

bookseventy  
twoSwords

This book is for the boxers. What follows is basically the summary of thousands of interactions, debates, & conversations that I engaged in over a few year period (circa 2015-2017) with various adeists, atheists, agnostics, theists, & deists. These interactions culminate in two “scripts” and a related poem entitled “The Marketplace of Ideas” - based on Luke 7:31-35. Hopefully, the following will assist the reader in their own internal battle against the lies that the systems of greed and power have infected them with. I’ll start with the simplified versions and then go deeper. Obviously, most of my “theist” points are based on Christianity - however, most of these points are equally valid for Judaism and Islam.

### The Atheist Script

Starts with the presentation of The Paradox of The Burden of Proof:

From our subjective perspective either some higher-level creative intelligence is responsible for our existence or not. There is currently no publicly-known, objectively-verifiable, scientifically-reproducible, peer-reviewed evidence sufficiently leading to proof that either is the objective truth. Whichever you choose you are using the concept of faith. Faith is belief without proof. Objectively speaking only one is the truth and our subjectively formulated opinions or lack thereof have no effect on that objective truth. Such is the nature, beauty, and glory of The Truth - He is perfect and unbreakable.

---

They respond something like, “you are wrong.”

[insert name here] - I’ll simplify for you.

Do you perceive the following statement to be true or false?

1. From our subjective perspective either some higher-level creative Intelligence is responsible for our existence or not.

How about this one?

2. Of the two subjective possibilities mentioned in the preceding statement - only one of them is the objective truth.

---

Assuming false is answered for either:

[insert name here] - I'll simplify even further for you - there are two subjective possibilities: intelligence or non-intelligence - three subjective choices: intelligence or non-intelligence or choose to not choose - one objective truth.

---

Assuming denial of the above

[insert name here] - If you are incapable of understanding these fundamental truths with respect to this conversation - then you are unqualified and incapable of having this conversation in a manner consistent with respect to truth and intellectual honesty.

---

The Theist Script

Starts with the presentation of The Good News:

The Good News Is  
The Kingdom of Heaven Is Now  
Turn to The Lord  
The Son of God Is The Truth  
The Truth Is a Mirror  
The Son of Man Is The Lie  
Your Sins Are Forgiven  
Your Faith Spiritually Heals You

---

[insert name here] -  
Who do you say The Son of God is?  
Who do you say The Son of Man is?

---

1 Samuel 15:3 - The Lord Almighty says, 'put to death men and women, children and infants'

[insert name here] - do you believe that The Lord literally commanded Samuel and in turn Saul and the soldiers - to literally and specifically kill literal children and infants - with the expectation that they would literally carry out the command?

---

Numbers 15:32 - While the Israelites were in the wilderness, a man was found gathering wood on the Sabbath day. 33 Those who found him gathering wood brought him to Moses and Aaron and the whole assembly, 34 and they kept him in custody, because it was not clear what should be done to him. 35 Then The Lord said to Moses, "The man must die. The whole assembly must stone him outside the camp." 36 So the assembly took him outside the camp and stoned him to death, as The Lord commanded Moses.

[insert name here] - do you believe that The Lord - The Creator - literally told Moses and in turn the assembly to literally stone a man to death for literally picking up sticks on a literal Saturday in history - with the expectation and foreknowledge that they would literally carry out the command?

---

[insert name here] - your teacher has taught you that The Lord literally commanded human beings to literally kill literal children and infants. Your teacher has also taught you that The Lord commanded humans to literally stone a man to death for literally picking up literal sticks on a literal Saturday in history. Your teacher has also taught you that The Son of Man is The Truth.

I believe that The Lord teaches me that The Lord did not literally tell human beings to kill children and infants - nor to kill a man for picking up sticks. I believe that The Lord also teaches me that The Son of God is The Truth - and that The Son of Man is The Lie humans tell about The Truth. Seems

like we are being taught by mutually exclusive teachers.

Matthew 15:10 - When He had called the multitude to Himself, He said to them, "Hear and understand: 11 not what goes into the mouth defiles a person; but what comes out of the mouth, this defiles a person."

