely assert it.

And thirdly, even if you were correct, you have provided no proof that the Creator ... is your God.

*Note that the proof does not say that professed unbelievers do not prove things. The argument is that you must borrow from the Christian worldview, and a God who makes universal, immaterial, unchanging laws possible in order to prove anything.*

Sye, your "proof" omitted providing evidence that the transcendental properties of the Universe are only possible if created by God. Other than that small item - dynamite proof dude.

*This type of logical proof deals with ‘transcendentals’ or ‘necessary starting points,’ and the proof is called a ‘transcendental proof.’*

Sye, the only thing you "proved" is that you have way too much time on your hands; time which could have been put to much more productive use in school; especially in science and logic classes.

*Any contrary view to the God of Christianity being the necessary starting point for rationality is reduced to absurdity.*

Sye, the Muslims and Hindus say the same thing about you. And your "proof" gave their Gods as much support as yours.

*You have to assume God in order to argue against Him.*

Sye, what happened to the law of non-contradiction?

How can you argue against the existence of God if you have to assume that He exists?

Seriously Sye, logic is not your friend. Like many apologists you've obviously spent a few minutes on Wikipedia studying how you can twist the laws of logic to get them to support your childish beliefs in ancient fairy tales. That time would have been better spent reading the material with an open mind and learning how to think rationally. Unfortunately Sye, that might result in putting you at risk of eternal damnation - and that is why you people read logic and science with a closed mind; only looking for ways around the harsh reality they demand.

*Only the Christian worldview can logically support rationality.*

Sye, no sane person could actually believe the argument that you just presented. The Christian worldview is about as far from logic and rationality as is humanly possible. The fact that you believe just the opposite, is a perfect demonstration of the power ... of delusion.

*"He who hates correction is stupid" proverbs 12:1b*

Sye, don't be stupid - you've already exceeded your lifetime allotment.

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

THE SCIENCE SEGMENT

ANTHROPOLOGIST FINDS EXPLANATION FOR HOMININ BRAIN EVOLUTION IN FAMOUS FOSSILS

One of the world's most important fossils has a story to tell about the brain evolution of modern humans and their ancestors.

The Taung fossil -- the first australopithecine ever discovered -- has two significant features that were analyzed by researchers. Their findings, suggest brain evolution was a result of a complex set of interrelated dynamics in childbirth among new bipeds.

These findings are significant because they provide a highly plausible explanation as to why the hominin brain might grow larger and more complex.

The first feature is a "persistent metopic suture," or unfused seam, in the frontal bone, which allows a baby's skull to be pliable during childbirth as it squeezes through the birth canal. In great apes -- gorillas, orangutans and chimpanzees -- the metopic suture closes shortly after birth. In humans, it does not fuse until around 2 years of age to accommodate rapid brain growth.

The second feature is the fossil's endocast, or imprint of the outside surface of the brain transferred to the inside of the skull. The endocast allows researchers to examine the brain's form and structure.

After examining the Taung fossil, as well as huge numbers of skulls belonging to apes and humans, as well as corresponding 3-D CT (three-dimensional computed tomographic) scans, and taking into account the fossil record for the past 3 million years, Researchers noted three important findings: The persistent metopic suture is an adaptation for giving birth to babies with larger brains; is related to the shift to a rapidly growing brain after birth; and may be related to expansion in the frontal lobes.

The persistent metopic suture, an advanced trait, probably occurred in conjunction with refining the ability to walk on two legs. The ability to walk upright caused an obstretric dilemma. Childbirth became more difficult because the shape of the birth canal became constricted while the size of the brain increased. The persistent metopic suture contributes to an evolutionary solution to this dilemma.

The later fusion of the metopic suture is most likely an adaptation of hominins who walked upright to be able to more easily give birth to babies with relatively large brains. The unfused seam is also related to the shift to rapidly growing brains after birth, an advanced human-like feature as compared to apes.

The later fusion was also associated with evolutionary expansion of the frontal lobes, which is evident from the endocasts of australopithecines such as Taung.

The Taung fossil, which is estimated to be around 2½ million years old, was discovered in 1924 in Taung, South Africa. It became the "type specimen," or main model, of the genus Australopithecus africanus when it was announced in 1925.

An australopithecine is any species of the extinct genera Australopithecus or Paranthropus that lived in Africa, walked on two legs and had relatively small brains.

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

FAMOUS QUOTES

John Fitzgerald "Jack" Kennedy (1917 –1963) 46 years.

He was the 35th President of the United States, serving from 1961 until his assassination in 1963. After military service as commander of the Motor Torpedo Boats PT-109 and PT-59 during World War II in the South Pacific, Kennedy represented Massachusetts's 11th congressional district in the U.S. House of Representatives from 1947 to 1953 as a Democrat. He then served in the U.S. Senate from 1953 until 1960. Kennedy defeated then Vice President and Republican candidate Richard Nixon in the 1960 U.S. presidential election. At the age of 43 he became the youngest man ever elected to the office. Kennedy is the only Catholic president, and is the only president to have won a Pulitzer Prize. Events during his presidency included the Bay of Pigs Invasion, the Cuban Missile Crisis, the building of the Berlin Wall, the Space Race, the African American Civil Rights Movement, and early stages of the Vietnam War.

Kennedy was assassinated on November 22, 1963, in Dallas, Texas. Lee Harvey Oswald was charged with the crime, but was shot and killed two days later by Jack Ruby before a trial could take place. The FBI, the Warren Commission, and the House Select Committee on Assassinations officially concluded that Oswald was the lone assassin. Today, Kennedy continues to rank highly in public opinion ratings of U.S. presidents.

"Those who make peaceful revolution impossible,

make violent revolution inevitable."