

Firstly, It is quite obvious you have been reading, or listening to, far too much fundamentalist theist propaganda, Dexter Roy. You don't have any good arguments, therefore you're going to try to restrict how we engage with you so you can feel that your rant and faulty definition looks more like a desperate attempt to reaffirm your own beliefs than ridicule ours. Defence by prior attack is what this is called.

Secondly, What I love is the assumption of what we all believe absolutely. Or that any of us believe anything absolutely at all. It seems, Dexter Roy, you come from an environment where absolute, blinkering, belief is mandatory then you cannot conceive that another might have shades of grey or divergent thoughts in their "belief". Thus you are suffering a kind of imposed and maintained ignorance. Trapped. Scholars and atheists themselves do not accept your definition of atheism, but you claim that you alone have the power to make the definition. Please explain how this works? You claim this is what we believe, yet I am telling you that is not the case. If I tell you that "X is not what we believe", why do you still claim "X is what you believe"? I think it is perfectly fair, in a serious discussion, to allow atheists to define what atheism is, just as it is fair to allow Christians to define what Christianity is.

Thirdly, Claiming atheists "believe" something is a non-starter. Disbelief is not a belief, not doing X does not imply that one is doing not-X as an activity of the same type as X. Atheists simply don't believe in a God. Your made-up definition fails on this point alone. Atheism is just a position on one subject -- a disbelief in a god, that is all. However, there is no set of beliefs concerning the cause, nature, and purpose of the universe, nor is there a set of beliefs and practices generally agreed upon, nor is there any the body of persons adhering to a particular set of beliefs and practices. Atheists as a group cannot be counted upon to have any beliefs or practices in common. There may be similarities as many atheists are Secular Humanists but there are no guarantees and in part that it's the recognition of that. Many atheists could be any number of things, which is why atheism does not really apply. It is up to the individual. You failed to define atheism explicitly, and your implicit definition is wrong. From the [Merriam-Webster](#) online dictionary:

Atheism *noun* athe·ism \ 'ā-thē-ī-zəm \
a lack of belief or a strong disbelief in the existence of a god or any gods.

So your assumption it requires other assertions about how life or the universe originated is fallacious. I no more wonder how life or the universe came to exist without a deity, than I wonder how it happened without pixies, I don't trouble myself over claims that can demonstrate no proper evidence to support them. You don't speak for atheists, no one does. No one can. Unlike the religious that bind together under one general belief, atheists don't have a central unified "belief" system. Therefore your whole premise is a fallacy.

Lastly, I could just say: "False Dilemma. I don't make any claims regarding the origin of life other than personal ignorance. I don't try and be harsh to others. Claiming all atheist do this is false. Next." This would suffice enough but that is never any fun. I like fun. So let's get into this shall we.

Now that that is clarified, before I get into my refutations, let's have a refresher (*with some new material*).

> *"But all of the atheists are just absolutely positive that life began out of nothing, just started."*

Who elected you to speak for *"all atheists"*? Who said life began from nothing? Citations, please. I don't know many... personally don't know any atheists who claim to positively know anything like that. Those words only seem to appear in straw man arguments against atheists. I have yet to observe an atheist who asserts that *"life began out of nothing"*. Generally an atheist would say that we don't know the exact process by which life began on this planet, but that there is no reason to accept the myths purporting to describe the process, given the lack of evidence supporting those myths. Atheism is just a result of skepticism, therefore no faith required.

And when (*if*) you do, know this; what one person says does not speak for what anyone else says. Furthermore, if an atheist told me such a thing as: *"life came out of nothing"* as an epistemic claim my response would be the same as to theists: *"how do you know that? Where's your evidence?"*

This would make your next sentence, *"they will absolutely lambaste you if you don't accept this as fact."* become moot. We, being the atheist also don't think of *"life came out of nothing"* and should not be expected as fact. Actually, I think one should criticise and consider everything first before they claim anything as fact. The lambasting you're currently receiving is earned by your constant misrepresentations.

