Subject: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Dedric Terry on Sat, 16 Sep 2006 22:48:09 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I don't want to start another religious or political thread - I just found this ironic, at best:

The Pope is under fire from the Islamic community because he quoted a Byzantine emperor's ancient writings in a talk rejecting religious motivation for violence. The emperor, in obscure writings hundreds of year old, characterized the teachings of Muhammad (Islam's founder) as "evil and inhuman" because if it's command to "spread by the sword the faith". The Pope made no such characterization - just quoted the old guy, and it isn't even clear if he quoted any of the "offensive" text.

As a protest, two Catholic, two Anglican, and one Greek church in the West Bank were attacked by Palestinians using guns, firebombs and lighter fluid - charring the churches and riddling them with bullet holes.

Umm...reality check: 2+2=4. The Earth still circles the Sun. And doesn't reacting with violence just prove the Emperor's assessment, and then some? Yet the press and the Islamic world seem to have missed the irony of this response, or at least are reluctant to admit it.

The Pope's comment is getting more press than the fact that violence was actually perpetrated when the churches were torched. To note, this was a response, not a crime.

Why are we (the world culture) so quick to defend Islam and work so hard to avoid offending Muslims, regardless of the cost - even if it means rewriting the definitions of peace and violence? Just something to think about....

Ignorance isn't bliss, it's the last step one takes before falling off of a cliff.

Back to music...
Dedric

Subject: Re: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Deej [1] on Sat, 16 Sep 2006 23:41:30 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

It's Bush's fault.

"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message news:C131DB49.356D%dterry@keyofd.net...
> I don't want to start another religious or political thread - I just found

> this ironic, at best:
>
> The Pope is under fire from the Islamic community because he quoted a
> Byzantine emperor's ancient writings in a talk rejecting religious
> motivation for violence. The emperor, in obscure writings hundreds of
year
> old, characterized the teachings of Muhammad (Islam's founder) as "evil
and
> inhuman" because if it's command to "spread by the sword the faith". The
> Pope made no such characterization - just quoted the old guy, and it isn't
> even clear if he quoted any of the "offensive" text.
>
> As a protest, two Catholic, two Anglican, and one Greek church in the West
> Bank were attacked by Palestinians using guns, firebombs and lighter
fluid -
> charring the churches and riddling them with bullet holes.
>
> Umm...reality check: 2+2=4. The Earth still circles the Sun. And
doesn't
> reacting with violence just prove the Emperor's assessment, and then some?
> Yet the press and the Islamic world seem to have missed the irony of this
> response, or at least are reluctant to admit it.
>
> The Pope's comment is getting more press than the fact that violence was
> actually perpetrated when the churches were torched. To note, this was a
> response, not a crime.
>
> Why are we (the world culture) so quick to defend Islam and work so hard
to
> avoid offending Muslims, regardless of the cost - even if it means
rewriting
> the definitions of peace and violence? Just something to think about....
>
> Ignorance isn't bliss, it's the last step one takes before falling off of
a
> cliff.
>
> Back to music...
> Dedric
>

Subject: Re: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by justcron on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 00:52:20 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Agreed to both.

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
news:450c8c11@linux...
> It's Bush's fault.
>
> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
> news:C131DB49.356D%dterry@keyofd.net...
>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread - I just
>> found
>> this ironic, at best:
>>
>> The Pope is under fire from the Islamic community because he quoted a
>> Byzantine emperor's ancient writings in a talk rejecting religious
>> motivation for violence. The emperor, in obscure writings hundreds of
> year
>> old, characterized the teachings of Muhammad (Islam's founder) as "evil
> and
>> inhuman" because if it's command to "spread by the sword the faith". The
>> Pope made no such characterization - just quoted the old guy, and it
>> isn't
>> even clear if he quoted any of the "offensive" text.
>>
>> As a protest, two Catholic, two Anglican, and one Greek church in the
>> West
>> Bank were attacked by Palestinians using guns, firebombs and lighter
> fluid -
>> charring the churches and riddling them with bullet holes.
>>
>> Umm...reality check: 2+2=4. The Earth still circles the Sun. And
> doesn't
>> reacting with violence just prove the Emperor's assessment, and then
>> some?
>> Yet the press and the Islamic world seem to have missed the irony of this
>> response, or at least are reluctant to admit it.
>>
>> The Pope's comment is getting more press than the fact that violence was
>> actually perpetrated when the churches were torched. To note, this was a
>> response, not a crime.
>>
>> Why are we (the world culture) so quick to defend Islam and work so hard
> to
>> avoid offending Muslims, regardless of the cost - even if it means
> rewriting
>> the definitions of peace and violence? Just something to think about....
>>
>> Ignorance isn't bliss, it's the last step one takes before falling off of
> a
>> cliff.
>>

>> Back to music...
>> Dedric
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Martin Harrington on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 01:14:15 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Seems to me that it's time to bring back King Arthur.....
--
Martin Harrington
www.lendanear-sound.com

"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
news:C131DB49.356D%dterry@keyofd.net...
>I don't want to start another religious or political thread - I just found
> this ironic, at best:
>
> The Pope is under fire from the Islamic community because he quoted a
> Byzantine emperor's ancient writings in a talk rejecting religious
> motivation for violence. The emperor, in obscure writings hundreds of
> year
> old, characterized the teachings of Muhammad (Islam's founder) as "evil
> and
> inhuman" because if it's command to "spread by the sword the faith". The
> Pope made no such characterization - just quoted the old guy, and it isn't
> even clear if he quoted any of the "offensive" text.
>
> As a protest, two Catholic, two Anglican, and one Greek church in the West
> Bank were attacked by Palestinians using guns, firebombs and lighter
> fluid -
> charring the churches and riddling them with bullet holes.
>
> Umm...reality check: 2+2=4. The Earth still circles the Sun. And
> doesn't
> reacting with violence just prove the Emperor's assessment, and then some?
> Yet the press and the Islamic world seem to have missed the irony of this
> response, or at least are reluctant to admit it.
>
> The Pope's comment is getting more press than the fact that violence was
> actually perpetrated when the churches were torched. To note, this was a
> response, not a crime.
>
> Why are we (the world culture) so quick to defend Islam and work so hard
> to

> avoid offending Muslims, regardless of the cost - even if it means
> rewriting
> the definitions of peace and violence? Just something to think about....
>
> Ignorance isn't bliss, it's the last step one takes before falling off of
> a
> cliff.
>
> Back to music...
> Dedric
>

Subject: Re: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Sarah on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 01:29:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I recall a similar irony, if that's the right word, during the Danish cartoon flap: Muslim fanatics using violence to protest the implication that Islam is a violent religion. Is it possible they didn't realize they were proving the validity of the cartoons? Hard to believe.

Unfortunately, Osama bin Laden and others have much of the Muslim world convinced that the US is engaged in a war on Islam. Even more unfortunately, I think for some this actually is an unspoken motive in our "war on terror."

To paraphrase John Lennon: imagine . . . no religion.

Sigh,

Sarah

"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
news:C131DB49.356D%dterry@keyofd.net...
>I don't want to start another religious or political thread - I just found
> this ironic, at best:
>
> The Pope is under fire from the Islamic community because he quoted a
> Byzantine emperor's ancient writings in a talk rejecting religious
> motivation for violence. The emperor, in obscure writings hundreds of
> year
> old, characterized the teachings of Muhammad (Islam's founder) as "evil
> and
> inhuman" because if it's command to "spread by the sword the faith". The
> Pope made no such characterization - just quoted the old guy, and it isn't
> even clear if he quoted any of the "offensive" text.

>
> As a protest, two Catholic, two Anglican, and one Greek church in the West
> Bank were attacked by Palestinians using guns, firebombs and lighter
> fluid -
> charring the churches and riddling them with bullet holes.
>
> Umm...reality check: 2+2=4. The Earth still circles the Sun. And
> doesn't
> reacting with violence just prove the Emperor's assessment, and then some?
> Yet the press and the Islamic world seem to have missed the irony of this
> response, or at least are reluctant to admit it.
>
> The Pope's comment is getting more press than the fact that violence was
> actually perpetrated when the churches were torched. To note, this was a
> response, not a crime.
>
> Why are we (the world culture) so quick to defend Islam and work so hard
> to
> avoid offending Muslims, regardless of the cost - even if it means
> rewriting
> the definitions of peace and violence? Just something to think about....
>
> Ignorance isn't bliss, it's the last step one takes before falling off of
> a
> cliff.
>
> Back to music...
> Dedric
>

Subject: Re: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Sarah on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 01:35:11 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

You don't need King Arthur, silly . . . you have King George the Decider and
Richard (Cheney) the Lyin' Hearted. :)

S

"Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote in message
news:450c9fbe$1@linux...
> Seems to me that it's time to bring back King Arthur.....
> --
> Martin Harrington
> www.lendanear-sound.com
>

> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
> news:C131DB49.356D%dterry@keyofd.net...
>>I don't want to start another religious or political thread - I just found
>> this ironic, at best:
>>
>> The Pope is under fire from the Islamic community because he quoted a
>> Byzantine emperor's ancient writings in a talk rejecting religious
>> motivation for violence. The emperor, in obscure writings hundreds of
>> year
>> old, characterized the teachings of Muhammad (Islam's founder) as "evil
>> and
>> inhuman" because if it's command to "spread by the sword the faith". The
>> Pope made no such characterization - just quoted the old guy, and it
>> isn't
>> even clear if he quoted any of the "offensive" text.
>>
>> As a protest, two Catholic, two Anglican, and one Greek church in the
>> West
>> Bank were attacked by Palestinians using guns, firebombs and lighter
>> fluid -
>> charring the churches and riddling them with bullet holes.
>>
>> Umm...reality check: 2+2=4. The Earth still circles the Sun. And
>> doesn't
>> reacting with violence just prove the Emperor's assessment, and then
>> some?
>> Yet the press and the Islamic world seem to have missed the irony of this
>> response, or at least are reluctant to admit it.
>>
>> The Pope's comment is getting more press than the fact that violence was
>> actually perpetrated when the churches were torched. To note, this was a
>> response, not a crime.
>>
>> Why are we (the world culture) so quick to defend Islam and work so hard
>> to
>> avoid offending Muslims, regardless of the cost - even if it means
>> rewriting
>> the definitions of peace and violence? Just something to think about....
>>
>> Ignorance isn't bliss, it's the last step one takes before falling off of
>> a
>> cliff.
>>
>> Back to music...
>> Dedric
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Deej [1] on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 01:36:38 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

.....wait!!!....it's Clinton's fault!!!.....no!!!.....it's Eisenhower's fault!!!!!.....hell, maybe it's Muhammad's fault!!!.....not, it's Jesus' fault!!!!.....

"justcron" <parisnews@hydrorecords.com> wrote in message
news:450c9a65@linux...
> Agreed to both.
>
> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
> news:450c8c11@linux...
> > It's Bush's fault.
> >
> > "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
> > news:C131DB49.356D%dterry@keyofd.net...
> >> I don't want to start another religious or political thread - I just
> >> found
> >> this ironic, at best:
> >>
> >> The Pope is under fire from the Islamic community because he quoted a
> >> Byzantine emperor's ancient writings in a talk rejecting religious
> >> motivation for violence. The emperor, in obscure writings hundreds of
> > year
> >> old, characterized the teachings of Muhammad (Islam's founder) as "evil
> > and
> >> inhuman" because if it's command to "spread by the sword the faith".
The
> >> Pope made no such characterization - just quoted the old guy, and it
> >> isn't
> >> even clear if he quoted any of the "offensive" text.
> >>
> >> As a protest, two Catholic, two Anglican, and one Greek church in the
> >> West
> >> Bank were attacked by Palestinians using guns, firebombs and lighter
> > fluid -
> >> charring the churches and riddling them with bullet holes.
> >>
> >> Umm...reality check: 2+2=4. The Earth still circles the Sun. And
> > doesn't
> >> reacting with violence just prove the Emperor's assessment, and then
> >> some?
> >> Yet the press and the Islamic world seem to have missed the irony of
this
> >> response, or at least are reluctant to admit it.

> >>
> >> The Pope's comment is getting more press than the fact that violence
was
> >> actually perpetrated when the churches were torched. To note, this was
a
> >> response, not a crime.
> >>
> >> Why are we (the world culture) so quick to defend Islam and work so
hard
> > to
> >> avoid offending Muslims, regardless of the cost - even if it means
> > rewriting
> >> the definitions of peace and violence? Just something to think
about....
> >>
> >> Ignorance isn't bliss, it's the last step one takes before falling off
of
> > a
> >> cliff.
> >>
> >> Back to music...
> >> Dedric
> >>
> >
> >
>
>

Subject: Re: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by DC on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 02:00:16 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote:

>To paraphrase John Lennon: imagine . . . no religion.

Imagine there's no hippies... It's easy if you try...

Sorry, couldn't resist.

DC

Subject: Re: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Deej [1] on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 02:00:25 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Apparently it's an abomination to Islam to discuss whether or not Mohammed said anything other than what a few *chosen* mullas decide is OK. I still find it disturbingly amazing that those on the left in this country are so friggin blind that they don't see what is in store for them if they win the ideological struggle that is going on in this country and in doing so, further empower the very anthisesis of everything they believe in.

Take a good look at what is happening. It is not Bush's fault. It started long before Bush took office. It is the natural progression of the radical Islamic agenda to use *any* excuse to jump up and down like a bunch of automations, shoot guns in the air and burn things whil'st blithering a bunch of racist, hate driven nonsense.

Coming soon to a *Sudetenland* near you.

"Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote in message news:450ca327@linux...
> I recall a similar irony, if that's the right word, during the Danish
> cartoon flap: Muslim fanatics using violence to protest the implication
> that Islam is a violent religion. Is it possible they didn't realize they
> were proving the validity of the cartoons? Hard to believe.
>
> Unfortunately, Osama bin Laden and others have much of the Muslim world
> convinced that the US is engaged in a war on Islam. Even more
> unfortunately, I think for some this actually is an unspoken motive in our
> "war on terror."
>
> To paraphrase John Lennon: imagine . . . no religion.
>
> Sigh,
>
> Sarah
>
>
> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
> news:C131DB49.356D%dterry@keyofd.net...
> >I don't want to start another religious or political thread - I just
found
> > this ironic, at best:
> >
> > The Pope is under fire from the Islamic community because he quoted a
> > Byzantine emperor's ancient writings in a talk rejecting religious
> > motivation for violence. The emperor, in obscure writings hundreds of
> > year
> > old, characterized the teachings of Muhammad (Islam's founder) as "evil
> > and

> > inhuman" because if it's command to "spread by the sword the faith". The
> > Pope made no such characterization - just quoted the old guy, and it isn't
> > even clear if he quoted any of the "offensive" text.
> >
> > As a protest, two Catholic, two Anglican, and one Greek church in the West
> > Bank were attacked by Palestinians using guns, firebombs and lighter
> > fluid -
> > charring the churches and riddling them with bullet holes.
> >
> > Umm...reality check: 2+2=4. The Earth still circles the Sun. And
> > doesn't
> > reacting with violence just prove the Emperor's assessment, and then some?
> > Yet the press and the Islamic world seem to have missed the irony of this
> > response, or at least are reluctant to admit it.
> >
> > The Pope's comment is getting more press than the fact that violence was
> > actually perpetrated when the churches were torched. To note, this was a
> > response, not a crime.
> >
> > Why are we (the world culture) so quick to defend Islam and work so hard
> > to
> > avoid offending Muslims, regardless of the cost - even if it means
> > rewriting
> > the definitions of peace and violence? Just something to think about....
> >
> > Ignorance isn't bliss, it's the last step one takes before falling off of
> > a
> > cliff.
> >
> > Back to music...
> > Dedric
> >
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by gene lennon on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 03:09:36 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>I don't want to start another religious or political thread -...

These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the current administration have had a variety of political, financial and power-based reasons for perusing the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier motivation.

Religion.

If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third Great Awakening" of the international religious struggle. This is a good thing as he sees it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight against terrorists

as "a confrontation between good and evil."
In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit of trouble (as has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.

Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be headed?

Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could easily go down hill from here.

More on the "Third Awakening":
 http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09 /12/AR2006091201594_pf.html

Gene

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by dc[3] on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 04:15:46 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:

>the president has had an even scarier motivation.
>
>Religion.

Gene, that's absurd. You just passed the 5-year anniversary of the worst attack on americans in history, and you can't even grant the president the motive of protecting the rest of us?

Agree with him or not, like his methods or not, do you really think it fair to discredit both his clearly stated motive and the reasoning behind it in favor of anti-christian paranoia?

Lincoln lived during the 2nd awakening and often used "good vs. evil" as a part of his reasoning as well. Would you be frightened of him as well?

Can only atheists be president?

Where is the specific evidence for the motivations you assign to Bush?

Can you not call the jihadis "evil"?

>Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be headed?

Oh hell yeah Gene, can't you?

http://www.breitbart.com/news/na/cp_w091615A.xml.html

http://www.dailymail.co.uk/pages/live/articles/news/worldnews.html?in_article_id=405238&in_page_id=1811&ico=Homepage&icl=TabModule&icc=NEWS&ct=5

http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/763199.html

http://www.timesonline.co.uk/printFriendly/0,,1-3-2360093-3, 00.html

http://www.thereligionofpeace.com/index.html#Attacks

And all you can do is hate Bush for being Christian...

What is your plan to protect us?

DC

Subject: Re: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Chris Latham on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 04:48:01 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Well stated!!!
It just amazes me how blind some people and the mainstream media can be to obvious TRUTH!

CL

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by gene lennon on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 05:25:29 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:
>
>"gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>
>>the president has had an even scarier motivation.
>>
>>Religion.
>
>
>Gene, that's absurd. You just passed the 5-year anniversary
>of the worst attack on americans in history, and you can't even
>grant the president the motive of protecting the rest of us?
>
>

as do I (at least for the moment). This is not just about religious fervor,

oars In the water. If I am right, this is the most dangerous period in our history.

But to my point, this is also from the Washington Post:

Another Rapture writer says he advises White House

by Dan Froomkin, Washington Post

Aug. 4, 2006

Joel C. Rosenberg, who writes Christian apocalyptic fiction, told me in an interview this week that he was invited to a White House Bible study group last year to talk about current events and biblical prophecy.

Rosenberg said that on February 10, 2005, he came to speak to a "couple dozen"

touch with several of them since.

Rosenberg wouldn't say exactly what was discussed. "The meeting itself was off the record, as you could imagine," he said. He declined to name the staffer he said invited him or describe the attendees in any way other than to say that the president was not among them. "I can't imagine they'd want to talk about it," he said.

"I can't tell you that the people that I spoke with agree with me, or believe

that prophecy can really help you understand what will happen next in the Middle East, but I'm not surprised that they're intrigued."

The White House press office wasn't able to confirm the visit for me, but there have been previous reports about White House Bible study groups inviting Christian authors to come speak.

Apocalyptic advice:
Aug. 12, 2003:
Apocalypse preacher says Bush administration solicits his advice

Aug. 17, 2003:
Rice briefs 'Christian Zionists'
on Mideast peace plan

May 18, 2004:
White House checked with rapture Christians before latest Israel move

Aug. 8, 2006:
Cheering for apocalypse, evangelical lunatics counsel Bush White House

Rapture radicals
Bush and the fundamentalists
Rosenberg says he got a call last year from a White House staffer.

"He said 'A lot of people over here are reading your novels, and they're intrigued that these things keep on happening ... . Your novels keep foreshadowing actual coming events. ... And so we're curious, how are you doing it? What's the secret? Why don't you come over and walk us through the story behind these novels?' So I did."

about the apocalypse. The consistent theme is that certain current events presage the end times, the Rapture, and the return of Jesus Christ. Rosenberg's particular pitch to journalists is that his books come true.

Here he is in a recent interview with Christian talk-show host Pat Robertson , talking about what he thinks is going to happen next: "Now I have to say,

says He's going to supernaturally judge Iran, Sudan, Lebanon, Syria, these other countries. We're talking about fire from heaven, a massive earthquake. It's going to be devastating and tragic. But I believe that afterwards there's going to be a great spiritual awakening. We're seeing more Muslims coming to Christ right now than at any other time in history. But I think that's just the beginning. We've got dark days ahead of us. But I believe there's a light at the end of that tunnel."

Rosenberg says he got a call last year from a White House staffer. "He said 'A lot of people over here are reading your novels, and they're intrigued that these things keep on happening ... . Your novels keep foreshadowing actual coming events. ... And so we're curious, how are you doing it? What's the secret? Why don't you come over and walk us through the story behind these novels?' So I did."

Judy Keen first wrote back in October 2002, in USA Today, that "some White House staffers have been meeting weekly at hour-long prayer and Bible study sessions."

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Deej [1] on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 05:35:47 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Gene,

If I actually believed this, I might agree with you. We've certainly disagreed on a number of issues like this but I respect your opinion. I'm sincerely interested to know if this is for real. I've got no problem with people practicing their faith but I do believe that faith in something (like armageddon) can definitely bring it about. I've read a number of articles discussing thes things you bring up here, but the sources were easily as fanatical as they purported Bush to be.

I agree that we may be living in the most dangerous time in the history of the human race, but I don't see the same villian that you do.

Deej

"gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote in message news:450cdc49$1@linux...
>
> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:
> >
> >"gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
> >
> >>the president has had an even scarier motivation.
> >>
> >>Religion.
> >
> >
> >Gene, that's absurd. You just passed the 5-year anniversary
> >of the worst attack on americans in history, and you can't even
> >grant the president the motive of protecting the rest of us?

> >
> >
>
> I'm not going to argue this with you. You still have a right to your
opinion,
> as do I (at least for the moment). This is not just about religious
fervor,
> I honestly think the Pres is not 100% with it. I don't think he has all
his
> oars In the water. If I am right, this is the most dangerous period in our
> history.
>
>
> But to my point, this is also from the Washington Post:
>
> Another Rapture writer says he advises White House
>
> by Dan Froomkin, Washington Post
>
> Aug. 4, 2006
>
> Joel C. Rosenberg, who writes Christian apocalyptic fiction, told me in an
> interview this week that he was invited to a White House Bible study group
> last year to talk about current events and biblical prophecy.
>
> Rosenberg said that on February 10, 2005, he came to speak to a "couple
dozen"
> White House aides in the Old Executive Office Building - and has stayed in
> touch with several of them since.
>
> Rosenberg wouldn't say exactly what was discussed. "The meeting itself was
> off the record, as you could imagine," he said. He declined to name the
staffer
> he said invited him or describe the attendees in any way other than to say
> that the president was not among them. "I can't imagine they'd want to
talk
> about it," he said.
>
> "I can't tell you that the people that I spoke with agree with me, or
believe
> that prophecy can really help you understand what will happen next in the
> Middle East, but I'm not surprised that they're intrigued."
>
> The White House press office wasn't able to confirm the visit for me, but
> there have been previous reports about White House Bible study groups
inviting
> Christian authors to come speak.
>

>
> Apocalyptic advice:
> Aug. 12, 2003:
> Apocalypse preacher says Bush administration solicits his advice
>
> Aug. 17, 2003:
> Rice briefs 'Christian Zionists'
> on Mideast peace plan
>
> May 18, 2004:
> White House checked with rapture Christians before latest Israel move
>
> Aug. 8, 2006:
> Cheering for apocalypse, evangelical lunatics counsel Bush White House
>
> Rapture radicals
> Bush and the fundamentalists
> Rosenberg says he got a call last year from a White House staffer.
>
> "He said 'A lot of people over here are reading your novels, and they're
> intrigued that these things keep on happening ... . Your novels keep
foreshadowing
> actual coming events. ... And so we're curious, how are you doing it?
What's
> the secret? Why don't you come over and walk us through the story behind
> these novels?' So I did."
> Rosenberg - like Tim LaHaye and Jerry B. Jenkins, the authors of the
phenomenally
> popular Left Behind series - writes fiction inspired by biblical prophecy
> about the apocalypse. The consistent theme is that certain current events
> presage the end times, the Rapture, and the return of Jesus Christ.
Rosenberg's
> particular pitch to journalists is that his books come true.
>
> Here he is in a recent interview with Christian talk-show host Pat
Robertson
> , talking about what he thinks is going to happen next: "Now I have to
say,
> Pat, I believe that Ezekiel 38 and 39 - the prophecies that we're talking
> about - I think this is about the end of radical Islam as we know it. God
> says He's going to supernaturally judge Iran, Sudan, Lebanon, Syria, these
> other countries. We're talking about fire from heaven, a massive
earthquake.
> It's going to be devastating and tragic. But I believe that afterwards
there's
> going to be a great spiritual awakening. We're seeing more Muslims coming
> to Christ right now than at any other time in history. But I think that's
> just the beginning. We've got dark days ahead of us. But I believe there's

> a light at the end of that tunnel."
>
> Rosenberg says he got a call last year from a White House staffer. "He
said
> 'A lot of people over here are reading your novels, and they're intrigued
> that these things keep on happening ... . Your novels keep foreshadowing
> actual coming events. ... And so we're curious, how are you doing it?
What's
> the secret? Why don't you come over and walk us through the story behind
> these novels?' So I did."
>
> Judy Keen first wrote back in October 2002, in USA Today, that "some White
> House staffers have been meeting weekly at hour-long prayer and Bible
study
> sessions."
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by gene lennon on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 06:17:16 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:
>Gene,
>
>If I actually believed this, I might agree with you. We've certainly
>disagreed on a number of issues like this but I respect your opinion. I'm
>sincerely interested to know if this is for real. I've got no problem with
>people practicing their faith but I do believe that faith in something (like
>armageddon) can definitely bring it about. I've read a number of articles
>discussing thes things you bring up here, but the sources were easily as
>fanatical as they purported Bush to be.
>
>I agree that we may be living in the most dangerous time in the history
of
>the human race, but I don't see the same villian that you do.
>
>Deej
>

There is not just one villain, there are plenty of villains. Saddam Hussein,

As a US citizen, I feel like I have been put on the list by the unconscionable actions of our government.

if not hundreds of thousands of innocent people in the name of bringing them

and put them to death without ever showing any evidence, why not.

Well I do have a problem. It is NOT OK.

I want my country back.

It was never perfect. No country ever was, but we stood for something great,
even if we sometimes had less than stellar moments. I know in my heart that
if the Founding Fathers of the United States were alive today they would
be calling for impeachment or revolution.

presidents that were deeply religions, but if he thinks that all the wars
and problems we are having in the world are actually a good thing because
they have ignited a resurgence in Christian Values, we are in deep shit.
Gene

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by excelav on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 07:02:56 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>
>Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>I don't want to start another religious or political thread -...
>
>
>These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the current administration
>have had a variety of political, financial and power-based reasons for perusing
>the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier motivation.

>
>Religion.

I think Bush believes in religious freedom, I don't think the jehadist feel
the same way.

>
>If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third Great Awakening"
>of the international religious struggle. This is a good thing as he sees
>it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight against terrorists

>as "a confrontation between good and evil."

>In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit of trouble (as
>has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
>
>Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be headed?

I don't think we are being give a choice, or did you forget 9/11?
>
>Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could easily go down
>hill from here.
>
Things will go down hill if we do take care of these problems.

>More on the "Third Awakening":
> http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09 /12/AR2006091201594_pf.html
>
>Gene
>

Gene, maybe I am misunderstanding what you are saying, but it sounds like you are saying that Bush is starting and wants a religious war. I think you may be confused. Other people have already started the religious war. Look in to the sixth and seventh pillar of Islam, some where in there it speaks of living by the sword. In other words, if you don't convert, you are to die. I for one do not believe they are civil or peaceful people. There has not been peace among those people for thousands of years, and now THEY have sucked us in.

They would be nothing in the middle east, but the Communists, Russia and China, supplied all these third world countries with tons of weapons! Now they can make bombs and wage war. Now they know how to make nuclear bombs that can take out US cities. Look at the middle east, south America, North Korea and the mess all across the continent of Africa. Evil people gave more evil people weapons to fight wars with. This has created a world problem, and the Communist want to keep supplying them with weapons and technology. I know, here comes the liberals with, we gave them weapons too. Think about it, where did this start?

I'm no fan of Bush, but it's just too easy, and unfair to say it's all Bush's fault.

I will say however, the War in Iraq was completely mishandled. Just do the math, one hundred and fifty thousand troops to take care of thirty five million people plus, and thousands of miles of open boarder, in a place the size of California. With five million troops, maybe??? I believe Bush and his friends wanted to be there for years and make all kinds of money on this war. He has created a bigger problem by not taking care of Iraq quickly. There is a lot of blame to go around in our federal government, it's not just one man.

As far as the war on terror, people should be honest with themselves. you can't negotiate a war. there is no diplomatic solution to a war. If you stop to talk, they reinforce, rebuild, and reorganize for more war. Or did we forget the lessons of the past.

In the end, bombs can never stop idealism. The problem is the people that want Jehad will not stop. Peace will never be lasting with these people, it's in their nature to be waring. They think they will be rewarded if they kill and die in the name of Islam. So how do you fix it?

We are more concerned with terrorist rights than doing the job we need to do. When they hit us, we'll have to take them out, make no mistake, it's going to get serious. When they kill millions of americans, blame the spineless politicians that wanted to talk things out and find political solutions instead of facing the hard truth, we are at WAR. We should take care of the problems now, but we are just too weak as a nation. Really think about why we are weak as a nation, and where the blame should go.

James

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Dedric Terry on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 07:07:04 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Gene -

You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your response pretty much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country and even the world society, is to place blame for religious conflict, violence and religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single largest growing, and currently most violent religion in the world. We ignore car bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of tortured and murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming the administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made the Pope quote a Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.

Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening, all-accepting religion our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western Muslims might be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else in many of the conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have talked to, and have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a different world from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have here. People die for converting to anything else, or their families do. At best, their families disown them and they sneak out of the country under threat of death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our country continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on our own country

in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to this kind of ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically correct thing to do.

The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God, and hence any sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the choice to believe or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name of Allah the 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10 commandments in 24 hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there is a sad, and frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should fear - it's believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's personal whims that is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day. That also includes believing in nothing.

As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in God and is wrong, at worst one has lived a good live and had some false hope as a sense of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is wrong, then at best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we should be considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that the President might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief really better than belief? What reference point for right and wrong accompanies disbelief in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference point for respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of belief in any guideline for living life and having respect and compassion for others?

It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a guy Islam doesn't like just because he called like he saw it - something we do on this forum every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's intent to take over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only goal is to give people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to not believe would rather take that right away and remove Christianity from public view. The only way to force someone to remove their belief from public in a country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes, is to outlaw it. Yet another paradox.

Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see the world as a black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party always wins and the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any validity in believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to maintain the balance that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust in the very thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most fallible characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic ideology.

I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.

I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of 10 hours of work :-((....

Regards,
Dedric

On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70$1@linux, "gene Lennon"
<glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:

>
> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread -...
>
>
> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the current
> administration
> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based reasons for
> perusing
> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier motivation.
>
> Religion.
>
> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third Great Awakening"
> of the international religious struggle. This is a good thing as he sees
> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight against terrorists

> as "a confrontation between good and evil."
> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit of trouble (as
> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
>
> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be headed?
>
> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could easily go down
> hill from here.
>
> More on the "Third Awakening":
> http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09 /12/AR200609120159
> 4_pf.html
>
> Gene
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by dc[3] on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 07:35:07 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Gene, I too respect your opinion.

I do ask you to look at another viewpoint.

I do consider yours, despite disagreeing with it often.

>As a US citizen, I feel like I have been put on the list by the unconscionable
>actions of our government.
>

There is no torture, not by any sane definition of the word.

Human Rights Watch recently defined putting an terrorist in a cold room, and blasting them with Red Hot Chili Peppers as torture. Hilarious. Abu Ghraib? Hazing rituals compared to Saddam, and the perps went to jail!

>Start wars without cause,

Now you know a case can be made for that war, don't you? Don't agree? Fine, but don't assume it does not exist.

>OK, cause the deaths of tens of thousands
>if not hundreds of thousands of innocent people in the name of bringing them
>freedom, no problem.

We spend millions of dollars on accurate weapons so we can kill the fewest innocents of any war in history,to liberate 25 million people, and this is how you characterize it? Again this just isn't a fair representation.

Never happened. In fact, the eavesdropping of international calls, made by likely terrorists,which was completely legal to do, and provided valuable information, was revealed by the NY Times, in an act of treason (to many of us). No one is opening your mail.

>have trials and find people guilty
>and put them to death without ever showing any evidence, why not.

Where did this happen? First, the Geneva Conventions *explicitly* exclude spies and saboteurs from protection, and

governments regularly have executed them without being charged
under the GC's, so how do you figure that jihadi are covered?

Do you think you and your loved ones are at risk from these
people? If you don't, why not?

>Well I do have a problem. It is NOT OK.
>
>I want my country back.

Yeah, and I want to go see Bird and Diz on 52nd st. and meet
a hot dame there.

Your country is a pre-9/11 one and I do not argue with you
because I like arguing, nor do I wish to offend you, since
I actually quite like you. But I am convinced that your views
would result in my family being put in terrible danger. I
cannot remain silent.

We will face jihadis, and we would if Ghandi himself were
president. They have revealed themselves to us, for the past
30 years, to be the scum they are. To believe that they can
be negotiated with, has to be beyond the pale today.

I wish it were otherwise.

>It was never perfect. No country ever was, but we stood for something great,
>even if we sometimes had less than stellar moments. I know in my heart that
>if the Founding Fathers of the United States were alive today they would
>be calling for impeachment or revolution.

This is an interesting point. They were very wary of "foreign
entanglements" but they also went to North Africa and fought the
Barbary Pirates so that the seas would be safe, so I am not sure
you are right on this.

They would certainly barely recognize our country though.
Liberal, big-govt. would have horrified them for certain; surely
you realize this?

>presidents that were deeply religions, but if he thinks that all the wars

>and problems we are having in the world are actually a good thing because
>they have ignited a resurgence in Christian Values, we are in deep shit.

I agree, but where is the *evidence* that he makes his decisions based upon those things? He's such a cautious man in so many ways. Don't believe me? Remember the "moral equivilence" argument that idiots like Ward Churchill make? That we are all "little eichmanns" participating in this great evil?

OK, so assume for a moment that we are morally equivalent to Al Queda. Now, what would we have done the morning of 9/12/01?

Think about it! All those subs, all those missiles, all those nukes.

Green glass in Kabul, green glass in Baghdad, same in Tehran, same in Damascus. Then Bush gets on TV and says: "who's next"? That's moral equivalence my friend, and frankly it's what those bastards would do to us if they could.

Instead, Bush tries to foment democracy, and he believes in it so much that he pays to do it the slow and painful way when he could have punched the big red button, and converted the survivors at gunpoint.

As a Christian, I can tell you that the Bible *at no point* says that we are to start wars and kill people to bring about armageddon. There are idiots who believe such things, but those named in the article you quoted are not among them, and those beliefs are not widely held among us. Believing it to be soon, is very different from trying to make it happen.

DC

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by DC on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 07:41:19 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>People
>die for converting to anything else, or their families do.

There's a pretty well-known engineer out here in LA whose ex-muslim wife must forever watch her back because she is under

the threat of "honor killing" (how's that for Orwellian double-
speak?) for marrying a non-muslim and leaving the faith.

DC

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by gene lennon on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 08:02:48 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:

>Gene, maybe I am misunderstanding what you are saying, but it sounds like
>you are saying that Bush is starting and wants a religious war. I think
>you may be confused. Other people have already started the religious
war.
> Look in to the sixth and seventh pillar of Islam, some where in there it
>speaks of living by the sword. In other words, if you don't convert, you
>are to die. I for one do not believe they are civil or peaceful people.
> There has not been peace among those people for thousands of years, and
>now THEY have sucked us in.
>
>They would be nothing in the middle east, but the Communists, Russia and
>China, supplied all these third world countries with tons of weapons! Now
>they can make bombs and wage war. Now they know how to make nuclear bombs
>that can take out US cities. Look at the middle east, south America, North
>Korea and the mess all across the continent of Africa. Evil people gave
>more evil people weapons to fight wars with. This has created a world problem,
>and the Communist want to keep supplying them with weapons and technology.
> I know, here comes the liberals with, we gave them weapons too. Think
about
>it, where did this start?
>
>I'm no fan of Bush, but it's just too easy, and unfair to say it's all Bush's
>fault.
>
> I will say however, the War in Iraq was completely mishandled. Just do
>the math, one hundred and fifty thousand troops to take care of thirty five
>million people plus, and thousands of miles of open boarder, in a place
>the size of California. With five million troops, maybe??? I believe Bush
>and his friends wanted to be there for years and make all kinds of money
>on this war. He has created a bigger problem by not taking care of Iraq
>quickly. There is a lot of blame to go around in our federal government,
>it's not just one man.
>
>As far as the war on terror, people should be honest with themselves. you
>can't negotiate a war. there is no diplomatic solution to a war. If you

>stop to talk, they reinforce, rebuild, and reorganize for more war. Or
did
>we forget the lessons of the past.
>
>In the end, bombs can never stop idealism. The problem is the people that
>want Jehad will not stop. Peace will never be lasting with these people,
>it's in their nature to be waring. They think they will be rewarded if
they
>kill and die in the name of Islam. So how do you fix it?
>
> We are more concerned with terrorist rights than doing the job we need
to
>do. When they hit us, we'll have to take them out, make no mistake, it's
>going to get serious. When they kill millions of americans, blame the spineless
>politicians that wanted to talk things out and find political solutions
instead
>of facing the hard truth, we are at WAR. We should take care of the problems
>now, but we are just too weak as a nation. Really think about why we are
>weak as a nation, and where the blame should go.
>
>James
>

James,

statement:

Please help me define what the problem is. Is it Muslims? Just some Muslims? Which ones?

What about North Korea? They are not Muslims, but they are first (or perhaps

things. Pakistan is Muslim and they have several bombs. They have just signed a treaty with the Taliban, and they are hiding the real person that caused 9/11, where is the outrage against Osama bin Laden and the people protecting him?

How about the Non-Aligned Movement. Over 100 countries banding together

with Cuba or Venezuela?

Now that we have succeeded in alienating ourselves from the majority of the world, should we see them all as threats? Almost all of our allies are abandoning us, or at the least distancing themselves from us. The only real leader left

is on our side is Tony Blair, and he has been summarily dismissed by his own party. With him out and anti-American sentiment running high in Great Britain, who do we have left?

I never said it was all Bushes fault. He just took a relatively unheard of small time international criminal/terrorist (Osama bin Laden) and turned him into an international movement to destroy the US.

_____

At a level of 1.2 billion, Muslims represent about 22% of the world's population. They are the second largest religion in the world. Only Christianity is larger, with 33% of the world's inhabitants.
Islam is growing about 2.9% per year. This is faster than the total world population which increases about 2.3% annually. It is thus attracting a progressively larger percentage of the world's population.

Peace to all
Gene

Subject: Re: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Martin Harrington on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 08:51:33 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

ROTFL 8>)
--
Martin Harrington
www.lendanear-sound.com

"Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote in message news:450ca49a$1@linux...
> You don't need King Arthur, silly . . . you have King George the Decider
> and Richard (Cheney) the Lyin' Hearted. :)
>
> S
>
>
> "Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote in message
> news:450c9fbe$1@linux...
>> Seems to me that it's time to bring back King Arthur.....
>> --
>> Martin Harrington
>> www.lendanear-sound.com
>>
>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
>> news:C131DB49.356D%dterry@keyofd.net...
>>>I don't want to start another religious or political thread - I just
>>>found
>>> this ironic, at best:

>>>
>>> The Pope is under fire from the Islamic community because he quoted a
>>> Byzantine emperor's ancient writings in a talk rejecting religious
>>> motivation for violence. The emperor, in obscure writings hundreds of
>>> year
>>> old, characterized the teachings of Muhammad (Islam's founder) as "evil
>>> and
>>> inhuman" because if it's command to "spread by the sword the faith".
>>> The
>>> Pope made no such characterization - just quoted the old guy, and it
>>> isn't
>>> even clear if he quoted any of the "offensive" text.
>>>
>>> As a protest, two Catholic, two Anglican, and one Greek church in the
>>> West
>>> Bank were attacked by Palestinians using guns, firebombs and lighter
>>> fluid -
>>> charring the churches and riddling them with bullet holes.
>>>
>>> Umm...reality check: 2+2=4. The Earth still circles the Sun. And
>>> doesn't
>>> reacting with violence just prove the Emperor's assessment, and then
>>> some?
>>> Yet the press and the Islamic world seem to have missed the irony of
>>> this
>>> response, or at least are reluctant to admit it.
>>>
>>> The Pope's comment is getting more press than the fact that violence was
>>> actually perpetrated when the churches were torched. To note, this was
>>> a
>>> response, not a crime.
>>>
>>> Why are we (the world culture) so quick to defend Islam and work so hard
>>> to
>>> avoid offending Muslims, regardless of the cost - even if it means
>>> rewriting
>>> the definitions of peace and violence? Just something to think
>>> about....
>>>
>>> Ignorance isn't bliss, it's the last step one takes before falling off
>>> of a
>>> cliff.
>>>
>>> Back to music...
>>> Dedric
>>>
>>
>>

>
>

Subject: Re: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Sarah on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 08:58:26 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I don't know if I'm a "leftie" (or a hippie for that matter), but I do know I'm definitely not blind. And here's another thing I'm not -- I'm not an idiot.

Not being an idiot enables me to reason beyond simplistic black-or-white logic. In doing so, what I find "disturbingly amazing" is this oft repeated nonsense that if I don't support Bush's Crusade, I support the terrorists.

NEWS FLASH: Scientists have concluded that there may be MORE than TWO approaches to the problem of terrorism. This should come as a relief to those who have believed that our only options are: 1. wage war on Islamic countries, or 2. do nothing. Yes, folks, there may be other possibilities in between those two extremes, as the recent thwarted terror plot in Britain demonstrates.

"OK, smart-ass, what about Iran?" you may be asking about now. Yes, what about Iran? Shall we leave Iraq in the toilet and try the same thing in Iran and hope for a different result? Isn't that the definition of insanity? OK, you say, what if Iran gets a nuke or two? Yeah, what if? Do you think they're going to guarantee their own obliteration by lobbing nukes into Israel? Or what? Isn't it possible that Iran notices that we haven't even threatened to attack North Korea, the neglected "Axis of Evil" sibling? Perhaps Iran is thinking, "If we have nukes, the US won't dare invade us." That would be a logical conclustion on their part, don't you think? If Iran is financing terror, we're going to need the help of our allies, if we have any left, to deal with them. We're also going to need leaders a lot smarter and more honest than the one's we've got.

Here's a thought -- it occurs to me that in fighting the Nazis, Communism, and now Terrorism that our real consistent enemy in all these is brutal authoritarianism, AKA totalitarianism: we don't cotton to anyone trying to violently force their beliefs upon everyone else. Well, wake up and smell the despots, gang, because in our blind terror of Islamic extremists, we're allowing the very thing we fight against to creep into our own government. And this is proven every time someone is accused of "appeasing the terrorists" because they oppose the "war" in Iraq.

Look, once and for all -- NOBODY LIKES TERRORISTS, OK? Except other terrorists. But this doesn't mean we should continue to let insane people lead the charge against them.

Love,

Sarah

"Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote in message news:450ca327@linux...
>I recall a similar irony, if that's the right word, during the Danish
>cartoon flap: Muslim fanatics using violence to protest the implication
>that Islam is a violent religion. Is it possible they didn't realize they
>were proving the validity of the cartoons? Hard to believe.
>
> Unfortunately, Osama bin Laden and others have much of the Muslim world
> convinced that the US is engaged in a war on Islam. Even more
> unfortunately, I think for some this actually is an unspoken motive in our
> "war on terror."
>
> To paraphrase John Lennon: imagine . . . no religion.
>
> Sigh,
>
> Sarah
>
>
> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
> news:C131DB49.356D%dterry@keyofd.net...
>>I don't want to start another religious or political thread - I just found
>> this ironic, at best:
>>
>> The Pope is under fire from the Islamic community because he quoted a
>> Byzantine emperor's ancient writings in a talk rejecting religious
>> motivation for violence. The emperor, in obscure writings hundreds of
>> year
>> old, characterized the teachings of Muhammad (Islam's founder) as "evil
>> and
>> inhuman" because if it's command to "spread by the sword the faith". The
>> Pope made no such characterization - just quoted the old guy, and it
>> isn't
>> even clear if he quoted any of the "offensive" text.
>>
>> As a protest, two Catholic, two Anglican, and one Greek church in the
>> West
>> Bank were attacked by Palestinians using guns, firebombs and lighter
>> fluid -
>> charring the churches and riddling them with bullet holes.
>>
>> Umm...reality check: 2+2=4. The Earth still circles the Sun. And
>> doesn't

>> reacting with violence just prove the Emperor's assessment, and then
>> some?
>> Yet the press and the Islamic world seem to have missed the irony of this
>> response, or at least are reluctant to admit it.
>>
>> The Pope's comment is getting more press than the fact that violence was
>> actually perpetrated when the churches were torched. To note, this was a
>> response, not a crime.
>>
>> Why are we (the world culture) so quick to defend Islam and work so hard
>> to
>> avoid offending Muslims, regardless of the cost - even if it means
>> rewriting
>> the definitions of peace and violence? Just something to think about....
>>
>> Ignorance isn't bliss, it's the last step one takes before falling off of
>> a
>> cliff.
>>
>> Back to music...
>> Dedric
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Deej [1] on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 12:55:05 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

> Almost all of our allies are abandoning >us, or at the least distancing
themselves from us.

This started long before 9-11. France, Russia , China and the UN were
working against us throughout the 90's. We just didn't have a clue because
we didn't have an intelligence service.

"gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote in message
news:450d0128$1@linux...
>
> "James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>
> >Gene, maybe I am misunderstanding what you are saying, but it sounds like
> >you are saying that Bush is starting and wants a religious war. I think
> >you may be confused.   Other people have already started the religious
> war.
> > Look in to the sixth and seventh pillar of Islam, some where in there it
> >speaks of living by the sword. In other words, if you don't convert, you

> >are to die. I for one do not believe they are civil or peaceful people.
> > There has not been peace among those people for thousands of years, and
> >now THEY have sucked us in.
> >
> >They would be nothing in the middle east, but the Communists, Russia and
> >China, supplied all these third world countries with tons of weapons!
Now
> >they can make bombs and wage war. Now they know how to make nuclear
bombs
> >that can take out US cities. Look at the middle east, south America,
North
> >Korea and the mess all across the continent of Africa. Evil people gave
> >more evil people weapons to fight wars with. This has created a world
problem,
> >and the Communist want to keep supplying them with weapons and
technology.
> > I know, here comes the liberals with, we gave them weapons too. Think
> about
> >it, where did this start?
> >
> >I'm no fan of Bush, but it's just too easy, and unfair to say it's all
Bush's
> >fault.
> >
> > I will say however, the War in Iraq was completely mishandled. Just do
> >the math, one hundred and fifty thousand troops to take care of thirty
five
> >million people plus, and thousands of miles of open boarder, in a place
> >the size of California. With five million troops, maybe??? I believe
Bush
> >and his friends wanted to be there for years and make all kinds of money
> >on this war. He has created a bigger problem by not taking care of Iraq
> >quickly. There is a lot of blame to go around in our federal government,
> >it's not just one man.
> >
> >As far as the war on terror, people should be honest with themselves. you
> >can't negotiate a war. there is no diplomatic solution to a war. If you
> >stop to talk, they reinforce, rebuild, and reorganize for more war. Or
> did
> >we forget the lessons of the past.
> >
> >In the end, bombs can never stop idealism. The problem is the people
that
> >want Jehad will not stop. Peace will never be lasting with these people,
> >it's in their nature to be waring. They think they will be rewarded if
> they
> >kill and die in the name of Islam. So how do you fix it?
> >

> > We are more concerned with terrorist rights than doing the job we need
> to
> >do. When they hit us, we'll have to take them out, make no mistake, it's
> >going to get serious. When they kill millions of americans, blame the
spineless
> >politicians that wanted to talk things out and find political solutions
> instead
> >of facing the hard truth, we are at WAR. We should take care of the
problems
> >now, but we are just too weak as a nation. Really think about why we
are
> >weak as a nation, and where the blame should go.
> >
> >James
> >
>
>
> James,
> You have just as much right to your opinion as I do and I know we won't
change
> each other's minds one iota, but I still have to question you about this
> statement:
>
> "We should take care of the problems now, but we are just too weak as a
nation."
>
> Please help me define what the problem is. Is it Muslims? Just some
Muslims?
> Which ones?
>
> What about North Korea? They are not Muslims, but they are first (or
perhaps
> second) on the list of "most likely to do bad things" to us - Big bad bomb
> things. Pakistan is Muslim and they have several bombs. They have just
signed
> a treaty with the Taliban, and they are hiding the real person that caused
> 9/11, where is the outrage against Osama bin Laden and the people
protecting
> him?
>
> How about the Non-Aligned Movement. Over 100 countries banding together
> against US policies and interests? - Should we get them all? Should we
start
> with Cuba or Venezuela?
>
> Now that we have succeeded in alienating ourselves from the majority of
the
> world, should we see them all as threats? Almost all of our allies are

abandoning
> us, or at the least distancing themselves from us. The only real leader
left
> is on our side is Tony Blair, and he has been summarily dismissed by his
> own party. With him out and anti-American sentiment running high in Great
> Britain, who do we have left?
>
> I never said it was all Bushes fault. He just took a relatively unheard of
> small time international criminal/terrorist (Osama bin Laden) and turned
> him into an international movement to destroy the US.
> _____
>
> At a level of 1.2 billion, Muslims represent about 22% of the world's
population.
> They are the second largest religion in the world. Only Christianity is
larger,
> with 33% of the world's inhabitants.
> Islam is growing about 2.9% per year. This is faster than the total world
> population which increases about 2.3% annually. It is thus attracting a
progressively
> larger percentage of the world's population.
>
> Peace to all
> Gene
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by justcron on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 14:46:57 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:450cfaab$1@linux...

>>As a US citizen, I feel like I have been put on the list by the
>>unconscionable
>>actions of our government.
>>
>>Torture, sure.
>
> There is no torture, not by any sane definition of the word.

hehe, classic.

Subject: Re: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Jamie K on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 14:55:32 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

One man's obvious truth is another man's propaganda.

Factual truth is not the same as spin. Whatever you believe, (I'm not speaking here of you specifically, Chris, but anyone), if you think people who disagree with you are simply blind, you may be experiencing confirmation bias.

A possible treatment for this is to find a friend who disagrees with you, sit down with them, and really listen to their reasoning. Hold your knee-jerk responses in check. Then find another friend with another point of view and do the same. If you are particularly brave, talk with strangers. You don't have to lose your point of view, but use these conversations as an opportunity to drop any internal defensive system and try, for a moment, to see things from someone else's point of view without promoting your own. It's a healthy brain exercise. We may find it's easier to love others when we operate from inclusively rather than defensive insecurity.

Those of us who live in free countries MUST live with disagreement. Disagreement makes free systems much stronger than systems that rigidly enforce a single point of view, because free systems examine problems from more than one perspective. The best solutions may come from a combination of perspectives. At the very least there will be more solutions from which to choose.

It's therefore healthy that we can have disagreements and enjoy discussions to explore them.

It's just as important that within these discussions at least some listening take place. If it's all mere preaching to respective exclusive choirs then it becomes a sort of babble.

I think most people can agree that fanatical, power hungry ideologues attempting to recruit others to kill for them are a danger to civilized society.

If an authority figure encourages a person to feel cornered and desperate, and then asks for his support in the context of that fear, the person could willingly become a pawn to the authority figure's aims. The person could, through manipulation of his own confirmation bias, feel rewarded by following a movement, even a destructive movement.

Confirmation bias is a reward within the brain when you find information that seems to support your own beliefs while generally ignoring even factual information that contradicts what you believe. From there the human talent of rationalization can kick in with the ability to feel smug and superior over those who "simply cannot see." And thus we don our own ironic blinders.

It can happen to anyone anywhere. It appears to be one of the trailer hitches on the human brain by which you can be towed willingly along while believing you are the driver.

It makes us susceptible, even receptive, to half-truths and even outright lies. We can be mislead by scapegoating. Herded by pride. Become parrots of spin and stake our lives on propaganda.

Fanatical nationalism, fanatical religious fervor, these can be harnessed as Machiavellian tools by con artists, wannabe kings, despots, technocrats and theocrats alike. It can happen anywhere.

We are not immune, but we are stronger by having a culture of free thinking, respectful listening and vigorous discussion. Still, we are NOT immune.

The price of freedom is eternal vigilance.

Cheers,
-Jamie
http://www.JamieKrutz.com

Chris Latham wrote:
> Well stated!!!
> It just amazes me how blind some people and the mainstream media can be to
> obvious TRUTH!
>
> CL
>
>

Subject: Re: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Dedric Terry on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 15:19:39 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi Sarah,

No one said you had to support Bush to not support terrorists, at least I

never did. It really doesn't help your argument to use sarcasm though.

I am referring to the ideology that has been growing in our country for many years - way before Bush 1, or Reagan for that matter. It has nothing to do with Bush 2. I was talking about the world's view of Islam in light of the Pope's comments, so the fact that he keeps coming up as the response, regardless of the original topic, just shows that we would rather blame Bush than address what is happening in the world and in our country's ideology - the people, not the government. The government has nothing to do with the belief systems and relativism that is pervading our culture, media, schools, streets, conversations - it's just a side topic for Monday morning water cooler talk by pale comparison - one that ebbs and flows in the tide of that ideology of the people.

After Bush leaves office I believe we will see the greatest surge of relativistic and chaotic thinking in our history as a reaction of counter-instinct. It isn't about supporting Bush, and I'm not "blaming" the coming reaction on a lack of support for Bush - I couldn't care less if you like him - it's been coming regardless. I don't hate Bush, but I don't like him as a President either. I support our country though and want to see it become a great and revered nation solely for it's commitment to caring about and aiding people that can't help themselves, but that is probably wishful thinking.

I can see past the political fears and ideology to understand that we were also in serious danger during Reagan's years (Russia), Bush 1, and Clinton too as terrorism worked on plans for 9/11 and more that we've since averted, simply because the FBI, CIA and other police are on the vigil more than before. We created the political climate we live with administration after administration - one of deals and compromise to keep the right people happy. It's better than many alternatives, but in way it just propagates a lack of significant positive change in exchange for subtly slow moral decay, since it in and of itself, and our competitive commerce driven society promotes a lack of integrity. Until people (everyone, not just leaders) are willing to risk money, careers, notoriety and stability to stand for something of more substance than sustaining the nice house, car and happy-go-lucky lifestyle we enjoy here, we will continue to cower to the whims of politics and the special interest flavor of the day instead.

I do agree that there is more than one way to fight terrorism - yes, 3, 4 5, maybe 100,000,000. Waging "war" on Islam isn't the answer. But assuming this terror war is simply another political disagreement that can be diplomatically solved with embargos and slaps on the wrist by the UN is also overly optimistic - if only, really I wish it were. I'm not saying you think it is - just making a point.

Truthfully, I don't believe we will ever "win" the war on terror, or rather the ideology that is behind it. We will just delay it for a few years here

and there over the next 10, 20, maybe more if we are lucky. But, eventually we will lose, and lose badly, simply because we as a nation don't have an ideology that is stronger, more grounded, and more committed than theirs.

Then again, we really are fighting the wrong war, and I'm not referring to Iraq.

Regards,
Dedric

On 9/17/06 2:58 AM, in article 450d0c7e@linux, "Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote:

> I don't know if I'm a "leftie" (or a hippie for that matter), but I do know
> I'm definitely not blind. And here's another thing I'm not -- I'm not an
> idiot.
>
> Not being an idiot enables me to reason beyond simplistic black-or-white
> logic. In doing so, what I find "disturbingly amazing" is this oft repeated
> nonsense that if I don't support Bush's Crusade, I support the terrorists.
>
> NEWS FLASH: Scientists have concluded that there may be MORE than TWO
> approaches to the problem of terrorism. This should come as a relief to
> those who have believed that our only options are: 1. wage war on Islamic
> countries, or 2. do nothing. Yes, folks, there may be other possibilities
> in between those two extremes, as the recent thwarted terror plot in Britain
> demonstrates.
>
> "OK, smart-ass, what about Iran?" you may be asking about now. Yes, what
> about Iran? Shall we leave Iraq in the toilet and try the same thing in
> Iran and hope for a different result? Isn't that the definition of
> insanity? OK, you say, what if Iran gets a nuke or two? Yeah, what if? Do
> you think they're going to guarantee their own obliteration by lobbing nukes
> into Israel? Or what? Isn't it possible that Iran notices that we haven't
> even threatened to attack North Korea, the neglected "Axis of Evil" sibling?
> Perhaps Iran is thinking, "If we have nukes, the US won't dare invade us."
> That would be a logical conclustion on their part, don't you think? If Iran
> is financing terror, we're going to need the help of our allies, if we have
> any left, to deal with them. We're also going to need leaders a lot smarter
> and more honest than the one's we've got.
>
> Here's a thought -- it occurs to me that in fighting the Nazis, Communism,
> and now Terrorism that our real consistent enemy in all these is brutal
> authoritarianism, AKA totalitarianism: we don't cotton to anyone trying to
> violently force their beliefs upon everyone else. Well, wake up and smell
> the despots, gang, because in our blind terror of Islamic extremists, we're
> allowing the very thing we fight against to creep into our own government.
> And this is proven every time someone is accused of "appeasing the

> terrorists" because they oppose the "war" in Iraq.
>
> Look, once and for all -- NOBODY LIKES TERRORISTS, OK? Except other
> terrorists. But this doesn't mean we should continue to let insane people
> lead the charge against them.
>
> Love,
>
> Sarah
>
>
> "Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote in message news:450ca327@linux...
>> I recall a similar irony, if that's the right word, during the Danish
>> cartoon flap: Muslim fanatics using violence to protest the implication
>> that Islam is a violent religion. Is it possible they didn't realize they
>> were proving the validity of the cartoons? Hard to believe.
>>
>> Unfortunately, Osama bin Laden and others have much of the Muslim world
>> convinced that the US is engaged in a war on Islam. Even more
>> unfortunately, I think for some this actually is an unspoken motive in our
>> "war on terror."
>>
>> To paraphrase John Lennon: imagine . . . no religion.
>>
>> Sigh,
>>
>> Sarah
>>
>>
>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
>> news:C131DB49.356D%dterry@keyofd.net...
>>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread - I just found
>>> this ironic, at best:
>>>
>>> The Pope is under fire from the Islamic community because he quoted a
>>> Byzantine emperor's ancient writings in a talk rejecting religious
>>> motivation for violence. The emperor, in obscure writings hundreds of
>>> year
>>> old, characterized the teachings of Muhammad (Islam's founder) as "evil
>>> and
>>> inhuman" because if it's command to "spread by the sword the faith". The
>>> Pope made no such characterization - just quoted the old guy, and it
>>> isn't
>>> even clear if he quoted any of the "offensive" text.
>>>
>>> As a protest, two Catholic, two Anglican, and one Greek church in the
>>> West
>>> Bank were attacked by Palestinians using guns, firebombs and lighter

>>> fluid -
>>> charring the churches and riddling them with bullet holes.
>>>
>>> Umm...reality check: 2+2=4. The Earth still circles the Sun. And
>>> doesn't
>>> reacting with violence just prove the Emperor's assessment, and then
>>> some?
>>> Yet the press and the Islamic world seem to have missed the irony of this
>>> response, or at least are reluctant to admit it.
>>>
>>> The Pope's comment is getting more press than the fact that violence was
>>> actually perpetrated when the churches were torched. To note, this was a
>>> response, not a crime.
>>>
>>> Why are we (the world culture) so quick to defend Islam and work so hard
>>> to
>>> avoid offending Muslims, regardless of the cost - even if it means
>>> rewriting
>>> the definitions of peace and violence? Just something to think about....
>>>
>>> Ignorance isn't bliss, it's the last step one takes before falling off of
>>> a
>>> cliff.
>>>
>>> Back to music...
>>> Dedric
>>>
>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Jamie K on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 15:40:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

To find the crassest of the villains, follow the money.

Cheers,
  -Jamie
  http://www.JamieKrutz.com

gene Lennon wrote:
> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:
>> Gene,
>>

>> If I actually believed this, I might agree with you. We've certainly
>> disagreed on a number of issues like this but I respect your opinion. I'm
>> sincerely interested to know if this is for real. I've got no problem with
>> people practicing their faith but I do believe that faith in something (like
>> armageddon) can definitely bring it about. I've read a number of articles
>> discussing thes things you bring up here, but the sources were easily as
>> fanatical as they purported Bush to be.
>>
>> I agree that we may be living in the most dangerous time in the history
> of
>> the human race, but I don't see the same villian that you do.
>>
>> Deej
>>
>
>
> There is not just one villain, there are plenty of villains. Saddam Hussein,

>

>
> As a US citizen, I feel like I have been put on the list by the unconscionable
> actions of our government.
>

> if not hundreds of thousands of innocent people in the name of bringing them

> and put them to death without ever showing any evidence, why not.
>
> Well I do have a problem. It is NOT OK.
>
> I want my country back.
>
> It was never perfect. No country ever was, but we stood for something great,
> even if we sometimes had less than stellar moments. I know in my heart that
> if the Founding Fathers of the United States were alive today they would
> be calling for impeachment or revolution.
>

> presidents that were deeply religions, but if he thinks that all the wars
> and problems we are having in the world are actually a good thing because
> they have ignited a resurgence in Christian Values, we are in deep shit.
> Gene

Subject: Re: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Sarah on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 20:58:57 GMT

Hi Dedric,

No, you didn't say I had to support Bush to not support terrorists . . . but that attitude is still out there, unfortunately, and some of the responses to your original post reminded me of that. My initial response to you was in complete agreement.

And I don't really disagree with anything you've said here except that I don't think relativism is quite the threat you seem to see it as. Most people don't take relativism to the extreme of justifying suicide bombers. Also, rejecting ethnocentrism doesn't make one a cultural relativist, speaking for myself. There is a middle ground there.

As for the sarcasm, sorry about that, but it helps me to diffuse my anger about these issues.

Near the end of this post, you said, "But, eventually we will lose, and lose badly, simply because we as a nation don't have an ideology that is stronger, more grounded, and more committed than theirs." I think we do have a stronger, more grounded, more committed ideology than theirs. It involves concepts like unity, integrity, honesty, democracy, and, as we all recited with hands on hearts in grade school, with liberty and justice for all. These are sky high ideals that our country is found upon, and the reason I get so angry and sarcastic is because it upsets me to see us drift steadily away from those ideals.

Sarah

"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message news:C132C3AB.35B0%dterry@keyofd.net...
> Hi Sarah,
>
> No one said you had to support Bush to not support terrorists, at least I
> never did. It really doesn't help your argument to use sarcasm though.
>
> I am referring to the ideology that has been growing in our country for
> many
> years - way before Bush 1, or Reagan for that matter. It has nothing to
> do
> with Bush 2. I was talking about the world's view of Islam in light of
> the
> Pope's comments, so the fact that he keeps coming up as the response,
> regardless of the original topic, just shows that we would rather blame
> Bush
> than address what is happening in the world and in our country's
> ideology -

> the people, not the government. The government has nothing to do with the
> belief systems and relativism that is pervading our culture, media,
> schools,
> streets, conversations - it's just a side topic for Monday morning water
> cooler talk by pale comparison - one that ebbs and flows in the tide of
> that
> ideology of the people.
>
> After Bush leaves office I believe we will see the greatest surge of
> relativistic and chaotic thinking in our history as a reaction of
> counter-instinct. It isn't about supporting Bush, and I'm not "blaming"
> the
> coming reaction on a lack of support for Bush - I couldn't care less if
> you
> like him - it's been coming regardless. I don't hate Bush, but I don't
> like
> him as a President either. I support our country though and want to see
> it
> become a great and revered nation solely for it's commitment to caring
> about
> and aiding people that can't help themselves, but that is probably wishful
> thinking.
>
> I can see past the political fears and ideology to understand that we were
> also in serious danger during Reagan's years (Russia), Bush 1, and Clinton
> too as terrorism worked on plans for 9/11 and more that we've since
> averted,
> simply because the FBI, CIA and other police are on the vigil more than
> before. We created the political climate we live with administration
> after
> administration - one of deals and compromise to keep the right people
> happy.
> It's better than many alternatives, but in way it just propagates a lack
> of
> significant positive change in exchange for subtly slow moral decay, since
> it in and of itself, and our competitive commerce driven society promotes
> a
> lack of integrity. Until people (everyone, not just leaders) are willing
> to
> risk money, careers, notoriety and stability to stand for something of
> more
> substance than sustaining the nice house, car and happy-go-lucky lifestyle
> we enjoy here, we will continue to cower to the whims of politics and the
> special interest flavor of the day instead.
>
> I do agree that there is more than one way to fight terrorism - yes, 3, 4
> 5,
> maybe 100,000,000. Waging "war" on Islam isn't the answer. But assuming

> this terror war is simply another political disagreement that can be
> diplomatically solved with embargos and slaps on the wrist by the UN is
> also
> overly optimistic - if only, really I wish it were. I'm not saying you
> think
> it is - just making a point.
>
> Truthfully, I don't believe we will ever "win" the war on terror, or
> rather
> the ideology that is behind it. We will just delay it for a few years
> here
> and there over the next 10, 20, maybe more if we are lucky. But,
> eventually
> we will lose, and lose badly, simply because we as a nation don't have an
> ideology that is stronger, more grounded, and more committed than theirs.
>
> Then again, we really are fighting the wrong war, and I'm not referring to
> Iraq.
>
> Regards,
> Dedric

Subject: Re: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Dedric Terry on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 22:01:04 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi Sarah,

I'm probably being overly pessimistic due to lack of sleep. How ideology plays out over the long term is a bit unknown (as in, I really don't know - just gut feeling), but I hope you are right: that as a world community we will diminish the threat from Al Quaeda, if not terrorism in general.

As to relativism - I probably do make it sound more prevalent than it is - I can't claim to have a broad enough scope for that to be any more than conjecture. I actually wasn't inferring that relativism does, or would ever justify suicide bombers, and I don't know anyone in this country who does. Relativism to me is more about the tide of overall softening of values for the sake of redefining social acceptability. It really is mainly about values and morals, rather than cultural change, though they could be considered of the same family, or even one in the same from time to time.

There are a lot of great people in this country regardless of widely varying beliefs, and you are right - we have a lot of fortitude and desire to maintain the freedoms and quality of life we have here. That's the cool aspect of this forum - even though we all disagree from time to time, we do have that in common - we want our country to be a great place to live, work,

raise a family, play, etc, and that is an encouraging common theme in most
of these threads.

Regards,
Dedric

On 9/17/06 2:58 PM, in article 450db55a$1@linux, "Sarah"
<sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote:

> Hi Dedric,
>
> No, you didn't say I had to support Bush to not support terrorists . . .
> but that attitude is still out there, unfortunately, and some of the
> responses to your original post reminded me of that. My initial response to
> you was in complete agreement.
>
> And I don't really disagree with anything you've said here except that I
> don't think relativism is quite the threat you seem to see it as. Most
> people don't take relativism to the extreme of justifying suicide bombers.
> Also, rejecting ethnocentrism doesn't make one a cultural relativist,
> speaking for myself. There is a middle ground there.
>
> As for the sarcasm, sorry about that, but it helps me to diffuse my
> anger about these issues.
>
> Near the end of this post, you said, "But, eventually we will lose, and
> lose badly, simply because we as a nation don't have an ideology that is
> stronger, more grounded, and more committed than theirs." I think we do
> have a stronger, more grounded, more committed ideology than theirs. It
> involves concepts like unity, integrity, honesty, democracy, and, as we all
> recited with hands on hearts in grade school, with liberty and justice for
> all. These are sky high ideals that our country is found upon, and the
> reason I get so angry and sarcastic is because it upsets me to see us drift
> steadily away from those ideals.
>
> Sarah
>
>
> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
> news:C132C3AB.35B0%dterry@keyofd.net...
>> Hi Sarah,
>>
>> No one said you had to support Bush to not support terrorists, at least I
>> never did. It really doesn't help your argument to use sarcasm though.
>>
>> I am referring to the ideology that has been growing in our country for
>> many
>> years - way before Bush 1, or Reagan for that matter. It has nothing to

>> do
>> with Bush 2. I was talking about the world's view of Islam in light of
>> the
>> Pope's comments, so the fact that he keeps coming up as the response,
>> regardless of the original topic, just shows that we would rather blame
>> Bush
>> than address what is happening in the world and in our country's
>> ideology -
>> the people, not the government. The government has nothing to do with the
>> belief systems and relativism that is pervading our culture, media,
>> schools,
>> streets, conversations - it's just a side topic for Monday morning water
>> cooler talk by pale comparison - one that ebbs and flows in the tide of
>> that
>> ideology of the people.
>>
>> After Bush leaves office I believe we will see the greatest surge of
>> relativistic and chaotic thinking in our history as a reaction of
>> counter-instinct. It isn't about supporting Bush, and I'm not "blaming"
>> the
>> coming reaction on a lack of support for Bush - I couldn't care less if
>> you
>> like him - it's been coming regardless. I don't hate Bush, but I don't
>> like
>> him as a President either. I support our country though and want to see
>> it
>> become a great and revered nation solely for it's commitment to caring
>> about
>> and aiding people that can't help themselves, but that is probably wishful
>> thinking.
>>
>> I can see past the political fears and ideology to understand that we were
>> also in serious danger during Reagan's years (Russia), Bush 1, and Clinton
>> too as terrorism worked on plans for 9/11 and more that we've since
>> averted,
>> simply because the FBI, CIA and other police are on the vigil more than
>> before. We created the political climate we live with administration
>> after
>> administration - one of deals and compromise to keep the right people
>> happy.
>> It's better than many alternatives, but in way it just propagates a lack
>> of
>> significant positive change in exchange for subtly slow moral decay, since
>> it in and of itself, and our competitive commerce driven society promotes
>> a
>> lack of integrity. Until people (everyone, not just leaders) are willing
>> to
>> risk money, careers, notoriety and stability to stand for something of

>> more
>> substance than sustaining the nice house, car and happy-go-lucky lifestyle
>> we enjoy here, we will continue to cower to the whims of politics and the
>> special interest flavor of the day instead.
>>
>> I do agree that there is more than one way to fight terrorism - yes, 3, 4
>> 5,
>> maybe 100,000,000. Waging "war" on Islam isn't the answer. But assuming
>> this terror war is simply another political disagreement that can be
>> diplomatically solved with embargos and slaps on the wrist by the UN is
>> also
>> overly optimistic - if only, really I wish it were. I'm not saying you
>> think
>> it is - just making a point.
>>
>> Truthfully, I don't believe we will ever "win" the war on terror, or
>> rather
>> the ideology that is behind it. We will just delay it for a few years
>> here
>> and there over the next 10, 20, maybe more if we are lucky. But,
>> eventually
>> we will lose, and lose badly, simply because we as a nation don't have an
>> ideology that is stronger, more grounded, and more committed than theirs.
>>
>> Then again, we really are fighting the wrong war, and I'm not referring to
>> Iraq.
>>
>> Regards,
>> Dedric
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by dc[3] on Sun, 17 Sep 2006 22:32:22 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

As long as we all have been yakking on these subjects, three
things have happened.

1. No one switched sides

2. Everyone learned something

3. Almost all of us have gotten much more skilled in being
nice to each other despite our differences.

I don't know about the rest of you, but I am going to declare
victory and have a beer...

DC

Subject: Re: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by uptown jimmy on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 00:09:55 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

The real irony here is that the head of the Catholic Church would dare to
criticize anybody, ever, for spreading religion with violence and brutality.

That is some serious irony right there.

Jimmy

"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
news:C131DB49.356D%dterry@keyofd.net...
> I don't want to start another religious or political thread - I just found
> this ironic, at best:
>
> The Pope is under fire from the Islamic community because he quoted a
> Byzantine emperor's ancient writings in a talk rejecting religious
> motivation for violence. The emperor, in obscure writings hundreds of
year
> old, characterized the teachings of Muhammad (Islam's founder) as "evil
and
> inhuman" because if it's command to "spread by the sword the faith". The
> Pope made no such characterization - just quoted the old guy, and it isn't
> even clear if he quoted any of the "offensive" text.
>
> As a protest, two Catholic, two Anglican, and one Greek church in the West
> Bank were attacked by Palestinians using guns, firebombs and lighter
fluid -
> charring the churches and riddling them with bullet holes.
>
> Umm...reality check: 2+2=4. The Earth still circles the Sun. And
doesn't
> reacting with violence just prove the Emperor's assessment, and then some?
> Yet the press and the Islamic world seem to have missed the irony of this
> response, or at least are reluctant to admit it.
>
> The Pope's comment is getting more press than the fact that violence was
> actually perpetrated when the churches were torched. To note, this was a
> response, not a crime.
>
> Why are we (the world culture) so quick to defend Islam and work so hard

to
> avoid offending Muslims, regardless of the cost - even if it means
rewriting
> the definitions of peace and violence? Just something to think about....
>
> Ignorance isn't bliss, it's the last step one takes before falling off of
a
> cliff.
>
> Back to music...
> Dedric
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Dedric Terry on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 00:10:07 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Good observations DC.

And if this newsgroup were put in charge of the country:

1. We would disagree on whether the White House comps would be PCs or Macs.

2. Cabinet meetings would refer to Marshall, Ampeg, etc.

3. Lobbying would refer to the noon jam session in the lobby

4. Bipartisan would mean we decided on both PC and Mac.

5. ProTools would mysteriously fall out of favor

(what? no, we would never do that...)

;-)

Dedric

On 9/17/06 4:32 PM, in article 450dccf6$1@linux, "DC"
<dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:

>
> As long as we all have been yakking on these subjects, three
> things have happened.
>
> 1. No one switched sides
>
> 2. Everyone learned something

>
> 3. Almost all of us have gotten much more skilled in being
> nice to each other despite our differences.
>
>
> I don't know about the rest of you, but I am going to declare
> victory and have a beer...
>
> DC
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by uptown jimmy on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 01:12:03 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have a strong morals
is absurd, I think.

Jimmy

"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...
> Gene -
>
> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your response pretty
> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country and even the
> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict, violence and
> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single largest
> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world. We ignore car
> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of tortured and
> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming the
> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made the Pope quote
a
> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.
>
> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening, all-accepting religion
> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western Muslims might
> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else in many of
the
> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have talked to, and
> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a different world
> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have here.
People
> die for converting to anything else, or their families do. At best, their
> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under threat of
> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our country

> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on our own
country
> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to this kind of
> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically correct thing to
> do.
>
> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God, and hence
any
> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the choice to believe
> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name of Allah the
> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10 commandments in 24
> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there is a sad,
and
> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should fear - it's
> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's personal whims that
> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day. That also
> includes believing in nothing.
>
> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in God and is
> wrong, at worst one has lived a good live and had some false hope as a
sense
> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is wrong, then at
> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we should be
> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that the President
> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief really better
> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong accompanies
disbelief
> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference point for
> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of belief in any
> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion for others?
>
> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a guy Islam
doesn't
> like just because he called like he saw it - something we do on this forum
> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's intent to take
> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only goal is to give
> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to not believe
> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity from public
view.
> The only way to force someone to remove their belief from public in a
> country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes, is to outlaw
it.
> Yet another paradox.
>
> Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see the world as a
> black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party always wins
and
> the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any validity in

> believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to maintain the
balance
> that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust in the very
> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most fallible
> characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic ideology.
>
> I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.
>
> I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of 10 hours of
work
> :-((....
>
> Regards,
> Dedric
>
> On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70$1@linux, "gene Lennon"
> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>
> >
> > Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
> >> I don't want to start another religious or political thread -...
> >
> >
> > These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the current
> > administration
> > have had a variety of political, financial and power-based reasons for
> > perusing
> > the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier motivation.
> >
> > Religion.
> >
> > If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third Great
Awakening"
> > of the international religious struggle. This is a good thing as he sees
> > it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight against
terrorists
> > (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war that he
depicts
> > as "a confrontation between good and evil."
> > In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit of trouble
(as
> > has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
> >
> > Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be headed?
> >
> > Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could easily go
down
> > hill from here.

> >
> > More on the "Third Awakening":
> >
http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09 /12/AR2006091201
59
> > 4_pf.html
> >
> > Gene
> >
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Dedric Terry on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 03:10:17 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hey Jimmy,

No doubt one can be a good person without believing in God - there are tons of great people with no faith, or very little. That in and of itself tells me there must be a God so even non-believers would have a strong sense of right and wrong on a societal and even global level.

To walk through some thoughts: with no God, or higher reference point, what would be considered moral, or at least good? What would one use to decide what is right and wrong?

Laws? Most would agree that we can't legislate morality now, so with no basis for what morality is, why would we even bother with laws since everyone would make their own choices anyway?

Intellect? That would simply depend on what one chose to accept as "intelligent" thought, based completely on opinion.

Reasoning and Logic? Logic is determined by a hypothesis that has a proven outcome in a given situation. Change the situation, and the reasoning or logic behind the "right" or "wrong" could easily change.

Experience? What if one's experience is filled with hatred, abuse, anger and violence, or worse? Then someone would have to decide whose experience we would use as a reference point. There would be no guarantee that person or persons had experiences that would be best for the good of the whole.

Survival instinct? If it were a reference point, then stealing, lying, cheating and even killing would be perfectly justified as those can be means of survival.

Why would right and wrong even exist? I would think that the differences

between societies' definitions of right and wrong, assuming societies even existed, would be so drastic we would never have ventured into any form of inter-cultural/inter-geographic interaction, much less relationships, diplomacy, collaboration, trade, and open travel.

As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual, they aren't absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes to make the choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There would only be an ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at the time, and based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from person to person, day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons would either be filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time because their choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we wouldn't have prisons, or likely even organized societies.

But is the majority always right? How would we know if there were no absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?

If there were no right and wrong, there would be no consequences of either, or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad consequence - it would just be another event in time.

But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice, both in whether to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong decisions. With moral absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to evaluate drastically differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency in reasoning and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry. Even when we choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without that option to choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would be no power in choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal and loving God rather than a dictator or puppet master.

Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see God in the way that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can discuss completely opposing opinions and still care enough to consider insulting, belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable concept; and 2) in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely trump greed and power in importance to life and survival together on this planet.

Regards,
Dedric

On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy" <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:

> The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have a strong morals
> is absurd, I think.
>

> Jimmy
>
>
> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
> news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...
>> Gene -
>>
>> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your response pretty
>> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country and even the
>> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict, violence and
>> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single largest
>> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world. We ignore car
>> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of tortured and
>> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming the
>> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made the Pope quote
> a
>> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.
>>
>> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening, all-accepting religion
>> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western Muslims might
>> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else in many of
> the
>> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have talked to, and
>> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a different world
>> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have here.
> People
>> die for converting to anything else, or their families do. At best, their
>> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under threat of
>> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our country
>> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on our own
> country
>> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to this kind of
>> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically correct thing to
>> do.
>>
>> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God, and hence
> any
>> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the choice to believe
>> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name of Allah the
>> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10 commandments in 24
>> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there is a sad,
> and
>> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should fear - it's
>> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's personal whims that
>> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day. That also
>> includes believing in nothing.
>>
>> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in God and is

>> wrong, at worst one has lived a good live and had some false hope as a
> sense
>> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is wrong, then at
>> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we should be
>> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that the President
>> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief really better
>> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong accompanies
> disbelief
>> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference point for
>> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of belief in any
>> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion for others?
>>
>> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a guy Islam
> doesn't
>> like just because he called like he saw it - something we do on this forum
>> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's intent to take
>> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only goal is to give
>> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to not believe
>> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity from public
> view.
>> The only way to force someone to remove their belief from public in a
>> country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes, is to outlaw
> it.
>> Yet another paradox.
>>
>> Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see the world as a
>> black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party always wins
> and
>> the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any validity in
>> believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to maintain the
> balance
>> that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust in the very
>> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most fallible
>> characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic ideology.
>>
>> I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.
>>
>> I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of 10 hours of
> work
>> :-((....
>>
>> Regards,
>> Dedric
>>
>> On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70$1@linux, "gene Lennon"
>> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>>
>>>

>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread -...
>>>
>>>
>>> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the current
>>> administration
>>> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based reasons for
>>> perusing
>>> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier motivation.
>>>
>>> Religion.
>>>
>>> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third Great
> Awakening"
>>> of the international religious struggle. This is a good thing as he sees
>>> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight against
> terrorists
>>> (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war that he
> depicts
>>> as "a confrontation between good and evil."
>>> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit of trouble
> (as
>>> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
>>>
>>> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be headed?
>>>
>>> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could easily go
> down
>>> hill from here.
>>>
>>> More on the "Third Awakening":
>>>
> http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09 /12/AR2006091201
> 59
>>> 4_pf.html
>>>
>>> Gene
>>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by uptown jimmy on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 03:55:20 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I have no desire to enter into a debate about gods and religion. I am not

interested in proving any given point, or in converting you to a state of mind similar to my own.

Jimmy

"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message news:C1336A39.35DE%dterry@keyofd.net...
> Hey Jimmy,
>
> No doubt one can be a good person without believing in God - there are tons
> of great people with no faith, or very little. That in and of itself tells
> me there must be a God so even non-believers would have a strong sense of
> right and wrong on a societal and even global level.
>
> To walk through some thoughts: with no God, or higher reference point, what
> would be considered moral, or at least good? What would one use to decide
> what is right and wrong?
>
> Laws? Most would agree that we can't legislate morality now, so with no
> basis for what morality is, why would we even bother with laws since
> everyone would make their own choices anyway?
>
> Intellect? That would simply depend on what one chose to accept as
> "intelligent" thought, based completely on opinion.
>
> Reasoning and Logic? Logic is determined by a hypothesis that has a proven
> outcome in a given situation. Change the situation, and the reasoning or
> logic behind the "right" or "wrong" could easily change.
>
> Experience? What if one's experience is filled with hatred, abuse, anger
> and violence, or worse? Then someone would have to decide whose experience
> we would use as a reference point. There would be no guarantee that person
> or persons had experiences that would be best for the good of the whole.
>
> Survival instinct? If it were a reference point, then stealing, lying,
> cheating and even killing would be perfectly justified as those can be means
> of survival.
>
> Why would right and wrong even exist? I would think that the differences
> between societies' definitions of right and wrong, assuming societies even

> existed, would be so drastic we would never have ventured into any form of
> inter-cultural/inter-geographic interaction, much less relationships,
> diplomacy, collaboration, trade, and open travel.
>
> As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual, they aren't
> absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes to make the
> choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There would only be an
> ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at the time, and
> based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from person to
person,
> day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons would either be
> filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time because
their
> choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we wouldn't have
> prisons, or likely even organized societies.
>
> But is the majority always right? How would we know if there were no
> absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?
>
> If there were no right and wrong, there would be no consequences of
either,
> or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad consequence - it
> would just be another event in time.
>
> But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice, both in
whether
> to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong decisions. With
moral
> absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to evaluate
drastically
> differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency in reasoning
> and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry. Even when we
> choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without that option to
> choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would be no power
in
> choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal and loving
God
> rather than a dictator or puppet master.
>
> Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see God in the way
> that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can discuss
> completely opposing opinions and still care enough to consider insulting,
> belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable concept; and
2)
> in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely trump greed
and
> power in importance to life and survival together on this planet.
>

> Regards,
> Dedric
>
> On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy"
> <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
>
> > The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have a strong
morals
> > is absurd, I think.
> >
> > Jimmy
> >
> >
> > "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
> > news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...
> >> Gene -
> >>
> >> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your response
pretty
> >> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country and even
the
> >> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict, violence and
> >> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single largest
> >> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world. We ignore
car
> >> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of tortured and
> >> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming the
> >> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made the Pope
quote
> > a
> >> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.
> >>
> >> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening, all-accepting
religion
> >> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western Muslims
might
> >> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else in many
of
> > the
> >> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have talked to,
and
> >> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a different
world
> >> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have here.
> > People
> >> die for converting to anything else, or their families do. At best,
their
> >> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under threat of

> >> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our country
> >> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on our own
> > country
> >> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to this kind of
> >> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically correct thing
to
> >> do.
> >>
> >> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God, and hence
> > any
> >> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the choice to
believe
> >> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name of Allah
the
> >> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10 commandments in
24
> >> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there is a sad,
> > and
> >> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should fear -
it's
> >> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's personal whims
that
> >> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day. That
also
> >> includes believing in nothing.
> >>
> >> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in God and is
> >> wrong, at worst one has lived a good live and had some false hope as a
> > sense
> >> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is wrong, then at
> >> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we should be
> >> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that the
President
> >> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief really
better
> >> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong accompanies
> > disbelief
> >> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference point for
> >> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of belief in any
> >> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion for others?
> >>
> >> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a guy Islam
> > doesn't
> >> like just because he called like he saw it - something we do on this
forum
> >> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's intent to
take
> >> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only goal is to

give
> >> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to not
believe
> >> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity from public
> > view.
> >> The only way to force someone to remove their belief from public in a
> >> country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes, is to
outlaw
> > it.
> >> Yet another paradox.
> >>
> >> Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see the world as
a
> >> black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party always wins
> > and
> >> the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any validity in
> >> believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to maintain the
> > balance
> >> that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust in the
very
> >> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most fallible
> >> characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic ideology.
> >>
> >> I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.
> >>
> >> I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of 10 hours of
> > work
> >> :-((....
> >>
> >> Regards,
> >> Dedric
> >>
> >> On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70$1@linux, "gene Lennon"
> >> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
> >>
> >>>
> >>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
> >>>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread -...
> >>>
> >>>
> >>> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the current
> >>> administration
> >>> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based reasons for
> >>> perusing
> >>> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier
motivation.
> >>>
> >>> Religion.

> >>>
> >>> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third Great
> > Awakening"
> >>> of the international religious struggle. This is a good thing as he
sees
> >>> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight against
> > terrorists
> >>> (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war that he
> > depicts
> >>> as "a confrontation between good and evil."
> >>> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit of trouble
> > (as
> >>> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
> >>>
> >>> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be headed?
> >>>
> >>> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could easily go
> > down
> >>> hill from here.
> >>>
> >>> More on the "Third Awakening":
> >>>
> >
 http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09 /12/AR2006091201
> > 59
> >>> 4_pf.html
> >>>
> >>> Gene
> >>>
> >>
> >
> >
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Jamie K on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 05:14:16 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Faith is complete trust or confidence in something or someone. Religious faith is one form of faith but not the only definition of "faith."

For example I have faith that if I drop a guitar pick it will find its way to the floor based on the gravitational attraction it has to the planet. I have faith that I'll breathe my next breath, that I'll see tomorrow morning. I have faith that other people are put together much like I am and that I can therefore relate to other folks.

Without faith, people would not invest money. Without faith people would not vote. Without faith people would not start businesses, hire other people, raise children. Without faith people would not ride trains, fly in planes or drive cars. Without faith no one would investigate scientific questions about reality.

While you can clearly have faith without religion, you cannot have religion without faith. Religion depends on faith that one or more deities (good and sometimes bad) exist, that their associated stories actually occurred, and often, that there is some sort of afterlife.

However, religious people believe in a variety of different deities. Even those who believe in the same deity disagree, sometimes violently, about the nature of their deity. Religions sometimes even disagree about the nature of reality. If you want to base morality strictly on religion, and you look around, you'll notice that religion can be a somewhat chaotic basis unless...

Ah, you might say, I want to base morality on MY religion. Well, you just dissed the majority of religions. No problem because THEY ARE WRONG. And people who believe in those religions may just be saying the same thing about you and your religion. For those religions who are not tolerant of other ideas, you may just have started a war.

So perhaps it's BETTER, in our time, to have a system of justice that is NOT based on a religion. But one which guarantees everyone the right to practice the religion of their choice, guarantees other freedoms such as we in the USA do in our Bill of Rights, encourages honesty and integrity, while enforcing some common sense limits such as no human sacrifices, a minimum age for marriage, no incest, no slavery, no murder, no rape, no stealing, those sorts of things.

What is viewed as morality beyond a fair justice system and common sense rules of behavior can be left to each freely chosen religion to sort out, like whether to restrict diet in some way, whether to wear a certain type of clothing, how to pray, etc. But none of these additional practices should be imposed on society as a whole.

The Golden Rule may also be of use as a basic moral foundation.

So yes, you can have a moral system, one that BTW protects the freedom to practice religious beliefs (or not), without basing it on any one religion. And it can protect all religions better than a system based on any one religion (AKA a theocracy).

There are other issues surrounding religions, such as the many examples of selfless dedication to helping others on the one hand, and hijacked religions used to legitimize earthly power structures in other cases.

Dedric, I look forward to talking with you about the positives and negatives of various religions, and where a moral culture ought to go from here, whenever we next get together.

Cheers,
-Jamie
http://www.JamieKrutz.com

Dedric Terry wrote:
> Hey Jimmy,
>
> No doubt one can be a good person without believing in God - there are tons
> of great people with no faith, or very little. That in and of itself tells
> me there must be a God so even non-believers would have a strong sense of
> right and wrong on a societal and even global level.
>
> To walk through some thoughts: with no God, or higher reference point, what
> would be considered moral, or at least good? What would one use to decide
> what is right and wrong?
>
> Laws? Most would agree that we can't legislate morality now, so with no
> basis for what morality is, why would we even bother with laws since
> everyone would make their own choices anyway?
>
> Intellect? That would simply depend on what one chose to accept as
> "intelligent" thought, based completely on opinion.
>
> Reasoning and Logic? Logic is determined by a hypothesis that has a proven
> outcome in a given situation. Change the situation, and the reasoning or
> logic behind the "right" or "wrong" could easily change.
>
> Experience? What if one's experience is filled with hatred, abuse, anger
> and violence, or worse? Then someone would have to decide whose experience
> we would use as a reference point. There would be no guarantee that person
> or persons had experiences that would be best for the good of the whole.
>
> Survival instinct? If it were a reference point, then stealing, lying,
> cheating and even killing would be perfectly justified as those can be means
> of survival.
>
> Why would right and wrong even exist? I would think that the differences
> between societies' definitions of right and wrong, assuming societies even
> existed, would be so drastic we would never have ventured into any form of
> inter-cultural/inter-geographic interaction, much less relationships,
> diplomacy, collaboration, trade, and open travel.
>
> As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual, they aren't

> absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes to make the
> choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There would only be an
> ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at the time, and
> based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from person to person,
> day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons would either be
> filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time because their
> choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we wouldn't have
> prisons, or likely even organized societies.
>
> But is the majority always right? How would we know if there were no
> absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?
>
> If there were no right and wrong, there would be no consequences of either,
> or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad consequence - it
> would just be another event in time.
>
> But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice, both in whether
> to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong decisions. With moral
> absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to evaluate drastically
> differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency in reasoning
> and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry. Even when we
> choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without that option to
> choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would be no power in
> choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal and loving God
> rather than a dictator or puppet master.
>
> Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see God in the way
> that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can discuss
> completely opposing opinions and still care enough to consider insulting,
> belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable concept; and 2)
> in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely trump greed and
> power in importance to life and survival together on this planet.
>
> Regards,
> Dedric
>
> On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy"
> <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
>
>> The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have a strong morals
>> is absurd, I think.
>>
>> Jimmy
>>
>>
>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
>> news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...
>>> Gene -

>>>
>>> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your response pretty
>>> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country and even the
>>> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict, violence and
>>> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single largest
>>> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world. We ignore car
>>> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of tortured and
>>> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming the
>>> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made the Pope quote
>> a
>>> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.
>>>
>>> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening, all-accepting religion
>>> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western Muslims might
>>> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else in many of
>> the
>>> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have talked to, and
>>> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a different world
>>> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have here.
>> People
>>> die for converting to anything else, or their families do. At best, their
>>> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under threat of
>>> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our country
>>> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on our own
>> country
>>> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to this kind of
>>> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically correct thing to
>>> do.
>>>
>>> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God, and hence
>> any
>>> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the choice to believe
>>> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name of Allah the
>>> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10 commandments in 24
>>> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there is a sad,
>> and
>>> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should fear - it's
>>> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's personal whims that
>>> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day. That also
>>> includes believing in nothing.
>>>
>>> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in God and is
>>> wrong, at worst one has lived a good live and had some false hope as a
>> sense
>>> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is wrong, then at
>>> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we should be
>>> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that the President
>>> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief really better

>>> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong accompanies
>> disbelief
>>> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference point for
>>> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of belief in any
>>> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion for others?
>>>
>>> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a guy Islam
>> doesn't
>>> like just because he called like he saw it - something we do on this forum
>>> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's intent to take
>>> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only goal is to give
>>> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to not believe
>>> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity from public
>> view.
>>> The only way to force someone to remove their belief from public in a
>>> country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes, is to outlaw
>> it.
>>> Yet another paradox.
>>>
>>> Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see the world as a
>>> black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party always wins
>> and
>>> the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any validity in
>>> believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to maintain the
>> balance
>>> that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust in the very
>>> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most fallible
>>> characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic ideology.
>>>
>>> I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.
>>>
>>> I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of 10 hours of
>> work
>>> :-((....
>>>
>>> Regards,
>>> Dedric
>>>
>>> On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70$1@linux, "gene Lennon"
>>> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread -...
>>>>
>>>> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the current
>>>> administration
>>>> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based reasons for
>>>> perusing

>>>> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier motivation.
>>>>
>>>> Religion.
>>>>
>>>> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third Great
>> Awakening"
>>>> of the international religious struggle. This is a good thing as he sees
>>>> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight against
>> terrorists
>>>> (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war that he
>> depicts
>>>> as "a confrontation between good and evil."
>>>> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit of trouble
>> (as
>>>> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
>>>>
>>>> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be headed?
>>>>
>>>> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could easily go
>> down
>>>> hill from here.
>>>>
>>>> More on the "Third Awakening":
>>>>
>> http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09 /12/AR2006091201
>> 59
>>>> 4_pf.html
>>>>
>>>> Gene
>>>>
>>
>
`

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Dedric Terry on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 06:38:11 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi Jamie,

While those are certainly good examples of the common definition of faith,, we shouldn't confuse faith in God with trust that event B will follow event A. The latter can also easily be attributed to learned behavior. But not all aspects of faith in God can be seen or experienced.

Hebrews 11:1
What is faith? It is the confident assurance that what we hope for is going

to happen. It is the evidence of things we cannot yet see.

And no doubt that can apply to a falling guitar pick, though I doubt you hope that will happen during a gig. ;-)

How does one believe that there is life after death though, or that God is sovereign even over devastating situations? That is where the faith I refer to comes into play. And I would also propose that the same sense of faith we use to start a business, or enter into marriage, or believe that we'll see the next day, is part of the desire and drive that God has designed in us to propel us forward, and draw us to Him as well. It is a part of being human - a feeling, thinking, growing, individual.

The point was that moral absolutes aren't based on religion, and wouldn't be moral absolutes if they were. The idea of God-defined absolutes excludes the possibility that man could create or change that absolute.

By saying that man creates absolutes based on his religions says that his religion is false (created by that man), and therefore, no belief has any absolutes, and all beliefs are relative only to a single individual at a single point in time. We could extrapolate that to whether murder, rape and other acts we consider "hideous", but would have to conclude that all are right and none are wrong. The reason being that we would only be viewing them through our own created "right and wrong" and not anyone else's. That would also extrapolate to terrorists that kill people believing that it is Allah's will to destroy those that oppose them. But obviously we don't believe that is "right" any more than we believe Charles Manson was "right" to do what he did.

So where do we get the foundation for a "fair justice system" and "common sense"? If we have no reference point, then we must have just made it up. In that case, it's only relative to our perspective, and is neither right or wrong to anyone else, and maybe not all of the time for us either. If we created right and wrong, and we aren't perfect, then there is nothing stopping us from changing the rules when it suits us individually, regardless of the impact on others. Without that sense of governing authority that outlasts our governments, what holds us to be by very nature mostly "good", by most any definition?

What makes all of our choices seem to follow a similar core value system? If we have no common thread of belief in what is right and wrong, then why do most people (and likely all, even extremist terrorists) prefer peace to war; love instead of hate; fairness instead of injustice; truth instead of deceit? If there is nothing connecting us and superceding our own locally relative decision process, then how could we have any sense of "common sense", much less right and wrong?

We see the evidence of these everyday. We easily agree as a world culture

for the most part (excepting obvious deviations), that murder is wrong; stealing is wrong; laws should be obeyed, not abolished; etc. That is the evidence of unseen, never globally written in stone, but always pervasive moral absolutes. So in reality we all have faith that moral absolutes do exist, and if no individual created them (by the hypothesis that relativism would make them irrelevant), and all mankind just happen to adopt and hear about them without actual communication to propagate those beliefs, where did they come from if not from God?

Regards,
Dedric

On 9/17/06 11:14 PM, in article 450e2955@linux, "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>
> Faith is complete trust or confidence in something or someone. Religious
> faith is one form of faith but not the only definition of "faith."
>
> For example I have faith that if I drop a guitar pick it will find its
> way to the floor based on the gravitational attraction it has to the
> planet. I have faith that I'll breathe my next breath, that I'll see
> tomorrow morning. I have faith that other people are put together much
> like I am and that I can therefore relate to other folks.
>
> Without faith, people would not invest money. Without faith people would
> not vote. Without faith people would not start businesses, hire other
> people, raise children. Without faith people would not ride trains, fly
> in planes or drive cars. Without faith no one would investigate
> scientific questions about reality.
>
> While you can clearly have faith without religion, you cannot have
> religion without faith. Religion depends on faith that one or more
> deities (good and sometimes bad) exist, that their associated stories
> actually occurred, and often, that there is some sort of afterlife.
>
> However, religious people believe in a variety of different deities.
> Even those who believe in the same deity disagree, sometimes violently,
> about the nature of their deity. Religions sometimes even disagree about
> the nature of reality. If you want to base morality strictly on
> religion, and you look around, you'll notice that religion can be a
> somewhat chaotic basis unless...
>
> Ah, you might say, I want to base morality on MY religion. Well, you
> just dissed the majority of religions. No problem because THEY ARE
> WRONG. And people who believe in those religions may just be saying the
> same thing about you and your religion. For those religions who are not
> tolerant of other ideas, you may just have started a war.

>
> So perhaps it's BETTER, in our time, to have a system of justice that is
> NOT based on a religion. But one which guarantees everyone the right to
> practice the religion of their choice, guarantees other freedoms such as
> we in the USA do in our Bill of Rights, encourages honesty and
> integrity, while enforcing some common sense limits such as no human
> sacrifices, a minimum age for marriage, no incest, no slavery, no
> murder, no rape, no stealing, those sorts of things.
>
> What is viewed as morality beyond a fair justice system and common sense
> rules of behavior can be left to each freely chosen religion to sort
> out, like whether to restrict diet in some way, whether to wear a
> certain type of clothing, how to pray, etc. But none of these additional
> practices should be imposed on society as a whole.
>
> The Golden Rule may also be of use as a basic moral foundation.
>
> So yes, you can have a moral system, one that BTW protects the freedom
> to practice religious beliefs (or not), without basing it on any one
> religion. And it can protect all religions better than a system based on
> any one religion (AKA a theocracy).
>
> There are other issues surrounding religions, such as the many examples
> of selfless dedication to helping others on the one hand, and hijacked
> religions used to legitimize earthly power structures in other cases.
> Dedric, I look forward to talking with you about the positives and
> negatives of various religions, and where a moral culture ought to go
> from here, whenever we next get together.
>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>
> Dedric Terry wrote:
>> Hey Jimmy,
>>
>> No doubt one can be a good person without believing in God - there are tons
>> of great people with no faith, or very little. That in and of itself tells
>> me there must be a God so even non-believers would have a strong sense of
>> right and wrong on a societal and even global level.
>>
>> To walk through some thoughts: with no God, or higher reference point, what
>> would be considered moral, or at least good? What would one use to decide
>> what is right and wrong?
>>
>> Laws? Most would agree that we can't legislate morality now, so with no
>> basis for what morality is, why would we even bother with laws since

>> everyone would make their own choices anyway?
>>
>> Intellect? That would simply depend on what one chose to accept as
>> "intelligent" thought, based completely on opinion.
>>
>> Reasoning and Logic? Logic is determined by a hypothesis that has a proven
>> outcome in a given situation. Change the situation, and the reasoning or
>> logic behind the "right" or "wrong" could easily change.
>>
>> Experience? What if one's experience is filled with hatred, abuse, anger
>> and violence, or worse? Then someone would have to decide whose experience
>> we would use as a reference point. There would be no guarantee that person
>> or persons had experiences that would be best for the good of the whole.
>>
>> Survival instinct? If it were a reference point, then stealing, lying,
>> cheating and even killing would be perfectly justified as those can be means
>> of survival.
>>
>> Why would right and wrong even exist? I would think that the differences
>> between societies' definitions of right and wrong, assuming societies even
>> existed, would be so drastic we would never have ventured into any form of
>> inter-cultural/inter-geographic interaction, much less relationships,
>> diplomacy, collaboration, trade, and open travel.
>>
>> As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual, they aren't
>> absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes to make the
>> choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There would only be an
>> ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at the time, and
>> based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from person to person,
>> day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons would either be
>> filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time because their
>> choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we wouldn't have
>> prisons, or likely even organized societies.
>>
>> But is the majority always right? How would we know if there were no
>> absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?
>>
>> If there were no right and wrong, there would be no consequences of either,
>> or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad consequence - it
>> would just be another event in time.
>>
>> But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice, both in whether
>> to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong decisions. With moral
>> absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to evaluate drastically
>> differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency in reasoning
>> and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry. Even when we
>> choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without that option to
>> choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would be no power in

>> choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal and loving God
>> rather than a dictator or puppet master.
>>
>> Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see God in the way
>> that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can discuss
>> completely opposing opinions and still care enough to consider insulting,
>> belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable concept; and 2)
>> in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely trump greed and
>> power in importance to life and survival together on this planet.
>>
>> Regards,
>> Dedric
>>
>> On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy"
>> <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
>>
>>> The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have a strong morals
>>> is absurd, I think.
>>>
>>> Jimmy
>>>
>>>
>>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
>>> news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...
>>>> Gene -
>>>>
>>>> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your response pretty
>>>> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country and even the
>>>> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict, violence and
>>>> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single largest
>>>> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world. We ignore car
>>>> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of tortured and
>>>> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming the
>>>> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made the Pope quote
>>> a
>>>> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.
>>>>
>>>> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening, all-accepting religion
>>>> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western Muslims might
>>>> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else in many of
>>> the
>>>> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have talked to, and
>>>> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a different world
>>>> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have here.
>>> People
>>>> die for converting to anything else, or their families do. At best, their
>>>> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under threat of
>>>> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our country

>>>> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on our own
>>> country
>>>> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to this kind of
>>>> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically correct thing to
>>>> do.
>>>>
>>>> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God, and hence
>>> any
>>>> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the choice to believe
>>>> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name of Allah the
>>>> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10 commandments in 24
>>>> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there is a sad,
>>> and
>>>> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should fear - it's
>>>> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's personal whims that
>>>> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day. That also
>>>> includes believing in nothing.
>>>>
>>>> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in God and is
>>>> wrong, at worst one has lived a good live and had some false hope as a
>>> sense
>>>> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is wrong, then at
>>>> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we should be
>>>> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that the President
>>>> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief really better
>>>> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong accompanies
>>> disbelief
>>>> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference point for
>>>> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of belief in any
>>>> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion for others?
>>>>
>>>> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a guy Islam
>>> doesn't
>>>> like just because he called like he saw it - something we do on this forum
>>>> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's intent to take
>>>> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only goal is to give
>>>> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to not believe
>>>> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity from public
>>> view.
>>>> The only way to force someone to remove their belief from public in a
>>>> country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes, is to outlaw
>>> it.
>>>> Yet another paradox.
>>>>
>>>> Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see the world as a
>>>> black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party always wins
>>> and
>>>> the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any validity in

>>>> believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to maintain the
>>> balance
>>>> that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust in the very
>>>> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most fallible
>>>> characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic ideology.
>>>>
>>>> I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.
>>>>
>>>> I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of 10 hours of
>>> work
>>>> :-((....
>>>>
>>>> Regards,
>>>> Dedric
>>>>
>>>> On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70$1@linux, "gene Lennon"
>>>> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread -...
>>>>>
>>>>> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the current
>>>>> administration
>>>>> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based reasons for
>>>>> perusing
>>>>> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier motivation.
>>>>>
>>>>> Religion.
>>>>>
>>>>> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third Great
>>> Awakening"
>>>>> of the international religious struggle. This is a good thing as he sees
>>>>> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight against
>>> terrorists
>>>>> (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war that he
>>> depicts
>>>>> as "a confrontation between good and evil."
>>>>> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit of trouble
>>> (as
>>>>> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
>>>>>
>>>>> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be headed?
>>>>>
>>>>> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could easily go
>>> down
>>>>> hill from here.
>>>>>
>>>>> More on the "Third Awakening":

>>>>>
>>> http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09 /12/AR2006091201
>>> 59
>>>>> 4_pf.html
>>>>>
>>>>> Gene
>>>>>
>>>
>>
> `

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Jamie K on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 07:40:57 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

My point is that faith is necessary for life, with or without religion. Faith in a deity, faith in an afterlife, these are certainly examples of faith. My point is that faith is not exclusive to religion.

Nor is a moral basis, a system of justice - these are necessary for civilization, again with or without religion. Religion is fairly useful in construction such a system, to the point that religions have been invented to help cement power and define social organization. But that doesn't mean a religion, or a universally acknowledged deity, is required for that role.

It may be that you are having trouble groking the idea of morality without a deity because you have so tightly associated the two in your life, which is totally understandable. But what you propose is begging the question. Others can make the distinction, and maybe it's worth the effort to understand why.

There are many perspectives. For example a social libertarian perspective. You own yourself. What you do with yourself is your choice until and unless it interferes with someone else's ownership of their own person. You can derive the rest from there. This is a pretty strong start which certainly can allow for a law-based free society, including religious freedom.

We are into a deep subject which is better discussed in person when people are willing to both talk and listen, as I have faith we are. :^)

I may be missing some of your intended points and I suspect we may be talking past each other somewhat in email. So since we don't live all that far apart, let's get together soon, explore the topic over a beer, and see what we come up with.

