From: neo@theskepticarena.com

To: carmstuff@yahoo.com

Date: Sun, Jul 08, 2012 1:16 pm

Matt Slick,

I would like to invite you to phone in to "talkshoe"

and defend your Transcendental Argument for the existence of God.

All callers will be put on hold and you will be the only one allowed to talk to me.

So that you know what to expect,

I have about a dozen questions which I would like you to answer.

You will be given as much time as you need to explain your answers.

I host my show every Saturday evening at 7pm (Boise time).

If this is inconvenient, please suggest a better time;

I can be flexible.

Please RSVP so that I can plan accordingly.

At the time of the debate, go to:

Talkshoe.com and click on "join a call"

then select "The Skeptic Arena" (ID# 45435).

talkshoe (phone# 724-444-7444)

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

From: carm.org

To: neo@theskepticarena.com

Date: Sun, Jul 08, 2012 6:55 pm

Dear Neo,

Thank you for the invitation. I am passing your request along to Matt.

In His Service,

Linda, Office Assistant

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

From: neo@theskepticarena.com

To: carm.org

Date: Wed, Jul 11, 2012 8:04 am

Hello Linda,

I'm just checking to see if Matt received my email

since I haven't heard from him yet.

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

From: neo@theskepticarena.com

To: carmstuff@yahoo.com

Date: Tue, Jul 17, 2012 8:51 am

Cc:

reverend@billygrahamministries.net,

rickw@saddleback.net,

testimonials@reasonablefaith.org,

contact@proofthatgodexists.org,

daniel.dennett@tufts.edu,

sans.deity@gmail.com,

tv@atheist-community.org,

pzmyers@gmail.com

Matt Slick,

Your secretary, Linda, told me that she forwarded my first email to you.

Both of you ignored my second email that I sent a week ago.

If you do not have the confidence to defend your argument (TAG)

please just say so, and I will find someone else who is willing to defend it.

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

From: carmstuff@yahoo.com

To: neo@theskepticarena.com

Date: Tue, Jul 17, 2012 9:54 am

Dear Neo,

We are not ignoring you. We get an overwhelming amount of email and are working with a very small staff. You are welcome to call the office and talk to Matt personally. He is usually available 10am-2pm Mountain time M-F.

CARM Office number: 208-466-1301

In His Service,

Linda, Office Assistant

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

From: neo@theskepticarena.com

To: christthetao@msn.com

Date: Thu, Jul 19, 2012 11:19 am

Cc:

reverend@billygrahamministries.net,

rickw@saddleback.net,

testimonials@reasonablefaith.org,

carmstuff@yahoo.com,

contact@proofthatgodexists.org,

winteryknightblog@yahoo.com,

vday@worldnetdaily.com,

bkeller@liveprayer.com,

bill@wildbillforamerica.com,

comments@godandscience.org,

pastor@fbcgh.net,

sans.deity@gmail.com

To everyone of you on this email list (except sans.deity):

It seems as though Matt Slick "talks the talk"

but crawls back under his rock

when it comes down to "walking the walk."

So here it is:

Remember the famous Brad Pitt line in the movie "Troy"

after he killed Boagrius in the opening fight scene ...

"Is there no one else? Is there no one else?"

Surely, among all of you, one has the courage

to defend Matt Slick's TAG argument for him?

How hard could it be?

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

From: carmstuff@yahoo.com

To: neo@theskepticarena.com

Date: Thu, Jul 19, 2012 12:59 pm

Cc:

reverend@billygrahamministries.net,

rickw@saddleback.net,

testimonials@reasonablefaith.org,

contact@proofthatgodexists.org,

christthetao@msn.com,

winteryknightblog@yahoo.com,

vday@worldnetdaily.com,

bkeller@liveprayer.com,

bill@wildbillforamerica.com,

comments@godandscience.org,

pastor@fbcgh.net

neo,

and why am I on this list as well????

I get atheists "trying" to refute tag but they either misrepresent it, fail to understand it, or just dismiss it.