You then say:

> *"Of course they won't say "life came from nothing", but in the end that will still be the claim. That one day there was no life & the next day there was & that just happened. Just some random out of nowhere random miraculous occurrence, and bam all life sprang forth"*

That is an assumption and a strawman. No they won't. As you are grossly misrepresenting science. *"Spontaneously sprang from nothing"* is a horrible misrepresentation of the science. Formation of amino acids and more complex xxx organic molecules by natural processes has been demonstrated time and again. The step from that to life is not a huge one; just an unusual one. But with a huge planet and hundreds of millions of years the rarity becomes far less of an obstacle to the odds. You said (*illogically*) that *"all of the atheists are just absolutely positive that life began out of nothing"*. I merely pointed out an error in your terminology. The prevailing scientific and atheist view is that life somehow arose spontaneously on the primeval Earth. That's not the same as *"from nothing"*.

There are ongoing scientific investigations into possible sequences of events that lead to the first life here on Earth. None of them have found the slightest indication that a miracle was required. If you care to learn more about these inquiries, try looking at the links in the addendum.

This quote gets a more rigorous scrutiny sentence by sentence elsewhere. This again would make your claim that we *"atheists are just absolutely positive that life began out of nothing"* become false. Many atheists like me simply say we don't know. What you claim is not what we believe.

> "Again the details of one's particular idea of how life began are not really relevant, even if they admit not knowing,"... "I don't know, you don't know."

As I said they are relevant if you keep misrepresenting the one of two options you are given me. Things need to be clarified. Anyways this seems to translate to: "*You may not claim it or know what is actually true but you do believe it (that that life came from nothing).*"

No, I don't actually. You're the one who believes the Universe and everything in it was winked into existence in 6 business days and a rest day. And yes, I am attacking what you most likely believe in i.e creation (*see below*).

I can't speak for every atheist on the planet, but I have a feeling most atheists share similar ideas: either we don't know one way or the other how life came about or how it even might have, and therefore make no claims on the matter, OR we accept abiogenesis, which also makes no such claims. Life emerging from metabolic and macromolecular precursors that would have been common on early Earth is not the same thing as something winking into existence ex nihilo. And if you're talking about the Big Bang Theory, Cosmic inflation doesn't really make any claims about how life on Earth started, but I'm also pretty sure that it doesn't even make claims about the Universe or planets like ours blinking into existence out of nothing.

> "*1) Either life was created Or 2) it spontaneously sprang from nothing.*"

This is a false dichotomy and is an intellectually lazy way to posit your position without meeting your claim. Setting up a false dilemma is not a good way to make an argument. You're concocting a false dichotomy and telling us that, between the two answers you postulate, we can't know which is true. I agree that we don't know exactly how life came about, but I reject your two choices as the only ones.

As best we can tell, life (*on earth*) came from non-life about 4 billion years ago. Not from nothing. There was a lot of something going on back then, it just didn't have life yet. Life was likely the consequence of the circumstances and the chemistry of that scenario.

The true dichotomy is either life was created, or it wasn't. We've no evidence or reason to think it was created, but we do have plausible ideas about how it could have happened when it did as a natural consequence of chemistry.

Do we know what happened with certainty? No. But that doesn't put all ideas on equal footing, and trying to equivocate religious faith with all other kinds of belief just doesn't work. You don't need that kind of faith if you have good reasons for what you believe.

You seem to want to create a dichotomy but have failed to do so. Let me help. Using your formula: There are actually 3 choices:

1) Either life was created

Or

2) it spontaneously sprang from nothing.

Or

3) I don't know, so i'm not gonna pretend that i do and make something up because it makes me feel better, and anyway, there *still* is no evidence for the existence of gods.

How about neither? You can withhold judgement and not believe either. Really, creationists hold both positions simultaneously and most educated atheists don't actually hold either one. So you're aiming this at someone who either doesn't exist or is such an extreme outlier that they wouldn't register on most pie charts.

