
Subject: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [Neil](#) on Thu, 15 Mar 2007 01:13:44 GMT

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

Bazillion-selling albums, gold & platinum records proly lining his walls, Beatles tribute act that he supposedly loved doing as his hobby band, coupla kids, divorce finalized or close to it, new fiancée... nothing to look forward to, or what?

<http://music.msn.com/music/article.aspx?news=255077>1=7702>

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [Paul Braun](#) on Thu, 15 Mar 2007 03:11:41 GMT

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

On 15 Mar 2007 13:56:43 +1000, "James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:

>
>I heard this on the radio tonight. They said he took two charcoal grills
>in to a bathroom and died of carbon monoxide posioning. If you were going
>to kill yourself, why would you do it in the way that he did? Why would
>he call the police for help if he really wanted to die? It doesn't sound
>right to me. If it's true, it's an even sadder story.

>
>
>James
>
>
>"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:

>>
>>Bazillion-selling albums, gold & platinum records proly lining
>>his walls, Beatles tribute act that he supposedly loved doing
>>as his hobby band, coupla kids, divorce finalized or close to
>>it, new fiancée... nothing to look forward to, or what?
>>
>> <http://music.msn.com/music/article.aspx?news=255077>1=7702>
>>

Yeah.... I'm even more depressed than I was when I heard he died. I just can't understand the mental process that brings somebody to that decision, especially with a family, a fiancée, and good friends.

Tragic.

pab

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [excelav](#) on Thu, 15 Mar 2007 03:56:43 GMT

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

I heard this on the radio tonight. They said he took two charcoal grills in to a bathroom and died of carbon monoxide poisoning. If you were going to kill yourself, why would you do it in the way that he did? Why would he call the police for help if he really wanted to die? It doesn't sound right to me. If it's true, it's an even sadder story.

James

"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:

>

>Bazillion-selling albums, gold & platinum records proly lining

>his walls, Beatles tribute act that he supposedly loved doing

>as his hobby band, coupla kids, divorce finalized or close to

>it, new fiancée... nothing to look forward to, or what?

>

> <http://music.msn.com/music/article.aspx?news=255077>1=7702>

>

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Thu, 15 Mar 2007 05:10:47 GMT

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

Some of the ugliest moments of my young life were related to interactions with fellow band members and asshole promoters/managers. It's been almost 35 years since I have spoken to some of them. That's sad because a couple of them were my best friends from as early as elementary school (5th grade). I think only one of them is still in the *biz*. Our drummer was Gary Osier.

<http://www.garyosier.com/default.html>

Looks like he's made a decent living in the biz. He was/is an excellent drummer and I saw him on CMT giving an interview about the Dixie chicks a while back s he's obviously still well connected.

There were some great players in the little orbit that was our management company in Ft. Worth Texas. One of them was Dean Parks who played in a Band called the Crowd Plus One (yeah....the 60's). I used to gawk at Dean's incredible prowess and learned a lot from watching him work close up. His band and our band shared quite a few bills.

Our keyboardist and my closest friend in the group was Riley Haws. He was a brilliant classical pianist and all around prodigal musician..

<http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9506E1D61738F935A35751C1A967948260>

I'll never forget the day he walked into my living room where I was practicing, picked up my Strat, said "check this out" and proceeded to play "The Wind Cries Mary" note for note.

Riley died a few years ago of heart failure. I really miss him.....and in a way, I miss the excitement of the lifestyle, until I remember how ugly and cruel it often was.

;o(

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:45f8cead\$1@linux...

>

> Here's another perspective...

>

> <http://thetrack.bostonherald.com/moreTrack/view.bg?articleid=188564>

>

> Ever been in a band?

>

> I think they all need a good smack in the nose....

>

> Pathetic.

>

> DC

>

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Thu, 15 Mar 2007 05:42:21 GMT

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

Here's another perspective...

<http://thetrack.bostonherald.com/moreTrack/view.bg?articleid=188564>

Ever been in a band?

I think they all need a good smack in the nose....

Pathetic.

DC

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [TCB](#) on Thu, 15 Mar 2007 08:42:03 GMT

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

It's called depression, and while the term is thrown out too easily these days there are people who do suffer from it. Things that the rest of us would

be happy to have/do to them are endlessly burdensome.

What he did is, in fact, very sad, but there's a long tradition in many societies of choosing one's time to die. It's hard for us to understand, though.

TCB

Paul Braun <cygnus_nospam@ctgonline.org> wrote:

>On 15 Mar 2007 13:56:43 +1000, "James McCloskey"

><excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:

>

>>

>>I heard this on the radio tonight. They said he took two charcoal grills
>>in to a bathroom and died of carbon monoxide poisoning. If you were going
>>to kill yourself, why would you do it in the way that he did? Why would
>>he call the police for help if he really wanted to die? It doesn't sound
>>right to me. If it's true, it's an even sadder story.

>>

>>

>>James

>>

>>

>>"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:

>>>

>>>Bazillion-selling albums, gold & platinum records proly lining
>>>his walls, Beatles tribute act that he supposedly loved doing
>>>as his hobby band, coupla kids, divorce finalized or close to
>>>it, new fiancée... nothing to look forward to, or what?

>>>

>>> <http://music.msn.com/music/article.aspx?news=255077>1=7702>

>>>

>

>Yeah.... I'm even more depressed than I was when I heard he died. I
>just can't understand the mental process that brings somebody to that
>decision, especially with a family, a fiancée, and good friends.

>

>Tragic.

>

>pab

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Thu, 15 Mar 2007 15:13:40 GMT

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

Interesting that you could diagnose this from such a distance on the available evidence.

Also, I would hope you realize that for many people, suicide has a moral dimension beyond mere choice. Notice also that you happily present suicide as a choice and depression without one.

Interesting.

DC

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>

>It's called depression, and while the term is thrown out too easily these days there are people who do suffer from it. Things that the rest of us would

>be happy to have/do to them are endlessly burdensome.

>

>What he did is, in fact, very sad, but there's a long tradition in many societies

>of choosing one's time to die. It's hard for us to understand, though.

>

>TCB

>

>Paul Braun <cygnus_nospam@ctgonline.org> wrote:

>>On 15 Mar 2007 13:56:43 +1000, "James McCloskey"

>><excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:

>>

>>>

>>>I heard this on the radio tonight. They said he took two charcoal grills
>>>in to a bathroom and died of carbon monoxide poisoning. If you were going
>>>to kill yourself, why would you do it in the way that he did? Why would
>>>he call the police for help if he really wanted to die? It doesn't sound
>>>right to me. If it's true, it's an even sadder story.

>>>

>>>

>>>James

>>>

>>>

>>>"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:

>>>>

>>>>Bazillion-selling albums, gold & platinum records proly lining
>>>>his walls, Beatles tribute act that he supposedly loved doing
>>>>as his hobby band, coupla kids, divorce finalized or close to
>>>>it, new fiancée... nothing to look forward to, or what?

>>>>

>>>> <http://music.msn.com/music/article.aspx?news=255077>1=7702>

>>>>

>>

>>Yeah.... I'm even more depressed than I was when I heard he died. I
>>just can't understand the mental process that brings somebody to that
>>decision, especially with a family, a fiancée, and good friends.
>>
>>Tragic.
>>
>>pab
>

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...
Posted by [John Macy](#) on Thu, 15 Mar 2007 15:14:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey DJ,

I hung with Dean a bit this past weekend at the Dallas Steel Guitar Show. It has been great getting to know him the last couple of years. He's as good a guy as he is a player...

;)

"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:

>Some of the ugliest moments of my young life were related to interactions

>with fellow band members and asshole promoters/managers. It's been almost

>35 years since I have spoken to some of them. That's sad because a couple of

>them were my best friends from as early as elementary school (5th grade).

I

>think only one of them is still in the *biz*. Our drummer was Gary Osier.

><http://www.garyosier.com/default.html>

>Looks like he's made a decent living in the biz. He was/is an excellent

>drummer and I saw him on CMT giving an interview about the Dixie chicks a

>while back s he's obviously still well connected.

>

>There were some great players in the little orbit that was our management

>company in Ft. Worth Texas. One of them was Dean Parks who played in a Band

>called the Crowd Plus One (yeah....the 60's). I used to gawk at Dean's

>incredible prowess and learned a lot from watching him work close up. His

>band and our band shared quite a few bills.
>
>Our keyboardist and my closest friend in the group was Riley Haws. He was
a
>brilliant classical pianist and all around prodigal musician..
> [http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9506E1D61738F 935A35751C1A967948260](http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9506E1D61738F935A35751C1A967948260)
>I'll never forget the day he walked into my living room where I was
>practicing, picked up my Strat, said "check this out" and proceeded to play

>"The Wind Cries Mary" note for note.
>Riley died a few years ago of heart failure. I really miss
>him.....and in a way, I miss the excitement of the lifestyle, until
I
>remember how ugly and cruel it often was.
>;o(
>
>"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:45f8cead\$1@linux...
>>
>> Here's another perspective...
>>
>> <http://thetrack.bostonherald.com/moreTrack/view.bg?articleid=188564>
>>
>> Ever been in a band?
>>
>> I think they all need a good smack in the nose....
>>
>> Pathetic.
>>
>> DC
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [Doug Wellington](#) on Thu, 15 Mar 2007 17:10:28 GMT

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

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:45f95494\$1@linux...
> Interesting that you could diagnose this from such a distance on the
> available evidence.

From the little evidence that has been presented, it does seem to be a
reasonable conclusion.

> Also, I would hope you realize that for many people, suicide has a moral
> dimension beyond mere choice. Notice also that you happily present

> suicide as a choice and depression without one.

On March 27th, it will be ten years since my own father took his life. Depression definitely contributed to his choice. I believe that depression has a strong genetic component that can be softened or exacerbated by many environmental factors...

I have had periodic battles with depression myself. At one point, about a year and a half before my father died, I was taken to a local hospital and placed on a suicide watch. I had always thought that I would be the one to kill myself - imagine my shock when my father was the one to go. It was a profound lesson, and really helped me to reevaluate my own life. I am thankful for that lesson. But what a cost...

I'm sure that my father could have been described with many of the same words that have been used about Brad Delp. He was always the "fixer," always helping others, yet not allowing anyone to "fix" him. It's a bind that is hard to get out of...

Doug

<http://www.parisfaqs.com>

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Thu, 15 Mar 2007 20:29:16 GMT

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

Hi Doug,

It is something that many people must deal with. As you, (and I) have discovered, it is not a death sentence, and it, like suicide is a choice.

Indeed, it sounds like Brad spent too many years trying to get a bunch of raging monumental egos to get along. What no one talks about, and I am sure you have dealt with a lot, is the reality that suicide is the ultimate passive-aggressive act. It is the one act of aggression that cannot be topped by one's opponents; the ultimate "I'll show you!". Now Tom, Fran, Sib and the rest of them will spend the rest of their lives hating themselves and being despised by the public for contributing to this death. And they did contribute to it. Gotcha!

Depression is a choice. How bad do you want to live? I want to live REAL bad, and so I find a way to consider depression my enemy instead of my deity.

There are three things that really help:

Disciplined and meaningful exercise. Martial arts is the best IMO, but exercise of any kind is great medicine against depression.

The rote learning of the habits of a good life. This is the only type of therapy that has any long-term success against depression. When depressed, you ask yourself what a healthy person would be doing now and simply do it. The more you do the things a healthy person would do, no matter whether you want to or not, the less depressed you get.

And for me, there must be a spiritual component. We are responsible for the lives we are given. My kid has a tendency towards depression, and one day, while passing a graveyard, I asked her "how many of those people in the ground over there would love to have you new, perfect little healthy body and life? Almost all of them, don't you think? And here you are, young, smart, beautiful, with the world before you, and this is the best you can do?? You are expected by God, to contribute to life and to others. As you contribute, you will feel your great grandma smiling at you, because that is how she lived too". (she was depressed because her great grandma had died, and couldn't seem to get past it) Life is a gift. Pass it on. It's why you were placed here. She still has, and will always have this tendency, as do you and do I and probably most of us on this NG (musicians are terribly vulnerable to it) but she also has a bunch of very good habits, a high rank in a very traditional karate style, and a walk with her saviour. She will be fine.

And for severe depression, there are good meds out now. I don't think that these drugs should be used for years, but there is a place for them.

I wish Brad had told the whole lot of 'em to go f*ck themselves (they probably would have grown up a bit if he had) rather than taking the passive-aggressive way out. This just sucks...

I am very sorry about your Dad. Mine passed a few years back from cancer, but I think a suicide would have been much harder on us.

And I am very glad that you are here in the world with us and you certainly contribute in a major way.

DC

"Doug Wellington" <doug@parisfaqs.com> wrote:

>"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:45f95494\$1@linux...

>> Interesting that you could diagnose this from such a distance on the

>> available evidence.

>

>From the little evidence that has been presented, it does seem to be a

>reasonable conclusion.

>

>> Also, I would hope you realize that for many people, suicide has a moral
>> dimension beyond mere choice. Notice also that you happily present
>> suicide as a choice and depression without one.

>

>On March 27th, it will be ten years since my own father took his life.

>Depression definitely contributed to his choice. I believe that depression

>has a strong genetic component that can be softened or exacerbated by many

>environmental factors...

>

>I have had periodic battles with depression myself. At one point, about
a

>year and a half before my father died, I was taken to a local hospital and

>placed on a suicide watch. I had always thought that I would be the one
to

>kill myself - imagine my shock when my father was the one to go. It was
a

>profound lesson, and really helped me to reevaluate my own life. I am

>thankful for that lesson. But what a cost...

>

>I'm sure that my father could have been described with many of the same

>words that have been used about Brad Delp. He was always the "fixer,"

>always helping others, yet not allowing anyone to "fix" him. It's a bind

>that is hard to get out of...

>

>Doug

>

><http://www.parisfaqs.com>

>

>

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [Doug Wellington](#) on Thu, 15 Mar 2007 23:28:43 GMT

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

> Indeed, it sounds like Brad spent too many years trying to get a

> bunch of raging monumental egos to get along.

....and maybe not being able to recognize that it wasn't his
responsibility...

- > What no one talks about, and I am sure you have dealt with a lot,
- > is the reality that suicide is the ultimate passive-aggressive act.
- > It is the one act of aggression that cannot be topped by one's
- > opponents; the ultimate "I'll show you!".

I'm not so sure about that one... When I was at the edge, looking into the abyss, there was nobody else but me... It wasn't about "showing" anyone, it wasn't about getting even, it was purely about ending the pain of being a failure. I didn't think about individual failings per se, didn't think about individual acts in my life. All I could think of was that I WAS A FAILURE, a waste of time, space and breath. I didn't think my death would have ANY impact upon the world. If I mattered, these simple things that I was striving for would have come true, wouldn't they? But when the people around me didn't seem to care about me, when nothing I said or did seemed to change anything, it just reinforced my lack of impact on the world, and solidified my belief that I should give up and leave. If I had thought I mattered that much, that someone valued my life at all for anything good or bad, I would not have been there at that point...

- > Now Tom, Fran, Sib and the rest of them will spend the rest of
- > their lives hating themselves and being despised by the public
- > for contributing to this death. And they did contribute to it.

Strictly speaking, yes, they did contribute to the situation, just as my mother contributed to my father's situation, but ultimately each death was the individual's doing. Hopefully the others will think about it and consider what they may have done to contribute and what they might have done to help, but it is up to each of them to walk the paths of their own lives. As for the public, I'm pretty cynical - the public will only remember it until the next newsblurb comes along...

In my father's case, I believe that his suicide was in many ways an apology. He and my mom had argued for years about many things. My mom has a lot of control issues, and she will never let anyone prove anything is wrong with her or prove that she has ever made an incorrect decision. My father's death was him giving in to that, saying, "yes, you're right, I was wrong." My dad also knew that my mom would get a half million bucks of insurance if he killed himself, and I believe that was another part of the apology. How does one accept an apology like that? I know that my mother and I have dealt with this in very different ways...

- > Depression is a choice. How bad do you want to live?

Maybe I'm arguing semantics, but clinical depression itself is not a choice. Many people who suffer from depression don't even know they have depression, and don't know that anything can be done about it. This is one of the reasons that I believe it should be talked about openly - it's no different from any other genetically encoded behavior pattern/tendency...

> There are three things that really help:

Yes, all three of these things are good, but I think we have to remember that everyone is different, and what works for one person may not work for another, no matter how much we believe in it. I think it is a mistake to map our own beliefs, issues and solutions onto others. Each person must be thought of separately, with separate genetics, separate environment, and separate spirit. If we truly want to help that person, we must be open to who they are. Being open to someone else's reality sometimes means that we must put aside our own belief system and just accept that person for who they are in that moment. For me personally, I trust that I am God's tool. I know God has a bigger plan than I can understand or even know about, and I strive to remain open to every moment and let each person be who they are, no matter what I would have chosen for them. I know that in every encounter, I have a role to play, and my part is to figure out exactly what my role is...

> And I am very glad that you are here in the world with us and you
> certainly contribute in a major way.

We all have our part to play in the grand theater. Thanks for joining me... :-)

Doug

<http://www.parisfaqs.com>

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [DC](#) on Fri, 16 Mar 2007 00:51:14 GMT

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

"Doug Wellington" <doug@parisfaqs.com> wrote:

>If I had thought I
>mattered that much, that someone valued my life at all for anything good
or
>bad, I would not have been there at that point...

Well, I am glad you found that many people indeed do value your life. I can't imagine this was Brad's problem though. Wish I knew what was on those notes he left...

>but ultimately each death was
>the individual's doing. Hopefully the others will think about it and
>consider what they may have done to contribute and what they might have

done

>to help, but it is up to each of them to walk the paths of their own lives.

Absolutely... But damn wouldn't it be nice if bands didn't do this
crap to each other?

>My father's

>death was him giving in to that, saying, "yes, you're right, I was wrong."

>My dad also knew that my mom would get a half million bucks of insurance
if

>he killed himself, and I believe that was another part of the apology.

How

>does one accept an apology like that?

Well especially since it is sort of apologizing while belting
someone with a baseball bat isn't it? One cannot accept it,
one simply gets angry, depressed, and guilty. But at some
point we decide that the pattern will not repeat...

>Maybe I'm arguing semantics, but clinical depression itself is not a choice.

>Many people who suffer from depression don't even know they have depression,

>and don't know that anything can be done about it. This is one of the

>reasons that I believe it should be talked about openly - it's no different

>from any other genetically encoded behavior pattern/tendency...

Clinical depression is simply depression that has become a
serious habit. Yes, there are genetic and brain-chemistry
components, but there is a component of choice too. What
the percentages are, is unknowable for any individual, which
is why we should never condemn, but rather encourage.

>Yes, all three of these things are good, but I think we have to remember

>that everyone is different, and what works for one person may not work for

>another, no matter how much we believe in it. I think it is a mistake to

>map our own beliefs, issues and solutions onto others. Each person must be
>thought of separately, with separate genetics, separate environment, and
>separate spirit. If we truly want to help that person, we must be open to
>who they are. Being open to someone else's reality sometimes means that we
>must put aside our own belief system and just accept that person for who
>they are in that moment. For me personally, I trust that I am God's tool.

>I know God has a bigger plan than I can understand or even know about, and I
>strive to remain open to every moment and let each person be who they are,

>no matter what I would have chosen for them. I know that in every
>encounter, I have a role to play, and my part is to figure out exactly what

>my role is...

Agreed. Yet we share enough to be able to learn from each other, I'm sure you agree. The things I spoke of do have an objective track record of success. Certainly not in all cases, but more than many other therapies for sure.

>We all have our part to play in the grand theater. Thanks for joining me...

>:-)
>
>Doug

Abso-fookin-lutely!

Here's a bumper sticker I want:

The atheists say;
Life's a bitch and then you die

The pollyanna Christians say
Life's great and then you go to heaven

I think they are both nutz...

I want one that says:
Lifes' a bitch! and then you go to heaven...

Works for me.

best

DC

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [Neil](#) on Fri, 16 Mar 2007 03:57:35 GMT

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

"DC" <dc@spammersinboston.com> wrote:

>Wish I knew what was on those notes he left...

Well, then here's a small portion:

<http://music.msn.com/music/article.aspx?news=255185>

Apparently, he looked out one morning, and the sun was gone.

....then closed his eyes, and slipped away....

Neil

(not trying to be glib, just finding some of those lyrics
ironic at this moment)

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [Doug Wellington](#) on Fri, 16 Mar 2007 05:19:04 GMT

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

Neil wrote:

> Both of you guys ought to read the 2nd paragraph of msg # 46:

>

> <http://boards.msn.com/Musicboards/thread.aspx?ThreadID=229720&BoardsParam=PostID%3D4798266>

Amen...

Doug

<http://www.parisfaqs.com>

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [Neil](#) on Fri, 16 Mar 2007 05:23:06 GMT

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

Both of you guys ought to read the 2nd paragraph of msg # 46:

<http://boards.msn.com/Musicboards/thread.aspx?ThreadID=229720&BoardsParam=PostID%3D4798266>

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [TCB](#) on Fri, 16 Mar 2007 05:31:18 GMT

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

Well, Don, one doesn't need to be Sigmund effin Freud to guess that when a healthy, financially and emotionally secure adult male with a family kills himself he might have been depressed. And reading what the family said ('he's now at peace' instead of 'we had no idea') makes it a notably stronger case.

Further, how you could say I 'happily' present suicide as a choice when in precisely that sentence I say that what he did was 'sad?' I was only observing that in many societies (as a history buff ancient Rome and Greece come immediately to mind) suicide was considered a viable and socially accepted choice, and it remains today not just a choice but kind of the ultimate choice. In addition, in our modern society in certain situations--like taking suicidal risks in wartime--leaving one's life on the table is considered heroic.

All of which is far too subtle for a blinkered mind such as your own. Your point is that if everyone would go to the gym and love Jesus there wouldn't be any depressed people anymore. I don't get offended by your pedantry anymore, that ended a few years ago. But from personal experience I can tell you that I come from a family of hard working, god fearing, Jesus loving, workout enjoying people and off the top of my head I can count six suicides among the males in the past three generations, and that's not counting the ones who took the slow ride via drugs and drink. The women are either of sturdier emotional stock or are contributing factors in the suicides because they all live forever. I believe one of the primary reasons my own father decided to get a doctorate in psychology was to better understand some of the demons that his, and my, family face. But I guess he would have been better off with a Stairmaster and a copy of the Good Book.

TCB

P.S. While my hatred of the stateside twice born remains intact, my suspicion of spirituality in general has been shaken by this trip to Thailand. It's my third time here, and each time I've made a few new friends and gotten closer to actual Thais. The country is over 90% Buddhist and their spirituality in the face of very real hardships is inspiring. I've never encountered a

sweeter, gentler group of people in my life. I've gotten to know the (unspeakably gorgeous) girls who work in the swank restaurant/bar in my hotel, and three of them just went on holiday together earlier this week. Where? To a Buddhist temple that cares for Thais with AIDS. They used their _vacation_ to take food and medicine and money to some people seriously fucked over by the world. One of the motivations was a friend of theirs who recently came out as gay to them, which is a far, far bigger deal in Thailand than in the US. And instead of doing what would be easy, i.e. throwing the person out of their life for making the wrong 'choice,' they embraced him and did something to help the gay community in their country. I remain an atheist and make no pretensions to Buddhism, but having seen how their piety brings out the noble traits of charity and understanding I can no longer dismiss all religion out of hand. Having seen what their quiet and sincere spirituality does for Thais I have no choice but to respect it. I just despise closed minded holy roller US fuckheads that much more.

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:

>

>Interesting that you could diagnose this from such a distance on the
>available evidence.

>

>Also, I would hope you realize that for many people, suicide has a moral
>dimension beyond mere choice. Notice also that you happily present
>suicide as a choice and depression without one.

>

>Interesting.

>

>DC

>

>

>

>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>>

>>It's called depression, and while the term is thrown out too easily these
>>days there are people who do suffer from it. Things that the rest of us
>would

>>be happy to have/do to them are endlessly burdensome.

>>

>>What he did is, in fact, very sad, but there's a long tradition in many
>societies

>>of choosing one's time to die. It's hard for us to understand, though.

>>

>>TCB

>>

>>Paul Braun <cygnus_nospam@ctgonline.org> wrote:

>>>On 15 Mar 2007 13:56:43 +1000, "James McCloskey"

>>><excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:

>>>
>>>>
>>>>I heard this on the radio tonight. They said he took two charcoal grills
>>>>in to a bathroom and died of carbon monoxide poisoning. If you were
going
>>>>to kill yourself, why would you do it in the way that he did? Why would
>>>>he call the police for help if he really wanted to die? It doesn't sound
>>>>right to me. If it's true, it's an even sadder story.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>James
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>Bazillion-selling albums, gold & platinum records prolly lining
>>>>>his walls, Beatles tribute act that he supposedly loved doing
>>>>>as his hobby band, coupla kids, divorce finalized or close to
>>>>>it, new fiancée... nothing to look forward to, or what?
>>>>>
>>>>> <http://music.msn.com/music/article.aspx?news=255077>1=7702>
>>>>>
>>>
>>>Yeah.... I'm even more depressed than I was when I heard he died. I
>>>just can't understand the mental process that brings somebody to that
>>>decision, especially with a family, a fiancée, and good friends.
>>>
>>>Tragic.
>>>
>>>pab
>>
>

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [Doug Wellington](#) on Fri, 16 Mar 2007 06:32:43 GMT

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

TCB wrote:

> Well, Don, one doesn't need to be Sigmund effin Freud

Eeek! Damn it man! Now I have to clean the milk and cookie chips off
my monitor! (and out of my nose!) :-)

> All of which is far too subtle for a blinkered mind such as your own.

