

Re: Marriage is under fire!!

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.basics/2004-08/0804.html>

From: Jonathan Kirwan (jkirwan_at_easystreet.com)

Date: 08/15/04

Date: Sun, 15 Aug 2004 06:32:08 GMT

On Sat, 14 Aug 2004 22:31:49 GMT, Rich Grise <null@example.net> wrote:

*>How do you know that there _aren't_ purple poka[sic]-dotted monsters eating
>the universe?*

I don't. But I'm not going to listen to some idiot telling me they do exist, where that same idiot cannot be bothered to present a clear, evidential case with support that is commensurate with the unusual nature of the claim.

If I claim that it rained yesterday and the circumstances of the discussion don't suggest some hidden agenda and if you also know I live in Oregon (where in my area I get about 65 inches a year, spread out equally each day) then you would probably believe me without any additional evidence beyond my casual testimony. Ordinary evidence is sufficient for ordinary claims.

But if I claimed there some Martian took me to Mars in the dark of night and performed bizarre experiments on me and then brought me back here, you might quite reasonably expect a little more than my testimony. Even if I'm such a nice guy, and all. Extraordinary evidential support is needed for such extraordinary claims. Quite reasonably.

So do I listen to someone telling me about those purple monsters? Not unless they do their diligence to make their case, first. Until then, I slam the door in their face and I do so, with malice aforethought. If the person who is making the claim cannot be bothered to do the work needed to make their case, why should I stupidly pick up some shovel to start carrying their dirt for them (either -for- or -against- their claim?)

It's a simply matter of expediency. I have a limited time in my life and I have limited resources. if I allowed every nutcase in the world to push their ideas without support and then foolishly picked up the challenge to try and discredit their points, I wouldn't have any life left. And in any case, they'd just ignore me and that hard work and then go find someone else to pester.

The proper course here is to simply insist that a comprehensive case be made and that if that case isn't manifest, then the door is slammed on their face.

I've an open mind, Rich. But it's not open to those who are too lazy to carry their own water.

>*Just because I've never seen you in the flesh doesn't prove
>that you don't exist. I could claim "Johathan Kirwan does not exist. It
>is merely a turing machine running on a Z-8 somewhere." Or, heaven forbid,
>some troll spoofing as you. ;-)*

Actually, it may be. So?

>*What happens to the atheists when they're met by St. Peter at the pearly
>gates? ;-)*

Never crossed my mind to ask. I'll try and think about it exactly when you are able to convince me it's a likely event.

>*I don't remember which philosopher said it – something about it's impossible
>to prove whether there is or isn't a god, but if I act like there isn't and
>there is, I'm in a Hell of a lot more trouble than if I act like there is
>and there isn't.*

Pascal's wager.

But you can think about this in a dozen ways.

One is to then ponder: "One must act as though all such systems are true, so that one avoids all manner of trouble." But then some of those faiths will tell you that this duplicitous behavior will just get you condemned, too. So then you are left with the quandary of deciding which of these Easter Bunny fairy tales all preaching your damnation forever should get your sycophantic adherence. And no matter which one you pick, Murphy's Law will ensure it's not the right one.

Anyway, it's all just stupid. What god in their sane mind would condemn poor people with inferior minds for not picking the exact right hen scratches to perform at midnight, for gosh sake? None I'd care to know. And I cannot imagine why anyone else would be foolish enough to imagine that such a god is worth a dime, let alone caring about, if so.

Jon