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I sent an email to Fatfist ridiculing the arguments he used in his debate with Matt Slick. He didn't have the courage to defend his arguments by sending me an email reply, so like any coward, he simply put up a reply in the comment section of his web site, hoping that I wouldn't return and see it. And I wouldn't have, if I had not been checking links to my site, at which time I discovered it. Here's what he wrote, followed by my replies.

*Neo,*

*Thanks for dropping by, I hope you don't mind if I critique just a majorly HUGE showstopper I found while quickly glancing over your webpage.*

Fatfist, why would I mind? So what exactly has your panties all knotted up in a bunch?

Now Fatfist quotes my web page:

“There is no evidence to support the existence of any God. That doesn't mean that they don't exist, it only means that it would be irrational to believe in them until such time as incontrovertible evidence is found.“

*What if I tell you: “There is no evidence to support the existence of any pill that makes you live forever. That doesn't mean that they don't exist, it only means that it would be irrational to believe in them until such time as incontrovertible evidence is found.“*

Well Fatfist, since you only replaced one word while repeating my statement, it's obvious that I would agree with you.

*And this: “There is no evidence to support the existence of any Flying Macaroni & Cheese Monster. That doesn't mean that they don't exist, it only means that it would be irrational to believe in them until such time as incontrovertible evidence is found.“*

Fatfist, my audience is getting bored. What's your point?

*Wouldn’t you say that we both have EQUALLY VALID arguments?*

Fatfist, asked ... and answered.

*Just as you claim it is rational for you to be in the atheist group of people, wouldn’t you say that it is equally rational for people to create new groups which lack belief in Flying Mac & Cheese Monsters and Eternal Life Pills, and groups lacking belief in billions of other claims? Why or why not? What is your critical reasoning to this obvious showstopper?*

Fatfist, the reason it is not necessary to create new groups which lack belief in the things you listed, is because none of *those* things have a long, bloody history of genocide, slavery, discrimination, and religiously-approved murder. None of those things you listed continue, to this day, to ostracize or kill those who will not submit to their beliefs. None of those things threaten to punish people who attempt to exercise their freedom of speech by criticizing those beliefs ... but religion does.

Fatfist, the only thing that "stopped the show" ... was your ignorance.

*I was looking at your video on Slick's TAG refutation. Sorry my friend, but you failed miserably. You did not refute his argument.*

Fatfist, nice assertion.

And believe me Fatfist - we are anything ... but friends.

*“Matt Slick is correct in stating that no atheist has been able to debunk his argument. And I am willing to go the extra mile and state that no atheist will ever be able to debunk Matt Slick’s argument.”*

Fatfist, that is why you cannot admit that Slick's argument was refuted: because to do so would require that you admit that your little prediction was wrong, and that is something that irrational minds are incapable of doing.

*Why will no atheist ever be able to debunk Matt Slick’s argument?*

*Because most atheists are divorced from reality!*

Fatfist, one thing I've noticed over the years while battling Creationists is that when they say something really absurd, they usually end it with an exclamation point, as if that somehow adds credibility. The more absurd the claim - the more exclamation points they use.

Your claim that most Atheists are divorced from reality is so absurd that ending it with an exclamation point was warranted. There is no possible way for you to know what percentage of Atheists are divorced from reality nor to what degree. That is simply another assertion that you apparently want to be true.

However, we can say that Theists are divorced from reality, but only on the subject of religion. In other areas it is entirely possible that they are far more rational than Atheists. For example, A Christian or Muslim may know that Acupuncture, Homeopathy, and other alternative medicine cures are unproven bunk, while an Atheist may swallow them hook, line, and sinker.

Atheism only guarantees rationality in one area ... by definition.

And here's a bonus critical thinking tip Fatfist: your premise "most Atheists are divorced from reality" does not logically lead to your conclusion "therefore Atheists will never debunk Slick's argument."

Think about it. Allow it to slowly dawn on that small area in your brain that you attempt to use for thinking. Debunking his argument requires evidence, like I provided in my video. It has nothing to do with whether or not I am divorced from reality.

*Atheists have FAITH in absolutes,*

Fatfist, you need to spend more time in the dictionary. Atheism has nothing to do with absolutes: Atheism is merely the rejection of religious crap.

*where it is easily shown that absolutes are a clear IMPOSSIBILITY.*

Fatfist, I pointed out in my video that the Logical Absolutes only exist when there is something to which the Law of Identity can be applied to. Therefore, they are not absolute in the sense that you are using them. So you are beating a dead horse.