Cheers,
-Jamie
http://www.JamieKrutz.com

Dedric Terry wrote:
> Hi Jamie,
>
> While those are certainly good examples of the common definition of faith,,
> we shouldn't confuse faith in God with trust that event B will follow event
> A. The latter can also easily be attributed to learned behavior. But not
> all aspects of faith in God can be seen or experienced.
>
> Hebrews 11:1
> What is faith? It is the confident assurance that what we hope for is going
> to happen. It is the evidence of things we cannot yet see.
>
> And no doubt that can apply to a falling guitar pick, though I doubt you
> hope that will happen during a gig. ;-)
>
> How does one believe that there is life after death though, or that God is
> sovereign even over devastating situations? That is where the faith I refer
> to comes into play. And I would also propose that the same sense of faith
> we use to start a business, or enter into marriage, or believe that we'll
> see the next day, is part of the desire and drive that God has designed in
> us to propel us forward, and draw us to Him as well. It is a part of being
> human - a feeling, thinking, growing, individual.
>
> The point was that moral absolutes aren't based on religion, and wouldn't be
> moral absolutes if they were. The idea of God-defined absolutes excludes
> the possibility that man could create or change that absolute.
>
> By saying that man creates absolutes based on his religions says that his
> religion is false (created by that man), and therefore, no belief has any
> absolutes, and all beliefs are relative only to a single individual at a
> single point in time. We could extrapolate that to whether murder, rape and
> other acts we consider "hideous", but would have to conclude that all are
> right and none are wrong. The reason being that we would only be viewing
> them through our own created "right and wrong" and not anyone else's. That
> would also extrapolate to terrorists that kill people believing that it is
> Allah's will to destroy those that oppose them. But obviously we don't
> believe that is "right" any more than we believe Charles Manson was "right"
> to do what he did.
>
> So where do we get the foundation for a "fair justice system" and "common

> sense"? If we have no reference point, then we must have just made it up.
> In that case, it's only relative to our perspective, and is neither right or
> wrong to anyone else, and maybe not all of the time for us either. If we
> created right and wrong, and we aren't perfect, then there is nothing
> stopping us from changing the rules when it suits us individually,
> regardless of the impact on others. Without that sense of governing
> authority that outlasts our governments, what holds us to be by very nature
> mostly "good", by most any definition?
>
> What makes all of our choices seem to follow a similar core value system?
> If we have no common thread of belief in what is right and wrong, then why
> do most people (and likely all, even extremist terrorists) prefer peace to
> war; love instead of hate; fairness instead of injustice; truth instead of
> deceit? If there is nothing connecting us and superceding our own locally
> relative decision process, then how could we have any sense of "common
> sense", much less right and wrong?
>
> We see the evidence of these everyday. We easily agree as a world culture
> for the most part (excepting obvious deviations), that murder is wrong;
> stealing is wrong; laws should be obeyed, not abolished; etc. That is the
> evidence of unseen, never globally written in stone, but always pervasive
> moral absolutes. So in reality we all have faith that moral absolutes do
> exist, and if no individual created them (by the hypothesis that relativism
> would make them irrelevant), and all mankind just happen to adopt and hear
> about them without actual communication to propagate those beliefs, where
> did they come from if not from God?
>
> Regards,
> Dedric
>
> On 9/17/06 11:14 PM, in article 450e2955@linux, "Jamie K"
> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>
>> Faith is complete trust or confidence in something or someone. Religious
>> faith is one form of faith but not the only definition of "faith."
>>
>> For example I have faith that if I drop a guitar pick it will find its
>> way to the floor based on the gravitational attraction it has to the
>> planet. I have faith that I'll breathe my next breath, that I'll see
>> tomorrow morning. I have faith that other people are put together much
>> like I am and that I can therefore relate to other folks.
>>
>> Without faith, people would not invest money. Without faith people would
>> not vote. Without faith people would not start businesses, hire other
>> people, raise children. Without faith people would not ride trains, fly
>> in planes or drive cars. Without faith no one would investigate
>> scientific questions about reality.
>>

>> While you can clearly have faith without religion, you cannot have
>> religion without faith. Religion depends on faith that one or more
>> deities (good and sometimes bad) exist, that their associated stories
>> actually occurred, and often, that there is some sort of afterlife.
>>
>> However, religious people believe in a variety of different deities.
>> Even those who believe in the same deity disagree, sometimes violently,
>> about the nature of their deity. Religions sometimes even disagree about
>> the nature of reality. If you want to base morality strictly on
>> religion, and you look around, you'll notice that religion can be a
>> somewhat chaotic basis unless...
>>
>> Ah, you might say, I want to base morality on MY religion. Well, you
>> just dissed the majority of religions. No problem because THEY ARE
>> WRONG. And people who believe in those religions may just be saying the
>> same thing about you and your religion. For those religions who are not
>> tolerant of other ideas, you may just have started a war.
>>
>> So perhaps it's BETTER, in our time, to have a system of justice that is
>> NOT based on a religion. But one which guarantees everyone the right to
>> practice the religion of their choice, guarantees other freedoms such as
>> we in the USA do in our Bill of Rights, encourages honesty and
>> integrity, while enforcing some common sense limits such as no human
>> sacrifices, a minimum age for marriage, no incest, no slavery, no
>> murder, no rape, no stealing, those sorts of things.
>>
>> What is viewed as morality beyond a fair justice system and common sense
>> rules of behavior can be left to each freely chosen religion to sort
>> out, like whether to restrict diet in some way, whether to wear a
>> certain type of clothing, how to pray, etc. But none of these additional
>> practices should be imposed on society as a whole.
>>
>> The Golden Rule may also be of use as a basic moral foundation.
>>
>> So yes, you can have a moral system, one that BTW protects the freedom
>> to practice religious beliefs (or not), without basing it on any one
>> religion. And it can protect all religions better than a system based on
>> any one religion (AKA a theocracy).
>>
>> There are other issues surrounding religions, such as the many examples
>> of selfless dedication to helping others on the one hand, and hijacked
>> religions used to legitimize earthly power structures in other cases.
>> Dedric, I look forward to talking with you about the positives and
>> negatives of various religions, and where a moral culture ought to go
>> from here, whenever we next get together.
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie

>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>> Hey Jimmy,
>>>
>>> No doubt one can be a good person without believing in God - there are tons
>>> of great people with no faith, or very little. That in and of itself tells
>>> me there must be a God so even non-believers would have a strong sense of
>>> right and wrong on a societal and even global level.
>>>
>>> To walk through some thoughts: with no God, or higher reference point, what
>>> would be considered moral, or at least good? What would one use to decide
>>> what is right and wrong?
>>>
>>> Laws? Most would agree that we can't legislate morality now, so with no
>>> basis for what morality is, why would we even bother with laws since
>>> everyone would make their own choices anyway?
>>>
>>> Intellect? That would simply depend on what one chose to accept as
>>> "intelligent" thought, based completely on opinion.
>>>
>>> Reasoning and Logic? Logic is determined by a hypothesis that has a proven
>>> outcome in a given situation. Change the situation, and the reasoning or
>>> logic behind the "right" or "wrong" could easily change.
>>>
>>> Experience? What if one's experience is filled with hatred, abuse, anger
>>> and violence, or worse? Then someone would have to decide whose experience
>>> we would use as a reference point. There would be no guarantee that person
>>> or persons had experiences that would be best for the good of the whole.
>>>
>>> Survival instinct? If it were a reference point, then stealing, lying,
>>> cheating and even killing would be perfectly justified as those can be means
>>> of survival.
>>>
>>> Why would right and wrong even exist? I would think that the differences
>>> between societies' definitions of right and wrong, assuming societies even
>>> existed, would be so drastic we would never have ventured into any form of
>>> inter-cultural/inter-geographic interaction, much less relationships,
>>> diplomacy, collaboration, trade, and open travel.
>>>
>>> As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual, they aren't
>>> absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes to make the
>>> choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There would only be an
>>> ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at the time, and
>>> based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from person to person,
>>> day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons would either be
>>> filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time because their

>>> choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we wouldn't have
>>> prisons, or likely even organized societies.
>>>
>>> But is the majority always right? How would we know if there were no
>>> absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?
>>>
>>> If there were no right and wrong, there would be no consequences of either,
>>> or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad consequence - it
>>> would just be another event in time.
>>>
>>> But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice, both in whether
>>> to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong decisions. With moral
>>> absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to evaluate drastically
>>> differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency in reasoning
>>> and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry. Even when we
>>> choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without that option to
>>> choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would be no power in
>>> choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal and loving God
>>> rather than a dictator or puppet master.
>>>
>>> Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see God in the way
>>> that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can discuss
>>> completely opposing opinions and still care enough to consider insulting,
>>> belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable concept; and 2)
>>> in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely trump greed and
>>> power in importance to life and survival together on this planet.
>>>
>>> Regards,
>>> Dedric
>>>
>>> On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy"
>>> <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
>>>
>>>> The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have a strong morals
>>>> is absurd, I think.
>>>>
>>>> Jimmy
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
>>>> news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...
>>>>> Gene -
>>>>>
>>>>> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your response pretty
>>>>> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country and even the
>>>>> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict, violence and
>>>>> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single largest
>>>>> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world. We ignore car

>>>>> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of tortured and
>>>>> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming the
>>>>> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made the Pope quote
>>>> a
>>>>> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.
>>>>>
>>>>> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening, all-accepting religion
>>>>> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western Muslims might
>>>>> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else in many of
>>>> the
>>>>> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have talked to, and
>>>>> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a different world
>>>>> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have here.
>>>> People
>>>>> die for converting to anything else, or their families do. At best, their
>>>>> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under threat of
>>>>> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our country
>>>>> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on our own
>>>> country
>>>>> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to this kind of
>>>>> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically correct thing to
>>>>> do.
>>>>>
>>>>> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God, and hence
>>>> any
>>>>> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the choice to believe
>>>>> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name of Allah the
>>>>> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10 commandments in 24
>>>>> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there is a sad,
>>>> and
>>>>> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should fear - it's
>>>>> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's personal whims that
>>>>> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day. That also
>>>>> includes believing in nothing.
>>>>>
>>>>> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in God and is
>>>>> wrong, at worst one has lived a good live and had some false hope as a
>>>> sense
>>>>> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is wrong, then at
>>>>> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we should be
>>>>> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that the President
>>>>> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief really better
>>>>> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong accompanies
>>>> disbelief
>>>>> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference point for
>>>>> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of belief in any
>>>>> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion for others?
>>>>>

>>>>> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a guy Islam
>>>> doesn't
>>>>> like just because he called like he saw it - something we do on this forum
>>>>> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's intent to take
>>>>> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only goal is to give
>>>>> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to not believe
>>>>> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity from public
>>>> view.
>>>>> The only way to force someone to remove their belief from public in a
>>>>> country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes, is to outlaw
>>>> it.
>>>>> Yet another paradox.
>>>>>
>>>>> Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see the world as a
>>>>> black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party always wins
>>>> and
>>>>> the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any validity in
>>>>> believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to maintain the
>>>> balance
>>>>> that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust in the very
>>>>> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most fallible
>>>>> characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic ideology.
>>>>>
>>>>> I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.
>>>>>
>>>>> I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of 10 hours of
>>>> work
>>>>> :-((....
>>>>>
>>>>> Regards,
>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>
>>>>> On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70$1@linux, "gene Lennon"
>>>>> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>>>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread -...
>>>>>> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the current
>>>>>> administration
>>>>>> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based reasons for
>>>>>> perusing
>>>>>> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier motivation.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Religion.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third Great
>>>> Awakening"
>>>>>> of the international religious struggle. This is a good thing as he sees

>>>>>> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight against
>>>> terrorists
>>>>>> (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war that he
>>>> depicts
>>>>>> as "a confrontation between good and evil."
>>>>>> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit of trouble
>>>> (as
>>>>>> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be headed?
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could easily go
>>>> down
>>>>>> hill from here.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> More on the "Third Awakening":
>>>>>>
>>>> http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09 /12/AR2006091201
>>>> 59
>>>>>> 4_pf.html
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Gene
>>>>>>
>> `
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Sarah on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 09:35:43 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hey Dedric,

I think I can answer your last question (i.e., where did our "moral absolutes" come from if not from God?). I don't murder because I don't want to be murdered. I don't steal because I don't want to be stolen from. I don't lie because I don't want to be lied to. And so on. I have faith that most human beings have an inate sense of "goodness," but I believe in laws just so a society has written agreement on what behaviour is unacceptable. That way, we're protected against those who may be out of touch with their own personal "sense of goodness." I do believe, though, that the worst among us are basically good underneath their rage and pain.

I watched an HBO documentary the other night called, "The Iceman and the Psychiatrist," about imprisoned serial killer/hit man Richard Kuklinski and his attempt to better understand his nature with the help of a shrink. What really struck me as I watched and listened to this terrifying man is that I still felt that inside the monster was still a flicker of that distant

"inate goodness."

It seems as though what I think of as inate goodness is what you call God, and that works for me. I think it's possible, though, that the "inate goodness" came from millennia of learning the hard way how not to live together with other humans. Even at that, though, one could argue that it was our "God-given" intelligence which allowed that moral evolution.

The only problem I have with using the word "God" in any discussion of morals, reality, etc., is that there are too many different ideas of who, what, or if God is. Thus "God" becomes kind of a short cut, a metaphor for pretty much anything that transcends human understanding.

Perhaps as a courtesy to others involved in a discussion, if one is going to use the word "God," one should include a definition of the term. For example, if by "God" you mean the inate awareness of good that connects all of us spiritually, I'm down wit dat. If by "God" you mean a Big Guy in the Sky who fries his own "children" in a lake of fire, I'm probably going to ask questions, like, "Well, um . . . does he have a penis?"

"The stars up above are runnin' on love." - Captain Beefheart

Love,

Sarah

"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
news:C1339AF3.35E7%dterry@keyofd.net...
> Hi Jamie,
>
> While those are certainly good examples of the common definition of
> faith,,
> we shouldn't confuse faith in God with trust that event B will follow
> event
> A. The latter can also easily be attributed to learned behavior. But not
> all aspects of faith in God can be seen or experienced.
>
> Hebrews 11:1
> What is faith? It is the confident assurance that what we hope for is
> going
> to happen. It is the evidence of things we cannot yet see.
>
> And no doubt that can apply to a falling guitar pick, though I doubt you
> hope that will happen during a gig. ;-)
>
> How does one believe that there is life after death though, or that God is
> sovereign even over devastating situations? That is where the faith I

> refer
> to comes into play. And I would also propose that the same sense of faith
> we use to start a business, or enter into marriage, or believe that we'll
> see the next day, is part of the desire and drive that God has designed in
> us to propel us forward, and draw us to Him as well. It is a part of
> being
> human - a feeling, thinking, growing, individual.
>
> The point was that moral absolutes aren't based on religion, and wouldn't
> be
> moral absolutes if they were. The idea of God-defined absolutes excludes
> the possibility that man could create or change that absolute.
>
> By saying that man creates absolutes based on his religions says that his
> religion is false (created by that man), and therefore, no belief has any
> absolutes, and all beliefs are relative only to a single individual at a
> single point in time. We could extrapolate that to whether murder, rape
> and
> other acts we consider "hideous", but would have to conclude that all are
> right and none are wrong. The reason being that we would only be viewing
> them through our own created "right and wrong" and not anyone else's. That
> would also extrapolate to terrorists that kill people believing that it is
> Allah's will to destroy those that oppose them. But obviously we don't
> believe that is "right" any more than we believe Charles Manson was
> "right"
> to do what he did.
>
> So where do we get the foundation for a "fair justice system" and "common
> sense"? If we have no reference point, then we must have just made it up.
> In that case, it's only relative to our perspective, and is neither right
> or
> wrong to anyone else, and maybe not all of the time for us either. If we
> created right and wrong, and we aren't perfect, then there is nothing
> stopping us from changing the rules when it suits us individually,
> regardless of the impact on others. Without that sense of governing
> authority that outlasts our governments, what holds us to be by very
> nature
> mostly "good", by most any definition?
>
> What makes all of our choices seem to follow a similar core value system?
> If we have no common thread of belief in what is right and wrong, then why
> do most people (and likely all, even extremist terrorists) prefer peace to
> war; love instead of hate; fairness instead of injustice; truth instead of
> deceit? If there is nothing connecting us and superceding our own locally
> relative decision process, then how could we have any sense of "common
> sense", much less right and wrong?
>
> We see the evidence of these everyday. We easily agree as a world culture

> for the most part (excepting obvious deviations), that murder is wrong;
> stealing is wrong; laws should be obeyed, not abolished; etc. That is the
> evidence of unseen, never globally written in stone, but always pervasive
> moral absolutes. So in reality we all have faith that moral absolutes do
> exist, and if no individual created them (by the hypothesis that
> relativism
> would make them irrelevant), and all mankind just happen to adopt and hear
> about them without actual communication to propagate those beliefs, where
> did they come from if not from God?
>
> Regards,
> Dedric
>
> On 9/17/06 11:14 PM, in article 450e2955@linux, "Jamie K"
> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>
>>
>> Faith is complete trust or confidence in something or someone. Religious
>> faith is one form of faith but not the only definition of "faith."
>>
>> For example I have faith that if I drop a guitar pick it will find its
>> way to the floor based on the gravitational attraction it has to the
>> planet. I have faith that I'll breathe my next breath, that I'll see
>> tomorrow morning. I have faith that other people are put together much
>> like I am and that I can therefore relate to other folks.
>>
>> Without faith, people would not invest money. Without faith people would
>> not vote. Without faith people would not start businesses, hire other
>> people, raise children. Without faith people would not ride trains, fly
>> in planes or drive cars. Without faith no one would investigate
>> scientific questions about reality.
>>
>> While you can clearly have faith without religion, you cannot have
>> religion without faith. Religion depends on faith that one or more
>> deities (good and sometimes bad) exist, that their associated stories
>> actually occurred, and often, that there is some sort of afterlife.
>>
>> However, religious people believe in a variety of different deities.
>> Even those who believe in the same deity disagree, sometimes violently,
>> about the nature of their deity. Religions sometimes even disagree about
>> the nature of reality. If you want to base morality strictly on
>> religion, and you look around, you'll notice that religion can be a
>> somewhat chaotic basis unless...
>>
>> Ah, you might say, I want to base morality on MY religion. Well, you
>> just dissed the majority of religions. No problem because THEY ARE
>> WRONG. And people who believe in those religions may just be saying the
>> same thing about you and your religion. For those religions who are not

>> tolerant of other ideas, you may just have started a war.
>>
>> So perhaps it's BETTER, in our time, to have a system of justice that is
>> NOT based on a religion. But one which guarantees everyone the right to
>> practice the religion of their choice, guarantees other freedoms such as
>> we in the USA do in our Bill of Rights, encourages honesty and
>> integrity, while enforcing some common sense limits such as no human
>> sacrifices, a minimum age for marriage, no incest, no slavery, no
>> murder, no rape, no stealing, those sorts of things.
>>
>> What is viewed as morality beyond a fair justice system and common sense
>> rules of behavior can be left to each freely chosen religion to sort
>> out, like whether to restrict diet in some way, whether to wear a
>> certain type of clothing, how to pray, etc. But none of these additional
>> practices should be imposed on society as a whole.
>>
>> The Golden Rule may also be of use as a basic moral foundation.
>>
>> So yes, you can have a moral system, one that BTW protects the freedom
>> to practice religious beliefs (or not), without basing it on any one
>> religion. And it can protect all religions better than a system based on
>> any one religion (AKA a theocracy).
>>
>> There are other issues surrounding religions, such as the many examples
>> of selfless dedication to helping others on the one hand, and hijacked
>> religions used to legitimize earthly power structures in other cases.
>> Dedric, I look forward to talking with you about the positives and
>> negatives of various religions, and where a moral culture ought to go
>> from here, whenever we next get together.
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>> Hey Jimmy,
>>>
>>> No doubt one can be a good person without believing in God - there are
>>> tons
>>> of great people with no faith, or very little. That in and of itself
>>> tells
>>> me there must be a God so even non-believers would have a strong sense
>>> of
>>> right and wrong on a societal and even global level.
>>>
>>> To walk through some thoughts: with no God, or higher reference point,
>>> what

>>> would be considered moral, or at least good? What would one use to
>>> decide
>>> what is right and wrong?
>>>
>>> Laws? Most would agree that we can't legislate morality now, so with no
>>> basis for what morality is, why would we even bother with laws since
>>> everyone would make their own choices anyway?
>>>
>>> Intellect? That would simply depend on what one chose to accept as
>>> "intelligent" thought, based completely on opinion.
>>>
>>> Reasoning and Logic? Logic is determined by a hypothesis that has a
>>> proven
>>> outcome in a given situation. Change the situation, and the reasoning
>>> or
>>> logic behind the "right" or "wrong" could easily change.
>>>
>>> Experience? What if one's experience is filled with hatred, abuse,
>>> anger
>>> and violence, or worse? Then someone would have to decide whose
>>> experience
>>> we would use as a reference point. There would be no guarantee that
>>> person
>>> or persons had experiences that would be best for the good of the whole.
>>>
>>> Survival instinct? If it were a reference point, then stealing, lying,
>>> cheating and even killing would be perfectly justified as those can be
>>> means
>>> of survival.
>>>
>>> Why would right and wrong even exist? I would think that the
>>> differences
>>> between societies' definitions of right and wrong, assuming societies
>>> even
>>> existed, would be so drastic we would never have ventured into any form
>>> of
>>> inter-cultural/inter-geographic interaction, much less relationships,
>>> diplomacy, collaboration, trade, and open travel.
>>>
>>> As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual, they aren't
>>> absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes to make
>>> the
>>> choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There would only be
>>> an
>>> ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at the time, and
>>> based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from person to
>>> person,
>>> day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons would either be

>>> filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time because
>>> their
>>> choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we wouldn't
>>> have
>>> prisons, or likely even organized societies.
>>>
>>> But is the majority always right? How would we know if there were no
>>> absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?
>>>
>>> If there were no right and wrong, there would be no consequences of
>>> either,
>>> or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad consequence -
>>> it
>>> would just be another event in time.
>>>
>>> But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice, both in
>>> whether
>>> to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong decisions. With
>>> moral
>>> absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to evaluate
>>> drastically
>>> differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency in
>>> reasoning
>>> and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry. Even when
>>> we
>>> choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without that option to
>>> choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would be no power
>>> in
>>> choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal and loving
>>> God
>>> rather than a dictator or puppet master.
>>>
>>> Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see God in the
>>> way
>>> that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can discuss
>>> completely opposing opinions and still care enough to consider
>>> insulting,
>>> belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable concept;
>>> and 2)
>>> in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely trump greed
>>> and
>>> power in importance to life and survival together on this planet.
>>>
>>> Regards,
>>> Dedric
>>>
>>> On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy"
>>> <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:

>>>
>>>> The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have a strong
>>>> morals
>>>> is absurd, I think.
>>>>
>>>> Jimmy
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
>>>> news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...
>>>>> Gene -
>>>>>
>>>>> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your response
>>>>> pretty
>>>>> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country and even
>>>>> the
>>>>> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict, violence and
>>>>> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single largest
>>>>> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world. We ignore
>>>>> car
>>>>> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of tortured and
>>>>> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming the
>>>>> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made the Pope
>>>>> quote
>>>> a
>>>>> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.
>>>>>
>>>>> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening, all-accepting
>>>>> religion
>>>>> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western Muslims
>>>>> might
>>>>> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else in many
>>>>> of
>>>> the
>>>>> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have talked to,
>>>>> and
>>>>> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a different
>>>>> world
>>>>> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have here.
>>>> People
>>>>> die for converting to anything else, or their families do. At best,
>>>>> their
>>>>> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under threat of
>>>>> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our country
>>>>> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on our own
>>>> country
>>>>> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to this kind
>>>>> of

>>>>> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically correct thing
>>>>> to
>>>>> do.
>>>>>
>>>>> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God, and
>>>>> hence
>>>> any
>>>>> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the choice to
>>>>> believe
>>>>> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name of Allah
>>>>> the
>>>>> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10 commandments in
>>>>> 24
>>>>> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there is a
>>>>> sad,
>>>> and
>>>>> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should fear -
>>>>> it's
>>>>> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's personal whims
>>>>> that
>>>>> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day. That
>>>>> also
>>>>> includes believing in nothing.
>>>>>
>>>>> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in God and
>>>>> is
>>>>> wrong, at worst one has lived a good live and had some false hope as a
>>>> sense
>>>>> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is wrong, then
>>>>> at
>>>>> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we should be
>>>>> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that the
>>>>> President
>>>>> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief really
>>>>> better
>>>>> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong accompanies
>>>> disbelief
>>>>> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference point for
>>>>> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of belief in any
>>>>> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion for
>>>>> others?
>>>>>
>>>>> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a guy Islam
>>>> doesn't
>>>>> like just because he called like he saw it - something we do on this
>>>>> forum
>>>>> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's intent to
>>>>> take

>>>>> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only goal is to
>>>>> give
>>>>> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to not
>>>>> believe
>>>>> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity from public
>>>> view.
>>>>> The only way to force someone to remove their belief from public in a
>>>>> country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes, is to
>>>>> outlaw
>>>> it.
>>>>> Yet another paradox.
>>>>>
>>>>> Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see the world
>>>>> as a
>>>>> black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party always
>>>>> wins
>>>> and
>>>>> the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any validity in
>>>>> believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to maintain the
>>>> balance
>>>>> that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust in the
>>>>> very
>>>>> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most fallible
>>>>> characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic ideology.
>>>>>
>>>>> I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.
>>>>>
>>>>> I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of 10 hours
>>>>> of
>>>> work
>>>>> :-((....
>>>>>
>>>>> Regards,
>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>
>>>>> On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70$1@linux, "gene Lennon"
>>>>> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>>>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread -...
>>>>>>
>>>>>> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the current
>>>>>> administration
>>>>>> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based reasons
>>>>>> for
>>>>>> perusing
>>>>>> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier
>>>>>> motivation.

>>>>>>
>>>>>> Religion.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third Great
>>>> Awakening"
>>>>>> of the international religious struggle. This is a good thing as he
>>>>>> sees
>>>>>> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight against
>>>> terrorists
>>>>>> (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war that he
>>>> depicts
>>>>>> as "a confrontation between good and evil."
>>>>>> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit of
>>>>>> trouble
>>>> (as
>>>>>> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be headed?
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could easily go
>>>> down
>>>>>> hill from here.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> More on the "Third Awakening":
>>>>>>
>>>> http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09 /12/AR2006091201
>>>> 59
>>>>>> 4_pf.html
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Gene
>>>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>> `
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Sarah on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 09:41:43 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Yes, Don, you win. And if you're ever in town, I'll let you have one of my
Drop Top Amber Ales, or a Black Butte Porter. :)

S

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:450dccf6$1@linux...

>
> As long as we all have been yakking on these subjects, three
> things have happened.
>
> 1. No one switched sides
>
> 2. Everyone learned something
>
> 3. Almost all of us have gotten much more skilled in being
> nice to each other despite our differences.
>
>
> I don't know about the rest of you, but I am going to declare
> victory and have a beer...
>
> DC
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by dc[3] on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 15:13:54 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I thought this was worth reading if any of you are interested.

Have a great Monday!

The Unholy Alliance Rolls Over the Pope
By Andrew Walden

In what has suddenly been made into a highly controversial

Regensberg, Pope Benedict describes Christian belief in a God whose words and acts are bound by reason, truth and the law of non-contradiction. Benedict contrasts this with Islamic belief

further contrasts Christian belief with that of secular humanists who see reason as being completely unbound of God.

In response, both Islamists and secularists have demanded the

genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis of the clash of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror. His analysis also explains the underlying cause of the alliance

between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.

Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.
Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor Manuel

you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command

unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top Shiite cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling party likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and accused him of reviving the mentality of the Crusades.

jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of rage that many fear could burst into violent protests like those that

safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.

reaction is not one of anger but a calculated attempt to force the Pope to parrot the PC line on Islam. Since Islam need not be

objective can be to assert the power of a God who is so transcendent that He is not bound by anything. If man is created

anything. (This explains the predilection on the part of some

their non-existent morality. They are asserting the only

is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist thought than

Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing precisely what

of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest mosque,

Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the Pope was,

description of the Islamic God as being unbound by reason is not an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What Muslims and

dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity. How dare he not

being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to the point is lost on them.

this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists are waging a propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension against

jihad, but not your violent jihad.

side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more clear than in the Islamist reaction to the Pope.

With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November the Islamists are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons and demand to hear from the Pope himself. This would place raging mobs of semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of forcing the leader of Christendom to bow before them.

In this demand for submission they are joined by the secularist mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times editorializes:

the secularists are driven only by their will to power. While the Islamists represent their demented version of God--unrestrained by reason, the secularists represent their demented version of reason--unrestrained by God. They are united by their self-worshipping world view.

our categories, even that of rationality...(The Islamic) God is

Islam embraces this description. In offering this description of Islam, Benedict refers to the views of leading modern French Islamist R. Arnaldez as discussed in the writings of Professor Theodore Khoury of Munster.

decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he considers

Benedict asserts that without reason, or without God, there can

Both Islamist and secularist seek to break God and reason apart. Each claims superiority over the Christian West. They believe absolute moral license makes them powerful. As globalization carries the Western tradition of reason throughout the world, both are in decline.

Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist and secularist

with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after the collapse of the allied forces on the western front.

What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear is having to

logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our partners in

Their fear of reason can only lead the world to disaster.

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Deej [1] on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 16:26:31 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

What he said!

;o)

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:450eb7b2$1@linux...
>

> I thought this was worth reading if any of you are interested.
>
> Have a great Monday!
>
>
> ---
>
> The Unholy Alliance Rolls Over the Pope
> By Andrew Walden
>
> In what has suddenly been made into a highly controversial
> speech, the day after September 11, at Bavaria's University of
> Regensberg, Pope Benedict describes Christian belief in a God
> whose words and acts are bound by reason, truth and the law of
> non-contradiction. Benedict contrasts this with Islamic belief
> in a God not bound by anything-including his own words. Benedict
> further contrasts Christian belief with that of secular humanists
> who see reason as being completely unbound of God.
>
> In response, both Islamists and secularists have demanded the
> Pope apologize. Benedict's speech is a work of enlightened
> genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between
> Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis of the clash
> of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror. His
> analysis also explains the underlying cause of the alliance
> between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.
>
> Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.
> Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor Manuel
> II: "Show me just what Mohammed brought that was new, and there
> you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command
> to spread by the sword the faith he preached."
>
> Four days later, according to AP: "Pakistan's legislature
> unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top Shiite
> cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling party
> likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and accused him of
> reviving the mentality of the Crusades.
>
> "Across the Islamic world Friday, Benedict's remarks on Islam and
> jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of rage that
> many fear could burst into violent protests like those that
> followed publication of caricatures of the Prophet Muhammad."
>
> Reuters quoted other sources expressing fears for the Pope's
> safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.
>
> The Islamist reaction proves Manuel II's 600-year-old point. The

> reaction is not one of anger but a calculated attempt to force
> the Pope to parrot the PC line on Islam. Since Islam need not be
> internally consistent and it is not bound by reason, it's only
> objective can be to assert the power of a God who is so
> transcendent that He is not bound by anything. If man is created
> in God's image then by extension Islamic man is not bound by
> anything. (This explains the predilection on the part of some
> Muslims to lie.) Islamists are not responding to any 'offense' to
> their non-existent morality. They are asserting the only
> 'morality' they have-the will to power.
>
> "Will to Power" is a key element of Nietzsche 's philosophy-hence
> the root of the term, Islamofascist. Moreover the Western "Left'
> is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist thought than
> by Marxist thought-hence the alliance between the Western "Left"
> and the Islamofascist 'Right.'
>
> Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing precisely what
> Manuel II said they would: "Syed Ahmed Bukhari, the chief cleric
> of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest mosque,
> extolled Muslims to 'respond in a manner which forces the Pope to
> apologize.'" Note they intend to use "force" not reason.
>
> Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the Pope was,
> "calling a spade a spade".
>
> The secularist mouthpiece, New York Times,editorializes, "Pope
> Benedict XVI has insulted Muslims.." This is false. The Pope's
> description of the Islamic God as being unbound by reason is not
> an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What Muslims and
> secularists fear is the Pope's decision to choose to enter
> dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity. How dare he not
> "apologize" for being a Christian? That is the so-called
> "insult."
>
> One might "reasonably" ask when will Muslims "apologize" for
> being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to the point is
> lost on them.
>
> Amazingly the Times continues: "Muslim leaders the world over
> have demanded apologies. For many Muslims, holy war - jihad - is
> a spiritual struggle, and not a call to violence." In saying
> this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists are waging a
> propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension against
> Christianity-and they explicitly endorse and join this jihad.
> The Times is saying to Islamists, 'we can join your 'spiritual'
> jihad, but not your violent jihad.
>

> The Times editors are living in a fool's paradise. The
> "spiritual" non-violent jihad of propaganda is merely the flip
> side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more clear than in
> the Islamist reaction to the Pope.
>
> With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November the Islamists
> are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons and demand
> to hear from the Pope himself. This would place raging mobs of
> semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of forcing the
> leader of Christendom to bow before them.
>
> In this demand for submission they are joined by the secularist
> mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times editorializes:
> "He needs to offer a deep and persuasive apology." The
> secularists too seek the Pope's submission. Like the Islamists,
> the secularists are driven only by their will to power. While
> the Islamists represent their demented version of
> God--unrestrained by reason, the secularists represent their
> demented version of reason--unrestrained by God. They are united
> by their self-worshipping world view.
>
> It should be noted that the carefully staged "anger' from the
> Islamic world does not condemn Benedict's characterization of
> Islam as a religion where God's "will is not bound up with any of
> our categories, even that of rationality...(The Islamic) God is
> not bound even by his own word.." This is not seen as an insult.
> Islam embraces this description. In offering this description of
> Islam, Benedict refers to the views of leading modern French
> Islamist R. Arnaldez as discussed in the writings of Professor
> Theodore Khoury of Munster.
>
> Likewise the secularists express no dismay at the pope's
> characterization of a secularist as: "(A) subject (who) then
> decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he considers
> tenable in matters of religion, and the subjective 'conscience'
> becomes the sole arbiter of what is ethical."
>
> Benedict asserts that without reason, or without God, there can
> be no modern system of morality. He explains, "In this
> way.ethics and religion lose their power to create a community
> and become (instead) a completely personal matter."
>
> Both Islamist and secularist seek to break God and reason apart.
> Each claims superiority over the Christian West. They believe
> absolute moral license makes them powerful. As globalization
> carries the Western tradition of reason throughout the world,
> both are in decline.
>

> Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist and secularist
> will meet in combat, just as Hitler's fascists broke their pact
> with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after the collapse
> of the allied forces on the western front.
>
> What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear is having to
> reply to the Pope's key point, borrowed from the Byzantine
> Emperor: "'Not to act reasonably, not to act with logos (word or
> reason) is contrary to the nature of God,'.. It is to this great
> logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our partners in
> the dialogue of cultures."
>
> Their fear of reason can only lead the world to disaster.
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Jamie K on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 16:37:24 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

The Catholic church doesn't speak for Christianity. Certainly not for Lutherans, and for good reason.

A Pope criticizing other religions (even other Christian sects, even other Catholics) is nothing new. Certainly much harsher things have been said about Islam by some (not all) extreme fundamentalist Christians. And certainly much harsher things have been said by certain extremist Islamists about Christianity. The more extremist of both camps seem to be spoiling to relive the crusades. With some of the more power hungry ready to endanger civilization by attempting to incite religious wars for their own questionable ends.

It's a vast generalization to say the "the left" or "secularists" or even "Christians" are demanding an apology from the Pope. I think a whole lot of people think the Pope can say whatever he wants. It doesn't matter to most non-Catholics in the USA and in reality, Papal declarations are ignored by a fair number of Catholics here, too. Obviously some Moslems are upset in some places, but how deep does that go? When black churches were burning in the USA, it would have been an exaggeration to blame everyone in the USA for that.

The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church which only very recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo. The church hung on tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view of the universe while denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, which describes the actual way the solar system works.

It also extends to a few Christian sects who, feeling similarly

insecure, tenaciously cling to the notion that the earth is only about 6,000 years old, by virtue of the biblical interpretations and clever (at the time) calculations of an Irish Bishop several centuries ago, and in the face of solid current scientific evidence to the contrary.

The fear of reason extends to some (not all) Christian churches who, feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and ever-mounting evidence of evolution, responding with dogma in psuedo-scientific clothing, and who seek to water down scientific education in the USA.

The fear of reason extends to power hungry industries who pay big bucks to spread denial about global warming for short term gain. Who push to control oil in the middle east with force. With our guns blazing, our soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically. And who sometimes hide behind Christianity to do so.

The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives who find ways to pretend that everyone is aligning against Christianity. And in spreading this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to keep them in power. And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of reason and the focus on the use of force.

Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and declare victory. ;^)

Have a great week!

Cheers,
-Jamie
http://www.JamieKrutz.com

DC wrote:
> I thought this was worth reading if any of you are interested.
>
> Have a great Monday!
>
>
> ---
>
> The Unholy Alliance Rolls Over the Pope
> By Andrew Walden
>
> In what has suddenly been made into a highly controversial

> Regensberg, Pope Benedict describes Christian belief in a God
> whose words and acts are bound by reason, truth and the law of
> non-contradiction. Benedict contrasts this with Islamic belief

> further contrasts Christian belief with that of secular humanists
> who see reason as being completely unbound of God.
>
> In response, both Islamists and secularists have demanded the

> genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between
> Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis of the clash
> of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror. His
> analysis also explains the underlying cause of the alliance
> between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.
>
> Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.
> Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor Manuel

> you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command

>

> unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top Shiite
> cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling party
> likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and accused him of
> reviving the mentality of the Crusades.
>

> jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of rage that
> many fear could burst into violent protests like those that

>

> safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.
>

> reaction is not one of anger but a calculated attempt to force
> the Pope to parrot the PC line on Islam. Since Islam need not be

> objective can be to assert the power of a God who is so
> transcendent that He is not bound by anything. If man is created

> anything. (This explains the predilection on the part of some

> their non-existent morality. They are asserting the only

>

> is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist thought than

>
> Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing precisely what

> of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest mosque,

>
> Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the Pope was,

>

> description of the Islamic God as being unbound by reason is not
> an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What Muslims and

> dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity. How dare he not

>

> being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to the point is
> lost on them.
>

> this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists are waging a
> propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension against

> jihad, but not your violent jihad.
>

> side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more clear than in
> the Islamist reaction to the Pope.
>
> With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November the Islamists
> are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons and demand
> to hear from the Pope himself. This would place raging mobs of
> semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of forcing the
> leader of Christendom to bow before them.
>
> In this demand for submission they are joined by the secularist
> mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times editorializes:

> the secularists are driven only by their will to power. While

> the Islamists represent their demented version of
> God--unrestrained by reason, the secularists represent their
> demented version of reason--unrestrained by God. They are united
> by their self-worshipping world view.
>

> our categories, even that of rationality...(The Islamic) God is

> Islam embraces this description. In offering this description of
> Islam, Benedict refers to the views of leading modern French
> Islamist R. Arnaldez as discussed in the writings of Professor
> Theodore Khoury of Munster.
>

> decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he considers

>
> Benedict asserts that without reason, or without God, there can

>
> Both Islamist and secularist seek to break God and reason apart.
> Each claims superiority over the Christian West. They believe
> absolute moral license makes them powerful. As globalization
> carries the Western tradition of reason throughout the world,
> both are in decline.
>
> Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist and secularist

> with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after the collapse
> of the allied forces on the western front.
>
> What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear is having to

> logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our partners in

>
> Their fear of reason can only lead the world to disaster.
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by justcron on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 17:50:07 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

This is awesome:
http://thelastoutpost.com/Portals/_TheLastOutpost/Video/mediaplayer/JapaneseSentToConcentrationCamps.wmv

just replace Japanese with Muslim

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message news:450ec91a@linux...
> What he said!
>
> ;o)
>
> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:450eb7b2$1@linux...
>>
>> I thought this was worth reading if any of you are interested.
>>
>> Have a great Monday!
>>
>>
>> ----------
>>
>> The Unholy Alliance Rolls Over the Pope
>> By Andrew Walden
>>
>> In what has suddenly been made into a highly controversial
>> speech, the day after September 11, at Bavaria's University of
>> Regensberg, Pope Benedict describes Christian belief in a God
>> whose words and acts are bound by reason, truth and the law of
>> non-contradiction. Benedict contrasts this with Islamic belief
>> in a God not bound by anything-including his own words. Benedict
>> further contrasts Christian belief with that of secular humanists
>> who see reason as being completely unbound of God.
>>
>> In response, both Islamists and secularists have demanded the
>> Pope apologize. Benedict's speech is a work of enlightened
>> genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between
>> Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis of the clash
>> of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror. His
>> analysis also explains the underlying cause of the alliance
>> between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.
>>
>> Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.
>> Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor Manuel
>> II: "Show me just what Mohammed brought that was new, and there
>> you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command

>> to spread by the sword the faith he preached."
>>
>> Four days later, according to AP: "Pakistan's legislature
>> unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top Shiite
>> cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling party
>> likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and accused him of
>> reviving the mentality of the Crusades.
>>
>> "Across the Islamic world Friday, Benedict's remarks on Islam and
>> jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of rage that
>> many fear could burst into violent protests like those that
>> followed publication of caricatures of the Prophet Muhammad."
>>
>> Reuters quoted other sources expressing fears for the Pope's
>> safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.
>>
>> The Islamist reaction proves Manuel II's 600-year-old point. The
>> reaction is not one of anger but a calculated attempt to force
>> the Pope to parrot the PC line on Islam. Since Islam need not be
>> internally consistent and it is not bound by reason, it's only
>> objective can be to assert the power of a God who is so
>> transcendent that He is not bound by anything. If man is created
>> in God's image then by extension Islamic man is not bound by
>> anything. (This explains the predilection on the part of some
>> Muslims to lie.) Islamists are not responding to any 'offense' to
>> their non-existent morality. They are asserting the only
>> 'morality' they have-the will to power.
>>
>> "Will to Power" is a key element of Nietzsche 's philosophy-hence
>> the root of the term, Islamofascist. Moreover the Western "Left'
>> is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist thought than
>> by Marxist thought-hence the alliance between the Western "Left"
>> and the Islamofascist 'Right.'
>>
>> Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing precisely what
>> Manuel II said they would: "Syed Ahmed Bukhari, the chief cleric
>> of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest mosque,
>> extolled Muslims to 'respond in a manner which forces the Pope to
>> apologize.'" Note they intend to use "force" not reason.
>>
>> Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the Pope was,
>> "calling a spade a spade".
>>
>> The secularist mouthpiece, New York Times,editorializes, "Pope
>> Benedict XVI has insulted Muslims.." This is false. The Pope's
>> description of the Islamic God as being unbound by reason is not
>> an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What Muslims and
>> secularists fear is the Pope's decision to choose to enter

>> dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity. How dare he not
>> "apologize" for being a Christian? That is the so-called
>> "insult."
>>
>> One might "reasonably" ask when will Muslims "apologize" for
>> being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to the point is
>> lost on them.
>>
>> Amazingly the Times continues: "Muslim leaders the world over
>> have demanded apologies. For many Muslims, holy war - jihad - is
>> a spiritual struggle, and not a call to violence." In saying
>> this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists are waging a
>> propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension against
>> Christianity-and they explicitly endorse and join this jihad.
>> The Times is saying to Islamists, 'we can join your 'spiritual'
>> jihad, but not your violent jihad.
>>
>> The Times editors are living in a fool's paradise. The
>> "spiritual" non-violent jihad of propaganda is merely the flip
>> side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more clear than in
>> the Islamist reaction to the Pope.
>>
>> With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November the Islamists
>> are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons and demand
>> to hear from the Pope himself. This would place raging mobs of
>> semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of forcing the
>> leader of Christendom to bow before them.
>>
>> In this demand for submission they are joined by the secularist
>> mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times editorializes:
>> "He needs to offer a deep and persuasive apology." The
>> secularists too seek the Pope's submission. Like the Islamists,
>> the secularists are driven only by their will to power. While
>> the Islamists represent their demented version of
>> God--unrestrained by reason, the secularists represent their
>> demented version of reason--unrestrained by God. They are united
>> by their self-worshipping world view.
>>
>> It should be noted that the carefully staged "anger' from the
>> Islamic world does not condemn Benedict's characterization of
>> Islam as a religion where God's "will is not bound up with any of
>> our categories, even that of rationality...(The Islamic) God is
>> not bound even by his own word.." This is not seen as an insult.
>> Islam embraces this description. In offering this description of
>> Islam, Benedict refers to the views of leading modern French
>> Islamist R. Arnaldez as discussed in the writings of Professor
>> Theodore Khoury of Munster.
>>

>> Likewise the secularists express no dismay at the pope's
>> characterization of a secularist as: "(A) subject (who) then
>> decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he considers
>> tenable in matters of religion, and the subjective 'conscience'
>> becomes the sole arbiter of what is ethical."
>>
>> Benedict asserts that without reason, or without God, there can
>> be no modern system of morality. He explains, "In this
>> way.ethics and religion lose their power to create a community
>> and become (instead) a completely personal matter."
>>
>> Both Islamist and secularist seek to break God and reason apart.
>> Each claims superiority over the Christian West. They believe
>> absolute moral license makes them powerful. As globalization
>> carries the Western tradition of reason throughout the world,
>> both are in decline.
>>
>> Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist and secularist
>> will meet in combat, just as Hitler's fascists broke their pact
>> with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after the collapse
>> of the allied forces on the western front.
>>
>> What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear is having to
>> reply to the Pope's key point, borrowed from the Byzantine
>> Emperor: "'Not to act reasonably, not to act with logos (word or
>> reason) is contrary to the nature of God,'.. It is to this great
>> logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our partners in
>> the dialogue of cultures."
>>
>> Their fear of reason can only lead the world to disaster.
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by excelav on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 18:22:03 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Here, read this! The war with America started on 9/11.

http://apnews.excite.com/article/20060918/D8K7B5UO1.html

Now how do we stop them? Talk to them, apologize to them, convert to Islam?
 Do you want to convert to Islam?

"gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>
>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>
>>Gene, maybe I am misunderstanding what you are saying, but it sounds like
>>you are saying that Bush is starting and wants a religious war. I think
>>you may be confused. Other people have already started the religious
>war.
>> Look in to the sixth and seventh pillar of Islam, some where in there
it
>>speaks of living by the sword. In other words, if you don't convert, you
>>are to die. I for one do not believe they are civil or peaceful people.
>> There has not been peace among those people for thousands of years, and
>>now THEY have sucked us in.
>>
>>They would be nothing in the middle east, but the Communists, Russia and
>>China, supplied all these third world countries with tons of weapons!
Now
>>they can make bombs and wage war. Now they know how to make nuclear bombs
>>that can take out US cities. Look at the middle east, south America, North
>>Korea and the mess all across the continent of Africa. Evil people gave
>>more evil people weapons to fight wars with. This has created a world
problem,
>>and the Communist want to keep supplying them with weapons and technology.
>> I know, here comes the liberals with, we gave them weapons too. Think
>about
>>it, where did this start?
>>
>>I'm no fan of Bush, but it's just too easy, and unfair to say it's all
Bush's
>>fault.
>>
>> I will say however, the War in Iraq was completely mishandled. Just do
>>the math, one hundred and fifty thousand troops to take care of thirty
five
>>million people plus, and thousands of miles of open boarder, in a place
>>the size of California. With five million troops, maybe??? I believe
Bush
>>and his friends wanted to be there for years and make all kinds of money
>>on this war. He has created a bigger problem by not taking care of Iraq
>>quickly. There is a lot of blame to go around in our federal government,
>>it's not just one man.
>>
>>As far as the war on terror, people should be honest with themselves. you
>>can't negotiate a war. there is no diplomatic solution to a war. If you
>>stop to talk, they reinforce, rebuild, and reorganize for more war. Or
>did
>>we forget the lessons of the past.

>>
>>In the end, bombs can never stop idealism. The problem is the people that
>>want Jehad will not stop. Peace will never be lasting with these people,
>>it's in their nature to be waring. They think they will be rewarded if
>they
>>kill and die in the name of Islam. So how do you fix it?
>>
>> We are more concerned with terrorist rights than doing the job we need
>to
>>do. When they hit us, we'll have to take them out, make no mistake, it's
>>going to get serious. When they kill millions of americans, blame the
spineless
>>politicians that wanted to talk things out and find political solutions
>instead
>>of facing the hard truth, we are at WAR. We should take care of the problems
>>now, but we are just too weak as a nation. Really think about why we
are
>>weak as a nation, and where the blame should go.
>>
>>James
>>
>
>
>James,

change

>statement:
>

>
>Please help me define what the problem is. Is it Muslims? Just some Muslims?
>Which ones?
>
>What about North Korea? They are not Muslims, but they are first (or perhaps

>things. Pakistan is Muslim and they have several bombs. They have just signed
>a treaty with the Taliban, and they are hiding the real person that caused
>9/11, where is the outrage against Osama bin Laden and the people protecting
>him?
>
>How about the Non-Aligned Movement. Over 100 countries banding together

>with Cuba or Venezuela?
>
>Now that we have succeeded in alienating ourselves from the majority of
the

>world, should we see them all as threats? Almost all of our allies are abandoning
>us, or at the least distancing themselves from us. The only real leader
left
>is on our side is Tony Blair, and he has been summarily dismissed by his
>own party. With him out and anti-American sentiment running high in Great
>Britain, who do we have left?
>
>I never said it was all Bushes fault. He just took a relatively unheard
of
>small time international criminal/terrorist (Osama bin Laden) and turned
>him into an international movement to destroy the US.
>_____
>
>At a level of 1.2 billion, Muslims represent about 22% of the world's population.
>They are the second largest religion in the world. Only Christianity is
larger,
>with 33% of the world's inhabitants.
>Islam is growing about 2.9% per year. This is faster than the total world
>population which increases about 2.3% annually. It is thus attracting a
progressively
>larger percentage of the world's population.
>
>Peace to all
>Gene
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Deej [1] on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 18:26:07 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

It doesn't matter at all whether this was the Pope. The bottom line is that
it is rationality as opposed to irrationality.

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:450ec970@linux...
>
> The Catholic church doesn't speak for Christianity. Certainly not for
> Lutherans, and for good reason.
>
> A Pope criticizing other religions (even other Christian sects, even
> other Catholics) is nothing new. Certainly much harsher things have been

> said about Islam by some (not all) extreme fundamentalist Christians.
> And certainly much harsher things have been said by certain extremist
> Islamists about Christianity. The more extremist of both camps seem to
> be spoiling to relive the crusades. With some of the more power hungry
> ready to endanger civilization by attempting to incite religious wars
> for their own questionable ends.
>
> It's a vast generalization to say the "the left" or "secularists" or
> even "Christians" are demanding an apology from the Pope. I think a
> whole lot of people think the Pope can say whatever he wants. It doesn't
> matter to most non-Catholics in the USA and in reality, Papal
> declarations are ignored by a fair number of Catholics here, too.
> Obviously some Moslems are upset in some places, but how deep does that
> go? When black churches were burning in the USA, it would have been an
> exaggeration to blame everyone in the USA for that.
>
> The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church which only very
> recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo. The church hung on
> tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view of the universe while
> denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, which describes the
> actual way the solar system works.
>
> It also extends to a few Christian sects who, feeling similarly
> insecure, tenaciously cling to the notion that the earth is only about
> 6,000 years old, by virtue of the biblical interpretations and clever
> (at the time) calculations of an Irish Bishop several centuries ago, and
> in the face of solid current scientific evidence to the contrary.
>
> The fear of reason extends to some (not all) Christian churches who,
> feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and ever-mounting evidence of
> evolution, responding with dogma in psuedo-scientific clothing, and who
> seek to water down scientific education in the USA.
>
> The fear of reason extends to power hungry industries who pay big bucks
> to spread denial about global warming for short term gain. Who push to
> control oil in the middle east with force. With our guns blazing, our
> soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically. And who sometimes
> hide behind Christianity to do so.
>
> The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives who find ways to
> pretend that everyone is aligning against Christianity. And in spreading
> this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to keep them in power.
> And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of reason and the focus
> on the use of force.
>
> Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and declare victory. ;^)
>
> Have a great week!

>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>
> DC wrote:
> > I thought this was worth reading if any of you are interested.
> >
> > Have a great Monday!
> >
> >
> > ----------
> >
> > The Unholy Alliance Rolls Over the Pope
> > By Andrew Walden
> >
> > In what has suddenly been made into a highly controversial

> > Regensberg, Pope Benedict describes Christian belief in a God
> > whose words and acts are bound by reason, truth and the law of
> > non-contradiction. Benedict contrasts this with Islamic belief

> > further contrasts Christian belief with that of secular humanists
> > who see reason as being completely unbound of God.
> >
> > In response, both Islamists and secularists have demanded the

> > genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between
> > Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis of the clash
> > of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror. His
> > analysis also explains the underlying cause of the alliance
> > between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.
> >
> > Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.
> > Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor Manuel

> > you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command

> >

> > unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top Shiite
> > cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling party
> > likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and accused him of
> > reviving the mentality of the Crusades.
> >

> > jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of rage that

> > many fear could burst into violent protests like those that

> >

> > safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.
> >

> > reaction is not one of anger but a calculated attempt to force
> > the Pope to parrot the PC line on Islam. Since Islam need not be

> > objective can be to assert the power of a God who is so
> > transcendent that He is not bound by anything. If man is created

> > anything. (This explains the predilection on the part of some

> > their non-existent morality. They are asserting the only

> >

> > is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist thought than

> >
> > Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing precisely what

> > of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest mosque,

> >
> > Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the Pope was,

> >

> > description of the Islamic God as being unbound by reason is not
> > an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What Muslims and

> > dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity. How dare he not

> >

> > being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to the point is
> > lost on them.
> >

> > this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists are waging a
> > propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension against

> > jihad, but not your violent jihad.
> >

> > side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more clear than in
> > the Islamist reaction to the Pope.
> >
> > With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November the Islamists
> > are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons and demand
> > to hear from the Pope himself. This would place raging mobs of
> > semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of forcing the
> > leader of Christendom to bow before them.
> >
> > In this demand for submission they are joined by the secularist
> > mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times editorializes:

> > the secularists are driven only by their will to power. While
> > the Islamists represent their demented version of
> > God--unrestrained by reason, the secularists represent their
> > demented version of reason--unrestrained by God. They are united
> > by their self-worshipping world view.
> >

> > our categories, even that of rationality...(The Islamic) God is

> > Islam embraces this description. In offering this description of
> > Islam, Benedict refers to the views of leading modern French
> > Islamist R. Arnaldez as discussed in the writings of Professor
> > Theodore Khoury of Munster.
> >

> > decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he considers

> >
> > Benedict asserts that without reason, or without God, there can

> >
> > Both Islamist and secularist seek to break God and reason apart.
> > Each claims superiority over the Christian West. They believe
> > absolute moral license makes them powerful. As globalization
> > carries the Western tradition of reason throughout the world,
> > both are in decline.
> >
> > Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist and secularist

> > with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after the collapse
> > of the allied forces on the western front.
> >
> > What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear is having to

> > logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our partners in

> >
> > Their fear of reason can only lead the world to disaster.
> >

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by justcron on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 18:40:28 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

or even emotion vs emotion at the animal level?

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
news:450ee547@linux...
> It doesn't matter at all whether this was the Pope. The bottom line is
> that
> it is rationality as opposed to irrationality.
>
> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:450ec970@linux...
>>
>> The Catholic church doesn't speak for Christianity. Certainly not for
>> Lutherans, and for good reason.
>>
>> A Pope criticizing other religions (even other Christian sects, even
>> other Catholics) is nothing new. Certainly much harsher things have been
>> said about Islam by some (not all) extreme fundamentalist Christians.
>> And certainly much harsher things have been said by certain extremist
>> Islamists about Christianity. The more extremist of both camps seem to
>> be spoiling to relive the crusades. With some of the more power hungry
>> ready to endanger civilization by attempting to incite religious wars
>> for their own questionable ends.

>>
>> It's a vast generalization to say the "the left" or "secularists" or
>> even "Christians" are demanding an apology from the Pope. I think a
>> whole lot of people think the Pope can say whatever he wants. It doesn't
>> matter to most non-Catholics in the USA and in reality, Papal
>> declarations are ignored by a fair number of Catholics here, too.
>> Obviously some Moslems are upset in some places, but how deep does that
>> go? When black churches were burning in the USA, it would have been an
>> exaggeration to blame everyone in the USA for that.
>>
>> The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church which only very
>> recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo. The church hung on
>> tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view of the universe while
>> denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, which describes the
>> actual way the solar system works.
>>
>> It also extends to a few Christian sects who, feeling similarly
>> insecure, tenaciously cling to the notion that the earth is only about
>> 6,000 years old, by virtue of the biblical interpretations and clever
>> (at the time) calculations of an Irish Bishop several centuries ago, and
>> in the face of solid current scientific evidence to the contrary.
>>
>> The fear of reason extends to some (not all) Christian churches who,
>> feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and ever-mounting evidence of
>> evolution, responding with dogma in psuedo-scientific clothing, and who
>> seek to water down scientific education in the USA.
>>
>> The fear of reason extends to power hungry industries who pay big bucks
>> to spread denial about global warming for short term gain. Who push to
>> control oil in the middle east with force. With our guns blazing, our
>> soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically. And who sometimes
>> hide behind Christianity to do so.
>>
>> The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives who find ways to
>> pretend that everyone is aligning against Christianity. And in spreading
>> this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to keep them in power.
>> And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of reason and the focus
>> on the use of force.
>>
>> Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and declare victory. ;^)
>>
>> Have a great week!
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>

>> DC wrote:
>> > I thought this was worth reading if any of you are interested.
>> >
>> > Have a great Monday!
>> >
>> >
>> > ---------------------------------------
>> >
>> > The Unholy Alliance Rolls Over the Pope
>> > By Andrew Walden
>> >
>> > In what has suddenly been made into a highly controversial
>> > speech, the day after September 11, at Bavaria's University of
>> > Regensberg, Pope Benedict describes Christian belief in a God
>> > whose words and acts are bound by reason, truth and the law of
>> > non-contradiction. Benedict contrasts this with Islamic belief
>> > in a God not bound by anything-including his own words. Benedict
>> > further contrasts Christian belief with that of secular humanists
>> > who see reason as being completely unbound of God.
>> >
>> > In response, both Islamists and secularists have demanded the
>> > Pope apologize. Benedict's speech is a work of enlightened
>> > genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between
>> > Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis of the clash
>> > of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror. His
>> > analysis also explains the underlying cause of the alliance
>> > between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.
>> >
>> > Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.
>> > Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor Manuel
>> > II: "Show me just what Mohammed brought that was new, and there
>> > you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command
>> > to spread by the sword the faith he preached."
>> >
>> > Four days later, according to AP: "Pakistan's legislature
>> > unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top Shiite
>> > cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling party
>> > likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and accused him of
>> > reviving the mentality of the Crusades.
>> >
>> > "Across the Islamic world Friday, Benedict's remarks on Islam and
>> > jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of rage that
>> > many fear could burst into violent protests like those that
>> > followed publication of caricatures of the Prophet Muhammad."
>> >
>> > Reuters quoted other sources expressing fears for the Pope's
>> > safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.
>> >

>> > The Islamist reaction proves Manuel II's 600-year-old point. The
>> > reaction is not one of anger but a calculated attempt to force
>> > the Pope to parrot the PC line on Islam. Since Islam need not be
>> > internally consistent and it is not bound by reason, it's only
>> > objective can be to assert the power of a God who is so
>> > transcendent that He is not bound by anything. If man is created
>> > in God's image then by extension Islamic man is not bound by
>> > anything. (This explains the predilection on the part of some
>> > Muslims to lie.) Islamists are not responding to any 'offense' to
>> > their non-existent morality. They are asserting the only
>> > 'morality' they have-the will to power.
>> >
>> > "Will to Power" is a key element of Nietzsche 's philosophy-hence
>> > the root of the term, Islamofascist. Moreover the Western "Left'
>> > is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist thought than
>> > by Marxist thought-hence the alliance between the Western "Left"
>> > and the Islamofascist 'Right.'
>> >
>> > Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing precisely what
>> > Manuel II said they would: "Syed Ahmed Bukhari, the chief cleric
>> > of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest mosque,
>> > extolled Muslims to 'respond in a manner which forces the Pope to
>> > apologize.'" Note they intend to use "force" not reason.
>> >
>> > Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the Pope was,
>> > "calling a spade a spade".
>> >
>> > The secularist mouthpiece, New York Times,editorializes, "Pope
>> > Benedict XVI has insulted Muslims.." This is false. The Pope's
>> > description of the Islamic God as being unbound by reason is not
>> > an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What Muslims and
>> > secularists fear is the Pope's decision to choose to enter
>> > dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity. How dare he not
>> > "apologize" for being a Christian? That is the so-called
>> > "insult."
>> >
>> > One might "reasonably" ask when will Muslims "apologize" for
>> > being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to the point is
>> > lost on them.
>> >
>> > Amazingly the Times continues: "Muslim leaders the world over
>> > have demanded apologies. For many Muslims, holy war - jihad - is
>> > a spiritual struggle, and not a call to violence." In saying
>> > this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists are waging a
>> > propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension against
>> > Christianity-and they explicitly endorse and join this jihad.
>> > The Times is saying to Islamists, 'we can join your 'spiritual'
>> > jihad, but not your violent jihad.

>> >
>> > The Times editors are living in a fool's paradise. The
>> > "spiritual" non-violent jihad of propaganda is merely the flip
>> > side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more clear than in
>> > the Islamist reaction to the Pope.
>> >
>> > With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November the Islamists
>> > are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons and demand
>> > to hear from the Pope himself. This would place raging mobs of
>> > semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of forcing the
>> > leader of Christendom to bow before them.
>> >
>> > In this demand for submission they are joined by the secularist
>> > mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times editorializes:
>> > "He needs to offer a deep and persuasive apology." The
>> > secularists too seek the Pope's submission. Like the Islamists,
>> > the secularists are driven only by their will to power. While
>> > the Islamists represent their demented version of
>> > God--unrestrained by reason, the secularists represent their
>> > demented version of reason--unrestrained by God. They are united
>> > by their self-worshipping world view.
>> >
>> > It should be noted that the carefully staged "anger' from the
>> > Islamic world does not condemn Benedict's characterization of
>> > Islam as a religion where God's "will is not bound up with any of
>> > our categories, even that of rationality...(The Islamic) God is
>> > not bound even by his own word.." This is not seen as an insult.
>> > Islam embraces this description. In offering this description of
>> > Islam, Benedict refers to the views of leading modern French
>> > Islamist R. Arnaldez as discussed in the writings of Professor
>> > Theodore Khoury of Munster.
>> >
>> > Likewise the secularists express no dismay at the pope's
>> > characterization of a secularist as: "(A) subject (who) then
>> > decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he considers
>> > tenable in matters of religion, and the subjective 'conscience'
>> > becomes the sole arbiter of what is ethical."
>> >
>> > Benedict asserts that without reason, or without God, there can
>> > be no modern system of morality. He explains, "In this
>> > way.ethics and religion lose their power to create a community
>> > and become (instead) a completely personal matter."
>> >
>> > Both Islamist and secularist seek to break God and reason apart.
>> > Each claims superiority over the Christian West. They believe
>> > absolute moral license makes them powerful. As globalization
>> > carries the Western tradition of reason throughout the world,
>> > both are in decline.

>> >
>> > Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist and secularist
>> > will meet in combat, just as Hitler's fascists broke their pact
>> > with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after the collapse
>> > of the allied forces on the western front.
>> >
>> > What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear is having to
>> > reply to the Pope's key point, borrowed from the Byzantine
>> > Emperor: "'Not to act reasonably, not to act with logos (word or
>> > reason) is contrary to the nature of God,'.. It is to this great
>> > logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our partners in
>> > the dialogue of cultures."
>> >
>> > Their fear of reason can only lead the world to disaster.
>> >
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Jamie K on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 18:47:32 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Let's keep from reacting to irrationality with irrationality of our own.
There's a lot of fear mongering. Chicken Little is back.

Cheers,
  -Jamie
  http://www.JamieKrutz.com

DJ wrote:
> It doesn't matter at all whether this was the Pope. The bottom line is that
> it is rationality as opposed to irrationality.
>
> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:450ec970@linux...
>> The Catholic church doesn't speak for Christianity. Certainly not for
>> Lutherans, and for good reason.
>>
>> A Pope criticizing other religions (even other Christian sects, even
>> other Catholics) is nothing new. Certainly much harsher things have been
>> said about Islam by some (not all) extreme fundamentalist Christians.
>> And certainly much harsher things have been said by certain extremist
>> Islamists about Christianity. The more extremist of both camps seem to
>> be spoiling to relive the crusades. With some of the more power hungry
>> ready to endanger civilization by attempting to incite religious wars
>> for their own questionable ends.
>>

>> It's a vast generalization to say the "the left" or "secularists" or
>> even "Christians" are demanding an apology from the Pope. I think a
>> whole lot of people think the Pope can say whatever he wants. It doesn't
>> matter to most non-Catholics in the USA and in reality, Papal
>> declarations are ignored by a fair number of Catholics here, too.
>> Obviously some Moslems are upset in some places, but how deep does that
>> go? When black churches were burning in the USA, it would have been an
>> exaggeration to blame everyone in the USA for that.
>>
>> The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church which only very
>> recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo. The church hung on
>> tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view of the universe while
>> denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, which describes the
>> actual way the solar system works.
>>
>> It also extends to a few Christian sects who, feeling similarly
>> insecure, tenaciously cling to the notion that the earth is only about
>> 6,000 years old, by virtue of the biblical interpretations and clever
>> (at the time) calculations of an Irish Bishop several centuries ago, and
>> in the face of solid current scientific evidence to the contrary.
>>
>> The fear of reason extends to some (not all) Christian churches who,
>> feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and ever-mounting evidence of
>> evolution, responding with dogma in psuedo-scientific clothing, and who
>> seek to water down scientific education in the USA.
>>
>> The fear of reason extends to power hungry industries who pay big bucks
>> to spread denial about global warming for short term gain. Who push to
>> control oil in the middle east with force. With our guns blazing, our
>> soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically. And who sometimes
>> hide behind Christianity to do so.
>>
>> The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives who find ways to
>> pretend that everyone is aligning against Christianity. And in spreading
>> this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to keep them in power.
>> And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of reason and the focus
>> on the use of force.
>>
>> Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and declare victory. ;^)
>>
>> Have a great week!
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>> DC wrote:

>>> I thought this was worth reading if any of you are interested.
>>>
>>> Have a great Monday!
>>>
>>>
>>> ---------------------------------------
>>>
>>> The Unholy Alliance Rolls Over the Pope
>>> By Andrew Walden
>>>
>>> In what has suddenly been made into a highly controversial

>>> Regensberg, Pope Benedict describes Christian belief in a God
>>> whose words and acts are bound by reason, truth and the law of
>>> non-contradiction. Benedict contrasts this with Islamic belief

>>> further contrasts Christian belief with that of secular humanists
>>> who see reason as being completely unbound of God.
>>>
>>> In response, both Islamists and secularists have demanded the

>>> genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between
>>> Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis of the clash
>>> of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror. His
>>> analysis also explains the underlying cause of the alliance
>>> between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.
>>>
>>> Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.
>>> Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor Manuel

>>> you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command

>>>

>>> unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top Shiite
>>> cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling party
>>> likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and accused him of
>>> reviving the mentality of the Crusades.
>>>

>>> jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of rage that
>>> many fear could burst into violent protests like those that

>>>

>>> safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.
>>>

>>> reaction is not one of anger but a calculated attempt to force
>>> the Pope to parrot the PC line on Islam. Since Islam need not be

>>> objective can be to assert the power of a God who is so
>>> transcendent that He is not bound by anything. If man is created

>>> anything. (This explains the predilection on the part of some

>>> their non-existent morality. They are asserting the only

>>>

>>> is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist thought than

>>>
>>> Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing precisely what

>>> of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest mosque,

>>>
>>> Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the Pope was,

>>>

>>> description of the Islamic God as being unbound by reason is not
>>> an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What Muslims and

>>> dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity. How dare he not

>>>

>>> being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to the point is
>>> lost on them.
>>>

>>> this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists are waging a
>>> propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension against

>>> jihad, but not your violent jihad.
>>>

>>> side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more clear than in
>>> the Islamist reaction to the Pope.
>>>
>>> With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November the Islamists
>>> are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons and demand
>>> to hear from the Pope himself. This would place raging mobs of
>>> semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of forcing the
>>> leader of Christendom to bow before them.
>>>
>>> In this demand for submission they are joined by the secularist
>>> mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times editorializes:

>>> the secularists are driven only by their will to power. While
>>> the Islamists represent their demented version of
>>> God--unrestrained by reason, the secularists represent their
>>> demented version of reason--unrestrained by God. They are united
>>> by their self-worshipping world view.
>>>

>>> our categories, even that of rationality...(The Islamic) God is

>>> Islam embraces this description. In offering this description of
>>> Islam, Benedict refers to the views of leading modern French
>>> Islamist R. Arnaldez as discussed in the writings of Professor
>>> Theodore Khoury of Munster.
>>>

>>> decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he considers

>>>
>>> Benedict asserts that without reason, or without God, there can

>>>
>>> Both Islamist and secularist seek to break God and reason apart.
>>> Each claims superiority over the Christian West. They believe
>>> absolute moral license makes them powerful. As globalization
>>> carries the Western tradition of reason throughout the world,
>>> both are in decline.
>>>

>>> Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist and secularist

>>> with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after the collapse
>>> of the allied forces on the western front.
>>>
>>> What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear is having to

>>> logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our partners in

>>>
>>> Their fear of reason can only lead the world to disaster.
>>>
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by gene Lennon[3] on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 19:03:59 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>
>Here, read this! The war with America started on 9/11.
>
>http://apnews.excite.com/article/20060918/D8K7B5UO1.html
>
>Now how do we stop them? Talk to them, apologize to them, convert to Islam?
> Do you want to convert to Islam?
>

The key word is group.

A group of neo-Nazis won seats in this weeks elections in Germany.

http://www.nytimes.com/2006/09/17/world/europe/17cnd-germany
.html?_r=1&hp&ex=1158552000&en=ae34ff540e2ea150&
amp;ei=5094&partner=homepage&oref=slogin

This group does not speak for all Germans.

A recent NYT article talks about the infiltration of the US Army with skinheads.

of your skin.

http://select.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html?res=F50713FE3B54
0C748CDDAE0894DE404482&showabstract=1

This group does not speak for all members of the Armed Services or all Americans.

The world is filled with small groups of extremists, even here in the USA.
The trick when dealing with them is to stop them without turning them into
figureheads or martyrs. Our blundering has had the opposite effect.

On 9/11 a small group of extremists who were basically seen as outcasts by
the majority of the Muslim world attacked our country. Our actions since
have doubled and doubled again the scope and severity of this problem.

I am afraid you are right, if we continue on our current course we will turn
this into a world war.

Gene

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by TCB on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 19:49:57 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

You're confusing 'faith' with 'a willingness to take risks.' Animals take
risks, to get food, create more animals, etc., but I doubt they have faith.
One needs no faith to start businesses, invest money, get married, etc.

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>
>Faith is complete trust or confidence in something or someone. Religious

>faith is one form of faith but not the only definition of "faith."
>
>For example I have faith that if I drop a guitar pick it will find its
>way to the floor based on the gravitational attraction it has to the
>planet. I have faith that I'll breathe my next breath, that I'll see
>tomorrow morning. I have faith that other people are put together much
>like I am and that I can therefore relate to other folks.
>
>Without faith, people would not invest money. Without faith people would

>not vote. Without faith people would not start businesses, hire other
>people, raise children. Without faith people would not ride trains, fly

>in planes or drive cars. Without faith no one would investigate

>scientific questions about reality.
>
>While you can clearly have faith without religion, you cannot have
>religion without faith. Religion depends on faith that one or more
>deities (good and sometimes bad) exist, that their associated stories
>actually occurred, and often, that there is some sort of afterlife.
>
>However, religious people believe in a variety of different deities.
>Even those who believe in the same deity disagree, sometimes violently,

>about the nature of their deity. Religions sometimes even disagree about

>the nature of reality. If you want to base morality strictly on
>religion, and you look around, you'll notice that religion can be a
>somewhat chaotic basis unless...
>
>Ah, you might say, I want to base morality on MY religion. Well, you
>just dissed the majority of religions. No problem because THEY ARE
>WRONG. And people who believe in those religions may just be saying the

>same thing about you and your religion. For those religions who are not

>tolerant of other ideas, you may just have started a war.
>
>So perhaps it's BETTER, in our time, to have a system of justice that is

>NOT based on a religion. But one which guarantees everyone the right to

>practice the religion of their choice, guarantees other freedoms such as

>we in the USA do in our Bill of Rights, encourages honesty and
>integrity, while enforcing some common sense limits such as no human
>sacrifices, a minimum age for marriage, no incest, no slavery, no
>murder, no rape, no stealing, those sorts of things.
>
>What is viewed as morality beyond a fair justice system and common sense

>rules of behavior can be left to each freely chosen religion to sort
>out, like whether to restrict diet in some way, whether to wear a
>certain type of clothing, how to pray, etc. But none of these additional

>practices should be imposed on society as a whole.
>
>The Golden Rule may also be of use as a basic moral foundation.
>
>So yes, you can have a moral system, one that BTW protects the freedom
>to practice religious beliefs (or not), without basing it on any one
>religion. And it can protect all religions better than a system based on

>any one religion (AKA a theocracy).
>
>There are other issues surrounding religions, such as the many examples

>of selfless dedication to helping others on the one hand, and hijacked
>religions used to legitimize earthly power structures in other cases.
>Dedric, I look forward to talking with you about the positives and
>negatives of various religions, and where a moral culture ought to go
>from here, whenever we next get together.
>
>Cheers,
> -Jamie
> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>
>Dedric Terry wrote:
>> Hey Jimmy,
>>
>> No doubt one can be a good person without believing in God - there are
tons
>> of great people with no faith, or very little. That in and of itself
tells
>> me there must be a God so even non-believers would have a strong sense
of
>> right and wrong on a societal and even global level.
>>
>> To walk through some thoughts: with no God, or higher reference point,
what
>> would be considered moral, or at least good? What would one use to decide
>> what is right and wrong?
>>
>> Laws? Most would agree that we can't legislate morality now, so with
no
>> basis for what morality is, why would we even bother with laws since
>> everyone would make their own choices anyway?
>>
>> Intellect? That would simply depend on what one chose to accept as
>> "intelligent" thought, based completely on opinion.
>>
>> Reasoning and Logic? Logic is determined by a hypothesis that has a proven
>> outcome in a given situation. Change the situation, and the reasoning
or
>> logic behind the "right" or "wrong" could easily change.
>>
>> Experience? What if one's experience is filled with hatred, abuse, anger
>> and violence, or worse? Then someone would have to decide whose experience
>> we would use as a reference point. There would be no guarantee that person

>> or persons had experiences that would be best for the good of the whole.
>>
>> Survival instinct? If it were a reference point, then stealing, lying,
>> cheating and even killing would be perfectly justified as those can be
means
>> of survival.
>>
>> Why would right and wrong even exist? I would think that the differences
>> between societies' definitions of right and wrong, assuming societies
even
>> existed, would be so drastic we would never have ventured into any form
of
>> inter-cultural/inter-geographic interaction, much less relationships,
>> diplomacy, collaboration, trade, and open travel.
>>
>> As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual, they aren't
>> absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes to make
the
>> choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There would only be
an
>> ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at the time, and
>> based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from person to person,
>> day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons would either
be
>> filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time because
their
>> choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we wouldn't have
>> prisons, or likely even organized societies.
>>
>> But is the majority always right? How would we know if there were no
>> absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?
>>
>> If there were no right and wrong, there would be no consequences of either,
>> or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad consequence
- it
>> would just be another event in time.
>>
>> But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice, both in whether
>> to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong decisions. With
moral
>> absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to evaluate drastically
>> differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency in reasoning
>> and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry. Even when
we
>> choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without that option
to
>> choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would be no power
in

>> choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal and loving
God
>> rather than a dictator or puppet master.
>>
>> Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see God in the
way
>> that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can discuss
>> completely opposing opinions and still care enough to consider insulting,
>> belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable concept;
and 2)
>> in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely trump greed
and
>> power in importance to life and survival together on this planet.
>>
>> Regards,
>> Dedric
>>
>> On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy"
>> <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
>>
>>> The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have a strong
morals
>>> is absurd, I think.
>>>
>>> Jimmy
>>>
>>>
>>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
>>> news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...
>>>> Gene -
>>>>
>>>> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your response pretty
>>>> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country and even
the
>>>> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict, violence and
>>>> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single largest
>>>> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world. We ignore
car
>>>> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of tortured and
>>>> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming the
>>>> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made the Pope
quote
>>> a
>>>> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.
>>>>
>>>> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening, all-accepting religion
>>>> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western Muslims
might

>>>> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else in many
of
>>> the
>>>> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have talked to,
and
>>>> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a different
world
>>>> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have here.
>>> People
>>>> die for converting to anything else, or their families do. At best,
their
>>>> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under threat
of
>>>> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our country
>>>> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on our own
>>> country
>>>> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to this kind
of
>>>> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically correct thing
to
>>>> do.
>>>>
>>>> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God, and hence
>>> any
>>>> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the choice to believe
>>>> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name of Allah
the
>>>> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10 commandments in
24
>>>> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there is a sad,
>>> and
>>>> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should fear -
it's
>>>> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's personal whims
that
>>>> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day. That
also
>>>> includes believing in nothing.
>>>>
>>>> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in God and
is
>>>> wrong, at worst one has lived a good live and had some false hope as
a
>>> sense
>>>> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is wrong, then
at
>>>> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we should
be

>>>> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that the President
>>>> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief really
better
>>>> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong accompanies
>>> disbelief
>>>> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference point for
>>>> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of belief in any
>>>> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion for others?
>>>>
>>>> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a guy Islam
>>> doesn't
>>>> like just because he called like he saw it - something we do on this
forum
>>>> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's intent to
take
>>>> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only goal is to
give
>>>> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to not believe
>>>> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity from public
>>> view.
>>>> The only way to force someone to remove their belief from public in
a
>>>> country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes, is to outlaw
>>> it.
>>>> Yet another paradox.
>>>>
>>>> Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see the world
as a
>>>> black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party always wins
>>> and
>>>> the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any validity
in
>>>> believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to maintain the
>>> balance
>>>> that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust in the
very
>>>> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most fallible
>>>> characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic ideology.
>>>>
>>>> I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.
>>>>
>>>> I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of 10 hours
of
>>> work
>>>> :-((....
>>>>
>>>> Regards,
>>>> Dedric

>>>>
>>>> On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70$1@linux, "gene Lennon"
>>>> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread -...
>>>>>
>>>>> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the current
>>>>> administration
>>>>> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based reasons
for
>>>>> perusing
>>>>> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier motivation.
>>>>>
>>>>> Religion.
>>>>>
>>>>> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third Great
>>> Awakening"
>>>>> of the international religious struggle. This is a good thing as he
sees
>>>>> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight against
>>> terrorists
>>>>> (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war that he
>>> depicts
>>>>> as "a confrontation between good and evil."
>>>>> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit of trouble
>>> (as
>>>>> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
>>>>>
>>>>> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be headed?
>>>>>
>>>>> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could easily go
>>> down
>>>>> hill from here.
>>>>>
>>>>> More on the "Third Awakening":
>>>>>
>>> http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09 /12/AR2006091201
>>> 59
>>>>> 4_pf.html
>>>>>
>>>>> Gene
>>>>>
>>>
>>
>`

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Deej [1] on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 19:50:26 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I haven't seen us react with irrationality.....yet. Al Quaeda just came out with an ultimatim stating that it's full on war now and the west will be destroyed. The only way to save ourselves is to convert to Islam. So where to you draw the line between irrationality and self defense?

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:450ee7ef@linux...
>
> Let's keep from reacting to irrationality with irrationality of our own.
> There's a lot of fear mongering. Chicken Little is back.
>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>
> DJ wrote:
> > It doesn't matter at all whether this was the Pope. The bottom line is that
> > it is rationality as opposed to irrationality.
> >
> > "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:450ec970@linux...
> >> The Catholic church doesn't speak for Christianity. Certainly not for
> >> Lutherans, and for good reason.
> >>
> >> A Pope criticizing other religions (even other Christian sects, even
> >> other Catholics) is nothing new. Certainly much harsher things have been
> >> said about Islam by some (not all) extreme fundamentalist Christians.
> >> And certainly much harsher things have been said by certain extremist
> >> Islamists about Christianity. The more extremist of both camps seem to
> >> be spoiling to relive the crusades. With some of the more power hungry
> >> ready to endanger civilization by attempting to incite religious wars
> >> for their own questionable ends.
> >>
> >> It's a vast generalization to say the "the left" or "secularists" or
> >> even "Christians" are demanding an apology from the Pope. I think a
> >> whole lot of people think the Pope can say whatever he wants. It doesn't
> >> matter to most non-Catholics in the USA and in reality, Papal
> >> declarations are ignored by a fair number of Catholics here, too.
> >> Obviously some Moslems are upset in some places, but how deep does that
> >> go? When black churches were burning in the USA, it would have been an
> >> exaggeration to blame everyone in the USA for that.
> >>

> >> The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church which only very
> >> recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo. The church hung on
> >> tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view of the universe
while
> >> denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, which describes the
> >> actual way the solar system works.
> >>
> >> It also extends to a few Christian sects who, feeling similarly
> >> insecure, tenaciously cling to the notion that the earth is only about
> >> 6,000 years old, by virtue of the biblical interpretations and clever
> >> (at the time) calculations of an Irish Bishop several centuries ago,
and
> >> in the face of solid current scientific evidence to the contrary.
> >>
> >> The fear of reason extends to some (not all) Christian churches who,
> >> feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and ever-mounting evidence
of
> >> evolution, responding with dogma in psuedo-scientific clothing, and who
> >> seek to water down scientific education in the USA.
> >>
> >> The fear of reason extends to power hungry industries who pay big bucks
> >> to spread denial about global warming for short term gain. Who push to
> >> control oil in the middle east with force. With our guns blazing, our
> >> soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically. And who sometimes
> >> hide behind Christianity to do so.
> >>
> >> The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives who find ways to
> >> pretend that everyone is aligning against Christianity. And in
spreading
> >> this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to keep them in power.
> >> And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of reason and the
focus
> >> on the use of force.
> >>
> >> Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and declare victory.
;^)
> >>
> >> Have a great week!
> >>
> >> Cheers,
> >> -Jamie
> >> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >>
> >>
> >> DC wrote:
> >>> I thought this was worth reading if any of you are interested.
> >>>
> >>> Have a great Monday!

> >>>
> >>>
> >>> ---------------------------------------
> >>>
> >>> The Unholy Alliance Rolls Over the Pope
> >>> By Andrew Walden
> >>>
> >>> In what has suddenly been made into a highly controversial

> >>> Regensberg, Pope Benedict describes Christian belief in a God
> >>> whose words and acts are bound by reason, truth and the law of
> >>> non-contradiction. Benedict contrasts this with Islamic belief

> >>> further contrasts Christian belief with that of secular humanists
> >>> who see reason as being completely unbound of God.
> >>>
> >>> In response, both Islamists and secularists have demanded the

> >>> genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between
> >>> Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis of the clash
> >>> of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror. His
> >>> analysis also explains the underlying cause of the alliance
> >>> between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.
> >>>
> >>> Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.
> >>> Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor Manuel

> >>> you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command

> >>>

> >>> unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top Shiite
> >>> cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling party
> >>> likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and accused him of
> >>> reviving the mentality of the Crusades.
> >>>

> >>> jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of rage that
> >>> many fear could burst into violent protests like those that

> >>>

> >>> safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.
> >>>

> >>> reaction is not one of anger but a calculated attempt to force
> >>> the Pope to parrot the PC line on Islam. Since Islam need not be

> >>> objective can be to assert the power of a God who is so
> >>> transcendent that He is not bound by anything. If man is created

> >>> anything. (This explains the predilection on the part of some

> >>> their non-existent morality. They are asserting the only

> >>>

> >>> is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist thought than

> >>>
> >>> Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing precisely what

> >>> of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest mosque,

> >>>
> >>> Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the Pope was,

> >>>

> >>> description of the Islamic God as being unbound by reason is not
> >>> an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What Muslims and

> >>> dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity. How dare he not

> >>>

> >>> being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to the point is
> >>> lost on them.
> >>>

> >>> this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists are waging a
> >>> propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension against

> >>> jihad, but not your violent jihad.
> >>>

> >>> side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more clear than in

> >>> the Islamist reaction to the Pope.
> >>>
> >>> With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November the Islamists
> >>> are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons and demand
> >>> to hear from the Pope himself. This would place raging mobs of
> >>> semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of forcing the
> >>> leader of Christendom to bow before them.
> >>>
> >>> In this demand for submission they are joined by the secularist
> >>> mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times editorializes:

> >>> the secularists are driven only by their will to power. While
> >>> the Islamists represent their demented version of
> >>> God--unrestrained by reason, the secularists represent their
> >>> demented version of reason--unrestrained by God. They are united
> >>> by their self-worshipping world view.
> >>>

> >>> our categories, even that of rationality...(The Islamic) God is

> >>> Islam embraces this description. In offering this description of
> >>> Islam, Benedict refers to the views of leading modern French
> >>> Islamist R. Arnaldez as discussed in the writings of Professor
> >>> Theodore Khoury of Munster.
> >>>

> >>> decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he considers

> >>>
> >>> Benedict asserts that without reason, or without God, there can

> >>>
> >>> Both Islamist and secularist seek to break God and reason apart.
> >>> Each claims superiority over the Christian West. They believe
> >>> absolute moral license makes them powerful. As globalization
> >>> carries the Western tradition of reason throughout the world,
> >>> both are in decline.
> >>>
> >>> Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist and secularist

> >>> with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after the collapse

> >>> of the allied forces on the western front.
> >>>
> >>> What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear is having to

> >>> logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our partners in

> >>>
> >>> Their fear of reason can only lead the world to disaster.
> >>>
> >
> >

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Tony Benson on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 20:17:11 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi Dedric,

Don't take my comments as an indication that I have no "faith" in a higher power, but couldn't our ability to feel empathy be one possible reason that the majority of people might have similar morals. I don't think an atheist knows murder is wrong just because god said "thou shalt not kill". I think the golden rule has a lot to do with it. Over time, we have learned as empathetic beings what is ultimately right and wrong. At least in the very broad sense. Now, how we got to the point where we feel such a vast number of emotions and are able to apply them to how we treat others is something else to ponder.

Tony

"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
news:C1336A39.35DE%dterry@keyofd.net...
> Hey Jimmy,
>
> No doubt one can be a good person without believing in God - there are
> tons
> of great people with no faith, or very little. That in and of itself
> tells
> me there must be a God so even non-believers would have a strong sense of
> right and wrong on a societal and even global level.
>
> To walk through some thoughts: with no God, or higher reference point,
> what
> would be considered moral, or at least good? What would one use to decide

> what is right and wrong?
>
> Laws? Most would agree that we can't legislate morality now, so with no
> basis for what morality is, why would we even bother with laws since
> everyone would make their own choices anyway?
>
> Intellect? That would simply depend on what one chose to accept as
> "intelligent" thought, based completely on opinion.
>
> Reasoning and Logic? Logic is determined by a hypothesis that has a
> proven
> outcome in a given situation. Change the situation, and the reasoning or
> logic behind the "right" or "wrong" could easily change.
>
> Experience? What if one's experience is filled with hatred, abuse, anger
> and violence, or worse? Then someone would have to decide whose
> experience
> we would use as a reference point. There would be no guarantee that
> person
> or persons had experiences that would be best for the good of the whole.
>
> Survival instinct? If it were a reference point, then stealing, lying,
> cheating and even killing would be perfectly justified as those can be
> means
> of survival.
>
> Why would right and wrong even exist? I would think that the differences
> between societies' definitions of right and wrong, assuming societies even
> existed, would be so drastic we would never have ventured into any form of
> inter-cultural/inter-geographic interaction, much less relationships,
> diplomacy, collaboration, trade, and open travel.
>
> As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual, they aren't
> absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes to make the
> choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There would only be an
> ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at the time, and
> based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from person to
> person,
> day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons would either be
> filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time because
> their
> choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we wouldn't have
> prisons, or likely even organized societies.
>
> But is the majority always right? How would we know if there were no
> absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?
>
> If there were no right and wrong, there would be no consequences of

> either,
> or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad consequence - it
> would just be another event in time.
>
> But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice, both in
> whether
> to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong decisions. With
> moral
> absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to evaluate
> drastically
> differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency in reasoning
> and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry. Even when we
> choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without that option to
> choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would be no power
> in
> choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal and loving
> God
> rather than a dictator or puppet master.
>
> Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see God in the way
> that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can discuss
> completely opposing opinions and still care enough to consider insulting,
> belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable concept; and
> 2)
> in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely trump greed
> and
> power in importance to life and survival together on this planet.
>
> Regards,
> Dedric
>
> On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy"
> <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
>
>> The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have a strong
>> morals
>> is absurd, I think.
>>
>> Jimmy
>>
>>
>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
>> news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...
>>> Gene -
>>>
>>> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your response pretty
>>> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country and even the
>>> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict, violence and

>>> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single largest
>>> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world. We ignore
>>> car
>>> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of tortured and
>>> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming the
>>> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made the Pope
>>> quote
>> a
>>> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.
>>>
>>> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening, all-accepting
>>> religion
>>> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western Muslims
>>> might
>>> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else in many of
>> the
>>> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have talked to,
>>> and
>>> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a different
>>> world
>>> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have here.
>> People
>>> die for converting to anything else, or their families do. At best,
>>> their
>>> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under threat of
>>> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our country
>>> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on our own
>> country
>>> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to this kind of
>>> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically correct thing
>>> to
>>> do.
>>>
>>> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God, and hence
>> any
>>> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the choice to
>>> believe
>>> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name of Allah
>>> the
>>> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10 commandments in 24
>>> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there is a sad,
>> and
>>> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should fear - it's
>>> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's personal whims
>>> that
>>> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day. That also
>>> includes believing in nothing.
>>>

>>> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in God and is
>>> wrong, at worst one has lived a good live and had some false hope as a
>> sense
>>> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is wrong, then at
>>> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we should be
>>> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that the
>>> President
>>> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief really
>>> better
>>> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong accompanies
>> disbelief
>>> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference point for
>>> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of belief in any
>>> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion for others?
>>>
>>> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a guy Islam
>> doesn't
>>> like just because he called like he saw it - something we do on this
>>> forum
>>> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's intent to
>>> take
>>> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only goal is to
>>> give
>>> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to not
>>> believe
>>> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity from public
>> view.
>>> The only way to force someone to remove their belief from public in a
>>> country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes, is to outlaw
>> it.
>>> Yet another paradox.
>>>
>>> Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see the world as
>>> a
>>> black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party always wins
>> and
>>> the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any validity in
>>> believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to maintain the
>> balance
>>> that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust in the very
>>> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most fallible
>>> characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic ideology.
>>>
>>> I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.
>>>
>>> I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of 10 hours of
>> work
>>> :-((....

>>>
>>> Regards,
>>> Dedric
>>>
>>> On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70$1@linux, "gene Lennon"
>>> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>>
>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread -...
>>>>
>>>> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the current
>>>> administration
>>>> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based reasons for
>>>> perusing
>>>> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier motivation.
>>>>
>>>> Religion.
>>>>
>>>> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third Great
>> Awakening"
>>>> of the international religious struggle. This is a good thing as he
>>>> sees
>>>> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight against
>> terrorists
>>>> (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war that he
>> depicts
>>>> as "a confrontation between good and evil."
>>>> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit of trouble
>> (as
>>>> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
>>>>
>>>> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be headed?
>>>>
>>>> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could easily go
>> down
>>>> hill from here.
>>>>
>>>> More on the "Third Awakening":
>>>>
>> http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09 /12/AR2006091201
>> 59
>>>> 4_pf.html
>>>>
>>>> Gene
>>>>
>>>
>>>

>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by excelav on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 20:18:54 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSP.com> wrote:
>
>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>
>>Here, read this! The war with America started on 9/11.
>>
>>http://apnews.excite.com/article/20060918/D8K7B5UO1.html
>>
>>Now how do we stop them? Talk to them, apologize to them, convert to Islam?
>> Do you want to convert to Islam?
>>
>
>
>

>
>The key word is group.
>
>
>A group of neo-Nazis won seats in this weeks elections in Germany.
>
> http://www.nytimes.com/2006/09/17/world/europe/17cnd-germany
.html?_r=1&hp&ex=1158552000&en=ae34ff540e2ea150&
amp;ei=5094&partner=homepage&oref=slogin
>
>This group does not speak for all Germans.
>
>A recent NYT article talks about the infiltration of the US Army with skinheads.

color
>of your skin.
>
> http://select.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html?res=F50713FE3B54
0C748CDDAE0894DE404482&showabstract=1
>
>This group does not speak for all members of the Armed Services or all Americans.
>
>The world is filled with small groups of extremists, even here in the USA.
>The trick when dealing with them is to stop them without turning them into

>figureheads or martyrs. Our blundering has had the opposite effect.
>
>On 9/11 a small group of extremists who were basically seen as outcasts
by
>the majority of the Muslim world attacked our country. Our actions since
>have doubled and doubled again the scope and severity of this problem.
>
>I am afraid you are right, if we continue on our current course we will
turn
>this into a world war.
>
>Gene
>

I don't think we are going to have a choice. WHEN they take out a couple of American cities, will you still believe in talk? Will you care what the rest of the world thinks of us?

We should have crossed the border in to Pakistan and got Bin laden, now what? Their not going to stop. The people or countries that harbor al-Qaida are the enemies of the US. The head of the CIA said that they have a "vary excellent idea of where Osama Bin laden is", but for political reasons they can't go get him. So who do you think is protecting him?

There is a lot more I could say, but the bottom line is we don't have the guts to do what is necessary. There are too many people in our country that are weak minded and weak willed. They know they can destroy us because our people are weak and divided.

Think about who has been against us the whole way. There is a much bigger picture.

James

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by excelav on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 20:23:14 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSP.com> wrote:
>
>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>
>>Here, read this! The war with America started on 9/11.
>>
>>http://apnews.excite.com/article/20060918/D8K7B5UO1.html
>>
>>Now how do we stop them? Talk to them, apologize to them, convert to Islam?

>> Do you want to convert to Islam?
>>
>
>
>

>
>The key word is group.
>
>
>A group of neo-Nazis won seats in this weeks elections in Germany.
>
> http://www.nytimes.com/2006/09/17/world/europe/17cnd-germany
.html?_r=1&hp&ex=1158552000&en=ae34ff540e2ea150&
amp;ei=5094&partner=homepage&oref=slogin
>
>This group does not speak for all Germans.
>
>A recent NYT article talks about the infiltration of the US Army with skinheads.

color
>of your skin.
>
> http://select.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html?res=F50713FE3B54
0C748CDDAE0894DE404482&showabstract=1
>
>This group does not speak for all members of the Armed Services or all Americans.
>
>The world is filled with small groups of extremists, even here in the USA.
>The trick when dealing with them is to stop them without turning them into
>figureheads or martyrs. Our blundering has had the opposite effect.
>
>On 9/11 a small group of extremists who were basically seen as outcasts
by
>the majority of the Muslim world attacked our country. Our actions since
>have doubled and doubled again the scope and severity of this problem.
>
>I am afraid you are right, if we continue on our current course we will
turn
>this into a world war.
>
>Gene
>

By the way Gene, we didn't start it they did, remember 9/11.

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Tony Benson on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 20:30:07 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

They didn't really mean it DJ. If we just ask them nicely not to kill us,
they'll leave us alone. ;>)

Tony

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
news:450ef92a@linux...
>I haven't seen us react with irrationality.....yet. Al Quaeda just
> came out with an ultimatim stating that it's full on war now and the west
> will be destroyed. The only way to save ourselves is to convert to Islam.
> So
> where to you draw the line between irrationality and self defense?
>
>
> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:450ee7ef@linux...
>>
>> Let's keep from reacting to irrationality with irrationality of our own.
>> There's a lot of fear mongering. Chicken Little is back.
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>> DJ wrote:
>> > It doesn't matter at all whether this was the Pope. The bottom line is
> that
>> > it is rationality as opposed to irrationality.
>> >
>> > "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
>> > news:450ec970@linux...
>> >> The Catholic church doesn't speak for Christianity. Certainly not for
>> >> Lutherans, and for good reason.
>> >>
>> >> A Pope criticizing other religions (even other Christian sects, even
>> >> other Catholics) is nothing new. Certainly much harsher things have
> been
>> >> said about Islam by some (not all) extreme fundamentalist Christians.
>> >> And certainly much harsher things have been said by certain extremist
>> >> Islamists about Christianity. The more extremist of both camps seem to
>> >> be spoiling to relive the crusades. With some of the more power hungry
>> >> ready to endanger civilization by attempting to incite religious wars
>> >> for their own questionable ends.
>> >>

>> >> It's a vast generalization to say the "the left" or "secularists" or
>> >> even "Christians" are demanding an apology from the Pope. I think a
>> >> whole lot of people think the Pope can say whatever he wants. It
> doesn't
>> >> matter to most non-Catholics in the USA and in reality, Papal
>> >> declarations are ignored by a fair number of Catholics here, too.
>> >> Obviously some Moslems are upset in some places, but how deep does
>> >> that
>> >> go? When black churches were burning in the USA, it would have been an
>> >> exaggeration to blame everyone in the USA for that.
>> >>
>> >> The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church which only very
>> >> recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo. The church hung on
>> >> tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view of the universe
> while
>> >> denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, which describes the
>> >> actual way the solar system works.
>> >>
>> >> It also extends to a few Christian sects who, feeling similarly
>> >> insecure, tenaciously cling to the notion that the earth is only about
>> >> 6,000 years old, by virtue of the biblical interpretations and clever
>> >> (at the time) calculations of an Irish Bishop several centuries ago,
> and
>> >> in the face of solid current scientific evidence to the contrary.
>> >>
>> >> The fear of reason extends to some (not all) Christian churches who,
>> >> feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and ever-mounting evidence
> of
>> >> evolution, responding with dogma in psuedo-scientific clothing, and
>> >> who
>> >> seek to water down scientific education in the USA.
>> >>
>> >> The fear of reason extends to power hungry industries who pay big
>> >> bucks
>> >> to spread denial about global warming for short term gain. Who push to
>> >> control oil in the middle east with force. With our guns blazing, our
>> >> soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically. And who sometimes
>> >> hide behind Christianity to do so.
>> >>
>> >> The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives who find ways to
>> >> pretend that everyone is aligning against Christianity. And in
> spreading
>> >> this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to keep them in power.
>> >> And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of reason and the
> focus
>> >> on the use of force.
>> >>
>> >> Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and declare victory.

> ;^)
>> >>
>> >> Have a great week!
>> >>
>> >> Cheers,
>> >> -Jamie
>> >> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>> >>
>> >>
>> >> DC wrote:
>> >>> I thought this was worth reading if any of you are interested.
>> >>>
>> >>> Have a great Monday!
>> >>>
>> >>>
>> >>> ---------------------------------------
>> >>>
>> >>> The Unholy Alliance Rolls Over the Pope
>> >>> By Andrew Walden
>> >>>
>> >>> In what has suddenly been made into a highly controversial
>> >>> speech, the day after September 11, at Bavaria's University of
>> >>> Regensberg, Pope Benedict describes Christian belief in a God
>> >>> whose words and acts are bound by reason, truth and the law of
>> >>> non-contradiction. Benedict contrasts this with Islamic belief
>> >>> in a God not bound by anything-including his own words. Benedict
>> >>> further contrasts Christian belief with that of secular humanists
>> >>> who see reason as being completely unbound of God.
>> >>>
>> >>> In response, both Islamists and secularists have demanded the
>> >>> Pope apologize. Benedict's speech is a work of enlightened
>> >>> genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between
>> >>> Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis of the clash
>> >>> of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror. His
>> >>> analysis also explains the underlying cause of the alliance
>> >>> between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.
>> >>>
>> >>> Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.
>> >>> Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor Manuel
>> >>> II: "Show me just what Mohammed brought that was new, and there
>> >>> you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command
>> >>> to spread by the sword the faith he preached."
>> >>>
>> >>> Four days later, according to AP: "Pakistan's legislature
>> >>> unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top Shiite
>> >>> cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling party
>> >>> likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and accused him of
>> >>> reviving the mentality of the Crusades.

>> >>>
>> >>> "Across the Islamic world Friday, Benedict's remarks on Islam and
>> >>> jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of rage that
>> >>> many fear could burst into violent protests like those that
>> >>> followed publication of caricatures of the Prophet Muhammad."
>> >>>
>> >>> Reuters quoted other sources expressing fears for the Pope's
>> >>> safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.
>> >>>
>> >>> The Islamist reaction proves Manuel II's 600-year-old point. The
>> >>> reaction is not one of anger but a calculated attempt to force
>> >>> the Pope to parrot the PC line on Islam. Since Islam need not be
>> >>> internally consistent and it is not bound by reason, it's only
>> >>> objective can be to assert the power of a God who is so
>> >>> transcendent that He is not bound by anything. If man is created
>> >>> in God's image then by extension Islamic man is not bound by
>> >>> anything. (This explains the predilection on the part of some
>> >>> Muslims to lie.) Islamists are not responding to any 'offense' to
>> >>> their non-existent morality. They are asserting the only
>> >>> 'morality' they have-the will to power.
>> >>>
>> >>> "Will to Power" is a key element of Nietzsche 's philosophy-hence
>> >>> the root of the term, Islamofascist. Moreover the Western "Left'
>> >>> is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist thought than
>> >>> by Marxist thought-hence the alliance between the Western "Left"
>> >>> and the Islamofascist 'Right.'
>> >>>
>> >>> Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing precisely what
>> >>> Manuel II said they would: "Syed Ahmed Bukhari, the chief cleric
>> >>> of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest mosque,
>> >>> extolled Muslims to 'respond in a manner which forces the Pope to
>> >>> apologize.'" Note they intend to use "force" not reason.
>> >>>
>> >>> Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the Pope was,
>> >>> "calling a spade a spade".
>> >>>
>> >>> The secularist mouthpiece, New York Times,editorializes, "Pope
>> >>> Benedict XVI has insulted Muslims.." This is false. The Pope's
>> >>> description of the Islamic God as being unbound by reason is not
>> >>> an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What Muslims and
>> >>> secularists fear is the Pope's decision to choose to enter
>> >>> dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity. How dare he not
>> >>> "apologize" for being a Christian? That is the so-called
>> >>> "insult."
>> >>>
>> >>> One might "reasonably" ask when will Muslims "apologize" for
>> >>> being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to the point is
>> >>> lost on them.

>> >>>
>> >>> Amazingly the Times continues: "Muslim leaders the world over
>> >>> have demanded apologies. For many Muslims, holy war - jihad - is
>> >>> a spiritual struggle, and not a call to violence." In saying
>> >>> this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists are waging a
>> >>> propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension against
>> >>> Christianity-and they explicitly endorse and join this jihad.
>> >>> The Times is saying to Islamists, 'we can join your 'spiritual'
>> >>> jihad, but not your violent jihad.
>> >>>
>> >>> The Times editors are living in a fool's paradise. The
>> >>> "spiritual" non-violent jihad of propaganda is merely the flip
>> >>> side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more clear than in
>> >>> the Islamist reaction to the Pope.
>> >>>
>> >>> With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November the Islamists
>> >>> are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons and demand
>> >>> to hear from the Pope himself. This would place raging mobs of
>> >>> semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of forcing the
>> >>> leader of Christendom to bow before them.
>> >>>
>> >>> In this demand for submission they are joined by the secularist
>> >>> mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times editorializes:
>> >>> "He needs to offer a deep and persuasive apology." The
>> >>> secularists too seek the Pope's submission. Like the Islamists,
>> >>> the secularists are driven only by their will to power. While
>> >>> the Islamists represent their demented version of
>> >>> God--unrestrained by reason, the secularists represent their
>> >>> demented version of reason--unrestrained by God. They are united
>> >>> by their self-worshipping world view.
>> >>>
>> >>> It should be noted that the carefully staged "anger' from the
>> >>> Islamic world does not condemn Benedict's characterization of
>> >>> Islam as a religion where God's "will is not bound up with any of
>> >>> our categories, even that of rationality...(The Islamic) God is
>> >>> not bound even by his own word.." This is not seen as an insult.
>> >>> Islam embraces this description. In offering this description of
>> >>> Islam, Benedict refers to the views of leading modern French
>> >>> Islamist R. Arnaldez as discussed in the writings of Professor
>> >>> Theodore Khoury of Munster.
>> >>>
>> >>> Likewise the secularists express no dismay at the pope's
>> >>> characterization of a secularist as: "(A) subject (who) then
>> >>> decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he considers
>> >>> tenable in matters of religion, and the subjective 'conscience'
>> >>> becomes the sole arbiter of what is ethical."
>> >>>
>> >>> Benedict asserts that without reason, or without God, there can

>> >>> be no modern system of morality. He explains, "In this
>> >>> way.ethics and religion lose their power to create a community
>> >>> and become (instead) a completely personal matter."
>> >>>
>> >>> Both Islamist and secularist seek to break God and reason apart.
>> >>> Each claims superiority over the Christian West. They believe
>> >>> absolute moral license makes them powerful. As globalization
>> >>> carries the Western tradition of reason throughout the world,
>> >>> both are in decline.
>> >>>
>> >>> Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist and secularist
>> >>> will meet in combat, just as Hitler's fascists broke their pact
>> >>> with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after the collapse
>> >>> of the allied forces on the western front.
>> >>>
>> >>> What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear is having to
>> >>> reply to the Pope's key point, borrowed from the Byzantine
>> >>> Emperor: '"Not to act reasonably, not to act with logos (word or
>> >>> reason) is contrary to the nature of God,'.. It is to this great
>> >>> logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our partners in
>> >>> the dialogue of cultures."
>> >>>
>> >>> Their fear of reason can only lead the world to disaster.
>> >>>
>> >
>> >
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by DC on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 20:41:46 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote:
>Yes, Don, you win. And if you're ever in town, I'll let you have one of
my
>Drop Top Amber Ales, or a Black Butte Porter. :)
>
>S

Just to be clear, my definition of victory was "not fighting",
rather than my having won the argument.

Someone is right here, and someone is wrong. If I am right, you
and some others will have some serious crow to eat. If you are
right, likewise for me and some others.

There is a point at which it is clear that no minds will change.
We have reached that point.

In the future, I would like us to commiserate together, rather
than say "I told you so" because the possible result of either
position could just **SUCK** huh?

Hence the "declaration".

DC

ps

Good friend of mine, (not a bushie by any means) dared to ask
some of his friends what their plan was, should the jihadis,
not the president, show themselves to be the real issue here.
these antiwar folks (long time friends of his BTW)literally
started yelling, spluttering and *chanting slogans* in his
face! We have avoided that. That is a victory.

So have a beer, and consider if the other guy has a point.

>
>
>"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:450dccf6$1@linux...
>>
>> As long as we all have been yakking on these subjects, three
>> things have happened.
>>
>> 1. No one switched sides
>>
>> 2. Everyone learned something
>>
>> 3. Almost all of us have gotten much more skilled in being
>> nice to each other despite our differences.
>>
>>
>> I don't know about the rest of you, but I am going to declare
>> victory and have a beer...
>>
>> DC
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by gene Lennon[3] on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 20:49:24 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>
>I don't think we are going to have a choice. WHEN they take out a couple
>of American cities, will you still believe in talk? Will you care what
the
>rest of the world thinks of us?
>
>We should have crossed the border in to Pakistan and got Bin laden, now
what?
> Their not going to stop. The people or countries that harbor al-Qaida
are
>the enemies of the US. The head of the CIA said that they have a "vary
excellent
>idea of where Osama Bin laden is", but for political reasons they can't
go
>get him. So who do you think is protecting him?
>
>There is a lot more I could say, but the bottom line is we don't have the
>guts to do what is necessary. There are too many people in our country
that
>are weak minded and weak willed. They know they can destroy us because
our
>people are weak and divided.
>
>Think about who has been against us the whole way. There is a much bigger
>picture.
>
>James
>

A purely pragmatic question.
If the worst happens and a WMD goes off in a major US city, what would the appropriate response be?

answer.

ourselves, but if the responsible people are a small percentage of the population of a country or region, what should we do? Nuke the Middle East?

This is the time we should be talking about it. If we wait till it happens we will be caught up in the moment and we could make decisions that literally end civilization.

I lost friends on 9/11. I have not forgotten. However, I do not blame innocent people for the actions of others.

Our government!
Gene

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by DC on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 21:08:07 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote:
>Hi Dedric,
>
>Don't take my comments as an indication that I have no "faith" in a higher

>power, but couldn't our ability to feel empathy be one possible reason that

>the majority of people might have similar morals. I don't think an atheist

>knows murder is wrong just because god said "thou shalt not kill". I think

>the golden rule has a lot to do with it. Over time, we have learned as
>empathetic beings what is ultimately right and wrong. At least in the very

>broad sense. Now, how we got to the point where we feel such a vast number

>of emotions and are able to apply them to how we treat others is something

>else to ponder.
>
>Tony

The problem, of course, is that without a belief in moral absolutes, reflecting realites designed into us by our creator, anyone can say "who cares" to any social construct, contract, set of mutual obligations, or anthroplogicial observation that morals do indeed exist.

In fact, one is invited to do so by an ideology that places humankind, not God at the center of existence. When the self is the center of the universe, one easily decides that someone else's morals and ideas of a social contract are an illusion. Worse, ideas about morals may even put them at a competitive disadvantage compared to the person who has none. (welcome

to the music biz!)

This result is likely given that set of assumptions, but it
becomes inevitable one you go down the road of the neo-darwinists
and socio-biologists who assert than humanity is simply a
vehicle for furthering our "selfish genes" rather than a created
being made to live in community with God and each other.

The theist (and certainly the Christian) must always live in
submission to a greater power, never being the center of
existence, and deriving morality from a higher power than the
self. Humility is our greatest calling, one I fail at
regularly, but still, it is there.

Without God, all is permitted.

DC

"It appears that the great sacred-cow of our culture, the self,
is not automatically interesting".

-Robert Hughes

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Jamie K on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 21:15:49 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

We can disagree about that but the first line is the dictionary definition.

