

Tuesday, March 06, 2012

Nide's 15

Christian apologist in-the-making Nide Corniell, who blogs and comments under the pseudonym "Hezekiah Ahaz," continues to insist on playing the court jester. I recently posed 15 questions for Nide to consider (in the comments section of [this blog](#)), and he addressed them in his usual evasive and tirelessly adolescent manner (see [here](#).)

Most of these are questions that I had posed to Nide earlier in our comment discussion but which he had resisted answering. Now we have his answers. Let's take a look and see what he says.

I asked: "1. How does your worldview *account for* life?"

Nide quoted Gen. 2:7: "Then the LORD God formed man of dust from the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living being."

This doesn't address the question. It only gives the biblical myth of how man came into being. It does not provide an *account for* life. Question: Is "the LORD God" supposed to be alive? Problem: If so, then appealing to said "LORD God" does not provide an *account for* life - you're just pointing to something that's already said to have life in order to *account for* life. Which means: You have no *account for* life. At best you have a go-nowhere [tape loop](#). Seriously, this is Incinerating Presuppositionalism 101 stuff. Time to give up on this one.

I asked: "2. If life didn't come from existence, where do you think it came from?"

Nide answered: "Look up."

You seem to be affirming the view that "life didn't come from existence," since you're consenting to there being some kind of alternative. But what am I supposed to "look up" to find an alternative to existence? Your god's cloak? The only alternative to existence is non-existence. So putting your answers to 1 and 2 together, the inference that your god is non-existent is inescapable. But, we already knew that. Welcome to the truth! Let me show you around.

I asked: "3. Does your god have a brain? Yes or no."

Nide answered: "No. Your God doesn't have any body parts."

So I was right: you worship a brainless god. Why did you resist answering this question the first time I raised it?

I asked: "4. You had charged that 'Rand was being arbitrary'. When are you going to support this claim?"

Nide answered: "I did already."

No, in fact you didn't. Go back and check the record: this is a charge that you affirmed, but never supported. I'm guessing you never will.

I asked: "5. If an algebra teacher drinks himself silly every night and beats his kids at home, is algebra false or "stupid" as a result of this? Yes or no?"

Nide replied: "No it's not stupid or false"

Okay, good. You agree with Objectivism then. Why was that so hard?

Nide continued: “but like I said this is a false analogy compared to the matter that was at hand.”

It’s not a “false analogy” by any means. I’ll help you to understand: If the Objectivist ethics are true, then they are true no matter what any particular individual *actually* does. In other words, pointing to someone’s particular actions will always be insufficient to show that the Objectivist ethics are wrong or false, just as pointing to any algebra teacher’s actions in the classroom or at home will always be insufficient to show that algebra is wrong or false. In terms of *principle*, we have a direct parallel here.

I asked: “6. If someone answers the question, ‘How do you know?’ with the statement, ‘We know without knowing how we know’, do you think this answer indicates that the one who said it has anything valuable to say about knowledge?”

Nide answered: “I gave you John Frame's contact info. Call him and then get back to us.”

I see, afraid to give your own assessment here? Why is that? When we get to the same issue in Question 10, we’ll see that you said “it’s called begging the question.” Should I tell John Frame that you think he was begging the question?

I asked: “7. Do Christians die?”

Nide replied: “Nobody dies.”

Really? So what are hospital morgues for? What are mortuary services for? What are cemeteries for? The bible itself affirms that people die. Very strange, Nide. You’re trying so hard to be slippery, but it’s such a juvenile effort.

I asked: “8. How does one determine whether or not he is ‘thinking God’s thoughts after him’? Please explain the steps you would take to make this determination.”

Nide replied: “Reading the bible and then applying it.”

It’s so simple a caveman could do it. And from what you describe here, it sounds like it’s something the believer does *himself* - by his own choices and effort. When you “think God’s thoughts after him,” are you in control of your thinking, or is your god in control of your thinking? It all sounds like you’re trying, from the vantage of a fallible and non-omniscient mind, to conform your thoughts to those of an infallible and omniscient mind that you can only apprehend in your imagination. How is fallible and non-omniscient effort supposed to somehow mirror the thinking of an infallible and omniscient mind?

Indeed, the formula which you propose seems only to open the flood gates to all the hundreds and thousands of varieties of Christian theology which circulate in the religious marketplace, including brands that have been deemed to be “heretical” by other brands. According to your proposed formula, anyone who is “reading the bible” can claim that he’s “applying it” and thereby “thinking God’s thoughts after him,” thus providing the seal of authenticity (given the formula you have outlined) to whatever view he ends up affirming as a result. And yet they’re in direct disagreement and conflict with others claiming to do the same. Wow, I’m glad these aren’t my problems!