*You started your argument by faithfully accepting Slick’s claim of Logical Absolutes.*

Fatfist, you tripped before you even got out of the batter's box. My argument didn't start by accepting Slick's claim, but by accepting Aristotle's. Your critiques would be more effective if you spent at least a little time, thinking, before writing down poorly thought-out ideas.

*The laws of logic are pre-defined axioms (rules) which are assumed in order to use the Classical System of Logic. They are not true.*

Fatfist, you are confusing "true" with "absolute certainty."

Many things are true, whereas absolute certainty only exists in the minds of fools and the religiously infected.

*And they certainly aren’t absolute as there are hundreds of systems of logic where they are inapplicable.*

Fatfist, "A=A" is true whether you wish to admit it or not. Even ancient humans like Aristotle knew that much 2,500 years ago. You are way behind the times Dude. In fact, even Christians are only 2,000 years behind modern, rational humans, so it looks like you've got some catching up to do.

Here's a plan, Fatfist: First accept Jesus as your personal Lord and Savior. That will move you up 500 years. Then start spending more time reading, listening, and learning, instead of trying to impress everyone with how smart you perceive yourself to be, and before you know it ... you'll make up the other 2,000 years.

And by the way, there exists no logic system to which the Law of Identity does not apply.

*Anyway....do yourself a huge favor and read this article which explains in detail why absolutes are impossible.*

Fatfist, I decided against wasting the time it would take to read your article after reading these pearls of wisdom on your web site:

*"Atheism is an irrational Religion."*

Fatfist, here's a link to Atheism in the thesaurus at Dictionary.com: http://thesaurus.com/browse/atheism?\_\_utma=1.44573507.1348958896.1348958896.1348961410.2&\_\_utmb=1.6.9.1348961487472&\_\_utmc=1&\_\_utmx=-&\_\_utmz=1.1348958896.1.1.utmcsr=(direct)|utmccn=(direct)|utmcmd=(none)&\_\_utmv=-&\_\_utmk=211642005

Fatfist, pay special attention to the antonyms. Then look up the word antonym. Your glaring error should become obvious ... even to you.

And no Fatfist, a thesaurus ... is not a dinosaur.

*"There is no difference between a theist, an atheist and an agnostic."*

Fatfist, once again, a dictionary would do you a world of good. If you don't know the difference between a Theist, an Atheist, and an Agnostic, then you shouldn't be posting *anything* to the internet.

*"If the so-called atheist is of the LACK OF BELIEF position, then he is no different than a Religionist who has belief."*

Fatfist, you have given new meaning to the term "being wrong." Your statement has the logical structure of A = ~A.

Fatfist, when you were in middle school, which I imagine wasn't all that long ago, didn't you ever learn how to diagram sentences? Well, applying a valid logical structure to a sentence is similar. Just take the time to examine what you write and see if it is logically valid. In this last case it would have saved you a ton of embarrassment. But that would have deprived my audience of several minutes of belly-busting laughter so maybe it's just as well you wrote it.

Now that I see, that in your little fantasy world "A = ~A" I am beginning to understand why you don't accept truth. Until you untangle all the knots in your mind, reality is as far away from you, as it is for most religious kooks.

*Matt Slick ate Matt Dillahunty for lunch on live TV on the Atheist Experience Show."*

Fatfist, you remind me of the Christian apologist who drew a similar conclusion after the Sam Harris vs. William Lane Craig debate. Like that apologist, you only saw what you wanted to see.

It is not possible to win a debate when one has zero supporting evidence. It is possible however, to give the impression that one has won; but that only works on those who are incapable of objectively evaluating the debate, and who are little more than cheerleaders for whichever side they already support.

Fatfist, remember the first time I contacted you, and told you that reading your debate with Matt Slick was like watching two clowns mutually masturbating each other? Well Fatfist, I now realize ... that I was probably being too polite.

Next we hear from one of Fatfist's loyal followers, Monkeyminds.

*monkeyminds quotes my web page:*

"Like the vast majority of Atheists, I was raised as a Christian"

*So, you traded one religion for another, eh?*

Monkeymind, like Fatfist you treat dictionaries the same way vampires avoid garlic. Now I see why you call yourself Monkeymind ... it fits perfectly.

*Sounds like a religion to me Neo.*

Monkeymind, to the dictionary it sounds like the exact opposite.

Let's see: Accepted definitions in all the major English dictionaries vs. a commenter named Monkeyminds. Boy, that's a tough one. Can I phone a friend?

*monkeyminds quotes my web page again:*

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

*Yep, you said the 'T' word, and the 'P' word of religion.*

Monkeymind, Fatfist has you so brainwashed that you can't even say the words? This is more like debating a group of kindergarten kids.