Cheers,
  -Jamie
  http://www.JamieKrutz.com

TCB wrote:
> You're confusing 'faith' with 'a willingness to take risks.' Animals take
> risks, to get food, create more animals, etc., but I doubt they have faith.
> One needs no faith to start businesses, invest money, get married, etc.
>
> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>> Faith is complete trust or confidence in something or someone. Religious
>
>> faith is one form of faith but not the only definition of "faith."
>>
>> For example I have faith that if I drop a guitar pick it will find its
>> way to the floor based on the gravitational attraction it has to the
>> planet. I have faith that I'll breathe my next breath, that I'll see

>> tomorrow morning. I have faith that other people are put together much
>> like I am and that I can therefore relate to other folks.
>>
>> Without faith, people would not invest money. Without faith people would
>
>> not vote. Without faith people would not start businesses, hire other
>> people, raise children. Without faith people would not ride trains, fly
>
>> in planes or drive cars. Without faith no one would investigate
>> scientific questions about reality.
>>
>> While you can clearly have faith without religion, you cannot have
>> religion without faith. Religion depends on faith that one or more
>> deities (good and sometimes bad) exist, that their associated stories
>> actually occurred, and often, that there is some sort of afterlife.
>>
>> However, religious people believe in a variety of different deities.
>> Even those who believe in the same deity disagree, sometimes violently,
>
>> about the nature of their deity. Religions sometimes even disagree about
>
>> the nature of reality. If you want to base morality strictly on
>> religion, and you look around, you'll notice that religion can be a
>> somewhat chaotic basis unless...
>>
>> Ah, you might say, I want to base morality on MY religion. Well, you
>> just dissed the majority of religions. No problem because THEY ARE
>> WRONG. And people who believe in those religions may just be saying the
>
>> same thing about you and your religion. For those religions who are not
>
>> tolerant of other ideas, you may just have started a war.
>>
>> So perhaps it's BETTER, in our time, to have a system of justice that is
>
>> NOT based on a religion. But one which guarantees everyone the right to
>
>> practice the religion of their choice, guarantees other freedoms such as
>
>> we in the USA do in our Bill of Rights, encourages honesty and
>> integrity, while enforcing some common sense limits such as no human
>> sacrifices, a minimum age for marriage, no incest, no slavery, no
>> murder, no rape, no stealing, those sorts of things.
>>
>> What is viewed as morality beyond a fair justice system and common sense
>
>> rules of behavior can be left to each freely chosen religion to sort
>> out, like whether to restrict diet in some way, whether to wear a

>> certain type of clothing, how to pray, etc. But none of these additional
>
>> practices should be imposed on society as a whole.
>>
>> The Golden Rule may also be of use as a basic moral foundation.
>>
>> So yes, you can have a moral system, one that BTW protects the freedom
>> to practice religious beliefs (or not), without basing it on any one
>> religion. And it can protect all religions better than a system based on
>
>> any one religion (AKA a theocracy).
>>
>> There are other issues surrounding religions, such as the many examples
>
>> of selfless dedication to helping others on the one hand, and hijacked
>> religions used to legitimize earthly power structures in other cases.
>> Dedric, I look forward to talking with you about the positives and
>> negatives of various religions, and where a moral culture ought to go
>>from here, whenever we next get together.
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>> Hey Jimmy,
>>>
>>> No doubt one can be a good person without believing in God - there are
> tons
>>> of great people with no faith, or very little. That in and of itself
> tells
>>> me there must be a God so even non-believers would have a strong sense
> of
>>> right and wrong on a societal and even global level.
>>>
>>> To walk through some thoughts: with no God, or higher reference point,
> what
>>> would be considered moral, or at least good? What would one use to decide
>>> what is right and wrong?
>>>
>>> Laws? Most would agree that we can't legislate morality now, so with
> no
>>> basis for what morality is, why would we even bother with laws since
>>> everyone would make their own choices anyway?
>>>
>>> Intellect? That would simply depend on what one chose to accept as
>>> "intelligent" thought, based completely on opinion.
>>>

>>> Reasoning and Logic? Logic is determined by a hypothesis that has a proven
>>> outcome in a given situation. Change the situation, and the reasoning
> or
>>> logic behind the "right" or "wrong" could easily change.
>>>
>>> Experience? What if one's experience is filled with hatred, abuse, anger
>>> and violence, or worse? Then someone would have to decide whose experience
>>> we would use as a reference point. There would be no guarantee that person
>>> or persons had experiences that would be best for the good of the whole.
>>>
>>> Survival instinct? If it were a reference point, then stealing, lying,
>>> cheating and even killing would be perfectly justified as those can be
> means
>>> of survival.
>>>
>>> Why would right and wrong even exist? I would think that the differences
>>> between societies' definitions of right and wrong, assuming societies
> even
>>> existed, would be so drastic we would never have ventured into any form
> of
>>> inter-cultural/inter-geographic interaction, much less relationships,
>>> diplomacy, collaboration, trade, and open travel.
>>>
>>> As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual, they aren't
>>> absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes to make
> the
>>> choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There would only be
> an
>>> ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at the time, and
>>> based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from person to person,
>>> day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons would either
> be
>>> filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time because
> their
>>> choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we wouldn't have
>>> prisons, or likely even organized societies.
>>>
>>> But is the majority always right? How would we know if there were no
>>> absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?
>>>
>>> If there were no right and wrong, there would be no consequences of either,
>>> or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad consequence
> - it
>>> would just be another event in time.
>>>
>>> But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice, both in whether
>>> to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong decisions. With
> moral

>>> absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to evaluate drastically
>>> differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency in reasoning
>>> and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry. Even when
> we
>>> choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without that option
> to
>>> choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would be no power
> in
>>> choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal and loving
> God
>>> rather than a dictator or puppet master.
>>>
>>> Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see God in the
> way
>>> that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can discuss
>>> completely opposing opinions and still care enough to consider insulting,
>>> belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable concept;
> and 2)
>>> in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely trump greed
> and
>>> power in importance to life and survival together on this planet.
>>>
>>> Regards,
>>> Dedric
>>>
>>> On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy"
>>> <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
>>>
>>>> The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have a strong
> morals
>>>> is absurd, I think.
>>>>
>>>> Jimmy
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
>>>> news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...
>>>>> Gene -
>>>>>
>>>>> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your response pretty
>>>>> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country and even
> the
>>>>> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict, violence and
>>>>> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single largest
>>>>> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world. We ignore
> car
>>>>> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of tortured and
>>>>> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming the

>>>>> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made the Pope
> quote
>>>> a
>>>>> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.
>>>>>
>>>>> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening, all-accepting religion
>>>>> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western Muslims
> might
>>>>> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else in many
> of
>>>> the
>>>>> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have talked to,
> and
>>>>> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a different
> world
>>>>> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have here.
>>>> People
>>>>> die for converting to anything else, or their families do. At best,
> their
>>>>> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under threat
> of
>>>>> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our country
>>>>> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on our own
>>>> country
>>>>> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to this kind
> of
>>>>> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically correct thing
> to
>>>>> do.
>>>>>
>>>>> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God, and hence
>>>> any
>>>>> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the choice to believe
>>>>> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name of Allah
> the
>>>>> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10 commandments in
> 24
>>>>> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there is a sad,
>>>> and
>>>>> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should fear -
> it's
>>>>> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's personal whims
> that
>>>>> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day. That
> also
>>>>> includes believing in nothing.
>>>>>
>>>>> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in God and

> is
>>>>> wrong, at worst one has lived a good live and had some false hope as
> a
>>>> sense
>>>>> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is wrong, then
> at
>>>>> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we should
> be
>>>>> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that the President
>>>>> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief really
> better
>>>>> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong accompanies
>>>> disbelief
>>>>> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference point for
>>>>> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of belief in any
>>>>> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion for others?
>>>>>
>>>>> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a guy Islam
>>>> doesn't
>>>>> like just because he called like he saw it - something we do on this
> forum
>>>>> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's intent to
> take
>>>>> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only goal is to
> give
>>>>> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to not believe
>>>>> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity from public
>>>> view.
>>>>> The only way to force someone to remove their belief from public in
> a
>>>>> country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes, is to outlaw
>>>> it.
>>>>> Yet another paradox.
>>>>>
>>>>> Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see the world
> as a
>>>>> black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party always wins
>>>> and
>>>>> the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any validity
> in
>>>>> believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to maintain the
>>>> balance
>>>>> that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust in the
> very
>>>>> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most fallible
>>>>> characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic ideology.
>>>>>
>>>>> I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.

>>>>>
>>>>> I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of 10 hours
> of
>>>> work
>>>>> :-((....
>>>>>
>>>>> Regards,
>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>
>>>>> On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70$1@linux, "gene Lennon"
>>>>> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>>>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread -...
>>>>>> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the current
>>>>>> administration
>>>>>> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based reasons
> for
>>>>>> perusing
>>>>>> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier motivation.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Religion.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third Great
>>>> Awakening"
>>>>>> of the international religious struggle. This is a good thing as he
> sees
>>>>>> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight against
>>>> terrorists
>>>>>> (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war that he
>>>> depicts
>>>>>> as "a confrontation between good and evil."
>>>>>> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit of trouble
>>>> (as
>>>>>> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be headed?
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could easily go
>>>> down
>>>>>> hill from here.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> More on the "Third Awakening":
>>>>>>
>>>> http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09 /12/AR2006091201
>>>> 59
>>>>>> 4_pf.html
>>>>>>

>>>>>> Gene
>>>>>>
>> `
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Jamie K on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 21:17:27 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Of course they came out with a blustery ultimatum. That's not news, it's an old pattern. It works for them to sit back and suggest that others do something via terror-grams such as this. If it makes you afraid as well, my guess is they would see that as a bonus.

By goading the USA into overreacting it helps them grow, raise money and convince others to actually see us as evil and act accordingly. It works, we keep falling for it. OTOH, for those here with a declared interest in emptying the US treasury, it's likewise beneficial to have the specter of an enemy out there. Fear sells.

We have yet to actually declare war on anyone in this whole mess. How do you declare war on a tactic?

Forced conversion and head taxes would go over like a lead balloon in the USA. Not gonna happen. We're far more sectarian than, say, Iraq.

Responsible leadership is needed in the world to calm extremist tendencies on all sides and help rational people who are trying to get by in worsening times. At the same time we need to be, and are attempting to be, vigilant against any self righteous group with fantasies of violence in the USA.

Any rush to some sort of "holy war" is irrational. There is nothing holy about war.

Cheers,
-Jamie
http://www.JamieKrutz.com

DJ wrote:
> I haven't seen us react with irrationality.....yet. Al Quaeda just
> came out with an ultimatim stating that it's full on war now and the west
> will be destroyed. The only way to save ourselves is to convert to Islam. So
> where to you draw the line between irrationality and self defense?
>

>
> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:450ee7ef@linux...
>> Let's keep from reacting to irrationality with irrationality of our own.
>> There's a lot of fear mongering. Chicken Little is back.
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>> DJ wrote:
>>> It doesn't matter at all whether this was the Pope. The bottom line is
> that
>>> it is rationality as opposed to irrationality.
>>>
>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:450ec970@linux...
>>>> The Catholic church doesn't speak for Christianity. Certainly not for
>>>> Lutherans, and for good reason.
>>>>
>>>> A Pope criticizing other religions (even other Christian sects, even
>>>> other Catholics) is nothing new. Certainly much harsher things have
> been
>>>> said about Islam by some (not all) extreme fundamentalist Christians.
>>>> And certainly much harsher things have been said by certain extremist
>>>> Islamists about Christianity. The more extremist of both camps seem to
>>>> be spoiling to relive the crusades. With some of the more power hungry
>>>> ready to endanger civilization by attempting to incite religious wars
>>>> for their own questionable ends.
>>>>
>>>> It's a vast generalization to say the "the left" or "secularists" or
>>>> even "Christians" are demanding an apology from the Pope. I think a
>>>> whole lot of people think the Pope can say whatever he wants. It
> doesn't
>>>> matter to most non-Catholics in the USA and in reality, Papal
>>>> declarations are ignored by a fair number of Catholics here, too.
>>>> Obviously some Moslems are upset in some places, but how deep does that
>>>> go? When black churches were burning in the USA, it would have been an
>>>> exaggeration to blame everyone in the USA for that.
>>>>
>>>> The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church which only very
>>>> recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo. The church hung on
>>>> tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view of the universe
> while
>>>> denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, which describes the
>>>> actual way the solar system works.
>>>>
>>>> It also extends to a few Christian sects who, feeling similarly
>>>> insecure, tenaciously cling to the notion that the earth is only about

>>>> 6,000 years old, by virtue of the biblical interpretations and clever
>>>> (at the time) calculations of an Irish Bishop several centuries ago,
> and
>>>> in the face of solid current scientific evidence to the contrary.
>>>>
>>>> The fear of reason extends to some (not all) Christian churches who,
>>>> feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and ever-mounting evidence
> of
>>>> evolution, responding with dogma in psuedo-scientific clothing, and who
>>>> seek to water down scientific education in the USA.
>>>>
>>>> The fear of reason extends to power hungry industries who pay big bucks
>>>> to spread denial about global warming for short term gain. Who push to
>>>> control oil in the middle east with force. With our guns blazing, our
>>>> soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically. And who sometimes
>>>> hide behind Christianity to do so.
>>>>
>>>> The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives who find ways to
>>>> pretend that everyone is aligning against Christianity. And in
> spreading
>>>> this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to keep them in power.
>>>> And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of reason and the
> focus
>>>> on the use of force.
>>>>
>>>> Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and declare victory.
> ;^)
>>>> Have a great week!
>>>>
>>>> Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> DC wrote:
>>>>> I thought this was worth reading if any of you are interested.
>>>>>
>>>>> Have a great Monday!
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> ---------------------------------------
>>>>>
>>>>> The Unholy Alliance Rolls Over the Pope
>>>>> By Andrew Walden
>>>>>
>>>>> In what has suddenly been made into a highly controversial

>>>>> Regensberg, Pope Benedict describes Christian belief in a God

>>>>> whose words and acts are bound by reason, truth and the law of
>>>>> non-contradiction. Benedict contrasts this with Islamic belief

>>>>> further contrasts Christian belief with that of secular humanists
>>>>> who see reason as being completely unbound of God.
>>>>>
>>>>> In response, both Islamists and secularists have demanded the

>>>>> genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between
>>>>> Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis of the clash
>>>>> of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror. His
>>>>> analysis also explains the underlying cause of the alliance
>>>>> between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.
>>>>>
>>>>> Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.
>>>>> Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor Manuel

>>>>> you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command

>>>>>

>>>>> unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top Shiite
>>>>> cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling party
>>>>> likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and accused him of
>>>>> reviving the mentality of the Crusades.
>>>>>

>>>>> jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of rage that
>>>>> many fear could burst into violent protests like those that

>>>>>

>>>>> safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.
>>>>>

>>>>> reaction is not one of anger but a calculated attempt to force
>>>>> the Pope to parrot the PC line on Islam. Since Islam need not be

>>>>> objective can be to assert the power of a God who is so
>>>>> transcendent that He is not bound by anything. If man is created

>>>>> anything. (This explains the predilection on the part of some

>>>>> their non-existent morality. They are asserting the only

>>>>>

>>>>> is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist thought than

>>>>>
>>>>> Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing precisely what

>>>>> of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest mosque,

>>>>>
>>>>> Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the Pope was,

>>>>>

>>>>> description of the Islamic God as being unbound by reason is not
>>>>> an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What Muslims and

>>>>> dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity. How dare he not

>>>>>

>>>>> being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to the point is
>>>>> lost on them.
>>>>>

>>>>> this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists are waging a
>>>>> propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension against

>>>>> jihad, but not your violent jihad.
>>>>>

>>>>> side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more clear than in
>>>>> the Islamist reaction to the Pope.
>>>>>
>>>>> With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November the Islamists
>>>>> are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons and demand
>>>>> to hear from the Pope himself. This would place raging mobs of
>>>>> semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of forcing the
>>>>> leader of Christendom to bow before them.
>>>>>
>>>>> In this demand for submission they are joined by the secularist
>>>>> mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times editorializes:

>>>>> the secularists are driven only by their will to power. While
>>>>> the Islamists represent their demented version of
>>>>> God--unrestrained by reason, the secularists represent their
>>>>> demented version of reason--unrestrained by God. They are united
>>>>> by their self-worshipping world view.
>>>>>

>>>>> our categories, even that of rationality...(The Islamic) God is

>>>>> Islam embraces this description. In offering this description of
>>>>> Islam, Benedict refers to the views of leading modern French
>>>>> Islamist R. Arnaldez as discussed in the writings of Professor
>>>>> Theodore Khoury of Munster.
>>>>>

>>>>> decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he considers

>>>>>
>>>>> Benedict asserts that without reason, or without God, there can

>>>>>
>>>>> Both Islamist and secularist seek to break God and reason apart.
>>>>> Each claims superiority over the Christian West. They believe
>>>>> absolute moral license makes them powerful. As globalization
>>>>> carries the Western tradition of reason throughout the world,
>>>>> both are in decline.
>>>>>
>>>>> Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist and secularist

>>>>> with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after the collapse
>>>>> of the allied forces on the western front.
>>>>>
>>>>> What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear is having to

>>>>> logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our partners in

>>>>>
>>>>> Their fear of reason can only lead the world to disaster.

>>>>>
>>>
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Jamie K on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 21:29:25 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"Without God, all is permitted."

A few questions about that assertion:

1) Which God? Your God or anyone's God? If your God, are you then asking for everyone to convert? If everyone doesn't convert will there be a head tax on those who don't?

2) When considering the non-deity case, why should we assume a sociopath as the arbiter of morality?

3) Pretty much all HAS been permitted in the name of a deity at one time or another. Sociopaths are not limited to the non-religious. How would you deal with religious sociopaths acting in the name of declared morality?

Cheers,
-Jamie
http://www.JamieKrutz.com

DC wrote:
> "Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote:
>> Hi Dedric,
>>
>> Don't take my comments as an indication that I have no "faith" in a higher
>
>> power, but couldn't our ability to feel empathy be one possible reason that
>
>> the majority of people might have similar morals. I don't think an atheist
>
>> knows murder is wrong just because god said "thou shalt not kill". I think
>
>> the golden rule has a lot to do with it. Over time, we have learned as
>> empathetic beings what is ultimately right and wrong. At least in the very
>
>> broad sense. Now, how we got to the point where we feel such a vast number
>

>> of emotions and are able to apply them to how we treat others is something
>
>> else to ponder.
>>
>> Tony
>
>
> The problem, of course, is that without a belief in moral
> absolutes, reflecting realites designed into us by our creator,
> anyone can say "who cares" to any social construct, contract,
> set of mutual obligations, or anthroplogicial observation that
> morals do indeed exist.
>
> In fact, one is invited to do so by an ideology that places
> humankind, not God at the center of existence. When the self
> is the center of the universe, one easily decides that someone
> else's morals and ideas of a social contract are an illusion.
> Worse, ideas about morals may even put them at a competitive
> disadvantage compared to the person who has none. (welcome
> to the music biz!)
>
> This result is likely given that set of assumptions, but it
> becomes inevitable one you go down the road of the neo-darwinists
> and socio-biologists who assert than humanity is simply a
> vehicle for furthering our "selfish genes" rather than a created
> being made to live in community with God and each other.
>
> The theist (and certainly the Christian) must always live in
> submission to a greater power, never being the center of
> existence, and deriving morality from a higher power than the
> self. Humility is our greatest calling, one I fail at
> regularly, but still, it is there.
>
> Without God, all is permitted.
>
> DC
>
> "It appears that the great sacred-cow of our culture, the self,
> is not automatically interesting".
>
> -Robert Hughes
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Tony Benson on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 22:05:19 GMT

Hi Don,

I'm not in the same league with you to debate theology. I'll try to state my feelings in the most coherent way, but it will be, at best, clumsy. The problem, from my point of view, with relying on "God" to dictate morality is that every different religion believes their God is the one true God (or God's in some cases). Evidently, fundamentalist Islam's God says it's completely moral and beyond that, an Islamic's duty to kill infidels. So, who's God's morals should all of mankind follow. You say yours. They say theirs. I can only follow what I believe to be true in my own heart. I feel that I can still have faith in something beyond myself (God) and faith that for what ever reason, I have the ability to sense right from wrong. Perhaps the one true God gave us that ability.? Obviously people do say "who cares" to the accepted social moral standards all the time. If not, we wouldn't have any murder, theft, rape, etc. But by and large, I think the majority of people know in their hearts the difference between right and wrong, regardless of what God they follow or weather they believe in God at all.

Tony

"DC" <dc@spammersinkabul.com> wrote in message news:450f0ab7$1@linux...
>
> "Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote:
>>Hi Dedric,
>>
>>Don't take my comments as an indication that I have no "faith" in a higher
>
>>power, but couldn't our ability to feel empathy be one possible reason
>>that
>
>>the majority of people might have similar morals. I don't think an atheist
>
>>knows murder is wrong just because god said "thou shalt not kill". I think
>
>>the golden rule has a lot to do with it. Over time, we have learned as
>>empathetic beings what is ultimately right and wrong. At least in the very
>
>>broad sense. Now, how we got to the point where we feel such a vast number
>
>>of emotions and are able to apply them to how we treat others is something
>
>>else to ponder.
>>
>>Tony
>
>

> The problem, of course, is that without a belief in moral
> absolutes, reflecting realites designed into us by our creator,
> anyone can say "who cares" to any social construct, contract,
> set of mutual obligations, or anthroplogicial observation that
> morals do indeed exist.
>
> In fact, one is invited to do so by an ideology that places
> humankind, not God at the center of existence. When the self
> is the center of the universe, one easily decides that someone
> else's morals and ideas of a social contract are an illusion.
> Worse, ideas about morals may even put them at a competitive
> disadvantage compared to the person who has none. (welcome
> to the music biz!)
>
> This result is likely given that set of assumptions, but it
> becomes inevitable one you go down the road of the neo-darwinists
> and socio-biologists who assert than humanity is simply a
> vehicle for furthering our "selfish genes" rather than a created
> being made to live in community with God and each other.
>
> The theist (and certainly the Christian) must always live in
> submission to a greater power, never being the center of
> existence, and deriving morality from a higher power than the
> self. Humility is our greatest calling, one I fail at
> regularly, but still, it is there.
>
> Without God, all is permitted.
>
> DC
>
> "It appears that the great sacred-cow of our culture, the self,
> is not automatically interesting".
>
> -Robert Hughes
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by TCB on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 22:08:22 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Here's dictionary.com

faith /feɪθ/ Pronunciation Key - Show Spelled Pronunciation[feyth] Pronunciation Key - Show IPA Pronunciation

1. confidence or trust in a person or thing: faith in another's ability.

2. belief that is not based on proof: He had faith that the hypothesis would be substantiated by fact.
3. belief in God or in the doctrines or teachings of religion: the firm faith of the Pilgrims.
4. belief in anything, as a code of ethics, standards of merit, etc.: to be of the same faith with someone concerning honesty.
5. a system of religious belief: the Christian faith; the Jewish faith.
6. the obligation of loyalty or fidelity to a person, promise, engagement, etc.: Failure to appear would be breaking faith.
7. the observance of this obligation; fidelity to one's promise, oath, allegiance, etc.: He was the only one who proved his faith during our recent troubles.
8. Christian Theology. the trust in God and in His promises as made through Christ and the Scriptures by which humans are justified or saved.

I don't see anything in there about risk. My point is that people can do the things you're talking about knowing full well they might fail, but do them anyway. That's taking a risk, not having faith. I don't have faith but I've taken lots of personal and professional risks in my life.

TCB

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>
>We can disagree about that but the first line is the dictionary definition.
>
>Cheers,
> -Jamie
> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>
>TCB wrote:
>> You're confusing 'faith' with 'a willingness to take risks.' Animals take
>> risks, to get food, create more animals, etc., but I doubt they have faith.
>> One needs no faith to start businesses, invest money, get married, etc.

>>
>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>> Faith is complete trust or confidence in something or someone. Religious
>>
>>> faith is one form of faith but not the only definition of "faith."
>>>
>>> For example I have faith that if I drop a guitar pick it will find its

>>> way to the floor based on the gravitational attraction it has to the

>>> planet. I have faith that I'll breathe my next breath, that I'll see

>>> tomorrow morning. I have faith that other people are put together much

>>> like I am and that I can therefore relate to other folks.
>>>
>>> Without faith, people would not invest money. Without faith people would
>>
>>> not vote. Without faith people would not start businesses, hire other

>>> people, raise children. Without faith people would not ride trains, fly
>>
>>> in planes or drive cars. Without faith no one would investigate
>>> scientific questions about reality.
>>>
>>> While you can clearly have faith without religion, you cannot have
>>> religion without faith. Religion depends on faith that one or more
>>> deities (good and sometimes bad) exist, that their associated stories

>>> actually occurred, and often, that there is some sort of afterlife.
>>>
>>> However, religious people believe in a variety of different deities.

>>> Even those who believe in the same deity disagree, sometimes violently,
>>
>>> about the nature of their deity. Religions sometimes even disagree about
>>
>>> the nature of reality. If you want to base morality strictly on
>>> religion, and you look around, you'll notice that religion can be a
>>> somewhat chaotic basis unless...
>>>
>>> Ah, you might say, I want to base morality on MY religion. Well, you

>>> just dissed the majority of religions. No problem because THEY ARE
>>> WRONG. And people who believe in those religions may just be saying the
>>
>>> same thing about you and your religion. For those religions who are not
>>
>>> tolerant of other ideas, you may just have started a war.
>>>
>>> So perhaps it's BETTER, in our time, to have a system of justice that
is
>>
>>> NOT based on a religion. But one which guarantees everyone the right
to
>>
>>> practice the religion of their choice, guarantees other freedoms such
as
>>
>>> we in the USA do in our Bill of Rights, encourages honesty and
>>> integrity, while enforcing some common sense limits such as no human

>>> sacrifices, a minimum age for marriage, no incest, no slavery, no
>>> murder, no rape, no stealing, those sorts of things.
>>>
>>> What is viewed as morality beyond a fair justice system and common sense
>>
>>> rules of behavior can be left to each freely chosen religion to sort

>>> out, like whether to restrict diet in some way, whether to wear a
>>> certain type of clothing, how to pray, etc. But none of these additional
>>
>>> practices should be imposed on society as a whole.
>>>
>>> The Golden Rule may also be of use as a basic moral foundation.
>>>
>>> So yes, you can have a moral system, one that BTW protects the freedom

>>> to practice religious beliefs (or not), without basing it on any one

>>> religion. And it can protect all religions better than a system based
on
>>
>>> any one religion (AKA a theocracy).
>>>
>>> There are other issues surrounding religions, such as the many examples
>>
>>> of selfless dedication to helping others on the one hand, and hijacked

>>> religions used to legitimize earthly power structures in other cases.

>>> Dedric, I look forward to talking with you about the positives and
>>> negatives of various religions, and where a moral culture ought to go

>>>from here, whenever we next get together.
>>> Cheers,
>>> -Jamie
>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>
>>>
>>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>>> Hey Jimmy,
>>>>
>>>> No doubt one can be a good person without believing in God - there are
>> tons
>>>> of great people with no faith, or very little. That in and of itself
>> tells
>>>> me there must be a God so even non-believers would have a strong sense
>> of

>>>> right and wrong on a societal and even global level.
>>>>
>>>> To walk through some thoughts: with no God, or higher reference point,
>> what
>>>> would be considered moral, or at least good? What would one use to
decide
>>>> what is right and wrong?
>>>>
>>>> Laws? Most would agree that we can't legislate morality now, so with
>> no
>>>> basis for what morality is, why would we even bother with laws since
>>>> everyone would make their own choices anyway?
>>>>
>>>> Intellect? That would simply depend on what one chose to accept as
>>>> "intelligent" thought, based completely on opinion.
>>>>
>>>> Reasoning and Logic? Logic is determined by a hypothesis that has a
proven
>>>> outcome in a given situation. Change the situation, and the reasoning
>> or
>>>> logic behind the "right" or "wrong" could easily change.
>>>>
>>>> Experience? What if one's experience is filled with hatred, abuse,
anger
>>>> and violence, or worse? Then someone would have to decide whose experience
>>>> we would use as a reference point. There would be no guarantee that
person
>>>> or persons had experiences that would be best for the good of the whole.
>>>>
>>>> Survival instinct? If it were a reference point, then stealing, lying,
>>>> cheating and even killing would be perfectly justified as those can
be
>> means
>>>> of survival.
>>>>
>>>> Why would right and wrong even exist? I would think that the differences
>>>> between societies' definitions of right and wrong, assuming societies
>> even
>>>> existed, would be so drastic we would never have ventured into any form
>> of
>>>> inter-cultural/inter-geographic interaction, much less relationships,
>>>> diplomacy, collaboration, trade, and open travel.
>>>>
>>>> As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual, they aren't
>>>> absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes to make
>> the
>>>> choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There would only
be

>> an
>>>> ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at the time,
and
>>>> based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from person to
person,
>>>> day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons would either
>> be
>>>> filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time because
>> their
>>>> choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we wouldn't
have
>>>> prisons, or likely even organized societies.
>>>>
>>>> But is the majority always right? How would we know if there were no
>>>> absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?
>>>>
>>>> If there were no right and wrong, there would be no consequences of
either,
>>>> or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad consequence
>> - it
>>>> would just be another event in time.
>>>>
>>>> But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice, both in
whether
>>>> to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong decisions. With
>> moral
>>>> absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to evaluate drastically
>>>> differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency in reasoning
>>>> and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry. Even when
>> we
>>>> choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without that option
>> to
>>>> choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would be no power
>> in
>>>> choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal and loving
>> God
>>>> rather than a dictator or puppet master.
>>>>
>>>> Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see God in the
>> way
>>>> that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can discuss
>>>> completely opposing opinions and still care enough to consider insulting,
>>>> belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable concept;
>> and 2)
>>>> in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely trump greed
>> and
>>>> power in importance to life and survival together on this planet.
>>>>

>>>> Regards,
>>>> Dedric
>>>>
>>>> On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy"
>>>> <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>> The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have a strong
>> morals
>>>>> is absurd, I think.
>>>>>
>>>>> Jimmy
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
>>>>> news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...
>>>>>> Gene -
>>>>>>
>>>>>> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your response
pretty
>>>>>> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country and even
>> the
>>>>>> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict, violence
and
>>>>>> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single largest
>>>>>> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world. We ignore
>> car
>>>>>> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of tortured
and
>>>>>> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming the
>>>>>> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made the Pope
>> quote
>>>>> a
>>>>>> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening, all-accepting
religion
>>>>>> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western Muslims
>> might
>>>>>> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else in many
>> of
>>>>> the
>>>>>> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have talked
to,
>> and
>>>>>> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a different
>> world
>>>>>> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have here.
>>>>> People

>>>>>> die for converting to anything else, or their families do. At best,
>> their
>>>>>> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under threat
>> of
>>>>>> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our country
>>>>>> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on our own
>>>>> country
>>>>>> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to this kind
>> of
>>>>>> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically correct thing
>> to
>>>>>> do.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God, and
hence
>>>>> any
>>>>>> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the choice to
believe
>>>>>> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name of Allah
>> the
>>>>>> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10 commandments
in
>> 24
>>>>>> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there is a
sad,
>>>>> and
>>>>>> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should fear
-
>> it's
>>>>>> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's personal whims
>> that
>>>>>> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day. That
>> also
>>>>>> includes believing in nothing.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in God and
>> is
>>>>>> wrong, at worst one has lived a good live and had some false hope
as
>> a
>>>>> sense
>>>>>> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is wrong, then
>> at
>>>>>> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we should
>> be
>>>>>> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that the President
>>>>>> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief really
>> better

>>>>>> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong accompanies
>>>>> disbelief
>>>>>> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference point
for
>>>>>> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of belief in
any
>>>>>> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion for others?
>>>>>>
>>>>>> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a guy Islam
>>>>> doesn't
>>>>>> like just because he called like he saw it - something we do on this
>> forum
>>>>>> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's intent
to
>> take
>>>>>> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only goal is
to
>> give
>>>>>> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to not
believe
>>>>>> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity from public
>>>>> view.
>>>>>> The only way to force someone to remove their belief from public in
>> a
>>>>>> country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes, is to
outlaw
>>>>> it.
>>>>>> Yet another paradox.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see the world
>> as a
>>>>>> black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party always
wins
>>>>> and
>>>>>> the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any validity
>> in
>>>>>> believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to maintain the
>>>>> balance
>>>>>> that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust in the
>> very
>>>>>> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most fallible
>>>>>> characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic ideology.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of 10 hours
>> of
>>>>> work

>>>>>> :-((....
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>>
>>>>>> On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70$1@linux, "gene Lennon"
>>>>>> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread -...
>>>>>>> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the current
>>>>>>> administration
>>>>>>> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based reasons
>> for
>>>>>>> perusing
>>>>>>> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier motivation.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Religion.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third Great
>>>>> Awakening"
>>>>>>> of the international religious struggle. This is a good thing as
he
>> sees
>>>>>>> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight against
>>>>> terrorists
>>>>>>> (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war that he
>>>>> depicts
>>>>>>> as "a confrontation between good and evil."
>>>>>>> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit of trouble
>>>>> (as
>>>>>>> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be headed?
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could easily
go
>>>>> down
>>>>>>> hill from here.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> More on the "Third Awakening":
>>>>>>>
>>>>> http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09 /12/AR2006091201
>>>>> 59
>>>>>>> 4_pf.html
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Gene
>>>>>>>

>>> `
>>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Deej [1] on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 22:16:06 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I don't see us overreacting Jamie. However, if there is indication of some sort of major threat, do we run and tell the NY times or do we blow the threat away before it pays us a visit?

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:450f0b12@linux...
>
> Of course they came out with a blustery ultimatum. That's not news, it's
> an old pattern. It works for them to sit back and suggest that others do
> something via terror-grams such as this. If it makes you afraid as well,
> my guess is they would see that as a bonus.
>
> By goading the USA into overreacting it helps them grow, raise money and
> convince others to actually see us as evil and act accordingly. It
> works, we keep falling for it. OTOH, for those here with a declared
> interest in emptying the US treasury, it's likewise beneficial to have
> the specter of an enemy out there. Fear sells.
>
> We have yet to actually declare war on anyone in this whole mess. How do
> you declare war on a tactic?
>
> Forced conversion and head taxes would go over like a lead balloon in
> the USA. Not gonna happen. We're far more sectarian than, say, Iraq.
>
> Responsible leadership is needed in the world to calm extremist
> tendencies on all sides and help rational people who are trying to get
> by in worsening times. At the same time we need to be, and are
> attempting to be, vigilant against any self righteous group with
> fantasies of violence in the USA.
>
> Any rush to some sort of "holy war" is irrational. There is nothing holy
> about war.
>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>
>
> DJ wrote:

> > I haven't seen us react with irrationality.....yet. Al Quaeda
just
> > came out with an ultimatim stating that it's full on war now and the
west
> > will be destroyed. The only way to save ourselves is to convert to
Islam. So
> > where to you draw the line between irrationality and self defense?
> >
> >
> > "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:450ee7ef@linux...
> >> Let's keep from reacting to irrationality with irrationality of our
own.
> >> There's a lot of fear mongering. Chicken Little is back.
> >>
> >> Cheers,
> >>   -Jamie
> >>   http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >>
> >>
> >> DJ wrote:
> >>> It doesn't matter at all whether this was the Pope. The bottom line is
> > that
> >>> it is rationality as opposed to irrationality.
> >>>
> >>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
news:450ec970@linux...
> >>>> The Catholic church doesn't speak for Christianity. Certainly not for
> >>>> Lutherans, and for good reason.
> >>>>
> >>>> A Pope criticizing other religions (even other Christian sects, even
> >>>> other Catholics) is nothing new. Certainly much harsher things have
> > been
> >>>> said about Islam by some (not all) extreme fundamentalist Christians.
> >>>> And certainly much harsher things have been said by certain extremist
> >>>> Islamists about Christianity. The more extremist of both camps seem
to
> >>>> be spoiling to relive the crusades. With some of the more power
hungry
> >>>> ready to endanger civilization by attempting to incite religious wars
> >>>> for their own questionable ends.
> >>>>
> >>>> It's a vast generalization to say the "the left" or "secularists" or
> >>>> even "Christians" are demanding an apology from the Pope. I think a
> >>>> whole lot of people think the Pope can say whatever he wants. It
> > doesn't
> >>>> matter to most non-Catholics in the USA and in reality, Papal
> >>>> declarations are ignored by a fair number of Catholics here, too.
> >>>> Obviously some Moslems are upset in some places, but how deep does

that
> >>>> go? When black churches were burning in the USA, it would have been
an
> >>>> exaggeration to blame everyone in the USA for that.
> >>>>
> >>>> The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church which only very
> >>>> recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo. The church hung on
> >>>> tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view of the universe
> > while
> >>>> denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, which describes the
> >>>> actual way the solar system works.
> >>>>
> >>>> It also extends to a few Christian sects who, feeling similarly
> >>>> insecure, tenaciously cling to the notion that the earth is only
about
> >>>> 6,000 years old, by virtue of the biblical interpretations and clever
> >>>> (at the time) calculations of an Irish Bishop several centuries ago,
> > and
> >>>> in the face of solid current scientific evidence to the contrary.
> >>>>
> >>>> The fear of reason extends to some (not all) Christian churches who,
> >>>> feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and ever-mounting evidence
> > of
> >>>> evolution, responding with dogma in psuedo-scientific clothing, and
who
> >>>> seek to water down scientific education in the USA.
> >>>>
> >>>> The fear of reason extends to power hungry industries who pay big
bucks
> >>>> to spread denial about global warming for short term gain. Who push
to
> >>>> control oil in the middle east with force. With our guns blazing, our
> >>>> soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically. And who sometimes
> >>>> hide behind Christianity to do so.
> >>>>
> >>>> The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives who find ways to
> >>>> pretend that everyone is aligning against Christianity. And in
> > spreading
> >>>> this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to keep them in power.
> >>>> And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of reason and the
> > focus
> >>>> on the use of force.
> >>>>
> >>>> Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and declare victory.
> > ;^)
> >>>> Have a great week!
> >>>>
> >>>> Cheers,

> >>>> -Jamie
> >>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>> DC wrote:
> >>>>> I thought this was worth reading if any of you are interested.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> Have a great Monday!
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>> ---------------------------------------
> >>>>>
> >>>>> The Unholy Alliance Rolls Over the Pope
> >>>>> By Andrew Walden
> >>>>>
> >>>>> In what has suddenly been made into a highly controversial

> >>>>> Regensberg, Pope Benedict describes Christian belief in a God
> >>>>> whose words and acts are bound by reason, truth and the law of
> >>>>> non-contradiction. Benedict contrasts this with Islamic belief

> >>>>> further contrasts Christian belief with that of secular humanists
> >>>>> who see reason as being completely unbound of God.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> In response, both Islamists and secularists have demanded the

> >>>>> genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between
> >>>>> Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis of the clash
> >>>>> of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror. His
> >>>>> analysis also explains the underlying cause of the alliance
> >>>>> between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.
> >>>>> Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor Manuel

> >>>>> you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command

> >>>>>

> >>>>> unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top Shiite
> >>>>> cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling party
> >>>>> likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and accused him of
> >>>>> reviving the mentality of the Crusades.
> >>>>>

> >>>>> jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of rage that
> >>>>> many fear could burst into violent protests like those that

> >>>>>

> >>>>> safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.
> >>>>>

> >>>>> reaction is not one of anger but a calculated attempt to force
> >>>>> the Pope to parrot the PC line on Islam. Since Islam need not be

> >>>>> objective can be to assert the power of a God who is so
> >>>>> transcendent that He is not bound by anything. If man is created

> >>>>> anything. (This explains the predilection on the part of some

> >>>>> their non-existent morality. They are asserting the only

> >>>>>

> >>>>> is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist thought than

> >>>>>
> >>>>> Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing precisely what

> >>>>> of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest mosque,

> >>>>>
> >>>>> Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the Pope was,

> >>>>>

> >>>>> description of the Islamic God as being unbound by reason is not
> >>>>> an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What Muslims and

> >>>>> dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity. How dare he not

> >>>>>

> >>>>> being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to the point is
> >>>>> lost on them.
> >>>>>

> >>>>> this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists are waging a

> >>>>> propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension against

> >>>>> jihad, but not your violent jihad.
> >>>>>

> >>>>> side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more clear than in
> >>>>> the Islamist reaction to the Pope.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November the Islamists
> >>>>> are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons and demand
> >>>>> to hear from the Pope himself. This would place raging mobs of
> >>>>> semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of forcing the
> >>>>> leader of Christendom to bow before them.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> In this demand for submission they are joined by the secularist
> >>>>> mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times editorializes:

> >>>>> the secularists are driven only by their will to power. While
> >>>>> the Islamists represent their demented version of
> >>>>> God--unrestrained by reason, the secularists represent their
> >>>>> demented version of reason--unrestrained by God. They are united
> >>>>> by their self-worshipping world view.
> >>>>>

> >>>>> our categories, even that of rationality...(The Islamic) God is

> >>>>> Islam embraces this description. In offering this description of
> >>>>> Islam, Benedict refers to the views of leading modern French
> >>>>> Islamist R. Arnaldez as discussed in the writings of Professor
> >>>>> Theodore Khoury of Munster.
> >>>>>

> >>>>> decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he considers

> >>>>>
> >>>>> Benedict asserts that without reason, or without God, there can

> >>>>>
> >>>>> Both Islamist and secularist seek to break God and reason apart.

> >>>>> Each claims superiority over the Christian West. They believe
> >>>>> absolute moral license makes them powerful. As globalization
> >>>>> carries the Western tradition of reason throughout the world,
> >>>>> both are in decline.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist and secularist

> >>>>> with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after the collapse
> >>>>> of the allied forces on the western front.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear is having to

> >>>>> logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our partners in

> >>>>>
> >>>>> Their fear of reason can only lead the world to disaster.
> >>>>>
> >>>
> >
> >

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by dc[3] on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 22:49:28 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Tony,

I think you did pretty well, actually.

"Which God to follow" can be a sincere question, as in:
"it makes sense to me that God would have a plan for our lives and
wants the best for us, and I need to know who God really is"

or it can be rhetoric, from a clear atheist position, as in:
"well, there's a god over here and there's a god over there, and
another one in Boston, and how are we to know which god is the
right one?"

and the person really believes in no God whatsover.

The difference is important because if one believes in a creator, it is
reasonable to assume that the creator is interested in him as well.
This, at least is the Christian position, and the Bible and certainly the

life of Christ centers on the issue of "who cares about humans

anyway?"

Well, John 3:16 answers that doesn't it, and while secularist reasoning can be shown to be utterly self-referential and even irrational, in the end spiritual things are spiritually discerned and if

someone simply wishes to dispute, they may do so, forever.

So, as a Christian, believing that Jesus came to save me, and that the Bible narrative, while not perfect in the details, nonetheless contains His story. I would say on that basis, that the God of the Bible is the right one, and I would say that the muslims are mistaken and do not serve God at all. "By their fruits you will know them"

However there is the obvious case of the righteous Muslim, Buddhist, Hindu etc. I do believe that the imprint of our creation exists in all of us, granting even the atheist a conscience, despite their basic antipathy to absolutes. Beyond that, I also believe that God turns no one away, so there is the mystery of those who seek God in their own culture and their own religion, clearly *finding* Him!

We are responsible for what we know, not what the other guy knows.

That doesn't make faiths all equal or the same.

BTW, the case can be made that ANY theistic belief is superior to atheism and neo-darwinism, simply because it gives at least some basis for universal morality.

What about the righteous atheist? Well, there are a few of these, and I think some of them have been called by God to do good despite their ideology and that thing they follow that they call "conscience" is in reality the Holy Spirit and they may be saved on the basis of their reaction to that voice of God. I also think that denominations generally thoroughly *suck* (good theological term eh?) and have driven away many righteous people who live without religion in a righteous manner. I do believe they are all called to join the rest of us at some point, but I will not pretend to judge them, nor Hindus, Muslims etc on when that is.

Brain Welch (Head) from Korn became a Christian a while back, and evidently has a new tune called "Religion Must Die" and I think he has a point. Take a look at his new site. I like the music.

http://www.headtochrist.com/

Of course, whatever emerges from the death of religion, even if it

is the most dynamic Christian community since the 1st century,
will be called 'religion' by the secularists who so dominate our
culture, so it's semantics to some extent.

DC

"Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote:
>Hi Don,
>
>I'm not in the same league with you to debate theology. I'll try to state
my
>feelings in the most coherent way, but it will be, at best, clumsy. The

>problem, from my point of view, with relying on "God" to dictate morality
is
>that every different religion believes their God is the one true God (or

>God's in some cases). Evidently, fundamentalist Islam's God says it's
>completely moral and beyond that, an Islamic's duty to kill infidels. So,

>who's God's morals should all of mankind follow. You say yours. They say

>theirs. I can only follow what I believe to be true in my own heart. I feel

>that I can still have faith in something beyond myself (God) and faith that

>for what ever reason, I have the ability to sense right from wrong. Perhaps

>the one true God gave us that ability.? Obviously people do say "who cares"

>to the accepted social moral standards all the time. If not, we wouldn't

>have any murder, theft, rape, etc. But by and large, I think the majority
of
>people know in their hearts the difference between right and wrong,
>regardless of what God they follow or weather they believe in God at all.
>
>Tony
>
>
>"DC" <dc@spammersinkabul.com> wrote in message news:450f0ab7$1@linux...
>>
>> "Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote:
>>>Hi Dedric,
>>>

>>>Don't take my comments as an indication that I have no "faith" in a higher
>>
>>>power, but couldn't our ability to feel empathy be one possible reason

>>>that
>>
>>>the majority of people might have similar morals. I don't think an atheist
>>
>>>knows murder is wrong just because god said "thou shalt not kill". I think
>>
>>>the golden rule has a lot to do with it. Over time, we have learned as
>>>empathetic beings what is ultimately right and wrong. At least in the
very
>>
>>>broad sense. Now, how we got to the point where we feel such a vast number
>>
>>>of emotions and are able to apply them to how we treat others is something
>>
>>>else to ponder.
>>>
>>>Tony
>>
>>
>> The problem, of course, is that without a belief in moral
>> absolutes, reflecting realites designed into us by our creator,
>> anyone can say "who cares" to any social construct, contract,
>> set of mutual obligations, or anthroplogicial observation that
>> morals do indeed exist.
>>
>> In fact, one is invited to do so by an ideology that places
>> humankind, not God at the center of existence. When the self
>> is the center of the universe, one easily decides that someone
>> else's morals and ideas of a social contract are an illusion.
>> Worse, ideas about morals may even put them at a competitive
>> disadvantage compared to the person who has none. (welcome
>> to the music biz!)
>>
>> This result is likely given that set of assumptions, but it
>> becomes inevitable one you go down the road of the neo-darwinists
>> and socio-biologists who assert than humanity is simply a
>> vehicle for furthering our "selfish genes" rather than a created
>> being made to live in community with God and each other.
>>
>> The theist (and certainly the Christian) must always live in
>> submission to a greater power, never being the center of
>> existence, and deriving morality from a higher power than the
>> self. Humility is our greatest calling, one I fail at
>> regularly, but still, it is there.

>>
>> Without God, all is permitted.
>>
>> DC
>>
>> "It appears that the great sacred-cow of our culture, the self,
>> is not automatically interesting".
>>
>> -Robert Hughes
>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by uptown jimmy on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 23:33:38 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Deej, good lord amighty, if we go around blowing away every perceived threat to us, we're gonna be dropping a lot of bombs on a lot of people. Where should we start? Seriously? How many countries shall we bomb back to the stone age in an attempt to rid the world of potential threats? How many civil wars shall we create and get bogged down in to appease our more war-like citizens? Cuz last time I checked, there were easily half 3 or 4 dangerous states posing a much greater economic and/or military threat to us and our allies than Iraq recently did.

And speaking of Iraq, how the hell are we ever gonna spare the man-power to fight other countries while we are so severely over-taxed in Iraq? Is it any accident that Iran has been so loud and obnoxious recently? They know we are compromised tactically. They laugh loud and long every day at our current difficulties.

Any of you guys ever bone up on the last 60 years or so of Arabic/Persian history? We've been playing with fire for a long time now, as far as I can tell. Seems to me that part of the current problem is that a lot of skeletons in our national closet are coming to light. I certainly don't condone the radical Islamic fringe that seems to have it in for us, but folks in the Mideast in general have a few good reasons to profoundly resent our beloved U.S.A. Would I like to erase the earth of all religious and political fundamentalism? Hell yes. I'd also like us to get really, really, serious about not meddling in the affairs of other people in a decades-long effort to influence the price of oil.

Jimmy

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
news:450f1b1d@linux...
> I don't see us overreacting Jamie. However, if there is indication of some
> sort of major threat, do we run and tell the NY times or do we blow the
> threat away before it pays us a visit?
>
>
> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:450f0b12@linux...
> > >
> > > Of course they came out with a blustery ultimatum. That's not news, it's
> > > an old pattern. It works for them to sit back and suggest that others do
> > > something via terror-grams such as this. If it makes you afraid as well,
> > > my guess is they would see that as a bonus.
> > >
> > > By goading the USA into overreacting it helps them grow, raise money and
> > > convince others to actually see us as evil and act accordingly. It
> > > works, we keep falling for it. OTOH, for those here with a declared
> > > interest in emptying the US treasury, it's likewise beneficial to have
> > > the specter of an enemy out there. Fear sells.
> > >
> > > We have yet to actually declare war on anyone in this whole mess. How do
> > > you declare war on a tactic?
> > >
> > > Forced conversion and head taxes would go over like a lead balloon in
> > > the USA. Not gonna happen. We're far more sectarian than, say, Iraq.
> > >
> > > Responsible leadership is needed in the world to calm extremist
> > > tendencies on all sides and help rational people who are trying to get
> > > by in worsening times. At the same time we need to be, and are
> > > attempting to be, vigilant against any self righteous group with
> > > fantasies of violence in the USA.
> > >
> > > Any rush to some sort of "holy war" is irrational. There is nothing holy
> > > about war.
> > >
> > > Cheers,
> > > -Jamie
> > > http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > DJ wrote:
> > > > I haven't seen us react with irrationality.....yet. Al Quaeda
> just
> > > > came out with an ultimatim stating that it's full on war now and the
> west
> > > > will be destroyed. The only way to save ourselves is to convert to
> Islam. So

> > > where to you draw the line between irrationality and self defense?
> > >
> > >
> > > "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
news:450ee7ef@linux...
> > >> Let's keep from reacting to irrationality with irrationality of our
> own.
> > >> There's a lot of fear mongering. Chicken Little is back.
> > >>
> > >> Cheers,
> > >> -Jamie
> > >> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> > >>
> > >>
> > >> DJ wrote:
> > >>> It doesn't matter at all whether this was the Pope. The bottom line
is
> > > that
> > >>> it is rationality as opposed to irrationality.
> > >>>
> > >>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> news:450ec970@linux...
> > >>>> The Catholic church doesn't speak for Christianity. Certainly not
for
> > >>>> Lutherans, and for good reason.
> > >>>>
> > >>>> A Pope criticizing other religions (even other Christian sects,
even
> > >>>> other Catholics) is nothing new. Certainly much harsher things have
> > > been
> > >>>> said about Islam by some (not all) extreme fundamentalist
Christians.
> > >>>> And certainly much harsher things have been said by certain
extremist
> > >>>> Islamists about Christianity. The more extremist of both camps seem
> to
> > >>>> be spoiling to relive the crusades. With some of the more power
> hungry
> > >>>> ready to endanger civilization by attempting to incite religious
wars
> > >>>> for their own questionable ends.
> > >>>>
> > >>>> It's a vast generalization to say the "the left" or "secularists"
or
> > >>>> even "Christians" are demanding an apology from the Pope. I think a
> > >>>> whole lot of people think the Pope can say whatever he wants. It
> > > doesn't
> > >>>> matter to most non-Catholics in the USA and in reality, Papal

> > >>>> declarations are ignored by a fair number of Catholics here, too.
> > >>>> Obviously some Moslems are upset in some places, but how deep does
> that
> > >>>> go? When black churches were burning in the USA, it would have been
> an
> > >>>> exaggeration to blame everyone in the USA for that.
> > >>>>
> > >>>> The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church which only very
> > >>>> recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo. The church hung
on
> > >>>> tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view of the universe
> > > while
> > >>>> denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, which describes the
> > >>>> actual way the solar system works.
> > >>>>
> > >>>> It also extends to a few Christian sects who, feeling similarly
> > >>>> insecure, tenaciously cling to the notion that the earth is only
> about
> > >>>> 6,000 years old, by virtue of the biblical interpretations and
clever
> > >>>> (at the time) calculations of an Irish Bishop several centuries
ago,
> > > and
> > >>>> in the face of solid current scientific evidence to the contrary.
> > >>>>
> > >>>> The fear of reason extends to some (not all) Christian churches
who,
> > >>>> feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and ever-mounting
evidence
> > > of
> > >>>> evolution, responding with dogma in psuedo-scientific clothing, and
> who
> > >>>> seek to water down scientific education in the USA.
> > >>>>
> > >>>> The fear of reason extends to power hungry industries who pay big
> bucks
> > >>>> to spread denial about global warming for short term gain. Who push
> to
> > >>>> control oil in the middle east with force. With our guns blazing,
our
> > >>>> soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically. And who
sometimes
> > >>>> hide behind Christianity to do so.
> > >>>>
> > >>>> The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives who find ways
to
> > >>>> pretend that everyone is aligning against Christianity. And in
> > > spreading

> > >>>> this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to keep them in
power.
> > >>>> And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of reason and the
> > > focus
> > >>>> on the use of force.
> > >>>>
> > >>>> Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and declare
victory.
> > > ;^)
> > >>>> Have a great week!
> > >>>>
> > >>>> Cheers,
> > >>>> -Jamie
> > >>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> > >>>>
> > >>>>
> > >>>> DC wrote:
> > >>>>> I thought this was worth reading if any of you are interested.
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> Have a great Monday!
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> ---------------------------------------
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> The Unholy Alliance Rolls Over the Pope
> > >>>>> By Andrew Walden
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> In what has suddenly been made into a highly controversial
> > >>>>> speech, the day after September 11, at Bavaria's University of
> > >>>>> Regensberg, Pope Benedict describes Christian belief in a God
> > >>>>> whose words and acts are bound by reason, truth and the law of
> > >>>>> non-contradiction. Benedict contrasts this with Islamic belief
> > >>>>> in a God not bound by anything-including his own words. Benedict
> > >>>>> further contrasts Christian belief with that of secular humanists
> > >>>>> who see reason as being completely unbound of God.
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> In response, both Islamists and secularists have demanded the
> > >>>>> Pope apologize. Benedict's speech is a work of enlightened
> > >>>>> genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between
> > >>>>> Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis of the clash
> > >>>>> of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror. His
> > >>>>> analysis also explains the underlying cause of the alliance
> > >>>>> between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.
> > >>>>> Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor Manuel
> > >>>>> II: "Show me just what Mohammed brought that was new, and there
> > >>>>> you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command

> > >>>>> to spread by the sword the faith he preached."
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> Four days later, according to AP: "Pakistan's legislature
> > >>>>> unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top Shiite
> > >>>>> cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling party
> > >>>>> likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and accused him of
> > >>>>> reviving the mentality of the Crusades.
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> "Across the Islamic world Friday, Benedict's remarks on Islam and
> > >>>>> jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of rage that
> > >>>>> many fear could burst into violent protests like those that
> > >>>>> followed publication of caricatures of the Prophet Muhammad."
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> Reuters quoted other sources expressing fears for the Pope's
> > >>>>> safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> The Islamist reaction proves Manuel II's 600-year-old point. The
> > >>>>> reaction is not one of anger but a calculated attempt to force
> > >>>>> the Pope to parrot the PC line on Islam. Since Islam need not be
> > >>>>> internally consistent and it is not bound by reason, it's only
> > >>>>> objective can be to assert the power of a God who is so
> > >>>>> transcendent that He is not bound by anything. If man is created
> > >>>>> in God's image then by extension Islamic man is not bound by
> > >>>>> anything. (This explains the predilection on the part of some
> > >>>>> Muslims to lie.) Islamists are not responding to any 'offense' to
> > >>>>> their non-existent morality. They are asserting the only
> > >>>>> 'morality' they have-the will to power.
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> "Will to Power" is a key element of Nietzsche 's philosophy-hence
> > >>>>> the root of the term, Islamofascist. Moreover the Western "Left'
> > >>>>> is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist thought than
> > >>>>> by Marxist thought-hence the alliance between the Western "Left"
> > >>>>> and the Islamofascist 'Right.'
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing precisely what
> > >>>>> Manuel II said they would: "Syed Ahmed Bukhari, the chief cleric
> > >>>>> of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest mosque,
> > >>>>> extolled Muslims to 'respond in a manner which forces the Pope to
> > >>>>> apologize.'" Note they intend to use "force" not reason.
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the Pope was,
> > >>>>> "calling a spade a spade".
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> The secularist mouthpiece, New York Times,editorializes, "Pope
> > >>>>> Benedict XVI has insulted Muslims.." This is false. The Pope's
> > >>>>> description of the Islamic God as being unbound by reason is not
> > >>>>> an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What Muslims and
> > >>>>> secularists fear is the Pope's decision to choose to enter

> > >>>>> dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity. How dare he not
> > >>>>> "apologize" for being a Christian? That is the so-called
> > >>>>> "insult."
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> One might "reasonably" ask when will Muslims "apologize" for
> > >>>>> being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to the point is
> > >>>>> lost on them.
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> Amazingly the Times continues: "Muslim leaders the world over
> > >>>>> have demanded apologies. For many Muslims, holy war - jihad - is
> > >>>>> a spiritual struggle, and not a call to violence." In saying
> > >>>>> this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists are waging a
> > >>>>> propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension against
> > >>>>> Christianity-and they explicitly endorse and join this jihad.
> > >>>>> The Times is saying to Islamists, 'we can join your 'spiritual'
> > >>>>> jihad, but not your violent jihad.
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> The Times editors are living in a fool's paradise. The
> > >>>>> "spiritual" non-violent jihad of propaganda is merely the flip
> > >>>>> side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more clear than in
> > >>>>> the Islamist reaction to the Pope.
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November the Islamists
> > >>>>> are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons and demand
> > >>>>> to hear from the Pope himself. This would place raging mobs of
> > >>>>> semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of forcing the
> > >>>>> leader of Christendom to bow before them.
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> In this demand for submission they are joined by the secularist
> > >>>>> mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times editorializes:
> > >>>>> "He needs to offer a deep and persuasive apology." The
> > >>>>> secularists too seek the Pope's submission. Like the Islamists,
> > >>>>> the secularists are driven only by their will to power. While
> > >>>>> the Islamists represent their demented version of
> > >>>>> God--unrestrained by reason, the secularists represent their
> > >>>>> demented version of reason--unrestrained by God. They are united
> > >>>>> by their self-worshipping world view.
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> It should be noted that the carefully staged "anger' from the
> > >>>>> Islamic world does not condemn Benedict's characterization of
> > >>>>> Islam as a religion where God's "will is not bound up with any of
> > >>>>> our categories, even that of rationality...(The Islamic) God is
> > >>>>> not bound even by his own word.." This is not seen as an insult.
> > >>>>> Islam embraces this description. In offering this description of
> > >>>>> Islam, Benedict refers to the views of leading modern French
> > >>>>> Islamist R. Arnaldez as discussed in the writings of Professor
> > >>>>> Theodore Khoury of Munster.
> > >>>>>

> > >>>>> Likewise the secularists express no dismay at the pope's
> > >>>>> characterization of a secularist as: "(A) subject (who) then
> > >>>>> decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he considers
> > >>>>> tenable in matters of religion, and the subjective 'conscience'
> > >>>>> becomes the sole arbiter of what is ethical."
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> Benedict asserts that without reason, or without God, there can
> > >>>>> be no modern system of morality. He explains, "In this
> > >>>>> way.ethics and religion lose their power to create a community
> > >>>>> and become (instead) a completely personal matter."
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> Both Islamist and secularist seek to break God and reason apart.
> > >>>>> Each claims superiority over the Christian West. They believe
> > >>>>> absolute moral license makes them powerful. As globalization
> > >>>>> carries the Western tradition of reason throughout the world,
> > >>>>> both are in decline.
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist and secularist
> > >>>>> will meet in combat, just as Hitler's fascists broke their pact
> > >>>>> with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after the collapse
> > >>>>> of the allied forces on the western front.
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear is having to
> > >>>>> reply to the Pope's key point, borrowed from the Byzantine
> > >>>>> Emperor: "'Not to act reasonably, not to act with logos (word or
> > >>>>> reason) is contrary to the nature of God,'.. It is to this great
> > >>>>> logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our partners in
> > >>>>> the dialogue of cultures."
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> Their fear of reason can only lead the world to disaster.
> > >>>>>
> > >>>
> > >
> > >
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by justcron on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 23:36:21 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"Uptown Jimmy" <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:450f2afe@linux...
> Deej, good lord amighty, if we go around blowing away every perceived
> threat
> to us, we're gonna be dropping a lot of bombs on a lot of people. Where
> should we start? Seriously? How many countries shall we bomb back to the

> stone age in an attempt to rid the world of potential threats? How many
> civil wars shall we create and get bogged down in to appease our more
> war-like citizens?

Only the ones Bush promotes on Fox News.

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by uptown jimmy on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 23:50:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Easy, there. Must be careful not to imply that Fox "News" is quite literally
a propaganda arm of the current administration. That's just gonna open up a
whole can of worms about how the NYTimes is a tool of the Devil, sent to
this earth to make life difficult for our dear sainted leader, who was in
turn appointed to the Presidency by the Lord himself...

Jimmy

"justcron" <parisnews@hydrorecords.com> wrote in message
news:450f2b8f$1@linux...
>
> "Uptown Jimmy" <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> news:450f2afe@linux...
> > Deej, good lord amighty, if we go around blowing away every perceived
> > threat
> > to us, we're gonna be dropping a lot of bombs on a lot of people. Where
> > should we start? Seriously? How many countries shall we bomb back to the
> > stone age in an attempt to rid the world of potential threats? How many
> > civil wars shall we create and get bogged down in to appease our more
> > war-like citizens?
>
> Only the ones Bush promotes on Fox News.
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Jamie K on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 00:30:48 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Neither, actually. And what we ought to do would depend on the nature of
the threat.

We might want to start with recommendations published in 1999, well
before the 9/11 attack.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Commission_on_Terroris m

We can disagree about whether our current policy is one of overreacting
or not. We can probably really disagree about the newly minted
preemptive attack policy. :^)

Cheers,
-Jamie
http://www.JamieKrutz.com

DJ wrote:
> I don't see us overreacting Jamie. However, if there is indication of some
> sort of major threat, do we run and tell the NY times or do we blow the
> threat away before it pays us a visit?
>
>
> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:450f0b12@linux...
>> Of course they came out with a blustery ultimatum. That's not news, it's
>> an old pattern. It works for them to sit back and suggest that others do
>> something via terror-grams such as this. If it makes you afraid as well,
>> my guess is they would see that as a bonus.
>>
>> By goading the USA into overreacting it helps them grow, raise money and
>> convince others to actually see us as evil and act accordingly. It
>> works, we keep falling for it. OTOH, for those here with a declared
>> interest in emptying the US treasury, it's likewise beneficial to have
>> the specter of an enemy out there. Fear sells.
>>
>> We have yet to actually declare war on anyone in this whole mess. How do
>> you declare war on a tactic?
>>
>> Forced conversion and head taxes would go over like a lead balloon in
>> the USA. Not gonna happen. We're far more sectarian than, say, Iraq.
>>
>> Responsible leadership is needed in the world to calm extremist
>> tendencies on all sides and help rational people who are trying to get
>> by in worsening times. At the same time we need to be, and are
>> attempting to be, vigilant against any self righteous group with
>> fantasies of violence in the USA.
>>
>> Any rush to some sort of "holy war" is irrational. There is nothing holy
>> about war.
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com

>>
>>
>>
>> DJ wrote:
>>> I haven't seen us react with irrationality.....yet. Al Quaeda
> just
>>> came out with an ultimatim stating that it's full on war now and the
> west
>>> will be destroyed. The only way to save ourselves is to convert to
> Islam. So
>>> where to you draw the line between irrationality and self defense?
>>>
>>>
>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:450ee7ef@linux...
>>>> Let's keep from reacting to irrationality with irrationality of our
> own.
>>>> There's a lot of fear mongering. Chicken Little is back.
>>>>
>>>> Cheers,
>>>>   -Jamie
>>>>   http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> DJ wrote:
>>>>> It doesn't matter at all whether this was the Pope. The bottom line is
>>> that
>>>>> it is rationality as opposed to irrationality.
>>>>>
>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> news:450ec970@linux...
>>>>>> The Catholic church doesn't speak for Christianity. Certainly not for
>>>>>> Lutherans, and for good reason.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> A Pope criticizing other religions (even other Christian sects, even
>>>>>> other Catholics) is nothing new. Certainly much harsher things have
>>> been
>>>>>> said about Islam by some (not all) extreme fundamentalist Christians.
>>>>>> And certainly much harsher things have been said by certain extremist
>>>>>> Islamists about Christianity. The more extremist of both camps seem
> to
>>>>>> be spoiling to relive the crusades. With some of the more power
> hungry
>>>>>> ready to endanger civilization by attempting to incite religious wars
>>>>>> for their own questionable ends.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> It's a vast generalization to say the "the left" or "secularists" or
>>>>>> even "Christians" are demanding an apology from the Pope. I think a
>>>>>> whole lot of people think the Pope can say whatever he wants. It

>>> doesn't
>>>>>> matter to most non-Catholics in the USA and in reality, Papal
>>>>>> declarations are ignored by a fair number of Catholics here, too.
>>>>>> Obviously some Moslems are upset in some places, but how deep does
> that
>>>>>> go? When black churches were burning in the USA, it would have been
> an
>>>>>> exaggeration to blame everyone in the USA for that.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church which only very
>>>>>> recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo. The church hung on
>>>>>> tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view of the universe
>>> while
>>>>>> denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, which describes the
>>>>>> actual way the solar system works.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> It also extends to a few Christian sects who, feeling similarly
>>>>>> insecure, tenaciously cling to the notion that the earth is only
> about
>>>>>> 6,000 years old, by virtue of the biblical interpretations and clever
>>>>>> (at the time) calculations of an Irish Bishop several centuries ago,
>>> and
>>>>>> in the face of solid current scientific evidence to the contrary.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some (not all) Christian churches who,
>>>>>> feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and ever-mounting evidence
>>> of
>>>>>> evolution, responding with dogma in psuedo-scientific clothing, and
> who
>>>>>> seek to water down scientific education in the USA.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to power hungry industries who pay big
> bucks
>>>>>> to spread denial about global warming for short term gain. Who push
> to
>>>>>> control oil in the middle east with force. With our guns blazing, our
>>>>>> soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically. And who sometimes
>>>>>> hide behind Christianity to do so.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives who find ways to
>>>>>> pretend that everyone is aligning against Christianity. And in
>>> spreading
>>>>>> this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to keep them in power.
>>>>>> And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of reason and the
>>> focus
>>>>>> on the use of force.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and declare victory.

>>> ;^)
>>>>>> Have a great week!
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> DC wrote:
>>>>>>> I thought this was worth reading if any of you are interested.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Have a great Monday!
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> ---------------------------------------
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> The Unholy Alliance Rolls Over the Pope
>>>>>>> By Andrew Walden
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> In what has suddenly been made into a highly controversial

>>>>>>> Regensberg, Pope Benedict describes Christian belief in a God
>>>>>>> whose words and acts are bound by reason, truth and the law of
>>>>>>> non-contradiction. Benedict contrasts this with Islamic belief

>>>>>>> further contrasts Christian belief with that of secular humanists
>>>>>>> who see reason as being completely unbound of God.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> In response, both Islamists and secularists have demanded the

>>>>>>> genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between
>>>>>>> Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis of the clash
>>>>>>> of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror. His
>>>>>>> analysis also explains the underlying cause of the alliance
>>>>>>> between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.
>>>>>>> Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor Manuel

>>>>>>> you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top Shiite
>>>>>>> cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling party
>>>>>>> likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and accused him of
>>>>>>> reviving the mentality of the Crusades.
>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of rage that
>>>>>>> many fear could burst into violent protests like those that

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.
>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> reaction is not one of anger but a calculated attempt to force
>>>>>>> the Pope to parrot the PC line on Islam. Since Islam need not be

>>>>>>> objective can be to assert the power of a God who is so
>>>>>>> transcendent that He is not bound by anything. If man is created

>>>>>>> anything. (This explains the predilection on the part of some

>>>>>>> their non-existent morality. They are asserting the only

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist thought than

>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing precisely what

>>>>>>> of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest mosque,

>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the Pope was,

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> description of the Islamic God as being unbound by reason is not
>>>>>>> an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What Muslims and

>>>>>>> dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity. How dare he not

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to the point is
>>>>>>> lost on them.
>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists are waging a
>>>>>>> propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension against

>>>>>>> jihad, but not your violent jihad.
>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more clear than in
>>>>>>> the Islamist reaction to the Pope.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November the Islamists
>>>>>>> are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons and demand
>>>>>>> to hear from the Pope himself. This would place raging mobs of
>>>>>>> semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of forcing the
>>>>>>> leader of Christendom to bow before them.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> In this demand for submission they are joined by the secularist
>>>>>>> mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times editorializes:

>>>>>>> the secularists are driven only by their will to power. While
>>>>>>> the Islamists represent their demented version of
>>>>>>> God--unrestrained by reason, the secularists represent their
>>>>>>> demented version of reason--unrestrained by God. They are united
>>>>>>> by their self-worshipping world view.
>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> our categories, even that of rationality...(The Islamic) God is

>>>>>>> Islam embraces this description. In offering this description of
>>>>>>> Islam, Benedict refers to the views of leading modern French
>>>>>>> Islamist R. Arnaldez as discussed in the writings of Professor
>>>>>>> Theodore Khoury of Munster.
>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he considers

>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Benedict asserts that without reason, or without God, there can

>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Both Islamist and secularist seek to break God and reason apart.
>>>>>>> Each claims superiority over the Christian West. They believe
>>>>>>> absolute moral license makes them powerful. As globalization
>>>>>>> carries the Western tradition of reason throughout the world,
>>>>>>> both are in decline.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist and secularist

>>>>>>> with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after the collapse
>>>>>>> of the allied forces on the western front.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear is having to

>>>>>>> logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our partners in

>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Their fear of reason can only lead the world to disaster.
>>>>>>>
>>>
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Jamie K on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 00:40:15 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

There you go, clearly faith is not limited to religion. Although just as clearly it's important for religion.

As to risk, many people have faith that their risks will pan out. Some people do things because they have such faith. I know people like that. I am people like that. That doesn't preclude anyone from doing something for some other reason, of course.

If you want to say you don't have faith in anything, using any of the definitions below, then that's your prerogative and I don't have a problem with that.

Cheers,
-Jamie
http://www.JamieKrutz.com

TCB wrote:
> Here's dictionary.com
>
> faith /feɪθ/ Pronunciation Key - Show Spelled Pronunciation[feyth]
> Pronunciation Key - Show IPA Pronunciation

> 1. confidence or trust in a person or thing: faith in another's ability.
> 2. belief that is not based on proof: He had faith that the hypothesis would
> be substantiated by fact.
> 3. belief in God or in the doctrines or teachings of religion: the firm faith
> of the Pilgrims.
> 4. belief in anything, as a code of ethics, standards of merit, etc.: to
> be of the same faith with someone concerning honesty.
> 5. a system of religious belief: the Christian faith; the Jewish faith.
> 6. the obligation of loyalty or fidelity to a person, promise, engagement,
> etc.: Failure to appear would be breaking faith.
> 7. the observance of this obligation; fidelity to one's promise, oath, allegiance,
> etc.: He was the only one who proved his faith during our recent troubles.
> 8. Christian Theology. the trust in God and in His promises as made through
> Christ and the Scriptures by which humans are justified or saved.
>
> I don't see anything in there about risk. My point is that people can do
> the things you're talking about knowing full well they might fail, but do
> them anyway. That's taking a risk, not having faith. I don't have faith but
> I've taken lots of personal and professional risks in my life.
>
> TCB
>
> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>> We can disagree about that but the first line is the dictionary definition.
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>> TCB wrote:
>>> You're confusing 'faith' with 'a willingness to take risks.' Animals take
>>> risks, to get food, create more animals, etc., but I doubt they have faith.
>>> One needs no faith to start businesses, invest money, get married, etc.
>
>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>> Faith is complete trust or confidence in something or someone. Religious
>>>> faith is one form of faith but not the only definition of "faith."
>>>>
>>>> For example I have faith that if I drop a guitar pick it will find its
>

>>>> way to the floor based on the gravitational attraction it has to the
>
>>>> planet. I have faith that I'll breathe my next breath, that I'll see
>
>>>> tomorrow morning. I have faith that other people are put together much
>
>>>> like I am and that I can therefore relate to other folks.
>>>>
>>>> Without faith, people would not invest money. Without faith people would
>>>> not vote. Without faith people would not start businesses, hire other
>
>>>> people, raise children. Without faith people would not ride trains, fly
>>>> in planes or drive cars. Without faith no one would investigate
>>>> scientific questions about reality.
>>>>
>>>> While you can clearly have faith without religion, you cannot have
>>>> religion without faith. Religion depends on faith that one or more
>>>> deities (good and sometimes bad) exist, that their associated stories
>
>>>> actually occurred, and often, that there is some sort of afterlife.
>>>>
>>>> However, religious people believe in a variety of different deities.
>
>>>> Even those who believe in the same deity disagree, sometimes violently,
>>>> about the nature of their deity. Religions sometimes even disagree about
>>>> the nature of reality. If you want to base morality strictly on
>>>> religion, and you look around, you'll notice that religion can be a
>>>> somewhat chaotic basis unless...
>>>>
>>>> Ah, you might say, I want to base morality on MY religion. Well, you
>
>>>> just dissed the majority of religions. No problem because THEY ARE
>>>> WRONG. And people who believe in those religions may just be saying the
>>>> same thing about you and your religion. For those religions who are not
>>>> tolerant of other ideas, you may just have started a war.
>>>>
>>>> So perhaps it's BETTER, in our time, to have a system of justice that
> is
>>>> NOT based on a religion. But one which guarantees everyone the right
> to
>>>> practice the religion of their choice, guarantees other freedoms such
> as
>>>> we in the USA do in our Bill of Rights, encourages honesty and
>>>> integrity, while enforcing some common sense limits such as no human
>
>>>> sacrifices, a minimum age for marriage, no incest, no slavery, no
>>>> murder, no rape, no stealing, those sorts of things.
>>>>

>>>> What is viewed as morality beyond a fair justice system and common sense
>>>> rules of behavior can be left to each freely chosen religion to sort
>
>>>> out, like whether to restrict diet in some way, whether to wear a
>>>> certain type of clothing, how to pray, etc. But none of these additional
>>>> practices should be imposed on society as a whole.
>>>>
>>>> The Golden Rule may also be of use as a basic moral foundation.
>>>>
>>>> So yes, you can have a moral system, one that BTW protects the freedom
>
>>>> to practice religious beliefs (or not), without basing it on any one
>
>>>> religion. And it can protect all religions better than a system based
> on
>>>> any one religion (AKA a theocracy).
>>>>
>>>> There are other issues surrounding religions, such as the many examples
>>>> of selfless dedication to helping others on the one hand, and hijacked
>
>>>> religions used to legitimize earthly power structures in other cases.
>
>>>> Dedric, I look forward to talking with you about the positives and
>>>> negatives of various religions, and where a moral culture ought to go
>
>>> >from here, whenever we next get together.
>>>> Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>>>> Hey Jimmy,
>>>>>
>>>>> No doubt one can be a good person without believing in God - there are
>>> tons
>>>>> of great people with no faith, or very little. That in and of itself
>>> tells
>>>>> me there must be a God so even non-believers would have a strong sense
>>> of
>>>>> right and wrong on a societal and even global level.
>>>>>
>>>>> To walk through some thoughts: with no God, or higher reference point,
>>> what
>>>>> would be considered moral, or at least good? What would one use to
> decide
>>>>> what is right and wrong?
>>>>>

>>>>> Laws? Most would agree that we can't legislate morality now, so with
>>> no
>>>>> basis for what morality is, why would we even bother with laws since
>>>>> everyone would make their own choices anyway?
>>>>>
>>>>> Intellect? That would simply depend on what one chose to accept as
>>>>> "intelligent" thought, based completely on opinion.
>>>>>
>>>>> Reasoning and Logic? Logic is determined by a hypothesis that has a
> proven
>>>>> outcome in a given situation. Change the situation, and the reasoning
>>> or
>>>>> logic behind the "right" or "wrong" could easily change.
>>>>>
>>>>> Experience? What if one's experience is filled with hatred, abuse,
> anger
>>>>> and violence, or worse? Then someone would have to decide whose experience
>>>>> we would use as a reference point. There would be no guarantee that
> person
>>>>> or persons had experiences that would be best for the good of the whole.
>>>>>
>>>>> Survival instinct? If it were a reference point, then stealing, lying,
>>>>> cheating and even killing would be perfectly justified as those can
> be
>>> means
>>>>> of survival.
>>>>>
>>>>> Why would right and wrong even exist? I would think that the differences
>>>>> between societies' definitions of right and wrong, assuming societies
>>> even
>>>>> existed, would be so drastic we would never have ventured into any form
>>> of
>>>>> inter-cultural/inter-geographic interaction, much less relationships,
>>>>> diplomacy, collaboration, trade, and open travel.
>>>>>
>>>>> As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual, they aren't
>>>>> absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes to make
>>> the
>>>>> choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There would only
> be
>>> an
>>>>> ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at the time,
> and
>>>>> based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from person to
> person,
>>>>> day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons would either
>>> be
>>>>> filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time because

>>> their
>>>>> choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we wouldn't
> have
>>>>> prisons, or likely even organized societies.
>>>>>
>>>>> But is the majority always right? How would we know if there were no
>>>>> absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?
>>>>>
>>>>> If there were no right and wrong, there would be no consequences of
> either,
>>>>> or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad consequence
>>> - it
>>>>> would just be another event in time.
>>>>>
>>>>> But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice, both in
> whether
>>>>> to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong decisions. With
>>> moral
>>>>> absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to evaluate drastically
>>>>> differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency in reasoning
>>>>> and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry. Even when
>>> we
>>>>> choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without that option
>>> to
>>>>> choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would be no power
>>> in
>>>>> choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal and loving
>>> God
>>>>> rather than a dictator or puppet master.
>>>>>
>>>>> Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see God in the
>>> way
>>>>> that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can discuss
>>>>> completely opposing opinions and still care enough to consider insulting,
>>>>> belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable concept;
>>> and 2)
>>>>> in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely trump greed
>>> and
>>>>> power in importance to life and survival together on this planet.
>>>>>
>>>>> Regards,
>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>
>>>>> On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy"
>>>>> <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>>> The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have a strong
>>> morals

>>>>>> is absurd, I think.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Jimmy
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
>>>>>> news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...
>>>>>>> Gene -
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your response
> pretty
>>>>>>> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country and even
>>> the
>>>>>>> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict, violence
> and
>>>>>>> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single largest
>>>>>>> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world. We ignore
>>> car
>>>>>>> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of tortured
> and
>>>>>>> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming the
>>>>>>> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made the Pope
>>> quote
>>>>>> a
>>>>>>> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening, all-accepting
> religion
>>>>>>> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western Muslims
>>> might
>>>>>>> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else in many
>>> of
>>>>>> the
>>>>>>> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have talked
> to,
>>> and
>>>>>>> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a different
>>> world
>>>>>>> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have here.
>>>>>> People
>>>>>>> die for converting to anything else, or their families do. At best,
>>> their
>>>>>>> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under threat
>>> of
>>>>>>> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our country
>>>>>>> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on our own
>>>>>> country
>>>>>>> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to this kind

>>> of
>>>>>>> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically correct thing
>>> to
>>>>>>> do.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God, and
> hence
>>>>>> any
>>>>>>> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the choice to
> believe
>>>>>>> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name of Allah
>>> the
>>>>>>> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10 commandments
> in
>>> 24
>>>>>>> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there is a
> sad,
>>>>>> and
>>>>>>> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should fear
> -
>>> it's
>>>>>>> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's personal whims
>>> that
>>>>>>> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day. That
>>> also
>>>>>>> includes believing in nothing.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in God and
>>> is
>>>>>>> wrong, at worst one has lived a good live and had some false hope
> as
>>> a
>>>>>> sense
>>>>>>> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is wrong, then
>>> at
>>>>>>> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we should
>>> be
>>>>>>> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that the President
>>>>>>> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief really
>>> better
>>>>>>> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong accompanies
>>>>>> disbelief
>>>>>>> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference point
> for
>>>>>>> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of belief in
> any
>>>>>>> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion for others?
>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a guy Islam
>>>>>> doesn't
>>>>>>> like just because he called like he saw it - something we do on this
>>> forum
>>>>>>> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's intent
> to
>>> take
>>>>>>> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only goal is
> to
>>> give
>>>>>>> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to not
> believe
>>>>>>> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity from public
>>>>>> view.
>>>>>>> The only way to force someone to remove their belief from public in
>>> a
>>>>>>> country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes, is to
> outlaw
>>>>>> it.
>>>>>>> Yet another paradox.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see the world
>>> as a
>>>>>>> black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party always
> wins
>>>>>> and
>>>>>>> the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any validity
>>> in
>>>>>>> believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to maintain the
>>>>>> balance
>>>>>>> that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust in the
>>> very
>>>>>>> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most fallible
>>>>>>> characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic ideology.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of 10 hours
>>> of
>>>>>> work
>>>>>>> :-((....
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70$1@linux, "gene Lennon"
>>>>>>> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread -...
>>>>>>>> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the current
>>>>>>>> administration
>>>>>>>> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based reasons
>>> for
>>>>>>>> perusing
>>>>>>>> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier motivation.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Religion.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third Great
>>>>>> Awakening"
>>>>>>>> of the international religious struggle. This is a good thing as
> he
>>> sees
>>>>>>>> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight against
>>>>>> terrorists
>>>>>>>> (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war that he
>>>>>> depicts
>>>>>>>> as "a confrontation between good and evil."
>>>>>>>> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit of trouble
>>>>>> (as
>>>>>>>> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be headed?
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could easily
> go
>>>>>> down
>>>>>>>> hill from here.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> More on the "Third Awakening":
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>> http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09 /12/AR2006091201
>>>>>> 59
>>>>>>>> 4_pf.html
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Gene
>>>>>>>>
>>>> `
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Aaron Allen on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 01:16:41 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dude, that is so in line with my thoughts on organized religion that you might be a long lost brother. As a kid I spent a lot of time in a small town church were I was told that God was, essentially, a must-fear mean old man type. I haven't spent a lot of time near that particular sect since I was able to 'not' be around it. I'm not too sure about all these 'we welcome all thinking and religion as ok" types either. There's got to be some kind of middle ground theology out there, I just haven't found it yet.

AA

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:450f2278$1@linux...
>
> Tony,
>
> I think you did pretty well, actually.
>
> "Which God to follow" can be a sincere question, as in:
> "it makes sense to me that God would have a plan for our lives and
> wants the best for us, and I need to know who God really is"
>
> or it can be rhetoric, from a clear atheist position, as in:
> "well, there's a god over here and there's a god over there, and
> another one in Boston, and how are we to know which god is the
> right one?"
>
> and the person really believes in no God whatsover.
>
> The difference is important because if one believes in a creator, it is
> reasonable to assume that the creator is interested in him as well.
> This, at least is the Christian position, and the Bible and certainly the
>
> life of Christ centers on the issue of "who cares about humans
> anyway?"
>
> Well, John 3:16 answers that doesn't it, and while secularist
> reasoning can be shown to be utterly self-referential and even
> irrational, in the end spiritual things are spiritually discerned and if
>
> someone simply wishes to dispute, they may do so, forever.
>
> So, as a Christian, believing that Jesus came to save me, and that
> the Bible narrative, while not perfect in the details, nonetheless
> contains His story. I would say on that basis, that the God of the
> Bible is the right one, and I would say that the muslims are mistaken
> and do not serve God at all. "By their fruits you will know them"
>
> *However* there is the obvious case of the righteous Muslim,
> Buddhist, Hindu etc. I do believe that the imprint of our creation

> exists in all of us, granting even the atheist a conscience, despite
> their basic antipathy to absolutes. Beyond that, I also believe that
> God turns no one away, so there is the mystery of those who
> seek God in their own culture and their own religion, clearly *finding*
> Him!
>
>
> We are responsible for what we know, not what the other guy knows.
>
> That doesn't make faiths all equal or the same.
>
> BTW, the case can be made that ANY theistic belief is superior
> to atheism and neo-darwinism, simply because it gives at least some
> basis for universal morality.
>
> What about the righteous atheist? Well, there are a few of these,
> and I think some of them have been called by God to do good despite their
> ideology and that thing they follow that they call
> "conscience" is in reality the Holy Spirit and they may be saved
> on the basis of their reaction to that voice of God. I also think that
> denominations generally thoroughly *suck* (good theological
> term eh?) and have driven away many righteous people who live
> without religion in a righteous manner. I do believe they are all
> called to join the rest of us at some point, but I will not pretend
> to judge them, nor Hindus, Muslims etc on when that is.
>
> Brain Welch (Head) from Korn became a Christian a while back, and
> evidently has a new tune called "Religion Must Die" and I think he
> has a point. Take a look at his new site. I like the music.
>
> http://www.headtochrist.com/
>
> Of course, whatever emerges from the death of religion, even if it
> is the most dynamic Christian community since the 1st century,
> will be called 'religion' by the secularists who so dominate our
> culture, so it's semantics to some extent.
>
> DC
>
>
>
>
> "Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote:
>>Hi Don,
>>
>>I'm not in the same league with you to debate theology. I'll try to state
> my
>>feelings in the most coherent way, but it will be, at best, clumsy. The

>
>>problem, from my point of view, with relying on "God" to dictate morality
> is
>>that every different religion believes their God is the one true God (or
>
>>God's in some cases). Evidently, fundamentalist Islam's God says it's
>>completely moral and beyond that, an Islamic's duty to kill infidels. So,
>
>>who's God's morals should all of mankind follow. You say yours. They say
>
>>theirs. I can only follow what I believe to be true in my own heart. I
>>feel
>
>>that I can still have faith in something beyond myself (God) and faith
>>that
>
>>for what ever reason, I have the ability to sense right from wrong.
>>Perhaps
>
>>the one true God gave us that ability.? Obviously people do say "who
>>cares"
>
>>to the accepted social moral standards all the time. If not, we wouldn't
>
>>have any murder, theft, rape, etc. But by and large, I think the majority
> of
>>people know in their hearts the difference between right and wrong,
>>regardless of what God they follow or weather they believe in God at all.
>>
>>Tony
>>
>>
>>"DC" <dc@spammersinkabul.com> wrote in message news:450f0ab7$1@linux...
>>>
>>> "Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote:
>>>>Hi Dedric,
>>>>
>>>>Don't take my comments as an indication that I have no "faith" in a
>>>>higher
>>>
>>>>power, but couldn't our ability to feel empathy be one possible reason
>
>>>>that
>>>
>>>>the majority of people might have similar morals. I don't think an
>>>>atheist
>>>
>>>>knows murder is wrong just because god said "thou shalt not kill". I

>>>>think
>>>
>>>>the golden rule has a lot to do with it. Over time, we have learned as
>>>>empathetic beings what is ultimately right and wrong. At least in the
> very
>>>
>>>>broad sense. Now, how we got to the point where we feel such a vast
>>>>number
>>>
>>>>of emotions and are able to apply them to how we treat others is
>>>>something
>>>
>>>>else to ponder.
>>>>
>>>>Tony
>>>
>>>
>>> The problem, of course, is that without a belief in moral
>>> absolutes, reflecting realites designed into us by our creator,
>>> anyone can say "who cares" to any social construct, contract,
>>> set of mutual obligations, or anthroplogicial observation that
>>> morals do indeed exist.
>>>
>>> In fact, one is invited to do so by an ideology that places
>>> humankind, not God at the center of existence. When the self
>>> is the center of the universe, one easily decides that someone
>>> else's morals and ideas of a social contract are an illusion.
>>> Worse, ideas about morals may even put them at a competitive
>>> disadvantage compared to the person who has none. (welcome
>>> to the music biz!)
>>>
>>> This result is likely given that set of assumptions, but it
>>> becomes inevitable one you go down the road of the neo-darwinists
>>> and socio-biologists who assert than humanity is simply a
>>> vehicle for furthering our "selfish genes" rather than a created
>>> being made to live in community with God and each other.
>>>
>>> The theist (and certainly the Christian) must always live in
>>> submission to a greater power, never being the center of
>>> existence, and deriving morality from a higher power than the
>>> self. Humility is our greatest calling, one I fail at
>>> regularly, but still, it is there.
>>>
>>> Without God, all is permitted.
>>>
>>> DC
>>>
>>> "It appears that the great sacred-cow of our culture, the self,

>>> is not automatically interesting".
>>>
>>> -Robert Hughes
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by TCB on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 02:05:54 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I never said faith was limited to religion _at all_ because that would be
silly. I only bring this up because I think it's a very important point.
Nearly every time you read 'without faith there would be no XXXXXXXX' it's
just not true and XXXXXXXX can get along just fine without faith. Probably
the best popular book about risk is called 'Against the Gods' and it's sort
of about this very topic.

http://www.amazon.com/Against-Gods-Remarkable-Story-Risk/dp/
0471295639/sr=8-1/qid=1158631839/ref=pd_bbs_1/002-2500887-29 81628?ie=UTF8&s=books

TCB

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>
>There you go, clearly faith is not limited to religion. Although just as

>clearly it's important for religion.
>
>As to risk, many people have faith that their risks will pan out. Some
>people do things because they have such faith. I know people like that.

>I am people like that. That doesn't preclude anyone from doing something

>for some other reason, of course.
>
>If you want to say you don't have faith in anything, using any of the
>definitions below, then that's your prerogative and I don't have a
>problem with that.
>
>Cheers,
> -Jamie
> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>

>TCB wrote:
>> Here's dictionary.com
>>
>> faith /feɪθ/ Pronunciation Key - Show Spelled Pronunciation[feyth]
>> Pronunciation Key - Show IPA Pronunciation

>> 1. confidence or trust in a person or thing: faith in another's ability.
>> 2. belief that is not based on proof: He had faith that the hypothesis
would
>> be substantiated by fact.
>> 3. belief in God or in the doctrines or teachings of religion: the firm
faith
>> of the Pilgrims.
>> 4. belief in anything, as a code of ethics, standards of merit, etc.:
to
>> be of the same faith with someone concerning honesty.
>> 5. a system of religious belief: the Christian faith; the Jewish faith.
>> 6. the obligation of loyalty or fidelity to a person, promise, engagement,
>> etc.: Failure to appear would be breaking faith.
>> 7. the observance of this obligation; fidelity to one's promise, oath,
allegiance,
>> etc.: He was the only one who proved his faith during our recent troubles.
>> 8. Christian Theology. the trust in God and in His promises as made through
>> Christ and the Scriptures by which humans are justified or saved.
>>
>> I don't see anything in there about risk. My point is that people can
do
>> the things you're talking about knowing full well they might fail, but
do
>> them anyway. That's taking a risk, not having faith. I don't have faith
but
>> I've taken lots of personal and professional risks in my life.
>>
>> TCB
>>
>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>> We can disagree about that but the first line is the dictionary definition.
>>>
>>> Cheers,
>>> -Jamie
>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>
>>>
>>> TCB wrote:
>>>> You're confusing 'faith' with 'a willingness to take risks.' Animals
take
>>>> risks, to get food, create more animals, etc., but I doubt they have
faith.

>>>> One needs no faith to start businesses, invest money, get married, etc.
>>
>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>> Faith is complete trust or confidence in something or someone. Religious
>>>>> faith is one form of faith but not the only definition of "faith."
>>>>>
>>>>> For example I have faith that if I drop a guitar pick it will find
its
>>
>>>>> way to the floor based on the gravitational attraction it has to the
>>
>>>>> planet. I have faith that I'll breathe my next breath, that I'll see
>>
>>>>> tomorrow morning. I have faith that other people are put together much
>>
>>>>> like I am and that I can therefore relate to other folks.
>>>>>
>>>>> Without faith, people would not invest money. Without faith people
would
>>>>> not vote. Without faith people would not start businesses, hire other
>>
>>>>> people, raise children. Without faith people would not ride trains,
fly
>>>>> in planes or drive cars. Without faith no one would investigate
>>>>> scientific questions about reality.
>>>>>
>>>>> While you can clearly have faith without religion, you cannot have

>>>>> religion without faith. Religion depends on faith that one or more

>>>>> deities (good and sometimes bad) exist, that their associated stories
>>
>>>>> actually occurred, and often, that there is some sort of afterlife.
>>>>>
>>>>> However, religious people believe in a variety of different deities.
>>
>>>>> Even those who believe in the same deity disagree, sometimes violently,
>>>>> about the nature of their deity. Religions sometimes even disagree
about
>>>>> the nature of reality. If you want to base morality strictly on
>>>>> religion, and you look around, you'll notice that religion can be a

>>>>> somewhat chaotic basis unless...
>>>>>
>>>>> Ah, you might say, I want to base morality on MY religion. Well, you
>>
>>>>> just dissed the majority of religions. No problem because THEY ARE

>>>>> WRONG. And people who believe in those religions may just be saying
the
>>>>> same thing about you and your religion. For those religions who are
not
>>>>> tolerant of other ideas, you may just have started a war.
>>>>>
>>>>> So perhaps it's BETTER, in our time, to have a system of justice that
>> is
>>>>> NOT based on a religion. But one which guarantees everyone the right
>> to
>>>>> practice the religion of their choice, guarantees other freedoms such
>> as
>>>>> we in the USA do in our Bill of Rights, encourages honesty and
>>>>> integrity, while enforcing some common sense limits such as no human
>>
>>>>> sacrifices, a minimum age for marriage, no incest, no slavery, no
>>>>> murder, no rape, no stealing, those sorts of things.
>>>>>
>>>>> What is viewed as morality beyond a fair justice system and common
sense
>>>>> rules of behavior can be left to each freely chosen religion to sort
>>
>>>>> out, like whether to restrict diet in some way, whether to wear a
>>>>> certain type of clothing, how to pray, etc. But none of these additional
>>>>> practices should be imposed on society as a whole.
>>>>>
>>>>> The Golden Rule may also be of use as a basic moral foundation.
>>>>>
>>>>> So yes, you can have a moral system, one that BTW protects the freedom
>>
>>>>> to practice religious beliefs (or not), without basing it on any one
>>
>>>>> religion. And it can protect all religions better than a system based
>> on
>>>>> any one religion (AKA a theocracy).
>>>>>
>>>>> There are other issues surrounding religions, such as the many examples
>>>>> of selfless dedication to helping others on the one hand, and hijacked
>>
>>>>> religions used to legitimize earthly power structures in other cases.
>>
>>>>> Dedric, I look forward to talking with you about the positives and

>>>>> negatives of various religions, and where a moral culture ought to
go
>>
>>>> >from here, whenever we next get together.
>>>>> Cheers,

>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>>>>> Hey Jimmy,
>>>>>>
>>>>>> No doubt one can be a good person without believing in God - there
are
>>>> tons
>>>>>> of great people with no faith, or very little. That in and of itself
>>>> tells
>>>>>> me there must be a God so even non-believers would have a strong sense
>>>> of
>>>>>> right and wrong on a societal and even global level.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> To walk through some thoughts: with no God, or higher reference point,
>>>> what
>>>>>> would be considered moral, or at least good? What would one use to
>> decide
>>>>>> what is right and wrong?
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Laws? Most would agree that we can't legislate morality now, so with
>>>> no
>>>>>> basis for what morality is, why would we even bother with laws since
>>>>>> everyone would make their own choices anyway?
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Intellect? That would simply depend on what one chose to accept as
>>>>>> "intelligent" thought, based completely on opinion.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Reasoning and Logic? Logic is determined by a hypothesis that has
a
>> proven
>>>>>> outcome in a given situation. Change the situation, and the reasoning
>>>> or
>>>>>> logic behind the "right" or "wrong" could easily change.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Experience? What if one's experience is filled with hatred, abuse,
>> anger
>>>>>> and violence, or worse? Then someone would have to decide whose experience
>>>>>> we would use as a reference point. There would be no guarantee that
>> person
>>>>>> or persons had experiences that would be best for the good of the
whole.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Survival instinct? If it were a reference point, then stealing, lying,
>>>>>> cheating and even killing would be perfectly justified as those can
>> be

>>>> means
>>>>>> of survival.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Why would right and wrong even exist? I would think that the differences
>>>>>> between societies' definitions of right and wrong, assuming societies
>>>> even
>>>>>> existed, would be so drastic we would never have ventured into any
form
>>>> of
>>>>>> inter-cultural/inter-geographic interaction, much less relationships,
>>>>>> diplomacy, collaboration, trade, and open travel.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual, they aren't
>>>>>> absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes to make
>>>> the
>>>>>> choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There would only
>> be
>>>> an
>>>>>> ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at the time,
>> and
>>>>>> based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from person
to
>> person,
>>>>>> day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons would either
>>>> be
>>>>>> filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time because
>>>> their
>>>>>> choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we wouldn't
>> have
>>>>>> prisons, or likely even organized societies.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> But is the majority always right? How would we know if there were
no
>>>>>> absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?
>>>>>>
>>>>>> If there were no right and wrong, there would be no consequences of
>> either,
>>>>>> or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad consequence
>>>> - it
>>>>>> would just be another event in time.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice, both
in
>> whether
>>>>>> to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong decisions. With
>>>> moral
>>>>>> absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to evaluate drastically
>>>>>> differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency in reasoning

>>>>>> and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry. Even
when
>>>> we
>>>>>> choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without that option
>>>> to
>>>>>> choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would be no
power
>>>> in
>>>>>> choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal and
loving
>>>> God
>>>>>> rather than a dictator or puppet master.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see God in
the
>>>> way
>>>>>> that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can discuss
>>>>>> completely opposing opinions and still care enough to consider insulting,
>>>>>> belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable concept;
>>>> and 2)
>>>>>> in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely trump
greed
>>>> and
>>>>>> power in importance to life and survival together on this planet.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>>
>>>>>> On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy"
>>>>>> <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have a strong
>>>> morals
>>>>>>> is absurd, I think.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Jimmy
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
>>>>>>> news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...
>>>>>>>> Gene -
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your response
>> pretty
>>>>>>>> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country and
even
>>>> the
>>>>>>>> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict, violence

>> and
>>>>>>>> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single largest
>>>>>>>> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world. We ignore
>>>> car
>>>>>>>> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of tortured
>> and
>>>>>>>> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming the
>>>>>>>> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made the
Pope
>>>> quote
>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening, all-accepting
>> religion
>>>>>>>> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western Muslims
>>>> might
>>>>>>>> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else in
many
>>>> of
>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have talked
>> to,
>>>> and
>>>>>>>> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a different
>>>> world
>>>>>>>> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have here.
>>>>>>> People
>>>>>>>> die for converting to anything else, or their families do. At best,
>>>> their
>>>>>>>> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under threat
>>>> of
>>>>>>>> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our country
>>>>>>>> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on our
own
>>>>>>> country
>>>>>>>> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to this
kind
>>>> of
>>>>>>>> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically correct
thing
>>>> to
>>>>>>>> do.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God, and
>> hence
>>>>>>> any
>>>>>>>> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the choice

to
>> believe
>>>>>>>> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name of
Allah
>>>> the
>>>>>>>> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10 commandments
>> in
>>>> 24
>>>>>>>> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there is
a
>> sad,
>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should fear
>> -
>>>> it's
>>>>>>>> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's personal
whims
>>>> that
>>>>>>>> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day. That
>>>> also
>>>>>>>> includes believing in nothing.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in God
and
>>>> is
>>>>>>>> wrong, at worst one has lived a good live and had some false hope
>> as
>>>> a
>>>>>>> sense
>>>>>>>> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is wrong,
then
>>>> at
>>>>>>>> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we should
>>>> be
>>>>>>>> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that the
President
>>>>>>>> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief really
>>>> better
>>>>>>>> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong accompanies
>>>>>>> disbelief
>>>>>>>> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference point
>> for
>>>>>>>> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of belief
in
>> any
>>>>>>>> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion for
others?
>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a guy Islam
>>>>>>> doesn't
>>>>>>>> like just because he called like he saw it - something we do on
this
>>>> forum
>>>>>>>> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's intent
>> to
>>>> take
>>>>>>>> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only goal
is
>> to
>>>> give
>>>>>>>> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to not
>> believe
>>>>>>>> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity from public
>>>>>>> view.
>>>>>>>> The only way to force someone to remove their belief from public
in
>>>> a
>>>>>>>> country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes, is to
>> outlaw
>>>>>>> it.
>>>>>>>> Yet another paradox.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see the world
>>>> as a
>>>>>>>> black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party always
>> wins
>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>> the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any validity
>>>> in
>>>>>>>> believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to maintain
the
>>>>>>> balance
>>>>>>>> that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust in
the
>>>> very
>>>>>>>> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most fallible
>>>>>>>> characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic ideology.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of 10 hours
>>>> of
>>>>>>> work
>>>>>>>> :-((....
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Regards,

>>>>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70$1@linux, "gene Lennon"
>>>>>>>> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread -...
>>>>>>>>> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the current
>>>>>>>>> administration
>>>>>>>>> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based reasons
>>>> for
>>>>>>>>> perusing
>>>>>>>>> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier motivation.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Religion.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third Great
>>>>>>> Awakening"
>>>>>>>>> of the international religious struggle. This is a good thing as
>> he
>>>> sees
>>>>>>>>> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight against
>>>>>>> terrorists
>>>>>>>>> (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war that
he
>>>>>>> depicts
>>>>>>>>> as "a confrontation between good and evil."
>>>>>>>>> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit of
trouble
>>>>>>> (as
>>>>>>>>> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be headed?
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could easily
>> go
>>>>>>> down
>>>>>>>>> hill from here.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> More on the "Third Awakening":
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09 /12/AR2006091201
>>>>>>> 59
>>>>>>>>> 4_pf.html
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Gene
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>> `

>>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Deej [1] on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 04:14:57 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:450f3862@linux...
>
> Neither, actually. And what we ought to do would depend on the nature of
> the threat.

Agreed.

>
> We might want to start with recommendations published in 1999, well
> before the 9/11 attack.
>
> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Commission_on_Terroris m
>
> We can disagree about whether our current policy is one of overreacting
> or not. We can probably really disagree about the newly minted
> preemptive attack policy. :^)

I don't think there is any newly minted attack policy. There has always been the *clear and present danger* perogative but it needs to be based on accurate intelligence. Had this been available, then I doubt that Bush, Kerry, Kennedy Pelosi and the rest would have authorized the invasion of Iraq, or perhaps they would have been able to find the WMD's before they were shipped out of the country or hidden. I just find it hard to stomach the hypocracy of the democrats whose policies neutered our intelligence services in the '90's when they trun around and blame Bush for the decisions made based on the intellegence blunders they created in the first place.

Regards,

Deej

>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>
> DJ wrote:
> > I don't see us overreacting Jamie. However, if there is indication of
some

> > sort of major threat, do we run and tell the NY times or do we blow the
> > threat away before it pays us a visit?
> >
> >
> > "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:450f0b12@linux...
> >> Of course they came out with a blustery ultimatum. That's not news,
it's
> >> an old pattern. It works for them to sit back and suggest that others
do
> >> something via terror-grams such as this. If it makes you afraid as
well,
> >> my guess is they would see that as a bonus.
> >>
> >> By goading the USA into overreacting it helps them grow, raise money
and
> >> convince others to actually see us as evil and act accordingly. It
> >> works, we keep falling for it. OTOH, for those here with a declared
> >> interest in emptying the US treasury, it's likewise beneficial to have
> >> the specter of an enemy out there. Fear sells.
> >>
> >> We have yet to actually declare war on anyone in this whole mess. How
do
> >> you declare war on a tactic?
> >>
> >> Forced conversion and head taxes would go over like a lead balloon in
> >> the USA. Not gonna happen. We're far more sectarian than, say, Iraq.
> >>
> >> Responsible leadership is needed in the world to calm extremist
> >> tendencies on all sides and help rational people who are trying to get
> >> by in worsening times. At the same time we need to be, and are
> >> attempting to be, vigilant against any self righteous group with
> >> fantasies of violence in the USA.
> >>
> >> Any rush to some sort of "holy war" is irrational. There is nothing
holy
> >> about war.
> >>
> >> Cheers,
> >> -Jamie
> >> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >> DJ wrote:
> >>> I haven't seen us react with irrationality.....yet. Al Quaeda
> > just
> >>> came out with an ultimatim stating that it's full on war now and the
> > west

> >>> will be destroyed. The only way to save ourselves is to convert to
> > Islam. So
> >>> where to you draw the line between irrationality and self defense?
> >>>
> >>>
> >>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
news:450ee7ef@linux...
> >>>> Let's keep from reacting to irrationality with irrationality of our
> > own.
> >>>> There's a lot of fear mongering. Chicken Little is back.
> >>>>
> >>>> Cheers,
> >>>> -Jamie
> >>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>> DJ wrote:
> >>>>> It doesn't matter at all whether this was the Pope. The bottom line
is
> >>> that
> >>>>> it is rationality as opposed to irrationality.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> > news:450ec970@linux...
> >>>>>> The Catholic church doesn't speak for Christianity. Certainly not
for
> >>>>>> Lutherans, and for good reason.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> A Pope criticizing other religions (even other Christian sects,
even
> >>>>>> other Catholics) is nothing new. Certainly much harsher things have
> >>> been
> >>>>>> said about Islam by some (not all) extreme fundamentalist
Christians.
> >>>>>> And certainly much harsher things have been said by certain
extremist
> >>>>>> Islamists about Christianity. The more extremist of both camps seem
> > to
> >>>>>> be spoiling to relive the crusades. With some of the more power
> > hungry
> >>>>>> ready to endanger civilization by attempting to incite religious
wars
> >>>>>> for their own questionable ends.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> It's a vast generalization to say the "the left" or "secularists"
or
> >>>>>> even "Christians" are demanding an apology from the Pope. I think a
> >>>>>> whole lot of people think the Pope can say whatever he wants. It

> >>> doesn't
> >>>>>> matter to most non-Catholics in the USA and in reality, Papal
> >>>>>> declarations are ignored by a fair number of Catholics here, too.
> >>>>>> Obviously some Moslems are upset in some places, but how deep does
> > that
> >>>>>> go? When black churches were burning in the USA, it would have been
> > an
> >>>>>> exaggeration to blame everyone in the USA for that.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church which only very
> >>>>>> recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo. The church hung
on
> >>>>>> tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view of the universe
> >>> while
> >>>>>> denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, which describes the
> >>>>>> actual way the solar system works.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> It also extends to a few Christian sects who, feeling similarly
> >>>>>> insecure, tenaciously cling to the notion that the earth is only
> > about
> >>>>>> 6,000 years old, by virtue of the biblical interpretations and
clever
> >>>>>> (at the time) calculations of an Irish Bishop several centuries
ago,
> >>> and
> >>>>>> in the face of solid current scientific evidence to the contrary.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some (not all) Christian churches
who,
> >>>>>> feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and ever-mounting
evidence
> >>> of
> >>>>>> evolution, responding with dogma in psuedo-scientific clothing, and
> > who
> >>>>>> seek to water down scientific education in the USA.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> The fear of reason extends to power hungry industries who pay big
> > bucks
> >>>>>> to spread denial about global warming for short term gain. Who push
> > to
> >>>>>> control oil in the middle east with force. With our guns blazing,
our
> >>>>>> soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically. And who
sometimes
> >>>>>> hide behind Christianity to do so.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives who find ways
to

> >>>>>> pretend that everyone is aligning against Christianity. And in
> >>> spreading
> >>>>>> this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to keep them in
power.
> >>>>>> And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of reason and the
> >>> focus
> >>>>>> on the use of force.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and declare
victory.
> >>> ;^)
> >>>>>> Have a great week!
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> Cheers,
> >>>>>> -Jamie
> >>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> DC wrote:
> >>>>>>> I thought this was worth reading if any of you are interested.
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> Have a great Monday!
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> ---------------------------------------
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> The Unholy Alliance Rolls Over the Pope
> >>>>>>> By Andrew Walden
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> In what has suddenly been made into a highly controversial

> >>>>>>> Regensberg, Pope Benedict describes Christian belief in a God
> >>>>>>> whose words and acts are bound by reason, truth and the law of
> >>>>>>> non-contradiction. Benedict contrasts this with Islamic belief

> >>>>>>> further contrasts Christian belief with that of secular humanists
> >>>>>>> who see reason as being completely unbound of God.
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> In response, both Islamists and secularists have demanded the

> >>>>>>> genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between
> >>>>>>> Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis of the clash
> >>>>>>> of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror. His
> >>>>>>> analysis also explains the underlying cause of the alliance
> >>>>>>> between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.
> >>>>>>> Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor Manuel

> >>>>>>> you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command

> >>>>>>>

> >>>>>>> unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top Shiite
> >>>>>>> cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling party
> >>>>>>> likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and accused him of
> >>>>>>> reviving the mentality of the Crusades.
> >>>>>>>

> >>>>>>> jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of rage that
> >>>>>>> many fear could burst into violent protests like those that

> >>>>>>>

> >>>>>>> safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.
> >>>>>>>

> >>>>>>> reaction is not one of anger but a calculated attempt to force
> >>>>>>> the Pope to parrot the PC line on Islam. Since Islam need not be

> >>>>>>> objective can be to assert the power of a God who is so
> >>>>>>> transcendent that He is not bound by anything. If man is created

> >>>>>>> anything. (This explains the predilection on the part of some

> >>>>>>> their non-existent morality. They are asserting the only

> >>>>>>>

> >>>>>>> is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist thought than

> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing precisely what

> >>>>>>> of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest mosque,

> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the Pope was,

> >>>>>>>

> >>>>>>> description of the Islamic God as being unbound by reason is not

> >>>>>>> an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What Muslims and

> >>>>>>> dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity. How dare he not

> >>>>>>>

> >>>>>>> being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to the point is
> >>>>>>> lost on them.
> >>>>>>>

> >>>>>>> this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists are waging a
> >>>>>>> propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension against

> >>>>>>> jihad, but not your violent jihad.
> >>>>>>>

> >>>>>>> side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more clear than in
> >>>>>>> the Islamist reaction to the Pope.
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November the Islamists
> >>>>>>> are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons and demand
> >>>>>>> to hear from the Pope himself. This would place raging mobs of
> >>>>>>> semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of forcing the
> >>>>>>> leader of Christendom to bow before them.
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> In this demand for submission they are joined by the secularist
> >>>>>>> mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times editorializes:

> >>>>>>> the secularists are driven only by their will to power. While
> >>>>>>> the Islamists represent their demented version of
> >>>>>>> God--unrestrained by reason, the secularists represent their
> >>>>>>> demented version of reason--unrestrained by God. They are united
> >>>>>>> by their self-worshipping world view.
> >>>>>>>

> >>>>>>> our categories, even that of rationality...(The Islamic) God is

> >>>>>>> Islam embraces this description. In offering this description of
> >>>>>>> Islam, Benedict refers to the views of leading modern French
> >>>>>>> Islamist R. Arnaldez as discussed in the writings of Professor

> >>>>>>> Theodore Khoury of Munster.
> >>>>>>>

> >>>>>>> decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he considers

> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> Benedict asserts that without reason, or without God, there can

> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> Both Islamist and secularist seek to break God and reason apart.
> >>>>>>> Each claims superiority over the Christian West. They believe
> >>>>>>> absolute moral license makes them powerful. As globalization
> >>>>>>> carries the Western tradition of reason throughout the world,
> >>>>>>> both are in decline.
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist and secularist

> >>>>>>> with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after the collapse
> >>>>>>> of the allied forces on the western front.
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear is having to

> >>>>>>> logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our partners in

> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> Their fear of reason can only lead the world to disaster.
> >>>>>>>
> >>>
> >
> >

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Jamie K on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 04:20:34 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Thanks for the link. It looks like it might be a more interesting read
than what you might expect of a book on probability theory.

Without risk management there would be no insurance.

Seems like we have some major risk management headaches ahead in the

foreign relations area. I don't have much faith that our current
government understands the situation or is capable of brokering a
lasting and beneficial peace.