Your false dichotomy is as cliché as it is wrong. We know how organic molecules began to move on their own and reproduce, we just don't fully understand the process yet. We do know it didn't come from "*nothing*". From what I said above, faith is belief without evidence. So taking this, using Occam's Razor, one can conclude the most likely and logical explanation without positing unnecessary assumptions would be, abiogenesis, which is not "*life springing from nothing*". It's life slowly emerging from a very specific environment over a long period of time. There is evidence that abiogenesis occurred. There is no proof yet, but there is *evidence*. [The Miller-Urey experiments](#), and subsequent research based on them, shows that complex organic compounds such as amino acids can arise naturally from nonliving environments. Specifically, from our best understanding of what the early-Earth environment was like. And [NASA's Stardust probe](#) has found some of those amino acids in the tails of comets. So clearly Earth is not alone in being able to produce the basic components of life. And once we had those basic building blocks? [Turns out they're more versatile than we thought. Nucleotides and amino acids can be synthesized via. simple chemical combination and bonding.](#) This is via. autocatalysis in itself. As seen in the Miller-Urey experiment, amino acids can be synthesized by inorganic compounds in conditions very similar to the early Earth itself. Thus, life could arise out of abiogenesis. None of this is definitive proof. But compared to other explanations, with less evidence (*or no evidence at all*), abiogenesis has got the most empirical support so far. There is no such supporting evidence for Creation. If there are two possible explanations, and one of them has some supporting evidence, and the other doesn't, isn't it reasonable to believe the one that has evidence supporting it? That which can be asserted without evidence can also be

dismissed without evidence. No more assumption should be taken than necessary. Does this mean I have 'faith' in it? No. I go with the evidence and the most reasonable hypothesis, and I am humble enough to say I don't know. What I mean is, there is a lot of evidence that shows what kind of ways non-living matter can form living matter. But for the sake of this argument and make things easier, let's assume we have no evidence of those methods. I would say, *"I don't know how life got started"*. Saying *"I don't know"* is the opposite of having faith.

If you're going to force a false dichotomy, please at least stay consistent: do you think all atheists believe life *"spontaneously sprang from nothing"*, or that all atheists believe life *"starts all by itself"*, or that all atheists believe that life *"began on its own"*? You are using these terms interchangeably, but they all mean different things. Come back to me with this sorted out please.

I put it to you, what is more likely a scenario?

A - The first self replicating cell came into being due to chance following a specific set of chemical events.

B - An invisible cosmic mage clicked her fingers, created everything, then buggered off leaving no detectable sign of her existence?

If you say if you believe B you have a substantial amount of faith. Then I would say you require a higher degree of standard of proof for your proposition than I perhaps do for mine. You have to say you have onus probandi, the onus is on the person making the greater claim, and not only that you have to be pitted against the scientific efforts of the last few hundred years.

> *"You can concoct an argument wrapped in all sorts of fancy language & unprovable theories"*

Well, here's the problem: again, the vast majority of atheists don't hold either position.

Rather, they accept the science that shows the following:

- Urey and Miller were able to demonstrate that when given sufficient heat, pressure, and the right chemical components, precursors to amino acids will form like amines, carboxylic acids, and the odd sulfate. Most of the amino acids aren't that far removed from one another: the most basic is glycine, and the reactions to convert one amino acid into another are simple enough to be done in the lab.

But each of the gases subjected to electrolysis in Miller and Urey's experiments are abundant where scientists believe that life originated, near the hydrothermal vents deep in the ocean.

- All monomeric subunits for macromolecules are formed from precursors which exist in nature and form therein all the time. Some of them have been found floating in space, like alcohols, sugars, etc. Phospholipids consist of a phosphate and two chains of methyl groups. The bases which make up nucleobases derive from precursors too: The purines form from xanthine and the pyrimidines form from 5,6-Dihydrouracil, and the only real difference between them and their precursors are the addition of a hydride ion or the swapping out of functional groups. The only real difference between ribose and deoxyribose is that an alcohol group has been swapped for a hydride at the 2' position. The self same kind of chemistry that governs the behavior of propane or ethylene governs theirs as well -- organic chemistry.

