
Subject: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Starbuzzz](#) on Thu, 16 Dec 2010 18:07:46 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

some progress...

<http://www.cnn.com/2010/POLITICS/12/15/gays.in.military/index.html?hpt=T2>

Read the idiotic comments by some conservative politicians lol:

Quote: This is "an imposition of somebody's social agenda," said Rep. Todd Akin, R-Missouri. It's an "eclipse of reason, an eclipse of common sense."

I wonder whose "social agenda" it was to make this into law in the first place?

Quote: Rep. Duncan Hunter, R-California. This is "a liberal crusade to create a utopia."

And someone tell me how is it wrong to try to remake our shit society into something where everyone can be amicable towards each other? Liberal crusade to create a utopia...wow these folks are blinded by their sheer arrogance.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Thu, 16 Dec 2010 19:29:46 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I was reading a couple days ago, that Russian intelligence still uses 'Honey Traps' as they remain the most effective method of seducing, and extracting information from hapless dudes.

Repealing Don't Ask, Don't Tell would be a huge national security advantage for the US. Once the military knows who bats for the same team, those people can be the ones entrusted with sensitive information, and would be impossible to seduce, thus ruining fifty years of cold war expertise on the part of the Russians.

Best part of all! Russian dudes are fucking ugly. No way they'd be able seduce dudes on our home team.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Thu, 16 Dec 2010 20:23:48 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Lol.

As far as the thread goes though, I never understood why it is considered 'bad' to be a homosexual... in any context. Someone want to elaborate that for me?

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Thu, 16 Dec 2010 20:30:38 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Because God said so.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Thu, 16 Dec 2010 22:35:03 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

the argument against christians serving in the military is a lot stronger than the argument against homosexuals serving in the military, and yet nobody says christians can't serve in the military.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [snpr1101](#) on Fri, 17 Dec 2010 01:17:42 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

nikki6ixx wrote on Thu, 16 December 2010 13:29I was reading a couple days ago, that Russian intelligence still uses 'Honey Traps' as they remain the most effective method of seducing, and extracting information from hapless dudes.

Repealing Don't Ask, Don't Tell would be a huge national security advantage for the US. Once the military knows who bats for the same team, those people can be the ones entrusted with sensitive information, and would be impossible to seduce, thus ruining fifty years of cold war expertise on the part of the Russians.

Best part of all! Russian dudes are fucking ugly. No way they'd be able seduce dudes on our home team.

I dunno, those Russians do have some fancy scarfs and turtlenecks that they could wave around.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [bmr_71](#) on Fri, 17 Dec 2010 02:54:48 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R315r4z0r wrote on Thu, 16 December 2010 15:23Lol.

As far as the thread goes though, I never understood why it is considered 'bad' to be a homosexual... in any context. Someone want to elaborate that for me?

It is against God's will. Please think before you post, sinner.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Fri, 17 Dec 2010 03:12:17 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

bmr_71 wrote on Thu, 16 December 2010 21:54R315r4z0r wrote on Thu, 16 December 2010 15:23Lol.

As far as the thread goes though, I never understood why it is considered 'bad' to be a homosexual... in any context. Someone want to elaborate that for me?

It is against God's will. Please think before you post, sinner.

Who is God? Was he important? How did he die? He must have been a pretty big deal type guy to be allowed that kind of decree in his will...

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [bmr_71](#) on Fri, 17 Dec 2010 05:46:08 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

God is our creator. All those who stand against him shall perish.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 17 Dec 2010 07:19:32 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

nikki6ixx wrote on Thu, 16 December 2010 11:29Best part of all! Russian dudes are fucking ugly. No way they'd be able seduce dudes on our home team.

But they have big guns and sandwiches. Some dudes are into that.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 17 Dec 2010 12:49:22 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

bmr_71 wrote on Thu, 16 December 2010 22:46God is our creator. All those who stand against him shall perish.

Actually everyone will perish at some point.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [snpr1101](#) on Fri, 17 Dec 2010 14:08:58 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Crimson wrote on Fri, 17 December 2010 06:49bmr_71 wrote on Thu, 16 December 2010 22:46God is our creator. All those who stand against him shall perish.

Actually everyone will perish at some point.

Don't do it...

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [InternetThug](#) on Fri, 17 Dec 2010 15:34:40 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R315r4z0r wrote on Thu, 16 December 2010 21:12bmr_71 wrote on Thu, 16 December 2010 21:54R315r4z0r wrote on Thu, 16 December 2010 15:23Lol.

As far as the thread goes though, I never understood why it is considered 'bad' to be a homosexual... in any context. Someone want to elaborate that for me?

It is against God's will. Please think before you post, sinner.

Who is God? Was he important? How did he die? He must have been a pretty big deal type guy to be allowed that kind of decree in his will...

Who's your idol? The tiny japanese dude who created the stupid anime in your avatar? Adam and Eve not Adam and Steve... bitches.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [bmr_71](#) on Fri, 17 Dec 2010 16:53:50 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Crimson wrote on Fri, 17 December 2010 07:49bmr_71 wrote on Thu, 16 December 2010 22:46God is our creator. All those who stand against him shall perish.

Actually everyone will perish at some point.

Only the sinners and nonbelievers.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Fri, 17 Dec 2010 18:09:08 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

bmr_71 wrote on Fri, 17 December 2010 10:53Crimson wrote on Fri, 17 December 2010 07:49bmr_71 wrote on Thu, 16 December 2010 22:46God is our creator. All those who stand against him shall perish.

Actually everyone will perish at some point.

Only the sinners and nonbelievers.

Oh wow.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Fri, 17 Dec 2010 19:30:19 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

M0FiR3 wrote on Fri, 17 December 2010 10:34R315r4z0r wrote on Thu, 16 December 2010 21:12bmr_71 wrote on Thu, 16 December 2010 21:54R315r4z0r wrote on Thu, 16 December 2010 15:23Lol.

As far as the thread goes though, I never understood why it is considered 'bad' to be a homosexual... in any context. Someone want to elaborate that for me?

It is against God's will. Please think before you post, sinner.

Who is God? Was he important? How did he die? He must have been a pretty big deal type guy to be allowed that kind of decree in his will...

Who's your idol? The tiny japanese dude who created the stupid anime in your avatar? Adam and Eve not Adam and Steve... bitches.

I don't worship anyone if that's what you're implying.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Fri, 17 Dec 2010 20:22:15 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I should indicate that despite the normal quality of posting from certain individuals who have posted in this topic, I do believe they are being intentionally humorous, and succeeding!

(TL;DR: Nothing in here is flaming nor trolling, yet)

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Pyr0man1c](#) on Fri, 17 Dec 2010 21:41:28 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R315r4z0r wrote on Fri, 17 December 2010 13:30M0FiR3 wrote on Fri, 17 December 2010 10:34R315r4z0r wrote on Thu, 16 December 2010 21:12bmr_71 wrote on Thu, 16 December 2010 21:54R315r4z0r wrote on Thu, 16 December 2010 15:23Lol.

As far as the thread goes though, I never understood why it is considered 'bad' to be a homosexual... in any context. Someone want to elaborate that for me?

It is against God's will. Please think before you post, sinner.

Who is God? Was he important? How did he die? He must have been a pretty big deal type guy to be allowed that kind of decree in his will...

Who's your idol? The tiny japanese dude who created the stupid anime in your avatar? Adam and Eve not Adam and Steve... bitches.

I don't worship anyone if that's what you're implying.

I worship you, even though I know your wrong... don't ask

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Tunaman](#) on Sat, 18 Dec 2010 11:33:51 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CarrierII wrote on Fri, 17 December 2010 15:22I should indicate that despite the normal quality of posting from certain individuals who have posted in this topic, I do believe they are being intentionally humorous, and succeeding!

(TL;DR: Nothing in here is flaming nor trolling, yet)

That's what trolling is... haha.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [bmr_71](#) on Sat, 18 Dec 2010 16:16:29 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I think God's a pretty cool guy. He made the world and dosnt afraid of of anybody

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Sat, 18 Dec 2010 20:12:17 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If God can do anything, can he create something so incredibly heavy that not even he can lift?

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [bmr_71](#) on Sat, 18 Dec 2010 20:19:47 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 18 December 2010 15:12If God can do anything, can he create something so incredibly heavy that not even he can lift?

Wow, what a test of intelligence that question is. I hope it isn't one that you frequent when arguing your case for atheism.

You got trolled, and you're not very smart. Me > Your feelings of superiority resulting from your lack of faith < your stupidity.

FYI I'm atheist too.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [bmr_71](#) on Sat, 18 Dec 2010 20:23:06 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Renegade is the most unique game ever. It's so easy to troll fags in forums, public servers, etc. it's ridiculous. That's why I was part of clanwars, because after all the trash talking and bitching at least people aren't morons or stupidly gullible.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Sat, 18 Dec 2010 20:57:39 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Two things:

1. I'm not an atheist.
2. I'm not arguing you, I'm asking you a question. Regardless of what you believe, I wanted to know how you would answer that.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Pyr0man1c](#) on Sat, 18 Dec 2010 21:34:42 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 18 December 2010 14:12If God can do anything, can he create something so incredibly heavy that not even he can lift?

That depends upon whether you believe that god can do the logically impossible or not. It wouldn't be unreasonable to answer that by saying yes, he could, but we wouldn't be able to understand how. But then... Yep, I though we were talking about homosexuals in the army? Btw if god was going to make something too heavy for him to lift, it would probably be a chain.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Sat, 18 Dec 2010 22:50:02 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Anyway, back on topic. What God says is right or wrong should not come into the picture. This is because religion is not supposed to interfere with government regulations. Freedom isn't free, if you want to live here, there are somethings that you have to be subjected to. Being gay can just be used as a loophole for people to avoid being drafted.

And besides, on top of that, wouldn't not allowing homosexuals in the army weaken the military's strength?

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Sat, 18 Dec 2010 22:54:20 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

WE ALL REALISE RELIGION IS DUMB

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2010 06:57:23 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

successful troll is successful

Also, repealing it won't exactly make everyone accept homosexuality in the military. Just throwing that out there.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2010 07:46:26 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Whether or not some, or even most folks will accept gays in the military is a moot point. In case you haven't been keeping up with the news, it's a done deal- as good as repealed the moment it gets to the Oval Office for signing.

Acceptance has a way of coming in its own good time. If you were to wait until everyone accepts gays in order to extend them equal protection of the laws, including open service in the military, it would never happen. Remember that there are still bigoted fuckwads who would rather there not be any blacks or hispanics or asians in the military... and racial integration happened under President Truman, a good two decades before rulings like Brown vs. Board of Ed. made segregated public services illegal. Took people a while to accept that one, didn't it? Well, it'll take people a while to accept gays too. Probably less of a while, all things considered. The "gay or no gay" issue has always had religious roots, and religion should never have been a factor in policy-making to begin with. "But then everyone will have to change and get used to the idea of knowing who's gay" is not a valid counter-argument. Servicemen have never had the option of picking and choosing who to serve with.

Yes, it will make the fundies get all butthurt and pissy, but... honestly? Fuck 'em. Some of my best friends are gay, and the thought of them being shat upon because they don't like the opposite sex just kinda pisses me off.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Starbuzzz](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2010 11:38:23 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

yeah, it's a done deal! The homophobes are cornered now.

Quote:"Gay and lesbian service members -- brave Americans who enable our freedoms -- will no longer have to hide who they are," Obama said in an e-mailed statement to supporters. "The fight for civil rights, a struggle that continues, will no longer include this one."

you gotta love this President. It's nice to see that homosexual people don't have to play a double-life anymore to homophobic christian pricks who love to control others.

I am very happy for this as this is one of the longest nails that have been hammered yet into the lid of the coffin of the dead and dying rotting religion known as christianity.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [snpr1101](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2010 13:15:44 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Starbuzzz wrote on Tue, 21 December 2010 05:38

I am very happy for this as this is one of the longest nails that have been hammered yet into the lid of the coffin of the dead and dying rotting religion known as christianity.

orly

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Starbuzzz](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2010 13:42:06 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

snpr1101 wrote on Tue, 21 December 2010 07:15Starbuzzz wrote on Tue, 21 December 2010 05:38

I am very happy for this as this is one of the longest nails that have been hammered yet into the lid of the coffin of the dead and dying rotting religion known as christianity.

orly

Considering the crapload of idiotic old testament laws that christians today conveniently disregard or ignore, this latest ruling is a massive setback for them as the law against homosexuality is one among few of the idiotic OT rules christians still trumpet around.

So I would say a big, "ya rly!" with the owl picture but won't.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2010 18:50:49 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 18 December 2010 16:50What God says is right or wrong should not come into the picture. This is because religion is not supposed to interfere with government regulations.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Pyr0man1c](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2010 19:10:23 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The policy was merely inspired by religion.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [InternetThug](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2010 22:20:23 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

i don't think this benefits gays or homosexuals .. they're still going to take shit lmao not like everyone's going to be like oh you're gay? that's cool with me cause DONT ASK DONT TELL GOT REPEALED ... i don't know why you think this is such a huge step forward lmao ... you're obviously democratic starbuzz but come on hahah you think they're not going to still get made fun of for being in the military?

there was a reason dont ask dont tell was in place in the beginning .. it's because people generally still aren't accepting of homosexuals and it was to protect them .. this will probably make it worse for them .. but whatever

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2010 22:50:09 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

M0FiR3 wrote on Tue, 21 December 2010 17:20i don't think this benefits gays or homosexuals .. they're still going to take shit lmao not like everyone's going to be like oh you're gay? that's cool with me cause DONT ASK DONT TELL GOT REPEALED ... i don't know why you think this is such a huge step forward lmao ... you're obviously democratic starbuzz but come on hahah you think they're not going to still get made fun of for being in the military?

there was a reason dont ask dont tell was in place in the beginning .. it's because people generally still aren't accepting of homosexuals and it was to protect them .. this will probably make it worse for them .. but whatever

That's not the point. They don't need your elitist sympathy or protection. It was their choice to live

that way and they have to live with that responsibility. That means defending their own life style.

It isn't about people 'getting made fun of' it's about what they can and can't legally do. There is no logical means to deny a person entry to the military just because they are gay. What difference does it make? How will a gay soldier cause any functionality issues in the military?

The military will work so long as its soldiers are disciplined enough. What difference does the soldier's sexuality make? It isn't like someone who is gay is going to have some learning defect that will make it impossible to discipline them...

It's 100% discrimination. Don't try to cover up that fact with "it's for their protection" or "it's for their own good" because that isn't for you to decide.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [InternetThug](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2010 02:34:25 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

are you gay or something? that would explain the anime fetish i guess .. just the fact that you got so defensive about the stuff i was saying .. not trying to be ad hominem but i don't personally really care what the fuck gays and lesbians do .. i don't really support their life choice but as long as they dont bother me whatever haha ... i just have a lot of friends in the military that were pretty upset by this shit ... not everyone is so accepting of guys plowing other guys buttholes as you bleeding liberals on this forum

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2010 04:04:29 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:... just the fact that you got so defensive about the stuff i was saying ..

I get defensive over it because I realize that it is attitudes like yours that are what is tearing the country apart.

There are way too many pointless restrictions on people that have no real reason to exist.

Living in America grants you liberty. But liberty doesn't give you the ability to deny it to someone else.

Quote:... i just have a lot of friends in the military that were pretty upset by this shit ... not everyone is so accepting of guys plowing other guys buttholes as you bleeding liberals on this forum
It isn't my concern that your friends are so insecure and fearful about their sexuality.

Just because someone is a homosexual doesn't make them a barbarian. They are exactly like everyone else. It isn't like they are going to mindlessly hunt down and rape everyone if they had the chance. It's a totally baseless fear.

Also, for the record: I'm not gay.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [InternetThug](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2010 05:16:41 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

no one's afraid of them or insecure with their sexuality .. they just dont like them because its kinda gross for one guy to put it up another dudes pooper .. i don't get why people get so defensive about that .. it's not very proper .. are there any other animals that try to mate with their own gender?

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Rocko](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2010 05:22:10 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

M0FiR3 wrote on Tue, 21 December 2010 23:16no one's afraid of them or insecure with their sexuality .. they just dont like them because its kinda gross for one guy to put it up another dudes pooper .. i don't get why people get so defensive about that .. it's not very proper .. are there any other animals that try to mate with their own gender?

http://articles.sfgate.com/2004-02-07/news/17414549_1_bruce-bagemihl-homosexual-gay-penguins

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [appshot](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2010 09:25:08 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

M0fir3 dam ur argument made me laugh.. good 1 dude

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Pyr0man1c](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2010 10:51:12 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

M0FiR3 wrote on Tue, 21 December 2010 20:34are you gay or something? that would explain the anime fetish i guess ..

No, it wouldn't.

Has anyone even given a reason why homosexuals shouldn't be in the army? Excepting religion, and that homosexuality is wrong.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [snpr1101](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2010 11:20:54 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Pyr0man1c wrote on Wed, 22 December 2010 04:51M0FiR3 wrote on Tue, 21 December 2010 20:34are you gay or something? that would explain the anime fetish i guess ..
No, it wouldn't.

Has anyone even given a reason why homosexuals shouldn't be in the army? Excepting religion, and that homosexuality is wrong.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2010 15:05:06 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

M0FiR3 wrote on Tue, 21 December 2010 16:20i don't think this benefits gays or homosexuals .. they're still going to take shit lmao not like everyones going to be like oh you're gay? that's cool wtih me cause DONT ASK DONT TELL GOT REPEALED ... i don't know why you think this is such a huge step forward lmao ... you're obviously democratic starbuzz but come on hahah you think they're not going to still get made fun of for being in the military?

there was a reason dont ask dont tell was in place in the beginning .. it's because people generally still aren't accepting of homosexuals and it was to protect them .. this will probably make it worse for them .. but whatever

the important thing isn't whether a bunch of homophobic idiots are nice, the important thing is whether a minority of people actually have their civil rights taken away or not

Quote: no one's afraid of them or insecure with their sexuality .. they just don't like them because it's kinda gross for one guy to put it up another dudes pooper

i don't like anal sex either, why would that make me act like a prick towards another heterosexual man who does like it? you think i want a law supporting my opinion?

Quote: are there any other animals that try to mate with their own gender?
yes, lots... homosexuality's been observed in lots of animals. but so what?

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [InternetThug](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2010 16:54:46 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

i dont get it ... how come anyone that doesn't like gays is a homophobe? is everyone that's racist afraid of that race? not really .. people make comments about jews .. doesn't mean they're afraid of them ...

anyone that doesn't like a gay person must be confused about their own sexuality!!! lol give me a break

like i already stated i don't really GIVE A SHIT about gays or lesbians being in the military ... i just think it's funny that all you liberals are like OMG U DONT LIKE GAYS U HOMOPHOBEE!!!! OMG U MUST BE A CLOSET HOMO U R SO INSECURE WITH UR SEXUALITY!!!! ... not really ... gays just bring nothing to the table evolution wise .. they won't procreate which is the only purpose of being on earth anyways.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [SSADMVR](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2010 17:12:47 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Also, a huge amount of gay men have characteristics that are pretty fucking annoying.

Oops, guess I'm a homophobe too now...

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2010 17:21:00 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SSADMVR wrote on Wed, 22 December 2010 11:12Also, a huge amount of gay men have characteristics that are pretty fucking annoying.

Oops, guess I'm a homophobe too now...Yes. yes you are.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2010 17:30:38 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

M0FiR3 wrote on Wed, 22 December 2010 10:54i dont get it ... how come anyone that doesnt like gays is a homophobe?
because that's the word for it

i think it's misnamed, since "homo" means "same", so "homo-phobic" means fear of the same... but whatever

Quote:is everyone that's racist afraid of that race? not really .. people make comments about jews .. doesn't mean they're afraid of them ...
that wasn't what you said in the first sentence.

it's true fear is not always the reason for the prejudice. so what?

Quote:anyone that doesnt like a gay person must be confused about their own sexuality!!! lol give

me a break

i agree, it would be silly to say that everyone who dislikes gay people is confused about their own sexuality. who says that?

Quote:like i already stated i don't really GIVE A SHIT about gays or lesbians being in the military ... i just think it's funny that all you liberals are like OMG U DONT LIKE GAYS U HOMOPHOBE!!!! again, "homophobe" is the word for that.

Quote:OMG U MUST BE A CLOSET HOMO U R SO INSECURE WITH UR SEXUALITY!!!! ... again, it's unwise to assume that. who is saying this?

Quote:not really ... gays just bring nothing to the table evolution wise .. they won't procreate which is the only purpose of being on earth anyways.

what do you bring to the table evolution-wise, mofire?

what shall we do about people who don't want kids? (such as myself)

as for "purpose", fuck off

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2010 17:32:02 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

M0FiR3 wrote on Wed, 22 December 2010 10:54i dont get it ... how come anyone that doesnt like gays is a homophobe? is everyone that's racist afraid of that race? not really ..

It's just an insult, really. That's all. No true meaning behind it.

On the other coin, gays often get called fa**ots and other such names as well.

The term "homophobe" can accurately describe some people who are against homosexuality, but not all of them. Same with the other terms. It's generalization.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [InternetThug](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2010 17:38:19 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Phobia is a fear or something, not a dislike. Not all dislikes are based on fear ... homophobe is NOT the word for anyone that doesn't like gays ... it's a term for people who are afraid of gays ... don't lump all gay haters together please.

I fuck women so obviously I bring a lot more to the table in the fact that if I was the last person on Earth except for one woman, I could continue the human race. A gay guy would just try to make her go shopping with him.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2010 17:47:20 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

M0FiR3 wrote on Wed, 22 December 2010 11:38I fuck women so obviously I bring a lot more to the table in the fact that if I was the last person on Earth except for one woman, I could continue the human race. A gay guy would just try to make her go shopping with him.

