
Subject: Firsts

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Wed, 07 May 2008 02:47:45 GMT

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

I'm looking forward to the time when society can finally advance because we have run out of "firsts". What are these firsts that I speak of? There are hundreds of them, here are just a couple that have been accomplished:

- * First free slaves "allowed" to own land
- * First black person "allowed" to vote
- * First woman "allowed" to vote

Here are a couple that have not:

- * First black man elected president
- * First woman elected president

Like I said there are many more. I think that as long as there are still things like this that have not been done and accepted, we will never evolve beyond the barbaric and narrow-minded race that we are. Think of how nice it will be, to have an election, where you simply debate the best person for the job, and the amount of pigmentation in their skin, nor their chromosomes are not even considered as a factor.

P.S. Yes I know that Obama is only "half black". It's sad that I had to make this statement just because I know that someone wants to nitpick what I said instead of actually thinking about it.

Subject: Re: Firsts

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Wed, 07 May 2008 14:46:35 GMT

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

I split my post out of the other thread since it is really a topic of it's own. For those that would argue that we are advancing as a civilization and a society, I offer this:

<http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,354327,00.html>

So there you have it. A teacher does a simple "magic trick", not much more complex than the "I've got your nose" trick that people do to little kids, and he gets accused of witchcraft and fired! What-the-fuck??? How can anyone think we are advancing as a society when we are still all but burning people at the stake for being witches, just like in the dark ages? LOL

Subject: Re: Firsts

Posted by [Cunin](#) on Wed, 07 May 2008 16:03:16 GMT

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

OMG

Subject: Re: Firsts
Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Wed, 07 May 2008 16:52:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

That's just a other reason why I should be world leader so I can end bullshit like that. :/

Subject: Re: Firsts
Posted by [The Executor](#) on Wed, 07 May 2008 16:58:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Cunin wrote on Wed, 07 May 2008 11:03OMG

In before Blazers thread is torn to shit and kicked around like his best friend being kicked around a gay bar.

Subject: Re: Firsts
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Wed, 07 May 2008 17:49:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Blazer wrote on Tue, 06 May 2008 21:47I'm looking forward to the time when society can finally advance because we have run out of "firsts". What are these firsts that I speak of? There are hundreds of them, here are just a couple that have been accomplished:

- * First free slaves "allowed" to own land
- * First black person "allowed" to vote
- * First woman "allowed" to vote

Here are a couple that have not:

- * First black man elected president
- * First woman elected president

Like I said there are many more. I think that as long as there are still things like this that have not been done and accepted, we will never evolve beyond the barbaric and narrow-minded race that we are. Think of how nice it will be, to have an election, where you simply debate the best person for the job, and the amount of pigmentation in their skin, nor their chromosomes are not even considered as a factor.

P.S. Yes I know that Obama is only "half black". It's sad that I had to make this statement just because I know that someone wants to nitpick what I said instead of actually thinking about it. the irony is that Obama's race and Hillary's gender never occurred to me, whereas they're very much in your criteria...

moot point since they won't count votes from a brit, although I have a funny feeling McCain's presidency won't be as a result of counting votes from Americans either

Subject: Re: Firsts
Posted by [renalpha](#) on Wed, 07 May 2008 17:52:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

lol after 2008 years and we still fuck it up
for example bush becoming president
black peoples votes getting denied.

Subject: Re: Firsts
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 07 May 2008 17:58:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Idiot, society has been around for a lot longer than 2008 years. It's been around since about the 10th millennium BC.

Subject: Re: Firsts
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Wed, 07 May 2008 18:07:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

How about a first non-religious President?

Subject: Re: Firsts
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Wed, 07 May 2008 18:16:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:where you simply debate the best person for the job, And it would be an even better world if there actually was a candidate thats good for the job...

Also, have you ever thought about watching beyond your own nose? Because it really makes me a bit sad that you talk about "society" when you really mean "USA".