Cheers,
  -Jamie
  http://www.JamieKrutz.com

TCB wrote:
> I never said faith was limited to religion _at all_ because that would be
> silly. I only bring this up because I think it's a very important point.
> Nearly every time you read 'without faith there would be no XXXXXXXX' it's
> just not true and XXXXXXXX can get along just fine without faith. Probably
> the best popular book about risk is called 'Against the Gods' and it's sort
> of about this very topic.
>
> http://www.amazon.com/Against-Gods-Remarkable-Story-Risk/dp/
0471295639/sr=8-1/qid=1158631839/ref=pd_bbs_1/002-2500887-29 81628?ie=UTF8&s=books
>
> TCB
>
> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>> There you go, clearly faith is not limited to religion. Although just as
>
>> clearly it's important for religion.
>>
>> As to risk, many people have faith that their risks will pan out. Some
>> people do things because they have such faith. I know people like that.
>
>> I am people like that. That doesn't preclude anyone from doing something
>
>> for some other reason, of course.
>>
>> If you want to say you don't have faith in anything, using any of the
>> definitions below, then that's your prerogative and I don't have a
>> problem with that.
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>> TCB wrote:
>>> Here's dictionary.com
>>>
>>> faith /feɪθ/ Pronunciation Key - Show Spelled Pronunciation[feyth]
>>> Pronunciation Key - Show IPA Pronunciation

>>> 1. confidence or trust in a person or thing: faith in another's ability.
>>> 2. belief that is not based on proof: He had faith that the hypothesis
> would
>>> be substantiated by fact.
>>> 3. belief in God or in the doctrines or teachings of religion: the firm
> faith
>>> of the Pilgrims.
>>> 4. belief in anything, as a code of ethics, standards of merit, etc.:
> to
>>> be of the same faith with someone concerning honesty.
>>> 5. a system of religious belief: the Christian faith; the Jewish faith.
>>> 6. the obligation of loyalty or fidelity to a person, promise, engagement,
>>> etc.: Failure to appear would be breaking faith.
>>> 7. the observance of this obligation; fidelity to one's promise, oath,
> allegiance,
>>> etc.: He was the only one who proved his faith during our recent troubles.
>>> 8. Christian Theology. the trust in God and in His promises as made through
>>> Christ and the Scriptures by which humans are justified or saved.
>>>
>>> I don't see anything in there about risk. My point is that people can
> do
>>> the things you're talking about knowing full well they might fail, but
> do
>>> them anyway. That's taking a risk, not having faith. I don't have faith
> but
>>> I've taken lots of personal and professional risks in my life.
>>>
>>> TCB
>>>
>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>> We can disagree about that but the first line is the dictionary definition.
>>>>
>>>> Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> TCB wrote:
>>>>> You're confusing 'faith' with 'a willingness to take risks.' Animals
> take
>>>>> risks, to get food, create more animals, etc., but I doubt they have
> faith.
>>>>> One needs no faith to start businesses, invest money, get married, etc.
>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>> Faith is complete trust or confidence in something or someone. Religious
>>>>>> faith is one form of faith but not the only definition of "faith."
>>>>>>

>>>>>> For example I have faith that if I drop a guitar pick it will find
> its
>>>>>> way to the floor based on the gravitational attraction it has to the
>>>>>> planet. I have faith that I'll breathe my next breath, that I'll see
>>>>>> tomorrow morning. I have faith that other people are put together much
>>>>>> like I am and that I can therefore relate to other folks.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Without faith, people would not invest money. Without faith people
> would
>>>>>> not vote. Without faith people would not start businesses, hire other
>>>>>> people, raise children. Without faith people would not ride trains,
> fly
>>>>>> in planes or drive cars. Without faith no one would investigate
>>>>>> scientific questions about reality.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> While you can clearly have faith without religion, you cannot have
>
>>>>>> religion without faith. Religion depends on faith that one or more
>
>>>>>> deities (good and sometimes bad) exist, that their associated stories
>>>>>> actually occurred, and often, that there is some sort of afterlife.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> However, religious people believe in a variety of different deities.
>>>>>> Even those who believe in the same deity disagree, sometimes violently,
>>>>>> about the nature of their deity. Religions sometimes even disagree
> about
>>>>>> the nature of reality. If you want to base morality strictly on
>>>>>> religion, and you look around, you'll notice that religion can be a
>
>>>>>> somewhat chaotic basis unless...
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Ah, you might say, I want to base morality on MY religion. Well, you
>>>>>> just dissed the majority of religions. No problem because THEY ARE
>
>>>>>> WRONG. And people who believe in those religions may just be saying
> the
>>>>>> same thing about you and your religion. For those religions who are
> not
>>>>>> tolerant of other ideas, you may just have started a war.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> So perhaps it's BETTER, in our time, to have a system of justice that
>>> is
>>>>>> NOT based on a religion. But one which guarantees everyone the right
>>> to
>>>>>> practice the religion of their choice, guarantees other freedoms such
>>> as
>>>>>> we in the USA do in our Bill of Rights, encourages honesty and
>>>>>> integrity, while enforcing some common sense limits such as no human

>>>>>> sacrifices, a minimum age for marriage, no incest, no slavery, no
>>>>>> murder, no rape, no stealing, those sorts of things.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> What is viewed as morality beyond a fair justice system and common
> sense
>>>>>> rules of behavior can be left to each freely chosen religion to sort
>>>>>> out, like whether to restrict diet in some way, whether to wear a
>>>>>> certain type of clothing, how to pray, etc. But none of these additional
>>>>>> practices should be imposed on society as a whole.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> The Golden Rule may also be of use as a basic moral foundation.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> So yes, you can have a moral system, one that BTW protects the freedom
>>>>>> to practice religious beliefs (or not), without basing it on any one
>>>>>> religion. And it can protect all religions better than a system based
>>> on
>>>>>> any one religion (AKA a theocracy).
>>>>>>
>>>>>> There are other issues surrounding religions, such as the many examples
>>>>>> of selfless dedication to helping others on the one hand, and hijacked
>>>>>> religions used to legitimize earthly power structures in other cases.
>>>>>> Dedric, I look forward to talking with you about the positives and
>
>>>>>> negatives of various religions, and where a moral culture ought to
> go
>>>>> >from here, whenever we next get together.
>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>>>>>> Hey Jimmy,
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> No doubt one can be a good person without believing in God - there
> are
>>>>> tons
>>>>>>> of great people with no faith, or very little. That in and of itself
>>>>> tells
>>>>>>> me there must be a God so even non-believers would have a strong sense
>>>>> of
>>>>>>> right and wrong on a societal and even global level.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> To walk through some thoughts: with no God, or higher reference point,
>>>>> what
>>>>>>> would be considered moral, or at least good? What would one use to
>>> decide
>>>>>>> what is right and wrong?

>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Laws? Most would agree that we can't legislate morality now, so with
>>>>> no
>>>>>>> basis for what morality is, why would we even bother with laws since
>>>>>>> everyone would make their own choices anyway?
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Intellect? That would simply depend on what one chose to accept as
>>>>>>> "intelligent" thought, based completely on opinion.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Reasoning and Logic? Logic is determined by a hypothesis that has
> a
>>> proven
>>>>>>> outcome in a given situation. Change the situation, and the reasoning
>>>>> or
>>>>>>> logic behind the "right" or "wrong" could easily change.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Experience? What if one's experience is filled with hatred, abuse,
>>> anger
>>>>>>> and violence, or worse? Then someone would have to decide whose experience
>>>>>>> we would use as a reference point. There would be no guarantee that
>>> person
>>>>>>> or persons had experiences that would be best for the good of the
> whole.
>>>>>>> Survival instinct? If it were a reference point, then stealing, lying,
>>>>>>> cheating and even killing would be perfectly justified as those can
>>> be
>>>>> means
>>>>>>> of survival.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Why would right and wrong even exist? I would think that the differences
>>>>>>> between societies' definitions of right and wrong, assuming societies
>>>>> even
>>>>>>> existed, would be so drastic we would never have ventured into any
> form
>>>>> of
>>>>>>> inter-cultural/inter-geographic interaction, much less relationships,
>>>>>>> diplomacy, collaboration, trade, and open travel.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual, they aren't
>>>>>>> absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes to make
>>>>> the
>>>>>>> choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There would only
>>> be
>>>>> an
>>>>>>> ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at the time,
>>> and
>>>>>>> based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from person
> to

>>> person,
>>>>>>> day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons would either
>>>>> be
>>>>>>> filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time because
>>>>> their
>>>>>>> choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we wouldn't
>>> have
>>>>>>> prisons, or likely even organized societies.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> But is the majority always right? How would we know if there were
> no
>>>>>>> absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> If there were no right and wrong, there would be no consequences of
>>> either,
>>>>>>> or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad consequence
>>>>> - it
>>>>>>> would just be another event in time.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice, both
> in
>>> whether
>>>>>>> to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong decisions. With
>>>>> moral
>>>>>>> absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to evaluate drastically
>>>>>>> differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency in reasoning
>>>>>>> and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry. Even
> when
>>>>> we
>>>>>>> choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without that option
>>>>> to
>>>>>>> choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would be no
> power
>>>>> in
>>>>>>> choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal and
> loving
>>>>> God
>>>>>>> rather than a dictator or puppet master.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see God in
> the
>>>>> way
>>>>>>> that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can discuss
>>>>>>> completely opposing opinions and still care enough to consider insulting,
>>>>>>> belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable concept;
>>>>> and 2)
>>>>>>> in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely trump
> greed

>>>>> and
>>>>>>> power in importance to life and survival together on this planet.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy"
>>>>>>> <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have a strong
>>>>> morals
>>>>>>>>> is absurd, I think.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Jimmy
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
>>>>>>>>> news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...
>>>>>>>>>> Gene -
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your response
>>> pretty
>>>>>>>>>> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country and
> even
>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict, violence
>>> and
>>>>>>>>>> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single largest
>>>>>>>>>> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world. We ignore
>>>>> car
>>>>>>>>>> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of tortured
>>> and
>>>>>>>>>> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming the
>>>>>>>>>> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made the
> Pope
>>>>> quote
>>>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>>> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening, all-accepting
>>> religion
>>>>>>>>>> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western Muslims
>>>>> might
>>>>>>>>>> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else in
> many
>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have talked

>>> to,
>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a different
>>>>> world
>>>>>>>>> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have here.
>>>>>>>> People
>>>>>>>>> die for converting to anything else, or their families do. At best,
>>>>> their
>>>>>>>>> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under threat
>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our country
>>>>>>>>> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on our
> own
>>>>>>>> country
>>>>>>>>> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to this
> kind
>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically correct
> thing
>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>> do.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God, and
>>> hence
>>>>>>>> any
>>>>>>>>> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the choice
> to
>>> believe
>>>>>>>>> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name of
> Allah
>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10 commandments
>>> in
>>>>> 24
>>>>>>>>> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there is
> a
>>> sad,
>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should fear
>>> -
>>>>> it's
>>>>>>>>> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's personal
> whims
>>>>> that
>>>>>>>>> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day. That
>>>>> also
>>>>>>>>> includes believing in nothing.
>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in God
> and
>>>>> is
>>>>>>>>> wrong, at worst one has lived a good live and had some false hope
>>> as
>>>>> a
>>>>>>>> sense
>>>>>>>>> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is wrong,
> then
>>>>> at
>>>>>>>>> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we should
>>>>> be
>>>>>>>>> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that the
> President
>>>>>>>>> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief really
>>>>> better
>>>>>>>>> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong accompanies
>>>>>>>> disbelief
>>>>>>>>> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference point
>>> for
>>>>>>>>> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of belief
> in
>>> any
>>>>>>>>> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion for
> others?
>>>>>>>>> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a guy Islam
>>>>>>>> doesn't
>>>>>>>>> like just because he called like he saw it - something we do on
> this
>>>>> forum
>>>>>>>>> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's intent
>>> to
>>>>> take
>>>>>>>>> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only goal
> is
>>> to
>>>>> give
>>>>>>>>> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to not
>>> believe
>>>>>>>>> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity from public
>>>>>>>> view.
>>>>>>>>> The only way to force someone to remove their belief from public
> in
>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>> country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes, is to
>>> outlaw
>>>>>>>> it.
>>>>>>>>> Yet another paradox.

>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see the world
>>>>> as a
>>>>>>>>> black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party always
>>> wins
>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>> the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any validity
>>>>> in
>>>>>>>>> believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to maintain
> the
>>>>>>>>> balance
>>>>>>>>> that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust in
> the
>>>>> very
>>>>>>>>> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most fallible
>>>>>>>>> characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic ideology.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of 10 hours
>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>> work
>>>>>>>>> :-((....
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70$1@linux, "gene Lennon"
>>>>>>>>> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread -...
>>>>>>>>>> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the current
>>>>>>>>>> administration
>>>>>>>>>> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based reasons
>>>>> for
>>>>>>>>>> perusing
>>>>>>>>>> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier motivation.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Religion.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third Great
>>>>>>>>> Awakening"
>>>>>>>>>> of the international religious struggle. This is a good thing as
>>> he
>>>>> sees
>>>>>>>>>> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight against
>>>>>>>>> terrorists

>>>>>>>>>> (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war that
> he
>>>>>>>> depicts
>>>>>>>>>> as "a confrontation between good and evil."
>>>>>>>>>> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit of
> trouble
>>>>>>>> (as
>>>>>>>>>> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be headed?
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could easily
>>> go
>>>>>>>> down
>>>>>>>>>> hill from here.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> More on the "Third Awakening":
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09 /12/AR2006091201
>>>>>>>> 59
>>>>>>>>>> 4_pf.html
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Gene
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>> `
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by gene lennon on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 04:50:34 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"Uptown Jimmy" <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:

>And speaking of Iraq, how the hell are we ever gonna spare the man-power
to
>fight other countries while we are so severely over-taxed in Iraq? Is it
any
>accident that Iran has been so loud and obnoxious recently? They know we
are
>compromised tactically. They laugh loud and long every day at our current
>difficulties.
>Jimmy
>

will be going into Iran soon. Military capacity or not. :-(
Gene

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by ulfiyya on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 05:11:22 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

for ... many times poeple.
THIS IS NOT A POLITIK SITE!!!
This is ...Paris site (Music) Remember...

Keep youre Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>
>Thanks for the link. It looks like it might be a more interesting read
>than what you might expect of a book on probability theory.
>
>Without risk management there would be no insurance.
>
>Seems like we have some major risk management headaches ahead in the
>foreign relations area. I don't have much faith that our current
>government understands the situation or is capable of brokering a
>lasting and beneficial peace.
>
>Cheers,
> -Jamie
> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>
>TCB wrote:
>> I never said faith was limited to religion _at all_ because that would
be
>> silly. I only bring this up because I think it's a very important point.
>> Nearly every time you read 'without faith there would be no XXXXXXXX'
it's
>> just not true and XXXXXXXX can get along just fine without faith. Probably
>> the best popular book about risk is called 'Against the Gods' and it's
sort
>> of about this very topic.
>>
>> http://www.amazon.com/Against-Gods-Remarkable-Story-Risk/dp/
0471295639/sr=8-1/qid=1158631839/ref=pd_bbs_1/002-2500887-29 81628?ie=UTF8&s=books
>>
>> TCB
>>
>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>> There you go, clearly faith is not limited to religion. Although just
as
>>
>>> clearly it's important for religion.
>>>

>>> As to risk, many people have faith that their risks will pan out. Some

>>> people do things because they have such faith. I know people like that.
>>
>>> I am people like that. That doesn't preclude anyone from doing something
>>
>>> for some other reason, of course.
>>>
>>> If you want to say you don't have faith in anything, using any of the

>>> definitions below, then that's your prerogative and I don't have a
>>> problem with that.
>>>
>>> Cheers,
>>> -Jamie
>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>
>>>
>>> TCB wrote:
>>>> Here's dictionary.com
>>>>
>>>> faith /feɪθ/ Pronunciation Key - Show Spelled Pronunciation[feyth]
>>>> Pronunciation Key - Show IPA Pronunciation

>>>> 1. confidence or trust in a person or thing: faith in another's ability.
>>>> 2. belief that is not based on proof: He had faith that the hypothesis
>> would
>>>> be substantiated by fact.
>>>> 3. belief in God or in the doctrines or teachings of religion: the firm
>> faith
>>>> of the Pilgrims.
>>>> 4. belief in anything, as a code of ethics, standards of merit, etc.:
>> to
>>>> be of the same faith with someone concerning honesty.
>>>> 5. a system of religious belief: the Christian faith; the Jewish faith.
>>>> 6. the obligation of loyalty or fidelity to a person, promise, engagement,
>>>> etc.: Failure to appear would be breaking faith.
>>>> 7. the observance of this obligation; fidelity to one's promise, oath,
>> allegiance,
>>>> etc.: He was the only one who proved his faith during our recent troubles.
>>>> 8. Christian Theology. the trust in God and in His promises as made
through
>>>> Christ and the Scriptures by which humans are justified or saved.
>>>>
>>>> I don't see anything in there about risk. My point is that people can
>> do
>>>> the things you're talking about knowing full well they might fail, but
>> do

>>>> them anyway. That's taking a risk, not having faith. I don't have faith
>> but
>>>> I've taken lots of personal and professional risks in my life.
>>>>
>>>> TCB
>>>>
>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>> We can disagree about that but the first line is the dictionary definition.
>>>>>
>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> TCB wrote:
>>>>>> You're confusing 'faith' with 'a willingness to take risks.' Animals
>> take
>>>>>> risks, to get food, create more animals, etc., but I doubt they have
>> faith.
>>>>>> One needs no faith to start businesses, invest money, get married,
etc.
>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>> Faith is complete trust or confidence in something or someone. Religious
>>>>>>> faith is one form of faith but not the only definition of "faith."
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> For example I have faith that if I drop a guitar pick it will find
>> its
>>>>>>> way to the floor based on the gravitational attraction it has to
the
>>>>>>> planet. I have faith that I'll breathe my next breath, that I'll
see
>>>>>>> tomorrow morning. I have faith that other people are put together
much
>>>>>>> like I am and that I can therefore relate to other folks.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Without faith, people would not invest money. Without faith people
>> would
>>>>>>> not vote. Without faith people would not start businesses, hire other
>>>>>>> people, raise children. Without faith people would not ride trains,
>> fly
>>>>>>> in planes or drive cars. Without faith no one would investigate
>>>>>>> scientific questions about reality.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> While you can clearly have faith without religion, you cannot have
>>
>>>>>>> religion without faith. Religion depends on faith that one or more
>>
>>>>>>> deities (good and sometimes bad) exist, that their associated stories

>>>>>>> actually occurred, and often, that there is some sort of afterlife.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> However, religious people believe in a variety of different deities.
>>>>>>> Even those who believe in the same deity disagree, sometimes violently,
>>>>>>> about the nature of their deity. Religions sometimes even disagree
>> about
>>>>>>> the nature of reality. If you want to base morality strictly on
>>>>>>> religion, and you look around, you'll notice that religion can be
a
>>
>>>>>>> somewhat chaotic basis unless...
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Ah, you might say, I want to base morality on MY religion. Well,
you
>>>>>>> just dissed the majority of religions. No problem because THEY ARE
>>
>>>>>>> WRONG. And people who believe in those religions may just be saying
>> the
>>>>>>> same thing about you and your religion. For those religions who are
>> not
>>>>>>> tolerant of other ideas, you may just have started a war.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> So perhaps it's BETTER, in our time, to have a system of justice
that
>>>> is
>>>>>>> NOT based on a religion. But one which guarantees everyone the right
>>>> to
>>>>>>> practice the religion of their choice, guarantees other freedoms
such
>>>> as
>>>>>>> we in the USA do in our Bill of Rights, encourages honesty and
>>>>>>> integrity, while enforcing some common sense limits such as no human
>>>>>>> sacrifices, a minimum age for marriage, no incest, no slavery, no

>>>>>>> murder, no rape, no stealing, those sorts of things.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> What is viewed as morality beyond a fair justice system and common
>> sense
>>>>>>> rules of behavior can be left to each freely chosen religion to sort
>>>>>>> out, like whether to restrict diet in some way, whether to wear a

>>>>>>> certain type of clothing, how to pray, etc. But none of these additional
>>>>>>> practices should be imposed on society as a whole.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> The Golden Rule may also be of use as a basic moral foundation.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> So yes, you can have a moral system, one that BTW protects the freedom
>>>>>>> to practice religious beliefs (or not), without basing it on any

one
>>>>>>> religion. And it can protect all religions better than a system based
>>>> on
>>>>>>> any one religion (AKA a theocracy).
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> There are other issues surrounding religions, such as the many examples
>>>>>>> of selfless dedication to helping others on the one hand, and hijacked
>>>>>>> religions used to legitimize earthly power structures in other cases.
>>>>>>> Dedric, I look forward to talking with you about the positives and
>>
>>>>>>> negatives of various religions, and where a moral culture ought to
>> go
>>>>>> >from here, whenever we next get together.
>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>>>>>>> Hey Jimmy,
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> No doubt one can be a good person without believing in God - there
>> are
>>>>>> tons
>>>>>>>> of great people with no faith, or very little. That in and of itself
>>>>>> tells
>>>>>>>> me there must be a God so even non-believers would have a strong
sense
>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>> right and wrong on a societal and even global level.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> To walk through some thoughts: with no God, or higher reference
point,
>>>>>> what
>>>>>>>> would be considered moral, or at least good? What would one use
to
>>>> decide
>>>>>>>> what is right and wrong?
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Laws? Most would agree that we can't legislate morality now, so
with
>>>>>> no
>>>>>>>> basis for what morality is, why would we even bother with laws since
>>>>>>>> everyone would make their own choices anyway?
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Intellect? That would simply depend on what one chose to accept
as
>>>>>>>> "intelligent" thought, based completely on opinion.

>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Reasoning and Logic? Logic is determined by a hypothesis that has
>> a
>>>> proven
>>>>>>>> outcome in a given situation. Change the situation, and the reasoning
>>>>>> or
>>>>>>>> logic behind the "right" or "wrong" could easily change.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Experience? What if one's experience is filled with hatred, abuse,
>>>> anger
>>>>>>>> and violence, or worse? Then someone would have to decide whose
experience
>>>>>>>> we would use as a reference point. There would be no guarantee
that
>>>> person
>>>>>>>> or persons had experiences that would be best for the good of the
>> whole.
>>>>>>>> Survival instinct? If it were a reference point, then stealing,
lying,
>>>>>>>> cheating and even killing would be perfectly justified as those
can
>>>> be
>>>>>> means
>>>>>>>> of survival.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Why would right and wrong even exist? I would think that the differences
>>>>>>>> between societies' definitions of right and wrong, assuming societies
>>>>>> even
>>>>>>>> existed, would be so drastic we would never have ventured into any
>> form
>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>> inter-cultural/inter-geographic interaction, much less relationships,
>>>>>>>> diplomacy, collaboration, trade, and open travel.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual, they aren't
>>>>>>>> absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes to
make
>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>> choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There would only
>>>> be
>>>>>> an
>>>>>>>> ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at the time,
>>>> and
>>>>>>>> based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from person
>> to
>>>> person,
>>>>>>>> day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons would either
>>>>>> be

>>>>>>>> filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time because
>>>>>> their
>>>>>>>> choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we wouldn't
>>>> have
>>>>>>>> prisons, or likely even organized societies.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> But is the majority always right? How would we know if there were
>> no
>>>>>>>> absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> If there were no right and wrong, there would be no consequences
of
>>>> either,
>>>>>>>> or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad consequence
>>>>>> - it
>>>>>>>> would just be another event in time.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice, both
>> in
>>>> whether
>>>>>>>> to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong decisions.
 With
>>>>>> moral
>>>>>>>> absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to evaluate
drastically
>>>>>>>> differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency in
reasoning
>>>>>>>> and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry. Even
>> when
>>>>>> we
>>>>>>>> choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without that option
>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>> choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would be
no
>> power
>>>>>> in
>>>>>>>> choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal and
>> loving
>>>>>> God
>>>>>>>> rather than a dictator or puppet master.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see God
in
>> the
>>>>>> way
>>>>>>>> that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can discuss
>>>>>>>> completely opposing opinions and still care enough to consider insulting,
>>>>>>>> belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable concept;

>>>>>> and 2)
>>>>>>>> in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely trump
>> greed
>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>> power in importance to life and survival together on this planet.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy"
>>>>>>>> <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have a
strong
>>>>>> morals
>>>>>>>>> is absurd, I think.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Jimmy
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
>>>>>>>>> news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...
>>>>>>>>>> Gene -
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your response
>>>> pretty
>>>>>>>>>> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country and
>> even
>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict, violence
>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single largest
>>>>>>>>>> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world. We
ignore
>>>>>> car
>>>>>>>>>> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of tortured
>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming the
>>>>>>>>>> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made the
>> Pope
>>>>>> quote
>>>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>>> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening, all-accepting
>>>> religion
>>>>>>>>>> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western Muslims
>>>>>>>> might

>>>>>>>>>> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else
in
>> many
>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have talked
>>>> to,
>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a different
>>>>>> world
>>>>>>>>>> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have
here.
>>>>>>>>> People
>>>>>>>>>> die for converting to anything else, or their families do. At
best,
>>>>>> their
>>>>>>>>>> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under threat
>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our country
>>>>>>>>>> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on our
>> own
>>>>>>>>> country
>>>>>>>>>> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to this
>> kind
>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically correct
>> thing
>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>> do.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God,
and
>>>> hence
>>>>>>>>> any
>>>>>>>>>> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the choice
>> to
>>>> believe
>>>>>>>>>> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name
of
>> Allah
>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10 commandments
>>>> in
>>>>>> 24
>>>>>>>>>> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there
is
>> a
>>>> sad,

>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should fear
>>>> -
>>>>>> it's
>>>>>>>>>> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's personal
>> whims
>>>>>> that
>>>>>>>>>> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day.
 That
>>>>>> also
>>>>>>>>>> includes believing in nothing.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in God
>> and
>>>>>> is
>>>>>>>>>> wrong, at worst one has lived a good live and had some false hope
>>>> as
>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>>> sense
>>>>>>>>>> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is wrong,
>> then
>>>>>> at
>>>>>>>>>> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we should
>>>>>> be
>>>>>>>>>> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that the
>> President
>>>>>>>>>> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief really
>>>>>> better
>>>>>>>>>> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong accompanies
>>>>>>>>> disbelief
>>>>>>>>>> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference point
>>>> for
>>>>>>>>>> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of belief
>> in
>>>> any
>>>>>>>>>> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion for
>> others?
>>>>>>>>>> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a guy
Islam
>>>>>>>>> doesn't
>>>>>>>>>> like just because he called like he saw it - something we do on
>> this
>>>>>> forum
>>>>>>>>>> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's intent
>>>> to
>>>>>> take
>>>>>>>>>> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only goal
>> is

>>>> to
>>>>>> give
>>>>>>>>>> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to
not
>>>> believe
>>>>>>>>>> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity from
public
>>>>>>>>> view.
>>>>>>>>>> The only way to force someone to remove their belief from public
>> in
>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>>> country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes, is
to
>>>> outlaw
>>>>>>>>> it.
>>>>>>>>>> Yet another paradox.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see the
world
>>>>>> as a
>>>>>>>>>> black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party always
>>>> wins
>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>> the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any validity
>>>>>> in
>>>>>>>>>> believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to maintain
>> the
>>>>>>>>> balance
>>>>>>>>>> that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust in
>> the
>>>>>> very
>>>>>>>>>> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most fallible
>>>>>>>>>> characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic ideology.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of 10
hours
>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>> work
>>>>>>>>>> :-((....
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70$1@linux, "gene Lennon"
>>>>>>>>>> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread
-...
>>>>>>>>>>> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the current
>>>>>>>>>>> administration
>>>>>>>>>>> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based reasons
>>>>>> for
>>>>>>>>>>> perusing
>>>>>>>>>>> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier motivation.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> Religion.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third Great
>>>>>>>>> Awakening"
>>>>>>>>>>> of the international religious struggle. This is a good thing
as
>>>> he
>>>>>>> sees
>>>>>>>>>>> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight against
>>>>>>>>> terrorists
>>>>>>>>>>> (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war that
>> he
>>>>>>>>> depicts
>>>>>>>>>>> as "a confrontation between good and evil."
>>>>>>>>>>> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit of
>> trouble
>>>>>>>>> (as
>>>>>>>>>>> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be headed?
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could easily
>>>> go
>>>>>>>>> down
>>>>>>>>>>> hill from here.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> More on the "Third Awakening":
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09 /12/AR2006091201
>>>>>>>>> 59
>>>>>>>>>>> 4_pf.html
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> Gene
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> `
>>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Jamie K on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 06:22:59 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

There is plenty of finger pointing to go around. No doubt specific
things could have been handled better under the previous government.

The transition of power between the previous and current governments was
pretty rocky, and a "not invented here" syndrome may have doomed the
hand-off of some al-Qaida related work that was in progress.

In any case, no government gets a pass by blaming the previous
government. The current government, for example, failed to follow
through and prioritize the al-Qaida threat ahead of 9/11 and failed to
prevent 9/11; failed to find and capture Bin Laden in Afghanistan;
failed to overcome Taliban control of large areas of Afghanistan;
allowed record drug production to reestablish itself there; failed to
plan for post Iraq invasion problems predicted by their own state
department; and they have continually exploited the "war on terrorism"
for domestic political ends.

You assert the WMDs were there. However Bush's chief inspector, and Bush
himself, say they weren't there after all. It was a bluff. One of the
Iraqi expatriate promoters of the bluff got the ear of our government,
was believed, and, last I heard, had parlayed it into a position of
power in Iraq after the invasion.

The dems you mentioned authorized the military attack on Iraq as a last
resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done as such.

Preemptive invasion is new as part of the "Bush (Jr.) Doctrine."

Cheers,
-Jamie
http://www.JamieKrutz.com

DJ wrote:
> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:450f3862@linux...
>> Neither, actually. And what we ought to do would depend on the nature of
>> the threat.
>
> Agreed.
>
>> We might want to start with recommendations published in 1999, well
>> before the 9/11 attack.
>>
>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Commission_on_Terroris m
>>

>> We can disagree about whether our current policy is one of overreacting
>> or not. We can probably really disagree about the newly minted
>> preemptive attack policy. :^)
>
> I don't think there is any newly minted attack policy. There has always been
> the *clear and present danger* perogative but it needs to be based on
> accurate intelligence. Had this been available, then I doubt that Bush,
> Kerry, Kennedy Pelosi and the rest would have authorized the invasion of
> Iraq, or perhaps they would have been able to find the WMD's before they
> were shipped out of the country or hidden. I just find it hard to stomach
> the hypocracy of the democrats whose policies neutered our intelligence
> services in the '90's when they trun around and blame Bush for the decisions
> made based on the intellegence blunders they created in the first place.
>
> Regards,
>
> Deej
>
>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>> DJ wrote:
>>> I don't see us overreacting Jamie. However, if there is indication of
> some
>>> sort of major threat, do we run and tell the NY times or do we blow the
>>> threat away before it pays us a visit?
>>>
>>>
>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:450f0b12@linux...
>>>> Of course they came out with a blustery ultimatum. That's not news,
> it's
>>>> an old pattern. It works for them to sit back and suggest that others
> do
>>>> something via terror-grams such as this. If it makes you afraid as
> well,
>>>> my guess is they would see that as a bonus.
>>>>
>>>> By goading the USA into overreacting it helps them grow, raise money
> and
>>>> convince others to actually see us as evil and act accordingly. It
>>>> works, we keep falling for it. OTOH, for those here with a declared
>>>> interest in emptying the US treasury, it's likewise beneficial to have
>>>> the specter of an enemy out there. Fear sells.
>>>>
>>>> We have yet to actually declare war on anyone in this whole mess. How

> do
>>>> you declare war on a tactic?
>>>>
>>>> Forced conversion and head taxes would go over like a lead balloon in
>>>> the USA. Not gonna happen. We're far more sectarian than, say, Iraq.
>>>>
>>>> Responsible leadership is needed in the world to calm extremist
>>>> tendencies on all sides and help rational people who are trying to get
>>>> by in worsening times. At the same time we need to be, and are
>>>> attempting to be, vigilant against any self righteous group with
>>>> fantasies of violence in the USA.
>>>>
>>>> Any rush to some sort of "holy war" is irrational. There is nothing
> holy
>>>> about war.
>>>>
>>>> Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> DJ wrote:
>>>>> I haven't seen us react with irrationality.....yet. Al Quaeda
>>> just
>>>>> came out with an ultimatim stating that it's full on war now and the
>>> west
>>>>> will be destroyed. The only way to save ourselves is to convert to
>>> Islam. So
>>>>> where to you draw the line between irrationality and self defense?
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> news:450ee7ef@linux...
>>>>>> Let's keep from reacting to irrationality with irrationality of our
>>> own.
>>>>>> There's a lot of fear mongering. Chicken Little is back.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> DJ wrote:
>>>>>>> It doesn't matter at all whether this was the Pope. The bottom line
> is
>>>>> that
>>>>>>> it is rationality as opposed to irrationality.

>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
>>> news:450ec970@linux...
>>>>>>>> The Catholic church doesn't speak for Christianity. Certainly not
> for
>>>>>>>> Lutherans, and for good reason.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> A Pope criticizing other religions (even other Christian sects,
> even
>>>>>>>> other Catholics) is nothing new. Certainly much harsher things have
>>>>> been
>>>>>>>> said about Islam by some (not all) extreme fundamentalist
> Christians.
>>>>>>>> And certainly much harsher things have been said by certain
> extremist
>>>>>>>> Islamists about Christianity. The more extremist of both camps seem
>>> to
>>>>>>>> be spoiling to relive the crusades. With some of the more power
>>> hungry
>>>>>>>> ready to endanger civilization by attempting to incite religious
> wars
>>>>>>>> for their own questionable ends.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> It's a vast generalization to say the "the left" or "secularists"
> or
>>>>>>>> even "Christians" are demanding an apology from the Pope. I think a
>>>>>>>> whole lot of people think the Pope can say whatever he wants. It
>>>>> doesn't
>>>>>>>> matter to most non-Catholics in the USA and in reality, Papal
>>>>>>>> declarations are ignored by a fair number of Catholics here, too.
>>>>>>>> Obviously some Moslems are upset in some places, but how deep does
>>> that
>>>>>>>> go? When black churches were burning in the USA, it would have been
>>> an
>>>>>>>> exaggeration to blame everyone in the USA for that.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church which only very
>>>>>>>> recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo. The church hung
> on
>>>>>>>> tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view of the universe
>>>>> while
>>>>>>>> denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, which describes the
>>>>>>>> actual way the solar system works.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> It also extends to a few Christian sects who, feeling similarly
>>>>>>>> insecure, tenaciously cling to the notion that the earth is only
>>> about
>>>>>>>> 6,000 years old, by virtue of the biblical interpretations and

> clever
>>>>>>>> (at the time) calculations of an Irish Bishop several centuries
> ago,
>>>>> and
>>>>>>>> in the face of solid current scientific evidence to the contrary.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some (not all) Christian churches
> who,
>>>>>>>> feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and ever-mounting
> evidence
>>>>> of
>>>>>>>> evolution, responding with dogma in psuedo-scientific clothing, and
>>> who
>>>>>>>> seek to water down scientific education in the USA.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to power hungry industries who pay big
>>> bucks
>>>>>>>> to spread denial about global warming for short term gain. Who push
>>> to
>>>>>>>> control oil in the middle east with force. With our guns blazing,
> our
>>>>>>>> soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically. And who
> sometimes
>>>>>>>> hide behind Christianity to do so.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives who find ways
> to
>>>>>>>> pretend that everyone is aligning against Christianity. And in
>>>>> spreading
>>>>>>>> this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to keep them in
> power.
>>>>>>>> And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of reason and the
>>>>> focus
>>>>>>>> on the use of force.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and declare
> victory.
>>>>> ;^)
>>>>>>>> Have a great week!
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> DC wrote:
>>>>>>>>> I thought this was worth reading if any of you are interested.
>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> Have a great Monday!
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> ---------------------------------------
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> The Unholy Alliance Rolls Over the Pope
>>>>>>>>> By Andrew Walden
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> In what has suddenly been made into a highly controversial

>>>>>>>>> Regensberg, Pope Benedict describes Christian belief in a God
>>>>>>>>> whose words and acts are bound by reason, truth and the law of
>>>>>>>>> non-contradiction. Benedict contrasts this with Islamic belief

>>>>>>>>> further contrasts Christian belief with that of secular humanists
>>>>>>>>> who see reason as being completely unbound of God.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> In response, both Islamists and secularists have demanded the

>>>>>>>>> genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between
>>>>>>>>> Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis of the clash
>>>>>>>>> of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror. His
>>>>>>>>> analysis also explains the underlying cause of the alliance
>>>>>>>>> between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.
>>>>>>>>> Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor Manuel

>>>>>>>>> you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top Shiite
>>>>>>>>> cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling party
>>>>>>>>> likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and accused him of
>>>>>>>>> reviving the mentality of the Crusades.
>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of rage that
>>>>>>>>> many fear could burst into violent protests like those that

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.
>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> reaction is not one of anger but a calculated attempt to force
>>>>>>>>> the Pope to parrot the PC line on Islam. Since Islam need not be

>>>>>>>>> objective can be to assert the power of a God who is so
>>>>>>>>> transcendent that He is not bound by anything. If man is created

>>>>>>>>> anything. (This explains the predilection on the part of some

>>>>>>>>> their non-existent morality. They are asserting the only

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist thought than

>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing precisely what

>>>>>>>>> of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest mosque,

>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the Pope was,

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> description of the Islamic God as being unbound by reason is not
>>>>>>>>> an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What Muslims and

>>>>>>>>> dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity. How dare he not

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to the point is
>>>>>>>>> lost on them.
>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists are waging a
>>>>>>>>> propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension against

>>>>>>>>> jihad, but not your violent jihad.
>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more clear than in
>>>>>>>>> the Islamist reaction to the Pope.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November the Islamists
>>>>>>>>> are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons and demand
>>>>>>>>> to hear from the Pope himself. This would place raging mobs of
>>>>>>>>> semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of forcing the
>>>>>>>>> leader of Christendom to bow before them.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> In this demand for submission they are joined by the secularist
>>>>>>>>> mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times editorializes:

>>>>>>>>> the secularists are driven only by their will to power. While
>>>>>>>>> the Islamists represent their demented version of
>>>>>>>>> God--unrestrained by reason, the secularists represent their
>>>>>>>>> demented version of reason--unrestrained by God. They are united
>>>>>>>>> by their self-worshipping world view.
>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> our categories, even that of rationality...(The Islamic) God is

>>>>>>>>> Islam embraces this description. In offering this description of
>>>>>>>>> Islam, Benedict refers to the views of leading modern French
>>>>>>>>> Islamist R. Arnaldez as discussed in the writings of Professor
>>>>>>>>> Theodore Khoury of Munster.
>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he considers

>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Benedict asserts that without reason, or without God, there can

>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Both Islamist and secularist seek to break God and reason apart.
>>>>>>>>> Each claims superiority over the Christian West. They believe
>>>>>>>>> absolute moral license makes them powerful. As globalization
>>>>>>>>> carries the Western tradition of reason throughout the world,
>>>>>>>>> both are in decline.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist and secularist

>>>>>>>>> with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after the collapse
>>>>>>>>> of the allied forces on the western front.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear is having to

>>>>>>>>> logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our partners in

>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Their fear of reason can only lead the world to disaster.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Tony Benson on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 16:31:50 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

With all due respect ulfiyya, the general consensus here is that anyone can discuss anything they feel like discussing. This group has morphed into more of a gathering place for PARIS users and former users. An online coffee house as such. The key for you is to simply skip the topics you don't want to read.

Tony

"ulfiyya" <ulfiyya@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:450f7bfa$1@linux...
>
> for ... many times poeple.
> THIS IS NOT A POLITIK SITE!!!
> This is ...Paris site (Music) Remember...
>
>
>
> Keep youre Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>
>>Thanks for the link. It looks like it might be a more interesting read
>>than what you might expect of a book on probability theory.
>>
>>Without risk management there would be no insurance.
>>
>>Seems like we have some major risk management headaches ahead in the
>>foreign relations area. I don't have much faith that our current
>>government understands the situation or is capable of brokering a

>>lasting and beneficial peace.
>>
>>Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>>TCB wrote:
>>> I never said faith was limited to religion _at all_ because that would
> be
>>> silly. I only bring this up because I think it's a very important point.
>>> Nearly every time you read 'without faith there would be no XXXXXXXX'
> it's
>>> just not true and XXXXXXXX can get along just fine without faith.
>>> Probably
>>> the best popular book about risk is called 'Against the Gods' and it's
> sort
>>> of about this very topic.
>>>
>>> http://www.amazon.com/Against-Gods-Remarkable-Story-Risk/dp/
0471295639/sr=8-1/qid=1158631839/ref=pd_bbs_1/002-2500887-29 81628?ie=UTF8&s=books
>>>
>>> TCB
>>>
>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>> There you go, clearly faith is not limited to religion. Although just
> as
>>>
>>>> clearly it's important for religion.
>>>>
>>>> As to risk, many people have faith that their risks will pan out. Some
>
>>>> people do things because they have such faith. I know people like that.
>>>
>>>> I am people like that. That doesn't preclude anyone from doing
>>>> something
>>>
>>>> for some other reason, of course.
>>>>
>>>> If you want to say you don't have faith in anything, using any of the
>
>>>> definitions below, then that's your prerogative and I don't have a
>>>> problem with that.
>>>>
>>>> Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>

>>>>
>>>> TCB wrote:
>>>>> Here's dictionary.com
>>>>>
>>>>> faith /feɪθ/ Pronunciation Key - Show Spelled
>>>>> Pronunciation[feyth]
>>>>> Pronunciation Key - Show IPA Pronunciation
>>>>> -noun
>>>>> 1. confidence or trust in a person or thing: faith in another's
>>>>> ability.
>>>>> 2. belief that is not based on proof: He had faith that the hypothesis
>>> would
>>>>> be substantiated by fact.
>>>>> 3. belief in God or in the doctrines or teachings of religion: the
>>>>> firm
>>> faith
>>>>> of the Pilgrims.
>>>>> 4. belief in anything, as a code of ethics, standards of merit, etc.:
>>> to
>>>>> be of the same faith with someone concerning honesty.
>>>>> 5. a system of religious belief: the Christian faith; the Jewish
>>>>> faith.
>>>>> 6. the obligation of loyalty or fidelity to a person, promise,
>>>>> engagement,
>>>>> etc.: Failure to appear would be breaking faith.
>>>>> 7. the observance of this obligation; fidelity to one's promise, oath,
>>> allegiance,
>>>>> etc.: He was the only one who proved his faith during our recent
>>>>> troubles.
>>>>> 8. Christian Theology. the trust in God and in His promises as made
> through
>>>>> Christ and the Scriptures by which humans are justified or saved.
>>>>>
>>>>> I don't see anything in there about risk. My point is that people can
>>> do
>>>>> the things you're talking about knowing full well they might fail, but
>>> do
>>>>> them anyway. That's taking a risk, not having faith. I don't have
>>>>> faith
>>> but
>>>>> I've taken lots of personal and professional risks in my life.
>>>>>
>>>>> TCB
>>>>>
>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>> We can disagree about that but the first line is the dictionary
>>>>>> definition.
>>>>>>

>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> TCB wrote:
>>>>>>> You're confusing 'faith' with 'a willingness to take risks.' Animals
>>> take
>>>>>>> risks, to get food, create more animals, etc., but I doubt they have
>>> faith.
>>>>>>> One needs no faith to start businesses, invest money, get married,
> etc.
>>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>> Faith is complete trust or confidence in something or someone.
>>>>>>>> Religious
>>>>>>>> faith is one form of faith but not the only definition of "faith."
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> For example I have faith that if I drop a guitar pick it will find
>>> its
>>>>>>>> way to the floor based on the gravitational attraction it has to
> the
>>>>>>>> planet. I have faith that I'll breathe my next breath, that I'll
> see
>>>>>>>> tomorrow morning. I have faith that other people are put together
> much
>>>>>>>> like I am and that I can therefore relate to other folks.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Without faith, people would not invest money. Without faith people
>>> would
>>>>>>>> not vote. Without faith people would not start businesses, hire
>>>>>>>> other
>>>>>>>> people, raise children. Without faith people would not ride trains,
>>> fly
>>>>>>>> in planes or drive cars. Without faith no one would investigate
>>>>>>>> scientific questions about reality.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> While you can clearly have faith without religion, you cannot have
>>>
>>>>>>>> religion without faith. Religion depends on faith that one or more
>>>
>>>>>>>> deities (good and sometimes bad) exist, that their associated
>>>>>>>> stories
>>>>>>>> actually occurred, and often, that there is some sort of afterlife.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> However, religious people believe in a variety of different
>>>>>>>> deities.
>>>>>>>> Even those who believe in the same deity disagree, sometimes
>>>>>>>> violently,

>>>>>>>> about the nature of their deity. Religions sometimes even disagree
>>> about
>>>>>>>> the nature of reality. If you want to base morality strictly on
>>>>>>>> religion, and you look around, you'll notice that religion can be
> a
>>>
>>>>>>>> somewhat chaotic basis unless...
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Ah, you might say, I want to base morality on MY religion. Well,
> you
>>>>>>>> just dissed the majority of religions. No problem because THEY ARE
>>>
>>>>>>>> WRONG. And people who believe in those religions may just be saying
>>> the
>>>>>>>> same thing about you and your religion. For those religions who are
>>> not
>>>>>>>> tolerant of other ideas, you may just have started a war.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> So perhaps it's BETTER, in our time, to have a system of justice
> that
>>>>> is
>>>>>>>> NOT based on a religion. But one which guarantees everyone the
>>>>>>>> right
>>>>> to
>>>>>>>> practice the religion of their choice, guarantees other freedoms
> such
>>>>> as
>>>>>>>> we in the USA do in our Bill of Rights, encourages honesty and
>>>>>>>> integrity, while enforcing some common sense limits such as no
>>>>>>>> human
>>>>>>>> sacrifices, a minimum age for marriage, no incest, no slavery, no
>
>>>>>>>> murder, no rape, no stealing, those sorts of things.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> What is viewed as morality beyond a fair justice system and common
>>> sense
>>>>>>>> rules of behavior can be left to each freely chosen religion to
>>>>>>>> sort
>>>>>>>> out, like whether to restrict diet in some way, whether to wear a
>
>>>>>>>> certain type of clothing, how to pray, etc. But none of these
>>>>>>>> additional
>>>>>>>> practices should be imposed on society as a whole.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> The Golden Rule may also be of use as a basic moral foundation.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> So yes, you can have a moral system, one that BTW protects the
>>>>>>>> freedom

>>>>>>>> to practice religious beliefs (or not), without basing it on any
> one
>>>>>>>> religion. And it can protect all religions better than a system
>>>>>>>> based
>>>>> on
>>>>>>>> any one religion (AKA a theocracy).
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> There are other issues surrounding religions, such as the many
>>>>>>>> examples
>>>>>>>> of selfless dedication to helping others on the one hand, and
>>>>>>>> hijacked
>>>>>>>> religions used to legitimize earthly power structures in other
>>>>>>>> cases.
>>>>>>>> Dedric, I look forward to talking with you about the positives and
>>>
>>>>>>>> negatives of various religions, and where a moral culture ought to
>>> go
>>>>>>> >from here, whenever we next get together.
>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>>>>>>>> Hey Jimmy,
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> No doubt one can be a good person without believing in God - there
>>> are
>>>>>>> tons
>>>>>>>>> of great people with no faith, or very little. That in and of
>>>>>>>>> itself
>>>>>>> tells
>>>>>>>>> me there must be a God so even non-believers would have a strong
> sense
>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>> right and wrong on a societal and even global level.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> To walk through some thoughts: with no God, or higher reference
> point,
>>>>>>> what
>>>>>>>>> would be considered moral, or at least good? What would one use
> to
>>>>> decide
>>>>>>>>> what is right and wrong?
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Laws? Most would agree that we can't legislate morality now, so
> with
>>>>>>> no

>>>>>>>>> basis for what morality is, why would we even bother with laws
>>>>>>>>> since
>>>>>>>>> everyone would make their own choices anyway?
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Intellect? That would simply depend on what one chose to accept
> as
>>>>>>>>> "intelligent" thought, based completely on opinion.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Reasoning and Logic? Logic is determined by a hypothesis that has
>>> a
>>>>> proven
>>>>>>>>> outcome in a given situation. Change the situation, and the
>>>>>>>>> reasoning
>>>>>>> or
>>>>>>>>> logic behind the "right" or "wrong" could easily change.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Experience? What if one's experience is filled with hatred,
>>>>>>>>> abuse,
>>>>> anger
>>>>>>>>> and violence, or worse? Then someone would have to decide whose
> experience
>>>>>>>>> we would use as a reference point. There would be no guarantee
> that
>>>>> person
>>>>>>>>> or persons had experiences that would be best for the good of the
>>> whole.
>>>>>>>>> Survival instinct? If it were a reference point, then stealing,
> lying,
>>>>>>>>> cheating and even killing would be perfectly justified as those
> can
>>>>> be
>>>>>>> means
>>>>>>>>> of survival.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Why would right and wrong even exist? I would think that the
>>>>>>>>> differences
>>>>>>>>> between societies' definitions of right and wrong, assuming
>>>>>>>>> societies
>>>>>>> even
>>>>>>>>> existed, would be so drastic we would never have ventured into any
>>> form
>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>> inter-cultural/inter-geographic interaction, much less
>>>>>>>>> relationships,
>>>>>>>>> diplomacy, collaboration, trade, and open travel.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual, they
>>>>>>>>> aren't

>>>>>>>>> absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes to
> make
>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>> choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There would
>>>>>>>>> only
>>>>> be
>>>>>>> an
>>>>>>>>> ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at the
>>>>>>>>> time,
>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>> based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from person
>>> to
>>>>> person,
>>>>>>>>> day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons would
>>>>>>>>> either
>>>>>>> be
>>>>>>>>> filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time
>>>>>>>>> because
>>>>>>> their
>>>>>>>>> choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we
>>>>>>>>> wouldn't
>>>>> have
>>>>>>>>> prisons, or likely even organized societies.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> But is the majority always right? How would we know if there were
>>> no
>>>>>>>>> absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> If there were no right and wrong, there would be no consequences
> of
>>>>> either,
>>>>>>>>> or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad
>>>>>>>>> consequence
>>>>>>> - it
>>>>>>>>> would just be another event in time.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice, both
>>> in
>>>>> whether
>>>>>>>>> to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong decisions.
> With
>>>>>>> moral
>>>>>>>>> absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to evaluate
> drastically
>>>>>>>>> differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency in
> reasoning
>>>>>>>>> and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry. Even
>>> when

>>>>>>> we
>>>>>>>> choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without that
>>>>>>>> option
>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>> choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would be
> no
>>> power
>>>>>>> in
>>>>>>>> choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal and
>>> loving
>>>>>>> God
>>>>>>>> rather than a dictator or puppet master.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see God
> in
>>> the
>>>>>>> way
>>>>>>>> that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can
>>>>>>>> discuss
>>>>>>>> completely opposing opinions and still care enough to consider
>>>>>>>> insulting,
>>>>>>>> belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable
>>>>>>>> concept;
>>>>>>> and 2)
>>>>>>>> in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely trump
>>> greed
>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>> power in importance to life and survival together on this planet.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy"
>>>>>>>> <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have a
> strong
>>>>>>> morals
>>>>>>>>> is absurd, I think.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Jimmy
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
>>>>>>>>> news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...
>>>>>>>>>> Gene -
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your

>>>>>>>>>>> response
>>>>> pretty
>>>>>>>>>>> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country and
>>> even
>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict,
>>>>>>>>>>> violence
>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single
>>>>>>>>>>> largest
>>>>>>>>>>> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world. We
> ignore
>>>>>>> car
>>>>>>>>>>> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of
>>>>>>>>>>> tortured
>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming the
>>>>>>>>>>> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made the
>>> Pope
>>>>>>> quote
>>>>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>>>> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening,
>>>>>>>>>>> all-accepting
>>>>> religion
>>>>>>>>>>> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western
>>>>>>>>>>> Muslims
>>>>>>> might
>>>>>>>>>>> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else
> in
>>> many
>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have
>>>>>>>>>>> talked
>>>>> to,
>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a
>>>>>>>>>>> different
>>>>>>> world
>>>>>>>>>>> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have
> here.
>>>>>>>>>> People
>>>>>>>>>>> die for converting to anything else, or their families do. At
> best,
>>>>>>> their
>>>>>>>>>>> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under

>>>>>>>>>>> threat
>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our
>>>>>>>>>>> country
>>>>>>>>>>> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on our
>>> own
>>>>>>>>>> country
>>>>>>>>>>> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to this
>>> kind
>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically correct
>>> thing
>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>>> do.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God,
> and
>>>>> hence
>>>>>>>>>> any
>>>>>>>>>>> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the choice
>>> to
>>>>> believe
>>>>>>>>>>> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name
> of
>>> Allah
>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10
>>>>>>>>>>> commandments
>>>>> in
>>>>>>> 24
>>>>>>>>>>> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there
> is
>>> a
>>>>> sad,
>>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should
>>>>>>>>>>> fear
>>>>> -
>>>>>>> it's
>>>>>>>>>>> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's personal
>>> whims
>>>>>>> that
>>>>>>>>>>> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day.
> That
>>>>>>> also
>>>>>>>>>>> includes believing in nothing.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in God

>>> and
>>>>>>> is
>>>>>>>>>> wrong, at worst one has lived a good live and had some false
>>>>>>>>>> hope
>>>>> as
>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>> sense
>>>>>>>>>> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is wrong,
>>> then
>>>>>>> at
>>>>>>>>>> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we
>>>>>>>>>> should
>>>>>>> be
>>>>>>>>>> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that the
>>> President
>>>>>>>>>> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief
>>>>>>>>>> really
>>>>>>> better
>>>>>>>>>> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong
>>>>>>>>>> accompanies
>>>>>>>>> disbelief
>>>>>>>>>> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference
>>>>>>>>>> point
>>>>> for
>>>>>>>>>> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of belief
>>> in
>>>>> any
>>>>>>>>>> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion for
>>> others?
>>>>>>>>>> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a guy
> Islam
>>>>>>>>> doesn't
>>>>>>>>>> like just because he called like he saw it - something we do on
>>> this
>>>>>>> forum
>>>>>>>>>> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's
>>>>>>>>>> intent
>>>>> to
>>>>>>> take
>>>>>>>>>> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only goal
>>> is
>>>>> to
>>>>>>> give
>>>>>>>>>> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to
> not
>>>>> believe
>>>>>>>>>> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity from
> public

>>>>>>>>>> view.
>>>>>>>>>> The only way to force someone to remove their belief from public
>>> in
>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>>> country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes, is
> to
>>>>> outlaw
>>>>>>>>>> it.
>>>>>>>>>> Yet another paradox.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see the
> world
>>>>>>> as a
>>>>>>>>>> black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party
>>>>>>>>>> always
>>>>> wins
>>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>> the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any
>>>>>>>>>> validity
>>>>>>> in
>>>>>>>>>> believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to maintain
>>> the
>>>>>>>>>> balance
>>>>>>>>>> that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust in
>>> the
>>>>>>> very
>>>>>>>>>> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most fallible
>>>>>>>>>> characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic
>>>>>>>>>> ideology.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of 10
> hours
>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>> work
>>>>>>>>>> :-((....
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70$1@linux, "gene Lennon"
>>>>>>>>>> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread
> -...
>>>>>>>>>> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the

>>>>>>>>>>>> current
>>>>>>>>>>>> administration
>>>>>>>>>>>> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based
>>>>>>>>>>>> reasons
>>>>>>> for
>>>>>>>>>>>> perusing
>>>>>>>>>>>> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier
>>>>>>>>>>>> motivation.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> Religion.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third
>>>>>>>>>>>> Great
>>>>>>>>>> Awakening"
>>>>>>>>>>>> of the international religious struggle. This is a good thing
> as
>>>>> he
>>>>>>> sees
>>>>>>>>>>>> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight
>>>>>>>>>>>> against
>>>>>>>>>> terrorists
>>>>>>>>>>>> (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war that
>>> he
>>>>>>>>>> depicts
>>>>>>>>>>>> as "a confrontation between good and evil."
>>>>>>>>>>>> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit of
>>> trouble
>>>>>>>>>> (as
>>>>>>>>>>>> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be
>>>>>>>>>>>> headed?
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could
>>>>>>>>>>>> easily
>>>>>> go
>>>>>>>>>> down
>>>>>>>>>>>> hill from here.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> More on the "Third Awakening":
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09 /12/AR2006091201
>>>>>>>>>> 59
>>>>>>>>>>>> 4_pf.html
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> Gene
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> `

>>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Deej [1] on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 17:23:10 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

The dems you mentioned authorized the military attack on Iraq as a last
resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done as such.

How convenient for them when it was the intelligence service that they
created over 8 years of hard work that they now attempt to slag and blame
for their decisdions so they can vote for the war before they vote against
it.

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:450f8aec@linux...
>
> There is plenty of finger pointing to go around. No doubt specific
> things could have been handled better under the previous government.
>
> The transition of power between the previous and current governments was
> pretty rocky, and a "not invented here" syndrome may have doomed the
> hand-off of some al-Qaida related work that was in progress.
>
> In any case, no government gets a pass by blaming the previous
> government. The current government, for example, failed to follow
> through and prioritize the al-Qaida threat ahead of 9/11 and failed to
> prevent 9/11; failed to find and capture Bin Laden in Afghanistan;
> failed to overcome Taliban control of large areas of Afghanistan;
> allowed record drug production to reestablish itself there; failed to
> plan for post Iraq invasion problems predicted by their own state
> department; and they have continually exploited the "war on terrorism"
> for domestic political ends.
>
> You assert the WMDs were there. However Bush's chief inspector, and Bush
> himself, say they weren't there after all. It was a bluff. One of the
> Iraqi expatriate promoters of the bluff got the ear of our government,
> was believed, and, last I heard, had parlayed it into a position of
> power in Iraq after the invasion.
>
> The dems you mentioned authorized the military attack on Iraq as a last
> resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done as such.
>
> Preemptive invasion is new as part of the "Bush (Jr.) Doctrine."
>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie

> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>
> DJ wrote:
> > "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:450f3862@linux...
> >> Neither, actually. And what we ought to do would depend on the nature
of
> >> the threat.
> >
> > Agreed.
> >
> >> We might want to start with recommendations published in 1999, well
> >> before the 9/11 attack.
> >>
> >> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Commission_on_Terroris m
> >>
> >> We can disagree about whether our current policy is one of overreacting
> >> or not. We can probably really disagree about the newly minted
> >> preemptive attack policy. :^)
> >
> > I don't think there is any newly minted attack policy. There has always
been
> > the *clear and present danger* perogative but it needs to be based on
> > accurate intelligence. Had this been available, then I doubt that Bush,
> > Kerry, Kennedy Pelosi and the rest would have authorized the invasion of
> > Iraq, or perhaps they would have been able to find the WMD's before they
> > were shipped out of the country or hidden. I just find it hard to
stomach
> > the hypocracy of the democrats whose policies neutered our intelligence
> > services in the '90's when they trun around and blame Bush for the
decisions
> > made based on the intellegence blunders they created in the first place.
> >
> > Regards,
> >
> > Deej
> >
> >
> >> Cheers,
> >> -Jamie
> >> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >>
> >>
> >> DJ wrote:
> >>> I don't see us overreacting Jamie. However, if there is indication of
> > some
> >>> sort of major threat, do we run and tell the NY times or do we blow
the

> >>> threat away before it pays us a visit?
> >>>
> >>>
> >>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
news:450f0b12@linux...
> >>>> Of course they came out with a blustery ultimatum. That's not news,
> > it's
> >>>> an old pattern. It works for them to sit back and suggest that others
> > do
> >>>> something via terror-grams such as this. If it makes you afraid as
> > well,
> >>>> my guess is they would see that as a bonus.
> >>>>
> >>>> By goading the USA into overreacting it helps them grow, raise money
> > and
> >>>> convince others to actually see us as evil and act accordingly. It
> >>>> works, we keep falling for it. OTOH, for those here with a declared
> >>>> interest in emptying the US treasury, it's likewise beneficial to
have
> >>>> the specter of an enemy out there. Fear sells.
> >>>>
> >>>> We have yet to actually declare war on anyone in this whole mess. How
> > do
> >>>> you declare war on a tactic?
> >>>>
> >>>> Forced conversion and head taxes would go over like a lead balloon in
> >>>> the USA. Not gonna happen. We're far more sectarian than, say, Iraq.
> >>>>
> >>>> Responsible leadership is needed in the world to calm extremist
> >>>> tendencies on all sides and help rational people who are trying to
get
> >>>> by in worsening times. At the same time we need to be, and are
> >>>> attempting to be, vigilant against any self righteous group with
> >>>> fantasies of violence in the USA.
> >>>>
> >>>> Any rush to some sort of "holy war" is irrational. There is nothing
> > holy
> >>>> about war.
> >>>>
> >>>> Cheers,
> >>>> -Jamie
> >>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>> DJ wrote:
> >>>>> I haven't seen us react with irrationality.....yet. Al
Quaeda

> >>> just
> >>>>> came out with an ultimatim stating that it's full on war now and the
> >>> west
> >>>>> will be destroyed. The only way to save ourselves is to convert to
> >>> Islam. So
> >>>>> where to you draw the line between irrationality and self defense?
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> > news:450ee7ef@linux...
> >>>>>> Let's keep from reacting to irrationality with irrationality of our
> >>> own.
> >>>>>> There's a lot of fear mongering. Chicken Little is back.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> Cheers,
> >>>>>> -Jamie
> >>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> DJ wrote:
> >>>>>>> It doesn't matter at all whether this was the Pope. The bottom
line
> > is
> >>>>> that
> >>>>>>> it is rationality as opposed to irrationality.
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> >>> news:450ec970@linux...
> >>>>>>>> The Catholic church doesn't speak for Christianity. Certainly not
> > for
> >>>>>>>> Lutherans, and for good reason.
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>> A Pope criticizing other religions (even other Christian sects,
> > even
> >>>>>>>> other Catholics) is nothing new. Certainly much harsher things
have
> >>>>> been
> >>>>>>>> said about Islam by some (not all) extreme fundamentalist
> > Christians.
> >>>>>>>> And certainly much harsher things have been said by certain
> > extremist
> >>>>>>>> Islamists about Christianity. The more extremist of both camps
seem
> >>> to
> >>>>>>>> be spoiling to relive the crusades. With some of the more power
> >>> hungry
> >>>>>>>> ready to endanger civilization by attempting to incite religious
> > wars

> >>>>>>>> for their own questionable ends.
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>> It's a vast generalization to say the "the left" or "secularists"
> > or
> >>>>>>>> even "Christians" are demanding an apology from the Pope. I think
a
> >>>>>>>> whole lot of people think the Pope can say whatever he wants. It
> >>>>> doesn't
> >>>>>>>> matter to most non-Catholics in the USA and in reality, Papal
> >>>>>>>> declarations are ignored by a fair number of Catholics here, too.
> >>>>>>>> Obviously some Moslems are upset in some places, but how deep
does
> >>> that
> >>>>>>>> go? When black churches were burning in the USA, it would have
been
> >>> an
> >>>>>>>> exaggeration to blame everyone in the USA for that.
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church which only very
> >>>>>>>> recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo. The church
hung
> > on
> >>>>>>>> tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view of the
universe
> >>>>> while
> >>>>>>>> denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, which describes
the
> >>>>>>>> actual way the solar system works.
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>> It also extends to a few Christian sects who, feeling similarly
> >>>>>>>> insecure, tenaciously cling to the notion that the earth is only
> >>> about
> >>>>>>>> 6,000 years old, by virtue of the biblical interpretations and
> > clever
> >>>>>>>> (at the time) calculations of an Irish Bishop several centuries
> > ago,
> >>>>> and
> >>>>>>>> in the face of solid current scientific evidence to the contrary.
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some (not all) Christian churches
> > who,
> >>>>>>>> feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and ever-mounting
> > evidence
> >>>>> of
> >>>>>>>> evolution, responding with dogma in psuedo-scientific clothing,
and
> >>> who
> >>>>>>>> seek to water down scientific education in the USA.

> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to power hungry industries who pay big
> >>> bucks
> >>>>>>>> to spread denial about global warming for short term gain. Who
push
> >>> to
> >>>>>>>> control oil in the middle east with force. With our guns blazing,
> > our
> >>>>>>>> soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically. And who
> > sometimes
> >>>>>>>> hide behind Christianity to do so.
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives who find ways
> > to
> >>>>>>>> pretend that everyone is aligning against Christianity. And in
> >>>>> spreading
> >>>>>>>> this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to keep them in
> > power.
> >>>>>>>> And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of reason and
the
> >>>>> focus
> >>>>>>>> on the use of force.
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>> Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and declare
> > victory.
> >>>>> ;^)
> >>>>>>>> Have a great week!
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>> Cheers,
> >>>>>>>> -Jamie
> >>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>> DC wrote:
> >>>>>>>>> I thought this was worth reading if any of you are interested.
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> Have a great Monday!
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> ---------------------------------------
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> The Unholy Alliance Rolls Over the Pope
> >>>>>>>>> By Andrew Walden
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> In what has suddenly been made into a highly controversial

> >>>>>>>>> Regensberg, Pope Benedict describes Christian belief in a God
> >>>>>>>>> whose words and acts are bound by reason, truth and the law of

> >>>>>>>>> non-contradiction. Benedict contrasts this with Islamic belief

Benedict
> >>>>>>>>> further contrasts Christian belief with that of secular
humanists
> >>>>>>>>> who see reason as being completely unbound of God.
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> In response, both Islamists and secularists have demanded the

> >>>>>>>>> genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between
> >>>>>>>>> Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis of the clash
> >>>>>>>>> of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror. His
> >>>>>>>>> analysis also explains the underlying cause of the alliance
> >>>>>>>>> between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.
> >>>>>>>>> Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor Manuel

> >>>>>>>>> you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command

> >>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>> unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top Shiite
> >>>>>>>>> cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling party
> >>>>>>>>> likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and accused him of
> >>>>>>>>> reviving the mentality of the Crusades.
> >>>>>>>>>

and
> >>>>>>>>> jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of rage that
> >>>>>>>>> many fear could burst into violent protests like those that

> >>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>> safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.
> >>>>>>>>>

The
> >>>>>>>>> reaction is not one of anger but a calculated attempt to force
> >>>>>>>>> the Pope to parrot the PC line on Islam. Since Islam need not be

> >>>>>>>>> objective can be to assert the power of a God who is so
> >>>>>>>>> transcendent that He is not bound by anything. If man is created

> >>>>>>>>> anything. (This explains the predilection on the part of some

to
> >>>>>>>>> their non-existent morality. They are asserting the only

> >>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>> is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist thought
than

> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing precisely what

> >>>>>>>>> of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest mosque,

to

> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the Pope was,

> >>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>> description of the Islamic God as being unbound by reason is not
> >>>>>>>>> an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What Muslims and

> >>>>>>>>> dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity. How dare he not

> >>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>> being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to the point is
> >>>>>>>>> lost on them.
> >>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>> this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists are waging a
> >>>>>>>>> propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension against

> >>>>>>>>> jihad, but not your violent jihad.
> >>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>> side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more clear than in
> >>>>>>>>> the Islamist reaction to the Pope.
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November the

Islamists
> >>>>>>>>> are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons and demand
> >>>>>>>>> to hear from the Pope himself. This would place raging mobs of
> >>>>>>>>> semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of forcing the
> >>>>>>>>> leader of Christendom to bow before them.
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> In this demand for submission they are joined by the secularist
> >>>>>>>>> mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times
editorializes:

> >>>>>>>>> the secularists are driven only by their will to power. While
> >>>>>>>>> the Islamists represent their demented version of
> >>>>>>>>> God--unrestrained by reason, the secularists represent their
> >>>>>>>>> demented version of reason--unrestrained by God. They are
united
> >>>>>>>>> by their self-worshipping world view.
> >>>>>>>>>

of
> >>>>>>>>> our categories, even that of rationality...(The Islamic) God is

insult.
> >>>>>>>>> Islam embraces this description. In offering this description
of
> >>>>>>>>> Islam, Benedict refers to the views of leading modern French
> >>>>>>>>> Islamist R. Arnaldez as discussed in the writings of Professor
> >>>>>>>>> Theodore Khoury of Munster.
> >>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>> decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he considers

> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> Benedict asserts that without reason, or without God, there can

> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> Both Islamist and secularist seek to break God and reason apart.
> >>>>>>>>> Each claims superiority over the Christian West. They believe
> >>>>>>>>> absolute moral license makes them powerful. As globalization
> >>>>>>>>> carries the Western tradition of reason throughout the world,
> >>>>>>>>> both are in decline.
> >>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>> Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist and secularist

> >>>>>>>>> with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after the collapse
> >>>>>>>>> of the allied forces on the western front.
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear is having to

or

great
> >>>>>>>>> logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our partners in

> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> Their fear of reason can only lead the world to disaster.
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>
> >
> >

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by rick on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 18:00:51 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

i nominate you for john's diplomat search..props to you...damn, i
wasn't going to enter this fray...

On Tue, 19 Sep 2006 11:31:50 -0500, "Tony Benson"
<tony@standinghampton.com> wrote:

>With all due respect ulfiyya, the general consensus here is that anyone can
>discuss anything they feel like discussing. This group has morphed into more
>of a gathering place for PARIS users and former users. An online coffee
>house as such. The key for you is to simply skip the topics you don't want
>to read.
>
>Tony
>
>
>"ulfiyya" <ulfiyya@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:450f7bfa$1@linux...
>>
>> for ... many times poeple.
>> THIS IS NOT A POLITIK SITE!!!
>> This is ...Paris site (Music) Remember...
>>
>>
>>

>> Keep youre Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>Thanks for the link. It looks like it might be a more interesting read
>>>than what you might expect of a book on probability theory.
>>>
>>>Without risk management there would be no insurance.
>>>
>>>Seems like we have some major risk management headaches ahead in the
>>>foreign relations area. I don't have much faith that our current
>>>government understands the situation or is capable of brokering a
>>>lasting and beneficial peace.
>>>
>>>Cheers,
>>> -Jamie
>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>
>>>
>>>TCB wrote:
>>>> I never said faith was limited to religion _at all_ because that would
>> be
>>>> silly. I only bring this up because I think it's a very important point.
>>>> Nearly every time you read 'without faith there would be no XXXXXXXX'
>> it's
>>>> just not true and XXXXXXXX can get along just fine without faith.
>>>> Probably
>>>> the best popular book about risk is called 'Against the Gods' and it's
>> sort
>>>> of about this very topic.
>>>>
>>>> http://www.amazon.com/Against-Gods-Remarkable-Story-Risk/dp/
0471295639/sr=8-1/qid=1158631839/ref=pd_bbs_1/002-2500887-29 81628?ie=UTF8&s=books
>>>>
>>>> TCB
>>>>
>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>> There you go, clearly faith is not limited to religion. Although just
>> as
>>>>
>>>>> clearly it's important for religion.
>>>>>
>>>>> As to risk, many people have faith that their risks will pan out. Some
>>
>>>>> people do things because they have such faith. I know people like that.
>>>>
>>>>> I am people like that. That doesn't preclude anyone from doing
>>>>> something
>>>>
>>>>> for some other reason, of course.

>>>>>
>>>>> If you want to say you don't have faith in anything, using any of the
>>
>>>>> definitions below, then that's your prerogative and I don't have a
>>>>> problem with that.
>>>>>
>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> TCB wrote:
>>>>>> Here's dictionary.com
>>>>>>
>>>>>> faith /feɪθ/ Pronunciation Key - Show Spelled
>>>>>> Pronunciation[feyth]
>>>>>> Pronunciation Key - Show IPA Pronunciation
>>>>>> -noun
>>>>>> 1. confidence or trust in a person or thing: faith in another's
>>>>>> ability.
>>>>>> 2. belief that is not based on proof: He had faith that the hypothesis
>>>> would
>>>>>> be substantiated by fact.
>>>>>> 3. belief in God or in the doctrines or teachings of religion: the
>>>>>> firm
>>>> faith
>>>>>> of the Pilgrims.
>>>>>> 4. belief in anything, as a code of ethics, standards of merit, etc.:
>>>> to
>>>>>> be of the same faith with someone concerning honesty.
>>>>>> 5. a system of religious belief: the Christian faith; the Jewish
>>>>>> faith.
>>>>>> 6. the obligation of loyalty or fidelity to a person, promise,
>>>>>> engagement,
>>>>>> etc.: Failure to appear would be breaking faith.
>>>>>> 7. the observance of this obligation; fidelity to one's promise, oath,
>>>> allegiance,
>>>>>> etc.: He was the only one who proved his faith during our recent
>>>>>> troubles.
>>>>>> 8. Christian Theology. the trust in God and in His promises as made
>> through
>>>>>> Christ and the Scriptures by which humans are justified or saved.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I don't see anything in there about risk. My point is that people can
>>>> do
>>>>>> the things you're talking about knowing full well they might fail, but
>>>> do
>>>>>> them anyway. That's taking a risk, not having faith. I don't have

>>>>>> faith
>>>> but
>>>>>> I've taken lots of personal and professional risks in my life.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> TCB
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>> We can disagree about that but the first line is the dictionary
>>>>>>> definition.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> TCB wrote:
>>>>>>>> You're confusing 'faith' with 'a willingness to take risks.' Animals
>>>> take
>>>>>>>> risks, to get food, create more animals, etc., but I doubt they have
>>>> faith.
>>>>>>>> One needs no faith to start businesses, invest money, get married,
>> etc.
>>>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>> Faith is complete trust or confidence in something or someone.
>>>>>>>>> Religious
>>>>>>>>> faith is one form of faith but not the only definition of "faith."
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> For example I have faith that if I drop a guitar pick it will find
>>>> its
>>>>>>>>> way to the floor based on the gravitational attraction it has to
>> the
>>>>>>>>> planet. I have faith that I'll breathe my next breath, that I'll
>> see
>>>>>>>>> tomorrow morning. I have faith that other people are put together
>> much
>>>>>>>>> like I am and that I can therefore relate to other folks.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Without faith, people would not invest money. Without faith people
>>>> would
>>>>>>>>> not vote. Without faith people would not start businesses, hire
>>>>>>>>> other
>>>>>>>>> people, raise children. Without faith people would not ride trains,
>>>> fly
>>>>>>>>> in planes or drive cars. Without faith no one would investigate
>>>>>>>>> scientific questions about reality.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> While you can clearly have faith without religion, you cannot have
>>>>

>>>>>>>>> religion without faith. Religion depends on faith that one or more
>>>>
>>>>>>>>> deities (good and sometimes bad) exist, that their associated
>>>>>>>>> stories
>>>>>>>>> actually occurred, and often, that there is some sort of afterlife.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> However, religious people believe in a variety of different
>>>>>>>>> deities.
>>>>>>>>> Even those who believe in the same deity disagree, sometimes
>>>>>>>>> violently,
>>>>>>>>> about the nature of their deity. Religions sometimes even disagree
>>>> about
>>>>>>>>> the nature of reality. If you want to base morality strictly on
>>>>>>>>> religion, and you look around, you'll notice that religion can be
>> a
>>>>
>>>>>>>>> somewhat chaotic basis unless...
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Ah, you might say, I want to base morality on MY religion. Well,
>> you
>>>>>>>>> just dissed the majority of religions. No problem because THEY ARE
>>>>
>>>>>>>>> WRONG. And people who believe in those religions may just be saying
>>>> the
>>>>>>>>> same thing about you and your religion. For those religions who are
>>>> not
>>>>>>>>> tolerant of other ideas, you may just have started a war.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> So perhaps it's BETTER, in our time, to have a system of justice
>> that
>>>>>> is
>>>>>>>>> NOT based on a religion. But one which guarantees everyone the
>>>>>>>>> right
>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>> practice the religion of their choice, guarantees other freedoms
>> such
>>>>>> as
>>>>>>>>> we in the USA do in our Bill of Rights, encourages honesty and
>>>>>>>>> integrity, while enforcing some common sense limits such as no
>>>>>>>>> human
>>>>>>>>> sacrifices, a minimum age for marriage, no incest, no slavery, no
>>
>>>>>>>>> murder, no rape, no stealing, those sorts of things.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> What is viewed as morality beyond a fair justice system and common
>>>> sense
>>>>>>>>> rules of behavior can be left to each freely chosen religion to
>>>>>>>>> sort

>>>>>>>>> out, like whether to restrict diet in some way, whether to wear a
>>
>>>>>>>>> certain type of clothing, how to pray, etc. But none of these
>>>>>>>>> additional
>>>>>>>>> practices should be imposed on society as a whole.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> The Golden Rule may also be of use as a basic moral foundation.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> So yes, you can have a moral system, one that BTW protects the
>>>>>>>>> freedom
>>>>>>>>> to practice religious beliefs (or not), without basing it on any
>> one
>>>>>>>>> religion. And it can protect all religions better than a system
>>>>>>>>> based
>>>>>> on
>>>>>>>>> any one religion (AKA a theocracy).
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> There are other issues surrounding religions, such as the many
>>>>>>>>> examples
>>>>>>>>> of selfless dedication to helping others on the one hand, and
>>>>>>>>> hijacked
>>>>>>>>> religions used to legitimize earthly power structures in other
>>>>>>>>> cases.
>>>>>>>>> Dedric, I look forward to talking with you about the positives and
>>>>
>>>>>>>>> negatives of various religions, and where a moral culture ought to
>>>> go
>>>>>>>>> >from here, whenever we next get together.
>>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>>>>>>>>> Hey Jimmy,
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> No doubt one can be a good person without believing in God - there
>>>> are
>>>>>>>>> tons
>>>>>>>>>> of great people with no faith, or very little. That in and of
>>>>>>>>>> itself
>>>>>>>>> tells
>>>>>>>>>> me there must be a God so even non-believers would have a strong
>> sense
>>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>> right and wrong on a societal and even global level.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> To walk through some thoughts: with no God, or higher reference

>> point,
>>>>>>>> what
>>>>>>>>> would be considered moral, or at least good? What would one use
>> to
>>>>>> decide
>>>>>>>>> what is right and wrong?
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Laws? Most would agree that we can't legislate morality now, so
>> with
>>>>>>>> no
>>>>>>>>> basis for what morality is, why would we even bother with laws
>>>>>>>>> since
>>>>>>>>> everyone would make their own choices anyway?
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Intellect? That would simply depend on what one chose to accept
>> as
>>>>>>>>> "intelligent" thought, based completely on opinion.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Reasoning and Logic? Logic is determined by a hypothesis that has
>>>> a
>>>>>>>> proven
>>>>>>>>> outcome in a given situation. Change the situation, and the
>>>>>>>>> reasoning
>>>>>>>> or
>>>>>>>>> logic behind the "right" or "wrong" could easily change.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Experience? What if one's experience is filled with hatred,
>>>>>>>>> abuse,
>>>>>>>> anger
>>>>>>>>> and violence, or worse? Then someone would have to decide whose
>> experience
>>>>>>>>> we would use as a reference point. There would be no guarantee
>> that
>>>>>>>> person
>>>>>>>>> or persons had experiences that would be best for the good of the
>>>> whole.
>>>>>>>>> Survival instinct? If it were a reference point, then stealing,
>> lying,
>>>>>>>>> cheating and even killing would be perfectly justified as those
>> can
>>>>>>>> be
>>>>>>>>> means
>>>>>>>>> of survival.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Why would right and wrong even exist? I would think that the
>>>>>>>>> differences
>>>>>>>>> between societies' definitions of right and wrong, assuming
>>>>>>>>> societies

>>>>>>>> even
>>>>>>>>> existed, would be so drastic we would never have ventured into any
>>>> form
>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>> inter-cultural/inter-geographic interaction, much less
>>>>>>>>> relationships,
>>>>>>>>> diplomacy, collaboration, trade, and open travel.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual, they
>>>>>>>>> aren't
>>>>>>>>> absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes to
>> make
>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>> choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There would
>>>>>>>>> only
>>>>>> be
>>>>>>>> an
>>>>>>>>> ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at the
>>>>>>>>> time,
>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>> based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from person
>>>> to
>>>>>> person,
>>>>>>>>> day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons would
>>>>>>>>> either
>>>>>>>> be
>>>>>>>>> filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time
>>>>>>>>> because
>>>>>>>> their
>>>>>>>>> choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we
>>>>>>>>> wouldn't
>>>>>> have
>>>>>>>>> prisons, or likely even organized societies.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> But is the majority always right? How would we know if there were
>>>> no
>>>>>>>>> absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> If there were no right and wrong, there would be no consequences
>> of
>>>>>> either,
>>>>>>>>> or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad
>>>>>>>>> consequence
>>>>>>>> - it
>>>>>>>>> would just be another event in time.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice, both
>>>> in

>>>>>> whether
>>>>>>>>> to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong decisions.
>> With
>>>>>>>> moral
>>>>>>>>> absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to evaluate
>> drastically
>>>>>>>>> differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency in
>> reasoning
>>>>>>>>> and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry. Even
>>>> when
>>>>>>>> we
>>>>>>>>> choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without that
>>>>>>>>> option
>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>> choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would be
>> no
>>>> power
>>>>>>>> in
>>>>>>>>> choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal and
>>>> loving
>>>>>>>> God
>>>>>>>>> rather than a dictator or puppet master.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see God
>> in
>>>> the
>>>>>>>> way
>>>>>>>>> that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can
>>>>>>>>> discuss
>>>>>>>>> completely opposing opinions and still care enough to consider
>>>>>>>>> insulting,
>>>>>>>>> belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable
>>>>>>>>> concept;
>>>>>>>> and 2)
>>>>>>>>> in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely trump
>>>> greed
>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>> power in importance to life and survival together on this planet.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy"
>>>>>>>>> <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have a
>> strong
>>>>>>>> morals

>>>>>>>>>>> is absurd, I think.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> Jimmy
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
>>>>>>>>>>> news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...
>>>>>>>>>>> Gene -
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your
>>>>>>>>>>> response
>>>>>> pretty
>>>>>>>>>>> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country and
>>>> even
>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict,
>>>>>>>>>>> violence
>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single
>>>>>>>>>>> largest
>>>>>>>>>>> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world. We
>> ignore
>>>>>>>> car
>>>>>>>>>>> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of
>>>>>>>>>>> tortured
>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming the
>>>>>>>>>>> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made the
>>>> Pope
>>>>>>>> quote
>>>>>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>>>> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening,
>>>>>>>>>>> all-accepting
>>>>>> religion
>>>>>>>>>>> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western
>>>>>>>>>>> Muslims
>>>>>>>> might
>>>>>>>>>>> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else
>> in
>>>> many
>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have
>>>>>>>>>>> talked
>>>>>> to,
>>>>>>>>>> and

>>>>>>>>>>>> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a
>>>>>>>>>>>> different
>>>>>>>> world
>>>>>>>>>>>> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have
>> here.
>>>>>>>>>>>> People
>>>>>>>>>>>> die for converting to anything else, or their families do. At
>> best,
>>>>>>>> their
>>>>>>>>>>>> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under
>>>>>>>>>>>> threat
>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>>> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our
>>>>>>>>>>>> country
>>>>>>>>>>>> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on our
>>>> own
>>>>>>>>>>>> country
>>>>>>>>>>>> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to this
>>>> kind
>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>>> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically correct
>>>> thing
>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>>>> do.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God,
>> and
>>>>>> hence
>>>>>>>>>>>> any
>>>>>>>>>>>> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the choice
>>>> to
>>>>>> believe
>>>>>>>>>>>> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name
>> of
>>>> Allah
>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>>> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10
>>>>>>>>>>>> commandments
>>>>>> in
>>>>>>>> 24
>>>>>>>>>>>> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there
>> is
>>>> a
>>>>>> sad,
>>>>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>>> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should
>>>>>>>>>>>> fear
>>>>>> -

>>>>>>>> it's
>>>>>>>>>>> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's personal
>>>> whims
>>>>>>>> that
>>>>>>>>>>> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day.
>> That
>>>>>>>> also
>>>>>>>>>>> includes believing in nothing.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in God
>>>> and
>>>>>>>> is
>>>>>>>>>>> wrong, at worst one has lived a good live and had some false
>>>>>>>>>>> hope
>>>>>> as
>>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>>>> sense
>>>>>>>>>>> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is wrong,
>>>> then
>>>>>>>> at
>>>>>>>>>>> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we
>>>>>>>>>>> should
>>>>>>>> be
>>>>>>>>>>> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that the
>>>> President
>>>>>>>>>>> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief
>>>>>>>>>>> really
>>>>>>>> better
>>>>>>>>>>> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong
>>>>>>>>>>> accompanies
>>>>>>>>>>> disbelief
>>>>>>>>>>> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference
>>>>>>>>>>> point
>>>>>> for
>>>>>>>>>>> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of belief
>>>> in
>>>>>> any
>>>>>>>>>>> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion for
>>>> others?
>>>>>>>>>>> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a guy
>> Islam
>>>>>>>>>>> doesn't
>>>>>>>>>>> like just because he called like he saw it - something we do on
>>>> this
>>>>>>>> forum
>>>>>>>>>>> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's
>>>>>>>>>>> intent
>>>>>> to

>>>>>>>> take
>>>>>>>>>>> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only goal
>>>> is
>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>> give
>>>>>>>>>>> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to
>> not
>>>>>> believe
>>>>>>>>>>> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity from
>> public
>>>>>>>>>> view.
>>>>>>>>>>> The only way to force someone to remove their belief from public
>>>> in
>>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>>>> country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes, is
>> to
>>>>>> outlaw
>>>>>>>>>> it.
>>>>>>>>>>> Yet another paradox.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see the
>> world
>>>>>>>> as a
>>>>>>>>>>> black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party
>>>>>>>>>>> always
>>>>>> wins
>>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>> the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any
>>>>>>>>>>> validity
>>>>>>>> in
>>>>>>>>>>> believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to maintain
>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>> balance
>>>>>>>>>>> that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust in
>>>> the
>>>>>>>> very
>>>>>>>>>>> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most fallible
>>>>>>>>>>> characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic
>>>>>>>>>>> ideology.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of 10
>> hours
>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>> work
>>>>>>>>>>> :-((....
>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>>>>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70$1@linux, "gene Lennon"
>>>>>>>>>>>> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread
>> -...
>>>>>>>>>>>> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the
>>>>>>>>>>>> current
>>>>>>>>>>>> administration
>>>>>>>>>>>> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based
>>>>>>>>>>>> reasons
>>>>>>>>> for
>>>>>>>>>>>> perusing
>>>>>>>>>>>> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier
>>>>>>>>>>>> motivation.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> Religion.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third
>>>>>>>>>>>> Great
>>>>>>>>>>> Awakening"
>>>>>>>>>>>> of the international religious struggle. This is a good thing
>> as
>>>>>> he
>>>>>>>>>> sees
>>>>>>>>>>>> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight
>>>>>>>>>>>> against
>>>>>>>>>>> terrorists
>>>>>>>>>>>> (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war that
>>>> he
>>>>>>>>>>> depicts
>>>>>>>>>>>> as "a confrontation between good and evil."
>>>>>>>>>>>> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit of
>>>> trouble
>>>>>>>>>>> (as
>>>>>>>>>>>> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be
>>>>>>>>>>>> headed?
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could
>>>>>>>>>>>> easily
>>>>>>>>>> go
>>>>>>>>>>> down
>>>>>>>>>>>> hill from here.

>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> More on the "Third Awakening":
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09
/12/AR2006091201
>>>>>>>>>>>> 59
>>>>>>>>>>>>> 4_pf.html
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Gene
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> `
>>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Tony Benson on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 18:26:02 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I'm sensing some sarcasm there Rick. ;>) I would make a terrible diplomat. I react far too much from the gut. Beside, it's hard to be a good communicator with your foot in your mouth!

I didn't mean to sound harsh to ulfiyya. He (she?) has every right to want this group to stick to PARIS related stuff. I guess it just feels more like a community to me than a technical reference source.

Tony

"rick" <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:k0c0h2hl6cc83qvha4esc96935fo3nqtb1@4ax.com...
>i nominate you for john's diplomat search..props to you...damn, i
> wasn't going to enter this fray...
>
> On Tue, 19 Sep 2006 11:31:50 -0500, "Tony Benson"
> <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote:
>
>>With all due respect ulfiyya, the general consensus here is that anyone
>>can
>>discuss anything they feel like discussing. This group has morphed into
>>more
>>of a gathering place for PARIS users and former users. An online coffee
>>house as such. The key for you is to simply skip the topics you don't want
>>to read.
>>

>>Tony
>>
>>
>>"ulfiyya" <ulfiyya@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:450f7bfa$1@linux...
>>>
>>> for ... many times poeple.
>>> THIS IS NOT A POLITIK SITE!!!
>>> This is ...Paris site (Music) Remember...
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> Keep youre Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>Thanks for the link. It looks like it might be a more interesting read
>>>>than what you might expect of a book on probability theory.
>>>>
>>>>Without risk management there would be no insurance.
>>>>
>>>>Seems like we have some major risk management headaches ahead in the
>>>>foreign relations area. I don't have much faith that our current
>>>>government understands the situation or is capable of brokering a
>>>>lasting and beneficial peace.
>>>>
>>>>Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>TCB wrote:
>>>>> I never said faith was limited to religion _at all_ because that would
>>> be
>>>>> silly. I only bring this up because I think it's a very important
>>>>> point.
>>>>> Nearly every time you read 'without faith there would be no XXXXXXXX'
>>> it's
>>>>> just not true and XXXXXXXX can get along just fine without faith.
>>>>> Probably
>>>>> the best popular book about risk is called 'Against the Gods' and it's
>>> sort
>>>>> of about this very topic.
>>>>>
>>>>> http://www.amazon.com/Against-Gods-Remarkable-Story-Risk/dp/
0471295639/sr=8-1/qid=1158631839/ref=pd_bbs_1/002-2500887-29 81628?ie=UTF8&s=books
>>>>>
>>>>> TCB
>>>>>
>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>> There you go, clearly faith is not limited to religion. Although just

>>> as
>>>>>
>>>>>> clearly it's important for religion.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> As to risk, many people have faith that their risks will pan out.
>>>>>> Some
>>>
>>>>>> people do things because they have such faith. I know people like
>>>>>> that.
>>>>>
>>>>>> I am people like that. That doesn't preclude anyone from doing
>>>>>> something
>>>>>
>>>>>> for some other reason, of course.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> If you want to say you don't have faith in anything, using any of the
>>>
>>>>>> definitions below, then that's your prerogative and I don't have a
>>>>>> problem with that.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> TCB wrote:
>>>>>>> Here's dictionary.com
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> faith /feɪθ/ Pronunciation Key - Show Spelled
>>>>>>> Pronunciation[feyth]
>>>>>>> Pronunciation Key - Show IPA Pronunciation
>>>>>>> -noun
>>>>>>> 1. confidence or trust in a person or thing: faith in another's
>>>>>>> ability.
>>>>>>> 2. belief that is not based on proof: He had faith that the
>>>>>>> hypothesis
>>>>> would
>>>>>>> be substantiated by fact.
>>>>>>> 3. belief in God or in the doctrines or teachings of religion: the
>>>>>>> firm
>>>>> faith
>>>>>>> of the Pilgrims.
>>>>>>> 4. belief in anything, as a code of ethics, standards of merit,
>>>>>>> etc.:
>>>>> to
>>>>>>> be of the same faith with someone concerning honesty.
>>>>>>> 5. a system of religious belief: the Christian faith; the Jewish
>>>>>>> faith.

>>>>>>> 6. the obligation of loyalty or fidelity to a person, promise,
>>>>>>> engagement,
>>>>>>> etc.: Failure to appear would be breaking faith.
>>>>>>> 7. the observance of this obligation; fidelity to one's promise,
>>>>>>> oath,
>>>>> allegiance,
>>>>>>> etc.: He was the only one who proved his faith during our recent
>>>>>>> troubles.
>>>>>>> 8. Christian Theology. the trust in God and in His promises as made
>>> through
>>>>>>> Christ and the Scriptures by which humans are justified or saved.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I don't see anything in there about risk. My point is that people
>>>>>>> can
>>>>> do
>>>>>>> the things you're talking about knowing full well they might fail,
>>>>>>> but
>>>>> do
>>>>>>> them anyway. That's taking a risk, not having faith. I don't have
>>>>>>> faith
>>>>> but
>>>>>>> I've taken lots of personal and professional risks in my life.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> TCB
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>> We can disagree about that but the first line is the dictionary
>>>>>>>> definition.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> TCB wrote:
>>>>>>>>> You're confusing 'faith' with 'a willingness to take risks.'
>>>>>>>>> Animals
>>>>> take
>>>>>>>>> risks, to get food, create more animals, etc., but I doubt they
>>>>>>>>> have
>>>>> faith.
>>>>>>>>> One needs no faith to start businesses, invest money, get married,
>>> etc.
>>>>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>> Faith is complete trust or confidence in something or someone.
>>>>>>>>>> Religious
>>>>>>>>>> faith is one form of faith but not the only definition of
>>>>>>>>>> "faith."

>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> For example I have faith that if I drop a guitar pick it will
>>>>>>>>>> find
>>>>> its
>>>>>>>>>> way to the floor based on the gravitational attraction it has to
>>> the
>>>>>>>>>> planet. I have faith that I'll breathe my next breath, that I'll
>>> see
>>>>>>>>>> tomorrow morning. I have faith that other people are put together
>>> much
>>>>>>>>>> like I am and that I can therefore relate to other folks.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Without faith, people would not invest money. Without faith
>>>>>>>>>> people
>>>>> would
>>>>>>>>>> not vote. Without faith people would not start businesses, hire
>>>>>>>>>> other
>>>>>>>>>> people, raise children. Without faith people would not ride
>>>>>>>>>> trains,
>>>>> fly
>>>>>>>>>> in planes or drive cars. Without faith no one would investigate
>>>>>>>>>> scientific questions about reality.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> While you can clearly have faith without religion, you cannot
>>>>>>>>>> have
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> religion without faith. Religion depends on faith that one or
>>>>>>>>>> more
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> deities (good and sometimes bad) exist, that their associated
>>>>>>>>>> stories
>>>>>>>>>> actually occurred, and often, that there is some sort of
>>>>>>>>>> afterlife.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> However, religious people believe in a variety of different
>>>>>>>>>> deities.
>>>>>>>>>> Even those who believe in the same deity disagree, sometimes
>>>>>>>>>> violently,
>>>>>>>>>> about the nature of their deity. Religions sometimes even
>>>>>>>>>> disagree
>>>>> about
>>>>>>>>>> the nature of reality. If you want to base morality strictly on
>>>>>>>>>> religion, and you look around, you'll notice that religion can be
>>> a
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> somewhat chaotic basis unless...
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Ah, you might say, I want to base morality on MY religion. Well,

>>> you
>>>>>>>>>> just dissed the majority of religions. No problem because THEY
>>>>>>>>>> ARE
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> WRONG. And people who believe in those religions may just be
>>>>>>>>>> saying
>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>> same thing about you and your religion. For those religions who
>>>>>>>>>> are
>>>>> not
>>>>>>>>>> tolerant of other ideas, you may just have started a war.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> So perhaps it's BETTER, in our time, to have a system of justice
>>> that
>>>>>>> is
>>>>>>>>>> NOT based on a religion. But one which guarantees everyone the
>>>>>>>>>> right
>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>> practice the religion of their choice, guarantees other freedoms
>>> such
>>>>>>> as
>>>>>>>>>> we in the USA do in our Bill of Rights, encourages honesty and
>>>>>>>>>> integrity, while enforcing some common sense limits such as no
>>>>>>>>>> human
>>>>>>>>>> sacrifices, a minimum age for marriage, no incest, no slavery, no
>>>
>>>>>>>>>> murder, no rape, no stealing, those sorts of things.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> What is viewed as morality beyond a fair justice system and
>>>>>>>>>> common
>>>>> sense
>>>>>>>>>> rules of behavior can be left to each freely chosen religion to
>>>>>>>>>> sort
>>>>>>>>>> out, like whether to restrict diet in some way, whether to wear a
>>>
>>>>>>>>>> certain type of clothing, how to pray, etc. But none of these
>>>>>>>>>> additional
>>>>>>>>>> practices should be imposed on society as a whole.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> The Golden Rule may also be of use as a basic moral foundation.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> So yes, you can have a moral system, one that BTW protects the
>>>>>>>>>> freedom
>>>>>>>>>> to practice religious beliefs (or not), without basing it on any
>>> one
>>>>>>>>>> religion. And it can protect all religions better than a system
>>>>>>>>>> based
>>>>>>> on

>>>>>>>>>> any one religion (AKA a theocracy).
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> There are other issues surrounding religions, such as the many
>>>>>>>>>> examples
>>>>>>>>>> of selfless dedication to helping others on the one hand, and
>>>>>>>>>> hijacked
>>>>>>>>>> religions used to legitimize earthly power structures in other
>>>>>>>>>> cases.
>>>>>>>>>> Dedric, I look forward to talking with you about the positives
>>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> negatives of various religions, and where a moral culture ought
>>>>>>>>>> to
>>>>> go
>>>>>>>>> >from here, whenever we next get together.
>>>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>> Hey Jimmy,
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> No doubt one can be a good person without believing in God -
>>>>>>>>>>> there
>>>>> are
>>>>>>>>> tons
>>>>>>>>>>> of great people with no faith, or very little. That in and of
>>>>>>>>>>> itself
>>>>>>>>> tells
>>>>>>>>>>> me there must be a God so even non-believers would have a strong
>>> sense
>>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>> right and wrong on a societal and even global level.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> To walk through some thoughts: with no God, or higher reference
>>> point,
>>>>>>>>> what
>>>>>>>>>>> would be considered moral, or at least good? What would one use
>>> to
>>>>>>>>> decide
>>>>>>>>>>> what is right and wrong?
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> Laws? Most would agree that we can't legislate morality now, so
>>> with
>>>>>>>>> no
>>>>>>>>>>> basis for what morality is, why would we even bother with laws
>>>>>>>>>>> since

>>>>>>>>>>> everyone would make their own choices anyway?
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> Intellect? That would simply depend on what one chose to accept
>>> as
>>>>>>>>>>> "intelligent" thought, based completely on opinion.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> Reasoning and Logic? Logic is determined by a hypothesis that
>>>>>>>>>>> has
>>>>> a
>>>>>>> proven
>>>>>>>>>>> outcome in a given situation. Change the situation, and the
>>>>>>>>>>> reasoning
>>>>>>>>> or
>>>>>>>>>>> logic behind the "right" or "wrong" could easily change.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> Experience? What if one's experience is filled with hatred,
>>>>>>>>>>> abuse,
>>>>>>> anger
>>>>>>>>>>> and violence, or worse? Then someone would have to decide whose
>>> experience
>>>>>>>>>>> we would use as a reference point. There would be no guarantee
>>> that
>>>>>>> person
>>>>>>>>>>> or persons had experiences that would be best for the good of
>>>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>> whole.
>>>>>>>>>>> Survival instinct? If it were a reference point, then stealing,
>>> lying,
>>>>>>>>>>> cheating and even killing would be perfectly justified as those
>>> can
>>>>>>> be
>>>>>>>>> means
>>>>>>>>>>> of survival.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> Why would right and wrong even exist? I would think that the
>>>>>>>>>>> differences
>>>>>>>>>>> between societies' definitions of right and wrong, assuming
>>>>>>>>>>> societies
>>>>>>>>> even
>>>>>>>>>>> existed, would be so drastic we would never have ventured into
>>>>>>>>>>> any
>>>>>> form
>>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>> inter-cultural/inter-geographic interaction, much less
>>>>>>>>>>> relationships,
>>>>>>>>>>> diplomacy, collaboration, trade, and open travel.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual, they

>>>>>>>>>>> aren't
>>>>>>>>>>> absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes to
>>> make
>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>> choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There would
>>>>>>>>>>> only
>>>>>>> be
>>>>>>>>> an
>>>>>>>>>>> ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at the
>>>>>>>>>>> time,
>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>> based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from
>>>>>>>>>>> person
>>>>> to
>>>>>>> person,
>>>>>>>>>>> day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons would
>>>>>>>>>>> either
>>>>>>>>> be
>>>>>>>>>>> filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time
>>>>>>>>>>> because
>>>>>>>>> their
>>>>>>>>>>> choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we
>>>>>>>>>>> wouldn't
>>>>>>> have
>>>>>>>>>>> prisons, or likely even organized societies.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> But is the majority always right? How would we know if there
>>>>>>>>>>> were
>>>>> no
>>>>>>>>>>> absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> If there were no right and wrong, there would be no consequences
>>> of
>>>>>>> either,
>>>>>>>>>>> or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad
>>>>>>>>>>> consequence
>>>>>>>>> - it
>>>>>>>>>>> would just be another event in time.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice,
>>>>>>>>>>> both
>>>>> in
>>>>>>> whether
>>>>>>>>>>> to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong decisions.
>>> With
>>>>>>>>> moral
>>>>>>>>>>> absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to evaluate
>>> drastically

>>>>>>>>>>> differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency in
>>> reasoning
>>>>>>>>>>> and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry.
>>>>>>>>>>> Even
>>>>> when
>>>>>>>>> we
>>>>>>>>>>> choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without that
>>>>>>>>>>> option
>>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>>> choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would be
>>> no
>>>>> power
>>>>>>>>> in
>>>>>>>>>>> choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal
>>>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>> loving
>>>>>>>>> God
>>>>>>>>>>> rather than a dictator or puppet master.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see God
>>> in
>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>> way
>>>>>>>>>>> that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can
>>>>>>>>>>> discuss
>>>>>>>>>>> completely opposing opinions and still care enough to consider
>>>>>>>>>>> insulting,
>>>>>>>>>>> belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable
>>>>>>>>>>> concept;
>>>>>>>>> and 2)
>>>>>>>>>>> in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely
>>>>>>>>>>> trump
>>>>> greed
>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>> power in importance to life and survival together on this
>>>>>>>>>>> planet.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>>>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy"
>>>>>>>>>>> <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have a
>>> strong
>>>>>>>>> morals
>>>>>>>>>>>> is absurd, I think.
>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>> Jimmy
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
>>>>>>>>>>>> news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Gene -
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your
>>>>>>>>>>>>> response
>>>>>>> pretty
>>>>>>>>>>>>> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country
>>>>>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>> even
>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>>>> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict,
>>>>>>>>>>>>> violence
>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>>>> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single
>>>>>>>>>>>>> largest
>>>>>>>>>>>>> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world. We
>>> ignore
>>>>>>>>> car
>>>>>>>>>>>>> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of
>>>>>>>>>>>>> tortured
>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>>>> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming the
>>>>>>>>>>>>> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made
>>>>>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>> Pope
>>>>>>>>> quote
>>>>>>>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening,
>>>>>>>>>>>>> all-accepting
>>>>>>> religion
>>>>>>>>>>>>> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Muslims
>>>>>>>>> might
>>>>>>>>>>>>> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else
>>> in
>>>>> many
>>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>>>> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have
>>>>>>>>>>>>> talked
>>>>>>> to,
>>>>>>>>> and

>>>>>>>>>>>> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a
>>>>>>>>>>>> different
>>>>>>>>> world
>>>>>>>>>>>> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have
>>> here.
>>>>>>>>>>>> People
>>>>>>>>>>>> die for converting to anything else, or their families do. At
>>> best,
>>>>>>>>> their
>>>>>>>>>>>> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under
>>>>>>>>>>>> threat
>>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>>> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our
>>>>>>>>>>>> country
>>>>>>>>>>>> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on
>>>>>>>>>>>> our
>>>>> own
>>>>>>>>>>>> country
>>>>>>>>>>>> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to
>>>>>>>>>>>> this
>>>>> kind
>>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>>> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically
>>>>>>>>>>>> correct
>>>>> thing
>>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>>>> do.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God,
>>> and
>>>>>>> hence
>>>>>>>>>>>> any
>>>>>>>>>>>> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the
>>>>>>>>>>>> choice
>>>>> to
>>>>>>> believe
>>>>>>>>>>>> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name
>>> of
>>>>> Allah
>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>>> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10
>>>>>>>>>>>> commandments
>>>>>>> in
>>>>>>>>> 24
>>>>>>>>>>>> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there
>>> is
>>>>> a
>>>>>>> sad,

>>>>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>>> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should
>>>>>>>>>>>> fear
>>>>>>> -
>>>>>>>>> it's
>>>>>>>>>>>> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's
>>>>>>>>>>>> personal
>>>>> whims
>>>>>>>>> that
>>>>>>>>>>>> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day.
>>> That
>>>>>>>>> also
>>>>>>>>>>>> includes believing in nothing.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in
>>>>>>>>>>>> God
>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>> is
>>>>>>>>>>>> wrong, at worst one has lived a good live and had some false
>>>>>>>>>>>> hope
>>>>>>> as
>>>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>>>>> sense
>>>>>>>>>>>> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is
>>>>>>>>>>>> wrong,
>>>>> then
>>>>>>>>> at
>>>>>>>>>>>> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we
>>>>>>>>>>>> should
>>>>>>>>> be
>>>>>>>>>>>> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that
>>>>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>> President
>>>>>>>>>>>> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief
>>>>>>>>>>>> really
>>>>>>>>> better
>>>>>>>>>>>> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong
>>>>>>>>>>>> accompanies
>>>>>>>>>>> disbelief
>>>>>>>>>>>> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference
>>>>>>>>>>>> point
>>>>>>> for
>>>>>>>>>>>> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of
>>>>>>>>>>>> belief
>>>>> in
>>>>>>>>> any
>>>>>>>>>>>> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion
>>>>>>>>>>>> for

>>>>> others?
>>>>>>>>>>>> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a guy
>>> Islam
>>>>>>>>>>>> doesn't
>>>>>>>>>>>> like just because he called like he saw it - something we do
>>>>>>>>>>>> on
>>>>> this
>>>>>>>>> forum
>>>>>>>>>>>> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's
>>>>>>>>>>>> intent
>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>> take
>>>>>>>>>>>> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only
>>>>>>>>>>>> goal
>>>>> is
>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>> give
>>>>>>>>>>>> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to
>>> not
>>>>>>> believe
>>>>>>>>>>>> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity from
>>> public
>>>>>>>>>>>> view.
>>>>>>>>>>>> The only way to force someone to remove their belief from
>>>>>>>>>>>> public
>>>>> in
>>>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>>>>> country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes, is
>>> to
>>>>>>> outlaw
>>>>>>>>>>>> it.
>>>>>>>>>>>> Yet another paradox.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see the
>>> world
>>>>>>>>> as a
>>>>>>>>>>>> black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party
>>>>>>>>>>>> always
>>>>>>> wins
>>>>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>>> the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any
>>>>>>>>>>>> validity
>>>>>>>>> in
>>>>>>>>>>>> believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to
>>>>>>>>>>>> maintain
>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>>> balance
>>>>>>>>>>>> that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust

>>>>>>>>>>>>> in
>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>> very
>>>>>>>>>>>>> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most
>>>>>>>>>>>>> fallible
>>>>>>>>>>>>> characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic
>>>>>>>>>>>>> ideology.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of 10
>>> hours
>>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>>> work
>>>>>>>>>>>>> :-((....
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70$1@linux, "gene Lennon"
>>>>>>>>>>>>> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread
>>> -...
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> current
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> administration
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> reasons
>>>>>>>>> for
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> perusing
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> motivation.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Religion.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Great
>>>>>>>>>>>> Awakening"
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> of the international religious struggle. This is a good thing
>>> as
>>>>>>> he
>>>>>>>>> sees
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> against
>>>>>>>>>>>> terrorists
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war

>>>>>>>>>>>>>> that
>>>>> he
>>>>>>>>>>>> depicts
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> as "a confrontation between good and evil."
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> of
>>>>> trouble
>>>>>>>>>>>> (as
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> headed?
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> easily
>>>>>>> go
>>>>>>>>>>>> down
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> hill from here.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> More on the "Third Awakening":
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09
/12/AR2006091201
>>>>>>>>>>>> 59
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> 4_pf.html
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Gene
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> `
>>>>>
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Jamie K on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 18:31:25 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

For most of the Clinton years the balance of power was divided between
both parties. Again, there is plenty of finger pointing to go around.
It's easy enough in hindsight to criticize the previous administration
on a number of counts.

And in retrospect, those dems made a mistake trusting Bush with that
vote. OTOH, it was a moment of unity.

Flash forward. Today all branches of national government are controlled

by one party. It doesn't bother me if you want to point blame at some of the policies under Clinton. But again, merely pointing fingers backwards in no way excuses the mistakes and failures of the current government.

They walked in stating in clear terms that they felt the previous government was wrong about almost everything, and then fell flat overall, domestically and internationally.

Looking at both governments, we can do better. We must do better. At some point, and we're coming up on six years, the buck stops with those in charge now.