If a refutation is out there, i've not seen it yet (or I'm just too dumb to get it).

Nevertheless, I am willing to do a public debate against an atheist using TAG.

Formal debate. Opening statements, responses, cross examine, etc., moderated,

I'll fly out to some place to do it.

I've offered challenges to Dillahunty and other atheists but no takers.

Anyway, if someone has a written response that seeks to refute the TAG argument, send it to me, with permission to reproduce it, so that I can write a response to it and post it on CARM.

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

From: neo@theskepticarena.com

To: carmstuff@yahoo.com

Date: Thu, Jul 19, 2012 2:49 pm

Cc:

reverend@billygrahamministries.net,

rickw@saddleback.net,

testimonials@reasonablefaith.org,

contact@proofthatgodexists.org,

christthetao@msn.com,

winteryknightblog@yahoo.com,

vday@worldnetdaily.com,

bkeller@liveprayer.com,

bill@wildbillforamerica.com,

comments@godandscience.org,

pastor@fbcgh.net

Matt Slick wrote:

*and why am I on this list as well????*

Because you are the subject of this email.

*I get atheists "trying" to refute tag but they either misrepresent it, fail to understand it, or just dismiss it.*

*If a refutation is out there, i've not seen it yet (or I'm just too dumb to get it).*

Dumb has nothing to do with it.

You refuse to accept the logical flaws that pervade your argument because you have put in too much time and effort. You are obviously very proud of your work, and the thought of dismissing it is more than you are willing to do.

(I know that feeling. I too had difficulty in letting go of ideas, of which I was very proud. The difference is, eventually rationality forced me to admit my mistakes. Since your beliefs are not based on rationality, you do not have that advantage).

*Nevertheless, I am willing to do a public debate against an atheist using TAG.*

*Formal debate. Opening statements, responses, cross examine, etc., moderated,*

*I'll fly out to some place to do it.*

I had something far less extravagant and time-consuming in mind.

Phone in to my show. I will ask you about a dozen questions regarding TAG. You will NOT be interrupted during your reply. In fact, to ensure that only one person is speaking at a time, I will mute the speaker icon. We will both be free to ask each other questions and provide answers, but never will anyone be allowed to speak over the other person, or cut the other person off.

*I've offered challenges to Dillahunty and other atheists but no takers.*

Well, you've got one now.

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

From: carmstuff@yahoo.com

To: neo@theskepticarena.com

Date: Thu, Jul 19, 2012 3:05 pm

Cc:

reverend@billygrahamministries.net,

rickw@saddleback.net,

testimonials@reasonablefaith.org,

contact@proofthatgodexists.org,

christthetao@msn.com,

winteryknightblog@yahoo.com,

vday@worldnetdaily.com,

bkeller@liveprayer.com,

bill@wildbillforamerica.com,

comments@godandscience.org,

pastor@fbcgh.net

Neo,

Honestly, I've not seen any logical flaws in the argument.

Just "saying" they are there, doesn't mean they are..and given the propensity of atheists to cling to most any supposed refutation offered, I doubt you're refutation is of any merirt.

now, if you want to give me a specific statement why the tag argument is invalid, please let me know.

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

From: neo@theskepticarena.com

To: carmstuff@yahoo.com

Date: Thu, Jul 19, 2012 3:41 pm

Cc:

reverend@billygrahamministries.net,

rickw@saddleback.net,

testimonials@reasonablefaith.org,

contact@proofthatgodexists.org,

christthetao@msn.com,

winteryknightblog@yahoo.com,

vday@worldnetdaily.com,

bkeller@liveprayer.com,

bill@wildbillforamerica.com,

comments@godandscience.org,

pastor@fbcgh.net

Matt Slick wrote:

*Honestly, I've not seen any logical flaws in the argument.*

I accept ... that you believe that.

*Just "saying" they are there, doesn't mean they are..*

True.

That was the whole point of my offer to accept your offer to defend TAG.

