**William Lane Craig and God, now on Metafilter**

**by Paul Wright**

***If an atheist says “All reasonable beliefs require evidence, there is no evidence for God, therefore belief in God is unreasonable”, the clever apologist will ask “All reasonable beliefs? Really? What evidence could there be for your belief that all beliefs require evidence?”***

**Paul, you palmed a card: you omitted the adjective "reasonable" before "beliefs" near the end of the paragraph. Your omission completely changed the meaning.**

***They will then go on to point out that it seems we all have to accept some unevidenced beliefs***

**Paul, like what? And why would I do that?**

***“Aha!” says the apologist, “you see, we all rely on faith, and my belief in God, angels, demons and whatnot is just an article of faith, like your belief in this induction thing you’re so fond of.***

**Paul, logical principles have nothing to do with faith. Logic has withstood thousands of years of assault from those, whose arguments have been defeated by it. If a logical principle is proved invalid, then like a failed scientific theory, it is discarded.**

**Belief in God, on the other hand, has withstood nothing. It has been bashed into thousands of insignificat little pieces and dumped unceremoniously into the trashbin of failed claims.**

***We’re not so different, you and I.”***

**Paul, we couldn't be more different. In fact, I would be willing to wager both my grapefruits that sex between a rationalist and a Ghost Worshipper would not result in an offspring ... we are different species.**

***I followed up with another comment explaining why Craig gets (admittedly grudging) respect from atheists***

**Paul, you must be hanging around the wrong crowd. Craig is a dishonest ass clown who neither deserves, nor gets, respect from any halfway competent Atheist.**

***the best explanation is a person who lacks several of properties of all persons we encounter (not material, not existing in time)***

**Paul, there is no such thing as "not existing in time." That is nonsense. They can't explain what it means because it has no meaning.**

**First one must understand what time is:**

**http://theskepticarena.com/scienceStories.aspx#neoScience**

**(essay #2)**

**Now ask them to explain what they mean by "outside of time."**

**They can't do it because it doesn't make any sense.**

**Besides, there are plenty of Bible verses that prove that God supposedly did interact inside of "time." So then God must be outside of time ... only when they need Him to be.**

***why not just say that there’s at least one mathematical concept with causal potency?***

**Paul, because that would make as much sense as "outside of time."**

**Which is ... none at all.**

***Dawkins will not debate with Craig because Dawkins would lose, horribly***

**Paul, it is not possible to win a debate when one has no evidence with which to debate. It is only possible to give the "impression" that one has won ... and even then only to his rabid followers who never had any intention to begin with ... of listening with an open mind.**

**neo**

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

**Paul replied:**

***It's a bit odd to reply to a blog post by emailing someone a Word***

***document rather than, say, using the little box at the bottom provided***

***for that purpose***

**Paul, lots of things in life are "odd."**

**(Readers, notice the immediate distraction technique. That is a good sign that he will not be replying to anything I said).**

***I gave up reading that at the point where it was obvious that you were***

***reading my quotation of an argument from a Christian apologist as if***

***it were an argument I myself had made. I am not making that argument,***

***I am criticising it.***

**Paul, I don't believe you. The reason you are claiming not to have read my email, is so that you can give yourself an excuse, for not being able to respond to the points I made.**

**Nowhere in your essay do you indicate that you were quoting an actual Christian apologist. Not once did you provide a reference or an attribution. It was clear that you were paraphrasing an imaginary Christian apologist.**

**If you can provide a quote from your essay to refute that claim, please feel free to do so.**

***If you have a substantial point, though, feel free to comment on the blog.***

**(Readers: if you want to have a good laugh, reread his offer for me to comment on his blog, and then go to his web site at:**

[**http://pw201.livejournal.com/194736.html**](http://pw201.livejournal.com/194736.html)

**and you'll notice that ...**

**he disabled the fucking comments!**

**I think this guy could use a long vacation).**