And the first precursors to living cells would not themselves be alive: they wouldn't be able to replicate outside of certain circumstances, but given enough time, it would be possible to form RNA structures with catalytic and enzymatic activity, such as most of the chemicals involved in protein synthesis. From there, it's just the evolution of cDNA away from fully functional living cells capable of replicating on their own.

So yeah, not exactly winked into existence out of nothing, and given that there's some scientific evidence to give a plausible account of how life arose through naturalistic means, I wouldn't exactly call that "*faith*" so much as finding the explanation to be the most likely one given the evidence provided. I don't sing songs praising Rutherford, Darwin, and Avogadro, and I don't pray for drug resistant gram negative bacteria to smite my enemies. I don't go to the "*First Church of Darwin*" or "*Church of Latter Day Ecologists*".

Apparently, it's evident that you don't know what the vast majority of atheists believe or what science actually claims. Besides, atheism itself isn't predicated necessarily on science, science literacy, or anything other than a non-belief in a deity. So I mean, it's almost moot to attack abiogenesis in the first place. What I am saying is your initial claim/definition that you are so persistent to define what an atheist actually is, is nothing more than a strawman. You claiming all atheists believe or consider or have faith in "*life coming from nothing*", which is wrong, is irrelevant to what an atheist actually is.

> *"I'm simply saying you don't know."*

We know we don't know. How many times do I have to tell you that atheism does not take a position on the origins of life, it is merely an answer to the question of *"do you believe in God?"*. So even on this basis alone you making up your own definition to put all atheists under is not only wrong but dishonest. Myself, I know that I don't know, but current models of abiogenesis seem like the more robust explanation between the three because it has supporting evidence, the other two being what I believe was meant to be a strawman and creationism.

> *"Pardon me but you're wasting your time ranting against a claim I never made."*

Says the guy ranting against a claim that no one here ever made (*that life sprang from nothing*).

> *"There are really only 2 choices, I am arguing neither." ... "Either way, this is irrelevant. I made no attempt to give any explanation, or provide any theory as to where or how life began.*

As usual the atheists are too busy attacking to recognize their own hypocrisy."

You very clearly are doing exactly that. Your entire false premise is constructed in order to mock (*you're being the hypocrite here*) one position based on an incorrect explanation of it while promoting the other. It is expressly designed to take sides. You certainly have repeatedly made claims about this, the most obvious ones being that we are limited to two choices, and that something can come from nothing, you have simply assert these of course with no evidence. I'm guessing the irony of your last sentence is wasted on you. You are wasting a lot of words to not have a position. What you are doing is pretending you don't have a position when you clearly do.

> *"Read this slowly I am not debating with you and will not debate with you how life was created. I don't know, you don't know."*

Yet you keep asserting it had to be either created by magic or originated by pure chance from nothing, those sound like claims to knowledge to me. Demonstrate them. If you are so willing to put them into a dilemma, then *"Life was created."* - Evidence please. *"It is either created or spontaneously just happened miraculously from nothing."* - Evidence please, and don't waste my time with common appeals to ignorance, it's your claim you give evidence for it.

> "I made no attempt to give any explanation, or provide any theory as to where or how life began. As usual the atheists are too busy attacking to recognize their own hypocrisy.

Read this slowly I am not debating with you and will not debate with you how life was created. I don't know, you don't know. My point is the demonization of people of faith by atheists Is hypocritical and frankly offensive."

My apologies. I did assume your position (*or did I? refer above*). But then again if you can force us into a position given only the two options you gave, one can also do the same for you. Using your own logic and sentence.

If YOU are adamant that life was not "spontaneously sprang from nothing" ... (*which you portray by describing it as "it spontaneously sprang from nothing." as I have only ever heard theists say. This way and in the multiple forms you say it in*).