That sounds like a movie plot or something.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Pyr0man1c](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2010 17:57:05 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Oops...

Homophobia can mean contempt for homosexuals too, in fact that's what it most commonly means, I don't know many people that are afraid of gays...

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2010 23:10:11 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I agree the word is poorly constructed, both of its component parts are misleading.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Rocko](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2010 23:18:22 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

god will destroy us for this

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [snpr1101](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2010 00:30:22 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Rocko wrote on Wed, 22 December 2010 17:18god will destroy us for this
Lies.

Credit To reddit.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2010 00:52:53 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

M0FiR3 wrote on Wed, 22 December 2010 11:54i dont get it ... how come anyone that doesnt like gays is a homophobe?

I'm taking that as a reply to what I said about your military friends.

I did not imply that disliking gays means you're homophobic.

But you said:

Quote:... i just have a lot of friends in the military that were pretty upset by this shit ... not everyone is so accepting of guys plowing other guys buttholes as you bleeding liberals on this forum

This implies that you're friends are afraid that a gay guy is going to rape them. That's the essence of homophobia.

Not liking/agreeing with their lifestyle is one thing. Fearing that their integration into the military will mean gay butt sex for all the straight soldiers is another.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Starbuzzz](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2010 05:08:29 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

LMFAO @ snpr! Good piece...yeah, the religion is so full of contradictory bullshit like this that they are helping themselves to their own demise by simply persisting with their dogma.

Pyr0man1c wrote on Wed, 22 December 2010 04:51

Has anyone even given a reason why homosexuals shouldn't be in the army? Excepting religion, and that homosexuality is wrong.

funny after having nothing to say about the unfairness of the DADT law nor able to answer the question you posed, the anti-homosexuals in this thread have latched on to the discussion of the correct usage of the word "homophobe."

Situation must be desperate for them I guess.

Altzan wrote on Tue, 21 December 2010 12:50R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 18 December 2010

16:50What God says is right or wrong should not come into the picture. This is because religion is not supposed to interfere with government regulations.

Even if we quote-pyramid that post all day long, it doesn't stop the religious institutions from doing exactly that. The religion itself is parasitically contagious in its nature as it tries to cancererously worm its way into the foundations of a free society that's on a slow march to peaceful secularism.

Churces in America routinely go out-of-their way to try to define the political landscape in their favour. This is a known deal so there's no point denying this. This November I got to see this for myself, first hand. And it was scary to see the illegal powers churches have.

Before the November elections, for almost a month, the church I am taken to against my will (a megachurch with perhaps millions in revenue) went out of its way as it does every election year to try to get people to vote. What was most disturbing was the distribution of a specially prepared and innocently named "Voter Guide" designed to influence the minds right before the elections. Along with voter registration kiosks and the pastor's insistence on "go vote! endtimes!" during the sermon, this "guide" was included with the regular pamphlet that are distributed for Sunday services.

I took some photos of this guide. First off, I am not sure why churches should be doing this in the first place...is this the kind of thing you would expect to see in a church where you came to hear about how to reach the kingdom of god? EVEN IF they can, it is blatantly obvious that this certainly is a artificial unnecessary influence; an intrusion by church powers into the political process to influence/steal the vote. With millions of church going zombies, we can begin to see how such illegal church powers have kept this country in the dark ages for so long by manipulating the vote this way.

Front:

Back:

Here are a few of the issues that are relevant to this topic:

Voluntary prayer in public schools and facilities

Seriously? This is getting old. I don't care if atheletes "pray" before a game...not like it's going to help their game.

Making sexual preference a protected minority status under existing civil rights laws

Quick, let's vote for a politician that opposes this! The homophobic nature of these church thugs shines thru and thru on this one. The awful fact here is that this actually tramples upon someone's basic civil right! wow

Enforcing the 1993 law banning homosexuals in the military
yeah, we all know where this went this week LMFAO!

Prohibit federal funding of medical benefits for "domestic partners" of govt. workers

This is completly idiotic given our society's current move towards a future where more people will cohabitate with less people marrying.

Federal Marriage Amendment to prevent same sex marriage
yeah, we know this one too well.

So you can see that these points are critical issues that our society faces moving forward that a

monolithic outdated institution as a church should have ZERO say in in the first place. But here's the one that makes my blood boil:

Legislation allowing physician-assisted suicide

The outdated entity known as the church has no say in this absolutely critical matter W H A T S O E V E R. Case closed.

So in light of such criminal intrusion into government (thru trying to influence and manipulate the vote of the church members), we have the repeal of the DADT law. What I don't understand is why exactly does a church have to do this? i.e, intrude into the democratic government of the country? It doesn't make any sense...it's the kingdom of god these folks should be concerned about; not fucking up the most free nation to ever light the planet.

Anyway, getting back to those that claim homosexuality is "out of the ordinary," one thing to bear in mind is that our collective moral values changes over and over. It is never a constant. It never was. But religious fanatics lie and lie and lie and lie about this over and over and over and over. A good example is with sexuality and it's appropriate to discuss this here.

For example, during ancient times, it was common for kings to collect all attractive looking girls and women to be put in the harem. The king can then use them as nightly sex slaves. This practice continued with almost every old testament king including the much hyped David and the over-rated Solomon.

You had the domination of the Greek culture, Alexander the Great's march across the known world and much later, the Romans that followed. Goddesses were worshipped in their temples and sexual acts with the temple priestesses was normal. It was around this time that Christianity began to spread into Asia Minor and later Europe eventually toppling all the dominant religions there and replacing them with the newer idiotic standard we are dealing with today.

Now in 2010, we have had 2000 years of the grip of this sadistic self-punishing degrading religion that had created a completely different reality than what was before it (the only reason the religion thrived for so long was the absence of science-as-we-know it, which only truly came in the last 500 years). So the funny thing is it was not at all always this way yet christians claim complete nonsense such as "sanctity of marriage" and other moral absolutes as if it were always this way since the beginning of time. Just flipping thru the bible tells you that polygamy was the norm of the day...why are Christians living in such denial? This cracks me up.

Our morals changed a lot in the 20th century and we have loosened up a lot. We are headed more in the direction of the "Brave New World" in terms of sexuality with casual sex, extensive usage of contraceptive devices and pills, artificial insemination and cohabitation. Marriage itself is steadily losing popularity along with the dying idea of the "purpose of life being able to marry and popping out a few kids." Marriage itself would be around though a lot of people are starting to feel that there is no need for a ring or a expensive ceremony (I feel its overrated bullshit but that's my opinion). Some form of this will be around but the most important thing to note is nothing is going to be permanent and the collective culture will keep changing over and over.

Anything is possible but definitely I feel that we will be more tolerant in the future and a lot more

critical civil rights laws will be in place along with a much more superior form of government than the blundering faith-befuddled entities we have today.

@Anthrax: I am sorry your whiny military friends are "disgusted" by gays. Listen, I could care less. Your friends' forefathers that served in the military when this country was a dangerous racist hellhole were also "disgusted" by the black skin of the first black soldiers to fight and die for this country.

Funny how homosexuality is all about raw sex to you. I guess "love" doesn't matter to you though if I brought up hetrosexual sex acts, love would automatically matter to you.

Getting back to the once male dominated military, they once made a good movie about the West Point military academy. There used to be a time when female cadets weren't allowed to join. And they faced so much misplaced phobia (yes, phobia) from their whiny bitch male counterparts who couldn't handle the changing social conditions. Now look where your country's military is: women fly F-15's, F-16's, Apache gunships, operate the chain gun on the AC-130 gunships along with easily flying the F/A-18 from aircraft carriers not to mention being in positions of high ranked command. This exact same process can be seen with how blacks integrated in your once despicably racist military...now blacks being in a positon to pilot submarines and having top leadership positions.

To learn that 14,000 homosexuals were dismissed from the military since this bastard act was law is shocking. We are talking skilled people like pilots, snipers, engineers, technicians across many ranks...all dismissed for being gay! No different in the least from the earlier struggle that blacks had to face just for having a darker colour and what women had to face just for not being a man. We learn through mistakes and wrongs and that's how we term it "progress"...we just need to re-educate every little brainwashed idiot that grew up with mommy, daddy and sunday school over and over till their shit-shaded glasses come off and they begin to see reality and stop denying history.

This is a great day for every soldier in your country. You should tell your whiny military friends to get over themselves just as their forefathers got over their bitching of black soldiers and female pilots.

As far as your argument as to what homosexuals bring to the table "evolution-wise" and your vain daydreaming fantasies about being the last person on earth, I can tell you are just a ignorant teenager because they say the same nonsense I have heard from people of that age group. You must be pretty arrogant to think the last surviving women in the world would be willing to fuck you to further the human race LMFAO. Most probably they would kick your tiny ass down a cliff. Now Altzan, THAT is what will make a blockbuster movie ending that will pick up the awards.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell
Posted by [Starbuzzz](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2010 05:09:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Pyr0man1c wrote on Wed, 22 December 2010
11:57 <http://teampyro.blogspot.com/2010/11/homophobia.html>

LMFAO that blogger is a pure idiot.

When the process of a oppressed minority getting their justice finally is portrayed by the posting of a apocalyptic picture...

you KNOW how dangerous homophobic people are. They have got to be thick as fuck! incredible lol

File Attachments

1) [Ominous Skies homophobic idiots.jpg](#), downloaded 889 times



Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [InternetThug](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2010 05:16:04 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

maybe you missed the part where i said i didn't care what gays did in the military? but im glad you spent 4 hours typing up a response to me .. i like how you keep saying my military? i didn't realize i was robert gates .. but thanks ... oh yeah you're a minority aren't you like indian or something? so by me prejudicing gays you must feel like im somehow indirectly insulting you too and therefore i must hate blacks and women? lmao get over yourself dude i already stated i don't really care what gays do as long as they don't bother me .. my best friend is black lol .. i have a girlfriend .. i think it's good women and minorities are in the military .. i don't care if uphill gardeners are in the military .. but i hope your buddys give you a virtual highfive for those lines you had about me not getting the last woman on earth to sleep with me .. im still laughing at your comedic genius

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2010 05:52:48 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Starbuzz wrote on Wed, 22 December 2010 23:08funny after having nothing to say about the unfairness of the DADT law nor able to answer the question you posed, the anti-homosexuals in this thread have latched on to the discussion of the correct usage of the word "homophobe."

Situation must be desperate for them I guess.

Yet you throw a mile-long post about politics and religion right after saying this.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [InternetThug](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2010 06:37:15 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

i can just see starbuzz typing out that last line about the last woman on earth wanting to push me off a cliff instead of continue the human race and think to himself " OH MAN THIS IS REALLY GOING TO GET HIM ... ALL MY E-BUDDIES WILL SLAP ME HUGE HIGHFIVES FOR THIS" ... and then you even type LMFAO at your own joke .. good one dude you're not an idiot at all

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Hitman](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2010 06:43:12 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

spoony has infected starbuzz with the 'must type essay at every subject at hand' syndrome...

another one bites the dust.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Pyr0man1c](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2010 09:42:11 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hitman wrote on Thu, 23 December 2010 00:43spoony has infected starbuzz with the 'must type essay at every subject at hand' syndrome...

another one bites the dust.

lol

Starbuzz wrote on Wed, 22 December 2010 23:09Pyr0man1c wrote on Wed, 22 December 2010 11:57http://teampyro.blogspot.com/2010/11/homophobia.html

LMFAO that blogger is a pure idiot.

When the process of a oppressed minority getting their justice finally is portrayed by the posting of a apocalyptic picture...

Maybe, maybe not. I just found the whole thing quite funny...

Quote:For one thing, practically all the arguments that have been set forth in favor of legitimizing homosexuality can be applied with equal effectiveness by advocates for any kind of perversion involving consensual partners, inanimate objects, animals, or whatever.

Quote:But if the arguments in favor of normalizing homosexuality are valid, then every kind of sexual debauchery (from pederasty to necrophilia and beyond) will ultimately be able to campaign for acceptance on those same grounds. (Actually, that process is already well underway.)http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/North_American_Man/Boy_Love_Association

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2010 11:05:05 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hitman wrote on Thu, 23 December 2010 00:43spoony has infected starbuzz with the 'must type essay at every subject at hand' syndrome...

another one bites the dust.

not really, just when there's a lot to say, and a lot of what he said there is a damning criticism of religious homophobia

i've never been certain why people are angry at the thought someone has more to say than they do, maybe it's just the intellectual jealousy it looks like

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2010 11:11:00 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

mofire is not capable of jealousy.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Hitman](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2010 12:35:09 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

im not angry spooner, if anything i was just joking

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Rocko](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2010 23:37:56 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hitman wrote on Thu, 23 December 2010 06:35im not angry spooner, if anything i was just joking this looks like intellectual jealousy to me

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Starbuzzz](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2010 00:01:49 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Altzan wrote on Wed, 22 December 2010 23:52Starbuzzz wrote on Wed, 22 December 2010 23:08funny after having nothing to say about the unfairness of the DADT law nor able to answer the question you posed, the anti-homosexuals in this thread have latched on to the discussion of the correct usage of the word "homophobe."

Situation must be desperate for them I guess.

Yet you throw a mile-long post about politics and religion right after saying this.

Looks like I have your attention finally. Don't embarrass yourself any further, Altzan. I started the topic intending to discuss it to the fullest and I had A LOT to say.

So then, it was funny to see the usual anti-homosexuals latch on to the discussion of the appropriate uses of a word while conveniently ignoring the accurate rebuttals brought against their side. I thought this was ridiculous. This is typical internet mentality for the losing side...they would rather talk about ANYTHING irrelevant to keep their drivel steaming on than to admit they are plain wrong on the main debate at hand. Worse, at the same time, they completely ignore the argument presented to them and don't refute it.

As I mentioned, I had A LOT to say ever since I ripped that idiotic voter guide from church 2 months ago. This topic all of a sudden presented the perfect opportunity to post the voter guide along with it's extensive negative impacts considering one of the main "issues" in it was embarrassingly wiped out in Congress this week never to be made into law again (a victory for humanity). And so, it was coincidentally the right time to post about how much illegal powers churches have hoarded up over the past decades.

Your dishonest irrelavent one-liner here along with Anthrax's immature high school rubbish is proof that the pro-homosexual rebuttals and questions as presented so far in this thread by Spoony, Nuke, Pyro and myself along with the all important issue of the seperation of church and state as detailed above will never be refuted. You think I made the post because I was desperate?

Of course you are welcome to attempt to tear apart what we have written so far quote-by-quote and offering credible refutations to everything I have said so far in the "mile-long post" that clearly has had you bitterly frustrated. Or you can just gracefully withdraw-in-defeat as you did to Spoony's last unanswered question in the Catholic debate thread (btw, for someone who claimed god as non-interfering, it sure was hard for you to say "yes" to that simple question; caught in a dogmatic contradiction of your own making I suppose). I didn't mean to bring this dead topic back up and put you on the spot, but I am getting sick of your dishonesty.

@Anthrax: Spoony and I refuted all your misinformed homophobic inhibitions to which you haven't yet responded to and probably won't. Still don't know why you keep ignoring what we have said so far and still keep throwing out irrelevant drivel. As far as me being minority and somehow that being the reason why I care so much for homosexuals for my own benefit (lol), it must be the TOP of the bullshit I have ever read on these forums!

@ Pyro:

yeah, this guy is whack.

homophobic blogger For one thing, practically all the arguments that have been set forth in favor of legitimizing homosexuality can be applied with equal effectiveness by advocates for any kind of perversion involving consensual partners, inanimate objects, animals, or whatever.

Religious fanatics like this guy will go to any lengths necessary to demonize those they disagree with. This guy is obviously full of bullshit. Having consensual partners is part of the incoming cultural changes so he is just wasting his breath ranting about it. As far as inanimate objects and animals, he is sounding desperate.

homophobic blogger But if the arguments in favor of normalizing homosexuality are valid, then every kind of sexual debauchery (from pederasty to necrophilia and beyond) will ultimately be able to campaign for acceptance on those same grounds. (Actually, that process is already well underway.)http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/North_American_Man/Boy_Love_Association


Again, he is being extremely dishonest and desperately trying to use ANY excuse he can grab. Oh no the "process is already underway!!!" He must know that the website for that criminal organization is down for like forever and they have been shutdown or dispersed away.

lol

Eventhough he is full of bullshit that can be easily refuted, atleast he is sticking up for what he believes in and has made a blog post of it...unlike pulling one-liners like Altzan.

File Attachments

1) [NAMBLALALA DOWN LOL.png](#), downloaded 605 times



Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell
Posted by [InternetThug](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2010 01:14:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

i havent said anything except personal opinions so im glad you refuted those dude lmao
im not exactly trying to argue with you but you sure are whooping my ass

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell
Posted by [Starbuzzz](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2010 01:20:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Far be from it as the issue has real-life consequences for many people. Of course, it doesn't affect you (it never did) so I can't blame you for mistakenly seeing it as another internet debate where I am supposedly out to "whoop your ass." It's the exact opposite.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell
Posted by [InternetThug](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2010 01:36:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

haha well you've just gotten so defensive about everything i've said .. you're obviously looking for

an arguement.

but i already said i don't really give a shit what faggots and dykes do with their lives so you're just preaching to the choir

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2010 04:12:40 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

i don't care what you do with your life either, but if someone was trying to deny you your basic rights just because they personally found you disgusting, i'd be on your side even though i find you disgusting too

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2010 04:15:22 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I am not interested in this subject in the slightest, Starbuzzz. If you're trying to draw me into a debate about it, I'll have to disappoint.

Why? Well, I know perfectly well how it will play out in the end, I am quite familiar with our last discussion. An issue this fierce, if it cannot be solved in vast society, certainly won't be solved on a gaming forum.

You've got opinions, Starbuzz, and I respect that. But you simply can't express them without sounding like a self-righteous know-it-all.

Yes, that's harsh, especially coming from me. But your word choice says it all.

Seriously, dude. Your attitude has dramatically changed. For the worse.

Starbuzzz wrote on Thu, 23 December 2010 18:01 Looks like I have your attention finally. Don't embarrass yourself any further, Altzan.

I'm not the one embarrassing myself.

Starbuzzz wrote on Thu, 23 December 2010 18:01 they would rather talk about ANYTHING irrelevant to keep their drivel steaming on than to admit they are plain wrong on the main debate at hand. Worse, at the same time, they completely ignore the argument presented to them and don't refute it.

It's not a contest, Starbuzzz. And nobody said it was a required one.

Starbuzzz wrote on Thu, 23 December 2010 18:01 Your dishonest irrelavent one-liner here along with Anthrax's immature high school rubbish is proof that the pro-homosexual rebuttals and

questions as presented so far in this thread by Spoony, Nuke, Pyro and myself along with the all important issue of the seperation of church and state as detailed above will never be refuted.

Wow. You sure are being a model example of nearly every atheist I've heard express himself/herself.

Starbuzzz wrote on Thu, 23 December 2010 18:01Of course you are welcome to attempt to tear apart what we have written so far quote-by-quote and offering credible refutations to everything I have said so far in the "mile-long post" that clearly has had you bitterly frustrated. Or you can just gracefully withdraw-in-defeat as you did to Spoony's last unanswered question in the Catholic debate thread (btw, for someone who claimed god as non-interfering, it sure was hard for you to say "yes" to that simple question; caught in a dogmatic contradiction of your own making I suppose). I didn't mean to bring this dead topic back up and put you on the spot, but I am getting sick of your dishonesty.

If I recall, I wasn't the one who "Gracefully withdrew in defeat". My last "essay" went unanswered.

That discussion is dead to me though. Act like it's a major victory if that makes you feel better.

Starbuzzz wrote on Thu, 23 December 2010 18:01...unlike pulling one-liners like Altzan.

You're implying - incorrectly - that that "one-liner" is all I can say on the subject. I'm not going to change it though, as I said I have no interest in debating it.

I'm under the impression that you have changed based on pressures put on you by your family and church. If that's not the case, forgive my assumption. But if it is, why take it up here, of all places? It's the least likely place to influence anyone's opinion of the subject.

I know I will be flamed for this. I know you all will think I am "gracefully withdrawing in defeat", "bitterly frustrated" with nothing to prove. Think that if you want. But not everything is a debate with a clear winner or loser, Starbuzzz. And I'm not obligated to enter it. Especially when you feel so compelled to insert thinly veiled contempt and insult every chance you get.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2010 04:59:40 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Starbuzzz wrote on Thu, 23 December 2010 19:01

homophobic bloggerFor one thing, practically all the arguments that have been set forth in favor of legitimizing homosexuality can be applied with equal effectiveness by advocates for any kind of perversion involving consensual partners, inanimate objects, animals, or whatever.

I really laughed at that.

He just basically said that sex is unnatural in any circumstance.

And that's not even talking about what he said about homosexuality.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [InternetThug](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2010 05:45:25 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Spoony wrote on Thu, 23 December 2010 22:12i don't care what you do with your life either, but if someone was trying to deny you your basic rights just because they personally found you disgusting, i'd be on your side even though i find you disgusting too

thats the point ive been making this whole time

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2010 08:30:15 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The News

America is today enacting legislation that will prevent openly heterosexual people from serving in the military...

Sounds perfectly reasonable, with servicemen and women in close quarters, with emotionally intense situations occurring almost daily... that could get distracting...

Any objections?

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [snpr1101](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2010 08:45:24 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CarrierII wrote on Fri, 24 December 2010 02:30The News

America is today enacting legislation that will prevent openly heterosexual people from serving in the military...

Sounds perfectly reasonable, with servicemen and women in close quarters, with emotionally intense situations occurring almost daily... that could get distracting...

Any objections?