While I think I understand your sentiment and might actually go so far
as to say that Don is what I would term a "close-minded believer," I

would like to hope that there is still an opportunity to help him see that God has allowed, and indeed created, other realities in the world besides his own. It is obvious to me that his reality works for him, as much as it may not work for others, and vice versa, but clubbing him on the head isn't going to change his attitude, but merely make him retreat deeper into that reality, building further artificial distinctions between his chosen group and others...

> P.S. While my hatred of the stateside twice born remains intact,

While it is easy to see a stereotype of Bush-loving, NASCAR-watching, Support-our-solders, WWE-fan, pickup-truck-driving, Wal-Mart shopping, born-again, self-righteous, judgmental, evangelical fundamentalists, not ALL of them are mindless sheep who lack spirituality...

> my suspicion of spirituality in general has been shaken by this
> trip to Thailand.

Thailand seems to be a magnificent place. Many people in my martial arts and oriental medicine school have traveled there to study, and I hope to join them on a future trip.

> The country is over 90% Buddhist and their spirituality
> in the face of very real hardships is inspiring.

I find true spirituality of any kind to be inspiring. While I myself have chosen a Zen Buddhist path, my teacher is not only a Roshi, but also a Catholic Priest, and someone I greatly admire.

> I remain an atheist and make no pretensions to Buddhism, but having
> seen how their piety brings out the noble traits of charity and
> understanding I can no longer dismiss all religion out of hand.

Would it seem odd if I said to you that you can be atheist and Buddhist at the same time?

Doug

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Fri, 16 Mar 2007 06:53:44 GMT

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

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>

>Well, Don, one doesn't need to be Sigmund effin Freud to guess that when

a

>healthy, financially and emotionally secure adult male with a family kills

>himself he might have been depressed. And reading what the family said ('he's
>now at peace' instead of 'we had no idea') makes it a notably stronger case.

Gee I didn't realize Freud was still in vogue... My point was that
"depression" is too easy and tells us next to nothing.

>Further, how you could say I 'happily' present suicide as a choice when
in
>precisely that sentence I say that what he did was 'sad?' I was only observing
>that in many societies (as a history buff ancient Rome and Greece come immediately
>to mind) suicide was considered a viable and socially accepted choice,

So, in that context, does your sadness amount to anything other than
a tossed-off fake sympathy?

After all, suicide can be a "viable and socially accepted choice" right?

There are other views, of course.

>it remains today not just a choice but kind of the ultimate choice. In addition,
>in our modern society in certain situations--like taking suicidal risks
in
>wartime--leaving one's life on the table is considered heroic.

None of which constitute suicide, so of course the reaction is, and
should be, different.

>All of which is far too subtle for a blinkered mind such as your own. Your
>point is that if everyone would go to the gym and love Jesus there wouldn't
>be any depressed people anymore. I don't get offended by your pedantry anymore,
>that ended a few years ago. But from personal experience I can tell you
that
>I come from a family of hard working, god fearing, Jesus loving, workout
>enjoying people and off the top of my head I can count six suicides among
>the males in the past three generations, and that's not counting the ones
>who took the slow ride via drugs and drink.

I can show you reams of evidence that these things work. Further, I doubt
your family is a good example of their failure. At least not if they are
as prejudiced and bitter as you appear to be. I think you can do
better. If you were really anything resembling an intellectual you
would be more tolerant. Just a thought.

>The women are either of sturdier
>emotional stock or are contributing factors in the suicides because they
>all live forever. I believe one of the primary reasons my own father decided
>to get a doctorate in psychology was to better understand some of the demons
>that his, and my, family face. But I guess he would have been better off
>with a Stairmaster and a copy of the Good Book.

I take it the Psych major worked for him? I sure hope so.

What works for you?

>P.S. While my hatred of the stateside twice born remains intact, my suspicion
>of spirituality in general has been shaken by this trip to Thailand. It's
>my third time here, and each time I've made a few new friends and gotten
>closer to actual Thais. The country is over 90% Buddhist and their spirituality
>in the face of very real hardships is inspiring. I've never encountered
a
>sweeter, gentler group of people in my life. I've gotten to know the (unspeakably
>gorgeous) girls who work in the swank restaurant/bar in my hotel, and three
>of them just went on holiday together earlier this week. Where? To a Buddhist
>temple that cares for Thais with AIDS. They used their _vacation_ to take
>food and medicine and money to some people seriously fucked over by the
world.
>One of the motivations was a friend of theirs who recently came out as gay
>to them, which is a far, far bigger deal in Thailand than in the US. And
>instead of doing what would be easy, i.e. throwing the person out of their
>life for making the wrong 'choice,' they embraced him and did something
to
>help the gay community in their country. I remain an atheist and make no
>pretensions to Buddhism, but having seen how their piety brings out the
noble
>traits of charity and understanding I can no longer dismiss all religion
>out of hand. Having seen what their quiet and sincere spirituality does
for
>Thais I have no choice but to respect it. I just despise closed minded holy
>roller US fuckheads that much more.

There is much to learn from Buddhism.

Your hate for people of faith is about you, not us. It doesn't bother me
since
it bears no relation to the truth. I have been around bitter, hateful atheists
all my life. My uncles were friends with Madalyn Murry O'Hare.

Here is the reward for her life:

<http://crimemagazine.com/ohair.htm>

I hope yours turns out better.

DC

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Fri, 16 Mar 2007 07:18:49 GMT

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

Wow, lonely guy huh?

Now it's Pam Sullivan (his fiance) and his kids turn to be lonely huh?

There's a story to be told here... And it ain't out there yet.

DC

Perhaps it is

"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:

>

>"DC" <dc@spammersinboston.com> wrote:

>>Wish I knew what was on those notes he left...

>

>Well, then here's a small portion:

>

><http://music.msn.com/music/article.aspx?news=255185>

>

>Apparently, he looked out one morning, and the sun was gone.

>

>...then closed his eyes, and slipped away....

>

>

>Neil

>(not trying to be glib, just finding some of those lyrics

>ironic at this moment)

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Fri, 16 Mar 2007 08:04:00 GMT

Doug Wellington <doug@parisfaqs.com> wrote:

>While I think I understand your sentiment and might actually go so far
>as to say that Don is what I would term a "close-minded believer," I
>would like to hope that there is still an opportunity to help him see
>that God has allowed, and indeed created, other realities in the world
>besides his own.

If there is a God, there is but one reality. We can aspire to it,
we can reject it, but there is but one. I aspire to know it.

The accusation of closed-mindedness is always a dead giveaway that
someone cannot respond to a point you have made. When someone
calls me "closed-minded", let alone "blinkered" I know they are
desperate and have little to say of substance.

Any knowledge of truth will appear closed-minded to someone who
does not have that knowledge. Physicists tend to be closed-minded
about gravity. Electricians tend to be closed-minded about the electrical
code, and so forth. Jesus made truth claims. He cannot be another
good and kind teacher. As C.S. Lewis has said, he is either a raving
lunatic, an evil schemer, or exactly who he said he was. I believe he is
who he said he was. If that is so, "open-mindedness" about that
conclusion is foolishness not intelligence. Calling me "closed-minded"
simply means you cannot make your case, so Thad does not anger me
with his insults.

>It is obvious to me that his reality works for him, as
>much as it may not work for others, and vice versa, but clubbing him on

>the head isn't going to change his attitude, but merely make him retreat

>deeper into that reality, building further artificial distinctions
>between his chosen group and others...

If you notice; when clubbed, I reach out rather than retreat. I hope
someday that Thad will stop fighting his own conscience about these
things. It is his soul he battles with, not me.

>While it is easy to see a stereotype of Bush-loving, NASCAR-watching,
>Support-our-solders, WWE-fan, pickup-truck-driving, Wal-Mart shopping,
>born-again, self-righteous, judgmental, evangelical fundamentalists, not

>ALL of them are mindless sheep who lack spirituality...

I don't even *know* any that fit your, or Thad's caricatures of Christians.
It's too silly to get upset about.

>Would it seem odd if I said to you that you can be atheist and Buddhist

>at the same time?

It's absolutely true. There is no deity required in Buddhism.

DC

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [TCB](#) on Fri, 16 Mar 2007 11:03:53 GMT

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

I don't pick fights with Don anymore, but I will respond when I am haughtily treated and mocked. I don't expect to change his mind, but it does chafe my ass to be told that depression is a 'choice' by someone who clearly doesn't understand anything about it.

As for being a buddhist and an atheist, I don't think so. I'm pretty technical about those kinds of words and I think to be a Thai buddhist you need to believe in reincarnation and amulets and all of that. However, I will say this, once a person is an atheist all religions become moral codes, and most are pretty awful. Christianity is, in my opinion, better than most if only because it's not especially vengeful or militaristic and Jesus himself believed in the separation of church and state. But I still find it to be a humanity hating religion, particularly if one happens to be a woman or enjoys having sex with members of one's own sex. The Grecofied Jesus we get in Luke is, again just in my opinion, the pick of the litter.

However, I will say this. As a moral code Thai buddhism, or more correctly the Thai flavor of Theravada buddhism, is pretty damn hard to beat. I'm learning more about it as time goes on, and I'm really going to dig in when I get back from this trip, but it's not only a rather good moral code on its own, it produces these people who so overwhelm me when I visit. Really, I almost starting crying at dinner when my waitress who I've become buddies with started showing me pictures of her 'vacation' to help out her friend helping out people dead sick with AIDS. Here I am, stinking rich American and when I go on vacation I go to Thailand and drink too much and go to titty bars and buy expensive hand made clothes from Sikh tailors (and stingray cowboy boots this time), and she who probably makes less in a year than I do in a month goes to help sick people who are treated like dirt in this country. I felt like such a repulsive first world cracker.

Now then, I'm a realist and there are plenty of assholes in this country too and I'm sure somewhere there are nut job buddhist fundies oppressing someone or another for some stupid reason. But in aggregate I have been slowly

overwhelmed by the generosity, quality, and simple morality of Thais. I mean, I'll be at a club, talk to the DJ about how much I like a song, and he'll try to give me the CD. Granted, he probably has it burned somewhere else, but it's not offered for sale but just offered as a gift to a near stranger. It's just the way they are. In any case, I will be learning a great deal more about their country and religion when I get back, they're definitely on to something.

The other thing I'm going to do is see what, if anything, is being done to get these AIDS patients medicine. I was talking to my waitress friend and was shocked at how sick people looked. AIDS isn't nearly the death sentence it used to be, as a doctor friend of mine said recently, he'd rather get AIDS than Hepatitis C. So I asked why these people were so sick and it's just a matter of money. The US government won't let developing nations make the medicines on their own and almost nobody can afford the treatment. So they go and waste away in the woods. I'm lucky enough to know a lot of really rich people and if I can do something to get some money directly to the place she visited maybe that's a small payback for the exquisite hospitality this country has shown me.

TCB

Doug Wellington <doug@parisfaqs.com> wrote:

>TCB wrote:

>> Well, Don, one doesn't need to be Sigmund effin Freud

>

>Eeek! Damn it man! Now I have to clean the milk and cookie chips off

>my monitor! (and out of my nose!) :-)

>

>> All of which is far too subtle for a blinkered mind such as your own.

>

>While I think I understand your sentiment and might actually go so far

>as to say that Don is what I would term a "close-minded believer," I

>would like to hope that there is still an opportunity to help him see

>that God has allowed, and indeed created, other realities in the world

>besides his own. It is obvious to me that his reality works for him, as

>much as it may not work for others, and vice versa, but clubbing him on

>the head isn't going to change his attitude, but merely make him retreat

>deeper into that reality, building further artificial distinctions

>between his chosen group and others...

>

>> P.S. While my hatred of the stateside twice born remains intact,

>

>While it is easy to see a stereotype of Bush-loving, NASCAR-watching,

>Support-our-solders, WWE-fan, pickup-truck-driving, Wal-Mart shopping,

>born-again, self-righteous, judgmental, evangelical fundamentalists, not

>ALL of them are mindless sheep who lack spirituality...

>

>> my suspicion of spirituality in general has been shaken by this

>> trip to Thailand.

>

>Thailand seems to be a magnificent place. Many people in my martial

>arts and oriental medicine school have traveled there to study, and I

>hope to join them on a future trip.

>

>> The country is over 90% Buddhist and their spirituality

>> in the face of very real hardships is inspiring.

>

>I find true spirituality of any kind to be inspiring. While I myself

>have chosen a Zen Buddhist path, my teacher is not only a Roshi, but

>also a Catholic Priest, and someone I greatly admire.

>

>> I remain an atheist and make no pretensions to Buddhism, but having

>> seen how their piety brings out the noble traits of charity and

>> understanding I can no longer dismiss all religion out of hand.

>

>Would it seem odd if I said to you that you can be atheist and Buddhist

>at the same time?

>

>Doug

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [TCB](#) on Fri, 16 Mar 2007 11:17:33 GMT

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

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:

>

>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>>

>>Well, Don, one doesn't need to be Sigmund effin Freud to guess that when

>a

>>healthy, financially and emotionally secure adult male with a family kills

>>himself he might have been depressed. And reading what the family said

('he's

>>now at peace' instead of 'we had no idea') makes it a notably stronger
case.

>

>

>Gee I didn't realize Freud was still in vogue... My point was that

>"depression" is too easy and tells us next to nothing.

>
>
>
>>Further, how you could say I 'happily' present suicide as a choice when
>in
>>precisely that sentence I say that what he did was 'sad?' I was only observing
>>that in many societies (as a history buff ancient Rome and Greece come
immediately
>>to mind) suicide was considered a viable and socially accepted choice,

>
>So, in that context, does your sadness amount to anything other than
>a tossed-off fake sympathy?

Do I feel as bad as I would if my cat died? No, but of course I feel bad for the family. I've seen first hand what suicide does to the people left behind and I wouldn't wish that on anyone.

>After all, suicide can be a "viable and socially accepted choice" right?
>
>There are other views, of course.
>
>
>>it remains today not just a choice but kind of the ultimate choice. In addition,
>>in our modern society in certain situations--like taking suicidal risks
>in
>>wartime--leaving one's life on the table is considered heroic.
>
>None of which constitute suicide, so of course the reaction is, and
>should be, different.
>
>
>>All of which is far too subtle for a blinkered mind such as your own. Your
>>point is that if everyone would go to the gym and love Jesus there wouldn't
>>be any depressed people anymore. I don't get offended by your pedantry anymore,
>>that ended a few years ago. But from personal experience I can tell you
>that
>>I come from a family of hard working, god fearing, Jesus loving, workout
>>enjoying people and off the top of my head I can count six suicides among
>>the males in the past three generations, and that's not counting the ones
>>who took the slow ride via drugs and drink.
>
>
>I can show you reams of evidence that these things work. Further, I doubt
>your family is a good example of their failure. At least not if they are
>as prejudiced and bitter as you appear to be. I think you can do

>better. If you were really anything resembling an intellectual you
>would be more tolerant. Just a thought.

>

>

>>The women are either of sturdier
>>emotional stock or are contributing factors in the suicides because they
>>all live forever. I believe one of the primary reasons my own father decided
>>to get a doctorate in psychology was to better understand some of the demons
>>that his, and my, family face. But I guess he would have been better off
>>with a Stairmaster and a copy of the Good Book.

>

>I take it the Psych major worked for him? I sure hope so.

He had a successful career as a college professor, survived a midlife divorce,
helped put both of his kids through college, remarried and plays a lot of
golf. I think it worked out pretty well for him, and I think his knowledge
of the 'technicalities' of personality did serve him well.

>What works for you?

The endless, relentless, and in the end probably impossible pursuit of beauty
and truth, both in actual things and in thoughts. It shows up in odd places
and at odd times, and it will shimmer at you for a second and then be gone.
But it's tough going and one has to be ready to admit being wrong, find out
things from places other people would ignore, and in the end be willing to
change one's mind. I'd suggest you try it but you are already in possession
of the Truth, as spoken by an apostate rabbi in a low rent Roman buffer colony.
Why bother finding beauty or truth when already in possession of Truth?

>

>>P.S. While my hatred of the stateside twice born remains intact, my suspicion
>>of spirituality in general has been shaken by this trip to Thailand. It's
>>my third time here, and each time I've made a few new friends and gotten
>>closer to actual Thais. The country is over 90% Buddhist and their spirituality
>>in the face of very real hardships is inspiring. I've never encountered
>a
>>sweeter, gentler group of people in my life. I've gotten to know the (unspeakably
>>gorgeous) girls who work in the swank restaurant/bar in my hotel, and three
>>of them just went on holiday together earlier this week. Where? To a Buddhist
>>temple that cares for Thais with AIDS. They used their _vacation_ to take
>>food and medicine and money to some people seriously fucked over by the
>world.
>>One of the motivations was a friend of theirs who recently came out as
gay
>>to them, which is a far, far bigger deal in Thailand than in the US. And
>>instead of doing what would be easy, i.e. throwing the person out of their
>>life for making the wrong 'choice,' they embraced him and did something
>to

>>help the gay community in their country. I remain an atheist and make no
>>pretensions to Buddhism, but having seen how their piety brings out the
>noble
>>traits of charity and understanding I can no longer dismiss all religion
>>out of hand. Having seen what their quiet and sincere spirituality does
>for
>>Thais I have no choice but to respect it. I just despise closed minded
holy
>>roller US fuckheads that much more.
>
>
>There is much to learn from Buddhism.
>
>Your hate for people of faith is about you, not us. It doesn't bother me
>since
>it bears no relation to the truth. I have been around bitter, hateful atheists
>all my life. My uncles were friends with Madalyn Murry O'Hare.

I don't hate faith, Don, I hate holy rollers who want to remake my home country into a Christian theocracy. You might be surprised by this but I actually fix computers at the Episcopal church down the block for free. One of the active lay people in the church drinks at my local watering hole and they do good things. Running a soup kitchen and after school programs for the poor kids who live nearby. So I help them out.

And the O'Hare person. I never heard of her before you mentioned her name and for some reason because she was an awful person you think that anyone who has any of the same beliefs must also be awful and bitter and likely to be murdered. That makes no sense.

TCB

>Here is the reward for her life:
>
><http://crimemagazine.com/ohair.htm>
>
>
>I hope yours turns out better.
>
>DC
>

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Fri, 16 Mar 2007 14:59:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>

>I don't pick fights with Don anymore, but I will respond when I am haughtily
>treated and mocked. I don't expect to change his mind, but it does chafe
>my ass to be told that depression is a 'choice' by someone who clearly doesn't
>understand anything about it.

<http://www.depressionisachoice.com/>

You may not agree, but it is you who is ignorant of this topic.

>But I still find it to be a humanity
>hating religion, particularly if one happens to be a woman or enjoys having
>sex with members of one's own sex.

These are lies. Paul was the great liberator of women, and while the Bible presents homosexual acts as sinful, it clearly expects the sinner to be respected as much as the porn addict, tax cheat, or infidel. Love the sinner, hate the sin. It's basic Christianity for everyone I know. And even hating the sin is not supposed to be a public act.

You are welcome to you own opinion, bigoted as it may be, you are not welcome to your own facts.

DC

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Fri, 16 Mar 2007 15:59:36 GMT

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

> And the O'Hare person. I never heard of her before you mentioned her name
> and for some reason because she was an awful person you think that anyone
> who has any of the same beliefs must also be awful and bitter and likely
> to be murdered. That makes no sense.
>

Thad.....I met her on a few occasions back in the 70's when I was a student at University of Texas and afterward. I don't know if she was awful because she was an atheist, or because she was an antheist who felt like she was being oppressed by the religious right (and there isn't much of that in Austin..it's always been a liberal minded place for the most part).....or because she was just mean.....but she was one of the most singularly unpleasant people I've ever had the misfortune to meet, more then once.....so from my perspective, this extreme unpleasantness seems to have been consistent thing. I never said anything to provoke this person.

As for her being murdered, if one subscribes to the theory that people attract to themselves those who are of like mind, then she certainly could have found herself up to her neck in a swirling brew of negative personalities.

Glad you're having good experiences in Thailand. It's springtime here, skunk season has arrived, the hounds are ecstatic and I am a bit fatigued due to having to do the "skunkcheck" for these guys prior to letting them outside at night when they alert that the property perimeters have been violated by some creature that has come out of hibernation and is foraging for food. Unsupervised boundary patrols by the dogs can be disastrous at this time of year.

Now back to the search for giant, combative cephalopods.....

;o)

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [Doug Wellington](#) on Fri, 16 Mar 2007 16:10:56 GMT

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

DC wrote:

- > If there is a God, there is but one reality. We can aspire to it,
- > we can reject it, but there is but one. I aspire to know it.

While I tend to agree that there is but one "true" reality, I would also say that each person can have, and indeed must have, a different perception of that one reality, hence my reference to multiple realities... Please bear with me for "fudging" the definitions. Have you ever studied philosophy? We could start bandying about with philosophical terms if you know the language used. (Do you understand the differences between the terms "realism", "idealism" and "representationalism"?)

- > The accusation of closed-mindedness is always a dead giveaway that
- > someone cannot respond to a point you have made.

Do you believe that I can't respond to a point you have made?

- > When someone calls me "closed-minded",

Is "close-minded" an observation? An accusation? A condemnation? An opportunity?

- > let alone "blinkerred" I know they are desperate and have
- > little to say of substance.

Ah, have I also now been so categorized...? Am I desperate? Do I have little to say of substance? Have you closed your mind to me?

- > Any knowledge of truth will appear closed-minded to someone who
- > does not have that knowledge.

Absolutely. The clubbing-of-the-heads can go both ways...

- > If you notice; when clubbed, I reach out rather than retreat.

Do you reach out with questions (open-mind) or statements (closed-mind)?

- > I hope someday that Thad will stop fighting his own conscience about
- > these things.

That is his path to worry about. I'm glad he's thinking about these things...

- > It is his soul he battles with, not me.

I can't speak for Thad, but I know that I have had my own fight with issues that are represented by people who speak in ways such as you do.

I am seeking a greater understanding, hence my involvement in this conversation...

- > I don't even *know* any that fit your, or Thad's caricatures of
- > Christians.

Heehee, as I said, not ALL Christians are like that, but if you deny ever having seen any like that, I'd suggest getting out more often... :-)
Have you ever read Twain's Letters From The Earth? Twain observed a difference between "professing" and "professional" Christians. I have seen both types, and I bet that if you have the open mind you claim to, you'll see both types as well... ;-)

Namaste,
Doug

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Fri, 16 Mar 2007 17:27:52 GMT

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

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>I'd suggest you try it but you are already in possession
>of the Truth, as spoken by an apostate rabbi in a low rent Roman buffer colony.

>Why bother finding beauty or truth when already in possession of Truth?

You're a bigot.

Worse, you're a bigot in possession of not truth, but Truth itself in making such claims about Christ, and faith of the highest order in your atheism, based on much flimsier evidence than I have for my faith in God. In saying there is no Truth, you make the highest Truth claim of all, based on nothing but your assertion.

Sorry, none for us thanks..

>I don't hate faith, Don, I hate holy rollers who want to remake my home country
>into a Christian theocracy.

This is a lie. You regularly denigrate Jesus, and belief in general.

Do you need quotes?

Those who actually follow Christ are the last to make a theocracy; it is the thing he resisted the most. You are lying about Christians.

>You might be surprised by this but I actually
>fix computers at the Episcopal church down the block for free. One of the
>active lay people in the church drinks at my local watering hole and they
>do good things. Running a soup kitchen and after school programs for the
>poor kids who live nearby. So I help them out.

But here is what the Bible says:

Ephesians 8

yourselves, it is the gift of God, not by works, so that no one can boast.

When you make fun of the "twice-born" it is these people you laugh at.

DC

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Fri, 16 Mar 2007 17:45:46 GMT

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

Vehemently anti-gay Christians are easy to find. In many denominations, not just fundamentalists. This is not a perception problem to be blamed on "the media."

Caring, generous and tolerant Christians are also easy to find and bring a lot of joy to the world, so to speak.

Vehemently anti-fundamentalist atheists are easy to find.

Caring, generous and tolerant atheists are also easy to find, and they also contribute much to our civilization.

What can we conclude from this?

Some people, for whatever reasons, behave as jerks. Hiding behind a particular belief system is a poor excuse.

Projection is epidemic in our culture.

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

DC wrote:

>> Heehee, as I said, not ALL Christians are like that, but if you deny
>> ever having seen any like that, I'd suggest getting out more often...
>
> Never seen any in 20 years. They exist, but their presence is absurdly
> exaggerated by those with an ox to gore. The reason they are so rare
> is that to be a hate-filled, anti-woman, anti-gay "christian" you have to
> not follow Christ. If you follow Christ, these things are sinful.
> At our church the pastor preaches acceptance of gays and we have
> female pastors. Heck, my wife and I were *married* by a woman. I have
> gay friends, and have had them for years. And we are not United
> Methodists or other liberals, we are evangelicals. The problem is that
> you guys get your views of "christians" from a secular media that
> deposes them. You believe lies about us, and I can prove it. But of
> course, that might involve going to church and all...

