NOVEMBER 6, 2011 THESKEPTICARENA.COM

I RECENTLY SENT THE FOLLOWING EMAIL:

TO: VOX DAY

FROM: NEO

I ASSUME THAT YOU SEND YOUR PACK OF MORONS (SUBSCRIBERS) TO HARASS THE PEOPLE ON YOUR LIST OF "TARGET-RICH ENVIRONMENTS."

THEREFORE, I AM REQUESTING TO BE ADDED TO THE LIST.

WHY?

I'M IN NEED OF FRESH MEAT.

VOX DAY'S REPLY:

I don't send anyone anywhere, for any reason, but nevertheless, his request is duly granted.

THIS EMAIL WAS POSTED ON HIS WEB SITE. OVER 160 READERS THEN POSTED COMMENTS. I HAVE SELECTED THE BEST ONES FOR THIS PODCAST (ABOUT 30 OF THEM), AND ADDED MY REPLIES ... BON APPÉTIT.

COMMENTS

Cinque

Yeah I couldn't get past the first page:

"Rationalists only accept as true

that which has been proven to be true

through the scientific method"

Where to begin... And science has proven this statement as "truth"?

NO CINQUE, STATEMENTS ARE PROVEN EITHER TRUE OR FALSE THROUGH THE APPLICATION OF LOGIC. WHERE DID YOU GET THE IDEA THAT SCIENCE PROVES STATEMENTS? SCIENCE ONLY PROVES WHAT THE STATEMENTS REFER TO.

And when did science "prove" things to be true?

CINQUE, SINCE WAY BEFORE YOU WERE BORN.

Sigh. Just regular old atheist poop. Why did Vox put this paperbag of dogskit on my doorstep so I had to step in it?

CINQUE, "DOGSKIT." YOU PEOPLE ARE SO INCOMPETENT. YOU CAN'T EVEN HURL INSULTS WITHOUT EMBARRASSING YOURSELVES. YOU'RE LIKE A LITTLE KID WHO JUST TRIED TO SPIT, AND WOUND UP WITH SALIVA ALL OVER HIS CHIN.

AND CINQUE, "PAPERBAG" IS TWO WORDS, NOT ONE.

HumanR

We're going to need to see data on the words to make the claim. Then we'll need data on the claim as a whole. But . . . then we'll need data on the methodology used to collect the data on the words in the claim and . . . .

HUMAN, THAT WAS A PERFECT EXAMPLE OF THE HYPOCRISY THAT *IS* THE CHRISTIAN MIND. ALL THOSE DEMANDS FOR DATA AND EVIDENCE BY SOMEONE WHO REQUIRES ABSOLUTELY NONE FOR HIS OWN BELIEFS. SOMEONE WHO BELIEVES THAT AN INVISIBLE MAN STOPPED THE SUN IN THE SKY FOR 24 HOURS. YOU DON'T NEED DATA, EVIDENCE, METHODOLOGY, OR ANY OF THE THINGS YOU ASKED FOR ... AND YOUR CHRISTIAN BELIEFS PROVE IT.

Stickwick

Cinque

And when did science "prove" things to be true?

Yeah, never.

SO STICKWICK, IF SCIENCE HAS NEVER PROVEN ANYTHING TO BE TRUE, WHY ARE YOU SO WILLING TO RISK YOUR LIFE MANY TIMES A DAY, EVERY TIME YOU APPLY THE BRAKES ON YOUR CAR? OH, MY MISTAKE. I FORGOT ABOUT YOUR INVISIBLE GHOST. HE BRACES HIMSELF, PUTS HIS ARMS OUT AND STOPS YOUR CAR AT EVERY RED LIGHT, DOESN'T HE?

He's ignorant and behind the times.

WELL STICKWICK, WE AGREE ON THAT ONE. I AM IGNORANT OF AN AMAZING AMOUNT OF KNOWLEDGE THAT IS STILL WAITING TO BE DISCOVERED, AND TONS OF KNOWLEDGE THAT HAS ALREADY BEEN DISCOVERED THAT I DON'T EVEN KNOW ABOUT.

Waste. of. time.

STICKWICK, I'M SURE YOUR INVISIBLE BUDDY WILL REIMBURSE YOU FOR YOUR TIME AFTER YOU DIE AND FLOAT UP TO FAIRYLAND. BE PATIENT.

HumanR

Wow, this guy wrote a 19 page review of the bible.

THANKS HUMAN, IT WAS NOTHING REALLY.

He claims its the book most likely to convert you to atheism, yet he gives it a grade of "F." Wouldn't that warrant a higher grade for his purposes?

HUMAN, IT DOESN'T SURPRISE ME THAT YOU WOULD QUESTION THE CONCEPT OF OBJECTIVITY SINCE IT IS NO WHERE TO BE FOUND IN CHRISTIANITY. LET ME EXPLAIN IT TO YOU: REGARDLESS OF WHAT PURPOSES MIGHT INFLUENCE THE AWARDING OF A HIGHER GRADE, BEING OBJECTIVE OVERRIDES THAT URGE. HENCE IT GOT THE GRADE IT DESERVED. ACTUALLY, THAT WASN'T REALLY TRUE EITHER, BECAUSE IF ANYTHING, I WAS PROBABLY TOO GENEROUS.

