

Re: Physics and metaphysics

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2005-03/5626.html>

From: Virgil (*ITSnetNOTcom#virgil_at_COMCAST.com*)

Date: 03/10/05

Date: Thu, 10 Mar 2005 12:29:35 -0700

In article <Qd6dnSFgKIXnGa3fRVn-1Q@comcast.com>, Atheistagnostic <atheistagnostic@nospam.net> wrote:

> *Virgil wrote:*

>

>

> > *What we are concerned with is whether gods are KNOWN to be impossible.*

>

>

> *That's the logical fallacy of trying to shift the burden of proof, moron.*

"We" merely means everyone except Simple Septic himself. What Simple Septic himself wishes to concern himself with in his private delusional world is of no consequence in the real world.

There are two questions of interest to us (exclusive of Simple Septic):

(1) "Is any god known to be possible?"

and

(2) "Are all gods known to be impossible?"

Agnostics answer both of these in the negative.

Thus as far as agnostics are concerned, either of the underlying issues

(1) "there is a god"

or

(2) "there are no gods"

could be, as far as anyone knows, true

or

could be, as far as anyone knows, false.

Until there is evidence sufficient to settle the issue one way or the other, agnostics will cling to their not knowing.

Why Simple Septic, who falsely has claimed to be an agnostic on many occasions, should object to this clearly agnostic point of view Simple Septic has not yet been willing to make clear.

So now I challenge Simple Septic to answer these two questions:

sci.physics: Re: Physics and metaphysics

(1) Is there anything about the position stated here that is not fully in accord with agnostic principles?

(2) Do you agree with the position stated here, and if not, why not?