Ye /agree. Pull every straight man and women out of service this instant.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2010 14:01:06 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

This thread is pretty gay.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Starbuzzz](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2010 15:14:12 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

@ Altzan: opinions? The fact that sexual morals have changed over and over is not an opinion. The fact that your favorite bible kings had hundreds of sex slaves with polygamy being the norm of the day is not an opinion. The fact that religions fail and get replaced by other religions is not an opinion. You deny basic middle school history and call me a " self-righteous know-it-all?"

You don't want to get involved in the debate and I can understand why. So be it.

Altzan wrote on Thu, 23 December 2010 22:15I issue this fierce, if it cannot be solved in vast society, certainly won't be solved on a gaming forum.

One such issue got solved this week in Congress fyi.

We will move on and solve problems just fine just as we "solved" racism and women's rights. Despite the people who once stood against it and still do, we are better off now than before.

Altzan wrote on Thu, 23 December 2010 22:15I'm under the impression that you have changed based on pressures put on you by your family and church. If that's not the case, forgive my assumption. But if it is, why take it up here, of all places? It's the least likely place to influence anyone's opinion of the subject.

This is not at all true. Plus, there is no harm in discussing these here. You seem to mistake discussion as some some form of infectious "propaganda" out to chnage your opinion! wow...

Many traumatized victims of crimes end up fighting for a cause against the crime. The internet is a suitable medium in this day among many others and there is no harm in disussing important issues. It is only a matter of time I see myself speaking openly in public about what I have endured so far. You seem to mistake me as using only this internet forum; how do you know that I have not contacted and am in touch with powerful organizations that can help me?

When you live under a tyranny and are dragged to a mosque, forced to worship facing mecca 5 times a day, and continualy mind-raped over and over and forced to believe something you can't, you would take to doing the same; using any communication medium to get your voice heard and speak out against the tyrants. It doesn't matter if they are the victims of rape, pedopilia, torture, or any other forms of tyranny.

So your statement of a person changing under pressure is irrelavent. Yes, they do. Some end up adapting to the pressure and some fight against it in anyway they can. I am obviously the latter.

It's as silly as asking the persecuted chinese bloggers to quit whining about their freedom because they can't influence anybody. Yeah, they can and they are making the world know of their problems. Because not everyone leads a comfortable life with basic civil rights insured such as you.

Altzan wrote on Thu, 23 December 2010 22:15I know I will be flamed for this. I know you all will think I am "gracefully withdrawing in defeat", "bitterly frustrated" with nothing to prove. Think that if you want. But not everything is a debate with a clear winner or loser, Starbuzzz. And I'm not obligated to enter it. Especially when you feel so compelled to insert thinly veiled contempt and insult every chance you get.

After the "mile-long-post" which clearly unsettled you, you made a one-liner about me "throwing a mile long post about politics and religion." Why did you do that first? Considering that was not all aimed at anyone in particular.

Have a nice holidays, Altzan. Maybe during this quiet time, you will finally think about all the people who are not as well-off as you elsewhere in the world and would finally stop whining about being insulted.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2010 15:29:57 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Altzan wroteBut if it is, why take it up here, of all places? It's the least likely place to influence anyone's opinion of the subject.

i've heard this sort of question before. "the internet isn't the right place to talk about this", sort of thing.

well, for most of history christianity didn't want you talking about it at all. you think books are a better option than the internet? you weren't allowed to own a bible in your own language for over 1000 years, they'd kill you if you tried. most people couldn't read AT ALL for most of christian history, the content of the bible was a secret the clergy had no interest in sharing with the common people. then you've got the vatican's long track record of banning books it doesn't like, etc etc etc...

the internet, by contrast, is great. not much censorship, much more accessible to people than the Bible used to be when the churches really had things their own way. long live e-debates!

merry christmas everyone, have a nice day with your families

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2010 17:15:28 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Altzan wroteBut if it is, why take it up here, of all places?

Yeah! What's up with all this discussing and debating that goes on in this sub-forum entitled "Heated Discussions and Debates"? It's just about the least appropriate place for this kind of thing.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Pyr0man1c](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2010 18:13:21 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Fri, 24 December 2010 08:01This thread is pretty gay.
I don't like gay things :/

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Pyr0man1c](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2010 18:16:20 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Edit: oops

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2010 19:11:13 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Starbuzz wrote on Fri, 24 December 2010 09:14opinions? The fact that sexual morals have changed over and over is not an opinion. The fact that your favorite bible kings had hundreds of sex slaves with polygamy being the norm of the day is not an opinion. The fact that religions fail and get replaced by other religions is not an opinion. You deny basic middle school history and call me a " self-righteous know-it-all?"

Your belief on how homosexuals should be treated is indeed an opinion. That's what I was getting at.

Starbuzz wrote on Fri, 24 December 2010 09:14You don't want to get involved in the debate and I can understand why. So be it.

If that's true, I'm glad.

Starbuzz wrote on Fri, 24 December 2010 09:14One such issue got solved this week in Congress fyi. We will move on and solve problems just fine just as we "solved" racism and women's rights. Despite the people who once stood against it and still do, we are better off now than before.

Good. But beside the point.

Starbuzz wrote on Fri, 24 December 2010 09:14Plus, there is no harm in discussing these here.

Of course.

Starbuzz wrote on Fri, 24 December 2010 09:14You seem to mistake discussion as some some form of infectious "propaganda" out to change your opinion! wow...

Your post earlier was not even close to neutral. It was heavily laced with pride and contempt. If I heard you speak it face-to-face, it would disgust me.

You have valid points, but speaking them the way you do indicates you're not out to change anyone's thoughts, you're out to rub it in their faces.

Starbuzz wrote on Fri, 24 December 2010 09:14Many traumatized victims of crimes end up fighting for a cause against the crime. The internet is a suitable medium in this day among many others and there is no harm in discussing important issues. It is only a matter of time I see myself speaking openly in public about what I have endured so far. You seem to mistake me as using only this internet forum; how do you know that I have not contacted and am in touch with powerful organizations that can help me?

If it's just for expression and not to start a fight, then it's great.

I'd think that if you did get in touch with a "powerful organization," it would be something you'd share, anyhow.

Starbuzz wrote on Fri, 24 December 2010 09:14When you live under a tyranny and are dragged to a mosque, forced to worship facing mecca 5 times a day, and continually mind-raped over and over and forced to believe something you can't, you would take to doing the same; using any communication medium to get your voice heard and speak out against the tyrants. It doesn't matter if they are the victims of rape, pedophilia, torture, or any other forms of tyranny.

I understand what you mean.

Starbuzz wrote on Fri, 24 December 2010 09:14So your statement of a person changing under pressure is irrelevant. Yes, they do. Some end up adapting to the pressure and some fight against it in anyway they can. I am obviously the latter. It's as silly as asking the persecuted Chinese bloggers to quit whining about their freedom because they can't influence anybody. Yeah, they can and they are making the world know of their problems. Because not everyone leads a comfortable life with basic civil rights insured such as you.

Assuming I do? Although you're correct. Unfortunately.

Starbuzz wrote on Fri, 24 December 2010 09:14After the "mile-long-post" which clearly unsettled you,

Starbuzz wrote on Fri, 24 December 2010 09:14you made a one-liner about me "throwing a mile long post about politics and religion." Why did you do that first? Considering that was not all aimed at anyone in particular.

It was more of a surprised response on how eloquent you suddenly became on the subject... as if you were waiting for a long time to express yourself.

Yeah, my "one-liner" was poorly worded, I admit.

Starbuzzz wrote on Fri, 24 December 2010 09:14Have a nice holidays, Altzan. Maybe during this quiet time, you will finally think about all the people who are not as well-off as you elsewhere in the world and would finally stop whining about being insulted.

Firstly, thanks. I hope you do as well.

Second, go ahead and view it as whining. Perhaps it is. But a discussion laced with such obscenities isn't a worthy discussion in my book. Or a discussion at all.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 24 December 2010 09:29the internet, by contrast, is great. not much censorship, much more accessible to people than the Bible used to be when the churches really had things their own way. long live e-debates!

Oh, I agree. Perhaps I wasn't really clear on what I meant. I just thought it wasn't as good as other websites or groups.

But as Starbuzzz said, he might have done so anyway.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2010 21:00:02 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Heated Discussions and Debates" section, while on a website intended for a video game, has absolutely nothing to do with said game. This section is for general topics.

As such, two people with opposing opinions are encouraged to post in this section.

While it might be true that winning or losing such debate on a website like this probably wont have any effect on the grander stance on the issue, that does not mean that it can't or shouldn't be discussed here period.

Saying that this is no place to discuss such a topic is merely a way of implying you don't want to argue anymore. As such, you no longer want to defend your position. But, since you also don't want to admit defeat on the issue, you're continuing to participate in the conversation.

Moral of the story: Don't enter an argument that you have no intention of finishing.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Rocko](#) on Sat, 25 Dec 2010 01:22:03 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Altzan can't be serious. No one can be that dumb.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Sat, 25 Dec 2010 04:48:22 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R315r4z0r wrote on Fri, 24 December 2010 15:00 "Heated Discussions and Debates" section, while on a website intended for a video game, has absolutely nothing to do with said game. This section is for general topics.

As such, two people with opposing opinions are encouraged to post in this section.

While it might be true that winning or losing such debate on a website like this probably won't have any effect on the grander stance on the issue, that does not mean that it can't or shouldn't be discussed here period.

Saying that this is no place to discuss such a topic is merely a way of implying you don't want to argue anymore. As such, you no longer want to defend your position. But, since you also don't want to admit defeat on the issue, you're continuing to participate in the conversation.

Moral of the story: Don't enter an argument that you have no intention of finishing.

It was more of a "relativity" issue. I didn't mean it was pointless, although I came off that way. Well said.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Sat, 25 Dec 2010 05:58:50 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I rather think that, aside from the ones that degenerate into flame-fests, some of the most informative discussions about controversial issues happen on forums not dedicated to the subject at hand. The reason is because, lacking a narrowly-defined topic, the discussion is more likely to go off on related-but-not-on-topic tangents... and people are more likely to say what's really on their minds instead of trying to sound reasonable. Nobody is afraid of being banned because they punched a prominent member's buttons... especially here. Punching peoples' buttons has been pretty much the way of life on Renforums since the bloody place came into being, even back when Westwood was running the place.

And now that I've spouted that bit of touchy-feely crap...

The fundies in here are full of shit. Sorry if I offended anybody, but... well, nobody has a right not to be offended. And that is the real heart of the issue, isn't it?

Because ultimately, that's what it all comes down to- people getting offended at the idea that something that disgusts them (homosexuality) is allowed to be shown the light of day. Yes, I'm well aware that it was considered taboo for most of human history (we have no way of knowing before history began, do we?)... but we live in a culture that accepts "get the government to ban it" as an acceptable way to hide the things that bother us. It is long past time for human society as a whole to grow the hell up and get over that shit.

I consider the issues of gay rights and censorship to be inextricably linked. Both revolve around the idea that, if the majority (or as the case may be, the minority with all the power) doesn't like something, they can make it go away. History tells us that this doesn't work- and tells us this over and over and over so many times you'd think you were listening to a broken record.

Forget about nature. It isn't about nature, or reproduction. Putting aside the fact that other species have demonstrated homosexual behavior, how many things do humans do that has nothing to do with our most basic biological purpose? How many of those things could potentially be offensive to a large and vocal minority of the population?

Now, how many of those things have any provable effect whatsoever on people who have access to, but choose not to use, participate, read, or have anything to do with those things? Whatever that very, very small number may turn out to be, homosexuality is not on the list. Being around gay people doesn't make you gay. Knowing that people are gay doesn't make you gay. Watching gay people having gay sex doesn't make you gay. So far, the only two ways to become gay are to either be born that way, or to make a conscious choice to engage in a homosexual lifestyle.

Any free society depends on the rule of liberty, not law, for its continued existence. Laws can be made and enforced in error; to deny that fact is to deny reality. The idea that a free person has the right to do as a free person will, without any interference, so long as they do not infringe upon the rights of another free person- that is fundamental. And thus we come back to the root of the issue: that, because it is so inevitable that everyone will be offended by something and there is something out there to offend everyone, no one has a right not to be offended. The fact that a person is gay may offend you, what they do may offend you, what they say may offend you... but none of that matters worth a damn.

What matters is that you would impose your will upon another free person so that you won't have to be offended by them. You are saying, in effect, that you are not the master of your own eyes- that you do not have the ability to simply look away from things that bother you, and that you do not have the courage to face them. You want the things- and the people- that bother you to be made to go away. No, you're not saying they should all be killed. You're saying that they should all be silent because you don't want to be offended. Whether it is because of your religion, or a phobia, or just a simple dislike of the mental image of two men buttfucking, ultimately you want gays to go away- by law- because you can't or won't handle the fact that they exist.

And you've got no problem with offending anyone else without realizing or caring about the hypocrisy of it all. And you know what? You've got every right to believe and say all that bunk, because the gays and gay rights advocates don't have a right not to be offended by you. But you do not have the right to impose your will as policy- and they do have the right to impose their will as policy. They have that right because their will does not infringe upon any of your rights, while your will does infringe upon theirs.

Am I getting up on my high horse? Yep. Can't deny it... because sometimes it is possible for one point of view to be right, and another to be wrong. There's no sense apologizing for that; the tides are changing. Sooner or later, humanity will get over this foolishness. I just hope I'm still alive to see that happen, at least in my own country if not the world.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Rocko](#) on Sat, 25 Dec 2010 08:30:21 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

wow nukeit that was fantastic, I completely agree

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Sat, 25 Dec 2010 14:20:36 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

i love when nukeit comes through and blows the place up, 100% without warning
his name makes sense i suppose

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Dover](#) on Sat, 25 Dec 2010 17:51:33 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Rocko wrote on Fri, 24 December 2010 17:22Altzan can't be serious. No one can be that dumb.

Par for the course in Tennessee.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Sat, 25 Dec 2010 21:28:21 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Sat, 25 December 2010 11:51Rocko wrote on Fri, 24 December 2010 17:22Altzan can't be serious. No one can be that dumb.

Par for the course in Tennessee.

?

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Starbuzzz](#) on Fri, 31 Dec 2010 16:55:38 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Altzan wrote on Fri, 24 December 2010 13:11Your post earlier was not even close to neutral.

There is something incredibly odd about a christian demanding neutrality. In any issue. PERIOD.

Altzan wrote on Fri, 24 December 2010 13:11Your belief on how homosexuals should be treated is indeed an opinion.

Altzan wrote on Fri, 24 December 2010 13:11Your belief on how blacks should be treated is indeed an opinion.

Altzan wrote on Fri, 24 December 2010 13:11Your belief on how women should be treated is indeed an opinion.

No, it isn't. See what I did there? Here is a fine example of what dogmatic religious indoctrination from a religion such as christianity can do to a person. It's sad we have to deal with people like this every generation for needless problems that we get over in the next generation.

We actually have a concept now of basic "human rights" that didn't exist when abraham's god was busy giving those despicable commandments in Deutronomy such as ordering those who don't worship "him" to be taken out of the camp to be killed and giving out the correct guidelines for using slaves (wow).

Thousands of years later after "he" gave these commandments, what do we see? We see that the absolute rules from such a power-crazed man-made god is not absolute afterall and humanity as a whole have rejected those idiotic rules (thru many struggles).

If such a god did forbid the use of slaves and promoted the concept that all humans have some form of basic rights, the religion would be growing, not shamefully dying as a laughingstock as it is. Our morals today are lightyears ahead of what the judeo-christian god came up with and it will be ever better as we move into the future.

@Nuke: hotly-condensed and very effective post right there. While everything you said makes sense to anyone not clouded by religious indoctrination, this is the part that is the mental blocker:

Nukelt15 wrote on Fri, 24 December 2010 23:58But you do not have the right to impose your will as policy- and they do have the right to impose their will as policy. They have that right because their will does not infringe upon any of your rights, while your will does infringe upon theirs.

From strong personal experience, it is extremely difficult for a religiously indoctrinated person to understand this. ^

The religious have 1 gold standard, i.e, the instructions of their god are absolute and CORRECT. Nobody can challenge it and add or take away from it and absolutely nobody can void it. This by itself is hypocritical considering the wide range of biblical laws that they conveneintly ignore because it will be too stupid to follow them now!

The other standard they see (which is our basic constantly evolving commonsense as the human journey continues) is what they automatically demonize as "ways of the world," "wickedness of the lost" and other drivel. This is a pure isolationist self-deceiving way of looking at our progress (which they ridicule).

So that is the absolute root of the problem and the challenge we get from the dogmatically indoctrinated. So no matter how often and how hard we repeat that, the religious find it very hard to accept it. You explained very well with the homosexuals example but no matter how much, their

gold standard is there so they have incredible mental difficulty to accept that "allright, he is a homosexual and I find him disgusting but he is not doing anything whatsoever to hurt me and so I should fuck off." Instead, they feel compelled to act to stop it proving the power trip nature of their quest.

This just shows the man-made nature of the religion and its use for pure purposes of control and power. If christians actually cared for the souls of the homosexuals (thy don't cos that's was bullshit from day 1), they won't be pathetically pleading to "enforce the 1993 law banning homosexuals from serving in the military" in a equally pathetic voter guide. They would be instead reaching out and pleading with compassion to try to change them (very few do this). It shows how in the end, it is all about trying to forcefully conform everyone to their standard so they can just sleep tight at night knowing they don't have to worry about facing reality. This probably defines the word, "pathetic."

I have read countless christian bloggers who, like that lunatic's blog Pyr0 linked to, are convinced that we are headed to moral decay in the issue of homosexuality and generally into the future.

Funny thing is, if I were half-honest, I would admit "moral decay" was at it's height during biblical times and many times directly precipitated by the the judeo-christian god (mass-killing children anyone?). The bible stories aside, thousands of years before biblical chastity grasped the collective human mind thousands of years ago as christian replaced then-exisiting religions in western lands, women were just sex slaves. They were like property, infact even the judeo-christian god put women (wife) as not to be coveted in the last of the ten commandments along with the rest of the things not to be coveted! Showed where things stood then.

Kings grabbed any attractive females they saw and had thousands of sex slaves (innocently named as "concubines" in the bible). Humans were handled like animals as slaves. If this was the norm then, why bitch about where we are headed now? You see so many bible nuts whine about how "sex is becoming more and more casual, oh noes!" and "how the world is becoming dangerous!"...these idiots should take a look at history and see how it has been constantly changing. Yes, sex is more recreational now (and so?) but atleast now it is widely consensual and much safer as opposed to what amounted to sadistic kidnap-rape in biblical times.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Fri, 31 Dec 2010 23:05:03 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Starbuzz wrote on Fri, 31 December 2010 10:55There is something incredibly odd about a christian demanding neutrality. In any issue. PERIOD.

How cute.

Is that the best counter you came up with?

Starbuzz wrote on Fri, 31 December 2010 10:55Changing quotes is fun!

Nice try.

Don't drag the "right and wrong" aspect into it, buddy - it wasn't my point, not by a long shot.

My point stands as thus:

Quote:Your belief on how homosexuals should be treated is indeed an opinion.

And you have yet to prove it false.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Starbuzzz](#) on Sat, 01 Jan 2011 02:06:43 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Altzan wrote on Fri, 31 December 2010 17:05Starbuzzz wrote on Fri, 31 December 2010 10:55There is something incredibly odd about a christian demanding neutrality. In any issue. PERIOD.

Is that the best counter you came up with?

You are raging about how I hurt your feelings by speaking my mind on a crucial issue while you are ready to crush and oppress people into behaving the way you want them to by supporting/favouring laws that are made to control and oppress people to your liking.

Still whining about how my "post didn't even come close to neutral?" Take a wild guess.

Altzan wrote on Fri, 31 December 2010 17:05Starbuzzz wrote on Fri, 31 December 2010 10:55Changing quotes is fun!

Nice try.

My point went flying over your head.

Altzan wrote on Fri, 31 December 2010 17:05Don't drag the "right and wrong" aspect into it, buddy - it wasn't my point, not by a long shot.

You are going to have to try a lot harder to worm out of this one, rookie. Besides "right and wrong" which you are so quick to pull out of and deny here (!!!), most importantly and foremost, it's a issue of "will you mind your own business and allow people to be themselves" or "will you continue to intrude into the personal

lives and life choices of others." The choice should be VERY easy considering they (homosexuals) have done NO WRONG TO YOU.

Altzan wrote on Fri, 31 December 2010 17:05My point stands as thus:

Quote:Your belief on how homosexuals should be treated is indeed an opinion.

And you have yet to prove it false.

No, that is most certainly NOT your point. Did you think it's going to be this easy? Your dishonest statement of "your belief on how homosexuals should be treated is indeed an opinion" is a

cunningly veiled translation of "I have a right to tell people (homosexuals) how to behave and will use the law to make them comply; and what anyone else says including yourself doesn't matter because it is only your opinion and a belief."

And now you are demanding me to disprove this absurdity?!

If you think you can hide behind such a wretched statement using words like "your opinion" and "belief" and think it will do your side any good...well, no it doesn't. We went thru this SAME word-play dishonesty in the Catholic debate thread.

It's extremely alarming to see such a dishonest religiously-intoxicated individual put the crucial civil rights issue of how certain people should be treated in the same sentence with "belief" and "an opinion."

Very dangerous times indeed. You only give me hyper-encouragement for fighting for the civil rights of those oppressed by the likes of short-sighted, history-denying individuals like yourself.

You have yet to counter any 1 single pro-homosexual argument presented here so far, not even having the decency to make a first point as to WHY these laws should be in place. Yet you demand disproof for a lame one-liner which has already been destroyed over and over.

In the meantime, you continue to ignore the exponential historical irrelavency of your entire belief system (as well as any other competing belief system) as pointed out here repeatedly.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Sat, 01 Jan 2011 02:30:00 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

take it easy on this guy Starbuzz, he spends quite a lot of time in Renegade build servers

Subject: pulling in and out again...

Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Sat, 01 Jan 2011 05:29:17 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Imo: this whole debate is somewhat moot. Gays have been allowed to openly serve in the military whether some people like it or not. Personally I would have preferred DADT, with the clause inserted that if someone is 3rd person outed they shouldn't have been kicked out, as it should have been quite effective at getting rid of the the Gay community complaints* about wanting to be able to serve in the military and not have to lie about being straight in order to do so. I have absolutely 0 problems with that, everyone should be able to serve our country in the military if they qualify physically and mentally.

However, DADT advocates are now being called bigots and homophobes for defending DADT. Yet before, they would have been called a bigot or homophobe for not wanting gays in the military at all*. Funny how when the right side of the political spectrum decides to compromise, which

may not have been the case then it is now though, the left seems to want to continue pushing their agenda under the guise of equal rights. It's not the fight for equal rights, it is elevating a minority over the majority. Now because of this, homosexuals that have been passed up for a promotion, demoted, dishonorably discharged, left on the field injured for whatever reason, etc. can now claim that is was because they were gay that what happened to them happened. I know most of them will not do that, but there are some who will.

And on this note, let me also state that I'm for civil unions or something along those lines replacing marriage in the state's eyes and allowing religion to keep their version of marriage. If this makes me a bigot for not believing in gay marriage, you've got a huge problem. TL:dr(not really)==> Churches can call marriages marriages. They'll have their right to. But in the eyes of the law, straight/gay/etc should be called a civil union, or mmarriage, or commonlaw, or anything else other than marriage. The religious connotation stays for the churches that wish to continue that tradition, and in the eyes of the law, everybody is equal and nothing is separate. And if you have churches that allow marriages of homosexual couples, then great, the homosexual couples can be a part of -those churches-.

Also on a slightly humorous note: Think of the pinups girls on the walls. Do you really think that gays aren't going to participate in that longstanding army tradition? They will put guy pinups which in all honesty no straight guy wants to see. Which means that someone will tear it down, the guy who had it will get butt hurt over it and as a result pinup girl and guy posters are banned. no one is happy.

*best wording I can come up with atm

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Sat, 01 Jan 2011 06:35:14 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Sheesh. Only one part of your reply is even worth touching, since you refuse to stop trying to drag me into conversations I want no part with.

Starbuzzz wrote on Fri, 31 December 2010 20:06You are raging

Really, now.

It's obvious you're raging a lot more than I am.

Starbuzzz wrote on Fri, 31 December 2010 20:06about how I hurt your feelings

Not really.

Starbuzzz wrote on Fri, 31 December 2010 20:06while you are ready to crush and oppress people into behaving the way you want them to by supporting/favouring laws that are made to control and oppress people to your liking.

Quote me where I said I support those laws. Go on.

Subject: Re: pulling in and out again...

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Sat, 01 Jan 2011 17:50:58 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Muad Dib15 wrote on Fri, 31 December 2010 23:29

Also on a slightly humorous note: Think of the pinups girls on the walls. Do you really think that gays aren't going to participate in that longstanding army tradition? They will put guy pinups which in all honesty no straight guy wants to see. Which means that someone will tear it down, the guy who had it will get butt hurt over it and as a result pinup girl and guy posters are banned. no one is happy.

Yeah, and I'm sure women who serve aren't terribly enthusiastic about pinup chicks either. Besides, gay dudes aren't into that stuff, and they don't care.

So yeah, it's entirely fair to ban pinup posters if straight dudes bitch about seeing men more attractive than them on the wall. Gay people are portrayed as being effeminate girls, and yet it seems in this debate, it's the straight people who are being the total c#nts.

Subject: Re: pulling in and out again...

Posted by [Dover](#) on Wed, 05 Jan 2011 18:43:16 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Muad Dib15 wrote on Fri, 31 December 2010 21:29lmo:

dgaf

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Wed, 05 Jan 2011 22:14:40 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 18 December 2010 13:12If God can do anything, can he create something so incredibly heavy that not even he can lift?

Depends if he didn't want to be able to lift it >.<

R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 18 December 2010 15:50Anyway, back on topic. What God says is right or wrong should not come into the picture. This is because religion is not supposed to interfere with government regulations. Freedom isn't free, if you want to live here, there are somethings that you have to be subjected to. Being gay can just be used as a loophole for people to avoid being drafted.

Sex change being the next loophole...

Best Case Scenario: Gays become more accepted in society.

Worst Case: Friendly Fire rates go up.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Wed, 05 Jan 2011 23:25:52 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jerad Gray wrote on Wed, 05 January 2011 17:14R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 18 December 2010 13:12If God can do anything, can he create something so incredibly heavy that not even he can lift?

Depends if he didn't want to be able to lift it >.<

Ah, but you see, if he creates something that he isn't able to lift, regardless of if it was intended, then it shows he isn't all powerful. If he can't create something that is too heavy for him to lift, then it shows that his creation powers are limited.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Wed, 05 Jan 2011 23:43:54 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 05 January 2011 16:25Jerad Gray wrote on Wed, 05 January 2011 17:14R315r4z0r wrote on Sat, 18 December 2010 13:12If God can do anything, can he create something so incredibly heavy that not even he can lift?

Depends if he didn't want to be able to lift it >.<

Ah, but you see, if he creates something that he isn't able to lift, regardless of if it was intended, then it shows he isn't all powerful. If he can't create something that is too heavy for him to lift, then it shows that his creation powers are limited.

He is all powerful if he decides he can't lift it beings that means he made the rules for it in the first place.

IE: He wouldn't be all powerful if he couldn't make something he could not lift.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [InternetThug](#) on Thu, 06 Jan 2011 00:56:52 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

thats just a stupid fucking paradox because if he was all powerful he could both make an object he could not lift and then give himself the power to lift it ... either way its a paradox ..

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Thu, 06 Jan 2011 04:47:05 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

My friend had that question put to him once... he accurately pointed out that the question covers

the physical and spiritual aspects together, something that makes no sense.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Thu, 06 Jan 2011 05:17:09 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Altzan wrote on Wed, 05 January 2011 23:47My friend had that question put to him once... he accurately pointed out that the question covers the physical and spiritual aspects together, something that makes no sense.

That's a cop-out answer.

God is supposed to be all powerful. He can be in spiritual form or in physical form depending on his choosing.

Let me put it to you this way:

1. God can do/create anything.
2. Therefore, God can make something that He can't do.
3. Not being able to do something conflicts with his ability to do/create anything.

If you can't do something, you can't do it. If God has the power to grant Himself the ability to do something He previously couldn't, then that means He COULD do it all along and just "pretended" He couldn't. Therefore, in order for God to create something He can't do, he has to absolutely relinquish the power to grant himself the ability to do it.

Whether or not He can create something He can't do shows that He isn't omnipotent.

-If He can create something He can't lift, then He isn't omnipotent because He can't lift it.

-If He can't create something He can't lift, then He isn't omnipotent because He can't create it.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [InternetThug](#) on Thu, 06 Jan 2011 05:25:07 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

its called a paradox retard ... its like arguing an unstoppable force vs an immovable object

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Thu, 06 Jan 2011 05:32:53 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

M0FiR3 wrote on Thu, 06 January 2011 00:25its called a paradox retard ... its like arguing an unstoppable force vs an immovable object

Right. And naming the literary term for it answers the question how exactly?

The question is a theoretical paradox. This is because God is merely a theory. There is no proof that God exists and thus no proof of His would-be power.

However, this particular paradox disproves the ability to be omnipotent in our level of reality. (Meaning if God ever 'appeared' to us in our reality, He couldn't be omnipotent without changing the laws of logic, probability and physics)

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Pyr0man1c](#) on Thu, 06 Jan 2011 05:47:18 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 05 January 2011 23:32M0FiR3 wrote on Thu, 06 January 2011 00:25its called a paradox retard ... its like arguing an unstoppable force vs an immovable object

However, this particular paradox disproves the ability to be omnipotent in our level of reality. (Meaning if God ever 'appeared' to us in our reality, He couldn't be omnipotent without changing the laws of logic, probability and physics)

What's your point?

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Thu, 06 Jan 2011 06:20:46 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote: A common response is that since God is supposedly omnipotent, the phrase "could not lift" doesn't make sense and the paradox is meaningless. An alternative version would be to assume that an non-corporeal God cannot lift anything, but can raise it (a linguistic pedantry) - or to use the beliefs of Christians and Hindus (That there is one God, who can be manifest as several different beings) that whilst it is possible for God to do all things, it is not possible for all his incarnations to do them. As such, God could create a stone so heavy that, in one incarnation, he was unable to lift it - but would be able to do something that an incarnation that could lift it couldn't.

C. S. Lewis argues that when talking about omnipotence, referencing "a rock so heavy that God cannot lift it" is nonsense just as much as referencing "a square circle." So asking "Can God create a rock so heavy that even he cannot lift it?" is just as much nonsense as asking "Can God draw a square circle?" The logical contradiction here being God's simultaneous ability and disability in lifting the rock (the statement "God can lift this rock" must have a truth value of either true or false, it cannot possess both). Therefore the question (and therefore the perceived paradox) is meaningless. Nonsense does not suddenly acquire sense and meaning with the addition of the two words, "God can" before it.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [InternetThug](#) on Thu, 06 Jan 2011 06:53:39 GMT

yeah i didnt look at the dudes name but whoever the weirdo writing in red is .. youre trying too hard ... i liked altzans response tho cause that basically sums up what i was thinking ... nerds

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Thu, 06 Jan 2011 07:47:36 GMT

Altzan wrote on Thu, 06 January 2011 01:20Quote:A common response is that since God is supposedly omnipotent, the phrase "could not lift" doesn't make sense and the paradox is meaningless. An alternative version would be to assume that an non-corporeal God cannot lift anything, but can raise it (a linguistic pedantry) - or to use the beliefs of Christians and Hindus (That there is one God, who can be manifest as several different beings) that whilst it is possible for God to do all things, it is not possible for all his incarnations to do them. As such, God could create a stone so heavy that, in one incarnation, he was unable to lift it - but would be able to do something that an incarnation that could lift it couldn't.

C. S. Lewis argues that when talking about omnipotence, referencing "a rock so heavy that God cannot lift it" is nonsense just as much as referencing "a square circle." So asking "Can God create a rock so heavy that even he cannot lift it?" is just as much nonsense as asking "Can God draw a square circle?" The logical contradiction here being God's simultaneous ability and disability in lifting the rock (the statement "God can lift this rock" must have a truth value of either true or false, it cannot possess both). Therefore the question (and therefore the perceived paradox) is meaningless. Nonsense does not suddenly acquire sense and meaning with the addition of the two words, "God can" before it.

That's a terrible answer. It doesn't correlate any reasoning as to why those metaphors are examples of it being nonsensical. It just says they are leaves it at that. The guy just threw in some big words to make it sound like he knew what he was talking about...

My car is as fast as the sky is blue. Does that make any sense to you? Probably not. Unless I give more perspective, that statement doesn't make sense at all.

So, explain to me how "a square circle" can draw any similarities to an item so heavy that God can't even lift it.

You can't draw a square circle. That's not a paradox, that's just nonsensical. But an item has weight; it can weigh so much one cannot lift it or it can weigh so little that anyone can. A heavy item is not nonsense.

As for the part about not being about lift anything but being able to raise it also fails to "solve" the paradox. Raising something does not require lifting (for example levitation), but lifting does require raising. To say he cannot lift is also saying he lacks the ability to and is therefore not omnipotent. Corporeal or not, God is said to be able to manifest physically or spiritually. Meaning if God can't "lift" something in non-corporeal form, then he should be able to do it in corporeal form.

Pyr0man1c wrote on Thu, 06 January 2011 00:47R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 05 January 2011

23:32M0F1R3 wrote on Thu, 06 January 2011 00:25its called a paradox retard ... its like arguing

an unstoppable force vs an immovable object

However, this particular paradox disproves the ability to be omnipotent in our level of reality.
(Meaning if God ever 'appeared' to us in our reality, He couldn't be omnipotent without changing the laws of logic, probability and physics)

What's your point?

My point is that being omnipotent is impossible.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Starbuzzz](#) on Thu, 06 Jan 2011 10:00:20 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Muad Dib15 wrote on Sat, 01 January 2011 06:29Imo: this whole debate is somewhat moot. Gays have been allowed to openly serve in the military whether some people like it or not.

Translation: the law has been repealed so let's stop talking about this because now homosexuality is widely accepted everywhere and people won't stand in their way in getting on with their lives!
Nope. If you have read this debate, the last few pages isn't about the law anymore; it's something more simple than that. The debate isn't moot in the least.

Muad Dib15 wrote on Sat, 01 January 2011 06:29However, DADT advocates are now being called bigots and homophobes for defending DADT. Yet before, they would have been called a bigot or homophobe for not wanting gays in the military at all*.

Doesn't matter in the least. Your side has yet to answer WHY the law was set up in the first place and what was the general consensus/motivation behind it.

It's simple; church thugs did it to get their way. So they deserve all the nasty shit that's coming their way.

Muad Dib15 wrote on Sat, 01 January 2011 06:29Funny how when the right side of the political spectrum decides to compromise, which may not have been the case then it is now though, the left seems to want to continue pushing their agenda under the guise of equal rights. It's not the fight for equal rights, it is elevating a minority over the majority.

Once again, you have to yet to answer WHY this law was set up in the first place and whose agenda it was before pointing fingers at those who killed the law and blaming THEM for having an "agenda."

Muad Dib15 wrote on Sat, 01 January 2011 06:29Now because of this, homosexuals that have been passed up for a promotion, demoted, dishonorably discharged, left on the field injured for whatever reason, etc. can now claim that is was because they were gay that what happened to them happened. I know most of them will not do that, but there are some who will.

This is an incredibly demeaning thing to say; in the past it would have been:

Quote:Now because of this, blacks that have been passed up for a promotion, demoted,

dishonorably discharged, left on the field injured for whatever reason, etc. can now claim that is was because they were black that what happened to them happened. I know most of them will not do that, but there are some who will.

Not playing the race-card here, but pointing out similar problems in the past which all boiled down to misinformed intolerance. What you said comes down to denial and downplaying the effect of DADT; so far we know that unnecessarily 14,000 skilled military people who would otherwise could have held on to their posts were kicked out for being gay. To deny this and twist it into what you just did above shows the sinister bias you have against homosexuals.

Muad Dib15 wrote on Sat, 01 January 2011 06:29And on this note, let me also state that I'm for civil unions or something along those lines replacing marriage in the state's eyes and allowing religion to keep their version of marriage.

Does it make any difference?

Muad Dib15 wrote on Sat, 01 January 2011 06:29Churches can call marriages marriages. They'll have their right to. But in the eyes of the law, straight/gay/etc should be called a civil union, or mmarrriage, or commonlaw, or anything else other than marriage.

And what EXACTLY IS your reasoning for this? You say you are not a bigot for believing in gay marriage but here you are asking for a social double standard. "Please use any other word except marriage!"

Nobody's out to take the church's power to ordain marriages. But you want "marriage" as we know it

The church has no power and it is always below the state. I don't think the state should bent over backwards just so an outdated entity such as a church can protect its "traditional right" that it supposedly had since the beginning of time. No wait, their tradional right that they acquired over a period of the last 2000 years due to changing social conditions! Why should the state help the church hold on to a power they gained over many years? If they want to have a monopoly on the word "marriage," they are welcome to try to hold on to it themselves.

Muad Dib15 wrote on Sat, 01 January 2011 06:29The religious connotation stays for the churches that wish to continue that tradition, and in the eyes of the law, everybody is equal and nothing is separate.

This is a double standard right there. So in the eyes of the law everyone is equal and in the eyes of the church (we could care less), they are not. You claim this entire matter is all about a minority getting "elevated" over the majority but here you see the majority wanting to keep the minority buckled down under their foot.

Muad Dib15 wrote on Sat, 01 January 2011 06:29And if you have churches that allow marriages of homosexual couples, then great, the homosexual couples can be a part of -those churches-

lol so this whole exercise is a complete waste of time. I suggest you figure this out and get a consensus within the faction-based nature of the church and it's multiple denominations before

trying to act all united.

By asking for a different verbal description for gay marriage so you can preserve the old way of the church "protecting" marriage, you are obviously asking for a double standard that will further prevent homosexuals from going about their lives. You said, "Oh please call it anything but marriage!!!" If this is not bigotry, I don't know what is.

Are you that insecure about your religion?

btw, I am heterosexual and will be getting married for sure but WON'T be doing so in a church. Will I still be a "married man" and fit your verbal definition of "marriage"? Sure I will be...cos of my lady.

Anyone can see thru what Muad REALLY wants; a legalized social divide and distinction between married homosexuals and married heterosexuals. All just so he can sleep tight at night feeling secure.

Altzan wrote on Sat, 01 January 2011 00:35Only one part of your reply is even worth touching, since you refuse to stop trying to drag me into conversations I want no part with.

^ seems a contradictory statement to say. I wonder what part of the conversation you didn't want a part in when you wanted something lame disproved. Glad to see you ignore the response to that and move on to this:

Altzan wrote on Sat, 01 January 2011 00:35Quote me where I said I support those laws. Go on.

This coming from someone who said a few months back that not setting up such laws and agreeing to them is "partaking/aiding in such sin." I blame this on either dishonesty or poor memory.

btw, a quick word on "sanctity of marriage." You hear people whine about this a lot and how homosexual marriage will somehow "taint" the "sanctity of marriage."

OK, first of as has been pointed out numerous times in this thread (and conveniently ignored by the religious fanatics here), marriage was never about 1 man and 1 woman. Polygamy was the norm of the day at the time the bible was written and women were mere property. It's important to note that the ban on homosexuality was in effect at this same time! So polygamy was the norm and homosexuality banned. Now we have history-denying church thugs who claim marriage was always about 1 man and 1 woman while at the same time banning homosexuality. Admit it, you lost on this big time. Morals and the way we live and think and behave collectively as a society are changing ALL THE TIME. No response at all to that one from fanatics here.

Not to mention how many times the god christians' worship orders his chosen people to attack countless cities and kill every man AND married woman ("kill all women who have known a man")

plus their children. And to take away the virgins as prize.

I find it really arrogant of the church to deny their own bible and now claim rights to decide the "sanctity of marriage." If anybody has the right to decide what this sanctity is all about, it should be by those who are not clouded by such spiteful ignorance and sheer history-denial.

btw, the church can preach its "sanctity" crap to its millions of members who walk down the aisle each year and split up years later citing "irreconcilable differences."

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Thu, 06 Jan 2011 15:41:35 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R315r4z0r wrote on Thu, 06 January 2011 01:47That's a terrible answer. It doesn't correlate any reasoning as to why those metaphors are examples of it being nonsensical. It just says they are leaves it at that. The guy just threw in some big words to make it sound like he knew what he was talking about...

It's not terrible. It makes sense. Whereas the paradox does not.

If it were so easy to understand this paradox, it wouldn't still be open to interpretation.

R315r4z0r wrote on Thu, 06 January 2011 01:47You can't draw a square circle. That's not a paradox, that's just nonsensical. But an item has weight; it can weigh so much one cannot lift it or it can weigh so little that anyone can. A heavy item is not nonsense.

Sure it isn't nonsense. Expecting a non-physical being to "be able to lift a rock or not" is nonsense.

Starbuzzz wrote on Thu, 06 January 2011 04:00Altzan wrote on Sat, 01 January 2011 00:35Only one part of your reply is even worth touching, since you refuse to stop trying to drag me into conversations I want no part with.

^ seems a contradictory statement to say. I wonder what part of the conversation you didn't want a part in when you wanted something lame disproved. Glad to see you ignore the response to that and move on to this:

Contradictory? I don't want to discuss homosexuality with an attitude like yours. Simple as that, buddy.

Simply, nobody can see whether or not you're right (and I do say either of us could be) because of all of your flaunting of how "in the right" you are and how we are all "a bunch of closed-minded bigots".

Maybe when you learn to "debate" and not "flame and taunt" you might get people willing to discuss it on your preferred level. Until then...

Starbuzzz wrote on Thu, 06 January 2011 04:00Altzan wrote on Sat, 01 January 2011 00:35Quote me where I said I support those laws. Go on.

This coming from someone who said a few months back that not setting up such laws and

agreeing to them is "partaking/aiding in such sin." I blame this on either dishonesty or poor memory.

I'm not surprised in the least. Honestly, what ISN'T to blame for all of the things you despise?

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [InternetThug](#) **on Thu, 06 Jan 2011 18:11:37 GMT**

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

r3l1arazrsr are you trying to be a fucking retard or does it just happen? If he was omnipotent he could both make an object he couldn't lift but he would be setting the rules for it ... and then if he didnt lift it he wouldnt be omnipotent? either way hes not omnipotent to your rules ... but he is omnipotent and he could do either but he'd be setting his own rules which he could also break ... CS Lewis explained it perfectly and you're just trying to act like you have even an ounce of intelligence when you're obviously a fucking moron ... it's depressing how stupid some people on this forum are ... go watch a 72 hour gundam marathon or something

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) **on Thu, 06 Jan 2011 18:40:38 GMT**

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey, M0FiR3!

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Pyr0man1c](#) **on Thu, 06 Jan 2011 19:44:29 GMT**

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Nevermind...

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [CarrierII](#) **on Thu, 06 Jan 2011 21:44:45 GMT**

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R3, that particular argument does boil down to pitting a hypothetical God's omnipotence against itself, which is not possible.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [appshot](#) **on Thu, 06 Jan 2011 22:30:53 GMT**

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

here answer this question... who created god? who created the thing/entity that created god? and so on..