---

Luke 22:38 - The above should be about all you need - but for those that want a little more:

Basically, the argument between the two sides boils down to the atheists calling theists stupid for believing and the theists calling the atheists damned for not believing. These two main positions are well documented in Matthew 5:21-22. The four main offenses mentioned are murder, anger, raca, fool. Murder is initially dismissed as a symptom rather than a cause. We fear what we do not understand - fear begets hate begets anger begets violence begets death. There are two shorelines when crossing the Jordan - meaning The Descending. The first is literal violence - the second is figurative/spiritual/mental violence - primarily expressed through lies. It is reasonable to separate literally violent people from non-violent people. An intellectual discussion of atheism vs. theism need not include literally violent people - they have a more pressing issue to deal with - stop fucking being violent assholes - we can all agree on that whatever we do or don't believe about "God." The discussion should start with the source of literal violence in the human mind - anger - which stems from hate - which branches off of fear - unrooted understanding. Matthew 5:21-22 describes two fundamental offenses that lead to anger - calling some one raca and calling some one a fool. This would be better communicated using the word stupid instead of raca and damned instead of fool. The entire argument serves only to demonstrate humanity's gross lack of capacity to understand the difference between objectively verifiable facts and subjectively formulated opinions. Three types of punishment are also mentioned: judgement, court/council, and hellFire. The first two - judgement and council are basically the same - however, hellFire even figuratively interpreted is seemingly a more severe penalty than judgement. Spiritually speaking judgement may be better expressed with the word reeducation. In other words - calling some one stupid - while offensive - is nowhere near the same level of offense as calling some one damned or unworthy of salvation - ultimately condemning them to eternal torturous

punishment separated from their creator - not cool. These are the two sides - atheism v theism - aka you're stupid vs. you're damned. Both often beget anger - which is the source of much violence on this rock.

Beware of posers - in my experience there are many atheists posing as theists and vice versa. These people work to weaken the arguments of the other side from within. Everything hidden is being revealed.

You will be tempted to exit the script and entertain the myriad tangents generated by the minds on both sides of the valley. It's your mind - your court - play your game - do not be drawn into their game with their rules and their traps. Their game is over.

---

Details:

Theism:

The theistic script is pretty simple. Sometimes after presenting The Good News - some will state something like, "The Son of Man and The Son of God are both Jesus." At which point you can skip the first two questions: Who do you say The Son of God is? & Who do you say The Son of Man is? Another typical "Christian" response goes something like this you answer my question first, seemingly calling upon Matthew 21:23-27. In which case - honestly and directly answer one question. Then it is your turn - and you need go no further if they will not answer your question - they are not playing fair at that point - thusly you win - since their doctrine is that they are the ones playing fair. The funny thing about this position is they see themselves as an anointed authority similar to Jesus that demands their question be answered prior to entertaining your "non-anointed" position. However, by presenting The Good News - you've already asked the first question - their challenge is their answer.

Either way - once they confirm their support of the typical Christian position that The Son of Man and The Son of God are the same entity - then you can move on to the 1 Samuel 15:3 question. Some will answer yes and offer a defense regurgitated from a few Alpha Christian apologist sources stating something along the lines of the Amalekites were evil and practiced child sacrifice - that's why God has the "good people" His "children" kill their

children - to prevent them from killing their own children anymore. Some towering intellects must have worked for years to generate such a well thought-out defense. Another defense goes something like this, "Who are you to question God's authority and judgement." That has nothing to do with the question of what they believe - a good response is, "you did not answer the question." They may try again - again, "you still did not answer the question." Of course many try not to answer the question directly and/or try to change the subject - simply re-present the 1 Samuel 15:3 question again. Or move on to the Numbers 15:32-36 question prefaced by the statement, "I'll take that as a yes - how about this one?"

The typical defense of Numbers 15:32-36 goes something like this, "The punishment for sin is death." Note again they often will not directly answer the question. Likely out of fear of Matthew 7:1-2 & Luke 6:37. You can employ the, "you did not answer the question" technique - or more typically, you can just move on to your final statement, "your teacher has taught you... Matthew 15:10..." - perhaps prefaced by, "I'll take that as a yes as well." After making this final statement - your work is done - Matthew 10:14. Note that dry-land dwellers have dust on their feet - not blood.

For your entertainment - another couple responses I received often went like this, "What about the flood?" or "What about Abraham and Isaac?" Of course those are horrible examples. In The Flood - God does all the literal killing in the story. And God stops Abraham from literal violence against a literal child in that story.