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Fri, 16 Mar 2007 18:10:42 GMT

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

Doug Wellington <doug@parisfaqs.com> wrote:

>While I tend to agree that there is but one "true" reality, I would also

>say that each person can have, and indeed must have, a different
>perception of that one reality, hence my reference to multiple
>realities...

Doug! You changed definitions of a word in one sentence to have opposite meanings. Do you think that the quotes around "true" will allow for this?

There are no multiple realities, there are only multiple perceptions. Perception is a synonym for opinion. When you elevate opinion to reality, you make the word reality, meaningless. Good PoMo I suppose, but certainly not good logic...

> > The accusation of closed-mindedness is always a dead giveaway that
> > someone cannot respond to a point you have made.

>Do you believe that I can't respond to a point you have made?

No, but you have not called me "closed-minded" yet and appear willing to actually engage the issues rather than simply attack the person.

> > When someone calls me "closed-minded",

>Is "close-minded" an observation? An accusation? A condemnation? An
>opportunity?

What does it mean to you? In Thad's case it is a denigration. Of course, atheists are never closed-minded are they? But I do not call people closed-minded because they disagree, for the reasons I stated.

> > let alone "blinkered" I know they are desperate and have
> > little to say of substance.

>Ah, have I also now been so categorized...? Am I desperate? Do I have

>little to say of substance? Have you closed your mind to me?

You did not use those words. Do you feel that way? When Thad describes a "blinkered" mind, he is expressing discomfort with someone who has beliefs he thinks are ridiculous and if I was just as sharp and hip as he,

I would be an atheist like him. This is called intolerance and it is worthy of an Islamist, frankly. And it is based upon what? Negation? Despising Christians? The almighty self screaming into the void that he is all there is, all there was, and all that ever will be?

None for me thanks... Pardon me for actually believing in my beliefs, so to speak, but I do and I believe them to reflect objective reality. For me to accept faith as human myth-making is just another way to describe accepting atheism.

> > Any knowledge of truth will appear closed-minded to someone who

>Do you reach out with questions (open-mind) or statements (closed-mind)?

Depends on whether the person is seeking or preaching. Thad is a preacher. He preaches bigotry against Christians.

Ask a physicist about string theory and he will be open-minded. Ask him about whether a glass will fall when you drop it, and he will be less so. This is the fundamental nature of the debate between atheism and theism. Thad is no more open-minded than I, but for me to call him "closed minded" is simply too insubstantive and really, silly, a response when there are much more important points to be made.

>I can't speak for Thad, but I know that I have had my own fight with
>issues that are represented by people who speak in ways such as you do.

> I am seeking a greater understanding, hence my involvement in this
>conversation...

Start here:

<http://www.dwillard.org/books/DivConsp.asp>

I will even send you a copy if you like. Let me know and I will send you my email.

>Heehee, as I said, not ALL Christians are like that, but if you deny
>ever having seen any like that, I'd suggest getting out more often...

Never seen any in 20 years. They exist, but their presence is absurdly exaggerated by those with an ox to gore. The reason they are so rare

is that to be a hate-filled, anti-woman, anti-gay "christian" you have to not follow Christ. If you follow Christ, these things are sinful. At our church the pastor preaches acceptance of gays and we have female pastors. Heck, my wife and I were *married* by a woman. I have gay friends, and have had them for years. And we are not United Methodists or other liberals, we are evangelicals. The problem is that you guys get your views of "christians" from a secular media that deposes them. You believe lies about us, and I can prove it. But of course, that might involve going to church and all...

>:-) Have you ever read Twain's Letters From The Earth? Twain observed
>a difference between "professing" and "professional" Christians. I have
>seen both types, and I bet that if you have the open mind you claim to,
>you'll see both types as well... ;-)

Twain of course, was far from neutral in these things, wouldn't you say? Was he "closed-minded"? Just a thought...

When Christians are phonies and hypocrites, and I fail in these areas as well, it is because they are not following Christ.

best,

DC

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [Doug Wellington](#) on Fri, 16 Mar 2007 20:59:38 GMT

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

TCB wrote:

> I don't expect to change his mind, but it does chafe my ass to be told
> that
> depression is a 'choice' by someone who clearly doesn't understand
> anything
> about it.

Yes, it seems obvious that Don does not have first hand knowledge of the subject. (Not that I would wish that for anyone...) And yet, shouldn't we take this opportunity to treat him as the un-knowing child-like spirit that he is and to help him learn the truth? Why be angry with the ignorant? Through interaction with us, God is providing him an opportunity for growth. It is up to him to choose to listen or not... (If it helps you to think in more atheistic terms, there is a coincidence in the universe right now where

a chance exists that we can help Don understand that his opinion of his perception of the one true reality might not be the same as yours or mine is, and to realize that each one is as valid as the other...)

DC wrote:

> These are lies. Paul was the great liberator of women,

Interesting that Mohammed was also considered the great liberator of women.

DC continues:

> while the Bible presents homosexual acts as sinful, it clearly
> expects the sinner to be respected as much as the porn addict,
> tax cheat, or infidel.

Don, in my reading of your messages, it seems to me that you do not show respect for Thad. Why the disconnect?

> Love the sinner, hate the sin. It's basic Christianity for everyone I
> know.
> And even hating the sin is not supposed to be a public act.

This makes me wonder even more about all of your public messages...why do you attack Thad so much? Are you not yet Christian enough to love him?

Doug

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [Doug Wellington](#) on Fri, 16 Mar 2007 22:10:12 GMT

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

"DC" wrote:

> Doug! You changed definitions of a word in one sentence to have opposite
> meanings. Do you think that the quotes around "true" will allow for
> this?

Ah, but you seem to have ignored my phrase "Please bear with me for 'fudging' the definitions." (Exactly my reason for putting the quotes around "true"...). And you didn't say anything about whether you understood what is meant by the various philosophical terms I mentioned...

> There are no multiple realities, there are only multiple perceptions.

I believe that you and I are in agreement on that, maybe for different reasons...

> Perception is a synonym for opinion. When you elevate opinion to
> reality, you make the word reality, meaningless.

And in all honesty, isn't it? (Or as my teacher might put it, "can you not handle the doubt?")

> Good PoMo I suppose, but certainly not good logic...

Sorry, what is "PoMo"? And since when did logic have anything to do with faith, spirituality, or for that matter, reality?

>>Do you believe that I can't respond to a point you have made?

>

> No, but you have not called me "closed-minded" yet and appear willing
> to actually engage the issues rather than simply attack the person.

Ah, but if you go back and look, I did indeed imply that... ;-)

>>Is "close-minded" an observation? An accusation? A condemnation? An
>>opportunity?

>

> What does it mean to you?

All of the above... More important than the phrase itself is one's
reaction to the phrase...

>>Do you reach out with questions (open-mind) or statements (closed-mind)?

>

> Depends on whether the person is seeking or preaching.

Why treat those two things differently? I've always liked that idea that when you point at others, there are three fingers pointing back... Are you yourself a seeker? Or a believer?

> <http://www.dwillard.org/books/DivConsp.asp>

It's interesting that you point out this book that includes phrases such as "consumer Christianity" and "bumper-sticker faith" yet you imply elsewhere that we only get those ideas about Christians from "a secular media that despises them (sic)"...

> You believe lies about us, and I can prove it.

I don't understand how you can be so prescriptive about what the "you" believe about the "us"... What can you prove?

> But of course, that might involve going to church and all...

"...church put me right off religion for fifteen years..." -John Cleese

Which church would be on the approved list to go to?

> Twain of course, was far from neutral in these things, wouldn't you say?

Neutral people are rarely inspired to write about anything. Have you actually read that book yourself?

Doug

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [duncan](#) on Fri, 16 Mar 2007 22:20:00 GMT

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

On 16 Mar 2007 06:29:16 +1000, "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:

>Depression is a choice. How bad do you want to live?

>

"Depression is a choice."

Really? Like left-handedness, bi-polar disorder, paranoid schizophrenia, and all those other poor decisions people make...?

Breathtakingly over-simple statement, man... It would certainly be a happier world if this were true, but -- isn't and it ain't...

-- hard to know what else to say -- good luck sorting this one out without the benefit of a third dimension in your perspective -- chas.

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Fri, 16 Mar 2007 23:26:28 GMT

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

"Doug Wellington" <doug@parisfaqs.com> wrote:

>Yes, it seems obvious that Don does not have first hand knowledge of the

>subject.

Wrong. You have no idea.

>(Not that I would wish that for anyone...) And yet, shouldn't we
>take this opportunity to treat him as the un-knowing child-like spirit that

>he is and to help him learn the truth?

Doug.. really... You really have no clue here.

Okay, both you and Thad need to read this book:

<http://www.depressionisachoice.com/>

and the new one Brainswitch. She is getting quite startling results. It is something you both need to be aware of before you apply such silly little characterizations to anyone...

Until you read it, the ignorance is not mine.

>a chance exists that we can help Don understand that his opinion of his

>perception of the one true reality might not be the same as yours or mine

>is,

Oh, that is a given here, and never in doubt. We will stipulate to different perceptions.

>and to realize that each one is as valid as the other...)

If this is true, then neither is valid, since there is no objective reality and both are therefore delusions.

But, both are actually truth claims. As such, at least one is wrong. Thad certainly thinks mine is wrong. See, that is the thing about atheists. Many of them are diehard modernists and are quite certain that there is an objective reality and they know it, at least the part about a deity...

Different realities, based upon subjective perception, is a postmodern conceit to them, as it is to me. Thad claims that there is no objective basis upon which to believe in God. You believe that there is no objectivity, other than one that we have no apparent access to. There really is no common ground here. It is quite best if we all talk about something else at this point.

>DC wrote:

>> These are lies. Paul was the great liberator of women,

>Interesting that Mohammed was also considered the great liberator of women.

Do you know the difference? Where did Mohammed say anything like this:

Galatians 3:28

There is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, male nor female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus.

I can show you dozens or maybe even hundreds of texts denying this in the Koran.

>> while the Bible presents homosexual acts as sinful, it clearly
>> expects the sinner to be respected as much as the porn addict,
>> tax cheat, or infidel.

>Don, in my reading of your messages, it seems to me that you do not show

>respect for Thad. Why the disconnect?

He hates Christians. He derides us every chance he gets, and is functioning as an advocate for hate.

Here's some quotes:

I just despise closed minded holy roller US fuckheads that much more.

P.S. While my hatred of the stateside twice born remains intact...

There have been many more over the years. Now imagine, instead of the anti-Christian slurs, you insert the N-word or an anti-arab slur? Oh, this place would be up in arms...

But it is perfectly OK to hate Christians?

Bull. And I will stand in his face and tell him enough... If you call that lack of respect, then you don't get it.

>> Love the sinner, hate the sin. It's basic Christianity for everyone I

>> know.

>> And even hating the sin is not supposed to be a public act.

>This makes me wonder even more about all of your public messages...why do

>you attack Thad so much? Are you not yet Christian enough to love him?

I love him dearly actually. He reminds me of so many lost souls trying to comfort their shouting consciences with hate.

He quite reminds me of myself at times, and worse he reminds me of my uncle-the-atheist on his deathbed dying of leukemia asking us for a reason to believe in God...

(He found one, BTW)

See, if I am wrong, I am just a silly cultist and you can all think I am stupid. I can live with that. Because if I am right, then we are living in the end times, and each of you will one day point a finger at me and scream "why didn't you TELL us?? You KNEW!! You knew, and you didn't tell us!" So, listen, or turn the page, but enough with the hate because of my faith in my Lord. It's pathetic and makes those who indulge in it look disturbed, and I will never back down in the face of this bigotry. The fact that some people are so offended that I care enough to tell them the truth, even if I am wrong, casts serious aspersions on their own beliefs and souls.

If a Hindu said to you that through good living, we can come back as higher beings in the next life, and through an evil life we will come back as bugs, some would listen, some would not, but few would insult the Hindu for his beliefs. But Christians? Yeah we're just a bunch of fuckheads...

Shame on you.

DC

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Fri, 16 Mar 2007 23:28:06 GMT

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

Chas. Duncan <duncan5199ATsbcbglobalDOTnet@> wrote:

>On 16 Mar 2007 06:29:16 +1000, "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:

>>Depression is a choice. How bad do you want to live?

>Really? Like left-handedness, bi-polar disorder, paranoid

>schizophrenia, and all those other poor decisions people make...?

>

>Breathtakingly over-simple statement, man...

Breathtaking results:

<http://www.depressionisachoice.com/>

DC

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Fri, 16 Mar 2007 23:45:16 GMT

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

"Doug Wellington" <doug@parisfaqs.com> wrote:

>Ah, but you seem to have ignored my phrase "Please bear with me for
>"fudging" the definitions." (Exactly my reason for putting the quotes
>around "true"...)

I did not ignore it, I rejected it. It is irrational and allows you
to say things that make no sense.

>And you didn't say anything about whether you understood
>what is meant by the various philosophical terms I mentioned...

I do not engage in credential-comparisons, nor in the use of
specialized terms as a way to establish authority, and will not
do so now. Let's just say I had a good education and spent many
years in academia...

>> Perception is a synonym for opinion. When you elevate opinion to
>> reality, you make the word reality, meaningless.

>And in all honesty, isn't it? (Or as my teacher might put it, "can you
not
>handle the doubt?")

You can define any word as meaningless then can't you?
Words like justice, fairness, equality, freedom?

I mean what is "meaning" right?

Yeah Doug, you go there if you want. I won't be joining you.

>> Good PoMo I suppose, but certainly not good logic...

>Sorry, what is "PoMo"? And since when did logic have anything to do with
>faith, spirituality, or for that matter, reality?

Post Modernism. The hoax of the last 200 years.

Logic has everything to do with faith and spirituality if Jesus was who he said he was. If not, it is just comforting myth-making and quasi-poetic claptrap for the weak who need that sort of thing.

>Ah, but if you go back and look, I did indeed imply that... ;-)

Ahh, then you are a silly little man as well <grin>

Again, if I am right, than I will appear closed-minded to the ignorant.... Open-mindedness towards lies, is stupidity.

>> Depends on whether the person is seeking or preaching.

>Why treat those two things differently?

One is advocating, one is not.

>Are you yourself a seeker? Or a believer?

I am a believer who seeks to know more than I currently do.
The fundamentals are known.

>> <http://www.dwillard.org/books/DivConsp.asp>

>It's interesting that you point out this book that includes phrases such as
>"consumer Christianity" and "bumper-sticker faith" yet you imply elsewhere
>that we only get those ideas about Christians from "a secular media that
>despises them (sic)"...

I implied no such thing. Willard does not despise Christians, since he is one, and the mainstream culture does. Read it.

>> You believe lies about us, and I can prove it.

>I don't understand how you can be so prescriptive about what the "you"
>believe about the "us"... What can you prove?

That Christians are very different than you and Thad have presented them. That would be easy.

>> But of course, that might involve going to church and all...

>"...church put me right off religion for fifteen years..." -John Cleese

Clever

>Which church would be on the approved list to go to?

Give me a call sometime. I can take you to a variety and introduce you to dozens of actual Christians, bearing no resemblance to your caricatures.

>> Twain of course, was far from neutral in these things, wouldn't you say?

>Neutral people are rarely inspired to write about anything. Have you
>actually read that book yourself?

But you presented it as an insightful comment. Tell you what, I'll read it and write a review if you do the same for "The Divine Conspiracy".

Deal?

DC

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [Doug Wellington](#) on Sat, 17 Mar 2007 00:38:20 GMT

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

Don,

> I did not ignore it, I rejected it. It is irrational and allows you
> to say things that make no sense.

Burning bush that talks? Rising from the dead? Do these things make "sense"? ;-)

> I do not engage in credential-comparisons, nor in the use of
> specialized terms as a way to establish authority, and will not
> do so now.

Hmmm, I have not displayed my credentials as of yet. I am merely trying establish a framework of communication where we use terms that have definitions familiar to all participants. No authority structure included... :-)

> You can define any word as meaningless then can't you?
> Words like justice, fairness, equality, freedom?

Different societies in different places and times seem to have reassigned different meanings to those words, have they not?

> Post Modernism. The hoax of the last 200 years.

More accurately, you mean "Post Modern Scientific Materialism"... Correct?

> Logic has everything to do with faith and spirituality if Jesus
> was who he said he was.

And therein lies the rub - how do you know who/what he said he was? How did what he claimed about himself compare to what others said about him? Do you believe that Scripture is inerrant? (Heehee, and which version of Scripture? And what about the other versions?) What's your take on the Synoptic Problem? Do you know what "Q" is? How do you reconcile the differences between John and the Synoptic Gospels? Have you ever read "Jesus, Son of Man" or "Misquoting Jesus"? Have you read any of Elaine Pagels' books? Have you read any of the Nag Hammadi writings? Are you familiar with any of the non-canonical Gospels? How would modern Christianity be different if the church had chosen Thomas instead of John as one of the four canonical Gospels? If Constantine had not embraced orthodox Christianity, what do you think would have happened with the "battle" between the Gnostics and the Orthodoxy? What kind of impact does the Gospel of Mary Magdalene have on the role of women in Christianity? Why was her true identity hidden and her reputation sullied by the Christian church? Are you familiar with the writings of St. John of the Cross? Meister Eckhart? Thomas Merton? Alan Watts? Krishnamurti? G.K. Chesterton? Josh McDowell? (Not trying to establish credentials or authority here, just wondering what common ground we might have...)

"Faith is no excuse for ignorance! Adherence to any tradition in disregard for textual evidence is sheer superstition." -Mahlon H. Smith

<http://www.virtualreligion.net>

> Ahh, then you are a silly little man as well <grin>

Hey, I resemble that! (Well, except for the "little" part...)

>>> Depends on whether the person is seeking or preaching.

>>Why treat those two things differently?

> One is advocating, one is not.

Aren't they each worth approaching with an open mind?

> That Christians are very different than you and Thad have

> presented them. That would be easy.

Have I made any blanket statements that I have said apply to all Christians?

>>Which church would be on the approved list to go to?

>

> Give me a call sometime.

Where do you live? I'm down here in Tucson, Arizona...

> I can take you to a variety and introduce you to dozens of

> actual Christians, bearing no resemblance to your caricatures.

Gee, I've never met an actual Christian before! [/sarcasm]

I'm pretty sure they aren't limited to your town and your church, as I've heard reports of Christians being spotted right here in this very county.

;-)

I'm sorry, I believe I should have asked a different question: "Which churches are NOT on the approved list to go to?"

[RE: Twain]

> But you presented it as an insightful comment.

Does a non-neutral viewpoint make it any less insightful?

> Tell you what, I'll read it and write a review if you do the

> same for "The Divine Conspiracy".

>

> Deal?

I'll take that bet and raise you one: I'll read your depression is a choice book if you promise to read Stan Grof's "Holotropic Mind" all the way through...

:~)

Doug

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [Doug Wellington](#) on Sat, 17 Mar 2007 01:41:35 GMT

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

OK, I don't have much time left today, but I'll try to hit the highlights...
It's been a fun ride... :~)

> See, that is the thing about atheists.

Don, I see this as you making a blanket statement about all atheists, while complaining that Thad makes blanket statements about all Christians. Don't we all have to play by the same rules to get along?

> I can show you dozens or maybe even hundreds of texts
> denying this in the Koran.

How much time have you spent looking for negativity in the Quran? How much time have you spent looking for inspiration? As I told an evangelical Christian friend of mine, I think it's not about whether to believe that the Bible is the Word of God, it's whether to believe that the Bible is the ONLY Word of God...

> He hates Christians. He derides us every chance he
> gets, and is functioning as an advocate for hate.

[shrug] I don't get that impression from him myself. He seems to hate your attitude, your actions, and your words, and those of other people like you. I don't think that includes all Christianity... (Heehee, have you ever seen that bumper sticker that says, "Jesus, Save Me From Your Followers!" ? Can you imagine why anyone would feel that way?)

> I love him dearly actually. He reminds me of so many lost
> souls trying to comfort their shouting consciences with hate.

Interesting. Aren't we supposed to reach out with kind words to those we love?

> The fact that some people are so offended that I care enough
> to tell them the truth, even if I am wrong,

Even if you are wrong? So you mean it might just be your opinion about your perception of reality after all? If there is a chance that you are wrong,

does that mean there is a chance Thad is right?

> Shame on you.

Duly chastised, the cloud of un-knowing shakes his weary head and turns back to his humble abode to find solace in the writings of the many prophets that have walked the earth...

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Sat, 17 Mar 2007 02:31:54 GMT

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

"Doug Wellington" <doug@parisfaqs.com> wrote:

>Don,

>Burning bush that talks? Rising from the dead? Do these things make
>"sense"? ;-)

Of course. Unless you are an atheist.

>Hmmm, I have not displayed my credentials as of yet. I am merely trying

>establish a framework of communication where we use terms that have
>definitions familiar to all participants. No authority structure
>included... :-)

Not here. Would you like my email and we can use all the esoteric language you like? I'm sure we would enjoy it.
The case for faith and against atheism can be made in everyday language.
That is important to me.

>> You can define any word as meaningless then can't you?

>> Words like justice, fairness, equality, freedom?

>

>Different societies in different places and times seem to have reassigned

>different meanings to those words, have they not?

Yes, and your point is what? That usage determines truth? That truth is cultural?

Again, if there is a God, then there is a standard outside ourselves.
Everything grows from your assumptions.

>> Post Modernism. The hoax of the last 200 years.

>

>More accurately, you mean "Post Modern Scientific Materialism"... Correct?

Not at all. What is that BTW?

>> Logic has everything to do with faith and spirituality if Jesus

>> was who he said he was.

>And therein lies the rub - how do you know who/what he said he was? How did

>what he claimed about himself compare to what others said about him? Do you

>believe that Scripture is inerrant? (Heehee, and which version of

>Scripture? And what about the other versions?) What's your take on the

>Synoptic Problem? Do you know what "Q" is? How do you reconcile the

>differences between John and the Synoptic Gospels? Have you ever read

>"Jesus, Son of Man" or "Misquoting Jesus"? Have you read any of Elaine

>Pagels' books? Have you read any of the Nag Hammadi writings? Are you

>familiar with any of the non-canonical Gospels? How would modern

>Christianity be different if the church had chosen Thomas instead of John

as

>one of the four canonical Gospels? If Constantine had not embraced orthodox

>Christianity, what do you think would have happened with the "battle"

>between the Gnostics and the Orthodoxy? What kind of impact does the Gospel

>of Mary Magdelene have on the role of women in Christianity? Why was her

>true identity hidden and her reputation sullied by the Christian church?

>Are you familiar with the writings of St. John of the Cross? Meister

>Eckhart? Thomas Merton? Alan Watts? Krishnamurti? G.K. Chesterton?

Josh

>McDowell? (Not trying to establish credentials or authority here, just

>wondering what common ground we might have...)

Fundamentally, if you assume that things are always as they are now, there are no miracles, Jesus was just a man, and the Bible is myth-making, and psychology and culture determine morality and behaviour, then those beliefs will form your view of these issues. If you believe it to be

impossible for Darwin to explain life, and the concepts of sin, the fall, salvation and grace are the best ways to explain the current unpleasantness, and you have seen miracles and the presence of God in the lives of humans, and the plan of salvation as fulfilled by Jesus Christ is the ultimate expression of both love and reality, then you will form very different views on these issues. Now, I do not believe in verbal inerrancy, but I most certainly do believe in conceptual inerrancy, and the basics may be understood by children. Which makes a faithful child infinitely better than a doubt-filled post-modern with a strong sense of superiority.

>"Faith is no excuse for ignorance! Adherence to any tradition in disregard

>for textual evidence is sheer superstition." -Mahlon H. Smith

"So then, just as you received Christ Jesus as Lord, continue to live in him,
rooted and built up in him, strengthened in the faith as you were taught,
and
overflowing with thankfulness.

See to it that no one takes you captive through hollow and deceptive philosophy, which depends on human tradition and the basic principles of this world rather than on Christ.

For in Christ all the fullness of the Deity lives in bodily form, and you have
been given fullness in Christ, who is the head over every power
and authority."

The Apostle Paul Col. 2: 6-10

>> One is advocating, one is not.

>

>Aren't they each worth approaching with an open mind?

Again, if something is true, and something else is false, to accuse the one seeing the falsehood of closed-mindedness goes beyond ad hominem arguing (attacking the person rather than the idea) and begs the original question. It is a sign that one is out of ideas and getting desperate.

>> That Christians are very different than you and Thad have
>> presented them. That would be easy.

>

>Have I made any blanket statements that I have said apply to all Christians?

As I said, I have met no Christians, none at all, that fit the caricature he has presented, in many years.

>> Give me a call sometime.

>

>Where do you live? I'm down here in Tucson, Arizona...

Nice town. Good Mexican food to be had. I am near L.A.

>> I can take you to a variety and introduce you to dozens of

>> actual Christians, bearing no resemblance to your caricatures.