... there is only one other possibility And that is that life was just created magically by a being who snapped his fingers aka "created".

All of the theists are just absolutely positive that life began out of nothing, just started by a being not yet proved who willed it into existence, from nothing.

You see what you said could be applied to you. If you feel somewhat used or manipulated, well then guess what, now you know what it's like to be a victim of when a false dichotomy is being used on you.

> "As usual the atheists are too busy attacking to recognize their own hypocrisy."

You claim I am attacking? Is that not what you are doing too? Yes, I am. I am merely pitting your own logic against you. But I am also defending. Which is below in my next answer to your quote. You see there is no "hypocrisy" and that would mean I do realise I am not being hypocritical and can attack all I want. Your statement becomes moot.

> "My point is the demonization of people of faith by atheists Is hypocritical and frankly offensive."

So says the person who made up a false position for his opponents and continues to criticize people for holding that position even after me pointed out they don't actually hold that position. The hypocritical one here is you. To be an atheist one doesn't have to have a belief about how life began (*no faith required*). If they do consider abiogenesis (*which has some amount of evidence*) as a viable explanation as scientists also think but in no way claim it as truth or fully proven (*This again, means we have no faith*). So this would abolish your

premise that we are "hypocritical" for "demonization of people of faith" for their faith. Your statement becomes moot once again.

> "My point is the demonization of people of faith by atheists Is hypocritical and frankly offensive."

Hey look, there's that strawman and tu quoque again. Firstly, fuck offence. If someone is offended, it's their problem. Someone can say something abusive about me, I welcome it, but be prepared to do it at your own risk. I hope that sums up my position without going off on a tangent on another topic. Meaning I recognize there is this thing called common sense and courtesy, but don't expect me to sit back and allow people's hurt feeling get in the way of my freedom of thought & speech and skeptical and critical way of thinking. As Salman Rushdie put it: "*What is freedom of expression? Without the freedom to offend, it ceases to exist. Nobody has the right to not be offended*". Personally I will try and be respectful and have a civil discussion but if what I say offends someone, especially after they are attacking me and my co-thinkers by the use of strawmanning and blanket statements and making bold assertions which you cannot demonstrate any evidence for, I don't give two flying fucks. There is nothing I can do about people getting offended.

On the other hand, it may seem like we are being harsh when in fact we may not be but as Daniel Dennett said "*There's no polite way to say that you've devoted your life to a folly*" In other words, the mildest form of criticism of religion is also the biggest. It is very often the case that I might say something pretty trivial and the religious call out all sorts, even for me to be silenced aka blasphemy laws. Or something as simple as writing a novel and then call for a fatwa condoning the murder of a novelist. If people are determined to be offended then there is nothing I can do about that.

As for the "demonization of people of faith", well while some people are guilty of it I tend not to be, although I do agree with Christopher Hitchens when he said faith is something not to taken as an immediate acceptance of goodwill or a rational mind but something to be curious about and contemptible of etc.

But you claim that all atheists are all guilty of "demonization of people of faith" which is a hasty generalisation and a blanket statement and one I can't see as being true. I know many atheists who are mild and timid, who aren't hell bent on attacking people of faith. I know many atheists who don't comment on their lack of belief at all. Billy Joel is an example from the top of my head who has a platform but very rarely speaks about his lack of belief. I know many atheists who say they realise why people believe in a religion and have faith in it, especially if they have read Freud on the matter, but they themselves don't involve themselves in it. I know many atheists who have family members who are religious. These

types of atheists usually don't think one way or the other about religion, again just that they don't feel like they belong as they don't believe in a God. There are as many different kinds of atheists as there are people. There are atheists who literally hate being atheists. What you're describing is some kind of fedora-tipping neckbeard pseudo-intellectual stereotype. It would be as if I described every theist as a Westboro-wannabe queer-hating gun-toting misogynist Koran-burning Trump-loving fetus fetishist who rapes altar boys in his spare time. Wouldn't really be fair, would it?