Additionally the more "loving" christians will take the time to rebuke you with various horrific insults. One of their favorites references 1 John 4:3 - they will likely insist on using the King James translation - which they use to conclude that the person who denies Jesus was in the flesh 2000 years ago has the spirit of the antiChrist. I say thank you. If having the opposite spirit of those that think the most beautiful story on the planet is the torturous humiliating murder of the most innocent person they can imagine - then that's definitely the spirit that's with me - whatever label they want to place on it. Call me what you will - I dub thee forgivable. The rest you can imagine - you are going to burn in hell for eternity separated from the God that loves you so much - you are with satan - you are a slave of satan - etc. Endure that hundreds of times - judge and be judged - condemn and be condemned - by the measure you use you will be measured.

Atheism:

The most common defense is some insult - aka "I'm smart - you're stupid." The next most common defense is mentioning some other concept. Something like "What about The Flying Spaghetti Monster or Bigfoot - I mean you don't think that believing that invisible pink unicorns are in your underwear drawer is a matter of faith do - you fucking pathetic moron? Go suck your sky daddy's dick you worthless religitar." Endure that a few hundred times - and never respond. Romans 12:20 Proverbs 25:21-22.

To which the response is:

[insert name here] - you are confusing and distracting yourself with irrelevant concepts and relabeling. Either you are suggesting that "The Flying Spaghetti Monster" is responsible for our existence or not. If not - then "The Flying Spaghetti Monster" is irrelevant with respect to my first statement. If you are suggesting that "The Flying Spaghetti Monster" is responsible for our existence - then "The Flying Spaghetti Monster" is either intelligent or not. And we are right back to the first statement again.

Some atheists - will continue to generate many additional randomized concepts in each new response. Simply rewording the above to address the newly introduced irrelevant concepts can go on ad nauseam. They can be cutoff with the following, "Please disable your random irrelevant concept generator prior to any further responses. And with particularly aggressive master debaters, "You you are demonstrating a gross lack of capacity with respect to reading comprehension - aggravated by your inability to disable your random irrelevant concept generator."

These individuals seem to be trying to dilute the original concept by relabeling the concept and/or randomly generating irrelevant concepts. They will often fervently insist on the absolute importance and relevance of these randomized irrelevant concepts to the discussion. To do otherwise would focus their attention on the main issue - the specific issue they are trying to avoid with their defenses. Furthermore, they seem to take pride in their capacity to mention non-related topics - often perceiving victory in the debate based on this grand capacity to randomly generate irrelevant concepts and/or repeatedly relabeling "some higher-level creative intelligence."

Another pseudo-zinger goes something like this, "Oh yeah - who made

your God?" To which the response is: With respect to the origin question - while I admit it is very interesting, it is also irrelevant/secondary with respect to the belief question. Either said Intelligence objectively exists or does not exist. If said Intelligence does not exist then the origin of said Intelligence is completely and totally irrelevant. If said Intelligence does exist - then the origin of said Intelligence is completely and totally irrelevant with respect to one's choice to believe said Intelligence exists - either your position is correct or not.

Some will say that you don't understand certain words - or ask you to define certain words. These people argue semantics - direct them to Dictionary.com Wikipedia and/or Google - and stay on script - don't play their game with their rules.

The paradox - many will claim there is no paradox. You do not have to define paradox - or explain the paradox. The paradox is expressed through their attacking of the truthfulness of the individual statements while simultaneously claiming the more truthful position and defining the parameters of truth with respect to the conversation. See, they basically state that "no God" is the default position and those that make the claim that there is a God need to provide evidence sufficiently leading to proof of said claim. This demonstrates their utter lack of understanding of the fundamental truths relating to the "God" questions. There are two questions - is there a "God" and whether there is a "God" or not - do you choose to believe said "God" exists. They are applying the standards of the first question which is a matter of objective fact - to the second question which is a matter of subjective faith. The theist inverts that and applies their standards of faith to a matter of fact. The vast majority of conflict on this planet is a direct result of a basic lack of understanding of the difference between objectively verifiable facts and subjectively formulated opinions. They both flicker between the two and try to unify two questions into one - creating their towers of Babble and confusion - ultimately, unnecessarily, and dangerously dividing the species. Ezekiel 25:17 as quoted in Pulp Fiction by SamUel L. JackSon. Some of the alphas knowingly sit atop these mountains of lies and reap the spoils of the mental and spiritual anguish of those they've climbed over to get to the top.

"The Paradox of The Burden of Proof" does not claim that there is a God - it simply outlines the argument about said choice to either believe or not - with a series of obviously true statements. I might as well be saying, "boots

exist - at least conceptually” - true or false. But because I’m obviously or at least perceptively a theist - the vast majority of atheists I encountered could not admit that the individual statements in the paradox are true - thusly exposing the paradoxical nature of their position. They arrogantly define the parameters of truth related to the topic - while simultaneously demonstrating their inability to understand fundamental truths with respect to the conversation.