*and given the propensity of atheists to cling to most any supposed refutation offered, I doubt you're refutation is of any merirt.*

As one who prides himself on logic, I'm sure everyone is surprised

that you would resort to the logical fallacy of "Hasty Generalization."

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hasty\_generalization

But if logical fallacies are how far you are willing to go,

in order to escape having to defend TAG

then I guess you've found your excuse to bail.

*now, if you want to give me a specific statement why the tag argument is invalid, please let me know.*

That was kind of the purpose of the debate.

But since it is obvious that you have no stomach for it,

perhaps someone else on this email list will step forward?

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

From: carmstuff@yahoo.com

To: neo@theskepticarena.com

Date: Fri, Jul 20, 2012 9:24 am

Cc:

reverend@billygrahamministries.net,

rickw@saddleback.net,

testimonials@reasonablefaith.org,

contact@proofthatgodexists.org,

christthetao@msn.com,

winteryknightblog@yahoo.com,

vday@worldnetdaily.com,

bkeller@liveprayer.com,

bill@wildbillforamerica.com,

comments@godandscience.org,

pastor@fbcgh.net

Neo,

I'll not bug anyone past this email if I don't receive any specific acceptance to my challenge. So, I'll ask one last time. Is there a competent atheist who is willing to do a formal, public, moderated debate on TAG and/or a topic dealing with "Morality, Atheism, and Christianity"?

We could debate TAG one night and morality a following night.

I am willing to travel to another city to do this at my own expense.

However, if you're not up to doing a public debate and you think you have a rock solid refutation of TAG, then email it to me and I'll take a look at it. If you refute it. Great. If not, even better.

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

From: neo@theskepticarena.com

To: carmstuff@yahoo.com

Date: Fri, Jul 20, 2012 11:24 am

Cc:

reverend@billygrahamministries.net,

rickw@saddleback.net,

testimonials@reasonablefaith.org,

contact@proofthatgodexists.org,

christthetao@msn.com,

winteryknightblog@yahoo.com,

vday@worldnetdaily.com,

bkeller@liveprayer.com,

bill@wildbillforamerica.com,

comments@godandscience.org,

pastor@fbcgh.net

Matt Slick wrote:

*Look, you can forgo the schoolyard taunts.*

My frustration over your "change of heart" to defend your TAG argument is anything but a schoolyard taunt. I merely suggested to other Christian Apologists that one of them might be willing to make a stand ... where you refuse.

*I'm willing to do a formal, public, moderated debate on TAG and/or a topic dealing with "Morality, Atheism, and Christianity."*

Apparently not.

My suggestion was far cheaper, quicker, and more convenient than yours ... and would accomplish the same thing.

I presume you take callers on your radio show and debate them all the time. So I'm a little confused at your reluctance to do, what so many of your callers are willing to do.

*I'm not interested in inane banter.*

What gave you the impression that I was? I made it quite clear that my interest is in debating the specific topic of TAG. I would hardly call that inane banter.

You sound like someone who is very desperate to run and hide. If you don't want to defend TAG, simply man up and have the guts to say so. I'm sure that there is someone on this email list who would be willing to replace you.

*If you're up to a serious public, formal debate, let's do it. If not, then I understand and let's stop with the attempted repartee. I have too much to do.*

Everyone reading these emails has to be asking themselves why you would require that airline flights be booked, an auditorium rented, ushers and security paid for, and various other expenses incurred? This is not Richard Dawkins Vs. Billy Graham.

All you have to do is call up and debate from the comfort of your own home ... for free.

Actually, I don't think anyone is wondering any more. It should be obvious to everyone that you are doing everything humanly possible to avoid defending your argument in a public forum. That is why you are making these ridiculous demands.

If you had really wanted a serious, public, formal debate, you could have that 2 weeks ago. At this point, all you're hoping to accomplish is to save face.

*If no one here is interested in doing such a public debate, then just bow out of the email exchange. No problem.*

The debate on Talkshoe IS public. Talkshoe records the shows for everyone to download. I'm ready to go. It's pretty clear which of us is desperately trying to bow out.