> Gee, I've never met an actual Christian before! [/sarcasm]

Well there has been little evidence of the encounter...

>I'm pretty sure they aren't limited to your town and your church, as I've

>heard reports of Christians being spotted right here in this very county.

>;-)

I'm shocked, shocked that there is Christianity going on here!!

>I'm sorry, I believe I should have asked a different question: "Which

>churches are NOT on the approved list to go to?"

Like martial arts, it ain't the style, it is the teacher and the spirit of the place.

>[RE: Twain]

>> But you presented it as an insightful comment.

>Does a non-neutral viewpoint make it any less insightful?

His hostility to Christians makes it less so on the surface, but I would like to read that sometime.

>
>> Tell you what, I'll read it and write a review if you do the
>> same for "The Divine Conspiracy".
>>
>> Deal?
>
>I'll take that bet and raise you one: I'll read your depression is a choice

>book if you promise to read Stan Grof's "Holotropic Mind" all the way
>through...

That looks interesting actually.

Tell you what. Read Willard first, and I will read Twain and we can
do book reviews in a week or so.

It is on amazon for about 12 bucks, or you can borrow my copy.

DC

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Sat, 17 Mar 2007 03:25:52 GMT

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

"Doug Wellington" <doug@parisfaqs.com> wrote:

>> See, that is the thing about atheists.

>Don, I see this as you making a blanket statement about all atheists, while

>complaining that Thad makes blanket statements about all Christians. Don't

>we all have to play by the same rules to get along?

Whoops! You selectively quoted. I said many atheists are modernists
and believe they are objectively correct.

Here is the evidence. <http://www.atheists.org/Atheism/>

>> I can show you dozens or maybe even hundreds of texts
>> denying this in the Koran.

>How much time have you spent looking for negativity in the Quran?

I let Osama do that. He's quite decent at it.

>As I told an evangelical

>Christian friend of mine, I think it's not about whether to believe that the

>Bible is the Word of God, it's whether to believe that the Bible is the ONLY

>Word of God...

I do believe in salvation for non-Christians, as do many Catholics.

That does not make the Bible and the Koran equal however...

>> He hates Christians. He derides us every chance he

>> gets, and is functioning as an advocate for hate.

>[shrug] I don't get that impression from him myself. He seems to hate your

>attitude, your actions, and your words, and those of other people like you.

>I don't think that includes all Christianity... (Heehee, have you ever seen

>that bumper sticker that says, "Jesus, Save Me From Your Followers!" ? Can

>you imagine why anyone would feel that way?)

It's rubbish, and insulting, and superior all at the same time. It is the atheist version of the Church Lady and her "superior dance".

And Thad has insulted anyone who believes in Jesus on numerous occasions.

>

>> I love him dearly actually. He reminds me of so many lost

>> souls trying to comfort their shouting consciences with hate.

>Interesting. Aren't we supposed to reach out with kind words to those we

>love?

I have. And I would be just as hard or moreso on my own brother if I thought he needed it.

>> The fact that some people are so offended that I care enough
>> to tell them the truth, even if I am wrong,

>Even if you are wrong? So you mean it might just be your opinion about
your

>perception of reality after all? If there is a chance that you are wrong,

>does that mean there is a chance Thad is right?

Sorry, I was writing too fast and did not express myself well. I was trying
to say that even if someone thinks I somebody else is wrong, there is
no reason for such hate.

>> Shame on you.

>Duly chastised, the cloud of un-knowing shakes his weary head and turns
back

>to his humble abode to find solace in the writings of the many prophets
that

>have walked the earth...

And a pilgrim asked to see the guru, and was told he must first spend
three years in meditation. After the three years, he was ushered into
the presence of the great one, and was asked "what is it you wish to know
my son?" Why the meaning of life master!

Life? Well, life is like a beanstalk isn't it?

(followed by a great screeching sound from the orchestra and a scream as
the young man fell into outer darkness)

"In Held 'Twas I" Procul Harum, live with the Edmonton Symphony.

DC

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Sat, 17 Mar 2007 04:26:32 GMT

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

Man...I'd love to go to Thailand for a while. I could spend a lot of money
that I'm not making because I'm on vacation and then worry the entire time
because while I'm enjoying myself on vacation, the bills continue to roll in
because they do not go on vacation and therefore I could spend my entire
vacation worrying about spending money that I'm not making while I'm
spending just as much money on bills that are not stopping.

Self employment is sooo cool sometimes.

;o)

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:45fb64e8\$1@linux...

>

> Yeah, she sure sounds like an awful person, and your individual experience

> matches up with what people write about her. Which has precisely zero to

> do with me, by the way.

>

> Good luck with the pups, the one (single, only, solitary) bad thing about

> this trip is that I miss my four legged friend back home. But I'll be

> seeing

> him on Monday when a very jetlagged and probably slightly hungover TCB

> will

> be returning to Connecticut, which I hear is currently under six inches of

> snow.

>

> TCB

>

> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:

>>> And the O'Hare person. I never heard of her before you mentioned her

>>> name

>>> and for some reason because she was an awful person you think that

>>> anyone

>>> who has any of the same beliefs must also be awful and bitter and likely

>>> to be murdered. That makes no sense.

>>>

>>

>>

>>Thad.....I met her on a few occasions back in the 70's when I was a

>>student at University of Texas and afterward. I don't know if she was

>>awful

>

>>because she was an atheist, or because she was an antheist who felt like

> she

>>was being oppressed by the religious right (and there isn't much of that

> in

>>Austin..it's always been a liberal minded place for the most

>>part).....or because she was just mean.....but she was one of the

>>most

>

>>singularly unpleasant people I've ever had the misfortune to meet, more

>

>>then once.....so from my perspective, this extreme unpleasantness

>>seems

>
>>to have been consistent thing. I never said anything to provoke this
>>person.
>
>>As for her being murdered, if one subscribes to the theory that people
>>attract to themselves those who are of of like mind, then she certainly
>
>>could have found herself up to her neck in a swirling brew of negative
>>personalities.
>>
>>Glad you're having good experiences in Thailand. It's springtime here,
>
>>skunk season has arrived, the hounds are estatic and I am a bit fatigued
> due
>>to having to do the "skunkcheck" for these guys prior to letting them
>>outside at night when they alert that the property perimeters have been
>
>>violated by some creature that has come out of hibernation and is foraging
>
>>for food. Unsupervised boundary patrols by the dogs can be disastrous at
>
>>this time of year.
>>
>>Now back to the seach for giant, combative cephalopods.....
>>
>>;o)
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [TCB](#) on Sat, 17 Mar 2007 04:47:52 GMT

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

Yeah, she sure sounds like an awful person, and your individual experience matches up with what people write about her. Which has precisely zero to do with me, by the way.

Good luck with the pups, the one (single, only, solitary) bad thing about this trip is that I miss my four legged friend back home. But I'll be seeing him on Monday when a very jetlagged and probably slightly hungover TCB will be returning to Connecticut, which I hear is currently under six inches of snow.

TCB

"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:

>> And the O'Hare person. I never heard of her before you mentioned her name
>> and for some reason because she was an awful person you think that anyone
>> who has any of the same beliefs must also be awful and bitter and likely
>> to be murdered. That makes no sense.

>>

>

>

>Thad.....I met her on a few occasions back in the 70's when I was a
>student at University of Texas and afterward. I don't know if she was awful

>because she was an atheist, or because she was an antheist who felt like
she

>was being oppressed by the religious right (and there isn't much of that
in

>Austin..it's always been a liberal minded place for the most
>part).....or because she was just mean.....but she was one of the most

>singularly unpleasant people I've ever had the misfortune to meet, more

>then once.....so from my perspective, this extreme unpleasantness seems

>to have been consistent thing. I never said anything to provoke this person.

>As for her being murdered, if one subscribes to the theory that people
>attract to themselves those who are of of like mind, then she certainly

>could have found herself up to her neck in a swirling brew of negative
>personalities.

>

>Glad you're having good experiences in Thailand. It's springtime here,

>skunk season has arrived, the hounds are estatic and I am a bit fatigued
due

>to having to do the "skunkcheck" for these guys prior to letting them
>outside at night when they alert that the property perimeters have been

>violated by some creature that has come out of hibernation and is foraging

>for food. Unsupervised boundary patrols by the dogs can be disastrous at

>this time of year.

>

>Now back to the seach for giant, combative cephalopods.....

>

>;0)

>

>

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [TCB](#) on Sat, 17 Mar 2007 05:56:05 GMT

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

Yeah, I'm technically self employed as well, I'm a mere consultant for the office where I work. Still, I'm lucky. I have no debt, rent my apartment for half what I should pay, and make a nice living. So I can set a budget for my trip here and that's that. Very sorry it's almost over though, I'd love to have another month here.

If things go right in my life I might seriously think about retiring here. The weather is miserable for a few months per year, but that's why air conditioning exists.

TCB

"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:

>Man...I'd love to go to Thailand for a while. I could spend a lot of money

>that I'm not making because I'm on vacation and then worry the entire time

>because while I'm enjoying myself on vacation, the bills continue to roll in

>because they do not go on vacation and therefore I could spend my entire

>vacation worrying about spending money that I'm not making while I'm

>spending just as much money on bills that are not stopping.

>

>Self employment is sooo cool sometimes.

>

>;o)

>

>

>

>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message [news:45fb64e8\\$1@linux...](mailto:news:45fb64e8$1@linux...)

>>

>> Yeah, she sure sounds like an awful person, and your individual experience

>> matches up with what people write about her. Which has precisely zero

to

>> do with me, by the way.

>>

>> Good luck with the pups, the one (single, only, solitary) bad thing about

>> this trip is that I miss my four legged friend back home. But I'll be

>> seeing

>> him on Monday when a very jetlagged and probably slightly hungover TCB

>> will

>> be returning to Connecticut, which I hear is currently under six inches

of
>> snow.
>>
>> TCB
>>
>> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
>>>> And the O'Hare person. I never heard of her before you mentioned her

>>>> name
>>>> and for some reason because she was an awful person you think that
>>>> anyone
>>>> who has any of the same beliefs must also be awful and bitter and likely
>>>> to be murdered. That makes no sense.
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>Thad.....I met her on a few occasions back in the 70's when I was a
>>>student at University of Texas and afterward. I don't know if she was

>>>awful
>>
>>>because she was an atheist, or because she was an antheist who felt like
>> she
>>>was being oppressed by the religious right (and there isn't much of that
>> in
>>>Austin..it's always been a liberal minded place for the most
>>>part).....or because she was just mean.....but she was one of the

>>>most
>>
>>>singularly unpleasant people I've ever had the misfortune to meet, more
>>
>>>then once.....so from my perspective, this extreme unpleasantness

>>>seems
>>
>>>to have been consistent thing. I never said anything to provoke this
>>>person.
>>
>>>As for her being murdered, if one subscribes to the theory that people
>>>attract to themselves those who are of of like mind, then she certainly
>>
>>>could have found herself up to her neck in a swirling brew of negative
>>>personalities.
>>>
>>>Glad you're having good experiences in Thailand. It's springtime here,
>>
>>>skunk season has arrived, the hounds are estatic and I am a bit fatigued

>> due
>>>to having to do the "skunkcheck" for these guys prior to letting them
>>>outside at night when they alert that the property perimeters have been
>>
>>>violated by some creature that has come out of hibernation and is foraging
>>
>>>for food. Unsupervised boundary patrols by the dogs can be disastrous
at
>>
>>>this time of year.
>>>
>>>Now back to the search for giant, combative cephalopods.....
>>>
>>>;0)
>>>
>>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...
Posted by [TCB](#) on Sat, 17 Mar 2007 11:28:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man; she must be silent."

How's about THAT for some liberation!

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:

>

>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>>

>>I don't pick fights with Don anymore, but I will respond when I am haughtily
>>treated and mocked. I don't expect to change his mind, but it does chafe
>>my ass to be told that depression is a 'choice' by someone who clearly
doesn't

>>understand anything about it.

>

><http://www.depressionisachoice.com/>

>

>You may not agree, but it is you who is ignorant of this topic.

>

>

>>But I still find it to be a humanity

>>hating religion, particularly if one happens to be a woman or enjoys having

>>sex with members of one's own sex.

>
>These are lies. Paul was the great liberator of women, and
>while the Bible presents homosexual acts as sinful, it clearly
>expects the sinner to be respected as much as the porn addict,
>tax cheat, or infidel. Love the sinner, hate the sin. It's basic
>Christianity for everyone I know. And even hating the sin is not
>supposed to be a public act.
>
>You are welcome to you own opinion, bigoted as it may be,
>you are not welcome to your own facts.
>
>DC
>

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...
Posted by [TCB](#) on Sat, 17 Mar 2007 11:34:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I never let anyone dictate my reading lists, but I'll make you a trade. If you write me a two page book report proving you actually read the new Richard Dawkins book I'll read up to 500 pages of anything you tell me to and write one back.

BTW - to anyone who is reading this, you MUST read Charlie Wilson's War. Whether you a leftie or a rightie or a commie doesn't matter, it's one of those 'Truth is WAY stranger than fiction' books. As much as I think I know about American imperial ways I had _no idea_ just how deeply we were into Afghanistan by th end of that war. And our tax dollars literally paid for the same AKs and mortars and RPGs being used to blow NATO soldiers.

TCB

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:

>
>"Doug Wellington" <doug@parisfaqs.com> wrote:
>
>>Yes, it seems obvious that Don does not have first hand knowledge of the
>
>>subject.
>
>Wrong. You have no idea.
>
>
>>(Not that I would wish that for anyone...) And yet, shouldn't we
>>take this opportunity to treat him as the un-knowing child-like spirit
that
>

>>he is and to help him learn the truth?

>

>Doug.. really... You really have no clue here.

>

>Okay, both you and Thad need to read this book:

>

><http://www.depressionisachoice.com/>

>

>and the new one Brainswitch. She is getting quite startling

>results. It is something you both need to be aware of before

>you apply such silly little characterizations to anyone...

>

>Until you read it, the ignorance is not mine.

>

>

>>a chance exists that we can help Don understand that his opinion of his

>

>>perception of the one true reality might not be the same as yours or mine

>

>>is,

>

>Oh, that is a given here, and never in doubt. We will stipulate

>to different perceptions.

>

>

>

>>and to realize that each one is as valid as the other...)

>

>If this is true, then neither is valid, since there is no objective

>reality and both are therefore delusions.

>

>But, both are actually truth claims. As such, at least one is

>wrong. Thad certainly thinks mine is wrong. See, that is the

>thing about atheists. Many of them are diehard modernists

>and are quite certain that there is an objective reality and they

>know it, at least the part about a deity...

>Different realities, based upon subjective perception,

>is a postmodern conceit to them, as it is to me. Thad

>claims that there is no objective basis upon which to believe

>in God. You believe that there is no objectivity, other than

>one that we have no apparent access to. There really is no

>common ground here. It is quite best if we all talk about

>something else at this point.

>

>

>

>>DC wrote:

>>> These are lies. Paul was the great liberator of women,

>
>>Interesting that Mohammed was also considered the great liberator of women.
>
>Do you know the difference? Where did Mohammed say anything
>like this:
>
>Galatians 3:28
>There is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, male nor female, for
>you are all one in Christ Jesus.
>
>I can show you dozens or maybe even hundreds of texts
>denying this in the Koran.
>
>
>>> while the Bible presents homosexual acts as sinful, it clearly
>>> expects the sinner to be respected as much as the porn addict,
>>> tax cheat, or infidel.
>
>>Don, in my reading of your messages, it seems to me that you do not show
>
>>respect for Thad. Why the disconnect?
>
>He hates Christians. He derides us every chance he
>gets, and is functioning as an advocate for hate.
>
>Here's some quotes:
>-----
>I just despise closed minded holy roller US fuckheads that
>much more.
>
>P.S. While my hatred of the stateside twice born remains intact...
>-----
>
>There have been many more over the years. Now imagine,
>instead of the anti-Christian slurs, you insert the N-word
>or an anti-arab slur? Oh, this place would be up in arms...
>
>But it is perfectly OK to hate Christians?
>
>Bull. And I will stand in his face and tell him enough... If you
>call that lack of respect, then you don't get it.
>
>
>>> Love the sinner, hate the sin. It's basic Christianity for everyone
I
>
>>> know.
>>> And even hating the sin is not supposed to be a public act.

>
>>This makes me wonder even more about all of your public messages...why
do
>
>>you attack Thad so much? Are you not yet Christian enough to love him?
>
>I love him dearly actually. He reminds me of so many lost
>souls trying to comfort their shouting consciences with hate.
>
>He quite reminds me of myself at times, and worse he reminds
>me of my uncle-the-atheist on his deathbed dying of leukemia
>asking us for a reason to believe in God...
>
>(He found one, BTW)
>
>See, if I am wrong, I am just a silly cultist and you can all think
>I am stupid. I can live with that. Because if I am right, then we
>are living in the end times, and each of you will one day point
>a finger at me and scream "why didn't you TELL us?? You KNEW!!
>You knew, and you didn't tell us!" So, listen, or turn the page,
>but enough with the hate because of my faith in my Lord.
>It's pathetic and makes those who indulge in it look disturbed,
>and I will never back down in the face of this bigotry.
>The fact that some people are so offended that I care enough
>to tell them the truth, even if I am wrong, casts serious
>aspersions on their own beliefs and souls.
>
>If a Hindu said to you that through good living, we can come
>back as higher beings in the next life, and through an evil life
>we will come back as bugs, some would listen, some would not,
>but few would insult the Hindu for his beliefs. But Christians?
>Yeah we're just a bunch of fuckheads...
>
>Shame on you.
>
>DC
>
>

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [Doug Wellington](#) on Sat, 17 Mar 2007 17:58:42 GMT

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

TCB wrote:

> "I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man; she must
> be silent."

Sigh... The discovery of the Gospel of Mary Magdelene and the more recent discovery of the Gospel of Thomas have not been greeted with approval by many people because of the role that Mary played in Jesus' life. She was his primary disciple and the first person he appeared to after the resurrection...

It's interesting to make a comparison to Mohammed, his treatment of women, and the first people to embrace Islam. I may be a bit off, but I think I remember reading that 23 of the first 60 Muslims were female...

I believe that the teachings both of Jesus and of Mohammed have been twisted over the years to further a patriarchal agenda...

> How's about THAT for some liberation!

I was married in the Roman Catholic church. It was very interesting going through the pre-marriage program with them. While some of it was very informative and enlightening, I found the gender role expectations surprising. I'll dig up the actual quotes if necessary, but I found the whole concept that a girl grows up underneath the control of her father, and then transfers that control to her husband when she marries is abhorrent! And some of those "observations" were even spoken of during the marriage ceremony itself! (IIRC, most of it was quotes from Deuteronomy and Numbers.)

After I got divorced :(nine years later, I was involved with a woman who was an extremely devoted Baptist. We attended the "Newly Marrieds" group at Tucson Baptist Temple for the year I was with her. There were very defined expectations, both implicit and explicit, for her behavior.

[Side note: One of my favorite moments was on a night that I had a drinking binge with a buddy of mine. I came home ABSOLUTELY PLOWED, to find that the Newly Marrieds Pastor and his wife had come to call. Well, being me, I walked right up to him, shook his hand and overwhelmed him with the stench of my alcohol breath! They never came back for some reason. Could never understand why...]

It is possible to find good and bad in any of our religious texts if you try hard enough. I know some will disagree with me, but I believe that all of our religious texts, no matter what the inspiration, were still all written by human hands, with human frailties, desires and agendas. And all of those texts have been reinterpreted, reevaluated and reemphasized to further various causes over the years.

I believe the measure of someone's spiritual enlightenment comes from how much they are willing to embrace the good points of any and all faiths, instead of how successful they are at rationalizing, proving, and evangelizing their own...

Doug

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Sat, 17 Mar 2007 18:25:32 GMT

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

We agree. The single largest issue with religion as a whole is that man appointed himself to interpret and distribute the rules.

AA

"Doug Wellington" <doug@parisfaqs.com> wrote in message
news:45fc2c60@linux...

> TCB wrote:

>> "I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man; she

>> must

>> be silent."

>

> Sigh... The discovery of the Gospel of Mary Magdelene and the more recent

> discovery of the Gospel of Thomas have not been greeted with approval by

> many people because of the role that Mary played in Jesus' life. She was

> his primary disciple and the first person he appeared to after the

> resurrection...

>

> It's interesting to make a comparison to Mohammed, his treatment of women,

> and the first people to embrace Islam. I may be a bit off, but I think I

> remember reading that 23 of the first 60 Muslims were female...

>

> I believe that the teachings both of Jesus and of Mohammed have been

> twisted over the years to further a patriarchal agenda...

>

>> How's about THAT for some liberation!

>

> I was married in the Roman Catholic church. It was very interesting going

> through the pre-marriage program with them. While some of it was very

> informative and enlightening, I found the gender role expectations

> surprising. I'll dig up the actual quotes if necessary, but I found the

> whole concept that a girl grows up underneath the control of her father,

> and then transfers that control to her husband when she marries is

> abhorrent! And some of those "observations" were even spoken of during

> the marriage ceremony itself! (IIRC, most of it was quotes from

> Deuteronomy and Numbers.)

>

> After I got divorced :(nine years later, I was involved with a woman who

> was an extremely devoted Baptist. We attended the "Newly Marrieds" group

> at Tucson Baptist Temple for the year I was with her. There were very

> defined expectations, both implicit and explicit, for her behavior.
>
> [Side note: One of my favorite moments was on a night that I had a
> drinking binge with a buddy of mine. I came home ABSOLUTELY PLOWED, to
> find that the Newly Marrieds Pastor and his wife had come to call. Well,
> being me, I walked right up to him, shook his hand and overwhelmed him
> with the stench of my alcohol breath! They never came back for some
> reason. Could never understand why...]
>
> It is possible to find good and bad in any of our religious texts if you
> try hard enough. I know some will disagree with me, but I believe that
> all of our religious texts, no matter what the inspiration, were still all
> written by human hands, with human frailties, desires and agendas. And all
> of those texts have been reinterpreted, reevaluated and reemphasized to
> further various causes over the years.
>
> I believe the measure of someone's spiritual enlightenment comes from how
> much they are willing to embrace the good points of any and all faiths,
> instead of how successful they are at rationalizing, proving, and
> evangelizing their own...
>
> Doug

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Sat, 17 Mar 2007 20:58:03 GMT

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

There were two issues in play in terms of women in the church in the 1st century. One of them was justice, one of them was decorum. In early churches, women, understanding that they really were equal in the eyes of God, felt free to speak up in church and participate.

One problem, the only women who did that in their culture were prostitutes. This became a stumbling block for new believers and non-believers attending for the first time.

Paul told the women of his time to be silent in church in the name of saving souls, a higher goal even than equality. He gave similar advice to slaves to not rebel as you may know.

Social change is always to be less valued than salvation, that is if you are a Christian. Nonetheless, he laid down the operating principle of social justice in Galatians 3:28:

There is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, male nor female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus.

The advice to women to not speak in church was specific advice to a 1st century middle-eastern culture, while Galatians 3 is the principle that is timeless.

It is clear God intends equality in these times when you simply read Acts 2.

I will pour out my Spirit on all people.
Your sons and daughters will prophesy,
your young men will see visions,
your old men will dream dreams.
Even on my servants, both men and women,
I will pour out my Spirit in those days,
and they will prophesy.

And of course the leading abolitionists were Christians too.

DC

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>

>"I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man; she must
>be silent."

>

>How's about THAT for some liberation!

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Sat, 17 Mar 2007 21:02:54 GMT

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

Funny that. No one dictates your reading list? Ok, mine neither...

I have no confidence that you have any interest here in anything other than denigrating Christians. I think it makes you feel better. This is why you are in danger of ending up like O'Hair. Hopefully not murdered, but bitter and proud of your hate.

I'm pretty familiar with Dawkins mein kampf. Frankly, he and Sam Harris and the rest are embarrassing the crap out of most scientists who want no more of their religion than they want of mine.