*You have a bible: Atheist Manifesto*

Monkeymind, I understand that dictionaries give you hives, but just read this from Dictionary.com: Bible

"holy book; authoritative book"

Monkeymind, the first term doesn't apply to Atheists, and the second term doesn't apply to Rationalists who never accept authority until that authority has been proven true.

*A Church: American Humanist Association*

Monkeymind, I don't go. But many "Humanists" do. The main difference is, they don't worship murdering, torturing invisible monsters.

*A Congregational Creed: subject to change as our knowledge and understandings advance, a consensus of what we do believe...*

Monkeymind, if your mind *were* more developed than a monkey, you might be able to comprehend that what you just described is actually the only rational way to think; probably not something that would interest you.

*A Dogma: Knowledge of the world is derived by observation, experimentation, and rational analysis.*

Monkeymind, again, what you think you are slamming, is actually the only rational position. Perhaps you would be so kind as to provide those of us less fortunate with an alternate way of knowing?

I didn't think so.

*Moto: Humans are social by nature and find meaning in relationships. Humanists long for and strive toward a world of mutual care and concern, free of cruelty and its consequences, where differences are resolved cooperatively without resorting to violence.*

Monkeymind, you need to change your name because you are giving the other primates a bad rap; even they aren't that stupid. Nothing you wrote had any similarity with religion, and in fact, promoted values quite the opposite of religions like Christianity and Islam who grant all benefits to their fellow Ghost Worshippers and eternal torture to everyone else.

And Monkeymind, if you ever do happen to find yourself in a dictionary, be sure to look up how to spell "moto."

*Oh and a Big Bang Creationist I see by the Video.*

Monkeymind, I noticed on Fatfist's web site that you morons, like Creationists, reject The Big Bang theory. Dude, nothing is more hysterically funny than reading the incoherent ramblings of pubescent minds who think they are far smarter than the world's scientists. "You people" are an embarrassment to Atheists everywhere. But I am granting you people forgiveness because of the inestimable amount of laughter you have provided for rational people.

Wow, another difficult decision: The vast majority of the world's scientists vs. a "Level 4" blog commenter named Monkeyminds?

Boy, these choices just get tougher and tougher.

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

THE SCIENCE SEGMENT

HOW A LEAF BEETLE WALKS UNDERWATER

Insects are experts when it comes to adhesion on dry surfaces. However, in nature, plants may be covered by water for quite a long period of time, especially after rain. Researchers have discovered the remarkable ability of the terrestrial leaf beetle to walk underwater. Picking up the beetle's locomotion mechanism, they designed an artificial material, which sticks to surfaces underwater.

It is commonly known that adhesion between two solids in air can be produced with the help of water. Just like paper that sticks to a table when it gets wet. The liquid surface tension between air, liquids and solids is called capillary force. In order to stick to dry surfaces insects use such capillary forces with the aid of their oil-covered adhesive setae instead of water.

The same principle under water remains an exciting perspective, because without air there is no capillary force. The beetle shows us how to do it. It takes air bubbles under water. The beetles use air bubbles trapped between their adhesive setae to produce the needed boundary between air, liquids and solids, and thus produce capillary adhesion under water. A necessary condition for this process is some hydrophobic property of the solid. But this is no problem in nature since many leaf tops are water-repellent to some degree.

Inspired by this idea, researchers have designed an artificial silicone polymer structure with underwater adhesive properties. The challenge was to find a possibility to keep air within the material. The solution was a micro structure which produces a material that is sticky underwater without using glue. Probable fields of application can be found in underwater optics or any other kind of underwater technologies.

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

FAMOUS QUOTES

JULES HENRI POINCARE (1854 – 1912) 58 years.

He was a French mathematician, theoretical physicist, engineer, and a philosopher of science. He is often described as a polymath, and in mathematics as The Last Universalist, since he excelled in all fields of the discipline as it existed during his lifetime.

As a mathematician and physicist, he made many original fundamental contributions to pure and applied mathematics, mathematical physics, and celestial mechanics. He was responsible for formulating the Poincaré conjecture, which was one of the most famous unsolved problems in mathematics until solved in 2003. In his research on the three-body problem, Poincaré became the first person to discover a chaotic deterministic system which laid the foundations of modern chaos theory. He is also considered to be one of the founders of the field of topology.

Poincaré was the first to present the Lorentz transformations in their modern symmetrical form. Poincaré discovered the remaining relativistic velocity transformations and thus obtained perfect invariance of all of Maxwell's equations, an important step in the formulation of the theory of special relativity.

"To doubt everything or to believe everything

are two equally convenient solutions;

both dispense with the necessity of reflection."