They might as well be saying “Chocolate is my favorite ice cream. Vanilla is your favorite. Now prove to me that vanilla is my favorite. I know that you cannot prove that - therefore it is true that chocolate is the greatest ice cream.” To which some one will undoubtedly respond favorite flavor of ice cream is not a matter of choice it is a matter of whichever flavor appeals to your tastebuds and the resulting electrochemical reactions within the brain. A scientific analysis of taste may illuminate the technical process of taste and resulting preference. However, illuminating a technical process does not negate the process that it illuminates. You still try chocolate and vanilla and determine(aka choose) which one you like better. This is the same technique used for the arguments surrounding evolution vs. creationism. Evolution and creationism are not mutually exclusive concepts. Let’s just say that evolution is 100% proven as the technical process that has brought us to the current state of human development. Ok - that does not mean that an intelligence could not have initiated and/or manipulated said process. Describing a technical process does not negate the meaning of that process. Describing the electrochemical process of what we call love does not negate love.

The paradox may be presented by some one who obviously has chosen to believe that some higher-level creative intelligence is responsible for their existence - so what - by presenting The Paradox one is not claiming that there is a God. They will try to draw that claim out of you - it’s not necessary - do not play their game with their rules - it’s a trick. They trick theists into claiming something they cannot prove is true - and then ask for proof that they know cannot be offered. Then the theist aggravates the circumstances with pseudo-science and the literalization of The Word of God - i.e. Adam and Eve were literally manifested and propagated the entire literal species, God so loved the world that He killed everyone including drowning millions of babies - except eight people which repropagated the species, Mary was literally a virgin of literal intercourse, etc. They win every time a theist defiles themselves with their mouths. The

theist in their attempt to offer a path to The Lord blocks the door with their mouths. The Atheist's faith that their position is the objective truth is emboldened by the theist's inability to defend scientifically ridiculous positions.

When either side runs out of words - they will descend to insulting you. At that point - you've won - don't drop down to their level - don't play their game with their rules.

Never argue at the same level with a ignorant/mean/arrogant person - they will drag you down to their level and beat you with experience.

The agnostic argument goes something like this, "You forgot the only intelligent option - not choosing either - since neither has been proven." To which The response is: One can choose to not choose - this is accounted for via the phrase, "or lack thereof." No further engagement is necessary - they hold no position - and call it the most intelligent position - it's no position at all. They are only stating the obvious, "we don't know." Again they are trying to blend the two separate questions - is there a "God" and whether or not there is - do you choose to believe there is or isn't. Of course if you choose to believe that there is or isn't a "God" - you don't know - you believe - duh. Now shut the fuck up until you actually choose a position and have something useful to add to the discussion.

I've found most self-proclaimed agnostics are essentially atheists. Either way, they seem not to understand the concept of faith. They want proof prior to choosing to believe. Faith and proof are mutually exclusive concepts. While faith may ultimately guide one to evidence sufficiently leading to proof - once you have proof you no longer have faith. Proof is a function of evidence - faith is a function of choice.

Another observation I've made is that both sides are fundamentally attacking choice - using a natural fear of not wanting to be wrong, stupid, and/or damned. Their individual "laws" of stupidity or damnation are designed to eliminate choice for the betas that submit to the alphas - so the alphas and their subs can program the betas to their benefit - typically fame, fortune, & pleasure. Note that at both atheists and theists financially and personally benefit from the literalization of The Word of God. The presenters of reality present the reality that benefits them the most.

I listened to a Sam Harris argument once that went something like this - I'm simplifying of course. Choice doesn't exist - example, if you choose to stay in bed - you will eventually have to get out of bed - negating your original choice. So, because you will eventually have to go to the bathroom, eat, or just get bored - you would likely have to eventually leave the bed you supposedly chose to stay in - therefore you can't choose to stay in bed - ergo choice does not exist. The problem with this argument is that it is borrowing hypothetical information from a time that does not exist - the future - and applying it to a choice made in a time that does exist - the now. By that measure and using that technique I could also prove that choice does exist. I'll just borrow information from another hypothesized future - I choose to stay in the bed - and I die - and no one removes me - thusly by the standard of his original argument I demonstrate that choice does exist. So, we are both able to use the same standard to demonstrate mutually exclusive concepts are simultaneously true - which demonstrates the fallacy of the original argument. Now, you might say that I would eventually decay and the bed would eventually disintegrate - therefore choice is negated by the fact that my physical body and the bed would eventually blend into the ground below us. But this only serves to further amplify the absurdity of borrowing hypothetical information from the future to define reality in the now.