AND HUMAN, "ITS" SHOULD HAVE AN APOSTROPHE.

Spacebunny

"Rationalists only accept as true

that which has been proven to be true

through the scientific method"

lol - first of all, couldn't find any dictionary to agree with that definition.

BUNNY, THAT'S BECAUSE I DIDN'T COPY IT OUT OF ANY DICTIONARY.

But good to know they completely deny all of the historical record among a myriad of other things.

BUNNY, WHERE DID YOU GET THE IDEA THAT WE DENY ALL HISTORICAL RECORDS?

HERE'S SOME ADVICE: IT'S NEVER A GOOD IDEA TO USE "ALL" UNLESS YOU CAN PROVE "ALL." HOWEVER, WE DO REJECT YOUR ANCIENT COMPILATION OF VIOLENT FAIRY TALES BASED ON YOUR INABILITY TO PRODUCE EVEN ONE SHRED OF EVIDENCE AFTER 2,000 YEARS OF DESPERATE ATTEMPTS.

Is it me or are atheists getting dumber?

BUNNY, YOU DON'T REALLY WANT ME TO ANSWER THAT ONE, DO YOU?

BESIDES, SOMEONE WHO TALKS TO INVISIBLE GHOSTS, AND ACTUALLY BELIEVES THEY ARE LISTENING, IS NOT SOMEONE IN A POSITION TO BE CRITICIZING RATIONAL PEOPLE. THE POSITION YOU SHOULD BE IN, IS CURLED UP IN THE FETAL POSITION ... INSIDE A PADDED ROOM.

ScottScheule

As others have noted, the title page displays a philosophy that is blatantly false: "Rationalists only accept as true that which has been proven to be true through the scientific method."

Well, no. Mathematical truths? Metaphysical truths? The scientific method itself? Why would anyone, theist or no, waste their time?

SCOTT, METAPHYSICAL TRUTHS? REALLY? PERHAPS YOU COULD NAME ONE?

REALIZING THAT YOU ACTUALLY BELIEVE THAT THERE ARE PROVABLE METAPHYSICAL TRUTHS, IS THE PROOF, THAT IN YOUR CASE, *THINKING* IS A WASTE OF YOUR TIME. IN YOUR CASE, I WOULD CONTINUE TO READ YOUR BIBLE ... A LOT.

MarkkuKoponen

So, how exactly HAS it been proven to be true by the scientific method, that only that which is proven true by the scientific method is true?

MARKKU, OBVIOUSLY ENGLISH ISN'T YOUR FIRST LANGUAGE, SO I'M GOING TO CUT YOU SOME SLACK HERE. THE STATEMENT DOESN'T SAY THAT ONLY THOSE THINGS THAT HAVE BEEN PROVEN TRUE BY THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD ARE TRUE. THERE ARE COUNTLESS THINGS THAT HAVE NOT YET BEEN DISCOVERED, OR BEEN PROVEN TRUE BY SCIENCE, YET WILL BE PROVEN TRUE IN THE FUTURE.

Jason1975

So if he only accepts that which can be proven by the scientific method?

Does he believe Hannibal crossed the Alps, with elephants no less?

JASON, I ACCEPT THAT HISTORIANS ACCEPT THAT AS FACT. AS THERE IS NOTHING SUPERNATURAL IN THE CLAIM, I HAVE NO REASON TO CHALLENGE IT. THAT DOESN'T PROVE IT REALLY HAPPENED, BUT IT MEANS THAT IT IS LIKELY TRUE THAT IT DID.

I FIND IT MILDLY DISTURBING THAT ELEPHANTS CROSSING ALPS COULD BE IMPOSSIBLE FOR YOU TO ACCEPT, YET YOU ACCEPT, AS HISTORICAL FACT ... THAT A DONKEY ONCE LECTURED A HUMAN.

(Numbers 22:28-31).

Did anything happen prior to the invention of the scientific method approximately 1000 years ago (Islamic world) or 500 years ago (Christian world)?

JASON, THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD WAS NOT AN "INVENTION." IT IS A PROCESS FOR DETERMINING REALITY; WHICH IS WHY YOU PEOPLE AVOID IT LIKE CROOKS AVOID COPS.

THOSE DATES YOU QUOTE ARE JUST BIZARRE, AND REQUIRE NO FURTHER COMMENT. YOU OBVIOUSLY HAVE NO IDEA WHAT YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT.

Stilicho

Spacebunny: "Is it me or are atheists getting dumber?"

That's just natural selection at work...

STILICHO, I THOUGHT YOU GHOST WORSHIPPERS WERE MAD AT DARWIN BECAUSE HE SHOWED THAT YOUR ADAM AND EVE FAIRY TALE WAS JUST ... A FAIRY TALE? I DIDN'T KNOW YOU WERE DOWN WITH EVOLUTION. HEY, AT LEAST THAT'S A START.