Subject: Re: Firsts
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 07 May 2008 18:56:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Surth, he's not even American...

Subject: Re: Firsts
Posted by [Ethenal](#) on Wed, 07 May 2008 18:59:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

cheesesoda wrote on Wed, 07 May 2008 13:56: Surth, he's not even American...

It's a quote from Blazer, and he's definitely American.

Subject: Re: Firsts

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Wed, 07 May 2008 19:00:36 GMT

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

^

sorry for not including the quoter's name, I often forget it.

Subject: Re: Firsts

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 07 May 2008 19:35:51 GMT

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

Well, yes, Blazer is American, but I know renalpha was just talking about American politics, as well.

Subject: Re: Firsts

Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Wed, 07 May 2008 19:47:03 GMT

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

It'd be ignorant if you vote for a president only because of his or her color or gender.

I don't think we need a "first black president" or "first woman president" to be equal. The fact that blacks and women can be nominated is good enough on its own.

Subject: Re: Firsts

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Thu, 08 May 2008 01:11:15 GMT

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

Spoony wrote on Wed, 07 May 2008 10:49

the irony is that Obama's race and Hillary's gender never occurred to me, whereas they're very much in your criteria...

It's not criteria, it was just a list of things that have not happened. While you may not have noticed/considered/cared that Obama is "black", the media and most people say, or have heard someone else say, that his hypothetical presidency would be "the first black president".

I think the world will be a better place when we have moved past "the first **", and can think about more important aspects of whatever the issue at hand is.

Subject: Re: Firsts

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Thu, 08 May 2008 01:15:19 GMT

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

I think it'd be more in America's interest to allow non native-born Americans to become president.

Subject: Re: Firsts

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Thu, 08 May 2008 01:16:45 GMT

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

Surth wrote on Wed, 07 May 2008 11:16: Also, have you ever thought about watching beyond your own nose? Because it really makes me a bit sad that you talk about "society" when you really mean "USA".

I was talking about the WORLD in general. It sounds like you are the one not looking past your nose, since apparently you think that everything is perfect in Germany?

Being a citizen of the USA, I will be the first to acknowledge that there is some pretty fucked up shit in this country. Some countries do some things better, but there are also some that do a lot worse (try living in some of the places that literally stone you to death or cut off limbs for not following the rules).

As a *global* society, the humans of planet earth have a lot of growing to do before we could be considered to be "advanced". I honestly think that if an intelligent alien race were to study us, they would decide to come back in a few hundred years in hopes that we have evolved (socially, intellectually).

Subject: Re: Firsts

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Thu, 08 May 2008 01:18:02 GMT

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

nikki6ixx wrote on Wed, 07 May 2008 18:15: I think it'd be more in America's interest to allow non native-born Americans to become president.

Hey we let Schwarzenegger be a Govenor...LOL.

Subject: Re: Firsts

Posted by [Ryu](#) on Thu, 08 May 2008 01:53:38 GMT

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

Blazer wrote on Thu, 08 May 2008 02:18: nikki6ixx wrote on Wed, 07 May 2008 18:15: I think it'd be more in America's interest to allow non native-born Americans to become president.

Hey we let Schwarzenegger be a Govenor...LOL.

Talking of him he's in some advert on UK television for a California holiday thing.

I lol'd when I saw him.

Subject: Re: Firsts

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Thu, 08 May 2008 12:29:51 GMT

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

Blazer wrote on Wed, 07 May 2008 20:16 Surth wrote on Wed, 07 May 2008 11:16 Also, have you ever thought about watching beyond your own nose? Because it really makes me a bit sad that you talk about "society" when you really mean "USA".

I was talking about the WORLD in general. Quote:

* First black man elected president

* First woman elected president

No you werent.

Quote: It sounds like you are the one not looking past your nose, since apparently you think that everything is perfect in Germany? Good thing is that I never said that. So yeah, why dont you lie some more? Is there any chance that you think im angry too?