DC

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>
>I never let anyone dictate my reading lists, but I'll make you a trade.
If
>you write me a two page book report proving you actually read the new Richard
>Dawkins book I'll read up to 500 pages of anything you tell me to and write
>one back.
>
>BTW - to anyone who is reading this, you MUST read Charlie Wilson's War.
>Whether you a leftie or a rightie or a commie doesn't matter, it's one of
>those 'Truth is WAY stranger than fiction' books. As much as I think I know
>about American imperial ways I had _no idea_ just how deeply we were into
>Afghanistan by the end of that war. And our tax dollars literally paid for
>the same AKs and mortars and RPGs being used to blow NATO soldiers.
>
>TCB
>
>"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:
>>
>>"Doug Wellington" <doug@parisfaqs.com> wrote:
>>
>>>Yes, it seems obvious that Don does not have first hand knowledge of the
>>
>>>subject.
>>
>>Wrong. You have no idea.
>>
>>
>>>(Not that I would wish that for anyone...) And yet, shouldn't we
>>>take this opportunity to treat him as the un-knowing child-like spirit
>that
>>
>>>he is and to help him learn the truth?
>>
>>Doug.. really... You really have no clue here.
>>
>>Okay, both you and Thad need to read this book:
>>
>><http://www.depressionisachoice.com/>
>>
>>and the new one Brainswitch. She is getting quite startling
>>results. It is something you both need to be aware of before
>>you apply such silly little characterizations to anyone...
>>
>>Until you read it, the ignorance is not mine.
>>
>>
>>>a chance exists that we can help Don understand that his opinion of his
>>

>>>perception of the one true reality might not be the same as yours or mine
>>
>>>is,
>>
>>Oh, that is a given here, and never in doubt. We will stipulate
>>to different perceptions.
>>
>>
>>
>>>and to realize that each one is as valid as the other...)
>>
>>If this is true, then neither is valid, since there is no objective
>>reality and both are therefore delusions.
>>
>>But, both are actually truth claims. As such, at least one is
>>wrong. Thad certainly thinks mine is wrong. See, that is the
>>thing about atheists. Many of them are diehard modernists
>>and are quite certain that there is an objective reality and they
>>know it, at least the part about a deity...
>>Different realities, based upon subjective perception,
>>is a postmodern conceit to them, as it is to me. Thad
>>claims that there is no objective basis upon which to believe
>>in God. You believe that there is no objectivity, other than
>>one that we have no apparent access to. There really is no
>>common ground here. It is quite best if we all talk about
>>something else at this point.
>>
>>
>>
>>>DC wrote:
>>>> These are lies. Paul was the great liberator of women,
>>
>>>Interesting that Mohammed was also considered the great liberator of women.
>>
>>Do you know the difference? Where did Mohammed say anything
>>like this:
>>
>>Galatians 3:28
>>There is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, male nor female, for
>>you are all one in Christ Jesus.
>>
>>I can show you dozens or maybe even hundreds of texts
>>denying this in the Koran.
>>
>>
>>>> while the Bible presents homosexual acts as sinful, it clearly
>>>> expects the sinner to be respected as much as the porn addict,
>>>> tax cheat, or infidel.

>>
>>>Don, in my reading of your messages, it seems to me that you do not show
>>
>>>respect for Thad. Why the disconnect?
>>
>>He hates Christians. He derides us every chance he
>>gets, and is functioning as an advocate for hate.
>>
>>Here's some quotes:
>>-----
>>I just despise closed minded holy roller US fuckheads that
>>much more.
>>
>>P.S. While my hatred of the stateside twice born remains intact...
>>-----
>>
>>There have been many more over the years. Now imagine,
>>instead of the anti-Christian slurs, you insert the N-word
>>or an anti-arab slur? Oh, this place would be up in arms...
>>
>>But it is perfectly OK to hate Christians?
>>
>>Bull. And I will stand in his face and tell him enough... If you
>>call that lack of respect, then you don't get it.
>>
>>
>>>> Love the sinner, hate the sin. It's basic Christianity for everyone
>I
>>
>>>> know.
>>>> And even hating the sin is not supposed to be a public act.
>>
>>>This makes me wonder even more about all of your public messages...why
>do
>>
>>>you attack Thad so much? Are you not yet Christian enough to love him?
>>
>>I love him dearly actually. He reminds me of so many lost
>>souls trying to comfort their shouting consciences with hate.
>>
>>He quite reminds me of myself at times, and worse he reminds
>>me of my uncle-the-atheist on his deathbed dying of leukemia
>>asking us for a reason to believe in God...
>>
>>(He found one, BTW)
>>
>>See, if I am wrong, I am just a silly cultist and you can all think
>>I am stupid. I can live with that. Because if I am right, then we

>>are living in the end times, and each of you will one day point
>>a finger at me and scream "why didn't you TELL us?? You KNEW!!
>>You knew, and you didn't tell us!" So, listen, or turn the page,
>>but enough with the hate because of my faith in my Lord.
>>It's pathetic and makes those who indulge in it look disturbed,
>>and I will never back down in the face of this bigotry.
>>The fact that some people are so offended that I care enough
>>to tell them the truth, even if I am wrong, casts serious
>>aspersions on their own beliefs and souls.
>>
>>If a Hindu said to you that through good living, we can come
>>back as higher beings in the next life, and through an evil life
>>we will come back as bugs, some would listen, some would not,
>>but few would insult the Hindu for his beliefs. But Christians?
>>Yeah we're just a bunch of fuckheads...
>>
>>Shame on you.
>>
>>DC
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...
Posted by [Neil](#) on Sat, 17 Mar 2007 21:04:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote:
>We agree. The single largest issue with religion as a whole is that man

>appointed himself to interpret and distribute the rules.

Well, since God hasn't actually shown up to do it...

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Sat, 17 Mar 2007 21:12:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Doug Wellington <doug@parisfaqs.com> wrote:

>I believe the measure of someone's spiritual enlightenment comes from
>how much they are willing to embrace the good points of any and all
>faiths, instead of how successful they are at rationalizing, proving,
>and evangelizing their own...

>
>Doug

And I hope that works for you. It is, of course, all purely human "creative activity". We have a name for that. Heresy.

The good news is that we are to love you, not persecute you for it.

DC

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Sat, 17 Mar 2007 21:15:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Neil" <OIUIOU@OIU.com> wrote:

>>We agree. The single largest issue with religion as a whole is that man
>
>>appointed himself to interpret and distribute the rules.

>Well, since God hasn't actually shown up to do it...

Actually he did:

Matthew 22.

"Teacher, which is the greatest commandment in the Law?"
Jesus replied: " 'Love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your mind.'
This is the first and greatest commandment.
And the second is like it: 'Love your neighbor as yourself.'
All the Law and the Prophets hang on these two commandments."

Pretty clear if you ask me.

DC

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...
Posted by [Doug Wellington](#) on Sun, 18 Mar 2007 10:24:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:

> And I hope that works for you. It is, of course, all purely
> human "creative activity". We have a name for that. Heresy.

Heresy - "theological or religious opinion or doctrine maintained in opposition, or held to be contrary, to the Roman Catholic or Orthodox doctrine of the Christian Church" -OED
(Compare and contrast to "Apostasy"...)

"given wide currency by Irenaeus in his tract Contra Haereses (Against Heresies) to describe and discredit his opponents in the early Christian Church."
(See just about any discussion of the first 400 years of Christianity, especially the struggle between the Gnostics and the Orthodoxy for control of the church. For extra credit, discuss why Irenaeus chose the particular set of writings he did to create the New Testament. Bonus question: when did the church vote to finally fix the selection of writings included in the Bible? See "Council of Trent". How did this list compare to the contents of Jerome's "Vulgate" Bible?)

"the term "heresy" has no purely objective meaning: the category exists only from the point of view of speakers within a group that has previously agreed about what counts as "orthodox"."

So, Don, are labeling me a heretic? [SHRUG] Seems accurate enough if we're going by the definition above. (BTW, are you Roman Catholic? If not, it would seem that you're a heretic too...) Joan of Arc, Copernicus, da Vinci, Newton, Einstein and many others were considered heretics. Not a bad crowd to be associated with IMHO... Hmmm, wasn't even Meister Eckhart on the verge of being tried for heresy (because he dared preach not in Latin, but in the local language that the flock could understand) by John XXII before God conveniently called him home?

Indeed, a majority of the world can not be considered to be Roman Catholic (since all Christians make up somewhere around 1/3 of the total earth's population and Roman Catholicism is a subset of all Christianity), so it would seem to me that there are a lot of heretics out there. Interesting to note is that as a pure percentage of total world population, Christianity is on the slow decline and Islam is on the rise, with Islam expected to take over as the dominant religion of the world sometime later this century...

> The good news is that we are to love you, not persecute you
> for it.

All I can say is: Praise God, you're not one of the "domini canes"!

Ladies and Gentlemen, the defense rests...

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Sun, 18 Mar 2007 17:54:09 GMT

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

"Doug Wellington" <doug@parisfaqs.com> wrote:

>Heresy - "theological or religious opinion or doctrine maintained in opposition,
>or held to be contrary, to the Roman Catholic or Orthodox doctrine of the
>Christian Church" -OED

This is only one definition. In the larger sense heresy is the deliberate holding and disseminating of false doctrine. If Jesus was who he said he was, then you deciding to take beliefs from any tradition you wish and accord them the value you feel to be correct, is heresy, because in doing so, you accord human opinions a higher place than his.

It's all dependent on your assumptions.

Ironically, there is plenty of evidence that non-christians can be saved. I do not believe any person who seeks God will be turned away. That does not make God poetry or human myth making, it is simply acknowledging the presence of the Holy Spirit in all human souls. It also does not make all belief equal (and therefore equally worthless ultimately).

So, I will not condemn you, nor even Thad, despite the fact that I confront your beliefs and question them. Your salvation is between you and God.

Man looks on the outward appearance, God looks on the heart.

But man was created, there is sin, there is a plan of salvation, and Jesus is exactly who he said he is. There is no other tradition that offers this, and the evidence is clear, both in history and in human hearts, that there was, and is, a Jesus.

So, when I say I hope it works out for you. I mean it.

best,

DC

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [Doug Wellington](#) on Sun, 18 Mar 2007 21:06:11 GMT

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

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:

> This is only one definition. In the larger sense heresy is

> the deliberate holding and disseminating of false doctrine.

Which of us gets to determine what is false? Irenaeus? Constantine? St. Dominic? The Pope? Opus Dei? The Moody Bible Institute? Josh McDowell? Willard? You?

> If Jesus was who he said he was

I'll refer you back to my previous message asking several questions about that. If he was not, then you have set up a straw man and have no real basis for your arguments. Will you answer the simple question: What if Jesus was not who you say he said he was? Or is that unthinkable?

> It's all dependent on your assumptions.

Again we agree.

> Ironically, there is plenty of evidence that non-christians
> can be saved.

[SHRUG] There are many roads to the top of the mountain...

> So, I will not condemn you,

I find it interesting that you presume to have such authority...

> But man was created, there is sin, there is a plan of
> salvation, and Jesus is exactly who he said he is.

To quote someone I respect:
"It's all dependent on your assumptions."

> There is no other tradition that offers this, and the
> evidence is clear, both in history and in human hearts,
> that there was, and is, a Jesus.

I'm not so sure of that clarity you claim. Will you clear up the Synoptic Problem for me? Or do you deny that the problem exists?

Doug

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Sun, 18 Mar 2007 21:27:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Doug Wellington" <doug@parisfaqs.com> wrote:

>Which of us gets to determine what is false? Irenaeus? Constantine? St.
>Dominic? The Pope? Opus Dei? The Moody Bible Institute? Josh McDowell?
> Willard? You?

Jesus. Unless of course, you think all sources are equal, or the truth cannot be known. Both, of course, rest on the assumption of atheism.

However, if you consider that Jesus was who he said he was, than those who have provided the gospel canon to us, and rejected some of the other writings, may have done so for a good reason.

What are your assumptions?

>Will you answer the simple question: What if Jesus
>was not who you say he said he was? Or is that unthinkable?

How would you determine this?

>I find it interesting that you presume to have such authority...

I don't! That is my point in withholding condemnation.
That does not mean that authority does not exist.

>> There is no other tradition that offers this, and the
>> evidence is clear, both in history and in human hearts,
>> that there was, and is, a Jesus.

>I'm not so sure of that clarity you claim. Will you clear up the Synoptic
>Problem for me? Or do you deny that the problem exists?

Not enough time. I can refer you to some other readings later if you like.

DC

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Ok, the synoptic problem.

There has been much scholarly debate about the similarities of Matthew and Luke to Mark, and the suggestion has been that the others were therefore copied.

This is a problem for the verbal-inspiration folks because they believe that each word was dictated by God and is infallible and original.

I am a thought-inspiration guy and I think it is clear that the words are the words of men. Hence, it is all very interesting to me, but the important thing is not the borrowing, if it happened, but rather the unity and quality of the message.

Should you try to assert that this apparent borrowing supports some sort of fraud, I would ask what the payoff was, since the disciples clearly believed what they said, to the extent of dying horrible deaths, and never recanting their beliefs. They lived lives of dedication and faith, spreading Christianity all over the known world with no payoff other than saved humans.

it is clear that they believed what they preached, and they were there to witness it.

So, the synoptic problem, and the existence or non-existence of Q, are interesting, but unrelated to the reality of Jesus.

Lee Strobel has some terrific videos on the issue of the Bible's credibility. Here's one:

<http://www.leestrobel.com/videos/Bible/strobelT1041.htm>

Watch as many of these as you have time for.

<http://www.leestrobel.com/Bible.htm>

Your perspective is, of course, as threatened by mine by the current war on faith. Actually yours is more threatened because you cannot base your views on anything other than personal need and choice. The Bible calls this building your house upon the sand.

Here's something I wrote on the coming war on faith:

DC

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [Doug Wellington](#) on Mon, 19 Mar 2007 05:51:04 GMT

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

DC wrote:

> "Doug Wellington" <doug@parisfaqs.com> wrote:

>> Which of us gets to determine what is false? Irenaeus? Constantine? St.

>> Dominic? The Pope? Opus Dei? The Moody Bible Institute? Josh McDowell?

>> Willard? You?

>

> Jesus.

So you're basing everything on a self-referential structure? ("Jesus said that he was Jesus.") Isn't that the same as saying the Flying Spaghetti Monster said he was the Flying Spaghetti Monster? (See <http://www.venganza.org>) Seems to me that using that kind of self-referential argument "is irrational and allows you to say things that make no sense", to selectively quote... ;-)

How do we truly know what Jesus said? Aren't we back to the question of inerrancy of scripture? How can we prove the accuracy of any quotes from Jesus in the Gospels when the first of the canonical Gospels wasn't even written until at least 50 CE, and more likely somewhere around 70 CE? And of the four gospels, why is it that only John asserts that Jesus is God? (Refer back to a previous message when I wondered how the church would have been different if the Gospel of Thomas had been chosen by Irenaeus instead of the Gospel of John. But of course he couldn't do that; he was a fine upstanding member of the Orthodoxy.) Interestingly, John was the last of the four Gospels, having been most likely completed somewhere after 90 CE. The Rylands Papyrus, which is the earliest actual fragment of the John manuscript, dates from about 125 CE. (BTW, please use "AD" if the more scholarly "CE" offends you.)

> Unless of course, you think all sources are equal, or
> the truth cannot be known.

I don't believe all sources are equal, but again, who is to determine which source is true or false? When you tell me that Jesus said that he was Jesus, am I to infer that you are the arbiter of that truth?

> Both, of course, rest on the assumption of atheism.

Are you claiming that all non-Christians are atheists? There are at least three major religious groups that profess belief in the God of Abraham, yet not all of them agree on the role of Jesus.

NOTE: If you substitute the word agnosticism for atheism in that sentence, then there is a possibility that we may be able to agree.

> However, if you consider that Jesus was who he said he was,

Again, how do we truly know who Jesus said he was? Can you prove inerrancy of scripture content and source?

> than those who have provided the gospel canon to us, and
> rejected some of the other writings, may have done so for
> a good reason.

Absolutely. My belief is that that good reason was and is to control the masses and indeed, keep them from true enlightenment, since enlightened individuals rarely make for an orderly society.

> What are your assumptions?

(Since you asked...) :-) I believe I have articulated many of my assumptions through my questions, but adding to the previous paragraph, and to put it in the proverbial nutshell, I am not an atheist, I do not believe in the inerrancy of scripture, I believe that both canonical and apochryphal writings have been chosen and modified knowingly and unknowingly by humans over the centuries for various reasons and agendas, and any cries of heresy are purely protectionist strategies. I assume that the importance of the Bible is primarily allegorical and I do not take the resurrection to be a literal event. How's that for a start?

>> Will you answer the simple question: What if Jesus
>> was not who you say he said he was? Or is that unthinkable?
>
> How would you determine this?

BINGO! :-) Isn't this the crux of the entire conversation? How can you/anyone presume to tell me/us that "you" are right and "we" are wrong without providing a way to determine this?

>> I'm not so sure of that clarity you claim. Will you clear up the Synoptic
>> Problem for me? Or do you deny that the problem exists?
>
> Not enough time. I can refer you to some other readings
> later if you like.

Not enough time? Same reason you haven't answered the vast majority of

my other questions? You seem quite willing to take the time to further your own agenda, imply that I am a heretic and directly accuse Thad of being a bigot, but when I ask for justification you don't have enough time? Can you not "respond to a point I have made"?

BTW, do I need to state what I consider to be the obvious? That I have already indulged in many of those readings? (Or would that be considered a "credential-comparison" or "establishment of authority"?)

Doug

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [Doug Wellington](#) on Mon, 19 Mar 2007 16:52:37 GMT

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

vlad wrote:

> for some time now i've suspected Satan lives in my third paris in/out card

Hey, can I come over and record some death metal?

Doug (uplifting and inspiring...!)

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [vlad](#) on Mon, 19 Mar 2007 17:44:45 GMT

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

hmmm

for some time now i've suspected Satan lives in my third paris in/out card

vlad

"Doug Wellington" <doug@parisfaqs.com> wrote:

>

>"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:

>> This is only one definition. In the larger sense heresy is

>> the deliberate holding and disseminating of false doctrine.

>

>Which of us gets to determine what is false? Irenaeus? Constantine? St.

>Dominic? The Pope? Opus Dei? The Moody Bible Institute? Josh McDowell?

> Willard? You?

>

>> If Jesus was who he said he was
>
>I'll refer you back to my previous message asking several questions about
>that. If he was not, then you have set up a straw man and have no real
basis
>for your arguments. Will you answer the simple question: What if Jesus
>was not who you say he said he was? Or is that unthinkable?
>
>> It's all dependent on your assumptions.
>
>Again we agree.
>
>> Ironically, there is plenty of evidence that non-christians
>> can be saved.
>
>[SHRUG] There are many roads to the top of the mountain...
>
>> So, I will not condemn you,
>
>I find it interesting that you presume to have such authority...
>
>> But man was created, there is sin, there is a plan of
>> salvation, and Jesus is exactly who he said he is.
>
>To quote someone I respect:
>"It's all dependent on your assumptions."
>
>> There is no other tradition that offers this, and the
>> evidence is clear, both in history and in human hearts,
>> that there was, and is, a Jesus.
>
>I'm not so sure of that clarity you claim. Will you clear up the Synoptic
>Problem for me? Or do you deny that the problem exists?
>
>Doug

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...
Posted by [Doug Wellington](#) on Mon, 19 Mar 2007 17:49:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

DC wrote:
> Ok, the synoptic problem.
>
> There has been much scholarly debate about the similarities
> of Matthew and Luke to Mark, and the suggestion has been
> that the others were therefore copied.
>

- > This is a problem for the verbal-inspiration folks because
- > they believe that each word was dictated by God and is
- > infallible and original.

So, you're dismissing the "problem" as something that doesn't concern you? Is it irrational? Does it not make sense? Is it a non-concern to all Christians? Should it be? Do you consider verbal-inspiration folks to be missing something? Can they be considered Christians? (In the C.S. Lewis sense of the word...)

- > I am a thought-inspiration guy and I think it is clear that the
- > words are the words of men.

Do we agree that the bible is full of the "words of men" then? This would seem to be at odds with the attitudes of many Christians. For example:

http://www.bible-infonet.org/bin/short_articles/Bible/Verbal .htm

Asking as a non-believer, which of you Christians should I listen to? Which of you is right? How do I determine that?

- > Hence, it is all very interesting
- > to me, but the important thing is not the borrowing, if it
- > happened, but rather the unity and quality of the message.

It seems to me that many different religions can be thought of to have a "unity and quality of the message". I don't see any religion as having a right of exclusive use on that concept... ("...hello? US Patent and Trade Mark office?")

- > Should you try to assert that this apparent borrowing supports
- > some sort of fraud,

I personally wouldn't use the word fraud. For me, it is merely a question of certainty. If I can't be certain about one part of the Bible, can I be certain about another? (These are "unity and quality" issues of course...)

- > it is clear that they believed what they preached, and they were
- > there to witness it.

The same can be said of the Jews, the Muslims, Mormons, Buddhists, and Hindus, right?

- > So, the synoptic problem, and the existence or non-existence
- > of Q, are interesting, but unrelated to the reality of Jesus.

From a philosophical point of view, I would say that you are absolutely correct. I might be so bold as to make the conjecture that the existence or non-existence of the entire Bible is interesting but possibly unrelated to the reality of Jesus...

> Lee Strobel has some terrific videos on the issue of the
> Bible's credibility. Here's one:
>
> <http://www.leestrobel.com/videos/Bible/strobelT1041.htm>

Interesting. Short, sweet, touches on all the things that many people WANT to believe. "Do you know of any other book that matches the credentials of the Bible?" [SHRUG] In a word, yes... To pick one example, we know way more about authorship of the Quran than we do about authorship of the books of the Bible. ...but wait, I thought we weren't going to compare credentials?

I've watched a few of those videos - I particularly like Ben Witherington's assertions about myth. He seems to have not heard of Osiris for example...

I continue to think that it is a self-referential issue. Jesus said he was Jesus, so therefore Christianity is the only path?

> Your perspective is, of course, as threatened by mine by the
> current war on faith. Actually yours is more threatened
> because you cannot base your views on anything other than
> personal need and choice.

Sorry, I couldn't follow you there... Are you suggesting that I should feel threatened? (By credentials? Authority? Moral superiority? By the people with "Resurrection Celebration" stickers on their cars? By people with hijacked Pagan geometry Jesus fish stickers? By the "liberal media"?) Seems to me that the faithful are the ones who feel threatened. Or is it the authorities that want you to be faithful that feel threatened? (Ever listen to Burns and Schreiber? "God needs your financial help in the struggle against the atheistic, communistic conspiracy! Send your dollars to Kill a Commie for Christ...")

Aren't all religious decisions based upon personal need and choice?

Doug

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Mon, 19 Mar 2007 18:13:24 GMT

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

After reading this entire inspirational discourse by you guys I have decided that I have no real choice other than to become a nun.

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.org> wrote in message news:45fe0308\$1@linux...

>
> Ok, the synoptic problem.
>
> There has been much scholarly debate about the similarities
> of Matthew and Luke to Mark, and the suggestion has been
> that the others were therefore copied.
>
> This is a problem for the verbal-inspiration folks because
> they believe that each word was dictated by God and is
> infallible and original.
>
> I am a thought-inspiration guy and I think it is clear that the
> words are the words of men. Hence, it is all very interesting
> to me, but the important thing is not the borrowing, if it
> happened, but rather the unity and quality of the mesaage.
>
> Should you try to assert that this apparent borrowing supports
> some sort of fraud, I would ask what the payoff was, since
> the disciples clearly believed what they said, to the extent of
> dying horrible deaths, and never recanting their beliefs. They
> lived lives of dedication and faith, spreading Christianity all over
> the known world with no payoff other than saved humans.
>
> it is clear that they believed what they preached, and they were
> there to witness it.
>
> So, the synoptic problem, and the existence or non-existence
> of Q, are interesting, but unrelated to the reality of Jesus.
>
> Lee Strobel has some terrific videos on the issue of the
> Bible's credibility. Here's one:
>
> <http://www.leestrobel.com/videos/Bible/strobelT1041.htm>
>
> Watch as many of these as you have time for.
>
> <http://www.leestrobel.com/Bible.htm>
>
>
> Your perspective is, of course, as threatened by mine by the
> current war on faith. Actually yours is more threatened
> because you cannot base your views on anything other than
> personal need and choice. The Bible calls this building your
> house upon the sand.

>
> Here's something I wrote on the coming war on faith:
>
> [http://doncicchetti.blogspot.com/2006/11/assault-on-faith.ht ml](http://doncicchetti.blogspot.com/2006/11/assault-on-faith.html)
>
>
> DC
>
>

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [rick](#) on Mon, 19 Mar 2007 18:29:35 GMT

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

i don't know about you but i'm having a slight problem with "sister
deej" or "sister simplicity". how does amy feel about you becoming a
nun?

On Mon, 19 Mar 2007 12:13:24 -0600, "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com>
wrote:

>After reading this entire inspirational discourse by you guys I have decided
>that I have no real choice other than to become a nun.
>
>"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.org> wrote in message [news:45fe0308\\$1@linux...](mailto:news:45fe0308$1@linux...)
>>
>> Ok, the synoptic problem.
>>
>> There has been much scholarly debate about the similarities
>> of Matthew and Luke to Mark, and the suggestion has been
>> that the others were therefore copied.
>>
>> This is a problem for the verbal-inspiration folks because
>> they believe that each word was dictated by God and is
>> infallible and original.
>>
>> I am a thought-inspiration guy and I think it is clear that the
>> words are the words of men. Hence, it is all very interesting
>> to me, but the important thing is not the borrowing, if it
>> happened, but rather the unity and quality of the mesaage.
>>
>> Should you try to assert that this apparent borrowing supports
>> some sort of fraud, I would ask what the payoff was, since
>> the disciples clearly believed what they said, to the extent of
>> dying horrible deaths, and never recanting their beliefs. They

>> lived lives of dedication and faith, spreading Christianity all over
>> the known world with no payoff other than saved humans.
>>
>> it is clear that they believed what they preached, and they were
>> there to witness it.
>>
>> So, the synoptic problem, and the existence or non-existence
>> of Q, are interesting, but unrelated to the reality of Jesus.
>>
>> Lee Strobel has some terrific videos on the issue of the
>> Bible's credibility. Here's one:
>>
>> <http://www.leestrobel.com/videos/Bible/strobelT1041.htm>
>>
>> Watch as many of these as you have time for.
>>
>> <http://www.leestrobel.com/Bible.htm>
>>
>>
>> Your perspective is, of course, as threatened by mine by the
>> current war on faith. Actually yours is more threatened
>> because you cannot base your views on anything other than
>> personal need and choice. The Bible calls this building your
>> house upon the sand.
>>
>> Here's something I wrote on the coming war on faith:
>>
>> [http://doncicchetti.blogspot.com/2006/11/assault-on-faith.ht ml](http://doncicchetti.blogspot.com/2006/11/assault-on-faith.html)
>>
>>
>> DC
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...
Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Mon, 19 Mar 2007 18:40:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

.....not sure yet. I think if I'm going to dress in drag though, the nun
thing would be preferable to an Anna Nicole
impersonation.....hey!!!...wait!!!!.....I could do an Anna Nicole
"dressed as a nun" impersonation and put those Judy Garland impersonators
out of business. I need the money.