MarkkuKoponen

So, how exactly HAS it been proven to be true by the scientific method, that only that which is proven true by the scientific method is true? Or perhaps they should add "except for THIS one dogma, which is religious"

MARKKU, I KNOW YOU'RE NOT A FIRST LANGUAGE ENGLISH-SPEAKER BUT IF YOU'RE GOING TO PLAY, YOU'VE GOT TO PAY. THAT MEANS, START SPENDING SOME QUIET TIME WITH MR. WEBSTER. HE WILL EXPLAIN TO YOU THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SCIENCE AND RELIGION. ALSO, HERE'S A LINK TO THE WORD "DOGMA" WHERE YOU CAN FIND ANTONYMS (THOSE ARE WORDS THAT MEAN THE OPPOSITE MARKKU), AND YOU SHOULD NOTICE THAT THOSE ANTONYMS DESCRIBE RATIONALISM AND ATHEISM.

http://thesaurus.com/browse/dogma

Note: This is a troll. I recall the atheists saying in certain threads that the accusation proves that we actually thing that "religious" is a bad thing, and since those threads are probably quite old, I'm trying to get an atheist to make the claim here.

MARKKU, "THING" SHOULD BE "THINK," AND "RELIGIOUS" SHOULD BE "RELIGION." IF YOU NEED HELP EDITING (LIKE MOST CHRISTIANS DO) ASK FOR IT. YOU HAVE AN ENTIRE FORUM OF PEOPLE THAT WILL HELP YOU WITH YOUR ENGLISH.

AND IF YOU MEANT TO SAY THAT YOU WANT TO GET AN ATHEIST TO MAKE THE CLAIM THAT "RELIGION" IS A BAD THING ... LOOK NO FURTHER.

Cumquat

I doubt this individual is older than 17. Anyone wanna guess his age? That's my guess. No older than 17.

WELL CUMQUAT, AS WE HAVE SEEN, GUESSING IS WHAT YOU GHOST WORSHIPPERS DO BEST. IN FACT, SINCE YOU ARE FORCED TO DENY REALITY TO CLING TO YOUR ANCIENT RELIGIOUS BELIEFS, I THINK IT WOULD BE MORE ACCURATE TO STATE THAT GUESSING IS *ALL* YOU DO.

The Deuce

"Rationalists only accept as true that which has been proven to be true through the scientific method"

Isn't that closer to the definition of empiricist, which is the opposite of a rationalist?

DEUCE, UNDERSTANDING WORDS SOMETIMES REQUIRES THAT YOU COMBINE DEFINITIONS IN ORDER TO UNDERSTAND THEIR MEANING RATHER THAN RELYING ON BRIEF, INCOMPLETE DEFINITIONS.

FROM DICTIONARY.COM, RATIONALIST:

THE PRINCIPLE OR HABIT OF ACCEPTING REASON AS THE SUPREME AUTHORITY IN MATTERS OF OPINION, BELIEF, OR CONDUCT.

AGAIN, FROM DICTIONARY.COM, REASON:

A BASIS OR CAUSE, AS FOR SOME BELIEF, ACTION, FACT, EVENT, ETC.

DEUCE, COMBINE THOSE 2 DEFINITIONS, AND EVEN YOU, SHOULD NOW BE ABLE TO UNDERSTAND WHAT A RATIONALIST IS. OUR BASIS FOR BELIEF IS EVIDENCE ... NOT ASSERTIONS.

Has he proven that statement through the scientific method, and if so, can we see the data and analysis that were used to prove it?

DEUCE, IT IS SO CUTE WHEN YOU GHOST WORSHIPPERS GET ALL SCIENTIFIC AND LOGICAL. BUT IT'S JUST SAD WATCHING YOU DESPERATELY TRYING TO AVOID REASON AND LOGIC WHEN IT COMES TO YOUR OWN BELIEFS. THERE ARE NO DATA NOR ANALYSIS TO PROVE ANYTHING IN THE BIBLE, AND YET YOU ACCEPT EVERY WORD. LOOK UP THE WORD HYPOCRITE, DEUCE ... YOUR PICTURE SHOULD BE RIGHT NEXT TO IT.

And if not, he presumably doesn't consider himself a rationalist, since he believes a statement that hasn't been proven to be true through the scientific method, right?

SO DEUCE, YOUR CONCLUSION AFTER READING MY STATEMENT CLAIMING TO BE A RATIONALIST IS THAT ... I DON'T CONSIDER MYSELF TO BE A RATIONALIST? THAT'S WHAT RELIGION DOES TO YOUR MIND, DEUCE: IT REDUCES IT TO MUSH.

whoschad

The Deuce, "Isn't that closer to the definition of empiricist, which is the opposite of a rationalist?"

This is, of course, true.

CHAD, FOLLOW MY ADVICE TO DEUCE AND GET YOURSELF OVER TO A DICTIONARY RATHER THAN JUST PARROTING HIS IGNORANCE.

