

Staks Rosch, atheist blogger, DangerousTalk.net

Today's accepted creed: that nothing created everything.

Atheist Cliches: <http://kgov.com/writings/does-god-exist-bob-enyart-vs-zakath>

Atheist Cliché 4: Only your five senses provide real knowledge!

Theist Rebuttal: Says which of the five? [2 seconds]

GBAIRC, IABE, PDBC

There's an east-coast atheist blogger named **Staks Rosch** who, like me, was born in northern New Jersey. He has a masters degree in philosophy, and I'll read to you his blog account of how we've arranged to interview him today. Quote:

"I will be a guest of the fundamentalist Christian radio show "["Bob Enyart Live."](#) ...Hemant Mehta ([The Friendly Atheist](#)) was a guest for two segments of "Bob Enyart Live." In the first segment he did okay, but the second half-hour he really was getting frustrated and in my opinion got slaughtered. [He attributed it to the old bait and switch](#) but the fact is that he did no opposition research. Whenever you go on Christian radio you really have to expect them to be hostile and be pleasantly surprised if they are not. In any case, I was critical of his performance on his blog and so Bob Enyart's producer checked out DangerousTalk.net and asked me if I was interested."

So yes, Staks said he was interested, so I emailed to Staks a list of possible topics to focus our discussion, being:

- the existence of God
- the origin of life
- the origin of the universe
- the resurrection of Christ
- the young age of the earth
- on right and wrong, OR
- \_\_\_\_\_ (other)

Staks wrote back, quote, "I definitely want to talk about morality and the existence of God. I also want to talk about faith and the scientific method, and the greater atheistic community."

Then, from DangerousTalk.net, Bob Enyart welcomed "the prepared atheist, Staks Rosch."

**Morality and God:** Staks, you selected first the subject of right and wrong, would you say that's one of your strong suits?

Where do you get your understanding of the world and reality? What tools do you use, and how do you determine what is right or wrong?

What tools of investigation do you use, and how do you determine if they are valid? Do you use scientific discovery, and the laws of science, do you use your five senses?

Which of your five senses can tell you that it's wrong to bear false witness against your neighbor? Or to torture him for entertainment?

Let's say you need to determine that it's wrong to kill a neighbor child and eat him, rather than to go shopping because you want to save money for a new car. Is there any absolute standard that tells you that is wrong, or does it just come down to your preference, your opinion, and perhaps the opinion of the majority?

If the majority think that homosexuals should not get married, then is it wrong for homosexuals to get married?

If the majority thinks, like Darwin did, that women are inferior to men, and that blacks are inferior to Europeans, are those views then morally correct and can be implemented in public policy?

Are the rules of morality physical, or non-physical? For example, the rule that it's wrong to rape a child, is that rule a physical entity, or a non-physical entity? Because for example, the laws of logic, justice, and reason are not physical. They don't have mass, polarity, temperature, or shape, the laws of grammar, logic, reason, these are non-physical. Information can be represented with physical symbols, but they are symbols, symbolic, information itself is not physical.

Is this true or false: The laws of the physical sciences do not employ the moral concepts of *right* and *wrong*? *None of the accepted laws of science, the laws of physics, even mention right and wrong. True?*

So, what is your basis for determining right and wrong? Is it your own preference? Conflicting? Majority opinion?

You write in Is there moral grounding without God that: "Morality isn't all absolute" Which parts are, and are not, absolute? If you don't know, how can you make that statement?

Christians who do wrong are condemned by the teaching of Christ, whereas atheistic evolutionary regimes that murder millions cannot be condemned by the laws of science.

**Faith and the Scientific Method:** Science is all about observing evidence, and the Bible defines faith as "the evidence of things not seen." Hebrews 11:1 like you might have evidence that electricity exists, even though you can't see it, so let's see if there's any common ground here.

Is atheism the conclusion arising from the laws of science, or is an assumption?

Methodological atheism, or methodological naturalism: is atheism a conclusion of these, or an assumption?

In 1936 Einstein [famously wrote](#), "the most incomprehensible thing about the world is that it is comprehensible," and in 1944, [remarking about Russell](#), he [described](#) the ability to get from matter to ideas as a "gulf—logically unbridgeable," which some scientists and linguists refer to as Einstein's Gulf.