I agree that some atheists are overconfident and overbearing when discussing this topic with those who believe in unfalsifiable, untestable myths about the origin of life. They adopt a condescending tone and use terms like *"amusing hypocrisy"*, *"pompous ass"*, *"typical [insert group you dislike]"*, *"As usual the [insert group you dislike] are too busy attacking to recognize their own hypocrisy"* or *create a false definition of people who are not you and apply it on all of them. etc.* in discussions. It doesn't do anything to advance the discussion, and only shows that they're ill-mannered and full of themselves.

Faith is utterly useless in determining the truth or falsity of anything, all it does is give a bias and make people comfortable with their close mindedness. If they wish to be that way, fine. Personally I have no use for and do not use faith to determine the truth of anything, and your rather cliched attempts to reverse the burden of proof to the rejection of a claim is fooling no one.

> *"My point is the demonization of people of faith of people of faith by atheists Is hypocritical and frankly offensive."* and *"condescendingly mock"*.

The undercurrent to your post and comments is your objection to the rhetoric of the atheists. You used words like *"mocking"*, *"attacking"*, *"condescending"* and *"amusing hypocrisy"*, etc. The irony is hilarious.

You do realise it's not like theists are the best proponents of love, decency and compassion you know. They have their hands in *"demonising"* too, along with the bad apples with unbelievers. As Richard Weatherwax said *"You do not need the Bible to justify love, but no better tool has been invented to justify hate."* and Steven Weinberg *"With or without religion, good people can behave well and bad people can do evil; but for good people to do evil - that takes religion."*

You speak of *demonization*.... I far too often see many comments proposed by supposed loving christians saying things that would be considered bullying by making strawmen and blanket statements and more importantly just being complete and utter dicks to atheists, by claiming all sorts from having no morals and cannot know love to being satanists and like to

sin i.e do evil. Take this as an example of demonizing. I came across on facebook, and I quote:

"This nation wasn't made for atheists. You will never be comfortable here. Better yet, move somewhere where you don't have to hear about God - somewhere like North Korea. Go somewhere where there are more people like you. You will always be the minority here. Get used to it."

I will not add the response to this as I think it is self evident that it is just nonsensical and hateful. More generic you see comments making hateful blanket statements about atheists and homosexuals, not unlike yourself Dextor and your twitter companion. Theists, more specifically Christians, again more particularly conservative bible-belt, red-neck type of Christian have been known, online and offline to demonize and stigmatize not only people of other faiths, unbelievers and homosexuals but to their own kin. Take [this example](#) of a mother screaming at her own son for saying he doesn't believe in God. Or [this example](#) of a mother doing the same thing.. but on a car journey. Or this David guy who posted on facebook ["All Atheists should be killed.. I don't hate you but you deserve to die"](#). How about the hate mail received by Dawkins Part [1](#) and [2](#). [How about denying an atheist to set up a highschool club for like minded people.\(and a follow up\)](#).

The latter example (*i.e the film with a complete false premise*) shows how Christians like to call for 'justice' whenever they are (*or are not*) being persecuted but very often they do the exact same thing to what they are campaigning against.

As Salman Rushdie said once:

"One of the things that is a classic trope of the religious bigot, is while they're denying people their rights, they claim that their rights are being denied. While they are persecuting people, they claim to be persecuted. While they are behaving colossally offensively, they claim to be the offended party."

Another example of Mr. Rushdie's point is this [video\(2\)](#) and this where Fox News hilariously yet disturbingly puts 'Atheists being protected under the law just as other groups have been' to mean 'hostility towards Christians'. What? It is in fact the other way around. Not allowing people who don't identify with any religion the same right of protection as people of religion **IS** hostility towards atheists. That is segregation. This is dehumanising. This is discrimination. This is condescendingly mocking atheists ([take this news segment as another example](#)). This is "amusing hypocrisy". The stupidity of Fox News is hilarious. This is "demonising" as you say. Not to mention some people of faith **literally** demonize atheists by claiming we are evil, have no morals and cannot love and follow satan and the devil.