BUT THERE'S A VERY GOOD REASON WHY YOU GHOST WORSHIPPERS WON'T GO NEAR DICTIONARIES ISN'T THERE CHAD? WHEN YOU OPEN ONE TO THE WORD GOOD, IT SEEMS TO DESCRIBE MANY THINGS ... EXCEPT YOUR GOD. AND WHEN YOU OPEN IT TO THE WORD EVIL, IT DESCRIBES YOUR GOD PERFECTLY. NO WONDER CHRISTIANS ALL OVER THE INTERNET SEEM SO ILLITERATE - IT'S DICTIONARY PHOBIA.

AND CHAD, IF YOU DON'T CONSIDER TORTURING BILLIONS OF PEOPLE "EVIL," THEN THAT WORD PROBABLY DESCRIBES YOU AS WELL.

He's describing 'empiricism' and calling it 'rationalism'.

CHAD, YOU ARE ONLY LOOKING AT THE DEFINITION FOR PHILOSOPHY. OPEN YOUR HORIZONS, CHAD ... AND FEEL THE FORCE.

We Christian rationalists

CHAD, CHRISTIAN WHAT? ARE YOU KIDDING? YOU SERIOUSLY NEED TO SPEND ABOUT 5 HOURS WRITING THE FOLLOWING DEFINITION ON A CHALKBOARD:

FROM DICTIONARY.COM, OXYMORON:

A FIGURE OF SPEECH BY WHICH A LOCUTION PRODUCES AN INCONGRUOUS, SEEMINGLY SELF-CONTRADICTORY EFFECT, AS IN “CRUEL KINDNESS.”

CHAD, OR AS IN "CHRISTIAN RATIONALISTS." JUST TYPING THOSE TWO WORDS IN THE SAME SENTENCE MADE MY FINGERS CRAMP.

are probably better left out of his arena for fear we might seriously injure someone.

CHAD, SERIOUSLY INJURING SOMEONE HAS NEVER BEEN A PROBLEM FOR RELIGIOUS PEOPLE BEFORE, SO I DON'T SEE WHY IT WOULD BOTHER YOU NOW.

In the mean time, we can have a little chuckle about his 'scientifically provable' factual error right on the home page without even having to go into the ineptness of his empiricist and scientistic philosophy (if he is even aware what a philosophy is). As quickly as possible, the hierarchy of truth runs something like this:

NOW CHAD WILL BESTOW UPON ALL THOSE OF US LESS GIFTED, THE HIERARCHY OF TRUTH.

Reality (Truth)

Things Known

Things Known Certainly

Things Proven

Things Scientifically Proven

HEY CHAD, THAT'S NOT BAD. GOD ISN'T ANYWHERE TO BE FOUND IN TOP 4. MAYBE WERE NOT SO FAR APART AFTER ALL.

If truth is relegated only to the subset of 'Things Scientifically Proven' you're missing out on a great deal of reality.

CHAD, THAT'S RICH COMING FROM A GUY WHO BELIEVES IN UNICORNS.

(BIBLE VERSES ... AVAILABLE UPON DEMAND).

TransplantedTexan

Adam: "I don't really get what his request was for since there doesn't seem to be anywhere on his page for debate or an exchange of ideas."

I was thinking the same. It's a giant link site. I can't even see any original content, much less a place for any input from readers.

TEXAN, THIS IS NOT A MEGA SITE. IT ONLY HAS ABOUT 5 PAGES. YET YOU DIDN'T EVEN BOTHER TO RESEARCH A SMALL SITE BEFORE BLASTING YOUR IGNORANCE OVER THE WEB. HAD YOU BOTHERED TO GO TO THE ARCHIVES PAGE, YOU WOULD HAVE ENCOUNTERED ALMOST 4 YEARS WORTH OF ORIGINAL CONTENT. HAVE YOU EVER HEARD THE EXPRESSION ABOUT NOT BEING ABLE TO FIND YOUR WAY OUT OF A ROOM WITH 3 WALLS MISSING? I DIDN'T THINK SO.

Noah B.

Josh: "There should be a prize for the first member of the ilk who has someone on that site threaten to not sleep with them."

Would it have to be someone from the opposite sex?

NOAH, YOU CHRISTIANS ARE SO PREDICTABLE. IN FACT, I'M SURPRISED IT TOOK THIS LONG BEFORE ONE OF YOU HATE-FILLED BIGOTS MADE A SLANDER AGAINST GAY PEOPLE.

BUT WHAT I FIND MOST AMUSING, IS HOW ALMOST EVERY TIME I TURN ON THE NEWS, ANOTHER "STRAIGHT" CONSERVATIVE CHRISTIAN, OR FOX NEWS JUNKIE, OR CATHOLIC PRIEST, OR FAR RIGHT POLITICIAN, IS CAUGHT ON VACATION WITH HIS CABANA BOY.

NOAH, YOU WOULD HAVE BEEN BETTER OFF HEEDING THE ADVICE OF SPACEBUNNY WHO EARLIER TRIED TO WARN YOU PEOPLE ABOUT NOT BEING HATERS. BUT AS YOU JUST PROVED, SHE'S PREACHING TO THE WRONG CROWD.

Orion

MarkkuKoponen:

"So, how exactly HAS it been proven to be true by the scientific method, that only that which is proven true by the scientific method is true?"

