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The following email was sent to me by Richard Deem, the author of the web site "God and Science."

*Neo (or whatever your real name is),*

Deem, it is not necessary for you to pry into my personal life. "neo" is sufficient for purposes of communication.

*God does hate sin, but he doesn’t hate you,*

Deem, we agree on that ... but not for the same reason.

*even though you mock and berate Him.*

Deem, you seem a little confused: how can I mock something that I don't believe exists? That doesn't make any sense.

Let me clear things up for you: I am mocking and berating you.

*God loves all people (including the racists, slave-owners, drug dealers, murderers, rapists, and prideful).*

Deem, so when God tortures them in hell, hour-after-hour, day-after-day, for all of eternity ... that's "love?"

I would sure like to take a look at the dictionary you're using. You just gave a perfect example of what religion does to the brain.

*His desire is that all repent of their evil and turn to him (2 Peter 3:9).*

Deem, I think your God was being more honest in 2 Thessalonians 2:11-12 when He said, "And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: That they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness."

Deem, not only did your God *not* desire that all repent, as you just claimed, He admitted to being the one who caused them to not repent. In court, that's referred to as ... a confession.

*Neo, your understanding of science is lacking.*

Deem, that is especially funny coming from someone who believes that an invisible man stopped the sun in the sky for a whole day. But please continue your lecture on science.

*I glanced through your site, and you seem to have missed some important research that basically refutes all you hold dear.*

Deem, how did I know you were going to resort to "projection."

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Psychological\_projection

Actually, science has refuted all that *you* hold dear. For example: the first law of thermodynamics refutes God's creation of the universe out of nothing; and the second law of thermodynamics refutes your belief in eternal life; and we haven't even gotten to biology yet, which has proven that humans didn't appear fully-formed from magic mud.

*For example, you have a link to the Miller-Urey experiment. However, science says that the earth’s early atmosphere was not reducing.*

Wrong Deem, no one knows what the Earth's early atmosphere was like. There are many theories ... but no one theory which has been proven to be true. So you substituted what you wanted to be true, "science says" for what is actually true, "one theory claims."

*In fact, it was oxidizing as early as 4.3 billion years ago – before the late heavy bombardment and the appearance of life.*

Deem, it's *your* understanding of science that is sorely lacking ... and you just proved it:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Great\_Oxygenation\_Event

I know Deem, facts are like kryptonite aren't they? Now you have to scramble all over the internet, hunting down apologetic web sites that have come up with specious denials that you can use to argue against the scientific evidence. You know Deem ... sites like yours.

*So, now there is no naturalistic mechanisms by which life could have been created.*

Deem, the fact that the overwhelming majority of scientists disagree with you should've been a big hint ... but you missed it.

What would be really funny, if it weren't so tragically sad, is that you pretend to be so scientific, until someone asks you how *you* believe it happened:

"Oh, an invisible man ordered everything to appear by magic ... and it did!"

Your beliefs expose your scientific "knowledge" for what it is ... garbage.

*Read this page for the details:*

*Origin of Life: Earth's Early Atmosphere Wasn't Reducing*

Sorry Deem, creationist propaganda was mildly interesting when I was a child; but when I became an adult, I put away childish things. Obviously, you haven't.

*You also link to a video that reports the universe can arise from nothing.*

Once again Deem, you make it clear which of us is severely lacking in scientific understanding. The video featuring physicist Lawrence Krauss explains that "nothing" does not have the same meaning in quantum physics that it has in Sunday School.

But check out the hypocrisy again: you argue that the universe cannot arise from "nothing" and yet you believe exactly that:

Hebrews 11:3: "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear."

Deem, you believe that an invisible ghost created the universe out of nothing. You are criticizing an idea that you yourself hold.

I will give you credit for one thing though: it's quite a feat to be able to function in society with that level of cognitive dissonance.

*However, what Krauss won’t tell you is that his “nothing” actually consists of the space-time foam,*

Deem, like all ghost worshippers, you have accepted as fact, an unproven theory. Here, check this out:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Space-time\_foam

Deem, read the first sentence carefully and you might notice the word "concept." Read the second sentence carefully and you might notice the word "supposed." Then again, *you* might not.

Maybe that's why Krauss won't tell you about the foam. Unlike the religious, scientists tell you what they know, not what they wish were true. I can see how that would be a foreign concept to you.

So rereading your assertion "actually consists" proves that you have accepted as fact, something that even science has not yet accepted. Maybe you should inform them that the foam theory is true (because you say so), and who knows, out of gratitude they might even nominate you for a Nobel prize.

