

DISCUSSION TOPICS:

DO YOU BELIEVE IN OBJECTIVE TRUTH?

HOW DO YOU IDENTIFY TRUTH, IF IT'S SUBJECTIVE TO OUR DEFINITIONS?

WHY DO YOU SPEND YOUR TIME TRYING TO PROVE THE NON-EXISTENCE OF GOD?

LISTEN TO MY REALLY COOL, TOTALLY SPIFFY COMPLETELY CONVINCING ARGUMENT/PHILOSOPHY FOR THE EXISTENCE OF GOD.



Freethinkers Around Redlands



Desert Atheist Community



Victor Valley



Atheists & Agnostics

TRUTH

AN ATHEIST
DISCUSSES TRUTH

Do you believe in objective truth?

"Truth/true" are words which people use duplicitously like with faith. A statement true by definition is only 'true' because we defined the words. Consider; "all bachelors are unmarried", is this true? Yes, but only if the word "bachelor" is a conversational shortcut for the concept 'unmarried man'. If instead, you mean 'person with a 4-year college degree' when you say "bachelor", the sentence is no longer valid because it was only true by definition. Words are descriptive of our concepts, not prescriptive of our surroundings.

How do you identify truth, if it's subjective to our definitions?

Skepticism's historical exemplar is Socrates. Why Socrates? Because, after all this time, he still stands out alone among all the famous saints and sages from antiquity to the present. Every religion has its sage. Judaism has Moses, Zoroastrianism has Zarathustra, Buddhism has the Buddha, Christianity has Jesus, Islam has Mohammad, Mormonism has Joseph Smith, and Bahai has Baha-u-lah. Every one of these individuals claimed to know the absolute truth. It is Socrates, alone among famous sages, who claimed to know NOTHING. Each devised a set of rules or laws, save Socrates. Instead, Socrates gave us a method --a method of questioning the rules of others, of cross-examination.

Socrates didn't die for truth, he died for rights and the rule of law. For these reasons, Socrates is the quintessential skeptical Humanist. He stands as a symbol, both of Greek rationalism and the Humanist tradition that grew out of it. And no equally recognized saint or sage has joined his company since his death.

Listen to my really cool, totally spiffy, argument/philosophy for the existence of God.

Ok, we will, and we can discuss the ideas contained therein. The absolute best an argument can aspire to be is deductive, valid, sound, and complete. However, arguments and philosophy are purely metaphysical so they don't establish the existence of anything but concepts. We can't argue/philosophize an object into existence in the same way you can't think an object out of existence from an armchair. Concepts only exist in minds, minds only exist in brains, unless you have Objective Evidence for the existence of a mind living independently of a brain?

$$\frac{1}{2} \text{ TRUTH} + \frac{1}{2} \text{ TRUTH} =$$

WHOLE LIE

Why do you spend your time trying to prove the non-existence of god?

"Prove/proof" are problematic terms unless you're doing mathematics or formal logic, so confusion is inevitable when it is applied. Something has either positive evidence supporting it, contrary evidence against it or no evidence pointing either way. I take extreme umbrage when I see people being manipulated or abused. If the supernatural claims of your religion are not factual, you are holding yourself hostage to false doctrine and being manipulated by possibly sinister clergy. No one puts any effort in trying to help people realize Star Wars movies are fictional because fans of the science-fiction series already know. If religious believers treated their ideas about how the universe works the same way fans at Comicon treat their favorite characters, no one would speak in opposition. Religious beliefs cause a lot of harm in the world, (tribalism, superstition, inequality, racism, misogyny, violence, making a virtue out of faith, diverting generous impulses and good intentions, helplessness, power-seeking,) and we could remove this specific strand of injury if people stopped treating their supernatural ideas as fact.

Hurt me with
the truth...

...But

don't comfort
me with a lie.