Cheers,
-Jamie
http://www.JamieKrutz.com

DJ wrote:
> The dems you mentioned authorized the military attack on Iraq as a last
> resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done as such.
>
> How convenient for them when it was the intelligence service that they
> created over 8 years of hard work that they now attempt to slag and blame
> for their decisdions so they can vote for the war before they vote against
> it.
>
> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:450f8aec@linux...
>> There is plenty of finger pointing to go around. No doubt specific
>> things could have been handled better under the previous government.
>>
>> The transition of power between the previous and current governments was
>> pretty rocky, and a "not invented here" syndrome may have doomed the
>> hand-off of some al-Qaida related work that was in progress.
>>
>> In any case, no government gets a pass by blaming the previous
>> government. The current government, for example, failed to follow
>> through and prioritize the al-Qaida threat ahead of 9/11 and failed to
>> prevent 9/11; failed to find and capture Bin Laden in Afghanistan;
>> failed to overcome Taliban control of large areas of Afghanistan;
>> allowed record drug production to reestablish itself there; failed to
>> plan for post Iraq invasion problems predicted by their own state
>> department; and they have continually exploited the "war on terrorism"
>> for domestic political ends.
>>
>> You assert the WMDs were there. However Bush's chief inspector, and Bush
>> himself, say they weren't there after all. It was a bluff. One of the
>> Iraqi expatriate promoters of the bluff got the ear of our government,

>> was believed, and, last I heard, had parlayed it into a position of
>> power in Iraq after the invasion.
>>
>> The dems you mentioned authorized the military attack on Iraq as a last
>> resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done as such.
>>
>> Preemptive invasion is new as part of the "Bush (Jr.) Doctrine."
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>> DJ wrote:
>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:450f3862@linux...
>>>> Neither, actually. And what we ought to do would depend on the nature
> of
>>>> the threat.
>>> Agreed.
>>>
>>>> We might want to start with recommendations published in 1999, well
>>>> before the 9/11 attack.
>>>>
>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Commission_on_Terroris m
>>>>
>>>> We can disagree about whether our current policy is one of overreacting
>>>> or not. We can probably really disagree about the newly minted
>>>> preemptive attack policy. :^)
>>> I don't think there is any newly minted attack policy. There has always
> been
>>> the *clear and present danger* perogative but it needs to be based on
>>> accurate intelligence. Had this been available, then I doubt that Bush,
>>> Kerry, Kennedy Pelosi and the rest would have authorized the invasion of
>>> Iraq, or perhaps they would have been able to find the WMD's before they
>>> were shipped out of the country or hidden. I just find it hard to
> stomach
>>> the hypocracy of the democrats whose policies neutered our intelligence
>>> services in the '90's when they trun around and blame Bush for the
> decisions
>>> made based on the intellegence blunders they created in the first place.
>>>
>>> Regards,
>>>
>>> Deej
>>>
>>>
>>>> Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie

>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> DJ wrote:
>>>>> I don't see us overreacting Jamie. However, if there is indication of
>>> some
>>>>> sort of major threat, do we run and tell the NY times or do we blow
> the
>>>>> threat away before it pays us a visit?
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> news:450f0b12@linux...
>>>>>> Of course they came out with a blustery ultimatum. That's not news,
>>> it's
>>>>>> an old pattern. It works for them to sit back and suggest that others
>>> do
>>>>>> something via terror-grams such as this. If it makes you afraid as
>>> well,
>>>>>> my guess is they would see that as a bonus.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> By goading the USA into overreacting it helps them grow, raise money
>>> and
>>>>>> convince others to actually see us as evil and act accordingly. It
>>>>>> works, we keep falling for it. OTOH, for those here with a declared
>>>>>> interest in emptying the US treasury, it's likewise beneficial to
> have
>>>>>> the specter of an enemy out there. Fear sells.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> We have yet to actually declare war on anyone in this whole mess. How
>>> do
>>>>>> you declare war on a tactic?
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Forced conversion and head taxes would go over like a lead balloon in
>>>>>> the USA. Not gonna happen. We're far more sectarian than, say, Iraq.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Responsible leadership is needed in the world to calm extremist
>>>>>> tendencies on all sides and help rational people who are trying to
> get
>>>>>> by in worsening times. At the same time we need to be, and are
>>>>>> attempting to be, vigilant against any self righteous group with
>>>>>> fantasies of violence in the USA.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Any rush to some sort of "holy war" is irrational. There is nothing
>>> holy
>>>>>> about war.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Cheers,

>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> DJ wrote:
>>>>>>> I haven't seen us react with irrationality.....yet. Al
> Quaeda
>>>>> just
>>>>>>> came out with an ultimatim stating that it's full on war now and the
>>>>> west
>>>>>>> will be destroyed. The only way to save ourselves is to convert to
>>>>> Islam. So
>>>>>>> where to you draw the line between irrationality and self defense?
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
>>> news:450ee7ef@linux...
>>>>>>>> Let's keep from reacting to irrationality with irrationality of our
>>>>> own.
>>>>>>>> There's a lot of fear mongering. Chicken Little is back.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> DJ wrote:
>>>>>>>>> It doesn't matter at all whether this was the Pope. The bottom
> line
>>> is
>>>>>>> that
>>>>>>>>> it is rationality as opposed to irrationality.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
>>>>> news:450ec970@linux...
>>>>>>>>>> The Catholic church doesn't speak for Christianity. Certainly not
>>> for
>>>>>>>>>> Lutherans, and for good reason.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> A Pope criticizing other religions (even other Christian sects,
>>> even
>>>>>>>>>> other Catholics) is nothing new. Certainly much harsher things
> have
>>>>>>> been
>>>>>>>>>> said about Islam by some (not all) extreme fundamentalist
>>> Christians.
>>>>>>>>>> And certainly much harsher things have been said by certain

>>> extremist
>>>>>>>>>> Islamists about Christianity. The more extremist of both camps
> seem
>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>> be spoiling to relive the crusades. With some of the more power
>>>>> hungry
>>>>>>>>>> ready to endanger civilization by attempting to incite religious
>>> wars
>>>>>>>>>> for their own questionable ends.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> It's a vast generalization to say the "the left" or "secularists"
>>> or
>>>>>>>>>> even "Christians" are demanding an apology from the Pope. I think
> a
>>>>>>>>>> whole lot of people think the Pope can say whatever he wants. It
>>>>>>> doesn't
>>>>>>>>>> matter to most non-Catholics in the USA and in reality, Papal
>>>>>>>>>> declarations are ignored by a fair number of Catholics here, too.
>>>>>>>>>> Obviously some Moslems are upset in some places, but how deep
> does
>>>>> that
>>>>>>>>>> go? When black churches were burning in the USA, it would have
> been
>>>>> an
>>>>>>>>>> exaggeration to blame everyone in the USA for that.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church which only very
>>>>>>>>>> recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo. The church
> hung
>>> on
>>>>>>>>>> tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view of the
> universe
>>>>>>> while
>>>>>>>>>> denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, which describes
> the
>>>>>>>>>> actual way the solar system works.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> It also extends to a few Christian sects who, feeling similarly
>>>>>>>>>> insecure, tenaciously cling to the notion that the earth is only
>>>>> about
>>>>>>>>>> 6,000 years old, by virtue of the biblical interpretations and
>>> clever
>>>>>>>>>> (at the time) calculations of an Irish Bishop several centuries
>>> ago,
>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>> in the face of solid current scientific evidence to the contrary.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some (not all) Christian churches

>>> who,
>>>>>>>>>> feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and ever-mounting
>>> evidence
>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>> evolution, responding with dogma in psuedo-scientific clothing,
> and
>>>>> who
>>>>>>>>>> seek to water down scientific education in the USA.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to power hungry industries who pay big
>>>>> bucks
>>>>>>>>>> to spread denial about global warming for short term gain. Who
> push
>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>> control oil in the middle east with force. With our guns blazing,
>>> our
>>>>>>>>>> soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically. And who
>>> sometimes
>>>>>>>>>> hide behind Christianity to do so.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives who find ways
>>> to
>>>>>>>>>> pretend that everyone is aligning against Christianity. And in
>>>>>>> spreading
>>>>>>>>>> this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to keep them in
>>> power.
>>>>>>>>>> And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of reason and
> the
>>>>>>> focus
>>>>>>>>>> on the use of force.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and declare
>>> victory.
>>>>>>> ;^)
>>>>>>>>>> Have a great week!
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> DC wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>> I thought this was worth reading if any of you are interested.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> Have a great Monday!
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> ---------------------------------------

>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> The Unholy Alliance Rolls Over the Pope
>>>>>>>>>>> By Andrew Walden
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> In what has suddenly been made into a highly controversial

>>>>>>>>>>> Regensberg, Pope Benedict describes Christian belief in a God
>>>>>>>>>>> whose words and acts are bound by reason, truth and the law of
>>>>>>>>>>> non-contradiction. Benedict contrasts this with Islamic belief

> Benedict
>>>>>>>>>>> further contrasts Christian belief with that of secular
> humanists
>>>>>>>>>>> who see reason as being completely unbound of God.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> In response, both Islamists and secularists have demanded the

>>>>>>>>>>> genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between
>>>>>>>>>>> Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis of the clash
>>>>>>>>>>> of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror. His
>>>>>>>>>>> analysis also explains the underlying cause of the alliance
>>>>>>>>>>> between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.
>>>>>>>>>>> Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor Manuel

>>>>>>>>>>> you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command

>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>> unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top Shiite
>>>>>>>>>>> cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling party
>>>>>>>>>>> likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and accused him of
>>>>>>>>>>> reviving the mentality of the Crusades.
>>>>>>>>>>>

> and
>>>>>>>>>>> jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of rage that
>>>>>>>>>>> many fear could burst into violent protests like those that

>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>> safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.
>>>>>>>>>>>

> The
>>>>>>>>>>> reaction is not one of anger but a calculated attempt to force
>>>>>>>>>>> the Pope to parrot the PC line on Islam. Since Islam need not be

>>>>>>>>>>> objective can be to assert the power of a God who is so
>>>>>>>>>>> transcendent that He is not bound by anything. If man is created

>>>>>>>>>>> anything. (This explains the predilection on the part of some

> to
>>>>>>>>>>> their non-existent morality. They are asserting the only

>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>> is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist thought
> than

>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing precisely what

>>>>>>>>>>> of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest mosque,

> to

>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the Pope was,

>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>> description of the Islamic God as being unbound by reason is not
>>>>>>>>>>> an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What Muslims and

>>>>>>>>>>> dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity. How dare he not

>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>> being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to the point is
>>>>>>>>>>> lost on them.
>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>> this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists are waging a
>>>>>>>>>>> propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension against

>>>>>>>>>>> jihad, but not your violent jihad.
>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>> side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more clear than in
>>>>>>>>>>> the Islamist reaction to the Pope.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November the
> Islamists
>>>>>>>>>>> are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons and demand
>>>>>>>>>>> to hear from the Pope himself. This would place raging mobs of
>>>>>>>>>>> semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of forcing the
>>>>>>>>>>> leader of Christendom to bow before them.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> In this demand for submission they are joined by the secularist
>>>>>>>>>>> mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times
> editorializes:

>>>>>>>>>>> the secularists are driven only by their will to power. While
>>>>>>>>>>> the Islamists represent their demented version of
>>>>>>>>>>> God--unrestrained by reason, the secularists represent their
>>>>>>>>>>> demented version of reason--unrestrained by God. They are
> united
>>>>>>>>>>> by their self-worshipping world view.
>>>>>>>>>>>

> of
>>>>>>>>>>> our categories, even that of rationality...(The Islamic) God is

> insult.
>>>>>>>>>>> Islam embraces this description. In offering this description
> of
>>>>>>>>>>> Islam, Benedict refers to the views of leading modern French
>>>>>>>>>>> Islamist R. Arnaldez as discussed in the writings of Professor
>>>>>>>>>>> Theodore Khoury of Munster.
>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>> decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he considers

>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> Benedict asserts that without reason, or without God, there can

>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> Both Islamist and secularist seek to break God and reason apart.
>>>>>>>>>>> Each claims superiority over the Christian West. They believe
>>>>>>>>>>> absolute moral license makes them powerful. As globalization
>>>>>>>>>>> carries the Western tradition of reason throughout the world,
>>>>>>>>>>> both are in decline.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist and secularist

>>>>>>>>>>> with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after the collapse
>>>>>>>>>>> of the allied forces on the western front.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear is having to

> or

> great
>>>>>>>>>>> logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our partners in

>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> Their fear of reason can only lead the world to disaster.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Deej [1] on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 19:36:51 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Rick,

Do you think it would help if we could just figure out a way to get into the
UN gallery (do they have a gallery?) and then start mooning people? I want
to do something constructive instead of sitting around bitching all the
time.

Deej

"rick" <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:k0c0h2hl6cc83qvha4esc96935fo3nqtb1@4ax.com...
> i nominate you for john's diplomat search..props to you...damn, i
> wasn't going to enter this fray...
>

> On Tue, 19 Sep 2006 11:31:50 -0500, "Tony Benson"
> <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote:
>
> >With all due respect ulfiyya, the general consensus here is that anyone
can
> >discuss anything they feel like discussing. This group has morphed into
more
> >of a gathering place for PARIS users and former users. An online coffee
> >house as such. The key for you is to simply skip the topics you don't
want
> >to read.
> >
> >Tony
> >
> >
> >"ulfiyya" <ulfiyya@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:450f7bfa$1@linux...
> >>
> >> for ... many times poeple.
> >> THIS IS NOT A POLITIK SITE!!!
> >> This is ...Paris site (Music) Remember...
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >> Keep youre Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
> >>>
> >>>Thanks for the link. It looks like it might be a more interesting read
> >>>than what you might expect of a book on probability theory.
> >>>
> >>>Without risk management there would be no insurance.
> >>>
> >>>Seems like we have some major risk management headaches ahead in the
> >>>foreign relations area. I don't have much faith that our current
> >>>government understands the situation or is capable of brokering a
> >>>lasting and beneficial peace.
> >>>
> >>>Cheers,
> >>> -Jamie
> >>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>TCB wrote:
> >>>> I never said faith was limited to religion _at all_ because that
would
> >> be
> >>>> silly. I only bring this up because I think it's a very important
point.
> >>>> Nearly every time you read 'without faith there would be no XXXXXXXX'
> >> it's

> >>>> just not true and XXXXXXXX can get along just fine without faith.
> >>>> Probably
> >>>> the best popular book about risk is called 'Against the Gods' and
it's
> >> sort
> >>>> of about this very topic.
> >>>>
> >>>>
http://www.amazon.com/Against-Gods-Remarkable-Story-Risk/dp/ 0471295639/sr=8-
1/qid=1158631839/ref=pd_bbs_1/002-2500887-2981628?ie=UTF8&am p;s=books
> >>>>
> >>>> TCB
> >>>>
> >>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
> >>>>> There you go, clearly faith is not limited to religion. Although
just
> >> as
> >>>>
> >>>>> clearly it's important for religion.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> As to risk, many people have faith that their risks will pan out.
Some
> >>
> >>>>> people do things because they have such faith. I know people like
that.
> >>>>
> >>>>> I am people like that. That doesn't preclude anyone from doing
> >>>>> something
> >>>>
> >>>>> for some other reason, of course.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> If you want to say you don't have faith in anything, using any of
the
> >>
> >>>>> definitions below, then that's your prerogative and I don't have a
> >>>>> problem with that.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> Cheers,
> >>>>> -Jamie
> >>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>> TCB wrote:
> >>>>>> Here's dictionary.com
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> faith /feɪθ/ Pronunciation Key - Show Spelled
> >>>>>> Pronunciation[feyth]
> >>>>>> Pronunciation Key - Show IPA Pronunciation

> >>>>>> -noun
> >>>>>> 1. confidence or trust in a person or thing: faith in another's
> >>>>>> ability.
> >>>>>> 2. belief that is not based on proof: He had faith that the
hypothesis
> >>>> would
> >>>>>> be substantiated by fact.
> >>>>>> 3. belief in God or in the doctrines or teachings of religion: the
> >>>>>> firm
> >>>> faith
> >>>>>> of the Pilgrims.
> >>>>>> 4. belief in anything, as a code of ethics, standards of merit,
etc.:
> >>>> to
> >>>>>> be of the same faith with someone concerning honesty.
> >>>>>> 5. a system of religious belief: the Christian faith; the Jewish
> >>>>>> faith.
> >>>>>> 6. the obligation of loyalty or fidelity to a person, promise,
> >>>>>> engagement,
> >>>>>> etc.: Failure to appear would be breaking faith.
> >>>>>> 7. the observance of this obligation; fidelity to one's promise,
oath,
> >>>> allegiance,
> >>>>>> etc.: He was the only one who proved his faith during our recent
> >>>>>> troubles.
> >>>>>> 8. Christian Theology. the trust in God and in His promises as made
> >> through
> >>>>>> Christ and the Scriptures by which humans are justified or saved.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> I don't see anything in there about risk. My point is that people
can
> >>>> do
> >>>>>> the things you're talking about knowing full well they might fail,
but
> >>>> do
> >>>>>> them anyway. That's taking a risk, not having faith. I don't have
> >>>>>> faith
> >>>> but
> >>>>>> I've taken lots of personal and professional risks in my life.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> TCB
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
> >>>>>>> We can disagree about that but the first line is the dictionary
> >>>>>>> definition.
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> Cheers,
> >>>>>>> -Jamie

> >>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> TCB wrote:
> >>>>>>>> You're confusing 'faith' with 'a willingness to take risks.'
Animals
> >>> take
> >>>>>>>> risks, to get food, create more animals, etc., but I doubt they
have
> >>> faith.
> >>>>>>>> One needs no faith to start businesses, invest money, get
married,
> >> etc.
> >>>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
> >>>>>>>>> Faith is complete trust or confidence in something or someone.
> >>>>>>>>> Religious
> >>>>>>>>> faith is one form of faith but not the only definition of
"faith."
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> For example I have faith that if I drop a guitar pick it will
find
> >>> its
> >>>>>>>>> way to the floor based on the gravitational attraction it has to
> >> the
> >>>>>>>>> planet. I have faith that I'll breathe my next breath, that I'll
> >> see
> >>>>>>>>> tomorrow morning. I have faith that other people are put
together
> >> much
> >>>>>>>>> like I am and that I can therefore relate to other folks.
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> Without faith, people would not invest money. Without faith
people
> >>> would
> >>>>>>>>> not vote. Without faith people would not start businesses, hire
> >>>>>>>>> other
> >>>>>>>>> people, raise children. Without faith people would not ride
trains,
> >>> fly
> >>>>>>>>> in planes or drive cars. Without faith no one would investigate
> >>>>>>>>> scientific questions about reality.
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> While you can clearly have faith without religion, you cannot
have
> >>>
> >>>>>>>>> religion without faith. Religion depends on faith that one or
more
> >>>

> >>>>>>>>> deities (good and sometimes bad) exist, that their associated
> >>>>>>>>> stories
> >>>>>>>>> actually occurred, and often, that there is some sort of
afterlife.
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> However, religious people believe in a variety of different
> >>>>>>>>> deities.
> >>>>>>>>> Even those who believe in the same deity disagree, sometimes
> >>>>>>>>> violently,
> >>>>>>>>> about the nature of their deity. Religions sometimes even
disagree
> >>>> about
> >>>>>>>>> the nature of reality. If you want to base morality strictly on
> >>>>>>>>> religion, and you look around, you'll notice that religion can
be
> >> a
> >>>>
> >>>>>>>>> somewhat chaotic basis unless...
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> Ah, you might say, I want to base morality on MY religion. Well,
> >> you
> >>>>>>>>> just dissed the majority of religions. No problem because THEY
ARE
> >>>>
> >>>>>>>>> WRONG. And people who believe in those religions may just be
saying
> >>>> the
> >>>>>>>>> same thing about you and your religion. For those religions who
are
> >>>> not
> >>>>>>>>> tolerant of other ideas, you may just have started a war.
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> So perhaps it's BETTER, in our time, to have a system of justice
> >> that
> >>>>>> is
> >>>>>>>>> NOT based on a religion. But one which guarantees everyone the
> >>>>>>>>> right
> >>>>>> to
> >>>>>>>>> practice the religion of their choice, guarantees other freedoms
> >> such
> >>>>>> as
> >>>>>>>>> we in the USA do in our Bill of Rights, encourages honesty and
> >>>>>>>>> integrity, while enforcing some common sense limits such as no
> >>>>>>>>> human
> >>>>>>>>> sacrifices, a minimum age for marriage, no incest, no slavery,
no
> >>
> >>>>>>>>> murder, no rape, no stealing, those sorts of things.

> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> What is viewed as morality beyond a fair justice system and
common
> >>>> sense
> >>>>>>>>> rules of behavior can be left to each freely chosen religion to
> >>>>>>>>> sort
> >>>>>>>>> out, like whether to restrict diet in some way, whether to wear
a
> >>
> >>>>>>>>> certain type of clothing, how to pray, etc. But none of these
> >>>>>>>>> additional
> >>>>>>>>> practices should be imposed on society as a whole.
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> The Golden Rule may also be of use as a basic moral foundation.
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> So yes, you can have a moral system, one that BTW protects the
> >>>>>>>>> freedom
> >>>>>>>>> to practice religious beliefs (or not), without basing it on any
> >> one
> >>>>>>>>> religion. And it can protect all religions better than a system
> >>>>>>>>> based
> >>>>>> on
> >>>>>>>>> any one religion (AKA a theocracy).
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> There are other issues surrounding religions, such as the many
> >>>>>>>>> examples
> >>>>>>>>> of selfless dedication to helping others on the one hand, and
> >>>>>>>>> hijacked
> >>>>>>>>> religions used to legitimize earthly power structures in other
> >>>>>>>>> cases.
> >>>>>>>>> Dedric, I look forward to talking with you about the positives
and
> >>>>
> >>>>>>>>> negatives of various religions, and where a moral culture ought
to
> >>>> go
> >>>>>>>>> >from here, whenever we next get together.
> >>>>>>>>> Cheers,
> >>>>>>>>> -Jamie
> >>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> Dedric Terry wrote:
> >>>>>>>>>> Hey Jimmy,
> >>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>> No doubt one can be a good person without believing in God -
there
> >>>> are

> >>>>>>>> tons
> >>>>>>>>> of great people with no faith, or very little. That in and of
> >>>>>>>>> itself
> >>>>>>>> tells
> >>>>>>>>> me there must be a God so even non-believers would have a
strong
> >> sense
> >>>>>>>> of
> >>>>>>>>> right and wrong on a societal and even global level.
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> To walk through some thoughts: with no God, or higher
reference
> >> point,
> >>>>>>>> what
> >>>>>>>>> would be considered moral, or at least good? What would one
use
> >> to
> >>>>>> decide
> >>>>>>>>> what is right and wrong?
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> Laws? Most would agree that we can't legislate morality now,
so
> >> with
> >>>>>>>> no
> >>>>>>>>> basis for what morality is, why would we even bother with laws
> >>>>>>>>> since
> >>>>>>>>> everyone would make their own choices anyway?
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> Intellect? That would simply depend on what one chose to
accept
> >> as
> >>>>>>>>> "intelligent" thought, based completely on opinion.
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> Reasoning and Logic? Logic is determined by a hypothesis that
has
> >>>> a
> >>>>>> proven
> >>>>>>>>> outcome in a given situation. Change the situation, and the
> >>>>>>>>> reasoning
> >>>>>>>> or
> >>>>>>>>> logic behind the "right" or "wrong" could easily change.
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> Experience? What if one's experience is filled with hatred,
> >>>>>>>>> abuse,
> >>>>>> anger
> >>>>>>>>> and violence, or worse? Then someone would have to decide
whose
> >> experience

> >>>>>>>>>> we would use as a reference point. There would be no guarantee
> >> that
> >>>>>> person
> >>>>>>>>>> or persons had experiences that would be best for the good of
the
> >>>> whole.
> >>>>>>>>>> Survival instinct? If it were a reference point, then
stealing,
> >> lying,
> >>>>>>>>>> cheating and even killing would be perfectly justified as those
> >> can
> >>>>>> be
> >>>>>>>> means
> >>>>>>>>>> of survival.
> >>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>> Why would right and wrong even exist? I would think that the
> >>>>>>>>>> differences
> >>>>>>>>>> between societies' definitions of right and wrong, assuming
> >>>>>>>>>> societies
> >>>>>>>> even
> >>>>>>>>>> existed, would be so drastic we would never have ventured into
any
> >>>> form
> >>>>>>>> of
> >>>>>>>>>> inter-cultural/inter-geographic interaction, much less
> >>>>>>>>>> relationships,
> >>>>>>>>>> diplomacy, collaboration, trade, and open travel.
> >>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>> As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual, they
> >>>>>>>>>> aren't
> >>>>>>>>>> absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes
to
> >> make
> >>>>>>>> the
> >>>>>>>>>> choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There would
> >>>>>>>>>> only
> >>>>>>>> be
> >>>>>>>> an
> >>>>>>>>>> ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at the
> >>>>>>>>>> time,
> >>>>>> and
> >>>>>>>>>> based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from
person
> >>>> to
> >>>>>> person,
> >>>>>>>>>> day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons would
> >>>>>>>>>> either
> >>>>>>>> be

> >>>>>>>>>> filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time
> >>>>>>>>>> because
> >>>>>>>> their
> >>>>>>>>>> choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we
> >>>>>>>>>> wouldn't
> >>>>>> have
> >>>>>>>>>> prisons, or likely even organized societies.
> >>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>> But is the majority always right? How would we know if there
were
> >>>> no
> >>>>>>>>>> absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?
> >>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>> If there were no right and wrong, there would be no
consequences
> >> of
> >>>>>> either,
> >>>>>>>>>> or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad
> >>>>>>>>>> consequence
> >>>>>>>> - it
> >>>>>>>>>> would just be another event in time.
> >>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>> But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice,
both
> >>>> in
> >>>>>> whether
> >>>>>>>>>> to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong decisions.
> >> With
> >>>>>>>> moral
> >>>>>>>>>> absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to evaluate
> >> drastically
> >>>>>>>>>> differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency
in
> >> reasoning
> >>>>>>>>>> and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry.
Even
> >>>> when
> >>>>>>>> we
> >>>>>>>>>> choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without that
> >>>>>>>>>> option
> >>>>>>>> to
> >>>>>>>>>> choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would be
> >> no
> >>>> power
> >>>>>>>> in
> >>>>>>>>>> choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal
and
> >>>> loving

> >>>>>>>> God
> >>>>>>>>> rather than a dictator or puppet master.
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see God
> >> in
> >>>> the
> >>>>>>>> way
> >>>>>>>>> that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can
> >>>>>>>>> discuss
> >>>>>>>>> completely opposing opinions and still care enough to consider
> >>>>>>>>> insulting,
> >>>>>>>>> belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable
> >>>>>>>>> concept;
> >>>>>>>> and 2)
> >>>>>>>>> in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely
trump
> >>>> greed
> >>>>>>>> and
> >>>>>>>>> power in importance to life and survival together on this
planet.
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> Regards,
> >>>>>>>>> Dedric
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy"
> >>>>>>>>> <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>> The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have a
> >> strong
> >>>>>>>> morals
> >>>>>>>>>> is absurd, I think.
> >>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>> Jimmy
> >>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
> >>>>>>>>>> news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...
> >>>>>>>>>>> Gene -
> >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your
> >>>>>>>>>>> response
> >>>>>> pretty
> >>>>>>>>>>> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country
and
> >>>> even
> >>>>>>>> the
> >>>>>>>>>>> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict,
> >>>>>>>>>>> violence

> >>>>>> and
> >>>>>>>>>>>> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single
> >>>>>>>>>>>> largest
> >>>>>>>>>>>> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world.
We
> >> ignore
> >>>>>>>>> car
> >>>>>>>>>>>> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of
> >>>>>>>>>>>> tortured
> >>>>>> and
> >>>>>>>>>>>> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming
the
> >>>>>>>>>>>> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made
the
> >>>> Pope
> >>>>>>>>> quote
> >>>>>>>>>>>> a
> >>>>>>>>>>>> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.
> >>>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>>> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening,
> >>>>>>>>>>>> all-accepting
> >>>>>> religion
> >>>>>>>>>>>> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western
> >>>>>>>>>>>> Muslims
> >>>>>>>>> might
> >>>>>>>>>>>> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else
> >> in
> >>>> many
> >>>>>>>>> of
> >>>>>>>>>>>> the
> >>>>>>>>>>>> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have
> >>>>>>>>>>>> talked
> >>>>>> to,
> >>>>>>>>> and
> >>>>>>>>>>>> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a
> >>>>>>>>>>>> different
> >>>>>>>>> world
> >>>>>>>>>>>> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have
> >> here.
> >>>>>>>>>>>> People
> >>>>>>>>>>>> die for converting to anything else, or their families do.
At
> >> best,
> >>>>>>>>> their
> >>>>>>>>>>>> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under
> >>>>>>>>>>>> threat
> >>>>>>>>> of
> >>>>>>>>>>>> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our

> >>>>>>>>>>>> country
> >>>>>>>>>>>> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on
our
> >>>> own
> >>>>>>>>>>>> country
> >>>>>>>>>>>> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to
this
> >>>> kind
> >>>>>>>>> of
> >>>>>>>>>>>> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically
correct
> >>>> thing
> >>>>>>>>> to
> >>>>>>>>>>>> do.
> >>>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>>> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God,
> >> and
> >>>>>> hence
> >>>>>>>>>>>> any
> >>>>>>>>>>>> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the
choice
> >>>> to
> >>>>>> believe
> >>>>>>>>>>>> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name
> >> of
> >>>> Allah
> >>>>>>>>> the
> >>>>>>>>>>>> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10
> >>>>>>>>>>>> commandments
> >>>>>> in
> >>>>>>>>> 24
> >>>>>>>>>>>> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there
> >> is
> >>>> a
> >>>>>> sad,
> >>>>>>>>>>>> and
> >>>>>>>>>>>> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should
> >>>>>>>>>>>> fear
> >>>>>> -
> >>>>>>>>> it's
> >>>>>>>>>>>> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's
personal
> >>>> whims
> >>>>>>>>> that
> >>>>>>>>>>>> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day.
> >> That
> >>>>>>>>> also
> >>>>>>>>>>>> includes believing in nothing.

> >>>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>>> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in
God
> >>>> and
> >>>>>>>> is
> >>>>>>>>>>>> wrong, at worst one has lived a good live and had some false
> >>>>>>>>>>>> hope
> >>>>>> as
> >>>>>>>> a
> >>>>>>>>>>> sense
> >>>>>>>>>>>> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is
wrong,
> >>>> then
> >>>>>>>> at
> >>>>>>>>>>>> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we
> >>>>>>>>>>>> should
> >>>>>>>> be
> >>>>>>>>>>>> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that
the
> >>>> President
> >>>>>>>>>>>> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief
> >>>>>>>>>>>> really
> >>>>>>>> better
> >>>>>>>>>>>> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong
> >>>>>>>>>>>> accompanies
> >>>>>>>>>>> disbelief
> >>>>>>>>>>>> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference
> >>>>>>>>>>>> point
> >>>>>> for
> >>>>>>>>>>>> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of
belief
> >>>> in
> >>>>>> any
> >>>>>>>>>>>> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion
for
> >>>> others?
> >>>>>>>>>>>> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a
guy
> >> Islam
> >>>>>>>>>>> doesn't
> >>>>>>>>>>>> like just because he called like he saw it - something we do
on
> >>>> this
> >>>>>>>> forum
> >>>>>>>>>>>> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's
> >>>>>>>>>>>> intent
> >>>>>> to
> >>>>>>>> take

> >>>>>>>>>>>> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only goal
> >>>> is
> >>>>>> to
> >>>>>>>> give
> >>>>>>>>>>>> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to
> >> not
> >>>>>> believe
> >>>>>>>>>>>> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity from
> >> public
> >>>>>>>>>>> view.
> >>>>>>>>>>>> The only way to force someone to remove their belief from public
> >>>> in
> >>>>>>>> a
> >>>>>>>>>>>> country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes, is
> >> to
> >>>>>> outlaw
> >>>>>>>>>>> it.
> >>>>>>>>>>>> Yet another paradox.
> >>>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>>> Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see the
> >> world
> >>>>>>>> as a
> >>>>>>>>>>>> black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party
> >>>>>>>>>>>> always
> >>>>>> wins
> >>>>>>>>>>> and
> >>>>>>>>>>>> the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any
> >>>>>>>>>>>> validity
> >>>>>>>> in
> >>>>>>>>>>>> believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to maintain
> >>>> the
> >>>>>>>>>>> balance
> >>>>>>>>>>>> that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust in
> >>>> the
> >>>>>>>> very
> >>>>>>>>>>>> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most fallible
> >>>>>>>>>>>> characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic
> >>>>>>>>>>>> ideology.
> >>>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>>> I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.

> >>>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>>> I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of
10
> >> hours
> >>>>>>>> of
> >>>>>>>>>>> work
> >>>>>>>>>>> :-((....
> >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>> Regards,
> >>>>>>>>>>> Dedric
> >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>> On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70$1@linux, "gene
Lennon"
> >>>>>>>>>>> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
> >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
> >>>>>>>>>>>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread
> >> -...
> >>>>>>>>>>> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the
> >>>>>>>>>>> current
> >>>>>>>>>>> administration
> >>>>>>>>>>> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based
> >>>>>>>>>>> reasons
> >>>>>>>>> for
> >>>>>>>>>>> perusing
> >>>>>>>>>>> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier
> >>>>>>>>>>> motivation.
> >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>> Religion.
> >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third
> >>>>>>>>>>> Great
> >>>>>>>>>> Awakening"
> >>>>>>>>>>> of the international religious struggle. This is a good
thing
> >> as
> >>>>>> he
> >>>>>>>>> sees
> >>>>>>>>>>> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight
> >>>>>>>>>>> against
> >>>>>>>>>> terrorists
> >>>>>>>>>>> (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war
that
> >>>> he
> >>>>>>>>>> depicts
> >>>>>>>>>>> as "a confrontation between good and evil."
> >>>>>>>>>>> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit
of

> >>>> trouble
> >>>>>>>>>>> (as
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> headed?
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> easily
> >>>>>> go
> >>>>>>>>>>> down
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> hill from here.
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> More on the "Third Awakening":
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>>
 http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09 /12/AR2006091201
> >>>>>>>>>>> 59
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> 4_pf.html
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> Gene
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> `
> >>>>
> >>
> >
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by uptown jimmy on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 20:06:03 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Forget mooning them. Wring a few of their necks while you're there.

Jimmy

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
news:45104797@linux...
> Rick,
>
> Do you think it would help if we could just figure out a way to get into
the
> UN gallery (do they have a gallery?) and then start mooning people? I want
> to do something constructive instead of sitting around bitching all the
> time.
>
> Deej

>
>
> "rick" <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:k0c0h2hl6cc83qvha4esc96935fo3nqtb1@4ax.com...
> > i nominate you for john's diplomat search..props to you...damn, i
> > wasn't going to enter this fray...
> >
> > On Tue, 19 Sep 2006 11:31:50 -0500, "Tony Benson"
> > <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote:
> >
> > >With all due respect ulfiyya, the general consensus here is that anyone
> can
> > >discuss anything they feel like discussing. This group has morphed into
> more
> > >of a gathering place for PARIS users and former users. An online coffee
> > >house as such. The key for you is to simply skip the topics you don't
> want
> > >to read.
> > >
> > >Tony
> > >
> > >
> > >"ulfiyya" <ulfiyya@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:450f7bfa$1@linux...
> > >>
> > >> for ... many times poeple.
> > >> THIS IS NOT A POLITIK SITE!!!
> > >> This is ...Paris site (Music) Remember...
> > >>
> > >>
> > >>
> > >> Keep youre Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
> > >>>
> > >>>Thanks for the link. It looks like it might be a more interesting
read
> > >>>than what you might expect of a book on probability theory.
> > >>>
> > >>>Without risk management there would be no insurance.
> > >>>
> > >>>Seems like we have some major risk management headaches ahead in the
> > >>>foreign relations area. I don't have much faith that our current
> > >>>government understands the situation or is capable of brokering a
> > >>>lasting and beneficial peace.
> > >>>
> > >>>Cheers,
> > >>> -Jamie
> > >>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> > >>>
> > >>>

> > >>>TCB wrote:
> > >>>> I never said faith was limited to religion _at all_ because that
> would
> > >> be
> > >>>> silly. I only bring this up because I think it's a very important
> point.
> > >>>> Nearly every time you read 'without faith there would be no
XXXXXXXX'
> > >> it's
> > >>>> just not true and XXXXXXXX can get along just fine without faith.
> > >>>> Probably
> > >>>> the best popular book about risk is called 'Against the Gods' and
> it's
> > >> sort
> > >>>> of about this very topic.
> > >>>>
> > >>>>
>
 http://www.amazon.com/Against-Gods-Remarkable-Story-Risk/dp/ 0471295639/sr=8-
> 1/qid=1158631839/ref=pd_bbs_1/002-2500887-2981628?ie=UTF8&am p;s=books
> > >>>>
> > >>>> TCB
> > >>>>
> > >>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
> > >>>>> There you go, clearly faith is not limited to religion. Although
> just
> > >> as
> > >>>>
> > >>>>> clearly it's important for religion.
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> As to risk, many people have faith that their risks will pan out.
> Some
> > >>
> > >>>>> people do things because they have such faith. I know people like
> that.
> > >>>>
> > >>>>> I am people like that. That doesn't preclude anyone from doing
> > >>>>> something
> > >>>>
> > >>>>> for some other reason, of course.
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> If you want to say you don't have faith in anything, using any of
> the
> > >>
> > >>>>> definitions below, then that's your prerogative and I don't have a
> > >>>>> problem with that.
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> Cheers,

> > >>>>> -Jamie
> > >>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> TCB wrote:
> > >>>>>> Here's dictionary.com
> > >>>>>>
> > >>>>>> faith /feɪθ/ Pronunciation Key - Show Spelled
> > >>>>>> Pronunciation[feyth]
> > >>>>>> Pronunciation Key - Show IPA Pronunciation
> > >>>>>> -noun
> > >>>>>> 1. confidence or trust in a person or thing: faith in another's
> > >>>>>> ability.
> > >>>>>> 2. belief that is not based on proof: He had faith that the
> hypothesis
> > >>>> would
> > >>>>>> be substantiated by fact.
> > >>>>>> 3. belief in God or in the doctrines or teachings of religion:
the
> > >>>>>> firm
> > >>>> faith
> > >>>>>> of the Pilgrims.
> > >>>>>> 4. belief in anything, as a code of ethics, standards of merit,
> etc.:
> > >>>> to
> > >>>>>> be of the same faith with someone concerning honesty.
> > >>>>>> 5. a system of religious belief: the Christian faith; the Jewish
> > >>>>>> faith.
> > >>>>>> 6. the obligation of loyalty or fidelity to a person, promise,
> > >>>>>> engagement,
> > >>>>>> etc.: Failure to appear would be breaking faith.
> > >>>>>> 7. the observance of this obligation; fidelity to one's promise,
> oath,
> > >>>> allegiance,
> > >>>>>> etc.: He was the only one who proved his faith during our recent
> > >>>>>> troubles.
> > >>>>>> 8. Christian Theology. the trust in God and in His promises as
made
> > >> through
> > >>>>>> Christ and the Scriptures by which humans are justified or saved.
> > >>>>>>
> > >>>>>> I don't see anything in there about risk. My point is that people
> can
> > >>>> do
> > >>>>>> the things you're talking about knowing full well they might
fail,
> but
> > >>>> do

> > >>>>>> them anyway. That's taking a risk, not having faith. I don't have
> > >>>>>> faith
> > >>>> but
> > >>>>>> I've taken lots of personal and professional risks in my life.
> > >>>>>>
> > >>>>>> TCB
> > >>>>>>
> > >>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
> > >>>>>>> We can disagree about that but the first line is the dictionary
> > >>>>>>> definition.
> > >>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>> Cheers,
> > >>>>>>> -Jamie
> > >>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> > >>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>> TCB wrote:
> > >>>>>>>> You're confusing 'faith' with 'a willingness to take risks.'
> Animals
> > >>>> take
> > >>>>>>>> risks, to get food, create more animals, etc., but I doubt they
> have
> > >>>> faith.
> > >>>>>>>> One needs no faith to start businesses, invest money, get
> married,
> > >> etc.
> > >>>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
> > >>>>>>>>> Faith is complete trust or confidence in something or someone.
> > >>>>>>>>> Religious
> > >>>>>>>>> faith is one form of faith but not the only definition of
> "faith."
> > >>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>> For example I have faith that if I drop a guitar pick it will
> find
> > >>>> its
> > >>>>>>>>> way to the floor based on the gravitational attraction it has
to
> > >> the
> > >>>>>>>>> planet. I have faith that I'll breathe my next breath, that
I'll
> > >> see
> > >>>>>>>>> tomorrow morning. I have faith that other people are put
> together
> > >> much
> > >>>>>>>>> like I am and that I can therefore relate to other folks.
> > >>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>> Without faith, people would not invest money. Without faith
> people

> > >>>> would
> > >>>>>>>>> not vote. Without faith people would not start businesses,
hire
> > >>>>>>>>> other
> > >>>>>>>>> people, raise children. Without faith people would not ride
> trains,
> > >>>> fly
> > >>>>>>>>> in planes or drive cars. Without faith no one would
investigate
> > >>>>>>>>> scientific questions about reality.
> > >>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>> While you can clearly have faith without religion, you cannot
> have
> > >>>>
> > >>>>>>>>> religion without faith. Religion depends on faith that one or
> more
> > >>>>
> > >>>>>>>>> deities (good and sometimes bad) exist, that their associated
> > >>>>>>>>> stories
> > >>>>>>>>> actually occurred, and often, that there is some sort of
> afterlife.
> > >>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>> However, religious people believe in a variety of different
> > >>>>>>>>> deities.
> > >>>>>>>>> Even those who believe in the same deity disagree, sometimes
> > >>>>>>>>> violently,
> > >>>>>>>>> about the nature of their deity. Religions sometimes even
> disagree
> > >>>> about
> > >>>>>>>>> the nature of reality. If you want to base morality strictly
on
> > >>>>>>>>> religion, and you look around, you'll notice that religion can
> be
> > >> a
> > >>>>
> > >>>>>>>>> somewhat chaotic basis unless...
> > >>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>> Ah, you might say, I want to base morality on MY religion.
Well,
> > >> you
> > >>>>>>>>> just dissed the majority of religions. No problem because THEY
> ARE
> > >>>>
> > >>>>>>>>> WRONG. And people who believe in those religions may just be
> saying
> > >>>> the
> > >>>>>>>>> same thing about you and your religion. For those religions
who

> are
> > >>>> not
> > >>>>>>>>> tolerant of other ideas, you may just have started a war.
> > >>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>> So perhaps it's BETTER, in our time, to have a system of
justice
> > >> that
> > >>>>>> is
> > >>>>>>>>> NOT based on a religion. But one which guarantees everyone the
> > >>>>>>>>> right
> > >>>>>> to
> > >>>>>>>>> practice the religion of their choice, guarantees other
freedoms
> > >> such
> > >>>>>> as
> > >>>>>>>>> we in the USA do in our Bill of Rights, encourages honesty and
> > >>>>>>>>> integrity, while enforcing some common sense limits such as no
> > >>>>>>>>> human
> > >>>>>>>>> sacrifices, a minimum age for marriage, no incest, no slavery,
> no
> > >>
> > >>>>>>>>> murder, no rape, no stealing, those sorts of things.
> > >>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>> What is viewed as morality beyond a fair justice system and
> common
> > >>>> sense
> > >>>>>>>>> rules of behavior can be left to each freely chosen religion
to
> > >>>>>>>>> sort
> > >>>>>>>>> out, like whether to restrict diet in some way, whether to
wear
> a
> > >>
> > >>>>>>>>> certain type of clothing, how to pray, etc. But none of these
> > >>>>>>>>> additional
> > >>>>>>>>> practices should be imposed on society as a whole.
> > >>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>> The Golden Rule may also be of use as a basic moral
foundation.
> > >>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>> So yes, you can have a moral system, one that BTW protects the
> > >>>>>>>>> freedom
> > >>>>>>>>> to practice religious beliefs (or not), without basing it on
any
> > >> one
> > >>>>>>>>> religion. And it can protect all religions better than a
system
> > >>>>>>>>> based

> > >>>>>> on
> > >>>>>>>>> any one religion (AKA a theocracy).
> > >>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>> There are other issues surrounding religions, such as the many
> > >>>>>>>>> examples
> > >>>>>>>>> of selfless dedication to helping others on the one hand, and
> > >>>>>>>>> hijacked
> > >>>>>>>>> religions used to legitimize earthly power structures in other
> > >>>>>>>>> cases.
> > >>>>>>>>> Dedric, I look forward to talking with you about the positives
> and
> > >>>>
> > >>>>>>>>> negatives of various religions, and where a moral culture
ought
> to
> > >>>> go
> > >>>>>>>>> >from here, whenever we next get together.
> > >>>>>>>>> Cheers,
> > >>>>>>>>> -Jamie
> > >>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> > >>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>> Dedric Terry wrote:
> > >>>>>>>>>> Hey Jimmy,
> > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>> No doubt one can be a good person without believing in God -
> there
> > >>>> are
> > >>>>>>>>> tons
> > >>>>>>>>>> of great people with no faith, or very little. That in and
of
> > >>>>>>>>>> itself
> > >>>>>>>>> tells
> > >>>>>>>>>> me there must be a God so even non-believers would have a
> strong
> > >> sense
> > >>>>>>>>> of
> > >>>>>>>>>> right and wrong on a societal and even global level.
> > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>> To walk through some thoughts: with no God, or higher
> reference
> > >> point,
> > >>>>>>>>> what
> > >>>>>>>>>> would be considered moral, or at least good? What would one
> use
> > >> to
> > >>>>>>>> decide
> > >>>>>>>>>> what is right and wrong?

> > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>> Laws? Most would agree that we can't legislate morality now,
> so
> > >> with
> > >>>>>>>> no
> > >>>>>>>>>> basis for what morality is, why would we even bother with
laws
> > >>>>>>>>>> since
> > >>>>>>>>>> everyone would make their own choices anyway?
> > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>> Intellect? That would simply depend on what one chose to
> accept
> > >> as
> > >>>>>>>>>> "intelligent" thought, based completely on opinion.
> > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>> Reasoning and Logic? Logic is determined by a hypothesis
that
> has
> > >>>> a
> > >>>>>>> proven
> > >>>>>>>>>> outcome in a given situation. Change the situation, and the
> > >>>>>>>>>> reasoning
> > >>>>>>>> or
> > >>>>>>>>>> logic behind the "right" or "wrong" could easily change.
> > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>> Experience? What if one's experience is filled with hatred,
> > >>>>>>>>>> abuse,
> > >>>>>>> anger
> > >>>>>>>>>> and violence, or worse? Then someone would have to decide
> whose
> > >> experience
> > >>>>>>>>>> we would use as a reference point. There would be no
guarantee
> > >> that
> > >>>>>>> person
> > >>>>>>>>>> or persons had experiences that would be best for the good of
> the
> > >>>> whole.
> > >>>>>>>>>> Survival instinct? If it were a reference point, then
> stealing,
> > >> lying,
> > >>>>>>>>>> cheating and even killing would be perfectly justified as
those
> > >> can
> > >>>>>>> be
> > >>>>>>>> means
> > >>>>>>>>>> of survival.
> > >>>>>>>>>>

> > >>>>>>>>>> Why would right and wrong even exist? I would think that the
> > >>>>>>>>>> differences
> > >>>>>>>>>> between societies' definitions of right and wrong, assuming
> > >>>>>>>>>> societies
> > >>>>>>>> even
> > >>>>>>>>>> existed, would be so drastic we would never have ventured
into
> any
> > >>>> form
> > >>>>>>>> of
> > >>>>>>>>>> inter-cultural/inter-geographic interaction, much less
> > >>>>>>>>>> relationships,
> > >>>>>>>>>> diplomacy, collaboration, trade, and open travel.
> > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>> As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual,
they
> > >>>>>>>>>> aren't
> > >>>>>>>>>> absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes
> to
> > >> make
> > >>>>>>>> the
> > >>>>>>>>>> choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There
would
> > >>>>>>>>>> only
> > >>>>>> be
> > >>>>>>>> an
> > >>>>>>>>>> ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at
the
> > >>>>>>>>>> time,
> > >>>>>> and
> > >>>>>>>>>> based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from
> person
> > >>>> to
> > >>>>>> person,
> > >>>>>>>>>> day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons
would
> > >>>>>>>>>> either
> > >>>>>>>> be
> > >>>>>>>>>> filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time
> > >>>>>>>>>> because
> > >>>>>>>> their
> > >>>>>>>>>> choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we
> > >>>>>>>>>> wouldn't
> > >>>>>> have
> > >>>>>>>>>> prisons, or likely even organized societies.
> > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>> But is the majority always right? How would we know if there
> were

> > >>>> no
> > >>>>>>>>>> absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?
> > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>> If there were no right and wrong, there would be no
> consequences
> > >> of
> > >>>>>> either,
> > >>>>>>>>>> or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad
> > >>>>>>>>>> consequence
> > >>>>>>>> - it
> > >>>>>>>>>> would just be another event in time.
> > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>> But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice,
> both
> > >>>> in
> > >>>>>> whether
> > >>>>>>>>>> to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong
decisions.
> > >> With
> > >>>>>>>> moral
> > >>>>>>>>>> absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to
evaluate
> > >> drastically
> > >>>>>>>>>> differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency
> in
> > >> reasoning
> > >>>>>>>>>> and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry.
> Even
> > >>>> when
> > >>>>>>>> we
> > >>>>>>>>>> choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without
that
> > >>>>>>>>>> option
> > >>>>>>>> to
> > >>>>>>>>>> choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would
be
> > >> no
> > >>>> power
> > >>>>>>>> in
> > >>>>>>>>>> choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal
> and
> > >>>> loving
> > >>>>>>>> God
> > >>>>>>>>>> rather than a dictator or puppet master.
> > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>> Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see
God
> > >> in

> > >>>> the
> > >>>>>>>> way
> > >>>>>>>>>> that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can
> > >>>>>>>>>> discuss
> > >>>>>>>>>> completely opposing opinions and still care enough to
consider
> > >>>>>>>>>> insulting,
> > >>>>>>>>>> belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable
> > >>>>>>>>>> concept;
> > >>>>>>>> and 2)
> > >>>>>>>>>> in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely
> trump
> > >>>> greed
> > >>>>>>>> and
> > >>>>>>>>>> power in importance to life and survival together on this
> planet.
> > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>> Regards,
> > >>>>>>>>>> Dedric
> > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>> On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy"
> > >>>>>>>>>> <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
> > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>> The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have
a
> > >> strong
> > >>>>>>>> morals
> > >>>>>>>>>> is absurd, I think.
> > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>> Jimmy
> > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
> > >>>>>>>>>> news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...
> > >>>>>>>>>> Gene -
> > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your
> > >>>>>>>>>> response
> > >>>>>> pretty
> > >>>>>>>>>> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country
> and
> > >>>> even
> > >>>>>>>> the
> > >>>>>>>>>> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict,
> > >>>>>>>>>> violence
> > >>>>>> and
> > >>>>>>>>>> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the
single

> > >>>>>>>>>>>> largest
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world.
> We
> > >> ignore
> > >>>>>>>> car
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> tortured
> > >>>>>> and
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming
> the
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made
> the
> > >>>> Pope
> > >>>>>>>> quote
> > >>>>>>>>>>> a
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.
> > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening,
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> all-accepting
> > >>>>>> religion
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> Muslims
> > >>>>>>>> might
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything
else
> > >> in
> > >>>> many
> > >>>>>>>> of
> > >>>>>>>>>>> the
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> talked
> > >>>>>> to,
> > >>>>>>>> and
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> different
> > >>>>>>>> world
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we
have
> > >> here.
> > >>>>>>>>>>> People
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> die for converting to anything else, or their families do.
> At
> > >> best,
> > >>>>>>>> their
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> families disown them and they sneak out of the country
under
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> threat
> > >>>>>>>> of

> > >>>>>>>>>>>> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> country
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn
on
> our
> > >>>> own
> > >>>>>>>>>>> country
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to
> this
> > >>>> kind
> > >>>>>>>>> of
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically
> correct
> > >>>> thing
> > >>>>>>>>> to
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> do.
> > >>>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in
God,
> > >> and
> > >>>>>> hence
> > >>>>>>>>>>> any
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the
> choice
> > >>>> to
> > >>>>>>> believe
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the
name
> > >> of
> > >>>> Allah
> > >>>>>>>>> the
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> commandments
> > >>>>>>> in
> > >>>>>>>>> 24
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but
there
> > >> is
> > >>>> a
> > >>>>>>> sad,
> > >>>>>>>>>>> and
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one
should
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> fear
> > >>>>>>> -
> > >>>>>>>>> it's
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's
> personal

> > >>>> whims
> > >>>>>>>> that
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one
day.
> > >> That
> > >>>>>>>> also
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> includes believing in nothing.
> > >>>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes
in
> God
> > >>>> and
> > >>>>>>>> is
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> wrong, at worst one has lived a good live and had some
false
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> hope
> > >>>>>> as
> > >>>>>>>> a
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> sense
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is
> wrong,
> > >>>> then
> > >>>>>>>> at
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that
we
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> should
> > >>>>>>>> be
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that
> the
> > >>>> President
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no
belief
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> really
> > >>>>>>>> better
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> accompanies
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> disbelief
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What
reference
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> point
> > >>>>>> for
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of
> belief
> > >>>> in
> > >>>>>> any
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion
> for
> > >>>> others?

> > >>>>>>>>>>>> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a
> guy
> > >> Islam
> > >>>>>>>>>>> doesn't
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> like just because he called like he saw it - something we
do
> on
> > >>>> this
> > >>>>>>>> forum
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> intent
> > >>>>>> to
> > >>>>>>>> take
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only
> goal
> > >>>> is
> > >>>>>> to
> > >>>>>>>> give
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide
to
> > >> not
> > >>>>>> believe
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity
> from
> > >> public
> > >>>>>>>>>>> view.
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> The only way to force someone to remove their belief from
> public
> > >>>> in
> > >>>>>>>> a
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes,
> is
> > >> to
> > >>>>>> outlaw
> > >>>>>>>>>>> it.
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> Yet another paradox.
> > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see
> the
> > >> world
> > >>>>>>>> as a
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> always
> > >>>>>> wins
> > >>>>>>>>>>> and
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> validity
> > >>>>>>>> in

> > >>>>>>>>>>>> believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to
> maintain
> > >>>> the
> > >>>>>>>>>>> balance
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our
trust
> in
> > >>>> the
> > >>>>>>>> very
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most
> fallible
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> ideology.
> > >>>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.
> > >>>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of
> 10
> > >> hours
> > >>>>>>>> of
> > >>>>>>>>>>> work
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> :-((....
> > >>>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> Regards,
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> Dedric
> > >>>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70$1@linux, "gene
> Lennon"
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
> > >>>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
> > >>>>>>>>>>>>> I don't want to start another religious or political
thread
> > >> -...
> > >>>>>>>>>>>>> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the
> > >>>>>>>>>>>>> current
> > >>>>>>>>>>>>> administration
> > >>>>>>>>>>>>> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based
> > >>>>>>>>>>>>> reasons
> > >>>>>>>> for
> > >>>>>>>>>>>>> perusing
> > >>>>>>>>>>>>> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even
scarier
> > >>>>>>>>>>>>> motivation.
> > >>>>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>>>>> Religion.
> > >>>>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>>>>> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third

> > >>>>>>>>>>>>> Great
> > >>>>>>>>>>> Awakening"
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> of the international religious struggle. This is a good
> thing
> > >> as
> > >>>>>> he
> > >>>>>>>> sees
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> against
> > >>>>>>>>>> terrorists
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war
> that
> > >>>> he
> > >>>>>>>>>> depicts
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> as "a confrontation between good and evil."
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a
bit
> of
> > >>>> trouble
> > >>>>>>>>>> (as
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
> > >>>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> headed?
> > >>>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> easily
> > >>>>>> go
> > >>>>>>>>>> down
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> hill from here.
> > >>>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> More on the "Third Awakening":
> > >>>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>>
>
http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09 /12/AR2006091201
> > >>>>>>>>>> 59
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> 4_pf.html
> > >>>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>>>> Gene
> > >>>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>> `
> > >>>>
> > >>
> > >
> >
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by TCB on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 22:29:10 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

The Dems are completely screwed because they _at least_ rolled over to a one. On the whole program, from start to finish. People forget Patriot I was Clinton legislation in reaction to Oklahoma City, Patriot II just took another nibble at what (little) was left of the constitution.

Unlike most people, I was a loud critic of this war _before_ it started. This was because I know what the US has done previously in Southeast Asia, Central America, and so on. We've invaded nearly every country south of the Mexican border at least twice, some more. The Dominican Republic had Marines there five time in the twentieth century, a country that couldn't defeat the Albany PD on a good day. Every time we've invaded another country it was to save it from a) itself or b) the evil empire. After reading in the 1980's about the terrifying strategic threats posed by Guatemala, Grenada, Nicarauga, and Panama I decided I'd be a bit skeptical henceforth.

But I remember seeing two of the most prominent Dems, Joe Lieberman and Hillary Clinton, on TV in the run up the war. Both were demanding to know why Bush hadn't invaded Iraq already. Why we weren't using bigger bombs on more people far faster etc. and so forth. And I said to myself, 'Well, that's the end of the Democratic party.' And it's hard to feel terribly nostalgic for it.

And, as you say Deej, now all effort is being made to blame the CIA because if we don't blame them we might actually blame the cringing sycophants we elected to represent We the People in Congress Assembled. Ironically it was the CIA that was most cautious about the Iraq war. The CIA may be a bunch of loathesome spooks who the US would assassinate if they did to us what they do to other countries in our name, but that doesn't make them wrong or stupid.

But I always say, think of two things about the current various wars on terror. Who at the very least paid for the training and equipping of Osama and his boys? During the brutal ten year Iran-Iraq war, did the US support one side with money or military equipment, and if so which side?

Both parties should pay for what they've done, neither will,

TCB

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:
>The dems you mentioned authorized the military attack on Iraq as a last
>resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done as such.
>
>How convenient for them when it was the intelligence service that they
>created over 8 years of hard work that they now attempt to slag and blame
>for their decisdions so they can vote for the war before they vote against

>it.
>
>"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:450f8aec@linux...
>>
>> There is plenty of finger pointing to go around. No doubt specific
>> things could have been handled better under the previous government.
>>
>> The transition of power between the previous and current governments was
>> pretty rocky, and a "not invented here" syndrome may have doomed the
>> hand-off of some al-Qaida related work that was in progress.
>>
>> In any case, no government gets a pass by blaming the previous
>> government. The current government, for example, failed to follow
>> through and prioritize the al-Qaida threat ahead of 9/11 and failed to
>> prevent 9/11; failed to find and capture Bin Laden in Afghanistan;
>> failed to overcome Taliban control of large areas of Afghanistan;
>> allowed record drug production to reestablish itself there; failed to
>> plan for post Iraq invasion problems predicted by their own state
>> department; and they have continually exploited the "war on terrorism"
>> for domestic political ends.
>>
>> You assert the WMDs were there. However Bush's chief inspector, and Bush
>> himself, say they weren't there after all. It was a bluff. One of the
>> Iraqi expatriate promoters of the bluff got the ear of our government,
>> was believed, and, last I heard, had parlayed it into a position of
>> power in Iraq after the invasion.
>>
>> The dems you mentioned authorized the military attack on Iraq as a last
>> resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done as such.
>>
>> Preemptive invasion is new as part of the "Bush (Jr.) Doctrine."
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>> DJ wrote:
>> > "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:450f3862@linux...
>> >> Neither, actually. And what we ought to do would depend on the nature
>of
>> >> the threat.
>> >
>> > Agreed.
>> >
>> >> We might want to start with recommendations published in 1999, well
>> >> before the 9/11 attack.
>> >>

>> >> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Commission_on_Terroris m
>> >>
>> >> We can disagree about whether our current policy is one of overreacting
>> >> or not. We can probably really disagree about the newly minted
>> >> preemptive attack policy. :^)
>> >
>> > I don't think there is any newly minted attack policy. There has always
>been
>> > the *clear and present danger* perogative but it needs to be based on
>> > accurate intelligence. Had this been available, then I doubt that Bush,
>> > Kerry, Kennedy Pelosi and the rest would have authorized the invasion
of
>> > Iraq, or perhaps they would have been able to find the WMD's before
they
>> > were shipped out of the country or hidden. I just find it hard to
>stomach
>> > the hypocracy of the democrats whose policies neutered our intelligence
>> > services in the '90's when they trun around and blame Bush for the
>decisions
>> > made based on the intellegence blunders they created in the first place.
>> >
>> > Regards,
>> >
>> > Deej
>> >
>> >
>> >> Cheers,
>> >>   -Jamie
>> >>   http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>> >>
>> >>
>> >> DJ wrote:
>> >>> I don't see us overreacting Jamie. However, if there is indication
of
>> > some
>> >>> sort of major threat, do we run and tell the NY times or do we blow
>the
>> >>> threat away before it pays us a visit?
>> >>>
>> >>>
>> >>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
>news:450f0b12@linux...
>> >>>> Of course they came out with a blustery ultimatum. That's not news,
>> > it's
>> >>>> an old pattern. It works for them to sit back and suggest that others
>> > do
>> >>>> something via terror-grams such as this. If it makes you afraid as
>> > well,

>> >>>> my guess is they would see that as a bonus.
>> >>>>
>> >>>> By goading the USA into overreacting it helps them grow, raise money
>> > and
>> >>>> convince others to actually see us as evil and act accordingly. It
>> >>>> works, we keep falling for it. OTOH, for those here with a declared
>> >>>> interest in emptying the US treasury, it's likewise beneficial to
>have
>> >>>> the specter of an enemy out there. Fear sells.
>> >>>>
>> >>>> We have yet to actually declare war on anyone in this whole mess.
How
>> > do
>> >>>> you declare war on a tactic?
>> >>>>
>> >>>> Forced conversion and head taxes would go over like a lead balloon
in
>> >>>> the USA. Not gonna happen. We're far more sectarian than, say, Iraq.
>> >>>>
>> >>>> Responsible leadership is needed in the world to calm extremist
>> >>>> tendencies on all sides and help rational people who are trying to
>get
>> >>>> by in worsening times. At the same time we need to be, and are
>> >>>> attempting to be, vigilant against any self righteous group with
>> >>>> fantasies of violence in the USA.
>> >>>>
>> >>>> Any rush to some sort of "holy war" is irrational. There is nothing
>> > holy
>> >>>> about war.
>> >>>>
>> >>>> Cheers,
>> >>>> -Jamie
>> >>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>> >>>>
>> >>>>
>> >>>>
>> >>>> DJ wrote:
>> >>>>> I haven't seen us react with irrationality.....yet. Al
>Quaeda
>> >>> just
>> >>>>> came out with an ultimatim stating that it's full on war now and
the
>> >>> west
>> >>>>> will be destroyed. The only way to save ourselves is to convert
to
>> >>> Islam. So
>> >>>>> where to you draw the line between irrationality and self defense?
>> >>>>>

>> >>>>>
>> >>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
>> > news:450ee7ef@linux...
>> >>>>>> Let's keep from reacting to irrationality with irrationality of
our
>> >>> own.
>> >>>>>> There's a lot of fear mongering. Chicken Little is back.
>> >>>>>>
>> >>>>>> Cheers,
>> >>>>>> -Jamie
>> >>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>> >>>>>>
>> >>>>>>
>> >>>>>> DJ wrote:
>> >>>>>>> It doesn't matter at all whether this was the Pope. The bottom
>line
>> > is
>> >>>>> that
>> >>>>>>> it is rationality as opposed to irrationality.
>> >>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
>> >>> news:450ec970@linux...
>> >>>>>>>> The Catholic church doesn't speak for Christianity. Certainly
not
>> > for
>> >>>>>>>> Lutherans, and for good reason.
>> >>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>> A Pope criticizing other religions (even other Christian sects,
>> > even
>> >>>>>>>> other Catholics) is nothing new. Certainly much harsher things
>have
>> >>>>> been
>> >>>>>>>> said about Islam by some (not all) extreme fundamentalist
>> > Christians.
>> >>>>>>>> And certainly much harsher things have been said by certain
>> > extremist
>> >>>>>>>> Islamists about Christianity. The more extremist of both camps
>seem
>> >>> to
>> >>>>>>>> be spoiling to relive the crusades. With some of the more power
>> >>> hungry
>> >>>>>>>> ready to endanger civilization by attempting to incite religious
>> > wars
>> >>>>>>>> for their own questionable ends.
>> >>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>> It's a vast generalization to say the "the left" or "secularists"
>> > or
>> >>>>>>>> even "Christians" are demanding an apology from the Pope. I think

>a
>> >>>>>>>> whole lot of people think the Pope can say whatever he wants.
It
>> >>>>> doesn't
>> >>>>>>>> matter to most non-Catholics in the USA and in reality, Papal
>> >>>>>>>> declarations are ignored by a fair number of Catholics here,
too.
>> >>>>>>>> Obviously some Moslems are upset in some places, but how deep
>does
>> >>> that
>> >>>>>>>> go? When black churches were burning in the USA, it would have
>been
>> >>> an
>> >>>>>>>> exaggeration to blame everyone in the USA for that.
>> >>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church which only
very
>> >>>>>>>> recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo. The church
>hung
>> > on
>> >>>>>>>> tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view of the
>universe
>> >>>>> while
>> >>>>>>>> denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, which describes
>the
>> >>>>>>>> actual way the solar system works.
>> >>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>> It also extends to a few Christian sects who, feeling similarly
>> >>>>>>>> insecure, tenaciously cling to the notion that the earth is only
>> >>> about
>> >>>>>>>> 6,000 years old, by virtue of the biblical interpretations and
>> > clever
>> >>>>>>>> (at the time) calculations of an Irish Bishop several centuries
>> > ago,
>> >>>>> and
>> >>>>>>>> in the face of solid current scientific evidence to the contrary.
>> >>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some (not all) Christian churches
>> > who,
>> >>>>>>>> feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and ever-mounting
>> > evidence
>> >>>>> of
>> >>>>>>>> evolution, responding with dogma in psuedo-scientific clothing,
>and
>> >>> who
>> >>>>>>>> seek to water down scientific education in the USA.
>> >>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to power hungry industries who pay

big
>> >>> bucks
>> >>>>>>>> to spread denial about global warming for short term gain. Who
>push
>> >>> to
>> >>>>>>>> control oil in the middle east with force. With our guns blazing,
>> > our
>> >>>>>>>> soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically. And who
>> > sometimes
>> >>>>>>>> hide behind Christianity to do so.
>> >>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives who find
ways
>> > to
>> >>>>>>>> pretend that everyone is aligning against Christianity. And in
>> >>>>> spreading
>> >>>>>>>> this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to keep them in
>> > power.
>> >>>>>>>> And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of reason and
>the
>> >>>>> focus
>> >>>>>>>> on the use of force.
>> >>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>> Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and declare
>> > victory.
>> >>>>> ;^)
>> >>>>>>>> Have a great week!
>> >>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>> Cheers,
>> >>>>>>>> -Jamie
>> >>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>> >>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>> DC wrote:
>> >>>>>>>>> I thought this was worth reading if any of you are interested.
>> >>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>> Have a great Monday!
>> >>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>> ---------------------------------------
>> >>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>> The Unholy Alliance Rolls Over the Pope
>> >>>>>>>>> By Andrew Walden
>> >>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>> In what has suddenly been made into a highly controversial

of
>> >>>>>>>>> Regensberg, Pope Benedict describes Christian belief in a God

>> >>>>>>>>> whose words and acts are bound by reason, truth and the law
of
>> >>>>>>>>> non-contradiction. Benedict contrasts this with Islamic belief

>Benedict
>> >>>>>>>>> further contrasts Christian belief with that of secular
>humanists
>> >>>>>>>>> who see reason as being completely unbound of God.
>> >>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>> In response, both Islamists and secularists have demanded the

>> >>>>>>>>> genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between
>> >>>>>>>>> Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis of the clash
>> >>>>>>>>> of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror. His
>> >>>>>>>>> analysis also explains the underlying cause of the alliance
>> >>>>>>>>> between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.
>> >>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>> Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.
>> >>>>>>>>> Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor Manuel

>> >>>>>>>>> you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command

>> >>>>>>>>>

>> >>>>>>>>> unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top Shiite
>> >>>>>>>>> cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling party
>> >>>>>>>>> likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and accused him
of
>> >>>>>>>>> reviving the mentality of the Crusades.
>> >>>>>>>>>

>and
>> >>>>>>>>> jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of rage that
>> >>>>>>>>> many fear could burst into violent protests like those that

>> >>>>>>>>>

>> >>>>>>>>> safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.
>> >>>>>>>>>

>The
>> >>>>>>>>> reaction is not one of anger but a calculated attempt to force
>> >>>>>>>>> the Pope to parrot the PC line on Islam. Since Islam need not
be

>> >>>>>>>>> objective can be to assert the power of a God who is so
>> >>>>>>>>> transcendent that He is not bound by anything. If man is created

>> >>>>>>>>> anything. (This explains the predilection on the part of some

>to
>> >>>>>>>>> their non-existent morality. They are asserting the only

>> >>>>>>>>>

>> >>>>>>>>> is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist thought
>than

>> >>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing precisely what

>> >>>>>>>>> of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest mosque,

>to

>> >>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the Pope was,

>> >>>>>>>>>

>> >>>>>>>>> description of the Islamic God as being unbound by reason is
not
>> >>>>>>>>> an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What Muslims
and

>> >>>>>>>>> dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity. How dare he
not

>> >>>>>>>>>

>> >>>>>>>>> being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to the point
is
>> >>>>>>>>> lost on them.
>> >>>>>>>>>

>> >>>>>>>>> this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists are waging
a
>> >>>>>>>>> propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension against

>> >>>>>>>>> jihad, but not your violent jihad.
>> >>>>>>>>>

>> >>>>>>>>> side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more clear than
in
>> >>>>>>>>> the Islamist reaction to the Pope.
>> >>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>> With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November the
>Islamists
>> >>>>>>>>> are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons and demand
>> >>>>>>>>> to hear from the Pope himself. This would place raging mobs
of
>> >>>>>>>>> semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of forcing the
>> >>>>>>>>> leader of Christendom to bow before them.
>> >>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>> In this demand for submission they are joined by the secularist
>> >>>>>>>>> mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times
>editorializes:

>> >>>>>>>>> the secularists are driven only by their will to power. While
>> >>>>>>>>> the Islamists represent their demented version of
>> >>>>>>>>> God--unrestrained by reason, the secularists represent their
>> >>>>>>>>> demented version of reason--unrestrained by God. They are
>united
>> >>>>>>>>> by their self-worshipping world view.
>> >>>>>>>>>

>of
>> >>>>>>>>> our categories, even that of rationality...(The Islamic) God
is

>insult.
>> >>>>>>>>> Islam embraces this description. In offering this description
>of
>> >>>>>>>>> Islam, Benedict refers to the views of leading modern French
>> >>>>>>>>> Islamist R. Arnaldez as discussed in the writings of Professor
>> >>>>>>>>> Theodore Khoury of Munster.
>> >>>>>>>>>

>> >>>>>>>>> decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he considers

>> >>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>> Benedict asserts that without reason, or without God, there
can

>> >>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>> Both Islamist and secularist seek to break God and reason apart.
>> >>>>>>>>> Each claims superiority over the Christian West. They believe
>> >>>>>>>>> absolute moral license makes them powerful. As globalization
>> >>>>>>>>> carries the Western tradition of reason throughout the world,
>> >>>>>>>>> both are in decline.
>> >>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>> Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist and secularist

>> >>>>>>>>> with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after the collapse
>> >>>>>>>>> of the allied forces on the western front.
>> >>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>> What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear is having
to

>or

>great
>> >>>>>>>>> logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our partners
in

>> >>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>> Their fear of reason can only lead the world to disaster.
>> >>>>>>>>>
>> >>>
>> >
>> >
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Deej [1] on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 22:32:37 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

>But again, merely pointing fingers backwards
>in no way excuses the mistakes and failures of the current government.

Our situation is directly related to the fact that our leaders based their
decisions on disinformation that was a result of the policies of the Clinton

administration. I'm not pointing the finger backwards for any other reason than I feel it is important to keep this in mind lest we elect the same misguided souls with the same naieve and misguided foriegn policy ideas to office once again and end up in an even bigger mess.....and yes.....it could be much bigger if the liberals take control of the national legislature.....much less, god forbid, having another Clinton in the white House.

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:451035a7@linux...
>
> For most of the Clinton years the balance of power was divided between
> both parties. Again, there is plenty of finger pointing to go around.
> It's easy enough in hindsight to criticize the previous administration
> on a number of counts.
>
> And in retrospect, those dems made a mistake trusting Bush with that
> vote. OTOH, it was a moment of unity.
>
> Flash forward. Today all branches of national government are controlled
> by one party. It doesn't bother me if you want to point blame at some of
> the policies under Clinton. But again, merely pointing fingers backwards
> in no way excuses the mistakes and failures of the current government.
>
> They walked in stating in clear terms that they felt the previous
> government was wrong about almost everything, and then fell flat
> overall, domestically and internationally.
>
> Looking at both governments, we can do better. We must do better.
> At some point, and we're coming up on six years, the buck stops with
> those in charge now.
>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>
>
> DJ wrote:
> > The dems you mentioned authorized the military attack on Iraq as a last
> > resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done as such.
> >
> > How convenient for them when it was the intelligence service that they
> > created over 8 years of hard work that they now attempt to slag and
blame
> > for their decisdions so they can vote for the war before they vote
against
> > it.

> >
> > "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:450f8aec@linux...
> >> There is plenty of finger pointing to go around. No doubt specific
> >> things could have been handled better under the previous government.
> >>
> >> The transition of power between the previous and current governments
was
> >> pretty rocky, and a "not invented here" syndrome may have doomed the
> >> hand-off of some al-Qaida related work that was in progress.
> >>
> >> In any case, no government gets a pass by blaming the previous
> >> government. The current government, for example, failed to follow
> >> through and prioritize the al-Qaida threat ahead of 9/11 and failed to
> >> prevent 9/11; failed to find and capture Bin Laden in Afghanistan;
> >> failed to overcome Taliban control of large areas of Afghanistan;
> >> allowed record drug production to reestablish itself there; failed to
> >> plan for post Iraq invasion problems predicted by their own state
> >> department; and they have continually exploited the "war on terrorism"
> >> for domestic political ends.
> >>
> >> You assert the WMDs were there. However Bush's chief inspector, and
Bush
> >> himself, say they weren't there after all. It was a bluff. One of the
> >> Iraqi expatriate promoters of the bluff got the ear of our government,
> >> was believed, and, last I heard, had parlayed it into a position of
> >> power in Iraq after the invasion.
> >>
> >> The dems you mentioned authorized the military attack on Iraq as a last
> >> resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done as such.
> >>
> >> Preemptive invasion is new as part of the "Bush (Jr.) Doctrine."
> >>
> >> Cheers,
> >>   -Jamie
> >>   http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >>
> >>
> >> DJ wrote:
> >>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
news:450f3862@linux...
> >>>> Neither, actually. And what we ought to do would depend on the nature
> > of
> >>>> the threat.
> >>> Agreed.
> >>>
> >>>> We might want to start with recommendations published in 1999, well
> >>>> before the 9/11 attack.
> >>>>

> >>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Commission_on_Terroris m
> >>>>
> >>>> We can disagree about whether our current policy is one of
overreacting
> >>>> or not. We can probably really disagree about the newly minted
> >>>> preemptive attack policy. :^)
> >>> I don't think there is any newly minted attack policy. There has
always
> > been
> >>> the *clear and present danger* perogative but it needs to be based on
> >>> accurate intelligence. Had this been available, then I doubt that
Bush,
> >>> Kerry, Kennedy Pelosi and the rest would have authorized the invasion
of
> >>> Iraq, or perhaps they would have been able to find the WMD's before
they
> >>> were shipped out of the country or hidden. I just find it hard to
> > stomach
> >>> the hypocracy of the democrats whose policies neutered our
intelligence
> >>> services in the '90's when they trun around and blame Bush for the
> > decisions
> >>> made based on the intellegence blunders they created in the first
place.
> >>>
> >>> Regards,
> >>>
> >>> Deej
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>> Cheers,
> >>>>   -Jamie
> >>>>   http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>> DJ wrote:
> >>>>> I don't see us overreacting Jamie. However, if there is indication
of
> >>> some
> >>>>> sort of major threat, do we run and tell the NY times or do we blow
> > the
> >>>>> threat away before it pays us a visit?
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> > news:450f0b12@linux...
> >>>>>> Of course they came out with a blustery ultimatum. That's not news,
> >>> it's

> >>>>>> an old pattern. It works for them to sit back and suggest that
others
> >>> do
> >>>>>> something via terror-grams such as this. If it makes you afraid as
> >>> well,
> >>>>>> my guess is they would see that as a bonus.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> By goading the USA into overreacting it helps them grow, raise
money
> >>> and
> >>>>>> convince others to actually see us as evil and act accordingly. It
> >>>>>> works, we keep falling for it. OTOH, for those here with a declared
> >>>>>> interest in emptying the US treasury, it's likewise beneficial to
> > have
> >>>>>> the specter of an enemy out there. Fear sells.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> We have yet to actually declare war on anyone in this whole mess.
How
> >>> do
> >>>>>> you declare war on a tactic?
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> Forced conversion and head taxes would go over like a lead balloon
in
> >>>>>> the USA. Not gonna happen. We're far more sectarian than, say,
Iraq.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> Responsible leadership is needed in the world to calm extremist
> >>>>>> tendencies on all sides and help rational people who are trying to
> > get
> >>>>>> by in worsening times. At the same time we need to be, and are
> >>>>>> attempting to be, vigilant against any self righteous group with
> >>>>>> fantasies of violence in the USA.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> Any rush to some sort of "holy war" is irrational. There is nothing
> >>> holy
> >>>>>> about war.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> Cheers,
> >>>>>> -Jamie
> >>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> DJ wrote:
> >>>>>>> I haven't seen us react with irrationality.....yet. Al
> > Quaeda
> >>>>> just
> >>>>>>> came out with an ultimatim stating that it's full on war now and

the
> >>>>> west
> >>>>>>> will be destroyed. The only way to save ourselves is to convert to
> >>>>> Islam. So
> >>>>>>> where to you draw the line between irrationality and self defense?
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> >>> news:450ee7ef@linux...
> >>>>>>>> Let's keep from reacting to irrationality with irrationality of
our
> >>>>> own.
> >>>>>>>> There's a lot of fear mongering. Chicken Little is back.
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>> Cheers,
> >>>>>>>> -Jamie
> >>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>> DJ wrote:
> >>>>>>>>> It doesn't matter at all whether this was the Pope. The bottom
> > line
> >>> is
> >>>>>>> that
> >>>>>>>>> it is rationality as opposed to irrationality.
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> >>>>> news:450ec970@linux...
> >>>>>>>>> The Catholic church doesn't speak for Christianity. Certainly
not
> >>> for
> >>>>>>>>> Lutherans, and for good reason.
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> A Pope criticizing other religions (even other Christian sects,
> >>> even
> >>>>>>>>> other Catholics) is nothing new. Certainly much harsher things
> > have
> >>>>>>> been
> >>>>>>>>> said about Islam by some (not all) extreme fundamentalist
> >>> Christians.
> >>>>>>>>> And certainly much harsher things have been said by certain
> >>> extremist
> >>>>>>>>> Islamists about Christianity. The more extremist of both camps
> > seem
> >>>>> to
> >>>>>>>>> be spoiling to relive the crusades. With some of the more power
> >>>>> hungry
> >>>>>>>>> ready to endanger civilization by attempting to incite

religious
> >>> wars
> >>>>>>>>>> for their own questionable ends.
> >>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>> It's a vast generalization to say the "the left" or
"secularists"
> >>> or
> >>>>>>>>>> even "Christians" are demanding an apology from the Pope. I
think
> > a
> >>>>>>>>>> whole lot of people think the Pope can say whatever he wants.
It
> >>>>>>> doesn't
> >>>>>>>>>> matter to most non-Catholics in the USA and in reality, Papal
> >>>>>>>>>> declarations are ignored by a fair number of Catholics here,
too.
> >>>>>>>>>> Obviously some Moslems are upset in some places, but how deep
> > does
> >>>>> that
> >>>>>>>>>> go? When black churches were burning in the USA, it would have
> > been
> >>>>> an
> >>>>>>>>>> exaggeration to blame everyone in the USA for that.
> >>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church which only
very
> >>>>>>>>>> recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo. The church
> > hung
> >>> on
> >>>>>>>>>> tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view of the
> > universe
> >>>>>>> while
> >>>>>>>>>> denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, which describes
> > the
> >>>>>>>>>> actual way the solar system works.
> >>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>> It also extends to a few Christian sects who, feeling similarly
> >>>>>>>>>> insecure, tenaciously cling to the notion that the earth is
only
> >>>>> about
> >>>>>>>>>> 6,000 years old, by virtue of the biblical interpretations and
> >>> clever
> >>>>>>>>>> (at the time) calculations of an Irish Bishop several centuries
> >>> ago,
> >>>>>>> and
> >>>>>>>>>> in the face of solid current scientific evidence to the
contrary.
> >>>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some (not all) Christian churches
> >>> who,
> >>>>>>>>>> feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and ever-mounting
> >>> evidence
> >>>>>>> of
> >>>>>>>>>> evolution, responding with dogma in psuedo-scientific clothing,
> > and
> >>>>> who
> >>>>>>>>>> seek to water down scientific education in the USA.
> >>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to power hungry industries who pay
big
> >>>>> bucks
> >>>>>>>>>> to spread denial about global warming for short term gain. Who
> > push
> >>>>> to
> >>>>>>>>>> control oil in the middle east with force. With our guns
blazing,
> >>> our
> >>>>>>>>>> soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically. And who
> >>> sometimes
> >>>>>>>>>> hide behind Christianity to do so.
> >>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives who find
ways
> >>> to
> >>>>>>>>>> pretend that everyone is aligning against Christianity. And in
> >>>>>>> spreading
> >>>>>>>>>> this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to keep them in
> >>> power.
> >>>>>>>>>> And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of reason and
> > the
> >>>>>>> focus
> >>>>>>>>>> on the use of force.
> >>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>> Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and declare
> >>> victory.
> >>>>>>> ;^)
> >>>>>>>>>> Have a great week!
> >>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>> Cheers,
> >>>>>>>>>> -Jamie
> >>>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>> DC wrote:
> >>>>>>>>>> I thought this was worth reading if any of you are interested.
> >>>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>>>> Have a great Monday!
> >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>> ---------------------------------------
> >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>> The Unholy Alliance Rolls Over the Pope
> >>>>>>>>>>> By Andrew Walden
> >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>> In what has suddenly been made into a highly controversial

> >>>>>>>>>>> Regensberg, Pope Benedict describes Christian belief in a God
> >>>>>>>>>>> whose words and acts are bound by reason, truth and the law of
> >>>>>>>>>>> non-contradiction. Benedict contrasts this with Islamic
belief

> > Benedict
> >>>>>>>>>>> further contrasts Christian belief with that of secular
> > humanists
> >>>>>>>>>>> who see reason as being completely unbound of God.
> >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>> In response, both Islamists and secularists have demanded the

> >>>>>>>>>>> genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between
> >>>>>>>>>>> Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis of the
clash
> >>>>>>>>>>> of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror. His
> >>>>>>>>>>> analysis also explains the underlying cause of the alliance
> >>>>>>>>>>> between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.
> >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>> Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.
> >>>>>>>>>>> Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor
Manuel

there
> >>>>>>>>>>> you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his
command

> >>>>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>>>> unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top Shiite
> >>>>>>>>>>> cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling party
> >>>>>>>>>>> likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and accused him of
> >>>>>>>>>>> reviving the mentality of the Crusades.
> >>>>>>>>>>>

> > and
> >>>>>>>>>>> jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of rage that
> >>>>>>>>>>> many fear could burst into violent protests like those that

> >>>>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>>>> safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.
> >>>>>>>>>>>

> > The
> >>>>>>>>>>> reaction is not one of anger but a calculated attempt to force
> >>>>>>>>>>> the Pope to parrot the PC line on Islam. Since Islam need not
be

> >>>>>>>>>>> objective can be to assert the power of a God who is so
> >>>>>>>>>>> transcendent that He is not bound by anything. If man is
created

> >>>>>>>>>>> anything. (This explains the predilection on the part of some

> > to
> >>>>>>>>>>> their non-existent morality. They are asserting the only

> >>>>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>>>> the root of the term, Islamofascist. Moreover the Western

> >>>>>>>>>>> is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist thought
> > than

> >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing precisely what

cleric
> >>>>>>>>>>> of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest mosque,

> > to

> >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the Pope was,

> >>>>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>>>> description of the Islamic God as being unbound by reason is
not
> >>>>>>>>>>> an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What Muslims

and

> >>>>>>>>>>> dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity. How dare he
not

> >>>>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>>>> being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to the point is
> >>>>>>>>>>> lost on them.
> >>>>>>>>>>>

is

> >>>>>>>>>>> this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists are waging
a
> >>>>>>>>>>> propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension against

> >>>>>>>>>>> jihad, but not your violent jihad.
> >>>>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>>>> side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more clear than in
> >>>>>>>>>>> the Islamist reaction to the Pope.
> >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>> With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November the
> > Islamists
> >>>>>>>>>>> are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons and
demand
> >>>>>>>>>>> to hear from the Pope himself. This would place raging mobs
of
> >>>>>>>>>>> semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of forcing the
> >>>>>>>>>>> leader of Christendom to bow before them.
> >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>> In this demand for submission they are joined by the
secularist
> >>>>>>>>>>> mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times
> > editorializes:

Islamists,
> >>>>>>>>>>> the secularists are driven only by their will to power. While
> >>>>>>>>>>> the Islamists represent their demented version of
> >>>>>>>>>>> God--unrestrained by reason, the secularists represent their
> >>>>>>>>>>> demented version of reason--unrestrained by God. They are

> > united
> >>>>>>>>>>> by their self-worshipping world view.
> >>>>>>>>>>>

> > of
> >>>>>>>>>>> our categories, even that of rationality...(The Islamic) God
is

> > insult.
> >>>>>>>>>>> Islam embraces this description. In offering this description
> > of
> >>>>>>>>>>> Islam, Benedict refers to the views of leading modern French
> >>>>>>>>>>> Islamist R. Arnaldez as discussed in the writings of Professor
> >>>>>>>>>>> Theodore Khoury of Munster.
> >>>>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>>>> decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he considers

> >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>> Benedict asserts that without reason, or without God, there
can

> >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>> Both Islamist and secularist seek to break God and reason
apart.
> >>>>>>>>>>> Each claims superiority over the Christian West. They believe
> >>>>>>>>>>> absolute moral license makes them powerful. As globalization
> >>>>>>>>>>> carries the Western tradition of reason throughout the world,
> >>>>>>>>>>> both are in decline.
> >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>> Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist and secularist

pact
> >>>>>>>>>>> with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after the
collapse
> >>>>>>>>>>> of the allied forces on the western front.
> >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>> What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear is having
to

> > or

> > great
> >>>>>>>>>>> logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our partners
in

> >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>> Their fear of reason can only lead the world to disaster.
> >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>
> >
> >

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Jamie K on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 23:41:03 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Our situation is directly related to more than half a century of our
decisions and actions, smart and stupid.

It's of limited usefulness to hone in on the last administration as if
that's the entire problem, surely you would have to take into account
decisions made before then and since then.

So while I agree with your point to an extent, it's insufficient to
inoculate the current admin from its own significant problems.

Bill and George aren't running again so we don't have to argue that one.
I am not writing off either major party or a third party, but we need a
change on many levels.

Cheers,
-Jamie
http://www.JamieKrutz.com

DJ wrote:
>> But again, merely pointing fingers backwards
>> in no way excuses the mistakes and failures of the current government.
>
> Our situation is directly related to the fact that our leaders based their
> decisions on disinformation that was a result of the policies of the Clinton
> administration. I'm not pointing the finger backwards for any other reason
> than I feel it is important to keep this in mind lest we elect the same
> misguided souls with the same naieve and misguided foriegn policy ideas to
> office once again and end up in an even bigger mess.....and yes.....it
> could be much bigger if the liberals take control of the national

> legislature.....much less, god forbid, having another Clinton in the white
> House.
>
>
> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:451035a7@linux...
>> For most of the Clinton years the balance of power was divided between
>> both parties. Again, there is plenty of finger pointing to go around.
>> It's easy enough in hindsight to criticize the previous administration
>> on a number of counts.
>>
>> And in retrospect, those dems made a mistake trusting Bush with that
>> vote. OTOH, it was a moment of unity.
>>
>> Flash forward. Today all branches of national government are controlled
>> by one party. It doesn't bother me if you want to point blame at some of
>> the policies under Clinton. But again, merely pointing fingers backwards
>> in no way excuses the mistakes and failures of the current government.
>>
>> They walked in stating in clear terms that they felt the previous
>> government was wrong about almost everything, and then fell flat
>> overall, domestically and internationally.
>>
>> Looking at both governments, we can do better. We must do better.
>> At some point, and we're coming up on six years, the buck stops with
>> those in charge now.
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>>
>> DJ wrote:
>>> The dems you mentioned authorized the military attack on Iraq as a last
>>> resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done as such.
>>>
>>> How convenient for them when it was the intelligence service that they
>>> created over 8 years of hard work that they now attempt to slag and
> blame
>>> for their decisdions so they can vote for the war before they vote
> against
>>> it.
>>>
>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:450f8aec@linux...
>>>> There is plenty of finger pointing to go around. No doubt specific
>>>> things could have been handled better under the previous government.
>>>>
>>>> The transition of power between the previous and current governments

> was
>>>> pretty rocky, and a "not invented here" syndrome may have doomed the
>>>> hand-off of some al-Qaida related work that was in progress.
>>>>
>>>> In any case, no government gets a pass by blaming the previous
>>>> government. The current government, for example, failed to follow
>>>> through and prioritize the al-Qaida threat ahead of 9/11 and failed to
>>>> prevent 9/11; failed to find and capture Bin Laden in Afghanistan;
>>>> failed to overcome Taliban control of large areas of Afghanistan;
>>>> allowed record drug production to reestablish itself there; failed to
>>>> plan for post Iraq invasion problems predicted by their own state
>>>> department; and they have continually exploited the "war on terrorism"
>>>> for domestic political ends.
>>>>
>>>> You assert the WMDs were there. However Bush's chief inspector, and
> Bush
>>>> himself, say they weren't there after all. It was a bluff. One of the
>>>> Iraqi expatriate promoters of the bluff got the ear of our government,
>>>> was believed, and, last I heard, had parlayed it into a position of
>>>> power in Iraq after the invasion.
>>>>
>>>> The dems you mentioned authorized the military attack on Iraq as a last
>>>> resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done as such.
>>>>
>>>> Preemptive invasion is new as part of the "Bush (Jr.) Doctrine."
>>>>
>>>> Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> DJ wrote:
>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> news:450f3862@linux...
>>>>>> Neither, actually. And what we ought to do would depend on the nature
>>> of
>>>>>> the threat.
>>>>> Agreed.
>>>>>
>>>>>> We might want to start with recommendations published in 1999, well
>>>>>> before the 9/11 attack.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Commission_on_Terroris m
>>>>>>
>>>>>> We can disagree about whether our current policy is one of
> overreacting
>>>>>> or not. We can probably really disagree about the newly minted
>>>>>> preemptive attack policy. :^)

>>>>> I don't think there is any newly minted attack policy. There has
> always
>>> been
>>>>> the *clear and present danger* perogative but it needs to be based on
>>>>> accurate intelligence. Had this been available, then I doubt that
> Bush,
>>>>> Kerry, Kennedy Pelosi and the rest would have authorized the invasion
> of
>>>>> Iraq, or perhaps they would have been able to find the WMD's before
> they
>>>>> were shipped out of the country or hidden. I just find it hard to
>>> stomach
>>>>> the hypocracy of the democrats whose policies neutered our
> intelligence
>>>>> services in the '90's when they trun around and blame Bush for the
>>> decisions
>>>>> made based on the intellegence blunders they created in the first
> place.
>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>
>>>>> Deej
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> DJ wrote:
>>>>>>> I don't see us overreacting Jamie. However, if there is indication
> of
>>>>> some
>>>>>>> sort of major threat, do we run and tell the NY times or do we blow
>>> the
>>>>>>> threat away before it pays us a visit?
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
>>> news:450f0b12@linux...
>>>>>>>> Of course they came out with a blustery ultimatum. That's not news,
>>>>> it's
>>>>>>>> an old pattern. It works for them to sit back and suggest that
> others
>>>>> do
>>>>>>>> something via terror-grams such as this. If it makes you afraid as
>>>>> well,
>>>>>>>> my guess is they would see that as a bonus.
>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> By goading the USA into overreacting it helps them grow, raise
> money
>>>>> and
>>>>>>>> convince others to actually see us as evil and act accordingly. It
>>>>>>>> works, we keep falling for it. OTOH, for those here with a declared
>>>>>>>> interest in emptying the US treasury, it's likewise beneficial to
>>> have
>>>>>>>> the specter of an enemy out there. Fear sells.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> We have yet to actually declare war on anyone in this whole mess.
> How
>>>>> do
>>>>>>>> you declare war on a tactic?
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Forced conversion and head taxes would go over like a lead balloon
> in
>>>>>>>> the USA. Not gonna happen. We're far more sectarian than, say,
> Iraq.
>>>>>>>> Responsible leadership is needed in the world to calm extremist
>>>>>>>> tendencies on all sides and help rational people who are trying to
>>> get
>>>>>>>> by in worsening times. At the same time we need to be, and are
>>>>>>>> attempting to be, vigilant against any self righteous group with
>>>>>>>> fantasies of violence in the USA.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Any rush to some sort of "holy war" is irrational. There is nothing
>>>>> holy
>>>>>>>> about war.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> DJ wrote:
>>>>>>>>> I haven't seen us react with irrationality.....yet. Al
>>> Quaeda
>>>>>>> just
>>>>>>>>> came out with an ultimatim stating that it's full on war now and
> the
>>>>>>> west
>>>>>>>>> will be destroyed. The only way to save ourselves is to convert to
>>>>>>> Islam. So
>>>>>>>>> where to you draw the line between irrationality and self defense?
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message

>>>>> news:450ee7ef@linux...
>>>>>>>>> Let's keep from reacting to irrationality with irrationality of
> our
>>>>>>> own.
>>>>>>>>> There's a lot of fear mongering. Chicken Little is back.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> DJ wrote:
>>>>>>>>>> It doesn't matter at all whether this was the Pope. The bottom
>>> line
>>>>> is
>>>>>>>>> that
>>>>>>>>>> it is rationality as opposed to irrationality.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
>>>>>>> news:450ec970@linux...
>>>>>>>>>>> The Catholic church doesn't speak for Christianity. Certainly
> not
>>>>> for
>>>>>>>>>>> Lutherans, and for good reason.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> A Pope criticizing other religions (even other Christian sects,
>>>>> even
>>>>>>>>>>> other Catholics) is nothing new. Certainly much harsher things
>>> have
>>>>>>>>> been
>>>>>>>>>>> said about Islam by some (not all) extreme fundamentalist
>>>>> Christians.
>>>>>>>>>>> And certainly much harsher things have been said by certain
>>>>> extremist
>>>>>>>>>>> Islamists about Christianity. The more extremist of both camps
>>> seem
>>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>>> be spoiling to relive the crusades. With some of the more power
>>>>>>> hungry
>>>>>>>>>>> ready to endanger civilization by attempting to incite
> religious
>>>>> wars
>>>>>>>>>>> for their own questionable ends.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> It's a vast generalization to say the "the left" or
> "secularists"
>>>>> or
>>>>>>>>>>> even "Christians" are demanding an apology from the Pope. I

> think
>>> a
>>>>>>>>>>>> whole lot of people think the Pope can say whatever he wants.
> It
>>>>>>>>> doesn't
>>>>>>>>>>>> matter to most non-Catholics in the USA and in reality, Papal
>>>>>>>>>>>> declarations are ignored by a fair number of Catholics here,
> too.
>>>>>>>>>>>> Obviously some Moslems are upset in some places, but how deep
>>> does
>>>>>>> that
>>>>>>>>>>>> go? When black churches were burning in the USA, it would have
>>> been
>>>>>>> an
>>>>>>>>>>>> exaggeration to blame everyone in the USA for that.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church which only
> very
>>>>>>>>>>>> recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo. The church
>>> hung
>>>>> on
>>>>>>>>>>>> tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view of the
>>> universe
>>>>>>>>> while
>>>>>>>>>>>> denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, which describes
>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>>> actual way the solar system works.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> It also extends to a few Christian sects who, feeling similarly
>>>>>>>>>>>> insecure, tenaciously cling to the notion that the earth is
> only
>>>>>>> about
>>>>>>>>>>>> 6,000 years old, by virtue of the biblical interpretations and
>>>>> clever
>>>>>>>>>>>> (at the time) calculations of an Irish Bishop several centuries
>>>>> ago,
>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>>> in the face of solid current scientific evidence to the
> contrary.
>>>>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some (not all) Christian churches
>>>>> who,
>>>>>>>>>>>> feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and ever-mounting
>>>>> evidence
>>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>>> evolution, responding with dogma in psuedo-scientific clothing,
>>> and
>>>>>>> who
>>>>>>>>>>>> seek to water down scientific education in the USA.

>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to power hungry industries who pay
> big
>>>>>>> bucks
>>>>>>>>>>>> to spread denial about global warming for short term gain. Who
>>> push
>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>>>> control oil in the middle east with force. With our guns
> blazing,
>>>>> our
>>>>>>>>>>>> soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically. And who
>>>>> sometimes
>>>>>>>>>>>> hide behind Christianity to do so.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives who find
> ways
>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>>>> pretend that everyone is aligning against Christianity. And in
>>>>>>>>> spreading
>>>>>>>>>>>> this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to keep them in
>>>>> power.
>>>>>>>>>>>> And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of reason and
>>> the
>>>>>>>>> focus
>>>>>>>>>>>> on the use of force.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and declare
>>>>> victory.
>>>>>>>>> ;^)
>>>>>>>>>>>> Have a great week!
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> DC wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>> I thought this was worth reading if any of you are interested.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Have a great Monday!
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> ---------------------------------------
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> The Unholy Alliance Rolls Over the Pope
>>>>>>>>>>>>> By Andrew Walden
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> In what has suddenly been made into a highly controversial

>>>>>>>>>>>>> Regensberg, Pope Benedict describes Christian belief in a God
>>>>>>>>>>>>> whose words and acts are bound by reason, truth and the law of
>>>>>>>>>>>>> non-contradiction. Benedict contrasts this with Islamic
> belief

>>> Benedict
>>>>>>>>>>>>> further contrasts Christian belief with that of secular
>>> humanists
>>>>>>>>>>>>> who see reason as being completely unbound of God.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> In response, both Islamists and secularists have demanded the

>>>>>>>>>>>>> genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis of the
> clash
>>>>>>>>>>>>> of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror. His
>>>>>>>>>>>>> analysis also explains the underlying cause of the alliance
>>>>>>>>>>>>> between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor
> Manuel

> there
>>>>>>>>>>>>> you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his
> command

>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>>> unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top Shiite
>>>>>>>>>>>>> cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling party
>>>>>>>>>>>>> likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and accused him of
>>>>>>>>>>>>> reviving the mentality of the Crusades.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>>>> jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of rage that
>>>>>>>>>>>>> many fear could burst into violent protests like those that

>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>>> safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>> The
>>>>>>>>>>>>> reaction is not one of anger but a calculated attempt to force
>>>>>>>>>>>>> the Pope to parrot the PC line on Islam. Since Islam need not

> be

>>>>>>>>>>>>> objective can be to assert the power of a God who is so
>>>>>>>>>>>>> transcendent that He is not bound by anything. If man is
> created

>>>>>>>>>>>>> anything. (This explains the predilection on the part of some

>>> to
>>>>>>>>>>>>> their non-existent morality. They are asserting the only

>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>>> the root of the term, Islamofascist. Moreover the Western

>>>>>>>>>>>>> is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist thought
>>> than

>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing precisely what

> cleric
>>>>>>>>>>>>> of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest mosque,

>>> to

>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the Pope was,

>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>>> description of the Islamic God as being unbound by reason is
> not
>>>>>>>>>>>>> an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What Muslims
> and

>>>>>>>>>>>>> dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity. How dare he
> not

>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>>> being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to the point is

>>>>>>>>>>>>> lost on them.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>

> is

>>>>>>>>>>>>> this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists are waging
> a
>>>>>>>>>>>>> propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension against

>>>>>>>>>>>>> jihad, but not your violent jihad.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>>> side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more clear than in
>>>>>>>>>>>>> the Islamist reaction to the Pope.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November the
>>> Islamists
>>>>>>>>>>>>> are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons and
> demand
>>>>>>>>>>>>> to hear from the Pope himself. This would place raging mobs
> of
>>>>>>>>>>>>> semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of forcing the
>>>>>>>>>>>>> leader of Christendom to bow before them.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> In this demand for submission they are joined by the
> secularist
>>>>>>>>>>>>> mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times
>>> editorializes:

> Islamists,
>>>>>>>>>>>>> the secularists are driven only by their will to power. While
>>>>>>>>>>>>> the Islamists represent their demented version of
>>>>>>>>>>>>> God--unrestrained by reason, the secularists represent their
>>>>>>>>>>>>> demented version of reason--unrestrained by God. They are
>>> united
>>>>>>>>>>>>> by their self-worshipping world view.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>>>> our categories, even that of rationality...(The Islamic) God
> is

>>> insult.
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Islam embraces this description. In offering this description
>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Islam, Benedict refers to the views of leading modern French
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Islamist R. Arnaldez as discussed in the writings of Professor
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Theodore Khoury of Munster.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>>> decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he considers

>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Benedict asserts that without reason, or without God, there
> can

>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Both Islamist and secularist seek to break God and reason
> apart.
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Each claims superiority over the Christian West. They believe
>>>>>>>>>>>>> absolute moral license makes them powerful. As globalization
>>>>>>>>>>>>> carries the Western tradition of reason throughout the world,
>>>>>>>>>>>>> both are in decline.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist and secularist

> pact
>>>>>>>>>>>>> with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after the
> collapse
>>>>>>>>>>>>> of the allied forces on the western front.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear is having
> to

>>> or

>>> great
>>>>>>>>>>>>> logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our partners
> in

>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Their fear of reason can only lead the world to disaster.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by uptown jimmy on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 23:49:13 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

So...you're blaming the situation in Iraq on Bill Clinton? Is that right?

Cuz that seems absurd to me.

Just sayin'.

Jimmy

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
news:4510721c@linux...
> >But again, merely pointing fingers backwards
> >in no way excuses the mistakes and failures of the current government.
>
> Our situation is directly related to the fact that our leaders based their
> decisions on disinformation that was a result of the policies of the
Clinton
> administration. I'm not pointing the finger backwards for any other reason
> than I feel it is important to keep this in mind lest we elect the same
> misguided souls with the same naieve and misguided foriegn policy ideas to
> office once again and end up in an even bigger mess.....and
yes.....it
> could be much bigger if the liberals take control of the national
> legislature.....much less, god forbid, having another Clinton in the
white
> House.
>
>
> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:451035a7@linux...
> >
> > For most of the Clinton years the balance of power was divided between
> > both parties. Again, there is plenty of finger pointing to go around.
> > It's easy enough in hindsight to criticize the previous administration
> > on a number of counts.
> >
> > And in retrospect, those dems made a mistake trusting Bush with that
> > vote. OTOH, it was a moment of unity.
> >
> > Flash forward. Today all branches of national government are controlled

> > by one party. It doesn't bother me if you want to point blame at some of
> > the policies under Clinton. But again, merely pointing fingers backwards
> > in no way excuses the mistakes and failures of the current government.
> >
> > They walked in stating in clear terms that they felt the previous
> > government was wrong about almost everything, and then fell flat
> > overall, domestically and internationally.
> >
> > Looking at both governments, we can do better. We must do better.
> > At some point, and we're coming up on six years, the buck stops with
> > those in charge now.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > -Jamie
> > http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >
> >
> >
> > DJ wrote:
> > > The dems you mentioned authorized the military attack on Iraq as a
last
> > > resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done as such.
> > >
> > > How convenient for them when it was the intelligence service that they
> > > created over 8 years of hard work that they now attempt to slag and
> blame
> > > for their decisdions so they can vote for the war before they vote
> against
> > > it.
> > >
> > > "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
news:450f8aec@linux...
> > >> There is plenty of finger pointing to go around. No doubt specific
> > >> things could have been handled better under the previous government.
> > >>
> > >> The transition of power between the previous and current governments
> was
> > >> pretty rocky, and a "not invented here" syndrome may have doomed the
> > >> hand-off of some al-Qaida related work that was in progress.
> > >>
> > >> In any case, no government gets a pass by blaming the previous
> > >> government. The current government, for example, failed to follow
> > >> through and prioritize the al-Qaida threat ahead of 9/11 and failed
to
> > >> prevent 9/11; failed to find and capture Bin Laden in Afghanistan;
> > >> failed to overcome Taliban control of large areas of Afghanistan;
> > >> allowed record drug production to reestablish itself there; failed to
> > >> plan for post Iraq invasion problems predicted by their own state

> > >> department; and they have continually exploited the "war on
terrorism"
> > >> for domestic political ends.
> > >>
> > >> You assert the WMDs were there. However Bush's chief inspector, and
> Bush
> > >> himself, say they weren't there after all. It was a bluff. One of the
> > >> Iraqi expatriate promoters of the bluff got the ear of our
government,
> > >> was believed, and, last I heard, had parlayed it into a position of
> > >> power in Iraq after the invasion.
> > >>
> > >> The dems you mentioned authorized the military attack on Iraq as a
last
> > >> resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done as such.
> > >>
> > >> Preemptive invasion is new as part of the "Bush (Jr.) Doctrine."
> > >>
> > >> Cheers,
> > >> -Jamie
> > >> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> > >>
> > >>
> > >> DJ wrote:
> > >>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> news:450f3862@linux...
> > >>>> Neither, actually. And what we ought to do would depend on the
nature
> > > of
> > >>>> the threat.
> > >>> Agreed.
> > >>>
> > >>>> We might want to start with recommendations published in 1999, well
> > >>>> before the 9/11 attack.
> > >>>>
> > >>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Commission_on_Terroris m
> > >>>>
> > >>>> We can disagree about whether our current policy is one of
> overreacting
> > >>>> or not. We can probably really disagree about the newly minted
> > >>>> preemptive attack policy. :^)
> > >>> I don't think there is any newly minted attack policy. There has
> always
> > > been
> > >>> the *clear and present danger* perogative but it needs to be based
on
> > >>> accurate intelligence. Had this been available, then I doubt that
> Bush,

> > >>> Kerry, Kennedy Pelosi and the rest would have authorized the
invasion
> of
> > >>> Iraq, or perhaps they would have been able to find the WMD's before
> they
> > >>> were shipped out of the country or hidden. I just find it hard to
> > > stomach
> > >>> the hypocracy of the democrats whose policies neutered our
> intelligence
> > >>> services in the '90's when they trun around and blame Bush for the
> > > decisions
> > >>> made based on the intellegence blunders they created in the first
> place.
> > >>>
> > >>> Regards,
> > >>>
> > >>> Deej
> > >>>
> > >>>
> > >>>> Cheers,
> > >>>> -Jamie
> > >>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> > >>>>
> > >>>>
> > >>>> DJ wrote:
> > >>>>> I don't see us overreacting Jamie. However, if there is indication
> of
> > >>> some
> > >>>>> sort of major threat, do we run and tell the NY times or do we
blow
> > > the
> > >>>>> threat away before it pays us a visit?
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> > > news:450f0b12@linux...
> > >>>>>> Of course they came out with a blustery ultimatum. That's not
news,
> > >>> it's
> > >>>>>> an old pattern. It works for them to sit back and suggest that
> others
> > >>> do
> > >>>>>> something via terror-grams such as this. If it makes you afraid
as
> > >>> well,
> > >>>>>> my guess is they would see that as a bonus.
> > >>>>>>
> > >>>>>> By goading the USA into overreacting it helps them grow, raise

> money
> > >>> and
> > >>>>>> convince others to actually see us as evil and act accordingly.
It
> > >>>>>> works, we keep falling for it. OTOH, for those here with a
declared
> > >>>>>> interest in emptying the US treasury, it's likewise beneficial to
> > > have
> > >>>>>> the specter of an enemy out there. Fear sells.
> > >>>>>>
> > >>>>>> We have yet to actually declare war on anyone in this whole mess.
> How
> > >>> do
> > >>>>>> you declare war on a tactic?
> > >>>>>>
> > >>>>>> Forced conversion and head taxes would go over like a lead
balloon
> in
> > >>>>>> the USA. Not gonna happen. We're far more sectarian than, say,
> Iraq.
> > >>>>>>
> > >>>>>> Responsible leadership is needed in the world to calm extremist
> > >>>>>> tendencies on all sides and help rational people who are trying
to
> > > get
> > >>>>>> by in worsening times. At the same time we need to be, and are
> > >>>>>> attempting to be, vigilant against any self righteous group with
> > >>>>>> fantasies of violence in the USA.
> > >>>>>>
> > >>>>>> Any rush to some sort of "holy war" is irrational. There is
nothing
> > >>> holy
> > >>>>>> about war.
> > >>>>>>
> > >>>>>> Cheers,
> > >>>>>> -Jamie
> > >>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> > >>>>>>
> > >>>>>>
> > >>>>>>
> > >>>>>> DJ wrote:
> > >>>>>>> I haven't seen us react with irrationality.....yet. Al
> > > Quaeda
> > >>>>> just
> > >>>>>>> came out with an ultimatim stating that it's full on war now and
> the
> > >>>>> west
> > >>>>>>> will be destroyed. The only way to save ourselves is to convert

to
> > >>>>> Islam. So
> > >>>>>>> where to you draw the line between irrationality and self
defense?
> > >>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> > >>> news:450ee7ef@linux...
> > >>>>>>>>> Let's keep from reacting to irrationality with irrationality of
> our
> > >>>>> own.
> > >>>>>>>>> There's a lot of fear mongering. Chicken Little is back.
> > >>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>> Cheers,
> > >>>>>>>>> -Jamie
> > >>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> > >>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>> DJ wrote:
> > >>>>>>>>>> It doesn't matter at all whether this was the Pope. The bottom
> > > line
> > >>> is
> > >>>>>>> that
> > >>>>>>>>>> it is rationality as opposed to irrationality.
> > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> > >>>>> news:450ec970@linux...
> > >>>>>>>>>> The Catholic church doesn't speak for Christianity. Certainly
> not
> > >>> for
> > >>>>>>>>>> Lutherans, and for good reason.
> > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>> A Pope criticizing other religions (even other Christian
sects,
> > >>> even
> > >>>>>>>>>> other Catholics) is nothing new. Certainly much harsher
things
> > > have
> > >>>>>>> been
> > >>>>>>>>>> said about Islam by some (not all) extreme fundamentalist
> > >>> Christians.
> > >>>>>>>>>> And certainly much harsher things have been said by certain
> > >>> extremist
> > >>>>>>>>>> Islamists about Christianity. The more extremist of both
camps
> > > seem
> > >>>>> to
> > >>>>>>>>>> be spoiling to relive the crusades. With some of the more

power
> > >>>>> hungry
> > >>>>>>>>>> ready to endanger civilization by attempting to incite
> religious
> > >>> wars
> > >>>>>>>>>> for their own questionable ends.
> > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>> It's a vast generalization to say the "the left" or
> "secularists"
> > >>> or
> > >>>>>>>>>> even "Christians" are demanding an apology from the Pope. I
> think
> > > a
> > >>>>>>>>>> whole lot of people think the Pope can say whatever he wants.
> It
> > >>>>>>> doesn't
> > >>>>>>>>>> matter to most non-Catholics in the USA and in reality, Papal
> > >>>>>>>>>> declarations are ignored by a fair number of Catholics here,
> too.
> > >>>>>>>>>> Obviously some Moslems are upset in some places, but how deep
> > > does
> > >>>>> that
> > >>>>>>>>>> go? When black churches were burning in the USA, it would
have
> > > been
> > >>>>> an
> > >>>>>>>>>> exaggeration to blame everyone in the USA for that.
> > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church which only
> very
> > >>>>>>>>>> recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo. The church
> > > hung
> > >>> on
> > >>>>>>>>>> tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view of the
> > > universe
> > >>>>>>> while
> > >>>>>>>>>> denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, which
describes
> > > the
> > >>>>>>>>>> actual way the solar system works.
> > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>> It also extends to a few Christian sects who, feeling
similarly
> > >>>>>>>>>> insecure, tenaciously cling to the notion that the earth is
> only
> > >>>>> about
> > >>>>>>>>>> 6,000 years old, by virtue of the biblical interpretations
and

> > >>> clever
> > >>>>>>>>>> (at the time) calculations of an Irish Bishop several
centuries
> > >>> ago,
> > >>>>>>> and
> > >>>>>>>>>> in the face of solid current scientific evidence to the
> contrary.
> > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some (not all) Christian
churches
> > >>> who,
> > >>>>>>>>>> feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and ever-mounting
> > >>> evidence
> > >>>>>>> of
> > >>>>>>>>>> evolution, responding with dogma in psuedo-scientific
clothing,
> > > and
> > >>>>> who
> > >>>>>>>>>> seek to water down scientific education in the USA.
> > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to power hungry industries who pay
> big
> > >>>>> bucks
> > >>>>>>>>>> to spread denial about global warming for short term gain.
Who
> > > push
> > >>>>> to
> > >>>>>>>>>> control oil in the middle east with force. With our guns
> blazing,
> > >>> our
> > >>>>>>>>>> soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically. And who
> > >>> sometimes
> > >>>>>>>>>> hide behind Christianity to do so.
> > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives who find
> ways
> > >>> to
> > >>>>>>>>>> pretend that everyone is aligning against Christianity. And
in
> > >>>>>>> spreading
> > >>>>>>>>>> this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to keep them
in
> > >>> power.
> > >>>>>>>>>> And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of reason
and
> > > the
> > >>>>>>> focus
> > >>>>>>>>>> on the use of force.

> > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>> Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and declare
> > >>> victory.
> > >>>>>>> ;^)
> > >>>>>>>>>> Have a great week!
> > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>> Cheers,
> > >>>>>>>>>> -Jamie
> > >>>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>> DC wrote:
> > >>>>>>>>>>> I thought this was worth reading if any of you are
interested.
> > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>> Have a great Monday!
> > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>> ----------
> > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>> The Unholy Alliance Rolls Over the Pope
> > >>>>>>>>>> By Andrew Walden
> > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>> In what has suddenly been made into a highly controversial
> > >>>>>>>>>> speech, the day after September 11, at Bavaria's University
of
> > >>>>>>>>>> Regensberg, Pope Benedict describes Christian belief in a
God
> > >>>>>>>>>> whose words and acts are bound by reason, truth and the law
of
> > >>>>>>>>>> non-contradiction. Benedict contrasts this with Islamic
> belief
> > >>>>>>>>>> in a God not bound by anything-including his own words.
> > > Benedict
> > >>>>>>>>>> further contrasts Christian belief with that of secular
> > > humanists
> > >>>>>>>>>> who see reason as being completely unbound of God.
> > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>> In response, both Islamists and secularists have demanded
the
> > >>>>>>>>>> Pope apologize. Benedict's speech is a work of enlightened
> > >>>>>>>>>> genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between
> > >>>>>>>>>> Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis of the
> clash
> > >>>>>>>>>> of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror. His
> > >>>>>>>>>> analysis also explains the underlying cause of the alliance
> > >>>>>>>>>> between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.
> > >>>>>>>>>>

> > >>>>>>>>>>> Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.
> > >>>>>>>>>>> Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor
> Manuel
> > >>>>>>>>>>> II: "Show me just what Mohammed brought that was new, and
> there
> > >>>>>>>>>>> you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his
> command
> > >>>>>>>>>>> to spread by the sword the faith he preached."
> > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>>> Four days later, according to AP: "Pakistan's legislature
> > >>>>>>>>>>> unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top
Shiite
> > >>>>>>>>>>> cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling party
> > >>>>>>>>>>> likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and accused him
of
> > >>>>>>>>>>> reviving the mentality of the Crusades.
> > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>>> "Across the Islamic world Friday, Benedict's remarks on
Islam
> > > and
> > >>>>>>>>>>> jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of rage
that
> > >>>>>>>>>>> many fear could burst into violent protests like those that
> > >>>>>>>>>>> followed publication of caricatures of the Prophet
Muhammad."
> > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>>> Reuters quoted other sources expressing fears for the Pope's
> > >>>>>>>>>>> safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.
> > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>>> The Islamist reaction proves Manuel II's 600-year-old point.
> > > The
> > >>>>>>>>>>> reaction is not one of anger but a calculated attempt to
force
> > >>>>>>>>>>> the Pope to parrot the PC line on Islam. Since Islam need
not
> be
> > >>>>>>>>>>> internally consistent and it is not bound by reason, it's
only
> > >>>>>>>>>>> objective can be to assert the power of a God who is so
> > >>>>>>>>>>> transcendent that He is not bound by anything. If man is
> created
> > >>>>>>>>>>> in God's image then by extension Islamic man is not bound by
> > >>>>>>>>>>> anything. (This explains the predilection on the part of
some
> > >>>>>>>>>>> Muslims to lie.) Islamists are not responding to any
'offense'
> > > to
> > >>>>>>>>>>> their non-existent morality. They are asserting the only

> > >>>>>>>>>>> 'morality' they have-the will to power.
> > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>>> "Will to Power" is a key element of Nietzsche 's
> > > philosophy-hence
> > >>>>>>>>>>> the root of the term, Islamofascist. Moreover the Western
> "Left'
> > >>>>>>>>>>> is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist thought
> > > than
> > >>>>>>>>>>> by Marxist thought-hence the alliance between the Western
> "Left"
> > >>>>>>>>>>> and the Islamofascist 'Right.'
> > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing precisely what
> > >>>>>>>>>>> Manuel II said they would: "Syed Ahmed Bukhari, the chief
> cleric
> > >>>>>>>>>>> of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest mosque,
> > >>>>>>>>>>> extolled Muslims to 'respond in a manner which forces the
Pope
> > > to
> > >>>>>>>>>>> apologize.'" Note they intend to use "force" not reason.
> > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the Pope
was,
> > >>>>>>>>>>> "calling a spade a spade".
> > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>>> The secularist mouthpiece, New York Times,editorializes,
"Pope
> > >>>>>>>>>>> Benedict XVI has insulted Muslims.." This is false. The
Pope
> 's
> > >>>>>>>>>>> description of the Islamic God as being unbound by reason is
> not
> > >>>>>>>>>>> an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What Muslims
> and
> > >>>>>>>>>>> secularists fear is the Pope's decision to choose to enter
> > >>>>>>>>>>> dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity. How dare he
> not
> > >>>>>>>>>>> "apologize" for being a Christian? That is the so-called
> > >>>>>>>>>>> "insult."
> > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>>> One might "reasonably" ask when will Muslims "apologize" for
> > >>>>>>>>>>> being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to the point
is
> > >>>>>>>>>>> lost on them.
> > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>>> Amazingly the Times continues: "Muslim leaders the world
over
> > >>>>>>>>>>> have demanded apologies. For many Muslims, holy war -

jihad -
> is
> > >>>>>>>>>>> a spiritual struggle, and not a call to violence." In
saying
> > >>>>>>>>>>> this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists are
waging
> a
> > >>>>>>>>>>> propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension against
> > >>>>>>>>>>> Christianity-and they explicitly endorse and join this
jihad.
> > >>>>>>>>>>> The Times is saying to Islamists, 'we can join your
'spiritual
> '
> > >>>>>>>>>>> jihad, but not your violent jihad.
> > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>>> The Times editors are living in a fool's paradise. The
> > >>>>>>>>>>> "spiritual" non-violent jihad of propaganda is merely the
flip
> > >>>>>>>>>>> side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more clear than
in
> > >>>>>>>>>>> the Islamist reaction to the Pope.
> > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>>> With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November the
> > > Islamists
> > >>>>>>>>>>> are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons and
> demand
> > >>>>>>>>>>> to hear from the Pope himself. This would place raging mobs
> of
> > >>>>>>>>>>> semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of forcing the
> > >>>>>>>>>>> leader of Christendom to bow before them.
> > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>>> In this demand for submission they are joined by the
> secularist
> > >>>>>>>>>>> mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times
> > > editorializes:
> > >>>>>>>>>>> "He needs to offer a deep and persuasive apology." The
> > >>>>>>>>>>> secularists too seek the Pope's submission. Like the
> Islamists,
> > >>>>>>>>>>> the secularists are driven only by their will to power.
While
> > >>>>>>>>>>> the Islamists represent their demented version of
> > >>>>>>>>>>> God--unrestrained by reason, the secularists represent their
> > >>>>>>>>>>> demented version of reason--unrestrained by God. They are
> > > united
> > >>>>>>>>>>> by their self-worshipping world view.
> > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>>> It should be noted that the carefully staged "anger' from
the

> > >>>>>>>>>>> Islamic world does not condemn Benedict's characterization
of
> > >>>>>>>>>>> Islam as a religion where God's "will is not bound up with
any
> > > of
> > >>>>>>>>>>> our categories, even that of rationality...(The Islamic) God
> is
> > >>>>>>>>>>> not bound even by his own word.." This is not seen as an
> > > insult.
> > >>>>>>>>>>> Islam embraces this description. In offering this
description
> > > of
> > >>>>>>>>>>> Islam, Benedict refers to the views of leading modern French
> > >>>>>>>>>>> Islamist R. Arnaldez as discussed in the writings of
Professor
> > >>>>>>>>>>> Theodore Khoury of Munster.
> > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>>> Likewise the secularists express no dismay at the pope's
> > >>>>>>>>>>> characterization of a secularist as: "(A) subject (who)
then
> > >>>>>>>>>>> decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he considers
> > >>>>>>>>>>> tenable in matters of religion, and the subjective
'conscience
> '
> > >>>>>>>>>>> becomes the sole arbiter of what is ethical."
> > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>>> Benedict asserts that without reason, or without God, there
> can
> > >>>>>>>>>>> be no modern system of morality. He explains, "In this
> > >>>>>>>>>>> way.ethics and religion lose their power to create a
community
> > >>>>>>>>>>> and become (instead) a completely personal matter."
> > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>>> Both Islamist and secularist seek to break God and reason
> apart.
> > >>>>>>>>>>> Each claims superiority over the Christian West. They
believe
> > >>>>>>>>>>> absolute moral license makes them powerful. As
globalization
> > >>>>>>>>>>> carries the Western tradition of reason throughout the
world,
> > >>>>>>>>>>> both are in decline.
> > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>>> Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist and
secularist
> > >>>>>>>>>>> will meet in combat, just as Hitler's fascists broke their
> pact
> > >>>>>>>>>>> with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after the

> collapse
> > >>>>>>>>>>> of the allied forces on the western front.
> > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>>> What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear is
having
> to
> > >>>>>>>>>>> reply to the Pope's key point, borrowed from the Byzantine
> > >>>>>>>>>>> Emperor: "'Not to act reasonably, not to act with logos
(word
> > > or
> > >>>>>>>>>>> reason) is contrary to the nature of God,'.. It is to this
> > > great
> > >>>>>>>>>>> logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our
partners
> in
> > >>>>>>>>>>> the dialogue of cultures."
> > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>>>>>>>>> Their fear of reason can only lead the world to disaster.
> > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>>
> > >
> > >
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Deej [1] on Wed, 20 Sep 2006 01:43:47 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Bill is most certainly running again.....he's just wearing a dress this
time.

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:45107e39@linux...
>
> Our situation is directly related to more than half a century of our
> decisions and actions, smart and stupid.
>
> It's of limited usefulness to hone in on the last administration as if
> that's the entire problem, surely you would have to take into account
> decisions made before then and since then.
>
> So while I agree with your point to an extent, it's insufficient to
> inoculate the current admin from its own significant problems.
>
> Bill and George aren't running again so we don't have to argue that one.
> I am not writing off either major party or a third party, but we need a

> change on many levels.
>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>
> DJ wrote:
> >> But again, merely pointing fingers backwards
> >> in no way excuses the mistakes and failures of the current government.
> >
> > Our situation is directly related to the fact that our leaders based
their
> > decisions on disinformation that was a result of the policies of the
Clinton
> > administration. I'm not pointing the finger backwards for any other
reason
> > than I feel it is important to keep this in mind lest we elect the same
> > misguided souls with the same naieve and misguided foriegn policy ideas
to
> > office once again and end up in an even bigger mess.....and
yes.....it
> > could be much bigger if the liberals take control of the national
> > legislature.....much less, god forbid, having another Clinton in the
white
> > House.
> >
> >
> > "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:451035a7@linux...
> >> For most of the Clinton years the balance of power was divided between
> >> both parties. Again, there is plenty of finger pointing to go around.
> >> It's easy enough in hindsight to criticize the previous administration
> >> on a number of counts.
> >>
> >> And in retrospect, those dems made a mistake trusting Bush with that
> >> vote. OTOH, it was a moment of unity.
> >>
> >> Flash forward. Today all branches of national government are controlled
> >> by one party. It doesn't bother me if you want to point blame at some
of
> >> the policies under Clinton. But again, merely pointing fingers
backwards
> >> in no way excuses the mistakes and failures of the current government.
> >>
> >> They walked in stating in clear terms that they felt the previous
> >> government was wrong about almost everything, and then fell flat
> >> overall, domestically and internationally.
> >>

> >> Looking at both governments, we can do better. We must do better.
> >> At some point, and we're coming up on six years, the buck stops with
> >> those in charge now.
> >>
> >> Cheers,
> >> -Jamie
> >> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >> DJ wrote:
> >>> The dems you mentioned authorized the military attack on Iraq as a
last
> >>> resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done as such.
> >>>
> >>> How convenient for them when it was the intelligence service that they
> >>> created over 8 years of hard work that they now attempt to slag and
> > blame
> >>> for their decisdions so they can vote for the war before they vote
> > against
> >>> it.
> >>>
> >>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
news:450f8aec@linux...
> >>>> There is plenty of finger pointing to go around. No doubt specific
> >>>> things could have been handled better under the previous government.
> >>>>
> >>>> The transition of power between the previous and current governments
> > was
> >>>> pretty rocky, and a "not invented here" syndrome may have doomed the
> >>>> hand-off of some al-Qaida related work that was in progress.
> >>>>
> >>>> In any case, no government gets a pass by blaming the previous
> >>>> government. The current government, for example, failed to follow
> >>>> through and prioritize the al-Qaida threat ahead of 9/11 and failed
to
> >>>> prevent 9/11; failed to find and capture Bin Laden in Afghanistan;
> >>>> failed to overcome Taliban control of large areas of Afghanistan;
> >>>> allowed record drug production to reestablish itself there; failed to
> >>>> plan for post Iraq invasion problems predicted by their own state
> >>>> department; and they have continually exploited the "war on
terrorism"
> >>>> for domestic political ends.
> >>>>
> >>>> You assert the WMDs were there. However Bush's chief inspector, and
> > Bush
> >>>> himself, say they weren't there after all. It was a bluff. One of the
> >>>> Iraqi expatriate promoters of the bluff got the ear of our

government,
> >>>> was believed, and, last I heard, had parlayed it into a position of
> >>>> power in Iraq after the invasion.
> >>>>
> >>>> The dems you mentioned authorized the military attack on Iraq as a
last
> >>>> resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done as such.
> >>>>
> >>>> Preemptive invasion is new as part of the "Bush (Jr.) Doctrine."
> >>>>
> >>>> Cheers,
> >>>> -Jamie
> >>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>> DJ wrote:
> >>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> > news:450f3862@linux...
> >>>>>> Neither, actually. And what we ought to do would depend on the
nature
> >>> of
> >>>>>> the threat.
> >>>>> Agreed.
> >>>>>
> >>>>>> We might want to start with recommendations published in 1999, well
> >>>>>> before the 9/11 attack.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Commission_on_Terroris m
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> We can disagree about whether our current policy is one of
> > overreacting
> >>>>>> or not. We can probably really disagree about the newly minted
> >>>>>> preemptive attack policy. :^)
> >>>>> I don't think there is any newly minted attack policy. There has
> > always
> >>> been
> >>>>> the *clear and present danger* perogative but it needs to be based
on
> >>>>> accurate intelligence. Had this been available, then I doubt that
> > Bush,
> >>>>> Kerry, Kennedy Pelosi and the rest would have authorized the
invasion
> > of
> >>>>> Iraq, or perhaps they would have been able to find the WMD's before
> > they
> >>>>> were shipped out of the country or hidden. I just find it hard to
> >>> stomach
> >>>>> the hypocracy of the democrats whose policies neutered our

> > intelligence
> >>>>> services in the '90's when they trun around and blame Bush for the
> >>> decisions
> >>>>> made based on the intellegence blunders they created in the first
> > place.
> >>>>> Regards,
> >>>>>
> >>>>> Deej
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>> Cheers,
> >>>>>> -Jamie
> >>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> DJ wrote:
> >>>>>>> I don't see us overreacting Jamie. However, if there is indication
> > of
> >>>>> some
> >>>>>>> sort of major threat, do we run and tell the NY times or do we
blow
> >>> the
> >>>>>>> threat away before it pays us a visit?
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> >>> news:450f0b12@linux...
> >>>>>>>> Of course they came out with a blustery ultimatum. That's not
news,
> >>>>> it's
> >>>>>>>> an old pattern. It works for them to sit back and suggest that
> > others
> >>>>> do
> >>>>>>>> something via terror-grams such as this. If it makes you afraid
as
> >>>>> well,
> >>>>>>>> my guess is they would see that as a bonus.
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>> By goading the USA into overreacting it helps them grow, raise
> > money
> >>>>> and
> >>>>>>>> convince others to actually see us as evil and act accordingly.
It
> >>>>>>>> works, we keep falling for it. OTOH, for those here with a
declared
> >>>>>>>> interest in emptying the US treasury, it's likewise beneficial to
> >>> have
> >>>>>>>> the specter of an enemy out there. Fear sells.

> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>> We have yet to actually declare war on anyone in this whole mess.
> > How
> >>>>> do
> >>>>>>>> you declare war on a tactic?
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>> Forced conversion and head taxes would go over like a lead
balloon
> > in
> >>>>>>>> the USA. Not gonna happen. We're far more sectarian than, say,
> > Iraq.
> >>>>>>>> Responsible leadership is needed in the world to calm extremist
> >>>>>>>> tendencies on all sides and help rational people who are trying
to
> >>> get
> >>>>>>>> by in worsening times. At the same time we need to be, and are
> >>>>>>>> attempting to be, vigilant against any self righteous group with
> >>>>>>>> fantasies of violence in the USA.
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>> Any rush to some sort of "holy war" is irrational. There is
nothing
> >>>>> holy
> >>>>>>>> about war.
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>> Cheers,
> >>>>>>>> -Jamie
> >>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>> DJ wrote:
> >>>>>>>>> I haven't seen us react with irrationality.....yet. Al
> >>> Quaeda
> >>>>>>> just
> >>>>>>>>> came out with an ultimatim stating that it's full on war now and
> > the
> >>>>>>> west
> >>>>>>>>> will be destroyed. The only way to save ourselves is to convert
to
> >>>>>>> Islam. So
> >>>>>>>>> where to you draw the line between irrationality and self
defense?
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> >>>>> news:450ee7ef@linux...
> >>>>>>>>>> Let's keep from reacting to irrationality with irrationality of
> > our

> >>>>>>> own.
> >>>>>>>>> There's a lot of fear mongering. Chicken Little is back.
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> Cheers,
> >>>>>>>>> -Jamie
> >>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> DJ wrote:
> >>>>>>>>>> It doesn't matter at all whether this was the Pope. The bottom
> >>> line
> >>>>> is
> >>>>>>>>> that
> >>>>>>>>>> it is rationality as opposed to irrationality.
> >>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> >>>>>>> news:450ec970@linux...
> >>>>>>>>>>> The Catholic church doesn't speak for Christianity. Certainly
> > not
> >>>>> for
> >>>>>>>>>>> Lutherans, and for good reason.
> >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>> A Pope criticizing other religions (even other Christian
sects,
> >>>>> even
> >>>>>>>>>>> other Catholics) is nothing new. Certainly much harsher
things
> >>> have
> >>>>>>>>> been
> >>>>>>>>>>> said about Islam by some (not all) extreme fundamentalist
> >>>>> Christians.
> >>>>>>>>>>> And certainly much harsher things have been said by certain
> >>>>> extremist
> >>>>>>>>>>> Islamists about Christianity. The more extremist of both
camps
> >>> seem
> >>>>>>>>> to
> >>>>>>>>>>> be spoiling to relive the crusades. With some of the more
power
> >>>>> hungry
> >>>>>>>>>>> ready to endanger civilization by attempting to incite
> > religious
> >>>>>>>>> wars
> >>>>>>>>>>> for their own questionable ends.
> >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>> It's a vast generalization to say the "the left" or
> > "secularists"
> >>>>>>>>> or

> >>>>>>>>>>>> even "Christians" are demanding an apology from the Pope. I
> > think
> >>> a
> >>>>>>>>>>>> whole lot of people think the Pope can say whatever he wants.
> > It
> >>>>>>>>> doesn't
> >>>>>>>>>>>> matter to most non-Catholics in the USA and in reality, Papal
> >>>>>>>>>>>> declarations are ignored by a fair number of Catholics here,
> > too.
> >>>>>>>>>>>> Obviously some Moslems are upset in some places, but how deep
> >>> does
> >>>>>>> that
> >>>>>>>>>>>> go? When black churches were burning in the USA, it would
have
> >>> been
> >>>>>>> an
> >>>>>>>>>>>> exaggeration to blame everyone in the USA for that.
> >>>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church which only
> > very
> >>>>>>>>>>>> recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo. The church
> >>> hung
> >>>>> on
> >>>>>>>>>>>> tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view of the
> >>> universe
> >>>>>>>>> while
> >>>>>>>>>>>> denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, which
describes
> >>> the
> >>>>>>>>>>>> actual way the solar system works.
> >>>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>>> It also extends to a few Christian sects who, feeling
similarly
> >>>>>>>>>>>> insecure, tenaciously cling to the notion that the earth is
> > only
> >>>>>>> about
> >>>>>>>>>>>> 6,000 years old, by virtue of the biblical interpretations
and
> >>>>> clever
> >>>>>>>>>>>> (at the time) calculations of an Irish Bishop several
centuries
> >>>>> ago,
> >>>>>>>>> and
> >>>>>>>>>>>> in the face of solid current scientific evidence to the
> > contrary.
> >>>>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some (not all) Christian
churches
> >>>>> who,

> >>>>>>>>>>>> feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and ever-mounting
> >>>>> evidence
> >>>>>>>>> of
> >>>>>>>>>>>> evolution, responding with dogma in psuedo-scientific
clothing,
> >>> and
> >>>>>>> who
> >>>>>>>>>>>> seek to water down scientific education in the USA.
> >>>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to power hungry industries who pay
> > big
> >>>>>>> bucks
> >>>>>>>>>>>> to spread denial about global warming for short term gain.
Who
> >>> push
> >>>>>>> to
> >>>>>>>>>>>> control oil in the middle east with force. With our guns
> > blazing,
> >>>>> our
> >>>>>>>>>>>> soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically. And who
> >>>>> sometimes
> >>>>>>>>>>>> hide behind Christianity to do so.
> >>>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives who find
> > ways
> >>>>> to
> >>>>>>>>>>>> pretend that everyone is aligning against Christianity. And
in
> >>>>>>>>> spreading
> >>>>>>>>>>>> this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to keep them
in
> >>>>> power.
> >>>>>>>>>>>> And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of reason
and
> >>> the
> >>>>>>>>> focus
> >>>>>>>>>>>> on the use of force.
> >>>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>>> Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and declare
> >>>>> victory.
> >>>>>>>>> ;^)
> >>>>>>>>>>>> Have a great week!
> >>>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>>> Cheers,
> >>>>>>>>>>>> -Jamie
> >>>>>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >>>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>>>>> DC wrote:
> >>>>>>>>>>>> I thought this was worth reading if any of you are
interested.
> >>>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>>> Have a great Monday!
> >>>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>>> ----------
> >>>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>>> The Unholy Alliance Rolls Over the Pope
> >>>>>>>>>>>> By Andrew Walden
> >>>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>>> In what has suddenly been made into a highly controversial

of
> >>>>>>>>>>>> Regensberg, Pope Benedict describes Christian belief in a
God
> >>>>>>>>>>>> whose words and acts are bound by reason, truth and the law
of
> >>>>>>>>>>>> non-contradiction. Benedict contrasts this with Islamic
> > belief

> >>> Benedict
> >>>>>>>>>>>> further contrasts Christian belief with that of secular
> >>> humanists
> >>>>>>>>>>>> who see reason as being completely unbound of God.
> >>>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>>> In response, both Islamists and secularists have demanded
the

> >>>>>>>>>>>> genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between
> >>>>>>>>>>>> Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis of the
> > clash
> >>>>>>>>>>>> of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror. His
> >>>>>>>>>>>> analysis also explains the underlying cause of the alliance
> >>>>>>>>>>>> between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.
> >>>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>>> Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.
> >>>>>>>>>>>> Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor
> > Manuel

> > there
> >>>>>>>>>>>> you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his
> > command

> >>>>>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>>>>> unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top

Shiite
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling party
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and accused him
of
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> reviving the mentality of the Crusades.
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>

Islam
> >>> and
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of rage
that
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> many fear could burst into violent protests like those that
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> followed publication of caricatures of the Prophet

> >>>>>>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>>>>>> safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>

> >>> The
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> reaction is not one of anger but a calculated attempt to
force
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> the Pope to parrot the PC line on Islam. Since Islam need
not
> > be

only
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> objective can be to assert the power of a God who is so
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> transcendent that He is not bound by anything. If man is
> > created

> >>>>>>>>>>>>> anything. (This explains the predilection on the part of
some
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> Muslims to lie.) Islamists are not responding to any

> >>> to
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> their non-existent morality. They are asserting the only

> >>>>>>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>>>>>> the root of the term, Islamofascist. Moreover the Western

> >>>>>>>>>>>>> is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist thought
> >>> than

> >>>>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing precisely what

> > cleric
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest mosque,

Pope
> >>> to

> >>>>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the Pope
was,

> >>>>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> The secularist mouthpiece, New York Times,editorializes,

Pope

> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> description of the Islamic God as being unbound by reason is
> > not
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What Muslims
> > and

> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity. How dare he
> > not

> >>>>>>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to the point
is
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> lost on them.
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>

over

> > is

saying
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists are
waging
> > a
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension against

jihad.

> >>>>>>>>>>>>> jihad, but not your violent jihad.
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>

flip
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more clear than
in
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> the Islamist reaction to the Pope.
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November the
> >>> Islamists
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons and
> > demand
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> to hear from the Pope himself. This would place raging mobs
> > of
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of forcing the
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> leader of Christendom to bow before them.
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> In this demand for submission they are joined by the
> > secularist
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times
> >>> editorializes:

> > Islamists,
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> the secularists are driven only by their will to power.
While
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> the Islamists represent their demented version of
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> God--unrestrained by reason, the secularists represent their
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> demented version of reason--unrestrained by God. They are
> >>> united
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> by their self-worshipping world view.
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>

the

of

any
> >>> of
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> our categories, even that of rationality...(The Islamic) God
> > is

> >>> insult.
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> Islam embraces this description. In offering this
description

> >>> of
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> Islam, Benedict refers to the views of leading modern French
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> Islamist R. Arnaldez as discussed in the writings of
Professor
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> Theodore Khoury of Munster.
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>

then
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he considers
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> tenable in matters of religion, and the subjective

> >>>>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> Benedict asserts that without reason, or without God, there
> > can

community

> >>>>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> Both Islamist and secularist seek to break God and reason
> > apart.
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> Each claims superiority over the Christian West. They
believe
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> absolute moral license makes them powerful. As
globalization
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> carries the Western tradition of reason throughout the
world,
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> both are in decline.
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist and
secularist

> > pact
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after the
> > collapse
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> of the allied forces on the western front.
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear is
having
> > to

(word
> >>> or

> >>> great
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our
partners
> > in

> >>>>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>>>> Their fear of reason can only lead the world to disaster.
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>
> >>>
> >
> >

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Deej [1] on Wed, 20 Sep 2006 01:51:12 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

No. I think the situation in Iraq, as it stands right now, is a result of the left undercutting the administration at every turn and thereby giving aid and encouragement to our enemies who, when they see the country so divided, can take it to the bank that the left will do their fair share to defeat our efforts. I'm just blaming the intelligence deficit and the lack of leadership that led to the UN sanctions being undercut at every turn on Clinton, otherwise the war that started in 1991, would not still be happening. Thius is a war that never stopped. It could have if Clinton would have had his eye on the ball and exercised some of the great *international leadership* that his supporters fantisize so much about.....but he didn't. He allowed the sanctions to be undercut by *our allies*.

"Uptown Jimmy" <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:45108022@linux...
> So...you're blaming the situation in Iraq on Bill Clinton? Is that right?
>
> Cuz that seems absurd to me.
>
> Just sayin'.
>
> Jimmy
>
>
> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
> news:4510721c@linux...
> > >But again, merely pointing fingers backwards
> > >in no way excuses the mistakes and failures of the current government.
> >

> > Our situation is directly related to the fact that our leaders based
their
> > decisions on disinformation that was a result of the policies of the
> Clinton
> > administration. I'm not pointing the finger backwards for any other
reason
> > than I feel it is important to keep this in mind lest we elect the same
> > misguided souls with the same naieve and misguided foriegn policy ideas
to
> > office once again and end up in an even bigger mess.....and
> yes.....it
> > could be much bigger if the liberals take control of the national
> > legislature.....much less, god forbid, having another Clinton in the
> white
> > House.
> >
> >
> > "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:451035a7@linux...
> > >
> > > For most of the Clinton years the balance of power was divided between
> > > both parties. Again, there is plenty of finger pointing to go around.
> > > It's easy enough in hindsight to criticize the previous administration
> > > on a number of counts.
> > >
> > > And in retrospect, those dems made a mistake trusting Bush with that
> > > vote. OTOH, it was a moment of unity.
> > >
> > > Flash forward. Today all branches of national government are
controlled
> > > by one party. It doesn't bother me if you want to point blame at some
of
> > > the policies under Clinton. But again, merely pointing fingers
backwards
> > > in no way excuses the mistakes and failures of the current government.
> > >
> > > They walked in stating in clear terms that they felt the previous
> > > government was wrong about almost everything, and then fell flat
> > > overall, domestically and internationally.
> > >
> > > Looking at both governments, we can do better. We must do better.
> > > At some point, and we're coming up on six years, the buck stops with
> > > those in charge now.
> > >
> > > Cheers,
> > > -Jamie
> > > http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> > >
> > >

> > >
> > > DJ wrote:
> > > > The dems you mentioned authorized the military attack on Iraq as a
> last
> > > > resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done as such.
> > > >
> > > > How convenient for them when it was the intelligence service that
they
> > > > created over 8 years of hard work that they now attempt to slag and
> > blame
> > > > for their decisdions so they can vote for the war before they vote
> > against
> > > > it.
> > > >
> > > > "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> news:450f8aec@linux...
> > > >> There is plenty of finger pointing to go around. No doubt specific
> > > >> things could have been handled better under the previous
government.
> > > >>
> > > >> The transition of power between the previous and current
governments
> > was
> > > >> pretty rocky, and a "not invented here" syndrome may have doomed
the
> > > >> hand-off of some al-Qaida related work that was in progress.
> > > >>
> > > >> In any case, no government gets a pass by blaming the previous
> > > >> government. The current government, for example, failed to follow
> > > >> through and prioritize the al-Qaida threat ahead of 9/11 and failed
> to
> > > >> prevent 9/11; failed to find and capture Bin Laden in Afghanistan;
> > > >> failed to overcome Taliban control of large areas of Afghanistan;
> > > >> allowed record drug production to reestablish itself there; failed
to
> > > >> plan for post Iraq invasion problems predicted by their own state
> > > >> department; and they have continually exploited the "war on
> terrorism"
> > > >> for domestic political ends.
> > > >>
> > > >> You assert the WMDs were there. However Bush's chief inspector, and
> > Bush
> > > >> himself, say they weren't there after all. It was a bluff. One of
the
> > > >> Iraqi expatriate promoters of the bluff got the ear of our
> government,
> > > >> was believed, and, last I heard, had parlayed it into a position of
> > > >> power in Iraq after the invasion.

> > > >>
> > > >> The dems you mentioned authorized the military attack on Iraq as a
> last
> > > >> resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done as such.
> > > >>
> > > >> Preemptive invasion is new as part of the "Bush (Jr.) Doctrine."
> > > >>
> > > >> Cheers,
> > > >> -Jamie
> > > >> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> > > >>
> > > >>
> > > >> DJ wrote:
> > > >>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> > news:450f3862@linux...
> > > >>>> Neither, actually. And what we ought to do would depend on the
> nature
> > > > of
> > > >>>> the threat.
> > > >>> Agreed.
> > > >>>
> > > >>>> We might want to start with recommendations published in 1999,
well
> > > >>>> before the 9/11 attack.
> > > >>>>
> > > >>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Commission_on_Terroris m
> > > >>>>
> > > >>>> We can disagree about whether our current policy is one of
> > overreacting
> > > >>>> or not. We can probably really disagree about the newly minted
> > > >>>> preemptive attack policy. :^)
> > > >>> I don't think there is any newly minted attack policy. There has
> > always
> > > > been
> > > >>> the *clear and present danger* perogative but it needs to be based
> on
> > > >>> accurate intelligence. Had this been available, then I doubt that
> > Bush,
> > > >>> Kerry, Kennedy Pelosi and the rest would have authorized the
> invasion
> > of
> > > >>> Iraq, or perhaps they would have been able to find the WMD's
before
> > they
> > > >>> were shipped out of the country or hidden. I just find it hard to
> > > > stomach
> > > >>> the hypocracy of the democrats whose policies neutered our
> > intelligence

> > > >>> services in the '90's when they trun around and blame Bush for the
> > > > decisions
> > > >>> made based on the intellegence blunders they created in the first
> > place.
> > > >>>
> > > >>> Regards,
> > > >>>
> > > >>> Deej
> > > >>>
> > > >>>
> > > >>>> Cheers,
> > > >>>> -Jamie
> > > >>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> > > >>>>
> > > >>>>
> > > >>>> DJ wrote:
> > > >>>>> I don't see us overreacting Jamie. However, if there is
indication
> > of
> > > >>> some
> > > >>>>> sort of major threat, do we run and tell the NY times or do we
> blow
> > > > the
> > > >>>>> threat away before it pays us a visit?
> > > >>>>>
> > > >>>>>
> > > >>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:450f0b12@linux...
> > > >>>>>> Of course they came out with a blustery ultimatum. That's not
> news,
> > > >>> it's
> > > >>>>>> an old pattern. It works for them to sit back and suggest that
> > others
> > > >>> do
> > > >>>>>> something via terror-grams such as this. If it makes you afraid
> as
> > > >>> well,
> > > >>>>>> my guess is they would see that as a bonus.
> > > >>>>>>
> > > >>>>>> By goading the USA into overreacting it helps them grow, raise
> > money
> > > >>> and
> > > >>>>>> convince others to actually see us as evil and act accordingly.
> It
> > > >>>>>> works, we keep falling for it. OTOH, for those here with a
> declared
> > > >>>>>> interest in emptying the US treasury, it's likewise beneficial
to

> > > > have
> > > >>>>>> the specter of an enemy out there. Fear sells.
> > > >>>>>>
> > > >>>>>> We have yet to actually declare war on anyone in this whole
mess.
> > How
> > > >>> do
> > > >>>>>> you declare war on a tactic?
> > > >>>>>>
> > > >>>>>> Forced conversion and head taxes would go over like a lead
> balloon
> > in
> > > >>>>>> the USA. Not gonna happen. We're far more sectarian than, say,
> > Iraq.
> > > >>>>>>
> > > >>>>>> Responsible leadership is needed in the world to calm extremist
> > > >>>>>> tendencies on all sides and help rational people who are trying
> to
> > > > > get
> > > >>>>>> by in worsening times. At the same time we need to be, and are
> > > >>>>>> attempting to be, vigilant against any self righteous group
with
> > > >>>>>> fantasies of violence in the USA.
> > > >>>>>>
> > > >>>>>> Any rush to some sort of "holy war" is irrational. There is
> nothing
> > > >>> holy
> > > >>>>>> about war.
> > > >>>>>>
> > > >>>>>> Cheers,
> > > >>>>>> -Jamie
> > > >>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> > > >>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>
> > > >>>>>> DJ wrote:
> > > >>>>>>> I haven't seen us react with irrationality.....yet.
Al
> > > > Quaeda
> > > >>>>> just
> > > >>>>>>> came out with an ultimatim stating that it's full on war now
and
> > the
> > > >>>>> west
> > > >>>>>>> will be destroyed. The only way to save ourselves is to
convert
> to
> > > >>>>> Islam. So

> > > >>>>>>> where to you draw the line between irrationality and self
> defense?
> > > >>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> > > >>> news:450ee7ef@linux...
> > > >>>>>>>>> Let's keep from reacting to irrationality with irrationality
of
> > our
> > > >>>>> own.
> > > >>>>>>>>> There's a lot of fear mongering. Chicken Little is back.
> > > >>>>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>>>> Cheers,
> > > >>>>>>>>> -Jamie
> > > >>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> > > >>>>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>>>> DJ wrote:
> > > >>>>>>>>>> It doesn't matter at all whether this was the Pope. The
bottom
> > > > line
> > > >>> is
> > > >>>>>>> that
> > > >>>>>>>>>> it is rationality as opposed to irrationality.
> > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> > > >>>>> news:450ec970@linux...
> > > >>>>>>>>>> The Catholic church doesn't speak for Christianity.
Certainly
> > not
> > > >>> for
> > > >>>>>>>>>> Lutherans, and for good reason.
> > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>>>>> A Pope criticizing other religions (even other Christian
> sects,
> > > >>> even
> > > >>>>>>>>>> other Catholics) is nothing new. Certainly much harsher
> things
> > > > have
> > > >>>>>>> been
> > > >>>>>>>>>> said about Islam by some (not all) extreme fundamentalist
> > > >>> Christians.
> > > >>>>>>>>>> And certainly much harsher things have been said by certain
> > > >>> extremist
> > > >>>>>>>>>> Islamists about Christianity. The more extremist of both
> camps
> > > > seem
> > > >>>>> to

> > > >>>>>>>>>> be spoiling to relive the crusades. With some of the more
> power
> > > > >>>>> hungry
> > > > >>>>>>>>>> ready to endanger civilization by attempting to incite
> > religious
> > > > >>> wars
> > > > >>>>>>>>>> for their own questionable ends.
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > > > >>>>>>>>>> It's a vast generalization to say the "the left" or
> > "secularists"
> > > > >>> or
> > > > >>>>>>>>>> even "Christians" are demanding an apology from the Pope. I
> > think
> > > > > a
> > > > >>>>>>>>>> whole lot of people think the Pope can say whatever he
wants.
> > It
> > > > >>>>>>> doesn't
> > > > >>>>>>>>>> matter to most non-Catholics in the USA and in reality,
Papal
> > > > >>>>>>>>>> declarations are ignored by a fair number of Catholics
here,
> > too.
> > > > >>>>>>>>>> Obviously some Moslems are upset in some places, but how
deep
> > > > > does
> > > > >>>>> that
> > > > >>>>>>>>>> go? When black churches were burning in the USA, it would
> have
> > > > > been
> > > > >>>>> an
> > > > >>>>>>>>>> exaggeration to blame everyone in the USA for that.
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > > > >>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church which
only
> > very
> > > > >>>>>>>>>> recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo. The
church
> > > > > hung
> > > > >>> on
> > > > >>>>>>>>>> tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view of the
> > > > > universe
> > > > >>>>>>> while
> > > > >>>>>>>>>> denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, which
> describes
> > > > > the
> > > > >>>>>>>>>> actual way the solar system works.
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>

> > > >>>>>>>>>> It also extends to a few Christian sects who, feeling
> similarly
> > > >>>>>>>>>> insecure, tenaciously cling to the notion that the earth is
> > only
> > > >>>>> about
> > > >>>>>>>>>> 6,000 years old, by virtue of the biblical interpretations
> and
> > > >>> clever
> > > >>>>>>>>>> (at the time) calculations of an Irish Bishop several
> centuries
> > > >>> ago,
> > > >>>>>>> and
> > > >>>>>>>>>> in the face of solid current scientific evidence to the
> > contrary.
> > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some (not all) Christian
> churches
> > > >>> who,
> > > >>>>>>>>>> feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and
ever-mounting
> > > >>> evidence
> > > >>>>>>> of
> > > >>>>>>>>>> evolution, responding with dogma in psuedo-scientific
> clothing,
> > > > and
> > > >>>>> who
> > > >>>>>>>>>> seek to water down scientific education in the USA.
> > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to power hungry industries who
pay
> > big
> > > >>>>> bucks
> > > >>>>>>>>>> to spread denial about global warming for short term gain.
> Who
> > > > push
> > > >>>>> to
> > > >>>>>>>>>> control oil in the middle east with force. With our guns
> > blazing,
> > > >>> our
> > > >>>>>>>>>> soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically. And who
> > > >>> sometimes
> > > >>>>>>>>>> hide behind Christianity to do so.
> > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives who
find
> > ways
> > > >>> to
> > > >>>>>>>>>> pretend that everyone is aligning against Christianity. And

> in
> > > >>>>>>> spreading
> > > >>>>>>>>>> this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to keep them
> in
> > > >>> power.
> > > >>>>>>>>>> And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of reason
> and
> > > > the
> > > >>>>>>> focus
> > > >>>>>>>>>> on the use of force.
> > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>>>>> Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and declare
> > > >>> victory.
> > > >>>>>>> ;^)
> > > >>>>>>>>>> Have a great week!
> > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>>>>> Cheers,
> > > >>>>>>>>>> -Jamie
> > > >>>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>>>>> DC wrote:
> > > >>>>>>>>>> I thought this was worth reading if any of you are
> interested.
> > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>>>>> Have a great Monday!
> > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>>>>> ---------------------------------------
> > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>>>>> The Unholy Alliance Rolls Over the Pope
> > > >>>>>>>>>> By Andrew Walden
> > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>>>>> In what has suddenly been made into a highly controversial
> > > >>>>>>>>>> speech, the day after September 11, at Bavaria's
University
> of
> > > >>>>>>>>>> Regensberg, Pope Benedict describes Christian belief in a
> God
> > > >>>>>>>>>> whose words and acts are bound by reason, truth and the
law
> of
> > > >>>>>>>>>> non-contradiction. Benedict contrasts this with Islamic
> > belief
> > > >>>>>>>>>> in a God not bound by anything-including his own words.
> > > > > Benedict
> > > >>>>>>>>>> further contrasts Christian belief with that of secular
> > > > > humanists

> > > >>>>>>>>>>> who see reason as being completely unbound of God.
> > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> In response, both Islamists and secularists have demanded
> the
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> Pope apologize. Benedict's speech is a work of enlightened
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis of the
> > clash
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror.
His
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> analysis also explains the underlying cause of the
alliance
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.
> > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor
> > Manuel
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> II: "Show me just what Mohammed brought that was new, and
> > there
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his
> > command
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> to spread by the sword the faith he preached."
> > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> Four days later, according to AP: "Pakistan's legislature
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top
> Shiite
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling
party
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and accused
him
> of
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> reviving the mentality of the Crusades.
> > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> "Across the Islamic world Friday, Benedict's remarks on
> Islam
> > > > > and
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of rage
> that
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> many fear could burst into violent protests like those
that
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> followed publication of caricatures of the Prophet
> Muhammad."
> > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> Reuters quoted other sources expressing fears for the
Pope's
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.
> > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> The Islamist reaction proves Manuel II's 600-year-old

point.
> > > > The
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> reaction is not one of anger but a calculated attempt to
> force
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> the Pope to parrot the PC line on Islam. Since Islam need
> not
> > be
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> internally consistent and it is not bound by reason, it's
> only
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> objective can be to assert the power of a God who is so
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> transcendent that He is not bound by anything. If man is
> > created
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> in God's image then by extension Islamic man is not bound
by
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> anything. (This explains the predilection on the part of
> some
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> Muslims to lie.) Islamists are not responding to any
> 'offense'
> > > > to
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> their non-existent morality. They are asserting the only
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> 'morality' they have-the will to power.
> > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> "Will to Power" is a key element of Nietzsche 's
> > > > philosophy-hence
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> the root of the term, Islamofascist. Moreover the Western
> > "Left'
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist
thought
> > > > than
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> by Marxist thought-hence the alliance between the Western
> > "Left"
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> and the Islamofascist 'Right.'
> > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing precisely
what
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> Manuel II said they would: "Syed Ahmed Bukhari, the chief
> > cleric
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest
mosque,
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> extolled Muslims to 'respond in a manner which forces the
> Pope
> > > > to
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> apologize.'" Note they intend to use "force" not reason.
> > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the Pope
> was,
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> "calling a spade a spade".
> > > >>>>>>>>>>>

> > > >>>>>>>>>>> The secularist mouthpiece, New York Times,editorializes,
> "Pope
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> Benedict XVI has insulted Muslims.." This is false. The
> Pope
> > 's
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> description of the Islamic God as being unbound by reason
is
> > not
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What
Muslims
> > and
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> secularists fear is the Pope's decision to choose to enter
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity. How dare
he
> > not
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> "apologize" for being a Christian? That is the so-called
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> "insult."
> > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> One might "reasonably" ask when will Muslims "apologize"
for
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to the
point
> is
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> lost on them.
> > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> Amazingly the Times continues: "Muslim leaders the world
> over
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> have demanded apologies. For many Muslims, holy war -
> jihad -
> > is
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> a spiritual struggle, and not a call to violence." In
> saying
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists are
> waging
> > a
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension against
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> Christianity-and they explicitly endorse and join this
> jihad.
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> The Times is saying to Islamists, 'we can join your
> 'spiritual
> > '
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> jihad, but not your violent jihad.
> > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> The Times editors are living in a fool's paradise. The
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> "spiritual" non-violent jihad of propaganda is merely the
> flip
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more clear
than

> in
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> the Islamist reaction to the Pope.
> > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November the
> > > > Islamists
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons and
> > demand
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> to hear from the Pope himself. This would place raging
mobs
> > of
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of forcing
the
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> leader of Christendom to bow before them.
> > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> In this demand for submission they are joined by the
> > secularist
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times
> > > > editorializes:
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> "He needs to offer a deep and persuasive apology." The
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> secularists too seek the Pope's submission. Like the
> > Islamists,
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> the secularists are driven only by their will to power.
> While
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> the Islamists represent their demented version of
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> God--unrestrained by reason, the secularists represent
their
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> demented version of reason--unrestrained by God. They are
> > > > united
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> by their self-worshipping world view.
> > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> It should be noted that the carefully staged "anger' from
> the
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islamic world does not condemn Benedict's characterization
> of
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islam as a religion where God's "will is not bound up with
> any
> > > > of
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> our categories, even that of rationality...(The Islamic)
God
> > is
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> not bound even by his own word.." This is not seen as an
> > > > insult.
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islam embraces this description. In offering this
> description
> > > > of
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islam, Benedict refers to the views of leading modern
French
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islamist R. Arnaldez as discussed in the writings of

> Professor
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> Theodore Khoury of Munster.
> > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> Likewise the secularists express no dismay at the pope's
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> characterization of a secularist as: "(A) subject (who)
> then
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he
considers
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> tenable in matters of religion, and the subjective
> 'conscience
> > '
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> becomes the sole arbiter of what is ethical."
> > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> Benedict asserts that without reason, or without God,
there
> > can
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> be no modern system of morality. He explains, "In this
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> way.ethics and religion lose their power to create a
> community
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> and become (instead) a completely personal matter."
> > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> Both Islamist and secularist seek to break God and reason
> > apart.
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> Each claims superiority over the Christian West. They
> believe
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> absolute moral license makes them powerful. As
> globalization
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> carries the Western tradition of reason throughout the
> world,
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> both are in decline.
> > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist and
> secularist
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> will meet in combat, just as Hitler's fascists broke their
> > pact
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after the
> > collapse
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> of the allied forces on the western front.
> > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear is
> having
> > to
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> reply to the Pope's key point, borrowed from the Byzantine
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> Emperor: "'Not to act reasonably, not to act with logos
> (word
> > > > > or
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> reason) is contrary to the nature of God,'.. It is to
this

> > > > great
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our
> partners
> > in
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> the dialogue of cultures."
> > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > >>>>>>>>>>> Their fear of reason can only lead the world to disaster.
> > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > >>>
> > > > >
> > > > >
> >
> >
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by uptown jimmy on Wed, 20 Sep 2006 03:55:53 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Man.

I'm sorry, DJ. You've been good to me, and I don't mean to offend you, but I don't quite understand what you're trying to say.

Not that I don't pay attention to things, usually....

I just think people ought to have to take responsibility for their own actions.

And I don't recall Slick Willy invading Iraq.

Guess I'm just ignernt.

Jimmy

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message news:45109ebf@linux...
> No. I think the situation in Iraq, as it stands right now, is a result of
> the left undercutting the administration at every turn and thereby giving
> aid and encouragement to our enemies who, when they see the country so
> divided, can take it to the bank that the left will do their fair share to
> defeat our efforts. I'm just blaming the intelligence deficit and the lack
> of leadership that led to the UN sanctions being undercut at every turn on
> Clinton, otherwise the war that started in 1991, would not still be
> happening. Thius is a war that never stopped. It could have if Clinton

would
> have had his eye on the ball and exercised some of the great
*international
> leadership* that his supporters fantisize so much about.....but he
> didn't. He allowed the sanctions to be undercut by *our allies*.
>
>
>
>
> "Uptown Jimmy" <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> news:45108022@linux...
> > So...you're blaming the situation in Iraq on Bill Clinton? Is that
right?
> >
> > Cuz that seems absurd to me.
> >
> > Just sayin'.
> >
> > Jimmy
> >
> >
> > "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
> > news:4510721c@linux...
> > > >But again, merely pointing fingers backwards
> > > >in no way excuses the mistakes and failures of the current
government.
> > >
> > > Our situation is directly related to the fact that our leaders based
> their
> > > decisions on disinformation that was a result of the policies of the
> > Clinton
> > > administration. I'm not pointing the finger backwards for any other
> reason
> > > than I feel it is important to keep this in mind lest we elect the
same
> > > misguided souls with the same naieve and misguided foriegn policy
ideas
> to
> > > office once again and end up in an even bigger mess.....and
> > yes.....it
> > > could be much bigger if the liberals take control of the national
> > > legislature.....much less, god forbid, having another Clinton in the
> > white
> > > House.
> > >
> > >
> > > "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
news:451035a7@linux...

> > > >
> > > > For most of the Clinton years the balance of power was divided
between
> > > > both parties. Again, there is plenty of finger pointing to go
around.
> > > > It's easy enough in hindsight to criticize the previous
administration
> > > > on a number of counts.
> > > >
> > > > And in retrospect, those dems made a mistake trusting Bush with that
> > > > vote. OTOH, it was a moment of unity.
> > > >
> > > > Flash forward. Today all branches of national government are
> controlled
> > > > by one party. It doesn't bother me if you want to point blame at
some
> of
> > > > the policies under Clinton. But again, merely pointing fingers
> backwards
> > > > in no way excuses the mistakes and failures of the current
government.
> > > >
> > > > They walked in stating in clear terms that they felt the previous
> > > > government was wrong about almost everything, and then fell flat
> > > > overall, domestically and internationally.
> > > >
> > > > Looking at both governments, we can do better. We must do better.
> > > > At some point, and we're coming up on six years, the buck stops with
> > > > those in charge now.
> > > >
> > > > Cheers,
> > > > -Jamie
> > > > http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > DJ wrote:
> > > > > The dems you mentioned authorized the military attack on Iraq as a
> > last
> > > > > resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done as
such.
> > > > >
> > > > > How convenient for them when it was the intelligence service that
> they
> > > > > created over 8 years of hard work that they now attempt to slag
and
> > > blame
> > > > > for their decisdions so they can vote for the war before they vote

> > > against
> > > > > it.
> > > > >
> > > > > "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> > news:450f8aec@linux...
> > > > > >> There is plenty of finger pointing to go around. No doubt
specific
> > > > > >> things could have been handled better under the previous
> government.
> > > > > >>
> > > > > >> The transition of power between the previous and current
> governments
> > > was
> > > > > >> pretty rocky, and a "not invented here" syndrome may have doomed
> the
> > > > > >> hand-off of some al-Qaida related work that was in progress.
> > > > > >>
> > > > > >> In any case, no government gets a pass by blaming the previous
> > > > > >> government. The current government, for example, failed to follow
> > > > > >> through and prioritize the al-Qaida threat ahead of 9/11 and
failed
> > to
> > > > > >> prevent 9/11; failed to find and capture Bin Laden in
Afghanistan;
> > > > > >> failed to overcome Taliban control of large areas of Afghanistan;
> > > > > >> allowed record drug production to reestablish itself there;
failed
> to
> > > > > >> plan for post Iraq invasion problems predicted by their own state
> > > > > >> department; and they have continually exploited the "war on
> > terrorism"
> > > > > >> for domestic political ends.
> > > > > >>
> > > > > >> You assert the WMDs were there. However Bush's chief inspector,
and
> > > Bush
> > > > > >> himself, say they weren't there after all. It was a bluff. One of
> the
> > > > > >> Iraqi expatriate promoters of the bluff got the ear of our
> > government,
> > > > > >> was believed, and, last I heard, had parlayed it into a position
of
> > > > > >> power in Iraq after the invasion.
> > > > > >>
> > > > > >> The dems you mentioned authorized the military attack on Iraq as
a
> > last
> > > > > >> resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done as

such.
> > > > >>
> > > > >> Preemptive invasion is new as part of the "Bush (Jr.) Doctrine."
> > > > >>
> > > > >> Cheers,
> > > > >> -Jamie
> > > > >> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> > > > >>
> > > > >>
> > > > >> DJ wrote:
> > > > >>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> > > news:450f3862@linux...
> > > > >>>> Neither, actually. And what we ought to do would depend on the
> > nature
> > > > > of
> > > > >>>> the threat.
> > > > >>> Agreed.
> > > > >>>
> > > > >>>> We might want to start with recommendations published in 1999,
> well
> > > > >>>> before the 9/11 attack.
> > > > >>>>
> > > > >>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Commission_on_Terroris m
> > > > >>>>
> > > > >>>> We can disagree about whether our current policy is one of
> > > overreacting
> > > > >>>> or not. We can probably really disagree about the newly minted
> > > > >>>> preemptive attack policy. :^)
> > > > >>> I don't think there is any newly minted attack policy. There has
> > > always
> > > > > been
> > > > >>> the *clear and present danger* perogative but it needs to be
based
> > on
> > > > >>> accurate intelligence. Had this been available, then I doubt
that
> > > Bush,
> > > > >>> Kerry, Kennedy Pelosi and the rest would have authorized the
> > invasion
> > > > of
> > > > >>> Iraq, or perhaps they would have been able to find the WMD's
> before
> > > they
> > > > >>> were shipped out of the country or hidden. I just find it hard
to
> > > > > stomach
> > > > >>> the hypocracy of the democrats whose policies neutered our
> > > intelligence

> > > > >>> services in the '90's when they trun around and blame Bush for
the
> > > > > decisions
> > > > >>> made based on the intellegence blunders they created in the
first
> > > place.
> > > > >>>
> > > > >>> Regards,
> > > > >>>
> > > > >>> Deej
> > > > >>>
> > > > >>>
> > > > >>> Cheers,
> > > > >>> -Jamie
> > > > >>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> > > > >>>
> > > > >>>
> > > > >>> DJ wrote:
> > > > >>>> I don't see us overreacting Jamie. However, if there is
> indication
> > > of
> > > > >>> some
> > > > >>>> sort of major threat, do we run and tell the NY times or do we
> > blow
> > > > > the
> > > > >>>> threat away before it pays us a visit?
> > > > >>>>
> > > > >>>>
> > > > >>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:450f0b12@linux...
> > > > >>>>> Of course they came out with a blustery ultimatum. That's not
> > news,
> > > > >>> it's
> > > > >>>>> an old pattern. It works for them to sit back and suggest
that
> > > others
> > > > >>> do
> > > > >>>>> something via terror-grams such as this. If it makes you
afraid
> > as
> > > > >>> well,
> > > > >>>>> my guess is they would see that as a bonus.
> > > > >>>>>
> > > > >>>>> By goading the USA into overreacting it helps them grow,
raise
> > > money
> > > > >>> and
> > > > >>>>> convince others to actually see us as evil and act

accordingly.
> > It
> > > > >>>>>> works, we keep falling for it. OTOH, for those here with a
> > declared
> > > > > >>>>>> interest in emptying the US treasury, it's likewise
beneficial
> to
> > > > > > have
> > > > > >>>>>> the specter of an enemy out there. Fear sells.
> > > > > >>>>>>
> > > > > >>>>>> We have yet to actually declare war on anyone in this whole
> mess.
> > > How
> > > > > > >>> do
> > > > > >>>>>> you declare war on a tactic?
> > > > > >>>>>>
> > > > > >>>>>> Forced conversion and head taxes would go over like a lead
> > balloon
> > > in
> > > > > >>>>>> the USA. Not gonna happen. We're far more sectarian than,
say,
> > > Iraq.
> > > > > >>>>>>
> > > > > >>>>>> Responsible leadership is needed in the world to calm
extremist
> > > > > >>>>>> tendencies on all sides and help rational people who are
trying
> > to
> > > > > > > get
> > > > > >>>>>> by in worsening times. At the same time we need to be, and
are
> > > > > >>>>>> attempting to be, vigilant against any self righteous group
> with
> > > > > >>>>>> fantasies of violence in the USA.
> > > > > >>>>>>
> > > > > >>>>>> Any rush to some sort of "holy war" is irrational. There is
> > nothing
> > > > > > >>> holy
> > > > > >>>>>> about war.
> > > > > >>>>>>
> > > > > >>>>>> Cheers,
> > > > > >>>>>> -Jamie
> > > > > >>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> > > > > >>>>>>
> > > > > >>>>>>
> > > > > >>>>>>
> > > > > >>>>>> DJ wrote:
> > > > > >>>>>>> I haven't seen us react with irrationality.....yet.

> Al
> > > > > Quaeda
> > > > > >>>>> just
> > > > > >>>>>>> came out with an ultimatim stating that it's full on war now
> and
> > > the
> > > > >>>>> west
> > > > > >>>>>>> will be destroyed. The only way to save ourselves is to
> convert
> > to
> > > > > >>>>> Islam. So
> > > > > >>>>>>> where to you draw the line between irrationality and self
> > defense?
> > > > > >>>>>>>
> > > > > >>>>>>>
> > > > > >>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> > > > > >>> news:450ee7ef@linux...
> > > > > >>>>>>>> Let's keep from reacting to irrationality with
irrationality
> of
> > > our
> > > > >>>>> own.
> > > > > >>>>>>>> There's a lot of fear mongering. Chicken Little is back.
> > > > > >>>>>>>>
> > > > > >>>>>>>> Cheers,
> > > > > >>>>>>>> -Jamie
> > > > > >>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> > > > > >>>>>>>>
> > > > > >>>>>>>>
> > > > > >>>>>>>> DJ wrote:
> > > > > >>>>>>>>> It doesn't matter at all whether this was the Pope. The
> bottom
> > > > > > line
> > > > > >>> is
> > > > > >>>>>>> that
> > > > > >>>>>>>>> it is rationality as opposed to irrationality.
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>
> > > > > >>>>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> > > > > >>>>> news:450ec970@linux...
> > > > > >>>>>>>>> The Catholic church doesn't speak for Christianity.
> Certainly
> > > not
> > > > >>> for
> > > > > >>>>>>>>> Lutherans, and for good reason.
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>
> > > > > >>>>>>>>> A Pope criticizing other religions (even other Christian
> > sects,
> > > > > >>> even

> > > > >>>>>>>>>> other Catholics) is nothing new. Certainly much harsher
> > things
> > > > > > have
> > > > > >>>>>>> been
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> said about Islam by some (not all) extreme fundamentalist
> > > > > >>> Christians.
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> And certainly much harsher things have been said by
certain
> > > > > >>> extremist
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> Islamists about Christianity. The more extremist of both
> > camps
> > > > > > seem
> > > > > >>>>> to
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> be spoiling to relive the crusades. With some of the more
> > power
> > > > > >>>>> hungry
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> ready to endanger civilization by attempting to incite
> > > religious
> > > > > >>> wars
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> for their own questionable ends.
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> It's a vast generalization to say the "the left" or
> > > "secularists"
> > > > > >>> or
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> even "Christians" are demanding an apology from the Pope.
I
> > > think
> > > > > > a
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> whole lot of people think the Pope can say whatever he
> wants.
> > > It
> > > > > >>>>> doesn't
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> matter to most non-Catholics in the USA and in reality,
> Papal
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> declarations are ignored by a fair number of Catholics
> here,
> > > too.
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> Obviously some Moslems are upset in some places, but how
> deep
> > > > > > does
> > > > > >>>>> that
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> go? When black churches were burning in the USA, it would
> > have
> > > > > > been
> > > > > >>>>> an
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> exaggeration to blame everyone in the USA for that.
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church which

> only
> > > very
> > > > >>>>>>>>>> recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo. The
> church
> > > > > hung
> > > > > >>> on
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view of the
> > > > > universe
> > > > > >>>>>>> while
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, which
> > describes
> > > > > the
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> actual way the solar system works.
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> It also extends to a few Christian sects who, feeling
> > similarly
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> insecure, tenaciously cling to the notion that the earth
is
> > > only
> > > > > >>>>> about
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> 6,000 years old, by virtue of the biblical
interpretations
> > and
> > > > > >>> clever
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> (at the time) calculations of an Irish Bishop several
> > centuries
> > > > > >>> ago,
> > > > > >>>>>>> and
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> in the face of solid current scientific evidence to the
> > > contrary.
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some (not all) Christian
> > churches
> > > > > >>> who,
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and
> ever-mounting
> > > > > >>> evidence
> > > > > >>>>>>> of
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> evolution, responding with dogma in psuedo-scientific
> > clothing,
> > > > > > and
> > > > > >>>>> who
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> seek to water down scientific education in the USA.
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to power hungry industries who
> pay
> > > big
> > > > > >>>>> bucks

> > > > >>>>>>>>>> to spread denial about global warming for short term
gain.
> > Who
> > > > > > push
> > > > > >>>>> to
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> control oil in the middle east with force. With our guns
> > > blazing,
> > > > > > >>> our
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically. And
who
> > > > > >>> sometimes
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> hide behind Christianity to do so.
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives who
> find
> > > ways
> > > > > > >>> to
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> pretend that everyone is aligning against Christianity.
And
> > in
> > > > > > >>>>>>> spreading
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to keep
them
> > in
> > > > > >>> power.
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of
reason
> > and
> > > > > > > the
> > > > > >>>>>>> focus
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> on the use of force.
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and
declare
> > > > > >>> victory.
> > > > > >>>>>>> ;^)
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> Have a great week!
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> Cheers,
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> -Jamie
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> DC wrote:
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> I thought this was worth reading if any of you are
> > interested.
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> Have a great Monday!

> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> ----------
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> The Unholy Alliance Rolls Over the Pope
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> By Andrew Walden
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> In what has suddenly been made into a highly
controversial
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> speech, the day after September 11, at Bavaria's
> University
> > of
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Regensberg, Pope Benedict describes Christian belief in
a
> > God
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> whose words and acts are bound by reason, truth and the
> law
> > of
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> non-contradiction. Benedict contrasts this with Islamic
> > > belief
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> in a God not bound by anything-including his own words.
> > > > > Benedict
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> further contrasts Christian belief with that of secular
> > > > > humanists
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> who see reason as being completely unbound of God.
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> In response, both Islamists and secularists have
demanded
> > the
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Pope apologize. Benedict's speech is a work of
enlightened
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis of
the
> > > clash
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror.
> His
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> analysis also explains the underlying cause of the
> alliance
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor
> > > Manuel
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> II: "Show me just what Mohammed brought that was new,
and
> > > there
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his

> > > command
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> to spread by the sword the faith he preached."
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Four days later, according to AP: "Pakistan's
legislature
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top
> > Shiite
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling
> party
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and accused
> him
> > of
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> reviving the mentality of the Crusades.
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "Across the Islamic world Friday, Benedict's remarks on
> > Islam
> > > > > and
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of rage
> > that
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> many fear could burst into violent protests like those
> that
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> followed publication of caricatures of the Prophet
> > Muhammad."
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Reuters quoted other sources expressing fears for the
> Pope's
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> The Islamist reaction proves Manuel II's 600-year-old
> point.
> > > > > The
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> reaction is not one of anger but a calculated attempt to
> > force
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> the Pope to parrot the PC line on Islam. Since Islam
need
> > not
> > > > be
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> internally consistent and it is not bound by reason,
it's
> > only
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> objective can be to assert the power of a God who is so
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> transcendent that He is not bound by anything. If man is
> > > created
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> in God's image then by extension Islamic man is not
bound
> by
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> anything. (This explains the predilection on the part
of

> > some
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Muslims to lie.) Islamists are not responding to any
> > 'offense'
> > > > > to
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>> their non-existent morality. They are asserting the
only
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>> 'morality' they have-the will to power.
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "Will to Power" is a key element of Nietzsche 's
> > > > > philosophy-hence
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>> the root of the term, Islamofascist. Moreover the
Western
> > > "Left'
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>> is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist
> thought
> > > > > than
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>> by Marxist thought-hence the alliance between the
Western
> > > "Left"
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>> and the Islamofascist 'Right.'
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing precisely
> what
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Manuel II said they would: "Syed Ahmed Bukhari, the
chief
> > > cleric
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>> of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest
> mosque,
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>> extolled Muslims to 'respond in a manner which forces
the
> > Pope
> > > > > > to
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>> apologize.'" Note they intend to use "force" not
reason.
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the Pope
> > was,
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "calling a spade a spade".
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>> The secularist mouthpiece, New York Times,editorializes,
> > "Pope
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Benedict XVI has insulted Muslims.." This is false.
The
> > Pope
> > > > 's
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>> description of the Islamic God as being unbound by
reason
> is

> > > not
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What
> Muslims
> > > and
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> secularists fear is the Pope's decision to choose to
enter
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity. How dare
> he
> > > not
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "apologize" for being a Christian? That is the
so-called
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "insult."
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> One might "reasonably" ask when will Muslims "apologize"
> for
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to the
> point
> > is
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> lost on them.
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Amazingly the Times continues: "Muslim leaders the world
> > over
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> have demanded apologies. For many Muslims, holy war -
> > jihad -
> > > is
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> a spiritual struggle, and not a call to violence." In
> > saying
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists are
> > waging
> > > a
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension
against
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Christianity-and they explicitly endorse and join this
> > jihad.
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> The Times is saying to Islamists, 'we can join your
> > 'spiritual
> > > '
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> jihad, but not your violent jihad.
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> The Times editors are living in a fool's paradise. The
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "spiritual" non-violent jihad of propaganda is merely
the
> > flip
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more clear
> than
> > > in
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> the Islamist reaction to the Pope.
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>

> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November the
> > > > > Islamists
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons and
> > > demand
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> to hear from the Pope himself. This would place raging
> mobs
> > > of
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of forcing
> the
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> leader of Christendom to bow before them.
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> In this demand for submission they are joined by the
> > > secularist
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times
> > > > > editorializes:
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "He needs to offer a deep and persuasive apology." The
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> secularists too seek the Pope's submission. Like the
> > > Islamists,
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> the secularists are driven only by their will to power.
> > While
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> the Islamists represent their demented version of
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> God--unrestrained by reason, the secularists represent
> their
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> demented version of reason--unrestrained by God. They
are
> > > > > united
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> by their self-worshipping world view.
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> It should be noted that the carefully staged "anger'
from
> > the
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islamic world does not condemn Benedict's
characterization
> > of
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islam as a religion where God's "will is not bound up
with
> > any
> > > > > of
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> our categories, even that of rationality...(The Islamic)
> God
> > > is
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> not bound even by his own word.." This is not seen as
an
> > > > > insult.
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islam embraces this description. In offering this
> > description
> > > > > of
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islam, Benedict refers to the views of leading modern

> French
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islamist R. Arnaldez as discussed in the writings of
> > Professor
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Theodore Khoury of Munster.
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Likewise the secularists express no dismay at the pope's
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> characterization of a secularist as: "(A) subject (who)
> > then
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he
> considers
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> tenable in matters of religion, and the subjective
> > 'conscience
> > > '
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> becomes the sole arbiter of what is ethical."
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Benedict asserts that without reason, or without God,
> there
> > > can
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> be no modern system of morality. He explains, "In this
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> way.ethics and religion lose their power to create a
> > community
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> and become (instead) a completely personal matter."
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Both Islamist and secularist seek to break God and
reason
> > > apart.
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Each claims superiority over the Christian West. They
> > believe
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> absolute moral license makes them powerful. As
> > globalization
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> carries the Western tradition of reason throughout the
> > world,
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> both are in decline.
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist and
> > secularist
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> will meet in combat, just as Hitler's fascists broke
their
> > > pact
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after the
> > > collapse
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> of the allied forces on the western front.
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear is
> > having
> > > > to
> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> reply to the Pope's key point, borrowed from the
Byzantine

> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Emperor: "'Not to act reasonably, not to act with logos
> > (word
> > > > > or
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>> reason) is contrary to the nature of God,'.. It is to
> this
> > > > > > great
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>> logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our
> > partners
> > > > in
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>> the dialogue of cultures."
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Their fear of reason can only lead the world to
disaster.
> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > > > > >>>
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Jamie K on Wed, 20 Sep 2006 04:11:52 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Heh. I'm OK with Hillary running. Maybe Laura should run, too. They both
have experience cleaning up messes left by their husbands...

Cheers,
  -Jamie
  http://www.JamieKrutz.com

DJ wrote:
> Bill is most certainly running again.....he's just wearing a dress this
> time.
>
>
> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:45107e39@linux...
>> Our situation is directly related to more than half a century of our
>> decisions and actions, smart and stupid.
>>
>> It's of limited usefulness to hone in on the last administration as if
>> that's the entire problem, surely you would have to take into account

>> decisions made before then and since then.
>>
>> So while I agree with your point to an extent, it's insufficient to
>> inoculate the current admin from its own significant problems.
>>
>> Bill and George aren't running again so we don't have to argue that one.
>> I am not writing off either major party or a third party, but we need a
>> change on many levels.
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>> DJ wrote:
>>>> But again, merely pointing fingers backwards
>>>> in no way excuses the mistakes and failures of the current government.
>>> Our situation is directly related to the fact that our leaders based
> their
>>> decisions on disinformation that was a result of the policies of the
> Clinton
>>> administration. I'm not pointing the finger backwards for any other
> reason
>>> than I feel it is important to keep this in mind lest we elect the same
>>> misguided souls with the same naieve and misguided foriegn policy ideas
> to
>>> office once again and end up in an even bigger mess.....and
> yes.....it
>>> could be much bigger if the liberals take control of the national
>>> legislature.....much less, god forbid, having another Clinton in the
> white
>>> House.
>>>
>>>
>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:451035a7@linux...
>>>> For most of the Clinton years the balance of power was divided between
>>>> both parties. Again, there is plenty of finger pointing to go around.
>>>> It's easy enough in hindsight to criticize the previous administration
>>>> on a number of counts.
>>>>
>>>> And in retrospect, those dems made a mistake trusting Bush with that
>>>> vote. OTOH, it was a moment of unity.
>>>>
>>>> Flash forward. Today all branches of national government are controlled
>>>> by one party. It doesn't bother me if you want to point blame at some
> of
>>>> the policies under Clinton. But again, merely pointing fingers
> backwards

>>>> in no way excuses the mistakes and failures of the current government.
>>>>
>>>> They walked in stating in clear terms that they felt the previous
>>>> government was wrong about almost everything, and then fell flat
>>>> overall, domestically and internationally.
>>>>
>>>> Looking at both governments, we can do better. We must do better.
>>>> At some point, and we're coming up on six years, the buck stops with
>>>> those in charge now.
>>>>
>>>> Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> DJ wrote:
>>>>> The dems you mentioned authorized the military attack on Iraq as a
> last
>>>>> resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done as such.
>>>>>
>>>>> How convenient for them when it was the intelligence service that they
>>>>> created over 8 years of hard work that they now attempt to slag and
>>> blame
>>>>> for their decisdions so they can vote for the war before they vote
>>> against
>>>>> it.
>>>>>
>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> news:450f8aec@linux...
>>>>>> There is plenty of finger pointing to go around. No doubt specific
>>>>>> things could have been handled better under the previous government.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> The transition of power between the previous and current governments
>>> was
>>>>>> pretty rocky, and a "not invented here" syndrome may have doomed the
>>>>>> hand-off of some al-Qaida related work that was in progress.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> In any case, no government gets a pass by blaming the previous
>>>>>> government. The current government, for example, failed to follow
>>>>>> through and prioritize the al-Qaida threat ahead of 9/11 and failed
> to
>>>>>> prevent 9/11; failed to find and capture Bin Laden in Afghanistan;
>>>>>> failed to overcome Taliban control of large areas of Afghanistan;
>>>>>> allowed record drug production to reestablish itself there; failed to
>>>>>> plan for post Iraq invasion problems predicted by their own state
>>>>>> department; and they have continually exploited the "war on
> terrorism"

>>>>>> for domestic political ends.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> You assert the WMDs were there. However Bush's chief inspector, and
>>> Bush
>>>>>> himself, say they weren't there after all. It was a bluff. One of the
>>>>>> Iraqi expatriate promoters of the bluff got the ear of our
> government,
>>>>>> was believed, and, last I heard, had parlayed it into a position of
>>>>>> power in Iraq after the invasion.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> The dems you mentioned authorized the military attack on Iraq as a
> last
>>>>>> resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done as such.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Preemptive invasion is new as part of the "Bush (Jr.) Doctrine."
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> DJ wrote:
>>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
>>> news:450f3862@linux...
>>>>>>>> Neither, actually. And what we ought to do would depend on the
> nature
>>>>> of
>>>>>>>> the threat.
>>>>>>> Agreed.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> We might want to start with recommendations published in 1999, well
>>>>>>>> before the 9/11 attack.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Commission_on_Terroris m
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> We can disagree about whether our current policy is one of
>>> overreacting
>>>>>>>> or not. We can probably really disagree about the newly minted
>>>>>>>> preemptive attack policy. :^)
>>>>>>> I don't think there is any newly minted attack policy. There has
>>> always
>>>>> been
>>>>>>> the *clear and present danger* perogative but it needs to be based
> on
>>>>>>> accurate intelligence. Had this been available, then I doubt that
>>> Bush,
>>>>>>> Kerry, Kennedy Pelosi and the rest would have authorized the
> invasion

>>> of
>>>>>>> Iraq, or perhaps they would have been able to find the WMD's before
>>> they
>>>>>>> were shipped out of the country or hidden. I just find it hard to
>>>>> stomach
>>>>>>> the hypocracy of the democrats whose policies neutered our
>>> intelligence
>>>>>>> services in the '90's when they trun around and blame Bush for the
>>>>> decisions
>>>>>>> made based on the intellegence blunders they created in the first
>>> place.
>>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Deej
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> DJ wrote:
>>>>>>>>> I don't see us overreacting Jamie. However, if there is indication
>>> of
>>>>>>> some
>>>>>>>>> sort of major threat, do we run and tell the NY times or do we
> blow
>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>> threat away before it pays us a visit?
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
>>>>> news:450f0b12@linux...
>>>>>>>>>> Of course they came out with a blustery ultimatum. That's not
> news,
>>>>>>> it's
>>>>>>>>>> an old pattern. It works for them to sit back and suggest that
>>> others
>>>>>>> do
>>>>>>>>>> something via terror-grams such as this. If it makes you afraid
> as
>>>>>>> well,
>>>>>>>>>> my guess is they would see that as a bonus.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> By goading the USA into overreacting it helps them grow, raise
>>> money
>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>> convince others to actually see us as evil and act accordingly.

> It
>>>>>>>>>> works, we keep falling for it. OTOH, for those here with a
> declared
>>>>>>>>>> interest in emptying the US treasury, it's likewise beneficial to
>>>>> have
>>>>>>>>>> the specter of an enemy out there. Fear sells.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> We have yet to actually declare war on anyone in this whole mess.
>>> How
>>>>>>> do
>>>>>>>>>> you declare war on a tactic?
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Forced conversion and head taxes would go over like a lead
> balloon
>>> in
>>>>>>>>>> the USA. Not gonna happen. We're far more sectarian than, say,
>>> Iraq.
>>>>>>>>>> Responsible leadership is needed in the world to calm extremist
>>>>>>>>>> tendencies on all sides and help rational people who are trying
> to
>>>>> get
>>>>>>>>>> by in worsening times. At the same time we need to be, and are
>>>>>>>>>> attempting to be, vigilant against any self righteous group with
>>>>>>>>>> fantasies of violence in the USA.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Any rush to some sort of "holy war" is irrational. There is
> nothing
>>>>>>> holy
>>>>>>>>>> about war.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> DJ wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>> I haven't seen us react with irrationality.....yet. Al
>>>>> Quaeda
>>>>>>>>> just
>>>>>>>>>>> came out with an ultimatim stating that it's full on war now and
>>> the
>>>>>>>>> west
>>>>>>>>>>> will be destroyed. The only way to save ourselves is to convert
> to
>>>>>>>>> Islam. So
>>>>>>>>>>> where to you draw the line between irrationality and self
> defense?

>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
>>>>>>> news:450ee7ef@linux...
>>>>>>>>>>>> Let's keep from reacting to irrationality with irrationality of
>>> our
>>>>>>>>>> own.
>>>>>>>>>>>> There's a lot of fear mongering. Chicken Little is back.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> DJ wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>> It doesn't matter at all whether this was the Pope. The bottom
>>>>> line
>>>>>>>>> is
>>>>>>>>>>> that
>>>>>>>>>>>>> it is rationality as opposed to irrationality.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
>>>>>>>>>> news:450ec970@linux...
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> The Catholic church doesn't speak for Christianity. Certainly
>>> not
>>>>>>>>> for
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Lutherans, and for good reason.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> A Pope criticizing other religions (even other Christian
>> sects,
>>>>>>>>> even
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> other Catholics) is nothing new. Certainly much harsher
>> things
>>>>> have
>>>>>>>>>>> been
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> said about Islam by some (not all) extreme fundamentalist
>>>>>>>>> Christians.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> And certainly much harsher things have been said by certain
>>>>>>>>> extremist
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Islamists about Christianity. The more extremist of both
>> camps
>>>>> seem
>>>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> be spoiling to relive the crusades. With some of the more
>> power
>>>>>>>>>> hungry
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> ready to endanger civilization by attempting to incite
>>> religious
>>>>>>>>> wars

>>>>>>>>>>>>> for their own questionable ends.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> It's a vast generalization to say the "the left" or
>>> "secularists"
>>>>>>> or
>>>>>>>>>>>>> even "Christians" are demanding an apology from the Pope. I
>>> think
>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>>>>>> whole lot of people think the Pope can say whatever he wants.
>>> It
>>>>>>>>>> doesn't
>>>>>>>>>>>>> matter to most non-Catholics in the USA and in reality, Papal
>>>>>>>>>>>>> declarations are ignored by a fair number of Catholics here,
>>> too.
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Obviously some Moslems are upset in some places, but how deep
>>>>> does
>>>>>>>>> that
>>>>>>>>>>>>> go? When black churches were burning in the USA, it would
> have
>>>>> been
>>>>>>>>> an
>>>>>>>>>>>>> exaggeration to blame everyone in the USA for that.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church which only
>>> very
>>>>>>>>>>>>> recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo. The church
>>>>> hung
>>>>>>>>> on
>>>>>>>>>>>>> tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view of the
>>>>> universe
>>>>>>>>>> while
>>>>>>>>>>>>> denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, which
> describes
>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>>>> actual way the solar system works.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> It also extends to a few Christian sects who, feeling
> similarly
>>>>>>>>>>>>> insecure, tenaciously cling to the notion that the earth is
>>> only
>>>>>>>>> about
>>>>>>>>>>>>> 6,000 years old, by virtue of the biblical interpretations
> and
>>>>>>> clever
>>>>>>>>>>>>> (at the time) calculations of an Irish Bishop several
> centuries
>>>>>>> ago,
>>>>>>>>>> and

>>>>>>>>>>>>>> in the face of solid current scientific evidence to the
>>> contrary.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some (not all) Christian
> churches
>>>>>>> who,
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and ever-mounting
>>>>>>> evidence
>>>>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> evolution, responding with dogma in psuedo-scientific
> clothing,
>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>> who
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> seek to water down scientific education in the USA.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to power hungry industries who pay
>>> big
>>>>>>>>> bucks
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> to spread denial about global warming for short term gain.
> Who
>>>>> push
>>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> control oil in the middle east with force. With our guns
>>> blazing,
>>>>>>> our
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically. And who
>>>>>>> sometimes
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> hide behind Christianity to do so.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives who find
>>> ways
>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> pretend that everyone is aligning against Christianity. And
> in
>>>>>>>>>>> spreading
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to keep them
> in
>>>>>>> power.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of reason
> and
>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>> focus
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> on the use of force.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and declare
>>>>>>> victory.
>>>>>>>>>>> ;^)
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Have a great week!
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> DC wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> I thought this was worth reading if any of you are
> interested.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Have a great Monday!
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> ---------------------------------------
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> The Unholy Alliance Rolls Over the Pope
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> By Andrew Walden
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> In what has suddenly been made into a highly controversial

> of
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Regensberg, Pope Benedict describes Christian belief in a
> God
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> whose words and acts are bound by reason, truth and the law
> of
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> non-contradiction. Benedict contrasts this with Islamic
>>> belief

>>>>> Benedict
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> further contrasts Christian belief with that of secular
>>>>> humanists
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> who see reason as being completely unbound of God.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> In response, both Islamists and secularists have demanded
> the

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis of the
>>> clash
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror. His
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> analysis also explains the underlying cause of the alliance
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor
>>> Manuel

>>> there
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his
>>> command

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top
> Shiite
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling party
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and accused him
> of
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> reviving the mentality of the Crusades.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

> Islam
>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of rage
> that
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> many fear could burst into violent protests like those that
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> followed publication of caricatures of the Prophet

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>> The
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> reaction is not one of anger but a calculated attempt to
> force
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the Pope to parrot the PC line on Islam. Since Islam need
> not
>>> be

> only
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> objective can be to assert the power of a God who is so
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> transcendent that He is not bound by anything. If man is
>>> created

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> anything. (This explains the predilection on the part of
> some
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Muslims to lie.) Islamists are not responding to any

>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> their non-existent morality. They are asserting the only

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the root of the term, Islamofascist. Moreover the Western

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist thought
>>>>> than

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing precisely what

>>> cleric
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest mosque,

> Pope
>>>>> to

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the Pope
> was,

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> The secularist mouthpiece, New York Times,editorializes,

> Pope

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> description of the Islamic God as being unbound by reason is
>>> not
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What Muslims
>>> and

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity. How dare he
>>> not

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to the point
> is
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> lost on them.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

> over

>>> is

> saying
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists are
> waging
>>> a
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension against

> jihad.

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> jihad, but not your violent jihad.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

> flip
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more clear than
> in
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the Islamist reaction to the Pope.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November the
>>>>> Islamists
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons and
>>> demand
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> to hear from the Pope himself. This would place raging mobs
>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of forcing the
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> leader of Christendom to bow before them.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> In this demand for submission they are joined by the
>>> secularist
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times
>>>>> editorializes:

>>> Islamists,
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the secularists are driven only by their will to power.
> While
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the Islamists represent their demented version of
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> God--unrestrained by reason, the secularists represent their
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> demented version of reason--unrestrained by God. They are
>>>>> united
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> by their self-worshipping world view.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

> the

> of

> any
>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> our categories, even that of rationality...(The Islamic) God
>>> is

>>>>> insult.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Islam embraces this description. In offering this
> description
>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Islam, Benedict refers to the views of leading modern French
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Islamist R. Arnaldez as discussed in the writings of
> Professor
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Theodore Khoury of Munster.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

> then
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he considers
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> tenable in matters of religion, and the subjective

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Benedict asserts that without reason, or without God, there
>>> can

> community

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Both Islamist and secularist seek to break God and reason
>>> apart.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Each claims superiority over the Christian West. They
> believe
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> absolute moral license makes them powerful. As
> globalization
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> carries the Western tradition of reason throughout the
> world,
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> both are in decline.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist and
> secularist

>>> pact
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after the
>>> collapse
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> of the allied forces on the western front.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear is
> having
>>> to

> (word
>>>>> or

>>>>> great
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our
> partners
>>> in

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Their fear of reason can only lead the world to disaster.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by TCB on Wed, 20 Sep 2006 04:12:43 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I'd vote for Caligula before I'd vote for Hillary, but I'd vote for Laura
Bush in a second. Every time I hear her speak or read what she writes she
seems like the level headed smart one in that outfit.

TCB

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>
>Heh. I'm OK with Hillary running. Maybe Laura should run, too. They both

>have experience cleaning up messes left by their husbands...
>
>Cheers,
> -Jamie
> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>
>DJ wrote:
>> Bill is most certainly running again.....he's just wearing a dress this
>> time.
>>
>>
>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:45107e39@linux...
>>> Our situation is directly related to more than half a century of our
>>> decisions and actions, smart and stupid.
>>>
>>> It's of limited usefulness to hone in on the last administration as if
>>> that's the entire problem, surely you would have to take into account

>>> decisions made before then and since then.
>>>
>>> So while I agree with your point to an extent, it's insufficient to
>>> inoculate the current admin from its own significant problems.
>>>
>>> Bill and George aren't running again so we don't have to argue that one.
>>> I am not writing off either major party or a third party, but we need
a
>>> change on many levels.
>>>
>>> Cheers,
>>> -Jamie
>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>
>>>
>>> DJ wrote:
>>>>> But again, merely pointing fingers backwards
>>>>> in no way excuses the mistakes and failures of the current government.
>>>> Our situation is directly related to the fact that our leaders based
>> their
>>>> decisions on disinformation that was a result of the policies of the
>> Clinton
>>>> administration. I'm not pointing the finger backwards for any other
>> reason
>>>> than I feel it is important to keep this in mind lest we elect the same
>>>> misguided souls with the same naieve and misguided foriegn policy ideas
>> to
>>>> office once again and end up in an even bigger mess.....and
>> yes.....it
>>>> could be much bigger if the liberals take control of the national
>>>> legislature.....much less, god forbid, having another Clinton in the
>> white
>>>> House.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:451035a7@linux...
>>>>> For most of the Clinton years the balance of power was divided between
>>>>> both parties. Again, there is plenty of finger pointing to go around.
>>>>> It's easy enough in hindsight to criticize the previous administration
>>>>> on a number of counts.
>>>>>
>>>>> And in retrospect, those dems made a mistake trusting Bush with that
>>>>> vote. OTOH, it was a moment of unity.
>>>>>
>>>>> Flash forward. Today all branches of national government are controlled
>>>>> by one party. It doesn't bother me if you want to point blame at some
>> of
>>>>> the policies under Clinton. But again, merely pointing fingers

>> backwards
>>>>> in no way excuses the mistakes and failures of the current government.
>>>>>
>>>>> They walked in stating in clear terms that they felt the previous
>>>>> government was wrong about almost everything, and then fell flat
>>>>> overall, domestically and internationally.
>>>>>
>>>>> Looking at both governments, we can do better. We must do better.
>>>>> At some point, and we're coming up on six years, the buck stops with
>>>>> those in charge now.
>>>>>
>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> DJ wrote:
>>>>>> The dems you mentioned authorized the military attack on Iraq as a
>> last
>>>>>> resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done as such.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> How convenient for them when it was the intelligence service that
they
>>>>>> created over 8 years of hard work that they now attempt to slag and
>>>> blame
>>>>>> for their decisdions so they can vote for the war before they vote
>>>> against
>>>>>> it.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
>> news:450f8aec@linux...
>>>>>>> There is plenty of finger pointing to go around. No doubt specific
>>>>>>> things could have been handled better under the previous government.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> The transition of power between the previous and current governments
>>>> was
>>>>>>> pretty rocky, and a "not invented here" syndrome may have doomed
the
>>>>>>> hand-off of some al-Qaida related work that was in progress.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> In any case, no government gets a pass by blaming the previous
>>>>>>> government. The current government, for example, failed to follow
>>>>>>> through and prioritize the al-Qaida threat ahead of 9/11 and failed
>> to
>>>>>>> prevent 9/11; failed to find and capture Bin Laden in Afghanistan;
>>>>>>> failed to overcome Taliban control of large areas of Afghanistan;
>>>>>>> allowed record drug production to reestablish itself there; failed

to
>>>>>>> plan for post Iraq invasion problems predicted by their own state
>>>>>>> department; and they have continually exploited the "war on
>> terrorism"
>>>>>>> for domestic political ends.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> You assert the WMDs were there. However Bush's chief inspector, and
>>>> Bush
>>>>>>> himself, say they weren't there after all. It was a bluff. One of
the
>>>>>>> Iraqi expatriate promoters of the bluff got the ear of our
>> government,
>>>>>>> was believed, and, last I heard, had parlayed it into a position
of
>>>>>>> power in Iraq after the invasion.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> The dems you mentioned authorized the military attack on Iraq as
a
>> last
>>>>>>> resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done as such.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Preemptive invasion is new as part of the "Bush (Jr.) Doctrine."
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>   -Jamie
>>>>>>>   http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> DJ wrote:
>>>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
>>>> news:450f3862@linux...
>>>>>>>>> Neither, actually. And what we ought to do would depend on the
>> nature
>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>> the threat.
>>>>>>>> Agreed.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> We might want to start with recommendations published in 1999,
well
>>>>>>>>> before the 9/11 attack.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Commission_on_Terroris m
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> We can disagree about whether our current policy is one of
>>>> overreacting
>>>>>>>>> or not. We can probably really disagree about the newly minted
>>>>>>>>> preemptive attack policy. :^)
>>>>>>>> I don't think there is any newly minted attack policy. There has

>>>> always
>>>>>> been
>>>>>>>> the *clear and present danger* perogative but it needs to be based
>> on
>>>>>>>> accurate intelligence. Had this been available, then I doubt that
>>>> Bush,
>>>>>>>> Kerry, Kennedy Pelosi and the rest would have authorized the
>> invasion
>>>> of
>>>>>>>> Iraq, or perhaps they would have been able to find the WMD's before
>>>> they
>>>>>>>> were shipped out of the country or hidden. I just find it hard to
>>>>>> stomach
>>>>>>>> the hypocracy of the democrats whose policies neutered our
>>>> intelligence
>>>>>>>> services in the '90's when they trun around and blame Bush for the
>>>>>> decisions
>>>>>>>> made based on the intellegence blunders they created in the first
>>>> place.
>>>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Deej
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> DJ wrote:
>>>>>>>>>> I don't see us overreacting Jamie. However, if there is indication
>>>> of
>>>>>>>> some
>>>>>>>>>> sort of major threat, do we run and tell the NY times or do we
>> blow
>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>> threat away before it pays us a visit?
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
>>>>>> news:450f0b12@linux...
>>>>>>>>>>> Of course they came out with a blustery ultimatum. That's not
>> news,
>>>>>>>> it's
>>>>>>>>>>> an old pattern. It works for them to sit back and suggest that
>>>> others
>>>>>>>> do
>>>>>>>>>>> something via terror-grams such as this. If it makes you afraid

>> as
>>>>>>>> well,
>>>>>>>>>> my guess is they would see that as a bonus.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> By goading the USA into overreacting it helps them grow, raise
>>>> money
>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>> convince others to actually see us as evil and act accordingly.
>> It
>>>>>>>>>> works, we keep falling for it. OTOH, for those here with a
>> declared
>>>>>>>>>> interest in emptying the US treasury, it's likewise beneficial
to
>>>>>> have
>>>>>>>>>> the specter of an enemy out there. Fear sells.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> We have yet to actually declare war on anyone in this whole mess.
>>>> How
>>>>>>>> do
>>>>>>>>>> you declare war on a tactic?
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Forced conversion and head taxes would go over like a lead
>> balloon
>>>> in
>>>>>>>>>> the USA. Not gonna happen. We're far more sectarian than, say,
>>>> Iraq.
>>>>>>>>>> Responsible leadership is needed in the world to calm extremist
>>>>>>>>>> tendencies on all sides and help rational people who are trying
>> to
>>>>>> get
>>>>>>>>>> by in worsening times. At the same time we need to be, and are
>>>>>>>>>> attempting to be, vigilant against any self righteous group with
>>>>>>>>>> fantasies of violence in the USA.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Any rush to some sort of "holy war" is irrational. There is
>> nothing
>>>>>>>> holy
>>>>>>>>>> about war.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> DJ wrote:
>>>>>>>>>> I haven't seen us react with irrationality.....yet.
 Al

>>>>>> Quaeda
>>>>>>>>>> just
>>>>>>>>>>>> came out with an ultimatim stating that it's full on war now
and
>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>> west
>>>>>>>>>>>> will be destroyed. The only way to save ourselves is to convert
>> to
>>>>>>>>>> Islam. So
>>>>>>>>>>>> where to you draw the line between irrationality and self
>> defense?
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
>>>>>>>> news:450ee7ef@linux...
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Let's keep from reacting to irrationality with irrationality
of
>>>> our
>>>>>>>>>> own.
>>>>>>>>>>>>> There's a lot of fear mongering. Chicken Little is back.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> DJ wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> It doesn't matter at all whether this was the Pope. The bottom
>>>>>> line
>>>>>>>> is
>>>>>>>>>>>> that
>>>>>>>>>>>>> it is rationality as opposed to irrationality.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
>>>>>>>>>> news:450ec970@linux...
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> The Catholic church doesn't speak for Christianity. Certainly
>>>> not
>>>>>>>> for
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Lutherans, and for good reason.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> A Pope criticizing other religions (even other Christian
>> sects,
>>>>>>>> even
>>>>>>>>>>>>> other Catholics) is nothing new. Certainly much harsher
>> things
>>>>>> have
>>>>>>>>>>>> been
>>>>>>>>>>>>> said about Islam by some (not all) extreme fundamentalist
>>>>>>>> Christians.

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> And certainly much harsher things have been said by certain
>>>>>>>> extremist
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Islamists about Christianity. The more extremist of both
>> camps
>>>>>> seem
>>>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> be spoiling to relive the crusades. With some of the more
>> power
>>>>>>>>>> hungry
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> ready to endanger civilization by attempting to incite
>>>> religious
>>>>>>>>> wars
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> for their own questionable ends.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> It's a vast generalization to say the "the left" or
>>>> "secularists"
>>>>>>>>> or
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> even "Christians" are demanding an apology from the Pope.
I
>>>> think
>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> whole lot of people think the Pope can say whatever he wants.
>>>> It
>>>>>>>>>>>> doesn't
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> matter to most non-Catholics in the USA and in reality, Papal
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> declarations are ignored by a fair number of Catholics here,
>>>> too.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Obviously some Moslems are upset in some places, but how
deep
>>>>>> does
>>>>>>>>>> that
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> go? When black churches were burning in the USA, it would
>> have
>>>>>> been
>>>>>>>>>> an
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> exaggeration to blame everyone in the USA for that.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church which only
>>>> very
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo. The church
>>>>>> hung
>>>>>>>>> on
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view of the
>>>>>> universe
>>>>>>>>>>>> while
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, which
>> describes
>>>>>> the

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> actual way the solar system works.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> It also extends to a few Christian sects who, feeling
>> similarly
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> insecure, tenaciously cling to the notion that the earth
is
>>>> only
>>>>>>>>>> about
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> 6,000 years old, by virtue of the biblical interpretations
>> and
>>>>>>>> clever
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> (at the time) calculations of an Irish Bishop several
>> centuries
>>>>>>>> ago,
>>>>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> in the face of solid current scientific evidence to the
>>>> contrary.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some (not all) Christian
>> churches
>>>>>>>> who,
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and ever-mounting
>>>>>>>> evidence
>>>>>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> evolution, responding with dogma in psuedo-scientific
>> clothing,
>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>> who
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> seek to water down scientific education in the USA.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to power hungry industries who
pay
>>>> big
>>>>>>>>>> bucks
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> to spread denial about global warming for short term gain.
>> Who
>>>>>> push
>>>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> control oil in the middle east with force. With our guns
>>>> blazing,
>>>>>>>> our
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically. And who
>>>>>>>> sometimes
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> hide behind Christianity to do so.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives who find
>>>> ways
>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> pretend that everyone is aligning against Christianity. And

>> in
>>>>>>>>>>>> spreading
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to keep them
>> in
>>>>>>>> power.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of reason
>> and
>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>>> focus
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> on the use of force.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and declare
>>>>>>>> victory.
>>>>>>>>>>>> ;^)
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Have a great week!
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> DC wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> I thought this was worth reading if any of you are
>> interested.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Have a great Monday!
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> ---------------------------------------
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> The Unholy Alliance Rolls Over the Pope
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> By Andrew Walden
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> In what has suddenly been made into a highly controversial

>> of
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Regensberg, Pope Benedict describes Christian belief in
a
>> God
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> whose words and acts are bound by reason, truth and the
law
>> of
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> non-contradiction. Benedict contrasts this with Islamic
>>>> belief

>>>>>> Benedict
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> further contrasts Christian belief with that of secular
>>>>>> humanists
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> who see reason as being completely unbound of God.

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> In response, both Islamists and secularists have demanded
>> the

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis of the
>>>> clash
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror.
His
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> analysis also explains the underlying cause of the alliance
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor
>>>> Manuel

>>>> there
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his
>>>> command

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top
>> Shiite
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling party
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and accused
him
>> of
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> reviving the mentality of the Crusades.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>> Islam
>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of rage
>> that
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> many fear could burst into violent protests like those that
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> followed publication of caricatures of the Prophet

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>> The
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> reaction is not one of anger but a calculated attempt to
>> force
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the Pope to parrot the PC line on Islam. Since Islam need
>> not
>>>> be

>> only
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> objective can be to assert the power of a God who is so
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> transcendent that He is not bound by anything. If man is
>>>> created

by
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> anything. (This explains the predilection on the part of
>> some
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Muslims to lie.) Islamists are not responding to any

>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> their non-existent morality. They are asserting the only

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the root of the term, Islamofascist. Moreover the Western

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist thought
>>>>>>> than

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing precisely what

>>>> cleric
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest mosque,

>> Pope
>>>>>>> to

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the Pope
>> was,

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> The secularist mouthpiece, New York Times,editorializes,

>> Pope

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> description of the Islamic God as being unbound by reason
is
>>>> not
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What Muslims
>>>> and

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity. How dare
he
>>>> not

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

for
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to the point
>> is
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> lost on them.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>> over

>>>> is

>> saying
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists are
>> waging
>>>> a
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension against

>> jihad.

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> jihad, but not your violent jihad.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>> flip
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more clear than
>> in
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the Islamist reaction to the Pope.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November the
>>>>>> Islamists
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons and
>>>> demand
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> to hear from the Pope himself. This would place raging
mobs
>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of forcing
the
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> leader of Christendom to bow before them.

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> In this demand for submission they are joined by the
>>>> secularist
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times
>>>>>> editorializes:

>>>> Islamists,
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the secularists are driven only by their will to power.
>> While
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the Islamists represent their demented version of
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> God--unrestrained by reason, the secularists represent their
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> demented version of reason--unrestrained by God. They are
>>>>>> united
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> by their self-worshipping world view.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>> the

>> of

>> any
>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> our categories, even that of rationality...(The Islamic)
God
>>>> is

>>>>>> insult.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Islam embraces this description. In offering this
>> description
>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Islam, Benedict refers to the views of leading modern French
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Islamist R. Arnaldez as discussed in the writings of
>> Professor
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Theodore Khoury of Munster.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>> then
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he considers
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> tenable in matters of religion, and the subjective

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Benedict asserts that without reason, or without God, there
>>>> can

>> community

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Both Islamist and secularist seek to break God and reason
>>>> apart.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Each claims superiority over the Christian West. They
>> believe
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> absolute moral license makes them powerful. As
>> globalization
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> carries the Western tradition of reason throughout the
>> world,
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> both are in decline.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist and
>> secularist

>>>> pact
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after the
>>>> collapse
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> of the allied forces on the western front.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear is
>> having
>>>> to

>> (word
>>>>>> or

>>>>>> great
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our
>> partners
>>>> in

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Their fear of reason can only lead the world to disaster.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>
>>
>>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Deej on Wed, 20 Sep 2006 05:17:32 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"Uptown Jimmy" <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:

>Man.
>
>I'm sorry, DJ. You've been good to me, and I don't mean to offend you, but
I
>don't quite understand what you're trying to say.
>
>Not that I don't pay attention to things, usually....
>
>I just think people ought to have to take responsibility for their own
>actions.
>
>And I don't recall Slick Willy invading Iraq.
>
>Guess I'm just ignernt.
>
>Jimmy
>
>
>"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
>news:45109ebf@linux...
>> No. I think the situation in Iraq, as it stands right now, is a result
of
>> the left undercutting the administration at every turn and thereby giving
>> aid and encouragement to our enemies who, when they see the country so
>> divided, can take it to the bank that the left will do their fair share
to
>> defeat our efforts. I'm just blaming the intelligence deficit and the
lack
>> of leadership that led to the UN sanctions being undercut at every turn
on
>> Clinton, otherwise the war that started in 1991, would not still be
>> happening. Thius is a war that never stopped. It could have if Clinton
>would
>> have had his eye on the ball and exercised some of the great
>*international
>> leadership* that his supporters fantisize so much about.....but he
>> didn't. He allowed the sanctions to be undercut by *our allies*.
>>
>>
>>
>>
>> "Uptown Jimmy" <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
>> news:45108022@linux...
>> > So...you're blaming the situation in Iraq on Bill Clinton? Is that
>right?
>> >
>> > Cuz that seems absurd to me.
>> >

>> > Just sayin'.
>> >
>> > Jimmy
>> >
>> >
>> > "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
>> > news:4510721c@linux...
>> > > >But again, merely pointing fingers backwards
>> > > >in no way excuses the mistakes and failures of the current
>government.
>> > > >
>> > > Our situation is directly related to the fact that our leaders based
>> their
>> > > decisions on disinformation that was a result of the policies of the
>> > Clinton
>> > > administration. I'm not pointing the finger backwards for any other
>> reason
>> > > than I feel it is important to keep this in mind lest we elect the
>same
>> > > misguided souls with the same naieve and misguided foriegn policy
>ideas
>> to
>> > > office once again and end up in an even bigger mess.....and
>> > yes.....it
>> > > could be much bigger if the liberals take control of the national
>> > > legislature.....much less, god forbid, having another Clinton in
>> the
>> > white
>> > > House.
>> > >
>> > >
>> > > "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
>news:451035a7@linux...
>> > > >
>> > > > For most of the Clinton years the balance of power was divided
>between
>> > > > both parties. Again, there is plenty of finger pointing to go
>around.
>> > > > It's easy enough in hindsight to criticize the previous
>administration
>> > > > on a number of counts.
>> > > >
>> > > > And in retrospect, those dems made a mistake trusting Bush with
>> that
>> > > > vote. OTOH, it was a moment of unity.
>> > > >
>> > > > Flash forward. Today all branches of national government are
>> controlled

>> > > > by one party. It doesn't bother me if you want to point blame at
>some
>> of
>> > > > the policies under Clinton. But again, merely pointing fingers
>> backwards
>> > > > in no way excuses the mistakes and failures of the current
>government.
>> > > >
>> > > > They walked in stating in clear terms that they felt the previous
>> > > > government was wrong about almost everything, and then fell flat
>> > > > overall, domestically and internationally.
>> > > >
>> > > > Looking at both governments, we can do better. We must do better.
>> > > > At some point, and we're coming up on six years, the buck stops
with
>> > > > those in charge now.
>> > > >
>> > > > Cheers,
>> > > > -Jamie
>> > > > http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>> > > >
>> > > >
>> > > >
>> > > > DJ wrote:
>> > > > > The dems you mentioned authorized the military attack on Iraq
as a
>> > last
>> > > > > resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done as
>such.
>> > > > >
>> > > > > How convenient for them when it was the intelligence service that
>> they
>> > > > > created over 8 years of hard work that they now attempt to slag
>and
>> > > blame
>> > > > > for their decisdions so they can vote for the war before they
vote
>> > against
>> > > > > it.
>> > > > >
>> > > > > "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
>> > news:450f8aec@linux...
>> > > > >> There is plenty of finger pointing to go around. No doubt
>specific
>> > > > >> things could have been handled better under the previous
>> government.
>> > > > >>
>> > > > >> The transition of power between the previous and current

>> governments
>> > > was
>> > > > >> pretty rocky, and a "not invented here" syndrome may have doomed
>> the
>> > > > > >> hand-off of some al-Qaida related work that was in progress.
>> > > > > >>
>> > > > > >> In any case, no government gets a pass by blaming the previous
>> > > > > >> government. The current government, for example, failed to follow
>> > > > > >> through and prioritize the al-Qaida threat ahead of 9/11 and
>failed
>> > > to
>> > > > > >> prevent 9/11; failed to find and capture Bin Laden in
>Afghanistan;
>> > > > > >> failed to overcome Taliban control of large areas of Afghanistan;
>> > > > > >> allowed record drug production to reestablish itself there;
>failed
>> to
>> > > > > >> plan for post Iraq invasion problems predicted by their own state
>> > > > > >> department; and they have continually exploited the "war on
>> > terrorism"
>> > > > > >> for domestic political ends.
>> > > > > >>
>> > > > > >> You assert the WMDs were there. However Bush's chief inspector,
>and
>> > > Bush
>> > > > > >> himself, say they weren't there after all. It was a bluff. One
of
>> the
>> > > > > >> Iraqi expatriate promoters of the bluff got the ear of our
>> > government,
>> > > > > >> was believed, and, last I heard, had parlayed it into a position
>of
>> > > > > >> power in Iraq after the invasion.
>> > > > > >>
>> > > > > >> The dems you mentioned authorized the military attack on Iraq
as
>a
>> > last
>> > > > > >> resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done as
>such.
>> > > > > >>
>> > > > > >> Preemptive invasion is new as part of the "Bush (Jr.) Doctrine."
>> > > > > >>
>> > > > > >> Cheers,
>> > > > > >> -Jamie
>> > > > > >> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>> > > > > >>
>> > > > > >>

>> > > > >> DJ wrote:
>> > > > >>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
>> > > news:450f3862@linux...
>> > > > >>>> Neither, actually. And what we ought to do would depend on
the
>> > nature
>> > > > > of
>> > > > >>>> the threat.
>> > > > >>> Agreed.
>> > > > >>>
>> > > > >>>> We might want to start with recommendations published in 1999,
>> well
>> > > > >>>> before the 9/11 attack.
>> > > > >>>
>> > > > >>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Commission_on_Terroris m
>> > > > >>>
>> > > > >>>> We can disagree about whether our current policy is one of
>> > > overreacting
>> > > > >>>> or not. We can probably really disagree about the newly minted
>> > > > >>>> preemptive attack policy. :^)
>> > > > >>> I don't think there is any newly minted attack policy. There
has
>> > > always
>> > > > > been
>> > > > >>> the *clear and present danger* perogative but it needs to be
>based
>> > > on
>> > > > >>> accurate intelligence. Had this been available, then I doubt
>that
>> > > Bush,
>> > > > >>> Kerry, Kennedy Pelosi and the rest would have authorized the
>> > > invasion
>> > > > >>> of
>> > > > >>> Iraq, or perhaps they would have been able to find the WMD's
>> before
>> > > they
>> > > > >>> were shipped out of the country or hidden. I just find it hard
>to
>> > > > > stomach
>> > > > >>> the hypocracy of the democrats whose policies neutered our
>> > > intelligence
>> > > > >>> services in the '90's when they trun around and blame Bush for
>the
>> > > > > decisions
>> > > > >>> made based on the intellegence blunders they created in the
>first
>> > > place.
>> > > > >>>

>> > > > >>> Regards,
>> > > > >>>
>> > > > >>> Deej
>> > > > >>>
>> > > > >>>
>> > > > >>>> Cheers,
>> > > > >>>> -Jamie
>> > > > >>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>> > > > >>>>
>> > > > >>>>
>> > > > >>>> DJ wrote:
>> > > > >>>>> I don't see us overreacting Jamie. However, if there is
>> indication
>> > > of
>> > > > >>> some
>> > > > >>>>> sort of major threat, do we run and tell the NY times or do
we
>> > blow
>> > > > > the
>> > > > >>>>> threat away before it pays us a visit?
>> > > > >>>>>
>> > > > >>>>>
>> > > > >>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
>> > > > > news:450f0b12@linux...
>> > > > >>>>>> Of course they came out with a blustery ultimatum. That's
not
>> > news,
>> > > > >>> it's
>> > > > >>>>>> an old pattern. It works for them to sit back and suggest
>that
>> > > others
>> > > > >>> do
>> > > > >>>>>> something via terror-grams such as this. If it makes you
>afraid
>> > as
>> > > > >>> well,
>> > > > >>>>>> my guess is they would see that as a bonus.
>> > > > >>>>>>
>> > > > >>>>>> By goading the USA into overreacting it helps them grow,
>raise
>> > > money
>> > > > >>> and
>> > > > >>>>>> convince others to actually see us as evil and act
>accordingly.
>> > It
>> > > > >>> works, we keep falling for it. OTOH, for those here with
a
>> > declared

>> > > > >>>>>> interest in emptying the US treasury, it's likewise
>beneficial
>> to
>> > > > > > have
>> > > > > >>>>>> the specter of an enemy out there. Fear sells.
>> > > > > >>>>>>
>> > > > > >>>>>> We have yet to actually declare war on anyone in this whole
>> mess.
>> > > How
>> > > > > >>> do
>> > > > > >>>>>> you declare war on a tactic?
>> > > > > >>>>>>
>> > > > > >>>>>> Forced conversion and head taxes would go over like a lead
>> > balloon
>> > > in
>> > > > > >>>>>> the USA. Not gonna happen. We're far more sectarian than,
>say,
>> > > Iraq.
>> > > > > >>>>>>
>> > > > > >>>>>> Responsible leadership is needed in the world to calm
>extremist
>> > > > > >>>>>> tendencies on all sides and help rational people who are
>trying
>> > to
>> > > > > > > get
>> > > > > >>>>>> by in worsening times. At the same time we need to be, and
>are
>> > > > > >>>>>> attempting to be, vigilant against any self righteous group
>> with
>> > > > > >>>>>> fantasies of violence in the USA.
>> > > > > >>>>>>
>> > > > > >>>>>> Any rush to some sort of "holy war" is irrational. There
is
>> > nothing
>> > > > > >>> holy
>> > > > > >>>>>> about war.
>> > > > > >>>>>>
>> > > > > >>>>>> Cheers,
>> > > > > >>>>>> -Jamie
>> > > > > >>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>> > > > > >>>>>>
>> > > > > >>>>>>
>> > > > > >>>>>>
>> > > > > >>>>>> DJ wrote:
>> > > > > >>>>>>> I haven't seen us react with irrationality.....yet.
>> Al
>> > > > > > Quaeda
>> > > > > >>>>> just

>> > > > >>>>>>> came out with an ultimatim stating that it's full on war
now
>> and
>> > > the
>> > > > >>>>> west
>> > > > >>>>>>> will be destroyed. The only way to save ourselves is to
>> convert
>> > to
>> > > > >>>>> Islam. So
>> > > > >>>>>>> where to you draw the line between irrationality and self
>> > defense?
>> > > > >>>>>>>
>> > > > >>>>>>>
>> > > > >>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
>> > > > >>> news:450ee7ef@linux...
>> > > > >>>>>>>>> Let's keep from reacting to irrationality with
>irrationality
>> of
>> > > our
>> > > > >>>>> own.
>> > > > >>>>>>>>> There's a lot of fear mongering. Chicken Little is back.
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>
>> > > > >>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>> > > > >>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>> > > > >>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>
>> > > > >>>>>>>>> DJ wrote:
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> It doesn't matter at all whether this was the Pope. The
>> bottom
>> > > > > line
>> > > > >>> is
>> > > > >>>>>>> that
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> it is rationality as opposed to irrationality.
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
>> > > > >>>>> news:450ec970@linux...
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> The Catholic church doesn't speak for Christianity.
>> Certainly
>> > > not
>> > > > >>> for
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> Lutherans, and for good reason.
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> A Pope criticizing other religions (even other Christian
>> > sects,
>> > > > >>> even
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> other Catholics) is nothing new. Certainly much harsher
>> > things

>> > > > > have
>> > > > >>>>>>> been
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> said about Islam by some (not all) extreme fundamentalist
>> > > > >>> Christians.
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> And certainly much harsher things have been said by
>certain
>> > > > >>> extremist
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> Islamists about Christianity. The more extremist of both
>> > camps
>> > > > > > seem
>> > > > > >>>>> to
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> be spoiling to relive the crusades. With some of the
more
>> > power
>> > > > > >>>>> hungry
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> ready to endanger civilization by attempting to incite
>> > > religious
>> > > > > >>> wars
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> for their own questionable ends.
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> It's a vast generalization to say the "the left" or
>> > > "secularists"
>> > > > > >>> or
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> even "Christians" are demanding an apology from the Pope.
>I
>> > > think
>> > > > > > a
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> whole lot of people think the Pope can say whatever he
>> wants.
>> > > It
>> > > > > >>>>>> doesn't
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> matter to most non-Catholics in the USA and in reality,
>> Papal
>> > > > > >>>>>> declarations are ignored by a fair number of Catholics
>> here,
>> > > too.
>> > > > > >>>>>> Obviously some Moslems are upset in some places, but
how
>> deep
>> > > > > > does
>> > > > > >>>>> that
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> go? When black churches were burning in the USA, it would
>> > have
>> > > > > > been
>> > > > > >>>>> an
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> exaggeration to blame everyone in the USA for that.
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church which

>> only
>> > > very
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo. The
>> church
>> > > > > > hung
>> > > > > >>> on
>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view of
the
>> > > > > > universe
>> > > > > >>>>>>> while
>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, which
>> > describes
>> > > > > > the
>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> actual way the solar system works.
>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>
>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> It also extends to a few Christian sects who, feeling
>> > similarly
>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> insecure, tenaciously cling to the notion that the earth
>is
>> > > > only
>> > > > > >>>>> about
>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> 6,000 years old, by virtue of the biblical
>interpretations
>> > and
>> > > > > >>> clever
>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> (at the time) calculations of an Irish Bishop several
>> > centuries
>> > > > > >>> ago,
>> > > > > >>>>>>> and
>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> in the face of solid current scientific evidence to the
>> > > > contrary.
>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>
>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some (not all) Christian
>> > churches
>> > > > > >>> who,
>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and
>> ever-mounting
>> > > > > >>> evidence
>> > > > > >>>>>>> of
>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> evolution, responding with dogma in psuedo-scientific
>> > clothing,
>> > > > > > and
>> > > > > >>>>> who
>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> seek to water down scientific education in the USA.
>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>
>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to power hungry industries
who
>> pay

>> > > big
>> > > > >>>>> bucks
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> to spread denial about global warming for short term
>gain.
>> > Who
>> > > > > > push
>> > > > > >>>>> to
>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> control oil in the middle east with force. With our guns
>> > > > blazing,
>> > > > > >>> our
>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically. And
>who
>> > > > > >>> sometimes
>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> hide behind Christianity to do so.
>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>
>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives who
>> find
>> > > > ways
>> > > > > >>> to
>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> pretend that everyone is aligning against Christianity.
>And
>> > > in
>> > > > > >>>>>>> spreading
>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to keep
>them
>> > > in
>> > > > > >>> power.
>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of
>reason
>> > > and
>> > > > > > the
>> > > > > >>>>>>> focus
>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> on the use of force.
>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>
>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and
>declare
>> > > > > >>> victory.
>> > > > > >>>>>>> ;^)
>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> Have a great week!
>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>
>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>
>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>
>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> DC wrote:
>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>> I thought this was worth reading if any of you are
>> > interested.