*along with its laws of physics, which were designed to support life.*

Deem, if the laws of physics in our universe were designed to support life, why can't we find it? If Earth were designed for life, why have 99.9% of all species gone extinct? Reality proves that if anything, our universe is designed for death.

Hey Deem, you might be able to use that: that was the best evidence yet for the existence of the god described in your bible.

*The truth is that real nothing cannot produce anything.*

Gee Deem, thanks for enlightening us with the truth. Now we can all just go home and pray.

*In addition, Krauss’s assumption that space-time has always existed is falsified by the Borde-Guth-Vilenkin Theorem, which demonstrates that all universes in which cosmic expansion occurs have a beginning–no exceptions.*

Deem, *your* claim has been falsified by none other than ... Vilenkin himself:

"If someone asks me whether or not the theorem I proved with Borde and Guth implies that the universe had a beginning, I would say that the short answer is 'yes.' If you are willing to get into subtleties, then the answer is 'No, but .…' So, there are ways to get around having a beginning, but then you are forced to have something nearly as special as a beginning."

Deem, Vilenkin's own words prove that his theory does allow for exceptions - which contradicts your claim of "no exceptions."

Deem, here is another quote from Vilenkin that you would never put on your web site: when asked if his theorem proved that the universe must have had a beginning, he answered:

"No. But it proves that the expansion of the universe must have had a beginning. You can evade the theorem by postulating that the universe was contracting prior to some time."

Deem, take special note of the word "No." That is the kind of embarrassment you should expect when you get your science information from a quack like William Lane Craig instead of real scientists like Lawrence Krauss and Alexander Vilenkin.

Trust me Deem, Vilenkin is not your friend. My guess is, if Vilenkin ever found himself in the same room with you and Craig, he would go WWE on both of you dishonest little twits.

How dishonest do you have to be, to devote your time to hunting through the scientific literature looking for opportunities to misquote and misrepresent scientists? Well Deem, to answer that question just ask Craig. That is apparently how he has decided to spend his life.

*So, Krauss, Hawking, Stenger, etc. are just plain wrong in their claim that universes can appear from nothing.*

Well then Deem, I guess that settles it. The most famous and brilliant physicists in the world are certainly no match for a creationist like you who has his own keyboard, a web site, and a degree from his local bible study.

*Read the article: Why is There Something Instead of Nothing?*

Deem, if there were nothing instead of something, we wouldn't be able to ask the question, would we? Since we can ask the question, we know that there is something rather than nothing. To ask "Why?" assumes there must be a reason for the existence of the universe. There may not be a reason for our existence - it may just be a simple fact: we exist.

Unfortunately for you, there is no evidence to support that our existence is dependent on the answer to your question.

*I am not sure how I got involved in your discussion on hate with Ken Silva,*

Well Deem, I'm certainly glad that you did because your involvement has provided more entertainment than a Jim Carrey comedy. Dishonest apologists (was that redundant?) like you are a neverending source of amusement for the rational people. It's a lot like going to the zoo.

*but you have much bigger problems than to argue semantics with Ken.*

Deem, and what problems would those be?

*Your arena is crumbling and you don’t even know it.*

Deem, have you ever bothered to look at anything on the internet outside of Christian propaganda sites and Fox News?

Apparently not.

(yes, I know that was another redundancy).

Christianity is the one that is crumbling worldwide. Centuries ago, almost everyone in the Western Nations and in Russia were Christian including nearly all of the scientists. Now, Science is kicking your God's ass, which is why most scientists no longer believe in God; and Allah (leader of the world's fastest-growing religion) is kicking your God's ass. At this rate, your God won't even be able to sit down on a soft cloud without shooting pain.

Even Newt Gingrich, that paragon of Christian virtue, admitted that America might become an atheist and Muslim nation.

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ybn7qYeAQj8

Even *he* thinks that it is *your* arena that is crumbling, and as I just pointed out, the facts are on his side. The way things are going, by the end of the century Christianity will be battling it out with Scientology for last place among all the cults; and Deem ... they have Tom Cruise.

*So, read those articles and get back to me.*

Deem, how about if I meet you halfway and just get back to you?

*May God bless and lead you.*

Yours in Christ, Richard

*Rich Deem*

neo

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

*Neo,*

Hi Deem, nice to hear from you again. I feel like there is definitely a bond forming here.