I asked: “9. What is your proof that I can think without a brain?”

Nide answered: “The bible.”

Where does the bible say that Dawson Bethrick can think without a brain? I haven’t read that, and yet you say that the bible provides proof that I can think without a brain. I admit this is all very hard to take this seriously. And even if the bible did state this, how would that constitute a proof? It would only be an instance of the very claim which needs to be proved in the first place. Needs work.

I asked: “10. If a Christian apologist challenges a non-believer to explain how he knows something he has affirmed, and the non-believer replies by saying, ‘We know without knowing how we know’, do you think

there's anything wrong with this? Yes or no. Please explain your answer."

Nide replied: "Yea, it's called begging the question."

I see. So, John Frame was begging the question when he stated "We know without knowing how we know"? (See [here](#).)

I'm curious though. Can you show how this statement - "We know without knowing how we know" - is an instance of "begging the question"? Do you know what this fallacy is? Your statements continually leave me in doubt on this matter.

Perhaps John Frame was simply "thinking God's thoughts after him." And yet here you're implying that this amounts to "begging the question." Man, you're all over the place!

I asked: "11. Do you agree with the Objectivist principle that man needs values in order to live? Yes or no."

Nide replied: "No."

Okay, there we have it: Nide thinks man does not need values in order to live. This could only mean that man does not need morality, on Nide's view. Wow. Just wow!

Nide continued: "Men need Jesus Christ in order to live."

I see. So, "Jesus Christ" is not a value. Indeed, I do not value Jesus Christ, and I live like few others ever have. See the proof?

I asked: "12. How do you know you're saved?"

Nide replied: "Because I recognize my moral depravity, and in light of that, I turn to God as my only hope."

I see. You did the recognizing, and you did the turning. It was all *your own doing*. Your salvation is all "me, me, me." It's clear: you saved yourself! Got it.

Nide continued: "God does not reject a broken heart and spirit."

Of course not: an imaginary being doesn't do anything except what its imaginer imagines it does in the confines of his imagination.

Has your god rejected me? If so, then I must not have "a broken heart and spirit," but rather an intact heart and a completely healthy spirit. Got it.

I asked: "13. Do you have 'the mind of Christ' (cf. I Cor. 2:16)? Yes or no."

Nide replied: "Yep,"

Okay, good - an unequivocal answer (so far, anyway). Let's remember that Christ is supposed to be a member of the trinity. Many Christians come out and say outright that Christ is "God." And the Christian god is supposed to be an infallible and omniscient mind, right?

Nide continued: "it means we can now obey God. Just like Christ did."

So you're going to allow yourself to be whipped, beaten and crucified, just as the Christian god allowed its "only begotten son" to be whipped, beaten and crucified? I'm reminded of the kamikaze pilots of WWII: very self-destructive.

I asked: "14. Is 'the mind of Christ' omniscient? Yes or no."

Nide replied: “Besides that this is a falliciously complex question,”

How is asking whether or not “the mind of Christ” is omniscient “a falliciously complex question”? It seems that either a mind is omniscient or it isn’t omniscient. Unless there’s some third alternative (the excluded middle, perhaps????), the question seems perfectly legitimate.

Nide continued: “No, Christians aren’t omniscient.”

Yes, that’s pretty obvious. So how do we square this fact with the notion that Christians also claim to have “the mind of Christ”? Perhaps they really don’t have “the mind of Christ”? Also, how do we square the fact that Christians aren’t omniscient with the claim that they “think God’s thoughts after him”? I’d say this is another instance of a Christian in double trouble.

I asked: “15. When are you going to do something about that bad smell over at your blog? Seriously, it really stinks over there.”

Nide replied: “I should have kept you out.”

But you invited me over. Several times in fact. Now that I’ve come over and discovered that awful smell, you express regrets. What happened?

So there you have it. Nide’s self-stultifying antics have been exposed yet again. Will this deter him? Of course not. A court jester delights in playing the fool. In fact, Nide seems particularly bent on honing his signature expertise in foolishness. It all just goes to underscore the fact that, here at IP, *Christians are the entertainment*.

by Dawson Bethrick

Labels: [Christian Psychopathy](#)

posted by Bahnsen Burner at [7:00 PM](#)