I have no scientific proof that Finland exists. Therefore I refuse to recognize your question.

ORION, YOU HAVE NO SCIENTIFIC PROOF THAT JESUS EVER EXISTED, SO WHY DON'T YOU REFUSE TO RECOGNIZE HIS EXISTENCE?

COME ON ORION, YOU'RE MAKING THIS WAY TOO EASY.

Taylor

tfl32:

"I nominate Taylor to have a chat with this guy"

That's where you are mistaken, sir. I wouldn't comment on that blithering idiot's blog with a 10-foot pole. To increase the ignominious retard's site meter by one would be against my principles. Rabid atheists' blogs should remain as obscure as they are ridiculous. And I have no intention of indulging his obvious need for attention, although I'm sure he is indeed in need of fresh meat - such an obviously delusional twat has probably never had any at all...Now, if this bigmouth should someday come trolling in my neck of the blogosphere, I will be happy to respond in kind.

NO TAYLOR, DON'T WORRY ABOUT ME VISITING YOU. ANYONE WHO TALKS AS TOUGH AND MEAN AS YOU, IS WAY OUT OF MY WEIGHT CLASS. IN FACT, WHEN I GOT TO THE WORD "TWAT," I IMMEDIATELY SUFFERED AN EMBARRASSING ACCIDENT IN MY PRIVATE AREA.

jeofurry

I didn't have time to ponder all of the idiocy because I couldn't wipe the tears out of my eyes from laughing at his listing of the butterfly collector's site as a "critical thinking website."

JEOFURRY, TIME FOR A REALITY CHECK. YOU BELIEVE IN INVISIBLE, MAGIC GHOSTS. YOU TALK TO THEM, AND YOU BELIEVE THAT THEY LISTEN, AND TALK BACK TO YOU. YOU BELIEVE THAT AFTER YOU DIE, YOU ARE GOING TO LIVE FOREVER WITH ALL YOUR INVISIBLE FRIENDS: ANGELS, GODS, AND CHRISTIANS.

JEOFURRY, YOU WOULDN'T KNOW A CRITICAL THINKING WEB SITE IF IT KICKED YOU SQUARE IN THE GROIN.

OH, AND BY THE WAY, WEB SITE IS 2 WORDS. I SHOULD BE CHARGING YOU PEOPLE FOR EDITING SERVICES.

I did manage to notice that he lists atheism as a religion further down though.

NO JEOFURRY, NOT *AS* A RELIGION - IT IS LISTED *IN* THE RELIGION SECTION. DAMN YOU PEOPLE ARE DENSE.

Taylor

Am I to understand that our intrepid atheist challenger, that menacing hulk of rationality and reason, has a blog with no commenting functionality - at all? Perhaps he expects we will tinkle on ourselves at the mere sight of his awesome atheist internet presence.

TAYLOR, I CAN SEE WHY THEY OFFERED YOU AS THEIR CHAMPION; YOU'RE KIND OF LIKE THE BIGGEST CHIHUAHUA IN THE PACK. THING IS TAYLOR, WHEN YOU HANG OUT WITH CHIHUAHUAS ALL THE TIME, YOU GET A FALSE SENSE OF YOUR OWN SIZE AND IMPORTANCE. AND FROM WHAT I'VE SEEN OF YOUR WRITING, YOU COULDN'T EVEN HOLD YOUR OWN IN A DEBATE WITH CHARLIE SHEEN.

MinnesotaSmith: "The origin of Islam dates to rather more recent than 1000 A.D,"

YES SPORTS FANS, THAT'S THE CHRISTIAN MIND IN ACTION, BURNING DOWN THE FREEWAY OF LIFE ... WITH THE PARKING BRAKE ON.

NOW ANOTHER COMMENTER "NORTHERN OBSERVER" COMES TO HIS AID:

Northern Observer

huh. Did you mean something else maybe?

NOW, MINNESOTA, REALIZING HOW BADLY HE HAS JUST HUMILIATED HIMSELF, DECIDES HE HAD BETTER RESPOND. DOES HE REPLY BY TRUTHFULLY ADMITTING HIS MISTAKE? WELL, HE STARTS TO; THEN ... WELL, HERE'S HIS REPLY:

Yes, I did. I seriously goofed on that post.

First, I misread the OP.

Then, I typed in something other than what I intended to type.

Not my day.

The apparent lesson for me to draw is to refrain from posting when I'm tired.

MINNESOTA, SO YOU INTENDED TO TYPE SOMETHING, BUT SOME MYSTERIOUS FORCE MADE YOU TYPE IN SOMETHING ELSE? WAS IT YOUR INVISIBLE BUDDY? WAS IT ... SATAN?

AND JUST IN CASE NO ONE BUYS INTO THAT ONE, YOU THROW IN AN EXTRA EXCUSE ABOUT BEING TIRED. SO WHEN YOU'RE FRESH, THEN YOU KNOW WHEN ISLAM BEGAN, BUT WHEN YOU'RE TIRED, THE DATE MOVES UP A FEW CENTURIES?