*You obviously didn’t read anything I sent you, which is quite common among today’s skeptics.*

Deem, you are correct - I did not. I also explained to you *why* I did not. It was for the same reason that you find quite common among today's skeptics - we've already heard it.

*The Wikipedia article on the great oxygenation event has nothing to do with the first advent of oxygen on the earth.*

Deem, that is correct. The great oxygenation event occurred billions of years after the Earth formed. See Deem, we are bonding - we agree on that one.

*That you couldn’t figure that out tells everybody that you don’t really know your science.*

Deem, aren't you the guy who believes that talking snakes (Genesis 3:1) and argumentative donkeys (Numbers 22:28) are real science?

I guess you're right Deem, I really don't know my science. That's why I'm glad we have people like you to teach everyone *real* science. So explain to me again, the science behind the sun stopping in the sky for a whole day.

*Since you didn’t read the article, I will hand feed it to you:*

Thanks Deem, that's very considerate of you after all the mean things I've said to you. Now I'm starting to feel a little guilty (and I'm not even Jewish).

*Scientists measure the oxidation state of zircons, which are the oldest minerals on earth (up to 4.3 billion years old). The rare earth metal cerium can exist in two oxidation forms. By measuring the prevalence of the two forms (the Ce4+/Ce3+ ratio) in zircons, scientists can determine the relative oxidation conditions under which the crystals formed. However, in order to calibrate the system, scientists had to produce zircons artificially under differing oxidative conditions to measure the Ce4+/Ce3+ ratio. The scientists then compared these values to those found in ancient zircons formed in the earth's mantle and those recovered from the moon. As expected, the lunar samples expressed a low cerium ratio, since they would have formed in the absence of oxidative conditions. However, the cerium ratios of earth's ancient zircons were ten-fold higher. By dating their sampling of zircons and comparing the cerium ratios, the scientists determined that the earth's mantle had reached its current oxidation state 4.3 billion years ago—a full 500 million years before the evidence for the first appearance of life. So, the result clearly shows that the earth’s atmosphere was not reducing before life appeared on the earth.*

Deem, before you reach orgasm, you might want to reread the story directly from the source:

<http://www.universetoday.com/91464/ancient-zircons-help-reveal-early-earth-atmosphere/>

Do you see any mention of an invisible ghost? Is there any reference to magic? Did anyone who was connected with the research make any statement that indicated doubt regarding a naturalistic explanation for the origin of life?

Deem, the answer to each question is ... no. Their discovery simply added information to the field of abiogenesis. Science always advances Deem ... religion never does.

That's why many modern humans have become rational while you remain frozen in a "dark ages" mentality, unable or unwilling to accept that your ancient fairy tales are just ... ancient fairy tales.

*This means that the Miller Urey experiment used the wrong atmosphere and is irrelevant to the appearance of life on earth.*

Deem, you misunderstand the meaning of the Miller-Urey results. Their experiment didn't prove that life began using their specific setup. What they did prove was that under certain conditions, life could arise from inorganic elements. Many other researchers have repeated the Miller-Urey experiments using a variety of different atmospheres. These experiments also resulted in the formation of the building blocks of life from inorganic elements. None of those experiments proved that life began like that. What they did prove, was that under many different atmospheric conditions, life can arise from inorganic elements ... without any supernatural assistance.

*Here is the original article (which I am sure you won’t read either):*

*Dustin Trail, D., E. B. Watson and N. D. Tailby. 2011. The oxidation state of Hadean magmas and implications for early Earth’s atmosphere. Nature doi:10.1038/nature10655.*

Deem, I said I wouldn't waste my time reading your creationist propaganda, since I have already spent many years doing so. However, I enjoyed reading their article which is why I linked to a similar one above.

*I love this quote from your comments:*

See Deem, I was right - we are bonding.

*That is the kind of embarrassment you should expect when you get your science information from a quack like William Lane Craig instead of real scientists like Lawrence Krauss and Alexander Vilenkin.*

Deem, I can see why you liked it: it pretty much hits the nail right on the head.

*I found this particularly amusing, since Alexander Vilenkin is one of the ones who proved the universe must have a beginning if is characterized by cosmic expansion (Hav > 0, the Borde-Guth-Vilenkin Theorem).*

Deem, I even gave you the quotes from Vilenkin himself that proved you wrong. Like all ghost worshippers, when confronted with proof that you got caught intentionally misrepresenting the facts, your only recourse is to ignore the embarrassment ... and then to repeat the lie.

Deem, repeating your misrepresentation does not increase its credibility ... it only decreases yours.