>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Have a great Monday!
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> ---------------------------------------
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> The Unholy Alliance Rolls Over the Pope
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> By Andrew Walden
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> In what has suddenly been made into a highly
>controversial
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> speech, the day after September 11, at Bavaria's
>> University
>> > of
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Regensberg, Pope Benedict describes Christian belief
in
>a
>> > God
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> whose words and acts are bound by reason, truth and
the
>> law
>> > of
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> non-contradiction. Benedict contrasts this with Islamic
>> > > belief
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> in a God not bound by anything-including his own words.
>> > > > > Benedict
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> further contrasts Christian belief with that of secular
>> > > > > humanists
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> who see reason as being completely unbound of God.
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> In response, both Islamists and secularists have
>demanded
>> > the
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Pope apologize. Benedict's speech is a work of
>enlightened
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis
of
>the
>> > > clash
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror.
>> His
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> analysis also explains the underlying cause of the
>> alliance
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor

>> > > Manuel
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> II: "Show me just what Mohammed brought that was new,
>and
>> > > there
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as
his
>> > > command
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> to spread by the sword the faith he preached."
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Four days later, according to AP: "Pakistan's
>legislature
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top
>> > Shiite
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling
>> party
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and accused
>> him
>> > of
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> reviving the mentality of the Crusades.
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "Across the Islamic world Friday, Benedict's remarks
on
>> > Islam
>> > > > > and
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of
rage
>> > that
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> many fear could burst into violent protests like those
>> that
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> followed publication of caricatures of the Prophet
>> > Muhammad."
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Reuters quoted other sources expressing fears for the
>> Pope's
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> The Islamist reaction proves Manuel II's 600-year-old
>> point.
>> > > > > The
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> reaction is not one of anger but a calculated attempt
to
>> > force
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> the Pope to parrot the PC line on Islam. Since Islam
>need
>> > not
>> > > > be
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> internally consistent and it is not bound by reason,
>it's

>> > only
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> objective can be to assert the power of a God who is
so
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> transcendent that He is not bound by anything. If man
is
>> > > created
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> in God's image then by extension Islamic man is not
>bound
>> by
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> anything. (This explains the predilection on the part
>of
>> > some
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Muslims to lie.) Islamists are not responding to any
>> > 'offense'
>> > > > > to
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> their non-existent morality. They are asserting the
>only
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> 'morality' they have-the will to power.
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "Will to Power" is a key element of Nietzsche 's
>> > > > > philosophy-hence
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> the root of the term, Islamofascist. Moreover the
>Western
>> > > "Left'
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist
>> thought
>> > > > > than
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> by Marxist thought-hence the alliance between the
>Western
>> > > "Left"
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> and the Islamofascist 'Right.'
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing precisely
>> what
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Manuel II said they would: "Syed Ahmed Bukhari, the
>chief
>> > > cleric
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest
>> mosque,
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> extolled Muslims to 'respond in a manner which forces
>the
>> > Pope
>> > > > > to
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> apologize.'" Note they intend to use "force" not
>reason.
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the
Pope

>> > was,
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "calling a spade a spade".
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> The secularist mouthpiece, New York Times,editorializes,
>> > "Pope
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Benedict XVI has insulted Muslims.." This is false.
>The
>> > Pope
>> > > 's
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> description of the Islamic God as being unbound by
>reason
>> is
>> > > not
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What
>> Muslims
>> > > and
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> secularists fear is the Pope's decision to choose to
>enter
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity. How
dare
>> he
>> > > not
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "apologize" for being a Christian? That is the
>so-called
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "insult."
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> One might "reasonably" ask when will Muslims "apologize"
>> for
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to the
>> point
>> > is
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> lost on them.
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Amazingly the Times continues: "Muslim leaders the world
>> > over
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> have demanded apologies. For many Muslims, holy war
-
>> > jihad -
>> > > > is
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> a spiritual struggle, and not a call to violence."
In
>> > saying
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists
are
>> > waging
>> > > > a
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension
>against

>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Christianity-and they explicitly endorse and join this
>> > jihad.
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> The Times is saying to Islamists, 'we can join your
>> > 'spiritual
>> > > '
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> jihad, but not your violent jihad.
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> The Times editors are living in a fool's paradise.
The
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "spiritual" non-violent jihad of propaganda is merely
>the
>> > flip
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more clear
>> than
>> > in
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> the Islamist reaction to the Pope.
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November
the
>> > > > > Islamists
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons
and
>> > > demand
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> to hear from the Pope himself. This would place raging
>> mobs
>> > > of
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of forcing
>> the
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> leader of Christendom to bow before them.
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> In this demand for submission they are joined by the
>> > > secularist
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times
>> > > > > editorializes:
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "He needs to offer a deep and persuasive apology."
The
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> secularists too seek the Pope's submission. Like the
>> > > Islamists,
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> the secularists are driven only by their will to power.
>> > While
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> the Islamists represent their demented version of
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> God--unrestrained by reason, the secularists represent
>> their
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> demented version of reason--unrestrained by God. They
>are
>> > > > > united
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> by their self-worshipping world view.
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>

>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> It should be noted that the carefully staged "anger'
>from
>> > the
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islamic world does not condemn Benedict's
>characterization
>> > of
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islam as a religion where God's "will is not bound up
>with
>> > any
>> > > > > > of
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> our categories, even that of rationality...(The Islamic)
>> God
>> > > is
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> not bound even by his own word.." This is not seen
as
>an
>> > > > > insult.
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islam embraces this description. In offering this
>> > description
>> > > > > > of
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islam, Benedict refers to the views of leading modern
>> French
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islamist R. Arnaldez as discussed in the writings of
>> > Professor
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Theodore Khoury of Munster.
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Likewise the secularists express no dismay at the pope's
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> characterization of a secularist as: "(A) subject (who)
>> > then
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he
>> considers
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> tenable in matters of religion, and the subjective
>> > 'conscience
>> > > > '
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> becomes the sole arbiter of what is ethical."
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Benedict asserts that without reason, or without God,
>> there
>> > > > can
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> be no modern system of morality. He explains, "In this
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> way.ethics and religion lose their power to create a
>> > community
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> and become (instead) a completely personal matter."
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Both Islamist and secularist seek to break God and
>reason
>> > > > apart.
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Each claims superiority over the Christian West. They

>> > believe
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> absolute moral license makes them powerful. As
>> > globalization
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> carries the Western tradition of reason throughout the
>> > world,
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> both are in decline.
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist and
>> > secularist
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> will meet in combat, just as Hitler's fascists broke
>their
>> > > pact
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after
the
>> > > collapse
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> of the allied forces on the western front.
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear
is
>> > having
>> > > to
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> reply to the Pope's key point, borrowed from the
>Byzantine
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Emperor: '"Not to act reasonably, not to act with logos
>> > (word
>> > > > > or
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> reason) is contrary to the nature of God,'.. It is
to
>> this
>> > > > > great
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our
>> > partners
>> > > in
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> the dialogue of cultures."
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Their fear of reason can only lead the world to
>disaster.
>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> > > > >>>
>> > > > > >
>> > > > > >
>> > > > >
>> > > >
>> > >
>> >
>>
>>
>

>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Deej on Wed, 20 Sep 2006 05:18:31 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi Jimmy,

No offense taken here. My point is that we are finishing a war that was started by Sadaam, not Bush. It was never brought to any conclusion be3cause the sanctions that were put in place to do this were circumvented and this was during Clinton's administration. Clinton also instituted a policy wherein our CIA couldn't work with anyone who had any taint of human rights abuses and also did everything they could to keep the various intelligence service and the domestic intelligence services from sharing information. All
of these things played a huge part in what happened on 9-11 and the crappy intelligence was what we based the decision on to go in and finish the gulf war that Sadaam started. Had we accurate intelligence, I'll bet things would have been handled much differently. You may not agree with this and that's OK. I'm not going to flog it anymore or Kim's gonna get pissed off at me and
I might die.

I've said my piece here. If you want to discuss this off the group it's animix@animas.net.

Regards,

Deej

"Deej" <animix@animass.netttt> wrote:
>
>"Uptown Jimmy" <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
>>Man.
>>
>>I'm sorry, DJ. You've been good to me, and I don't mean to offend you, but
>I
>>don't quite understand what you're trying to say.
>>
>>Not that I don't pay attention to things, usually....
>>
>>I just think people ought to have to take responsibility for their own
>>actions.
>>

>>And I don't recall Slick Willy invading Iraq.
>>
>>Guess I'm just ignernt.
>>
>>Jimmy
>>
>>
>>"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
>>news:45109ebf@linux...
>>> No. I think the situation in Iraq, as it stands right now, is a result
>of
>>> the left undercutting the administration at every turn and thereby giving
>>> aid and encouragement to our enemies who, when they see the country so
>>> divided, can take it to the bank that the left will do their fair share
>to
>>> defeat our efforts. I'm just blaming the intelligence deficit and the
>lack
>>> of leadership that led to the UN sanctions being undercut at every turn
>on
>>> Clinton, otherwise the war that started in 1991, would not still be
>>> happening. Thius is a war that never stopped. It could have if Clinton
>>would
>>> have had his eye on the ball and exercised some of the great
>>*international
>>> leadership* that his supporters fantisize so much about.....but he
>>> didn't. He allowed the sanctions to be undercut by *our allies*.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> "Uptown Jimmy" <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
>>> news:45108022@linux...
>>> > So...you're blaming the situation in Iraq on Bill Clinton? Is that
>>right?
>>> >
>>> > Cuz that seems absurd to me.
>>> >
>>> > Just sayin'.
>>> >
>>> > Jimmy
>>> >
>>> >
>>> > "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
>>> > news:4510721c@linux...
>>> > > >But again, merely pointing fingers backwards
>>> > > >in no way excuses the mistakes and failures of the current
>>government.
>>> > >

>>> > > Our situation is directly related to the fact that our leaders based
>>> their
>>> > > decisions on disinformation that was a result of the policies of
the
>>> > Clinton
>>> > > administration. I'm not pointing the finger backwards for any other
>>> reason
>>> > > than I feel it is important to keep this in mind lest we elect the
>>same
>>> > > misguided souls with the same naieve and misguided foriegn policy
>>ideas
>>> to
>>> > > office once again and end up in an even bigger mess.....and
>>> > yes.....it
>>> > > could be much bigger if the liberals take control of the national
>>> > > legislature.....much less, god forbid, having another Clinton in
>the
>>> > white
>>> > > House.
>>> > >
>>> > >
>>> > > "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
>>news:451035a7@linux...
>>> > > >
>>> > > > For most of the Clinton years the balance of power was divided
>>between
>>> > > > both parties. Again, there is plenty of finger pointing to go
>>around.
>>> > > > It's easy enough in hindsight to criticize the previous
>>administration
>>> > > > on a number of counts.
>>> > > >
>>> > > > And in retrospect, those dems made a mistake trusting Bush with
>that
>>> > > > vote. OTOH, it was a moment of unity.
>>> > > >
>>> > > > Flash forward. Today all branches of national government are
>>> controlled
>>> > > > by one party. It doesn't bother me if you want to point blame at
>>some
>>> of
>>> > > > the policies under Clinton. But again, merely pointing fingers
>>> backwards
>>> > > > in no way excuses the mistakes and failures of the current
>>government.
>>> > > >
>>> > > > They walked in stating in clear terms that they felt the previous
>>> > > > government was wrong about almost everything, and then fell flat

>>> > > > overall, domestically and internationally.
>>> > > >
>>> > > > Looking at both governments, we can do better. We must do better.
>>> > > > At some point, and we're coming up on six years, the buck stops
>with
>>> > > > those in charge now.
>>> > > >
>>> > > > Cheers,
>>> > > > -Jamie
>>> > > > http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>> > > >
>>> > > >
>>> > > >
>>> > > > DJ wrote:
>>> > > > > The dems you mentioned authorized the military attack on Iraq
>as a
>>> > last
>>> > > > > resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done as
>>such.
>>> > > > > >
>>> > > > > How convenient for them when it was the intelligence service
that
>>> they
>>> > > > > created over 8 years of hard work that they now attempt to slag
>>and
>>> > > blame
>>> > > > > for their decisdions so they can vote for the war before they
>vote
>>> > > against
>>> > > > > it.
>>> > > > > >
>>> > > > > "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
>>> > news:450f8aec@linux...
>>> > > > >> There is plenty of finger pointing to go around. No doubt
>>specific
>>> > > > >> things could have been handled better under the previous
>>> government.
>>> > > > >>
>>> > > > >> The transition of power between the previous and current
>>> governments
>>> > > was
>>> > > > >> pretty rocky, and a "not invented here" syndrome may have doomed
>>> the
>>> > > > >> hand-off of some al-Qaida related work that was in progress.
>>> > > > >>
>>> > > > >> In any case, no government gets a pass by blaming the previous
>>> > > > >> government. The current government, for example, failed to follow
>>> > > > >> through and prioritize the al-Qaida threat ahead of 9/11 and

>>failed
>>> > to
>>> > > > >> prevent 9/11; failed to find and capture Bin Laden in
>>Afghanistan;
>>> > > > >> failed to overcome Taliban control of large areas of Afghanistan;
>>> > > > >> allowed record drug production to reestablish itself there;
>>failed
>>> to
>>> > > > >> plan for post Iraq invasion problems predicted by their own
state
>>> > > > >> department; and they have continually exploited the "war on
>>> > terrorism"
>>> > > > >> for domestic political ends.
>>> > > > >>
>>> > > > >> You assert the WMDs were there. However Bush's chief inspector,
>>and
>>> > > Bush
>>> > > > >> himself, say they weren't there after all. It was a bluff. One
>of
>>> the
>>> > > > >> Iraqi expatriate promoters of the bluff got the ear of our
>>> > government,
>>> > > > >> was believed, and, last I heard, had parlayed it into a position
>>of
>>> > > > >> power in Iraq after the invasion.
>>> > > > >>
>>> > > > >> The dems you mentioned authorized the military attack on Iraq
>as
>>a
>>> > last
>>> > > > >> resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done as
>>such.
>>> > > > >>
>>> > > > >> Preemptive invasion is new as part of the "Bush (Jr.) Doctrine."
>>> > > > >>
>>> > > > >> Cheers,
>>> > > > >>   -Jamie
>>> > > > >>   http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>> > > > >>
>>> > > > >>
>>> > > > >> DJ wrote:
>>> > > > >>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
>>> > > news:450f3862@linux...
>>> > > > >>>> Neither, actually. And what we ought to do would depend on
>the
>>> > nature
>>> > > > > of
>>> > > > >>>> the threat.

>>> > > > >>> Agreed.
>>> > > > >>>
>>> > > > >>>> We might want to start with recommendations published in 1999,
>>> well
>>> > > > >>>> before the 9/11 attack.
>>> > > > >>>>
>>> > > > >>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Commission_on_Terroris m
>>> > > > >>>>
>>> > > > >>>> We can disagree about whether our current policy is one of
>>> > > overreacting
>>> > > > >>>> or not. We can probably really disagree about the newly minted
>>> > > > >>>> preemptive attack policy. :^)
>>> > > > >>> I don't think there is any newly minted attack policy. There
>has
>>> > > always
>>> > > > > > been
>>> > > > >>> the *clear and present danger* perogative but it needs to be
>>based
>>> > > on
>>> > > > >>> accurate intelligence. Had this been available, then I doubt
>>that
>>> > > Bush,
>>> > > > >>> Kerry, Kennedy Pelosi and the rest would have authorized the
>>> > invasion
>>> > > > of
>>> > > > >>> Iraq, or perhaps they would have been able to find the WMD's
>>> before
>>> > > > they
>>> > > > >>> were shipped out of the country or hidden. I just find it hard
>>to
>>> > > > > > stomach
>>> > > > >>> the hypocracy of the democrats whose policies neutered our
>>> > > > intelligence
>>> > > > >>> services in the '90's when they trun around and blame Bush
for
>>the
>>> > > > > > decisions
>>> > > > >>> made based on the intellegence blunders they created in the
>>first
>>> > > > place.
>>> > > > >>>
>>> > > > >>> Regards,
>>> > > > >>>
>>> > > > >>> Deej
>>> > > > >>>
>>> > > > >>>
>>> > > > >>>> Cheers,
>>> > > > >>>>   -Jamie

>>> > > > >>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>> > > > >>>>
>>> > > > >>>>
>>> > > > >>>> DJ wrote:
>>> > > > >>>>> I don't see us overreacting Jamie. However, if there is
>>> indication
>>> > > of
>>> > > > >>> some
>>> > > > >>>>> sort of major threat, do we run and tell the NY times or
do
>we
>>> > blow
>>> > > > > the
>>> > > > >>>>> threat away before it pays us a visit?
>>> > > > >>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
>>> > > > > news:450f0b12@linux...
>>> > > > >>>>>> Of course they came out with a blustery ultimatum. That's
>not
>>> > news,
>>> > > > >>> it's
>>> > > > >>>>>> an old pattern. It works for them to sit back and suggest
>>that
>>> > > others
>>> > > > >>> do
>>> > > > >>>>>> something via terror-grams such as this. If it makes you
>>afraid
>>> > as
>>> > > > >>> well,
>>> > > > >>>>>> my guess is they would see that as a bonus.
>>> > > > >>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>> By goading the USA into overreacting it helps them grow,
>>raise
>>> > > money
>>> > > > >>> and
>>> > > > >>>>>> convince others to actually see us as evil and act
>>accordingly.
>>> > It
>>> > > > >>> works, we keep falling for it. OTOH, for those here with
>a
>>> > declared
>>> > > > >>> interest in emptying the US treasury, it's likewise
>>beneficial
>>> to
>>> > > > > have
>>> > > > >>>>>> the specter of an enemy out there. Fear sells.
>>> > > > >>>>>>

>>> > > > >>>>>> We have yet to actually declare war on anyone in this whole
>>> mess.
>>> > > How
>>> > > > >>> do
>>> > > > >>>>>> you declare war on a tactic?
>>> > > > >>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>> Forced conversion and head taxes would go over like a lead
>>> > balloon
>>> > > in
>>> > > > >>>>>> the USA. Not gonna happen. We're far more sectarian than,
>>say,
>>> > > Iraq.
>>> > > > >>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>> Responsible leadership is needed in the world to calm
>>extremist
>>> > > > >>>>>> tendencies on all sides and help rational people who are
>>trying
>>> > to
>>> > > > > > get
>>> > > > >>>>>> by in worsening times. At the same time we need to be, and
>>are
>>> > > > >>>>>> attempting to be, vigilant against any self righteous group
>>> with
>>> > > > >>>>>> fantasies of violence in the USA.
>>> > > > >>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>> Any rush to some sort of "holy war" is irrational. There
>is
>>> > nothing
>>> > > > > >>> holy
>>> > > > >>>>>> about war.
>>> > > > >>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>> Cheers,
>>> > > > >>>>>> -Jamie
>>> > > > >>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>> > > > >>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>> DJ wrote:
>>> > > > >>>>>>> I haven't seen us react with irrationality.....yet.
>>> Al
>>> > > > > > Quaeda
>>> > > > >>>>> just
>>> > > > >>>>>>> came out with an ultimatim stating that it's full on war
>now
>>> and
>>> > > > the
>>> > > > >>>>> west
>>> > > > >>>>>>> will be destroyed. The only way to save ourselves is to

>>> convert
>>> > to
>>> > > > >>>>> Islam. So
>>> > > > >>>>>>> where to you draw the line between irrationality and self
>>> > defense?
>>> > > > >>>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
>>> > > > >>> news:450ee7ef@linux...
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>> Let's keep from reacting to irrationality with
>>irrationality
>>> of
>>> > > our
>>> > > > >>>>> own.
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>> There's a lot of fear mongering. Chicken Little is back.
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>> DJ wrote:
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> It doesn't matter at all whether this was the Pope. The
>>> bottom
>>> > > > > line
>>> > > > >>> is
>>> > > > >>>>>>> that
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> it is rationality as opposed to irrationality.
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
>>> > > > >>>>> news:450ec970@linux...
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> The Catholic church doesn't speak for Christianity.
>>> Certainly
>>> > > > not
>>> > > > >>> for
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Lutherans, and for good reason.
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> A Pope criticizing other religions (even other Christian
>>> > sects,
>>> > > > >>> even
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> other Catholics) is nothing new. Certainly much harsher
>>> > things
>>> > > > > have
>>> > > > >>>>>>> been
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> said about Islam by some (not all) extreme fundamentalist
>>> > > > >>> Christians.
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> And certainly much harsher things have been said by
>>certain

>>> > > > >>> extremist
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> Islamists about Christianity. The more extremist of
both
>>> > camps
>>> > > > > > seem
>>> > > > > >>>>> to
>>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> be spoiling to relive the crusades. With some of the
>more
>>> > power
>>> > > > > >>>>> hungry
>>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> ready to endanger civilization by attempting to incite
>>> > > religious
>>> > > > > >>> wars
>>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> for their own questionable ends.
>>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> It's a vast generalization to say the "the left" or
>>> > > "secularists"
>>> > > > > > >>> or
>>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> even "Christians" are demanding an apology from the
Pope.
>>I
>>> > > think
>>> > > > > > > a
>>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> whole lot of people think the Pope can say whatever
he
>>> wants.
>>> > > It
>>> > > > > >>>>>>> doesn't
>>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> matter to most non-Catholics in the USA and in reality,
>>> Papal
>>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> declarations are ignored by a fair number of Catholics
>>> here,
>>> > > too.
>>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> Obviously some Moslems are upset in some places, but
>how
>>> deep
>>> > > > > > does
>>> > > > > >>>>> that
>>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> go? When black churches were burning in the USA, it
would
>>> > have
>>> > > > > > been
>>> > > > > >>>>> an
>>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> exaggeration to blame everyone in the USA for that.
>>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church which
>>> only
>>> > > very

>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo. The
>>> church
>>> > > > > hung
>>> > > > >>> on
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view of
>the
>>> > > > > universe
>>> > > > >>>>>>> while
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, which
>>> > describes
>>> > > > > the
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> actual way the solar system works.
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> It also extends to a few Christian sects who, feeling
>>> > similarly
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> insecure, tenaciously cling to the notion that the earth
>>is
>>> > > only
>>> > > > >>>>> about
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> 6,000 years old, by virtue of the biblical
>>interpretations
>>> > and
>>> > > > >>> clever
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> (at the time) calculations of an Irish Bishop several
>>> > centuries
>>> > > > >>> ago,
>>> > > > >>>>>>> and
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> in the face of solid current scientific evidence to
>the
>>> > > contrary.
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some (not all) Christian
>>> > churches
>>> > > > >>> who,
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and
>>> ever-mounting
>>> > > > >>> evidence
>>> > > > >>>>>>> of
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> evolution, responding with dogma in psuedo-scientific
>>> > clothing,
>>> > > > > and
>>> > > > >>>>> who
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> seek to water down scientific education in the USA.
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to power hungry industries
>who
>>> pay
>>> > > big

>>> > > > >>>>> bucks
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> to spread denial about global warming for short term
>>gain.
>>> > Who
>>> > > > > > push
>>> > > > > >>>>> to
>>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> control oil in the middle east with force. With our
guns
>>> > > blazing,
>>> > > > > >>> our
>>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically. And
>>who
>>> > > > > >>> sometimes
>>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> hide behind Christianity to do so.
>>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives
who
>>> find
>>> > > > ways
>>> > > > > >>> to
>>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> pretend that everyone is aligning against Christianity.
>>And
>>> > in
>>> > > > > >>>>>>> spreading
>>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to keep
>>them
>>> > in
>>> > > > > >>> power.
>>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of
>>reason
>>> > and
>>> > > > > > the
>>> > > > > >>>>>>> focus
>>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> on the use of force.
>>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and
>>declare
>>> > > > > >>> victory.
>>> > > > > >>>>>>> ;^)
>>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> Have a great week!
>>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> DC wrote:
>>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>> I thought this was worth reading if any of you are

>>> > interested.
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Have a great Monday!
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> ----------
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> The Unholy Alliance Rolls Over the Pope
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> By Andrew Walden
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> In what has suddenly been made into a highly
>>controversial
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> speech, the day after September 11, at Bavaria's
>>> University
>>> > of
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Regensberg, Pope Benedict describes Christian belief
>in
>>a
>>> > God
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> whose words and acts are bound by reason, truth and
>the
>>> law
>>> > of
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> non-contradiction. Benedict contrasts this with Islamic
>>> > > belief
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> in a God not bound by anything-including his own words.
>>> > > > > Benedict
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> further contrasts Christian belief with that of secular
>>> > > > > humanists
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> who see reason as being completely unbound of God.
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> In response, both Islamists and secularists have
>>demanded
>>> > the
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Pope apologize. Benedict's speech is a work of
>>enlightened
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis
>of
>>the
>>> > > clash
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror.
>>> His
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> analysis also explains the underlying cause of the
>>> alliance
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.

>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor
>>> > > Manuel
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> II: "Show me just what Mohammed brought that was new,
>>and
>>> > > there
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as
>his
>>> > > command
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> to spread by the sword the faith he preached."
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Four days later, according to AP: "Pakistan's
>>legislature
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's
top
>>> > Shiite
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling
>>> party
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and accused
>>> him
>>> > of
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> reviving the mentality of the Crusades.
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "Across the Islamic world Friday, Benedict's remarks
>on
>>> > Islam
>>> > > > > and
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of
>rage
>>> > that
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> many fear could burst into violent protests like those
>>> that
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> followed publication of caricatures of the Prophet
>>> > Muhammad."
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Reuters quoted other sources expressing fears for the
>>> Pope's
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> The Islamist reaction proves Manuel II's 600-year-old
>>> point.
>>> > > > > The
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> reaction is not one of anger but a calculated attempt
>to
>>> > force
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> the Pope to parrot the PC line on Islam. Since Islam
>>need
>>> > not
>>> > > > be

>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> internally consistent and it is not bound by reason,
>>it's
>>> > only
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> objective can be to assert the power of a God who is
>so
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> transcendent that He is not bound by anything. If man
>is
>>> > > created
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> in God's image then by extension Islamic man is not
>>bound
>>> by
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> anything. (This explains the predilection on the part
>>of
>>> > some
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Muslims to lie.) Islamists are not responding to any
>>> > 'offense'
>>> > > > > to
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> their non-existent morality. They are asserting the
>>only
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> 'morality' they have-the will to power.
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "Will to Power" is a key element of Nietzsche 's
>>> > > > > philosophy-hence
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> the root of the term, Islamofascist. Moreover the
>>Western
>>> > > "Left'
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist
>>> thought
>>> > > > > than
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> by Marxist thought-hence the alliance between the
>>Western
>>> > > "Left"
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> and the Islamofascist 'Right.'
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing precisely
>>> what
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Manuel II said they would: "Syed Ahmed Bukhari, the
>>chief
>>> > > cleric
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest
>>> mosque,
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> extolled Muslims to 'respond in a manner which forces
>>the
>>> > Pope
>>> > > > > to
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> apologize.'" Note they intend to use "force" not
>>reason.
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>

>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the
>Pope
>>> > was,
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "calling a spade a spade".
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> The secularist mouthpiece, New York Times,editorializes,
>>> > "Pope
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Benedict XVI has insulted Muslims.." This is false.
>>The
>>> > Pope
>>> > > > 's
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> description of the Islamic God as being unbound by
>>reason
>>> is
>>> > > not
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What
>>> Muslims
>>> > > and
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> secularists fear is the Pope's decision to choose to
>>enter
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity. How
>dare
>>> he
>>> > > not
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "apologize" for being a Christian? That is the
>>so-called
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "insult."
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> One might "reasonably" ask when will Muslims "apologize"
>>> for
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to the
>>> point
>>> > is
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> lost on them.
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Amazingly the Times continues: "Muslim leaders the
world
>>> > over
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> have demanded apologies. For many Muslims, holy war
>-
>>> > jihad -
>>> > > > is
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> a spiritual struggle, and not a call to violence."

>In
>>> > saying
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists
>are

>>> > waging
>>> > > a
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension
>>against
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Christianity-and they explicitly endorse and join this
>>> > jihad.
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> The Times is saying to Islamists, 'we can join your
>>> > 'spiritual
>>> > > '
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> jihad, but not your violent jihad.
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> The Times editors are living in a fool's paradise.

>The
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "spiritual" non-violent jihad of propaganda is merely
>>the
>>> > flip
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more clear
>>> than
>>> > in
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> the Islamist reaction to the Pope.
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November
>the
>>> > > > > Islamists
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons
>and
>>> > > demand
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> to hear from the Pope himself. This would place raging
>>> mobs
>>> > > of
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of forcing
>>> the
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> leader of Christendom to bow before them.
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> In this demand for submission they are joined by the
>>> > > secularist
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times
>>> > > > > editorializes:
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "He needs to offer a deep and persuasive apology."

>The
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> secularists too seek the Pope's submission. Like the
>>> > > Islamists,
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> the secularists are driven only by their will to power.
>>> > While
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> the Islamists represent their demented version of
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> God--unrestrained by reason, the secularists represent

>>> their
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> demented version of reason--unrestrained by God. They
>>are
>>> > > > > united
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> by their self-worshipping world view.
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> It should be noted that the carefully staged "anger'
>>from
>>> > the
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islamic world does not condemn Benedict's
>>characterization
>>> > of
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islam as a religion where God's "will is not bound
up
>>with
>>> > any
>>> > > > > of
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> our categories, even that of rationality...(The Islamic)
>>> God
>>> > > is
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> not bound even by his own word.." This is not seen
>as
>>an
>>> > > > > insult.
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islam embraces this description. In offering this
>>> > description
>>> > > > > of
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islam, Benedict refers to the views of leading modern
>>> French
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islamist R. Arnaldez as discussed in the writings of
>>> > Professor
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Theodore Khoury of Munster.
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Likewise the secularists express no dismay at the pope's
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> characterization of a secularist as: "(A) subject
(who)
>>> > then
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he
>>> considers
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> tenable in matters of religion, and the subjective
>>> > 'conscience
>>> > > '
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> becomes the sole arbiter of what is ethical."
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Benedict asserts that without reason, or without God,
>>> there
>>> > > can
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> be no modern system of morality. He explains, "In

this
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> way.ethics and religion lose their power to create
a
>>> > community
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> and become (instead) a completely personal matter."
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Both Islamist and secularist seek to break God and
>>reason
>>> > > apart.
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Each claims superiority over the Christian West. They
>>> > believe
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> absolute moral license makes them powerful. As
>>> > globalization
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> carries the Western tradition of reason throughout
the
>>> > world,
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> both are in decline.
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist and
>>> > secularist
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> will meet in combat, just as Hitler's fascists broke
>>their
>>> > > pact
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after
>the
>>> > > collapse
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> of the allied forces on the western front.
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear
>is
>>> > having
>>> > > to
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> reply to the Pope's key point, borrowed from the
>>Byzantine
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Emperor: '"Not to act reasonably, not to act with
logos
>>> > (word
>>> > > > > or
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> reason) is contrary to the nature of God,'.. It is
>to
>>> this
>>> > > > > great
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our
>>> > partners
>>> > > in
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> the dialogue of cultures."
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Their fear of reason can only lead the world to

>>disaster.
>>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>>> > > > >>>
>>> > > > >
>>> > > > > >
>>> > >
>>> > >
>>> >
>>> >
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by rick on Wed, 20 Sep 2006 09:08:13 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

i was serious...diplomacy doesn't mean ass kissing...just a position
of reason.

On Tue, 19 Sep 2006 13:26:02 -0500, "Tony Benson"
<tony@standinghampton.com> wrote:

>I'm sensing some sarcasm there Rick. ;>) I would make a terrible diplomat. I
>react far too much from the gut. Beside, it's hard to be a good communicator
>with your foot in your mouth!
>
>I didn't mean to sound harsh to ulfiyya. He (she?) has every right to want
>this group to stick to PARIS related stuff. I guess it just feels more like
>a community to me than a technical reference source.
>
>
>Tony
>
>
>"rick" <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>news:k0c0h2hl6cc83qvha4esc96935fo3nqtb1@4ax.com...
>>i nominate you for john's diplomat search..props to you...damn, i
>> wasn't going to enter this fray...
>>
>> On Tue, 19 Sep 2006 11:31:50 -0500, "Tony Benson"
>> <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote:
>>
>>>With all due respect ulfiyya, the general consensus here is that anyone
>>>can

>>>discuss anything they feel like discussing. This group has morphed into
>>>more
>>>of a gathering place for PARIS users and former users. An online coffee
>>>house as such. The key for you is to simply skip the topics you don't want
>>>to read.
>>>
>>>Tony
>>>
>>>
>>>"ulfiyya" <ulfiyya@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:450f7bfa$1@linux...
>>>>
>>>> for ... many times poeple.
>>>> THIS IS NOT A POLITIK SITE!!!
>>>> This is ...Paris site (Music) Remember...
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Keep youre Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>Thanks for the link. It looks like it might be a more interesting read
>>>>>than what you might expect of a book on probability theory.
>>>>>
>>>>>Without risk management there would be no insurance.
>>>>>
>>>>>Seems like we have some major risk management headaches ahead in the
>>>>>foreign relations area. I don't have much faith that our current
>>>>>government understands the situation or is capable of brokering a
>>>>>lasting and beneficial peace.
>>>>>
>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>TCB wrote:
>>>>>> I never said faith was limited to religion _at all_ because that would
>>>> be
>>>>>> silly. I only bring this up because I think it's a very important
>>>>>> point.
>>>>>> Nearly every time you read 'without faith there would be no XXXXXXXX'
>>>> it's
>>>>>> just not true and XXXXXXXX can get along just fine without faith.
>>>>>> Probably
>>>>>> the best popular book about risk is called 'Against the Gods' and it's
>>>> sort
>>>>>> of about this very topic.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> http://www.amazon.com/Against-Gods-Remarkable-Story-Risk/dp/

0471295639/sr=8-1/qid=1158631839/ref=pd_bbs_1/002-2500887-29 81628?ie=UTF8&s=books
>>>>>>
>>>>>> TCB
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>> There you go, clearly faith is not limited to religion. Although just
>>>> as
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> clearly it's important for religion.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> As to risk, many people have faith that their risks will pan out.
>>>>>>> Some
>>>>
>>>>>>> people do things because they have such faith. I know people like
>>>>>>> that.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I am people like that. That doesn't preclude anyone from doing
>>>>>>> something
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> for some other reason, of course.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> If you want to say you don't have faith in anything, using any of the
>>>>
>>>>>>> definitions below, then that's your prerogative and I don't have a
>>>>>>> problem with that.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> TCB wrote:
>>>>>>>> Here's dictionary.com
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> faith /feɪθ/ Pronunciation Key - Show Spelled
>>>>>>>> Pronunciation[feyth]
>>>>>>>> Pronunciation Key - Show IPA Pronunciation
>>>>>>>> -noun
>>>>>>>> 1. confidence or trust in a person or thing: faith in another's
>>>>>>>> ability.
>>>>>>>> 2. belief that is not based on proof: He had faith that the
>>>>>>>> hypothesis
>>>>>> would
>>>>>>>> be substantiated by fact.
>>>>>>>> 3. belief in God or in the doctrines or teachings of religion: the
>>>>>>>> firm
>>>>>> faith
>>>>>>>> of the Pilgrims.

>>>>>>>> 4. belief in anything, as a code of ethics, standards of merit,
>>>>>>>> etc.:
>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>> be of the same faith with someone concerning honesty.
>>>>>>>> 5. a system of religious belief: the Christian faith; the Jewish
>>>>>>>> faith.
>>>>>>>> 6. the obligation of loyalty or fidelity to a person, promise,
>>>>>>>> engagement,
>>>>>>>> etc.: Failure to appear would be breaking faith.
>>>>>>>> 7. the observance of this obligation; fidelity to one's promise,
>>>>>>>> oath,
>>>>>> allegiance,
>>>>>>>> etc.: He was the only one who proved his faith during our recent
>>>>>>>> troubles.
>>>>>>>> 8. Christian Theology. the trust in God and in His promises as made
>>>> through
>>>>>>>> Christ and the Scriptures by which humans are justified or saved.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> I don't see anything in there about risk. My point is that people
>>>>>>>> can
>>>>>> do
>>>>>>>> the things you're talking about knowing full well they might fail,
>>>>>>>> but
>>>>>> do
>>>>>>>> them anyway. That's taking a risk, not having faith. I don't have
>>>>>>>> faith
>>>>>> but
>>>>>>>> I've taken lots of personal and professional risks in my life.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> TCB
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>> We can disagree about that but the first line is the dictionary
>>>>>>>>> definition.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> TCB wrote:
>>>>>>>>>> You're confusing 'faith' with 'a willingness to take risks.'
>>>>>>>>>> Animals
>>>>>> take
>>>>>>>>>> risks, to get food, create more animals, etc., but I doubt they
>>>>>>>>>> have
>>>>>> faith.
>>>>>>>>>> One needs no faith to start businesses, invest money, get married,

>>>> etc.
>>>>>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>> Faith is complete trust or confidence in something or someone.
>>>>>>>>>> Religious
>>>>>>>>>> faith is one form of faith but not the only definition of
>>>>>>>>>> "faith."
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> For example I have faith that if I drop a guitar pick it will
>>>>>>>>>> find
>>>>>> its
>>>>>>>>>> way to the floor based on the gravitational attraction it has to
>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>> planet. I have faith that I'll breathe my next breath, that I'll
>>>> see
>>>>>>>>>> tomorrow morning. I have faith that other people are put together
>>>> much
>>>>>>>>>> like I am and that I can therefore relate to other folks.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Without faith, people would not invest money. Without faith
>>>>>>>>>> people
>>>>>> would
>>>>>>>>>> not vote. Without faith people would not start businesses, hire
>>>>>>>>>> other
>>>>>>>>>> people, raise children. Without faith people would not ride
>>>>>>>>>> trains,
>>>>>> fly
>>>>>>>>>> in planes or drive cars. Without faith no one would investigate
>>>>>>>>>> scientific questions about reality.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> While you can clearly have faith without religion, you cannot
>>>>>>>>>> have
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> religion without faith. Religion depends on faith that one or
>>>>>>>>>> more
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> deities (good and sometimes bad) exist, that their associated
>>>>>>>>>> stories
>>>>>>>>>> actually occurred, and often, that there is some sort of
>>>>>>>>>> afterlife.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> However, religious people believe in a variety of different
>>>>>>>>>> deities.
>>>>>>>>>> Even those who believe in the same deity disagree, sometimes
>>>>>>>>>> violently,
>>>>>>>>>> about the nature of their deity. Religions sometimes even
>>>>>>>>>> disagree
>>>>>> about
>>>>>>>>>> the nature of reality. If you want to base morality strictly on

>>>>>>>>>>> religion, and you look around, you'll notice that religion can be
>>>> a
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> somewhat chaotic basis unless...
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> Ah, you might say, I want to base morality on MY religion. Well,
>>>> you
>>>>>>>>>>> just dissed the majority of religions. No problem because THEY
>>>>>>>>>>> ARE
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> WRONG. And people who believe in those religions may just be
>>>>>>>>>>> saying
>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>> same thing about you and your religion. For those religions who
>>>>>>>>>>> are
>>>>>> not
>>>>>>>>>>> tolerant of other ideas, you may just have started a war.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> So perhaps it's BETTER, in our time, to have a system of justice
>>>> that
>>>>>>>>> is
>>>>>>>>>>> NOT based on a religion. But one which guarantees everyone the
>>>>>>>>>>> right
>>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>>> practice the religion of their choice, guarantees other freedoms
>>>> such
>>>>>>>>> as
>>>>>>>>>>> we in the USA do in our Bill of Rights, encourages honesty and
>>>>>>>>>>> integrity, while enforcing some common sense limits such as no
>>>>>>>>>>> human
>>>>>>>>>>> sacrifices, a minimum age for marriage, no incest, no slavery, no
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> murder, no rape, no stealing, those sorts of things.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> What is viewed as morality beyond a fair justice system and
>>>>>>>>>>> common
>>>>>>> sense
>>>>>>>>>>> rules of behavior can be left to each freely chosen religion to
>>>>>>>>>>> sort
>>>>>>>>>>> out, like whether to restrict diet in some way, whether to wear a
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> certain type of clothing, how to pray, etc. But none of these
>>>>>>>>>>> additional
>>>>>>>>>>> practices should be imposed on society as a whole.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> The Golden Rule may also be of use as a basic moral foundation.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> So yes, you can have a moral system, one that BTW protects the

>>>>>>>>>>> freedom
>>>>>>>>>>> to practice religious beliefs (or not), without basing it on any
>>>> one
>>>>>>>>>>> religion. And it can protect all religions better than a system
>>>>>>>>>>> based
>>>>>>>> on
>>>>>>>>>>> any one religion (AKA a theocracy).
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> There are other issues surrounding religions, such as the many
>>>>>>>>>>> examples
>>>>>>>>>>> of selfless dedication to helping others on the one hand, and
>>>>>>>>>>> hijacked
>>>>>>>>>>> religions used to legitimize earthly power structures in other
>>>>>>>>>>> cases.
>>>>>>>>>>> Dedric, I look forward to talking with you about the positives
>>>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> negatives of various religions, and where a moral culture ought
>>>>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>> go
>>>>>>>>>> >from here, whenever we next get together.
>>>>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>> Hey Jimmy,
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> No doubt one can be a good person without believing in God -
>>>>>>>>>>>> there
>>>>>> are
>>>>>>>>>> tons
>>>>>>>>>>>> of great people with no faith, or very little. That in and of
>>>>>>>>>>>> itself
>>>>>>>>>> tells
>>>>>>>>>>>> me there must be a God so even non-believers would have a strong
>>>> sense
>>>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>>> right and wrong on a societal and even global level.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> To walk through some thoughts: with no God, or higher reference
>>>> point,
>>>>>>>>>> what
>>>>>>>>>>>> would be considered moral, or at least good? What would one use
>>>> to
>>>>>>>> decide
>>>>>>>>>>>> what is right and wrong?

>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> Laws? Most would agree that we can't legislate morality now, so
>>>> with
>>>>>>>>>>> no
>>>>>>>>>>>> basis for what morality is, why would we even bother with laws
>>>>>>>>>>>> since
>>>>>>>>>>>> everyone would make their own choices anyway?
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> Intellect? That would simply depend on what one chose to accept
>>>> as
>>>>>>>>>>>> "intelligent" thought, based completely on opinion.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> Reasoning and Logic? Logic is determined by a hypothesis that
>>>>>>>>>>>> has
>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>> proven
>>>>>>>>>>>> outcome in a given situation. Change the situation, and the
>>>>>>>>>>>> reasoning
>>>>>>>>>>> or
>>>>>>>>>>>> logic behind the "right" or "wrong" could easily change.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> Experience? What if one's experience is filled with hatred,
>>>>>>>>>>>> abuse,
>>>>>>>>> anger
>>>>>>>>>>>> and violence, or worse? Then someone would have to decide whose
>>>> experience
>>>>>>>>>>>> we would use as a reference point. There would be no guarantee
>>>> that
>>>>>>>>> person
>>>>>>>>>>>> or persons had experiences that would be best for the good of
>>>>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>> whole.
>>>>>>>>>>>> Survival instinct? If it were a reference point, then stealing,
>>>> lying,
>>>>>>>>>>>> cheating and even killing would be perfectly justified as those
>>>> can
>>>>>>>>> be
>>>>>>>>>>> means
>>>>>>>>>>>> of survival.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> Why would right and wrong even exist? I would think that the
>>>>>>>>>>>> differences
>>>>>>>>>>>> between societies' definitions of right and wrong, assuming
>>>>>>>>>>>> societies
>>>>>>>>>>> even
>>>>>>>>>>>> existed, would be so drastic we would never have ventured into
>>>>>>>>>>>> any
>>>>>>> form

>>>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>> inter-cultural/inter-geographic interaction, much less
>>>>>>>>>>> relationships,
>>>>>>>>>>> diplomacy, collaboration, trade, and open travel.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual, they
>>>>>>>>>>> aren't
>>>>>>>>>>> absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes to
>>>> make
>>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>> choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There would
>>>>>>>>>>> only
>>>>>>>> be
>>>>>>>>>> an
>>>>>>>>>>> ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at the
>>>>>>>>>>> time,
>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>> based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from
>>>>>>>>>>> person
>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>> person,
>>>>>>>>>>> day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons would
>>>>>>>>>>> either
>>>>>>>>>> be
>>>>>>>>>>> filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time
>>>>>>>>>>> because
>>>>>>>>>> their
>>>>>>>>>>> choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we
>>>>>>>>>>> wouldn't
>>>>>>>> have
>>>>>>>>>>> prisons, or likely even organized societies.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> But is the majority always right? How would we know if there
>>>>>>>>>>> were
>>>>>> no
>>>>>>>>>>> absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> If there were no right and wrong, there would be no consequences
>>>> of
>>>>>>>> either,
>>>>>>>>>>> or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad
>>>>>>>>>>> consequence
>>>>>>>>>> - it
>>>>>>>>>>> would just be another event in time.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice,
>>>>>>>>>>> both
>>>>>> in

>>>>>>>> whether
>>>>>>>>>> to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong decisions.
>>>> With
>>>>>>>>> moral
>>>>>>>>>> absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to evaluate
>>>> drastically
>>>>>>>>>> differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency in
>>>> reasoning
>>>>>>>>>> and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry.
>>>>>>>>>> Even
>>>>>> when
>>>>>>>>> we
>>>>>>>>>> choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without that
>>>>>>>>>> option
>>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>> choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would be
>>>> no
>>>>>> power
>>>>>>>>> in
>>>>>>>>>> choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal
>>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>> loving
>>>>>>>>> God
>>>>>>>>>> rather than a dictator or puppet master.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see God
>>>> in
>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>> way
>>>>>>>>>> that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can
>>>>>>>>>> discuss
>>>>>>>>>> completely opposing opinions and still care enough to consider
>>>>>>>>>> insulting,
>>>>>>>>>> belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable
>>>>>>>>>> concept;
>>>>>>>>> and 2)
>>>>>>>>>> in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely
>>>>>>>>>> trump
>>>>>> greed
>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>> power in importance to life and survival together on this
>>>>>>>>>> planet.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy"
>>>>>>>>>> <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:

>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have a
>>>> strong
>>>>>>>>>> morals
>>>>>>>>>>>>> is absurd, I think.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Jimmy
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
>>>>>>>>>>>>> news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Gene -
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> response
>>>>>>>> pretty
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>> even
>>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict,
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> violence
>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> largest
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world. We
>>>> ignore
>>>>>>>>>> car
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> tortured
>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming the
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>> Pope
>>>>>>>>>> quote
>>>>>>>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening,
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> all-accepting
>>>>>>>> religion
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Muslims
>>>>>>>>>> might
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else
>>>> in
>>>>>> many

>>>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>>> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have
>>>>>>>>>>>> talked
>>>>>>>> to,
>>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>>> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a
>>>>>>>>>>>> different
>>>>>>>>>> world
>>>>>>>>>>>> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have
>>>> here.
>>>>>>>>>>>> People
>>>>>>>>>>>> die for converting to anything else, or their families do. At
>>>> best,
>>>>>>>>>> their
>>>>>>>>>>>> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under
>>>>>>>>>>>> threat
>>>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>>> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our
>>>>>>>>>>>> country
>>>>>>>>>>>> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on
>>>>>>>>>>>> our
>>>>>> own
>>>>>>>>>>>> country
>>>>>>>>>>>> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to
>>>>>>>>>>>> this
>>>>>> kind
>>>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>>> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically
>>>>>>>>>>>> correct
>>>>>> thing
>>>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>>>> do.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God,
>>>> and
>>>>>>>> hence
>>>>>>>>>>>> any
>>>>>>>>>>>> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the
>>>>>>>>>>>> choice
>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>> believe
>>>>>>>>>>>> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name
>>>> of
>>>>>> Allah
>>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>>> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10
>>>>>>>>>>>> commandments

>>>>>>>> in
>>>>>>>>> 24
>>>>>>>>>>>>> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there
>>>> is
>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>> sad,
>>>>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>>>> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should
>>>>>>>>>>>>> fear
>>>>>>>> -
>>>>>>>>>> it's
>>>>>>>>>>>>> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's
>>>>>>>>>>>>> personal
>>>>>> whims
>>>>>>>>>> that
>>>>>>>>>>>>> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day.
>>>> That
>>>>>>>>>> also
>>>>>>>>>>>>> includes believing in nothing.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in
>>>>>>>>>>>>> God
>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>> is
>>>>>>>>>>>>> wrong, at worst one has lived a good live and had some false
>>>>>>>>>>>>> hope
>>>>>>>> as
>>>>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>>>>> sense
>>>>>>>>>>>>> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is
>>>>>>>>>>>>> wrong,
>>>>>> then
>>>>>>>>>> at
>>>>>>>>>>>>> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we
>>>>>>>>>>>>> should
>>>>>>>>>> be
>>>>>>>>>>>>> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that
>>>>>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>> President
>>>>>>>>>>>>> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief
>>>>>>>>>>>>> really
>>>>>>>>>> better
>>>>>>>>>>>>> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong
>>>>>>>>>>>>> accompanies
>>>>>>>>>>>> disbelief
>>>>>>>>>>>>> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference
>>>>>>>>>>>>> point
>>>>>>>> for

>>>>>>>>>>>>>> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> belief
>>>>>> in
>>>>>>>> any
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> for
>>>>>> others?
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a guy
>>>> Islam
>>>>>>>>>>>> doesn't
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> like just because he called like he saw it - something we do
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> on
>>>>>> this
>>>>>>>>>> forum
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> intent
>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>> take
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> goal
>>>>>>> is
>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>> give
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to
>>>> not
>>>>>>>> believe
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity from
>>>> public
>>>>>>>>>>>>> view.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> The only way to force someone to remove their belief from
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> public
>>>>>>> in
>>>>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes, is
>>>> to
>>>>>>>> outlaw
>>>>>>>>>>>>> it.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Yet another paradox.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see the
>>>> world
>>>>>>>>>> as a
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> always
>>>>>>>> wins
>>>>>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> validity

>>>>>>>>>> in
>>>>>>>>>>>>> believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to
>>>>>>>>>>>>> maintain
>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>>> balance
>>>>>>>>>>>>> that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust
>>>>>>>>>>>>> in
>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>> very
>>>>>>>>>>>>> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most
>>>>>>>>>>>>> fallible
>>>>>>>>>>>>> characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic
>>>>>>>>>>>>> ideology.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of 10
>>>> hours
>>>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>>> work
>>>>>>>>>>>>> :-((....
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70$1@linux, "gene Lennon"
>>>>>>>>>>>>> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread
>>>> -...
>>>>>>>>>>>>> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the
>>>>>>>>>>>>> current
>>>>>>>>>>>>> administration
>>>>>>>>>>>>> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based
>>>>>>>>>>>>> reasons
>>>>>>>>>> for
>>>>>>>>>>>>> perusing
>>>>>>>>>>>>> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier
>>>>>>>>>>>>> motivation.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Religion.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Great
>>>>>>>>>>>> Awakening"
>>>>>>>>>>>>> of the international religious struggle. This is a good thing
>>>> as

>>>>>>>> he
>>>>>>>>> sees
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> against
>>>>>>>>>>>>> terrorists
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> that
>>>>>> he
>>>>>>>>>>>>> depicts
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> as "a confrontation between good and evil."
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>> trouble
>>>>>>>>>>>>> (as
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> headed?
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> easily
>>>>>>>>> go
>>>>>>>>>>>>> down
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> hill from here.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> More on the "Third Awakening":
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09
/12/AR2006091201
>>>>>>>>>>>>> 59
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> 4_pf.html
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Gene
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> `
>>>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by rick on Wed, 20 Sep 2006 09:11:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

i've never seen a sitting moon so....hell yeah. since i quit smoking
2 1/2 yrs ago i no longer get the exercise from coughing i used to.

on second thought that feat has also given me a bigger ass so let me
ponder on that a bit.

On Tue, 19 Sep 2006 13:36:51 -0600, "DJ"
<animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:

>Rick,
>
>Do you think it would help if we could just figure out a way to get into the
>UN gallery (do they have a gallery?) and then start mooning people? I want
>to do something constructive instead of sitting around bitching all the
>time.
>
>Deej
>
>
>"rick" <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>news:k0c0h2hl6cc83qvha4esc96935fo3nqtb1@4ax.com...
>> i nominate you for john's diplomat search..props to you...damn, i
>> wasn't going to enter this fray...
>>
>> On Tue, 19 Sep 2006 11:31:50 -0500, "Tony Benson"
>> <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote:
>>
>> >With all due respect ulfiyya, the general consensus here is that anyone
>can
>> >discuss anything they feel like discussing. This group has morphed into
>more
>> >of a gathering place for PARIS users and former users. An online coffee
>> >house as such. The key for you is to simply skip the topics you don't
>want
>> >to read.
>> >
>> >Tony
>> >
>> >
>> >"ulfiyya" <ulfiyya@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:450f7bfa$1@linux...
>> >>
>> >> for ... many times poeple.
>> >> THIS IS NOT A POLITIK SITE!!!
>> >> This is ...Paris site (Music) Remember...
>> >>
>> >>
>> >>
>> >> Keep youre Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>> >>>
>> >>>Thanks for the link. It looks like it might be a more interesting read
>> >>>than what you might expect of a book on probability theory.

>> >>>
>> >>>Without risk management there would be no insurance.
>> >>>
>> >>>Seems like we have some major risk management headaches ahead in the
>> >>>foreign relations area. I don't have much faith that our current
>> >>>government understands the situation or is capable of brokering a
>> >>>lasting and beneficial peace.
>> >>>
>> >>>Cheers,
>> >>> -Jamie
>> >>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>> >>>
>> >>>
>> >>>TCB wrote:
>> >>>> I never said faith was limited to religion _at all_ because that
>would
>> >> be
>> >>>> silly. I only bring this up because I think it's a very important
>point.
>> >>>> Nearly every time you read 'without faith there would be no XXXXXXXX'
>> >> it's
>> >>>> just not true and XXXXXXXX can get along just fine without faith.
>> >>>> Probably
>> >>>> the best popular book about risk is called 'Against the Gods' and
>it's
>> >> sort
>> >>>> of about this very topic.
>> >>>>
>> >>>>
> http://www.amazon.com/Against-Gods-Remarkable-Story-Risk/dp/ 0471295639/sr=8-
> 1/qid=1158631839/ref=pd_bbs_1/002-2500887-2981628?ie=UTF8&am p;s=books
>> >>>>
>> >>>> TCB
>> >>>>
>> >>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>> >>>>> There you go, clearly faith is not limited to religion. Although
>just
>> >> as
>> >>>>
>> >>>>> clearly it's important for religion.
>> >>>>>
>> >>>>> As to risk, many people have faith that their risks will pan out.
>Some
>> >>
>> >>>>> people do things because they have such faith. I know people like
>that.
>> >>>>
>> >>>>> I am people like that. That doesn't preclude anyone from doing

>> >>>>> something
>> >>>>
>> >>>>> for some other reason, of course.
>> >>>>>
>> >>>>> If you want to say you don't have faith in anything, using any of
>the
>> >>
>> >>>>> definitions below, then that's your prerogative and I don't have a
>> >>>>> problem with that.
>> >>>>>
>> >>>>> Cheers,
>> >>>>> -Jamie
>> >>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>> >>>>>
>> >>>>>
>> >>>>> TCB wrote:
>> >>>>>> Here's dictionary.com
>> >>>>>>
>> >>>>>> faith /feɪθ/ Pronunciation Key - Show Spelled
>> >>>>>> Pronunciation[feyth]
>> >>>>>> Pronunciation Key - Show IPA Pronunciation
>> >>>>>> -noun
>> >>>>>> 1. confidence or trust in a person or thing: faith in another's
>> >>>>>> ability.
>> >>>>>> 2. belief that is not based on proof: He had faith that the
>hypothesis
>> >>>> would
>> >>>>>> be substantiated by fact.
>> >>>>>> 3. belief in God or in the doctrines or teachings of religion: the
>> >>>>>> firm
>> >>>> faith
>> >>>>>> of the Pilgrims.
>> >>>>>> 4. belief in anything, as a code of ethics, standards of merit,
>etc.:
>> >>>> to
>> >>>>>> be of the same faith with someone concerning honesty.
>> >>>>>> 5. a system of religious belief: the Christian faith; the Jewish
>> >>>>>> faith.
>> >>>>>> 6. the obligation of loyalty or fidelity to a person, promise,
>> >>>>>> engagement,
>> >>>>>> etc.: Failure to appear would be breaking faith.
>> >>>>>> 7. the observance of this obligation; fidelity to one's promise,
>oath,
>> >>>> allegiance,
>> >>>>>> etc.: He was the only one who proved his faith during our recent
>> >>>>>> troubles.
>> >>>>>> 8. Christian Theology. the trust in God and in His promises as made
>> >> through

>> >>>>>> Christ and the Scriptures by which humans are justified or saved.
>> >>>>>>
>> >>>>>> I don't see anything in there about risk. My point is that people
>can
>> >>>> do
>> >>>>>> the things you're talking about knowing full well they might fail,
>but
>> >>>> do
>> >>>>>> them anyway. That's taking a risk, not having faith. I don't have
>> >>>>>> faith
>> >>>> but
>> >>>>>> I've taken lots of personal and professional risks in my life.
>> >>>>>>
>> >>>>>> TCB
>> >>>>>>
>> >>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>> >>>>>>> We can disagree about that but the first line is the dictionary
>> >>>>>>> definition.
>> >>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>> Cheers,
>> >>>>>>> -Jamie
>> >>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>> >>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>> TCB wrote:
>> >>>>>>>> You're confusing 'faith' with 'a willingness to take risks.'
>Animals
>> >>>> take
>> >>>>>>>> risks, to get food, create more animals, etc., but I doubt they
>have
>> >>>> faith.
>> >>>>>>>> One needs no faith to start businesses, invest money, get
>married,
>> >> etc.
>> >>>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>> >>>>>>>>> Faith is complete trust or confidence in something or someone.
>> >>>>>>>>> Religious
>> >>>>>>>>> faith is one form of faith but not the only definition of
>"faith."
>> >>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>> For example I have faith that if I drop a guitar pick it will
>find
>> >>>> its
>> >>>>>>>>> way to the floor based on the gravitational attraction it has to
>> >> the
>> >>>>>>>>> planet. I have faith that I'll breathe my next breath, that I'll
>> >> see
>> >>>>>>>>> tomorrow morning. I have faith that other people are put

>together
>> >> much
>> >>>>>>>>> like I am and that I can therefore relate to other folks.
>> >>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>> Without faith, people would not invest money. Without faith
>people
>> >>>> would
>> >>>>>>>>> not vote. Without faith people would not start businesses, hire
>> >>>>>>>>> other
>> >>>>>>>>> people, raise children. Without faith people would not ride
>trains,
>> >>>> fly
>> >>>>>>>>> in planes or drive cars. Without faith no one would investigate
>> >>>>>>>>> scientific questions about reality.
>> >>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>> While you can clearly have faith without religion, you cannot
>have
>> >>>>
>> >>>>>>>>> religion without faith. Religion depends on faith that one or
>more
>> >>>>
>> >>>>>>>>> deities (good and sometimes bad) exist, that their associated
>> >>>>>>>>> stories
>> >>>>>>>>> actually occurred, and often, that there is some sort of
>afterlife.
>> >>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>> However, religious people believe in a variety of different
>> >>>>>>>>> deities.
>> >>>>>>>>> Even those who believe in the same deity disagree, sometimes
>> >>>>>>>>> violently,
>> >>>>>>>>> about the nature of their deity. Religions sometimes even
>disagree
>> >>>> about
>> >>>>>>>>> the nature of reality. If you want to base morality strictly on
>> >>>>>>>>> religion, and you look around, you'll notice that religion can
>be
>> >> a
>> >>>>
>> >>>>>>>>> somewhat chaotic basis unless...
>> >>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>> Ah, you might say, I want to base morality on MY religion. Well,
>> >> you
>> >>>>>>>>> just dissed the majority of religions. No problem because THEY
>ARE
>> >>>>
>> >>>>>>>>> WRONG. And people who believe in those religions may just be
>saying
>> >>>> the

>> >>>>>>>>> same thing about you and your religion. For those religions who
>are
>> >>>> not
>> >>>>>>>>> tolerant of other ideas, you may just have started a war.
>> >>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>> So perhaps it's BETTER, in our time, to have a system of justice
>> >> that
>> >>>>>> is
>> >>>>>>>>> NOT based on a religion. But one which guarantees everyone the
>> >>>>>>>>> right
>> >>>>>> to
>> >>>>>>>>> practice the religion of their choice, guarantees other freedoms
>> >> such
>> >>>>>> as
>> >>>>>>>>> we in the USA do in our Bill of Rights, encourages honesty and
>> >>>>>>>>> integrity, while enforcing some common sense limits such as no
>> >>>>>>>>> human
>> >>>>>>>>> sacrifices, a minimum age for marriage, no incest, no slavery,
>no
>> >>
>> >>>>>>>>> murder, no rape, no stealing, those sorts of things.
>> >>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>> What is viewed as morality beyond a fair justice system and
>common
>> >>>> sense
>> >>>>>>>>> rules of behavior can be left to each freely chosen religion to
>> >>>>>>>>> sort
>> >>>>>>>>> out, like whether to restrict diet in some way, whether to wear
>a
>> >>
>> >>>>>>>>> certain type of clothing, how to pray, etc. But none of these
>> >>>>>>>>> additional
>> >>>>>>>>> practices should be imposed on society as a whole.
>> >>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>> The Golden Rule may also be of use as a basic moral foundation.
>> >>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>> So yes, you can have a moral system, one that BTW protects the
>> >>>>>>>>> freedom
>> >>>>>>>>> to practice religious beliefs (or not), without basing it on any
>> >> one
>> >>>>>>>>> religion. And it can protect all religions better than a system
>> >>>>>>>>> based
>> >>>>>> on
>> >>>>>>>>> any one religion (AKA a theocracy).
>> >>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>> There are other issues surrounding religions, such as the many
>> >>>>>>>>> examples
>> >>>>>>>>> of selfless dedication to helping others on the one hand, and

>> >>>>>>>>> hijacked
>> >>>>>>>>> religions used to legitimize earthly power structures in other
>> >>>>>>>>> cases.
>> >>>>>>>>> Dedric, I look forward to talking with you about the positives
>and
>> >>>>
>> >>>>>>>>> negatives of various religions, and where a moral culture ought
>to
>> >>>> go
>> >>>>>>>>> >from here, whenever we next get together.
>> >>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>> >>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>> >>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>> >>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>> >>>>>>>>>> Hey Jimmy,
>> >>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>> No doubt one can be a good person without believing in God -
>there
>> >>>> are
>> >>>>>>>>> tons
>> >>>>>>>>>> of great people with no faith, or very little. That in and of
>> >>>>>>>>>> itself
>> >>>>>>>>> tells
>> >>>>>>>>>> me there must be a God so even non-believers would have a
>strong
>> >> sense
>> >>>>>>>>> of
>> >>>>>>>>>> right and wrong on a societal and even global level.
>> >>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>> To walk through some thoughts: with no God, or higher
>reference
>> >> point,
>> >>>>>>>>> what
>> >>>>>>>>>> would be considered moral, or at least good? What would one
>use
>> >> to
>> >>>>>> decide
>> >>>>>>>>>> what is right and wrong?
>> >>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>> Laws? Most would agree that we can't legislate morality now,
>so
>> >> with
>> >>>>>>>>> no
>> >>>>>>>>>> basis for what morality is, why would we even bother with laws
>> >>>>>>>>>> since
>> >>>>>>>>>> everyone would make their own choices anyway?

>> >>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>> Intellect? That would simply depend on what one chose to
>accept
>> >> as
>> >>>>>>>>>> "intelligent" thought, based completely on opinion.
>> >>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>> Reasoning and Logic? Logic is determined by a hypothesis that
>has
>> >>>> a
>> >>>>>> proven
>> >>>>>>>>>> outcome in a given situation. Change the situation, and the
>> >>>>>>>>>> reasoning
>> >>>>>>>> or
>> >>>>>>>>>> logic behind the "right" or "wrong" could easily change.
>> >>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>> Experience? What if one's experience is filled with hatred,
>> >>>>>>>>>> abuse,
>> >>>>>>> anger
>> >>>>>>>>>> and violence, or worse? Then someone would have to decide
>whose
>> >> experience
>> >>>>>>>>>> we would use as a reference point. There would be no guarantee
>> >> that
>> >>>>>>> person
>> >>>>>>>>>> or persons had experiences that would be best for the good of
>the
>> >>>> whole.
>> >>>>>>>>>> Survival instinct? If it were a reference point, then
>stealing,
>> >> lying,
>> >>>>>>>>>> cheating and even killing would be perfectly justified as those
>> >> can
>> >>>>>>> be
>> >>>>>>>> means
>> >>>>>>>>>> of survival.
>> >>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>> Why would right and wrong even exist? I would think that the
>> >>>>>>>>>> differences
>> >>>>>>>>>> between societies' definitions of right and wrong, assuming
>> >>>>>>>>>> societies
>> >>>>>>>> even
>> >>>>>>>>>> existed, would be so drastic we would never have ventured into
>any
>> >>>> form
>> >>>>>>>> of
>> >>>>>>>>>> inter-cultural/inter-geographic interaction, much less
>> >>>>>>>>>> relationships,
>> >>>>>>>>>> diplomacy, collaboration, trade, and open travel.

>> >>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>> As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual, they
>> >>>>>>>>>> aren't
>> >>>>>>>>>> absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes
>to
>> >> make
>> >>>>>>>>> the
>> >>>>>>>>>> choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There would
>> >>>>>>>>>> only
>> >>>>>> be
>> >>>>>>>>> an
>> >>>>>>>>>> ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at the
>> >>>>>>>>>> time,
>> >>>>>>> and
>> >>>>>>>>>> based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from
>person
>> >>>> to
>> >>>>>>> person,
>> >>>>>>>>>> day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons would
>> >>>>>>>>>> either
>> >>>>>>>>> be
>> >>>>>>>>>> filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time
>> >>>>>>>>>> because
>> >>>>>>>>> their
>> >>>>>>>>>> choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we
>> >>>>>>>>>> wouldn't
>> >>>>>>> have
>> >>>>>>>>>> prisons, or likely even organized societies.
>> >>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>> But is the majority always right? How would we know if there
>were
>> >>>> no
>> >>>>>>>>>> absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?
>> >>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>> If there were no right and wrong, there would be no
>consequences
>> >> of
>> >>>>>>> either,
>> >>>>>>>>>> or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad
>> >>>>>>>>>> consequence
>> >>>>>>>>> - it
>> >>>>>>>>>> would just be another event in time.
>> >>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>> But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice,
>both
>> >>>> in
>> >>>>>>> whether
>> >>>>>>>>>> to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong decisions.

>> >> With
>> >>>>>>>> moral
>> >>>>>>>>>> absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to evaluate
>> >> drastically
>> >>>>>>>>>> differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency
>in
>> >> reasoning
>> >>>>>>>>>> and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry.
>Even
>> >>>> when
>> >>>>>>>> we
>> >>>>>>>>>> choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without that
>> >>>>>>>>>> option
>> >>>>>>>> to
>> >>>>>>>>>> choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would be
>> >> no
>> >>>> power
>> >>>>>>>> in
>> >>>>>>>>>> choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal
>and
>> >>>> loving
>> >>>>>>>> God
>> >>>>>>>>>> rather than a dictator or puppet master.
>> >>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>> Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see God
>> >> in
>> >>>> the
>> >>>>>>>> way
>> >>>>>>>>>> that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can
>> >>>>>>>>>> discuss
>> >>>>>>>>>> completely opposing opinions and still care enough to consider
>> >>>>>>>>>> insulting,
>> >>>>>>>>>> belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable
>> >>>>>>>>>> concept;
>> >>>>>>>> and 2)
>> >>>>>>>>>> in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely
>trump
>> >>>> greed
>> >>>>>>>> and
>> >>>>>>>>>> power in importance to life and survival together on this
>planet.
>> >>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>> Regards,
>> >>>>>>>>>> Dedric
>> >>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>> On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy"
>> >>>>>>>>>> <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
>> >>>>>>>>>>

>> >>>>>>>>>>> The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have a
>> >> strong
>> >>>>>>>> morals
>> >>>>>>>>>>> is absurd, I think.
>> >>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>>> Jimmy
>> >>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
>> >>>>>>>>>>> news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...
>> >>>>>>>>>>> Gene -
>> >>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>>> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your
>> >>>>>>>>>>> response
>> >>>>>> pretty
>> >>>>>>>>>>> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country
>and
>> >>>> even
>> >>>>>>>>> the
>> >>>>>>>>>>> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict,
>> >>>>>>>>>>> violence
>> >>>>>> and
>> >>>>>>>>>>> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single
>> >>>>>>>>>>> largest
>> >>>>>>>>>>> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world.
>We
>> >> ignore
>> >>>>>>>> car
>> >>>>>>>>>>> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of
>> >>>>>>>>>>> tortured
>> >>>>>> and
>> >>>>>>>>>>> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming
>the
>> >>>>>>>>>>> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made
>the
>> >>>> Pope
>> >>>>>>>>> quote
>> >>>>>>>>>>> a
>> >>>>>>>>>>> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.
>> >>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>>> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening,
>> >>>>>>>>>>> all-accepting
>> >>>>>> religion
>> >>>>>>>>>>> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western
>> >>>>>>>>>>> Muslims
>> >>>>>>>>> might
>> >>>>>>>>>>> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else
>> >> in

>> >>>> many
>> >>>>>>>> of
>> >>>>>>>>>> the
>> >>>>>>>>>>> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have
>> >>>>>>>>>>> talked
>> >>>>>> to,
>> >>>>>>>> and
>> >>>>>>>>>>> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a
>> >>>>>>>>>>> different
>> >>>>>>>> world
>> >>>>>>>>>>> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have
>> >> here.
>> >>>>>>>>>> People
>> >>>>>>>>>>> die for converting to anything else, or their families do.
>At
>> >> best,
>> >>>>>>>> their
>> >>>>>>>>>>> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under
>> >>>>>>>>>>> threat
>> >>>>>>>> of
>> >>>>>>>>>>> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our
>> >>>>>>>>>>> country
>> >>>>>>>>>>> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on
>our
>> >>>> own
>> >>>>>>>>>> country
>> >>>>>>>>>>> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to
>this
>> >>>> kind
>> >>>>>>>> of
>> >>>>>>>>>>> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically
>correct
>> >>>> thing
>> >>>>>>>> to
>> >>>>>>>>>>> do.
>> >>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>>> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God,
>> >> and
>> >>>>>> hence
>> >>>>>>>>>> any
>> >>>>>>>>>>> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the
>choice
>> >>>> to
>> >>>>>> believe
>> >>>>>>>>>>> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name
>> >> of
>> >>>> Allah
>> >>>>>>>> the

>> >>>>>>>>>>>> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> commandments
>> >>>>>> in
>> >>>>>>>> 24
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there
>> >> is
>> >>>> a
>> >>>>>> sad,
>> >>>>>>>>>>> and
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> fear
>> >>>>>> -
>> >>>>>>>> it's
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's
>personal
>> >>>> whims
>> >>>>>>>> that
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day.
>> >> That
>> >>>>>>>> also
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> includes believing in nothing.
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in
>God
>> >>>> and
>> >>>>>>>> is
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> wrong, at worst one has lived a good live and had some false
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> hope
>> >>>>>>> as
>> >>>>>>>> a
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> sense
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is
>wrong,
>> >>>> then
>> >>>>>>>> at
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> should
>> >>>>>>>> be
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that
>the
>> >>>> President
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> really
>> >>>>>>>> better
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> accompanies
>> >>>>>>>>>>> disbelief
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference

>> >>>>>>>>>>>> point
>> >>>>>> for
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of
>belief
>> >>>> in
>> >>>>>> any
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion
>for
>> >>>> others?
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a
>guy
>> >> Islam
>> >>>>>>>>>>> doesn't
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> like just because he called like he saw it - something we do
>on
>> >>>> this
>> >>>>>>>> forum
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> intent
>> >>>>>> to
>> >>>>>>>> take
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only
>goal
>> >>>> is
>> >>>>>> to
>> >>>>>>>> give
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to
>> >> not
>> >>>>>> believe
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity
>from
>> >> public
>> >>>>>>>>>>> view.
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> The only way to force someone to remove their belief from
>public
>> >>>> in
>> >>>>>>>> a
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes,
>is
>> >> to
>> >>>>>> outlaw
>> >>>>>>>>>>> it.
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> Yet another paradox.
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see
>the
>> >> world
>> >>>>>>>> as a

>> >>>>>>>>>>>> black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> always
>> >>>>>> wins
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> and
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> validity
>> >>>>>>>>> in
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to
>maintain
>> >>>> the
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> balance
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust
>in
>> >>>> the
>> >>>>>>>>> very
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most
>fallible
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> ideology.
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of
>10
>> >> hours
>> >>>>>>>>> of
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> work
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> :-((....
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> Regards,
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> Dedric
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70$1@linux, "gene
>Lennon"
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread
>> >> -...
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>> current
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>> administration
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>> reasons
>> >>>>>>>>> for
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>> perusing
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>> motivation.

>> >>>>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> Religion.
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> Great
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> Awakening"
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> of the international religious struggle. This is a good
>thing
>> >> as
>> >>>>>> he
>> >>>>>>>> sees
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> against
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> terrorists
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war
>that
>> >>>> he
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> depicts
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> as "a confrontation between good and evil."
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit
>of
>> >>>> trouble
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> (as
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> headed?
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> easily
>> >>>>>> go
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> down
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> hill from here.
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> More on the "Third Awakening":
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>
> http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09 /12/AR2006091201
>> >>>>>>>>>>>> 59
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> 4_pf.html
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> Gene
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>> `
>> >>>>
>> >>
>> >
>>

>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Kim on Wed, 20 Sep 2006 10:13:36 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"Deej" <animixx@animass.net> wrote:
>I'm not going to flog it anymore or Kim's gonna get pissed off at me
>and
>I might die.

Hehe. It's not me dude. I don't mind at all. :o)

It's just that I know many others do...

Personally I'm just wishing I wasn't moderator, because then I'd join in...

....not that I've ever deleted a post, except one, but you know what I mean.
;o)

Cheers,
Kim.

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by animix on Wed, 20 Sep 2006 13:21:22 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

> Hehe. It's not me dude. I don't mind at all. :o)
>
> It's just that I know many others do...

Ahhh, c'mon Kim. Even Sara puts up with me sometimes.

;o)

"Kim" <hiddensounds@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:45111450$1@linux...
>
> "Deej" <animixx@animass.net> wrote:
> >I'm not going to flog it anymore or Kim's gonna get pissed off at me
> >and
> >I might die.
>
> Hehe. It's not me dude. I don't mind at all. :o)

>
> It's just that I know many others do...
>
> Personally I'm just wishing I wasn't moderator, because then I'd join
in...
>
> ...not that I've ever deleted a post, except one, but you know what I
mean.
> ;o)
>
> Cheers,
> Kim.

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Kim on Wed, 20 Sep 2006 14:34:48 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"DJ" <notachance@net.net> wrote:
>Ahhh, c'mon Kim. Even Sara puts up with me sometimes.

;o)

Now you're making me feel like the newsgroup police. ;o) DOH! I am... oh
I hate that. ;o)

Cheers,
Kim.

>
>;o)
>
>"Kim" <hiddensounds@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:45111450$1@linux...
>>
>> "Deej" <animixx@animass.net> wrote:
>> >I'm not going to flog it anymore or Kim's gonna get pissed off at me
>> >and
>> >I might die.
>>
>> Hehe. It's not me dude. I don't mind at all. :o)
>>
>> It's just that I know many others do...
>>
>> Personally I'm just wishing I wasn't moderator, because then I'd join
>in...
>>
>> ...not that I've ever deleted a post, except one, but you know what I

>mean.
>> ;o)
>>
>> Cheers,
>> Kim.
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Tony Benson on Wed, 20 Sep 2006 16:07:56 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Oh, um, cool then! Call me Kiss Jr. ;>)

Tony

"rick" <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:9512h2tegb39563k94p4lf6f5gdgu0srao@4ax.com...
>i was serious...diplomacy doesn't mean ass kissing...just a position
> of reason.
>
> On Tue, 19 Sep 2006 13:26:02 -0500, "Tony Benson"
> <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote:
>
>>I'm sensing some sarcasm there Rick. ;>) I would make a terrible diplomat.
>>I
>>react far too much from the gut. Beside, it's hard to be a good
>>communicator
>>with your foot in your mouth!
>>
>>I didn't mean to sound harsh to ulfiyya. He (she?) has every right to want
>>this group to stick to PARIS related stuff. I guess it just feels more
>>like
>>a community to me than a technical reference source.
>>
>>
>>Tony
>>
>>
>>"rick" <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>>news:k0c0h2hl6cc83qvha4esc96935fo3nqtb1@4ax.com...
>>>i nominate you for john's diplomat search..props to you...damn, i
>>> wasn't going to enter this fray...
>>>
>>> On Tue, 19 Sep 2006 11:31:50 -0500, "Tony Benson"
>>> <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote:

>>>
>>>>With all due respect ulfiyya, the general consensus here is that anyone
>>>>can
>>>>discuss anything they feel like discussing. This group has morphed into
>>>>more
>>>>of a gathering place for PARIS users and former users. An online coffee
>>>>house as such. The key for you is to simply skip the topics you don't
>>>>want
>>>>to read.
>>>>
>>>>Tony
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>"ulfiyya" <ulfiyya@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:450f7bfa$1@linux...
>>>>>
>>>>> for ... many times poeple.
>>>>> THIS IS NOT A POLITIK SITE!!!
>>>>> This is ...Paris site (Music) Remember...
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> Keep youre Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Thanks for the link. It looks like it might be a more interesting read
>>>>>>than what you might expect of a book on probability theory.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Without risk management there would be no insurance.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Seems like we have some major risk management headaches ahead in the
>>>>>>foreign relations area. I don't have much faith that our current
>>>>>>government understands the situation or is capable of brokering a
>>>>>>lasting and beneficial peace.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>TCB wrote:
>>>>>>> I never said faith was limited to religion _at all_ because that
>>>>>>> would
>>>>> be
>>>>>>> silly. I only bring this up because I think it's a very important
>>>>>>> point.
>>>>>>> Nearly every time you read 'without faith there would be no
>>>>>>> XXXXXXXX'
>>>>> it's
>>>>>>> just not true and XXXXXXXX can get along just fine without faith.

>>>>>>> Probably
>>>>>>> the best popular book about risk is called 'Against the Gods' and
>>>>>>> it's
>>>>> sort
>>>>>>> of about this very topic.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> http://www.amazon.com/Against-Gods-Remarkable-Story-Risk/dp/
0471295639/sr=8-1/qid=1158631839/ref=pd_bbs_1/002-2500887-29 81628?ie=UTF8&s=books
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> TCB
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>> There you go, clearly faith is not limited to religion. Although
>>>>>>>> just
>>>>> as
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> clearly it's important for religion.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> As to risk, many people have faith that their risks will pan out.
>>>>>>>> Some
>>>>>
>>>>>>>> people do things because they have such faith. I know people like
>>>>>>>> that.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> I am people like that. That doesn't preclude anyone from doing
>>>>>>>> something
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> for some other reason, of course.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> If you want to say you don't have faith in anything, using any of
>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>
>>>>>>>> definitions below, then that's your prerogative and I don't have a
>>>>>>>> problem with that.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> TCB wrote:
>>>>>>>>> Here's dictionary.com
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> faith /feɪθ/ Pronunciation Key - Show Spelled
>>>>>>>>> Pronunciation[feyth]
>>>>>>>>> Pronunciation Key - Show IPA Pronunciation
>>>>>>>>> -noun
>>>>>>>>> 1. confidence or trust in a person or thing: faith in another's

>>>>>>>>> ability.
>>>>>>>>> 2. belief that is not based on proof: He had faith that the
>>>>>>>>> hypothesis
>>>>>>> would
>>>>>>>>> be substantiated by fact.
>>>>>>>>> 3. belief in God or in the doctrines or teachings of religion: the
>>>>>>>>> firm
>>>>>>> faith
>>>>>>>>> of the Pilgrims.
>>>>>>>>> 4. belief in anything, as a code of ethics, standards of merit,
>>>>>>>>> etc.:
>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>> be of the same faith with someone concerning honesty.
>>>>>>>>> 5. a system of religious belief: the Christian faith; the Jewish
>>>>>>>>> faith.
>>>>>>>>> 6. the obligation of loyalty or fidelity to a person, promise,
>>>>>>>>> engagement,
>>>>>>>>> etc.: Failure to appear would be breaking faith.
>>>>>>>>> 7. the observance of this obligation; fidelity to one's promise,
>>>>>>>>> oath,
>>>>>>> allegiance,
>>>>>>>>> etc.: He was the only one who proved his faith during our recent
>>>>>>>>> troubles.
>>>>>>>>> 8. Christian Theology. the trust in God and in His promises as
>>>>>>>>> made
>>>>> through
>>>>>>>>> Christ and the Scriptures by which humans are justified or saved.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> I don't see anything in there about risk. My point is that people
>>>>>>>>> can
>>>>>>> do
>>>>>>>>> the things you're talking about knowing full well they might fail,
>>>>>>>>> but
>>>>>>> do
>>>>>>>>> them anyway. That's taking a risk, not having faith. I don't have
>>>>>>>>> faith
>>>>>>> but
>>>>>>>>> I've taken lots of personal and professional risks in my life.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> TCB
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>> We can disagree about that but the first line is the dictionary
>>>>>>>>>> definition.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com

>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> TCB wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>> You're confusing 'faith' with 'a willingness to take risks.'
>>>>>>>>>>> Animals
>>>>>>> take
>>>>>>>>>>> risks, to get food, create more animals, etc., but I doubt they
>>>>>>>>>>> have
>>>>>>> faith.
>>>>>>>>>>> One needs no faith to start businesses, invest money, get
>>>>>>>>>>> married,
>>>>> etc.
>>>>>>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>> Faith is complete trust or confidence in something or someone.
>>>>>>>>>>>> Religious
>>>>>>>>>>>> faith is one form of faith but not the only definition of
>>>>>>>>>>>> "faith."
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> For example I have faith that if I drop a guitar pick it will
>>>>>>>>>>>> find
>>>>>>> its
>>>>>>>>>>>> way to the floor based on the gravitational attraction it has
>>>>>>>>>>>> to
>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>>> planet. I have faith that I'll breathe my next breath, that
>>>>>>>>>>>> I'll
>>>>> see
>>>>>>>>>>>> tomorrow morning. I have faith that other people are put
>>>>>>>>>>>> together
>>>>> much
>>>>>>>>>>>> like I am and that I can therefore relate to other folks.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> Without faith, people would not invest money. Without faith
>>>>>>>>>>>> people
>>>>>>> would
>>>>>>>>>>>> not vote. Without faith people would not start businesses, hire
>>>>>>>>>>>> other
>>>>>>>>>>>> people, raise children. Without faith people would not ride
>>>>>>>>>>>> trains,
>>>>>>> fly
>>>>>>>>>>>> in planes or drive cars. Without faith no one would investigate
>>>>>>>>>>>> scientific questions about reality.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> While you can clearly have faith without religion, you cannot
>>>>>>>>>>>> have
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> religion without faith. Religion depends on faith that one or
>>>>>>>>>>>> more

>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> deities (good and sometimes bad) exist, that their associated
>>>>>>>>>>> stories
>>>>>>>>>>> actually occurred, and often, that there is some sort of
>>>>>>>>>>> afterlife.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> However, religious people believe in a variety of different
>>>>>>>>>>> deities.
>>>>>>>>>>> Even those who believe in the same deity disagree, sometimes
>>>>>>>>>>> violently,
>>>>>>>>>>> about the nature of their deity. Religions sometimes even
>>>>>>>>>>> disagree
>>>>>>> about
>>>>>>>>>>> the nature of reality. If you want to base morality strictly on
>>>>>>>>>>> religion, and you look around, you'll notice that religion can
>>>>>>>>>>> be
>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> somewhat chaotic basis unless...
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> Ah, you might say, I want to base morality on MY religion.
>>>>>>>>>>> Well,
>>>>> you
>>>>>>>>>>> just dissed the majority of religions. No problem because THEY
>>>>>>>>>>> ARE
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> WRONG. And people who believe in those religions may just be
>>>>>>>>>>> saying
>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>> same thing about you and your religion. For those religions who
>>>>>>>>>>> are
>>>>>>> not
>>>>>>>>>>> tolerant of other ideas, you may just have started a war.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> So perhaps it's BETTER, in our time, to have a system of
>>>>>>>>>>> justice
>>>>> that
>>>>>>>>> is
>>>>>>>>>>> NOT based on a religion. But one which guarantees everyone the
>>>>>>>>>>> right
>>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>>> practice the religion of their choice, guarantees other
>>>>>>>>>>> freedoms
>>>>> such
>>>>>>>>> as
>>>>>>>>>>> we in the USA do in our Bill of Rights, encourages honesty and
>>>>>>>>>>> integrity, while enforcing some common sense limits such as no
>>>>>>>>>>> human

>>>>>>>>>>>> sacrifices, a minimum age for marriage, no incest, no slavery,
>>>>>>>>>>>> no
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> murder, no rape, no stealing, those sorts of things.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> What is viewed as morality beyond a fair justice system and
>>>>>>>>>>>> common
>>>>>>> sense
>>>>>>>>>>>> rules of behavior can be left to each freely chosen religion to
>>>>>>>>>>>> sort
>>>>>>>>>>>> out, like whether to restrict diet in some way, whether to wear
>>>>>>>>>>>> a
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> certain type of clothing, how to pray, etc. But none of these
>>>>>>>>>>>> additional
>>>>>>>>>>>> practices should be imposed on society as a whole.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> The Golden Rule may also be of use as a basic moral foundation.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> So yes, you can have a moral system, one that BTW protects the
>>>>>>>>>>>> freedom
>>>>>>>>>>>> to practice religious beliefs (or not), without basing it on
>>>>>>>>>>>> any
>>>>>>> one
>>>>>>>>>>>> religion. And it can protect all religions better than a system
>>>>>>>>>>>> based
>>>>>>>>> on
>>>>>>>>>>>> any one religion (AKA a theocracy).
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> There are other issues surrounding religions, such as the many
>>>>>>>>>>>> examples
>>>>>>>>>>>> of selfless dedication to helping others on the one hand, and
>>>>>>>>>>>> hijacked
>>>>>>>>>>>> religions used to legitimize earthly power structures in other
>>>>>>>>>>>> cases.
>>>>>>>>>>>> Dedric, I look forward to talking with you about the positives
>>>>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> negatives of various religions, and where a moral culture ought
>>>>>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>> go
>>>>>>>>>>>> >from here, whenever we next get together.
>>>>>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> Dedric Terry wrote:

>>>>>>>>>>>>> Hey Jimmy,
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> No doubt one can be a good person without believing in God -
>>>>>>>>>>>>> there
>>>>>>> are
>>>>>>>>>>> tons
>>>>>>>>>>>>> of great people with no faith, or very little. That in and of
>>>>>>>>>>>>> itself
>>>>>>>>>>> tells
>>>>>>>>>>>>> me there must be a God so even non-believers would have a
>>>>>>>>>>>>> strong
>>>>> sense
>>>>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>>>> right and wrong on a societal and even global level.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> To walk through some thoughts: with no God, or higher
>>>>>>>>>>>>> reference
>>>>> point,
>>>>>>>>>>> what
>>>>>>>>>>>>> would be considered moral, or at least good? What would one
>>>>>>>>>>>>> use
>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>> decide
>>>>>>>>>>>>> what is right and wrong?
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Laws? Most would agree that we can't legislate morality now,
>>>>>>>>>>>>> so
>>>>> with
>>>>>>>>>>> no
>>>>>>>>>>>>> basis for what morality is, why would we even bother with laws
>>>>>>>>>>>>> since
>>>>>>>>>>>>> everyone would make their own choices anyway?
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Intellect? That would simply depend on what one chose to
>>>>>>>>>>>>> accept
>>>>> as
>>>>>>>>>>>>> "intelligent" thought, based completely on opinion.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Reasoning and Logic? Logic is determined by a hypothesis that
>>>>>>>>>>>>> has
>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>>> proven
>>>>>>>>>>>>> outcome in a given situation. Change the situation, and the
>>>>>>>>>>>>> reasoning
>>>>>>>>>>> or
>>>>>>>>>>>>> logic behind the "right" or "wrong" could easily change.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Experience? What if one's experience is filled with hatred,

>>>>>>>>>>>> abuse,
>>>>>>>>> anger
>>>>>>>>>>>> and violence, or worse? Then someone would have to decide
>>>>>>>>>>>> whose
>>>>> experience
>>>>>>>>>>>> we would use as a reference point. There would be no
>>>>>>>>>>>> guarantee
>>>>> that
>>>>>>>>> person
>>>>>>>>>>>> or persons had experiences that would be best for the good of
>>>>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>> whole.
>>>>>>>>>>>> Survival instinct? If it were a reference point, then
>>>>>>>>>>>> stealing,
>>>>> lying,
>>>>>>>>>>>> cheating and even killing would be perfectly justified as
>>>>>>>>>>>> those
>>>>> can
>>>>>>>>> be
>>>>>>>>>>> means
>>>>>>>>>>>> of survival.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> Why would right and wrong even exist? I would think that the
>>>>>>>>>>>> differences
>>>>>>>>>>>> between societies' definitions of right and wrong, assuming
>>>>>>>>>>>> societies
>>>>>>>>>>> even
>>>>>>>>>>>> existed, would be so drastic we would never have ventured into
>>>>>>>>>>>> any
>>>>>>> form
>>>>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>>> inter-cultural/inter-geographic interaction, much less
>>>>>>>>>>>> relationships,
>>>>>>>>>>>> diplomacy, collaboration, trade, and open travel.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual, they
>>>>>>>>>>>> aren't
>>>>>>>>>>>> absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes
>>>>>>>>>>>> to
>>>>> make
>>>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>>> choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There would
>>>>>>>>>>>> only
>>>>>>>>> be
>>>>>>>>>>> an
>>>>>>>>>>>> ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at the
>>>>>>>>>>>> time,
>>>>>>>>> and

>>>>>>>>>>>>> based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from
>>>>>>>>>>>>> person
>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>> person,
>>>>>>>>>>>>> day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons would
>>>>>>>>>>>>> either
>>>>>>>>>>> be
>>>>>>>>>>>>> filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time
>>>>>>>>>>>>> because
>>>>>>>>>>> their
>>>>>>>>>>>>> choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we
>>>>>>>>>>>>> wouldn't
>>>>>>>>> have
>>>>>>>>>>>>> prisons, or likely even organized societies.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> But is the majority always right? How would we know if there
>>>>>>>>>>>>> were
>>>>>>> no
>>>>>>>>>>>>> absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> If there were no right and wrong, there would be no
>>>>>>>>>>>>> consequences
>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>> either,
>>>>>>>>>>>>> or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad
>>>>>>>>>>>>> consequence
>>>>>>>>>>> - it
>>>>>>>>>>>>> would just be another event in time.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice,
>>>>>>>>>>>>> both
>>>>>>> in
>>>>>>>>> whether
>>>>>>>>>>>>> to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong
>>>>>>>>>>>>> decisions.
>>>>> With
>>>>>>>>>>> moral
>>>>>>>>>>>>> absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to
>>>>>>>>>>>>> evaluate
>>>>> drastically
>>>>>>>>>>>>> differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency
>>>>>>>>>>>>> in
>>>>> reasoning
>>>>>>>>>>>>> and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry.
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Even
>>>>>>> when
>>>>>>>>>>> we
>>>>>>>>>>>>> choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without that

>>>>>>>>>>>>> option
>>>>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>>>>> choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would
>>>>>>>>>>>>> be
>>>>> no
>>>>>>> power
>>>>>>>>>>> in
>>>>>>>>>>>>> choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal
>>>>>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>> loving
>>>>>>>>>>> God
>>>>>>>>>>>>> rather than a dictator or puppet master.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see
>>>>>>>>>>>>> God
>>>>> in
>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>> way
>>>>>>>>>>>>> that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can
>>>>>>>>>>>>> discuss
>>>>>>>>>>>>> completely opposing opinions and still care enough to consider
>>>>>>>>>>>>> insulting,
>>>>>>>>>>>>> belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable
>>>>>>>>>>>>> concept;
>>>>>>>>>>> and 2)
>>>>>>>>>>>>> in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely
>>>>>>>>>>>>> trump
>>>>>>> greed
>>>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>>>> power in importance to life and survival together on this
>>>>>>>>>>>>> planet.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy"
>>>>>>>>>>>>> <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> a
>>>>> strong
>>>>>>>>>>> morals
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> is absurd, I think.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Jimmy
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message

>>>>>>>>>>>>>> news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Gene -
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> response
>>>>>>>>> pretty
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>> even
>>>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict,
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> violence
>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> largest
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> We
>>>>> ignore
>>>>>>>>>>> car
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> tortured
>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>> Pope
>>>>>>>>>>> quote
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening,
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> all-accepting
>>>>>>>>> religion
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Muslims
>>>>>>>>>>> might
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> else
>>>>> in
>>>>>>> many
>>>>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> talked
>>>>>>>>> to,
>>>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a

>>>>>>>>>>>>>> different
>>>>>>>>>>> world
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> have
>>>>> here.
>>>>>>>>>>>>> People
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> die for converting to anything else, or their families do.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> At
>>>>> best,
>>>>>>>>>>> their
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> threat
>>>>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> country
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> our
>>>>>>> own
>>>>>>>>>>>>> country
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> this
>>>>>>> kind
>>>>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> correct
>>>>>>> thing
>>>>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> do.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> God,
>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>> hence
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> any
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> choice
>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>> believe
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> name
>>>>> of
>>>>>>> Allah
>>>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> commandments
>>>>>>>>>> in
>>>>>>>>>>> 24
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but

>>>>>>>>>>>>>> there
>>>>> is
>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>> sad,
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> fear
>>>>>>>>> -
>>>>>>>>>>> it's
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> personal
>>>>>>> whims
>>>>>>>>>>> that
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> day.
>>>>> That
>>>>>>>>>>> also
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> includes believing in nothing.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> God
>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>> is
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> wrong, at worst one has lived a good live and had some false
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> hope
>>>>>>>>> as
>>>>>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> sense
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> wrong,
>>>>>>> then
>>>>>>>>>>> at
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> should
>>>>>>>>>>> be
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>> President
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> really
>>>>>>>>>>> better
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> accompanies
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> disbelief
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> point
>>>>>>>>> for
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of

>>>>>>>>>>>>>> belief
>>>>>>> in
>>>>>>>> any
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> for
>>>>>>> others?
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> guy
>>>>> Islam
>>>>>>>>>>>>> doesn't
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> like just because he called like he saw it - something we do
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> on
>>>>>>> this
>>>>>>>>>>> forum
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> intent
>>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>>> take
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> goal
>>>>>>> is
>>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>>> give
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> to
>>>>> not
>>>>>>>>> believe
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> from
>>>>> public
>>>>>>>>>>>>> view.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> The only way to force someone to remove their belief from
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> public
>>>>>>> in
>>>>>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes,
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> is
>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>> outlaw
>>>>>>>>>>>>> it.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Yet another paradox.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>> world
>>>>>>>>>>> as a
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> always

>>>>>>>>> wins
>>>>>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> validity
>>>>>>>>>>> in
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> maintain
>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>>>> balance
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> in
>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>> very
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> fallible
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> ideology.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> 10
>>>>> hours
>>>>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> work
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> :-((....
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70$1@linux, "gene
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Lennon"
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> I don't want to start another religious or political
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> thread
>>>>>> -...
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> current
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> administration
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> reasons
>>>>>>>>>>> for
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> perusing
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> motivation.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Religion.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Great
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Awakening"
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> of the international religious struggle. This is a good
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> thing
>>>>> as
>>>>>>>>> he
>>>>>>>>>>> sees
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> against
>>>>>>>>>>>>> terrorists
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> that
>>>>>>> he
>>>>>>>>>>>>> depicts
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> as "a confrontation between good and evil."
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>> trouble
>>>>>>>>>>>>> (as
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> headed?
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> easily
>>>>>>>>> go
>>>>>>>>>>>>> down
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> hill from here.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> More on the "Third Awakening":
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09
/12/AR2006091201
>>>>>>>>>>>>> 59
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> 4_pf.html
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Gene
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> `
>>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>

>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by uptown jimmy on Wed, 20 Sep 2006 17:03:46 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Kim, you're Aussie, right? That would be a nice perspective to hear from.

Jimmy

"Kim" <hiddensounds@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:45111450$1@linux...
>
> "Deej" <animixx@animass.net> wrote:
> >I'm not going to flog it anymore or Kim's gonna get pissed off at me
> >and
> >I might die.
>
> Hehe. It's not me dude. I don't mind at all. :o)
>
> It's just that I know many others do...
>
> Personally I'm just wishing I wasn't moderator, because then I'd join
in...
>
> ...not that I've ever deleted a post, except one, but you know what I
mean.
> ;o)
>
> Cheers,
> Kim.

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by rick on Wed, 20 Sep 2006 18:11:50 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

ya mean Mr. KissAss??? now that's sarcasm. ;o)

On Wed, 20 Sep 2006 11:07:56 -0500, "Tony Benson"
<tony@standinghampton.com> wrote:

>Oh, um, cool then! Call me Kiss Jr. ;>)
>
>Tony
>

>
>"rick" <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>news:9512h2tegb39563k94p4lf6f5gdgu0srao@4ax.com...
>>i was serious...diplomacy doesn't mean ass kissing...just a position
>> of reason.
>>
>> On Tue, 19 Sep 2006 13:26:02 -0500, "Tony Benson"
>> <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote:
>>
>>>I'm sensing some sarcasm there Rick. ;>) I would make a terrible diplomat.
>>>I
>>>react far too much from the gut. Beside, it's hard to be a good
>>>communicator
>>>with your foot in your mouth!
>>>
>>>I didn't mean to sound harsh to ulfiyya. He (she?) has every right to want
>>>this group to stick to PARIS related stuff. I guess it just feels more
>>>like
>>>a community to me than a technical reference source.
>>>
>>>
>>>Tony
>>>
>>>
>>>"rick" <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>>>news:k0c0h2hl6cc83qvha4esc96935fo3nqtb1@4ax.com...
>>>>i nominate you for john's diplomat search..props to you...damn, i
>>>> wasn't going to enter this fray...
>>>>
>>>> On Tue, 19 Sep 2006 11:31:50 -0500, "Tony Benson"
>>>> <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>With all due respect ulfiyya, the general consensus here is that anyone
>>>>>can
>>>>>discuss anything they feel like discussing. This group has morphed into
>>>>>more
>>>>>of a gathering place for PARIS users and former users. An online coffee
>>>>>house as such. The key for you is to simply skip the topics you don't
>>>>>want
>>>>>to read.
>>>>>
>>>>>Tony
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>"ulfiyya" <ulfiyya@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:450f7bfa$1@linux...
>>>>>>
>>>>>> for ... many times poeple.
>>>>>> THIS IS NOT A POLITIK SITE!!!

>>>>>> This is ...Paris site (Music) Remember...
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Keep youre Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Thanks for the link. It looks like it might be a more interesting read
>>>>>>>than what you might expect of a book on probability theory.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Without risk management there would be no insurance.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Seems like we have some major risk management headaches ahead in the
>>>>>>>foreign relations area. I don't have much faith that our current
>>>>>>>government understands the situation or is capable of brokering a
>>>>>>>lasting and beneficial peace.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>TCB wrote:
>>>>>>>> I never said faith was limited to religion _at all_ because that
>>>>>>>> would
>>>>>>> be
>>>>>>>> silly. I only bring this up because I think it's a very important
>>>>>>>> point.
>>>>>>>> Nearly every time you read 'without faith there would be no
>>>>>>>> XXXXXXXX'
>>>>>>> it's
>>>>>>>> just not true and XXXXXXXX can get along just fine without faith.
>>>>>>>> Probably
>>>>>>>> the best popular book about risk is called 'Against the Gods' and
>>>>>>>> it's
>>>>>>> sort
>>>>>>>> of about this very topic.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> http://www.amazon.com/Against-Gods-Remarkable-Story-Risk/dp/
0471295639/sr=8-1/qid=1158631839/ref=pd_bbs_1/002-2500887-29 81628?ie=UTF8&s=books
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> TCB
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>> There you go, clearly faith is not limited to religion. Although
>>>>>>>>> just
>>>>>>> as
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> clearly it's important for religion.

>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> As to risk, many people have faith that their risks will pan out.
>>>>>>>>> Some
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> people do things because they have such faith. I know people like
>>>>>>>>> that.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> I am people like that. That doesn't preclude anyone from doing
>>>>>>>>> something
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> for some other reason, of course.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> If you want to say you don't have faith in anything, using any of
>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> definitions below, then that's your prerogative and I don't have a
>>>>>>>>> problem with that.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> TCB wrote:
>>>>>>>>>> Here's dictionary.com
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> faith /feɪθ/ Pronunciation Key - Show Spelled
>>>>>>>>>> Pronunciation[feyth]
>>>>>>>>>> Pronunciation Key - Show IPA Pronunciation
>>>>>>>>>> -noun
>>>>>>>>>> 1. confidence or trust in a person or thing: faith in another's
>>>>>>>>>> ability.
>>>>>>>>>> 2. belief that is not based on proof: He had faith that the
>>>>>>>>>> hypothesis
>>>>>>>>> would
>>>>>>>>>> be substantiated by fact.
>>>>>>>>>> 3. belief in God or in the doctrines or teachings of religion: the
>>>>>>>>>> firm
>>>>>>>>> faith
>>>>>>>>>> of the Pilgrims.
>>>>>>>>>> 4. belief in anything, as a code of ethics, standards of merit,
>>>>>>>>>> etc.:
>>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>> be of the same faith with someone concerning honesty.
>>>>>>>>>> 5. a system of religious belief: the Christian faith; the Jewish
>>>>>>>>>> faith.
>>>>>>>>>> 6. the obligation of loyalty or fidelity to a person, promise,
>>>>>>>>>> engagement,

>>>>>>>>>> etc.: Failure to appear would be breaking faith.
>>>>>>>>>> 7. the observance of this obligation; fidelity to one's promise,
>>>>>>>>>> oath,
>>>>>>>> allegiance,
>>>>>>>>>> etc.: He was the only one who proved his faith during our recent
>>>>>>>>>> troubles.
>>>>>>>>>> 8. Christian Theology. the trust in God and in His promises as
>>>>>>>>>> made
>>>>>> through
>>>>>>>>>> Christ and the Scriptures by which humans are justified or saved.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> I don't see anything in there about risk. My point is that people
>>>>>>>>>> can
>>>>>>>> do
>>>>>>>>>> the things you're talking about knowing full well they might fail,
>>>>>>>>>> but
>>>>>>>> do
>>>>>>>>>> them anyway. That's taking a risk, not having faith. I don't have
>>>>>>>>>> faith
>>>>>>>> but
>>>>>>>>>> I've taken lots of personal and professional risks in my life.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> TCB
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>> We can disagree about that but the first line is the dictionary
>>>>>>>>>> definition.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> TCB wrote:
>>>>>>>>>> You're confusing 'faith' with 'a willingness to take risks.'
>>>>>>>>>> Animals
>>>>>>>> take
>>>>>>>>>> risks, to get food, create more animals, etc., but I doubt they
>>>>>>>>>> have
>>>>>>>> faith.
>>>>>>>>>> One needs no faith to start businesses, invest money, get
>>>>>>>>>> married,
>>>>>>> etc.
>>>>>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>> Faith is complete trust or confidence in something or someone.
>>>>>>>>>> Religious
>>>>>>>>>> faith is one form of faith but not the only definition of
>>>>>>>>>> "faith."