MINNESOTA, THE APPARENT LESSON YOU NEED TO DRAW IS NOT TO MAKE LAME EXCUSES AND MAKE YOURSELF LOOK EVEN MORE PATHETIC. YOU SHOULD HAVE ENDED YOUR REPLY AFTER THE FIRST LINE WHERE YOU SAID, "Yes, I did. I seriously goofed on that post."

MikeMaier

I am pretty sure I'm missing a really, really bad joke here.

Someone explain it to my dumbarse, using really small words?

MIKE, THAT'S THE FIRST SIGN OF HONESTY I'VE SEEN YET. BUT FROM WHAT I'VE READ HERE SO FAR, I DON'T EVEN THINK SMALL WORDS ARE GOING TO HELP.

MikeMaier quotes Idle Spectator:

"Haha you FOOLS. No one expects the Secular Inquisition!"

Au contraire, I FULLY expect it before too long.

Satan running this world and all.

MIKE, SO YOUR LITTLE INVISIBLE FRIEND, THE ONE WITH THE HORNS AND PITCHFORK, IS RUNNING THE WORLD? ISN'T THAT SPECIAL? ADULTS WITH THE MINDS OF LITTLE CHILDREN. WHEN YOU SAY STUFF LIKE THAT YOU MAKE ME FEEL LIKE I'M BEATING UP ON A RETARD.

Rirus Hale

AS a result of reading the The Skeptic Arena I have lost my faith in God. The searing reason and superior intellect on display have overcome any resistance to the atheist Behemoth that is The Skeptics Arena.

Long live Neo!

MR. HALE I SALUTE YOU. NOT FOR YOUR OFFBEAT HUMOR BUT FOR THE FACT THAT YOU GOT THROUGH THAT PARAGRAPH WITH ONLY 3 GRAMMATICAL ERRORS WHICH IS QUITE STUNNING FOR A CHRISTIAN.

("AS, Behemoth, Skeptics").

STG58

What are you supposed to do on the website? It just looks like statements in large fonts. Is there anywhere to comment on his statements?

STG, WHAT DID YOU HAVE IN MIND - LEAVING BIBLE VERSES? FROM WHAT I'VE SEEN IN THESE COMMENTS, IT'S LESS ANNOYING TO GET A PRESENT FROM MY NEIGHBOR'S DOG THAN ANY CRAP YOU PEOPLE WOULD LEAVE ON MY SITE.

jmarinara

I literally lost count of the fallacies on that website.

J, I'M NOT DOUBTING YOUR ABILITY TO COUNT, BUT I HAVEN'T SEEN ANY EVIDENCE THAT EVEN ONE OF YOU COULD RECOGNIZE A FALLACY IF YOU DID SEE ONE. BUT SEEING THINGS THAT DON'T EXIST IS PRETTY MUCH WHAT YOU PEOPLE ARE ALL ABOUT, ISN'T IT?

AND J, PLEASE, YOU GUYS ARE KILLING ME. WEB SITE IS TWO WORDS. SOME ADVICE J - FIND A DICTIONARY. IT WASN'T WRITTEN BY SATAN. TRUST ME ON THIS ONE. GOD WON'T PUNISH YOU IF YOU OPEN ONE ONCE IN AWHILE.

FrankNorman

Sad thing is, that is what those rabid atheist types seriously believe. That everyone else is out to get them.

WELL FRANK, 2,000 YEARS OF BLOODY, VIOLENT CHRISTIAN HISTORY IS A PRETTY GOOD REASON TO THINK THAT. THERE'S AN OLD SAYING FRANK, "JUST BECAUSE YOU'RE PARANOID, THAT DOESN'T MEAN THEY'RE *NOT* OUT TO GET YOU."

NOW HERE IS PROBABLY THE BEST EMAIL OF THE WHOLE LOT. EARLIER A GUY NAMED TOBY, HAD ASKED IF MR. HALE WAS SERIOUS WHEN HALE SAID MY SITE CONVERTED HIM TO ATHEISM? WELL, CHECK OUT THIS EXCHANGE OF NEURAL ACTIVITY:

TobyTemple:

"is this serious?"

Rirus Hale

Sorry. Left off the sarcasm tag on original comment.

YES LISTENERS, SOME OF THESE PEOPLE ARE FLOATING SO FAR OFF IN THE SPIRIT WORLD THAT THEY NEED TAGS TO TELL THEM WHEN SOMEONE IS BEING SARCASTIC. I DID NOT MAKE THAT UP. THERE IS NOTHING MY SITE CAN DO FOR SOMEONE LIKE THIS. I THINK TOBY SHOULD STAY RIGHT WHERE HE'S AT. VOX DAY'S SITE IS PERFECT FOR HIM. IT WILL KEEP HIM HAPPY ... UNTIL HE DIES.

Vidad

Spacebunny: "Show of hands - how many of you will be participating in the live broadcast this Sunday?"

I would, but my rigid and irrational religiosity compel me to set aside one day a week for my imaginary God.

QUESTION VIDAD: WHEN YOU SET ASIDE THAT DAY FOR YOUR INVISIBLE GHOST, HOW DO YOU EXPLAIN TO HIM WHY YOU DON'T KILL THOSE WHO DON'T?