And whereas Staks hopes that Sam Harris is correct that that science (specifically, neuroscience) can show us the ultimate source of right and wrong, in 1950, Einstein [wrote](#) that "science can only ascertain what *is*, but not what *should be*," necessarily excluding from its domain "value judgments of all kinds."

Science can't tell you whether it's wrong to lynch a black man, or tear the arms and legs off of a child in the womb, can it? What laws of physics tell you that it might be wrong for the strong to kill the weak and survival of the fittest?

Five senses? Which of your five senses can identify the laws of logic. Is it touch, or smell, or taste? Or hearing, if someone reads the laws of logic, do the sounds of the syllables determine whether they are valid, and what if they sound different in different languages?

Staks, you wrote, in *Why do atheists care about religion* (Staks words in italics): "*Faith can't be reasoned with or compromised.*" [Of course it can; the Bible says, "Come let us reason together." I reason and compromise in faith every day, and many of the fathers of the physical sciences were motivated out of their Christian beliefs, including Copernicus, Isaac Newton, Johann Kepler, and so many others. And you wrote:] *When someone has faith in something, no amount of logic or evidence can change their immediate view* [of course it can, I see that

all the time]. *Such a thought numbing mindset is not just a justification for cruelty, hate, and violence; it is a direct cause of such things.*

Staks, you should be able to admit that atheistic Darwinist regimes of the last century have slaughtered tens of millions of their own people. So the atheist blaming religion for violence is like the pot calling the kettle black. No?

To tie this in with our discussion on Morality, Staks, you wrote about the Tuscon murders and wounding of Gabrielle Giffords, and you seem to be struggling to find a way to show that crime as truly wrong. That's probably because you don't believe in absolute right and wrong. But, here's what you wrote, promoting your own personal preferences as the reasons why this is wrong: quote:

"...even if she [the congresswoman Giffords] were someone who I disagreed with on every issue (like Sarah Palin), I would not wish for her to be harmed.

Could we take a detour for a moment Staks on your comment on Sarah Palin? You disagree with her on every issue? In her book she says that the government should keep creation out of schools and that they should teach evolution, and she is extremely complimentary of homosexuals, and she appointed a Planned Parenthood board member to the Alaska Supreme Court, and I could give you a dozen other examples of why many liberal activists in Alaska supported her. So, you wouldn't disagree with Palin on any of those major positions, would you?

Staks: "*We live but one life and taking life makes us less of who we are.*" [Why does that matter? If a fish eats another fish, that second becomes less of who it was. So what? Is that an absolute that cannot be justly violated, that we can't make someone less of who she is?] "*Violence is an attack on the intellect.*" [Do you mean on the physical neurons in the brain, so that you're talking about atoms crashing into other atoms, or are you recognizing the intellect is not physical?]

"*Our political system is based on dialog not violence.*" [You seem to argue that people should comply with your preferences. You prefer our political system, to let people be who they are, and to not attack the intellect. Other folks couldn't care less about these matters, so unless they represent absolutes, they're just your own opinion and preferences, or those of a minority or majority, as compared to the values of others.

(And probably not worth bringing up, but he disagrees with Palin on "everything?" I guess he's pro-life and anti-homosexual and believes Creationism should be taught in public schools...)

**Forwarded conversation**

Subject: **Hello Researcher friends! In a couple hours I'll be interviewing an atheist and...**

From: **Bob Enyart** <Bob@kgov.com>

Date: Wed, Jan 12, 2011 at 12:38 PM

To: Art Brown <arthurb.53@gmail.com>, Bob Kyffin <robertkyffin@yahoo.com>, Chris Fisher <christopher.c.fisher@gmail.com>, Darrell Birkey <darrellbirkey@aol.com>, Greg Bayman <gregbayman@gmail.com>, James Craddock & Amy <climber14er@gmail.com>, Jaydan Brown <jayjoeb@yahoo.com>, Jefferson George <jeffersonageorge@gmail.com>, Jim Scofield <jim.ginh@gmail.com>, Joe Desrosiers <jcamd@comcast.net>, Joe Rossano <joe.rossano@e-gineering.com>, Joel Flake <joel.flake@gmail.com>, Josh Horstman <jmhorstman@gmail.com>, Judy Zabik <jrzabik@att.net>, Laura Scofield <lainpdx@yahoo.com>, Paul Mileski <pmileski@yahoo.com>, Russ Holmes <russellholmes@comcast.net>, Scott Evans <COScottEvans@gmail.com>, Will Duffy <will@kgov.com>, Josiah Enyart <josiahenyart@gmail.com>

Hello Researcher friends! In a couple hours I'll be interviewing an atheist (today at 3pm MT), Staks Rosch, and, while the time is short, if any of you are able to check out his [Atheism 101](#) topics and want to email to me your thoughts on his comments (related to the two topics below), feel free, and thank you so much!