>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> For example I have faith that if I drop a guitar pick it will
>>>>>>>>>>>>> find
>>>>>>>>> its
>>>>>>>>>>>>> way to the floor based on the gravitational attraction it has
>>>>>>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>>>> planet. I have faith that I'll breathe my next breath, that
>>>>>>>>>>>>> I'll
>>>>>>> see
>>>>>>>>>>>>> tomorrow morning. I have faith that other people are put
>>>>>>>>>>>>> together
>>>>>>> much
>>>>>>>>>>>>> like I am and that I can therefore relate to other folks.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Without faith, people would not invest money. Without faith
>>>>>>>>>>>>> people
>>>>>>>>> would
>>>>>>>>>>>>> not vote. Without faith people would not start businesses, hire
>>>>>>>>>>>>> other
>>>>>>>>>>>>> people, raise children. Without faith people would not ride
>>>>>>>>>>>>> trains,
>>>>>>>>> fly
>>>>>>>>>>>>> in planes or drive cars. Without faith no one would investigate
>>>>>>>>>>>>> scientific questions about reality.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> While you can clearly have faith without religion, you cannot
>>>>>>>>>>>>> have
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> religion without faith. Religion depends on faith that one or
>>>>>>>>>>>>> more
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> deities (good and sometimes bad) exist, that their associated
>>>>>>>>>>>>> stories
>>>>>>>>>>>>> actually occurred, and often, that there is some sort of
>>>>>>>>>>>>> afterlife.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> However, religious people believe in a variety of different
>>>>>>>>>>>>> deities.
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Even those who believe in the same deity disagree, sometimes
>>>>>>>>>>>>> violently,
>>>>>>>>>>>>> about the nature of their deity. Religions sometimes even
>>>>>>>>>>>>> disagree
>>>>>>>>> about
>>>>>>>>>>>>> the nature of reality. If you want to base morality strictly on
>>>>>>>>>>>>> religion, and you look around, you'll notice that religion can
>>>>>>>>>>>>> be
>>>>>>> a

>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> somewhat chaotic basis unless...
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> Ah, you might say, I want to base morality on MY religion.
>>>>>>>>>>>> Well,
>>>>>> you
>>>>>>>>>>>> just dissed the majority of religions. No problem because THEY
>>>>>>>>>>>> ARE
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> WRONG. And people who believe in those religions may just be
>>>>>>>>>>>> saying
>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>>> same thing about you and your religion. For those religions who
>>>>>>>>>>>> are
>>>>>>>>> not
>>>>>>>>>>>> tolerant of other ideas, you may just have started a war.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> So perhaps it's BETTER, in our time, to have a system of
>>>>>>>>>>>> justice
>>>>>> that
>>>>>>>>>> is
>>>>>>>>>>>> NOT based on a religion. But one which guarantees everyone the
>>>>>>>>>>>> right
>>>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>>>> practice the religion of their choice, guarantees other
>>>>>>>>>>>> freedoms
>>>>>> such
>>>>>>>>>> as
>>>>>>>>>>>> we in the USA do in our Bill of Rights, encourages honesty and
>>>>>>>>>>>> integrity, while enforcing some common sense limits such as no
>>>>>>>>>>>> human
>>>>>>>>>>>> sacrifices, a minimum age for marriage, no incest, no slavery,
>>>>>>>>>>>> no
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> murder, no rape, no stealing, those sorts of things.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> What is viewed as morality beyond a fair justice system and
>>>>>>>>>>>> common
>>>>>>>>> sense
>>>>>>>>>>>> rules of behavior can be left to each freely chosen religion to
>>>>>>>>>>>> sort
>>>>>>>>>>>> out, like whether to restrict diet in some way, whether to wear
>>>>>>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> certain type of clothing, how to pray, etc. But none of these
>>>>>>>>>>>> additional
>>>>>>>>>>>> practices should be imposed on society as a whole.
>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>>> The Golden Rule may also be of use as a basic moral foundation.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> So yes, you can have a moral system, one that BTW protects the
>>>>>>>>>>>>> freedom
>>>>>>>>>>>>> to practice religious beliefs (or not), without basing it on
>>>>>>>>>>>>> any
>>>>>> one
>>>>>>>>>>>>> religion. And it can protect all religions better than a system
>>>>>>>>>>>>> based
>>>>>>>>>> on
>>>>>>>>>>>>> any one religion (AKA a theocracy).
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> There are other issues surrounding religions, such as the many
>>>>>>>>>>>>> examples
>>>>>>>>>>>>> of selfless dedication to helping others on the one hand, and
>>>>>>>>>>>>> hijacked
>>>>>>>>>>>>> religions used to legitimize earthly power structures in other
>>>>>>>>>>>>> cases.
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Dedric, I look forward to talking with you about the positives
>>>>>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> negatives of various religions, and where a moral culture ought
>>>>>>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>> go
>>>>>>>>>>>>> >from here, whenever we next get together.
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Hey Jimmy,
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> No doubt one can be a good person without believing in God -
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> there
>>>>>>>> are
>>>>>>>>>>>>> tons
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> of great people with no faith, or very little. That in and of
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> itself
>>>>>>>>>>>>> tells
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> me there must be a God so even non-believers would have a
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> strong
>>>>>>> sense
>>>>>>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> right and wrong on a societal and even global level.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> To walk through some thoughts: with no God, or higher
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> reference

>>>>>> point,
>>>>>>>>>>> what
>>>>>>>>>>>>> would be considered moral, or at least good? What would one
>>>>>>>>>>>>> use
>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>> decide
>>>>>>>>>>>>> what is right and wrong?
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Laws? Most would agree that we can't legislate morality now,
>>>>>>>>>>>>> so
>>>>>> with
>>>>>>>>>>> no
>>>>>>>>>>>>> basis for what morality is, why would we even bother with laws
>>>>>>>>>>>>> since
>>>>>>>>>>>>> everyone would make their own choices anyway?
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Intellect? That would simply depend on what one chose to
>>>>>>>>>>>>> accept
>>>>>> as
>>>>>>>>>>>>> "intelligent" thought, based completely on opinion.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Reasoning and Logic? Logic is determined by a hypothesis that
>>>>>>>>>>>>> has
>>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>>> proven
>>>>>>>>>>>>> outcome in a given situation. Change the situation, and the
>>>>>>>>>>>>> reasoning
>>>>>>>>>>> or
>>>>>>>>>>>>> logic behind the "right" or "wrong" could easily change.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Experience? What if one's experience is filled with hatred,
>>>>>>>>>>>>> abuse,
>>>>>>>>>> anger
>>>>>>>>>>>>> and violence, or worse? Then someone would have to decide
>>>>>>>>>>>>> whose
>>>>>> experience
>>>>>>>>>>>>> we would use as a reference point. There would be no
>>>>>>>>>>>>> guarantee
>>>>>> that
>>>>>>>>>> person
>>>>>>>>>>>>> or persons had experiences that would be best for the good of
>>>>>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>> whole.
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Survival instinct? If it were a reference point, then
>>>>>>>>>>>>> stealing,
>>>>>> lying,
>>>>>>>>>>>>> cheating and even killing would be perfectly justified as
>>>>>>>>>>>>> those

>>>>>> can
>>>>>>>>> be
>>>>>>>>>>> means
>>>>>>>>>>>>> of survival.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Why would right and wrong even exist? I would think that the
>>>>>>>>>>>>> differences
>>>>>>>>>>>>> between societies' definitions of right and wrong, assuming
>>>>>>>>>>>>> societies
>>>>>>>>>>> even
>>>>>>>>>>>>> existed, would be so drastic we would never have ventured into
>>>>>>>>>>>>> any
>>>>>>>> form
>>>>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>>>> inter-cultural/inter-geographic interaction, much less
>>>>>>>>>>>>> relationships,
>>>>>>>>>>>>> diplomacy, collaboration, trade, and open travel.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual, they
>>>>>>>>>>>>> aren't
>>>>>>>>>>>>> absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes
>>>>>>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>> make
>>>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>>>> choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There would
>>>>>>>>>>>>> only
>>>>>>>>>> be
>>>>>>>>>>> an
>>>>>>>>>>>>> ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at the
>>>>>>>>>>>>> time,
>>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>>>> based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from
>>>>>>>>>>>>> person
>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>> person,
>>>>>>>>>>>>> day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons would
>>>>>>>>>>>>> either
>>>>>>>>>>> be
>>>>>>>>>>>>> filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time
>>>>>>>>>>>>> because
>>>>>>>>>>> their
>>>>>>>>>>>>> choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we
>>>>>>>>>>>>> wouldn't
>>>>>>>>>> have
>>>>>>>>>>>>> prisons, or likely even organized societies.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> But is the majority always right? How would we know if there
>>>>>>>>>>>>> were

>>>>>>>> no
>>>>>>>>>>>>> absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> If there were no right and wrong, there would be no
>>>>>>>>>>>>> consequences
>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>> either,
>>>>>>>>>>>>> or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad
>>>>>>>>>>>>> consequence
>>>>>>>>>>>> - it
>>>>>>>>>>>>> would just be another event in time.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice,
>>>>>>>>>>>>> both
>>>>>>>>> in
>>>>>>>>>> whether
>>>>>>>>>>>>> to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong
>>>>>>>>>>>>> decisions.
>>>>>> With
>>>>>>>>>>>> moral
>>>>>>>>>>>>> absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to
>>>>>>>>>>>>> evaluate
>>>>>> drastically
>>>>>>>>>>>>> differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency
>>>>>>>>>>>>> in
>>>>>> reasoning
>>>>>>>>>>>>> and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry.
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Even
>>>>>>>>> when
>>>>>>>>>>>> we
>>>>>>>>>>>>> choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without that
>>>>>>>>>>>>> option
>>>>>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>>>>> choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would
>>>>>>>>>>>>> be
>>>>>> no
>>>>>>>>> power
>>>>>>>>>>>> in
>>>>>>>>>>>>> choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal
>>>>>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>> loving
>>>>>>>>>>>> God
>>>>>>>>>>>>> rather than a dictator or puppet master.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see
>>>>>>>>>>>>> God
>>>>>> in
>>>>>>>>> the

>>>>>>>>>>>> way
>>>>>>>>>>>>> that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can
>>>>>>>>>>>>> discuss
>>>>>>>>>>>>> completely opposing opinions and still care enough to consider
>>>>>>>>>>>>> insulting,
>>>>>>>>>>>>> belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable
>>>>>>>>>>>>> concept;
>>>>>>>>>>>> and 2)
>>>>>>>>>>>>> in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely
>>>>>>>>>>>>> trump
>>>>>>>>> greed
>>>>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>>>> power in importance to life and survival together on this
>>>>>>>>>>>>> planet.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy"
>>>>>>>>>>>>> <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> a
>>>>>> strong
>>>>>>>>>>>> morals
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> is absurd, I think.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Jimmy
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Gene -
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> response
>>>>>>>>>> pretty
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>> even
>>>>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict,
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> violence
>>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> largest
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> We

>>>>>> ignore
>>>>>>>>>>> car
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> tortured
>>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>> Pope
>>>>>>>>>>>> quote
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening,
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> all-accepting
>>>>>>>>>> religion
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Muslims
>>>>>>>>>>>> might
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> else
>>>>>>> in
>>>>>>>> many
>>>>>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> talked
>>>>>>>>>> to,
>>>>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> different
>>>>>>>>>>>> world
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> have
>>>>>>> here.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> People
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> die for converting to anything else, or their families do.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> At
>>>>>>> best,
>>>>>>>>>>>> their
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> threat
>>>>>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> country
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> our

>>>>>>>> own
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> country
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> this
>>>>>>>>> kind
>>>>>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> correct
>>>>>>>>> thing
>>>>>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> do.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> God,
>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>> hence
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> any
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> choice
>>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>> believe
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> name
>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>> Allah
>>>>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> commandments
>>>>>>>>>> in
>>>>>>>>>>>> 24
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> there
>>>>>> is
>>>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>>> sad,
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> fear
>>>>>>>>>> -
>>>>>>>>>>>> it's
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> personal
>>>>>>>>> whims
>>>>>>>>>>>> that
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> day.
>>>>>> That
>>>>>>>>>>>> also

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> includes believing in nothing.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> God
>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>>> is
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> wrong, at worst one has lived a good live and had some false
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> hope
>>>>>>>>>>> as
>>>>>>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> sense
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> wrong,
>>>>>>>>> then
>>>>>>>>>>>> at
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> should
>>>>>>>>>>>> be
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>> President
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> really
>>>>>>>>>>>> better
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> accompanies
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> disbelief
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> point
>>>>>>>>>> for
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> belief
>>>>>>>>> in
>>>>>>>>>> any
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> for
>>>>>>>>> others?
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> guy
>>>>>> Islam
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> doesn't
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> like just because he called like he saw it - something we do
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> on
>>>>>>>>> this
>>>>>>>>>>>> forum
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> intent
>>>>>>>>>> to

>>>>>>>>>>>> take
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> goal
>>>>>>>>> is
>>>>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>>>> give
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>> not
>>>>>>>>>>> believe
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> from
>>>>>> public
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> view.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> The only way to force someone to remove their belief from
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> public
>>>>>>>>> in
>>>>>>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes,
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> is
>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>>> outlaw
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> it.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Yet another paradox.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>> world
>>>>>>>>>>>> as a
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> always
>>>>>>>>>>> wins
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> validity
>>>>>>>>>>>> in
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> maintain
>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> balance
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> in
>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>>> very
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> fallible
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> ideology.

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> 10
>>>>>> hours
>>>>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> work
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> :-((....
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70$1@linux, "gene
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Lennon"
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> I don't want to start another religious or political
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> thread
>>>>>>> -...
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> current
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> administration
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> reasons
>>>>>>>>>>> for
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> perusing
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> motivation.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Religion.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Great
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Awakening"
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> of the international religious struggle. This is a good
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> thing
>>>>>>> as
>>>>>>>>>> he
>>>>>>>>>>> sees
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> against
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> terrorists
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> that
>>>>>>>>> he
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> depicts

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> as "a confrontation between good and evil."
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>> trouble
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> (as
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> headed?
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> easily
>>>>>>>>>> go
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> down
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> hill from here.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> More on the "Third Awakening":
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09
/12/AR2006091201
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> 59
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> 4_pf.html
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Gene
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> `
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by uptown jimmy on Thu, 21 Sep 2006 01:07:49 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Sorry, brother. There's too much evidence that Bush and Co. were really, really, really eager to invade Iraq, even in the face of well-documented evidence that they were barking up the wrong tree, even that they knew they were barking up the wrong tree. It's a matter of record that the CIA was skeptical about the "slam-dunk" theory of WMDs, as espoused unequivocally by Cheney over and over again before the invasion.

There are documents dating from the mid-'90s showing key Bush administration officials and advisors making concrete, detailed plans to make an example of

Iraq by invading it and "nation building" it into an ally. That certainly had nothing to do with Clinton's administration.The general consensus on the part of most reasonable folk is that Iraq was a dead-center target for Bush, et al, looooong before he got elected.

Frankly, I gave them the benefit of the doubt as the invasion occurred. I said to myself, maybe they're right. Maybe we win, things shift in the Mid-East, we're all happier. Didn't work out that way.

We didn't have to do it. Fact is, certain now-powerful neo-cons had been fantasizing about it for a decade or more when Bush took office, and they seized the opportunity and made it happen. And because of that, we're up to our necks in a global firestorm of hate and civil war and over-extension and tactical weakness.

Any attempt to lay all of this at the feet of anybody other than the current administration seems awfully wrong-headed to me. Just seems like desperation, ideological desperation.

God help us if we find ourselves routinely torturing people in order to preserve our way of life. God help us. That's not who I want to be. I'll leave this country before that becomes commonplace. I won't be party to the torture of other humans in order to preserve for ourselves cheap gas and relative safety from those who have learned to hate us at least PARTLY because we have been manipulating their governments, their history, their economies and their lives for decades solely to keep a steady flow of cheap oil.

I despise the destruction of innocent lives. Be clear on that. And I love my country above all else. But I will not be a hypocrite, and I will not be bullied into hard-partisan faux-patriotism. I fear we are losing our grip, as a nation, on what it means to be an American. It is a fear that seizes my heart like a clammy premonition of impending doom. I hope I am wrong.....

BTW, if we want to win this war on conservative terms, we need to show everybody right now how we will deal with those who harbor non-traditional combatants in their midsts, whether it's Lebanon or Pakistan or Syria or Iran: we nuke them. Just the major cities. Warn folks a gew days before we drop the hammer, give 'em time to get out.

That's how we won WWII, more or less. Anything less isn't going to work. Anything less is the worst sort of wishy-washy hypocricy. War is hell, and anything less than hell isn't war. End of discussion.

Over and out.

Jimmy

"Deej" <animixx@animass.net> wrote in message news:4510cf27$1@linux...
>
> Hi Jimmy,
>
> No offense taken here. My point is that we are finishing a war that was
> started by Sadaam, not Bush. It was never brought to any conclusion
be3cause
> the sanctions that were put in place to do this were circumvented and this
> was during Clinton's administration. Clinton also instituted a policy
> wherein our CIA couldn't work with anyone who had any taint of human
rights
> abuses and also did everything they could to keep the various intelligence
> service and the domestic intelligence services from sharing information.
> All
> of these things played a huge part in what happened on 9-11 and the crappy
> intelligence was what we based the decision on to go in and finish the
gulf
> war that Sadaam started. Had we accurate intelligence, I'll bet things
would
> have been handled much differently. You may not agree with this and that's
> OK. I'm not going to flog it anymore or Kim's gonna get pissed off at me
> and
> I might die.
>
> I've said my piece here. If you want to discuss this off the group it's
> animix@animas.net.
>
> Regards,
>
> Deej
>
>
> "Deej" <animix@animass.netttt> wrote:
> >
> >"Uptown Jimmy" <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
> >>Man.
> >>
> >>I'm sorry, DJ. You've been good to me, and I don't mean to offend you,
> but
> >I
> >>don't quite understand what you're trying to say.
> >>
> >>Not that I don't pay attention to things, usually....
> >>
> >>I just think people ought to have to take responsibility for their own
> >>actions.
> >>

> >>And I don't recall Slick Willy invading Iraq.
> >>
> >>Guess I'm just ignernt.
> >>
> >>Jimmy
> >>
> >>
> >>"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
> >>news:45109ebf@linux...
> >>> No. I think the situation in Iraq, as it stands right now, is a result
> >of
> >>> the left undercutting the administration at every turn and thereby
giving
> >>> aid and encouragement to our enemies who, when they see the country so
> >>> divided, can take it to the bank that the left will do their fair
share
> >to
> >>> defeat our efforts. I'm just blaming the intelligence deficit and the
> >lack
> >>> of leadership that led to the UN sanctions being undercut at every
turn
> >on
> >>> Clinton, otherwise the war that started in 1991, would not still be
> >>> happening. Thius is a war that never stopped. It could have if Clinton
> >>would
> >>> have had his eye on the ball and exercised some of the great
> >>*international
> >>> leadership* that his supporters fantisize so much about.....but he
> >>> didn't. He allowed the sanctions to be undercut by *our allies*.
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>> "Uptown Jimmy" <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> >>> news:45108022@linux...
> >>> > So...you're blaming the situation in Iraq on Bill Clinton? Is that
> >>right?
> >>> >
> >>> > Cuz that seems absurd to me.
> >>> >
> >>> > Just sayin'.
> >>> >
> >>> > Jimmy
> >>> >
> >>> >
> >>> > "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
> >>> > news:4510721c@linux...
> >>> > > >But again, merely pointing fingers backwards

> >>> > > >in no way excuses the mistakes and failures of the current
> >>government.
> >>> > >
> >>> > > Our situation is directly related to the fact that our leaders
based
> >>> their
> >>> > > decisions on disinformation that was a result of the policies of
> the
> >>> > Clinton
> >>> > > administration. I'm not pointing the finger backwards for any
other
> >>> reason
> >>> > > than I feel it is important to keep this in mind lest we elect the
> >>same
> >>> > > misguided souls with the same naieve and misguided foriegn policy
> >>ideas
> >>> to
> >>> > > office once again and end up in an even bigger mess.....and
> >>> > yes.....it
> >>> > > could be much bigger if the liberals take control of the national
> >>> > > legislature.....much less, god forbid, having another Clinton in
> >the
> >>> > white
> >>> > > House.
> >>> > >
> >>> > >
> >>> > > "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> >>news:451035a7@linux...
> >>> > > >
> >>> > > > For most of the Clinton years the balance of power was divided
> >>between
> >>> > > > both parties. Again, there is plenty of finger pointing to go
> >>around.
> >>> > > > It's easy enough in hindsight to criticize the previous
> >>administration
> >>> > > > on a number of counts.
> >>> > > >
> >>> > > > And in retrospect, those dems made a mistake trusting Bush with
> >that
> >>> > > > vote. OTOH, it was a moment of unity.
> >>> > > >
> >>> > > > Flash forward. Today all branches of national government are
> >>> controlled
> >>> > > > by one party. It doesn't bother me if you want to point blame at
> >>some
> >>> of
> >>> > > > the policies under Clinton. But again, merely pointing fingers
> >>> backwards

> >>> > > > in no way excuses the mistakes and failures of the current
> >>government.
> >>> > > >
> >>> > > > They walked in stating in clear terms that they felt the
previous
> >>> > > > government was wrong about almost everything, and then fell flat
> >>> > > > overall, domestically and internationally.
> >>> > > >
> >>> > > > Looking at both governments, we can do better. We must do
better.
> >>> > > > At some point, and we're coming up on six years, the buck stops
> >>with
> >>> > > > those in charge now.
> >>> > > >
> >>> > > > Cheers,
> >>> > > > -Jamie
> >>> > > > http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >>> > > >
> >>> > > >
> >>> > > >
> >>> > > > DJ wrote:
> >>> > > > > The dems you mentioned authorized the military attack on Iraq
> >>as a
> >>> last
> >>> > > > > resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done as
> >>such.
> >>> > > > >
> >>> > > > > How convenient for them when it was the intelligence service
> >that
> >>> they
> >>> > > > > created over 8 years of hard work that they now attempt to
slag
> >>and
> >>> > blame
> >>> > > > > for their decisdions so they can vote for the war before they
> >>vote
> >>> > against
> >>> > > > > it.
> >>> > > > >
> >>> > > > > "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> >>> news:450f8aec@linux...
> >>> > > > >> There is plenty of finger pointing to go around. No doubt
> >>specific
> >>> > > > >> things could have been handled better under the previous
> >>> government.
> >>> > > > >>
> >>> > > > >> The transition of power between the previous and current
> >>> governments

> >>> > > was
> >>> > > > >> pretty rocky, and a "not invented here" syndrome may have
doomed
> >>> the
> >>> > > > >> hand-off of some al-Qaida related work that was in progress.
> >>> > > > >>
> >>> > > > >> In any case, no government gets a pass by blaming the
previous
> >>> > > > >> government. The current government, for example, failed to
follow
> >>> > > > >> through and prioritize the al-Qaida threat ahead of 9/11 and
> >>failed
> >>> > to
> >>> > > > >> prevent 9/11; failed to find and capture Bin Laden in
> >>Afghanistan;
> >>> > > > >> failed to overcome Taliban control of large areas of
Afghanistan;
> >>> > > > >> allowed record drug production to reestablish itself there;
> >>failed
> >>> to
> >>> > > > >> plan for post Iraq invasion problems predicted by their own
> state
> >>> > > > >> department; and they have continually exploited the "war on
> >>> > terrorism"
> >>> > > > >> for domestic political ends.
> >>> > > > >>
> >>> > > > >> You assert the WMDs were there. However Bush's chief
inspector,
> >>and
> >>> > > Bush
> >>> > > > >> himself, say they weren't there after all. It was a bluff.
One
> >of
> >>> the
> >>> > > > >> Iraqi expatriate promoters of the bluff got the ear of our
> >>> > government,
> >>> > > > >> was believed, and, last I heard, had parlayed it into a
position
> >>of
> >>> > > > >> power in Iraq after the invasion.
> >>> > > > >>
> >>> > > > >> The dems you mentioned authorized the military attack on Iraq
> >as
> >>a
> >>> > last
> >>> > > > >> resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done as
> >>such.
> >>> > > > >>

> >>> > > > >> Preemptive invasion is new as part of the "Bush (Jr.)
Doctrine."
> >>> > > > >>
> >>> > > > >> Cheers,
> >>> > > > >> -Jamie
> >>> > > > >> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >>> > > > >>
> >>> > > > >>
> >>> > > > >> DJ wrote:
> >>> > > > >>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> >>> > > news:450f3862@linux...
> >>> > > > >>>> Neither, actually. And what we ought to do would depend on
> >the
> >>> > nature
> >>> > > > > of
> >>> > > > >>>> the threat.
> >>> > > > >>> Agreed.
> >>> > > > >>>
> >>> > > > >>>> We might want to start with recommendations published in
1999,
> >>> well
> >>> > > > >>>> before the 9/11 attack.
> >>> > > > >>>
> >>> > > > >>>
 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Commission_on_Terroris m
> >>> > > > >>>
> >>> > > > >>>> We can disagree about whether our current policy is one of
> >>> > > overreacting
> >>> > > > >>>> or not. We can probably really disagree about the newly
minted
> >>> > > > >>>> preemptive attack policy. :^)
> >>> > > > >>> I don't think there is any newly minted attack policy. There
> >has
> >>> > > always
> >>> > > > > been
> >>> > > > >>> the *clear and present danger* perogative but it needs to be
> >>based
> >>> > on
> >>> > > > >>> accurate intelligence. Had this been available, then I doubt
> >>that
> >>> > > > Bush,
> >>> > > > >>> Kerry, Kennedy Pelosi and the rest would have authorized the
> >>> > invasion
> >>> > > > of
> >>> > > > >>> Iraq, or perhaps they would have been able to find the WMD's
> >>> before
> >>> > > > they
> >>> > > > >>> were shipped out of the country or hidden. I just find it

hard
> >>to
> >>> > > > > stomach
> >>> > > > >>> the hypocracy of the democrats whose policies neutered our
> >>> > > intelligence
> >>> > > > >>> services in the '90's when they trun around and blame Bush
> for
> >>the
> >>> > > > > decisions
> >>> > > > >>> made based on the intellegence blunders they created in the
> >>first
> >>> > > place.
> >>> > > > >>>
> >>> > > > >>> Regards,
> >>> > > > >>>
> >>> > > > >>> Deej
> >>> > > > >>>
> >>> > > > >>>
> >>> > > > >>> Cheers,
> >>> > > > >>> -Jamie
> >>> > > > >>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >>> > > > >>>
> >>> > > > >>>
> >>> > > > >>> DJ wrote:
> >>> > > > >>>> I don't see us overreacting Jamie. However, if there is
> >>> indication
> >>> > > of
> >>> > > > >>> some
> >>> > > > >>>> sort of major threat, do we run and tell the NY times or
> do
> >we
> >>> > blow
> >>> > > > > the
> >>> > > > >>>> threat away before it pays us a visit?
> >>> > > > >>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>
> >>> > > > >>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> >>> > > > > news:450f0b12@linux...
> >>> > > > >>>> Of course they came out with a blustery ultimatum. That's
> >not
> >>> > news,
> >>> > > > >>> it's
> >>> > > > >>>> an old pattern. It works for them to sit back and suggest
> >>that
> >>> > > others
> >>> > > > >>> do
> >>> > > > >>>> something via terror-grams such as this. If it makes you
> >>afraid

> >>> > as
> >>> > > > >>> well,
> >>> > > > >>>>>> my guess is they would see that as a bonus.
> >>> > > > >>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>> By goading the USA into overreacting it helps them grow,
> >>raise
> >>> > > money
> >>> > > > >>> and
> >>> > > > >>>>>> convince others to actually see us as evil and act
> >>accordingly.
> >>> > It
> >>> > > > >>>>>> works, we keep falling for it. OTOH, for those here with
> >a
> >>> > declared
> >>> > > > >>>>>> interest in emptying the US treasury, it's likewise
> >>beneficial
> >>> to
> >>> > > > > have
> >>> > > > >>>>>> the specter of an enemy out there. Fear sells.
> >>> > > > >>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>> We have yet to actually declare war on anyone in this
whole
> >>> mess.
> >>> > > How
> >>> > > > >>> do
> >>> > > > >>>>>> you declare war on a tactic?
> >>> > > > >>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>> Forced conversion and head taxes would go over like a
lead
> >>> balloon
> >>> > > in
> >>> > > > >>>>>> the USA. Not gonna happen. We're far more sectarian than,
> >>say,
> >>> > > Iraq.
> >>> > > > >>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>> Responsible leadership is needed in the world to calm
> >>extremist
> >>> > > > >>>>>> tendencies on all sides and help rational people who are
> >>trying
> >>> > to
> >>> > > > > get
> >>> > > > >>>>>> by in worsening times. At the same time we need to be,
and
> >>are
> >>> > > > >>>>>> attempting to be, vigilant against any self righteous
group
> >>> with
> >>> > > > >>>>>> fantasies of violence in the USA.

> >>> > > > >>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>> Any rush to some sort of "holy war" is irrational. There
> >is
> >>> > nothing
> >>> > > > > >>> holy
> >>> > > > > >>>>>> about war.
> >>> > > > > >>>>>>
> >>> > > > > >>>>>> Cheers,
> >>> > > > > >>>>>> -Jamie
> >>> > > > > >>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >>> > > > > >>>>>>
> >>> > > > > >>>>>>
> >>> > > > > >>>>>>
> >>> > > > > >>>>>> DJ wrote:
> >>> > > > > >>>>>>> I haven't seen us react with
irrationality.....yet.
> >>> Al
> >>> > > > > > Quaeda
> >>> > > > > >>>>> just
> >>> > > > > >>>>>>> came out with an ultimatim stating that it's full on war
> >now
> >>> and
> >>> > > the
> >>> > > > > >>>>> west
> >>> > > > > >>>>>>> will be destroyed. The only way to save ourselves is to
> >>> convert
> >>> > to
> >>> > > > > >>>>> Islam. So
> >>> > > > > >>>>>>> where to you draw the line between irrationality and
self
> >>> defense?
> >>> > > > > >>>>>>>
> >>> > > > > >>>>>>>
> >>> > > > > >>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> >>> news:450ee7ef@linux...
> >>> > > > > >>>>>>>> Let's keep from reacting to irrationality with
> >irrationality
> >>> of
> >>> > > our
> >>> > > > > >>>>> own.
> >>> > > > > >>>>>>>> There's a lot of fear mongering. Chicken Little is
back.
> >>> > > > > >>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > > >>>>>>>> Cheers,
> >>> > > > > >>>>>>>> -Jamie
> >>> > > > > >>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >>> > > > > >>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > > >>>>>>>>

> >>> > > > >>>>>>>> DJ wrote:
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>> It doesn't matter at all whether this was the Pope.
The
> >>> bottom
> >>> > > > > line
> >>> > > > >>> is
> >>> > > > >>>>>>> that
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>> it is rationality as opposed to irrationality.
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> >>> > > > >>>>> news:450ec970@linux...
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> The Catholic church doesn't speak for Christianity.
> >>> Certainly
> >>> > > not
> >>> > > > >>> for
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> Lutherans, and for good reason.
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> A Pope criticizing other religions (even other
Christian
> >>> > sects,
> >>> > > > >>> even
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> other Catholics) is nothing new. Certainly much
harsher
> >>> > things
> >>> > > > > have
> >>> > > > >>>>>>> been
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> said about Islam by some (not all) extreme
fundamentalist
> >>> > > > >>> Christians.
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> And certainly much harsher things have been said by
> >>certain
> >>> > > > >>> extremist
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> Islamists about Christianity. The more extremist of
> both
> >>> > camps
> >>> > > > > seem
> >>> > > > >>>>> to
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> be spoiling to relive the crusades. With some of the
> >more
> >>> > power
> >>> > > > >>> hungry
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> ready to endanger civilization by attempting to
incite
> >>> > > religious
> >>> > > > >>> wars
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> for their own questionable ends.
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> It's a vast generalization to say the "the left" or

> >>> > > "secularists"
> >>> > > > >>> or
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> even "Christians" are demanding an apology from the
> Pope.
> >>I
> >>> > > think
> >>> > > > > a
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> whole lot of people think the Pope can say whatever
> he
> >>> wants.
> >>> > > It
> >>> > > > >>>>>>> doesn't
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> matter to most non-Catholics in the USA and in
reality,
> >>> Papal
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> declarations are ignored by a fair number of
Catholics
> >>> here,
> >>> > > too.
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Obviously some Moslems are upset in some places, but
> >how
> >>> deep
> >>> > > > > does
> >>> > > > >>>>> that
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> go? When black churches were burning in the USA, it
> would
> >>> > have
> >>> > > > > > been
> >>> > > > > >>>>> an
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> exaggeration to blame everyone in the USA for that.
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church
which
> >>> only
> >>> > > very
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo.
The
> >>> church
> >>> > > > > > hung
> >>> > > > > >>> on
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view of
> >the
> >>> > > > > universe
> >>> > > > >>>>>>> while
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, which
> >>> describes
> >>> > > > > the
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> actual way the solar system works.

> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> It also extends to a few Christian sects who, feeling
> >>> > similarly
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> insecure, tenaciously cling to the notion that the
earth
> >>is
> >>> > > only
> >>> > > > >>>>> about
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> 6,000 years old, by virtue of the biblical
> >>interpretations
> >>> > and
> >>> > > > >>> clever
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> (at the time) calculations of an Irish Bishop several
> >>> > centuries
> >>> > > > >>> ago,
> >>> > > > >>>>>>> and
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> in the face of solid current scientific evidence to
> the
> >>> > > contrary.
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some (not all)
Christian
> >>> > churches
> >>> > > > >>> who,
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and
> >>> ever-mounting
> >>> > > > >>> evidence
> >>> > > > >>>>>>> of
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> evolution, responding with dogma in psuedo-scientific
> >>> > clothing,
> >>> > > > > and
> >>> > > > >>>>> who
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> seek to water down scientific education in the USA.
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to power hungry industries
> >who
> >>> pay
> >>> > > big
> >>> > > > >>>>> bucks
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> to spread denial about global warming for short term
> >>gain.
> >>> > Who
> >>> > > > > push
> >>> > > > >>>>> to
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> control oil in the middle east with force. With our
> guns
> >>> > > blazing,
> >>> > > > >>> our

> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically.
And
> >>who
> >>> > > > >>> sometimes
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> hide behind Christianity to do so.
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives
> who
> >>> find
> >>> > > ways
> >>> > > > >>> to
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> pretend that everyone is aligning against
Christianity.
> >>And
> >>> > in
> >>> > > > >>>>>>> spreading
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to
keep
> >>them
> >>> > in
> >>> > > > >>> power.
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of
> >>reason
> >>> > and
> >>> > > > > the
> >>> > > > >>>>>>> focus
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> on the use of force.
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and
> >>declare
> >>> > > > >>> victory.
> >>> > > > >>>>>>> ;^)
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> Have a great week!
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> Cheers,
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> -Jamie
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> DC wrote:
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> I thought this was worth reading if any of you are
> >>> > interested.
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> Have a great Monday!
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> ----------
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>

> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> The Unholy Alliance Rolls Over the Pope
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> By Andrew Walden
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> In what has suddenly been made into a highly
> >>controversial
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> speech, the day after September 11, at Bavaria's
> >>> University
> >>> > of
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Regensberg, Pope Benedict describes Christian belief
> >in
> >>a
> >>> God
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> whose words and acts are bound by reason, truth and
> >the
> >>> law
> >>> > of
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> non-contradiction. Benedict contrasts this with
Islamic
> >>> > > belief
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> in a God not bound by anything-including his own
words.
> >>> > > > > Benedict
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> further contrasts Christian belief with that of
secular
> >>> > > > > humanists
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> who see reason as being completely unbound of God.
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> In response, both Islamists and secularists have
> >>demanded
> >>> > the
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Pope apologize. Benedict's speech is a work of
> >>enlightened
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> genius. He has clearly laid out the differences
between
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis
> >of
> >>the
> >>> > > clash
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> of civilizations we now experience as the War on
Terror.
> >>> His
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> analysis also explains the underlying cause of the
> >>> alliance
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> between the western Left and the Islamofascist
Right.
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the
speech.

> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine
Emperor
> >>> > > Manuel
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> II: "Show me just what Mohammed brought that was
new,
> >>and
> >>> > > there
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as
> >his
> >>> > > command
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> to spread by the sword the faith he preached."
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Four days later, according to AP: "Pakistan's
> >>legislature
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's
> top
> >>> > > Shiite
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the
ruling
> >>> party
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and
accused
> >>> him
> >>> > of
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> reviving the mentality of the Crusades.
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "Across the Islamic world Friday, Benedict's remarks
> >on
> >>> > Islam
> >>> > > > > and
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of
> >rage
> >>> > that
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> many fear could burst into violent protests like
those
> >>> that
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> followed publication of caricatures of the Prophet
> >>> > Muhammad."
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Reuters quoted other sources expressing fears for
the
> >>> Pope's
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> The Islamist reaction proves Manuel II's
600-year-old
> >>> point.
> >>> > > > > The

> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> reaction is not one of anger but a calculated
attempt
> >to
> >>> > force
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> the Pope to parrot the PC line on Islam. Since Islam
> >>need
> >>> > not
> >>> > > be
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> internally consistent and it is not bound by reason,
> >>it's
> >>> > only
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> objective can be to assert the power of a God who is
> >so
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> transcendent that He is not bound by anything. If
man
> >is
> >>> > > created
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> in God's image then by extension Islamic man is not
> >>bound
> >>> by
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> anything. (This explains the predilection on the
part
> >>of
> >>> > some
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Muslims to lie.) Islamists are not responding to any
> >>> > 'offense'
> >>> > > > > to
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> their non-existent morality. They are asserting the
> >>only
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> 'morality' they have-the will to power.
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "Will to Power" is a key element of Nietzsche 's
> >>> > > > > philosophy-hence
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> the root of the term, Islamofascist. Moreover the
> >>Western
> >>> > > "Left'
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist
> >>> thought
> >>> > > > > than
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> by Marxist thought-hence the alliance between the
> >>Western
> >>> > > "Left"
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> and the Islamofascist 'Right.'
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing
precisely
> >>> what
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Manuel II said they would: "Syed Ahmed Bukhari, the

> >>chief
> >>> > > cleric
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest
> >>> mosque,
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> extolled Muslims to 'respond in a manner which
forces
> >>the
> >>> > Pope
> >>> > > > > to
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> apologize.'" Note they intend to use "force" not
> >>reason.
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the
> >Pope
> >>> > was,
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "calling a spade a spade".
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> The secularist mouthpiece, New York
Times,editorializes,
> >>> > "Pope
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Benedict XVI has insulted Muslims.." This is false.
> >>The
> >>> > Pope
> >>> > > 's
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> description of the Islamic God as being unbound by
> >>reason
> >>> is
> >>> > > not
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What
> >>> Muslims
> >>> > > and
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> secularists fear is the Pope's decision to choose to
> >>enter
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity. How
> >dare
> >>> he
> >>> > > not
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "apologize" for being a Christian? That is the
> >>so-called
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "insult."
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> One might "reasonably" ask when will Muslims
"apologize"
> >>> for
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to
the
> >>> point
> >>> > is

> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> lost on them.
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Amazingly the Times continues: "Muslim leaders the
> world
> >>> > over
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> have demanded apologies. For many Muslims, holy war
> >-
> >>> > jihad -
> >>> > > is
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> a spiritual struggle, and not a call to violence."
>
> >In
> >>> > saying
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists
> >are
> >>> > waging
> >>> > > a
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension
> >>against
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Christianity-and they explicitly endorse and join
this
> >>> > jihad.
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> The Times is saying to Islamists, 'we can join your
> >>> > 'spiritual
> >>> > > '
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> jihad, but not your violent jihad.
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> The Times editors are living in a fool's paradise.
>
> >The
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "spiritual" non-violent jihad of propaganda is
merely
> >>the
> >>> > flip
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more
clear
> >>> than
> >>> > in
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> the Islamist reaction to the Pope.
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November
> >the
> >>> > > > Islamists
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons
> >and
> >>> > > demand
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> to hear from the Pope himself. This would place
raging

> >>> mobs
> >>> > > of
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of
forcing
> >>> the
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> leader of Christendom to bow before them.
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> In this demand for submission they are joined by the
> >>> > > secularist
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times
> >>> > > > > editorializes:
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "He needs to offer a deep and persuasive apology."
>
> >The
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> secularists too seek the Pope's submission. Like
the
> >>> > > Islamists,
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> the secularists are driven only by their will to
power.
> >>> > While
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> the Islamists represent their demented version of
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> God--unrestrained by reason, the secularists
represent
> >>> their
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> demented version of reason--unrestrained by God.
They
> >>are
> >>> > > > > united
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> by their self-worshipping world view.
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> It should be noted that the carefully staged "anger'
> >>from
> >>> > the
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islamic world does not condemn Benedict's
> >>characterization
> >>> > of
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islam as a religion where God's "will is not bound
> up
> >>with
> >>> > any
> >>> > > > > of
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> our categories, even that of rationality...(The
Islamic)
> >>> God
> >>> > > is
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> not bound even by his own word.." This is not seen
> >as
> >>an

> >>> > > > > insult.
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islam embraces this description. In offering this
> >>> > description
> >>> > > > > of
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islam, Benedict refers to the views of leading
modern
> >>> French
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islamist R. Arnaldez as discussed in the writings of
> >>> > Professor
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Theodore Khoury of Munster.
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Likewise the secularists express no dismay at the
pope's
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> characterization of a secularist as: "(A) subject
> (who)
> >>> > then
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he
> >>> considers
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> tenable in matters of religion, and the subjective
> >>> > 'conscience
> >>> > > '
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> becomes the sole arbiter of what is ethical."
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Benedict asserts that without reason, or without
God,
> >>> there
> >>> > > can
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> be no modern system of morality. He explains, "In
> this
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> way.ethics and religion lose their power to create
> a
> >>> > community
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> and become (instead) a completely personal matter."
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Both Islamist and secularist seek to break God and
> >>reason
> >>> > > apart.
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Each claims superiority over the Christian West.
They
> >>> > believe
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> absolute moral license makes them powerful. As
> >>> > globalization
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> carries the Western tradition of reason throughout
> the
> >>> > world,
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> both are in decline.
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist and

> >>> > secularist
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> will meet in combat, just as Hitler's fascists broke
> >>their
> >>> > > pact
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after
> >the
> >>> > > collapse
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> of the allied forces on the western front.
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear
> >is
> >>> > having
> >>> > > to
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> reply to the Pope's key point, borrowed from the
> >>Byzantine
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Emperor: "'Not to act reasonably, not to act with
> logos
> >>> > (word
> >>> > > > > > or
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> reason) is contrary to the nature of God,'.. It is
> >to
> >>> this
> >>> > > > > great
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our
> >>> > partners
> >>> > > in
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> the dialogue of cultures."
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Their fear of reason can only lead the world to
> >>disaster.
> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> >>> > > > >>>
> >>> > > > > >
> >>> > > > > >
> >>> > > >
> >>> > >
> >>> >
> >>> >
> >>>
> >>
> >>
> > >
> >

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope

Jimmy,

did it ever occur to you that someone was actually paying some attention to Iraq and what was happening there, even when Clinton wasn't? Considering the intelligence assessments (or lack thereof) I would think that any potential leader of this country might be thinking ahead. "W" would have a special interest I'll grant you, since his father's administration was the one who organized the war and was instrumental in putting together the sanctions that were ignored by the world. How that is portrayed by 36354567645 million pundits with an agenda (including you and me, of course) is a matter of speculation.

Deej

"Uptown Jimmy" <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote in message news:4511e40a@linux...
> Sorry, brother. There's too much evidence that Bush and Co. were really,
> really, really eager to invade Iraq, even in the face of well-documented
> evidence that they were barking up the wrong tree, even that they knew they
> were barking up the wrong tree. It's a matter of record that the CIA was
> skeptical about the "slam-dunk" theory of WMDs, as espoused unequivocally by
> Cheney over and over again before the invasion.
>
> There are documents dating from the mid-'90s showing key Bush administration
> officials and advisors making concrete, detailed plans to make an example of
> Iraq by invading it and "nation building" it into an ally. That certainly
> had nothing to do with Clinton's administration.The general consensus on the
> part of most reasonable folk is that Iraq was a dead-center target for Bush,
> et al, looooong before he got elected.
>
> Frankly, I gave them the benefit of the doubt as the invasion occurred. I
> said to myself, maybe they're right. Maybe we win, things shift in the
> Mid-East, we're all happier. Didn't work out that way.
>
> We didn't have to do it. Fact is, certain now-powerful neo-cons had been
> fantasizing about it for a decade or more when Bush took office, and they
> seized the opportunity and made it happen. And because of that, we're up to
> our necks in a global firestorm of hate and civil war and over-extension

and
> tactical weakness.
>
> Any attempt to lay all of this at the feet of anybody other than the
> current administration seems awfully wrong-headed to me. Just seems like
> desperation, ideological desperation.
>
> God help us if we find ourselves routinely torturing people in order to
> preserve our way of life. God help us. That's not who I want to be. I'll
> leave this country before that becomes commonplace. I won't be party to
the
> torture of other humans in order to preserve for ourselves cheap gas and
> relative safety from those who have learned to hate us at least PARTLY
> because we have been manipulating their governments, their history, their
> economies and their lives for decades solely to keep a steady flow of
cheap
> oil.
>
> I despise the destruction of innocent lives. Be clear on that. And I love
my
> country above all else. But I will not be a hypocrite, and I will not be
> bullied into hard-partisan faux-patriotism. I fear we are losing our grip,
> as a nation, on what it means to be an American. It is a fear that seizes
my
> heart like a clammy premonition of impending doom. I hope I am wrong.....
>
> BTW, if we want to win this war on conservative terms, we need to show
> everybody right now how we will deal with those who harbor non-traditional
> combatants in their midsts, whether it's Lebanon or Pakistan or Syria or
> Iran: we nuke them. Just the major cities. Warn folks a gew days before we
> drop the hammer, give 'em time to get out.
>
> That's how we won WWII, more or less. Anything less isn't going to work.
> Anything less is the worst sort of wishy-washy hypocricy. War is hell, and
> anything less than hell isn't war. End of discussion.
>
> Over and out.
>
> Jimmy
>
>
> "Deej" <animixx@animass.net> wrote in message news:4510cf27$1@linux...
> >
> > Hi Jimmy,
> >
> > No offense taken here. My point is that we are finishing a war that was
> > started by Sadaam, not Bush. It was never brought to any conclusion
> be3cause

> > the sanctions that were put in place to do this were circumvented and
this
> > was during Clinton's administration. Clinton also instituted a policy
> > wherein our CIA couldn't work with anyone who had any taint of human
> rights
> > abuses and also did everything they could to keep the various
intelligence
> > service and the domestic intelligence services from sharing information.
> > All
> > of these things played a huge part in what happened on 9-11 and the
crappy
> > intelligence was what we based the decision on to go in and finish the
> gulf
> > war that Sadaam started. Had we accurate intelligence, I'll bet things
> would
> > have been handled much differently. You may not agree with this and
that's
> > OK. I'm not going to flog it anymore or Kim's gonna get pissed off at me
> > and
> > I might die.
> >
> > I've said my piece here. If you want to discuss this off the group it's
> > animix@animas.net.
> >
> > Regards,
> >
> > Deej
> >
> >
> > "Deej" <animix@animass.netttt> wrote:
> > >
> > >"Uptown Jimmy" <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
> > >>Man.
> > >>
> > >>I'm sorry, DJ. You've been good to me, and I don't mean to offend you,
> > but
> > >>I
> > >>don't quite understand what you're trying to say.
> > >>
> > >>Not that I don't pay attention to things, usually....
> > >>
> > >>I just think people ought to have to take responsibility for their own
> > >>actions.
> > >>
> > >>And I don't recall Slick Willy invading Iraq.
> > >>
> > >>Guess I'm just ignernt.
> > >>

> > >>Jimmy
> > >>
> > >>
> > >>"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
> > >>news:45109ebf@linux...
> > > >>> No. I think the situation in Iraq, as it stands right now, is a
result
> > >of
> > > >>> the left undercutting the administration at every turn and thereby
> giving
> > > >>> aid and encouragement to our enemies who, when they see the country
so
> > > >>> divided, can take it to the bank that the left will do their fair
> share
> > >to
> > > >>> defeat our efforts. I'm just blaming the intelligence deficit and
the
> > >lack
> > > >>> of leadership that led to the UN sanctions being undercut at every
> turn
> > >on
> > > >>> Clinton, otherwise the war that started in 1991, would not still be
> > > >>> happening. Thius is a war that never stopped. It could have if
Clinton
> > >>would
> > > >>> have had his eye on the ball and exercised some of the great
> > >>*international
> > > >>> leadership* that his supporters fantisize so much about.....but
he
> > > >>> didn't. He allowed the sanctions to be undercut by *our allies*.
> > > >>>
> > > >>>
> > > >>>
> > > >>>
> > > >>> "Uptown Jimmy" <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> > > >>> news:45108022@linux...
> > > >>> > So...you're blaming the situation in Iraq on Bill Clinton? Is that
> > >>right?
> > > >>> >
> > > >>> > Cuz that seems absurd to me.
> > > >>> >
> > > >>> > Just sayin'.
> > > >>> >
> > > >>> > Jimmy
> > > >>> >
> > > >>> >
> > > >>> > "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
> > > >>> > news:4510721c@linux...

> > >>> > > >But again, merely pointing fingers backwards
> > >>> > > >in no way excuses the mistakes and failures of the current
> > >>government.
> > >>> > >
> > >>> > > Our situation is directly related to the fact that our leaders
> based
> > >>> their
> > >>> > > decisions on disinformation that was a result of the policies of
> > the
> > >>> > Clinton
> > >>> > > administration. I'm not pointing the finger backwards for any
> other
> > >>> reason
> > >>> > > than I feel it is important to keep this in mind lest we elect
the
> > >>same
> > >>> > > misguided souls with the same naieve and misguided foriegn
policy
> > >>ideas
> > >>> to
> > >>> > > office once again and end up in an even bigger mess.....and
> > >>> > yes.....it
> > >>> > > could be much bigger if the liberals take control of the
national
> > >>> > > legislature.....much less, god forbid, having another Clinton
in
> > >the
> > >>> > white
> > >>> > > House.
> > >>> > >
> > >>> > >
> > >>> > > "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> > >>news:451035a7@linux...
> > >>> > > >
> > >>> > > > For most of the Clinton years the balance of power was divided
> > >>between
> > >>> > > > both parties. Again, there is plenty of finger pointing to go
> > >>around.
> > >>> > > > It's easy enough in hindsight to criticize the previous
> > >>administration
> > >>> > > > on a number of counts.
> > >>> > > >
> > >>> > > > And in retrospect, those dems made a mistake trusting Bush
with
> > >that
> > >>> > > > vote. OTOH, it was a moment of unity.
> > >>> > > >
> > >>> > > > Flash forward. Today all branches of national government are

> > >>> controlled
> > >>> > > > by one party. It doesn't bother me if you want to point blame
at
> > >>some
> > >>> of
> > >>> > > > the policies under Clinton. But again, merely pointing fingers
> > >>> backwards
> > >>> > > > in no way excuses the mistakes and failures of the current
> > >>government.
> > >>> > > >
> > >>> > > > They walked in stating in clear terms that they felt the
> previous
> > >>> > > > government was wrong about almost everything, and then fell
flat
> > >>> > > > overall, domestically and internationally.
> > >>> > > >
> > >>> > > > Looking at both governments, we can do better. We must do
> better.
> > >>> > > > At some point, and we're coming up on six years, the buck
stops
> > >>with
> > >>> > > > those in charge now.
> > >>> > > >
> > >>> > > > Cheers,
> > >>> > > >   -Jamie
> > >>> > > >   http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> > >>> > > >
> > >>> > > >
> > >>> > > >
> > >>> > > > DJ wrote:
> > >>> > > > > The dems you mentioned authorized the military attack on
Iraq
> > >>as a
> > >>> > last
> > >>> > > > > resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done
as
> > >>such.
> > >>> > > > >
> > >>> > > > > How convenient for them when it was the intelligence service
> > that
> > >>> they
> > >>> > > > > created over 8 years of hard work that they now attempt to
> slag
> > >>and
> > >>> > blame
> > >>> > > > > for their decisdions so they can vote for the war before
they
> > >>vote

> > >>> > > against
> > >>> > > > > it.
> > >>> > > > >
> > >>> > > > > "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> > >>> > news:450f8aec@linux...
> > >>> > > > >> There is plenty of finger pointing to go around. No doubt
> > >>specific
> > >>> > > > >> things could have been handled better under the previous
> > >>> government.
> > >>> > > > >>
> > >>> > > > >> The transition of power between the previous and current
> > >>> governments
> > >>> > > was
> > >>> > > > > pretty rocky, and a "not invented here" syndrome may have
> doomed
> > >>> the
> > >>> > > > > hand-off of some al-Qaida related work that was in
progress.
> > >>> > > > >>
> > >>> > > > >> In any case, no government gets a pass by blaming the
> previous
> > >>> > > > >> government. The current government, for example, failed to
> follow
> > >>> > > > >> through and prioritize the al-Qaida threat ahead of 9/11
and
> > >>failed
> > >>> > to
> > >>> > > > >> prevent 9/11; failed to find and capture Bin Laden in
> > >>Afghanistan;
> > >>> > > > >> failed to overcome Taliban control of large areas of
> Afghanistan;
> > >>> > > > >> allowed record drug production to reestablish itself there;
> > >>failed
> > >>> > to
> > >>> > > > >> plan for post Iraq invasion problems predicted by their own
> > state
> > >>> > > > >> department; and they have continually exploited the "war on
> > >>> terrorism"
> > >>> > > > >> for domestic political ends.
> > >>> > > > >>
> > >>> > > > >> You assert the WMDs were there. However Bush's chief
> inspector,
> > >>and
> > >>> > Bush
> > >>> > > > >> himself, say they weren't there after all. It was a bluff.
> One
> > >of
> > >>> the

> > >>> > > > >> Iraqi expatriate promoters of the bluff got the ear of our
> > >>> > government,
> > >>> > > > >> was believed, and, last I heard, had parlayed it into a
> position
> > >>of
> > >>> > > > >> power in Iraq after the invasion.
> > >>> > > > >>
> > >>> > > > >> The dems you mentioned authorized the military attack on
Iraq
> > >as
> > >>a
> > >>> > last
> > >>> > > > >> resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done
as
> > >>such.
> > >>> > > > >>
> > >>> > > > >> Preemptive invasion is new as part of the "Bush (Jr.)
> Doctrine."
> > >>> > > > >>
> > >>> > > > >> Cheers,
> > >>> > > > >> -Jamie
> > >>> > > > >> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> > >>> > > > >>
> > >>> > > > >>
> > >>> > > > >> DJ wrote:
> > >>> > > > >> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> > >>> > news:450f3862@linux...
> > >>> > > > >> Neither, actually. And what we ought to do would depend
on
> > >the
> > >>> > nature
> > >>> > > > > of
> > >>> > > > >> the threat.
> > >>> > > > >> Agreed.
> > >>> > > > >>
> > >>> > > > >> We might want to start with recommendations published in
> 1999,
> > >>> well
> > >>> > > > >> before the 9/11 attack.
> > >>> > > > >>
> > >>> > > > >>
> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Commission_on_Terroris m
> > >>> > > > >>
> > >>> > > > >> We can disagree about whether our current policy is one
of
> > >>> > overreacting
> > >>> > > > >> or not. We can probably really disagree about the newly
> minted

> > >>> > > > >>>> preemptive attack policy. :^)
> > >>> > > > >>> I don't think there is any newly minted attack policy.
There
> > >has
> > >>> > > always
> > >>> > > > > been
> > >>> > > > >>> the *clear and present danger* perogative but it needs to
be
> > >>based
> > >>> > on
> > >>> > > > >>> accurate intelligence. Had this been available, then I
doubt
> > >>that
> > >>> > > Bush,
> > >>> > > > >>> Kerry, Kennedy Pelosi and the rest would have authorized
the
> > >>> > invasion
> > >>> > > of
> > >>> > > > > >>> Iraq, or perhaps they would have been able to find the
WMD's
> > >>> before
> > >>> > > they
> > >>> > > > > >>> were shipped out of the country or hidden. I just find it
> hard
> > >>to
> > >>> > > > > stomach
> > >>> > > > > >>> the hypocracy of the democrats whose policies neutered our
> > >>> > > intelligence
> > >>> > > > > >>> services in the '90's when they trun around and blame Bush
> > for
> > >>the
> > >>> > > > > decisions
> > >>> > > > > >>> made based on the intellegence blunders they created in
the
> > >>first
> > >>> > > place.
> > >>> > > > > >>>
> > >>> > > > > >>> Regards,
> > >>> > > > > >>>
> > >>> > > > > >>> Deej
> > >>> > > > > >>>
> > >>> > > > > >>>
> > >>> > > > > >>> Cheers,
> > >>> > > > > >>> -Jamie
> > >>> > > > > >>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> > >>> > > > > >>>
> > >>> > > > > >>>
> > >>> > > > > >>> DJ wrote:

> > >>> > > > >>>>> I don't see us overreacting Jamie. However, if there is
> > >>> indication
> > >>> > > of
> > >>> > > > >>> some
> > >>> > > > > >>>>> sort of major threat, do we run and tell the NY times or
> > do
> > >we
> > >>> > blow
> > >>> > > > > > the
> > >>> > > > > >>>>> threat away before it pays us a visit?
> > >>> > > > > >>>>>
> > >>> > > > > >>>>>
> > >>> > > > > >>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> > >>> > > > > > news:450f0b12@linux...
> > >>> > > > > >>>>>> Of course they came out with a blustery ultimatum.
That's
> > >not
> > >>> > news,
> > >>> > > > > >>> it's
> > >>> > > > > >>>>>> an old pattern. It works for them to sit back and
suggest
> > >>that
> > >>> > > > others
> > >>> > > > > >>> do
> > >>> > > > > >>>>>> something via terror-grams such as this. If it makes
you
> > >>afraid
> > >>> > as
> > >>> > > > > >>> well,
> > >>> > > > > >>>>>> my guess is they would see that as a bonus.
> > >>> > > > > >>>>>>
> > >>> > > > > >>>>>> By goading the USA into overreacting it helps them
grow,
> > >>raise
> > >>> > > money
> > >>> > > > > >>> and
> > >>> > > > > >>>>>> convince others to actually see us as evil and act
> > >>accordingly.
> > >>> > It
> > >>> > > > > >>>>>> works, we keep falling for it. OTOH, for those here
with
> > >a
> > >>> > declared
> > >>> > > > > >>>>>> interest in emptying the US treasury, it's likewise
> > >>beneficial
> > >>> to
> > >>> > > > > > have
> > >>> > > > > >>>>>> the specter of an enemy out there. Fear sells.

> > >>> > > > >>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>> We have yet to actually declare war on anyone in this
> whole
> > >>> mess.
> > >>> > > How
> > >>> > > > >>> do
> > >>> > > > >>>>>> you declare war on a tactic?
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>> Forced conversion and head taxes would go over like a
> lead
> > >>> > balloon
> > >>> > > in
> > >>> > > > >>>>>> the USA. Not gonna happen. We're far more sectarian
than,
> > >>say,
> > >>> > > Iraq.
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>> Responsible leadership is needed in the world to calm
> > >>extremist
> > >>> > > > >>>>>> tendencies on all sides and help rational people who
are
> > >>trying
> > >>> > to
> > >>> > > > > get
> > >>> > > > >>>>>> by in worsening times. At the same time we need to be,
> and
> > >>are
> > >>> > > > >>>>>> attempting to be, vigilant against any self righteous
> group
> > >>> with
> > >>> > > > >>>>>> fantasies of violence in the USA.
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>> Any rush to some sort of "holy war" is irrational.
There
> > >is
> > >>> > nothing
> > >>> > > > >>> holy
> > >>> > > > >>>>>> about war.
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>> Cheers,
> > >>> > > > >>>>>> -Jamie
> > >>> > > > >>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>> DJ wrote:
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>> I haven't seen us react with
> irrationality.....yet.

> > >>> Al
> > >>> > > > > Quaeda
> > >>> > > > >>>>> just
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>> came out with an ultimatim stating that it's full on
war
> > >now
> > >>> and
> > >>> > > the
> > >>> > > > >>>>> west
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>> will be destroyed. The only way to save ourselves is
to
> > >>> convert
> > >>> > to
> > >>> > > > >>>>> Islam. So
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>> where to you draw the line between irrationality and
> self
> > >>> > defense?
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> > >>> > > > >>> news:450ee7ef@linux...
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>> Let's keep from reacting to irrationality with
> > >>irrationality
> > >>> of
> > >>> > > our
> > >>> > > > >>>>> own.
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>> There's a lot of fear mongering. Chicken Little is
> back.
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>> Cheers,
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>   -Jamie
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>   http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>> DJ wrote:
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>> It doesn't matter at all whether this was the Pope.
> The
> > >>> bottom
> > >>> > > > > line
> > >>> > > > >>> is
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>> that
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>> it is rationality as opposed to irrationality.
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> > >>> > > > >>>>> news:450ec970@linux...
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>> The Catholic church doesn't speak for Christianity.
> > >>> Certainly
> > >>> > > not

> > >>> > > > >>> for
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> Lutherans, and for good reason.
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> A Pope criticizing other religions (even other
> Christian
> > >>> > sects,
> > >>> > > > >>> even
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> other Catholics) is nothing new. Certainly much
> harsher
> > >>> > things
> > >>> > > > > have
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>> been
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> said about Islam by some (not all) extreme
> fundamentalist
> > >>> > > > >>> Christians.
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> And certainly much harsher things have been said by
> > >>certain
> > >>> > > > >>> extremist
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> Islamists about Christianity. The more extremist of
> > both
> > >>> > camps
> > >>> > > > > seem
> > >>> > > > >>>>> to
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> be spoiling to relive the crusades. With some of
> the
> > >more
> > >>> > power
> > >>> > > > >>>>> hungry
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> ready to endanger civilization by attempting to
> incite
> > >>> > religious
> > >>> > > > >>> wars
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> for their own questionable ends.
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> It's a vast generalization to say the "the left" or
> > >>> > "secularists"
> > >>> > > > >>> or
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> even "Christians" are demanding an apology from the
> > Pope.
> > >>I
> > >>> > think
> > >>> > > > > a
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> whole lot of people think the Pope can say whatever
> > he
> > >>> wants.
> > >>> > > It
> > >>> > > > >>>>> doesn't
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> matter to most non-Catholics in the USA and in

> reality,
> > >>> Papal
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> declarations are ignored by a fair number of
> Catholics
> > >>> here,
> > >>> > > too.
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> Obviously some Moslems are upset in some places,
but
> > >how
> > >>> deep
> > >>> > > > > does
> > >>> > > > >>>>> that
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> go? When black churches were burning in the USA, it
> > would
> > >>> > have
> > >>> > > > > > been
> > >>> > > > > >>>>> an
> > >>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> exaggeration to blame everyone in the USA for that.
> > >>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church
> which
> > >>> only
> > >>> > > very
> > >>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo.
> The
> > >>> church
> > >>> > > > > > hung
> > >>> > > > > >>> on
> > >>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view
of
> > >the
> > >>> > > > > > universe
> > >>> > > > > >>>>>>> while
> > >>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus,
which
> > >>> > describes
> > >>> > > > > > the
> > >>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> actual way the solar system works.
> > >>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> It also extends to a few Christian sects who,
feeling
> > >>> > similarly
> > >>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> insecure, tenaciously cling to the notion that the
> earth
> > >>is
> > >>> > > only
> > >>> > > > > > about
> > >>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> 6,000 years old, by virtue of the biblical

> > >>interpretations
> > >>> > and
> > >>> > > > >>> clever
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> (at the time) calculations of an Irish Bishop
several
> > >>> > centuries
> > >>> > > > >>> ago,
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>> and
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> in the face of solid current scientific evidence to
> > the
> > >>> > > contrary.
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some (not all)
> Christian
> > >>> > churches
> > >>> > > > >>> who,
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and
> > >>> ever-mounting
> > >>> > > > >>> evidence
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>> of
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> evolution, responding with dogma in
psuedo-scientific
> > >>> > clothing,
> > >>> > > > > and
> > >>> > > > >>>>> who
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> seek to water down scientific education in the USA.
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to power hungry
industries
> > >who
> > >>> pay
> > >>> > > big
> > >>> > > > >>>>> bucks
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> to spread denial about global warming for short
term
> > >>gain.
> > >>> > Who
> > >>> > > > > push
> > >>> > > > >>>>> to
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> control oil in the middle east with force. With our
> > guns
> > >>> > > blazing,
> > >>> > > > >>> our
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically.
> And
> > >>who
> > >>> > > > >>> sometimes
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> hide behind Christianity to do so.

> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives
> > who
> > >>> find
> > >>> > > ways
> > >>> > > > >>> to
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> pretend that everyone is aligning against
> Christianity.
> > >>And
> > >>> > in
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>> spreading
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to
> keep
> > >>them
> > >>> > in
> > >>> > > > >>> power.
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of
> > >>reason
> > >>> > and
> > >>> > > > > the
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>> focus
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> on the use of force.
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and
> > >>declare
> > >>> > > > >>> victory.
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>> ;^)
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> Have a great week!
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> Cheers,
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> -Jamie
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> DC wrote:
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> I thought this was worth reading if any of you are
> > >>> interested.
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Have a great Monday!
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> ---------------------------------------
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> The Unholy Alliance Rolls Over the Pope
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> By Andrew Walden
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> In what has suddenly been made into a highly
> > >>controversial

> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> speech, the day after September 11, at Bavaria's
> > >>> University
> > >>> > of
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Regensberg, Pope Benedict describes Christian
belief
> > >in
> > >>a
> > >>> > God
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> whose words and acts are bound by reason, truth
and
> > >the
> > >>> law
> > >>> > of
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> non-contradiction. Benedict contrasts this with
> Islamic
> > >>> > > belief
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> in a God not bound by anything-including his own
> words.
> > >>> > > > > Benedict
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> further contrasts Christian belief with that of
> secular
> > >>> > > > humanists
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> who see reason as being completely unbound of God.
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> In response, both Islamists and secularists have
> > >>demanded
> > >>> > the
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Pope apologize. Benedict's speech is a work of
> > >>enlightened
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> genius. He has clearly laid out the differences
> between
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Christian culture and Islamic culture and the
basis
> > >of
> > >>the
> > >>> > > clash
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> of civilizations we now experience as the War on
> Terror.
> > >>> His
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> analysis also explains the underlying cause of the
> > >>> alliance
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> between the western Left and the Islamofascist
> Right.
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the
> speech.
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine
> Emperor

> > >>> > > Manuel
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> II: "Show me just what Mohammed brought that was
> new,
> > >>and
> > >>> > > there
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> you will find things only evil and inhuman, such
as
> > >his
> > >>> > > command
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> to spread by the sword the faith he preached."
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Four days later, according to AP: "Pakistan's
> > >>legislature
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's
> > top
> > >>> > Shiite
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the
> ruling
> > >>> party
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and
> accused
> > >>> him
> > >>> > of
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> reviving the mentality of the Crusades.
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "Across the Islamic world Friday, Benedict's
remarks
> > >on
> > >>> > Islam
> > >>> > > > > and
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent
of
> > >rage
> > >>> > that
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> many fear could burst into violent protests like
> those
> > >>> that
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> followed publication of caricatures of the Prophet
> > >>> > Muhammad."
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Reuters quoted other sources expressing fears for
> the
> > >>> Pope's
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> The Islamist reaction proves Manuel II's
> 600-year-old
> > >>> point.

> > >>> > > > > The
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> reaction is not one of anger but a calculated
> attempt
> > >to
> > >>> > force
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> the Pope to parrot the PC line on Islam. Since
Islam
> > >>need
> > >>> > not
> > >>> > > be
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> internally consistent and it is not bound by
reason,
> > >>it's
> > >>> > only
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> objective can be to assert the power of a God who
is
> > >so
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> transcendent that He is not bound by anything. If
> man
> > >is
> > >>> > > created
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> in God's image then by extension Islamic man is
not
> > >>bound
> > >>> by
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> anything. (This explains the predilection on the
> part
> > >>of
> > >>> > some
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Muslims to lie.) Islamists are not responding to
any
> > >>> 'offense'
> > >>> > > > > to
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> their non-existent morality. They are asserting
the
> > >>only
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> 'morality' they have-the will to power.
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "Will to Power" is a key element of Nietzsche 's
> > >>> > > > > philosophy-hence
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> the root of the term, Islamofascist. Moreover the
> > >>Western
> > >>> > > "Left'
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> is today guided far more by Nietzsche
existentialist
> > >>> thought
> > >>> > > > > than
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> by Marxist thought-hence the alliance between the

> > >>Western
> > >>> > > "Left"
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> and the Islamofascist 'Right.'
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing
> precisely
> > >>> what
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Manuel II said they would: "Syed Ahmed Bukhari,
the
> > >>chief
> > >>> > > cleric
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's
largest
> > >>> mosque,
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> extolled Muslims to 'respond in a manner which
> forces
> > >>the
> > >>> > Pope
> > >>> > > > > to
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> apologize.'" Note they intend to use "force" not
> > >>reason.
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out
the
> > >Pope
> > >>> > was,
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "calling a spade a spade".
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> The secularist mouthpiece, New York
> Times,editorializes,
> > >>> > "Pope
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Benedict XVI has insulted Muslims.." This is
false.
> > >>The
> > >>> > Pope
> > >>> > > > 's
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> description of the Islamic God as being unbound by
> > >>reason
> > >>> is
> > >>> > > not
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith.
What
> > >>> Muslims
> > >>> > > and
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> secularists fear is the Pope's decision to choose
to
> > >>enter
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity.

How
> > >dare
> > >>> he
> > >>> > > not
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "apologize" for being a Christian? That is the
> > >>so-called
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "insult."
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> One might "reasonably" ask when will Muslims
> "apologize"
> > >>> for
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to
> the
> > >>> point
> > >>> > is
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> lost on them.
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Amazingly the Times continues: "Muslim leaders the
> > > world
> > >>> > over
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> have demanded apologies. For many Muslims, holy
war
> > >-
> > >>> > jihad -
> > >>> > > > is
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> a spiritual struggle, and not a call to violence."
> >
> > >In
> > >>> > saying
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> this, the Times implicitly recognizes the
Islamists
> > >are
> > >>> > waging
> > >>> > > > a
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension
> > >>against
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Christianity-and they explicitly endorse and join
> this
> > >>> jihad.
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> The Times is saying to Islamists, 'we can join
your
> > >>> > 'spiritual
> > >>> > > > '
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> jihad, but not your violent jihad.
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> The Times editors are living in a fool's paradise.
> >
> > >The

> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "spiritual" non-violent jihad of propaganda is
> merely
> > >>the
> > >>> > flip
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more
> clear
> > >>> than
> > >>> > in
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> the Islamist reaction to the Pope.
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in
November
> > >the
> > >>> > > > > Islamists
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> are rejecting any apology from Vatican
spokespersons
> > >and
> > >>> > > demand
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> to hear from the Pope himself. This would place
> raging
> > >>> mobs
> > >>> > > of
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of
> forcing
> > >>> the
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> leader of Christendom to bow before them.
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> In this demand for submission they are joined by
the
> > >>> > > secularist
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times
> > >>> > > > > editorializes:
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "He needs to offer a deep and persuasive apology."
> >
> > >The
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> secularists too seek the Pope's submission. Like
> the
> > >>> > > Islamists,
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> the secularists are driven only by their will to
> power.
> > >>> > While
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> the Islamists represent their demented version of
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> God--unrestrained by reason, the secularists
> represent
> > >>> their
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> demented version of reason--unrestrained by God.
> They
> > >>are

> > >>> > > > > united
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> by their self-worshipping world view.
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> It should be noted that the carefully staged
"anger'
> > >>from
> > >>> > the
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islamic world does not condemn Benedict's
> > >>characterization
> > >>> > of
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islam as a religion where God's "will is not bound
> > up
> > >>with
> > >>> > any
> > >>> > > > > > of
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> our categories, even that of rationality...(The
> Islamic)
> > >>> God
> > >>> > > is
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> not bound even by his own word.." This is not
seen
> > >as
> > >>an
> > >>> > > > > > insult.
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islam embraces this description. In offering this
> > >>> > description
> > >>> > > > > > of
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islam, Benedict refers to the views of leading
> modern
> > >>> French
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islamist R. Arnaldez as discussed in the writings
of
> > >>> > Professor
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Theodore Khoury of Munster.
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Likewise the secularists express no dismay at the
> pope's
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> characterization of a secularist as: "(A) subject
> > (who)
> > >>> > then
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he
> > >>> considers
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> tenable in matters of religion, and the subjective
> > >>> > 'conscience
> > >>> > > > '
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> becomes the sole arbiter of what is ethical."
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Benedict asserts that without reason, or without

> God,
> > >>> there
> > >>> > > can
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> be no modern system of morality. He explains, "In
> > this
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> way.ethics and religion lose their power to create
> > a
> > >>> > community
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> and become (instead) a completely personal
matter."
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Both Islamist and secularist seek to break God and
> > >>reason
> > >>> > > apart.
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Each claims superiority over the Christian West.
> They
> > >>> > believe
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> absolute moral license makes them powerful. As
> > >>> > globalization
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> carries the Western tradition of reason throughout
> > the
> > >>> > world,
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> both are in decline.
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist
and
> > >>> > secularist
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> will meet in combat, just as Hitler's fascists
broke
> > >>their
> > >>> > > pact
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941
after
> > >the
> > >>> > collapse
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> of the allied forces on the western front.
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> What the Islamists and the New York Times both
fear
> > >is
> > >>> > having
> > >>> > > to
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> reply to the Pope's key point, borrowed from the
> > >>Byzantine
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Emperor: "'Not to act reasonably, not to act with
> > logos
> > >>> > (word
> > >>> > > > > > or

> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> reason) is contrary to the nature of God,'.. It
is
> > >to
> > >>> this
> > >>> > > > > great
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite
our
> > >>> > partners
> > >>> > > in
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> the dialogue of cultures."
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Their fear of reason can only lead the world to
> > >>disaster.
> > >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
> > >>> > > > > >>>
> > >>> > > > > >
> > >>> > > > >
> > >>> > > >
> > >>> > > >
> > >>> > >
> > >>> > >
> > >>> >
> > >>> >
> > >>>
> > >>>
> > >>
> > >>
> > >
> > >
> >
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by uptown jimmy on Thu, 21 Sep 2006 03:00:37 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Like I said, brother: over and out.

Jimmy

"DJ" <notachance@net.net> wrote in message news:4511f8b5@linux...
> Jimmy,
>
> did it ever occur to you that someone was actually paying some attention
to
> Iraq and what was happening there, even when Clinton wasn't? Considering
the
> intelligence assessments (or lack thereof) I would think that any

potential
> leader of this country might be thinking ahead. "W" would have a special
> interest I'll grant you, since his father's administration was the one who
> organized the war and was instrumental in putting together the sanctions
> that were ignored by the world. How that is portrayed by 36354567645
million
> pundits with an agenda (including you and me, of course) is a matter of
> speculation.
>
> Deej
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Sarah on Thu, 21 Sep 2006 03:45:53 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hey, whaddya talkin' about, DJ . . . I put up with you all the time. I even
put up with DC and he's crazier than a fruit bat on mushrooms. :)

S

PS: You forgot my "H" dude. Let's try to be more careful.

"DJ" <notachance@net.net> wrote in message news:45114087$1@linux...
>> Hehe. It's not me dude. I don't mind at all. :o)
>>
>> It's just that I know many others do...
>
>
>
> Ahhh, c'mon Kim. Even Sara puts up with me sometimes.
>
> ;o)
>
> "Kim" <hiddensounds@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:45111450$1@linux...
>>
>> "Deej" <animixx@animass.net> wrote:
>> >I'm not going to flog it anymore or Kim's gonna get pissed off at me
>> >and
>> >I might die.
>>
>> Hehe. It's not me dude. I don't mind at all. :o)
>>
>> It's just that I know many others do...
>>
>> Personally I'm just wishing I wasn't moderator, because then I'd join
> in...

>>
>> ...not that I've ever deleted a post, except one, but you know what I
> mean.
>> ;o)
>>
>> Cheers,
>> Kim.
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by DC on Thu, 21 Sep 2006 04:39:14 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Oh Hey, I'm sure I would look that way from your perspective...

heh

I love you too

DC

"Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote:
>Hey, whaddya talkin' about, DJ . . . I put up with you all the time. I
even
>put up with DC and he's crazier than a fruit bat on mushrooms. :)
>
>S
>
>PS: You forgot my "H" dude. Let's try to be more careful.
>
>"DJ" <notachance@net.net> wrote in message news:45114087$1@linux...
>>> Hehe. It's not me dude. I don't mind at all. :o)
>>>
>>> It's just that I know many others do...
>>
>>
>>
>> Ahhh, c'mon Kim. Even Sara puts up with me sometimes.
>>
>> ;o)
>>
>> "Kim" <hiddensounds@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:45111450$1@linux...
>>>
>>> "Deej" <animixx@animass.net> wrote:
>>> >I'm not going to flog it anymore or Kim's gonna get pissed off at me

>>> >and
>>> >I might die.
>>>
>>> Hehe. It's not me dude. I don't mind at all. :o)
>>>
>>> It's just that I know many others do...
>>>
>>> Personally I'm just wishing I wasn't moderator, because then I'd join
>> in...
>>>
>>> ...not that I've ever deleted a post, except one, but you know what I
>> mean.
>>> ;o)
>>>
>>> Cheers,
>>> Kim.
>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by Pauln[1] on Thu, 21 Sep 2006 13:11:15 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Jimmy,

Good post. I think this pretty much states where I am on the subject as well.
Thanks for posting it.

"Uptown Jimmy" <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
>Sorry, brother. There's too much evidence that Bush and Co. were really,
>really, really eager to invade Iraq, even in the face of well-documented
>evidence that they were barking up the wrong tree, even that they knew they
>were barking up the wrong tree. It's a matter of record that the CIA was
>skeptical about the "slam-dunk" theory of WMDs, as espoused unequivocally
by
>Cheney over and over again before the invasion.
>
>There are documents dating from the mid-'90s showing key Bush administration
>officials and advisors making concrete, detailed plans to make an example
of
>Iraq by invading it and "nation building" it into an ally. That certainly
>had nothing to do with Clinton's administration.The general consensus on
the
>part of most reasonable folk is that Iraq was a dead-center target for Bush,

>et al, looooong before he got elected.
>
>Frankly, I gave them the benefit of the doubt as the invasion occurred.
I
>said to myself, maybe they're right. Maybe we win, things shift in the
>Mid-East, we're all happier. Didn't work out that way.
>
>We didn't have to do it. Fact is, certain now-powerful neo-cons had been
>fantasizing about it for a decade or more when Bush took office, and they
>seized the opportunity and made it happen. And because of that, we're up
to
>our necks in a global firestorm of hate and civil war and over-extension
and
>tactical weakness.
>
> Any attempt to lay all of this at the feet of anybody other than the
>current administration seems awfully wrong-headed to me. Just seems like
>desperation, ideological desperation.
>
>God help us if we find ourselves routinely torturing people in order to
>preserve our way of life. God help us. That's not who I want to be. I'll
>leave this country before that becomes commonplace. I won't be party to
the
>torture of other humans in order to preserve for ourselves cheap gas and
>relative safety from those who have learned to hate us at least PARTLY
>because we have been manipulating their governments, their history, their
>economies and their lives for decades solely to keep a steady flow of cheap
>oil.
>
>I despise the destruction of innocent lives. Be clear on that. And I love
my
>country above all else. But I will not be a hypocrite, and I will not be
>bullied into hard-partisan faux-patriotism. I fear we are losing our grip,
>as a nation, on what it means to be an American. It is a fear that seizes
my
>heart like a clammy premonition of impending doom. I hope I am wrong.....
>
>BTW, if we want to win this war on conservative terms, we need to show
>everybody right now how we will deal with those who harbor non-traditional
>combatants in their midsts, whether it's Lebanon or Pakistan or Syria or
>Iran: we nuke them. Just the major cities. Warn folks a gew days before
we
>drop the hammer, give 'em time to get out.
>
>That's how we won WWII, more or less. Anything less isn't going to work.
>Anything less is the worst sort of wishy-washy hypocricy. War is hell, and
>anything less than hell isn't war. End of discussion.
>

>Over and out.
>
>Jimmy
>
>
>"Deej" <animixx@animass.net> wrote in message news:4510cf27$1@linux...
>>
>> Hi Jimmy,
>>
>> No offense taken here. My point is that we are finishing a war that was
>> started by Sadaam, not Bush. It was never brought to any conclusion
>be3cause
>> the sanctions that were put in place to do this were circumvented and
this
>> was during Clinton's administration. Clinton also instituted a policy
>> wherein our CIA couldn't work with anyone who had any taint of human
>rights
>> abuses and also did everything they could to keep the various intelligence
>> service and the domestic intelligence services from sharing information.
>> All
>> of these things played a huge part in what happened on 9-11 and the crappy
>> intelligence was what we based the decision on to go in and finish the
>gulf
>> war that Sadaam started. Had we accurate intelligence, I'll bet things
>would
>> have been handled much differently. You may not agree with this and that's
>> OK. I'm not going to flog it anymore or Kim's gonna get pissed off at
me
>> and
>> I might die.
>>
>> I've said my piece here. If you want to discuss this off the group it's
>> animix@animas.net.
>>
>> Regards,
>>
>> Deej
>>
>>
>> "Deej" <animix@animass.netttt> wrote:
>> >
>> >"Uptown Jimmy" <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
>> >>Man.
>> >>
>> >>I'm sorry, DJ. You've been good to me, and I don't mean to offend you,
>> but
>> >I
>> >>don't quite understand what you're trying to say.

>> >>
>> >>Not that I don't pay attention to things, usually....
>> >>
>> >>I just think people ought to have to take responsibility for their own
>> >>actions.
>> >>
>> >>And I don't recall Slick Willy invading Iraq.
>> >>
>> >>Guess I'm just ignernt.
>> >>
>> >>Jimmy
>> >>
>> >>
>> >>"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
>> >>news:45109ebf@linux...
>> >>> No. I think the situation in Iraq, as it stands right now, is a result
>> >of
>> >>> the left undercutting the administration at every turn and thereby
>giving
>> >>> aid and encouragement to our enemies who, when they see the country
so
>> >>> divided, can take it to the bank that the left will do their fair
>share
>> >to
>> >>> defeat our efforts. I'm just blaming the intelligence deficit and
the
>> >lack
>> >>> of leadership that led to the UN sanctions being undercut at every
>turn
>> >on
>> >>> Clinton, otherwise the war that started in 1991, would not still be
>> >>> happening. Thius is a war that never stopped. It could have if Clinton
>> >>would
>> >>> have had his eye on the ball and exercised some of the great
>> >>*international
>> >>> leadership* that his supporters fantisize so much about.....but
he
>> >>> didn't. He allowed the sanctions to be undercut by *our allies*.
>> >>>
>> >>>
>> >>>
>> >>>
>> >>> "Uptown Jimmy" <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
>> >>> news:45108022@linux...
>> >>> > So...you're blaming the situation in Iraq on Bill Clinton? Is that
>> >>right?
>> >>> >
>> >>> > Cuz that seems absurd to me.

>> >>> >
>> >>> > Just sayin'.
>> >>> >
>> >>> > Jimmy
>> >>> >
>> >>> >
>> >>> > "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
>> >>> > news:4510721c@linux...
>> >>> > > >But again, merely pointing fingers backwards
>> >>> > > >in no way excuses the mistakes and failures of the current
>> >>government.
>> >>> > >
>> >>> > > Our situation is directly related to the fact that our leaders
>based
>> >>> their
>> >>> > > decisions on disinformation that was a result of the policies
of
>> the
>> >>> > Clinton
>> >>> > > administration. I'm not pointing the finger backwards for any
>other
>> >>> reason
>> >>> > > than I feel it is important to keep this in mind lest we elect
the
>> >>same
>> >>> > > misguided souls with the same naieve and misguided foriegn policy
>> >>ideas
>> >>> to
>> >>> > > office once again and end up in an even bigger mess.....and
>> >>> > yes.....it
>> >>> > > could be much bigger if the liberals take control of the national
>> >>> > > legislature.....much less, god forbid, having another Clinton
in
>> >the
>> >>> > white
>> >>> > > House.
>> >>> > >
>> >>> > >
>> >>> > > "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
>> >>news:451035a7@linux...
>> >>> > > >
>> >>> > > > For most of the Clinton years the balance of power was divided
>> >>between
>> >>> > > > both parties. Again, there is plenty of finger pointing to go
>> >>around.
>> >>> > > > It's easy enough in hindsight to criticize the previous
>> >>administration
>> >>> > > > on a number of counts.

>> >>> > > >
>> >>> > > > And in retrospect, those dems made a mistake trusting Bush with
>> >that
>> >>> > > > vote. OTOH, it was a moment of unity.
>> >>> > > >
>> >>> > > > Flash forward. Today all branches of national government are
>> >>> controlled
>> >>> > > > by one party. It doesn't bother me if you want to point blame
at
>> >>some
>> >>> of
>> >>> > > > the policies under Clinton. But again, merely pointing fingers
>> >>> backwards
>> >>> > > > in no way excuses the mistakes and failures of the current
>> >>government.
>> >>> > > >
>> >>> > > > They walked in stating in clear terms that they felt the
>previous
>> >>> > > > government was wrong about almost everything, and then fell
flat
>> >>> > > > overall, domestically and internationally.
>> >>> > > >
>> >>> > > > Looking at both governments, we can do better. We must do
>better.
>> >>> > > > At some point, and we're coming up on six years, the buck stops
>> >>with
>> >>> > > > those in charge now.
>> >>> > > >
>> >>> > > > Cheers,
>> >>> > > > -Jamie
>> >>> > > > http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>> >>> > > >
>> >>> > > >
>> >>> > > >
>> >>> > > > DJ wrote:
>> >>> > > > > The dems you mentioned authorized the military attack on Iraq
>> >>as a
>> >>> > last
>> >>> > > > > resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done
as
>> >>such.
>> >>> > > > >
>> >>> > > > > How convenient for them when it was the intelligence service
>> >>that
>> >>> they
>> >>> > > > > created over 8 years of hard work that they now attempt to
>slag
>> >>and

>> >>> > > blame
>> >>> > > > > for their decisdions so they can vote for the war before they
>> >vote
>> >>> > > against
>> >>> > > > > it.
>> >>> > > > >
>> >>> > > > > "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
>> >>> > news:450f8aec@linux...
>> >>> > > > >> There is plenty of finger pointing to go around. No doubt
>> >>specific
>> >>> > > > >> things could have been handled better under the previous
>> >>> government.
>> >>> > > > >>
>> >>> > > > >> The transition of power between the previous and current
>> >>> governments
>> >>> > > was
>> >>> > > > >> pretty rocky, and a "not invented here" syndrome may have
>doomed
>> >>> the
>> >>> > > > >> hand-off of some al-Qaida related work that was in progress.
>> >>> > > > >>
>> >>> > > > >> In any case, no government gets a pass by blaming the
>previous
>> >>> > > > >> government. The current government, for example, failed to
>follow
>> >>> > > > >> through and prioritize the al-Qaida threat ahead of 9/11
and
>> >>failed
>> >>> > to
>> >>> > > > >> prevent 9/11; failed to find and capture Bin Laden in
>> >>Afghanistan;
>> >>> > > > >> failed to overcome Taliban control of large areas of
>Afghanistan;
>> >>> > > > >> allowed record drug production to reestablish itself there;
>> >>failed
>> >>> to
>> >>> > > > >> plan for post Iraq invasion problems predicted by their own
>> state
>> >>> > > > >> department; and they have continually exploited the "war
on
>> >>> > terrorism"
>> >>> > > > >> for domestic political ends.
>> >>> > > > >>
>> >>> > > > >> You assert the WMDs were there. However Bush's chief
>inspector,
>> >>and
>> >>> > > Bush
>> >>> > > > >> himself, say they weren't there after all. It was a bluff.

>One
>> >of
>> >>> the
>> >>> > > > >> Iraqi expatriate promoters of the bluff got the ear of our
>> >>> > government,
>> >>> > > > >> was believed, and, last I heard, had parlayed it into a
>position
>> >>of
>> >>> > > > >> power in Iraq after the invasion.
>> >>> > > > >>
>> >>> > > > >> The dems you mentioned authorized the military attack on
Iraq
>> >as
>> >>a
>> >>> > last
>> >>> > > > >> resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done
as
>> >>such.
>> >>> > > > >>
>> >>> > > > >> Preemptive invasion is new as part of the "Bush (Jr.)
>Doctrine."
>> >>> > > > >>
>> >>> > > > >> Cheers,
>> >>> > > > >> -Jamie
>> >>> > > > >> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>> >>> > > > >>
>> >>> > > > >>
>> >>> > > > >> DJ wrote:
>> >>> > > > >>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
>> >>> > > news:450f3862@linux...
>> >>> > > > >>>> Neither, actually. And what we ought to do would depend
on
>> >>the
>> >>> > nature
>> >>> > > > > of
>> >>> > > > >>>> the threat.
>> >>> > > > >>> Agreed.
>> >>> > > > >>>
>> >>> > > > >>>> We might want to start with recommendations published in
>1999,
>> >>> well
>> >>> > > > >>>> before the 9/11 attack.
>> >>> > > > >>>
>> >>> > > > >>>
> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Commission_on_Terroris m
>> >>> > > > >>>
>> >>> > > > >>>> We can disagree about whether our current policy is one
of

>> >>> > > overreacting
>> >>> > > > >>>> or not. We can probably really disagree about the newly
>minted
>> >>> > > > >>>> preemptive attack policy. :^)
>> >>> > > > >>> I don't think there is any newly minted attack policy. There
>> >has
>> >>> > > always
>> >>> > > > > been
>> >>> > > > >>> the *clear and present danger* perogative but it needs to
be
>> >>based
>> >>> > > on
>> >>> > > > >>> accurate intelligence. Had this been available, then I doubt
>> >>that
>> >>> > > Bush,
>> >>> > > > >>> Kerry, Kennedy Pelosi and the rest would have authorized
the
>> >>> > invasion
>> >>> > > > of
>> >>> > > > >>> Iraq, or perhaps they would have been able to find the WMD's
>> >>> before
>> >>> > > > they
>> >>> > > > >>> were shipped out of the country or hidden. I just find it
>hard
>> >>to
>> >>> > > > > stomach
>> >>> > > > >>> the hypocracy of the democrats whose policies neutered our
>> >>> > > > intelligence
>> >>> > > > >>> services in the '90's when they trun around and blame Bush
>> for
>> >>the
>> >>> > > > > decisions
>> >>> > > > >>> made based on the intellegence blunders they created in
the
>> >>first
>> >>> > > place.
>> >>> > > > >>>
>> >>> > > > >>> Regards,
>> >>> > > > >>>
>> >>> > > > >>> Deej
>> >>> > > > >>>
>> >>> > > > >>>
>> >>> > > > >>>> Cheers,
>> >>> > > > >>>> -Jamie
>> >>> > > > >>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>> >>> > > > >>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>> DJ wrote:

>> >>> > > > >>>>> I don't see us overreacting Jamie. However, if there is
>> >>> indication
>> >>> > > of
>> >>> > > > >>> some
>> >>> > > > >>>>> sort of major threat, do we run and tell the NY times
or
>> do
>> >we
>> >>> > blow
>> >>> > > > > the
>> >>> > > > >>>>> threat away before it pays us a visit?
>> >>> > > > >>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
>> >>> > > > > news:450f0b12@linux...
>> >>> > > > >>>>>> Of course they came out with a blustery ultimatum. That's
>> >not
>> >>> > news,
>> >>> > > > >>> it's
>> >>> > > > >>>>>> an old pattern. It works for them to sit back and suggest
>> >>that
>> >>> > > others
>> >>> > > > >>> do
>> >>> > > > >>>>>> something via terror-grams such as this. If it makes
you
>> >>afraid
>> >>> > as
>> >>> > > > >>> well,
>> >>> > > > >>>>>> my guess is they would see that as a bonus.
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>> By goading the USA into overreacting it helps them grow,
>> >>raise
>> >>> > > money
>> >>> > > > >>> and
>> >>> > > > >>>>>> convince others to actually see us as evil and act
>> >>accordingly.
>> >>> > It
>> >>> > > > >>>>>> works, we keep falling for it. OTOH, for those here with
>> >a
>> >>> > declared
>> >>> > > > >>>>>> interest in emptying the US treasury, it's likewise
>> >>beneficial
>> >>> to
>> >>> > > > > have
>> >>> > > > >>>>>> the specter of an enemy out there. Fear sells.
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>> We have yet to actually declare war on anyone in this
>whole

>> >>> mess.
>> >>> > > How
>> >>> > > > >>> do
>> >>> > > > >>>>>> you declare war on a tactic?
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>> Forced conversion and head taxes would go over like a
>lead
>> >>> > balloon
>> >>> > > in
>> >>> > > > >>>>>> the USA. Not gonna happen. We're far more sectarian than,
>> >>say,
>> >>> > > Iraq.
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>> Responsible leadership is needed in the world to calm
>> >>extremist
>> >>> > > > >>>>>> tendencies on all sides and help rational people who
are
>> >>trying
>> >>> > > to
>> >>> > > > > > get
>> >>> > > > >>>>>> by in worsening times. At the same time we need to be,
>and
>> >>are
>> >>> > > > >>>>>> attempting to be, vigilant against any self righteous
>group
>> >>> with
>> >>> > > > >>>>>> fantasies of violence in the USA.
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>> Any rush to some sort of "holy war" is irrational. There
>> >is
>> >>> > nothing
>> >>> > > > >>> holy
>> >>> > > > >>>>>> about war.
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>> Cheers,
>> >>> > > > >>>>>> -Jamie
>> >>> > > > >>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>> DJ wrote:
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>> I haven't seen us react with
>irrationality.....yet.
>> >>> Al
>> >>> > > > > Quaeda
>> >>> > > > >>>>> just
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>> came out with an ultimatim stating that it's full on
war

>> >now
>> >>> and
>> >>> > > the
>> >>> > > > >>>>> west
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>> will be destroyed. The only way to save ourselves is
to
>> >>> convert
>> >>> > to
>> >>> > > > > >>>>> Islam. So
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>> where to you draw the line between irrationality and
>self
>> >>> > defense?
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
>> >>> > > > >>> news:450ee7ef@linux...
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>> Let's keep from reacting to irrationality with
>> >>irrationality
>> >>> of
>> >>> > > our
>> >>> > > > > >>>>> own.
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>> There's a lot of fear mongering. Chicken Little is
>back.
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>> Cheers,
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>> -Jamie
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>> DJ wrote:
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>> It doesn't matter at all whether this was the Pope.
>The
>> >>> bottom
>> >>> > > > > > line
>> >>> > > > > >>> is
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>> that
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>> it is rationality as opposed to irrationality.
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
>> >>> > > > > >>>>> news:450ec970@linux...
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> The Catholic church doesn't speak for Christianity.
>> >>> Certainly
>> >>> > > not
>> >>> > > > > >>> for
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> Lutherans, and for good reason.
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> A Pope criticizing other religions (even other
>Christian

>> >>> > sects,
>> >>> > > > >>> even
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> other Catholics) is nothing new. Certainly much
>harsher
>> >>> > things
>> >>> > > > > > have
>> >>> > > > > >>>>>>> been
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> said about Islam by some (not all) extreme
>fundamentalist
>> >>> > > > > >>> Christians.
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> And certainly much harsher things have been said
by
>> >>certain
>> >>> > > > > >>> extremist
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> Islamists about Christianity. The more extremist
of
>> both
>> >>> > camps
>> >>> > > > > > seem
>> >>> > > > > >>>>> to
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> be spoiling to relive the crusades. With some of
the
>> >more
>> >>> > power
>> >>> > > > > >>>>> hungry
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> ready to endanger civilization by attempting to
>incite
>> >>> > > religious
>> >>> > > > > >>> wars
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> for their own questionable ends.
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> It's a vast generalization to say the "the left"
or
>> >>> > > "secularists"
>> >>> > > > > > >>> or
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> even "Christians" are demanding an apology from the
>> Pope.
>> >>I
>> >>> > > think
>> >>> > > > > > > a
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> whole lot of people think the Pope can say whatever
>> he
>> >>> wants.
>> >>> > > It
>> >>> > > > > > >>>>> doesn't
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> matter to most non-Catholics in the USA and in
>reality,
>> >>> Papal

>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> declarations are ignored by a fair number of
>Catholics
>> >>> here,
>> >>> > > too.
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> Obviously some Moslems are upset in some places,
but
>> >how
>> >>> deep
>> >>> > > > > > does
>> >>> > > > > >>>>> that
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> go? When black churches were burning in the USA,
it
>> would
>> >>> > have
>> >>> > > > > > been
>> >>> > > > > >>>>> an
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> exaggeration to blame everyone in the USA for that.
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church
>which
>> >>> only
>> >>> > > very
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo.
>The
>> >>> church
>> >>> > > > > > hung
>> >>> > > > > >>> on
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view
of
>> >the
>> >>> > > > > > universe
>> >>> > > > > >>>>>>> while
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, which
>> >>> > describes
>> >>> > > > > > the
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> actual way the solar system works.
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> It also extends to a few Christian sects who, feeling
>> >>> > similarly
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> insecure, tenaciously cling to the notion that the
>earth
>> >>is
>> >>> > > only
>> >>> > > > > > about
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> 6,000 years old, by virtue of the biblical
>> >>interpretations
>> >>> > and
>> >>> > > > > >>> clever

>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> (at the time) calculations of an Irish Bishop several
>> >>> > centuries
>> >>> > > > > >>> ago,
>> >>> > > > > >>>>>>> and
>> >>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> in the face of solid current scientific evidence
to
>> the
>> >>> > > contrary.
>> >>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some (not all)
>Christian
>> >>> > churches
>> >>> > > > > >>> who,
>> >>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and
>> >>> ever-mounting
>> >>> > > > > >>> evidence
>> >>> > > > > >>>>>>> of
>> >>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> evolution, responding with dogma in psuedo-scientific
>> >>> > clothing,
>> >>> > > > > > and
>> >>> > > > > >>>>> who
>> >>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> seek to water down scientific education in the USA.
>> >>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to power hungry industries
>> >who
>> >>> pay
>> >>> > > big
>> >>> > > > > >>>>> bucks
>> >>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> to spread denial about global warming for short term
>> >>gain.
>> >>> > Who
>> >>> > > > > > push
>> >>> > > > > >>>>> to
>> >>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> control oil in the middle east with force. With our
>> guns
>> >>> > > blazing,
>> >>> > > > > >>> our
>> >>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically.
>And
>> >>who
>> >>> > > > > >>> sometimes
>> >>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> hide behind Christianity to do so.
>> >>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > > >>>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives
>> who
>> >>> find
>> >>> > > ways
>> >>> > > > > >>> to

>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> pretend that everyone is aligning against
>Christianity.
>> >>And
>> >>> > in
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>> spreading
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to
>keep
>> >>them
>> >>> > in
>> >>> > > > >>> power.
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> And in so pandering, help to continue the denial
of
>> >>reason
>> >>> > and
>> >>> > > > > the
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>> focus
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> on the use of force.
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and
>> >>declare
>> >>> > > > >>> victory.
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>> ;^)
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> Have a great week!
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>> DC wrote:
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> I thought this was worth reading if any of you are
>> >>> > interested.
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Have a great Monday!
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> ----------
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> The Unholy Alliance Rolls Over the Pope
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> By Andrew Walden
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> In what has suddenly been made into a highly
>> >>controversial
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> speech, the day after September 11, at Bavaria's
>> >>> University
>> >>> > of
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Regensberg, Pope Benedict describes Christian belief
>> >in

>> >>a
>> >>> > God
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> whose words and acts are bound by reason, truth
and
>> >the
>> >>> law
>> >>> > of
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> non-contradiction. Benedict contrasts this with
>Islamic
>> >>> > > belief
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> in a God not bound by anything-including his own
>words.
>> >>> > > > > Benedict
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> further contrasts Christian belief with that of
>secular
>> >>> > > > > humanists
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> who see reason as being completely unbound of God.
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> In response, both Islamists and secularists have
>> >>demanded
>> >>> > the
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Pope apologize. Benedict's speech is a work of
>> >>enlightened
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> genius. He has clearly laid out the differences
>between
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis
>> >of
>> >>the
>> >>> > > clash
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> of civilizations we now experience as the War on
>Terror.
>> >>> His
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> analysis also explains the underlying cause of the
>> >>> alliance
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> between the western Left and the Islamofascist
>Right.
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the
>speech.
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine
>Emperor
>> >>> > > Manuel
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> II: "Show me just what Mohammed brought that was
>new,
>> >>and
>> >>> > > there
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> you will find things only evil and inhuman, such
as

>> >his
>> >>> > > command
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> to spread by the sword the faith he preached."
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Four days later, according to AP: "Pakistan's
>> >>legislature
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's
>> top
>> >>> > Shiite
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the
>ruling
>> >>> party
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and
>accused
>> >>> him
>> >>> > of
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> reviving the mentality of the Crusades.
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "Across the Islamic world Friday, Benedict's remarks
>> >on
>> >>> > Islam
>> >>> > > > > > and
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent
of
>> >rage
>> >>> > that
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> many fear could burst into violent protests like
>those
>> >>> that
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> followed publication of caricatures of the Prophet
>> >>> > Muhammad."
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Reuters quoted other sources expressing fears for
>the
>> >>> Pope's
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> The Islamist reaction proves Manuel II's
>600-year-old
>> >>> point.
>> >>> > > > > > The
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> reaction is not one of anger but a calculated
>attempt
>> >>to
>> >>> > force
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> the Pope to parrot the PC line on Islam. Since Islam
>> >>need
>> >>> > not

>> >>> > > be
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> internally consistent and it is not bound by reason,
>> >>it's
>> >>> > only
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> objective can be to assert the power of a God who
is
>> >so
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> transcendent that He is not bound by anything. If
>man
>> >is
>> >>> > > created
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> in God's image then by extension Islamic man is
not
>> >>bound
>> >>> by
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> anything. (This explains the predilection on the
>part
>> >>of
>> >>> > some
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Muslims to lie.) Islamists are not responding to
any
>> >>> > 'offense'
>> >>> > > > > to
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> their non-existent morality. They are asserting
the
>> >>only
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> 'morality' they have-the will to power.
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "Will to Power" is a key element of Nietzsche 's
>> >>> > > > > philosophy-hence
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> the root of the term, Islamofascist. Moreover the
>> >>Western
>> >>> > > "Left'
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist
>> >>> thought
>> >>> > > > > than
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> by Marxist thought-hence the alliance between the
>> >>Western
>> >>> > > "Left"
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> and the Islamofascist 'Right.'
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing
>precisely
>> >>> what
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Manuel II said they would: "Syed Ahmed Bukhari,
the
>> >>chief
>> >>> > > cleric

>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest
>> >>> mosque,
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> extolled Muslims to 'respond in a manner which
>forces
>> >>the
>> >>> > Pope
>> >>> > > > > to
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> apologize.'" Note they intend to use "force" not
>> >>reason.
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out
the
>> >Pope
>> >>> > was,
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "calling a spade a spade".
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> The secularist mouthpiece, New York
>Times,editorializes,
>> >>> > "Pope
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Benedict XVI has insulted Muslims.." This is false.
>> >>The
>> >>> > Pope
>> >>> > > > 's
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> description of the Islamic God as being unbound
by
>> >>reason
>> >>> is
>> >>> > > not
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What
>> >>> Muslims
>> >>> > > and
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> secularists fear is the Pope's decision to choose
to
>> >>enter
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity.
How
>> >dare
>> >>> he
>> >>> > > not
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "apologize" for being a Christian? That is the
>> >>so-called
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "insult."
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> One might "reasonably" ask when will Muslims
>"apologize"
>> >>> for
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to
>the

>> >>> point
>> >>> > is
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> lost on them.
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Amazingly the Times continues: "Muslim leaders the
>> world
>> >>> > over
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> have demanded apologies. For many Muslims, holy
war
>> >-
>> >>> > jihad -
>> >>> > > is
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> a spiritual struggle, and not a call to violence."
>>
>> >In
>> >>> > saying
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists
>> >are
>> >>> > waging
>> >>> > > a
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension
>> >>against
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Christianity-and they explicitly endorse and join
>this
>> >>> > jihad.
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> The Times is saying to Islamists, 'we can join your
>> >>> > 'spiritual
>> >>> > > '
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> jihad, but not your violent jihad.
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> The Times editors are living in a fool's paradise.
>>
>> >The
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "spiritual" non-violent jihad of propaganda is
>merely
>> >>the
>> >>> > flip
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more
>clear
>> >>> than
>> >>> > in
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> the Islamist reaction to the Pope.
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November
>> >the
>> >>> > > > > Islamists
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons
>> >and

>> >>> > > demand
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> to hear from the Pope himself. This would place
>raging
>> >>> mobs
>> >>> > > of
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of
>forcing
>> >>> the
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> leader of Christendom to bow before them.
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> In this demand for submission they are joined by
the
>> >>> > > secularist
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times
>> >>> > > > > editorializes:
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> "He needs to offer a deep and persuasive apology."
>>
>> >The
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> secularists too seek the Pope's submission. Like
>the
>> >>> > > Islamists,
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> the secularists are driven only by their will to
>power.
>> >>> > While
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> the Islamists represent their demented version of
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> God--unrestrained by reason, the secularists
>represent
>> >>> their
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> demented version of reason--unrestrained by God.
>They
>> >>are
>> >>> > > > > united
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> by their self-worshipping world view.
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> It should be noted that the carefully staged "anger'
>> >>from
>> >>> > the
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islamic world does not condemn Benedict's
>> >>characterization
>> >>> > of
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islam as a religion where God's "will is not bound
>> up
>> >>with
>> >>> > any
>> >>> > > > > of
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> our categories, even that of rationality...(The
>Islamic)
>> >>> God

>> >>> > > is
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> not bound even by his own word.." This is not seen
>> >as
>> >>an
>> >>> > > > > insult.
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islam embraces this description. In offering this
>> >>> > description
>> >>> > > > > of
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islam, Benedict refers to the views of leading
>modern
>> >>> French
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Islamist R. Arnaldez as discussed in the writings
of
>> >>> > Professor
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Theodore Khoury of Munster.
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Likewise the secularists express no dismay at the
>pope's
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> characterization of a secularist as: "(A) subject
>> (who)
>> >>> > then
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he
>> >>> considers
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> tenable in matters of religion, and the subjective
>> >>> > 'conscience
>> >>> > > '
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> becomes the sole arbiter of what is ethical."
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Benedict asserts that without reason, or without
>God,
>> >>> there
>> >>> > > can
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> be no modern system of morality. He explains, "In
>> this
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> way.ethics and religion lose their power to create
>> a
>> >>> > community
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> and become (instead) a completely personal matter."
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Both Islamist and secularist seek to break God and
>> >>>reason
>> >>> > > apart.
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Each claims superiority over the Christian West.
>They
>> >>> > believe
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> absolute moral license makes them powerful. As
>> >>> > globalization
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> carries the Western tradition of reason throughout

>> the
>> >>> > world,
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> both are in decline.
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist
and
>> >>> > secularist
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> will meet in combat, just as Hitler's fascists broke
>> >>their
>> >>> > > pact
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after
>> >the
>> >>> > > collapse
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> of the allied forces on the western front.
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear
>> >is
>> >>> > having
>> >>> > > to
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> reply to the Pope's key point, borrowed from the
>> >>Byzantine
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Emperor: "'Not to act reasonably, not to act with
>> logos
>> >>> > (word
>> >>> > > > > > or
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> reason) is contrary to the nature of God,'.. It
is
>> >to
>> >>> this
>> >>> > > > > great
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite
our
>> >>> > partners
>> >>> > > in
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> the dialogue of cultures."
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>> Their fear of reason can only lead the world to
>> >>disaster.
>> >>> > > > >>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>> > > > >>>
>> >>> > > > > >
>> >>> > > > > >
>> >>> > > >
>> >>> > > >
>> >>> > >
>> >>> > >
>> >>>
>> >>>

>> >>
>> >>
>> >
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: An interesting paradox - Islam and the Pope
Posted by animix on Thu, 21 Sep 2006 14:57:08 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

> PS: You forgot my "H" dude. Let's try to be more careful.

see????.....I just can't do anything right. Ask my wife.

;o)

"Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote in message news:4512092e@linux...
> Hey, whaddya talkin' about, DJ . . . I put up with you all the time. I
even
> put up with DC and he's crazier than a fruit bat on mushrooms. :)
>
> S
>
> PS: You forgot my "H" dude. Let's try to be more careful.
>
> "DJ" <notachance@net.net> wrote in message news:45114087$1@linux...
> >> Hehe. It's not me dude. I don't mind at all. :o)
> >>
> >> It's just that I know many others do...
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > Ahhh, c'mon Kim. Even Sara puts up with me sometimes.
> > >
> > > ;o)
> > >
> > > "Kim" <hiddensounds@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:45111450$1@linux...
> >>
> >> "Deej" <animixx@animass.net> wrote:
> >> >I'm not going to flog it anymore or Kim's gonna get pissed off at me
> >> >and
> >> >I might die.
> >>
> >> Hehe. It's not me dude. I don't mind at all. :o)

> >>
> >> It's just that I know many others do...
> >>
> >> Personally I'm just wishing I wasn't moderator, because then I'd join
> > in...
> >>
> >> ...not that I've ever deleted a post, except one, but you know what I
> > mean.
> >> ;o)
> >>
> >> Cheers,
> >> Kim.
> >
> >
>
>