*If you're not up to a public debate and you think you have a rock solid refutation of TAG, then email it to me and I'll take a look...sooner or later and deal with it. If you refute it. Great. If not, even better. So, step up, step out, or provide THE refutation of TAG.*

The debate is just a phone call away, yet you write a mini novel trying to get out of it. You said yourself that no Atheist has been able to refute it. This should be a piece of cake for you. You should be chomping at the bit.

Something isn't right here ... and it's obviously not me.

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

From: carmstuff@yahoo.com

To: neo@theskepticarena.com

Date: Fri, Jul 20, 2012 11:58 am

Cc:

reverend@billygrahamministries.net,

rickw@saddleback.net,

testimonials@reasonablefaith.org,

contact@proofthatgodexists.org,

christthetao@msn.com,

winteryknightblog@yahoo.com,

vday@worldnetdaily.com,

bkeller@liveprayer.com,

bill@wildbillforamerica.com,

comments@godandscience.org,

pastor@fbcgh.net

(NOTE: Matt Slick's responses are enclosed in blocks)

Matt Slick originally wrote:

*Look, you can forgo the schoolyard taunts.*

I originally wrote:

My frustration over your "change of heart" to defend your TAG argument is anything but a schoolyard taunt. I merely suggested to other Christian Apologists that one of them might be willing to make a stand ... where you refuse.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Matt Slick replied:

*There is no change of heart.*

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Matt Slick originally wrote:

*I'm willing to do a formal, public, moderated debate on TAG and/or a topic dealing with "Morality, Atheism, and Christianity."*

I originally wrote:

Apparently not.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Matt Slick replied:

*Now, what do I do with someone who apparently is trying to be a mind reader? I say I am willing to do a formal, public, moderated debate yet you say I am not. I'm tempted at this point to just dismiss your further comments since you are, essentially, calling me a liar. Please refrain from this, okay?*

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

I originally wrote:

My suggestion was far cheaper, quicker, and more convenient than yours ... and would accomplish the same thing.

I presume you take callers on your radio show and debate them all the time. So I'm a little confused at your reluctance to do, what so many of your callers are willing to do.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Matt Slick replied:

*Feel free to call me on the radio any time.*

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Matt Slick originally wrote:

*I'm not interested in inane banter.*

I originally wrote:

What gave you the impression that I was? I made it quite clear that my interest is in debating the specific topic of TAG. I would hardly call that inane banter.

You sound like someone who is very desperate to run and hide. If you don't want to defend TAG, simply man up and have the guts to say so. I'm sure that there is someone on this email list who would be willing to replace you.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Matt Slick replied:

*Interesting. To you my offer to debate publicly and my recommendation for you to call the radio show is actually running and hiding? I didn't know that that was running and hiding. Thanks for the clarification.*

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Matt Slick originally wrote:

*If you're up to a serious public, formal debate, let's do it. If not, then I understand and let's stop with the attempted repartee. I have too much to do.*

I originally wrote:

Everyone reading these emails has to be asking themselves why you would require that airline flights be booked, an auditorium rented, ushers and security paid for, and various other expenses incurred? This is not Richard Dawkins Vs. Billy Graham.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Matt Slick replied:

*Everyone is asking themselves these things? Really? So not only do you know my heart you know there's also?*

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

I originally wrote:

All you have to do is call up and debate from the comfort of your own home ... for free.