I THOUGHT GOD MADE HIMSELF VERY CLEAR IN NUMBERS 15:32-36. WELL, APPARENTLY NOT.

FCie

Very impressive site. Thanks for the link. I was immediately drawn in by his grasp of rational thought and scientific inquiry, and will very likely spend the weekend listening to his various podcasts and chuckling at the cartoons. I am worried about the challenges to my faith because I haven't heard many of the arguments he makes before, yet despite my psychological blocks from rational inquiry I am inexplicably drawn to read further and thus question my deepest-held beliefs.

FC, THERE IS NO POWER ON EARTH THAT CAN HELP YOU QUESTION YOUR DEEPEST BELIEFS, WHEN THE PENALTY FOR DOING SO IS ETERNAL TORTURE. THERE IS NO EXISTENCE ON EARTH, ANIMAL OR HUMAN, THAT COMPARES TO THE HORROR OF LIVING UNDER THE THREAT THAT CONTROLS YOUR LIVES. THAT'S RIGHT FC, EVEN A WORM IS BETTER OFF.

IN CONCLUSION I NEED TO SAY A FEW THINGS

FIRST, I OWE THE "ILK" AN APOLOGY FOR THE INITIAL EMAIL I SENT, WHERE I ASKED VOX DAY TO ADD ME TO HIS LIST OF TARGET-RICH ENVIRONMENTS. IN IT I REFERRED TO THE "ILK" AS A PACK OF MORONS. THAT WAS WRONG AND I APOLOGIZE. THAT APOLOGY DOES NOT EXTEND TO ANYTHING I SAID AFTERWARDS HOWEVER.

I DON'T CONSIDER THE "ILK" A PACK OF MORONS. I CONSIDER THEM TO BE VICTIMS OF A HORRIBLE RELIGION WHICH TERRORIZES PEOPLE BY THREATENING THEM WITH UNIMAGINABLE HORROR IF THEY DARE TO DISBELIEVE. EVEN THE BRIGHTEST AMONG US ARE NOT IMMUNE FROM THESE TERRIBLE THREATS FROM THE SPIRIT WORLD.

ATHEISTS ARE WORKING TO FREE HUMANS FROM THIS SELF-IMPOSED PRISON OF FEAR. THE ONES WE TRY TO HELP, HATE US FOR IT. BUT LIKE VICTIMS OF STOCKHOLM SYNDROME, BELIEVERS BOND WITH THEIR CAPTORS. BELIEVERS CANNOT TELL THE GOOD FROM THE BAD. BUT IT'S NOT ALL THEIR FAULT. AS AN EX-CHRISTIAN, I KNOW HOW DIFFICULT IT IS TO CHALLENGE AN INVISIBLE MONSTER WHO PROMISES ETERNAL FIRE FOR DISBELIEF.

TO THE ILK: AS MUCH AS WE MAY WANT TO HELP YOU, THERE IS ONLY SO MUCH THAT WE CAN DO. ONLY YOU CAN FIND THE COURAGE TO FREE YOURSELVES FROM THE THREATS OF INVISIBLE MONSTERS. FOR THE ONE BILLION OF US ON EARTH WHO HAVE, YOU COULDN'T EVEN BEGIN TO IMAGINE WHAT THAT FREEDOM IS LIKE.

YOU SAY WE BELIEVE IN NOTHING. BUT ONCE YOU FREE YOURSELF FROM BEING ENSLAVED BY MURDEROUS GHOSTS, YOU'LL FIND THAT YOU BELIEVE IN EVERYTHING ... THAT IS REAL.

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

THE SCIENCE SEGMENT

NEW METHOD DETECTS EMERGING SUNSPOTS DEEP INSIDE THE SUN, PROVIDES WARNING OF DANGEROUS SOLAR FLARES

VIEWED FROM THE TECHNOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE OF MODERN HUMANS, THE SUN IS A SEETHING CAULDRON OF DISRUPTIVE INFLUENCES THAT CAN WREAK HAVOC ON COMMUNICATION SYSTEMS, AIR TRAVEL, POWER GRIDS AND SATELLITES -- NOT TO MENTION ASTRONAUTS IN SPACE.

IF DISRUPTIONS SUCH AS SOLAR FLARES AND MASS ERUPTIONS COULD BE PREDICTED, PROTECTIVE MEASURES COULD BE TAKEN TO SHIELD VULNERABLE ELECTRONICS BEFORE SOLAR STORMS STRIKE.

NOW STANFORD RESEARCHERS HAVE DEVELOPED A METHOD THAT ALLOWS THEM TO PEER DEEP INTO THE SUN'S INTERIOR, USING ACOUSTIC WAVES TO CATCH SUNSPOTS IN THE EARLY STAGE OF DEVELOPMENT AND GIVING AS MUCH AS TWO DAYS' WARNING.

SUNSPOTS DEVELOP IN ACTIVE SOLAR REGIONS OF STRONG, CONCENTRATED MAGNETIC FIELDS AND APPEAR DARK WHEN THEY REACH THE SURFACE OF THE SUN. ERUPTIONS OF THE INTENSE MAGNETIC FLUX GIVE RISE TO SOLAR STORMS, BUT UNTIL NOW, NO ONE HAS HAD LUCK IN PREDICTING THEM.