The Merovingian in The Matrix suggests that, "Choice is an illusion created between those with power and those without." This is somewhat true. However, with respect to faith - even if I am without power and the reality around me is falsified by those with power - the choice is subjectively real to me and at least has meaning with respect to my mental/spiritual development even if somehow it is distorted by powers above me. Either way - even if choice is distorted by those with power - those with power exercised choice in their manipulation of the choices of those less powerful than themselves. It seems to me if there are two entities with approximately equal amounts of power - even if there is a greater power above them - with respect to each other according to The Merovingian's theory they would then have choice - at least with respect to issues between them. Furthermore, if two entities of essentially equal power are trying to manipulate/control/distort the choice of a less powerful individual(s)- then they would be creating a tension that would ultimately deliver choice to the less powerful individual - making their "vote" between the two manipulated realities a more powerful choice than the choice of those with greater power to try to take their choice away. Two houses both

alike in indignity.

The Architect scene in The Matrix suggests that the choice of the “less powerful” entity is specifically the problem - that prevents the “more powerful” being from accomplishing the full realization of it’s own choice. So the choice to distort/manipulate the choice of the less powerful being by the more powerful being gives tremendous power to the less powerful individual - at least at the apex of the choice pyramid of the less powerful group of people. The one vote of one person ultimately defines and potentially negates the desired outcome of the choice of the more powerful entity. Neo keeps fighting because he chooses to - I know the feeling.

So, my conclusion on choice is that denying choice is an intellectual dead-end - at least with respect to the choice to believe that either some higher-level creative intelligence is responsible for our existence or not.

Another less common attack goes something like this, “Why is the truth a Man?” To Which the response is: “It is a common literary device known as personification - the statement basically means that the truth is whatever the truth is regardless of our opinions - try understanding meaning - rather than being bound by literal interpretation.”

These are usually the weaker ones in my experience. The personification is there for a few reasons - to honor The Word of The Lord, to trap the weaker ones into attacking a common literary device - so that you can move on to stronger opponents more quickly - and to exemplify a simple non-literal interpretation of scripture to both sides.

The Children in The Marketplace of Ideas

This Generation - Like All Generations  
Is Like Children Calling Out to Each Other  
In The Marketplace of Ideas  
The Atheists Saying  
We Played a Song for You - But You Did Not Dance  
The Paradox of The Burden of Proof:  
From Our Subjective Perspective  
Either Some Higher-level Creative Intelligence  
Is Responsible for Our Existence or Not  
There Is Currently No Publicly-known Objectively-verifiable

Scientifically-reproducible Peer-reviewed Evidence  
Sufficiently Leading to Proof That Either  
Is The Objective Truth  
It Is a Choice to Believe One or The Other Is The Truth  
Whichever You Choose  
You Are Using The Concept of Faith  
Faith Is Belief Without Proof  
Objectively Speaking Only One Is The Truth and  
Our Subjectively Formulated Opinions or Lack Thereof  
Have No Effect on That Objective Truth  
Such Is The Nature Beauty and Glory of The Truth  
He Is Perfect and Unbreakable  
Jesus Is The Personification of The Truth  
The Theists Say  
We Sang a Song for You but You Did Not Weep  
The Paradox of The Doctrine of Literal Inerrancy  
You Shall Not Murder  
The False Profit Says God Says...  
Put to Death Men and Women Children and Infants  
The Truth Replies You Shall Not Murder  
Yet Wisdom Is Vindicated by All Her Children

“Remember the love bit also” - Christopher Hitchens

I took the road less traveled by - both - and thusly I rage against the dying  
of the light.

johnTwenTyTwenTy  
thePricelsPaidInFull  
cQcQTwenTyTwenTyIsHindSighttt

Thanx to all the singers, musicians, scientists, debaters, preachers, writers,  
dancers, actors, directors, artists, workers, friends, family & Co. Thank You  
Lord for Your words, Your world, and all Your beautiful children. Truly,  
salvation comes from The Lord - AKA Love.

theTruthIsAMirrorPointNet  
© 2019 Tony Terrana