Actually, I don't think anyone is wondering any more. It should be obvious to everyone that you are doing everything humanly possible to avoid defending your argument in a public forum. That is why you are making these ridiculous demands.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Matt Slick replied:

*It is ridiculous to want a formal, public debate? And/or have you send me the precise "refutation" of the argument so I can address it? Seriously, maybe the planet you're living on is a little too close to the sun.*

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

I originally wrote:

If you had really wanted a serious, public, formal debate, you could have that 2 weeks ago. At this point, all you're hoping to accomplish is to save face.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Matt Slick replied:

*I have no idea what you're referring to.*

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Matt Slick originally wrote:

*If no one here is interested in doing such a public debate, then just bow out of the email exchange. No problem.*

I originally wrote:

The debate on Talkshoe IS public. Talkshoe records the shows for everyone to download. I'm ready to go. It's pretty clear which of us is desperately trying to bow out.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Matt Slick replied:

*My apologies but I have hundreds of emails to go through and am months behind. Sometimes I respond to emails quickly and other times not. Sometimes I forget what I've said to who since I'm so busy. Therefore, if we've had a previous email exchange and it appears that I don't remember it, don't be surprised.*

*Now, what is talkshoe? It rings a bell, but I don't remember.*

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Matt Slick originally wrote:

*If you're not up to a public debate and you think you have a rock solid refutation of TAG, then email it to me and I'll take a look...sooner or later and deal with it. If you refute it. Great. If not, even better. So, step up, step out, or provide THE refutation of TAG.*

I originally wrote:

The debate is just a phone call away, yet you write a mini novel trying to get out of it. You said yourself that no Atheist has been able to refute it. This should be a piece of cake for you. You should be chomping at the bit.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

*Matt Slick replied:*

*You want me to call into a show you have/run/want to do? To discuss TAG? That's it? Will it be one on one? two on one? Are you going to silence me if you get cornered?*

*Come on... let me know what the conditions are... since you, and Matt Dilahunty, are not up to doing a formal, public debate, I'll consider the dialogue but if you treat me on your "show" like you do here, I'll just politely bow out. You're going to have to up your game if you want to play.*

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

I originally wrote:

Something isn't right here ... and it's obviously not me.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Matt Slick replied:

*What isn't right is your approach*

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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

From: neo@theskepticarena.com

To: carmstuff@yahoo.com

Date: Fri, Jul 20, 2012 1:58 pm

Cc:

reverend@billygrahamministries.net,

rickw@saddleback.net,

testimonials@reasonablefaith.org,

contact@proofthatgodexists.org,

christthetao@msn.com,

winteryknightblog@yahoo.com,

vday@worldnetdaily.com,

bkeller@liveprayer.com,

bill@wildbillforamerica.com,

comments@godandscience.org,

pastor@fbcgh.net

I'll skip all the nonsense in the first part of your email and get right to the gist.

Matt Slick wrote:

*You want me to call into a show you have/run/want to do? To discuss TAG? That's it?*

That is all you have ever been asked to do.

*Will it be one on one? two on one?*

I copied this from the first email that I sent you:

"All callers will be put on hold and you will be the only one allowed to talk to me.

So that you know what to expect, I have about a dozen questions which I would like you to answer.

You will be given as much time as you need to explain your answers."

*Are you going to silence me if you get cornered?*

As explained above, you will NEVER be silenced. I will reply when I am certain that you have concluded your response.

*Come on... let me know what the conditions are...*

See my first email ... or read them above.

*since you, and Matt Dilahunty, are not up to doing a formal, public debate,*

I don't know what you mean by "up to." But I don't see the point in booking airline reservations unless you are just desperate to get away from your wife.

*I'll consider the dialogue but if you treat me on your "show" like you do here, I'll just politely bow out.*

I've never heard anyone beg for politeness before a debate before. I don't use profanity because I feel it weakens an argument. However, you will get no complaint from me should you choose to use it. You can insult me to your heart's content; again, I won't complain. I don't plan on using those tactics because I don't want to "give away" the debate. We both know that a debate is won on 1) the strength of the arguments, and 2) the debater's demeanor. Neither of us has anything to gain by mistreating the other.

*You're going to have to up your game if you want to play.*

I thought you weren't big on schoolyard taunts?