(Hi spoony ;P)

Subject: Re: Firsts

Posted by [Spoon](#) on Thu, 08 May 2008 14:11:31 GMT

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

Blazer wrote on Wed, 07 May 2008 20:16 I was talking about the WORLD in general. It sounds like you are the one not looking past your nose, since apparently you think that everything is perfect in Germany?

the world in general?

both Surth's country and mine have elected female heads of state (we're counting the Prime Minister as the head of state here, not the King/Queen, before anyone argues). and Thatcher, while she had plenty of faults, was better imho than Major, Blair and definitely Brown.

(although since Brown was never elected PM, it's perhaps a moot point to say that)

Blazer wrote on Wed, 07 May 2008 20:16 It's not criteria, it was just a list of things that have not

happened. While you may not have noticed/considered/cared that Obama is "black", the media and most people say, or have heard someone else say, that his hypothetical presidency would be "the first black president".

and like I said, I'm still waiting for the first atheist president. then maybe you truly can move forward

Subject: Re: Firsts

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 08 May 2008 18:27:50 GMT

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

I don't think faith is really that big of an issue in American politics. Disregarding the stupid accusations of Obama being a Muslim, faith doesn't come up a lot. It's just that in America you have a large majority of people claiming to be Christian. Even if they're not practicing, they seem to label themselves with a faith. It's hard to elect someone who doesn't claim to a Christian denomination to run for an office. I'm not denying that there would be a backlash towards someone openly claiming to be an atheist, but you have to blame the candidates, as well.

Subject: Re: Firsts

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Thu, 08 May 2008 19:25:27 GMT

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

Blazer wrote on Wed, 07 May 2008 16:46I split my post out of the other thread since it is really a topic of it's own. For those that would argue that we are advancing as a civilization and a society, I offer this:

<http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,354327,00.html>

So there you have it. A teacher does a simple "magic trick", not much more complex than the "I've got your nose" trick that people do to little kids, and he gets accused of witchcraft and fired! What-the-fuck??? How can anyone think we are advancing as a society when we are still all but burning people at the stake for being witches, just like in the dark ages? LOL

These things happen mainly due to the actions of the few people who have the power to influence in that particular situation.

And frankly I am not surprised at all. I hear about this everyday.

I am pretty sure the Board of teachers were made up of anti-magic Christian pukers who had nothing better to do than showcase their primordial beliefs by destroying the career of someone who is not in-line with their beliefs.

The thing is though, this happens both ways. If Atheists/Agnostics are in power, then they would use their power to influence events as well.

Consider the case where a student was suspended 2 days from school because he drew an

artwork depicting the fucking Bible verse John 3:16. You can watch that here:
<http://ca.youtube.com/watch?v=Huhds5EQoFk&feature=relate>

But that stupid kid deserved it and it was justified because that fucking verse pretty much indirectly tells everyone to "accept Jesus or perish in hell." That's the last thing I need to worry about in this world. And it is offensive.

So you see, it goes both ways. It all comes down to survival of the fittest. People from all beliefs are finding out the hard way that if you shut up, then you are asking to be kicked. That's why we hear about these incidents each day.

The question we must ask is which of these ideals is beneficial to the further development of mankind.

As for the whole theme of the topic, my views are not that different than Spooky's. Any half-brained creature can tell you that a few elitist fags are the ones running America at the cost of everyone else. I laugh at the patriots who STILL claim that the American government is "by the people, for the people." That era no longer exists.

cheesesoda wrote on Thu, 08 May 2008 13:27 I'm not denying that there would be a backlash towards someone openly claiming to be an atheist, but you have to blame the candidates, as well.

For what may I ask? For being Atheist? For being "evil"? For being "Anti-Christ"? For not representing the masses of narrow-minded religious freaks who don't see the fact that a bold, neutral, Atheist leader with an initiative would be more than capable of governing a divided population?