This shows the negative stigmatization due to religious forceful authority and brainwashing. Because if/when someone comes out to be an atheist they are scrutinised,

looked down upon which would not do any favours for their mental health: having the community they grew up in, basically ostracize them. Too add, in certain areas of the world people who don't believe in a God or say what they want about the religion they left are often persecuted or even killed.

Moving swiftly on, when religion is often in control, women were not treated equally in society, unbelievers and more recently homosexuals were and some still are dehumanised, demonised and discriminated against often to the point of suicide. From comments on the internet saying they that we will burn in fiery damnation for their sinful ways, or to more extreme side by saying things like a pastor said about the Orlando Night Club Shooting "*They should have all been killed anyway by a righteous government*". Or how about the barbaric act of genital mutilation of little babies. Religion often held down advancement in society by calling for blasphemy laws to silence anybody who dared question and criticise their doctrines and in turn slow equal rights development way down. In fact there were no people like myself or most of us would be afraid to say something, I would guarantee you catholic priests would still be raping innocent children right now, if there were not people who would stand up against authority. Skeptics like myself are needed for this abuse of power to stop.

Nevertheless, also in relation to your complaint about my use of long and unnecessary words. I get the impression that you, Dexter, think people are often deliberately trying to make you feel stupid. And you're particularly defensive about it.

But honestly, I don't think the atheists are trying to make you feel stupid. Granted, they're not trying to make you feel smart either. Many do, however, have a bias toward expressing their positions with as much precision as possible. And precision often requires specialized vocabulary.

My point:

What is my point after saying all of this, you may ask? It's very simple really. I am showing that your claim *all* atheists are intolerant of people of faith is a blanket statement and thus false (*most of my family are religious so I can respect their belief*) and your claim also implies that theists/christians aren't, or not as intolerant of people who don't believe in their God, of which I have argued it could be seen as the opposite ([*I mean come on how the fuck is having an atheist convention at Easter Disrespectful to people who do believe???*](#) - *This kind of mentality is a step away from putting laws in place to prevent another group from having the freedom the founding fathers wanted*) Both parties, atheism and theism or

rather Christian Theism have their bad apples. There are people in both groups that are condescending, hypocritical and hateful and demonize and mock people. Also my side point was also to show that when we, being atheists, sometimes getting a bit irked at what the religious say and do, is justifiable. I have shown examples above but I think the following can sum this up.

"Religious apologists complain bitterly that atheists and secularists are aggressive and hostile in their criticism of them. I always say: look, when you guys were in charge, you didn't argue with us, you just burnt us at the stake. Now what we're doing is, we're presenting you with some arguments and some challenging questions, and you complain." - A.C. Grayling

"I'll tell you what you did with Atheists for about 1500 years. You outlawed them from the universities or any teaching careers, besmirched their reputations, banned or burned their books or their writings of any kind, drove them into exile, humiliated them, seized their properties, arrested them for blasphemy. You dehumanised them with beatings and exquisite torture, gouged out their eyes, slit their tongues, stretched, crushed, or broke their limbs, tore off their breasts if they were women, crushed their scrotums if they were men, imprisoned them, stabbed them, disembowelled them, hanged them, burnt them alive. And you have nerve enough to complain to me that I laugh at you." - Madalyn Murray O'Hair

Summary of your argument:

Your problem is that first, you define what everybody thinks and then state that they believe and say what you defined. You don't offer ANY proof whatsoever that that is the fact. You don't get to define what atheists believe or don't believe, with one exception. Atheists don't believe in a deity or deities. I don't have any faith. I have an understanding of the FACTS. That isn't a faith. I'll mock anyone I desire to mock so as far as that is concerned you can go fuck yourself! But I tend not to. You may think that you have the authority to define what other people think and or believe, but you don't and you're wrong in the first place.