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

From: neo@theskepticarena.com

To: testimonials@reasonablefaith.org

Date: Tue, Jul 24, 2012 11:38 am

Cc:

reverend@billygrahamministries.net,

rickw@saddleback.net,

testimonials@reasonablefaith.org,

contact@proofthatgodexists.org,

christthetao@msn.com,

winteryknightblog@yahoo.com,

vday@worldnetdaily.com,

bkeller@liveprayer.com,

bill@wildbillforamerica.com,

comments@godandscience.org,

pastor@fbcgh.net

It has become obvious that no matter how hard I try,

Matt Slick simply will not defend his TAG argument.

One of you (who shall remain unnamed)

criticized me for bullying someone

who was desperately trying to avoid a debate,

and who was only replying in order to save face.

Your criticism was, of course, completely correct.

At this point, I am starting to look like a schoolyard bully.

So as you might have noticed

Matt Slick was not included in this email;

nor will I bother him any further

since it is clear that he has no will to fight.

So this is the last opportunity for someone to step up, and either

1) defend Matt Slick's TAG argument

 as it appears on his web site, or

2) present your own TAG argument for debate.

Once again I paraphrase Achilles,

standing in front of the Greek army,

issuing a challenge after he has defeated Boagrius:

Is there no other?

.....

.....

.....

Is there no other?

(it's better if you picture, famous Atheist Brad Pitt

decked out in armor).

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

(Only one person on the email cc list tried to defend Slick. Here is that email)

Richard Deem ("comments@godandscience.org")wrote:

*"It sounds to me that you are too chicken to do a public debate."*

Apparently, your memory could use a little refreshing:

1) It was I who challenged Matt Slick to a debate,

 not the other way around.

 So in your mind, you somehow conclude that I'm chicken.

2) It was Matt Slick who refused to acknowledge multiple email

 challenges until I cc'd enough people that he felt pressured

 into responding to me.

 But the way you think, that indicates that I am chicken.

3) It was Slick who made outrageous demands requiring large

 investments of time and money before he would debate,

 knowing that this would insulate him from defending TAG.

 And your sputtering neurons conclude that I'm chicken.

4) I was the one who offered a "public" forum that would save

 him the cost of airline tickets, auditorium rental, security and

 usher expenses, and other miscellaneous costs. Why would

 anyone in their right mind turn down an offer that saves them

 a large amount of money and time?

 But to you, that indicates that I'm chicken.

5) I was the one who bent over backwards and agreed to every

 one of his demands regarding how the debate would be

 conducted, and I agreed that he would never be interrupted.

 How did he respond when I acceded ... crickets.

 He crawled back under his rock and hid motionless.

 And your amazing reasoning powers deduce that I'm chicken.

I've done everything short of offering my firstborn on an altar

in order to get him to debate.

But, Richard Deem, you were cc'd on all of these emails.

You already know these things;

yet you try to claim that I am the one trying to avoid a debate ...

which I was trying to provoke?

You've just given everyone a perfect example

of how religious belief degrades the thinking process

(well actually, your web site is the best example).

If you have ever taken a logic class in your entire life,

you should have no trouble getting your tuition refunded.

Just show them this email series.

I guarantee, they will give you back your money ... with interest.

Richard wrote:

*"The only thing you seem really good at is annoying people with endless banter."*

According to Dictionary.com - banter:

"An exchange of light, playful, teasing remarks; good-natured raillery."

Dude ... you have seriously misread me.

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

Here is the transcript of the video titled:

Neo V. Matt Slick's

Transcendental Argument for the existence of God

Matt Slick operates the web site CARM.org (which stands for Christian Apologetics and Research Ministry) where he has posted an argument which claims that the Logical Absolutes are proof for the existence of God. This argument is known as TAG (which is short for: the Transcendental Argument for the existence of God).

Matt Slick challenges any Atheist to refute his argument, and claims that no one has ever successfully done so. I emailed Matt Slick, informing him that I would like to accept his challenge to debate TAG.

After several emails went unanswered I finally got him to reply when I cc'd a few well known Christians including Billy Graham and Rick Warren.

Matt Slick and I then exchanged a series of emails in which he did everything humanly possible to avoid the debate.