There will be a huge backlash by these religious bigots and the "rapture fanatics" will all claim that a hypothetical Atheist candidate is the Anti-Christ. Bible thumpers will go about the land spreading the "end times" fear into the population through the media just as they did when Israel undertook a combined-arms military assault against the Hezbollah in the summer of 2006.

Heck, EVEN Obama was accused of being the Anti-Christ in early 2007 when he announced his presidential campaign.

More than 200 years of Christian faith and the "love of Jesus" has not covered the evils of racism in America. And both of the races-in-question (whose main religion is Christianity) has to be blamed...Christians! Good job!

Subject: Re: Firsts

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 08 May 2008 19:30:25 GMT

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

Starbuzz For what may I ask? For being Atheist? For being "evil"? For being "Anti-Christ"? For not representing the masses of narrow-minded religious freaks who don't see the fact that a bold, neutral, Atheist leader with an initiative would be more than capable of governing a divided population?

There will be a huge backlash by these religious bigots and the "rapture fanatics" will all claim that a hypothetical Atheist candidate is the Anti-Christ. Bible thumpers will go about the land spreading the "end times" fear into the population through the media just as they did when Israel undertook a combined-arms military assault against the Hezbollah in the summer of 2006.

Heck, EVEN Obama was accused of being the Anti-Christ in early 2007 when he announced his presidential campaign.

More than 200 years of Christian faith and the "love of Jesus" has not covered the evils of racism in America. And both of the races-in-question (whose main religion is Christianity) has to be blamed...Christians! Good job!

Not the atheist candidates, you fuckwit. I'm talking about the non-practicing "Christian" candidates that align themselves with a faith that they aren't really a part of.

Subject: Re: Firsts

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Thu, 08 May 2008 19:33:22 GMT

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

Why don't you go back and reread your post, retard. Make up your mind.

Subject: Re: Firsts

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 08 May 2008 19:35:46 GMT

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

I thought it was pretty clear that I was talking about those that label themselves atheists. Though, I can see where the confusion is.

Regardless, I'm guessing a lot of why we don't elect atheists is because there is no such thing as an atheist candidate, as everybody clings to a faith (in name, anyway).

Subject: Re: Firsts

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Thu, 08 May 2008 19:45:59 GMT

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

FYI...

JFK was a Catholic, and is beloved by Americans, and respected by people around the globe.

Jimmy Carter is a Baptist, and is beloved by Americans, and respected by people around the globe.

Ronald Reagan was a Presbyterian, and is beloved by Americans, and respected by people around the globe.

Lyndon Baines Johnson was a Disciple of Christ, and save for the 'Vietnam' deal(not entirely his fault), he used his powers to help mend racial intolerance, and lessen the income-gap in America.

Yeah, those dudes were real intolerant, Bible-thumping assholes...

Subject: Re: Firsts

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Thu, 08 May 2008 19:55:18 GMT

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

nikki6ixx wrote on Thu, 08 May 2008 14:45FYI...

JFK was a Catholic, and is beloved by Americans, and respected by people around the globe.

Jimmy Carter is a Baptist, and is beloved by Americans, and respected by people around the globe.

Ronald Reagan was a Presbyterian, and is beloved by Americans, and respected by people around the globe.

Lyndon Baines Johnson was a Disciple of Christ, and save for the 'Vietnam' deal(not entirely his fault), he used his powers to help mend racial intolerance, and lessen the income-gap in America.

Yeah, those dudes were real intolerant, Bible-thumping assholes...

Reread my post please. You shot and missed pretty bad.

Subject: Re: Firsts

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Thu, 08 May 2008 20:26:07 GMT

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

[LAWStarbuzz wrote on Thu, 08 May 2008 14:55]

Reread my post please. You shot and missed pretty bad.

I wasn't responding to your post, or anyone's in particular, really. If I did, I'd have quoted you, or anyone else.

