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

Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Tue, 11 Jan 2011 09:58:55 GMT

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

Starbuzz wrote on Tue, 11 January 2011 05:23CarrierII wrote on Sun, 09 January 2011 14:45I'd call attempting to codify beliefs as laws "obnoxious", thus my statement is intact.

Not so fast; you have yet to say what the atheists ("lack thereof") have done that is as comparable to the theists "attempting to codify beliefs as laws" and how it amounts to being "obnoxious."

Till you show that, your statement is atleast only partially correct, i.e, IF the "lack thereof" is stripped out. Go on...

From the perspective of those who hold faith, atheists attempting to enforce secularism is, I'm sure, obnoxious.

Starbuzz

CarrierII wrote on Mon, 10 January 2011 11:37

To forcibly tell others that your God, or lack thereof, is right (and by implication, that their's, if they have a God, is wrong) is obnoxious.

Please don't mention "your god, or lack thereof" in the same line because it doesn't make any sense. The atheist reason is the same. The theists are not; there are plenty of religions all claiming they got the bullseye. I understand you wrote "your God."

Does it help if I phrase it as "Your God, or insistance upon a lack thereof,"?

Starbuzz

Besides, theists are the ones that "tell that they are right." Atheists "tell how they are right and give ample reason to back it up to irrefutable levels." This thread is a good example.

"Without faith, I [God] am nothing" - and I'm not even a thiest.

Starbuzz

You shouldn't mention both in the same line considering theists have the lionshare of explaining to do. Besides, your statement seems to wrongly show atheism as another "belief system" that is competing with the actual belief systems. This is not the case.

Re-read it with my alternative phrasing proposed above, does that help?

Starbuzz

Starbuzz wrote on Sat, 08 January 2011 16:42Discussing a issue in a heated exchange is the least of a problem when one side wants to codify their views as laws with everyone obligated to obey them. Now THAT, is a real problem (re: voter guide). Read what you are saying...so which

side is being obnoxious? Your statement falls apart as we are always willing to make compromises IF it is fair and just to everyone; those of faith find this unfulfilling.

I did say, "which side is being obnoxious?" since it is only the dogmatic theists that go to such lengths to codify their beliefs as law (re: voter guide). They have done this and gotten away with this for centuries. So now finally, atheists having the power to openly challenge them DOES NOT equal atheists being obnoxious as well. But this is what your original statement stupidly implied.

Only the "dogmatic theists"? I note that many countries encode secularism as law... if only to keep the theists from arguing.

I should indicate that I am not in favour of "Don't ask, don't tell", or any other idiotic law that undermines equality in a diverse society.

Starbuzz

Here's a breakdown of your original quote:

Quote:Being obnoxious about your faith, or lack thereof, is the real cause of problems relating to faith, or lack thereof.

First off, when I read this a day ago, I seriously thought you have had a brainfade. Anyway:

There are 2 groups, 1 description and 1 "result" in your statement:

- faith - group 1
- lack thereof - group 2
- obnoxious - 1 description
- "real cause of problems" - 1 result

Here's an analogy (within the framework of your statement):

- invading army - group 1
- defending army - group 2
- barbarians - 1 description
- "fighting off the invasion" - 1 result

Here's an accurate matchup (obviously, your statement has to be entirely rewritten if this were to make sense) but the elements are the same for this mental exercise:

faith = invading army.
lack thereof = defending army
obnoxious = barbarians
"real cause of problems" = "fighting off the invasion"

Steady on - Permit me to clarify: I've nothing against holding faith in private, or in the company of others of the same faith. I've everything against using your faith as a reason to do evil.

This goes for athiests as well - if you're preaching tolerance, prevent only evil, not the holding of faith for its own sake.

Does that help?

Stuff you wrote because I wasn't clear

Starbuzz

And so your original statement, in light of this analogy, illogically says that:

-the mere act of defending from an invading army makes both sides barbarians.

-the mere act of "defending" is the real cause of problems as opposed to the invasion itself.

Even without the analogy to illustrate it; your statement still spouts the same fallacy:

-the act of attempting to curb intrusive theists makes both sides obnoxious(?)

-the mere act of atheists attempting to curb such illegal intrusion of the theists is the real cause of the problem.(seriously?)

What a fucked up hypothesis! It's screwed up because this is what theists are actually trying to do:

-attempt to worm their way into centres of power to gain influence

-attempting to make laws in their own favour so as to subjugate those who disgaree with their beliefs. (Good examples are laws regarding homosexuality and suicide clinics).

Since the actions of atheists are not vile and abhorrent as what the theists are trying to do, "lack thereof" can be stripped away from the statement. Why? Take a good look at this thread: theists say homosexuals should be kept locked up because their dogma states so. If this is not obnoxious, I don't know what it. However, the atheist responses in this thread cannot be compared to the theists because we are not telling them how to live; but refuting their extraordinary unjust bullshit. We can tell how wrong they are and have given them the irrefutable reasons; they have thrown up their hands in the air and claimed that they are still right. Both sides are not equal; one obvious side has merit and good intentions going for it.