To save face, he even offered to fly out and debate at his own expense; yet when I told him he could save a ton of money, and a lot of time, by simply calling into my show from the comfort of his own home for free ... he ignored my offer.

He then sent one final email in which he said that he would only debate if treated politely, and, be allowed to speak uninterrupted. I agreed to his every request. His reply ... dead silence.

I had wanted to make an interesting video of the debate. But it takes two to tango ... and I'm out here on the dance floor all alone. So I've decided to provide this video containing my replies to Matt Slick's Transcendental Argument for the existence of God.

The 3 Logical Absolutes were first presented by Aristotle. They are:

1) The Law of Identity (a rock is a rock).

2) The Law of Noncontradiction (a rock cannot be both a rock and "not a

 rock" at the same time). This makes the Law of Identity exclusive.

3) The Law of Excluded Middle (Only one of two contradictory propositions

 can be true). This makes the Law of Identity exhaustive.

Now for the debate

Matt Slick wrote

*"Logical absolutes are conceptual by nature (and Matt Slick then went on to explain that reality is either physical or conceptual)."*

Matt, by attempting to divide reality into physical and conceptual you have created a false dichotomy. There is no evidence for a dichotomy of reality. Everything that exists is either physical or dependent upon the physical Universe; including the Absolutes.

Concepts are produced by the mind, which itself, is an emergent property of the brain. Concepts are dependent upon a brain for their very existence, and therefore, they are very much a part of the physical Universe.

Logical Absolutes, on the other hand, are attributes of the Universe. They are not dependent upon any mind for their existence as they existed long before there were any minds. Why are the Absolutes what they are? Because they couldn't be anything else: how could a rock not be a rock?

You assert that they require an author, and you reject that the Absolutes simply exist as an inherent essence of the Universe because that contradicts the premise upon which you wish to build your argument.

Now I will present evidence that you are creating a false dichotomy when you arbitrarily divide reality into physical and conceptual:

1) Many cognitive functions such as information transfer, memory, motor control, and perception (things that you consider part of the conceptual realm) have all been linked to neural oscillations in the brain.

2) To exist in the physical world, you require that things be measurable.

 Well, brain waves can be measured by frequency, by amplitude, and by

 phase. A few examples:

 wave type involved in

 beta active concentration

 delta deep sleep

 theta memory function

3) Neuroscientists can pinpoint where in the brain these waves originate.

4) Oxytocin is a hormone that contributes to emotional love in the brain in

 various ways that are measureable.

The conceptual world that you imagine, is quite real ... and measurable.

Matt Slick wrote:

*"If the logical absolutes were properties of the universe then they could be measured the same way heat, motion, mass, etc., are measured. Since they cannot be measured, they are not properties of the universe."*

You have tried to impose limits on the way the Absolutes can be measured.

The Absolutes can be measured by logical truth statements. For example, if X does in fact equal X then the First Law is measured as true.

Matt Slick wrote:

*"But, if the universe did not exist, logical absolutes are still true."*

Then explain how a rock can be a rock ... in a nonexistent Universe.

In a nonexistent Universe, there would be nothing for the Law of Identity to apply to, therefore the Absolutes could not exist.

Matt Slick wrote:

*"Logical Absolutes are not the product of the physical universe, since that would mean they were contingent on atoms ..."*

When do you think atoms first formed?

Atoms didn't form until almost 380,000 years after the Big Bang; so the Absolutes were never contingent upon atoms.

If you try to move the goalposts back to when atomic nuclei first formed, your attempt will still fail because nucleosynthesis didn't begin until almost 3 minutes after the Big Bang and lasted nearly 20 minutes. Before that the Universe contained a quark-gluon plasma. Since this soup was matter the Absolutes had to exist: a quark was a quark, and a quark was not, not a quark.

The Absolutes have existed from the first moment that there was something in the Universe, to which the Law of Identity could be applied to.

Matt Slick wrote:

*"A statement is either true or false, without a middle ground."*

Your claim is only true in a bivalent logic system. But the Principle of Bivalence is a property that semantics may or may not have. The Principle cannot overrule the Absolutes.