- 1) You have made many assumptions and claims, therefore much of the onus probandi is on you. Namely, you constricted how life began to two options. You need to explain why that is the case and only case and why each option is even worth considering. You keep asserting it had to be either created by magic or originated by pure chance from nothing. You also claimed "*all atheist*" believe this and are all "*demonizing people of faith*". You created your own definition of me and my co-thinkers. Those sound like claims to knowledge to me. Demonstrate them.
- 2) Claiming atheists "*believe*" something is a non-starter. Atheists simply don't believe in a god/s. You don't speak for atheists, no one does. No one can. Unlike the religious that bind together under one general belief, atheists don't have a central unified "*belief*" system. It is not a position on how life started. One can be an atheist (*i.e. lack a belief in any god*) without being adamant or absolutely positive about anything. Your post is therefore a complete strawman

argument - you are attacking a position that people do not in fact adopt. Therefore your whole premise is a fallacy.

3) I don't know how life began. I don't make any claims regarding the origin of life other than personal ignorance. You can withhold judgement and not believe either.

4) You presented a false dichotomy. There are other possibilities. I have given support for these.

- I don't know (*aka rational skepticism*).
- Gradually arose through chemical processes by *creatio ex materia*.
- Something else not yet known.

5) The two choices you gave are essentially the same anyway. It's one choice.

6) The most likely explanation, abiogenesis, is not "*life springing from nothing*". It's life slowly emerging from a very specific environment over a long period of time. In other words, the hypothesis of abiogenesis proposes that life arose from pre-life self-replicating chemicals, not from nothing. Here are just a couple of the possibilities suggested:

- [New Szostak protocell is closest approximation to origin of life and Darwinian evolution so far.](#)
- [Evidence suggests life on Earth started after meteorites splashed into warm little ponds.](#)
- [Researchers may have solved origin-of-life conundrum.](#)

6) There is empirical evidence for abiogenesis. There is no evidence for creation. The fundamentals of abiogenesis is testable, falsifiable and observable. Creation is not.

7) Faith is a specific type of belief. Faith is belief without sufficient evidence. Faith is belief in spite of, even perhaps because of, the lack of evidence. Faith is the surrender of reason and skepticism. We have reasonable beliefs based on the best available evidence (*as I demonstrated*).

8) While there are [some good models](#), remember I'm honest enough to say that I just don't know, that I am open to other suggestions that may come up in the future. If they do, I will look into these claims and see if they pass the muster. Until then, I still don't know or believe anything to be absolute truth.

9) To be an atheist one doesn't have to have a belief about how life began (*no faith required*). If they do consider abiogenesis (*which has some amount of evidence*) as a viable explanation as scientists also think but in no way claim it as truth or fully proven (*This again, means we have no faith*). In other words, I don't have faith, I have good reason to believe, based on evidence for this. So this would abolish your claim that we are "*hypocritical*" for the "*demonization of people of faith*" for their faith. Your statement becomes moot once again.

10) I don't demonize people of faith. Many atheists don't either. To say all atheists do this is to fall into illogical thinking that inferring that something is true of the *whole* from the fact that it is true of some *part* of the whole. I don't intentionally go out and offend people of faith but if they do get offended, it's not my problem. I.e there may be atheists who do demonize people of faith but you have not provided any evidence that all atheists do this, not in any way to make it a part of the group as a whole. The reason why you may see more people of faith cry out "*that's*

offensive” is merely because there are more of them and also the fact that it seems the mildest form of criticism of religion is also the biggest.

Addendum:

I think the major conflict here is that you to assign supernatural significance to the formation of life, rather than seeing it as a physical process arising naturally from the random interactions of non-living substances.

False dichotomy, straw man, appeal to ignorance, tu quoque, begging the question etc....pick one. You have abused all of these and I can show you where if you so wish to keep this up. Your reasoning is illogical. Your dishonesty is contemptible. Full stop.