I merely put that out there before someone came ringing in that an Atheist leader would automatically be better than anyone who was religious in any way, and in shape or form. I doubt that'll happen, but hey, it's happened before.

And dude, you really ought to tone down the attitude a bit. It only turns this stuff into stupid flame wars.

Subject: Re: Firsts

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 08 May 2008 20:35:25 GMT

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

Nikki, he doesn't like music (or, REAL music, requiring the use of musical instruments). It explains why he's so tense.

Subject: Re: Firsts

Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Thu, 08 May 2008 20:42:36 GMT

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

That's unneeded ad hominem, were someone to make a similar to statement to you, you'd label it as such immediately.

At the same time, Starbuzz, in attacking religion so strongly, you just look like a zealot without a banner to stand under.

Subject: Re: Firsts

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Thu, 08 May 2008 21:20:05 GMT

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

nikki6ixx wrote on Thu, 08 May 2008 21:26 I wasn't responding to your post, or anyone's in particular, really. If I did, I'd have quoted you, or anyone else.

It was obvious.

nikki6ixx wrote on Thu, 08 May 2008 21:26 And dude, you really ought to tone down the attitude a bit. It only turns this stuff into stupid flame wars.

What is responsible for flame wars? My attitude or your inability to control yourself in posting references to my attitude? There are certain "games" I won't ever play nice but I keep it logical. If you still can't stop complaining, then I believe the problem is not on my side.

cheesesoda wrote on Thu, 08 May 2008 16:35 Nikki, he doesn't like music (or, REAL music, requiring the use of musical instruments). It explains why he's so tense.

I thought you were more mature than this. I was wrong. Very wrong.

CarrierII wrote on Thu, 08 May 2008 15:42 At the same time, Starbuzz, in attacking religion so strongly, you just look like a zealot without a banner to stand under.

If I was truly attacking religion, I wouldn't be taking a neutral stand by indirectly defending the religious by referring to the art school student suspension case.

If I was mindlessly attacking religion, then why would I bring up the art school case? I could have simply based all my arguments on Blazer's Fox news link and started basing my arguments from there. Instead, I gave a unbiased (but stern) view of the problem in the first part of my post while a zealot would have ignorantly jumped the gun.

Subject: Re: Firsts

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 08 May 2008 21:58:57 GMT

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

You stated in another thread that you don't like instruments or anything to do with them. Music therapy is one of the most common and efficient forms of stress relief. Heaven forbid I suggest a reason as to why you always seem so uptight.

Subject: Re: Firsts

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Thu, 08 May 2008 22:00:45 GMT

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

[LAWStarbuzz wrote on Thu, 08 May 2008 14:33]

What is responsible for flame wars? My attitude or your inability to control yourself in posting references to my attitude? There are certain "games" I won't ever play nice but I keep it logical. If you still can't stop complaining, then I believe the problem is not on my side.

[LAWStarbuzz wrote on Thu, 08 May 2008 14:33]Why don't you go back and reread your post, retard. Make up your mind.

And like I said before, my post was not directed at you, or anyone. I put it in there, because we always get crap from people saying Atheists should be in power, and claim that 'religious' people in power are intolerant assholes.

Subject: Re: Firsts

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Thu, 08 May 2008 22:21:30 GMT

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

When did I say that religious people "in power" are "intolerant assholes"? I was talking about religious people. Period. And I did not say "asshole" either. Good job spinning everything I said, buddy.

Meanwhile, my original post stands unedited.

@ Cheesesoda: Anymore toys left in your pram to throw out?

Subject: Re: Firsts

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 08 May 2008 22:25:06 GMT

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

When the fuck did he ever say you said that? Oh, that's right, he didn't. You're just assuming that he's saying it towards you. He's already said it more than once that it was just said in general. Could it have been sparked by what you said? Probably, but that doesn't mean it's in response to it.
