

Re: Physics and metaphysics

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2005-03/4067.html>

From: Atheistagnostic (*atheistagnostic_at_nospam.net*)

Date: 03/08/05

Date: Mon, 07 Mar 2005 16:08:19 -0800

Virgil wrote:

> *In article* <*ksadnWSCGuGzaLbfRVn-sA@comcast.com*>,

> *Atheistagnostic* <*atheistagnostic@nospam.net*> wrote:

>

>

>> *Virgil wrote:*

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>>... *has proposed that gods are impossible ...*

>>

>> *That's a lie. Your side makes the proposition in question, that there might be X (whatever you imagine X is) anyway, even though there is nothing in evidence you can point to and say, 'There, that's what I'm talking about', all you can do is keep trying to shift the burden of proof to anyone who questions your lame ideas.*

Your argument *_ad ignorantiam_* is no better disguised than that of these theologs of Galileo's time:

<quote>

Famous in the history of science is the argument *_ad ignorantiam_* given in criticism of Galileo, when he showed leading astronomers of his time the mountains and valleys on the moon that could be seen through his telescope. Some scholars of that age, absolutely convinced that the moon was a perfect sphere, as theology and Aristotelian science had long taught, argued against Galileo that, although we see what appear to be mountains and valleys, the moon is in fact a perfect sphere, because all its apparent irregularities are filled in by an invisible crystalline substance. And this hypothesis, which saves the perfection of the heavenly bodies, Galileo could not prove false!

</quote>

(Copi and Cohen, *_Introduction to Logic_*, p. 117)

[In this case the term, 'hypothesis' means a speculative, 'might be' imagining with no basis in fact.]

>

>

sci.physics: Re: Physics and metaphysics

- > *Actually, Simple Septic, under several aliases, has often claimed (in*
- > *response to suggestions that there might be a god or that gods are not*
- > *known to be impossible) "False, there are no such things"*

That's not an assertion, moron, it's the denial of one, and you can't shift the burden of proof to the denial, so the denial is the only reasonable presumption. Didn't your daddy teach you the basics?