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Thu, 06 Jan 2011 22:58:31 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Carrierll wrote on Thu, 06 January 2011 16:44R3, that particular argument does boil down to pitting a hypothetical God's omnipotence against itself, which is not possible.

While I really don't get what this means since no one bothers to explain it... it doesn't really matter. To be honest, the question doesn't really relate to God but rather the concept of omnipotence itself.

You ever hear the phrase "where there is a will there is a way"? This is what I'm trying to say about omnipotence.

If you can't do something one way, then you can change yourself or the environment to be able to do it another way. However, since you had the power to change yourself all along, then logically, you were never able to not do it to begin with! But not being able to do something contradicts the idea of omnipotence.

Something that is impossible to do is not the same as something that can't be done until something else is done first. (Does that make sense?)

Something that is impossible means that there is absolutely nothing that can be done to allow you to reach a goal. There is a permanent obstacle in the way that can not be circumvented under any circumstance.

Let's say you want to play a new video game on your computer. However, your current computer doesn't have the necessary specs to run the game. Does that mean that it is impossible to play that game? No, because all you have to do is upgrade your computer and THEN you can play the game! You had the ability to play that game all along, you just were required to do some other task(s) first.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Fri, 07 Jan 2011 00:24:37 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

M0FiR3 wrote on Wed, 05 January 2011 17:56thats just a stupid fucking paradox because if he was all powerful he could both make an object he could not lift and then give himself the power to lift it ... either way its a paradox ..

Incorrect, if he couldn't make an object he couldn't lift then he wouldn't be all powerful, the creation of an object he can't lift is just a side effect of his all powerfulness.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Fri, 07 Jan 2011 00:29:10 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R315r4z0r wrote on Thu, 06 January 2011 00:47Pyr0man1c wrote on Thu, 06 January 2011 00:47R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 05 January 2011 23:32M0FiR3 wrote on Thu, 06 January 2011 00:25its called a paradox retard ... its like arguing an unstoppable force vs an immovable object

However, this particular paradox disproves the ability to be omnipotent in our level of reality. (Meaning if God ever 'appeared' to us in our reality, He couldn't be omnipotent without changing the laws of logic, probability and physics)

What's your point?

My point is that being omnipotent is impossible.

Impossible to us perhaps, I'd expect cheating and he'd just split reality into two dimensions, within one he'd lift the object, the other he'd fail to lift it...

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [bmr_71](#) on Fri, 07 Jan 2011 01:33:24 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You're a bunch of retards

trolling is a art

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Fri, 07 Jan 2011 02:22:17 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

bmr_71 wrote on Thu, 06 January 2011 20:33You're a bunch of retards

Your words have touched me and I now see the error in my ways. You have changed my life and I will forever live a life of prosperity.

Look out world, here I come!

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Fri, 07 Jan 2011 16:32:26 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Pyr0man1c](#) on Fri, 07 Jan 2011 21:46:03 GMT

Stfu, you're joking around whilst the poor guy doesn't know what's going on.
Really though, this topic should be split so we can discuss God's omnipotence B-)

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Starbuzzz](#) on Sat, 08 Jan 2011 02:30:23 GMT

Pyr0man1c wrote on Fri, 07 January 2011 15:46

Really though, this topic should be split so we can discuss God's omnipotence B-)

No! Let's not split the topic. This side discussion of "omnipotence" perfectly shows that theists can only debate a topic they are comfortable with. Why and how? Easy: when debating "omnipotence" theists don't have to deal with the hard parts, ie, is this god even real in the first place? are the literary works that they base their stupid assumptions on within sound reason? Are they uniform in providing a homogeneous data source about the "god" in question? Are the authors of these works confirmed and identified and reliable individuals? And most importantly, what is the seniority level of the religion compared with other competing religions?

Oh not at all; the main question ignores all these PREREQUISITES and so, it makes no sense to discuss the "omnipotence" of ANY god in the first place. And since theists are never asked to show these preliminary requisites, they take great pleasure in wallowing in their delusional bullshit like they are doing here in a mediocre subtopic. Then again, that's what theists are good at: spinning bullshit.

Altzan wrote on Thu, 06 January 2011 09:41Contradictory? I don't want to discuss homosexuality with an attitude like yours. Simple as that, buddy.

Simply, nobody can see whether or not you're right (and I do say either of us could be) because of all of your flaunting of how "in the right" you are and how we are all "a bunch of closed-minded bigots".

Maybe when you learn to "debate" and not "flame and taunt" you might get people willing to discuss it on your preferred level. Until then...

If your excuse to not defend your position was because I butthurt you, then your are lying (not surprising since its you) thru your teeth as you could have just as easily responded to Spoony or Nukelt15.

anyway:

Starbuzzz: Here's my stand and here are the reasons to back it up soundly.

Altzan: I am insulted by the way you said it and so won't reply. also I maybe right too!

so there you have it everyone, the entire debate is dogma vs reason; on the side of reason, one side has offered concrete reasoning to back up their assertions meticulously. On the side of dogma and despite faced with decimating irrefutable reason, a vile indoctrinated individual can just throw up his hands in the air and say he is still right without offering any rebuttal.

We are perfectly convinced now.

Altzan wrote on Thu, 06 January 2011 09:41Starbuzzz wrote on Thu, 06 January 2011 04:00Altzan wrote on Sat, 01 January 2011 00:35Quote me where I said I support those laws. Go on.

This coming from someone who said a few months back that not setting up such laws and agreeing to them is "partaking/aiding in such sin." I blame this on either dishonesty or poor memory.

I'm not surprised in the least. Honestly, what ISN'T to blame for all of the things you despise?

Changes the subject with irrelevant question after prompt rebuttal of previous one-liner.

Altzan wrote on Thu, 06 January 2011 09:41R315r4z0r wrote on Thu, 06 January 2011 01:47You can't draw a square circle. That's not a paradox, that's just nonsensical. But an item has weight; it can weigh so much one cannot lift it or it can weigh so little that anyone can. A heavy item is not nonsense.

Sure it isn't nonsense. Expecting a non-physical being to "be able to lift a rock or not" is nonsense.

No, it's not considering this is the same "non-physical being" that had to:

- rest on the 7th day after 6 days of shooting out lame one-liners (1 lame one-liner a day).
- feel the need to walk in the garden in the cool of the day
- screw up the human language because he was scared shitless of humans unitedly building a tower to reach him in the clouds and kicking his ass
- send down "chariots of fire" to pick up VIP's (Elijah)

Most often, he was probably some kind of lame alien with obvious limitations. "Omnipresent" and "omnipotent" were words that theologians grabbed and zealously attached to their god. They failed.

ps: read your bible without skipping a single verse.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Sat, 08 Jan 2011 03:07:35 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Starbuzzz wrote on Fri, 07 January 2011 20:30because I butthurt you

Keep at it, good chum! Someone might believe you eventually.

Starbuzzz wrote on Fri, 07 January 2011 20:30on the side of reason, one side has offered concrete reasoning to back up their assertions meticulously.

That's a pathetic laugh. There's nothing "concrete" or "meticulous" about your hate-babble.

Starbuzz wrote on Fri, 07 January 2011 20:30Changes the subject with irrelevant question after prompt rebuttal of previous one-liner.

Fight fire with fire, I say.

Starbuzz wrote on Fri, 07 January 2011 20:30No, it's not considering this is the same "non-physical being" that had to:

- rest on the 7th day after 6 days of shooting out lame one-liners (1 lame one-liner a day).
- feel the need to walk in the garden in the cool of the day
- screw up the human language because he was scared shitless of humans unitedly building a tower to reach him in the clouds and kicking his ass
- send down "chariots of fire" to pick up VIP's (Elijah)

Seriously? He doesn't have to be a physical being to do any of that.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Sat, 08 Jan 2011 04:16:08 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Altzan wrote on Fri, 07 January 2011 21:07nothing "concrete" or "meticulous" about your hate-babble.

Hate, eh? Now that's a fundamentalist religious mind, right there. Your parents and church did a damn good job allright.

Altzan wrote on Fri, 07 January 2011 21:07

Seriously? He doesn't have to be a physical being to do any of that.

Exactly, so why did "he" freak out at mere humans building a tower to reach him in the clouds? Why so scared? I would think a spirit god or an interchangeable spirit/physical god could care less. You dug a nice hole there.

btw, slow down; reply to this first without ignoring it like last time:

Starbuzz wrote on Fri, 07 January 2011 20:30is this god even real in the first place? are the literary works that they base their stupid assumptions on within sound reason? Are they uniform in providing a homogeneous data source about the "god" in question? Are the authors of these works confirmed and identified and reliable individuals? And most importantly, what is the seniority level of the religion compared with other competing religions?

After you have answered all that, you can come to me with your delusional assumptions of whatever being you worship and why "he doesn't have to be a physical being to do any of that." gg

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Sat, 08 Jan 2011 04:24:19 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Altzan wrote on Fri, 07 January 2011 22:07Starbuzzz wrote on Fri, 07 January 2011 20:30on the side of reason, one side has offered concrete reasoning to back up their assertions meticulously.

That's a pathetic laugh. There's nothing "concrete" or "meticulous" about your hate-babble. Not hate, what he means is that whenever a scientific discovery is made, it is backed up with evidence and proof of the phenomenon.

Many things have gone from ideas and theories to scientific law after evidence was found to support the claims. This has happened hundreds of thousands of times throughout the history of man kind.

However, the existence of God has forever remained a theory; since the day the idea of God was conceived up to even now.

Also, I just want to point out, I'm not trying do support or deny the existence of God. I apologist if that's the impression you might have gotten. I'm just being objective; makes for better conversation.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Starbuzzz](#) on Sat, 08 Jan 2011 04:55:00 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R315r4z0r wrote on Fri, 07 January 2011 22:24Altzan wrote on Fri, 07 January 2011 22:07Starbuzzz wrote on Fri, 07 January 2011 20:30on the side of reason, one side has offered concrete reasoning to back up their assertions meticulously.

That's a pathetic laugh. There's nothing "concrete" or "meticulous" about your hate-babble. Not hate, what he means is that whenever a scientific discovery is made, it is backed up with evidence and proof of the phenomenon.

Many things have gone from ideas and theories to scientific law after evidence was found to support the claims. This has happened hundreds of thousands of times throughout the history of man kind.

Thanks, R3. Yeah, that's what I said; obviously he is a fundamentalist and so he's not gonna get that. Sadly understandable though.

There was a time when my religious brainwashing was at its total peak (18-20 yrs) that I would zealously demonize anything I didn't agree with. There were times when I would be flipping thru the TV channels and momentarily watch Discovery or History channel and would see some

documentary about the Big Bang or anything about the universe. I would burn with hate, curse out loud, and change or turn off the TV.

It's crazy what indoctrination could do to a person; makes them blind hateful ignorant fucks.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [InternetThug](#) on Sat, 08 Jan 2011 05:00:25 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

..

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Sat, 08 Jan 2011 06:09:30 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Starbuzz wrote on Fri, 07 January 2011 22:16Hate, eh? Now that's a fundamentalist religious mind, right there. Your parents and church did a damn good job allright.

Now look at who's changing the subject, eh? I could have suspected.

Starbuzz wrote on Fri, 07 January 2011 22:16Exactly, so why did "he" freak out at mere humans building a tower to reach him in the clouds? Why so scared? I would think a spirit god or an interchangeable spirit/physical god could care less. You dug a nice hole there.

If you're implying he was scared that man would reach him or something, nice try.

Starbuzz wrote on Fri, 07 January 2011 22:16btw, slow down; reply to this first without ignoring it like last time:

Starbuzz wrote on Fri, 07 January 2011 20:30Is this god even real in the first place? are the literary works that they base their stupid assumptions on within sound reason? Are they uniform in providing a homogeneous data source about the "god" in question? Are the authors of these works confirmed and identified and reliable individuals? And most importantly, what is the seniority level of the religion compared with other competing religions?

Give me a good reason why I should bother? You "know" the answers already.

Starbuzz wrote on Fri, 07 January 2011 22:16After you have answered all that, you can come to me with your delusional assumptions of whatever being you worship and why "he doesn't have to be a physical being to do any of that." gg

Same as above.

R315r4z0r wrote on Fri, 07 January 2011 22:24Not hate, what he means is that whenever a scientific discovery is made, it is backed up with evidence and proof of the phenomenon.

Many things have gone from ideas and theories to scientific law after evidence was found to support the claims. This has happened hundreds of thousands of times throughout the history of man kind.

However, the existence of God has forever remained a theory; since the day the idea of God was conceived up to even now.

Also, I just want to point out, I'm not trying do support or deny the existence of God. I apologist if that's the impression you might have gotten. I'm just being objective; makes for better conversation.

I understand that, and I appreciate it. It wasn't really what I was referring to, though. He knows what I'm talking about.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Starbuzzz](#) on Sat, 08 Jan 2011 15:21:43 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Altzan wrote on Sat, 08 January 2011 00:09Starbuzzz wrote on Fri, 07 January 2011 22:16Hate, eh? Now that's a fundamentalist religious mind, right there. Your parents and church did a damn good job allright.

Now look at who's changing the subject, eh? I could have suspected.

lol changing the subject considering I am the one trying to be on-topic. You have yet to yet to offer a valid argument as to why homosexuality has to banned, how are they hurting you personally, why it will be end of the world (lol), and why laws should be made to keep them buckled down. Everyone here has offered meticulous arguments as to why that should not be the case. You dismissed all that as "hate-babble" (showing your fundamentalist upbringing in a intolerant throughly outdated dogma by parents/church) while dishonestly citing "insults" as why you won't reply. Yeah, we believe you will totally refute all the arguments. NOT.

Altzan wrote on Sat, 08 January 2011 00:09Starbuzzz wrote on Fri, 07 January 2011 22:16Exactly, so why did "he" freak out at mere humans building a tower to reach him in the clouds? Why so scared? I would think a spirit god or an interchangeable spirit/physical god could care less. You dug a nice hole there.

If you're implying he was scared that man would reach him or something, nice try.

Missed the point, again.

Altzan wrote on Sat, 08 January 2011 00:09Starbuzzz wrote on Fri, 07 January 2011 22:16btw, slow down; reply to this first without ignoring it like last time:

Starbuzz wrote on Fri, 07 January 2011 20:30Is this god even real in the first place? are the literary works that they base their stupid assumptions on within sound reason? Are they uniform in providing a homogeneous data source about the "god" in question? Are the authors of these works confirmed and identified and reliable individuals? And most importantly, what is the seniority level of the religion compared with other competing religions?

Give me a good reason why I should bother? You "know" the answers already.

Cop-out. I DON'T know the answers that's why I am asking. After we know the answers, we can talk about the varied intricacies of the "omnipotent" airgod you were brought up to believe in.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Sat, 08 Jan 2011 16:21:01 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hypothesis: Being obnoxious about your faith, or lack thereof, is the real cause of problems relating to faith, or lack thereof.

Discuss.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [kadoosh](#) on Sat, 08 Jan 2011 16:30:21 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

So...uhm...yeah...Gays in the military...who gives a shit?

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Sat, 08 Jan 2011 18:24:41 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Starbuzz wrote on Sat, 08 January 2011 10:21You have yet to yet to offer a valid argument as to why homosexuality has to be banned, how are they hurting you personally, why it will be end of the world (lol), and why laws should be made to keep them buckled down.

Cop-out. I DON'T know the answers that's why I am asking. After we know the answers, we can talk about the varied intricacies of the "omnipotent" airgod you were brought up to believe in.

My answer to both is the same - this "meticulous" back-and-forth will cease once you finally realize that I'm not interested in debating it, and I have my reasons. Make your own conclusions if it tickles your fancy. But as long as you keep trying to draw me in, I'll just keep deflecting them back (in a way that apparently annoys you).

CarrierII wrote on Sat, 08 January 2011 10:21Hypothesis: Being obnoxious about your faith, or lack thereof, is the real cause of problems relating to faith, or lack thereof.

Discuss.

Agreed wholeheartedly.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Sat, 08 Jan 2011 21:58:39 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Altzan wrote on Sat, 08 January 2011 12:24Starbuzz wrote on Sat, 08 January 2011 10:21You have yet to yet to offer a valid argument as to why homosexuality has to banned, how are they hurting you personally, why it will be end of the world (lol), and why laws should be made to keep them buckled down.

Cop-out. I DON'T know the answers that's why I am asking. After we know the answers, we can talk about the varied intricacies of the "omnipotent" airgod you were brought up to believe in.

My answer to both is the same - this "meticulous" back-and-forth will cease once you finally realize that I'm not interested in debating it, and I have my reasons. Make your own conclusions if it tickles your fancy. But as long as you keep trying to draw me in, I'll just keep deflecting them back (in a way that apparently annoys you).

Carrierll wrote on Sat, 08 January 2011 10:21Hypothesis: Being obnoxious about your faith, or lack thereof, is the real cause of problems relating to faith, or lack thereof.

Discuss.

Agreed wholeheartedly.

This. ^ also, Starbuzz has turned from radical religious zealot, to radical antireligious zealot.... gj. Like Altzan said, it's pointless to debate you when you act like this.

PS: the whole mmarrige thing I mentioned was originally posted by a gay guy. gj.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Sat, 08 Jan 2011 22:42:23 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Altzan wrote on Sat, 08 January 2011 12:24

My answer to both is the same - this "meticulous" back-and-forth will cease once you finally realize that I'm not interested in debating it, and I have my reasons. Make your own conclusions if it tickles your fancy. But as long as you keep trying to draw me in, I'll just keep deflecting them back (in a way that apparently annoys you).

Next time, if you don't have anything to say anything useful without getting stumped, stick to the Spam Fest with the fist-pumping one-liners.

bye.

CarrierII wrote on Sat, 08 January 2011 10:21Hypothesis: Being obnoxious about your faith, or lack thereof, is the real cause of problems relating to faith, or lack thereof.

Discussing a issue in a heated exchange is the least of a problem when one side wants to codify their views as laws with everyone obligated to obey them. Now THAT, is a real problem (re: voter guide). Read what you are saying...so which side is being obnoxious? Your statement falls apart as we are always willing to make compromises IF it is fair and just to everyone; those of faith find this unfulfilling.

Muad Dib15 wrote on Sat, 08 January 2011 15:58Starbuzz has turned from radical religious zealot, to radical antireligious zealot.... gj. Like Altzan said, it's pointless to debate you when you act like this.

Both of you stumped and throwing toys out the pram.

bye.

Muad Dib15 wrote on Sat, 08 January 2011 15:58PS: the whole mmarriage thing I mentioned was originally posted by a gay guy. gj.

Does every gay person agree to that? I will post that around in gay community forums and will be getting back to you on that. Whole chunks of it sounded unfair to me (a hetrosexual); if it was one gay person's request, then fine by me.

In addition, you said some really stupid stuff that was rebuked as well.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Sat, 08 Jan 2011 22:53:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

so long as the concept of hell is a mainstream religious belief - which it is - please don't say we atheists are the ones being offensive

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell
Posted by [HaTe](#) on Sat, 08 Jan 2011 23:13:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If religions of any sort offend somebody, they are indeed selfish in my mind. People can believe what they want, and I'm fine with it. It's when people start pushing certain religions that it gets offensive. I was born a religious person, but slowly began to turn atheist, and though I was never converted or anything, I no longer believe in hell, god, heaven, or any high being for that matter. Who cares if gays are in the military anyway? So long as they don't start molesting or raping

anybody, what's the issue anyway?

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Sun, 09 Jan 2011 00:37:15 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Starbuzzz wrote on Sat, 08 January 2011 16:42Next time, if you don't have anything to say anything useful without getting stumped, stick to the Spam Fest with the fist-pumping one-liners.

On the contrary. My words were useful indeed, maybe not to you though.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Pyr0man1c](#) on Sun, 09 Jan 2011 10:37:09 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CarrierII wrote on Fri, 24 December 2010 02:30The News

America is today enacting legislation that will prevent openly heterosexual people from serving in the military...

Sounds perfectly reasonable, with servicemen and women in close quarters, with emotionally intense situations occurring almost daily... that could get distracting...

Any objections?

It would be better to have heterosexual men and homosexual women. That way we reach a compromise with a large army (with only homosexuals, the army wouldn't be big enough), and we also get to keep pinup chicks, AND there's no chances of people being distracted.

Nukelt15 wrote on Fri, 24 December 2010 23:58Watching gay people having gay sex doesn't make you gay. So far, the only two ways to become gay are to either be born that way, or to make a conscious choice to engage in a homosexual lifestyle.

I've known people that have turned gay in the presence of other gay people...

R3, I think the point about the square circle was that it is logically impossible to draw one, just as it's logically impossible to lift an object created so that it couldn't be lifted...

Starbuzzz wrote on Fri, 07 January 2011 20:30Pyr0man1c wrote on Fri, 07 January 2011 15:46
Really though, this topic should be split so we can discuss God's omnipotence B-)

No! Let's not split the topic. This side discussion of "omnipotence" perfectly shows that theists can only debate a topic they are comfortable with. Why and how? Easy: when debating "omnipotence" theists don't have to deal with the hard parts, ie, is this god even real in the first place? are the literary works that they base their stupid assumptions on within sound reason? Are they uniform in providing a homogeneous data source about the "god" in question? Are the authors of these works confirmed and identified and reliable individuals? And most importantly, what is the

seniority level of the religion compared with other competing religions?
No, it's not considering this is the same "non-physical being" that had to:

- rest on the 7th day after 6 days of shooting out lame one-liners (1 lame one-liner a day).
- feel the need to walk in the garden in the cool of the day
- screw up the human language because he was scared shitless of humans unitedly building a tower to reach him in the clouds and kicking his ass
- send down "chariots of fire" to pick up VIP's (Elijah)

Most often, he was probably some kind of lame alien with obvious limitations. "Omnipresent" and "omnipotent" were words that theologians grabbed and zealously attached to their god. They failed.

ps: read your bible without skipping a single verse.