"rick" <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:7iltv2d5llpldnfl6a4a0rp9mn4hsegpkp@4ax.com...

>

> i don't know about you but i'm having a slight problem with "sister
> deej" or "sister simplicity". how does amy feel about you becoming a
> nun?

>

>

>

> On Mon, 19 Mar 2007 12:13:24 -0600, "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com>
> wrote:

>

>>After reading this entire inspirational discourse by you guys I have
>>decided

>>that I have no real choice other than to become a nun.

>>

>>"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.org> wrote in message news:45fe0308\$1@linux...

>>>

>>> Ok, the synoptic problem.

>>>

>>> There has been much scholarly debate about the similarities
>>> of Matthew and Luke to Mark, and the suggestion has been
>>> that the others were therefore copied.

>>>

>>> This is a problem for the verbal-inspiration folks because
>>> they believe that each word was dictated by God and is
>>> infallible and original.

>>>

>>> I am a thought-inspiration guy and I think it is clear that the
>>> words are the words of men. Hence, it is all very interesting
>>> to me, but the important thing is not the borrowing, if it
>>> happened, but rather the unity and quality of the mesaage.

>>>

>>> Should you try to assert that this apparent borrowing supports
>>> some sort of fraud, I would ask what the payoff was, since
>>> the disciples clearly believed what they said, to the extent of
>>> dying horrible deaths, and never recanting their beliefs. They
>>> lived lives of dedication and faith, spreading Christianity all over
>>> the known world with no payoff other than saved humans.

>>>

>>> it is clear that they believed what they preached, and they were
>>> there to witness it.

>>>

>>> So, the synoptic problem, and the existence or non-existence
>>> of Q, are interesting, but unrelated to the reality of Jesus.

>>>

>>> Lee Strobel has some terrific videos on the issue of the
>>> Bible's credibility. Here's one:

>>>
>>> <http://www.leestrobels.com/videos/Bible/strobelT1041.htm>
>>>
>>> Watch as many of these as you have time for.
>>>
>>> <http://www.leestrobels.com/Bible.htm>
>>>
>>>
>>> Your perspective is, of course, as threatened by mine by the
>>> current war on faith. Actually yours is more threatened
>>> because you cannot base your views on anything other than
>>> personal need and choice. The Bible calls this building your
>>> house upon the sand.
>>>
>>> Here's something I wrote on the coming war on faith:
>>>
>>> <http://doncicchetti.blogspot.com/2006/11/assault-on-faith.html>
>>>
>>>
>>> DC
>>>
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...
Posted by [DC](#) on Mon, 19 Mar 2007 19:22:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Doug Wellington <doug@parisfaqs.com> wrote:

>So you're basing everything on a self-referential structure?

Whoops! Selective quoting again... Follow the whole line of reasoning please. This is a straw man.

Let me ask you a question that will resolve this for you:

Do you believe that the issues you mention show that Jesus was not a real person, and was certainly not the Son of God?

If so, then you have your answer. If not, why are you raising them?

>And of the four gospels, why is it that only John asserts that

>Jesus is God?

Do you doubt this? Why or why not? If you doubt it, how does your definition of "evidence" influence your decision?

>(Refer back to a previous message when I wondered how the
>church would have been different if the Gospel of Thomas had been chosen

>by Irenaeus instead of the Gospel of John. But of course he couldn't do

>that; he was a fine upstanding member of the Orthodoxy.)

And of course, we all know that the church is simply based upon human wishful thinking and the views of those closest to the time of Jesus, and their judgements about the canon, are much easier to critique and revise today, almost 2000 years later, right?

>(BTW,
>please use "AD" if the more scholarly "CE" offends you.)

That's hilarious... Your atheist assumptions are as clear as can be aren't they? Any view of history that includes Christ as a reality, is not scholarly.... ok Doug.

>Are you claiming that all non-Christians are atheists? There are at
>least three major religious groups that profess belief in the God of
>Abraham, yet not all of them agree on the role of Jesus.

Of course, the opposite of atheist is not Christian, it is theist...

Looks like you have a few more on the other side than you thought.

>NOTE: If you substitute the word agnosticism for atheism in that
>sentence, then there is a possibility that we may be able to agree.

Well, as soon as you determine what constitutes proof. The belief that only the natural world, as we understand it, is real, is not agnostic, it is atheist. It is an act of faith that "science" as we know it, can explain everything. I am certain that our definition of the natural is entirely too small, and if so, as Clarke said:

"Any sufficiently advanced technology is indistinguishable from magic"

So, of naturalism cannot explain everything, don't you think that would impact your definition of proof?

Which is it? How do you differentiate between atheism and agnosticism?

>> than those who have provided the gospel canon to us, and
>> rejected some of the other writings, may have done so for
>> a good reason.

>Absolutely. My belief is that that good reason was and is to control
>the masses and indeed, keep them from true enlightenment, since
>enlightened individuals rarely make for an orderly society.

And so, there it is. Christianity is the opiate of the masses.
Ok, well. I certainly see where you are coming from.

Define enlightened.

>> What are your assumptions?

>(Since you asked...) :-) I believe I have articulated many of my
>assumptions through my questions, but adding to the previous paragraph,

>and to put it in the proverbial nutshell, I am not an atheist, I do not

>believe in the inerrancy of scripture, I believe that both canonical and

>apochryphal writings have been chosen and modified knowingly and
>unknowingly by humans over the centuries for various reasons and
>agendas, and any cries of heresy are purely protectionist strategies. I

>assume that the importance of the Bible is primarily allegorical and I
>do not take the resurrection to be a literal event. How's that for a start?

That's a good start. And I much appreciate your honesty.

Being a non-atheist, would you say that you are a theist of any kind? What sort?

If not, then we have a divide we cannot bridge easily.

If it is impossible, and I believe it is, for any version of

Darwinism to explain life and the universe, then what is your alternative? If, on the other hand, you believe that as the atheists do, that science (meaning naturalism) is adequate to explain it all, then of what use is agnosticism?

>*BINGO!* :-) Isn't this the crux of the entire conversation? How can

>you/anyone presume to tell me/us that "you" are right and "we" are wrong

>without providing a way to determine this?

There are many ways. The Bible says:

1 Corinthians 2:14

The man without the Spirit does not accept the things that come from the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness to him, and he cannot understand them, because they are spiritually discerned.

Now, there are reams of objective reasons for believing in God. But if you deny theism, you will always find a way to deny the reasons as well. One cannot find God with the maps of an atheist. You have to desire to know God first.

I spent years with doubt about all this. My temptations were never drugs and drink and a lot of the other stuff we get involved with. My temptation was, and it took a while to realize this, atheism. There are times I hate Christians more than Thad does, because I expect them to live up to their beliefs and they often do not. Nor do I, yet I know God has saved my very life on several occasions. I studied all this stuff for a long time, and I know, that while there are, and there will be many more, examples of proof and evidence, the best you can do with atheist assumptions is a draw, and only then after a long, long debate, as you know. And it is that knowledge, that Christians do have substantive reasons for our faith, and 2 more things that allowed me to put this issue to bed.

The first was the day I realized, from years of study and reading, that Darwinism is garbage. It is the last of the 19th-century mystery religions.

Darwin said: "If it can be shown that the cell is more complex than I had thought, than absolutely, my theory would totally fall apart"

Well, it's thousands of times more complex than he thought, and his theory is still around isn't it?

Take a look at this:

http://www.arn.org/arnproducts/php/book_show_item.php?id=26

and if you think, oh that's just one book, then just read the abstracts for the first 20 of these books, and you will see the trouble Darwin is really in today:

http://www.arn.org/arnproducts/php/book_show_catalog.php

The other was the realization that nothing else, nothing, is as likely to be true, and fits the reality of human life, as well as the words and thoughts of Jesus Christ. That is why all those guys willingly died on crosses, upside down sometimes, others beheaded, others torn apart by animals in the colliseum, and still others burned at the stake as heretics, to keep the Bible alive and Christianity vital. And so it is.

>Not enough time? Same reason you haven't answered the vast majority of

>my other questions?

Rubbish Doug. I was running out the door to a birthday party. I did answer you. Did you see it?

>You seem quite willing to take the time to further
>your own agenda, imply that I am a heretic and directly accuse Thad of
>being a bigot, but when I ask for justification you don't have enough
>time?

First, Thad is clearly a bigot, and while he would not use that word, he regularly expresses hate for millions of people, some of whom would take a bullet to save his life. Second, your views are clearly heretical with regards to Christianity. Do you deny this?

Be a happy heretic. Heck, start a band and name it that.

You do not answer to me.

best,

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [DC](#) on Mon, 19 Mar 2007 19:44:07 GMT

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

Doug Wellington <doug@parisfaqs.com> wrote:

>So, you're dismissing the "problem" as something that doesn't concern
>you? Is it irrational? Does it not make sense? Is it a non-concern to

>all Christians? Should it be? Do you consider verbal-inspiration folks

>to be missing something? Can they be considered Christians? (In the
>C.S. Lewis sense of the word...)

It is an academic problem. Nothing more. Whether or not
anyone borrowed, the ideas are still intact.

>> I am a thought-inspiration guy and I think it is clear that the
>> words are the words of men.

>Do we agree that the bible is full of the "words of men" then? This
>would seem to be at odds with the attitudes of many Christians.

Whoops!

Did you forget the times I said that the ideas are those of God?

Is that unimportant to you? If we both see Hulk Hogan at
an autograph signing, and you claim he was wearing the
yellow shirt, and I write he was wearing the red, does this
mean that there is no Hulk Hogan?

>Asking as a non-believer, which of you Christians should I listen to?
>Which of you is right? How do I determine that?

We all agree on how you can be saved. You do not believe in
such things. There is your problem.

>It seems to me that many different religions can be thought of to have a

>"unity and quality of the message". I don't see any religion as having

>a right of exclusive use on that concept... ("...hello? US Patent and
>Trade Mark office?")

Clever. Still, you have to decide this for yourself. Are you here to debate, or do you care about which is right? Do you believe in the possibility of rightness? Of God?

>I personally wouldn't use the word fraud. For me, it is merely a
>question of certainty. If I can't be certain about one part of the
>Bible, can I be certain about another? (These are "unity and quality"
>issues of course...)

No, they are verbal and historical issues that you use to dismiss the content.

>> it is clear that they believed what they preached, and they were
>> there to witness it.

>The same can be said of the Jews, the Muslims, Mormons, Buddhists, and
>Hindus, right?

No one witnessed anything in Islam but Mohammed and he makes no claim to divinity.

The Jews are still looking for messiah. Or are atheists.
Could they have missed him? Just a thought.

Hindus? I am not convinced. Are you?

I notice you left off the buddhists.. Of course, no God...

That leaves us with 2 things.

Make up your own beliefs

or

Jesus Christ.

I made my choice.

> From a philosophical point of view, I would say that you are absolutely

>correct. I might be so bold as to make the conjecture that the
>existence or non-existence of the entire Bible is interesting but
>possibly unrelated to the reality of Jesus...

But even the slightest examination of this claim would destroy it...

>> <http://www.leestrobels.com/videos/Bible/strobelT1041.htm>

>Interesting. Short, sweet, touches on all the things that many people
>WANT to believe. "Do you know of any other book that matches the
>credentials of the Bible?" [SHRUG] In a word, yes... To pick one
>example, we know way more about authorship of the Quran than we do about

>authorship of the books of the Bible. ...but wait, I thought we weren't

>going to compare credentials?

Clever. Substance-free, but clever.

Doug, let's give this NG a break OK? This is clearly pointless.

>Sorry, I couldn't follow you there... Are you suggesting that I should

>feel threatened?

No. I imagine you will grow comfortable with your beliefs
being dismissed with a wave of the naturalist hand.

>Aren't all religious decisions based upon personal need and choice?

As are choices to buy gasoline. That does not mean that
gas pumps are a myth created by man to comfort himself.

DC

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Mon, 19 Mar 2007 20:04:59 GMT

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

soooo.....is this because you don't think I'll look absolutely fabulous
in black?

> I didn't mean to infer or imply anything other than that I don't believe
> that you think it's pointless to continue the topic.
>
> Chuck

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...
Posted by [chuck duffy](#) on Mon, 19 Mar 2007 20:29:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Doug, let's give this NG a break OK? This is clearly pointless."

Don, I don't believe you believe that :-)

Chuck

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Mon, 19 Mar 2007 20:35:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"chuck duffy" <c@c.com> wrote:

>Don, I don't believe you believe that :-)
>
>Chuck

Oh, I do. What continually surprises me is how atheism is accepted as neutrality and faith as advocacy. So of course, it is the faith guy who is pushing something and not the other one.

Startling when you stop and think about it.

DC

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...
Posted by [Doug Wellington](#) on Mon, 19 Mar 2007 20:43:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

DC wrote:

> Let me ask you a question that will resolve this for you:
>
> Do you believe that the issues you mention show that Jesus
> was not a real person, and was certainly not the Son of God?

I have not been able to ascertain, with the evidence I have so far, what

the answer to that question is, one way OR the other...

> If so, then you have your answer. If not, why are you raising
> them?

Exactly in order to answer that question one way or the other.

>> And of the four gospels, why is it that only John asserts that
>> Jesus is God?

>

> Do you doubt this? Why or why not? If you doubt it, how does
> your definition of "evidence" influence your decision?

I DO doubt this, as I doubt so very many other things. I will have to think more about the "why" before I can give you a good answer. If it helps you, my first thought is that I'd say it is just because it is inconsistent with the other three gospels. I am continuously revising my definition of "evidence" as I have continued to do during this conversation...

> And of course, we all know that the church is simply based
> upon human wishful thinking and the views of those closest
> to the time of Jesus, and their judgements about the canon,
> are much easier to critique and revise today, almost 2000
> years later, right?

That comes across to me as a quite flippant answer. I truly believe that I am asking legitimate questions, and I do not always believe that I receive legitimate answers...

> That's hilarious... Your atheist assumptions are as clear as
> can be aren't they? Any view of history that includes Christ
> as a reality, is not scholarly.... ok Doug.

Again, this seems rather flippant to me. I have already told you that I am not an atheist. Being scholarly is not exclusionary to any reality.
Some Christians are offended by the term CE - hence my advice...

> Of course, the opposite of atheist is not Christian, it is theist...

Sure, as the opposite of agnostic is gnostic...

> Looks like you have a few more on the other side than you thought.

Ummm, not sure what you mean by that... Would you please rephrase that?

> The belief that only the natural world, as we understand it,
> is real, is not agnostic, it is atheist.

Have I ever argued for "the natural world" being real at all?

- > It is an act of faith that "science" as we know it, can
- > explain everything.

What have I said to you that implies that I think science has anything to do with religion? (Unless you consider "thinking" to be a science? I don't think ;-) thinking is a science...)

- > "Any sufficiently advanced technology is indistinguishable from
- > magic"

Cool quote.

- > Which is it? How do you differentiate between atheism and
- > agnosticism?

Well, there's strong atheism which believes that there is NO deity, and there is weak atheism that assumes there is no deity but admits to a lack of knowledge about deities. This is orthogonal to agnosticism, which believes there is a deity, but doesn't know the details. Of course, we should then add on a discussion of the term gnostic, which is about direct knowing. Gnosis differs from the Orthodoxy in the sense that (in my words) the Orthodoxy seems to believe that it is not possible for the individual to know things at the same level that Jesus knew them...

- > And so, there it is. Christianity is the opiate of the masses.
- > Ok, well. I certainly see where you are coming from.

Is that a flippant answer or a legitimate one?

- > Define enlightened.

:-) I'll let you know when/if I find enlightenment...

- > Being a non-atheist, would you say that you are a theist of
- > any kind? What sort?

I was raised in the Unitarian/Universalist environment and still hold many of the beliefs, if that's what you're asking.

- > Now, there are reams of objective reasons for believing in
- > God.

I do not deny the existence of God.

- > I spent years with doubt about all this. My temptations
- > were never drugs and drink and a lot of the other stuff we
- > get involved with. My temptation was, and it took a while to
- > realize this, atheism.

Rather Quixotic, wouldn't you think? I don't believe I have that same issue...

- > The first was the day I realized, from years of study and reading,
- > that Darwinism is garbage. It is the last of the 19th-century
- > mystery religions.

Darwin was searching for an explanation for something. With the evidence he had, I think he did a mighty fine job. Does it answer my questions about the world? No. Does it answer my questions about God? Of course not. I don't even consider Darwin when I think about religion...

- > The other was the realization that nothing else, nothing, is as
- > likely to be true, and fits the reality of human life, as well as
- > the words and thoughts of Jesus Christ.

I'm glad that resonates with you. Many people feel the same about the words and thoughts of the Buddha. Many believe the same about Mohammed, and many feel the same about Joseph Smith...

- > Rubbish Doug. I was running out the door to a birthday party.
- > I did answer you. Did you see it?

I did indeed, and I see that you have replied to it. Thank you. I must run out the door myself, so I'll read and reply to that one later.

- > First, Thad is clearly a bigot,

I do not see that personally.

- > and while he would not use that
- > word, he regularly expresses hate for millions of people, some
- > of whom would take a bullet to save his life.

Is this supposed to be some kind of guilt trip you're laying on him?

- > Second, your views are clearly heretical with regards to
- > Christianity. Do you deny this?

I readily admit that my views are sometimes in disagreement with ORTHODOX Christianity.

> You do not answer to me.

True. And yet you throw that at me as if you are morally superior?

Doug

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [chuck duffy](#) on Mon, 19 Mar 2007 20:54:02 GMT

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

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:

>

>"chuck duffy" <c@c.com> wrote:

>

>>Don, I don't believe you believe that :-)

>>

>>Chuck

>

>Oh, I do. What continually surprises me is how atheism is
>accepted as neutrality and faith as advocacy. So of course, it
>is the faith guy who is pushing something and not the other one.

>

>Startling when you stop and think about it.

Hi Don,

I didn't mean to infer or imply anything other than that I don't believe
that you think it's pointless to continue the topic.

Chuck

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Mon, 19 Mar 2007 21:08:59 GMT

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

"chuck duffy" <c@c.com> wrote:

>I didn't mean to infer or imply anything other than that I don't believe
>that you think it's pointless to continue the topic.

it reaches that point when it is clear that the basic assumptions
of the people involved are so different that resolution is not
possible.

It seems we have reached that point.

For another discussion on this subject by a couple of black belts
go here:

http://www.jewcy.com/dialogue/11-16/day_1_sam_harris_why_are_atheists_so_angry

At the end, you will agree with one or the other. They too,
came to a closing point.

best

DC

Subject: AAAAAAAAAHHHHHHHHHHHHH!!!!!!!!!!

Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Mon, 19 Mar 2007 21:25:37 GMT

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

Why are you guys forcing me to read all this?????????????it's
not fair!!!!.....it's even worse than the TV I am forced to watch and the
radio stations I am forced to listen to!!!!.....my brain is going
to explode and I'm picking out pumps.(are pumps appropriate for nuns?)

"DC" <dc@spammerinhell.com> wrote in message news:45fefbe2\$1@linux...

>

> Doug Wellington <doug@parisfaqs.com> wrote:

>

>>I am continuously revising

>>my definition of "evidence" as I have continued to do during this

>>conversation...

>

> Then, one day you will likely settle on a definition.

> Answers will follow.

>

>

>>> And of course, we all know that the church is simply based

>>> upon human wishful thinking and the views of those closest

>>> to the time of Jesus, and their judgements about the canon,

>>> are much easier to critique and revise today, almost 2000

>>> years later, right?

>

>>That comes across to me as a quite flippant answer. I truly believe

>>that I am asking legitimate questions, and I do not always believe that

>

>>I receive legitimate answers...

>

> Sorry for the tone, but it is 100% legit. It seems that you would
> know to ask those questions about the primacy of direct
> sources. We assume these first century people to be less
> intelligent and in this case, less honest than we. That view will
> produce skewed results.
>
>
>>Being scholarly is not exclusionary to any reality.
>
> This simply isn't true. 'Scholarly' once excluded coelacanths..
>
>
> And that is it for me. Doug if you want to continue, let me know
> and I will get you my email.
>
> best
>
> DC
>
>
>

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [chuck duffy](#) on Mon, 19 Mar 2007 21:54:08 GMT

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

">At the end, you will agree with one or the other. They too,
>came to a closing point."

Hey Don, I went over that link. I don't identify/agree with any of the posts.
I do understand why you posted that as an example of futility.

Chuck

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:

>
>"chuck duffy" <c@c.com> wrote:
>
>>I didn't mean to infer or imply anything other than that I don't believe
>>that you think it's pointless to continue the topic.
>
>it reaches that point when it is clear that the basic assumptions
>of the people involved are so different that resolution is not
>possible.
>
>It seems we have reached that point.
>

>For another discussion on this subject by a couple of black belts
>go here:
>
> http://www.jewcy.com/dialogue/11-16/day_1_sam_harris_why_are_atheists_so_angry
>
>At the end, you will agree with one or the other. They too,
>came to a closing point.
>
>best
>
>DC
>

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...
Posted by [DC](#) on Mon, 19 Mar 2007 22:08:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Doug Wellington <doug@parisfaqs.com> wrote:

>I am continuously revising
>my definition of "evidence" as I have continued to do during this
>conversation...

Then, one day you will likely settle on a definition.
Answers will follow.

>> And of course, we all know that the church is simply based
>> upon human wishful thinking and the views of those closest
>> to the time of Jesus, and their judgements about the canon,
>> are much easier to critique and revise today, almost 2000
>> years later, right?

>That comes across to me as a quite flippant answer. I truly believe
>that I am asking legitimate questions, and I do not always believe that

>I receive legitimate answers...

Sorry for the tone, but it is 100% legit. It seems that you would know to ask those questions about the primacy of direct sources. We assume these first century people to be less intelligent and in this case, less honest than we. That view will produce skewed results.

>Being scholarly is not exclusionary to any reality.

This simply isn't true. 'Scholarly' once excluded coelacanths..

And that is it for me. Doug if you want to continue, let me know and I will get you my email.

best

DC

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Mon, 19 Mar 2007 22:15:24 GMT

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

"chuck duffy" <c@c.com> wrote:

>Hey Don, I went over that link. I don't identify/agree with any of the posts.

> I do understand why you posted that as an example of futility.

>

>Chuck

Futile? Well certainly at changing minds. But I think something was learned by reading it, don't you? I learned something here as well.

Here's another one;

<http://www.dennisprager.com/samharris.html>

In this one, (which is 2 years earlier than the other), Dennis gets the upper hand at quite a few points, and I believe that is what caused Sam to come out swinging so hard in the 2006 debate.

best,

DC

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [chuck duffy](#) on Mon, 19 Mar 2007 22:37:47 GMT

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

Hi Doug,

My two cents, haha

The synoptic problem is a question in search of an answer. Go with Mark.
An old J once asked me if I'd rather catch a drop of liquor from a bottle,
or hear the story as told by the guy who licked the drop of liquor from the
floor.

Chuck

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [Doug Wellington](#) on Tue, 20 Mar 2007 04:02:13 GMT

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

Don,

Since you seem to wish to stop this discussion, I will abbreviate my
comments in this message and will hold no expectation of answer to any
questions...

> We all agree on how you can be saved. You do not believe in
> such things. There is your problem.

That is a blanket statement and I'm not sure which "we" you mean. I
also find it interesting that you seem to know my beliefs better than I
do. I am not an atheist. I believe in salvation, redemption, and
atonement. But if salvation is between me and my Lord, then I don't
have to fear the so-called war on faith or the expectations, judgments
or condemnations of those such as yourself who presume to know the one
truth. The only real "problem" I have is determining which path is the
true path...

> No, they are verbal and historical issues that you use to dismiss
> the content.

I do not wish to dismiss the content, I wish to ascertain its truth. If
Jesus was indeed God-incarnate here on earth, why is it that the first
three Gospels don't mention that, and it is only near the end of the
first century that the idea is written down in the fourth Gospel? If it
were true, and the Christian writers were there to witness it, I would
have expected that idea to infuse ALL of the Christian writings in the
first century, regardless of the intellectual abilities or knowledge
levels of those writers.

> Doug, let's give this NG a break OK? This is clearly pointless.