Outside of a bivalent logic system, the negation of true is not false: the negation of true is "not true." False is merely a subset of "not true." One example of a value that is neither true nor false, is NULL.

Matt Slick wrote:

*"it must be an absolute transcendent mind that is authoring them. This mind is called God."*

PLAY "God didn't author absolutes" from Matt Slick's appearance on the Atheist Experience.

That's not a logical fallacy: that's just a plain and simple contradiction.

So when your left brain quits fighting with your right brain ... perhaps you could let us know which it is.

If anything, evidence would point to the Big Bang as the author of the Absolutes since they could not have existed before it, and they have existed ever since it occurred.

Matt Slick wrote:

*Since the Logical Absolutes are transcendent, absolute, are perfectly consistent, and are independent of the universe, then it seems proper to say that they reflect a transcendent, absolute, perfect, and independent mind. We call this transcendent, absolute, perfect, and independent mind God.*

Since you haven't proven that the Absolutes are independent of the Universe, nor have you proven that they reflect a perfect mind ...

it doesn't really matter what you call it.

A commenter at Matt Slick's web site wrote

"Logical Absolutes simply exist."

Matt Slick wrote:

*"This is begging the question by saying they exist because they exist and does not provide an explanation for their existence. Simply saying they exist is not an answer."*

And yet you had no problem using that same argument, so "Begging the Question" is okay ... when you do it.

PLAY "God's essence" from Matt Slick's appearance on the Atheist Experience.

See what I mean? You deny to others the same argument that you allow for yourself. That is logically inconsistent.

Matt Slick wrote:

*"How is it logical absolutes could exist without a mind? After all, logic is a process of the mind."*

It's true that logic is a process of the mind but the Absolutes are not.

Before there were any minds in the Universe ... a rock was still a rock.

Matt Slick wrote:

*"How can an atheist logically claim that one chemical state in the brain which leads to another state necessitates proper logical inference?"*

An Atheist has nothing to do with any of that. An Atheist is simply someone who thinks that your beliefs are full of crap.

Matt Slick wrote:

*"Therefore, logical absolutes, which are not contradictory, cannot be the product of minds that are contradictory."*

Your claim implies that imperfect minds are incapable of producing noncontradictory things. I can think of many examples that prove you wrong, but I'll just give you one: logic.

CONCLUSION: ONLY TWO OPTIONS

In true false dichotomy style, you have titled your conclusion "Only Two Options."

Matt Slick wrote:

*"If we have only two possible options by which we can explain something and one of those options is removed, by default the other option is verified since it is impossible to negate both of the only two exist options."*

We only have evidence for one option, so by your own reasoning ... you lose.

Matt Slick wrote:

*"God either exists or does not exist. There is no third option."*

Actually, there are thousands of other options. So even if you were able to prove the existence of God, you would still have to prove that of all the possible spookies out there ... He's your spooky.

Matt Slick wrote:

*"If the no-god position, atheism, clearly fails to account for Logical Absolutes from its perspective, then it is negated and the other option is verified. Atheism cannot account for the necessary preconditions for intelligibility; namely, the existence of logical absolutes."*

The precondition for intelligibility does not come from the Absolutes but from biology: that precondition is a brain.

Atheism is nothing more than a rejection of God, and therefore has nothing to do with the Absolutes. So the other option (invisible ghost) is not verified.

Matt Slick wrote:

"Therefore, it is invalidated as a viable option for accounting for the absolutes and the only other option, God exists, is validated."

Only in your dreams Ghost Boy. Your TAG argument is so full of holes you could strain cheese through it.

Millions of Christians accept science, are tolerant of others with whom they disagree, and strongly support the separation of Church and State. Unfortunately there are also millions of Fundamentalist Christians who do great damage to our nation. They actually worship ignorance. If they were fish, most of them would die of thirst. Now I'll end with a tribute to the Transcendental Argument for the existence of God.

PLAY "taps"