-Bob

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Bob Enyart** <[Bob@kgov.com](mailto:Bob@kgov.com)>  
Date: Wed, Jan 12, 2011 at 12:33 PM  
Subject: Re: Staks, I'm looking forward to talking with you today. Can you be on a land line, and should we...  
To: Staks Rosch <[dangeroustalk@gmail.com](mailto:dangeroustalk@gmail.com)>  
Cc: Josiah Enyart <[josiahenyart@gmail.com](mailto:josiahenyart@gmail.com)>, Will Duffy <[will@kgov.com](mailto:will@kgov.com)>

Staks, your topics sound great. If I'm wrong in any of my arguments, I hope you can demonstrate any error. And yes, we'll provide you a good quality recording of the program. Also, we can go for about 25 minutes without commercial break. So I'll do a short intro to the discussion, and here's our topics:

- morality and the existence of God
- faith and the scientific method

-Bob

On Wed, Jan 12, 2011 at 12:20 PM, Staks Rosch <[dangeroustalk@gmail.com](mailto:dangeroustalk@gmail.com)> wrote:  
I'll call in at 2:57 your time. I definitely want to talk about morality and the existence of God. I also want to talk about faith and the scientific method and the greater atheistic community. I'm looking forward to talking to you. Would I be able to get a digital copy of the broadcast that I could post on my website?  
-Staks

On Wed, Jan 12, 2011 at 2:04 PM, Bob Enyart <[Bob@kgov.com](mailto:Bob@kgov.com)> wrote:  
Staks, I'm looking forward to talking with you today. Can you be on a landline, and should we call you or would you like to call us?

We're at 303-463-1707 or 303-463-7789. Whether we call you or you call us, it'd be great if we can get you on the line at 2:57 Mountain Time (4:57p E.T.)

Also Staks, if you'd like feel free to call now or ahead of time if you'd like to talk about which areas of disagreement that you'd like to discuss.

Possibilities include:

- the existence of God
- the origin of life
- the origin of the universe
- the resurrection of Christ
- the young age of the earth
- on right and wrong
- \_\_\_\_\_ (other)

Thanks Staks, and I'm looking forward to talking with you!

-Bob Enyart, KGOV.com &  
Pastor, Denver Bible Church

-----  
From: **Mail Delivery Subsystem** <[mailer-daemon@googlemail.com](mailto:mailer-daemon@googlemail.com)>  
Date: Wed, Jan 12, 2011 at 12:39 PM  
To: [bobenyart@gmail.com](mailto:bobenyart@gmail.com)

Delivery to the following recipient failed permanently:

[russellholmes@comcast.net](mailto:russellholmes@comcast.net)

Technical details of permanent failure:

Google tried to deliver your message, but it was rejected by the recipient domain. We recommend contacting the other email provider for further information about the cause of this error. The error that the other server returned was: 550 550 5.1.1 <[russellholmes@comcast.net](mailto:russellholmes@comcast.net)> Account not available (state 17).