I'm sorry you think it's pointless. Heehee, I won't ask what you think

is pointless about it - I think we both know. ;-) Thank you for your input. I've learned a lot about you and your beliefs. I will continue to seek knowledge and wisdom from other sources...

> No. I imagine you will grow comfortable with your beliefs
> being dismissed with a wave of the naturalist hand.

Well, I'm getting more and more comfortable with my beliefs being dismissed with a wave of the Christian hand... ;-)

To speak in terms I think you understand, may The Lord bless you and keep you, Don Cicchetti. Go in peace.

Doug Wellington

P.S. My real email address has been included in each of these posts. If you are ever near Tucson, I invite you to be my guest. Please contact me. BTW, have you ever visited a Redemptorist Center?

P.P.S. Might I prevail upon you to lay off the judgmentalism towards Thad and others who don't share your beliefs? Pray about it and I bet you'll know what is the right thing to do...

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Tue, 20 Mar 2007 05:59:13 GMT

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

Doug Wellington <doug@parisfaqs.com> wrote:

>> We all agree on how you can be saved. You do not believe in
>> such things. There is your problem.

Sorry. I meant to say that all the different Christian groups agree. The word should have been they, not we. You had asked which group was right, and I meant to say that they agree on the important part.

I've been trying to do too many things at once, and got to typing too fast.

As far as the rest goes, I will email you privately.

As far as judgementalism, you are wrong. Calling millions of Christians fuckheads is no different than calling black people the n-word. I expect better from someone I admire as much as I do Thad.

and again I am sorry. that typo really screwed up the point I was making...

DC

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [Doug Wellington](#) on Tue, 20 Mar 2007 10:39:51 GMT

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

DC wrote:

> As far as judgementalism, you are wrong.

Sorry for the selective quote Don, but that's hilarious!

Doug

Subject: Re: AAAAAAAAAHHHHHHHHHHHHH!!!!!!!!!!

Posted by [Doug Wellington](#) on Tue, 20 Mar 2007 14:47:30 GMT

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

DJ wrote:

> Why are you guys forcing me to read all this?????????????it's
> not fair!!!!.....it's even worse than the TV I am forced to watch and the
> radio stations I am forced to listen to!!!!.....my brain is going
> to explode and I'm picking out pumps.(are pumps appropriate for nuns?)

Heehee! It's like your mother said about castor oil - because it's good for you!

Doug (Imagining DJ in one of those nun outfits...)

P.S. Here's some other stuff that I need to force you to read:

> We assume these first century people to be less
> intelligent and in this case, less honest than we.

Less honest? You mean they had...an agenda? BTW, how do you prove the assumption that they were less intelligent? I can easily see how they might be less knowledgeable, but less intelligent? Hard to prove...

>> Being scholarly is not exclusionary to any reality.
> This simply isn't true. "Scholarly" once excluded coelacanths..

So, "scholarly" is open to change, but faith isn't? How does one deal with new information that challenges one's faith? Yell "heresy" and call out the troops to fight the upcoming war on faith?

Oh, sorry, I'll stop now...

Subject: Re: AAAAAAAAAHHHHHHHHHHHHHH!!!!!!!
Posted by [Doug Wellington](#) on Tue, 20 Mar 2007 21:41:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Steve, I knew you'd show as soon as coelacanths were mentioned!

> well, personally, I found that exchange much more interesting than 99% of
> the "this preamp is better than that preamp" posts I used to wade through.

I personally find this the most fascinating subject of all, at so many levels...

Hey, do you think Jeremy knows the Flying Spaghetti Monster? ;-)

Doug

<http://www.parisfaqs.com>

Subject: Re: AAAAAAAAAHHHHHHHHHHHHHH!!!!!!!
Posted by [steve the artguy](#) on Tue, 20 Mar 2007 21:57:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

well, personally, I found that exchange much more interesting than 99% of the "this preamp is better than that preamp" posts I used to wade through.

What makes it more interesting than reading some anonymous internet exchange is that I know these guys, at least through the Paris world, and that informs the discussion in my head.

Thanks, guys.

-steve

Doug Wellington <doug@parisfaqs.com> wrote:

>DJ wrote:

>> Why are you guys forcing me to read all this?????????????it's

>> not fair!!!!.....it's even worse than the TV I am forced to watch and the

>> radio stations I am forced to listen to!!!!.....my brain is going

>> to explode and I'm picking out pumps.(are pumps appropriate for nuns?)

>

>Heehee! It's like your mother said about castor oil - because it's good
>for you!
>
>Doug (Imagining DJ in one of those nun outfits...)
>
>
>P.S. Here's some other stuff that I need to force you to read:
>
>> We assume these first century people to be less
>> intelligent and in this case, less honest than we.
>
>Less honest? You mean they had...an agenda? BTW, how do you prove the

>assumption that they were less intelligent? I can easily see how they
>might be less knowledgeable, but less intelligent? Hard to prove...
>
>>> Being scholarly is not exclusionary to any reality.
>> This simply isn't true. "Scholarly" once excluded coelacanth..
>
>So, "scholarly" is open to change, but faith isn't? How does one deal
>with new information that challenges one's faith? Yell "heresy" and
>call out the troops to fight the upcoming war on faith?
>
>Oh, sorry, I'll stop now...

Subject: Re: AAAAAAAAAHHHHHHHHHHHHHHH!!!!!!!
Posted by [Neil](#) on Tue, 20 Mar 2007 22:26:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"steve the artguy" <artguy@somethingrother.net> wrote:

>
>well, personally, I found that exchange much more interesting than 99% of
>the "this preamp is better than that preamp" posts I used to wade through.

Then let's start a new thread... "Which preamp has God
proclaimed to be the best?"

:)

Subject: Re: AAAAAAAAAHHHHHHHHHHHHHHH!!!!!!!
Posted by [DC](#) on Tue, 20 Mar 2007 22:49:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Doug Wellington <doug@parisfaqs.com> wrote:

>> We assume these first century people to be less
>> intelligent and in this case, less honest than we.

>Less honest? You mean they had...an agenda? BTW, how do you prove the

>assumption that they were less intelligent? I can easily see how they
>might be less knowledgeable, but less intelligent? Hard to prove...

Doug! Who are you speaking to here?

Ok, you got the last word.

Now email me privately and I will discuss your points if you like.

DC

DC

Subject: Re: AAAAAAAAAHHHHHHHHHHHH!!!!!!!
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Wed, 21 Mar 2007 00:18:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Agreed. Nice discussion.

Feel free to keep it going, is my vote. No reason to take it to email.

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

steve the artguy wrote:

> well, personally, I found that exchange much more interesting than 99% of
> the "this preamp is better than that preamp" posts I used to wade through.
>

> What makes it more interesting than reading some anonymous internet exchange
> is that I know these guys, at least through the Paris world, and that informs
> the discussion in my head.

>
> Thanks, guys.

>
> -steve

>
> Doug Wellington <doug@parisfaqs.com> wrote:

>> DJ wrote:
>>> Why are you guys forcing me to read all this?????????????it's
>
>>> not fair!!!!.....it's even worse than the TV I am forced to watch and
> the
>>> radio stations I am forced to listen to!!!!.....my brain is
> going
>>> to explode and I'm picking out pumps.(are pumps appropriate for nuns?)
>> Heehee! It's like your mother said about castor oil - because it's good
>
>> for you!
>>
>> Doug (Imagining DJ in one of those nun outfits...)
>>
>>
>> P.S. Here's some other stuff that I need to force you to read:
>>
>>> We assume these first century people to be less
>>> intelligent and in this case, less honest than we.
>> Less honest? You mean they had...an agenda? BTW, how do you prove the
>
>> assumption that they were less intelligent? I can easily see how they
>> might be less knowledgeable, but less intelligent? Hard to prove...
>>
>>>> Being scholarly is not exclusionary to any reality.
>>> This simply isn't true. "Scholarly" once excluded coelacanths..
>> So, "scholarly" is open to change, but faith isn't? How does one deal
>> with new information that challenges one's faith? Yell "heresy" and
>> call out the troops to fight the upcoming war on faith?
>>
>> Oh, sorry, I'll stop now...
>

Subject: Re: AAAAAAAAAHHHHHHHHHHHHHHH!!!!!!!
Posted by [Doug Wellington](#) on Wed, 21 Mar 2007 00:52:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.org> wrote in message news:460056f0\$1@linux...
> Doug! Who are you speaking to here?

I thought it was obvious that I was "forcing" DJ to read more... :-)

Doug (waiting for his brain to explode...)

Subject: Re: AAAAAAAAAHHHHHHHHHHHHHHH!!!!!!!

Posted by [Doug Wellington](#) on Wed, 21 Mar 2007 01:13:42 GMT

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

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:460079a7@linux...

>

> Agreed. Nice discussion.

>

> Feel free to keep it going, is my vote. No reason to take it to email.

Well, I'm afraid I took a chance and tossed the proverbial holy hand grenade at Don in email. It is my fervent hope that he is ready to understand it's content and learn the true lesson intended...

For those of you who are so inclined, would you please pray for him? I mean that sincerely...

If you'll excuse me, I believe I have some penance to attend to.

Doug

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [TCB](#) on Wed, 21 Mar 2007 21:38:31 GMT

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

I've stayed out of this because I have nothing to add. However, two points. First I don't think you 'admire' me at all. Second, I didn't call all Christians fuckheads. This is the section in question.

+++++

P.S. While my hatred of the stateside twice born remains intact, my suspicion of spirituality in general has been shaken by this trip to Thailand. It's my third time here, and each time I've made a few new friends and gotten closer to actual Thais. The country is over 90% Buddhist and their spirituality in the face of very real hardships is inspiring. I've never encountered a sweeter, gentler group of people in my life. I've gotten to know the (unspeakably gorgeous) girls who work in the swank restaurant/bar in my hotel, and three of them just went on holiday together earlier this week. Where? To a Buddhist temple that cares for Thais with AIDS. They used their _vacation_ to take food and medicine and money to some people seriously fucked over by the world. One of the motivations was a friend of theirs who recently came out as gay to them, which is a far, far bigger deal in Thailand than in the US. And instead of doing what would be easy, i.e. throwing the person out of their life for making the wrong 'choice,' they embraced him and did something to help the gay community in their country. I remain an atheist and make no pretensions to Buddhism, but having seen how their piety brings out the noble traits of charity and understanding I can no longer dismiss all religion

out of hand. Having seen what their quiet and sincere spirituality does for Thais I have no choice but to respect it. I just despise closed minded holy roller US fuckheads that much more.

+++++

So the fuckheads are 'closed minded holy roller' types in the US. And I stand by that, and I mean the kind of people who are 'curing' same sexers and scaring teenagers who masturbate and insisting that the US is a Christian nation and all of that. So I want those two things noted.

Oddest of all to me is that, as most would see from the above quote, I was actually writing something _positive_ about religion. At least by my standards. This last trip to Thailand was a real watershed moment for me. Previously I had thought of religion as at best a crutch for psyches unable to manage without it, and at worst just another tool used by the few to control the many. But this trip, having spent time with youngish Thais, I had to admit that part of what made them such inspiring and beautiful souls was their inspiring and beautiful religion. I'd be a total hypocrite to suddenly claim to be a buddhist, I'm an atheist just like I was before I went, but for the first time I saw the good in religion.

I'd think that if a) you actually 'admired' me and b) you were interested in spirituality in the broader sense you'd think that was a good thing. Instead you misquote me and call me bitter and bigoted and hint that I might wind up murdered like what's her name. Real class, Don.

TCB

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:

>

>Doug Wellington <doug@parisfaqs.com> wrote:

>

>>> We all agree on how you can be saved. You do not believe in

>>> such things. There is your problem.

>

>Sorry. I meant to say that all the different Christian groups agree. The

>word should have been they, not we. You had asked which group was

>right, and I meant to say that they agree on the important part.

>

>I've been trying to do too many things at once, and got to typing too fast.

>

>As far as the rest goes, I will email you privately.

>

>

>As far as judgementalism, you are wrong. Calling millions of Christians

>fuckheads is no different than calling black people the n-word.

>I expect better from someone I admire as much as I do Thad.

>

>and again I am sorry. that typo really screwed up the point I was making...
>
>DC
>

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Wed, 21 Mar 2007 21:48:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"P.S. While my hatred of the stateside twice born remains intact"

John 3:5-7

Jesus answered, "I tell you the truth, no one can enter the kingdom of God unless he is born of water and the Spirit. Flesh gives birth to flesh, but the Spirit gives birth to spirit. You should not be surprised at my saying, 'You must be born again.'

Thad,
You hate all Christians.
Either amend your statement or accept your prejudices.
And of course, there are many good charismatic Christians (holy rollers) as well. Your version of "open-minded" is, of course, rather subjective, as is everyone elses.

And I quite admire you. Your word on several subjects is the gold standard IMO.

DC

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>
>I've stayed out of this because I have nothing to add. However, two points.
>First I don't think you 'admire' me at all. Second, I didn't call all Christians
>fuckheads. This is the section in question.
>
>++++
>
>P.S. While my hatred of the stateside twice born remains intact, my suspicion
>of spirituality in general has been shaken by this trip to Thailand. It's
>my third time here, and each time I've made a few new friends and gotten
>closer to actual Thais. The country is over 90% Buddhist and their spirituality
>in the face of very real hardships is inspiring. I've never encountered
>a
>sweeter, gentler group of people in my life. I've gotten to know the (unspeakably

>gorgeous) girls who work in the swank restaurant/bar in my hotel, and three
>of them just went on holiday together earlier this week. Where? To a Buddhist
>temple that cares for Thais with AIDS. They used their _vacation_ to take
>food and medicine and money to some people seriously fucked over by the
world.

>One of the motivations was a friend of theirs who recently came out as gay
>to them, which is a far, far bigger deal in Thailand than in the US. And
>instead of doing what would be easy, i.e. throwing the person out of their
>life for making the wrong 'choice,' they embraced him and did something
to

>help the gay community in their country. I remain an atheist and make no
>pretensions to Buddhism, but having seen how their piety brings out the
noble

>traits of charity and understanding I can no longer dismiss all religion
>out of hand. Having seen what their quiet and sincere spirituality does
for

>Thais I have no choice but to respect it. I just despise closed minded holy
>roller US fuckheads that much more.

>+++++

>

>So the fuckheads are 'closed minded holy roller' types in the US. And I
stand

>by that, and I mean the kind of people who are 'curing' same sexers and
scaring

>teenagers who masturbate and insisting that the US is a Christian nation
>and all of that. So I want those two things noted.

>

>Oddest of all to me is that, as most would see from the above quote, I was
>actually writing something _positive_ about religion. At least by my standards.

>This last trip to Thailand was a real watershed moment for me. Previously
>I had thought of religion as at best a crutch for psyches unable to manage

>without it, and at worst just another tool used by the few to control the
>many. But this trip, having spent time with youngish Thais, I had to admit

>that part of what made them such inspiring and beautiful souls was their
>inspiring and beautiful religion. I'd be a total hypocrite to suddenly claim

>to be a buddhist, I'm an atheist just like I was before I went, but for
the

>first time I saw the good in religion.

>

>I'd think that if a) you actually 'admired' me and b) you were interested
>in spirituality in the broader sense you'd think that was a good thing.

Instead

>you misquote me and call me bitter and bigoted and hint that I might wind
>up murdered like what's her name. Real class, Don.

>

>TCB

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [TCB](#) on Wed, 21 Mar 2007 22:06:49 GMT

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

Well, maybe by your definition of Christian I do hate them all, but I'm fine with a lot of people that most would consider Christian. I have no problem with the average two mimosas after service Episcopalian. I think the world of the Catholics I met when working for CISPES in the 90's who literally went to jail trying to stop the US sponsored slaughter in El Salvador.

>And I quite admire you. Your word on several subjects is
>the gold standard IMO.

This is not admiration. This is realizing that I'm smart and have acquired expert knowledge in some areas that are useful to you.

TCB

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:

>
>"P.S. While my hatred of the stateside twice born remains intact"

>
>John 3:5-7

>Jesus answered, "I tell you the truth, no one can enter the
>kingdom of God unless he is born of water and the Spirit.
>Flesh gives birth to flesh, but the Spirit gives birth to spirit.
>You should not be surprised at my saying,
>'You must be born again.'

>
>Thad,
>You hate all Christians.
>Either amend your statement or accept your prejudices.
>And of course, there are many good charismatic Christians
>(holy rollers) as well. Your version of "open-minded" is,
>of course, rather subjective, as is everyone elses.

>
>And I quite admire you. Your word on several subjects is
>the gold standard IMO.

>
>DC

>
>
>
>
>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>>
>>I've stayed out of this because I have nothing to add. However, two points.
>>First I don't think you 'admire' me at all. Second, I didn't call all Christians
>>fuckheads. This is the section in question.
>>

>>+++++

>>

>>P.S. While my hatred of the stateside twice born remains intact, my suspicion
>>of spirituality in general has been shaken by this trip to Thailand. It's
>>my third time here, and each time I've made a few new friends and gotten
>>closer to actual Thais. The country is over 90% Buddhist and their spirituality
>>in the face of very real hardships is inspiring. I've never encountered

>a

>>sweeter, gentler group of people in my life. I've gotten to know the (unspeakably
>>gorgeous) girls who work in the swank restaurant/bar in my hotel, and three
>>of them just went on holiday together earlier this week. Where? To a Buddhist
>>temple that cares for Thais with AIDS. They used their _vacation_ to take
>>food and medicine and money to some people seriously fucked over by the
>world.

>>One of the motivations was a friend of theirs who recently came out as
>gay

>>to them, which is a far, far bigger deal in Thailand than in the US. And
>>instead of doing what would be easy, i.e. throwing the person out of their
>>life for making the wrong 'choice,' they embraced him and did something
>to

>>help the gay community in their country. I remain an atheist and make no
>>pretensions to Buddhism, but having seen how their piety brings out the
>noble

>>traits of charity and understanding I can no longer dismiss all religion
>>out of hand. Having seen what their quiet and sincere spirituality does
>for

>>Thais I have no choice but to respect it. I just despise closed minded
>holy

>>roller US fuckheads that much more.

>>+++++

>>

>>So the fuckheads are 'closed minded holy roller' types in the US. And I
>stand

>>by that, and I mean the kind of people who are 'curing' same sexers and
>scaring

>>teenagers who masturbate and insisting that the US is a Christian nation
>>and all of that. So I want those two things noted.

>>

>>Oddest of all to me is that, as most would see from the above quote, I
>was

>>actually writing something _positive_ about religion. At least by my standards.

>>This last trip to Thailand was a real watershed moment for me. Previously

>>I had thought of religion as at best a crutch for psyches unable to manage

>>without it, and at worst just another tool used by the few to control the

>>many. But this trip, having spent time with youngish Thais, I had to admit

>>that part of what made them such inspiring and beautiful souls was their

>>inspiring and beautiful religion. I'd be a total hypocrite to suddenly
>claim

>>to be a buddhist, I'm an atheist just like I was before I went, but for
>the
>>first time I saw the good in religion.
>>
>>I'd think that if a) you actually 'admired' me and b) you were interested
>>in spirituality in the broader sense you'd think that was a good thing.
>Instead
>>you misquote me and call me bitter and bigoted and hint that I might wind
>>up murdered like what's her name. Real class, Don.
>>
>>TCB
>

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Wed, 21 Mar 2007 22:12:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>

>Well, maybe by your definition of Christian I do hate them all,

It's not my definition, but thanks for your honesty.

>>And I quite admire you. Your word on several subjects is
>>the gold standard IMO.

>This is not admiration. This is realizing that I'm smart and have acquired
>expert knowledge in some areas that are useful to you.

Nah, there's lots of other smart people and useful experts
in the world. You have a talent for understanding the big
picture in this industry, and no one can buy your opinions.
Reminds me of SSC actually.

Even if he did hit on your girlfriend...

DC

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Wed, 21 Mar 2007 22:20:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

> of them just went on holiday together earlier this week. Where? To a
> Buddhist

> temple that cares for Thais with AIDS. They used their _vacation_ to take
> food and medicine and money to some people

Thad - just fyi, this is quite common among Christians as well. Don't believe what the political circles and news media tell you about Christians.

When in college, I attended at church that had one of the strongest college ministries in the state. Every spring break we went to an inner city or remote rural area to work with Habitat for Humanity and other local organization building and repairing homes for low/no income people. There are many churches doing the same kinds of things every day, every week, every year, quietly without the news media around to make anyone aware of any of it.

The church we attend here in Colorado has a partnership with a ministry in Swaziland helping people there with food, medicine, etc. AIDs is expected to wipe out over half the population in 5 years there. It is one of the most AIDs-devastated countries in Africa right now.

This isn't a "look what great things we are doing" post - just an fyi that there are way more Christians doing really cool things for others than the news media would lead you to believe. People in general can be overbearing - the "beating people over the head" mentality isn't unique to Christians.

The important thing for both viewpoints is to not become judgemental and stereotype people for their beliefs simply because a news story made their faith appear a certain way.

There is a difference between condoning behavior and accepting people - simply condoning every behavior to avoid setting boundaries and making any distinction between right and wrong is a problem in and of itself, and not the enlightened attitude some would have the world believe.

And there is also a distinct difference between judging an action as right or wrong, and showing grace for the person, and they aren't mutually exclusive, or counter intuitive.

The bottom line: love is always far more powerful than hate, regardless of what you believe. But that is the true foundation of Christianity.

Regards,
Dedric

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:460197c7@linux...
seriously fucked over by the world.

> One of the motivations was a friend of theirs who recently came out as gay
> to them, which is a far, far bigger deal in Thailand than in the US. And
> instead of doing what would be easy, i.e. throwing the person out of their
> life for making the wrong 'choice,' they embraced him and did something to
> help the gay community in their country. I remain an atheist and make no
> pretensions to Buddhism, but having seen how their piety brings out the
> noble
> traits of charity and understanding I can no longer dismiss all religion
> out of hand. Having seen what their quiet and sincere spirituality does
> for
> Thais I have no choice but to respect it. I just despise closed minded
> holy
> roller US fuckheads that much more.

> ++++++

>

> So the fuckheads are 'closed minded holy roller' types in the US. And I
> stand
> by that, and I mean the kind of people who are 'curing' same sexers and
> scaring
> teenagers who masturbate and insisting that the US is a Christian nation
> and all of that. So I want those two things noted.

>

> Oddest of all to me is that, as most would see from the above quote, I was
> actually writing something _positive_ about religion. At least by my
> standards.

> This last trip to Thailand was a real watershed moment for me. Previously
> I had thought of religion as at best a crutch for psyches unable to manage
> without it, and at worst just another tool used by the few to control the
> many. But this trip, having spent time with youngish Thais, I had to admit
> that part of what made them such inspiring and beautiful souls was their
> inspiring and beautiful religion. I'd be a total hypocrite to suddenly
> claim

> to be a buddhist, I'm an atheist just like I was before I went, but for
> the

> first time I saw the good in religion.

>

> I'd think that if a) you actually 'admired' me and b) you were interested
> in spirituality in the broader sense you'd think that was a good thing.

> Instead

> you misquote me and call me bitter and bigoted and hint that I might wind
> up murdered like what's her name. Real class, Don.

>

> TCB
>
> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:
>>
>>Doug Wellington <doug@parisfaqs.com> wrote:
>>
>>>> We all agree on how you can be saved. You do not believe in
>>>> such things. There is your problem.
>>
>>Sorry. I meant to say that all the different Christian groups agree. The
>>word should have been they, not we. You had asked which group was
>>right, and I meant to say that they agree on the important part.
>>
>>I've been trying to do too many things at once, and got to typing too
>>fast.
>>
>>As far as the rest goes, I will email you privately.
>>
>>
>>As far as judgementalism, you are wrong. Calling millions of Christians
>>fuckheads is no different than calling black people the n-word.
>>I expect better from someone I admire as much as I do Thad.
>>
>>and again I am sorry. that typo really screwed up the point I was
>>making...
>>
>>DC
>>
>

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...
Posted by [TCB](#) on Wed, 21 Mar 2007 22:24:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:
>
>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>
>>Well, maybe by your definition of Christian I do hate them all,
>
>It's not my definition, but thanks for your honesty.
>
>
>>>And I quite admire you. Your word on several subjects is
>>>the gold standard IMO.
>
>>This is not admiration. This is realizing that I'm smart and have acquired

>>expert knowledge in some areas that are useful to you.
>
>Nah, there's lots of other smart people and useful experts
>in the world. You have a talent for understanding the big
>picture in this industry, and no one can buy your opinions.
>Reminds me of SSC actually.
>
>Even if he did hit on your girlfriend...

And I never held it against him. She was frighteningly beautiful and smarter
as a whip. The kind of girl that will short circuit some minds, and we're
still friends.

>DC
>

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Wed, 21 Mar 2007 22:47:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

One problem is that Christianity is an umbrella term that covers a huge
range of beliefs.

Christianity is splintered into a large number of independent sects
which regularly disagree about religious doctrine, political issues,
behavioral issues, and acceptance of various scientific evidence.

Some can hardly talk to each other, the disagreements run so deep.

A quick, dishonest way to rile up a lot of people is to take advantage
of the ambiguity to recast criticism of the behavior of one sect to make
it seem like an attack on anyone who calls themselves a Christian.