Actually theists didn't start this side-topic... it was R3

Those references from the bibles would probably be considered as metaphors by Christians, I doubt they believe that God needed to rest on the 7th day...

Your last line here is important though, because:

Carrierll wrote on Sat, 08 January 2011 10:21Hypothesis: Being obnoxious about your faith, or lack thereof, is the real cause of problems relating to faith, or lack thereof.

Discuss.

People are always going to view things from their prospective, that's not easy to change. But if you are going to be obnoxious it helps if you know what you're talking about (ie:know everything about your religion)

Spoony wrote on Sat, 08 January 2011 16:53so long as the concept of hell is a mainstream religious belief - which it is - please don't say we atheists are the ones being offensive

let's see somebody reply to that...

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell
Posted by [grant89uk](#) on Sun, 09 Jan 2011 16:33:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

God is really alanis morissette.

Discuss...

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell
Posted by [Starbuzzz](#) on Sun, 09 Jan 2011 19:58:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Pyr0man1c wrote on Sun, 09 January 2011 04:37Actually theists didn't start this side-topic... it

was R3

Never said they did, did I? Just that they like debating it cos its a easy topic to wallow in. I can just as easily start a topic discussing the powers of Shiva; then again the Christian theists here will beg the same preliminary questions I asked them above.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Sun, 09 Jan 2011 20:45:11 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'd call attempting to codify beliefs as laws "obnoxious", thus my statement is intact.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Pyr0man1c](#) on Sun, 09 Jan 2011 21:43:13 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

That can be refuted. One of the may things we could say is "God said it so we should make it law".

please don't take that path. If god "said it", there must have been a good reason for him to say "it". for example Muslims don't drink alcohol. This is because it is intoxicating to the brain.

Pleads dont flame.

Edit: so yeah, carrier is probably right, you'd have to be obnoxious to assume your God is right

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Sun, 09 Jan 2011 22:46:30 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Pyr0man1c wrote on Sun, 09 January 2011 05:37R3, I think the point about the square circle was that it is logically impossible to draw one, just as it's logically impossible to lift an object created so that it couldn't be lifted...

But that isn't what the paradox is. It's not about lifting an object that can't be lifted, period. It's just so heavy that it is damn near impossible. There is a difference.

Pyr0man1c wrote on Sun, 09 January 2011 05:37Actually theists didn't start this side-topic... it was R3

No I did not. I was just trollin' my first few posts. Not my fault that everyone decided to debate over it. Granted I'm guilty of continuing the discussion, but I did not start the derail.

In fact, it was a total done deal until someone quoted me many, many posts later.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Mon, 10 Jan 2011 17:37:23 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Pyr0man1c wrote on Sun, 09 January 2011 21:43...

Edit: so yeah, carrier is probably right, you'd have to be obnoxious to assume your God is right

Nearly, to assume your God is right is fine.

To forcibly tell others that your God, or lack thereof, is right (and by implication, that their's, if they have a God, is wrong) is obnoxious.

To try to make your God's word law is obnoxious in the extreme.

Edit: Corrected for balance. Thanks for indicating, Altzan.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Mon, 10 Jan 2011 18:01:49 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CarrierII wrote on Mon, 10 January 2011 11:37To forcibly tell others that your God is right (and by implication, that their's, if they have a God, is wrong) is obnoxious.

That, or lack thereof, as you stated before.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Mon, 10 Jan 2011 19:18:17 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

altzan is stupid

stop believing in bullshit

ty

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Pyr0man1c](#) on Mon, 10 Jan 2011 20:21:35 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CarrierII wrote on Mon, 10 January 2011 11:37Pyr0man1c wrote on Sun, 09 January 2011 21:43...

Edit: so yeah, carrier is probably right, you'd have to be obnoxious to assume your God is right

Nearly, to assume your God is right is fine.

To forcibly tell others that your God, or lack thereof, is right (and by implication, that their's, if they have a God, is wrong) is obnoxious.

To try to make your God's word law is obnoxious in the extreme...

If it is fine to assume that your God is right, then it is fine to assume other people's God's are wrong.

By telling others that your God is right (or that no God is right), you're just trying to help them. But by doing this forcefully, you are impeding upon their right to hold their own opinion. This is what you consider as being "obnoxious": thinking that it would be good to tell others that your Religion (or lack of) is right, even if it offends them, and doing this to the point of actually affecting others by law is even worse. Is that right?

(sorry for the boring post)

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Mon, 10 Jan 2011 20:22:09 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Herr Surth wrote on Mon, 10 January 2011 13:18altzan is stupid

stop believing in bullshit

ty

You're welcome

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Rocko](#) on Tue, 11 Jan 2011 01:20:10 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

the word obnoxious is getting obnoxious

almost as obnoxious as retard christians lol

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Starbuzzz](#) on Tue, 11 Jan 2011 05:23:46 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CarrierII wrote on Sun, 09 January 2011 14:45I'd call attempting to codify beliefs as laws

"obnoxious", thus my statement is intact.

Not so fast; you have yet to say what the atheists ("lack thereof") have done that is as comparable to the theists "attempting to codify beliefs as laws" and how it amounts to being "obnoxious."

Till you show that, your statement is atleast only partially correct, i.e, IF the "lack thereof" is stripped out. Go on...

CarrierII wrote on Mon, 10 January 2011 11:37

To forcibly tell others that your God, or lack thereof, is right (and by implication, that their's, if they have a God, is wrong) is obnoxious.

Please don't mention "your god, or lack thereof" in the same line because it doesn't make any sense. The atheist reason is the same. The theists are not; there are plenty of religions all claiming they got the bullseye. I understand you wrote "your God."

Besides, theists are the ones that "tell that they are right." Atheists "tell how they are right and give ample reason to back it up to irrefutable levels." This thread is a good example.

You shouldn't mention both in the same line considering theists have the lionshare of explaining to do. Besides, your statement seems to wrongly show atheism as another "belief system" that is competing with the actual belief systems. This is not the case.

Starbuzzz wrote on Sat, 08 January 2011 16:42

Discussing a issue in a heated exchange is the least of a problem when one side wants to codify their views as laws with everyone obligated to obey them. Now THAT, is a real problem (re: voter guide). Read what you are saying...so which side is being obnoxious? Your statement falls apart as we are always willing to make compromises IF it is fair and just to everyone; those of faith find this unfulfilling.

I did say, "which side is being obnoxious?" since it is only the dogmatic theists that go to such lengths to codify their beliefs as law (re: voter guide). They have done this and gotten away with this for centuries. So now finally, atheists having the power to openly challenge them DOES NOT equal atheists being obnoxious as well. But this is what your original statement stupidly implied.

Here's a breakdown of your original quote:

Quote:Being obnoxious about your faith, or lack thereof, is the real cause of problems relating to faith, or lack thereof.

First off, when I read this a day ago, I seriously thought you have had a brainfade. Anyway:

There are 2 groups, 1 description and 1 "result" in your statement:

- faith - group 1
- lack thereof - group 2
- obnoxious - 1 description
- "real cause of problems" - 1 result

Here's an analogy (within the framework of your statement):

- invading army - group 1
- defending army - group 2
- barbarians - 1 description
- "fighting off the invasion" - 1 result

Here's an accurate matchup (obviously, your statement has to be entirely rewritten if this were to make sense) but the elements are the same for this mental exercise:

- faith = invading army.
- lack thereof = defending army
- obnoxious = barbarians
- "real cause of problems" = "fighting off the invasion"

And so your original statement, in light of this analogy, illogically says that:

- the mere act of defending from an invading army makes both sides barbarians.
- the mere act of "defending" is the real cause of problems as opposed to the invasion itself.

Even without the analogy to illustrate it; your statement still spouts the same fallacy:

- the act of attempting to curb intrusive theists makes both sides obnoxious(?)
- the mere act of atheists attempting to curb such illegal intrusion of the theists is the real cause of the problem.(seriously?)

What a fucked up hypothesis! It's screwed up because this is what theists are actually trying to do:

- attempt to worm their way into centres of power to gain influence
- attempting to make laws in their own favour so as to subjugate those who disagree with their beliefs. (Good examples are laws regarding homosexuality and suicide clinics).

Since the actions of atheists are not vile and abhorrent as what the theists are trying to do, "lack thereof" can be stripped away from the statement. Why? Take a good look at this thread: theists say homosexuals should be kept locked up because their dogma states so. If this is not obnoxious, I don't know what it. However, the atheist responses in this thread cannot be compared to the theists because we are not telling them how to live; but refuting their extraordinary unjust bullshit. We can tell how wrong they are and have given them the irrefutable reasons; they have thrown up their hands in the air and claimed that they are still right. Both sides are not equal; one obvious side has merit and good intentions going for it.

Matching Conclusions:

- The invasion is the REAL cause of the problem; defending is not the real problem (your

hypothesis states the opposite).

-i.e, the intrusion of church into the state is the REAL cause of the problem; the atheist attempt to eliminate this intrusion is not (and doesn't make them obnoxious in the least).

-Those of faith are the invading army as they are the ones doing everything they can to turn the law to favour themselves

-The atheist response to stop this trend makes them the defending army and rightly so.

-Those of faith are the obnoxious shits that have crept into government over a period of many decades enjoying great powers of influence.

-"Lack thereof" are the non-obnoxious ones that are attempting to remove such unjust and illegal "occupation" of the state by the church.

The invasion is the REAL cause of the problem just as the voter guide (which represents church intrusion into government) is the real cause of problem. So the atheist reaction to that is NOT the "real cause of problems" and nor can it be described as obnoxious. The theist bitches were simply asking for it when they tried to shove their crap as law. It makes them obnoxious and our side the justified counter-attackers in defense of those who would otherwise suffer under the theists' dogmatically influenced laws.

So in conclusion, adding the "lack thereof" in your original statement makes your hypothesis partially wrong (due to "lack thereof" being present) while removing "lack thereof" makes it fully correct. It is those of faith that cause problems by attempting to subjugate others while those of no faith fight the injustice of the intrusive actions of the faithful. Both actions are not equal; one side is justified in their actions; the other side is SOL steaming out of excuses while at the same time, they overstep their boundaries and have greatly affected the peace-of-mind of individuals that want no part in their dogma.

And so, here is your corrected statement:

Quote:Being obnoxious about your faith is the real cause of problems relating to faith.

Excellent. Makes perfect sense now, doesn't it? The faithful are not creating any problems by just existing and minding their own fucking business (example; Amish); but when they act obnoxious as the wing-nut fanatics (re: voter guide, "repent or burn in hell" billboards, homophobic laws), they create the problem (and fully deserve any shit that comes their way). And please, I think the atheist bus ads are lame as well but atleast you can either take or leave it as it is because nobody is threatened with hellfire if they reject it.

It's a win-win situation for atheists. Why?:

-We want a place where people of all differences can live side-by side.

-We will only fight theist influence where it does not belong; example, in government. (We will never try to codify laws that force anyone to share our mindset unlike the theists who without shame beg to have laws enacted banning people they despise from leading a good happy life.)

At the same time however, it is a lose-lose situation for theists: Why?

-They rarely favour a secular state; they want a theocracy with their beliefs codified as law and everyone obligated to obey them.

-They will do everything in their power (including the misuse of church resources as in the voter guide) to aid in their intrusion to control influence in government thru votes. Such is their insecurity.

So in conclusion, going back to your original statement:

Quote:Being obnoxious about your faith, or lack thereof, is the real cause of problems relating to faith, or lack thereof.

Your statement will only be correct if we live in a world where atheists are as wicked as theists are now (across all religions)...trying to influence government to favour themselves (note that removing the 10 commandments from a courthouse doesn't count as "taking over" as government property is taxpayer funded and hence, secular). If atheists try to cripple churches, force christians underground, for example, then yes, they are being obnoxious and your misinformed, misguided hypothesis will be true.

Altzan wrote on Sat, 08 January 2011 12:24Carrierll wrote on Sat, 08 January 2011 10:21Hypothesis: Being obnoxious about your faith, or lack thereof, is the real cause of problems relating to faith, or lack thereof.

Discuss.

Agreed wholeheartedly.

Altzan wrote on Mon, 10 January 2011 12:01Carrierll wrote on Mon, 10 January 2011 11:37To forcibly tell others that your God is right (and by implication, that their's, if they have a God, is wrong) is obnoxious.

That, or lack thereof, as you stated before.

Notice how this particularly vile excuse of a human being is way too eager to jump onto Carrierll's idiotic hypothesis? Anyone know why? Cos it feebly attempts to show atheism as yet another "belief system" that could be either right or wrong. Of course, this is obviously bullshit; but we can trust such young indoctrinated fanatics to not know the difference.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Tue, 11 Jan 2011 07:10:11 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Starbuzzz wrote on Mon, 10 January 2011 23:23

Altzan wrote on Mon, 10 January 2011 12:01Carrierll wrote on Mon, 10 January 2011 11:37To forcibly tell others that your God is right (and by implication, that their's, if they have a God, is wrong) is obnoxious.

That, or lack thereof, as you stated before.

Notice how this particularly vile excuse of a human being is way too eager to jump onto CarrierII's idiotic hypothesis? Anyone know why? Cos it feebly attempts to show atheism as yet another "belief system" that could be either right or wrong. Of course, this is obviously bullshit; but we can trust such young indoctrinated fanatics to not know the difference.

You know, you're starting to sound a lot like the very people you so virulently dislike.

And what happened to:

Starbuzzz wrote on Mon, 10 January 2011 23:23

It's a win-win situation for atheists. Why?:

-We want a place where people of all differences can live side-by side.

Calling a dude 'vile' isn't a terribly good step.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Tue, 11 Jan 2011 08:43:30 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Starbuzzz wrote on Mon, 10 January 2011 23:23Notice how this particularly vile excuse of a human being is way too eager to jump onto CarrierII's idiotic hypothesis? Anyone know why?

You are so full of it, it's pathetic. Seriously.

Starbuzzz wrote on Mon, 10 January 2011 23:23Cos it feebly attempts to show atheism as yet another "belief system" that could be either right or wrong. Of course, this is obviously bullshit; but we can trust such young indoctrinated fanatics to not know the difference.

Ah, of course. The usual "ATHEISM ISN'T A BELIEF LOL" crap.

And of COURSE you're right and everyone else is wrong. It's so OBVIOUS, surely ANYONE can see it.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Tue, 11 Jan 2011 09:58:55 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Starbuzzz wrote on Tue, 11 January 2011 05:23CarrierII wrote on Sun, 09 January 2011 14:45I'd call attempting to codify beliefs as laws "obnoxious", thus my statement is intact.

Not so fast; you have yet to say what the atheists ("lack thereof") have done that is as comparable to the theists "attempting to codify beliefs as laws" and how it amounts to being "obnoxious."

Till you show that, your statement is atleast only partially correct, i.e, IF the "lack thereof" is stripped out. Go on...

From the perspective of those who hold faith, atheists attempting to enforce secularism is, I'm sure, obnoxious.

Starbuzzz

Carrierll wrote on Mon, 10 January 2011 11:37

To forcibly tell others that your God, or lack thereof, is right (and by implication, that their's, if they have a God, is wrong) is obnoxious.

Please don't mention "your god, or lack thereof" in the same line because it doesn't make any sense. The atheist reason is the same. The theists are not; there are plenty of religions all claiming they got the bullseye. I understand you wrote "your God."

Does it help if I phrase it as "Your God, or insistence upon a lack thereof,"?

Starbuzzz

Besides, theists are the ones that "tell that they are right." Atheists "tell how they are right and give ample reason to back it up to irrefutable levels." This thread is a good example.

"Without faith, I [God] am nothing" - and I'm not even a theist.

Starbuzzz

You shouldn't mention both in the same line considering theists have the lionshare of explaining to do. Besides, your statement seems to wrongly show atheism as another "belief system" that is competing with the actual belief systems. This is not the case.

Re-read it with my alternative phrasing proposed above, does that help?

Starbuzzz

Starbuzzz wrote on Sat, 08 January 2011 16:42 Discussing a issue in a heated exchange is the least of a problem when one side wants to codify their views as laws with everyone obligated to obey them. Now THAT, is a real problem (re: voter guide). Read what you are saying...so which side is being obnoxious? Your statement falls apart as we are always willing to make compromises IF it is fair and just to everyone; those of faith find this unfulfilling.

I did say, "which side is being obnoxious?" since it is only the dogmatic theists that go to such lengths to codify their beliefs as law (re: voter guide). They have done this and gotten away with this for centuries. So now finally, atheists having the power to openly challenge them DOES NOT equal atheists being obnoxious as well. But this is what your original statement stupidly implied.

Only the "dogmatic theists"? I note that many countries encode secularism as law... if only to keep the theists from arguing.

I should indicate that I am not in favour of "Don't ask, don't tell", or any other idiotic law that

undermines equality in a diverse society.

Starbuzzz

Here's a breakdown of your original quote:

Quote: Being obnoxious about your faith, or lack thereof, is the real cause of problems relating to faith, or lack thereof.

First off, when I read this a day ago, I seriously thought you have had a brainfade. Anyway:

There are 2 groups, 1 description and 1 "result" in your statement:

- faith - group 1
- lack thereof - group 2
- obnoxious - 1 description
- "real cause of problems" - 1 result

Here's an analogy (within the framework of your statement):

- invading army - group 1
- defending army - group 2
- barbarians - 1 description
- "fighting off the invasion" - 1 result

Here's an accurate matchup (obviously, your statement has to be entirely rewritten if this were to make sense) but the elements are the same for this mental exercise:

faith = invading army.
lack thereof = defending army
obnoxious = barbarians
"real cause of problems" = "fighting off the invasion"

Steady on - Permit me to clarify: I've nothing against holding faith in private, or in the company of others of the same faith. I've everything against using your faith as a reason to do evil.

This goes for athiests as well - if you're preaching tolerance, prevent only evil, not the holding of faith for its own sake.

Does that help?

Stuff you wrote because I wasn't clear

Starbuzzz

And so your original statement, in light of this analogy, illogically says that:

- the mere act of defending from an invading army makes both sides barbarians.
- the mere act of "defending" is the real cause of problems as opposed to the invasion itself.

Even without the analogy to illustrate it; your statement still spouts the same fallacy:

- the act of attempting to curb intrusive theists makes both sides obnoxious(?)
- the mere act of atheists attempting to curb such illegal intrusion of the theists is the real cause of the problem.(seriously?)

What a fucked up hypothesis! It's screwed up because this is what theists are actually trying to do:

- attempt to worm their way into centres of power to gain influence
- attempting to make laws in their own favour so as to subjugate those who disagree with their beliefs. (Good examples are laws regarding homosexuality and suicide clinics).

Since the actions of atheists are not vile and abhorrent as what the theists are trying to do, "lack thereof" can be stripped away from the statement. Why? Take a good look at this thread: theists say homosexuals should be kept locked up because their dogma states so. If this is not obnoxious, I don't know what it. However, the atheist responses in this thread cannot be compared to the theists because we are not telling them how to live; but refuting their extraordinary unjust bullshit. We can tell how wrong they are and have given them the irrefutable reasons; they have thrown up their hands in the air and claimed that they are still right. Both sides are not equal; one obvious side has merit and good intentions going for it.

Matching Conclusions:

- The invasion is the REAL cause of the problem; defending is not the real problem (your hypothesis states the opposite).
- i.e, the intrusion of church into the state is the REAL cause of the problem; the atheist attempt to eliminate this intrusion is not (and doesn't make them obnoxious in the least).
- Those of faith are the invading army as they are the ones doing everything they can to turn the law to favour themselves
- The atheist response to stop this trend makes them the defending army and rightly so.
- Those of faith are the obnoxious shits that have crept into government over a period of many decades enjoying great powers of influence.
- "Lack thereof" are the non-obnoxious ones that are attempting to remove such unjust and illegal "occupation" of the state by the church.

The invasion is the REAL cause of the problem just as the voter guide (which represents church intrusion into government) is the real cause of problem. So the atheist reaction to that is NOT the "real cause of problems" and nor can it be described as obnoxious. The theist bitches were simply asking for it when they tried to shove their crap as law. It makes them obnoxious and our side the justified counter-attackers in defense of those who would otherwise suffer under the theists' dogmatically influenced laws.

This bit is interesting, emphasis added:

Starbuzzz

So in conclusion, adding the "lack thereof" in your original statement makes your hypothesis partially wrong (due to "lack thereof" being present) while removing "lack thereof" makes it fully correct. It is those of faith that cause problems by attempting to subjugate others while those of no faith fight the injustice of the intrusive actions of the faithful. Both actions are not equal; one side is justified in their actions; the other side is SOL steaming out of excuses while at the same time, they overstep their boundaries and have greatly affected the peace-of-mind of individuals that want no part in their dogma.

Apparently, athiests have never attempted to subjugate anyone...

As mentioned, upholding equality is fine, that includes permitting people to hold faith. You are seem to be pushing for a complete removal of faith (from the world), because a few people use it as an excuse or reason to do evil.

Carrying on:

Starbuzzz

And so, here is your corrected statement:

Quote:Being obnoxious about your faith is the real cause of problems relating to faith.

Excellent. Makes perfect sense now, doesn't it? The faithful are not creating any problems by just existing and minding their own fucking business (example; Amish); but when they act obnoxious as the wing-nut fanatics (re: voter guide, "repent or burn in hell" billboards, homophobic laws), they create the problem (and fully deserve any shit that comes their way). And please, I think the atheist bus ads are lame as well but atleast you can either take or leave it as it is because nobody is threatened with hellfire if they reject it.

Some people find the lack of hellfire a scary idea. They won't be able to take it or leave it.