*Since our universe is characterized by cosmic expansion, it must have had a beginning.*

Deem, that's not what Vilenkin said, it's what you desperately *wish* he had said. So just like everything else in your belief system, reality is whatever you wish it to be.

Unfortunately for you, reality doesn't care what machinations you have to perform in your head to pretend that the world is the way you want it to be.

If you want to test that claim, go up on your roof and see if Jesus will gently lower you to the ground when you jump.

Warning Deem, before the test - get your affairs in order first. Jesus doesn't have a very good track record in this test.

*Another real science article for you to read:*

*Borde, A., A. H. Guth, and A. Vilenkin. 2003. Inflationary spacetimes are not past-complete. Phys. Rev. Lett. 90: 151301.*

Deem, you consider Genesis to be a "real science article." That's why I don't take your suggestions very seriously.

Your selection of articles is only based on one thing: whether or not the information contained in them can be manipulated to support your belief in the supernatural. So you'll have to forgive me for not wanting to waste my time.

But Deem - you are wasting your *whole life* ... on fairy tales.

*Since I have a real name, I have a real job in science research*

Deem, I don't think washing beakers and cleaning mice cages is what most people think of when they picture *science research*.

Also I'm a little puzzled by your attempt at logic: why does having a real name imply that you have a real job?

*and a pile of peer-review publications.*

Deem, that pile is as imaginary as your floating friend. In case you hadn't noticed, there are no creationist beliefs to be found in any scientific journal, except possibly at the back in the *humor* section. How could you not have noticed that none of your beliefs are to be found in science textbooks, legitimate news sources, or science documentaries? Of course you've noticed. When your beliefs are not being completely ignored, they are being ridiculed by the entire worldwide scientific community. You people are a joke, and you are only relevant because you still control the ignorant masses. Modern rational people look at you, the same way you look at the ancient Greeks and Romans.

No, Deem ... that wasn't a compliment.

And Deem, peer-reviewed by other ghost worshippers doesn't carry any weight in the real world; a world which you will likely never understand.

*I couldn’t find any peer-reviewed publications under “Neo.”*

Deem, in your first email you stated that Krauss, Hawking, and Stenger, were "just plain wrong." If you dismiss the world's greatest scientists when they don't go along with your fantasies, who would believe that you would be interested in anything that I may or may not have published?

*However, you should have taken the red pill instead of the blue pill.*

Deem, either pill is preferable to the one you took ... the invisible pill.

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

THE SCIENCE SEGMENT

HOW PROTEIN IN TEARDROPS ANNIHILATES HARMFUL BACTERIA:

NOVEL TECHNOLOGY REVEALS LYSOZYMES HAVE JAWS

A disease-fighting protein in our teardrops has been tethered to a tiny transistor, enabling scientists to discover exactly how it destroys dangerous bacteria. The research could prove critical to long-term work aimed at diagnosing cancers and other illnesses in their very early stages.

Ever since Alexander Fleming found that human tears contain antiseptic proteins called lysozymes about a century ago, scientists have tried to solve the mystery of how they could relentlessly wipe out far larger bacteria. It turns out that lysozymes have jaws that latch on and chomp through rows of cell walls like someone hungrily devouring an ear of corn.

Those jaws chew apart the walls of the bacteria that are trying to get into your eyes and infect them. The researchers decoded the protein's behavior by building one of the world's smallest transistors -- 25 times smaller than similar circuitry in laptop computers or smartphones. Individual lysozymes were glued to the live wire, and their eating activities were monitored.

It took years for the scientists to assemble the transistor and attach single-molecule teardrop proteins. The scientists hope the same novel technology can be used to detect cancerous molecules. It could take a decade to figure out but would be well worth it.

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

FAMOUS QUOTES

FRED BROOKS (BORN 1931) 80 YEARS OLD.

Brooks is a software engineer and computer scientist, best known for managing the development of IBM's system/360 family of computers and the os/360 software support package, then later writing candidly about the process in his seminal book The Mythical Man-Month. Brooks has received many awards, including the National Medal of Technology in 1985 and the Turing award in 1999.

"YOU CAN LEARN MORE FROM FAILURE THAN SUCCESS.

IN FAILURE YOU'RE FORCED TO FIND OUT WHAT PART DID NOT WORK.

BUT IN SUCCESS YOU CAN BELIEVE EVERYTHING YOU DID WAS GREAT,

WHEN IN FACT SOME PARTS MAY NOT HAVE WORKED AT ALL.

FAILURE FORCES YOU TO FACE REALITY."