Christianity is hardly alone in being splintered. Generalizations are
always dangerous (irony intended).

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

Dedric Terry wrote:

>> of them just went on holiday together earlier this week. Where? To a
>> Buddhist
>> temple that cares for Thais with AIDS. They used their _vacation_ to take
>> food and medicine and money to some people

>

> Thad - just fyi, this is quite common among Christians as well. Don't

> believe

> what the political circles and news media tell you about Christians.

>

> When in college, I attended at church that had one of the strongest college

> ministries

> in the state. Every spring break we went to an inner city or remote rural

> area

> to work with Habitat for Humanity and other local organization building and

> repairing homes for low/no income people. There are many churches doing

> the same kinds of things every day, every week, every year, quietly without

> the news media around to make anyone aware of any of it.

>

> The church we attend here in Colorado has a partnership with a ministry in

> Swaziland

> helping people there with food, medicine, etc. AIDs is expected to wipe out

> over half the population

> in 5 years there. It is one of the most AIDs-devastated countries in Africa

> right now.

>

> This isn't a "look what great things we are doing" post -

> just an fyi that there are way more Christians doing really cool things for

> others

> than the news media would lead you to believe. People in general can be

> overbearing -

> the "beating people over the head" mentality isn't unique to Christians.

>

> The important thing for both viewpoints is to not become judgemental and

> stereotype

> people for their beliefs simply because a news story made their faith appear

> a certain way.

>

> There is a difference between condoning behavior and accepting people -

> simply condoning every behavior to avoid setting boundaries and making any

> distinction between

> right and wrong is a problem in and of itself, and not the enlightened

> attitude some would have the world believe.

>

> And there is also a distinct difference between judging an action as right

> or wrong, and showing grace for the person,

> and they aren't mutually exclusive, or counter intuitive.

>

> The bottom line: love is always far more powerful than hate, regardless of

> what you believe. But that

> is the true foundation of Christianity.

>

> Regards,

> Dedric
>
> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:460197c7@linux...
> seriously fucked over by the world.
>> One of the motivations was a friend of theirs who recently came out as gay
>> to them, which is a far, far bigger deal in Thailand than in the US. And
>> instead of doing what would be easy, i.e. throwing the person out of their
>> life for making the wrong 'choice,' they embraced him and did something to
>> help the gay community in their country. I remain an atheist and make no
>> pretensions to Buddhism, but having seen how their piety brings out the
>> noble
>> traits of charity and understanding I can no longer dismiss all religion
>> out of hand. Having seen what their quiet and sincere spirituality does
>> for
>> Thais I have no choice but to respect it. I just despise closed minded
>> holy
>> roller US fuckheads that much more.
>> ++++++
>>
>> So the fuckheads are 'closed minded holy roller' types in the US. And I
>> stand
>> by that, and I mean the kind of people who are 'curing' same sexers and
>> scaring
>> teenagers who masturbate and insisting that the US is a Christian nation
>> and all of that. So I want those two things noted.
>>
>> Oddest of all to me is that, as most would see from the above quote, I was
>> actually writing something _positive_ about religion. At least by my
>> standards.
>> This last trip to Thailand was a real watershed moment for me. Previously
>> I had thought of religion as at best a crutch for psyches unable to manage
>> without it, and at worst just another tool used by the few to control the
>> many. But this trip, having spent time with youngish Thais, I had to admit
>> that part of what made them such inspiring and beautiful souls was their
>> inspiring and beautiful religion. I'd be a total hypocrite to suddenly
>> claim
>> to be a buddhist, I'm an atheist just like I was before I went, but for
>> the
>> first time I saw the good in religion.
>>
>> I'd think that if a) you actually 'admired' me and b) you were interested
>> in spirituality in the broader sense you'd think that was a good thing.
>> Instead
>> you misquote me and call me bitter and bigoted and hint that I might wind
>> up murdered like what's her name. Real class, Don.
>>
>> TCB
>>

>> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:
>>> Doug Wellington <doug@parisfaqs.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>> We all agree on how you can be saved. You do not believe in
>>>>> such things. There is your problem.
>>> Sorry. I meant to say that all the different Christian groups agree. The
>>> word should have been they, not we. You had asked which group was
>>> right, and I meant to say that they agree on the important part.
>>>
>>> I've been trying to do too many things at once, and got to typing too
>>> fast.
>>>
>>> As far as the rest goes, I will email you privately.
>>>
>>>
>>> As far as judgementalism, you are wrong. Calling millions of Christians
>>> fuckheads is no different than calling black people the n-word.
>>> I expect better from someone I admire as much as I do Thad.
>>>
>>> and again I am sorry. that typo really screwed up the point I was
>>> making...
>>>
>>> DC
>>>
>
>

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Thu, 22 Mar 2007 00:48:29 GMT

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

The range of beliefs between Christian sects is obvious, even when they profess to believe the same thing. You are quite right that people make it complicated. And everyone has their own reasons for doing so.

The history is fascinating. I can give you the Lutheran point of view, born out of the reformation to spring free of the control and excesses of the Catholic church at that time.

As you imply, there are also ranges of beliefs within other umbrella-labeled religions as well as non-religious belief systems.

Your Sunni/Shiite example in Iraq, or Catholic/Protestant in Ireland, are both examples where people within the "same" religion have had rather violent disagreements.

And we haven't even touched the differences between different religions.

My simple point: generalizing leads to misunderstandings. I agree it applies to many situations, not just Christianity, which is why I mentioned that Christianity is hardly alone in being splintered. But Christianity was the sticking point in this thread.

To expand on your expansion, it would be useful if people were more clear about just what and who they are criticizing or praising, so that other sub-groups don't take offense or credit.

And we should be very aware and careful how we may be manipulated by ambiguous language.

As far as finding reference points on unity, we can surely use any we can get, religious or non-religious. One problem with using religious reference points is the fact that there are many religions and they disagree on major issues. We may do better internationally by using common human reference points that are shared by many people, religious and non-religious alike.

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

Dedric Terry wrote:

> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:4601b5ef@linux...

>> One problem is that Christianity is an umbrella term that covers a huge

>> range of beliefs.

>>

> The term doesn't cover a huge range of beliefs - just one. It is people in

> our human imperfection that diverge on beliefs.

> Christianity implies a very simple faith in Christ as God's son, sent to

> give his life on behalf of all of us.

> People make it more complicated than that simply because we are imperfect.

> No human born

> belief system is perfect. Faith in God is only originated, and perfected in

> and through Christ, not in in lieu of.

>

>> Christianity is splintered into a large number of independent sects which

>> regularly disagree about religious doctrine, political issues, behavioral

>> issues, and acceptance of various scientific evidence.

>>

>> Some can hardly talk to each other, the disagreements run so deep.

>>

> How is that different from non-Christian/agnostic/atheist belief systems?

> (even a lack of belief in a deity is a belief system). It's easy to judge

> Christianity's

> faults without acknowledging the complete failure of a non-religious society
> to
> have a lasting positive impact on the world as a whole in terms of peace,
> unity, love and compassion.
>
> I would have to say the divergence among Islamic sects (Sunni and Shiites)
> significantly overshadows the variations among Christian denominations.
>
>> A quick, dishonest way to rile up a lot of people is to take advantage of
>> the ambiguity to recast criticism of the behavior of one sect to make it
>> seem like an attack on anyone who calls themselves a Christian.
>
> Not sure I follow you here. Are you saying that Christians divert criticism
> to make it appear something it isn't, or are you using the convenience of
> ambiguous
> non-Christian beliefs to say the Christianity is rarely unfairly criticized.
> :-)
>
> To expand a bit, are you implying that it's normal/okay for anyone
> to criticize Christianity in the interest of balance, but when Christians
> bring that criticism to light, it's
> an opportunistic way of "rallying the faithful", as it were?
>
> In truth, who is being opportunistic? By the same token, there are a lot of
> people
> in different camps (white vs black, minority vs. minority, culture vs.
> culture) that say
> the other is in no way unfairly treated simply from lack of being in that
> other camp.
>
> It's really just a matter of people using their own frame of reference to
> evaluate someone else's,
> but that's the crux of what I think you are saying people shouldn't do. It
> seems to me, that should apply to all, not just Christians.
>
> How many news casts, books or documentaries focused on a handful of
> "Christians"
> and used or altered that to claim that Christianity is assaulting America?
> I have seen few if any news stories
> that say anything good about Christians in many years. Dirt sells, so we as
> a country are
> more than happy to dish it out about anyone we don't have to look squarely
> in the eye
> on a daily basis, whether it's the truth or not. Sad isn't it?
>
>> Christianity is hardly alone in being splintered. Generalizations are
>> always dangerous (irony intended).
>>

>
> Denominations of Christianity are splintered on varying issues, but only a
> few would
> call or consider those issues divisive. In contrast, I would find it quite
> difficult if not impossible
> to use the irreligious world as a reference point for unity.
>
> More than not, divisiveness within Christianity actually originates outside
> the walls of the church
> where Christians are faced with a world that demands they check their
> beliefs (in visible form) at the door when
> leaving the home, and accept what the world considers moral, right and just.
> Disagreements only
> gain weight when there is gravity to tug on them.
>
> Regards,
> Dedric
>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>>
>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>>> of them just went on holiday together earlier this week. Where? To a
>>>> Buddhist
>>>> temple that cares for Thais with AIDS. They used their _vacation_ to
>>>> take
>>>> food and medicine and money to some people
>>> Thad - just fyi, this is quite common among Christians as well. Don't
>>> believe
>>> what the political circles and news media tell you about Christians.
>>>
>>> When in college, I attended at church that had one of the strongest
>>> college ministries
>>> in the state. Every spring break we went to an inner city or remote
>>> rural area
>>> to work with Habitat for Humanity and other local organization building
>>> and
>>> repairing homes for low/no income people. There are many churches doing
>>> the same kinds of things every day, every week, every year, quietly
>>> without
>>> the news media around to make anyone aware of any of it.
>>>
>>> The church we attend here in Colorado has a partnership with a ministry
>>> in Swaziland
>>> helping people there with food, medicine, etc. AIDs is expected to wipe

>>> out over half the population
>>> in 5 years there. It is one of the most AIDs-devastated countries in
>>> Africa right now.
>>>
>>> This isn't a "look what great things we are doing" post -
>>> just an fyi that there are way more Christians doing really cool things
>>> for others
>>> than the news media would lead you to believe. People in general can be
>>> overbearing -
>>> the "beating people over the head" mentality isn't unique to Christians.
>>>
>>> The important thing for both viewpoints is to not become judgemental and
>>> stereotype
>>> people for their beliefs simply because a news story made their faith
>>> appear a certain way.
>>>
>>> There is a difference between condoning behavior and accepting people -
>>> simply condoning every behavior to avoid setting boundaries and making
>>> any distinction between
>>> right and wrong is a problem in and of itself, and not the enlightened
>>> attitude some would have the world believe.
>>>
>>> And there is also a distinct difference between judging an action as
>>> right or wrong, and showing grace for the person,
>>> and they aren't mutually exclusive, or counter intuitive.
>>>
>>> The bottom line: love is always far more powerful than hate, regardless
>>> of what you believe. But that
>>> is the true foundation of Christianity.
>>>
>>> Regards,
>>> Detric
>>>
>>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:460197c7@linux...
>>> seriously fucked over by the world.
>>>> One of the motivations was a friend of theirs who recently came out as
>>>> gay
>>>> to them, which is a far, far bigger deal in Thailand than in the US. And
>>>> instead of doing what would be easy, i.e. throwing the person out of
>>>> their
>>>> life for making the wrong 'choice,' they embraced him and did something
>>>> to
>>>> help the gay community in their country. I remain an atheist and make no
>>>> pretensions to Buddhism, but having seen how their piety brings out the
>>>> noble
>>>> traits of charity and understanding I can no longer dismiss all religion
>>>> out of hand. Having seen what their quiet and sincere spirituality does
>>>> for

>>>> Thais I have no choice but to respect it. I just despise closed minded
>>>> holy
>>>> roller US fuckheads that much more.
>>>> ++++++
>>>>
>>>> So the fuckheads are 'closed minded holy roller' types in the US. And I
>>>> stand
>>>> by that, and I mean the kind of people who are 'curing' same sexers and
>>>> scaring
>>>> teenagers who masturbate and insisting that the US is a Christian nation
>>>> and all of that. So I want those two things noted.
>>>>
>>>> Oddest of all to me is that, as most would see from the above quote, I
>>>> was
>>>> actually writing something _positive_ about religion. At least by my
>>>> standards.
>>>> This last trip to Thailand was a real watershed moment for me.
>>>> Previously
>>>> I had thought of religion as at best a crutch for psyches unable to
>>>> manage
>>>> without it, and at worst just another tool used by the few to control
>>>> the
>>>> many. But this trip, having spent time with youngish Thais, I had to
>>>> admit
>>>> that part of what made them such inspiring and beautiful souls was their
>>>> inspiring and beautiful religion. I'd be a total hypocrite to suddenly
>>>> claim
>>>> to be a buddhist, I'm an atheist just like I was before I went, but for
>>>> the
>>>> first time I saw the good in religion.
>>>>
>>>> I'd think that if a) you actually 'admired' me and b) you were
>>>> interested
>>>> in spirituality in the broader sense you'd think that was a good thing.
>>>> Instead
>>>> you misquote me and call me bitter and bigoted and hint that I might
>>>> wind
>>>> up murdered like what's her name. Real class, Don.
>>>>
>>>> TCB
>>>>
>>>> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:
>>>>> Doug Wellington <doug@parisfaqs.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>> We all agree on how you can be saved. You do not believe in
>>>>>> such things. There is your problem.
>>>>>> Sorry. I meant to say that all the different Christian groups agree.
>>>>>> The

>>>>> word should have been they, not we. You had asked which group was
>>>>> right, and I meant to say that they agree on the important part.
>>>>>
>>>>> I've been trying to do too many things at once, and got to typing too
>>>>> fast.
>>>>>
>>>>> As far as the rest goes, I will email you privately.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> As far as judgementalism, you are wrong. Calling millions of Christians
>>>>> fuckheads is no different than calling black people the n-word.
>>>>> I expect better from someone I admire as much as I do Thad.
>>>>>
>>>>> and again I am sorry. that typo really screwed up the point I was
>>>>> making...
>>>>>
>>>>> DC
>>>>>
>

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Thu, 22 Mar 2007 01:11:13 GMT

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

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:4601b5ef@linux...

>

> One problem is that Christianity is an umbrella term that covers a huge
> range of beliefs.

>

The term doesn't cover a huge range of beliefs - just one. It is people in
our human imperfection that diverge on beliefs.

Christianity implies a very simple faith in Christ as God's son, sent to
give his life on behalf of all of us.

People make it more complicated than that simply because we are imperfect.

No human born

belief system is perfect. Faith in God is only originated, and perfected in
and through Christ, not in in lieu of.

> Christianity is splintered into a large number of independent sects which
> regularly disagree about religious doctrine, political issues, behavioral
> issues, and acceptance of various scientific evidence.

>

> Some can hardly talk to each other, the disagreements run so deep.

>

How is that different from non-Christian/agnostic/atheist belief systems?
(even a lack of belief in a deity is a belief system). It's easy to judge
Christianity's

faults without acknowledging the complete failure of a non-religious society to have a lasting positive impact on the world as a whole in terms of peace, unity, love and compassion.

I would have to say the divergence among Islamic sects (Sunni and Shiites) significantly overshadows the variations among Christian denominations.

> A quick, dishonest way to rile up a lot of people is to take advantage of
> the ambiguity to recast criticism of the behavior of one sect to make it
> seem like an attack on anyone who calls themselves a Christian.

Not sure I follow you here. Are you saying that Christians divert criticism to make it appear something it isn't, or are you using the convenience of ambiguous non-Christian beliefs to say the Christianity is rarely unfairly criticized.
:-)

To expand a bit, are you implying that it's normal/okay for anyone to criticize Christianity in the interest of balance, but when Christians bring that criticism to light, it's an opportunistic way of "rallying the faithful", as it were?

In truth, who is being opportunistic? By the same token, there are a lot of people in different camps (white vs black, minority vs. minority, culture vs. culture) that say the other is in no way unfairly treated simply from lack of being in that other camp.

It's really just a matter of people using their own frame of reference to evaluate someone else's, but that's the crux of what I think you are saying people shouldn't do. It seems to me, that should apply to all, not just Christians.

How many news casts, books or documentaries focused on a handful of "Christians" and used or altered that to claim that Christianity is assaulting America? I have seen few if any news stories that say anything good about Christians in many years. Dirt sells, so we as a country are more than happy to dish it out about anyone we don't have to look squarely in the eye on a daily basis, whether it's the truth or not. Sad isn't it?

> Christianity is hardly alone in being splintered. Generalizations are
> always dangerous (irony intended).
>

Denominations of Christianity are splintered on varying issues, but only a few would call or consider those issues divisive. In contrast, I would find it quite difficult if not impossible to use the irreligious world as a reference point for unity.

More than not, divisiveness within Christianity actually originates outside the walls of the church where Christians are faced with a world that demands they check their beliefs (in visible form) at the door when leaving the home, and accept what the world considers moral, right and just. Disagreements only gain weight when there is gravity to tug on them.

Regards,
Dedric

> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> www.JamieKrutz.com

>
>
>

> Dedric Terry wrote:

>>> of them just went on holiday together earlier this week. Where? To a
>>> Buddhist
>>> temple that cares for Thais with AIDS. They used their _vacation_ to
>>> take

>>> food and medicine and money to some people
>>

>> Thad - just fyi, this is quite common among Christians as well. Don't
>> believe

>> what the political circles and news media tell you about Christians.
>>

>> When in college, I attended at church that had one of the strongest
>> college ministries

>> in the state. Every spring break we went to an inner city or remote
>> rural area

>> to work with Habitat for Humanity and other local organization building
>> and

>> repairing homes for low/no income people. There are many churches doing
>> the same kinds of things every day, every week, every year, quietly
>> without

>> the news media around to make anyone aware of any of it.
>>

>> The church we attend here in Colorado has a partnership with a ministry
>> in Swaziland

>> helping people there with food, medicine, etc. AIDs is expected to wipe
>> out over half the population
>> in 5 years there. It is one of the most AIDs-devastated countries in
>> Africa right now.
>>
>> This isn't a "look what great things we are doing" post -
>> just an fyi that there are way more Christians doing really cool things
>> for others
>> than the news media would lead you to believe. People in general can be
>> overbearing -
>> the "beating people over the head" mentality isn't unique to Christians.
>>
>> The important thing for both viewpoints is to not become judgemental and
>> stereotype
>> people for their beliefs simply because a news story made their faith
>> appear a certain way.
>>
>> There is a difference between condoning behavior and accepting people -
>> simply condoning every behavior to avoid setting boundaries and making
>> any distinction between
>> right and wrong is a problem in and of itself, and not the enlightened
>> attitude some would have the world believe.
>>
>> And there is also a distinct difference between judging an action as
>> right or wrong, and showing grace for the person,
>> and they aren't mutually exclusive, or counter intuitive.
>>
>> The bottom line: love is always far more powerful than hate, regardless
>> of what you believe. But that
>> is the true foundation of Christianity.
>>
>> Regards,
>> Dedic
>>
>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:460197c7@linux...
>> seriously fucked over by the world.
>>> One of the motivations was a friend of theirs who recently came out as
>>> gay
>>> to them, which is a far, far bigger deal in Thailand than in the US. And
>>> instead of doing what would be easy, i.e. throwing the person out of
>>> their
>>> life for making the wrong 'choice,' they embraced him and did something
>>> to
>>> help the gay community in their country. I remain an atheist and make no
>>> pretensions to Buddhism, but having seen how their piety brings out the
>>> noble
>>> traits of charity and understanding I can no longer dismiss all religion
>>> out of hand. Having seen what their quiet and sincere spirituality does

>>> for
>>> Thais I have no choice but to respect it. I just despise closed minded
>>> holy
>>> roller US fuckheads that much more.
>>> ++++++
>>>
>>> So the fuckheads are 'closed minded holy roller' types in the US. And I
>>> stand
>>> by that, and I mean the kind of people who are 'curing' same sexers and
>>> scaring
>>> teenagers who masturbate and insisting that the US is a Christian nation
>>> and all of that. So I want those two things noted.
>>>
>>> Oddest of all to me is that, as most would see from the above quote, I
>>> was
>>> actually writing something _positive_ about religion. At least by my
>>> standards.
>>> This last trip to Thailand was a real watershed moment for me.
>>> Previously
>>> I had thought of religion as at best a crutch for psyches unable to
>>> manage
>>> without it, and at worst just another tool used by the few to control
>>> the
>>> many. But this trip, having spent time with youngish Thais, I had to
>>> admit
>>> that part of what made them such inspiring and beautiful souls was their
>>> inspiring and beautiful religion. I'd be a total hypocrite to suddenly
>>> claim
>>> to be a buddhist, I'm an atheist just like I was before I went, but for
>>> the
>>> first time I saw the good in religion.
>>>
>>> I'd think that if a) you actually 'admired' me and b) you were
>>> interested
>>> in spirituality in the broader sense you'd think that was a good thing.
>>> Instead
>>> you misquote me and call me bitter and bigoted and hint that I might
>>> wind
>>> up murdered like what's her name. Real class, Don.
>>>
>>> TCB
>>>
>>> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:
>>>> Doug Wellington <doug@parisfaqs.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>> We all agree on how you can be saved. You do not believe in
>>>>> such things. There is your problem.
>>>> Sorry. I meant to say that all the different Christian groups agree.

>>>> The
>>>> word should have been they, not we. You had asked which group was
>>>> right, and I meant to say that they agree on the important part.
>>>>
>>>> I've been trying to do too many things at once, and got to typing too
>>>> fast.
>>>>
>>>> As far as the rest goes, I will email you privately.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> As far as judgementalism, you are wrong. Calling millions of Christians
>>>> fuckheads is no different than calling black people the n-word.
>>>> I expect better from someone I admire as much as I do Thad.
>>>>
>>>> and again I am sorry. that typo really screwed up the point I was
>>>> making...
>>>>
>>>> DC
>>>>
>>

Subject: Re: Well, this sucks...

Posted by [Doug Wellington](#) on Thu, 22 Mar 2007 20:35:02 GMT

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

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

> The range of beliefs between Christian sects is obvious, even when they
> profess to believe the same thing.

What is the definition of "Christian"? For good discussion about this, see Mere Christianity by C.S. Lewis. One problem comes about when some mis-use the word Christian to mean Christian-like behavior. As Lewis points out, that definition is useless.

At the same time, many people profess to be Christians and behave in what they would say is a Christian-like manner, but they may or may not adhere to the true definition of being Christian. This leads to problems for observers, because one can't tell by looking at the outside of a person whether they are truly Christian or not...

Something that can be hard to do is to separate the behavior from the faith. We all behave differently. Becoming a Christian does not necessarily result in behavior change! Some Christians do not act in what some would call a Christian-like manner. Lewis points out that this is like saying that a "gentleman" (land owner with coat of arms) isn't behaving in a gentleman-like fashion. Some observers look at some Christians and can only see the behavior. Some of them are very vocal about not liking that

behavior, but have no problem with the faith itself when the distinction is pointed out to them. Some defend the faith against all perceived attacks, including the observed dislike of the behavior. Where do we draw the line? Is an attack on the behavior an attack on all of Christianity?

- > Your Sunni/Shiite example in Iraq, or Catholic/Protestant in Ireland, are
- > both examples where people within the "same" religion have had rather
- > violent disagreements.

Human imperfections? Belief vs. behavior? Message vs. messenger? It is interesting to see how each side claims that God is with them. Ironically, I think this is true, but maybe not in the way some claim. If God created everything, then isn't everything important? Would God have created something that wasn't important?

- > My simple point: generalizing leads to misunderstandings.

So true... But sometimes it would seem we can be too specific. If we look specifically at one thing without having a context to the big picture, we may have misunderstandings as well. (Tree?) And yet, sometimes one must generalize in order to create a starting point for discussion. (Forest?) I think the trick is to know when to choose the generalization and when to choose the specific. Of course, there are many levels of distinction between the general and specific. Put differently, there are many shades of grey in the world...

- > As far as finding reference points on unity, we can surely use any we can
- > get, religious or non-religious. One problem with using religious
- > reference points is the fact that there are many religions and they
- > disagree on major issues. We may do better internationally by using common
- > human reference points that are shared by many people, religious and
- > non-religious alike.

Something the founders of the United States of America struggled with...

Doug

Subject: Re: AAAAAAAAAHHHHHHHHHHHHH!!!!!!!

Posted by [erlilo](#) on Sat, 24 Mar 2007 22:55:25 GMT

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

.....Hmmm.....been away too long to understand a damn shit about what's happening here with DJ's brain.... ...hmmm...

Erlilo

"Doug Wellington" <doug@parisfaqs.com> skrev i en meddelelse

news:460081b5@linux...

> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.org> wrote in message news:460056f0\$1@linux...

>> Doug! Who are you speaking to here?

>

> I thought it was obvious that I was "forcing" DJ to read more... :-)

>

> Doug (waiting for his brain to explode...)

>