MANY SOLAR PHYSICISTS TRIED DIFFERENT WAYS TO PREDICT WHEN SUNSPOTS WOULD APPEAR, BUT WITH NO SUCCESS. THE KEY TO THE NEW METHOD IS USING ACOUSTIC WAVES GENERATED INSIDE THE SUN BY THE TURBULENT MOTION OF PLASMA AND GASES IN CONSTANT MOTION. IN THE NEAR-SURFACE REGION, SMALL-SCALE CONVECTION CELLS -- ABOUT THE SIZE OF CALIFORNIA -- GENERATE SOUND WAVES THAT TRAVEL TO THE INTERIOR OF THE SUN AND ARE REFRACTED BACK TO THE SURFACE.

THE RESEARCHERS GOT HELP FROM THE MICHELSON DOPPLER IMAGER ABOARD NASA'S SOLAR AND HELIOSPHERIC OBSERVATORY SATELLITE, KNOWN AS SOHO. THE CRAFT SPENT 15 YEARS MAKING DETAILED OBSERVATIONS OF THE SOUND WAVES WITHIN THE SUN. IT WAS SUPERSEDED IN 2010 WITH THE LAUNCH OF NASA'S SOLAR DYNAMICS OBSERVATORY SATELLITE, WHICH CARRIES THE HELIOSEISMIC AND MAGNETIC IMAGER.

USING THE MASSES OF DATA GENERATED BY THE TWO IMAGERS RESEARCHERS WERE ABLE TO DEVELOP A WAY TO REDUCE THE ELECTRONIC CLUTTER IN THE DATA SO THEY COULD ACCURATELY MEASURE THE SOLAR SOUNDS.

THE NEW METHOD ENABLED THEM TO DETECT SUNSPOTS IN THE EARLY STAGES OF FORMATION AS DEEP AS 65,000 KILOMETERS INSIDE THE SUN. BETWEEN ONE AND TWO DAYS LATER, THE SUNSPOTS WOULD APPEAR ON THE SURFACE.

THE PRINCIPLES USED TO TRACK AND MEASURE THE ACOUSTIC WAVES TRAVELING THROUGH THE SUN ARE COMPARABLE TO MEASURING SEISMIC WAVES ON EARTH. THE RESEARCHERS MEASURE THE TRAVEL TIME OF ACOUSTIC WAVES BETWEEN WIDELY SEPARATED POINTS ON THE SOLAR SURFACE.

SCIENTISTS KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT THE STRUCTURE OF THE SUN THAT THEY CAN PREDICT THE TRAVEL PATH AND TRAVEL TIME OF AN ACOUSTIC WAVE AS IT PROPAGATES THROUGH THE INTERIOR OF THE SUN. TRAVEL TIMES GET PERTURBED IF THERE ARE MAGNETIC FIELDS LOCATED ALONG THE WAVE'S TRAVEL PATH. THOSE PERTURBATIONS ARE WHAT TIP THE RESEARCHERS THAT A SUNSPOT IS FORMING.

BY MEASURING AND COMPARING MILLIONS OF PAIRS OF POINTS AND THE TRAVEL TIMES BETWEEN THEM, THE RESEARCHERS ARE ABLE TO HOME IN ON THE ANOMALIES THAT REVEAL THE GROWING PRESENCE OF MAGNETIC FLUX ASSOCIATED WITH AN INCIPIENT SUNSPOT.

THEY FOUND THAT SUNSPOTS THAT ULTIMATELY BECOME LARGE RISE UP TO THE SURFACE MORE QUICKLY THAN ONES THAT STAY SMALL. THE LARGER SUNSPOTS ARE THE ONES THAT SPAWN THE BIGGEST DISRUPTIONS, AND FOR THOSE THE WARNING TIME IS ROUGHLY A DAY. THE SMALLER ONES CAN BE FOUND UP TO TWO DAYS BEFORE THEY REACH THE SURFACE.

RESEARCHERS HAVE SUSPECTED FOR A LONG TIME THAT SUNSPOT REGIONS ARE GENERATED IN THE DEEP SOLAR INTERIOR, BUT UNTIL NOW THE EMERGENCE OF THESE REGIONS THROUGH THE CONVECTION ZONE TO THE SURFACE HAD GONE UNDETECTED. THEY HAVE NOW SUCCESSFULLY DETECTED THEM FOUR TIMES AND TRACKED THEM MOVING UPWARD AT SPEEDS BETWEEN 1,000 AND 2,000 KILOMETERS PER HOUR.

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

FAMOUS QUOTES

REV. DONALD MORGAN (UNABLE TO LOCATE ANY INFO ON MORGAN. HE MAY BE A CONTRIBUTOR TO "THE SECULAR WEB" BUT I'M NOT SURE).

"THE CERTAINTY WITH WHICH A RELIGIOUS BELIEF IS HELD

IS USUALLY IN DIRECT PROPORTION TO ITS ABSURDITY."