Starbuzzz

It's a win-win situation for atheists. Why?:

- We want a place where people of all differences can live side-by side.
- We will only fight theist influence where it does not belong; example, in government. (We will never try to codify laws that force anyone to share our mindset unlike the theists who without shame beg to have laws enacted banning people they despise from leading a good happy life.)

At the same time however, it is a lose-lose situation for theists: Why?

- They rarely favour a secular state; they want a theocracy with their beliefs codified as law and everyone obligated to obey them.
- They will do everything in their power (including the misuse of church resources as in the voter guide) to aid in their intrusion to control influence in government thru votes. Such is their insecurity.

So in conclusion, going back to your original statement:

Quote:Being obnoxious about your faith, or lack thereof, is the real cause of problems relating to faith, or lack thereof.

Your statement will only be correct if we live in a world where atheists are as wicked as theists are now (across all religions)...trying to influence government to favour themselves (note that removing the 10 commandments from a courthouse doesn't count as "taking over" as government property is taxpayer funded and hence, secular). If atheists try to cripple churches, force christians underground, for example, then yes, they are being obnoxious and your misinformed, misguided hypothesis will be true.

Athiests, are, at the end of the day, human beings. Some human beings are evil, and will try to do evil things. The venn diagram will overlap; I'm sure somewhere in the world right now, there is an athiestic Gov't advisor pushing an evil agenda.

Starbuzzz

Altzan wrote on Sat, 08 January 2011 12:24Carrierll wrote on Sat, 08 January 2011 10:21Hypothesis: Being obnoxious about your faith, or lack thereof, is the real cause of problems relating to faith, or lack thereof.

Discuss.

Agreed wholeheartedly.

Altzan wrote on Mon, 10 January 2011 12:01Carrierll wrote on Mon, 10 January 2011 11:37To forcibly tell others that your God is right (and by implication, that their's, if they have a God, is wrong) is obnoxious.

That, or lack thereof, as you stated before.

Notice how this particularly vile excuse of a human being is way too eager to jump onto Carrierll's idiotic hypothesis? Anyone know why? Cos it feebly attempts to show atheism as yet another "belief system" that could be either right or wrong. Of course, this is obviously bullshit; but we can trust such young indoctrinated fanatics to not know the difference.

And you have irrefutable proof of God's non-existence? Wow. The whole point of faith, is... well... faith.

Athiests believe there is no God. Unless you show me proof, I will continue to say so.

Another attempt at clarification: I was using obnoxious as a byword for "doing evil, making others change, or otherwise not being nice".

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [reborn](#) on Tue, 11 Jan 2011 11:41:16 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CarrierII wrote on Tue, 11 January 2011 04:58

Atheists believe there is no God. Unless you show me proof, I will continue to say so.

Atheism by definition is a complete lack of theism. It is not a belief that God does not exist, it's a total absence of belief in his existence.

I'm not saying you're doing it deliberately, but your arguement has been used by many others before, and it is a poor attempt to try and group atheists in with other belief systems. They simply do not fit into that catagory.

You can try and fool some stupid atheists into saying "I believe that God does not exist". In reality though, most of them will say (unless lead and pushed into saying) that "I do not believe in God".

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Tue, 11 Jan 2011 12:36:44 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CarrierII wrote on Tue, 11 January 2011 03:58

Atheists believe there is no God. Unless you show me proof, I will continue to say so.

Another attempt at clarification: I was using obnoxious as a byword for "doing evil, making others change, or otherwise not being nice".

You cant prove the absence of something. why do you lower yourself to defend theism, carrier? :/

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Tue, 11 Jan 2011 13:02:16 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CarrierII wrote on Tue, 11 January 2011 03:58From the perspective of those who hold faith, atheists attempting to enforce secularism is, I'm sure, obnoxious.

Yes, for exactly the same reason that from a dictator's perspective, democracy and those who insist upon it are "obnoxious". EXACTLY the same reason.

Quote:Does it help if I phrase it as "Your God, or insistance upon a lack thereof,"?

No; if there really was a god I'd still be very firmly in favour of secular democracy.

Quote:Starbuzzz

Besides, theists are the ones that "tell that they are right." Atheists "tell how they are right and give ample reason to back it up to irrefutable levels." This thread is a good example.

"Without faith, I [God] am nothing" - and I'm not even a theist.

it's true. if you don't buy into the ridiculous con known as "faith", religions do look very silly indeed.

Quote:Quote:I did say, "which side is being obnoxious?" since it is only the dogmatic theists that go to such lengths to codify their beliefs as law (re: voter guide). They have done this and gotten away with this for centuries. So now finally, atheists having the power to openly challenge them DOES NOT equal atheists being obnoxious as well. But this is what your original statement stupidly implied.

Only the "dogmatic theists"? I note that many countries encode secularism as law... if only to keep the theists from arguing.

which is not the same thing at all. Having a secular country is nothing at all comparable to wanting a Christian (for example) country.

Quote:This bit is interesting, emphasis added:

Starbuzzz

So in conclusion, adding the "lack thereof" in your original statement makes your hypothesis partially wrong (due to "lack thereof" being present) while removing "lack thereof" makes it fully correct. It is those of faith that cause problems by attempting to subjugate others while those of no faith fight the injustice of the intrusive actions of the faithful. Both actions are not equal; one side is justified in their actions; the other side is SOL steaming out of excuses while at the same time, they overstep their boundaries and have greatly affected the peace-of-mind of individuals that want no part in their dogma.

Apparently, athiests have never attempted to subjugate anyone...
that was a waste of a sentence

Quote:As mentioned, upholding equality is fine, that includes permitting people to hold faith. You are seem to be pushing for a complete removal of faith (from the world), because a few people use it as an excuse or reason to do evil.

no, not a complete removal of religion, just a limit on the enormous power it has, much of which is not just "used to do evil", but IS evil. Telling someone they're going to be tortured for not agreeing with your religion? THIS IS EVIL, and it's a mainstream religious position - you don't need to talk to the bin ladens of the world to find it. It's propagated to children all over the world in supposedly civilised countries and we fucking tolerate it, why?

[quote]Starbuzzz

And so, here is your corrected statement:

Quote:Being obnoxious about your faith is the real cause of problems relating to faith.

Excellent. Makes perfect sense now, doesn't it? The faithful are not creating any problems by just existing and minding their own fucking business (example; Amish)

given how badly they mistreat their children, i would hope for religion's sake that a better example of "not creating any problems" could be found than the Amish

Quote:Quote:but when they act obnoxious as the wing-nut fanatics (re: voter guide, "repent or burn in hell" billboards, homophobic laws), they create the problem (and fully deserve any shit that

comes their way). And please, I think the atheist bus ads are lame as well but atleast you can either take or leave it as it is because nobody is threatened with hellfire if they reject it.

Some people find the lack of hellfire a scary idea. They won't be able to take it or leave it. i expect a heroin addict finds the lack of heroin a scary idea, it's still much better for him

Quote:Athiests, are, at the end of the day, human beings. Some human beings are evil, and will try to do evil things. The venn diagram will overlap; I'm sure somewhere in the world right now, there is an athiestic Gov't advisor pushing an evil agenda.

and if there was, you'd find atheists in civilised countries protesting against it and sticking up for the victims of the regime no matter what religion the victims happened to be.

yes, some humans are evil and will do evil things, but in an atheist's case there's no holy book telling him to do evil things, as - for example - the bible and qur'an repeatedly do.

sure, some atheists are bad, because atheism is simply the rejection of theism and that's all it is. it doesn't necessarily say anything else about you. it's like saying some non-smokers live unhealthy lifestyles.

Quote:And you have irrefutable proof of God's non-existence? Wow. The whole point of faith, is... well... faith.

Athiests believe there is no God. Unless you show me proof, I will continue to say so. i can see that despite supposedly not being a theist, you've fallen for the faith con.

Please explain what is good about "faith", i.e. the concept that lack of evidence is a good thing; that it is praiseworthy to believe things without a good reason to believe them.

secondly, you also seem to've fallen for the theist's definition of "atheism". an atheist needn't assert the non-existence of any particular god; he simply rejects theism, i.e. the EXTREMELY SPECIFIC claims made by religions.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Carrierll](#) on Tue, 11 Jan 2011 14:35:54 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Spoony wrote on Tue, 11 January 2011 13:02Carrierll wrote on Tue, 11 January 2011 03:58From the perspective of those who hold faith, atheists attempting to enforce secularism is, I'm sure, obnoxious.

Yes, for exactly the same reason that from a dictator's perspective, democracy and those who insist upon it are "obnoxious". EXACTLY the same reason.

Doesn't stop it causing offense, I never claimed it was a reason to stop enforcing state secularism.

Quote:

Quote:Does it help if I phrase it as "Your God, or insistence upon a lack thereof,"?

No; if there really was a god I'd still be very firmly in favour of secular democracy.

A hypothetical God might not be in favour of secularism, but that's an entire discussion of its own.

Quote:

Quote:Starbuzzz

Besides, theists are the ones that "tell that they are right." Atheists "tell how they are right and give ample reason to back it up to irrefutable levels." This thread is a good example.

"Without faith, I [God] am nothing" - and I'm not even a theist.

it's true. if you don't buy into the ridiculous con known as "faith", religions do look very silly indeed.

Faith is the belief in something. We speak of "faith in humanity", for instance.

Quote:

Quote:Quote:I did say, "which side is being obnoxious?" since it is only the dogmatic theists that go to such lengths to codify their beliefs as law (re: voter guide). They have done this and gotten away with this for centuries. So now finally, atheists having the power to openly challenge them DOES NOT equal atheists being obnoxious as well. But this is what your original statement stupidly implied.

Only the "dogmatic theists"? I note that many countries encode secularism as law... if only to keep the theists from arguing.

which is not the same thing at all. Having a secular country is nothing at all comparable to wanting a Christian (for example) country.

Not from your perspective, doesn't make your perspective (IE, secularism) the best (or indeed, worst) option from someone else's perspective, though.

Quote:

Quote:This bit is interesting, emphasis added:

Starbuzzz

So in conclusion, adding the "lack thereof" in your original statement makes your hypothesis partially wrong (due to "lack thereof" being present) while removing "lack thereof" makes it fully correct. It is those of faith that cause problems by attempting to subjugate others while those of no faith fight the injustice of the intrusive actions of the faithful. Both actions are not equal; one side is justified in their actions; the other side is SOL steaming out of excuses while at the same time, they overstep their boundaries and have greatly affected the peace-of-mind of individuals that want no part in their dogma.

Apparently, atheists have never attempted to subjugate anyone...
that was a waste of a sentence

Starbuzz is attempting to suggest that only theists do wrong. I don't think that is accurate, I just summed it up poetically.

Quote:

Quote: As mentioned, upholding equality is fine, that includes permitting people to hold faith. You seem to be pushing for a complete removal of faith (from the world), because a few people use it as an excuse or reason to do evil.
no, not a complete removal of religion, just a limit on the enormous power it has, much of which is not just "used to do evil", but IS evil. Telling someone they're going to be tortured for not agreeing with your religion? THIS IS EVIL, and it's a mainstream religious position - you don't need to talk to the bin ladens of the world to find it. It's propagated to children all over the world in supposedly civilised countries and we fucking tolerate it, why?

I have several Christian friends who keep their faith to themselves, and have never once asserted to myself, nor anyone else, as far as I'm aware, that non-believers will be "tortured", or otherwise persecuted or punished.

Once again, it's the "being obnoxious" thing - forcibly telling people they will "go to hell" if they don't believe is wrong. (Free speech otherwise protects them. If they wish to post stupid billboards, that's fine. We can all have a good laugh)

Quote: Starbuzz

And so, here is your corrected statement:

Quote: Being obnoxious about your faith is the real cause of problems relating to faith.

Excellent. Makes perfect sense now, doesn't it? The faithful are not creating any problems by just existing and minding their own fucking business (example: Amish)
given how badly they mistreat their children, I would hope for religion's sake that a better example of "not creating any problems" could be found than the Amish

Quote: but when they act obnoxious as the wing-nut fanatics (re: voter guide, "repent or burn in hell" billboards, homophobic laws), they create the problem (and fully deserve any shit that comes their way). And please, I think the atheist bus ads are lame as well but at least you can either take or leave it as it is because nobody is threatened with hellfire if they reject it.

Some people find the lack of hellfire a scary idea. They won't be able to take it or leave it.
I expect a heroin addict finds the lack of heroin a scary idea, it's still much better for him

Implying that all faith is as bad as heroin. Again, needing to distinguish between harmless faith (eg: attending church) and harmful faith (eg: encouraging radicalisation of communities, children etc).

Quote:

Quote: Athiests, are, at the end of the day, human beings. Some human beings are evil, and will

try to do evil things. The venn diagram will overlap; I'm sure somewhere in the world right now, there is an atheist Gov't advisor pushing an evil agenda.
and if there was, you'd find atheists in civilised countries protesting against it and sticking up for the victims of the regime no matter what religion the victims happened to be.

yes, some humans are evil and will do evil things, but in an atheist's case there's no holy book telling him to do evil things, as - for example - the bible and qur'an repeatedly do.

sure, some atheists are bad, because atheism is simply the rejection of theism and that's all it is. it doesn't necessarily say anything else about you. it's like saying some non-smokers live unhealthy lifestyles.

I already agree. See harmful faith vs harmless faith.

Quote:

Quote: And you have irrefutable proof of God's non-existence? Wow. The whole point of faith, is... well... faith.

Atheists believe there is no God. Unless you show me proof, I will continue to say so.
i can see that despite supposedly not being a theist, you've fallen for the faith con.

Please explain what is good about "faith", i.e. the concept that lack of evidence is a good thing; that it is praiseworthy to believe things without a good reason to believe them.

Faith that some people wanted me to be alive stopped me killing myself. I can't prove my worth to them, to myself, but it stopped me.

Quote:

secondly, you also seem to've fallen for the theist's definition of "atheism". an atheist needn't assert the non-existence of any particular god; he simply rejects theism, i.e. the EXTREMELY SPECIFIC claims made by religions.

I apologise.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Tue, 11 Jan 2011 14:56:31 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CarrierII wrote on Tue, 11 January 2011 08:35
Spoony wrote on Tue, 11 January 2011 14:56:31 GMT
13:02
CarrierII wrote on Tue, 11 January 2011 03:58
From the perspective of those who hold faith, atheists attempting to enforce secularism is, I'm sure, obnoxious.

Yes, for exactly the same reason that from a dictator's perspective, democracy and those who insist upon it are "obnoxious". EXACTLY the same reason.

Doesn't stop it causing offense, I never claimed it was a reason to stop enforcing state secularism.

offending dictators and theocrats is usually a sign that you're doing something right

Quote:Quote:

Quote:Does it help if I phrase it as "Your God, or insistence upon a lack thereof,"?
No; if there really was a god I'd still be very firmly in favour of secular democracy.

A hypothetical God might not be in favour of secularism, but that's an entire discussion of its own.
yes, we can have it very quickly

1. prove there's a god
2. prove that what this god wants is what the holy book says he wants
3. explain why his wishes trump democracy

nobody's done the first one never mind all three

Quote:Faith is the belief in something. We speak of "faith in humanity", for instance.
i was talking about the most common usage of the word "faith". if you meant a general positive
opinion instead then that's obviously an entirely different question.

Quote:Not from your perspective, doesn't make your perspective (IE, secularism) the best (or
indeed, worst) option from someone else's perspective, though.
a secular democracy is the best option for everybody. religious countries are only good for a small
minority of one particular religion, and bad for everybody else - including, usually, many people
from that religion.

Quote:I have several Christian friends who keep their faith to themselves, and have never once
asserted to myself, nor anyone else, as far as I'm aware, that non-believers will be "tortured", or
otherwise persecuted or punished.

If they haven't said so, has it occurred to you to wonder if they think so? If I thought a fellow
human being was in danger of being tortured, the very least I'd do is warn them - even if it was
someone I didn't like. Friends?

Quote:Once again, it's the "being obnoxious" thing - forcibly telling people they will "go to hell" if
they don't believe is wrong. (Free speech otherwise protects them. If they wish to post stupid
billboards, that's fine. We can all have a good laugh)

Free speech protects them? I assume you mean it also protects someone calling in a bomb
threat, for example, or any conman who lies to you to get your money, or someone who tells you
he'll kick your ass if you don't hand over your wallet. Does the word "coercion" mean anything to
you?

Quote:Implying that all faith is as bad as heroin. Again, needing to distinguish between harmless
faith (eg: attending church) and harmful faith (eg: encouraging radicalisation of communities,
children etc).

I didn't compare heroin to 'faith', I compared it to hell. This comparison is unfair to heroin; heroin is
absolutely nowhere near as bad as hell.

Quote:Faith that some people wanted me to be alive stopped me killing myself. I can't prove my

worth to them, to myself, but it stopped me.

Did you have a good reason to think that? I'm not asking for lab results, I'm asking did you have a good reason to think "these people wanted me to be alive"; if not, why did you think it?

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [reborn](#) on Tue, 11 Jan 2011 15:17:06 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Spoony wrote on Tue, 11 January 2011 09:56Quote:Faith that some people wanted me to be alive stopped me killing myself. I can't prove my worth to them, to myself, but it stopped me.

Did you have a good reason to think that? I'm not asking for lab results, I'm asking did you have a good reason to think "these people wanted me to be alive"; if not, why did you think it?

That's pretty cold blooded, Spoony.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Tue, 11 Jan 2011 16:38:26 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Spoony wrote on Tue, 11 January 2011 14:56CarrierII wrote on Tue, 11 January 2011

08:35Spoony wrote on Tue, 11 January 2011 13:02CarrierII wrote on Tue, 11 January 2011

03:58From the perspective of those who hold faith, atheists attempting to enforce secularism is, I'm sure, obnoxious.

Yes, for exactly the same reason that from a dictator's perspective, democracy and those who insist upon it are "obnoxious". EXACTLY the same reason.

Doesn't stop it causing offense, I never claimed it was a reason to stop enforcing state secularism. offending dictators and theocrats is usually a sign that you're doing something right

Only right in your opinion, that your opinion maybe more justifiable is of little difference to those who care neither for your opinion nor the justification. (That's not me, incidentally, I'm merely pointing out that a lot of people who live in religious states like it. Sure, some people don't like it, and the humanitarian record isn't good either)

Quote:

Quote:Quote:

Quote:Does it help if I phrase it as "Your God, or insistence upon a lack thereof,"?

No; if there really was a god I'd still be very firmly in favour of secular democracy.

A hypothetical God might not be in favour of secularism, but that's an entire discussion of its own. yes, we can have it very quickly

1. prove there's a god

2. prove that what this god wants is what the holy book says he wants
3. explain why his wishes trump democracy

nobody's done the first one never mind all three

The hypothetical God in the scenario I created with that sentence isn't about holy books and proof. He's more about using lightning bolts on people he doesn't like. It was a joke, hence the ":d" smiley.

I see where the confusion came from (my lack of an editor) - Let me try again: In a hypothetical world with a powerful deity that certifiably exists - secularism may not be the best option in terms of long term survival (due to aforementioned lightning bolts).

Quote:

Quote:Faith is the belief in something. We speak of "faith in humanity", for instance. i was talking about the most common usage of the word "faith". if you meant a general positive opinion instead then that's obviously an entirely different question.

Having a generally positive opinion about a species hardwired for selfishness (due to evolution, struggle to survive etc) is hard, thus it requires a belief people can act better than their worst - that is having "faith in humanity" - not having "faith in humanity" is feeling that all people will be selfish etc.

Quote:

Quote:Not from your perspective, doesn't make your perspective (IE, secularism) the best (or indeed, worst) option from someone else's perspective, though. a secular democracy is the best option for everybody. religious countries are only good for a small minority of one particular religion, and bad for everybody else - including, usually, many people from that religion.

Not in the opinion of those who benefit from a non-secular arrangement.

Quote:

Quote:I have several Christian friends who keep their faith to themselves, and have never once asserted to myself, nor anyone else, as far as I'm aware, that non-believers will be "tortured", or otherwise persecuted or punished.

If they haven't said so, has it occurred to you to wonder if they think so? If I thought a fellow human being was in danger of being tortured, the very least I'd do is warn them - even if it was someone I didn't like. Friends?

If they do think so, I'm not too scared of what someone else thinks (or says, until their speech goes from a general threat to a specific one) - to be paranoid of what other people's thoughts are is a shortcut to madness, for you will never be able to tell what others are thinking. The good news is it doesn't matter, until their thoughts become actions, they can't touch you. This isn't "Inception"

(which is a good movie).

Quote:

Quote:Once again, it's the "being obnoxious" thing - forcibly telling people they will "go to hell" if they don't believe is wrong. (Free speech otherwise protects them. If they wish to post stupid billboards, that's fine. We can all have a good laugh)

Free speech protects them? I assume you mean it also protects someone calling in a bomb threat, for example, or any conman who lies to you to get your money, or someone who tells you he'll kick your ass if you don't hand over your wallet. Does the word "coercion" mean anything to you?

See the word "forcibly" in italics? We're on the same page. (I don't find a written message at all scary, unless the threat is specific - I don't think we'll ever see billboards insisting that a "Mr J. Smith" of <some address> must convert or we'll attack him", not least because the paper trail will easily lead to the people who had it displayed)

Quote:

Quote:Implying that all faith is as bad as heroin. Again, needing to distinguish between harmless faith (eg: attending church) and harmful faith (eg: encouraging radicalisation of communities, children etc).

I didn't compare heroin to 'faith', I compared it to hell. This comparison is unfair to heroin; heroin is absolutely nowhere near as bad as hell.

Perhaps my fault for not being clear: when I said "... find a lack of hellfire scary", I meant the whole afterlife shebang that religions like to peddle - death scares a lot of people, with good reason, it's very damn scary.