----- Original message -----

Received: by 10.216.167.65 with SMTP id h43mr2641868wel.17.1294861129440; Wed, 12 Jan 2011 11:38:49 -0800 (PST)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Sender: [bobenyart@gmail.com](mailto:bobenyart@gmail.com)  
Received: by 10.216.155.194 with HTTP; Wed, 12 Jan 2011 11:38:29 -0800 (PST)  
From: Bob Enyart <[Bob@KGOV.com](mailto:Bob@KGOV.com)>  
Date: Wed, 12 Jan 2011 12:38:29 -0700  
X-Google-Sender-Auth: QZ2rKvTQw\_6txHCx7mlAOB0fYTs  
Message-ID: <AANLkTi=mHSfN+y2eZjFfZ7qe7uf-xovz=H8spA\_vmZTk@mail.gmail.com>  
Subject: Hello Researcher friends! In a couple hours I'll be interviewing an atheist and...  
To: Art Brown <[arthurb.53@gmail.com](mailto:arthurb.53@gmail.com)>, Bob Kyffin <[robertkyffin@yahoo.com](mailto:robertkyffin@yahoo.com)>, Chris Fisher <[christopher.c.fisher@gmail.com](mailto:christopher.c.fisher@gmail.com)>, Darrell Birkey <[darrellbirkey@aol.com](mailto:darrellbirkey@aol.com)>, Greg Bayman <[gregbayman@gmail.com](mailto:gregbayman@gmail.com)>, "James Craddock & Amy" <[climber14er@gmail.com](mailto:climber14er@gmail.com)>, Jaydan Brown <[jayjoeb@yahoo.com](mailto:jayjoeb@yahoo.com)>, Jefferson George <[jeffersonageorge@gmail.com](mailto:jeffersonageorge@gmail.com)>, Jim Scofield <[jim\\_ginh@gmail.com](mailto:jim_ginh@gmail.com)>, Joe Desrosiers <[jcamd@comcast.net](mailto:jcamd@comcast.net)>, Joe Rossano <[joe.rossano@e-gineering.com](mailto:joe.rossano@e-gineering.com)>, Joel Flake <[joel.flake@gmail.com](mailto:joel.flake@gmail.com)>,

Josh Horstman <[jmhorstman@gmail.com](mailto:jmhorstman@gmail.com)>, Judy Zabik <[jrzabik@att.net](mailto:jrzabik@att.net)>, Laura Scofield <[lainpdx@yahoo.com](mailto:lainpdx@yahoo.com)>, Paul Mileski <[pmileski@yahoo.com](mailto:pmileski@yahoo.com)>, Russ Holmes <[russellholmes@comcast.net](mailto:russellholmes@comcast.net)>, Scott Evans <[COScottEvans@gmail.com](mailto:COScottEvans@gmail.com)>, Will Duffy <[wjill@kgov.com](mailto:wjill@kgov.com)>, Josiah Enyart <[josiahenyart@gmail.com](mailto:josiahenyart@gmail.com)>  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary=0016364c7d57a760e20499ab5986  
<<http://www.dangeroustalk.net/?p=1768>>topics and want to email to me

-----  
From: **Jamie misc** <[jim.ginh@gmail.com](mailto:jim.ginh@gmail.com)>

Date: Wed, Jan 12, 2011 at 12:51 PM

To: Bob Enyart <[Bob@kgov.com](mailto:Bob@kgov.com)>

At his site, he lists recent posts. Among them is one about the Arizona shootings. In the 3rd paragraph, he says:

"But even if she were someone who I disagreed with on every issue (like Sarah Palin), I would not wish for her to be harmed. We live but one life and taking life makes us less of who we are. Violence is an attack on the intellect. It is an acknowledgement that we can't change minds with logical and reason. Violence therefore is the last resort to only be used in self defense. Our political system is based on dialog not violence."

First of all, "violence is an attack on the intellect?" What is the intellect? Is violence an attack on the neurons in a person's physical brain? Or is he referring to something else? Is he referring to a physical attack on a physical bodily organ? Or, rather, is he more likely referring to a non-physical "attack" on a non-physical aspect of a human being, the mind? Which of his five senses gives him the data that proves the existence of this non-physical attack on a non-physical mind?

(And probably not worth bringing up, but he disagrees with Palin on "everything?" I guess he's pro-life and anti-homosexual and believes Creationism should be taught in public schools...)

From Jamie Scofield: At his site, he lists recent posts. Among them is one about the Arizona shootings. In the 3rd paragraph, he says:

"But even if she were someone who I disagreed with on every issue (like Sarah Palin), I would not wish for her to be harmed. We live but one life and taking life makes us less of who we are. Violence is an attack on the intellect. It is an acknowledgement that we can't change minds with logical and reason. Violence therefore is the last resort to only be used in self defense. Our political system is based on dialog not violence."

First of all, "violence is an attack on the intellect?" What is the intellect? Is violence an attack on the neurons in a person's physical brain? Or is he referring to something else? Is he referring to a physical attack on a physical bodily organ? Or, rather, is he more likely referring to a non-physical "attack" on a non-physical aspect of a human being, the mind? Which of his five senses gives him the data that proves the existence of this non-physical attack on a non-physical mind?

(And probably not worth bringing up, but he disagrees with Palin on "everything?" I guess he's pro-life and anti-homosexual and believes Creationism should be taught in public schools...)