Matching Conclusions:

-The invasion is the REAL cause of the problem; defending is not the real problem (your hypothesis states the opposite).

-i.e, the intrusion of church into the state is the REAL cause of the problem; the atheist attempt to eliminate this intrusion is not (and doesn't make them obnoxious in the least).

-Those of faith are the invading army as they are the ones doing everything they can to turn the law to favour themselves

-The atheist response to stop this trend makes them the defending army and rightly so.

-Those of faith are the obnoxious shits that have crept into government over a period of many decades enjoying great powers of influence.
-"Lack thereof" are the non-obnoxious ones that are attempting to remove such unjust and illegal "occupation" of the state by the church.

The invasion is the REAL cause of the problem just as the voter guide (which represents church intrusion into government) is the real cause of problem. So the atheist reaction to that is NOT the "real cause of problems" and nor can it be described as obnoxious. The theist bitches were simply asking for it when they tried to shove their crap as law. It makes them obnoxious and our side the justified counter-attackers in defense of those who would otherwise suffer under the theists' dogmatically influenced laws.

This bit is interesting, emphasis added:

Starbuzzz

So in conclusion, adding the "lack thereof" in your original statement makes your hypothesis partially wrong (due to "lack thereof" being present) while removing "lack thereof" makes it fully correct. It is those of faith that cause problems by attempting to subjugate others while those of no faith fight the injustice of the intrusive actions of the faithful. Both actions are not equal; one side is justified in their actions; the other side is SOL steaming out of excuses while at the same time, they overstep their boundaries and have greatly affected the peace-of-mind of individuals that want no part in their dogma.

Apparently, athiests have never attempted to subjugate anyone...

As mentioned, upholding equality is fine, that includes permitting people to hold faith. You are seem to be pushing for a complete removal of faith (from the world), because a few people use it as an excuse or reason to do evil.

Carrying on:

Starbuzzz

And so, here is your corrected statement:

Quote:Being obnoxious about your faith is the real cause of problems relating to faith.

Excellent. Makes perfect sense now, doesn't it? The faithful are not creating any problems by just existing and minding their own fucking business (example; Amish); but when they act obnoxious as the wing-nut fanatics (re: voter guide, "repent or burn in hell" billboards, homophobic laws), they create the problem (and fully deserve any shit that comes their way). And please, I think the atheist bus ads are lame as well but atleast you can either take or leave it as it is because nobody is threatened with hellfire if they reject it.

Some people find the lack of hellfire a scary idea. They won't be able to take it or leave it.

Starbuzzz

It's a win-win situation for atheists. Why?:

-We want a place where people of all differences can live side-by side.

-We will only fight theist influence where it does not belong; example, in government. (We will never try to codify laws that force anyone to share our mindset unlike the theists who without shame beg to have laws enacted banning people they despise from leading a good happy life.)

At the same time however, it is a lose-lose situation for theists: Why?

-They rarely favour a secular state; they want a theocracy with their beliefs codified as law and everyone obligated to obey them.

-They will do everything in their power (including the misuse of church resources as in the voter guide) to aid in their intrusion to control influence in government thru votes. Such is their insecurity.

So in conclusion, going back to your original statement:

Quote:Being obnoxious about your faith, or lack thereof, is the real cause of problems relating to faith, or lack thereof.

Your statement will only be correct if we live in a world where atheists are as wicked as theists are now (across all religions)...trying to influence government to favour themselves (note that removing the 10 commandments from a courthouse doesn't count as "taking over" as government property is taxpayer funded and hence, secular). If atheists try to cripple churches, force christians underground, for example, then yes, they are being obnoxious and your misinformed, misguided hypothesis will be true.

Atheists, are, at the end of the day, human beings. Some human beings are evil, and will try to do evil things. The venn diagram will overlap; I'm sure somewhere in the world right now, there is an atheistic Gov't advisor pushing an evil agenda.

Starbuzz

Altzan wrote on Sat, 08 January 2011 12:24CarrierII wrote on Sat, 08 January 2011

10:21Hypothesis: Being obnoxious about your faith, or lack thereof, is the real cause of problems relating to faith, or lack thereof.

Discuss.

Agreed wholeheartedly.

Altzan wrote on Mon, 10 January 2011 12:01CarrierII wrote on Mon, 10 January 2011 11:37To forcibly tell others that your God is right (and by implication, that their's, if they have a God, is wrong) is obnoxious.

That, or lack thereof, as you stated before.

Notice how this particularly vile excuse of a human being is way too eager to jump onto CarrierII's idiotic hypothesis? Anyone know why? Cos it feebly attempts to show atheism as yet another "belief system" that could be either right or wrong. Of course, this is obviously bullshit; but we can

trust such young indoctrinated fanatics to not know the difference.

And you have irrefutable proof of God's non-existence? Wow. The whole point of faith, is... well... faith.

Athiests believe there is no God. Unless you show me proof, I will continue to say so.

Another attempt at clarification: I was using obnoxious as a byword for "doing evil, making others change, or otherwise not being nice".