Edit: Expanding upon this point: these people also can't see how a world could work without threats like eternal damnation to keep people from misbehaving.

Quote:

Quote:Faith that some people wanted me to be alive stopped me killing myself. I can't prove my worth to them, to myself, but it stopped me.

Did you have a good reason to think that? I'm not asking for lab results, I'm asking did you have a good reason to think "these people wanted me to be alive"; if not, why did you think it?

See reborn's post. I'm glad you display that much compassion towards your fellow man. One of the nice things about my Christian friends is the amount of compassion they have, which they assure me is related to their faith...

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Tue, 11 Jan 2011 18:09:47 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CarrierII wrote on Tue, 11 January 2011 10:38Only right in your opinion, that your opinion maybe

more justifiable is of little difference to those who care neither for your opinion nor the justification. (That's not me, incidentally, I'm merely pointing out that a lot of people who live in religious states like it. Sure, some people don't like it, and the humanitarian record isn't good either) across the board.

Quote: The hypothetical God in the scenario I created with that sentence isn't about holy books and proof. He's more about using lightning bolts on people he doesn't like. It was a joke, hence the ":d" smiley.

I see where the confusion came from (my lack of an editor) - Let me try again: In a hypothetical world with a powerful deity that certifiably exists - secularism may not be the best option in terms of long term survival (due to aforementioned lightning bolts).

i was hoping you'd say that. this is what religion always boils down to.

Quote: Having a generally positive opinion about a species hardwired for selfishness (due to evolution, struggle to survive etc) is hard, thus it requires a belief people can act better than their worst - that is having "faith in humanity" - not having "faith in humanity" is feeling that all people will be selfish etc.

you're just using two completely different definitions of the word faith.

if you're basically saying that having a high opinion of humanity is a faith-based position because the evidence points to us acting selfishly, actually no it doesn't for the most part.

Quote:Quote:

Quote: Not from your perspective, doesn't make your perspective (IE, secularism) the best (or indeed, worst) option from someone else's perspective, though.

a secular democracy is the best option for everybody. religious countries are only good for a small minority of one particular religion, and bad for everybody else - including, usually, many people from that religion.

Not in the opinion of those who benefit from a non-secular arrangement.
uh yes, that's the minority i was talking about.

Quote: If they do think so, I'm not too scared of what someone else thinks (or says, until their speech goes from a general threat to a specific one) - to be paranoid of what other people's thoughts are is a shortcut to madness, for you will never be able to tell what others are thinking. The good news is it doesn't matter, until their thoughts become actions, they can't touch you. This isn't "Inception" (which is a good movie).

that didn't really answer the question.

Quote: See the word "forcibly" in italics? We're on the same page. (I don't find a written message at all scary, unless the threat is specific - I don't think we'll ever see billboards insisting that a "Mr J. Smith" of <some address> must convert or we'll attack him", not least because the paper trail will easily lead to the people who had it displayed)

and yet we live in a world where telling people they'll be tortured for not being the right religion (which of course varies) is a pretty common thing. the two main target demographics for this coercive threat are children and old/sick/dying people. and we're supposed to find this

compassionate?

Quote:Perhaps my fault for not being clear: when I said "... find a lack of hellfire scary", I meant the whole afterlife shebang that religions like to peddle - death scares a lot of people, with good reason, it's very damn scary.

Edit: Expanding upon this point: these people also can't see how a world could work without threats like eternal damnation to keep people from misbehaving.
which is incredibly short-sighted of them. what do they think police and prisons are for, i wonder?

Quote:Quote:

Quote:Faith that some people wanted me to be alive stopped me killing myself. I can't prove my worth to them, to myself, but it stopped me.

Did you have a good reason to think that? I'm not asking for lab results, I'm asking did you have a good reason to think "these people wanted me to be alive"; if not, why did you think it?

See reborn's post. I'm glad you display that much compassion towards your fellow man. One of the nice things about my Christian friends is the amount of compassion they have, which they assure me is related to their faith...

both you and reborn misunderstood the question. i was getting towards the fact you almost certainly had a good reason to think that this is what they thought about you killing yourself, in which case it isn't faith.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Tue, 11 Jan 2011 19:03:14 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Why are you seriously debating my joke? :/

I'll reply to the rest later.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Wed, 12 Jan 2011 05:30:37 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

http://www.cracked.com/article_15759_10-things-christians-atheists-can-and-must-agree-on.html

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Wed, 12 Jan 2011 06:51:04 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Muad Dib15 wrote on Tue, 11 January 2011 23:30

http://www.cracked.com/article_15759_10-things-christians-atheists-can-and-must-agree-on.html

Pretty interesting read.

waits for Starbuzz to condemn it

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Wed, 12 Jan 2011 11:59:44 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

i could deconstruct that, because there are critical flaws in all ten. but the over-riding and all-pervading error he makes is not even knowing what atheism actually is; it's the same error carrier made.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [reborn](#) on Wed, 12 Jan 2011 13:12:03 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Spoony wrote on Tue, 11 January 2011 13:09both you and reborn misunderstood the question. i was getting towards the fact you almost certainly had a good reason to think that this is what they thought about you killing yourself, in which case it isn't faith.

Hand on heart, I totally understood that you was trying to lead him to that conclusion. I didn't misunderstand and assume you was suggesting something worse.

I believe though that the value of human life should of occurred to you before you decided to use that point as a tool to try and make Carrier come to that outcome by himself.

I totally get that you was trying to free him from what you likely feel is an illusion, and probably a mental prison of guilt. I honestly believe you have the right reasons in mind.

However, if you succeeded and "won" the arguement, then the basis of what supposedly saved his life would of been lost. His anchor broken. Unless the new conclusion that he came to (that his friends love him) is strong enough to be the new mental anchor, you've basically led him to a very dark place indeed.

Perhaps I'm reading too much into it, and giving the notion of changing someones mind on the internet too much weight, because lets face it, it's a rare occurance. I would just personally think twice about it.

Although I concede that Carrier shouldn't of been so silly as to put something so personal into an online debate if he isn't prepared for someone to challenge that, I guess. Otherwise I suppose it's like a trump card you hold up that says "Can't argue with me, I played the race card, you argue then you is racist, lol". Still though...

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Wed, 12 Jan 2011 13:24:33 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

reborn wrote on Wed, 12 January 2011 07:12I believe though that the value of human life should of occurred to you before you decided to use that point as a tool to try and make Carrier come to that outcome by himself.

the value of human life is never far from my thoughts.

Quote:I totally get that you was trying to free him from what you likely feel is an illusion, and probably a mental prison of guilt. I honestly believe you have the right reasons in mind.

However, if you succeeded and "won" the arguement, then the basis of what supposedly saved his life would of been lost. His anchor broken. Unless the new conclusion that he came to (that his friends love him) is strong enough to be the new mental anchor, you've basically led him to a very dark place indeed.

no.

if i'd won the argument, the basis of what supposedly saved his life wouldn't have been lost, it would have been reinforced. he basically said he had faith that his friends/family (he didn't specify but we'll assume that) would have been devastated if he'd killed himself. well, it's undoubtedly true that they would have been, but this isn't a faith-based position. it's an evidence-based position. all the evidence of how families and friends react to their loved ones committing suicide (unless he was terminally ill and in an extraordinary amount of pain, perhaps) is firmly on one side. what saved his life isn't weaker by what i'm saying; it's stronger because it doesn't rely on faith.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Wed, 12 Jan 2011 13:54:13 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Spoony wrote on Wed, 12 January 2011 05:59i could deconstruct that, because there are critical flaws in all ten. but the over-riding and all-pervading error he makes is not even knowing what atheism actually is; it's the same error carrier made.

Really? I thought it was a moot point in terms of the article itself.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [reborn](#) on Wed, 12 Jan 2011 14:59:03 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Spoony wrote on Wed, 12 January 2011 08:24

no.

if i'd won the argument, the basis of what supposedly saved his life wouldn't have been lost, it would have been reinforced. he basically said he had faith that his friends/family (he didn't specify

but we'll assume that) would have been devastated if he'd killed himself. well, it's undoubtedly true that they would have been, but this isn't a faith-based position. it's an evidence-based position. all the evidence of how families and friends react to their loved ones committing suicide (unless he was terminally ill and in an extraordinary amount of pain, perhaps) is firmly on one side. what saved his life isn't weaker by what i'm saying; it's stronger because it doesn't rely on faith.

Your response assumes his faith is based on evidence. Going out on a limb I would say you made this assumption as you're an atheist, and therefore think in terms of logic and evidence.

It's likely that your assumption is right, but what if it isn't? You take away that faith and he is left with fuck all.

There's a man who I work with who lost a child a year ago. He was devastated and nly carried on living because he had Two other children. I cannot imagine what he must of felt. I probably would end my life if I was in a similar situation, only having the One child, currently.

He found Christianity, and this has had a massive positive effect on his attitude.

He is ofcourse still sad, but he went from a broken man, to One that can go to work, smile and function as a father to his remaining children.

I am happy to not see him shattered.

Now you may say that the church caught him at his very most vunerable, and preyed on that. For him though, having faith has let him carry on.

Even if it is a lie (which I am not suggesting either way to be honest), surely he is better for the lie?

I'm not so sure that therapy, counselling or other sources would of had the same effect.

My point is that for some people, faith litterally is a life line.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Wed, 12 Jan 2011 18:28:14 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:Your response assumes his faith is based on evidence. Going out on a limb I would say you made this assumption as you're an atheist, and therefore think in terms of logic and evidence.

It's likely that your assumption is right, but what if it isn't? You take away that faith and he is left with fuck all.

if nobody had ever conned him into thinking faith was a good thing, he wouldn't have been in the predicament in the first place. he wouldn't need to say "i have faith that my family/friends will be crushed if i commit suicide"; remove the bullshit con that is 'faith', cut the first four words of the sentence and it not only still works, it's much better.

Quote:There's a man who I work with who lost a child a year ago. He was devastated and nly carried on living because he had Two other children. I cannot imagine what he must of felt. I probably would end my life if I was in a similar situation, only having the One child, currently. He found Christianity, and this has had a massive positive effect on his attitude.

He is ofcourse still sad, but he went from a broken man, to One that can go to work, smile and function as a father to his remaining children.

I am happy to not see him shattered.

Now you may say that the church caught him at his very most vunerable, and preyed on that. For him though, having faith has let him carry on.

Even if it is a lie (which I am not suggesting either way to be honest), surely he is better for the lie?

one must not be absolutist. in almost every situation honesty is the best policy, though situations can be found where it isn't (the usually cited example is when the nazis knock on your door and ask you if you know the location of any jews)

sure, if someone lies to you about what's happening to a dead loved one it may well make you feel better, but that's a subjective thing. i don't want to be lied to about that and i don't want anyone assuming i would.

i would be curious to know just how he "found" christianity. i also suggest that there are other things you could swap for the word "christianity" in that paragraph without having to change another word.

Quote:My point is that for some people, faith litterally is a life line.
not really faith itself, though, is it? the article of faith might be.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Wed, 12 Jan 2011 20:17:51 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If you cut out the first four words of the sentence, you start to require evidence. Not exactly available on a cliff edge.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Wed, 12 Jan 2011 21:06:09 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

like i said, i wasn't asking for lab results, just "what is your reason for thinking that?" there is a good reason to think how suicide would affect family/friends, and if there's a good reason then it's not faith.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Wed, 12 Jan 2011 23:12:43 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Tbh, "faith" is just a synonym for "hope."

"I have faith in God" is just a fancy way of saying "I hope God exists... cause if not I'm pretty much screwed."

:V

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [reborn](#) on Thu, 13 Jan 2011 06:39:46 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Spoony wrote on Wed, 12 January 2011 13:28

if nobody had ever conned him into thinking faith was a good thing, he wouldn't have been in the predicament in the first place. he wouldn't need to say "i have faith that my family/friends will be crushed if i commit suicide"; remove the bullshit con that is 'faith', cut the first four words of the sentence and it not only still works, it's much better.

I'm not saying you're wrong, I can see sense in your arguement. The thing is though, he is in that predicament, is it fair to tamper with that?

Spoony wrote on Wed, 12 January 2011 13:28

one must not be absolutist. in almost every situation honesty is the best policy, though situations can be found where it isn't (the usually cited example is when the nazis knock on your door and ask you if you know the location of any jews)

sure, if someone lies to you about what's happening to a dead loved one it may well make you feel better, but that's a subjective thing. i don't want to be lied to about that and i don't want anyone assuming i would.

i would be curious to know just how he "found" christianity. i also suggest that there are other things you could swap for the word "christianity" in that paragraph without having to change another word.

It may not work for you, but it certainly worked for this guy. He is almost like his old self. If a book, belief or place of worship can give him that relief then I think it's a good thing for him. You may think that he has swapped one imprisonment for another, but if this is true, then in his case I believe it is the lesser prison.

He found Christianity I believe from a family member some time after his child passed away.

The thing is, he believed his child had died and that was it. They was gone. From your point of

view he believed the truth, he just couldn't handle it. He turned to faith and this allowed him to continue. Is that so bad?

Spoony wrote on Wed, 12 January 2011 13:28
not really faith itself, though, is it? the article of faith might be.

I don't actually understand, sorry.

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 12 January 2011 18:12Tbh, "faith" is just a synonym for "hope."

"I have faith in God" is just a fancy way of saying "I hope God exists... cause if not I'm pretty much screwed."

:V

No, that's not what it means to people who have it. They truly believe. There is no hope about it. If they had the level of doubt you're describing then it isn't really and truly faith, they're just going through the motions...

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Thu, 13 Jan 2011 08:18:24 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

reborn wrote on Thu, 13 January 2011 00:39I'm not saying you're wrong, I can see sense in your argument. The thing is though, he is in that predicament, is it fair to tamper with that? he doesn't appear to be in the predicament any more, and it sounds a little desperate to suggest that telling him that he has a good reason to think this and therefore it is not 'faith' is a dangerous thing to be saying.

Quote:It may not work for you, but it certainly worked for this guy. He is almost like his old self. If a book, belief or place of worship can give him that relief then I think it's a good thing for him. You may think that he has swapped one imprisonment for another, but if this is true, then in his case I believe it is the lesser prison.

He found Christianity I believe from a family member some time after his child passed away.

The thing is, he believed his child had died and that was it. They were gone. From your point of view he believed the truth, he just couldn't handle it. He turned to faith and this allowed him to continue. Is that so bad?

like I said, some people may prefer a comforting lie to the cold truth. if the religion works for the guy and doesn't harm or try to harm others he's welcome to it; I hope it comforts him. have you actually read any of my comments on religion? it doesn't sound like it tbh

Quote:Spoony wrote on Wed, 12 January 2011 13:28
not really faith itself, though, is it? the article of faith might be.
I don't actually understand, sorry.

it's what is being believed that has the effect, not the act of believing something for no reason and against evidence.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [reborn](#) on Thu, 13 Jan 2011 08:49:12 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 January 2011 03:18

he doesn't appear to be in the predicament any more, and it sounds a little desperate to suggest that telling him that he has a good reason to think this and therefore it is not 'faith' is a dangerous thing to be saying.

I'm not so sure. Clearly in this case, it was the difference between life and death.

Perhaps you're right though, I just just wouldn't want to have to answer the question "So ok, you're right. Christianity is nothing more than lies based on lies and I clung to it because I was scared and desperately wanted to believe in something, because I cannot believe in myself. Now I know this is all rubbish, I still cannot believe in myself and my reason for living has been taken away, what do you think I should do now, because I'm on my way to Suicide cliff.".

I wouldn't want that sort of shit on my head. Granted though, that's for cases where faith is their entire life. Although if they claim they truely have faith in their religion then this should apply to many many many more people then it does in reality.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 January 2011 03:18

like i said, some people may prefer a comforting lie to the cold truth. if the religion works for the guy and doesn't harm or try to harm others he's welcome to it; i hope it comforts him. have you actually read any of my comments on religion? it doesn't sound like it tbh

I have, and I do read your posts. It's why I was surprised to see you try to steer Carrier down a different trail of thought when he mentioned something quite touching.

The way I see your position on it is "If they keep that poison to themselves, you can shoot it up all day long. Just keep it away from the kids, and anyone else for that matter.". I hope the drug analogy was not lost.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 January 2011 03:18

it's what is being believed that has the effect, not the act of believing something for no reason and against evidence.

Yeah I guess you're right. I can't argue with that and wouldn't want to.

I'm just saying that if there is no evidence of it, but they want to believe it and you start pointing out the fact that all the evidence points otherwise, in some situations you're not doing them any favours. Although you've displayed that you've grapsed what I am saying, so I am possibly

rambling.

I must admit though, this is probably getting far fetched in this case.

My entire point could probably be summed up with: "You don't have to fight every battle just because it's there, especially when your defense of "doing it for the right reasons" can sometimes fail you (or more importantly fail the person you're trying to "save" ("save" being a rather ironic word to choose I suppose)).".

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Pyr0man1c](#) **on** Thu, 13 Jan 2011 09:37:50 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R315r4z0r wrote on Wed, 12 January 2011 17:12

"I have faith in God" is just a fancy way of saying "I hope God exists... cause if not I'm pretty much screwed."

Explain please? If god doesn't exist, how would religious believers be screwed?

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [reborn](#) **on** Thu, 13 Jan 2011 09:49:29 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Mortality. Afterlife.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Pyr0man1c](#) **on** Thu, 13 Jan 2011 10:01:04 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

True, but the theist shouldnt really sacrifice much at all for a better afterlife, and so wouldn't be screwed

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Spoony](#) **on** Thu, 13 Jan 2011 10:30:48 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

reborn wrote on Thu, 13 January 2011 02:49Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 January 2011 03:18

he doesn't appear to be in the predicament any more, and it sounds a little desperate to suggest that telling him that he has a good reason to think this and therefore it is not 'faith' is a dangerous thing to be saying.

I'm not so sure. Clearly in this case, it was the difference between life and death. and am i really the first person to point out that what made the difference was a hell of a lot stronger than religion would have us believe?

Quote:Perhaps you're right though, I just just wouldn't want to have to answer the question "So ok, you're right. Christianity is nothing more than lies based on lies and I clung to it because I was scared and desperately wanted to believe in something, because I cannot believe in myself. Now I know this is all rubbish, I still cannot believe in myself and my reason for living has been taken away, what do you think I should do now, because I'm on my way to Suicide cliff.". you're still talking about the guy with two kids here?

the answer's in the question. it really would be sad if i had to point out to him that you have at least two reasons for living, reasons that are real and don't require faith.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 January 2011 03:18
like i said, some people may prefer a comforting lie to the cold truth. if the religion works for the guy and doesn't harm or try to harm others he's welcome to it; i hope it comforts him. have you actually read any of my comments on religion? it doesn't sound like it tbh

I have, and I do read your posts. It's why I was surprised to see you try to steer Carrier down a different trail of thought when he mentioned something quite touching.
are you even reading this thread? didn't you see the part where i pointed out that what supposedly saved his life was a hell of a lot stronger than he's been conned into thinking it was?

Quote:The way I see your position on it is "If they keep that poison to themselves, you can shoot it up all day long. Just keep it away from the kids, and anyone else for that matter.". I hope the drug analogy was not lost.

It's poorly phrased.

Quote:Yeah I guess you're right. I can't argue with that and wouldn't want to.
I'm just saying that if there is no evidence of it, but they want to believe it and you start pointing out the fact that all the evidence points otherwise, in some situations you're not doing them any favours. Although you've displayed that you've grapsed what I am saying, so I am possibly rambling.

In your new thread you suggested that if there's no God then there's no meaning to life and it's all a waste of time.

If anything on this forum would be a dangerous idea to plant in the head of the guy with two children, it'd be that.

Quote:My entire point could probably be summed up with: "You don't have to fight every battle just because it's there, especially when your defense of "doing it for the right reasons" can sometimes fail you (or more importantly fail the person you're trying to "save" ("save" being a rather ironic word to choose I suppose)).".

now you're rambling.

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [Pyr0man1c](#) on Thu, 13 Jan 2011 10:53:19 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 January 2011 04:30

In your new thread you suggested that if there's no God then there's no meaning to life and it's all a waste of time.

If anything on this forum would be a dangerous idea to plant in the head of the guy with two children, it'd be that.

I believe the reason why he suggested that was so that somebody would be able to show why life isn't meaningless without god; stopping the dangerous idea being planted in peoples' heads

Subject: Re: don't ask don't tell

Posted by [reborn](#) on Thu, 13 Jan 2011 11:54:09 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 January 2011 05:30

you're still talking about the guy with two kids here?

Sorry, no. I was talking about Carrier.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 January 2011 05:30

are you even reading this thread? didn't you see the part where i pointed out that what supposedly saved his life was a hell of a lot stronger than he's been conned into thinking it was?

Yes I did read the thread. I saw you point it out, but you are assuming that it was based on fact. I'm sure many people care for Carrier, but suppose they didn't? Suppose people do not really care about him one way or the other... Faith in the belief that they do kept him from committing suicide.

It wasn't faith in Jesus, it was faith in the belief that people cared for him. All the same, it was still faith.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 January 2011 05:30

It's poorly phrased.

Really? I thought you held religion in the same contempt as drugs. If not worse?

Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 January 2011 05:30

In your new thread you suggested that if there's no God then there's no meaning to life and it's all a waste of time.

If anything on this forum would be a dangerous idea to plant in the head of the guy with two children, it'd be that.

Yeah, you're right. I am routing for you in the other thread though. I know you'll come through, I have faith in it .

Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 January 2011 05:30
now you're rambling.

Me, ramble? Never! I do think you (and I mean you as in everyone, not you specifically) need to be careful in life when you challenge peoples core beliefs. Some people are more fragile than you realise.
